

THE REASONS FOR MY FAITH

Class

3

No

147

Edward S. Ballenger

Date

Cost

BY W. W. FLETCHER

The Reasons for My Faith

**Adventist Heritage Center
James White Library**

This book originally from the Library of
A. F. and E. S. Ballenger

The Reasons for My Faith

By W. W. Fletcher

An Appeal to Seventh-Day Adventists,
Concerning Vital Truths of the Gospel

SYDNEY:
WILLIAM BROOKS & CO., LTD.,
35 PITT STREET.

1982.

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

BX
6155.4
F54
C. 2.

HER.

CONTENTS

Chapter.	Page.
Foreword	5
✕ I. The Main Questions at Issue Summarised ..	11
Report Adopted by the Australasian Union Conference Committee	30
II. Arguments against the First Proposition Reviewed	41
III. A Review of Positions taken against the Second Proposition	51
IV. How did the Levitical Priests "Bear the Iniquity of the Congregation"? ..	61
V. On the Third Proposition	72
VI. The Three Propositions Discussed in the United States	80
VII. In Recapitulation	102
VIII. The Relation of the Propositions to Questions of Prophetic Interpretation	106
✕ IX. The Cleansing of the Sanctuary	108
X. Further Difficulties involved in the Accepted Interpretation of the Cleansing of the Sanctuary	115
* XI. The Significance of the Services of the Day of Atonement	119
XII. The Meaning of the Two Apartments of the Earthly Sanctuary	128
XIII. The Relation of the Day of Atonement to the Judgment	137
XIV. The Nature of the Judgment of Rev. 14:7	142
XV. Consideration of the Judgment Described in the Seventh Chapter of Daniel ..	148
XVI. The Coming of the Son of Man to the Ancient of Days	155
XVII. An Appeal	161
XVIII. In Conclusion	169
Appendix	176

THE REASONS FOR MY FAITH

FOREWORD.

Since it became necessary for me to resign from the ministry of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, because of certain doctrinal views and convictions concerning our Saviour's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, there has been impressed upon me the necessity for the publication of a statement giving the reasons for my faith. I have received numerous inquiries for such a statement. Some inquirers are concerned about the same questions that have of recent years given me so much exercise of mind. Others, more or less acquainted with my ministry, are perplexed that one who has laboured for many years in the cause should now relinquish doctrinal positions so long held. There is a large number of fellow-workers in the homeland and in the mission fields with whom I have been brought into intimate contact; there are many who were students in my classes during the years spent at the Australasian Missionary College; many others are acquainted with my ministry in preaching and teaching at camp-meetings and other general gatherings, and in our churches; these all have a right to know the reasons for my faith; and I greatly desire that they should know them.

It would not be right for me to leave those who may hear of the stand I have taken to conclude, from hearsay or conjecture, that the underlying cause is some subtle doubt or unbelief on my part, or a departure from the great truths of the gospel or of the advent message, when such is certainly not the case.

I speak of "the reasons for my faith," because the stand I have felt constrained to take is a declaration of faith, and not of unbelief. I **believe** the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ. I **cherish** more ardently than ever the advent hope. It is of this faith that I desire now to testify.

There is of course, inevitably, something to be said on the negative side, in such a statement as

is contained in these pages. The belief of the truth naturally calls for the rejection of all that is opposed to the truth. But I seek here primarily to set forth the reasons for my faith concerning the position and work of our great High-Priest, Jesus the Son of God, in the heavenly sanctuary.

This faith is capable of expression in a simple and concise statement. I have endeavoured to set it forth in just such terms, and have been led from the beginning of this controversy to express it in the form of brief and easily understood propositions. These propositions, and a summary of the reasons for maintaining them, will be given in the first chapter.

There is, however, need also for a fuller statement. The subject of our Saviour's heavenly ministry is a deep one, and its consideration in detail is both necessary and helpful for the Christian. No apology is due, therefore, for the space here given to its consideration.

There are, moreover, certain theories concerning Christ's position and work in the sanctuary that have long been held and taught among us. The consideration of these is necessary and unavoidable if the reasons for relinquishing them are to be understood.

It seems best to present the whole matter in the order in which the developments occurred in my own experience; in the formation of new convictions, the urge to communicate these to the brethren, and the resulting discussions with union conference leaders in Australia, and general conference leaders in America. This method of presentation has at least this advantage, that it brings into bold relief the main points at issue, and permits in an easy and natural way the review of the various considerations and arguments that have arisen during the discussions.

New convictions were formed gradually during the three years, 1924 to 1926, that I served as Bible teacher in the Australasian Missionary College. I had returned from a period of service in the Southern Asia division, and was led by the very nature of my work at the college to make a closer study of our doctrinal positions than I had

been able to make while under the heavy pressure of field and administrative work.

In 1927 I again took up field work in connection with the Australasian union conference. During this year I continued prayerful reflection upon the subjects on which I had formed new convictions at the college. Finding that further investigation confirmed those views, I felt it to be my duty to speak to certain leading brethren regarding the matter. This I did during the latter part of 1928 and the earlier part of 1929.

Finding still no satisfactory confirmation of the accepted sanctuary teaching, I eventually, in August of 1929, wrote a formal declaration of my convictions to the president of the general conference. The president, in replying to my letter, referred the matter back to the Australasian union conference. I then asked the president of the union conference to give me opportunity to present my views before such of the leading brethren as he might select. This was immediately agreed to, and on the second of December of that year arrangements were made for me to speak to a group of leading workers. The outcome of that meeting was that the brethren requested me to state myself more fully than I had done in my letter to the president of the general conference, touching a number of subjects related to the sanctuary teaching, a list of which was given me. Time was allowed me for this work, and the fuller statement called for was handed to the president of the union conference on the seventh of February, 1930.

A meeting of the union conference committee was then held, and a sub-committee appointed to study and report on the statement submitted. The committee was called together again in April, and the report of the sub-committee received, and, with certain amendments, adopted. At this meeting I was invited to go to the United States of America, and study with the brethren there the questions at issue.

During my visit to America, I had interviews with the brethren at Washington, D.C., and at other places, in July and August of 1930, and met

in a series of meetings at the general conference office with a group of thirteen members of the general conference committee that had been appointed for that purpose.

A review of the leading features of these statements, reports, and discussions, will afford the reader the best opportunity of judging both the nature and importance of the questions under consideration, and of forming his own conclusions concerning them.

In the first chapter, the main questions at issue are stated as presented in my letter to the president of the general conference, in August, 1929. This is immediately followed by the report in reply adopted by the Australian Union Conference Committee, in April, 1930. The positions taken in this report are examined in several succeeding chapters. In the sixth chapter consideration is given to the report on the subject adopted by the specially appointed section of the general conference committee, at Washington, D.C., U.S.A., in July, 1930.

This review is presented under the solemn conviction that the teachings dealt with are important and vital, and that all should be given opportunity to study them. Much more is involved than mere questions of prophetic interpretation. There are certain fundamental facts and gospel truths that are of supreme importance. None of these must be contravened by any schemes or theories of prophetic teaching. And it is some of these fundamentals that are involved in the present discussion.

There are extant modern theories of the fulfilment of prophecy that contravene important gospel truths. Take, for instance, a well-known plan of the ages that denies the bodily resurrection of Christ. The bodily resurrection of the Saviour is explained away in order to accommodate that great fact to an accepted theory. This is all wrong. Our prophetic interpretation must be subordinated to the great gospel facts, and not the fundamental facts themselves modified in order to accommodate them to a theory of prophecy.

The apostle Paul's contentions and discussions

were in the main with reference to this very truth of the resurrection of the Messiah. Did Jesus Christ rise from the dead? or did He not? There was nothing the Jews could urge against him, said the apostle, "except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question before you this day." The governor, Festus, summarizing Paul's case to King Agrippa, said that the Jews "had certain questions against him of their own religion, and of one Jesus, who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive." It was evidently the supreme burden of the early apostolic preaching to testify to the great fact of the resurrection of Christ. "With great power gave the apostles their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all." Acts 4:33.

There must be something wrong with any theory (such as the one referred to above) that is out of harmony with the truth of the bodily resurrection of Christ, so unmistakably testified to in the New Testament, and so vital to the gospel. My Adventist brethen will, I know, readily agree with me in this.

But have we Adventists held theories that contravene in any measure some fundamentals of the gospel? I am afraid we have done that very thing in our sanctuary teaching.

It is one of the great facts of the gospel that Christ, after his death and resurrection, ascended to heaven and took his place at the Father's right hand. That place, in the immediate unveiled presence of Almighty God, is plainly taught in the scriptures to be the highest and holiest in all the universe. A scheme of prophetic interpretation which teaches that Christ did not enter upon his ministry in the Holy of Holies until 1844, is out of harmony with this important fact.

When Jesus Christ went in "to appear before the face of God for us," had He reached the place of ultimate holiness? or had He not? To teach that Christ did not take up his ministry in the Holy of Holies until 1844, at the very least obscures or minimises the significance of his unrestrained

access to the thrice holy presence of the Father from the time of his ascension.

And that is not all. There is an intimate connection between the **sacrifice** of Christ, his resurrection, and his ministry in the sanctuary. Misapprehension of the significance of the **position** taken up by Christ in the heavenly temple has been followed by a confusing interpretation of **the nature of the Saviour's ministry** there, and **its relation to the work accomplished on the cross.**

To help clear the ground on such subjects as these is the object of this publication. The writer prepares and sends forth these pages with feelings of great solemnity, and earnest prayer that God will by his Holy Spirit illuminate both himself and the reader with the blessed light of his glorious gospel.

W. W. FLETCHER.

P.O. Box 3062 N.N.,
Sydney,
Australia.

CHAPTER ONE.

THE MAIN QUESTIONS AT ISSUE SUMMARISED.

It has been said in the Foreword that it is the intention of the writer to present the matters discussed in these pages in the order of development in which they occurred. A brief and comprehensive statement of the doctrinal position, as the writer views it, may be obtained from the contents of a letter written to the president of the general conference, in August, 1929. This letter was the introduction to a series of discussions and a train of events that resulted in the writer's separation from the denominational ministry. It is not proposed here to reproduce the letter in full, or even to limit this chapter strictly to its contents, but only to present the arguments contained in it in a form suitable for the present purpose.

It seems best, while following the developments in the order in which they occurred, to avoid as far as possible all personal references, and to present only those facts that are necessary to give a clear view of the principles involved, and the positions taken in the discussions.

The letter referred to set forth three propositions or affirmations of truth, and presented arguments in support of them in substance as follow:

The Propositions.

1. That it was the immediate unveiled presence of God as manifested in the Holy Shekinah that constituted the inner apartment of the earthly sanctuary the most holy place, and that consequently when at the time of his ascension the Lord Jesus Christ sat down at the right hand of God, thus "appearing in the presence of God for us," He entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. There can be no place in heaven more holy than the place of the unveiled presence of Almighty God.

2. That in the typical service of the earthly sanctuary the sprinkling of blood upon the altar and before the veil represented the expiation of sin, and not its transfer into the sanctuary.

3. That it is necessary to modify our view that the Testimonies are to be regarded as having the authority of a direct revelation from God.

The First Proposition.

✓ In support of the first proposition it was maintained that the scriptures lay great stress upon the fact that when Jesus Christ ascended to heaven He was exalted at the right hand of the Father. See Mark 16:19; Acts 7:55, 56; Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 10:12, 13; 12:2; Pet. 3:22; Rev. 3:21. That this is the most highly exalted place in the universe, the place of the greatest power and influence, is stated over and over again. The place of the immediate presence of God must also beyond question be the place of the greatest holiness. We cannot conceive of any place more holy than that of the immediate presence of God.

The Old Testament record clearly shows that the supreme holiness of the inner sanctuary was due to the personal presence of Jehovah. "For **I will appear** in the cloud above the mercy-seat", is the reason urged upon Aaron and his sons for not coming at all times into the most holy place. Lev. 16:1, 2. "**There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat.**" Ex. 25:22.

All other places, persons, and things were holy, according to their relation to the Most Holy One who dwelt in the most holy place. Degrees of holiness were recognised, and a series of progressive restrictions imposed, in the approach to God, culminating in the exclusion of all but the high-priest from the innermost and holiest place of the sanctuary.

The land of Palestine was called the "holy land"; but it was not so holy as to exclude the Gentiles. Even within the "holy temple" the Gentiles were admitted. They were not however permitted to come within the court reserved for the Jews, unless they themselves "became Jews".

Then there was a point beyond which the Jews might not go, except by means of the mediating tribe of Levi. The Levites served between the people and the altar. But the Levites could not **minister** at the altar. Only the family of Aaron might serve there, and within the sanctuary.

And of the family of Aaron, only the high priest might enter the most holy place of all, the place of God's immediate presence.

The first apartment of the sanctuary was called the "holy place" because of its proximity to the "most holy place", the place of God's presence. The altar and the sacrifice were most holy because they were the means of approach to the presence of God.

Places or things can have no holiness in themselves. Their holiness springs from their proximity or relation to the Most Holy One. "The place whereon thou standest is holy ground", said the Lord, when Moses stood in his presence at the burning bush. It is impossible therefore that there should be a more holy place than the place of the immediate and unveiled presence of God. In the type that Presence was represented by the Holy Shekinah, in the innermost sanctuary. In the antitype, it was into that Most Holy Presence that Jesus went at the time of his ascension to heaven.

Are there degrees of exaltation and holiness in the heavenly places? If there are, Christ went at his ascension to the highest and holiest of them all. This seems unquestionably to be Paul's meaning when he says that Christ ascended "far above all the heavens". Eph. 1:10.* There was no higher or holier place beyond. Christ at once penetrated to the highest and holiest place in all the universe.

There is an unmistakable and indisputable connection between the highness of Christ's position in the heavens and the holiness of it. Both are due to his position at the right hand of the Father. God is "higher than the highest". Eccles. 5:8. Therefore to be as closely associated with Him as Christ is, is to be "far above all the heavens". But the supreme isolation of God's position, "higher than the highest", is inseparable from the holiness of his presence. The supreme isolation is in fact **due** to that holiness. So the Lord himself teaches us. "For thus saith the high and lofty One, that inhabiteth eternity, **whose name is**

* Quotations throughout are from the Revised Version, unless otherwise stated.

Holy; I dwell in the **high** and **holy** place." Isa. 57:15.

For the apostle to say that Christ has been exalted to the heaven that is "far above all the heavens", is therefore equivalent to his saying that Christ has penetrated to the holy place that is the holiest of all.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, what is spoken of in one place as the "sanctuary . . . which the Lord pitched", is elsewhere described as "heaven itself". Heb. 8:2; cp. 9:24. There is of course no reason why the two terms "heavenly sanctuary", and "heaven itself" might not be applied to one and the same place. The tabernacle which the Lord pitched must be inconceivably greater than that pitched by man; and while we may think of it as being **in** heaven, we are bound also to regard it as being in itself the heaven of heavens. The place where God dwells must be highest and holiest heaven.

That the apostle is thinking of the heavenly sanctuary when he speaks of "heaven itself", is evident from the fact that he uses the term in making a direct comparison with the earthly sanctuary. "For Christ entered not into a **holy place made with hands**, like in pattern to the true; but into **heaven itself**, now to appear before the face of God for us." Heb. 9:24. And we are assured in the epistle to the Ephesians, that this "heaven itself", this "sanctuary" to which Jesus went at the time of his ascension, is "**far above all the heavens**". This seems to be in direct conflict with the idea of a still holier place to which Christ could go some 1800 years later.

We have sometimes reasoned that as God's throne is represented in the scriptures as a living, moving thing, it is not to be thought of as being confined to the inner apartment of the sanctuary. At times the Lord met with both Moses and the children of Israel at the door of the tabernacle. This, however, does not by any means free our accepted teaching from the difficulties and objections referred to above. Whatever exceptions there may be, it cannot be denied that in the Old Testament the most holy place was regarded as

the place of God's presence, and that the whole sanctuary service centred there. The occasions when the Holy Shekinah was manifested elsewhere were the exception and not the rule. If in the antitype the presence of God was manifested continually in the first apartment of the sanctuary for a period of 1800 years, then what was a rare exception in the type became the rule in the antitype!

In the book of Revelation there is no reference to an intervening veil, dividing the heavenly sanctuary into holy and most holy places; but there is unmistakable evidence that the throne of God is represented as being in a position that would correspond to the holy of holies, and not to the holy place, of the earthly sanctuary.

The altar of incense in the earthly sanctuary was placed immediately before the veil that covered the most holy place and the presence of God. **"And thou shalt put it before the veil that is by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy-seat that is over the testimony, where I will meet with thee."** Ex. 30:6.

The heavenly altar of incense is, in Rev. 8:3; 9:13, said to be **"before the throne"**, and **"before God"**. This corresponds exactly with the above-quoted expressions, **"before the mercy-seat"**, and **"where I will meet with thee"**, and shows that the throne at which Christ ministered in the presence of God during the centuries covered by the seven trumpets prophecy, was in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. How then can we teach that during all that period Christ ministered in the holy place and not in the most holy?

The Rev. E. B. Elliott's note, reproduced in the "Source Book" (Art. Revelation, Book of, Scenery employed in), rightly states that the heavenly "temple proper, or sanctuary, was similarly constituted of the holy place and that most holy; save that there was no veil, as of old, to separate them."

In the epistle to the Hebrews we are given an important clue to the meaning of the inner veil of the earthly sanctuary. See Hebrews 10:19, 20. Here it is explained that the veil represents the

flesh of Christ. "Through the veil, that is to say his flesh."

The veil was not placed in the earthly sanctuary to keep men away from God, but to enable them to draw near. God directed that the tabernacle and veil be prepared that He might "dwell among" the children of Israel. Ex. 25:8. It was necessary that his presence should be veiled. But that veiling enabled God to draw near to men, and men to draw near to God. The purpose of the veil was not to divide between man and God, but to enable them to draw together.

The tabernacle as a whole was a type of Christ, with particular reference to his incarnation. "The Word was made flesh, and tabernacled among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father)". John 1:14, margin. Just as of old "the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle" (Ex. 40:35), and the people saw it (2 Chron. 7:2, 3); so in the antitype, when "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us", we saw "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. 4:6.

The veil of the sanctuary also was a type of Christ. In his heavenly ministry the incarnate Son of God is the Mediator between God and man. Christ meets man at the door of the sanctuary, and lays his hand upon him. Rev. 1:12-18. Within the sanctuary, in the holy of holies, He represents man in the presence of God. The first apartment of the sanctuary represents the manward aspect of the service,—God, in Christ, drawing near to man. The Holy of Holies stands for the Godward aspect of the service,—man, in the person of Christ, drawing near to God. In both cases the veil was in the typical service the medium of approach. So also in the antitype, the flesh of the incarnate Christ is the medium of approach for God in drawing near to man, and for man in drawing near to God.

While the passage in Hebrews just referred to gives the veil this application, the same epistle speaks again of the meaning of the division of the earthly sanctuary into two apartments. We are told in Heb. 9:1-12 that the Holy Spirit had a

definite lesson to teach in the distinctive services of the holy and most holy places, viz., "that the way into the holiest of all was not made manifest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." A.V. The true significance of the entry into the most holy place would not be grasped until the earthly sanctuary had served its purpose, and Christ had come to be the High-Priest of the greater and more perfect tabernacle, to enter into heaven itself, there to appear before the face of God for us.

It is evident that this is what the apostle means in this passage. He first describes the two apartments and their respective furnishings. See verses 1-5. He next summarises the work of the priests in the two apartments. Verses 6 and 7. He then declares (in verse 8) that the Holy Ghost intended by all this arrangement to teach that "the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing."

So long as the earthly sanctuary retained its standing, the fact that the services were confined almost entirely to the first apartment signified that full and free access to God was not yet obtained; but that, as represented by the entrance of the high-priest once a year into the most holy place, it would ultimately be obtained. And the lesson that the Holy Spirit would teach in this dispensation is, according to the same passage, that what could not be obtained through the services of the earthly priests, has been obtained for us through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and by his entry into the heavenly sanctuary on our behalf. For the apostle continues in the 11th and 12th verses of the same chapter, "Christ having come a High-Priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle . . . entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption."

Where have any of our people given an explanation of this scripture that would show the passage to be in harmony with our accepted position, that Christ did not take up his ministry in the most holy place until 1844? We have

attached a meaning to the two apartments of the earthly sanctuary that is entirely different from that which is expressly revealed in the epistle to the Hebrews! We constantly present an interpretation that is only inferred by us from the fact that the earthly sanctuary was a type or pattern of the heavenly. We practically ignore this important passage in the epistle which is the divine comment on the sanctuary service, a passage which claims to tell us **the way** in which the division of the earthly sanctuary into two apartments was a figure of the heavenly.

Not only is our interpretation in conflict with these express statements in the epistle to the Hebrews: it is out of harmony with all the epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the book of Revelation, which testify to the effect that Christ was at his ascension at once exalted to the highest and holiest place in heaven.

The Second Proposition.

Relating to the Expiation of Sin.

2. That in the typical service of the earthly sanctuary the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar and before the veil represented the expiation of sin, and not its transfer into the sanctuary.

Sin is an offence to God. Jehovah is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on perverseness." Hab. 1:13. Sin intervenes between the sinner and the Lord, preventing his approach into the divine presence.

In the typical service, the sprinkling of the atoning blood upon the altar and within the sanctuary, removed the offence, and opened the way for the repentent sinner to come to God.

In the antitype we have "boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus." Heb. 10:19. This holy boldness springs from knowledge that the blood of Christ has removed the sins of the believer, so that they no longer intervene between him and God. Boldness would not be warranted if sin were merely **transferred** to the divine presence, or deposited or recorded there by the blood.

Speaking of the typical system, the apostle says that according to the law "almost all things are

cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no **remission**". Heb. 9:22. This is equivalent to saying that through the shedding of blood there is remission. Now if sins are **cleansed** or **remitted** through the blood, that is the very opposite of their being **transferred, deposited, or recorded**.

It was "when He had by Himself **made purification** of our sins", that Christ "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Heb. 1:3. That is why we may now have "boldness to enter into the holy place **by the blood of Jesus**."

The Denominational Teaching.

The denominational teaching, however, is that sins are transferred to the sanctuary by the blood of the sacrifice, and accumulated there. Brother Uriah Smith speaks repeatedly of sin being "lodged in the sanctuary itself." He says:—

"There was thus a continual transfer of sins from the people to the offerings, and through them to the sanctuary, through the year." "Sin could not be allowed to accumulate in the sanctuary forever." "The daily ministration . . . was the means by which sins were borne into the sanctuary; the day of atonement reversed the process, and shows us the means by which they were borne out." "If sins were not there, considered as concrete things, and by Aaron's hands transferred to the head of the scapegoat, and with the goat borne away and lost in the wilderness, the record is fictitious and misleading." "Looking Unto Jesus", pp. 90-92, 97.

Sister E. G. White writes as follows:—

"As anciently the sins of the people were by faith placed upon the sin-offering, and through its blood transferred, in figure, to the earthly sanctuary, so in the new covenant the sins of the repentant are by faith placed upon Christ, and transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary. And as the typical cleansing of the earthly was accomplished by the removal of the sins by which it had been polluted, so the actual cleansing of the heavenly is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins that are there recorded." "Great Controversy", pp. 421, 422.

Sins are (in the passage quoted above), said to be "**transferred in fact to the heavenly sanctuary**", and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is said to be accomplished by "the removal, or blotting out, of the sins that are **there recorded**." There is, however, no true analogy between sin

itself and the record of sin. The **"record"** cannot be said to be sin **"in fact"**. There is a great difference between the two.

The man whose **sins** are blotted out will not need to be anxious about the heavenly **record**, for that is bound to reveal the fact that his sins, though many, are all forgiven.

The following paragraph is taken from **"Patriarchs and Prophets"**, pp. 355, 356:—

"In the sin-offerings presented during the year, a substitute had been accepted in the sinner's stead; but the blood of the victim **had not made full atonement for the sin**. It had **only** provided a means by which the sin was **transferred** to the sanctuary. By the offering of the blood, the sinner acknowledged the authority of the law, confessed the guilt of his transgression, and expressed his faith in Him who was to take away the sin of the world; **but he was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law**. On the day of atonement the high priest, having taken an offering for the congregation, went into the most holy place with the blood, and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, above the tables of the law. Thus the claims of the law, which demanded the life of the sinner, were satisfied. Then in his character of mediator the priest took the sins upon himself, and leaving the sanctuary, he bore with him the burden of Israel's guilt. At the door of the tabernacle he laid his hands upon the head of the scapegoat, and confessed over him 'all the iniquities of the children, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat'. **And as the goat bearing these sins was sent away, they were with him regarded as forever separated from the people.**" The preceding paragraph (p. 355) contains this statement:—"Not until the goat had been thus sent away, did the people regard themselves as freed from the burden of their sins." (Emphasis mine throughout.)

This all teaches plainly that all that the sacrifices accomplished was the **transfer** of sin, and not its expiation. We recognise of course that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins"; but that is not what Sister White means here, for she states that while the blood of one goat did not provide complete release from sin, the fate of the other goat did. And also she is speaking here of what was **represented** in the typical service. This is evident from the following paragraph:—

"The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, **was not to cancel the sin**; it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the final atonement; so in the type the blood of the

sin-offering removed the sin from the penitent, but it rested in the sanctuary until the day of atonement." Id. p. 357.

This statement is one that has troubled me very much. If sin is not cancelled by the blood of Christ, by what means then is it cancelled? If Christ's blood is only a means of the transfer of sins into the sanctuary, and then at a later stage of their transfer out of that place to be put upon the head of the anti-typical scapegoat, by what means are these sins finally brought to an end? Is it by the death of the scapegoat? Does the destruction of Azazel accomplish something that the death of Christ could not accomplish? We of course do not intend to teach that it does; and yet if it be true that the blood of Christ does not cancel the sin, but merely provides a means for its transfer into and out of the sanctuary, there is no place at which it can be said that sin is expiated until the death of the scapegoat occurs. Sister White seems to recognise this when she says, "Not until the goat had been thus sent away, did the people regard themselves as freed from the burden of their sins". Brother Smith says that the scapegoat "bore them away, and **with him they perished.**" "Looking Unto Jesus", p. 96.

With reference to the atonement, Brother Smith boldly declares that Christ "did not make the atonement when He shed his blood upon the cross", and adds, "Let this fact be fixed forever in the mind." "Looking Unto Jesus", p. 237. He attempts to justify this assertion by picturing Universalism or ultra-Calvinism as the only alternative positions for those who believe that the atonement was made upon the cross. It is difficult to understand how Brother Smith could have taken this position, in view of the fact that in Dan. 9:24 it is explicitly said that the Messiah would "make reconciliation for iniquity" within the seventy weeks, and not at the end of the 2300 days. In this clause the same Hebrew word (KAPHAR) is used that is translated "atonement" in Leviticus 16. Daniel declares that the atonement would be made within the seventy weeks. Brother Smith urges us to get it "fixed forever in our minds" that it was **not** made at that time!

Reverting to Sister White's statement that "the blood of Christ . . . was not to cancel the sin", it is refreshing to note that in a more recent publication one of our leading writers says that "It is **through the blood of Christ that all the sins of the believer are cancelled** and the righteousness of God is put in their place to the believer's account." "Christ Our Righteousness", p. 22. Thank God, this is true! Wesley expresses this truth in one of his hymns when he says that Christ "breaks the power of cancelled sin, and sets the prisoner free." This is in harmony with scripture. It is the sacrifice of Christ that "makes an end of sins, and makes reconciliation for iniquity, and brings in everlasting righteousness." Dan. 9:24. This great work was accomplished on the cross. There is a transfer of sins from the repentant believing sinner to the person of Christ, the sinner's substitute; but right there the process of transfer ceases, and the transferred or imputed sin is expiated in the death of the Saviour.

Sin **may** be transferred to a person. "The Lord hath **laid on Him** the iniquity of us all." "He hath **made Him to be sin** for us." But sin **cannot** be transferred to a **place**. Neither sin nor righteousness is ever imputed in the scriptures to places or things. **Holiness** is attributed to places or things, because of the presence or service of the Holy One, and places and things are said to be **defiled** because of the presence of sinners (Eze. 28:18; Gen. 3:17; Rom. 8:20-22; Isa. 24:5; Lev. 16:16); but sin itself is never said to rest in or upon places or things.

"The wages of sin is death". The law does not pursue the condemned after the execution of the death penalty. "The law hath dominion over a man for so long time as he liveth". Rom. 7:1. But with the death of the sinner, sin ceases to exist. "For he that hath died is justified from sin". Rom. 6:7. "Christ suffered in the flesh", even unto death; and "he that hath suffered in the flesh [i.e., unto death] hath ceased from sin." 1 Pet. 4:1.

In the "day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men" (2 Pet. 3:7), "fire comes down out

of heaven and devours them, and the devil that deceived them is cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20:9, 10. That is the end of sin for those who are lost. "The great controversy is ended. Sin and sinners are no more."

The saved, however, are saved because their sins come to an end in the death of their substitute, Jesus Christ. They do not look forward to a work that Christ **will do**, that will make an end of their sins; **they look back to a work that He has done**, in which they see their own death to sin, and thus an end of sins for them. Christ "his own self carried up our sins in his own body to the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24; margin), and, in his death, expiated them, made an end of them there. Dan. 9:24. Sin does not and cannot exist apart from the sinner, or as imputed to the sinner's substitute; and sin comes to an end with the death either of the sinner or the sinner's substitute. "**Ye died,**" says the scripture to the believer, "**Ye died with Christ**". "We", writes the apostle, "**died to sin**". Reginald Heber expresses this truth in the last lines of the following verse:—

"Bread of the world, in mercy broken,
Wine of the soul, in mercy shed,
By whom the words of life were spoken,
And in whose death our sins are dead."

To this view it might be objected that sin is (in Lev. 16:21, 22) said to be put upon the head of the scapegoat, and therefore must be transferred to him from the sanctuary. To this it would be sufficient to reply that "since Satan is the originator of sin, the direct instigator of all the sins that caused the death of the Son of God, justice demands that Satan shall suffer the final punishment." "Patriarchs and Prophets", p. 358.

The atonement for the sins of God's people is made with "the goat upon which the lot fell for the Lord", "the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people." Lev. 16:9, 15. The sprinkling of that blood does not represent mere transfer, but expiation. The casting back upon Satan of his own guilt in instigating the sin of mankind is a

separate act. Our idea of the transfer of sin has led us to make a rigid connection that does not necessarily exist between various acts in the sanctuary service.

If when Christ leaves the heavenly sanctuary He comes to earth bearing the sins of his people, to place them upon the head of Satan, how could the prophecy of Heb. 9:28 be true? Christ is there said to **appear** a second time **apart from sin**, in contrast with the time when He first **"appeared to put away sin"** by the sacrifice of Himself." Verse 26. A.V. It is I think generally recognised that Heb. 9:26-28 contains an allusion to the services of the day of atonement. The high-priest appears "once" (verse 26) to **put away sin** by the atoning sacrifice. He disappears within the sanctuary to present there the blood of the expiatory offering, and is thus for a time lost to the sight of the people. But soon he appears **"a second time"**, and this time **"apart from sin"**, and the people rejoice to see Him again, after the successful completion of his work in their behalf **"before the face of God."**

If our teaching about the transfer of sins were correct, Christ would come out from heaven bearing the sins He had removed from the sanctuary, to place them upon the head of the scapegoat. But this scripture expressly declares that when He appears the second time it will not be as a sin-bearer in any sense, but **"apart from sin"**. The fact that at that juncture Satan's "mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate" (Psa. 7:16) is not to be interpreted to mean that sins are **transferred** to him from the sanctuary.

Notice again the statement from "Patriarchs and Prophets", p. 356:—"Then in his character of mediator the high-priest took the sins upon himself, and leaving the sanctuary he **"bore with him the burden of Israel's guilt."** This cannot be harmonised with the express declaration of Heb. 9:28 that when our great High-Priest issues forth from the heavenly sanctuary He comes **"without sin"**, in direct contrast with his first appearing

when He "was once offered to bear the sins of many".

If, then, dear reader, you want to see the end of your sins, look to Calvary's cross. Do not look to the judgment, to the second coming of Christ, or to any present or future event. It is something Christ has done in the past, and not something He will do in the future, that brings your release.

"Look to the cross, sinner believe it,

Look to the cross, healing is there:

Pardon is thine, only receive it,

Look to the cross in prayer".

The Third Proposition.

With Reference to the Testimonies.

3. That it is necessary to modify our view that the Testimonies are to be regarded as a direct revelation from God.

Passages eliminated from some of Sister White's earlier visions, and the history of our movement from 1844 to 1851 show that our early pioneers held during that time the view that Christ's entry into the most holy place in heaven in 1844 meant that "the door was shut", and that there was no more salvation for sinners. It seems that Sister White unquestionably shared this view. I recognise that this in itself would not be a fatal objection to her claim to have received light by direct revelation from God. An instrument of the Lord might hold mistaken views, as prophets and apostles did in their time. It would not be consistent with inspiration in the highest and fullest sense, however, for mistaken views to be taught in what purported to be a revelation from heaven. And the early records show that Sister White did teach the "shut door" doctrine, even in the relation of visions that were thought to be of divine inspiration.

The record of the very first vision, as it was originally published, contained the following passage:—

"Others rashly denied the light behind them, and said that it was not God that had led them out so far. The light behind them went out leaving their feet in perfect darkness, and they stumbled and got their eyes off the mark and lost sight of Jesus, and fell off the path down in the dark and wicked world below. It was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the City, as all the wicked world which God had rejected. They fell all along the path one after another, until we heard the voice of God like many waters, which gave us the day and hour of Jesus' coming."

The sentence printed in bold type was afterwards eliminated, and does not appear in the current edition of "Early Writings." One can only conclude that this sentence taught that the world outside the Advent people was a rejected world, and that the salvation of Adventists who once "fell off the path" was also "impossible." The conclusion is inevitable that it was for this reason that the passage was eliminated, when, in later years, the brethren modified the "shut door" teaching.

There are other evidences that Sister White taught the "shut door" doctrine in the early days. On page 45 of "Early Writings" there is the following statement:—

"My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked but could not see it; for the time of their salvation is past."

This again expresses the then prevalent conviction that there was no more salvation for sinners. The explanatory notes appended do not succeed in giving the passage a reasonable appearance of having another meaning, especially when two eliminated sentences, immediately preceding, are taken into consideration.

On page 55 of "Early Writings", referring to the time when Jesus arose and transferred his ministry to the most holy place, there is another statement reflecting the same view, where it is said:—

"I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness."

This teaches that no more light came to the careless, unbelieving world, after Christ made his supposed change of position in the heavenly sanctuary.

The same chapter speaks of those who did not receive the advanced light as bowed down before the throne in the holy place, oblivious to the fact that Christ had now entered the most holy place, with the result that their prayers were not accepted. It is difficult to see the force of this, when it is remembered that the Christians of that time, and during all the preceding centuries had always believed Christ to have been in the most holy place from the time of his ascension. They

had all along been directing their prayers to Him there. I doubt if any intelligent Christian at that time would, if asked, have agreed to the idea that Christ was in the holy place and not in the holy of holies. How then could they be consistently represented as looking to Christ in the first apartment?

The fact that Sister White was thus seriously mistaken in her earlier version of the sanctuary teaching, is sufficient indication that we are not bound to accept her revised teaching on that subject as necessarily authoritative. The facts concerning the earlier experience, when known, explain in quite a large measure why it is that so much difficulty is found in reconciling the present teaching with the holy scriptures. The original teaching was mistaken, and so also is the revised teaching. The original teaching was not the result of direct revelation from God, and neither is the revised teaching divinely inspired. I do not charge Sister White with a deliberate intention to deceive, in her claim to be the channel of direct revelations; but I cannot but regard that claim as a mistaken one.

Sister White's experiences and those of the pioneers in this movement must be subjected to the supreme authority of the word of God itself. We dare not hold to certain interpretations of scripture simply because the pioneers received great blessing and apparently made great advancement with the work while holding those views, and because the views seem inseparably connected with what have appeared to be God's leadings. Both the doctrine and experience of the church must be tried and brought back to normal by being tested by and subjected to what is revealed in the Bible.

Closing Remarks.

It may seem that to relinquish the position that we have held so long regarding the sanctuary is tantamount to a repudiation of the whole spiritual experience through which Seventh-day Adventists have passed. I do not take that view; although I deeply sense the gravity of the ques-

tions here raised, and the seriousness of our position when the sanctuary teaching is effectively challenged. I have received too much of blessing in my own experience among this people to permit me to repudiate the whole, because of what I believe to be a mistake in prophetic interpretation. It was among the Adventists that I experienced conversation. It was the preaching of the advent message, and the results seen in the lives of those who sought to obey it, that made the first deep and lasting impressions upon my mind, and led me to yield my heart to God. What growth in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord I have made since that time has been largely contributed to by my association with godly men and women I have met in the movement, and by other Adventist brethren whose books and messages I have read.

The teaching concerning the second coming of Christ and its nearness has changed the whole current of my life, and made me entirely unwilling to live for this present world; but satisfied rather to confess myself a stranger and a pilgrim here, waiting for the return of my Lord from heaven. This blessed hope has not diminished; but is more dear to me than ever before.

That we should have been at all mistaken in the interpretation of prophecy, although disappointing and perplexing, is no ground for dismay or discouragement. Eve thought that the promise of the coming Seed was being fulfilled in the birth of her firstborn. Was her ardent expectancy in vain? No indeed! for she did through the birth of Seth become the mother of the promised Deliverer. So it has always been with regard to the fulfilment of prophecy. It has ever been necessary for the church to be willing to receive additional light, and even to profit by the lessons learned from her own mistakes. Is the church to be despised because in the ardour of her love for her Lord and of longing for his appearing she cherishes some mistaken anticipations of the fulfilment of prophecy? God forbid! This ardent, waiting, longing, anticipating church is most dear to the heart of Christ. Feeling this

most deeply I have no disposition to value lightly the inestimable blessings that I have received and still hold through my connection with the advent movement, even though I feel compelled to change my views in some important respects concerning the priestly ministry of our Lord.

In matters of faith, the humblest of God's children is bound to exercise his judgment according to the best light the Lord has given him. I do this in the fear of God. I must some day render an account to Him that called me to this stewardship, and I desire above all things to finish my course with joy, and the ministry that I have received of the Lord Jesus.

I therefore make this frank declaration of my convictions to my brethren, with the earnest desire that it be used of God to lead to a clearer apprehension of vital truth in connection with our Saviour's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.*

* The president of the general conference having referred the matter of the writer's communication with him back to the Australasian union conference for official action, the union conference committee eventually adopted a report endeavouring to refute the doctrinal positions taken. This report is reproduced in the following pages in order to acquaint the reader with the positions maintained in defence of the accepted sanctuary teaching. A few closing paragraphs, bearing upon questions of prophetic interpretation not dealt with in these pages, are omitted. Otherwise the report is reproduced in full. The positions taken on the main propositions under discussion are reviewed in chapters immediately following.

**REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE
APPOINTED TO CONSIDER POSITIONS OUTLINED
BY PASTOR W. W. FLETCHER,**

**AS ADOPTED BY THE AUSTRALASIAN UNION CON-
FERENCE COMMITTEE, APRIL 9, 1930.**

The committee first dealt with the three main propositions of Brother Fletcher, as stated in his letter to Pastor W. A. Spicer, President of the General Conference, under date of August 25, 1929; and now submits its findings as under:—

Proposition No. 1.

“That it was the immediate unveiled presence of God as manifested in the Holy Shekinah that constituted the inner apartment of the earthly sanctuary the Most Holy place, and that consequently when at the time of his ascension the Lord Jesus sat down at the right hand of God, thus ‘appearing in the presence of God for us,’ He entered the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. There can be no place in heaven more holy than the place of the unveiled presence of Almighty God.”

We do not believe that it was “the immediate unveiled presence of God” alone that constituted the inner apartment of the Sanctuary the “Most Holy Place”; but that the inner apartment was so designated by God Himself because of the nature of the work carried on therein; and because of its containing the sacred law, which is declared to be holy, perfect, etc., and which is the basis of His government and the standard of the judgment; and because that in that apartment was typified the consummation of the great controversy between good and evil, in which the very character of God is involved, and He Himself is on trial before the universe.

A. Brother Fletcher’s position is based on the assumption that Aaron and his sons were urged not to enter the most holy place at all times, because God had said, “There will I meet with thee”. Ex. 25:22. If the fact of God’s meeting with the priests or people constituted such place of meeting “the most holy place”, then the court must also have become the “most holy place”, because God promised to meet there with His people:—“There shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord; where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee. And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by My glory.” Exodus 29:42, 43.

Again the same reasoning applies to the “tabernacle of the congregation”, or first apartment, where God promised to meet with the priests. Exodus 30:36. See also Num. 17:4.

Further, we read that the presence of God filled the whole of Solomon’s temple. 1 Kings 8:11. The same is said of the whole tabernacle. Exodus 40:34, 35. Yet this

manifestation of God's presence did not constitute the whole structure "the most holy place"!

B. It is further assumed from the wording of Rev. 8:3, 4.—"Another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it . . . upon the golden altar which was before the throne."—that there is no veil in the heavenly sanctuary, because the golden altar is said to be "before the throne".

This is not in harmony with the record of Exodus 30:6-8. The altar was to be put before the veil which separated it from the ark; yet when Aaron offered incense upon it, it is said that he did this "**before the Lord**", the veil being there notwithstanding.

That the words "before the Lord" do not necessarily mean "the immediate unveiled presence of God", is seen from the following passages:—

Lev. 10:1, 2. Nadab and Abihu were slain "before the Lord," while offering strange fire. This was not in the most holy place.

Lev. 9:23, 24. Fire came from "before the Lord" and appeared unto all the people in the outer court.

Exodus 23:27. "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord God."

Exodus 27:21. "In the tabernacle of the congregation without the veil which is before the testimony, Aaron and his sons shall order it (the lamp) from evening to morning before the Lord."

C. "On the right hand of God."

When it is said in Heb. 8:1.—"Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens",—location is not stressed, but degree of exaltation, and place of honour. This is parallel to the expression in Heb. 1:9. "Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." See also Acts 2:33; Matt. 20:20-23.

D. Opening of the Temple in Heaven.

Rev. 15:5. "The temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened." This opening resulted in "the ark of His testament" being "**seen in His temple**," (Rev. 11:19) and indicates the drawing aside of something which had hitherto **obstructed** John's view of the ark. We do not need to conjecture as to what that something was, for the type makes this certain—it was the veil!

If the fact that the veil is **not mentioned** in Revelation proves that there is no veil in the heavenly Sanctuary, then the argument is sound that because the fourth commandment is not expressly repeated in the New Testament, the Sabbath is no longer in force.

E. "After the Pattern."

We are told in Heb. 8:5 that Moses was instructed "to make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee (him) in the Mount". The word "pattern" in the original signifies "a die, a print, a model for imitation, a resemblance, figure, form, likeness, similitude."

Fifteen times Moses was told that he was to make all things "after the pattern" shown him in the Mount.

Exodus 40:16-24 records the completion of the tabernacle and the Lord's acceptance of it, signified by His glory filling it. Eight times it is stated that Moses completed each detail "as the Lord commanded Moses"; and the record concludes, "so Moses finished the work."

Then the veil must have been a copy of the original in heaven; "for see, saith He, that thou make **ALL** things according to the pattern shewed thee in the Mount." Heb. 8:5.*

Proposition No. 2.

Covering Section I. and Section XX.

In Pastor W. W. Fletcher's Written Statement.

Expiation and Not Transfer.

The Cleansing of the Sanctuary.

The Relation of the Day of Atonement to the Judgment..

"That in the typical service of the earthly sanctuary the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar and before the veil represented the expiation of sin, and not its transfer into the sanctuary."

We believe that the daily service and daily offerings of the typical Sanctuary effected the **transfer only** of sins to the priesthood and to the "tabernacle of the congregation", or first apartment of the Sanctuary; and that their **expiation** was not fully accomplished until the annual service on the Day of Atonement, for the following reasons:—

A. The Outline of the Daily Service.

1. The sinner brought his offering to the court and was met at the altar of burnt offering by the priest. The offender then confessed his sin, and by his own hand slew the victim. Lev. 4:22-24, 27-29.

2. The priest then sprinkled the blood upon the altar of burnt offering, poured out the rest of the blood at the bottom of that altar and burned "his fat upon the altar." Lev. 4:25, 26, 30, 31.

3. "The priest shall make an atonement for him . . . and it shall be forgiven him." This was done in the two cases referred to above, viz.: that of the "ruler" and that

* Moses was shown "a pattern", not "the original in heaven". The pattern called for pillars, and curtains, and fillets, and sockets, and for four distinct awnings or coverings. Were there such as these in heaven? No one will suggest that there were, or are, or that they even represented any particulars or arrangements of the heavenly sanctuary. The brazen altar of sacrifice was one of the things made "according to the pattern"; but there is no such altar in heaven. Neither are we to conclude that there are two rooms in heaven, separated by a veil, simply because the pattern shown Moses called for such on earth. The epistle to the Hebrews explains for us the significance of the veil, and of the division of the sanctuary into two apartments. The tabernacle and priesthood as a whole provide "a copy and a shadow of the heavenly things." This does not warrant our insisting that things in heaven must conform to all the mechanical arrangements of the earthly sanctuary. W.W.F.

of "one of the **common people**" by the priests eating certain portions of the flesh of the victim, (Lev. 6:26, 29) in the court.

4. In these cases the blood was not taken into the Sanctuary proper. Only when a priest sinned and brought his offering was this done, or when "the whole congregation of Israel" was involved in a sin of ignorance. Lev. 4:3, 7, and Lev. 4:13, 18. In all of these instances the flesh was **not to be eaten**, as the atonement was made, within the first apartment, by sprinkling the blood on the **golden altar** of incense. Lev. 6:30. There was to be no duplication in making the atonement. In the one case the transfer was made in type to the officiating priest; in the other the transfer was made to the altar of incense. Both the priests and the altar thus became defiled by the guilt of the transgressors.

5. The priesthood, by eating the flesh of the sacrifice, were said "to **bear** the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord." Lev. 10:17; Num. 18:1; Exodus 28:38.

6. In the majority of cases the burden thus rested on the priesthood;—it was only in exceptional cases in which the priesthood was involved in the sin, that the transfer was made by blood to the altar within the Sanctuary. It is evident that if the service indicated a transfer of guilt to the priesthood, it also indicated a transfer of guilt to the altar of incense when the blood was sprinkled thereon, for atonement was made for both, on the Day of Atonement.

7. The sinner who did not confess, bore his sin upon him. Lev. 5:1. Similarly a sin of ignorance until discovered and confessed involved full responsibility. "Yet he is guilty and shall **bear** his iniquity." Lev. 5:17. The word "bear" in these cases is the same as that used in the above paragraph, No. 5.

B. The Service of the Day of Atonement.

1. On the tenth day of the seventh month a further transfer was made. The daily service throughout the year had been increasing the burden of **imputed guilt** borne into the Sanctuary. Now the time had come for its removal.

2. Robed in his significant garments; wearing the breastplate of judgment (Exodus 28:29) which bore the names of the twelve tribes; having put on the mitre upon which was "a plate of pure gold" engraven with the words "Holiness unto the Lord"; the High Priest took incense (Lev. 16:12) and the blood of the bullock (Lev. 16:11) and entered the Most Holy place. There upon the mercy seat he sprinkled the blood of the bullock seven times. Then leaving the Sanctuary, he killed the goat for the sin offering—which the casting of lots had selected "for the Lord" (verse 8), and "for the people" (verse 15),—and took in its blood—there being no mention of incense on this occasion—to accomplish the work of cleansing.

3. He next proceeded to make an atonement for the Most Holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, for the altar,

for himself, his household, and for all the congregation (Lev. 16:16-19). Since this atonement for the altar is said to "cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleanness"; we are, we believe, justified in concluding that **cleansing** is implied for the Sanctuary by the "atonement". This we believe is the intended meaning of the expression "reconciling" and "making atonement."

4. When he had "made an end" of this work (verse 20) he came out "the second time", and confessed over the head of the scapegoat the sins of the people—a **further transfer** of guilt—representing the placing upon Satan of his responsibility as instigator and originator of "all the sins that caused the death of the Son of God."

5. In the details and surroundings of the services of the Day of Atonement, we have all the elements of judgment—the Judge, the law, the transgressor (represented in the person of the priest, who appears as his advocate), the plea of guilt indicated in the blood: the witnesses, as pictured by Daniel, millions of angels; the sentences, exonerating the repentant transgressor and condemning the instigator and originator of sin.

C. New Testament Evidence.

1. It is generally recognised that all the typical offerings found their fulfilment in the one offering of Christ. In place of repeated sacrifices both daily and yearly, "by **one offering** He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10:14. Thus it was impossible for either the offerings singly, the priests or the high priest individually, to typify accurately and completely His perfect offering and work. Consequently as the complete typical service was intended to teach and to represent the **whole** of God's plan for the forgiveness of the repentant, and for the punishment of the unrepentant, we cannot look for a complete transaction in any one phase of the service. Hence it is that the sin offering **did not completely expiate the guilt**. The sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law until the type was completed on the Day of Atonement; for the blood did not reach the mercy seat over the law until then. Heb. 10:1-3 makes this clear. Had the personal sin offering brought immediate and complete release, "the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a **remembrance again made of sins every year**. The yearly service was required to complete the transaction in the type. In the antitype the expiation of guilt is complete in the one act of confession, and the exercise of faith in Christ; for "through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins" (Acts 13:38), and "if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to **cleanse** us from all unrighteousness." 1 John 1:9.

The word used in the original for "cleanse", in 1 John 1:9, is identical with that used in Heb. 9:23, "purified", and Heb. 9:14 and 22, "purge your conscience" and "purged with blood". It occurs also in Acts 15:9, "purifying your hearts".

The same original is translated "cleanse" in Eph. 5:26 and Jas. 4:8. In every instance it has to do with sin. This makes it clear that "the heavenly things themselves" are defiled by sin. What are they to be cleansed from, if not from sin?

Christ's offering was at once the antitype of the daily sin offering and the yearly sin offering on the Day of Atonement. The blood of Christ thus does release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law;—but inasmuch as the responsibility for the act of sin primarily belongs to Satan—and this Christ cannot assume—cancellation of the sin does not take place when man's guilt for participation in it is borne away from him by the Saviour. The responsibility must remain to be at last laid upon Satan, the originator of the act. Christ takes full responsibility for the cancellation of the life record of the repentant sinner, when his case comes up in the judgment.

2. "Christ the Sin-bearer."

The work of Christ foretold by Isaiah is thus described by Matthew: "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." The Hebrew word used in Isaiah 53:4, 12 is the same word as is used throughout Exodus and Leviticus where reference is made to the priests bearing the iniquities of Israel. The Greek word used in Matthew is the equivalent of this Hebrew word, and is defined by Young:—"To bear, to take up, to carry". Bagster's "Analytical Greek Lexicon" gives a further definition of this word "**Bastazo**" thus: "To bear as a burden, to endure, to suffer, to sustain."

There seems no ground for the translation of the Greek word "epi" in 1 Peter 2:24 by the word "to" in the English Revised Version, instead of the word "on" in the A.V., A.R.V., Moffatt, Derby and the Douay. The general use of the word "Epi" in the New Testament is "on", or "upon", as in Matt. 4:5. "On a pinnacle of the Temple." Matt. 5:15. Mark 4:21. "On a candlestick." Matt. 5:39; Luke 6:29. "On the right cheek." John 1:33. "Spirit remaining on Him." "Epi" is translated "on", one hundred and fourteen times; and "upon", one hundred and five times. There are several other translations, "to" being among them, but the context makes such translation clear.

3. When did Christ take the burden of our sins?

Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The Prophet Isaiah declared, "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows . . . the chastisement of our peace was upon Him . . . and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all . . . My righteous servant shall justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities." Here the work of the sin-bearer is foretold; but does Isaiah indicate when Christ was to assume or take up the burden? He does:—"He shall divide the spoil with the strong; because He hath poured out His soul unto death: and He was numbered

with the transgressors." By His death on the cross, He sealed His acceptance of the load of the world's sins. He carries the sins of all who accept His sacrifice, until the antitypical Day of Atonement—"Seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. 8:25. "For He hath made Him to be sin for us." 2 Cor. 5:21.

Paul clearly presents this thought in Heb. 9:26-28. The ultimate of Christ's work is to "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." In the typical service, when the sinner slew the offering he had brought, he by that act acknowledged that he himself was worthy of death—"It is appointed unto men once to die." But that this was not the full end is indicated by Paul's next words, "but after this the judgment." The priest accepted the transfer of his guilt, made atonement for him, and bore the guilt until the Day of Atonement.

Paul then draws his conclusion of the lesson from the types:—"So Christ was once offered to bear (as did the priest) the sins of many [those who accept His mediation;] and unto them that look for Him [those who claim His advocacy for them in the judgment] shall He appear the second time **without sin** unto salvation."

If sin was cancelled at the cross, there is no need for a scapegoat. The typical service, however, provided one, which is proof that the sin was not cancelled at the altar of burnt offering which is the equivalent of the cross. The sin was finally atoned for in the most holy place in the type, so it will be finally atoned for, not at the cross, but in the true tabernacle in heaven before the "ark of His testament", which John saw in vision.

4. Christ's Qualifications.

In order to bear our sins, Christ had first to take human nature. Deut. 18:18; Ruth 2:20; Ruth 3:9; Gal. 4:4; Heb. 2:17; Gal. 4:15; Heb. 5:2. Then He must have something to offer. Heb. 8:3. There was no blood to offer until He died on the cross. He must also be inaugurated as priest. This took place after His resurrection. Thus there could be no service in the heavenly Sanctuary before His ascension. It is impossible from this standpoint for Christ's work to have been completed on the cross. Moreover, all the typical sacrifices are declared in Col. 2:17; and Heb. 10:1, to be shadows of things to come, not shadows of a service then being carried on in the sanctuary in heaven.

5. The Atonement and the Judgment are Associated in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

"For if we sin wilfully . . . there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment." Heb. 10:26, 27. These verses closely associate the thought of Christ's sacrifice with the thought of a judgment. The following verses present "Moses law"—the old covenant; and the Son of God who provided "the blood of the

covenant", i.e., the new covenant. The typical Day of Atonement revealed who had accepted God's means of salvation provided in the offering of "the Lord's goat", which had to be brought by the people, and was received by the high priest, in the first place; and by "the affliction of soul" of those who sincerely participated in the atonement, in the second place. Thus it made a separation of Israel into two companies: him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not. This was clearly a judgment, deciding the destiny of each member of the congregation of Israel. Similarly the "Lamb's book of life" will reveal in the antitypical Day of Atonement, (or the investigative judgment) who will be among "the sheep" and who will be among "the goats",—on Christ's right hand or on His left,—and will decide their destiny for eternity.

That the typical service in the Most Holy Place of the earthly Sanctuary on the Day of Atonement, typified judgment is clearly indicated in the following passage:—

"When he goeth in before the Lord . . . Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." Exodus 28:30.*

On the Day of Atonement only those who had previously brought their sacrifices, and that day by faith took part in the service, were justified. In the investigative judgment only those who have claimed the blood of Christ as their means of forgiveness and who maintain their faith in Him unto the end will have their names retained in the "Lamb's book of life." 1 Peter 4:17; Rev. 21:27.

6. Cancelling Sin at the Cross would free Satan.

If at the time of offering in the type, and at the time of confession under the priesthood of Christ, the sin is cancelled, Satan would thus be freed from his responsibility as originator and instigator of such sins.

The cancellation would free both parties—Satan and the sinner—though only the latter had confessed, and accepted the Substitute. Therefore it is utterly impossible for God, at the moment of forgiveness, to cancel the sin that has been forgiven. If He did, He would make the Saviour not

* This is a most fallacious argument. Ex. 28:30 does not have reference to the services of the day of atonement, but to the continual or daily ministration. The text plainly says so. "When he goeth in before the Lord . . . continually." Would this make every day of the year a day of judgment? Certainly not. The sixteenth chapter of Leviticus seems moreover to indicate that the high priest did not wear the breast-plate and other glorious garments when entering the most holy place, but only certain specified linen garments. See verses 4, 28, 24, and 32.

The breast-plate was called the breast-plate of judgment because it was the means of obtaining counsel, judgment, or direction from the Lord. The title had no connection whatsoever with an investigative judgment such as the report seeks to suggest.

For scriptural instances of the sense in which the breast-plate was used as a means of making known the judgments or decisions of the Lord, see Num. 27:21, and Ezra 2:68. See also "Patriarchs and Prophets", chapter 30, para. 28 (p. 351). W.W.F.

only the sinner's substitute, but the devil's substitute as well.* The sin has been borne away from the repentant sinner never to return to him, because the Substitute stands responsible for his guilt, as the priesthood bore the sins of Israel in the type—"He hath made Him to be sin for us." In becoming our Substitute, He has made Himself responsible also for placing the penalty of **instigating** sin upon the devil. This responsibility He will discharge when "He shall appear the second time **without sin** unto salvation," for the sins of God's people will then have been blotted out, and He will execute upon Satan the sentence of the "Judge of all the earth", and Satan, the antitypical scapegoat, will be for one thousand years confined to the desolate earth, pending his final destruction in the lake of fire.

Proposition No. 3.

"That it is necessary to modify our view that the Testimonies are to be regarded as having the authority of a direct revelation from God."

A. We believe that the testimonies of Sister White are to be regarded as a direct revelation from God, for the reasons which will follow. At the same time we are not to regard them as being an addition to the Bible; for she herself states they are not to be so regarded:—"Brother R. would confuse the mind by seeking to make it appear that the light God has given through the testimonies is an addition to the word of God: but in this he presents the matter in a false light." Vol 5, p. 663. Nor can we regard them as presenting new doctrines, for she says:—"The written testimonies are not to give new light, but to impress vividly upon the heart the truths of inspiration already revealed . . . additional truth is not brought out; but God has through the testimonies simplified the great truths already given, and in His own chosen way brought them before the people, to awaken and impress the mind with them, that all may be left without excuse . . . The testimonies are not to belittle the word of God, but to exalt it,

* Is this true? This is a very strongly worded passage; but sometimes emphatic declamation is necessitated because of the weakness and unavailability of the positions taken.

My own guilt and Satan's responsibility for my sin, are two entirely separate and distinct things. Satan will suffer whether the sinner repents or not. He is equally guilty whether the sinner repents or not. The perfect and complete remission of my sin does not in the slightest degree release him. This is true whether my release is described as pardon, remission, cancellation, or whatsoever term may be used.

Here is a youth who has been enticed into an offence by an habitual criminal. Both are charged before the court; but their cases are dealt with separately. The young man pleads guilty; but, by the governor's intervention is granted a free pardon. Will that free the instigator of the crime? Of course it will not.

The two offences are separate and distinct. The one criminal committed the crime, although he did not instigate it; the other instigated the crime, although he did not commit it. Each is guilty of his own particular offence, or part in the offence, aside altogether from the offence of the other. The guilt of the one does not have to be preserved and store up somewhere in order to prevent the other from escaping punishment. No human court would take such a view. Why should we reason as though God were less wise than man?

and attract minds to it, that the beautiful simplicity of truth may impress all." Vol. 5, p. 665.

B. Direct Revelations from God.

We are given a clear test of the gift of prophecy in Jer. 23:18-22, from which we quote: "For the latter days ye shall consider it perfectly. I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in My counsel, and had caused My people to hear My words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings." Herein lies the work of the true messenger of God: (1) To stand in God's counsel, (2) To cause His people to hear His word, and (3) To turn them from their evil ways. These three features have always marked the work of Sister White, and her testimonies demonstrate by their teaching, and their effect that they are of God.

"If you had made God's word your study, with a desire to reach the Bible standard and attain to Christian perfection, you would not have needed the testimonies." Vol. 5, p. 665.

"Then, to leave men and women without excuse, God gives plain and pointed testimonies, bringing them back to the Word that they have neglected to follow." Vol. 5, p. 663.

"I was directed to bring out general principles, in speaking and in writing, and at the same time to specify the dangers, errors, and sins of some individuals, that they might be warned, reproved, and counselled." Vol. 5, p. 660.

"The Lord has seen fit to give me a view of the needs and errors of His people. Painful though it has been to me, I have faithfully set before the offenders their faults, and the means of remedying them." Vol. 5, p. 661.

This counsel meets fully the three tests laid down in Jeremiah. An unbiassed reading of the writings of Sister White will reveal that they are in full harmony with the counsel contained in these four citations.

C. Her Own Statements as to the Source of the Testimonies.

"I have no special wisdom in myself; I am only an instrument in the Lord's hands to do the work He has set for me to do. The instructions that I have given by pen or voice have been an expression of the light that God has given me. I have tried to place before you the principles that the Spirit of God has for years been impressing upon my mind and writing on my heart." Vol. 5, p. 691.

"God has raised you up, and has given you words to speak to the people and to reach hearts, as He has given to no other one. He has shaped your testimonies to meet cases that are in need of help . . . In order to be God's special instrument you should lean on no one, but hang upon Him alone, and, like the clinging vine, let your tendrils entwine about Him. He will make you a means through which to communicate His light to the people." Vol. 5, p. 667.

SECTION XV. PAGES 36, 37 OF MSS. THE TERM "SANCTUARY".

We find no ground whatever in scripture for giving to the word "Sanctuary", as it occurs in Dan. 8:14, such a meaning as "The sacrificial service or priestly ministration, and the city with which the Sanctuary was associated." Nor do we find any justification for the view "that the people and the city are included in that word 'Sanctuary' as used in this verse." Heb. 8:1, 2, and Heb. 9:1, 8-11 show that the true tabernacle is in heaven. Rev. 11:19 and Rev. 15:5 present the heavenly sanctuary as seen by John in vision. This is the only sanctuary in existence at the close of the 2300 days, that is in 1844.

We therefore hold it to be scriptural to apply the expression "cleansing of the Sanctuary", which we all agree is an event to begin in 1844, to the work in "the Sanctuary of the New Covenant," that is the heavenly.

SECTION XVII., PAGE 71, OF MSS. THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS.

After consulting and comparing many versions and translations of the New Testament, we are convinced that the rendering of Revelation 19:10, Revelation 12:17, and Revelation 1:9, in the form "the testimony of Jesus" is correct and satisfactory, and therefore that the interpretation of these verses which we have been giving for over fifty years is the correct one: namely, that the expression "the testimony of Jesus" "indicates the manifestation of the prophetic gift in the remnant church".*

* The report here conveniently ignores the fact that the expression, "the testimony of Jesus" occurs also in Rev. 20:4. "I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God . . . and they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years." R.V. In the Greek the passage here rendered "the testimony of Jesus" in the R.V. is precisely the same as in the places in Rev. 19:10; 12:17, and 1:9 to which the brethren refer. The passage in Rev. 20:4 refers to the martyrs slain during long ages of persecution, and cannot be taken to indicate "the manifestation of the prophetic gift in the remnant church". This shows conclusively that we have been giving the wrong interpretation to the expression in the other places in which it occurs.

The brethren speak of the present accepted interpretation as one "which we have been giving for over fifty years." It is well for the reader to know that fifty years ago a different construction was placed upon the passage even by James White, and his wife, Ellen G. White.

On page 9 of his tract entitled "Christ in the Old Testament", No. 16 of "Bible Students' Library", Old Series, James White says:—

"When the angel said to John in Patmos, The Testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, he meant more than expositors generally suppose. His words reach far back to the days of fallen Adam when the plan of salvation was instituted, and embrace the prophetic Word of both Testaments".

James White and Ellen G. White, in their book, "Life Sketches", edition of 1880, p. 335, wrote as follows:—

"We now inquire, What is the testimony of Jesus? The angel gives John the answer in the broadest signification. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Rev. 19:10. The spirit, soul, and substance of prophecy, is the testimony of Jesus Christ. Or, the voice of the prophets relating to the plan and work of human redemption, is the voice of the Redeemer. Christ undertook the work of redemption, and who should inspire a book on the subject but the Redeemer himself?"

CHAPTER TWO.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE FIRST PROPOSITION REVIEWED.

In the report adopted by the Australasian Union Conference Committee, the brethren, in reply to the position taken in the first proposition (that it was the immediate unveiled presence of God that constituted the inner apartment of the sanctuary the most holy place) state that they "do not believe that it was 'the immediate unveiled presence of God' alone that constituted the inner apartment of the Sanctuary the 'Most Holy Place'", and assign three additional reasons for the special sacredness of that apartment. This means that they recognise that the presence of God **was one** of the reasons for the holiness of the place; but consider that there were other factors contributing to that holiness. That is, that it was the holiness of God's presence, plus three other things. They maintain that the inner apartment was most holy "because of the nature of the work carried on therein; and because of its containing the sacred law . . . and because that in that apartment was typified the consummation of the great controversy between good and evil . . ." p. 30. Is this right? Can anything besides the divine presence contribute to the holiness of the place where God is? Let us examine the three supposed additional causes of holiness assigned by the report, and see.

1. "The Nature of the Work Carried on Therein."

What was "the nature of the work carried on" in the most holy place? The whole service in that apartment is described in five brief verses of Lev. 16.

"And he [Aaron] shall take a censer full of coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil: and he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not: and he shall take the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy-seat on the east; and before the mercy-seat shall

he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times. Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with his blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat: and he shall make atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins." vv. 12-16.

What was there in **the work** thus described, that made **the place** more holy than any other? It consisted in the burning of incense, and the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering. Did not the priests burn incense in the first apartment? and was not the blood of the sin-offering sprinkled there, and outside the sanctuary, at the brazen altar? Was it the work within the veil that made the place more holy, or was it the place that gave the work its special significance?

"For whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that hath sanctified the gold?"

"For whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?"

The same **work** carried out in some other **place** than the one appointed, and sanctified by the Lord's presence, would not make such other place holy.

"Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tent of meeting, to sacrifice it unto the Lord; even that man shall be cut off from his people." Lev. 17:8, 9.

The offerings whose blood was brought within the veil on the day of atonement were sin-offerings. There were three distinct places where the blood of the sin-offering was presented, in differing circumstances. (1) The blood of the sin-offerings of individuals among the rulers or the common people was put upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and poured out at the base of that altar. Lev. 4:25, 30, 34. (2) The blood of the sin-offerings of the priests, and of the congregation as a whole (which included the priests) was sprinkled seven times before the veil of the sanctuary, put upon the horns of the altar of incense, and poured out at the base of the altar of burnt-offering. vv. 6, 7, 17, 18. (3) The blood of the sin-offerings of the day of atonement was

sprinkled seven times upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat in the most holy place. Ch. 16:14, 15.

The significance of all this is obvious. The people and their rulers might not approach nearer to the divine presence than the altar of burnt-offering. The priests, who were sanctified for the purpose, might, for themselves and for the people, approach to the golden altar before the veil, but no nearer. Only the high priest might, for himself and for the people, approach the mercy-seat within the veil. That was the supreme accomplishment of the mediatorial service.

The degrees of holiness were not determined by the nature of the work that was carried on (for it was in all cases the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering), but by the places in which that work was done. The significance of the work was in each instance influenced by the place in which it was performed. And in all cases the place drew its holiness wholly from its degree of nearness to the personal presence of Jehovah. Places and things can have no holiness in themselves. Greater restrictions were imposed upon the approach to the golden altar of incense than upon the approach to the brazen altar of sacrifice, not because one was of gold and the other of brass, nor because of the greater splendour of the way through the sanctuary; but because of the comparative nearness to the divine presence. That presence was indeed in itself the reason both for the greater splendour and the increasing seclusion that reached its climax in the innermost apartment.

The gold does not sanctify the temple; but the temple sanctifies the gold. And what, in turn, sanctifies the temple, and makes it possible for the temple to sanctify the gold? It is the personal presence of Jehovah. "He that sweareth by the temple, sweareth by it, and **by him that dwelleth therein.**" Matt. 23:21.

So that to say that the most holy place was "so designated . . . because of the nature of the work carried on therein" only serves to emphasise the truthfulness of the first proposition; because the work referred to consisted in the sprinkling of the

blood of the sin-offering in the divine presence, and **drew its special significance from that presence.** Remove that presence (or the symbol of that presence, as we are speaking of the typical service) and the work immediately loses its special significance. We are therefore led right back to the fact that "it was the immediate unveiled presence of God as manifested in the Holy Shekinah that constituted the inner apartment of the earthly sanctuary the most holy place."

2. "Because of Its Containing the Sacred Law".

The same is true of this suggestion, as of the one just considered. The law draws its sacredness from its Author. It is holy because He is holy. It is holy because it is the transcript of his character. There is nevertheless a great deal of difference between the law and its Author, in this matter of holiness. God is the **source** of holiness; but the law is not. The law defines and demands holiness; but is utterly incapable of imparting the holiness which it demands. God alone is able to **impart** holiness.

The law is in the sanctuary **demanding** holiness, and God is there **diffusing** holiness. From which then does the holiness of the most holy place proceed? And if holiness is communicated to that place by the presence of the One who is the **source** of holiness, is the holiness increased, or even contributed to by the presence of the **demand** for holiness?

It is true that the demands of that "fiery law" emphasize the danger threatening the sinner, should he seek to draw near to the sacred presence of the thrice holy God. The great purpose of the service of the sanctuary was to show that God would in mercy avert that threatening danger, and provide for man a way of approach. Blessed be his name, He has accomplished that purpose! The blood of Jesus Christ has been sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, satisfying the claims of the holy law, and we are now invited to "draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace."

But the inner apartment of the sanctuary was most holy simply and solely because God was

there, without any additional contribution of holiness because of the presence of the law.

3. "The Consummation of the Great Controversy".

The third additional reason assigned for the special holiness of the inner apartment, is that "in that apartment was typified the consummation of the great controversy between good and evil." What do the brethren mean by this? If they had said that **the services of the day of atonement** included a representation of the final outcome of the conflict between good and evil, the statement would have been more accurate. But those services were not by any means confined to the most holy place. The sin-offerings were presented and slain outside the sanctuary altogether. See Lev. 16:6, 7. These represented the victory of good over evil that was won through the death of Christ. That victory was potentially complete the moment Christ died. It is "through death" that he destroys "him that had the power of death, that is the devil." Heb. 2:14. But the full fruition of that victory over Satan is to appear at Christ's second advent. "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." Rom. 16:20. The chief reason for the delay in "the consummation of the great controversy" is that opportunity may be provided, while Christ is in the most holy place, for men to be saved from the wrath to come.

But the victory over Satan gained by the death of Christ, and the final binding of the great adversary and the casting of him into the abyss, are both represented as taking place **outside** the sanctuary, "at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation"; the first represented by the death of the goat that was "for the Lord", and the last by the sending away into the wilderness of the goat that was "for Azazel".

It is worthy of note that these two acts of the high priest were the first and last acts of the services of the day of atonement (except of course the presentation of the personal sin-offering of the high priest), and that it was **between these two acts** that he ministered in the unveiled presence

of God in the most holy place. This gives a comprehensive view of the whole saving ministry of Christ. The priest first offers the sacrifice for sins outside the sanctuary. He enters within, and presents the merits of the atoning blood "before the face of God". Christ does this throughout the whole Christian dispensation. He issues forth from the sanctuary at his second advent, and carries into effect the victory already gained over the great adversary, by casting him into the abyss, and finally into the lake of fire. "The great controversy is ended. Sin and sinners are no more."

So that "the consummation of the great controversy" between good and evil takes place, not inside the sanctuary at all, but outside, and cannot be assigned as a reason for the special holiness of the most holy place.

What then becomes of the three additional causes of holiness assigned by the brethren? They are found to be not even contributing causes of holiness in this instance. We are led right back to the fact of the immediate presence of Almighty God **alone**, as the one incomparable and all-sufficient cause of the supreme holiness of the most holy place.

"There I will meet with thee".

In its next paragraph (p. 30), the report points out that the promise "there I will meet with thee", or its equivalent, was applied to God's meeting with the children of Israel at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation (Ex. 29:42, 43), with the ordinary priests at the altar of incense before the veil (30:36), as well as with the high priest in the most holy place (25:22). This is quite true. But what is the significance of these facts? The Lord met with the children of Israel at the altar of burnt offering, because that was the nearest point to which they were permitted to come, in approaching the divine presence. He met the ordinary priests before the veil, because they were not permitted to approach any nearer than the veil. In these instances God accommodated himself to the circumstances of the people, and met them where they might meet him. But in doing

this, and in speaking thus, it was well understood that God met them there **as from his special abiding place in the holiest of all**. Thus we have God meeting man at those places where by special appointment men were permitted to meet Him. But when the high-priest went into the most holy place, we have man going in to meet God, which is a very different thing. And this is the very thing that Christ did, when after his ascension He went in "to appear before the face of God for us". This is just what the typical service represented by the entrance of the high-priest into the most holy place on the day of atonement.

"I will appear".

What about the other statement, in Lev. 16:2, in which the Lord says, **"I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat"**? The report seems to ignore this. And yet it is a more direct statement than the one above-mentioned, in its bearing on the question under consideration. In this passage the Lord expressly assigns his personal presence as the reason why the high-priest might not ordinarily come within the veil.

"Come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, before the mercy-seat . . . **for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat.**"

This plainly teaches that the most holy was the place of God's abiding personal presence. This is in harmony with the testimony of all scripture. "Thou that sittest upon the cherubim, shine forth," says the psalmist. Psal. 80:1.

Continuing their report, the brethren say:

"Further, we read that the presence of God filled the whole of Solomon's temple. 1 Kings 8:11. The same is said of the whole tabernacle. Exodus 40:34, 35. Yet this manifestation of God's presence did not constitute the whole structure 'the most holy place!' " pp. 30, 31.

But that manifestation of the divine presence **did** constitute the whole structure for the time being the most holy place.

"Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting [i.e., the first apartment] because the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle."

At the dedication of Solomon's temple:

"It came to pass, when the priests were come out of the holy place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so

that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord."

The priests were unable to enter even into the first apartment at this time, for the same reason they were unable to enter into that apartment on the annual day of atonement. On that day, the hand of the high-priest lifted the intervening veil, thus in a sense throwing the two apartments for the time being into one. That is doubtless why it was expressly forbidden that any of the ordinary priests should on that occasion be found in the first apartment.

"And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting when he goeth in to make atonement in the holy place, until he come out." Lev. 16:17.

When, at the dedication of the tabernacle in the wilderness, and of the temple at Jerusalem, the manifestation of the divine presence filled both apartments, the effect was the same. The two apartments were virtually thrown into one. The priests were therefore unable to enter. So glorious was the manifestation that even the high-priest and Moses were unable to enter.

There is One, however, who **has been able** to enter a glory far surpassing that manifested at the dedication of the earthly temple. The Son of Man has been brought near before the Ancient of days. Thanks be to God for such an high priest! who is "able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him."

The report continues again as follows:—

"It is further assumed from the reading of Rev. 8:3, 4,— 'Another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it . . . upon the golden altar which was before the throne.'—that there is no veil in the heavenly sanctuary, because the golden altar is said to be 'before the throne'.

"This is not in harmony with the record of Exodus 30:6-8. The altar was to be put before the veil which separated it from the ark; yet when Aaron offered incense upon it, it is said that he did this 'before the Lord', the veil being there notwithstanding." p. 31.

The brethren seem here to take the position that there is a veil intervening between the golden altar and the throne in the heavenly sanctuary. Well, if that be so, Christ was **on that throne within that**

veil during the time represented by the seven trumpets prophecy. It is evident that we are up against the whole testimony of the Bible in trying to evade that fact, and that we become more and more involved in difficulties and inconsistencies in trying to prove otherwise.

"Location is not stressed".

The report maintains that "When it is said in Heb. 8:1.—'Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens,'—location is not stressed, but degree of exaltation, and place of honour." p. 31, Section C.

The trouble is, however, that in **our** teaching concerning the sanctuary, **location is stressed**, a very great deal, and it is this very feature that has brought us into such serious difficulty. We cannot deny that we have placed the emphasis upon the **location** of the ministry for the first 1810 years, and a **different location** subsequent to 1844.

And as a matter of fact location **is** stressed in the passage in Hebrews referred to, and in numerous other scriptures. When we read that Christ is "at the right hand of God", "in the midst of the throne", "before the face of God", "far above all the heavens", etc., do not all these expressions lay emphasis upon location? They certainly do. It is the **location** that signifies "the degree of exaltation and place of honour." And let us humbly admit that the location referred to involves also the **supreme degree of holiness**, for we cannot reverently doubt it, or deny it.

I do not write these things in a contentious spirit. Whatever perplexity we as a people are involved in as a result of having taken a mistaken position is my perplexity as well as that of my brethren. I feel the position deeply and keenly. "There can be no place in heaven more holy than the place of the unveiled presence of Almighty God." No one has ventured to dispute the truth of this statement. The brethren are afraid to do it. They reverence God, and feel instinctively that it is not to be disputed. That is just how I felt when I first saw the ministry in the heavenly sanctuary in that light. I felt afraid to think of any place more holy than that of the presence of the infinite God. And I am afraid now to talk too

freely about that blessed presence, or to speak of it as a mere argument in a contention or dispute. It is not my intention to do that in what I am now writing. I am just trying to give my own personal testimony of faith, and to state in all humility the chief reason for my present convictions. I cannot adhere to a teaching that conceives of an apartment called "the most holy place", separated from the place to which Jesus went to commence his mediatorial ministry at the time of his ascension, for He undoubtedly at that time entered the unveiled presence of Almighty God, and there could be no more holy place beyond.

CHAPTER THREE.

A REVIEW OF THE POSITIONS TAKEN AGAINST THE SECOND PROPOSITION.

That in the typical service of the earthly sanctuary the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar and before the veil represented the expiation of sin, and not its transfer into the sanctuary.

To this proposition the brethren in the report under consideration made the following reply:—

"We believe that the daily service and daily offerings of the typical Sanctuary effected the **transfer only** of sins to the priesthood and to the 'tabernacle of the congregation', or first apartment of the Sanctuary; and that their **expiation** was not fully accomplished until the annual service on the Day of Atonement . . ." p. 32.

The report goes on to give the reasons which are held to warrant this conclusion. The reader is invited to consider first of all the main position taken, in the teaching of the report as to the time at which Jesus Christ acts as man's sin-bearer. The following is a summary of the position on this point taken by the brethren:—

"By his death on the cross, He [Christ] sealed His acceptance of the load of the world's sins." p. 36, para. 1.

He did not discharge, or put away that load or burden by his work on the cross; He merely by his death "sealed his acceptance" of it. That this is what is intended is indicated by the very next sentence:—

"He carries the sins of all who accept His sacrifice, until the antitypical Day of Atonement."

Having "sealed his acceptance of the load . . . He carries" it, or some portion of it, "until the antitypical Day of Atonement."

In the next paragraph this sentence occurs:—

"The priest accepted the transfer of his [the sinner's] guilt, made atonement for him, and bore the guilt until the Day of Atonement."

This is said in discussing the priesthood of Christ as the antitype of the Aaronic priesthood. The sub-heading for the section reads,—"**When did Christ take the burden of our sins?**" p. 35. The whole argument is therefore intended to show "**when**" Christ "**took**" (not put away) the burden of our sins. And the position is taken, that having

assumed that burden at the cross, and having then "sealed His acceptance of the load He carries [it] . . . until the antitypical Day of Atonement."

The conclusion is then stated that "the **ultimate** of Christ's work is to '**put away sin**' by the sacrifice of Himself" (p. 36, para. 2) ; meaning, as the whole context shows, that Christ, having at the cross assumed the load of sin, carries it throughout the whole of his ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, until the antitypical day of atonement (which is understood to commence in 1844), and then, at that time, or after that time, ultimately puts it away. This would doubtless mean that the load of sin is not yet put away, for the putting away would probably be the last act of "the antitypical Day of Atonement" (according to the view advocated in the report), and not the first.

That this is a correct summarization of the teaching of the report is borne out by the deductions drawn from certain aspects of the typical service. In that connection it is taught:—

1. That the priesthood, by eating the flesh of the sin-offering, were said to "bear the iniquity of the congregation . . .". Section A, para. 5 (p. 33).

2. That "in the majority of cases the burden thus rested on the priesthood", and that "it was only in exceptional cases in which the priesthood was involved in the sin, that the transfer was made by blood to the altar within the Sanctuary" (i.e., the golden altar of incense). Para. 6.

3. That "the daily service throughout the year" had thus "been increasing the burden of **imputed guilt** borne into the sanctuary." Section B, para. 1. This would mean, of course, that the burden of imputed guilt was increased particularly upon the priesthood, for it has already been said that "in the majority of cases the burden rested on the priesthood" and "it was only in exceptional cases . . . that the transfer was made . . . to the altar" of incense. Section A, para. 6.

4. This all leads to the conclusion that on the annual day of atonement "the time had come for **its removal**", i.e., the removal of the increasing burden of imputed guilt from the priesthood and from the altar. Section B, para. 1.

In all this there is a clear correspondence between (1) what is held to have been done by the typical priests, in assuming the burden of sin by eating of the flesh of the sin-offerings, carrying that imputed burden in their own persons throughout the year, and finally obtaining relief from it, or ridding themselves of it on the tenth day of the seventh month, in connection with the services of the day of atonement; and (2) the work attributed to Christ, in which He is said to assume the load of the world's guilt at the cross, to carry it throughout his heavenly ministry, and to put it away in the antitypical day of atonement, on the 22nd day of October, 1844, or at some time subsequent to that date.

Is this a correct analysis of the Bible teaching of the work of God and of Christ in dealing with sinners, and in putting away sin? Is this a correct explanation of the services of the sanctuary, and the work of the priesthood, in type and antitype?

When did Christ bear our Sins?

The scriptures make such plain statements as to the time at which Christ bore the sins of men, that there can be no excuse for misunderstanding them. I cannot adequately express my surprise and regret that any of our brethren should take the position maintained in this report, that Christ bears the burden of sins throughout the whole Christian dispensation. Nothing but the exigencies of a mistaken theory could have led them to do it. Let us now review the simple, straightforward, and unmistakable testimony of scripture relating to the question.

"So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin." Heb. 9:28.

Why was Christ offered? To bear the sins of many. When did He bear the sins of many? When He was offered. No argument is needed to show that this is the meaning of the text. No one without some axe to grind would ever make anything else out of it. If (as in the report) the question is asked, "When did Christ **take** the burden of our sins?" this text makes no reply.

It is not speaking of when Christ **took** the burden, but of when He **bore** it. And it definitely states that it was **in the act of being offered** that Christ "**bore the sins of many**".

There is a very similar statement in Peter's first epistle.

"Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit." 1 Peter 3:18.

In Hebrews it is "Christ . . . once offered". According to Peter, Christ "suffered for sins once". In Hebrews, Christ was offered "to bear . . . sins". According to Peter, Christ "suffered for sins". In Hebrews, Christ bore sins when He was "offered". According to Peter, Christ suffered for our sins by "being put to death in the flesh."

In an earlier passage in the same epistle the apostle Peter writes of Christ, "Who his own self **bare our sins** in his body **upon the tree**." 2:24. How did Christ bear our sins? In his own body. Where did Christ bear our sins? On the tree. When did Christ bear our sins? When He was on the tree.

If (as in the report) the question is asked, "When did Christ **take** the burden of our sins?" this passage also makes no reply. It is not speaking of when Christ **took** the burden: but it does discuss how, and when, and where He **bore** those sins.

Let us now consider a passage from the second epistle to the Corinthians. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses." 5:19. If God did not reckon their trespasses to the world of men, to whom did He reckon them? Evidently He imputed them to Christ. This, then, must be that "**burden of imputed guilt**" spoken of in the report. Is this act of God in reckoning the sins of men to Christ spoken of as past, present, or future? It is spoken of as in the past. "God **was** in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." Does then this scripture harmonize with the conception that Christ, in his priestly work in the heavenly sanctuary "carries the sins of all who accept his sacrifice, until the antitypical Day of

Atonement" in 1844? It does not at all harmonize with such a conception; for it places wholly in the past the imputation of the world's sins to Christ. When was God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself? It was when Christ suffered on Calvary's cross. It was **then** that God "made his soul an offering for sin." Isa. 53:10.

The same passage in the epistle to the Corinthians contains in a later verse the following statement: "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin in our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." Verse 21.

This scripture touches the depths of the profound mystery of Christ's sin-bearing. During those awful hours on the cross, the Father treated the Son, who knew no sin, as though He were the very embodiment of sin. He did it **for us**: that we might escape the wrath due to us as sinners, and that we might we made the righteousness of God in Christ. That was an awful ordeal. Thank God it is over! The holy God cannot endure the presence of sin. Sin cannot be brought into his sacred presence. It belongs to the place of outer darkness. In that outer darkness, sin and sinners will finally perish. Christ passed through that darkness, when He bore our sins on the cross. It was **then** that the Father "made Him to be sin for us", that we might be spared that awful separation from the presence of God.

To speak, then, of Christ "carrying the sins of all who accept His sacrifice" throughout the long period of his ministry in heaven is a grave error. When Christ bore sin, He had to bear it away from the Father's presence, not into that holy presence. And so He did, thank God, and made an end of it in that outer darkness.

This leads us to another scripture, with a meaning similar to that of the passage just considered. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. 3:13. "Becoming a curse for us" is closely related to being "made to be sin for us". And it was when He was **bearing sin** for us, that He was "made to be sin for us," and thus "became a curse

for us". These passages all undoubtedly refer to the same great work, the atonement on the cross, as a completed work, as the efficient cause from which all the subsequent work of salvation springs. Notice how all these scriptures unite in placing the work of sin-bearing in the past.

"Christ . . . **having been once offered** to bear the sins of many."

"Who his own self **bare** our sins in his body upon the tree."

"Because Christ also **suffered** for sins **once**."

"God **was** in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."

"Him who knew no sin He **made** to be sin in our behalf."

"Christ redeemed us . . . **having become** a curse for us."

It is wrong for any man to attempt to change the testimony of all these scriptures into the present or future tense.

It might be objected that in Matt. 8:17 it is stated that in his works of healing the sick and casting out devils, Christ fulfilled that "which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases", and that therefore the sin-bearing cannot be regarded as confined to the time of the Saviour's suffering and death.

When Christ was "made in the likeness of men" He had already greatly humbled Himself. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah seems to contemplate Christ's lowly life and walk from his youth up, as well as his atoning death. The prophet speaks of his growing up "as a tender plant", of his acquaintance with sorrow and grief. In all that ministry Christ identified Himself with our sufferings, and was affected by all the conditions of men. "O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I bear with you." Matt. 17:17.

But the actual sin-bearing is always spoken of as pertaining to the sufferings associated with the cross.

According to the epistle to the Phillipians, Christ first of all emptied Himself of his glory, and

"was made in the likeness of men". He was thus "touched with the feeling of our infirmities". But there was another awful step before the Son of man, something that impelled Him to cry, "Father, save me from this hour", although He knew that for this very hour He had come into the world. The thought of that final ordeal kept his soul "straightened, until it should be accomplished." "Being found in fashion as a man", it was necessary for Him to still further humble Himself, and become "obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross." It was thus not simply death that He faced, but "the death of the cross". And the death of the cross involved something far more awful than mere humiliation and physical pain. He was hung on the tree as one accursed of God, for our sakes. He was "made a curse for us". God imputed our sins to Him: "made Him to be sin for us". He thus "bore our sins in his own body **on the tree.**"

Behold Him, there, upon the cross! Who among men could imagine this to be the Chosen of God? "His visage" is "so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men." It seems to those who stand by that He must be "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." "In his humiliation his judgment was taken away: his generation who shall declare? For his life is taken from the earth". Acts 8:33.

This, then, is the climax of his humiliation. At last He is able to cry, "It is finished". I am glad that it is finished; and so also, I know, are all those who love Him. Let no one therefore theorize about his bearing sin any longer. His form is no longer bowed, nor his visage marred. The blood-sweat has been wiped from his brow forever. It was the sin-bearing that caused us, as well as God, to "hide as it were our faces from Him." Now that that awful and yet glorious work is fully accomplished, the body of his humiliation has been changed into a body of glory. And the time will come when we also, who believe in Him, shall be similarly changed, and made like Him, as He now is. For "we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of

our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory." Phil. 3:20, 21.

"The Ultimate of Christ's Work."

There is another important statement in the report to which we must now give attention. After taking the position that "by his death on the cross" Christ "sealed his acceptance of the load of the world's sins", and that "He carries the sins of all who accept his sacrifice", the brethren go on to say that "the ultimate of Christ's work is to **'put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.'**" p. 36, para. 2. The **ultimate** is, of course, the final result, the last step, the conclusion. This means that in heaven Christ "carries the sins of all who accept his sacrifice, until the antitypical Day of Atonement", and then **ultimately**, in 1844, or many years thereafter, **puts away those sins**, by the sacrifice of Himself.

That this is what is meant is confirmed by the appeal to the type which follows immediately in the same paragraph, concluding, "The priest accepted the transfer of his guilt, made atonement for him, and bore the guilt until the Day of Atonement."

Reference is made to Heb. 9:26-28 as supporting this teaching. Let us examine that scripture. Verse twenty-six reads, in part, "But now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." A.V. From this it is evidently concluded that the act of "putting away sin" is something that takes place "in the end of the world", and that this therefore is done in 1844, or subsequently. The "end of the world", however, does not in this instance mean the last days of the world's history. The Revised Version translates this clause, "At the end of the ages"; and the marginal reading is, "at the consummation of the **ages**". This is not the same as "the consummation of the **age**" spoken of in Matt. 24:3 (R.V. margin), in which the disciples connected that phrase with the second coming of Christ. There is a difference between "the consummation of the **age**", and "the consummation of the **ages**". We may speak of the consummation

of any age, Christian, Levitical, Antedeluvian, or any other. But when we speak of "the consummation of the ages", we must mean either the consummation of all dispensations, or at least of a number, or series of dispensations.

That the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews regarded the ministry of Christ at his first advent, and his sacrificial and atoning death as the consummation or climax of all the ages, is clear beyond the shadow of a doubt. The apostle refers to it in similar terms in his epistle to the Galatians. "But when **the fulness of time came**, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law." Gal. 4:4. The "consummation of the ages", and the "fulness of the time", as used in these scriptures, apply to the same time, and to events connected with the first advent of Christ.

That the apostle Paul regarded the period that had witnessed the first advent of Christ and its glorious events as the climax of the ages, is further illustrated in his epistle to the Corinthians. "These things happened unto them [in former dispensations] by way of example; and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the **ends of the ages** are come." 1 Cor. 10:11. Those "upon whom the ends of the ages" had come were the people of Paul's own day and generation. The phrase is just as applicable to our own time, it is true; but it must be admitted that Paul applied it to the age in which he lived. The reasonableness of this is of course self-evident. The first advent of Christ **did** mark the climax of the ages. And the sacrifice of the cross **always will be** so regarded, both in time and in eternity.

The apostle's meaning is moreover abundantly clear from the passage in Heb. 9:26 itself. What **event** was it that marked "the consummation of the ages"? At that time Christ was "manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself". **When** was Christ "manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself"? When He was "offered to bear the sins of many", on Calvary's cross, some nineteen hundred years ago. What **time**, then, does the apostle refer to as "the consummation of the ages"? Undoubtedly to the time, some nine-

teen centuries ago, when Christ "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."

To make the "putting away of sin" refer to a supposed antitypical day of atonement in 1844 is an absolute contradiction of the teaching of the text. The apostle says, "**Now . . . hath** He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." The work was past and completed in Paul's day. The apostle John uses almost the same words, thus,—"**And ye know that He was** manifested to take away sins." 1 John 3:5. Christ's work of putting away sin is always spoken of in the past tense.

The report teaches that the **ultimate, or last step**, of Christ's work, is to "**put away sin** by the sacrifice of Himself." The very opposite of this is true. The putting away of sin is **the initial or first step** of Christ's great work of salvation. So the scriptures plainly teach.

"This man, **AFTER He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever** sat down on the right hand of God." That is, it was **after** He had offered the sacrifice for sins that He entered upon his ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

"Who . . . **WHEN HE HAD** by Himself **purged our sins**, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Heb. 10:12; 1:3. A.V.

CHAPTER FOUR.

HOW DID THE LEVITICAL PRIESTS "BEAR THE INIQUITY OF THE CONGREGATION."?

The report seeks to build up a theory that the priests in the earthly sanctuary bore throughout the year an increasing load of guilt, because they ate of the sin-offerings of the people. Reliance is placed upon Lev. 10:17, as a support for this theory.

"Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord." A.V.

In order to understand what is meant in this scripture by the priests "bearing the iniquity of the congregation", it is necessary to compare the passage with other similar instructions governing the sanctuary service. For there is a **series** of directions to the priests and Levites in which they are said to "bear iniquity" in connection with the sanctuary and its services. Take for instance the following:—

1. **To both priests and Levites:** "Thou and thy sons and thy fathers' house with thee shall bear the iniquity of the sanctuary." Num. 18:1.

2. **To the Levites:** "The Levites shall do the service of the tent of meeting, and they shall bear their iniquity." Verse 23.

3. **To the Priests:** "Thou and thy sons with thee shall bear the iniquity of your priesthood." Verse 1.

4. **To the High-Priest:** "And Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the holy things." Ex. 28:38.

A careful study of these passages will show that they refer to the responsibility that came upon the priests and Levites for the care of the sacred things, and for the proper discharge of the services. If anything were neglected, or went wrong, they were responsible. It was necessary that men properly instructed and set aside for the purpose should attend to the requirements of the divine worship, and assist the people so that they might draw near to God acceptably. If the common people were to attempt to draw near without the assistance of the mediating tribe or the priesthood, they could not (under the requirements of

the law as it was then instituted) do so acceptably, and were liable to bear sin and die. And so the Levites were appointed to assist them, and the priests to minister for them. This is the very reason assigned in these scriptures for the "bearing of iniquity" by the mediating tribe.

"Henceforth the children of Israel shall not come nigh the tent of meeting, lest they bear sin, and die. But the Levites shall do the service of the tent of meeting, and they shall bear their iniquity." Num. 18:22, 23.

This evidently does not mean that the Levites were to bear their own iniquity, but the iniquity of the congregation. In what sense? What iniquity were they to bear? The iniquity that might attach to the people in attempting to draw nigh to God unworthily, or, through ignorance or any other cause, without the proper observance of the divine requirements. The Levites were to be responsible, and thus, through the proper discharge of their appointed duties, to "bear the iniquity" that would otherwise fall upon the congregation.

The same was true of the work of the priesthood. It was no light thing to come within the sanctuary and seek to approach the living God. There was more likelihood that an ordinary man would fail to approach acceptably in the sphere of the priests than in the sphere in which the Levites ministered. Therefore the family of Aaron was made responsible. They were to "bear the iniquity of their priesthood". Notice that it was not their own iniquity, but "the iniquity of their priesthood". This was borne on behalf of the whole congregation for whom the priesthood served.

The same was true in the case of the high-priest. There were certain holy things in which he ministered for some of which he alone must be responsible. The iniquity that would come upon the people, or even upon the Levites and the ordinary priests should they venture beyond their appointed sphere, must be borne by the high-priest. "Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the holy things".

That this is a correct view of the meaning of these scriptures is confirmed by the fact that the

same passages give directions for the support of the priests and Levites, in consideration of the responsibilities they were thus to undertake for the people.

"And unto the children of Levi, behold, I have given all the tithe in Israel for an inheritance, in return for their service which they serve . . . And henceforth the children of Israel shall not come nigh the tent of meeting, lest they bear sin, and die." Verses 21, 22.

"Moreover thou shalt speak unto the Levites and say unto them, When ye take of the children of Israel the tithe which I have given you from them for an inheritance, then ye shall offer up an heave offering of it for the Lord, a tithe of the tithe. And . . . ye shall give the Lord's heave offering to Aaron the priest." Verses 26-28.

The fact that to "bear the iniquity" of these things meant to carry the responsibility for the proper discharge of the services, is confirmed again by the closing instructions of this chapter. Of that which remained after the Levites had returned a tenth of the tithe to the Lord, they were permitted to eat, they and their households, "in every place." **"And ye shall bear no sin by reason of it, when ye have heaved from it the best thereof, and ye shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, neither shall ye die."** Verses 31, 32, margin.

This all has a very definite connection with the passage in Lev. 10:17 on which the brethren rely so much for the support of their theory that the typical priests carried an increasing load of guilt during their annual ministry, and that in the anti-type Christ bears sin in his own body in the heavenly sanctuary.

When Moses said of the sin-offering to Eleazar and Ithamar, "God hath given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord", he meant that the right to eat of the sin-offering was part of the patrimony of the priests, and that this provision was made for them in order that they might be free to carry the responsibilities of their sacred ministry. They acted in behalf of the whole congregation. It is not said that the priests were to bear the iniquity of some particular individual bringing a sin-offering, but "the iniquity of the congregation" in general. So also they, accord-

ing to this passage, were to "make atonement" in general. The atonement for the individual is always described as "an atonement for him". See Lev. 4:26, 31, 35; 5:10.

The Levites also were said to "bear their [the congregation's] iniquity." Because of this the tithe was given them for their support, and a tenth of the tithe was set aside for the house of Aaron for the same reason. But in addition to their proportion of the tithe, the priests were given the right to eat of the sin-offerings, and some other offerings. It is to this very arrangement that the apostle Paul refers when he says that "they which minister about sacred things eat of the things of the temple, and they which wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar." 1 Cor. 9:13. From this the apostle draws the lesson that it is the Lord's will that "they which proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." This is a very different interpretation of the Old Testament practice, and a very different application of the principle to New Testament times from that which the brethren seek to make in their report.

Dr. Moffatt's translation of Lev. 10:17 brings out the meaning of the text in a way that accords entirely with the view arrived at above by the sound process of comparison with related scriptures. Dr. Moffatt renders the passage:—

"Why have you not eaten the sin-offering at the Sanctuary? It is most sacred, and you were given it as food in order that you might remove the guilt of the community, by making expiation for them before the Eternal."

"It is the Blood that maketh Atonement".

Let us now cite the direct testimony of scripture as to the **means** by which atonement was made. It is true that the priests were appointed to **make** the atonement, and that they were permitted to eat of the sin-offerings; but it is not true that they made the atonement by thus partaking of the sacrifices. Here is the scripture testimony:—

"Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, that eateth any manner of blood; I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to

you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life. Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood, neither shall any stranger that is among you eat blood." Lev. 17:10-12.

Why were both priests and people forbidden to eat blood? For the expressly stated reason that it was "given to them upon the altar to make atonement for their souls". It is clear from this that the priests were not regarded as making the atonement by eating the flesh of the sacrifice, but by offering the blood. This is stated over and over again in the law of the sin-offering.

"And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and the blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar . . . and the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven." See Lev. 4:25, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35; 5:9, 10.

In a later passage further directions concerning this offering are given to the priests, and it is said that "the priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it." Lev. 6:26. But nothing that is said here indicates that the act of eating made atonement, for the simple reason that "it is the blood that maketh atonement."

The brethren have followed a false scent, in thinking that the atonement was made by the priests eating the sin-offering. Had they followed the crimson line of the blood, they would not have made this mistake. They would not have said that "in the majority of cases the burden thus rested upon the priesthood", and that "it was only in exceptional cases . . . that the transfer was made by blood to the altar within the Sanctuary". Exceptional cases, forsooth! The blood of the atonement was sprinkled in every case in which the sin-offering was presented. The variation was only in the place in which the blood was applied. For the rulers, or the common people, it was sprinkled upon the altar of sacrifice, outside the sanctuary. For the ordinary priests, it was sprinkled upon the altar of incense, in the first apartment. For the high-priest it was sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, within the veil. Lev. 4:25; 30:7; 16:11, 14.

The brethren have overlooked the fact that the blood was put upon the golden altar for the ordinary priests, because that was the place where the Lord met with those priests, and the object of the sprinkling was to keep open the way of approach for them, that they might still minister there for the people. There was nothing exceptional about this: the same rule applied to the other sin-offerings.

The appointed place of meeting for the rulers and the common people was at the brazen altar of sacrifice. In their cases the blood of the sin-offering was sprinkled upon that altar. That was to keep open the way of approach appointed for them.

Then in the case of the high priest, he alone might go within the veil, and there the Lord would meet with him and with no other. The blood of his sin-offering, when he solemnly entered that meeting place, was not sprinkled upon the brazen altar, nor upon the golden altar, but upon the mercy-seat itself. That was to keep open the way of approach appointed for him. And that way of approach being thus kept open, his next act was to present the blood of the atoning sacrifice on behalf of the whole people.

Christ summed all this up in his one offering. He "needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people: for this He did once for all, when He offered up Himself." Heb. 7:27.

What was it that influenced the brethren to start aside from the well defined crimson line, sprinkled from the altar of sacrifice outside the sanctuary to the mercy-seat within the veil, to see what they thought was an atonement in the eating of the sin-offerings of the people by the priests? The answer is plain enough. They were looking for evidence of transfer, and not of expiation. This is indicated by the very first paragraph in this division of their report.

"We believe that the daily service and daily offerings of the typical Sanctuary effected the **transfer only** of sins to the priesthood and to the 'tabernacle of the congregation', or first apartment of the Sanctuary; and that their **expiation**

was not fully accomplished until the annual service on the Day of Atonement . . .” p. 32.

Notice that it is **“transfer only”** (emphasis theirs) that is said to be accomplished through the sin-offerings of the daily service. Let the reader reflect upon the fact that there is not one scintilla of evidence in the Bible that the blood of the sin-offering transferred and accumulated sin **anywhere**. **“Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin expiated”**, is the testimony of scripture. Isa. 6:7, margin.

The report is not quite consistent when it takes an uncompromising stand for **“transfer only”**, and then in the same sentence says that **“expiation was not fully accomplished until the annual service on the Day of Atonement”**; for if it is **“transfer only”**, then expiation cannot be said to be even **partially** accomplished. In a later paragraph (Section C. 1.) the report says that “. . . the sin-offering **did not completely expiate the guilt**. The sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law until the type was completed on the Day of Atonement; for the blood did not reach the mercy seat over the law until then.”

What then? Did the sin-offering **partially** expiate the guilt? And if the sinner was not **entirely** released, was he **partly** released from the condemnation of the law? Four times, in the law of the sin-offering, it is declared that the one bringing the offering would “be forgiven” (Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35). How can a man “be forgiven”, and yet not be “entirely released from the condemnation of the law”?

There is something very unsatisfactory and inconclusive about these statements. To say that “the sin-offering **did not completely expiate the guilt**” implies that it **partly** expiated it. To say that “the sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law”, implies that he was **partly** released. It seems as though the scripture evidence of expiation and release is so unmistakable that the brethren could not “entirely” and “completely” deny it! Why then do they contend for **“transfer only”**? Or if it is **“transfer only”**, why do they speak as though it were in part

expiation and release? These arguments remind one of the contention of Dr. Eck, in his debate with Carlstadt, that "the **whole** good work really proceeds from God, but not **wholly**." D'Aubigne, Vol. II., p. 48.

What is the basis of this confusing reasoning? Consider the ground assigned for it in the report:

"The sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law until the type was complete on the Day of Atonement; for the blood did not reach the mercy seat over the law until then." Section C, para. 1. (p. 34).

Are we to conclude then, that in the antitype, in the Christian dispensation, repentant, believing men, were "not entirely released from the condemnation of the law until . . . the Day of Atonement", commencing on the 22nd day of October, 1844? Was Paul "not entirely released" until then? He evidently did not understand the matter that way, for he wrote in the first century that "there is therefore **NOW** no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8:1.

Are we to conclude further, that no Adventist believer since 1844 has been "entirely released from the condemnation of the law", because the antitypical day of atonement is not yet completed?

Are we to conclude, in fine, that the blood of Christ "did not reach the mercy seat" until 1844? or (as the antitype is not yet "completed") that it has not yet reached the mercy seat? Perish the thought! Could the "Lamb as it had been slain" appear "in the midst of the throne", and yet no blood be upon the mercy seat? Impossible! The truth is that the blood of Christ's sacrifice reached the heavenly mercy seat at the very commencement of his ministry there. This fact is referred to as the very basis of God's offer of salvation to the believer. The apostle speaks of "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God." Rom. 3:24, 25.

The meaning of this passage is, that through the sprinkling of his blood, Christ is set forth as a

mercy seat, at which men may receive remission of sins. Weymouth's translation of this passage and note upon it will help to make this clear.

"He it is whom God put forward as a Mercy-Seat, rendered efficacious through faith in his blood."

Note:—"A Mercy-Seat, or 'a propitiation'. But 'mercy-seat' is the meaning of the word in the only other passage (Heb. 9:5) where it is found in the N.T., and almost everywhere in the LXX., and is favoured by the Greek Commentators."

It is claimed in the report (in the passage under consideration) that Heb. 10:1-3 supports the teaching that "the sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law until the type was completed". Had the personal sin offering brought immediate and complete release, "the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year." A wrong meaning has been read into this scripture. It does not mean that the sins confessed during the year were recalled to memory at the close of the year; but that the services being repeated year after year showed that they did not really take away sin. The revised version reads: "In those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year". Weymouth translates this passage,—“In those sacrifices sins are recalled to memory year after year.”

Continuing our examination of this section of the report, we are surprised to find the following statement:—"In the antitype the expiation of guilt is complete in the one act of confession, and the exercise of faith in Christ." We are constrained to inquire, Why is it that in the type the personal sin-offering did not bring "immediate and complete release", and "the sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law until the type was completed on the Day of Atonement", and yet "in the antitype the expiation of guilt is complete in the one act", etc.?

The report has now given us three different interpretations of the result of the approach to God by individual worshippers. Let us place them together, and notice how they disagree.

1.	2.	3.
"The daily offerings . . . effected the transfer only of sins." p. 32.	"The sin offering did not completely expiate the guilt." p. 34.	"In the antitype the expiation of guilt is complete in the one act of confession, and the exercise of faith in Christ." p. 34.

If it is **"transfer only"**, then it is not expiation in part; and if it is **"expiation . . . complete"**, then it is not transfer at all!

How different from all this, is the clear and decisive testimony of the gospel!

"Repent ye . . . unto the remission of your sins." Acts 2:38.

"Repent ye . . . that your sins may be blotted out." Ch. 3:19.

"Him did God exalt at his right hand . . . for to give repentance . . . and remission of sins." Ch. 5:31, Margin.

"Through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins." Ch. 13:38.

"Every one that believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins." Ch. 10:43.

"And their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. 10:17.

An Important Lesson, and a Blessed Truth.

Before leaving the subject dealt with in this chapter—that of the significance of the part played by the priests of old in "bearing the iniquity" "of the congregation", "of the holy things", "of the sanctuary", and "of their priesthood"—let us call to mind that in our approach to a thrice holy God, we stand in the same need of a priest and mediator as did the children of Israel. In our shortsightedness, with our dim apprehension of spiritual things, our inability to perceive in ourselves and even in our worship things that might grieve God and make that worship unacceptable to Him, we need one who can "bear the iniquity of the sanctuary" for us, and undertake the responsibility of making our approach acceptable to God.

"We **have** such a high priest" in Jesus Christ. He is "able to bear gently with the ignorant and erring", seeing that He Himself is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities". **"Such a high**

priest" is He to **us**-ward. And yet when He acts for us "in things pertaining to God"—when He turns in our behalf **God**-ward, He is "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." "Such a high priest **became** us", indeed, for through his mediation our faulty and imperfect worship is presented to the Father fragrant and acceptable with the incense of his own perfection.

Blessed be God, Who appointed his Son to this ministry for us! "Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession . . . Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help us in time of need." Heb. 4:14, 16.

ON THE THIRD PROPOSITION.

That it is necessary to modify our view that the Testimonies are to be regarded as a direct revelation from God.

The brethren touch this subject very briefly and very lightly. I shall not discuss at any great length the contents of this section of their report; but must call attention to the fact that it is silent on the very point on which it should have spoken. It ignores the question of Sister White's **former** erroneous teaching on the subject of the sanctuary, and her abandonment of that teaching. This is a matter of grave importance in its bearing upon the authority of her present teaching. But perhaps the brethren felt that the only safe course to follow was to leave that aspect of the subject alone.

In preceding pages I have given my reasons for relinquishing the sanctuary teaching **as now held** by the denomination. The convictions stated in the first two propositions were formed first of all. I came under the conviction that the denominational teaching, and Sister White's teaching, in the books **as they now stand**, is out of harmony with the Bible on the points referred to in those propositions. I did not, however, then know that our early pioneers, including Sister White, had for a number of years after 1844 held views regarding the sanctuary that were still more erroneous, views that were afterward abandoned; that is, that they believed and taught in those days, that when Christ entered the most holy place in 1844, the door was shut, and there was no more salvation for sinners. The fact that Sister White taught that erroneous doctrine in her writings, including the visions, is proof positive and final that her Testimonies are not to be regarded as having the authority of a direct revelation from God. For no divine revelation could possibly teach error, or prove after the lapse of a few years to be a mistake.

A wrong course has been followed by the denomination in ignoring, evading, or denying the fact of the mistaken teachings of the early years.

Had all the facts been known to our people, they could not have continued to regard the Testimonies as infallible. But the facts have not been known. They have been covered up. In saying this I am not bringing a railing accusation against anyone. I do not say that all who have helped to bring about this situation or to perpetuate it have done so wilfully. A good deal has been due to a prevalent feeling that the Testimonies must be held to and believed in as inspired, notwithstanding the most serious difficulties and evidences to the contrary. It seems to be felt by many that it is duty to close the eyes to the clearest indications that Sister White held mistaken views, and taught doctrines out of harmony with the Bible: and that she eliminated passages from her writings, and changed them, for the very evident reason that she had taken mistaken positions, and had been compelled to relinquish them. These changes have been made even in what have been claimed to be inspired visions. I know that an effort is made to deny this; but it is an entirely unsuccessful effort.

The evidence of a change in Sister White's teaching on the sanctuary question is overwhelming and undeniable. The evasion of the force of the facts in this case on the part of those who know them may in many cases be due to weakness rather than wilfulness; but it is a culpable weakness nevertheless; for no Adventist minister can stand free from the responsibility to face the facts referred to, to weigh them, and to protect the church from being misled.

Instead of the facts in the case being made available to our people, important information has been withheld, and unpleasant facts denied. This is not right. Many even of our ministers have been kept in ignorance of these things for a long period of years. The writer had been connected with the organised work for almost a quarter of a century before learning the truth about the eliminations from "Early Writings", for instance. Such information should have been furnished us in a proper way from within the body. Is it right that our ministers here in the Antipodes, and in

all the other ends of the earth should be encouraged, and even required to teach the inspiration and infallibility of the Testimonies, and at the same time be denied vital information bearing on the question of such infallibility? It certainly is not right. For we are expressly directed in connection with prophesyings to "prove all things", and to hold fast only that which is good. And it is impossible to prove the nature of the gift when vital information is withheld. When only that which is favourable to the claim is related and recorded, and all that is unfavourable is withheld or eliminated, neither the ministry nor the church is in a position to judge or to "prove" anything.

What do I mean by all this? I mean that Sister White, in the early years of the work taught the "shut door" view of the sanctuary service, and taught it on the authority of her visions, and in the name of inspiration. All the pioneers taught the "shut door" theory during those years. When sufficient time had elapsed to demonstrate that the views held were mistaken, they were modified and revised. Important passages teaching the "shut door" were either eliminated from Sister White's "Early Writings", or else explained away by notes claiming that they did not teach that view. A publisher's preface was introduced, claiming that in that edition "no changes from the original work had been made, except the occasional employment of a new word, or a change in the construction of a sentence, to better express the idea, and no portion of the work had been omitted",* which certainly was not true with reference to the original publication of the earlier visions, and was consequently very misleading.

A later publication, claiming to give a history of the rise and progress of the movement, denied point blank that Seventh-day Adventists had ever taught the "shut door". This was a denial of the truth. The author, in making quotations from the publications of the early days, in some cases omitted expressions that would have revealed the fact that at that time the brethren did teach the

* See the Appendix (pp. 176, 200) for details and particulars.

"shut door".* The book referred to is still stocked and circulated by our publishing agencies.

This course of action has been continued right down to the present time, articles having been published of quite recent years in our leading church paper, denying that the "shut door" was taught in the early days.

Why all this evasion? Why this denial of indisputable facts, testified to by the printed records of those days? Would it be a really fatal thing to acknowledge that our pioneer brethren for a time held mistaken views? Certainly not! We would not need to be ashamed of it. It would be sufficient for us to be able to show that notwithstanding early misconceptions, the brethren were eventually led into a wide field of truth. Why should there be such a persistent effort to deny the "shut door" experience? The answer is, that it is because Sister White was involved in that experience, and set the seal of the approval of her testimonies upon that teaching. To acknowledge this would be to rob of their reputation for infallibility subsequent teachings of the same author.

"There is nothing covered", however, "that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known."

The facts are there, in our early records, and cannot be denied. A comparatively recent publication, on "The 'Shut Door', and the Close of Probation", written in defence of the Testimonies, acknowledges the fact that the pioneers did for a number of years hold to the "shut door" theory. This pamphlet even quotes statements made by the author of the Testimonies teaching that view, including some of the eliminated passages; but endeavours to show that Sister White did not really mean what she said in some of those instances. The appearance of this publication is gratifying in the respect that it frankly acknowledges that the "shut door" was taught in the early days of our work, and also in that it acknowledges the fact of certain eliminations from "Early Writings", and even reproduces some of them. This is a refresh-

* See Appendix, pp. 201-203.

ing departure from the policy of evasion or denial followed for so many preceding years.

Why should there be this very reluctant and restrained reproduction of the writings of the early days? We are practically limited to vague assurances from those who have access to the early volumes that everything is all right; that the pioneers did not teach the "shut door"; or that if **they** taught it, Sister White did not; or that if Sister White taught it she did not do so on the authority of the visions; or that if she taught it in relating the visions she did not really mean what she said! Meanwhile others are publishing the very words of the pioneers and of Sister White on those subjects, publishing them voluminously and in detail. Why does not the general conference undertake that work? Why does not one of our publishing houses reproduce the whole of the publications of those early years? This would place all our ministers and people in a position to do some original research work, and would provide valuable reference books for the denominational history classes in our schools and colleges.

The report adopted by the Australasian union conference committee follows the usual practice of referring to favourable features of Sister White's work, and ignoring those features which if properly weighed could not but prove that she was mistaken in her claim to be the channel of direct revelation from God.

I do not deny the favourable features. Sister White's pointed testimonies of reproof for sin, and her uncompromising and convicting demands for vital godliness, holy living, and unswerving devotion to the cause and kingdom of Christ have always impressed me greatly. But I cannot because of these things close my eyes to the evidence that her claim to inspiration, in the highest sense of all, was a mistaken one. Just how much she herself was responsible for the mistake I do not presume to judge. It seems that she was sincerely mistaken. But even this view does not justify her course in all respects in connection with her writings. It seems, however, that she was an earnest, fervent-spirited Christian woman. God

is very merciful, and graciously blesses and uses his children despite their mistaken views, and their oft-times mistaken actions.

So also with some of those who have participated in ignoring, covering up, or explaining away facts that if generally known would long ere this have compelled a great modification of the claims made in behalf of Sister White. Doubtless this has in many cases been due to a mistaken sense of duty, and a fear that to doubt the inspiration of the Testimonies because of these facts would be a manifestation of unbelief, and thus displeasing to God. But this is not unbelief in the Bible sense, for the faith that God calls for is defined as "the belief of the truth". There is no genuine piety in believing things that are not true. God has mercifully blessed many who in sincerity of heart have believed in the plenary inspiration of the Testimonies. He has just as mercifully blessed a multitude of earnest men and women in other religious bodies, notwithstanding mistaken views on some points of truth and doctrine tenaciously held by them. The undue authority attached to Sister White's writings has nevertheless had a harmful influence. Any help the Lord may have been able to give to those who believed the claims made, or to the one who made them, is to be attributed to his mercy, and not to the truth of the claims. The Lord has been good to his God-fearing children despite this mistake and not because of it.

As for the harmful influence referred to, there has been a tendency to subject Bible teaching to the teaching of the Testimonies. Bible truth has been regarded as being "clinched", when it could be supported by a statement from the Testimonies. And a statement from the Testimonies on any point has been sufficient to deter from the investigation of scriptures apparently teaching to the contrary. Voices that would teach differently from Sister White on any point, even in the smallest details, are immediately silenced by an appeal to something she has written. This could not be harmful if everything Sister White has written were in very truth by direct revelation from God;

but if Sister White were mistaken in any teaching, it most effectually binds that mistake upon the whole church forever. No amount of evidence from the Bible, differing from Sister White, is sufficient to convince believers in the inspiration of the Testimonies.

Even in regard to Christian experience, many of our people are more familiar with what Sister White has said regarding forgiveness, and acceptance, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, than they are with the declarations and promises of the Bible itself. They seem to feel that the statements of the Testimonies are plainer and more understandable, and therefore a safer basis of reliance than their own understanding of the teachings of the Bible. This is a serious weakness. For the full assurance of faith springs from reliance upon the very word of God itself. Faith requires God's word to rest upon, and not something Sister White has said about that word, no matter how good the saying may be.

The following extract from the columns of our denominational organ, "The Ministry", may be taken as an illustration of this tendency:—

"In doing personal work, I make constant use of 'Steps to Christ', because I find it meets every need better than anything else. Of course, I use the Scriptures, but many of our young people are familiar with the Scriptures, as far as the theory is concerned, but they have no insight into the practical application of them, and this in what 'Steps to Christ' gives. I use the 'Army and Navy' edition, which is most convenient for carrying in my pocket." June, 1926. Article, "Easy Steps in Personal Work."

The writer then proceeds to give an outline of his method of teaching various phases of Christian experience by using "Steps to Christ", giving page and paragraph from that book on all the different points.

Why is it that "many of our young people . . . have no insight into the practical application" of scriptures relating to Christian experience? Is it not the principal duty of the church to teach that very thing? And should not the ministers teach the flock how to exercise faith in the original promises of God recorded in the Bible, and not train them up to depend on page and paragraph from

"Steps to Christ" and other similar books? There has always been a tendency in the church to add some other authority to the word of God, something that explains things to the people so that they know what to do more clearly than they would if left to depend upon the Bible alone. The Pharisees of old added tradition to the word of God. The Roman Catholic church has done the same. The statement quoted above, advocating "constant use of 'Steps to Christ', because . . . it meets the need better than anything else", reminds one of Dr. di Bruno's comparison of the Bible with the Roman tradition, in which he declared, while approving of the Bible, that "of the two, tradition is to us more clear and safe."

Reverting again to the positions taken in the report under consideration, it is maintained by the brethren, that while the Testimonies are to be regarded as a direct revelation from God, "we are not to regard them as an addition to the Bible." p. 38. But if they **are** a direct revelation, they **are** an addition to the Bible. And it cannot be denied that the denomination treats them as such. In theory, or rather in profession, we claim to stand on the true Protestant platform of "the Bible, and the Bible only", as the foundation of our faith. In practice the church absolutely requires men to subscribe to the Testimonies also. Let a minister or a lay member of the church become known to dissent from some teaching of Sister White, and he is at once regarded as having departed from the truth, and is almost sure to be promptly deprived of any participation in the work of the church.

We leave here the consideration of the report adopted by the brethren in Australasia, and pass on in the next chapter to the consideration of views expressed by the brethren in America.

CHAPTER SIX.

THE THREE PROPOSITIONS DISCUSSED IN THE UNITED STATES.

It remains to consider some of the arguments brought forward in the United States against the positions taken in the three propositions submitted to the president of the general conference. A group of thirteen members of the general conference committee was appointed to give the writer a hearing, and to discuss the questions under consideration. A series of seven meetings was held, each of several hours' duration, at the general conference office, at Washington, D.C. There were other meetings with a smaller group and with other workers. The writer was given opportunity to present his views at reasonable length, and in a friendly atmosphere.

The findings of the special committee of thirteen are briefly summarised in the following resolution adopted by them:—

"We believe that Brother Fletcher's principal propositions are fundamentally wrong; that therefore the conclusions he has reached and to which he holds tenaciously, believing on these propositions, are also wrong."

Details of the findings of the committee were reported by the chairman to the brethren in Australasia as follow:—

"1. As pertains to the first two of the three propositions put forth in the two letters to Brother Spicer, we believe that Brother Fletcher has placed strained interpretations and undue emphasis on certain words, phrases, and expressions found in Holy Scripture pertaining to the sanctuary and its service, and has drawn unwarranted conclusions from those interpretations. The positions taken are not new, but were set forth in the writings and opinions of church leaders and commentators before and during the early days of the message. The pioneers of the advent movement met and discarded these views as untenable and out of harmony with the Scripture.

"2. As pertains to the third proposition, to our minds no other result than the virtual repudiation of the spirit of prophecy could come from holding the views expressed in the first two propositions.

"3. To be more specific: The position taken in proposition one is based chiefly on a strained interpretation of the phrase 'in the presence of God', whereas the identical phrase,

verbatim et literatim, is many times used elsewhere than in Heb. 9:24, in both Old Testament and New Testament, in connections that cannot possibly refer to the Holy of Holies as an apartment of the sanctuary. A few typical examples are cited herewith:—

'Presence of God'

'Presence'—Heb. **panim**, Gr. **prosopon**, both words meaning literally—face, countenance.

In O.T. **panim** is used 66 times out of a total of 76 times where the rendering is 'presence'. Out of the 66, it is used 36 times of God, otherwise of kings, groups, and individuals. In LXX., wherever the Greek construction requires the use of a noun, it is usually **prosopon**.

Examples in Old Testament:

Gen. 3:8, Adam and Eve hid from **panim** (**prosopon**) of Lord God.

Gen. 4:16, Cain went out from **panim** (**prosopon**) of God.

Job 1:12 and 2:7, Satan went forth from **panim** (**prosopon**) of Lord.

Ps. 95:2, Let us come before his **panim** (**prosopon**) with thanksgiving.

Jonah 1:3, 10, Jonah fled from **panim** (**prosopon**) of Lord.

In N.T., **prosopon** is used 7 times out of a total of 19 times where the rendering is 'presence'. Of the other 12 instances, **enopion**, a variant form of the same root, meaning in the eye of, is used 8 times.

Examples in New Testament:

Acts 3:13, Denied Jesus in **prosopon** of Pilate.

Acts 3:19, Refreshing from **prosopon** of Lord.

2 Thess. 1:19, Destruction from **prosopon** of Lord.

Heb. 9:24, Appear in **prosopon** of God for us.

Luke 1:19, Gabriel stands **enopion** God.

Luke 15:10, Joy **enopion** the angels.

"In attempts to sustain the interpretation that Jesus passed immediately into the Holy of Holies to begin his ministration in the heavenly sanctuary, equally strained meanings are given by Brother Fletcher to expressions like 'there I will meet with thee', 'far above all heavens', 'heaven itself', 'before the throne', 'passed through the heavens', 'before the veil'—interpreting these phrases to mean that Jesus passed directly into the Holy of Holies at his ascension to begin his ministration for sinners. None of these phrases can be shown to have such meaning without wresting the Scriptures.

"4. Proposition 2 is based on a conflict between the term 'transfer' appearing in our denominational literature, and a limitation Brother Fletcher places on the word 'expiation'. This difficulty is easily solved in two ways:

(a) By understanding 'transfer' in the same sense as 'lay upon', 'bring to', 'put upon', 'brought into', and 'bear', as used in the following scriptures: Lev. 3:2, 8, 13; 4:3-12,

15-20, 24-26, 29-31; Lev. 6:26-30; 10:17; Lev. 16:16-22, 30; Isa. 53:11; Heb. 9:28; 1 Pet. 2:24. In other words we understand by 'transfer' that in the earthly sanctuary the confessed sin was borne into the sanctuary by the priest, in figure, by the sprinkling of the blood and the eating of the flesh of the victim; and that in the heavenly sanctuary, the confessed sin is borne into the sanctuary by Christ in fact through the merits of his own shed blood.

(b) By further recognising that 'expiation', while fully provided for in the death of the victim, is not completed until the ministry of the merits of the shed blood is fully accomplished in the blotting out and final destruction of sin and sinners and the author of sin.

"5. Proposition 3 is entirely groundless in the light of the Scriptures and of the foregoing explanation. The Scripture and the spirit of prophecy harmonize perfectly when no strained interpretation is read into the phraseology."

Touching the first proposition, the brethren, in the above report, give a list of passages referring to the "presence of God". What is the object of this list? and what is the drift of the argument? Is it sought to show that there is no difference between the saints "coming before God's presence with thanksgiving," in worship, as in Psa. 95:2, and Christ's "appearing in the presence of God for us", as in Heb. 9:24? Does the latter mean no more than the former? One does not need to know a great deal of Hebrew and Greek to detect a vast difference between the two statements. When Christ went in "to appear before the face of God for us", He entered into the most intimate relations possible with the Father. He is said to be "on the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him." 1 Pet. 3:22. That is, He occupies a place nearer to God than that accorded even to angels and seraphim. The angels are "round about the throne", and the four living creatures are "in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne"; but "the Lamb as it had been slain" is "in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures." Rev. 4:6; 5:6, 11. There could be no holier place than this; no more intimate relationship with God.

While the leading spokesman was presenting in committee the argument now under consideration, an elderly member of the committee interjected,—“Do you think that in the case of Jonah,

the same nearness to God was signified, as in the case of Heb. 9:24?" A very pertinent inquiry, indeed!

Touching the second proposition, the brethren speak of "a limitation Brother Fletcher places on the word 'expiation' ". Wherein have I placed a limitation upon that word? The brethren here charge me with doing the very thing the exponents and defenders of the accepted teaching have done. Sister White teaches plainly that "the blood of the victim had not made full atonement for the sin . . . The sinner . . . was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law." She maintains that "the blood of Christ . . . was not to cancel the sin." "Patriarchs and Prophets", pp. 355-357.

The brethren in Australia, in their report, echo Sister White's statement that "the sinner was not entirely released from the condemnation of the law." They submit also that "the sin offering **did not completely expiate the guilt**", and underline the passage to show that they mean every word of it. My second proposition was intended to be a protest against this very kind of teaching. Notice the following comparison:—

"The sprinkling of the blood . . . represented the expiation of sin."	"The sin offering did not completely expiate the guilt ".
---	--

Proposition 2.

Australasian Report.

In the face of all this, the brethren at Washington speak of "a limitation Brother Fletcher places on the word 'expiation' " ! Let the reader judge as to who it is that places a limitation upon the work for which the word stands.

During the discussion at Washington, a member of the committee asked, with reference to the second proposition, if I could not regard the work in the sanctuary as representing both expiation and transfer. I replied that I could not. How could it represent both? The expiation of sin, and its transfer, are just about opposite conceptions. According to our own books, transfer results in "the sins of the church . . . accumulating in heaven" ("Hour of God's Judgment", p. 64).* The Bible, however, uses the following

* See quotations at the close of this chapter, p. 101.

expressions in its doctrine of expiation:—

"Thine iniquity is **taken away**, and thy sin **purged**". Margin "**expiated**". Isa. 6:6.

Christ "**loosed us from our sins by his blood**." Rev. 1:5.

He "**made purification of sins**". Heb. 1:3.

The Messiah was to "**make an end of sins**", and to "**make reconciliation for (margin, purge away) iniquity**", within the seventy weeks. Dan. 9:24.

There is a world of difference between sins "accumulating in heaven", and sins "taken away", "purged", "expiated", and "made an end of".

The brethren at Washington say in their report "that 'expiation', while fully provided for in the death of the victim, is not completed until the ministry of the merits of the shed blood is fully accomplished in the blotting out and final destruction of sin and sinners and the author of sin." This sentence exhibits the erroneous nature of the doctrine the brethren are trying to defend. "Sinners" do not meet their "final destruction" through "the ministry of the merits of the shed blood": far from it. Their doom comes **through the rejection** of the ministry and merits of that blood. Their destruction is therefore not the expiation for which Christ's blood "fully provided". What about the sins of those who are saved? When is expiation "completed" for them? Without doubt it was both "fully provided for" and "completed" upon Calvary's cross. Thanks be to God!

In my letter to the president of the general conference, in commenting on Sister White's teaching that "the blood of Christ . . . was not to cancel the sin", I wrote as follows:—

"If it be true that the blood of Christ does not cancel the sin, but merely provides a means of its transfer into and out of the sanctuary, there is no place at which you can say that sin is expiated until you reach the death of the scape-goat."

The brethren at Washington, in the section of their report now under consideration, have given a practical demonstration of the truth of this argument. They say that "expiation", "is not completed" "in the death of the victim", although "fully provided for" in that death: it is "fully accomplished" in the "destruction of sin and sinners

and the author if sin". This, then, is their answer to the questions asked in my letter to the president of the general conference:—

"If sin is not cancelled by the blood of Christ, by what means then is it cancelled? . . . Is it by the death of the scape-goat? Does the death of Satan accomplish something that the death of Christ could not accomplish?"

Australasian Report Endorsed.

The question will probably suggest itself to the mind of the reader, Did the brethren in America endorse the positions taken in the report adopted by the brethren in Australia? This question is answered by the chairman of the special committee that met at Washington, D.C., in the covering letter sent by him conveying that committee's actions to the leaders of the work in Australasia. He wrote as follows:—

"I do wish to express the Committee's appreciation of the answer which your sub-committee prepared and which was adopted by the Australasian Union Conference. We feel that this statement is both tenable and adequate to prove the error of the views held by Brother Fletcher, and we appreciate the work which your committee did very much."*

The brethren in America are thus committed to the doctrine of Christ bearing sin in the sanctuary throughout the whole Christian dispensation, which is a leading feature of the Australasian report, a doctrine unknown to scripture, and not taught hitherto by the denomination. Our leading, representative men have thus, in their endeavours to maintain the old position, taken up an entirely new position. In their endeavours to defend an untenable position they have thrust the denomination into a new and equally untenable position. The erroneous nature of this and other leading features of the Australasian report has already been sufficiently demonstrated in preceding chapters. It will not therefore be necessary to refer here to similar arguments brought forward in America. It may be of interest to the reader, however, to consider other arguments or explanations advocated in America in defence of the accepted teaching, in addition to those contained in the statements already dealt with.

* Taken from a circular letter dated December 4, 1930, sent by the president of the Australasian division to institutional managers, members of the executive committee, and ministerial workers in that field.

Other Arguments Considered.

The writer has thus far in these pages refrained from mentioning the names of individuals, and that plan will be adhered to in this chapter also. The matter is presented solely with the object of giving the reader opportunity to consider the various views expressed by members of the special committee, or by others, in public talks, or in private conversations. The truth is frequently opened up more fully to the mind as a result of discussion, "for the ear trieth words, as the palate tasteth meat". May God grant both reader and writer true discernment, to perceive where the truth is found. The writer believes and earnestly contends that the three propositions he has felt constrained to maintain among the brethren are simple statements of fundamental truth, abundantly sustained by scripture. He feels that the various explanations submitted in defence of the accepted position with reference to the sanctuary only serve to illustrate and emphasise the untenability of that position.

On the Supposed Transfer of Sins to the Sanctuary.

In my letter to the president of the general conference I had maintained that "sin **may** be transferred to a **person** . . . but sin **cannot** be transferred to a **place**." "There is a transfer of sin from the repentant believing sinner to the person of Christ, the sinner's substitute; but right there the process of transfer ceases, and the transferred sin is expiated in the death of the Saviour."

In the meetings with the sub-committee at Washington, one of the brethren questioned the correctness of the view that sin was even transferred to Christ. He maintained that "sin itself cannot be transferred—even to a person, a substitute. Its wages, its penalty—death—can be transferred, but not sin itself, . . . But blood as evidence, as record, that a transferred penalty has been paid, can be transferred. In the figure it was transferred from the victim to the priest, to the altars, to the mercy-seat."

This interpretation differs widely from the teaching of one of our books, which speaks of "the blood record of sins confessed during the year." ("How to give Bible Readings", p. 99.) There is a world of difference between viewing the blood as **recording sin**, and viewing it "as evidence, as **record, that a transferred penalty has been paid.**" This latter view the writer can joyfully accept, and wishes that it could be regarded as a true reflection of the denominational teaching.

It will be noticed that the brother from whom we now quote speaks of the record of the paid penalty in the blood being "transferred from the victim to the priest, to the altars, to the mercy-seat." I asked this brother, in a private conversation, if he could at all entertain the idea that the blood of Christ, sprinkled upon the golden altar (figuratively speaking), made prayer acceptable throughout the Christian dispensation; but that the blood was not applied to the heavenly mercy-seat until 1844? I was surprised and pained to find that that idea **was** entertained, and that an effort was made to defend it. It was defended on the ground that the typical service implied a lapse of time between the advancing stages of the work of atonement. This is an entirely mistaken view. The different parts of the typical service represented different aspects of the work of salvation, and not successive stages in the development of that work. This truth is more fully brought out in a later chapter. See pp. 128-136.

The conception that the typical service in the two apartments of the sanctuary implied a lapse of time between advancing stages of the work of atonement led our brother on to the claim (in the discussions in committee as well as in private conversation) that the whole of God's dealings with sin are by the deferred method. He maintained that as God did not destroy Satan at the time of his rebellion, nor our first parents at the fall, and as the work of redemption will not be complete until sin and sinners are blotted out, we have proof in this that God follows the deferred method in dealing with sin. This, however, is not deferred disposition of sin, but deferred judgment of sin-

ners, which is a very different thing. The latter is God's method of procedure; but the former is not. This is clear from the following comparison of scriptures:—

**The Disposition of Sin
already accomplished.**

"Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people . . . to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity." Dan. 9:24.

"Now once at the consummation of the ages hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." Heb. 9:26, marg.

**The Judgment of Sinners
deferred.**

"Sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily." Eccles. 8:11.

"The Lord . . . is long-suffering . . . not wishing that any should perish . . . But the day of the Lord will come." 2 Pet. 3:9, 10.

Can the reader believe that the blood of Christ did not reach the heavenly mercy-seat until 1844? Surely not!

"Done is the work that saves,
Once and forever done;
Finished the righteousness
That clothes the unrighteous one.
The love that blesses all below
Is flowing freely to us now.

"The sacrifice is o'er;
The veil is rent in twain;
The mercy-seat is red
With blood of victim slain;
Why stand ye then without, in fear?
The blood divine invites us near.

"Beside the mercy-seat
The High Priest stands within;
The blood is in his hand
Which makes and keeps us clean.
With boldness let us now draw near;
That blood has banished every fear."

H. Bonar.

The Finished Work of Christ.

In one of the meetings, a member of the committee referred to the subject of the finished work of Christ. Some, he said, object to our teaching because they regard the atonement on the cross as a finished work, and feel that they must reject as harmful the view that the final work of atonement is something to be looked forward to, as yet to be accomplished. If this is a valid objection to our teaching, he continued, what must have been the

situation of those who lived thousands of years before Christ? They had to look forward to a work yet to be done, and this did not seem to have been a fatal hindrance to them.

To this the obvious reply was, That there was nothing inimical to faith in looking forward in the old dispensation to a work to be done, that had not yet been done; but that it **was** inimical to faith to be looking forward in the new dispensation to a work as something yet to be done, when that work was already accomplished.

Consecutive Stages of Ministry, or Simultaneous Phases?

During the discussions at Washington, it developed that the brethren attached much importance to the conception that Christ's ministry in the sanctuary is made up of two successive stages. There seemed (if the writer rightly apprehended the mental attitude of the brethren on this subject) to be no great objection to the view that Christ, from his one position with the Father in the throne, discharged the services pertaining to both first and second apartments of the sanctuary. I had maintained further, however, that the typical services of the two apartments represented two aspects of Christ's work, discharged simultaneously, throughout the whole Christian dispensation.

At one stage in the discussions I was asked if I believed in the "continuous" ministry of Christ, and replied in the affirmative. It developed afterward, however, that in using the term "continuous ministry", the questioner had in mind two successive stages of ministry.*

One of the brethren exclaimed, in the midst of a spirited speech,—**"I demand** of God that there be two services, the same as in the type! If this isn't so, the Bible isn't the book of God."

This reminds one of Brother Uriah Smith's statement concerning the transfer of sins, that "if sins were not there, considered as concrete things, and by Aaron's hands transferred to the head of the

* My reasons for believing that two simultaneous phases of the ministry are represented, the manward aspect in the first apartment, and the Godward aspect in the second apartment, are given in chapters 11 and 12.

scapegoat, and with the goat borne away and lost in the wilderness, the record is fictitious and misleading." "Looking Unto Jesus", p. 97.

It is well for us humbly to remember that while we ourselves are liable to be mistaken in our conceptions of truth, the Bible is still the book of God, and is neither fictitious nor misleading even though some of our cherished theories must fall to the ground.

It is unsafe for us to **demand** that the antitype conform to the type. This demand is a significant illustration of the attitude of mind into which we as a people have drifted. We reason too largely from type to antitype. We insist that the antitype must be compressed and fitted into the mould of the type. We "**demand** of God that there be two services, **the same as in the type.**" We might as reasonably demand of man that his legs be long in proportion to his body, because the rising moon seems to cast his shadow that way.

It would be a good deal safer for us, in our search after truth, to **demand of ourselves** that our over-rigid views of what is called for by the type, be entirely subjected to what God has plainly told us about the antitype.

God has spoken on this subject. Let the reader turn once more to Heb. 9:1-12, and give it a prayerful reading. Here we are told what the Holy Spirit intended to signify by the division of the earthly sanctuary into two apartments.

Seventh-day Adventists claim to have special light on the subject of the sanctuary. The epistle to the Hebrews is written to enlighten us on that very subject. The interpretation of the sanctuary service taught by Seventh-day Adventists stands or falls with the correctness or otherwise of the accepted view as to the meaning of the two apartments and their services. The passage in Heb. 9:1-8 claims to be an expression of the mind of the Holy Spirit as to the meaning of these apartments and their related services. And yet Seventh-day Adventists give no reasoned interpretation of this passage in explaining and advocating their theory of the sanctuary! At least the writer has no knowledge of the passage being so interpreted.

If our theory were correct, we should find Heb. 9:1-12 the strongest support for it in all the Bible. The neglect of this scripture is therefore very significant.

My appeal to my brethren is that we prayerfully seek to apprehend the truth concerning our Saviour's priestly ministry as it is revealed in the New Testament, unreservedly subjecting our views as to the meaning of the type to what is plainly taught concerning the antitype.

The Message must conform to the Gospel.

Brethren of admirable principles, devoted Christians whom I highly regard and love, urge me to "preach the things of Christ, the deep things of God; but **do it in the setting of the great three-fold message.**" To these my reply has been, that if we have adopted a wrong setting of the sanctuary teaching, no amount of effort and devotion on our part to conform the teaching of the gospel to that setting could possibly be truly successful.

It grieves me to hear preachers and people speaking repeatedly of "the message", and "this message", while scarcely mentioning the blessed name of Christ. One may hear a sermon an hour long, on "the triumphs of the message" in the mission fields or elsewhere, with constant reference to "the message", or "this message", while the name of Christ is scarcely heard. Too often it is the same in our testimony meetings. Many will tell how thankful they are for the message, but will fail to tell of their personal love for Christ, or their faith in his atoning sacrifice. This cannot be right. It must grieve God that the direct testimony of faith and affection for the Saviour should be so lacking.

When, in reply to the doctrinal positions I have felt constrained to maintain, someone says, "I believe in **this message**, just as we have held it all these years", the expression of loyalty does not appeal to me very much, nor convince me. We must be loyal to **Christ**, even if that means a revision of the message. We have to decide whether the gospel is to be made to conform to the message, or the message to the gospel.

Let no one conclude from what I have here written that I at all lightly regard the message of the second advent. No, No! The advent message, as such, claims my warmest affection and unswerving allegiance. I love the Lord's appearing, and all the truths we hold concerning it. But the advent message is only part of the gospel, and not the whole, and must not be allowed to take the place of the whole. And all our teachings concerning the second advent and the fulfilment of prophecy must be made strictly to conform to the whole gospel.

The truth concerning our Saviour's mediatorial ministry in heaven is also part of the gospel; but as for the sanctuary teaching as we have received it, I say unhesitatingly that in many respects it obscures the gospel, that in some respects it is quite subversive of the gospel, and that in all these respects we ought to reject it.

The truth of the expiation of sin through the blood of Christ, and of the Saviour's immediate entrance through the blood into the holiest of all, the unveiled presence of God, in our behalf, is the very heart of the gospel; and yet this is all rejected as dangerous by those who seek to perpetuate the accepted sanctuary teaching!

"Danger, Darkness, and Disaster."

In the council at Washington, one of the brethren read a carefully prepared statement in which he declared that he was "unable to see other than danger, darkness, and disaster in the three propositions submitted, and in their essential corollaries". He said he "must not only clearly deny them but must warn against them."

What "danger, darkness, and disaster" is there in the belief that Jesus Christ reached the holiest of all when He ascended to the bosom of the Father? or in the belief that sin is expiated through the shed blood of his atoning sacrifice? There must be something wrong with a theory that fears danger and disaster from the propagation of these truths.

When I first recognised the truth that the presence of God is the holiest of all, and saw its

application to our sanctuary teaching, I passed through a period of distress of mind and pain of heart. I realised how much it would mean to our people if we were wrong in our interpretation of the sanctuary service. I took the matter to the Lord much in prayer. Eventually, as I was engaged in prayer early one morning, burdened and weeping before the Lord, my mind was suddenly arrested with the questions,—Are you grieved because Christ went to the most holy place in heaven at the time of his ascension? If this be true, what sense is there in weeping over it? What is there to weep about, anyway? Is not this great truth occasion for rejoicing rather than weeping? If you have in this matter been cherishing a mistaken view, should you not be glad to be delivered from it, rather than sorry?

I could not but answer the latter questions whole-heartedly in the affirmative, and the former in the negative. I immediately dropped my burden of anxiety and perplexity, and found peace of mind and rest of heart in believing that Christ entered into the Holiest, once for all, at the time of his ascension. In the subsequent discussions with the brethren I have had no feelings of anxiety with regard to the truth of the doctrine I had to maintain. I can see that for God's people the danger and darkness come from the obscuration of these truths, and not from the acceptance of them.

Some Further Discussions.

In the discussions several of the brethren said that they agreed with the first part of the first proposition, but regarded the deduction drawn in the second part as unwarranted and illogical. One speaker maintained that "Brother Fletcher has frequently uttered a truth and followed it immediately by, it seems to me, an unwarranted, illogical conclusion."

Another of the brethren submitted a written Bible study from which I quote the following passage:—

"In relation to the sanctuary, there can be no doubt that it is the presence of God that constitutes the second apartment the 'Holy of Holies' as it is called in Heb. 9:3. This

presence, Holy Shekinah, is on the mercy-seat in the figure and on the throne in the true."

This might be taken as entirely in harmony with the first proposition. The study went on, however, to maintain that "it is clear that 'to appear in the presence of God for us', it is not necessary that Christ appear in the second apartment, for like the golden altar, He can appear, 'before God', and 'before the throne' in the first apartment."

On another occasion, one of our ministers with whom I was given opportunity to study these matters, took the propositions and amended them as shown hereunder. The propositions as originally submitted, and as they would read with the suggested amendments are here placed side by side, with the proposed amendments in heavier type, the emphasis being indicated as written by the minister referred to.

1. That it was the immediate unveiled presence of God as manifested in the Holy Shekinah that constituted the inner apartment of the earthly sanctuary the Most Holy place, and that consequently when at the time of his ascension the Lord Jesus sat down at the right hand of God, thus "appearing in the presence of God for us", He entered the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. There can be no place in heaven more holy than the place of the unveiled presence of Almighty God.

2. That in the typical service of the earthly sanctuary the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar and before the veil represented the expiation of sin, and not its transfer into the sanctuary.

1. That it was the immediate unveiled presence of God as manifested in the Holy Shekinah that constituted the inner apartment of the earthly sanctuary the Most Holy place, and that consequently when at the time of his ascension the Lord Jesus in fulfilment of the type of the "Earthly Sanctuary Service" sat down at the right hand of God in the **OUTER APARTMENT** of the Heavenly Temple, the Divine Presence made that apartment (the Outer) the **"MOST HOLY"** Place then, and during the entire dispensation, until 1844 when the service opened in the **INNER** apartment. Since then (1844) the Divine Presence in the Inner Apartment makes **THAT**, now, the Most Holy Place.

2. That in the typical service of the earthly sanctuary the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar and before the veil represented the expiation of sin (**as GUILT, but not as CRIME**).

3. That it is necessary to modify our view that the Testimonies are to be regarded as having the authority of a direct revelation from God.

3. NO!

Whatever may be said about the **logic** of the respective statements, I leave the reader to judge on which side the **truth** lies.

It should be noted that in the above-quoted emendations to the propositions, this minister acknowledges that it is the presence of God that constitutes any place the most holy. It is an unworthy expedient to seek to overcome the difficulty by moving in this meaningless and purposeless fashion the Father and the Son from one room to another in 1844, simply to accommodate a theory that the denomination has nailed as a flag to the mast. The theory itself, and the various expedients adopted in its defence, are entirely unworthy of being maintained by a thinking Christian people.

Mrs. E. G. White recognized that the distinguishing feature of the most holy place was that it was sacred to the divine presence. She plainly tells us so in the following passage:—

"In the sanctuary and the temple, that were the earthly symbols of God's dwelling-place, one apartment was sacred to His presence. The veil inwrought with cherubim at its entrance was not to be uplifted by any hand save one. To lift that veil, and intrude unbidden into the sacred mystery of the most holy place was death. For above the mercy-seat and the bowed, worshipping angels, dwelt the glory of the Holiest,—glory upon which no man could look and live. On the one day of the year appointed for ministry in the most holy place, the high priest with trembling entered God's presence, while clouds of incense veiled the glory from his sight." *Testimonies*, Vol. 8, p. 284.

Many years earlier, Sister White wrote of the 1844 experience:—

"Thus those who followed in the advancing light of the prophetic word, saw that instead of coming to the earth at the termination of the 2300 days, in 1844, Christ **then entered the most holy place, into the presence of God, to perform the closing work of atonement, preparatory to his coming.**" "Great Controversy", Vol. 4, third edition, p. 266.

Notice that in this passage Sister White again identifies "the presence of God" and "the most

place". Here, however, it is declared that in 1844, Christ "then entered . . . into the presence of God". This is directly contrary to scripture.

In the first century of our era, the writer of the epistles to the Hebrews taught that Christ had **already** entered "into heaven itself, **NOW to appear in the presence of God** for us".

In the nineteenth century of our era, Sister White wrote that "in 1844, Christ **THEN entered . . . into the presence of God . . .**"

These statements cannot both be inspired, direct revelations from God. Which must give way? the apostle, or the author of the Testimonies? Sister White must give way. The implied assumption that Christ did not enter into the presence of God until 1844 was too patently unscriptural, and had to be eliminated. In recent editions of "Great Controversy" the passage reads differently. See the next to last paragraph of chapter 23, p. 422.

My brother minister (referred to above) dismisses the third proposition with an emphatic "NO!" That proposition cannot be so summarily disposed of, however. The instances of Sister White's mistaken teachings, necessitating subsequent changes and eliminations, are numerous, and the facts in the case stubborn. They do not disappear into thin air by process of being ignored.

Reply to a Letter of Counsel.

One of the brethren wrote advising me to be careful in the application of the statement contained in the first proposition that there can be no place more holy than the presence of God. He maintained that "the priests were in the immediate presence of God when they were in the holy place of the earthly sanctuary", and that "the disciples were in the immediate presence of God when they associated with Jesus". To this counsel I replied as follows:—

It is my earnest desire to be reverent and restrained in all thought and teaching concerning the nature and being of God, just as you have advised. I realise that we cannot comprehend God, and the glory of his presence, or measure his relationship with other beings by what we know of the relations of men one to another. It seems, however, that

while we cannot comprehend the presence of God, we are compelled by reason no less than by the unanimous testimony of scripture to acknowledge that that presence is the place of ultimate holiness.

There is a sense in which we all are, here and now, in the immediate presence of God. If a king were to give an audience to ten thousand of his subjects in one large assembly hall, they could all truly be said to be in his presence. Ten thousand times ten thousand worlds, with all their inhabitants, are in the presence of God. And God's presence pervades all space in a way that cannot be illustrated by any earthly personality.

"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?

Or whither shall I flee from Thy Presence?

If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there:

If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there.

If I take the wings of the morning,

And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;

Even there shall thy hand lead me,

And thy right hand shall hold me".

There is a sense, however, in which beings in heaven are more directly in the presence of God than are those here on earth. When the angel said to Mary, "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God" we understand that he meant something different from Elijah, when he spoke of "standing before the Lord God of Israel". While Christ was in the presence of God on earth, it was necessary for him to ascend to heaven in order to "appear before the face of God" for us in the sense contemplated in the scriptures.

While it is true that the disciples were in the presence of God when they associated with Jesus, it cannot be said that they were in God's unveiled presence. The scriptures teach that the flesh of Christ was a veil (Heb. 10:20), and speak of his incarnation as a tabernacling among men. "Divinity was veiled in humanity".

The allusion to the tabernacle in connection with the incarnation of Christ (John 1:14, margin) reminds us that the priests who ministered there were not in the unveiled presence of God. That is just the point that is stressed in the epistle to the Hebrews. And in striking contrast the epistle stresses the fact that Christ has carried the ministry of reconciliation through to that unveiled presence.

The Throne of God said to be represented in the holy place.

Another esteemed minister, in a series of camp-meeting addresses, and in a private Bible study, maintained that there was a symbol of the throne and presence of God in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary, as well as in the second. The

table of shewbread, he said, represented the throne of God in the holy place, just as the ark and the mercy-seat did in the most holy. The table of shewbread represented the mediatorial throne, while the ark represented the legal or judgment throne. The twelve loaves (bread of the presence) were placed on the table in two piles, representing the Father and the Son. The table of shewbread is not mentioned as such in the description of the contents of the heavenly sanctuary given in the book of Revelation. It was suggested that the reason for this is that the throne of God itself is the antitype of that table, and the throne being described it was not necessary to mention the table of shewbread. This table was by divine direction placed upon the north side of the earthly tabernacle; the side for the throne. Satan in his rebellion had said, "I will sit in the mount (tabernacle) of the congregation, in the sides of the north."

This view seems to me to be so lacking in scriptural support that I do not consider it necessary to discuss it here, or attempt to refute it. It is introduced as an illustration of the desperate straits in which our workers find themselves in their search for a feasible explanation of the sanctuary teaching, an explanation that will reconcile the accepted position with the fact that Christ went immediately to the very throne of God at the time of his ascension.

"The Record or Registration of Sin."

In the council at Washington importance was attached to the heavenly records, and the relation of those records to man's final standing in the judgment. The views advocated by the writer were spoken of as reflecting "a vague, indefinite, and uncertain attitude upon the whole matter of the record or registration of sin, and its confession, and of man's final attitude toward the salvation of God."

The thought of the heavenly records may well trouble an unconverted man; an unrepentant, unbelieving sinner. Emphasis should be laid on this in the preaching of the gospel, in order to warn

men to flee from the wrath to come. But for the Christian there is no scriptural ground for placing so much emphasis upon the **record** of sins, as though that record were something to be dealt with separately from the sins themselves. If the sins themselves are forgiven (Rom. 4:7), blotted out (Acts 3:19), washed away (Acts 22:16), purged (Heb. 1:3), and forgotten (Heb. 10:17), why be anxious about the record? Why teach that the believer is "not entirely released from the condemnation of the law" until there is a blotting out of the heavenly records? Why teach that the most solemn part of Christ's mediatorial ministry, and the most essential application of the power of his blood are reserved for a supposed investigative judgment, that is to result in the **record** of sins being removed; when God has assured us that **the sins themselves** have been taken away long before? Whether is the greater, the blotting out of **sin**, or the blotting out of the **record** of sin?

A man might run into debt with a business concern so heavily as to be entirely unable to pay. His creditors might apply to the court for a judgment against him, so that his worldly possessions could be sold, and payment made. They might present their books in court, as evidence of the existence of the debt. But if it should be true that a friend, hearing of his difficulties, had gone to the firm and paid in a large amount to his credit, far exceeding the amount of the debt, what would the books of record disclose? They would show that this man, although he had been a debtor, now had a substantial credit balance in his favour.

No business firm would take a case to court in such circumstances. Neither will God. For even "the foolishness of God is wiser than men." "He that believeth my word, and believeth Him that sent me . . . cometh not into judgment", Christ assures us. John 5:24. God does not need to hold an investigation almost a century long in order to blot sins out from the heavenly records that he had forgiven long ages before. The heavenly intelligences do not need such an investigation; for while they were witnesses of the sin, they were witness also of the repentance, and of

the forgiveness of that sin. If their hands recorded the one, they recorded also the other.

If I were heavily in debt to a firm, and could not pay, and all the employees of the firm knew it, I should not be very much at ease in entering those business premises. But if someone had paid my debt, and more than paid it, I should enter without embarrassment. Someone might remind me that I had been heavily in debt; but I should smilingly reply that that debt was now paid. The employees would begin to look on me as one that had been in debt, but who now had such a credit balance as to make him practically part owner of the business. It is true that I should not be able to boast among them, as though I had out of my own resources paid the debt and acquired an interest. I should have to walk softly, on that account. But I could be joyful among them, nevertheless; and they would rejoice with me, so long as I remained humble enough to acknowledge that my present standing was a matter of grace, bestowed by a friend, and not something due to me on account of my own intrinsic worth.

The entry of many debit charges in a man's account may thus be altogether offset by one payment to his credit. The entry of the credit item cancels of itself all the previous debit entries. The debit entries do not need any further "blotting out" than that. They are already "blotted out", the moment the credit entry is made.

How is it with you, reader? Has the glorious entry of full and free remission of sins been made on your account? If so, you need not fear about any future "investigation" of the books. God "will give thee a place of access among these that stand by" his throne. You will enter there joyfully, and without embarrassment so long as you rest in the free grace of the gift, and do not go about to establish your own righteousness.

A friend told me that the teaching of the investigative judgment made one feel that "you never knew when God would come to your own name in the judgment, and when He did, you were **done!**" Is this the full assurance of faith? Is this the "boldness in the day of judgment" that the Lord

gives his children? It is a shame that this false theory of atonement and judgment should be taught by professed ministers of the gospel, thus obscuring for many thousands of people the most precious truths of God's great salvation.

In this we have another instance of our denominational tendency to obscure antitypical truth by insisting on limiting it to what we conceive to be foreshadowed by the type. Because we have conceived that in the type the sins confessed during the year were stored up, and dealt with again on the day of atonement, we can see nothing for it but that the same procedure must be followed in the antitype. We have failed to apprehend the true significance of the type. We have failed also to recognise that in this instance the type is such by contrast rather than by similarity. For whereas in the type there was "a remembrance made of sins year by year", in the antitype God declares, "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

Note: Reference is made on page 83 to the teaching of the accumulation of sins in the sanctuary, as found in our books. The following passages are from "The Hour of God's Judgment", by C. B. Haynes:—

Speaking of the typical service: "In this way the sins of the entire encampment accumulated in the sanctuary". p. 57.

Speaking of the day of atonement: "The Lord's goat was on that day to die for the sins of the people, which had been accumulating in the sanctuary for the entire year." p. 59.

Speaking of the work of the high priest: "Then, bearing these accumulated sins upon his own body, after making atonement for them, the high priest passed out of the most holy place." Ib.

Speaking of Christ's ministry in heaven: "For nineteen centuries, then, the sins of God's people have been accumulating in the heavenly sanctuary above." p. 64.

The book "Bible Readings" speaks of the high priest "bearing the accumulated sins of the year in before the mercy seat." p. 240.

There seems to be a conflict here, between the writer in "Bible Readings" and Brother Haynes. The former speaks of the high priest "bearing the accumulated sins of the year IN before the mercy seat", while the latter teaches that the high priest "bearing these accumulated sins upon his own body . . . passed OUT of the most holy place".

A writer in the "Australasian Record" finds no problem in this. According to his interpretation, the high priest bore the accumulated sins in and laid them upon the mercy seat by means of offering that was "for himself", and afterwards removed them by means of the offering that was "for the people".

"Until the day of atonement, the priests in their ministration in the holy place carried in their persons an ever-increasing load of imputed sin, through the flesh of the offerings they had eaten. This burden of guilt was itself transferred from them to the sanctuary—the mercy seat—by the high priest in the first portion of the service of the day of atonement "This ceremony removed the sin, both personal and imputed, from the priests to the inmost sanctuary" "The second part of the service . . . was to accomplish the removal of all sin from the most holy place." "Things New and Old" on the Sanctuary Question", "Record" for May 13 and 20, 1929.

CHAPTER SEVEN.

IN RECAPITULATION.

If we review the arguments brought forward to off-set the self-evident and scriptural truth that the entrance of Christ at his ascension into the immediate unveiled presence of God was his entrance into the holiest place in all heaven, what do we find? Briefly recapitulated the arguments are as follow:—

1. That the most holy place was constituted such by the nature of the work carried on therein;
2. Because of its containing the sacred law; and
3. Because it was the scene of the consummation of the great controversy between good and evil.

4. It is maintained that in all that is said about Christ being "set on the right hand of the throne", location is not stressed;

5. That because Moses was instructed to "make all things according to the pattern", therefore Christ must have gone through a certain routine in heaven for 1800 years before He entered the most holy place;

6. That the typical service implied a lapse of time between the advancing stages of the work of atonement, and that in harmony with the type, Christ's blood, shed on Calvary's cross, was not sprinkled on the heavenly mercy-seat prior to 1844.

7. That the services in the two apartments of the earthly sanctuary represented two successive stages of Christ's work in heaven, and not two simultaneous aspects or phases of that ministry.

8. That the table of shewbread represented the throne of God in the first apartment, just as the ark did in the second, and that consequently Christ could be present with the Father in the throne in either apartment.

Is the reader satisfied with all of these arguments, or with any of them? Do they make up a case such as the denomination could with confidence present in a book or pamphlet on the subject? If not, why not? Perhaps some reader

will say that he is not altogether satisfied with the arguments presented; but that he believes that other and better arguments could be found. Then if better proofs and stronger supports of the accepted position are available, they ought to be produced without further delay. They will, however, never be produced. The reason is plainly to be seen. On some subjects there is an abundance of scripture testimony at hand for the support of the teaching. On this there is none.

Transfer, or Expiation?

If we review the arguments brought forward in support of the idea that sins are transferred to the sanctuary, and not expiated by the blood of the sacrifice, what do we find?

We hear the brethren in Australia saying in their report,—“We believe that the daily service and daily offerings effected the **transfer only** of sins to the priesthood . . .”, etc. (Emphasis theirs.)

On the other hand we hear the brother put forward as a leading spokesman in the discussions at Washington maintaining that “sin itself **cannot be transferred**—even to a person, a substitute.”*

Against this brother, however, we hear the voice of Sister White, teaching that “in the new covenant the sins of the repentant **are . . . transferred in fact to the heavenly sanctuary**”.

Elder Uriah Smith backs this up by saying that “if sins are not there, considered as concrete things . . . the record is fictitious and misleading.”

The brethren in Australia hold that “in the majority of cases the burden thus rested on the priesthood”, and that “if the service indicated a transfer of guilt to the priesthood, it also indicated a transfer of guilt to the altar of incense when the blood was sprinkled thereon.”

But Sister White thinks that “both ceremonies alike symbolised the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary.”

We hear the general conference home missionary department, in teaching the people how to

* Emphasis mine throughout the remainder of this chapter.

give Bible readings, instructing them that on the day of atonement "the sanctuary was cleansed of the blood record of sins confessed during the year". "How to Give Bible Readings", p. 99.

An associate editor of the "Review and Herald" agrees with this, when he writes that "all the record of the year was **registered** in the sanctuary by the **sprinkled blood** of the sacrifice over which the sins had been confessed. "Review and Herald", Feb. 13, 1930, p. 12.

We are refreshed, however, to hear the leading spokesman at Washington openly maintain in the full session of the special committee, and in a lengthy study he was appointed to give in sub-committee, that that sprinkled blood was "**evidence**", or "**record, that a transferred penalty had been paid**", and that "**the record of the paid penalty of sin was, in the figure, transferred through the blood to the golden altar . . .**", etc.

We hear the brethren in Australia, and some of the brethren in America maintaining that by eating of the sin-offering presented by the worshipper "the priest accepted the transfer of his guilt, made atonement for him, and bore the guilt until the day of atonement." We hear them translating this from type to antitype by affirming that "by his death on the cross" Christ "sealed His acceptance of the load of the world's sins", and that "He carries the sins by all who accept his sacrifice, until the antitypical Day of Atonement."

Fortunately we do not hear any rejoinder from the authors of our published works confirming this particular interpretation.

The brethren in Australia say that "the **ultimate** of Christ's work is to 'put away sin by the sacrifice of himself'".

At this point we turn again to the Bible, and find it teaching that the sacrifice of Christ was the **first** step in his ministry of salvation, and not the "ultimate", or conclusion of that work; carried out in the first century of our era, and not to be accomplished in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The soul will never find deliverance and rest in all this mechanical and materialistic conception of

sins "considered as concrete things", "transferred in fact", "increasing the burden of imputed guilt borne into the sanctuary", so that "for the last 1800 years sins of the church have been accumulating in heaven".

There is no gospel in this accumulation of sins.

The believer will find rest in receiving and relying upon the word of God, that Christ, **"when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high"**. He will find rest in believing that the atoning blood has reached the heavenly mercy-seat, and that thus God has "set forth" Christ, "to be a propitiation, **through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.**"

Thanks be to God!

The reader cannot hold to the medley of views and interpretations summarized above. Let him trust in that "one sacrifice for sins forever", and acknowledge his faith in the atoning blood before men. Of such Christ says, "Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven."

CHAPTER EIGHT.

THE RELATION OF THE PROPOSITIONS TO QUESTIONS OF PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION.

Some months before adopting the report reproduced on pp. 30 to 40, the brethren leading out in the work in Australia requested me to make a statement of my views on what they described as the positive side, as touching certain doctrines, rather than the negative. In submitting the statement called for, I said that I regarded my communication to the president of the general conference as a positive expression of my convictions on the points it dealt with. The truth concerning the supreme holiness of the personal presence of Almighty God, and the expiation of sin through the blood of Jesus Christ, is positive, primary, and fundamental. I hold unhesitatingly to this. I may not set aside such truths, modify them, or explain them away in order to accommodate my views as to the meaning of types and shadows, or the interpretation of prophetic passages. I feel compelled to hold to the position set forth in that letter entirely independently of my ability or inability to explain some prophecy or prophecies. There is no prophecy that can be shown to be in conflict with the teaching that sin is expiated by the blood of Christ, and that Christ entered the holy of holies in heaven at the time of his ascension. It is only our interpretation of some of the prophecies and types that is in conflict with those truths. I did not therefore attempt to deal with any of the prophecies, even with those we are accustomed to regard as related to the sanctuary teaching, with the idea that my success or otherwise in this could have any bearing on the truth or error of the positions maintained in my letter to the president of the general conference.

The truth concerning Christ's person and work, his expiatory sacrifice, and his priestly office and position in the heavenly courts is set forth in the Bible in plain language. The types are shadowy;

and the prophecies are figurative, symbolical, and somewhat hidden; as compared with the more direct teaching of the truth contained in the gospels and the epistles. We must not govern our understanding of the plainly expressed teachings by our conception of the meaning of types and prophecies, but *vice versa*. It is granted that to a wonderful extent prophetic symbols and figures are explained in the Bible itself in plain language, and that the types reflect in a marvellous way the light of the gospel. But even so we are bound to give precedence to the more plainly expressed teaching concerning Christ's person and work.

It may be necessary for the Christian to admit that he cannot understand or explain some features of the prophecies. Such an admission is not to be regarded as necessarily an evidence of weakness, or of error in doctrine. There is no branch of Bible study that calls for more humility, forbearance, and patience than does the study of prophecy. Since prophecy was first given, the church has been compelled over and over again to recognise her mistakes in its interpretation, and humbly to receive further light, or patiently to wait for light. We must not think that the church in this generation is exempt from this universal experience.

In their request (in December, 1929) that I should prepare a statement dealing more fully with the questions at issue, the brethren leading out in the work in Australia asked that I should explain the meaning of the cleansing of the sanctuary of Dan. 8:14, the significance of the services of the day of atonement, the nature of the hour of God's judgment of Rev. 14:6, 7, and other related prophecies. My statement in compliance with this request was placed in the hands of the president of the union conference on the 7th of February, 1930. This document contained some twenty-nine sections, or chapters. Certain of these have been adopted in more or less adapted form as the succeeding chapters of the present publication.

THE CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY.

In order to understand what is meant by the **cleansing** of the sanctuary referred to in Dan. 8:13, 14, it is necessary for us to give careful consideration to the circumstances described in the prophecy as making the cleansing necessary.

We are not warranted in holding too rigidly to the word "cleansed", for the marginal reading in the different versions is "justified". The translators of the A.V. advised that marginal readings be regarded as practically equally authoritative with the renderings adopted in the text. In the passage under consideration, the marginal reading is the literal rendering of the Hebrew. The word here translated "cleansed" (marg. Heb. "justified") is **tsadaq**. Of its use here Barnes says:—

"The Hebrew word (**tsadaq**) means, to be right or straight, and then to be just or righteous; then to vindicate or justify. In the form here used (**niphal**), it means to be declared just; to be justified or vindicated, and, as applied to the temple or sanctuary, to be vindicated from violence or injury; that is, to be cleansed."

The Cambridge Bible has the following note by Driver:—

"'Then shall the Sanctuary be Justified', i.e., have justice done to it, be shown not to have deserved desecration. 'The justification of the sanctuary is the vindication of its cause, for as long as it is polluted it lies under condemnation.' (Bevan)."

One definition of the English verb "to justify" is "to adjust or arrange exactly". This would be the sense in which the word would be used when referring to the setting right of things that had been disarranged or thrown out of adjustment.

In order to understand what is contemplated by a **cleansing**, it is necessary to give consideration to the sense in which the object referred to has become **defiled**. In order to understand in what way an object or cause is to be justified, it is necessary to ascertain in **what way it has been wrongly used**, subjected to hardship, mistreatment, or misrepresentation.

There must be a relation between the cleansing and the defilement, between the justification and that which made the justification necessary.

In the eighth chapter of Daniel much is said about great calamities that would befall "the pleasant land", "the host", "the sanctuary", "the continual burnt offering", and "the place of the sanctuary". The sanctuary and the host are said to be "trodden under foot". Then it is predicted that after a long period the sanctuary would be cleansed or justified. It is manifest that this cleansing, this justifying, or setting right, must be a reversal of or deliverance from the conditions that are described as a "treading under foot", or "trampling upon".

In "Bible Readings", pp. 224-229, we have a setting forth of our interpretation of the eighth chapter of Daniel, from which I select the following passages—

"The little horn of the eighth chapter represents Rome, both pagan and papal, in its ecclesiastical aspect, with its union of paganism, and later of apostate Christianity, with the secular power; with its antichristian persecutions of the saints of God; with its perversion of the priesthood of Christ; and with its assertion of both temporal and spiritual power over all the world. It is evident that pagan Rome is introduced into this prophecy chiefly as a means of locating the place and work of papal Rome, and the ecclesiastical features of pagan Rome as typical of the same features accentuated in papal Rome, and that the emphasis is to be placed upon the fulfilment of the prophecy in the work of papal Rome. A careful comparison of Dan. 7:21, 25, with Dan. 8:10-12, R.V., and 2 Thess. 2:3, 4, will amply justify this conclusion.

"In Dan. 8:11-13, in the Revised Version, the words 'burnt offering' have been supplied by the translators after the word 'continual'; but this rendering seems to place too restricted a meaning upon the word 'continual'. The fact that no word is connected with 'continual' in the original text, although in the typical service of the sanctuary it is used with 'burnt offering' (Ex. 29:42), with 'incense' (Ex. 30:8, here rendered perpetual), and with 'shewbread' (Num. 4:7), indicates that that which is continual represents the **continual service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary**, in which all that was continual in the typical service found its antitype and fulfilment. See Heb. 6:19, 20; 7:1-3, 14-16, 23-25. The action which made the Pope the vicar of God and the high-priest of the apostasy, really took away from Christ, as far as human intent and power were concerned, his place and work as the only Mediator between God and man (1 Tim. 2:5), and this took away from Him, as far as man could take it away, the continual mediation, according to the prediction of this prophecy.

"In Verse 13, R.V., the vision is clearly defined. It is 'the vision concerning the continual burnt offering (or continual mediation), and the transgression that maketh desolate', which results in giving both the sanctuary and the people of God to be trodden under foot".

Here we have a description of the conditions that called for the cleansing or justifying of the sanctuary. What are those conditions, according to the foregoing interpretation?

The sanctuary and the people of God are trodden under foot by the Papacy. The continual service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is taken away from Him by the false system of the Papacy.

Now if these things constitute **the need** for a work of justification or cleansing, what must be the **nature** of the work of justification or cleansing? Manifestly it must be a setting right or correction of the wrong that has been wrought through the false system, by a vindication of the true service or mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and the relief or deliverance of those who with the sanctuary have been trodden under foot.

When we turn (in the book referred to) to the next reading, on the 2300 days, we have these notes:—

"The seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, extend from the restoration of the literal Jerusalem and the literal temple to the preaching of the gospel to all the world. See Acts 15:14-17. This special preaching of the gospel was completed in one generation, and was followed by the destruction of Jerusalem.

"The twenty-three hundred prophetic days, or twenty-three hundred literal years, begin at the same time as the four hundred and ninety years, or seventy weeks, or 457 B.C., when the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem went forth; and extend from the restoration of literal Jerusalem and the typical temple service after the captivity in ancient Babylon, in the time of the Medes and Persians, to A.D. 1844, the time for the restoration of spiritual Jerusalem and of the knowledge of the mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, taken away by the little horn, after the captivity in modern Babylon. This work of restoration is to be accomplished in one generation by the preaching of the gospel in all the world (Rev. 14:6-12), and this will be followed by the destruction of the world, or fall of all the nations, of which the destruction of Jerusalem was a type." Ib. p. 231.

Then, later, follows question 17, on page 236:—

“What prophetic period, therefore, extends to the deliverance of God’s people from the captivity of modern Babylon, and the restoration to them of the mediation of Christ?”

Notice the answer given to this question:—

“And he said unto me, **Unto two thousand and three hundred days**; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” Dan. 8:14.

Now if we take this question and answer just as they read, we are bound to conclude that the cleansing of the sanctuary is “the deliverance of God’s people from the captivity of modern Babylon, and the restoration to them of the mediation of Christ.”

This conclusion would be in harmony with what I have pointed out above, that there must be an agreement between the cleansing and the defilement, between the justification and that which makes the justification necessary; the one must rectify the other. This principle is tacitly recognised again in the following statement from the same reading:—

“In this chapter the leading theme is the effort of the Papacy to substitute its own mediatorial system for the mediatorial work of Christ, and the announcement of a prophetic period (the 2300 years), **at the end of which the counterfeit system introduced by the Papacy was to be fully exposed.**” p. 237. Emphasis mine.

The teaching in “Bible Readings”, however, and in all our books, seeks at this point to transfer the interpretation to a work going on in heaven. I ask the reader to consider whether we do not in this make a great mistake.

Let us get the two divisions of the teaching before us; the teaching concerning the fulfilment of the prophecy on earth, as reviewed above; and the teaching concerning the cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven; and let us see if the two agree together, and harmonise with the prophecy. The following note on the typical sanctuary appears in “Bible Readings”, page 240:—

“Sins were conveyed into the sanctuary during the year by the blood of the personal sin-offerings offered daily at the door of the tabernacle. Here they remained till the day of atonement, when the high priest went into the most holy place with the blood of the goat on which the Lord’s lot fell; and, bearing the accumulated sins of the year in before the mercy-seat, he there, in type, atoned for them, and so cleansed the sanctuary.”

Then on page 243 there occurs the following statement:—

“The priestly work in the earthly sanctuary was typical of the work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.”

This agrees with what is taught in “Great Controversy”, pp. 421, 422:—

“As anciently the sins of the people were by faith placed upon the sin-offering, and through its blood transferred in figure to the earthly sanctuary, so in the new covenant the sins of the repentant are by faith placed upon Christ, and transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary. And as the typical cleansing of the earthly was accomplished by the removal of the sins by which it had been polluted, so the actual cleansing of the heavenly is accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins that are there recorded.”

Now we have the two phases of the teaching before us. The one affirms, that the taking away of the continual burnt offering, the casting down of the sanctuary, the casting down of the truth to the ground, and the treading of both the sanctuary and the host under foot, are fulfilled by the Papacy, “with its antichristian persecution of the saints of God; [and] with its perversion of the priesthood of Christ.” It is set forth that, “the action which made the Pope the vicar of God and the high priest of the apostasy, really took away from Christ, as far as human intent and power were concerned, His place and work as the only Mediator between God and man (1 Tim. 2:5), and this took away from Him, as far as man could take it away, the continual mediation, according to the prediction of this prophecy.” “Bible Readings”, p. 228.

The other side of the teaching affirms that the sins of believing men and women are “transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary”, and that “the actual cleansing of the heavenly is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins that are there recorded.”

Do these two sets of teaching agree? I maintain that they do not at all agree together.

The blotting out of the saints' sins in heaven was not made necessary by the blasphemous course pursued by the Papacy on earth. That blotting out would have been necessary even had there been no Papacy. If the Papacy's sins had

been transferred to heaven, and were to be blotted out, there might be some connection. But it is the "sins of the repentant" which are "by faith placed upon Christ" that are said to be "transferred . . . to the heavenly sanctuary". The Papacy has never repented. "God gave her space to repent . . . and she repented not". The cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary will not set her doings right, in any sense that is called for in the prophecy. But there is a means by which God has counteracted her work, and delivered the true teaching and worship and the sufferings saints from her age-long misrepresentations and persecutions.

The Papacy did not "take away from Christ" his place and ministry **in heaven**: it did that **on earth**. It was on earth that the truth concerning the heavenly sanctuary was misrepresented, the priesthood of Christ perverted, and the saints of God "trodden under foot".

If the sanctuary has been **defiled** by the course followed by the Papacy, in a similar sense it is to be **cleansed**, and not in an entirely different sense. If the Papacy's treatment of the truth concerning Christ's continual mediation, and of the saints, constitutes the **defiling** contemplated by the prophecy, then it is defiled **in a figurative sense**, and so the **cleansing** must also be carried out **in the same figurative sense**.

The typical services of the day of atonement were not observed in order to clear away the misrepresentations and hurtful workings of an enemy, or of a counterfeit priesthood or sanctuary, or the persecutions of an opposer of God's people. It is evident then, that the cleansing or justifying referred to in this passage, does not refer to one of the annual ceremonies of the sanctuary, but to the rectifying of the wrongs predicted in the prophecy.

The truth which had been cast to the ground, was vindicated by a great increase of gospel light. The false mediatorial system, consisting of priests, saints, and the Virgin Mary, and the counterfeit and frequently offered "sacrifice of the mass" was

swept away by the revelation of the knowledge of Him who is the "one Mediator between God and man", who first "offered one sacrifice for sins for ever", and then entered the heavenly sanctuary "to appear before the face of God for us."

As for the persecuted saints, their cause was also vindicated. They are represented in Rev. 6:10 as appealing to God for justice and judgment. Uriah Smith says, "They had gone down to the grave in an ignominious manner. Their lives had been misrepresented, their reputations tarnished, their names defamed, their motives maligned, and their graves covered with shame and reproach, as containing the dishonoured dust of the most vile and despicable of characters. Thus the church of Rome, which then moulded the sentiment of the principal nations of the earth, spared no pains to make her victims an abhorring unto all flesh." "Daniel and the Revelation", p. 442.

This condition of things began to be corrected by the work of the Reformation. Speaking of this, Uriah Smith says:—

"The work went on among the most enlightened nations, the reputation of the church going down, and that of the martyrs coming up, until the corruptions of the papal abominations were fully exposed, and that huge system of iniquity stood forth before the world in all its naked deformity, while the martyrs were vindicated from all the aspersions under which that unchristian church had sought to bury them. Then it was seen that they had suffered, not for being vile and criminal, but 'for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held'. Their praises were sung, their virtues admired, their fortitude applauded, their names honoured, and their memories cherished. White robes were thus given to every one of them." Ib. 442, 443.

To the extent that the Papacy fulfilled the prophecy of Dan 8:9-13 by perverting the truth concerning the true sanctuary and the ministry of Christ, and by trampling upon the saints; to that extent also the vindication of God's worship, and the deliverance of the saints, by putting a period to the papal supremacy, and the breaking of the Pope's power and influence, constitute the justification or cleansing referred to in verse fourteen of the prophecy.

CHAPTER TEN.

FURTHER DIFFICULTIES INVOLVED IN THE ACCEPTED INTERPRETATION OF THE CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY.

In our system of teaching, we arbitrarily import the services of the day of atonement, and inject them into the prophecy of Dan. 8:14 as "the cleansing of the sanctuary" referred to. We have no warrant for this. It is a significant fact that the Hebrew word **tsadaq** (rendered "cleansed" in Dan. 8:14) is never used in the Bible in connection with the day of atonement. The typical sanctuary is, in fact, never once spoken of even in the English version as being "cleansed" on that day. This may seem to be a startling statement; but it is true. The altar is said to be "cleansed" on that day (Lev. 16:9), but not the sanctuary. Our writers find it necessary to infer the cleansing of the sanctuary, from what is said about the cleansing of the altar.

"God commanded that an atonement be made for each of the sacred apartments, **as for the altar**, to 'cleanse' it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel." "Patriarchs and Prophets", p. 341.

The Bible quotation here is from the verse that speaks of the cleansing of the altar. The expression "cleanse the sanctuary" does not occur in Lev. 16, or in any other passage describing the services of the day of atonement, so could not be quoted. In one of our more recent publications it is said that "the service by which this was done was called the cleansing of the sanctuary." ("Hour of God's Judgment", p. 60). Where is it so called? No reference is given.

I do not maintain that the **idea** of a cleansing of the sanctuary (verse 16), and of the tent of meeting (vv. 16, 20) in the same sense as the cleansing of the altar (verse 19) and the congregation (verse 30) may not be reasonably **inferred** from the 16th chapter of Leviticus. I simply point out that "the cleansing of the sanctuary" is not a Biblical expression in this connection. This should

lead us to be at least cautious and conservative in insisting that the statement in Dan. 8:14 must refer to the services of the day of atonement, especially when in our system of teaching so much depends upon the correctness of this particular interpretation.

On the other hand there is much direct scriptural evidence to support the idea that a cleansing of the sanctuary would be called for either at its original dedication, or to restore it or any of the associated holy places after a period of desecration.

Thus Ezekiel writes concerning his mystic temple,—“In the first month, in the first day of the month . . . thou shalt cleanse the sanctuary.” Eze. 45:18. This has no connection with the day of atonement, as the time designated for its observance shows. This “cleansing” was to be carried out on the first day of the first month. It had to do rather with the inception of the services in Ezekiel’s temple, and accords with the setting up of the tabernacle in the wilderness “in the first month in the second year, on the first day of the month.” Ex. 40:17. It is in harmony also with the cleansing of the altar at the time of its original dedication. See Ex. 29:36, 37, and Lev. 8:15.

This (Eze. 45:18) is the only place in the Bible where the expression “cleanse the sanctuary” occurs, and even this is not a true parallel passage with Dan. 8:14, where the Hebrew is different, and where the connection is entirely distinct from that in Eze. 45:18.

An instance of the cleansing of the temple after a period of defilement is given in 2 Chron. 29. Hezekiah “did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord;” he “opened the doors of the house of the Lord,” and “brought in the priests and the Levites . . . and said unto them, Hear me, ye Levites; now sanctify yourselves, and sanctify the house of the Lord, the God of your fathers, and carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place.” “And they gathered their brethren, and sanctified themselves, and went in, according to the commandment of the king by the words of the Lord, to cleanse the house of the Lord. And the priests

went in unto the inner part of the house of the Lord, to cleanse it, and brought out all the uncleanness that they found in the temple of the Lord into the court of the house of the Lord. And the Levites took it, to carry it out abroad to the brook Kidron." "Then they went in to Hezekiah the king within the palace, and said, We have cleansed all the house of the Lord, and the altar of burnt offering, with all the vessels thereof, and the table of shewbread, with all the vessels thereof". (Verses 5, 15, 16, 18).

A similar cleansing, though not of the sanctuary itself, is recorded by Nehemiah, when he says: "I came to Jerusalem, and understood of the evil that Eliashib had done for Tobiah, in preparing him a chamber in the courts of the house of God. And it grieved me sore: therefore I cast forth all the household stuff of Tobiah out of the chamber. Then I commanded, and they cleansed the chambers: and thither brought I again the vessels of the house of God, with the meal offerings and the frankincense." Neh. 13:7-9.

Now it is just such a cleansing as these (in Chronicles and Nehemiah) that is called for in Dan. 8:14,—a deliverance of the sanctuary and the host from the desolating and defiling powers that the prophecy predicted would trample them under foot.

That this was the kind of cleansing the Jews themselves understood to be predicted by Daniel is very evident from the book of Maccabees. The writer says that Antiochus Epiphanes "entered proudly into the sanctuary", that the "sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness"; that Antiochus wrote to his whole kingdom that they should "pollute the sanctuary and holy people"; that on a certain day "they set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar"; that "Jerusalem lay void as a wilderness . . . the sanctuary also was trodden down." He then describes the cleansing thus:—

"Then said Judas and his brethren, Behold, our enemies are discomfited: let us go up and cleanse and dedicate the sanctuary."

"Then Judas appointed certain men to fight against those that were in the fortress, until he had cleansed the sanctuary. So he chose priests of blameless conversation, such

as had pleasure in the law: who cleansed the sanctuary, and bare out the defiled stones into an unclean place." 1 Macc. 1:21, 39, 41, 54; 3:45, 51; 4:36, 41-53.

It is very evident that the Jews at that time regarded these events as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Dan. 8:10-14, and that they understood the cleansing of the sanctuary spoken of in that scripture to be something of the nature described by the writer of the passage in Maccabees cited above, and not as having a connection with the services of the day of atonement.

Moreover, if the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to the annual atonement, the earthly sanctuary was cleansed hundreds of times before the Romans destroyed Jerusalem. This fact would greatly weaken the force of the prediction that the cleansing would not occur until the close of the 2300 days.

CHAPTER ELEVEN.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SERVICES OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

The annual feasts and holy days of the Mosaic law are described in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus. The weekly sabbath, while not of the same nature, was associated with these; doubtless because the annual sabbaths are part of a complete sabbatic system, representing developments extending from the creation of the world to the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The following is an outline of the system of sevens referred to, in which the sabbatic design is self-evident:—

The seventh day: Lev. 23:1-3.

The seventh week: vv. 4-21.

The seventh month: vv. 23-44.

The seventh year: ch. 25:1-7.

Seven times seven years: vv. 8-55.

It cannot be by accident that the ascending scale of sevens is thus grouped together. We are familiar with the Biblical significance of this sacred number. It stands for fulness or completeness, or for the consummation of that with which it is associated.

The **seventh day sabbath** is associated with the original creation.

The holy days that are grouped together so as to culminate in the **seventh week** are: (1) the Passover, representing Christ's death; (2) the Firstfruits, representing his resurrection; and (3) Pentecost, representing the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

The annual sabbaths grouped together in the **seventh month** are (1) the feast of Trumpets, representing the warning note accompanying the gospel, arousing men to consider what is to follow in the other feasts of the seventh month; (2) the Day of Atonement, representing the entrance of our great High Priest into the immediate presence of God in the heavenly sanctuary, to minister there in our behalf; and (3) the Feast of Tabernacles, representing the second advent of Christ, and the gathering together of God's people.

The **seventh year**, the sabbath of the land, represents the rest of the earth during the millennium.

The Jubilee of the fiftieth year (**seven times seven**) represents the establishment of the eternal kingdom of God in the new earth.

The idea of consummation is attached to each of these groups or divisions. The first, the **seventh day**, the weekly sabbath, stands for the consummation of the original creation. "The works were **finished** from the creation of the world." Heb. 4:3.

The second group, culminating in the Day of Pentecost, at the close of the **seventh week**, represents the consummation of Christ's atoning work on earth; the accomplishment of his death and resurrection and the bestowal on the church of the gift of the Holy Spirit. All this was grouped together in the types from Passover to Pentecost.

The observances of the **seventh month** represent the consummation of Christ's atoning work in the carrying of his shed blood with its all-availing merits into the immediate presence of Almighty God. This is plainly intended to be understood as the grand climax of the work of atonement. The Feast of Tabernacles represents the issue of Christ's mediatorial work in heaven and the preaching of the gospel on earth, in the eventual bringing of God and man together again, face to face, at the second advent.

In one of our text books on Bible doctrine, it is taught that—

"In the manifestation of the person of Christ, the great centre of the gospel, seven facts, around which many minor events cluster, stand out prominently. They are: The deity of Christ; the incarnation of Christ; the atoning death of Christ; the resurrection of Christ; the mediatorial work of Christ; and the second advent of Christ. The testimony to these facts is found in the history, the types, and the predictions of the Old Testament." "Doctrine of Christ", p. 38.

Of these seven facts, five (the whole of the series of manifestations subsequent to the incarnation) are represented in the feasts and holy days of the Jewish year: the death, the resurrection,

the ascension, the priestly mediation, and the second advent of Christ.

The ascension of Christ, and his exaltation at the right hand of the Father are intimately associated with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go I will send Him unto you." John 16:7. On the day of Pentecost, Peter explained the outpouring of the Spirit to be the result of Christ's resurrection and ascension. "Being therefore at the right hand of God exalted . . . He hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear." Acts 2:33. In the system of annual sabbaths, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is represented, rather than the ascension; but there is in the scriptures an intimate association between the two. The type and antitype of these great facts concerning Christ may therefore be viewed as corresponding in the following way:—

The Passover: The death of Christ.

The Sheaf of Firstfruits: The Resurrection of Christ.

The Day of Pentecost: The ascension of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

The Day of Atonement: The Mediatorial work of Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary.

The Feast of Tabernacles: The Second Advent of Christ.

The whole of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, and not merely the latter part of it, is represented by the services of the day of atonement. This view can be fully sustained from the scriptures.

I do not mean that there was no antitypical significance to the ministry of the priests in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary. Everything in that ministry had its significance, and bore its relation to antitypical truth. But the aspect of Christ's ministry that is represented in the first apartment **also runs through the whole of that ministry, and not through the former portion of it only.** So that, in a sense, the services of both holy and most holy places of the earthly sanctuary represented unitedly the whole of Christ's heavenly ministry throughout. The full significance of the work of the first apartment on earth was not made manifest however until the

high priest entered the most holy place on the day of atonement. **The moment the high-priest lifted the veil that covered the most holy place, the two apartments were thrown into one.** That is why the ordinary priests were commanded to vacate the first apartment on that occasion. Lev. 16:17. The holy and most holy places of the earthly sanctuary were "patterns of things in the heavens", and there is therefore a direct correspondence between type and anti-type. We must however be guided by what the New Testament teaches as to the **manner** in which the two correspond; and that teaching leads unmistakably to the conclusion that there is no intervening veil in the heavenly sanctuary. The New Testament gives an interpretation of the veil, and the significance of the division of the earthly sanctuary into two apartments that not only harmonises with this conclusion, but makes it the natural and unavoidable one.

The significance of the ministry in the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary will be given further consideration in the next chapter. In the present chapter attention is concentrated upon the fact that the services of the day of atonement in the type represented the whole of Christ's mediatorial ministry in heaven. This is maintained upon these grounds:—

1. That the Old Testament throughout recognises the most holy place of the sanctuary as representing the place of God's immediate presence, and the carrying of the priestly ministry into that presence as the supreme end toward which the sanctuary service was working, and toward which it pointed.

2. That the New Testament throughout teaches that Christ at the time of his ascension entered the unveiled presence of Almighty God (thus accomplishing the supreme end toward which the earthly sanctuary service pointed), and "sat down" or remained there; and that He will remain there until the time when his enemies shall "be made the footstool of his feet".

3. That the epistle to the Hebrews (the divine commentary on the sanctuary service) throughout

explains the anti-typical priesthood in a way that harmonises with this conception; and

4. That the book of Revelation (which gives a view of the heavenly sanctuary) also agrees with the same view.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

To illustrate the fact that this is the view contemplated in the epistle to the Hebrews, a number of passages are here cited. In some of these the evidence is only circumstantial; but it is nevertheless very important and very significant. Direct evidence is not by any means lacking, as will be seen.

1. The epistle to the Hebrews states at the outset that when Christ "had made purification of sins", He "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Ch. 1:3. This is emphasized in the same chapter by calling attention to the fact that no angel has ever occupied that position; and the original statement is repeated in later chapters of the epistle. See Ch. 8:1; 12:2.

2. We are said to have "a great High Priest, **who hath passed through the heavens.**" Ch. 4:14. This is equivalent to his having entered "within the veil". He has ascended "far above all the heavens". Eph. 4:10. The meaning is unmistakable that He has passed to the ultimate heaven of heavens, the holiest of all, without being detained at any intermediate veils or holy places. This is confirmed by what follows. In view of the fact that we have such an High Priest, we are exhorted to come boldly "to the throne of grace". Verse 16. The throne-room of the sanctuary is the holy of holies. Because Jesus has "passed through the heavens", we are invited to come by faith, through his mediation boldly **even "to the throne."**

3. Later, the epistle states that Christ has entered as our fore-runner "within the veil". This is the equivalent of a number of other expressions in this epistle referring to Christ's general entry into the heavenly sanctuary (see 1:3; 4:14; 6:19, 20; 7:26; 8:1; 9:12, 24; 10:12, 13; 12:2), and agrees with them all in regarding Him as having

entered the place of ultimate holiness. The use as a figure of the expression, "within the veil", which in the Old Testament is applied exclusively to the most holy place, strongly implies this.

4. Another general reference to Christ's entry into the "true tabernacle" is given in Heb. 8:1, 2, where He is described as "a minister of the sanctuary". That the writer has in mind here nothing short of his entry into the holy of holies is proven by his saying that "the chief point is this: we have such a High Priest, who sat down **on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.**"

5. "Through his own blood", Christ "entered in **once for all** into the holy place." Heb. 9:12. He does not enter in over and over again, as did the earthly priests. His entry is not even to be conceived of as a double or divided event. He enters "once for all". There is no need for a further formal entry into a second apartment many years later.

The use of the term "holy place" in the English version does not indicate a reference to the first apartment particularly. Uriah Smith calls attention to the fact that the Greek here has the plural, "the holy places", as in ch. 9:8, 24, 25. "Daniel and the Revelation", pp. 192, 198. See also other commentators. The holy places in heaven are **one** in the mind of the writer of this epistle, and he speaks of our great High Priest's entry into them as having already taken place "once for all". See ch. 7:27. Christ "offered up Himself" "**once for all**"; and ch. 10:10, "Through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ **once for all.**" So also He entered into the sanctuary "**once for all.**"

6. "For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us." Ch. 9:24. "Heaven itself", here, is another reference to the ultimate heaven, the "heaven of heavens", "far above all the heavens", the heaven to which Christ ascended when He "passed through the heavens". And when the apostle says here that Christ went in "to appear before the face of God for us", he undoubtedly alludes to the typical service of the day

of atonement, for the entrance of the high priest immediately into the divine presence, to appear before the face of God in Israel's behalf, was the outstanding characteristic feature of the observances of that day. See Lev. 16:2.

7. "But now once at the end of the ages hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself . . . So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him, unto salvation". Ch. 9:26, 28.

This passage contains an allusion to the services of the day of atonement. On that solemn day, as the people watched the progress of the service, they saw the high priest first of all offering the sacrifice for sin. Then for a time he was lost to their view, having entered withing the veil, into the very presence of God. They waited anxiously for his re-appearance. Soon he appeared "a second time", not to offer another sacrifice, but to bless the waiting congregation, and the people rejoiced because his work in their behalf had been successfully completed.

8. "But He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made the footstool of his feet." Ch. 10: 12, 13. Having taken his place in the heavenly sanctuary, Christ continues his ministry there, "henceforth expecting", looking forward, not to a change of ministration, but to the events represented in the succeeding sabbaths of the typical system, to the time when Satan will be bound, and, with all the wicked, finally destroyed, and thus Christ's enemies "be made the footstool of his feet."

9. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which He dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a great Priest over the house of God; let us draw near." Ch. 10:19-22. Here the "veil" spoken of as a symbol of the flesh of Christ is beyond question the second veil, the final medium of approach between God and man. Having this "great Priest" we are through Him to "draw near" by faith into the holiest of all, the immediate presence of God.

"In and through his flesh, mankind enter into the heavenly life and presence of the Godhead, and worship in the unveiled temple." Dr. C. A. Briggs, in "The Incarnation of the Lord", p. 205.

The Book of Revelation.

The book of Revelation agrees with the epistle to the Hebrews in its descriptions of the heavenly sanctuary. It shows that, as compared with the earthly sanctuary, the heavenly "temple proper, or sanctuary, was similarly constituted of the holy place and that most holy; save that there was no veil, as of old, to separate them." "Source Book", Art. Rev., Book of, Scenery employed in.

Not only is the veil not mentioned in the book of Revelation; the visions indicate that there is no intervening veil in the heavenly temple.

The altar of incense is in Rev. 8:3; 9:13 said to be "before the throne", and "before God". Speaking of the immediate proximity of the incense altar to the veil and the most holy place, Sister White says:—

"Just before the veil separating the holy place from the most holy place and the immediate presence of God, stood the golden altar of incense."

"In the offering of incense the priest was brought more directly into the presence of God than in any other act in the daily ministration." "Patriarchs and Prophets", pp. 334, 339.

But in the heavenly temple, we learn from Rev. 8:3, 4, there is no intervening veil between the altar of incense and the immediate presence of God. In the words of Dr. Briggs, quoted above, we "worship in the unveiled temple."

Delitzsch, in his commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews, discussing the possible reasons for the altar of incense being in Heb. 9:4 associated with the most holy place, says:—

"We ask, first: May we discern a motive which might have influenced the writer of this epistle, though well acquainted with the position of the incense altar in the outer sanctuary to assign it nevertheless to the holy of holies? Such a motive may certainly be discovered, and is indeed recognised by Bleek himself.

"The sacred writer", so says Bleek, and after him Tholuck, 'regards the holy of holies without its veil as a

symbol of the heavenly sanctuary, and had therefore a direct interest in regarding the incense altar whose incense oblation symbolised the prayers of saints (Rev. 8:3) as pertaining to the inner sanctuary.'

"This is the exact truth."

These writers recognise that both in Hebrews and in the Revelation the heavenly temple is conceived of as similar to the sanctuary on earth, except that there is no longer any intervening veil to divide it into two apartments.

It might be asked, Why then is it said in Rev. 11:19 that "there was opened the temple of God that is in heaven; and there was seen in his temple the ark of his covenant"; as though the ark had not been seen before? The answer is that the prophet here has a view of the closing events of earth's history and of the sanctuary service. At the end of all things the heavenly temple will have finished its work, and will, metaphorically speaking, be thrown open before the witnessing universe; just as at the close of the former dispensation, the earthly sanctuary was thrown open by the rending of the veil, so as to call all to witness that its work was finished.

This opening of the temple in connection with the last judgments of Rev. 11:18, 19 is evidently similar in significance to the casting down of the censer, of Ch. 8:5. On this, Uriah Smith says:—

"This symbolic act can have its application only at the time when the ministration of Christ in the sanctuary in behalf of mankind has forever ceased. And following the angel's act are voices, thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake,—exactly such occurrences as we are elsewhere informed transpire at the close of human probation. (See Rev. 11:19; 16:17, 18)."

The ark is not spoken of as such in the former visions of the heavenly sanctuary seen by John, its place evidently being taken by the descriptions of the throne and its glorious Occupant. The ark was "the symbol of God's presence." Testimonies, Vol. 8, p. 284.

THE MEANING OF THE TWO APARTMENTS OF THE EARTHLY SANCTUARY.

We have been accustomed to base our whole argument concerning the heavenly sanctuary on the two-compartment arrangement of the earthly sanctuary; insisting that Christ must similarly minister in two compartments successively in heaven. The scriptures are against us in this, however. We have rightly emphasised the fact that the holy things on earth were "like in pattern to the true", and that Moses was commanded to "make all things according to the pattern that was showed him in the mount." Great light and blessing are received in following out the truth thus expressed, and recognising in the ministry of our Saviour the fulfilment of what is thus "written in the law" concerning him. We need to be careful however, not to make the mistake of insisting too rigidly that the antitype must conform to the type. If we do this we are in danger of making the antitype conform to **our idea of the meaning of the type**; and as the types are after all but **shadows** of things to come, there is a good deal of risk of misunderstanding them, and becoming confused through adopting some idea as a governing principle that God never intended to be such.

We need especially to linger attentively on every explanation of the types, and every hint at their meaning that the Holy Spirit has been pleased to give. And if something the Spirit has said in the scriptures gives the interpretation a different setting than we should have though probable in reasoning from our own conception of the meaning of the type, we must by all means surrender to **His** interpretation. This is our only safe course.

Now we as a people have adopted as a governing principle the idea that because there were two apartments in the earthly sanctuary, there must necessarily be two apartments in the heavenly, and consequently two divisions in the heavenly ministry of our great High Priest. Everything has

been made to conform to that conception. We have interpreted scripture accordingly.

But the Bible gives quite a different meaning to the bi-cameral arrangement of the earthly sanctuary. Here is the inspired comment on the meaning of the two apartments:—

“Now these things having been thus prepared, the priests go in continually into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the services; but into the second the high priest alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while as the first tabernacle is yet standing.” Heb. 9:6-8.

It is plainly stated here that the interpretation given is one signified by the Holy Spirit. And the interpretation is certainly different from the one we have been accustomed to give. In this scripture, the first apartment is called the “first tabernacle”, and the holy of holies the “second”. This may be verified by reading verses two and three. A literal rendering of the clause in verse eight, “while the first tabernacle is yet standing”, would be, “while the first tabernacle hath a standing.” This is stated by commentators in general.

“The eighth verse, literally rendered, expresses that the outer sanctuary ‘held a position’”. **Expositor’s Bible**, on Heb. 9:8.

It is not difficult to see the meaning of this eighth verse, whether we view it as related to the annual round of service in the earthly sanctuary, or as referring to the change from type to antitype. In the former case the service in the first tabernacle occupied practically the whole of the year. During all that time “the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest” (A.V.). Not until the annual day of atonement was the way opened, or manifest, into “the tabernacle which is called the holy of holies”. During all the preceding months of the year the service in the first tabernacle, or apartment, occupied the field, had the right of way, “had a standing”; but on the day of atonement the work in the first tabernacle gave way to the service in the most holy place.

There is the same relation precisely between the earthly service in the first apartment and the ser-

vice of the antitypical High Priest in heaven. The annual entry into the most holy place on earth was a foreshadowing of the entrance of Jesus Christ into the very presence of God in the sanctuary above. Just as the service in the first apartment on earth gave way annually to the service in the holy of holies in the earthly tabernacle, now it gives place once for all to Christ's service in the holy of holies in heaven.

Christ did not have to go through a round of service in a first apartment in heaven, in order to show that the way into the heavenly "holiest of all" "was not yet manifest". That way **was open and manifest right "through the heavens"**, to the very throne of God, from the moment our great High Priest entered upon his heavenly ministry. There did not exist the same reason for a prolonged ministry in the first apartment in heaven as existed and made necessary that service as long as the earthly sanctuary continued. This is all borne out by what follows in the epistle to the Hebrews:—

"Which is a parable for the time now present; according to which are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect, being only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation." Ch. 9:9, 10.

This offering of gifts and sacrifices and observance of carnal ordinances pertained chiefly to the services of the first apartment; and the "time of reformation" spoken of was foreshadowed in the service of the high priest in the most holy place. It was necessary that the carnal ordinances of the first apartment should be imposed on them **"until"** a better way could be found. That better way was typified in the services of the annual day of atonement, and it was gloriously realised when Jesus Christ entered into the heavenly sanctuary, there **"to appear before the face of God for us"**. This agrees with what follows again in the same passage in the epistle to the Hebrews:—

"But Christ having come a High Priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation,

nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption". Ch. 9:11, 12.

My statement that the "carnal ordinances" pertained chiefly to the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary may be questioned by some reader, on account of the ordinances connected with the day of atonement. It is admitted that this must be borne in mind, and it is not sought here to make out that the "carnal ordinances" were confined **altogether** to the work in the holy place. The services of the day of atonement were themselves only typical, and so required similar ordinances. The high priests were such that it was necessary for them to offer a bullock for themselves before they could go in to offer for the people. Nevertheless the fact remains that so far as the people were concerned, and the priesthood as a body, the services observed by them pertained to the first apartment. The great contrast between all that work and the work that was symbolised by the annual entry of the high priest into the holy of holies is emphasized by the direction that on that solemn day the ordinary priests were not even permitted to remain in the holy place. "There shall be no man in the tent of meeting (i.e., the first apartment) when he goeth into to make atonement in the holy place, until he come out." Lev. 16:17.

It has been pointed out by another that in the earthly sanctuary the ark of the covenant and the Holy Shekinah represented the presence of the Father, the shewbread represented Christ, and the seven golden candlesticks the Holy Spirit. The golden altar of incense represented prayer to the Father, in the name and merits of the Son, by the illumination and guidance of the Holy Spirit. The veil represents the flesh of Christ. See Heb. 10:20. This throws further light on the meaning of the division of the earthly sanctuary into two apartments, and harmonises with the passage in Heb. 9:1-12 we have just been considering. The service in the first apartment represented the manward aspect, and the service in the second apartment the Godward aspect of the ministry.

Through the incarnation, the Son of God and the Holy Spirit come out, as it were, and meet men where they are. We are permitted to eat "the living bread" "which came down out of heaven". We are enlightened also by "the Holy Ghost sent forth from heaven." In all this we have God the Father coming out to meet man, in the person of the Son and the Holy Spirit. In the Godward aspect of the service, however, we have man, in the person of Christ, and through the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ, going into the most holy place, into the very presence of the Father.

This is illustrated in the first two visions of the book of Revelation. In the first vision Christ meets man (John, representing the church) in the outer part of the sanctuary, walking "in the midst of the candlesticks". In the second vision, the same Christ is seen "in the midst of the throne", with the Father. There is no intervening veil in the sanctuary in heaven. The only intermediary between God and man, between the Godward aspect of the service and the manward aspect, is the incarnate Son of God Himself.

The ordinary Levitical priests were permitted to appear and minister only in the first apartment of the sanctuary. They represented the manward aspect of the ministry. They might meet God only where God was pleased to meet man. On the Godward side they might not, at the peril of their lives, venture beyond the veil. The high priest alone might enter "within the veil". His ministry represented the Godward aspect of the work as well as the manward aspect, and he was thus more fully a type of Christ.

When, after his incarnation and atoning sacrifice, Christ entered upon his priestly ministry in heaven, He was not at any time restricted, like the earthly priests, to the manward aspect of the service, the ministry in the first apartment of the sanctuary. Christ's ministry has not at any time been restricted to either one apartment or the other. He is equally able to "appear before the face of God for us", and to "lay his hand upon" man. He is the great "daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both." Job. 9:33.

"His flesh" is "the veil", the final medium of approach between God and man." Heb. 10:19-22.

In concluding the consideration of the passage in Heb. 9:6-12, I wish to call attention to a translation made by Prof. Goodspeed. This translation is in substantial agreement with the rendering of the passage in the Twentieth Century New Testament, and other modern speech versions.

"With these arrangements for worship, the priests used constantly to go into the outer part of the tent, in the performance of their rites, but only the high priest could enter the inner part, and he but once a year, and never without taking some victim's blood, to offer on his own behalf and for the sins committed through ignorance by the people. In all this the Holy Spirit was seeking to show that there was no free access to the sanctuary while the outer tent was still standing. And all this looked toward the present time and was symbolic of the fact that the mere offering of material gifts and sacrifices cannot inwardly qualify the worshipper to approach God, since they have only to do with drinks and various washings—material regulations in force only until the time for the new order.

"But when Christ came, as the high priest of the better system under which we live, He went once for all, through the greater, more perfect tent of worship not made by human hands nor a part of our material creation, into the sanctuary, taking with Him no blood of goats and calves, but his own, and secured our permanent deliverance."

Heb. 9:6-12, in an American translation of the New Testament, by Edgar J. Goodspeed, Prof. of Biblical and Patristic Greek, University of Chicago.

The Importance of a Correct Interpretation of the Types.

In our book, "Bible Readings", page 243, an important principle is laid down, when it is said that "Upon a correct understanding of the type depends a correct understanding of the antitype."

If we adopt a mistaken interpretation of the type, we are likely to be led into a mistaken interpretation of the anti-type. The conception that the two apartments of the earthly sanctuary represented a similar arrangement in heaven, and a change from one apartment to another in the ministration of Christ, has led us to make quite a series of misapplications of scripture. Some of these have long dropped out of use; but some we still retain. The following are instances of the

misapplication of scripture resulting from the idea of Christ's moving from one apartment to another in 1844.

The Blotting Out of Sins.

Acts 3:19 has been explained to mean that the blotting out of sins would occur subsequently to Christ's entry into the most holy place in heaven in 1844, when the times of refreshing would come, and the latter rain be received by the church. One of our recent publications applies this scripture thus:—

"The heavenly sanctuary is cleansed but once . . . That cleansing began in 1844.

"Peter undoubtedly referred to this when he said: 'Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord'". "Hour of God's Judgment", pp. 65, 66.

We are certainly not justified in using this passage in this way. The R.V. rendering is: "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." A comparison of Acts 3:19 with 2:38 shows that Peter evidently intended the former to be a re-statement of the latter.

Repent ye . . . unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Acts 2:38.

Repent ye therefore . . . that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.

Acts 3:19, R.V.

"Going in to the Marriage."

2. "The proclamation, 'Behold the Bridegroom cometh', in the summer of 1844, led thousands to expect the immediate advent of the Lord. At the appointed time the Bridegroom came, not to the earth, as the people expected, but to the Ancient of days in heaven, to the marriage, the reception of his kingdom. 'They that were ready went in with him to the marriage, and the door was shut.'"

"In the parable it was those that had oil in their vessels with their lamps that went in to the marriage. Those who, with a knowledge of the truth from the scriptures, had also the Spirit and grace of God, and who, in the night of their bitter trial, had patiently waited, searching the Bible for clearer light,—these saw the truth concerning the sanctuary in Heaven and the Saviour's change of ministration, and by faith they followed him in his work in the sanctuary

above. And all who through the testimony of the Scriptures accept the same truths, following Christ by faith as he enters in before God to perform the last work of mediation, and at its close to receive his kingdom,—all these are represented as going in to the marriage.” “**Great Controversy**”, pp. 427, 428.

Is this what Christ meant when He said in the parable, “They that were ready went in with him to the marriage, and the door was shut”? Surely not!

The “Open and Shut Door.”

“I saw that Jesus had shut the door of the holy place, and no man can open it; and that He had opened the door into the most holy, and no man can shut it (Rev. 3:7, 8)”. “**Early Writings**”, p. 42.

“The view of the ‘Open and the Shut Door’, on pages 42-45, was given in 1849. The application of Rev. 3:7, 8 to the heavenly sanctuary and Christ’s ministry was entirely new to me. I had never heard the idea advanced by anyone. Now as the subject of the sanctuary is being clearly understood, the application is seen in its force and beauty.” Ib. p. 86.

This interpretation seems strained and improbable. It is “the key of David” that is referred to in Rev. 3:7, 8 as giving the power to “open and shut”. David had no power over the sanctuary. He had to have the consent of Ahimelech the priest before he could use even the bread that was to be removed from the holy place. To one of David’s descendants, the priests said, “It pertaineth not to thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests the sons of Aaron . . . Go out of the sanctuary.” 2 Chron. 26:18. So that to regard the “key of David” as having reference to Christ’s power to unlock one door of the heavenly sanctuary and open another seems to have no scriptural basis. Both priestly and kingly offices are united in Christ; but “the key of David” is not likely to be associated with the priestly aspect of his work. It would much more probably refer to the opening before the church of such doors as Paul speaks of when he says that God had “opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles”; “a great door and effectual is opened to me”, etc.

Furthermore, if the door into the holy place were closed, it could hardly avail anything for

sinner that the door into the most holy should be opened; for the only way of access to the most holy is through the holy place. To close the door of the outer apartment would be to bar sinners altogether from access to the sanctuary. This fact no doubt influenced the brethren during the period from 1844 to 1851 in adhering to the "no more salvation for sinners" doctrine.

These instances are not cited in order to cast disparagement on our past or present interpretations. Misconceptions of the meaning of scripture have prevailed for a time with other bodies of Christians, and in other ages. Because, however, it is likely to seem to some readers that what is written in preceding pages regarding the meaning of the two apartments of the earthly sanctuary and of the services of the day of atonement, "does violence to the type", these instances are cited to show that our accepted interpretation **does violence to the antitype**, which is more serious still. But the view that the services of the day of atonement represented the **whole period** of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is **not in conflict** with the type in any way: it harmonizes with the testimony of all scripture.

This is not a new or strange doctrine, although it may seem so to those who have been indoctrinated in the idea that the two apartments represented two distinct and successive stages of Christ's ministry. The view that the entry of the Levitical high priest into the most holy place on the day of atonement represented the entrance of Jesus Christ into the unveiled presence of God the Father at the time of his ascension has been held by Christian students from the days of the apostles to the present time. No one suggested anything else until 1844. Our pioneer brethren at that time evidently thought that they had in the new view found an explanation of experiences through which they had recently passed. It is very evident, however, that they were mistaken in this. We could not possibly be justified in adhering to their mistake, and insisting that our ministers continue to subscribe to what has undoubtedly proved to be a misconception.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN.

THE RELATION OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT TO THE JUDGMENT.

The fourteenth chapter of Revelation contains a solemn message announcing the hour of God's judgment. "Fear God, and give Him glory; for the hour of his judgment is come." Is the judgment referred to here the antitype of the services of the day of atonement?

There **was** an element of judgment in connection with the services of the day of atonement. Men were judged according to their attitude toward the sacrifice that had been offered, and the solemn mission of the high priest in their behalf into the holy of holies. If any man would not "afflict his soul" on that day; that is, take up a due attitude of repentance toward God, of confession of sin, and of reverence for the atoning sacrifice, he would be "cut off", or "destroyed" "from among his people." Lev. 23:27-30. This agrees precisely with the New Testament teaching about the condemnation that comes upon those who reject the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and despise or neglect his mediation in heaven in their behalf. "For judgment came I into this world." John 9:39.

Christ is a stumbling block and rock of offence to many, but it is to their condemnation.

"He that believeth on Him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God." "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:18, 36.

Men are judged here and now according to their attitude toward Jesus Christ. Because of their attitude toward **Him**, and **his sacrifice**, and **his mediation**, men are justified, or are condemned and "cut off from among" his people. This corresponds to the same features in the typical day

of atonement. This of course is not the final judgment, for that takes place after the second advent of Christ.

An element of judgment in connection with Christ's mediatorial work in heaven is indicated also in the scripture: "Everyone therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 10:32, 33. The same characteristic of Christ's work appears in the teaching of the apostle that "if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." 1 John 2:1. These have been features of Christ's mediation, however, from the time of his ascension to heaven.

There is no evidence that **an investigative judgment**, such as we as a denomination have taught, is typified by the services of the day of atonement. What was there in the ceremonies of that day that had the least resemblance to an investigation such as we have pictured as taking place in heaven? Did anything transpire within the holy of holies that could be understood to typify an investigation of the standing of the people? Nothing at all that could be so represented. The high priest's visits within the veil were very brief. He was to take of the blood of the bullock and of the goat and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat and before the mercy seat seven times; and was to have meanwhile, for his own protection, a cloud of incense covering the mercy seat. These things were no figure of a detailed investigation of the cases of the people. The only work of investigation carried on would be conducted **outside the sanctuary, among the people**, where it would be noticed that some did not respect the offering and the service; and these would be excommunicated, or excluded from the congregation. This was not a judgment of the righteous ones, but a reproof of the careless and indifferent ones.

We are not warranted in building up a theory of an investigative judgment on the fact that men were said to be "cut off from among" the people in this way; for that sentence was passed upon defaulting Jews for many other offences besides

inattention on the day of atonement. Here follows a list of them: the children of Israel were liable to be cut off from among God's people:

- for neglecting the passover (Num. 9:13);
- for eating leaven during the passover (Ex. 12:15, 19);
- for touching the dead, and coming into the tabernacle while neglecting purification (Num. 19:13);
- for imitating the holy oil, or the holy incense (Ex. 30:33, 38);
- for eating the peace offering while unclean (Lev. 7:20);
- for eating the fat, or the blood (Lev. 7:25, 27; 17:14);
- for offering sacrifice elsewhere than at the tabernacle (Ch. 17:4, 9);
- for eating the peace offering on the third day (Ch. 19:8);
- for giving children to Molech (Ch. 20:3); as well as
- for refusing to seek God on the day of atonement (Ch. 23:29).

This punishment was evidently visited upon them for disrespect or inattention in these various ways to the things of God, for presumption regarding those things, or for the neglect of them.

The same warnings appear in the New Testament regarding the attitude of men toward the antitypical sacrifice, and priesthood, and ministry.

"How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard."

"See that ye refuse not Him that speaketh. For if they escaped not, when they refused Him that warned them on earth, much more shall not we escape, who turn away from Him that warneth from heaven."

"For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" Heb. 2:3; 12:25; 10:26-29.

In some way the idea has gained currency among us that the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice in the sanctuary **recorded** the sin con-

fessed. Building on this idea it is next supposed that on the day of atonement the sin thus recorded was reconsidered and blotted out, and that this is what constituted the day of atonement a day of investigative judgment.

Seeing that it is the blood of Christ that is supposed to be represented in both cases, it ought to be explained in what way that blood could record sin on one occasion, and blot out that same sin on another occasion. The two processes are exact opposites. It may be readily understood that the blood of Christ might at once time witness **against** the sinner **who rejects it**, and then at a later time witness **for** the same sinner **when he repented and believed on the Saviour**; but it is difficult to understand how the blood of Christ could record the sins of a repentant believing man on one occasion, and blot out the same sins of the same man (who had remained faithful) on another occasion. I quote again an extract from one of our recently published books:—

“The tenth day of the seventh month was the day of atonement. On this day the sanctuary was cleansed of the blood record of sins confessed during the year.” “How to Give Bible Readings”, p. 99. Published by the General Conference Home Missionary Department.

Does blood record sin? Yes, it did so in the case of Abel. “The voice of thy brother’s blood crieth unto me from the ground”, said the Lord to Cain. But does the blood of Jesus Christ **record** the confessed sins of believing men? (For it must be noted that it is **only confessed sins** that are said to be thus recorded. “In the great day of final atonement and investigative judgment, the only cases considered are those of the professed people of God.” “Great Controversy”, p. 480). Does Christ’s blood **record** the sins of his people? The scriptures teach **the very opposite**. We have come “to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of the sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.” Heb. 12:24 A.V.

What a contrast! Abel’s blood cried to God from the ground for vengeance upon Cain. But it is not so with the blood of Christ. That precious blood cries from the ground to God for

the pardon of the very ones who shed it. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." It **"speaketh better things than that of Abel."** Heb. 12:24 A.V.

"Five bleeding wounds He bears
Received on Calvary:
They pour effectual prayers;
They strongly speak for me;
Forgive him, O forgive, they cry,
Nor let the contrite sinner die."

No, the blood of Jesus Christ does not **record** the confessed sins of his people. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son **cleanseth** us from all sin."

CHAPTER FOURTEEN.

THE NATURE OF THE JUDGMENT OF REVELATION 14:7.

What then? Is there any other sense in which Rev. 14:6, 7 may be understood, in its declaration that "the hour of God's judgment is come?" The answer to this question comes from the book of Revelation itself.

The latter chapters of the Revelation have much to say about judgment. They may for this reason rightly be described as "judgment chapters". In the earlier chapters, those preceding the fourteenth, there is not only no announcement of judgment, but there is an enquiry and an appeal for it.

The three lines of prophecy contained in the seven seals; the seven trumpets; and the descriptions of the dragon, beast and false prophet of chapters twelve and thirteen; all depict the tribulations and persecutions through which the church would have to pass during the Christian dispensation. Little is said until the fourteenth chapter is reached about any retributive judgments from God falling upon the persecuting and desolating powers themselves. In the first thirteen chapters only two references are made to judgment. The first is the cry of the martyrs asking why God **does not** judge and avenge their blood (Ch. 6:10), and the other (Ch. 11:18) says that under the seventh trumpet the time to judge the dead has come. But after chapter fourteen is reached, judgment follows judgment in rapid succession. Chapters fourteen to twenty may therefore be regarded as judgment chapters. The evidence of this is not by any means confined to the use of the word "judgment"; but the following list of passages in which that word is used will nevertheless serve to justify the view here advocated.

The First Portion of the Book.

"How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Ch. 6:10.

"And thy wrath came, and the time of the dead to be judged." Ch. 11:18.

The Turning Point.

"Fear God, and give Him glory; for the hour of his judgment is come." Ch. 14:7.

The Latter Portion of the Book.

"Righteous art Thou, which art and which wast, Thou Holy One, because Thou didst thus judge." Ch. 16:5.

"True and righteous are thy judgments." Ch. 16:7.

"Come hither, I will show thee the judgment of the great harlot that sitteth upon many waters." Ch. 17:1.

"For strong is the Lord God which judged her." Ch. 18:8.

"For in one hour is thy judgment come." Ch. 18:10.

"Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye saints, and ye apostles, and ye prophets, for God hath judged your judgment on her." Ch. 18:20.

"For true and righteous are his judgments: for He hath judged the great harlot." Ch. 19:2.

"In righteousness doth He judge and make war." Ch. 19:11.

"And judgment was given unto them." Ch. 20:4.

"And I saw a great white throne . . . and the dead were judged out of the things which were written . . . and they were judged every man according to their works." Ch. 20:11-13.

The judgment announced in verse seven of the fourteenth chapter is the commencement of the retributive judgments of God upon the powers represented by the beast and his image, and also (as appears from Ch. 16:12) upon the desolating forces issuing from the region of the Euphrates (Ch. 9:14) in the preceding prophecy. The seven plagues are described as "God's judgments". Ch. 16:7. The Papacy is desolated by the very powers that had supported her for 1260 years. Ch. 17:16, 17. This is the beginning of the judgment of the great harlot. Ch. 17:1. Chapter eighteen describes the effect upon men of the judgments that will fall upon Babylon, and the first part of chapter nineteen tells how those judgments will be regarded in heaven. The judgments begin to fall prior to the second advent of Christ, while the gospel is still being preached, and (according to Ch. 19:11-21) reach a great climax at that advent.

It is clear that all these judgment chapters are directly connected with the prophecy of chapters twelve and thirteen. There are many evidences of this. In Ch. 19:20; 20:1-3, 10, for instance, is brought to view the ultimate fate of the dragon,

the beast, and the false prophet, the three persecuting powers of chapters twelve and thirteen. Although the dragon of chapter twelve may be regarded as representing pagan Rome, it seems to stand primarily for Satan himself. Thus the three symbols of chapters twelve and thirteen are dealt with in succession in the passage from Ch. 19:20 to 20:10. The beast and the false prophet are taken, and then the dragon is cast into the abyss.

The twentieth chapter describes the judgment during the millennium, in which the saints participate, and finally the judgment of the great white throne. There is a turning point between the long-drawn-out persecutions of chapters twelve and thirteen, in which the saints seem to be at the mercy of earthly powers, and the long train of judgments upon those powers described in chapters fourteen to twenty, and that turning point is announced in the seventh verse of chapter fourteen.

But these judgment chapters provide more than an answer to chapters twelve and thirteen; they connect also with the prophecy of the seven trumpets, in describing the ultimate fate of the Mohammedan powers, as already mentioned, and with other features of that prophecy; they reach back to the prophecy of the seven churches, and announce the accomplishment of the judgments threatened against Jezebel and her paramours (Ch. 2:21-23); and they provide also a response to the cry for judgment in the prophecy of the seven seals, as the following comparison will show:—

<p>“How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?” Ch. 6:10.</p>	<p>“For He hath judged the great harlot, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand.” Ch. 19:2.</p>
---	---

The original words for “to judge” and “to avenge” are the same in both these passages. The fact that Ch. 19:2 is heaven’s answer to the cry of Ch. 6:19 seems unmistakable. God’s response to the same cry is also clearly observable in a later chapter. “God hath judged your judgment upon her”. Ch. 18:10. The turning point between the saints’ cry for judgment and the

Lord's response in judgment appears in the fourteenth chapter.

The question now arises, Is there any specified time at which the hour of God's judgment of Rev. 14:7 would begin?

It must be borne in mind that the judgments introduced from this point in the book of Revelation onward, are judgments upon the great, apostate, desolating powers described in the prophecies, and upon a world which through drinking the wine of this apostasy has become one vast antitypical Babylon.

Now the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation have both assigned specified times for the duration of these persecuting supremacies. The Little Horn of Dan. 7:25 was to continue "until a time, and times, and half a time." The Little Horn of Dan. 8 with its successors was to continue its desolations of "the sanctuary and the host" "unto two thousand and three hundred days". The desolating power of Dan. 12:7 was to "scatter the power of the holy people", "for a times, times, and a half."

In the Revelation, the angels loosed from the Euphrates were prepared to kill for an hour, a day, a month, and a year.

The treading of the holy city under foot by the Gentiles was to continue forty and two months.

The two witnesses were to be clothed with sackcloth for a thousand two hundred and three-score days.

The woman fled into the wilderness from the persecutions of the dragon and from the face of the serpent for a similar period.

The seven headed and ten horned beast received "authority to continue forty and two months."

The "time and times and half a time" of Dan. 7:25 came to an end in 1798 with a crushing judgment upon the Papacy. He that led so many into captivity was himself led into captivity. This event fulfilled also the parallel prophecies in the Revelation referring to the same power. All the

above-mentioned time prophecies in both Daniel and the Revelation have expired, and have met their fulfilment.

Now the whole trend of the prophecies of these two books would lead us to expect that the powers which have so devastated God's people, would, at the expiration of their allotted time, be themselves subjected to the judgments of God. And the passage in Rev. 14:6, 7 marks that very turning point. Prior to the hour of God's judgment the church suffers under the long-drawn-out persecutions of the anti-christian powers. There appears to be no intervention from heaven. The years roll by until it seems that no flesh will be saved from the insatiable maw of the forces that wear out the saints. The cry goes up to heaven, "How long, O Master, the holy and the true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?"

But a great change takes place at the expiration of the prophetic periods. The tables are turned. The persecuted saints are given relief, and the persecuting powers themselves encounter troublous times. For them, judgment follows judgment in rapid succession.

Upon the Papacy there falls the stroke of the deadly wound. There is a going into captivity. There is a killing with the sword. The very forces that supported her now hate her, and make her desolate and naked and finally burn her with fire. She may from time to time seem to recover; but each apparent recovery in due course gives way to some fresh evidence that her dominion is departed. She may even, through the development of a latter-day apostasy appear to have recovered so much of her former glory as to be emboldened to say, "I sit a queen, and am no widow"; but swiftly as "in one day shall her plagues come . . . for strong is the Lord God who judged her."

As for Islam, the judgments that fall upon her have their own distinctive characteristics, in harmony with the specifications of the prophecy. She is smitten with wasting and decay. The sceptre of dominion over the unfortunate peoples of the

Eastern empire falls gradually and slowly from her enfeebled grasp. Long before the final drying up of the Euphrates, a preliminary shrinkage appears. The Western nations, in their own interests, seek to stay the forces of disintegration, but without success. The great desolator of the east and of the pleasant land finally comes to an end in utter helplessness.

We have for a century or so been living in a time when the operation of these judgments has been working out before our eyes; and the end is not yet.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN.

CONSIDERATION OF THE JUDGMENT DESCRIBED IN THE SEVENTH CHAPTER OF DANIEL.

The preceding chapter leads naturally to a consideration of the judgment scene depicted in the seventh chapter of Daniel, and the connection in which the judgment is spoken of in that chapter.

The connection is much the same as in the book of Revelation. The succession of earthly powers passes in review first of all. These are represented by a series of wild beasts. The fourth of them is the most ferocious and dreadful of all. But the climax of oppression and blasphemy is reached in the career of the Little Horn, which springs up among the ten horns of the fourth beast.

Up to this point the earthly powers represented in the symbols have been allowed to go on with their work apparently unhindered and unchecked. But following the career of the Little Horn a change is observed. At this juncture the judgment sits, the issue of which is that "the beast is slain, and his body destroyed, and he is given to be burned with fire."

In the interpretation the same general course of events is reviewed. The interpretation is first summarised in verses seventeen and eighteen. The four beasts represent four kingdoms; but finally the saints take the kingdom.

Daniel desired to know more about the fourth beast, however, and particularly about the Little Horn. This latter power he observed, "made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High."

Here again the judgment is brought in as an anti-climax to the persecutions of the Little Horn. The climax of dreadfulness in the course of the earthly events predicted is reached when this power is seen not only to make war with the saints, but to **prevail** against them. No cessation of this persecution takes place until the Ancient

of days intervenes; but when **He** comes to judgment there is a drastic reversal of conditions. "Judgment is given to the saints", or according to the marginal reading, "judgment is given **for** the saints." If we follow the first reading, the meaning evidently is that justice **was meted out** to the saints. If we take the second reading, the meaning would be that judgment was given **in favour of** the saints. In the tribunals of earth, dominated by the Little Horn, the saints have been accounted worthy of death; but now heaven's tribunal sits, and reverses the decisions of earth.

Now if justice is meted out to the saints, it must be at the expense of the Little Horn; and if justice is given in favour of the saints, it must be a judgment against the Little Horn; for the unequal contest is between the saints and the Little Horn.

"And they cried with a great voice, saying, How long, O Master the holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth." Rev. 6:10.

This is borne out in the seventh chapter of Daniel by what follows in the fuller interpretation. The angel interprets the meaning of the fourth beast, and the ten horns, and then enlarges especially upon the blasphemous and injurious course of the Little Horn. The last point mentioned in the specifications concerning the Little Horn has to do with the period of the duration of its dominion. He prevails for "a time and times and half a time". This is the climax. It is followed immediately by the anti-climax.

"But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end." Verse 26.

The first issue of the judgment is that the Little Horn's dominion is taken away. That dominion is never fully restored. Heaven's judgment is, "to consume and to destroy it unto the end." There is a sharp distinction between dominion **continuing** for "a time and times and half a time", and dominion **taken away** and **consumed** and **destroyed** unto the end.

The **event** that marks the turning point from one state of things to another is the intervention of God in judgment. The **effect** of the judgment is

seen in the outcome both for the saints and for the Little Horn. The outcome for the saints is that judgment is given **for** them (v. 22 margin), or in their favour; they eventually **possess** "the kingdom and the dominion". The outcome for the Little Horn is that the judgment is **against** it: its **dominion** is **taken away**, to be consumed unto the end; and eventually the beast, Little Horn and all, will be given to the burning flame and **destroyed**. The dominion that comes to the saints however, is one which "**shall not pass away**", and **shall not be destroyed**."

In all this we have unmistakable evidence as to **the nature** of the judgment referred to. Its **object** is to deal with matters as they stand between the saints and the Little Horn. This does not call for an investigation of the cases of the saints, in their relations with the Lord. It is the cases of the saints in their relations with the great persecuting power that come up for review. Or rather, it is **the case against the Little Horn** that is up for consideration. The saints had long ago appealed to high heaven against the power that was destroying them. Rev. 6:10. Judgment was deferred at that time (verse 11); but now "**the hour of God's judgment is come**".

The books are opened, not to reveal the confessed sins of the saints; but to witness against the Papacy, in its blasphemous words against the Most High, and its cruel treatment of God's faithful servants.

What do these books disclose? What do they witness concerning the saints, who through long ages have been so cruelly done to death? This is their record: "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints". Rev. 13:10.

What, on the other hand, is written in the heavenly records concerning the Little Horn? What will be revealed concerning the Papacy, when "the judgment is set and the books are opened."?

"In her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that have been slain upon the earth." Rev. 18:24.

Little wonder that the judgment is **for** the saints, and **against** the Little Horn!

The judgment brought to view in Dan. 7:9, 10 is the beginning of a prolonged and advancing course of judgment, culminating in the destruction of the wicked at the close of the millennium. The judgment of the seventh of Daniel is introductory, and leads on to other developments; whereas the judgment of Rev. 20:11-15 is final, and brings God's dealings with sin and sinners to an everlasting conclusion.

The immediate result of the judgment of Daniel seven is that the **dominion** of the Little Horn is taken away. This is not the end of the earthly **existence** of that power; for there is a period after the taking away of its dominion, and prior to "the end", in which the prophecy implies that it will be gradually consumed and destroyed. "They shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end." Verse 26. Daniel's vision looked forward to the time when the fourth beast would be "slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." This doubtless coincides with the committing of "the beast" to "the lake of fire and brimstone" described in Rev. 20:10. There is a long course of events, however, between the taking away of the dominion of the Little Horn at the close of the "time, times, and half a time", and the destruction of the beast by fire. Dan. 7:9, 10 depicts the judgment scene at the beginning of that course of events, and Rev. 20:11-15 depicts the scene at its close.

"This (Dan 7:10) is not spoken of the final judgment; but of that which he [God] was to execute upon the **fourth beast**, the Roman Empire; and the **little boasting horn**, which is part of the fourth beast, and must fall when the other falls." **Adam Clarke.**

"All that is fairly implied here (Dan. 7:9) is, that events would occur in regard to this fourth beast as if God should sit in judgment on it, and should condemn it in the manner here referred to. We are, doubtless, in the fulfilment of this, to look for some event that will be of so decisive and marked a character that it may be regarded as a Divine judgment in the case, or that will show the strongly marked Divine disapprobation—as really as if the judgment were formally set, and God should appear in majesty to give sentence." **Barnes' Notes on Daniel**, p. 53.

There is nothing in the "placing of the thrones" of Dan. 7:9 that warrants our teaching that the thrones were at that juncture moved from one apartment of the heavenly sanctuary to another. So far as the thrones are concerned, and the concourse of heavenly attendants, the scene is the same as that described in the fourth and fifth chapters of Revelation. In the latter passage there is described first of all the central throne of God the Father; and then it is said that "round about the throne were four and twenty thrones". Finally there are "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands" of "angels round about the throne". This was the scene in heaven toward the close of the first century, when the vision was given to John. So that there was no need of a special moving of the thrones in order to bring about the scene described by Daniel. The distinctive feature of Daniel's vision is that at a certain juncture God and the heavenly intelligences assumed an attitude of judgment toward a certain earthly power which was a leading subject of the vision.

Have we in the Bible any other instances of the heavenly council being thus called into action in connection with events transpiring on the earth? We have indeed, and a notable one right in the book of Daniel itself. In the vision in which king Nebuchadnezzar was represented as being sentenced to spend seven years "with the beasts in the grass of the earth", the announcement was made by "a watcher and an holy one", with the declaration that "the sentence is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones." Dan. 4:17.

Who were the holy watchers here referred to, but the attendants described in Dan. 7:10 as surrounding the throne? And what council could have issued a decree passing sentence upon Nebuchadnezzar except such a council of judgment as that described in Dan. 7:9, 10?

Now if that heavenly council intervened with a decision concerning the king of Babylon in Daniel's day, it is perfectly consistent that it be represented as sitting in the latter days to issue a still more

momentous decree against the Little Horn, the ruler of antitypical Babylon.

We have also another prophecy of God's entering into judgment with a persecuting power, that can be regarded as analagous to the one in the seventh of Daniel now under consideration. In the prophetic vision given to Abraham, recorded in the fifteenth of Genesis, it was said to the patriarch: "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge." Gen. 15:13, 14.

Here was a period of four hundred years during which Abraham's descendants would suffer affliction under an oppressing power. At the conclusion of that period, God would judge the oppressor. We know very well how the Lord caused that prophecy to be fulfilled. At the close of the prophetic period he commissioned Moses to announce, "I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments." Ex. 6:6. He did this by pouring out ten awful plagues upon the Egyptians.

In the seventh chapter of Daniel we have a similar prophecy of a prolonged oppression of God's people. This oppression continues for "a time, times, and half a time". But again God intervenes in judgment. Whom does He now judge? He judges the persecuting power, of course, just as He did in the days of Pharaoh. This time his plagues are seven, and not ten; but they are unmistakably directed against the persecuting power symbolised by the Little Horn.

The first plague falls upon the supporters of the beast. Rev. 16:2.

When the third plague is poured out, and the rivers and fountains of waters become blood, the cry goes up from the heavenly watchers, "Righteous art Thou, which art and which wast, thou Holy One, because Thou didst thus judge; for they poured out the blood of saints and prophets, and poured hast Thou given them to drink: they are worthy." vv. 5, 6.

inction between the two advents, so familiar to us, was unknown to the prophets. They inquired concerning it; but it was not God's will to enlighten them in the matter. 1 Pet. 1:10-12.

We have in the book of Malachi a good illustration of this characteristic of the Old Testament method of presenting the truth.

"Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; and the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, behold, he cometh, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver; and they shall offer unto the Lord offerings in righteousness." Mal. 3:1-3.

It is difficult even now to draw a clear line of distinction between references to the first and second advents in this passage. The same difficulty would be found in dealing with the following statement of the prophet Isaiah:—

"O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion, get thee up into the high mountain; O thou that tellest good tidings to Jerusalem, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold, your God! Behold the Lord God will come as a mighty one, and his arm shall rule for him: behold his reward is with him, and his recompense before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, he shall gather the lambs in his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that give suck." Isa. 40:9-11.

There are indications that the apostle Peter had Daniel particularly in mind when he wrote of the prophets "inquiring and searching diligently" in their endeavours to understand "what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them."

With so much evidence in the scriptures that this was the prevailing method of presenting Messianic truth in the Old Testament, and with Peter's evident allusion particularly to Daniel in this connection, we ought to be prepared to see a wider meaning in the passage in Daniel 7:13, 14 than we have been accustomed to attribute to those verses.

The verses referred to cover the whole Christian dispensation. Christ was brought by the angels to the Ancient of days at the time of his ascension to heaven. The whole of the New Testament testifies to the fact that He went in at that time to appear before God in our behalf.

It might be objected to this, that Christ did not at the time of his ascension receive the kingdom, as represented in this scripture. But neither did He receive the kingdom in 1844. If we can allow the greater part of a century between the two events, there is nothing to forbid the intervention of nineteen centuries. Christ's going in before the Ancient of days stands at one end, and his reception of the kingdom at the other end of the period in either case. The length of the period makes no particular difference.

Take, for further illustration, the passage in Isa. 61:2, "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God." There are many centuries of time between the commencement of the "acceptable year of the Lord", and the coming of the "day of vengeance of our God". Who could tell that from the passage itself? We could not tell it, and the prophets themselves could not discern it. Already the "acceptable year of the Lord" has extended over nineteen hundred years, and the "day of vengeance of our God" has not yet fully begun.

Neither can we tell how long a period intervenes between the thirteenth and fourteenth verses of the seventh of Daniel. This much is certain, (1) that the Son of man was brought into the presence of the Ancient of days at the time of his ascension to heaven, and (2) that the reception of the kingdom takes place at the close of his present mediatorial ministry.

We have in the New Testament a prediction of Christ's departure from the earth, his reception of the kingdom, and his return, that is no less brief and all-embracing than the one in Daniel under consideration.

"A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Luke 19:12.

We are bound to recognize that some nineteen centuries elapse between the departure of the nobleman (the Son of man), and the reception of the kingdom and return. The points of similarity between this passage and the one in Daniel are so unmistakable that what we concede in the one instance we cannot refuse to allow in the other. A similar period may elapse between the entry of the Son of man into the presence of the Ancient of days, and his eventual reception of "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve Him".

Let us linger a moment longer in the contemplation of the sublime scene and the sublime truth presented in Daniel's vision. The Son of man **"came even to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him."** This is that supreme accomplishment of which it was the central purpose of the earthly sanctuary service to testify and to prophesy; that Christ should go "through the heavens" to the very throne of God, there "to appear before the face of God for us", that he should take his place "at the right hand of God", and there "also make intercession for us".

Consider that it is the **"Son of man"** who is thus ushered into the presence of the Ancient of days. Christ goes there as **man's** representative. It was to this end that He took our nature upon him, that having been "made like unto his brethren . . . he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God." He is the last Adam; the new Head of our once scattered, but now redeemed and (in Him) restored race; and it is in **that** capacity that He now goes in before the Father.

"And they brought him near before him". The one thing above all others that fallen and sinful man might **not** do, was to draw near to that Divine Presence. This lesson was forcibly impressed upon the people in connection with the sanctuary in the wilderness. **"The children of Israel shall not come nigh the tent of meeting, lest they bear sin, and die."** Num. 18:22. The tribe of Levi

were to be a go-between, "That there be no plague among the children of Israel **when the children of Israel come nigh** unto the sanctuary." Ch. 8:19.

The command was to "**bring the tribe of Levi near**" (Ch. 3:6); but this was only a comparative nearness. "**They shall not come nigh** unto the vessels of the sanctuary and unto the altar, that they die not". Ch. 18:3. It was commanded concerning them that "**they shall not go in** to see the sanctuary even for a moment, lest they die." Ch. 4:20.

After the judgments of God had been visited upon the presumptuous company of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, "the children of Israel spake unto Moses, saying, Behold, we perish, we are undone, we are all undone. **Every one that cometh near, that cometh near** unto the tabernacle of the Lord dieth." Ch. 17:12, 13.

The priests were permitted to minister in the holy place, but were not allowed to enter the inner sanctuary, the place of the Divine Presence. The high priest alone was authorised to enter there, and even he must enter in "not without blood", and a covering cloud of incense. The ordinary priests on that occasion must keep out of the sanctuary altogether. Lev. 16:17.

As for the **Gentiles**, they were kept "far off". The outer court, which, in the more permanent structure was "given to the Gentiles", was spacious enough; but it was well "without" the courts reserved for the Jews, the Levites, and the priests.

Such was the state of mankind. The Jews were only able to "draw nigh" even to the earthly symbol of God's dwelling place through a mediating tribe and priesthood, with varying degrees of nearness; the final admission into the Divine Presence being represented by the entrance of one man for a brief space on one day of the year. The Gentiles, comprising the great mass of the human race, were still more completely separated and "far off".

But now a blessed revolution has been effected through the incarnation and atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. The "time of reformation" has come. Redeemed mankind, in the person of

its Head, the "Son of man", is conducted by angels into the very presence of the Deity. "They **brought him near** before him." Behold ye Gentiles, One who is more than the Son of Abraham, One who identifies himself with **us also**, loving to speak of himself as "the Son of man"; behold him now brought into the presence of the Ancient of days in our behalf, with no intervening veil of separation!

"Now in Christ Jesus ye [Gentiles] that once were **far off** are **made nigh** in the blood of Christ." "He came and preached peace to you [Gentiles] that were far off, and peace to them [the Jews] that were [comparatively] nigh . . . Through him we both [Jew and Gentile] have our **access in one Spirit unto the Father.**" "Blessed be God . . . who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ." Eph. 2:13, 17, 18; 1:3.

That holy Son of man, whom nineteen centuries ago the angels "brought near before" the Ancient of days, still appears in the presence of God for us. He has not yet laid aside the priestly robe for the kingly crown. Through him we may still draw near. "**Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace.**" Heb. 4:16.

"Draw nigh and take the Body of the Lord,
And drink the holy Blood for you outpoured.

"Saved by that body and that holy Blood,
With souls redeemed we render thanks to God.

"Offered was he, for greatest and for least,
Himself the Victim, and Himself the Priest.

"Approach ye, then, with faithful hearts sincere,"
To God, in reconciliation here.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN.

AN APPEAL.

A grave responsibility rests upon ministers, with reference to the doctrine taught to the people. Above all things, faithfulness is required in stewards. We ministers have been put in trust with the gospel. We are stewards of the mysteries of God. It is one of our chief duties earnestly to contend for the faith as it was once for all delivered to the saints. If error creeps into the church, or mistaken interpretations gain the ascendancy, we cannot, on discovery of these things, evade the responsibility to bear witness for the truth. We are to do this at any sacrifice to ourselves, "that the truth of the gospel may continue with" the people.

How important a function of our office this is, the guarding and preserving of the truth! If we are faithful in this, in life and teaching, we will both save ourselves and those that hear us. If we fail in this, we will involve those that hear us in perplexity and danger, and will have to give an account of ourselves to Him who called us to this ministry.

Consider the charge of the apostle Paul, that "in doctrine" we are to show "uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity". Titus 2:7 A.V. The word "sincerity" in this passage is translated from the Greek, **aptharsia**, elsewhere rendered "immortality" and "incorruption". The meaning here is that the doctrine we teach must be such as will not be adversely affected by the lapse of time. The English word "sincerity" is derived from the Latin, **sine cere**, literally, without wax. It was customary with the Latins to inscribe a piece of genuine statuary with the words, **sine cere**, as a guarantee that it was of solid marble. Some statuary was put on the market that looked very beautiful and attractive, because cracks, flaws, or depressions were filled in and rounded out with wax. The purchaser might be tempted to buy at a high price, only to find that storm or sunshine would in time cause the wax to disappear, and leave gaping

blemishes exposed to view. The genuine statuary was *sine cere*, without wax. Such, then, must be the nature of the doctrine taught by the preacher of the gospel. There must be no wax filling, showing a plausible and seemingly perfectly rounded outline at the time of presentation, only to alarm and disquiet the receiver, when, at a later period he becomes conscious of mistakes and misconceptions originally unsuspected.

In spiritual things there is a terrible risk involved in leading men to repose confidence in mistaken theories. Erroneous views cannot but hamper the believer more or less while they are held, and there is no telling what the result may be when the period of disillusionment arrives. We are living in a dark, lost world. Conflicting and confusing influences press on men from every side. Without Christ, we are tossed as though on the bosom of a vast heaving ocean, utterly unable to help ourselves, or to control the issues of life, or even to discern what those issues should be. Religious convictions are very sacred, and occupy a tender place in the heart's affections. Convictions of truth concerning God and eternity are as an anchor to the soul. To know Christ, the very "Polestar of a shipwrecked world", is unspeakably precious. To lose God and Christ and religion out of the life is a worse tragedy than "battle, murder, and sudden death". And yet we ministers involve the souls of men in that awful risk when we persuade them to embrace mistaken theories of religion. The discovery of our mistakes may lead to a loss of faith in all of God's revelation. Especially is this the case when the faulty theory is made the hub and centre of all interpretation, and the people are made to believe that with it everything must stand or fall.

What was the result of the positive preaching that Christ would come in 1844? For a time it caused a great awakening. This was doubtless due to the fact that the second advent is a fundamental gospel truth, and its preaching awakens men, alarms them, and leads them to repent and flee from the wrath to come. But when the time passed, and Christ did not come, a great multitude

lost their bearings, gave up their hope, and drifted back into the world. Some reader will perhaps say that they should not have given up. Of course they should not! But neither should William Miller and his associates have persuaded all those people to believe that Christ would come at that time. They had no scripture warrant for it. The prediction on which they based their calculation did not refer to the second advent of Christ. And Christ has plainly told us that the day and hour of his second coming are not known. So that whatever good was done by the preaching of the Advent message, was heavily discounted by the error of setting a time for the Saviour to appear. The preachers cannot evade responsibility for the loss of souls that resulted. They may themselves be saved, for they seem to have been sincere Christian men; but their escape will be "so as by fire"; for God is very jealous of the preaching of the gospel of his Son.

And now we Seventh-day Adventists have come upon the scene, and for almost ninety years have been persuading ourselves and those that hear us, that while Christ did not return to the earth in 1844, He did at that time pass from one apartment of the heavenly sanctuary to another. William Miller was mistaken, we say, not in the time he preached, but in the event that was to take place. This is, on the face of it, a weak explanation. Is it conceivable that God would ordain the preaching of time, with the wrong event associated with the end of the period? Is such preaching of any value to men? Suppose that Joseph had got mixed up in the interpretation of the dreams, and told Pharaoh's chief baker that in three days he would be restored to his position, and that the butler would be hanged. When at the end of those days the king's guard suddenly seized the baker, and hurried him off to the gallows, he would have good reason to look reproachfully at Joseph, at the failure of his prediction. Joseph might in such circumstances have said, Well, well, friend, you see that I was right in the preaching of the time, and was mistaken only in the event that was to take place. How would the baker

feel about the explanation? The event would mean everything to him. Such a mistake would have deprived him of three days' notice of approaching death, and would have been worse than useless.

We now profess to have discovered William Miller's mistake, and to have set the right event at the end of the period. Have we discovered the right event, though, even now? The scriptures are against us in teaching that Christ did not reach the most holy place in heaven until 1844. They teach that He went right in "to appear before the face of God for us" at the time of his ascension. So that there was no such thing as a transfer from one apartment of heaven to another in 1844!

See, further, how we have woven this idea of a movement from the holy place to the most holy in 1844 into the very warp and woof of our prophetic interpretation! See how emphatically Sister White has taught it, and how we have indoctrinated hundreds of thousands of people with the belief that her testimonies are divinely inspired! Little wonder that those who have imbibed these views, and who rely upon them, feel that the very ground is slipping from beneath their feet when it is shown from the scriptures that our sanctuary teaching is mistaken. And this ground **will** slip from beneath the feet of those who are trying to stand on it, for it is not the steadfast ground. We ministers will be required to answer for our work in thus perpetuating a mistaken teaching. God will have mercy upon those who like William Miller have in all sincerity taught a mistaken position; but we cannot claim that mercy if we continue to teach error, to condone it, or to support it in any way, after having had our eyes opened to see the truth.

The very trials of mind and pain of heart through which I have myself passed in obtaining deliverance from these misconceptions, have made me feel deeply for others who are bound, sooner or later, to pass through the same experience. As a realisation of our position gradually came to me, I felt a very tender concern for those who were

receiving instruction through my teaching and preaching. Must our young people be left to struggle with these problems in later years? Shall we leave this heritage of misconception wholly to them, to darken and endanger their pathway, when they awaken to a realisation of the situation? God forbid! Let us face the facts and grapple with the difficulties now, and not weakly pass on to the rising generation misconceptions received from a preceding generation.

Many are awakening already. Many among our workers are conscious of the fact that there is something wrong with the sanctuary teaching. Many of our evangelists, who preach on the prophecies in our public efforts, are conscious of serious difficulties in our way of presenting this subject. This uneasiness and uncertainty is bound to increase. Truth, like the rays of the sun, has a wonderful way of bursting through clouds of misconception. Eventually the truth will out, and no power on earth will be sufficient to keep it back. But many will pass through a painful experience in the process. I feel deeply for them. I feel deeply for all who have the responsibility of teaching our doctrinal positions to the people. That is why I have felt constrained to bring my convictions to the knowledge of the leading brethren. I might have remained silent. I might have refused to take a course that would create an issue, and almost certainly result in my separation from the work. But I could not refuse to bear the painful burden of responsibility that rested upon me. I reflected that if I did, I should only be leaving that burden to others, for it is a burden that must be borne. I knew that many fellow-workers, students, and fellow-believers with whom I had been intimately associated, and whom I loved better than life itself, would, when they heard of my doctrinal stand, give me up as having departed from the truth. But I knew also that many of these beloved friends must themselves eventually grapple with the same difficulties in reconciling the sanctuary teaching with the Bible, and the same hard facts of denominational history that had compelled me to relinquish the traditional

teaching. I hoped that the testimony I am now bearing would be a help to them then, and would assist them at that time to realise how glorious is the gospel of Jesus Christ, and how blessed the truth concerning his heavenly ministry, when freed from the misconceptions with which through our sanctuary teaching we have obscured it.

In writing thus I am not thinking of myself as a pioneer in protesting against the accepted sanctuary teaching. Others have preceded me, some to my knowledge, and others of whom I have heard little or nothing. I acknowledge my indebtedness to them. We are indebted to every one who has used his influence in protesting against error, and in seeking to lead the way into light and truth.

There may be many of our ministers who have not yet permitted themselves to see that the sanctuary teaching is mistaken; but there must be a multitude of others who are not satisfied with the evidences as we present them in support of that teaching. Upon all these men there rests the responsibility not only to investigate, but to do something to help deliver the flock from the thralldom of the mistaken views. This cannot be done without cost; but the minister has no right to expect to be shielded from hardship in the exercise of his calling. In times of danger, a ship's officer cannot study the interests of his family, and seek to save his own life. He must act in the interests of the hundreds of passengers for whose safety he is responsible, irrespective of personal danger. Much more must the minister of the gospel act so as to safeguard the eternal interests of the souls under his care and influence. He must be faithful to the charge committed to him, no matter what the cost to himself. He may have to suffer the loss of all things for the gospel's sake; but it is better for him to suffer that loss than to prove unfaithful to his stewardship. "For whosoever would save his life shall lose it", said the Master, "and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it."

It is a hard thing for a minister to face the prospect of unemployment, should he feel impelled

to witness for a truth that is unacceptable to the body with which he is associated. But we ministers have been teaching that a man ought to exercise faith, and obey God's commandments at all costs, at any age, notwithstanding the prospect of loss of the accustomed means of earning a living, and the fact that no other means of livelihood is in sight. If this is good for the people it is also good for the minister. The minister, and of course any Christian, may, like Abraham, be called to go out not knowing whither he goes. For the gospel ministry is no sinecure. We are called on to "endure hardness, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ." No soldier has a right to expect an easy time, while the war is still on. If, however, a man is called on to take some hazards for the gospel's sake, he will be in good company; for this is what all the reformers and spiritual leaders of the past have had to do, including the early apostles, and the divine Master Himself. "Let us therefore go forth unto Him, without the camp", if necessary, "bearing his reproach". Only let us be faithful to our ministry at all costs.

The minister of the gospel may say, with Christ, his Master, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." John 18:37.

Do I speak now to ministers only? Every true Christian shares the responsibility of the ministry. Special gifts are given to some of God's servants, "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering." Eph. 4:12. So that the whole church is to be engaged in "the work of ministering" the truth of the gospel to men. Church members cannot therefore leave a few ministers to struggle alone in this battle for truth. Every one should seek guidance and grace from God, in bearing witness for the gospel, each in his own lot and station. And none of us can be free from the responsibility to help to the extent of our ability those who are brought into strait places through the acknowledgment of the truth. "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." Gal. 6:6.

This "work of ministering" is to continue "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error; but speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him, which is the head, even Christ." Eph. 4:13-15.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN.

IN CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, I appeal to the reader to consider how grave a mistake has been made, and how difficult a position has been created, in the elevation of what is at best a piece of doubtful prophetic interpretation to the place of a test of fellowship in the church, and of fitness for the ministry. It has been the experience of the church throughout the ages that she has had, from time to time, to modify or expand her views of the fulfilment of prophecy. There are fundamentals of truth concerning God, and Christ, and the atonement, that are essential to Christianity. God has not, however, made the church infallible in the interpretation of prophecy. The Lord doubtless intends by this to keep his people in a constant attitude of watchfulness and expectancy. He has told us sufficient to enable us to discern when the Master is "near, even at the doors". He has told us that when certain things "begin to come to pass" we are to look up, and lift up our heads; because our redemption draweth nigh. But He has at the same time warned us that "the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." He applies this warning to the whole church. "What I say unto you, I say unto **all, WATCH.**"

God has so ordered things that the light on the prophecies increases with the lapse of time and the unfolding of events. The study of the prophetic word therefore calls for humility in the student; for patience in the watcher, in the face of disappointments arising from misconceptions or partial misconceptions; and for forbearance in the believer in his attitude toward those who may differ from him in viewpoint.

One of our greatest needs is that our people generally should learn not to attach too great importance to details, nor to feel that the foundations are being destroyed and the whole superstructure of faith thrown to the ground, because a new or modified view of certain prophecies is entertained.

The demand that all the watchmen should see eye to eye is not, in the study of prophecy at any

rate, as reasonable or well warranted as it might at the first thought seem. When the watchmen are all compelled to look at the prophecies from one angle, it is foolish to conclude that the safety of the church is thereby assured. The watchmen ought to be scanning the horizon with the prophetic glass from every possible angle. This, with God-fearing watchmen, will not lead away from the truth: it is more likely to lead to a fuller apprehension of the truth. The events for which we wait are to come upon the church as well as upon the world suddenly and unexpectedly. We may have a theory that certain events must take place before Christ comes, with the result that He will come suddenly, "in an hour when ye think **not.**" As yet we see but "darkly" even through the prophetic glass. God's people greatly need to realise that some divergence of viewpoint in the understanding of prophecy is not necessarily a great evil; and is certainly not to be regarded as of the same nature as a conflict of opinion on vital and fundamental **doctrines** of the Christian faith.

For the church to lay down her prophetic interpretation like a rigid permanent way of reinforced concrete is a great mistake. This has a tendency to prevent an increase of light reaching the believers. In the first place it keeps a check on individual research and investigation, by requiring all to direct their studies to the justification or endorsement of the accepted positions. In the second place it makes it more difficult for the church to receive enlightenment through the unfolding of events. It leads to an ignoring of developments tending in a direction different from the accepted interpretation.

We as a people have suffered and are suffering as a result of a certain setting of prophetic interpretation assuming the status of an article of faith in the church. I realise the gravity of the situation that arises for us when the sanctuary teaching is shown to be mistaken. The foundation of our present difficulties was laid, however, when this teaching was so rigidly set that no man might henceforth move a block or stir a pin of it. What has been the result?

There has been a check on individual study and investigation; and especially of that freedom of intercourse among Bible students in the comparison of convictions and findings that is so necessary and helpful in prophetic study. We have felt, to begin with, that to entertain any question as to the soundness of the sanctuary teaching would lead us away from the truth. This has deterred men from entering upon a candid study of the subject. On the other hand, those who have begun to entertain thoughts of a different interpretation have been deterred from comparing studies with fellow-workers for fear of being thought disloyal to the whole message and movement.

We have been held fast to the conceptions of 1844, and the decade or so thereafter when the sanctuary teaching became fixed. These views made a strong appeal to the brethren at that time. Many of them we cannot but see now to be palpably mistaken. The lapse of eighty years or so gives a different viewpoint. But the church is still, in theory at least, held to the positions of eighty years ago. She is thus in a large measure prevented from benefiting from the broader understanding of all scripture that should come with the lapse of time.

Another great loss has been the spiritual handicap we have sustained through a mistaken viewpoint. I say this advisedly. While we have received great spiritual blessing from the measure of truth we have held, we have been correspondingly hindered by such misconceptions as we have cherished. This could not but be so. One writer has said that "the tendency of all error is to famish the soul." Another has observed that "error can only be harmless, in proportion as truth is valueless."

Our conception of apartments in heaven has been altogether too mechanical and materialistic and the lessons deducted generally void of spiritual life and light. I quote the following paragraph from "The Great Controversy":—

"They lost their burden of soul for the salvation of sinners . . . All this confirmed them in the belief that . . . 'the door of mercy was shut' ". p. 429.

"But while it was true that that door of hope and mercy by which men had for eighteen hundred years found access to God was closed, another door was opened . . . There was still an 'open door' to the heavenly sanctuary." p. 430.

In what sense can there be "a door of hope and mercy" opened since 1844 that is different from that through which for the previous 1800 years sinners had found access to God? If they should go to the door by which for so long sinners had found entrance they would find it closed! They must know **which door** to go to! All this seems very confusing, and very improbable. Jesus said, "I am the door; **by ME** if any man enter in he shall be saved." "No man cometh unto the Father, **but by ME.**"

Are we to believe that there is a partition in heaven, and that men are saved or lost according to which side of that partition they believe Jesus Christ to be ministering? Impossible!

Is it not sufficient that we should believe that the Son is in the presence of the Father, and that He has been there continually since the time of his ascension to heaven? What more is needed? Beside that great and glorious truth all questions of partitions and divisions and places are without significance or importance. They are as "weak and beggarly elements" in comparison. I speak thus strongly because the situation demands it. I do not enjoy the discussion of such mechanical questions as those relating to rooms and apartments in heaven. It is a thousand pities that these were not long ago dropped into oblivion, where they rightly belong. This, however, has not been done, and in consequence we are now in a grave and difficult position. When this erroneous prophetic interpretation obtrudes itself so harmfully into the realm of the atonement and the heavenly ministry of our great High Priest, I feel compelled, as one of Christ's ministers, to enter this earnest protest.

We ought forever to desist from hinging so much of our explanation of the prophecies upon the relation in geographical position of our Saviour's mediatorial ministry to some supposed dividing veil in the heavenly ministry. Such veil

could have no meaning, even if it existed, in view of Christ's presence in the bosom of the Father. If Christ had **not yet** reached the most holy place of the Father's presence, our salvation would **not yet** be fully accomplished. But now that the Son abides in the presence of the Father, all other questions of place or position whether in earth or heaven sink into insignificance. On earth it is not a question of Jerusalem or Samaria, but of spiritual worship. In heaven it is not a question of the first apartment or the second, but of the adorable presence of the eternal God, and of Jesus Christ whom He raised from the dead and set at his own right hand in the heavenly places. And yet in passages already quoted from our books, and in many others that might be reproduced, the standing of the souls of men and women, the acceptance of their prayers, and the genuineness of revivals among them, are all made to depend on their conviction as to which side of a certain supposed dividing veil in heaven Jesus Christ is ministering!

The truth is that Jesus Christ is **Himself** the dividing line between eternal salvation and eternal loss. Men are saved or lost according to their relation to **Him**. If a man is on the **obedient** and **believing** side, in relation to Christ, he is **saved**; but if on the **unbelieving** and **disobedient** side, he is **lost**.

He that believeth on Him is not judged.

He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.



He that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God.

He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

There is no need for those who love the Lord's appearing to feel that the advent message depends on the conception of divisions and apartments in the heavenly sanctuary. The glorious truth of our Saviour's soon coming shines out with greater clearness and certainty than ever before, independently of any and all our misconceptions. I thank God with all my heart that teachings that

so stirred and convinced and blessed me when I first heard the advent message still hold good in what I regard as the main outlines and fundamental conclusions. We have not followed cunningly devised fables in preaching the swiftly approaching second advent of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is no message more needed to-day than this. The church needs it. The world needs it. It is distressing to think of the multitudes of people around us, even in the christian homelands, who are bewildered and perplexed by what they see taking place in the world; who are distressed with the cares, disappointments and sorrows of life; but who hear no voice telling them in a truly convincing and persuading way of Christ and his great salvation. This must grieve the heart of God. There are so few Spirit-filled and enlightened preachers of the things of Christ. Yet the scriptures would lead us to expect that there will be a more widespread preaching of the gospel just before the second advent than ever before. God grant that his purposes in this respect may be speedily accomplished, and that all who love Christ's appearing may see it, and participate in it.

I love my brethren in the Adventist church, and have confidence in them. I have confidence in the Lord, and in his care for his people. I have committed my own way entirely to Him. I am "sorrowful" when I think of the trial of mind through which many must pass in relinquishing or modifying views that have been held so firmly and so long, and of the danger this is likely to entail for some who are inexperienced, or weak in faith; "yet always rejoicing" as I remember Him who "loved the church, and gave Himself for it", and who will certainly pilot those who put their trust in Him through the present difficulties, and preserve his people unto his everlasting kingdom and glory. We will not be by any means the first ones to be tried by disappointment in some of our expectations. Let us have faith in God, and we shall hear the voice of the Spirit saying, "Thou must prophesy again over many peoples and nations and tongues and kings." Not prophesy some-

thing essentially different from great truths of the advent message already apprehended, but the essential truths, with increased light, and with the removal of the dimming effect of misconceptions of the past.

The lamp of prophecy will shine more and more brightly until the day dawn. But let us look to Christ, and depend more upon **Him** than upon our own understanding of the times and the seasons. It is still true that the Father keeps these things more or less "within his own authority". Let us keep our eyes fixed upon "Him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood".

"To Him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen".

APPENDIX.

THE GENESIS OF THE ACCEPTED SANCTUARY TEACHING.

The object of this Appendix is to make available to the reader evidences that show that for a period of years in their early history, Seventh-day Adventists held and taught the "shut door" theory, a form of the sanctuary teaching which was afterwards relinquished as mistaken; that Mrs. E. G. White held and taught the mistaken view, on the authority of what were claimed to be visions of revelation from God; and that a wrong course has been followed in subsequent years in ignoring these facts, denying them, or attempting to explain them away, so that both laity and ministry have been to a large extent kept in ignorance of them, and thus prevented from realising their full force and significance.

The "Shut-door" Theory.

The original teaching concerning the sanctuary, as held by the denomination from 1844 to 1851, was that Christ's intercession in behalf of the world of sinners ceased when He finished his ministration in the first apartment in heaven in 1844; that probation closed at that time; and that Christ's intercession in the second apartment, from 1844 onward, was in behalf of "the whole house of Israel" only.

Speaking of the Adventists in 1844 and immediately thereafter, Mrs. E. G. White thus explains the origin of the doctrine of the shut door:—

"After the passing of the time when the Saviour was expected, they still believed his coming to be near; they held that they had reached an important crisis, and that the work of Christ as man's intercessor before God, had ceased. It appeared to them to be taught in the Bible, that man's probation would close a short time before the actual coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven. This seemed evident from those scriptures which point to a time when men will seek, knock, and cry at the door of mercy, and it will not be opened. And it was a question with them whether the date to which they had looked for the coming of Christ might not rather mark the beginning of this period which was to immediately precede his coming. Having given the

warning of the Judgment near, they felt that their work for the world was done, and they lost their burden of soul for the salvation of sinners, while the bold and blasphemous scoffing of the ungodly seemed to them another evidence that the Spirit of God had been withdrawn from the rejectors of his mercy. All this confirmed them in the belief that probation had ended, or, as they then expressed it, 'the door of mercy was shut.' "Great Controversy", p. 429.

The "shut door" is also thus explained by another of the early pioneers:—

"What may be understand the shutting of the door to denote? . . . By this act is undoubtedly denoted the exclusion from all further access to saving mercy, of those who have rejected its offers during their time of probation . . . But can any impenitent sinners be converted if the door is shut? Of course they cannot, though changes that men would call conversions may take place." A. Hale, in the "Review and Herald", September 16, 1851; editor, James White, husband of Ellen G. White.

James White states plainly that the brethren regarded their "work for the world" as "finished forever". He also expounds the reasons for holding the shut door view.

"That there is to be a shut door prior to the second advent, many will admit; yet but few seem willing to have it where it actually took place. Let us take a brief view of our past history, as marked out by the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. xxv., 1-11) and I think we shall clearly see that there can be no other place for the shut door but at the Autumn of 1844." . . .

"When we came up to that point of time, all our sympathy, burden and prayers for sinners ceased, and the unanimous feeling and testimony was, that our work for the world was finished forever." . . .

"Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened (compared) unto ten virgins.' &c. When? At this very time, when the faithful servant is giving meat to the 'HOUSE-HOLD' (not to the unbelieving world), and is opposed by the evil servant, and when the advent history, marked out by the parable, is fulfilled, and the shut door in the past. Now we may see that the only place for the shut door was in 1844. Amen.

"But says the objector—'The door of mercy will not be closed until Jesus comes.' We do not read of such a door as 'the door of mercy' in the Bible; neither do we teach that such a door was shut in 1844. God's 'mercy endureth for ever'. See Ps. cxxxvi.; cvi., 1; cviii., 1. He is still merciful to his saints, and ever will be; and Jesus is still their advocate and priest. But the sinner, to whom Jesus had stretched out his arms all the day long, and who had rejected the offers of salvation, was left without an advocate, when Jesus passed into the Holy Place, and shut that door

in 1844. The professed church, who rejected the truth, was also rejected, and smitten with blindness." Editorial on the "Sanctuary, 2300 days, and The Shut Door", in "The Present Truth", for May, 1850.

"From the ascension to the shutting of the door, October, 1844, Jesus stood with wide-spread arms of love, and mercy; ready to receive, and plead the cause of every sinner, who would come to God by him. On the 10th day of the 7th month, 1844, he passed into the Holy of Holies, where he has since been a merciful 'high priest over the house of God.'" James White, in "A Word to the Little Flock", p. 2, published in 1847.

From these brief statements by Brother White it is evident:—

1. That the brethren's "burden and prayers for sinners" had "ceased";

2. That they regarded their "work for the world" as "finished forever";

3. That they were seeking to give "meat to the 'HOUSEHOLD' (not to the unbelieving world)";

4. That while they believed that God was "still merciful to his saints, and ever would be, and Jesus was still their Advocate and Priest", they claimed,

5. That "the sinner . . . was left without an advocate", and

6. That "the professed church . . . was also rejected, and smitten with blindness."

The "Shut-door" regarded as "Present Truth."

Mrs. White states, in "Spiritual Gifts", Vol. 4, p. 271, that "Adventists were for a time united in the belief that the door of mercy was shut." This period of unity was brief, however. The Adventists who had not accepted the Sabbath, at a conference held at Albany, N.Y., in April, 1845, formally abandoned the shut door theory, and resumed their efforts for the salvation of the unconverted. For this they were sternly denounced by the Seventh-day Adventists. The latter continued the teaching of the shut door. In the December, 1849, issue of the "Present Truth", the editor, James White, wrote as follows:—

"We still believe what the whole host once believed; and with holy confidence and energy published and preached to the world. And strange to tell, many of those who have abandoned the fulfilment of prophecy in our past experience,

are ready to brand us with fanaticism, and rank us with Shakers, &c., for believing what they once believed, and for carrying out and showing a consistent fulfilment of the parable, in all its parts, which shows that the door is shut. These men should be the last to oppose our views, and complain of a lack of charity on our part, when they, in such an unsparing manner, rank us with apostates for holding fast and carrying out what they once believed and boldly proclaimed. When we in 1843 sang, 'My Bible leads to glory', we sang a true sentiment. It did not stop in 1844, and 'lead' us back around another way, no, no; but it led onward by the shut door, through the WAITING TIME, and keeping off 'the commandments of God,' into the kingdom. Glory to God, 'My Bible leads to glory.' Amen." Article, "Who Has Left the Sure Word?"

The Seventh-day Adventists continued the teaching of the shut door until 1851. It was expected by them that Christ's ministry in the second apartment would extend over a very limited period. It was inferred by some, from the fact that in the type the high priest sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering upon the mercy-seat seven times, that Christ's ministry in the most holy place would continue for only seven years. After the seven year period had passed, and nothing had happened to mark its termination, the shut door form of the teaching was relinquished, and the doctrine of the sanctuary as it is now held by the denomination was gradually formed.

During the years 1844 to 1851 Seventh-day Adventists taught the shut door emphatically and uncompromisingly. It was an outstanding feature of their message. One of the early brethren, E. P. Butler (father of G. I. Butler, who later became president of the general conference) wrote to Brother and Sister White as follows:—

"Since I have been converted to the SHUT DOOR, and seventh day Sabbath, I have been out in this town . . . to try to get off some of the prejudice from other minds, which I so deeply felt in my own. Some have been converted to the present truth, and some prejudice (I trust) removed. I have learned from conversation with others, as well as by past experience, that the **shut door** has been the **great shoal** on to which the Adventists have run their ship, and foundered. They have been running their small boats this way and that way, to see if they could get around it; but have not been able. So they undertake to cover up the 'landmarks' behind them." . . . "Review and Herald", January, 1851. Emphasis his.

In another letter, published in the next issue of the "Review", the same brother says:—

"I have been greatly blessed in meeting with the Seventh day Sabbath and Shut Door brethren. They hold to the past, and define our present position. I believe they have the truth, and that God is leading them by his Spirit."

Another of the brethren wrote as follows:—

"I have, from the presentation of this truth, embraced the seventh day Sabbath, and the shut door, as being my last refuge in this dark and gloomy day . . . Hence I embrace the 'Midnight Cry', the 'Shut Door', and 'the Third Angel's Message' as being my last refuge" . . . Letter from "A Second Advent brother to his Son." "Review and Herald", February, 1851.

These extracts show the impression made upon the minds of those who listened to the preaching of the pioneers. The message was that of "the Sabbath and the Shut Door". The leaders themselves called this the "present truth". Speaking of one who had at first opposed the doctrine, Sister White wrote,—"I saw that in Bro. Rhodes' mouth there had been no guile, in speaking against the present truth, relating to the Sabbath and Shut Door." "Present Truth", December, 1849.

Joseph Bates, in a tract on the Sanctuary, published in 1850, says,—"The 'Present Truth', then, of this third angel's message, is, **THE SABBATH AND THE SHUT DOOR.**" Emphasis his.

In 1850, Hiram Edson, David Arnold, Geo. W. Holt, S. W. Rhodes, and James White, associated themselves together as a committee to print the "Advent Review". After four issues of this "Review" had been published, there was a special issue of forty-eight pages, containing much of the matter published in the preceding numbers. The object of this special number seems to have been largely to show that the Adventists as a body had originally taught the shut door; that those who had given it up had departed from the faith; and that Seventh-day Adventists in retaining the doctrine were loyal to the truth. This special issue of the "Advent Review" (p. 12) quotes George Needham as saying, in "The Voice of Truth", for March 19, 1845:—

"I am, and have been convinced, since the 10th of the 7th month, that our work with the world and the foolish

virgins is done. I must deny that glorious movement as the work of God, or I can come to no other conclusion. That, I can never do. How can we do them any good? The foolish virgins have gone to their old establishments, where they sell oil, and are crying to us to come after them; and the world are there with them, to buy a little oil, and shall we go to them with the hope of doing them any good? **Not lest we die!!**"

This may be taken as indicative of the view held by Adventists in general in 1845, and by Seventh-day Adventists in 1850, when this document ("The Advent Review") was published.

The following passages are taken from articles written by J. B. Cook. Brother Cook seems to have been quite a prominent writer at the time. James White speaks thus of his contributions, published in the "Advent Review":—

"The articles from the pen of J. B. Cook, on 'The Doctrine of Providence', 'Midnight Cry', 'Sabbath', 'The Necessity and Certainty of Divine Guidance', &c., are rich" . . . Foreword inserted in 1853.

J. B. Cook on the Shut Door.

"God never intended that the whole and apparently happy 'ten' should enter the kingdom—no more than he intended to take all of Babylon into heaven. He who said 'Come out of her my people' has revealed the fact that 'five of that virgin band had not oil in their vessels.' Such would want 'the door' open after it was **TOO LATE.**" . . .

"The Advent cross was large—the tarrying cross was larger, because of the reproach which attached to faith after the time passed. The Midnight Cry was the largest and tallest of the whole. It bore us quite out of the world; we supposed it would have been the last . . . The cross has become very sweet, it is worth more to me than worlds—still the shut-door cross transcends all that have gone before it. The world, the flesh and the devil will not consent to the door's being shut. It **brings JUDGMENT TOO NEAR, makes it too CERTAIN.**" . . .

"The shut-door and the knocking must of necessity precede this answer of our Lord—must be before the actual revelation of the Son of Man . . . Those who will not 'confess Christ' in the shut-door, dare not in the 'New Commandment'. They are on the popular side, avoiding the cross in these points; and justifying so far the disobedience and unbelief of the church and world.

"To them the cross of Christ has become irksome. They have believed and obeyed and borne the cross far enough!!! Instead of confessing the Spirit and providence of God in the past and present state of the once virgin band, they confess to the world—'draw back' from 'present truth', and yet will have it believed that 'the door' is open still!" . . .

"'Thus it is written, and thus it **must be**', that one part would wish the door open after it was 'SHUT'" . . .

"There is finally, a necessity for the experience connected with the shut-door. There is need for the shut-door to separate us finally and forever from the world, preparatory to ascension" . . . "Advent Review", pp. 30-34.

Joseph Bates on the Shut Door.

In reading the following extracts from articles by Joseph Bates, it should be borne in mind that our Seventh-day Adventist pioneers spoke of the Advent church, as it existed in 1844, and continued in those who held the shut door teaching, as the Philadelphia church. The Adventists who gave up the shut door doctrine were referred to as Laodiceans. The Protestant churches in general were described as Sardis, and regarded as having been rejected. Seventh-day Adventists took strong positions against the other Adventist brethren, who in 1845 gave up the shut door view.

"We believe that this [Laodicean] state of the church exists, and that it is composed of second advent ministers and people, who have backslidden and become 'lukewarm'.

"When and where did this state of the church commence? We believe that it commenced in 1845, at the conference in the city of Albany, N.Y. . . . See VOICE OF TRUTH

. . . 'Conference Address', [J.B. here quotes, disapprovingly] 'Our brethren, east, west, north and south, are harmoniously (with a few exceptions) united in the faith and hope of the gospel, and well engaged in extending their benign influence and blessings to others. They are making preparations for going to work the PRESENT SEASON understandingly, and effectually, for the SALVATION OF PERISHING THOUSANDS around them.' [On this J.B. comments thus] . . . This shows the decided change and departure from the Philadelphia state of the church, where they all from the Philadelphia state of the church, where they all professed to be, at the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844 . . . Undoubtedly they were then in the right state of the church, and holding fast that to which they had attained, viz.: the change from Babylon, or the Sardis state of the church, to the Philadelphia state. When they changed from the Philadelphia to the Laodicean state, we believe they influenced hundreds of honest souls to go with them. These are the ones we are trying to seek out, by this article, and every other possible way . . . In their proclamation of an open door for Babylon, and all the world . . . they prove clearly that they have gained nothing; made no progress . . . It looks clear that they have acknowledged their Laodicean state of neither cold nor hot . . . The shut door believers are in the Philadelphia church. The nominal

church, are back of 1844, in the Sardis state, spiritually dead." . . . Article, "The Laodicean Church," in "Review and Herald", November, 1850. Emphasis throughout by Joseph Bates.

"For when the Midnight Cry is made as it was, in the fall of 1844, at the end of the 2300 days, then at **that time** the door is shut . . . The door must be shut, for our High Priest to open the other door, Rev. iii., 7, 8; xi., 19, and enter into the Most Holy Place to cleanse the **Sanctuary** . . . This work of cleansing the Sanctuary is this; Jesus our great High Priest, crowned and robed, in his royal court dress (just like the high priest in the shadow), rises up, and shuts the door (Luke xii., 25); where he had been the Mediator for all the world, and opens the door of the Most Holy Place (or as John calls it, the Temple of God), and there appears before God, as Daniel saw him (ch. vii., 13) with the whole Israel of God represented on his breast-plate of judgment (like the high priest), to plead with God, to blot out the sins of Israel" . . .

"With all this array of argument before them, many of them would say, at times, why I believe it in part; because it looked too glaring to deny it. We say that God never had this work done in **part**. It was all accomplished then, and we have just shown how it was affirmed to by the church of God. When they say they believe it, they prove themselves liars; for after the formation of the Laodicean state of the church at Albany, N.Y., April 29, 1845, the greater portion of the lecturers went out through the land, advocating an open door, in direct and immediate opposition to the Midnight Cry. For that work **shut the door** without the shadow of a doubt" . . .

"We say then, that here is positive proof that they have been **SINNING AGAINST GOD EVER SINCE**, in writing, preaching, and in various other ways, by opposing and setting at naught the very and identical point in their Advent experience, which was the 'MAINSRING' to the whole vision. Yes, after the Albany conference in 1845, where they organised the Laodicean church, they went out openly and boldly declaring to their hearers, that the door was wide open. They said it **was not shut**, neither would it be, until Jesus came" . . .

"If by any means whatever, they could prove from all their past six years' united labour, throughout this land, England, or the West Indies, that they have gained one **single** convert to God, then would they appear in a **hundred fold** more heinous light than they now do. For by their own published, standing confessions (as before stated), the Lord Jesus, as Master of the house (before described), had shut the door, and no man could open it . . . This was the last day's work of the Midnight Cry, where the fulness of the Gentiles came in. Rom. xi., 25. Now if they have opened the door, then they have gained the victory over the Son of God, and proved him to have uttered a falsehood. In no other way could they get one true Gentile convert."

"Talk about searching out sinners, that the work of the Midnight Cry left in outer darkness six years ago! He will not save you, if you do not quickly flee from the dreadful snare you are now in." Joseph Bates, in "Review and Herald", December, 1850, Article entitled "Midnight Cry in the Past".

"Behold I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and wonders in Israel.' Etc. Who are these? The same people. The first wonderful sign by which they were distinctly known from Second Advents, was shut door believers, but the greatest wonder and sign by which they are now known is 7th day Sabbath believers . . . The shut door and Sabbath, then, are the two prominent marks by which they are known . . . It is a people who are in their trial or patient waiting time for the Lord, having the law and the testimony. The present truth of which is the shut door and the 7th day Sabbath." "The Sealing Message", by Joseph Bates, p. 56, published in 1849.

"Borne in on the Breast-Plate of Judgment."

It will be noted from one of the statements of Brother Bates above-quoted, that the pioneers regarded Christ's entry into the second apartment of the sanctuary as having been made on behalf of "the whole house of Israel", who were said to be "represented on his breast-plate of judgment." During his ministration in the first apartment, until a certain day in October, 1844, "he had been the Mediator of all the world."

Considerable discussion went on as to just whose names might be regarded as having been "borne in on the breast-plate of judgment."

"Then on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, our Great High Priest, attired in all his priestly garments, having over his heart the breast-plate of judgment, on which is represented the names of all the true Israel of God, rises up and shuts the door . . . Mark this: here was a literal transaction in heaven, at that time, and all true, shut-door believers, so teach." . . .

"Here a question arises, who are meant by the whole house of Israel? We believe they comprise all honest, obedient believers, that had up to that time overcome, Rev. iii., 5, and also children that had not come to the years of accountability." . . . Joseph Bates, in "Review and Herald", August 19, 1851.

"Therefore we are brought, by the force of circumstances, and the fulfilment of events, to the irresistible conclusion that, on the tenth day of the seventh month (Jewish time), in the autumn of 1844, Christ did close his daily or continual ministration or mediation in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and SHUT THE DOOR, which no man

can open; and opened a door, in the second apartment, or Holiest of all, which no man can shut (see Rev. iii., 7, 8) and passed within the second veil, bearing before the Father, on the breast-plate of judgment, all for whom he is now acting as intercessor. If this is the position that Christ now occupies, then there is no intercessor in the first apartment; and in vain do misguided souls knock at that door, saying 'Lord, Lord, open to us.' . . .

"But, says the objector, does not this leave the present generation, who have passed the line of accountability since that time without an intercessor or mediator, and leave them destitute of the means of salvation? In reply to this objection I would remark, that as they were then in a state of INNOCENCY, they were entitled to a record upon the breast-plate of judgment as much as those who had sinned and received pardon; and are therefore subjects of the present intercession of our Great High Priest." David Arnold, in "Present Truth", for December, 1849.

On page 44 of the same number of the "Present Truth" is the statement:—

"On this day of atonement, he is a high priest for those only whose names are inscribed on the breast-plate of judgment."

Hiram Edson writes as follows, in "An Appeal to the Laodicean Church", published in an "Advent Review" extra, in 1850:—

"And among those that were borne in, I believe, were some that had not had the light on the second advent doctrine, and had not rejected it, but were living according to the best light they had. And I believe also, that there were others who had a sacred reverence for God and his word, and had his fear before their eyes, yet they made no profession of religion, or of conversion, but in the sight of God who see not as man sees, they were much nearer a state of justification before God, than very many who made a great profession of religion. Again, children who had not arrived to years of accountability were borne in on the breast-plate of judgment. These three classes are the standing heads of wheat to be gleaned . . ."

"Some suppose that if the door is shut, there can be no more repentance unto life, or forgiveness of sins. This is certainly a mistake. All who were borne in on the breast-plate of judgment, and have not sinned wilfully, may repent and find forgiveness. Jesus says to the Laodiceans, 'as many as I love I rebuke and chasten, be zealous therefore and repent.'"

James White speaks of the same three classes, who might be subjects of conversion.

"Conversion, in the strictest sense, signifies a change from sin to holiness. In that sense we readily answer that it [the shut door] does not 'exclude ALL conversions,' but we believe that those who heard the 'everlasting gospel' message

and rejected it, or refused to hear it, are excluded by it. We have no message to such. They have no ears to hear us, unless we lower the standard of truth so low that there would be no salvation in it. But there are those who may be converted.

"1. Erring brethren. We believe there are many in the Laodicean church, who will yet be converted as the Apostle directs in his epistle to the waiting brethren." . . .

"2. Children, who were not old enough to understandingly receive or reject the truth, when our Great High Priest closed his mediation in the Holy Place . . . Their names were borne in upon the breast-plate of judgment, and they are the subjects of the mediation of Jesus." . . .

"3. When Elijah thought that he was alone, God said to him, 'I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed to the image of Baal.' We believe that God has reserved to himself a multitude of precious souls, some even in the churches. These he will manifest IN HIS OWN TIME. They were living up to what light they had when Jesus closed his mediation for the world, and when they hear the voice of the Shepherd in the message of the third angel they will gladly receive the whole truth. Such will be converted to the truth, and from their errors. But we think we have no message to such now, still 'he that hath an ear let him hear.' Our message is to the Laodiceans, yet some of these hidden souls are being manifested."

"Review and Herald", April 7, 1851.

With all this differentiation, the brethren made it clear that no names might be added to the breast-plate of judgment after 1844, although the names of those who refused to accept further light might be erased.

"When the Master of the house (the Lord Jesus) rose up and shut the door, all honest believers, that had submitted to his will, and children that had not arrived to the years of accountability, were undoubtedly borne in on his breast-plate of judgment which is over his heart. The names of all that fully keep the commandments are retained. Those who do not, will have their names erased before Jesus leaves the Holiest." . . .

"It is true, some persons that are ignorant of this message may, and undoubtedly will be saved if they die before Jesus leaves the Holiest. I mean those that were believers before 1844. Sinners and backsliders cannot get their names on the breast-plate of judgment now." Joseph Bates, in "Review and Herald", for January, 1851.

Did Mrs. E. G. White teach the Shut Door?

The questions must now be considered, Did Mrs. E. G. White teach the shut door? and if so, Did she teach that doctrine on the authority of visions claimed to be of divine origin? James White

answers both these questions in the affirmative. In "A Word to the Little Flock", published in 1847, he says:—

"When she received her first vision, Dec. 1844, she and all the band in Portland, Maine (where her parents then resided) had given up the midnight cry, and shut door, as being in the past. It was then that the Lord shew her in vision, the error into which she and the band in Portland had fallen. She then related her vision to the band, and about sixty confessed their error, and acknowledge their 7th month experience to be the work of God." Page 22.

"The midnight cry and shut door as being in the past", means that both became accomplished facts in 1844, and that from that time the shutting of the door was a past and not a future event. It is clear from this statement by James White, that his wife had at first given up the shut door idea (presumably in common with other Adventists who early changed their minds on that point, as for instance "the band in Portland", of which Brother White here speaks); but that "the Lord shewed her in vision the error into which she and the band in Portland had fallen", with the result that "about sixty confessed their error." Brother White says that they then "acknowledged their seventh month experience to be of God." By this he means that they acknowledged their experience in giving "the midnight cry" and subsequently regarding the door as "shut" in the seventh month (Jewish time) of 1844, to be of God. Joseph Bates (as already quoted) says that it was the work of the midnight cry that "**shut the door** without the shadow of a doubt."

Sister White herself, in the same publication, thus relates her first vision:—

"While praying at the family altar, the Holy Ghost fell on me, and I seemed to be rising higher and higher, far above the dark world. I turned to look for the Advent people in the world, but could not find them—when a voice said to me, 'Look again, and look a little higher.' At this I raised my eyes and saw a straight and narrow path, cast up high above the world. On this path the Advent people were travelling to the City, which was at the farther end of the path. They had a bright light set up behind them at the first end of the path, which an angel told me was the Midnight Cry. This light shone all along the path, and gave light for their feet so they might not stumble. And if they kept their eyes fixed on Jesus, who was just before them, leading them to the City, they were safe. But soon

some grew weary, and they said the City was a great way off, and they expected to have entered it before. Then Jesus would encourage them by raising his glorious right arm, and from his arm came a glorious light which waved over the Advent band, and they shouted Hallelujah! Others rashly denied the light behind them, and said that it was not God that had led them out so far. The light behind them went out leaving their feet in perfect darkness, and they stumbled and got their eyes off the mark and lost sight of Jesus, and fell off the path down in the dark and wicked world below. It was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the City, as all the wicked world which God had rejected. They fell all the way along the path one after another, until we heard the voice of God like many waters, which gave us the day and hour of Jesus' coming". "A Word to the Little Flock", p. 14.

The passage printed above in bold type has been omitted from "Early Writings"; but should appear in that book between the words, "below", and "Soon we heard the voice of God like many waters", on page 11 of the old edition, and page 15 of the new edition. The words in bold type were contained in the vision as originally published. This first vision therefore teaches:—

1. That the "Advent people" were now separated from "the world". Sister White looked for them "in the world": she could not see them there, but found them on a path "cast up high above the world".

2. The point at which the Advent people were separated from the world, was the giving of the "midnight cry", in 1844. "They had a bright light set up behind them at the beginning of the path, which an angel told me was the Midnight Cry".

3. To deny the light behind them (i.e., the "midnight cry" as "being in the past") resulted in their fall from among the Advent people "down into the dark and wicked world below".

4. Such backsliders had no hope of restoration. It was "impossible for them to get on the path again".

5. The world, aside from the Advent people, is described as "all the wicked world which God had rejected." It was "impossible for them to get on the path" and "go to the City".

This utter hopelessness of backsliders and of "the wicked world" is all in agreement with

Joseph Bates' statement (already quoted) that **"sinners and backsliders cannot get their names on the breast-plate of judgment now."**

The hopelessness of backsliders is strongly emphasised in another passage eliminated from "Early Writings".

"And if one believed, and kept the Sabbath, and received the blessing attending it, and then gave it up, and broke the holy commandment, they would shut the gates of the Holy City against themselves, as sure as there is a God that rules in heaven above."

This sentence should appear in "Early Writings" in the chapter headed "Subsequent Visions" on page 27 of the old edition and page 33 of the new, between the words, "waiting saints", and "I saw that God had children". The vision seems to have been first written in a letter to Joseph Bates, and was published in that form in "A Word to the Little Flock", p. 19, in 1847. As then published it contained the sentence quoted above, which has since been omitted.

On the 21st of April, 1847, Sister White wrote to Brother Eli Curtis as follows:—

"Your Extra is now on the stand before me; and I beg leave to state to you, and the scattered flock of God, what I have seen in vision relative to those things on which you have written You think, that those who worship before the saints' feet, (Rev. 3:9) will at the last be saved. Here I must differ with you; for God shew me that this class were professed Adventists They will know that they are forever lost; and overwhelmed with anguish of spirit, they will bow at the saints' feet."

"The Lord has shown me in vision, that Jesus rose up and shut the door, and entered the Holy of Holies at the 7th month, 1844."

"I believe the Sanctuary, to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, is the New Jerusalem Temple, of which Christ is a minister. The Lord shew me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crozier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, &c.; and that it was his will, that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the Day Star Extra, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorised by the Lord, to recommend that Extra, to every saint." "A Word to the Little Flock", pp. 11, 12.

Brother O. R. L. Crozier was among the Adventists who early gave up the shut door view. The "Harbinger" of March 5, 1853, published his answers to inquiries regarding his position on the sanctuary. Brother Crozier there says:—

"My views have been somewhat changed on the subject of the 'Sanctuary' since 1845, when I wrote the article on the law of Moses, from which the Sabbatarian Adventists quote so often . . . The above named persons appear to me insincere in quoting from this article, (1) because they know that it was written for the express purpose of explaining and proving the doctrine of the 'shut-door', which they now, I understand, disclaim." Quoted in "Review and Herald", March 17, 1853.

Sister White, then, claimed in 1847, that the Lord had shown her in vision, more than a year previously, that "Brother Crozier had the true light on the cleansing of the Sanctuary", in a certain article he had published. Brother Crozier himself states that that article was written "for the express purpose of explaining and proving the doctrine of the 'shut-door'", and claims that the "Sabbatarian Adventists" were well aware of that fact! James White (in the "Review" for March 17, 1853) maintains that the article referred to "no more goes to prove a shut door than it does an open door"; but apart from that question, the outstanding facts remain,—1. That the article was written "for the express purpose of explaining and proving the doctrine of the 'shut-door'"; 2. That the "Sabbatarian Adventists" knew that to be the case; and 3. That at that time and in those circumstances Sister White related a vision in which it was shown her that "Brother Crozier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary"!

"The Sabbath and the Shut Door."

Sister White relates the following, concerning a vision given at Topsham, Maine, on Sabbath, March 24, 1849:—

"Then I was shown that the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus, relating to the shut door, could not be separated." "Early Writings", p. 42.

In the "Present Truth" for December of the same year, 1849, Sister White wrote that:—

"The 'commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ' are to us the present truth—the meat in due season. The little flock here in this region are established on the Sabbath, and our past Advent experience." . . .

"I saw that in Brother Rhodes' mouth there had been no guile in speaking against the present truth, relating to the Sabbath and the Shut Door."

These statements are all in agreement, first with themselves, and second with the views held by the brethren at that time. The testimony of Jesus, "related to the shut door", and became, with the Sabbath, the "present truth", the "meat in due season". When the little flock were "established on the Sabbath, and [their] past Advent experience", they were established on "the Sabbath and the shut door", for the "past Advent experience" had reference to the midnight cry and shut door proclamation of 1844. Brother White has already told us that Sister White was shown in her first vision that it was an error to give up the view of "the midnight cry and shut door as being in the past". So Brother Rhodes had spoken "against the present truth", when he had spoken against "the Sabbath and Shut Door"; but there had nevertheless been no guile in his mouth in speaking thus.

No Light for the Careless Multitude after 1844.

In the vision, "End of the 2300 Days" ("Early Writings", pp. 54-56), two groups of people are described:—

"Before the throne I saw the Advent people—the church and the world. I saw two companies, one bowed before the throne, deeply interested, while the other stood uninterested and careless." p. 54.

The company of Adventist believers is then represented as praying, and receiving light from the Father and the Son.

"Then I saw an exceeding bright light come from the Father to the Son, and from the Son it waved over the people before the throne. But few would receive this great light. Many came out from under it and immediately resisted it; others were careless and did not cherish the light, and it moved off from them. Some cherished it, and went and bowed down with the little praying company. This company all received the light, and rejoiced in it, and their countenances shone with its glory." p. 55.

This "exceeding bright light" was doubtless the "midnight cry", for the first vision speaks of "a bright light set up behind them . . . which an angel told me was the midnight cry", p. 14. "But few [of the Adventists] would receive this great light. Many came out from under it and immediately resisted it; others were careless and did not cherish the light, and it moved off from them

[These would be the Adventists who from 1845 gave up the shut door view, and thus became the "Laodicean" church]. Some cherished it, and went and bowed down with the little praying company [The Seventh-day Adventists]. This company all received the light, and rejoiced in it, and their countenances shone with its glory."

The further experience of the Adventists and other Christians who did not receive the advanced light is thus described:—

"I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne; they did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan appeared to be by the throne, trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, 'Father, give us Thy Spirit'. Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy, and peace." . . . p. 56.

Thus much for the professed Christians. But what became of "the world"? those who from the first had "stood disinterested and careless"?

"I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness." p. 55.

This is what one might describe (using one of the expressions of the pioneers) as "a shut door of the closest kind" ("Advent Review", p. 18). The door was shut so tightly and so effectively that there was neither chink, crack, nor crevice through which so much as "one ray of light" might pass "to the careless multitude"! Their darkness was complete!

In relating the Topsham vision (already referred to), Sister White said that she "was shown that the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ relating to the shut door, could not be separated." The last part of that vision should read as follows:—

"I saw that the mysterious signs, and wonders, and false reformations would increase, and spread. The reformations that were shown me, were not reformations from error to truth; but from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart, had only wrapped about them a religious garb, which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people; but if their hearts could be seen, they would appear as black as ever. My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be.

I looked, but could not see it; for the time for their salvation is past." "Present Truth" for August, 1849.

The passage printed in bold type was contained in the vision as originally published; but has been omitted from "Early Writings". See page 45 of the new edition, and page 37 of the old edition.

This paragraph plainly teaches that the time for the salvation of sinners was past. The antecedent of the pronoun "their" in the last sentence, is the noun "sinners" in the preceding sentence. This is made doubly clear when the eliminated sentence is restored. For many years, in the old edition of "Early Writings", a note by the publishers sought to make out that the last sentence applied to false shepherds. "It is the false shepherds therefore, and not sinners in general, to whom this sentence applies". See page 37. This questionable explanation does not appear in the present edition of that book. Such an interpretation fails entirely to harmonise with the text. The "false shepherds", or "ministers who have rejected the truth" are not referred to in the immediate context. It is the "sinners" of the last paragraph whose "salvation is past". This passage does not speak of **some** sinners, who have passed the boundary line, and cannot be saved. The statement is a sweeping one, referring to sinners in general.

The publishers, in a footnote endeavouring to show that this passage does not really mean what it plainly says, claim that "at the very time when these things were written she herself was labouring for the salvation of sinners, as she has been doing ever since." New edition, page 45. This is an unwarranted claim. The documentary evidence of the period shows unquestionably that Sister White was following no such course, "when these things were written."

What would Joseph Bates have thought if at that time Sister White had gone out to work for the salvation of sinners? He was scandalized when the "Laodicean" Adventists did it. "Talk about searching out sinners", he exclaimed in 1850, "that the work of the Midnight Cry left in outer darkness six years ago!"

What would James White have thought, if his wife had in 1849 gone out "labouring for sinners"? He was willing to admit, in 1851, that "God had reserved to himself a multitude of precious souls, some even in the churches", those who were "living up to what light they had when Jesus closed his mediation for the world"; "But," he added, "we think we have no message for such now." Did his wife, two years earlier, have a message for "the world", for whom Christ's mediation had "closed", and fail to tell her husband of it, or to convince him of it?

Speaking of "the autumn of 1844" James White says that at "that point of time all our sympathy, burden and prayers for sinners ceased". "Present Truth", May, 1850. Sister White says that they "lost their burden of soul for the salvation of sinners". "Spiritual Gifts", Vol. 4, p. 271. In March, 1849, she wrote that her accompanying angel bade her "look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be". She "looked, but could not see it; for the time for their salvation" was "past". Who had lost the "travail of soul for sinners" that they used to have? Mrs. White and her husband, and their associates, according to their own testimony. For whose salvation, was "the time . . . past"? Was it past for those who had lost their burden, or for the sinners for whom the burden was lost? It is obvious that when Sister White wrote that "the time for their salvation is past", she had reference to sinners.

The assertion of the publishers that "at the very time when these things were written she [Sister White] herself was labouring for the salvation of sinners", is one that is frequently repeated by those who seek to maintain the infallibility of the Testimonies. Let the reader take due note of the fact that not one scintilla of evidence from the documents of that early period is ever produced to justify this assertion. The reason for this is that there is none to produce. The early publications abound with evidence to the contrary, that from 1844 to 1851 all the pioneers regarded their "work for the world" as "finished forever", and were

giving their time to providing "meat in due season" for the "household" of faith.

In those early days the brethren regarded the first angel's message as the last message to **the world**, fulfilled and closed in 1844; and the third angel's message as the last message to **the church**, or "scattered flock", from 1844 to the end. Thus, in the "Present Truth" for April, 1850, James White wrote of the first message,—“This angel's message represents the last message of mercy to the world; and it has been fulfilled.” In the same issue of the paper, speaking of the third message, he taught that “this angel declares the last message of mercy to the scattered flock; therefore it is the sealing message.”

By “the scattered flock” the pioneers meant the Advent people. The Adventists were united up to 1844; but the great disappointment of that year threw them into confusion and “scattered” them. Sister White speaks of this as “the scattering time.” After discovering what they thought to be the true light on the sanctuary, the Seventh-day Adventists felt that they had a message that would once more unite the scattered flock, and spoke of this as “the gathering time”.

“During the scattering time we have passed through many heartrending trials, while we have seen the precious flock scattered, torn and driven; but, thank God, the time has come for the flock to be gathered into the ‘unity of the faith’”. E. G. White, in “Present Truth” for December, 1849.

Sister White's labours, and those of her associates, were all directed toward this one end, the gathering of the “scattered” flock.

“The brethren sent in more means than was necessary to sustain the paper, which I have since used in travelling to visit the scattered flock.” James White, *Ib.*

“Brethren Holt and Rhodes returned to this city last week . . . They feel that they cannot rest; but must go on as fast as possible, and hunt up the scattered ‘sheep’” . . . *Ib.*

“I think he will go in search of the scattered sheep, for the Lord is showing him his light and truth very fast.” S. W. Rhodes, in “Present Truth”, for November, 1850.

“We want to hear, especially, from the dear brethren that travel, how the cause prospers, and of their success in searching out the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Such letters give interest to the paper, and cheer the ‘little flock’”. James White, *Ib.*

"I spent five days visiting from house to house; where I could find Advent believers." Joseph Bates, Report of labours at Baltimore, in "Review and Herald", for October 7, 1851.

"I saw that the quick work that God was doing on earth would soon be cut short in righteousness, and that the swift messengers must speed on their way to search out the scattered flock." Ellen G. White, in "Present Truth" for April, 1850, article entitled, "To the 'Little Flock'".

"We have but a little space of time left in which to work for God. Nothing should be too dear to sacrifice for the . . . scattered and torn flock of Jesus. "Early Writings", p. 47, written in 1849.

"Speed the messengers on their way to feed the hungry sheep." Ib. p. 49, written in 1850.

"The messengers must speed swiftly on their way to search out the scattered flock." Ib. p. 50.

"The Lord has often given me a view of the situation and wants of the scattered jewels who have not yet come to the light of the present truth, and has shown that the messengers should speed their way to them as fast as possible, to give them the light." Ib. p. 61.

On page 62 of "Early Writings" Sister White speaks of "the last message of mercy that is now being given to the scattered flock". This agrees precisely with James White's statement that the third angel's message is "the last message of mercy to the scattered flock", in contrast with the first angel's message, which he taught was "the last message of mercy to the world", closing in 1844.

"The Lord has shown me that the message of the third angel must go, and be proclaimed to the scattered children of the Lord, but it must not be hung on time." Ib. p. 75, written in September, 1850.

"The Lord has shown me that precious souls are starving, and dying for want of the present, sealing truth, the meat in due season; and that the swift messengers should speed on their way, and feed the flock with the present truth. I heard an angel say, 'Speed the swift messengers, speed the swift messengers; for the case of every soul will soon be decided, either for life or for death.'" E. G. White, in "Present Truth" for September, 1849.

About two years after the brethren had given up the shut-door view, we find Sister White writing as follows:—

"Do we believe with all the heart that Christ is soon coming? and that we are now having the last message of mercy that is ever to be given to a guilty world?" "Review and Herald", February 17, 1853.

But no such message as this from her pen is found in the records of the years 1844 to 1851.

How unwarranted then, and how misleading is the oft-repeated assertion that when Sister White wrote that "the time for their salvation is past", she herself "was labouring for the salvation of sinners"!

We must not leave the consideration of this passage in "Early Writings" (stating that "the time for their salvation is past". E.W. p. 45) without noticing the significance of the eliminated sentences, reproduced (pp. 188-192) in bold-faced type. One of the sentences reads: "Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people; but if their hearts could be seen, they would appear as black as ever". See p. 192.

In what way would such seeming conversions be likely to "deceive God's people"? The answer is, that the believers might be deceived into thinking the door must be open, and not shut.

Those sentences should never have been eliminated from the "Early Writings". They help to fix the meaning of the context.

Accounting for Revivals in the Other Churches.

Having fully received the view that in 1844 Christ "rose up and shut the door" of the first apartment, "where He had been Mediator for all the world", the pioneers could not credit the genuineness of revivals or of the conversion of sinners reported by the "Sardis" or "fallen" churches, or by the "Laodicean" Adventists. These were either denied, or explained away, or attributed to Satanic agencies.

"Can any impenitent sinners be converted if the door is shut? Of course they cannot, though changes that men would call conversions may take place." A. Hale, "Review and Herald," September 16, 1851.

"The professed conversions, through the instrumentality of the various sects, are also urged as positive proof that the door is not shut. I cannot give up the clear fulfilment of prophecy, in our experience, which shows the shut door in the past, for the opinions, fancies and feelings of men, based upon human sympathy and a superstitious reverence for early imbibed views." David Arnold, "Present Truth", December, 1849.

"Many will point us to one who is said to be converted, for positive proof that the door is not shut, thus yielding the word of God for the feelings of an individual." Ib. Letter from Brother Holt.

A favourite text with the pioneers, during those years, was Hosea 5:6, 7. They regarded this passage as supporting their view of the shut door, and also as accounting for what they thought must be spurious conversions and revivals. Here is James White's application of the text:—

"The professed church, who rejected the truth, was also rejected, smitten with blindness, and now, 'with their flocks and with their herds' they go 'to seek the Lord' as still an advocate for sinners; but, says the prophet, Hosea v. 6, 7, 'they shall not find him; he hath WITHDRAWN HIMSELF from them. They have dealt treacherously against the Lord; for they have begotten strange children.'

"The reason why they do not find the Lord is simply this, they seek him where he is not; 'He hath withdrawn himself' to the Most Holy Place. The prophet of God calls their man-made converts, 'STRANGE CHILDREN'; 'now shall a month devour them, and their portions'." "Present Truth", for May, 1850.

Joseph Bates gives this text the same application:—

"But it is said they have converts. Yes, but they are strange ones, because they come after the house of Israel have their names borne into the Holiest. Hence says the Prophet, 'He hath withdrawn himself from them', 'now shall a month devour them with their portions'". "Review and Herald", August 19, 1851.

David Arnold applies the passage in the same way, in the "Present Truth" for December, 1849.

Did Sister White share with the brethren this view of the meaning of Hosea 5:6, 7, involving as it did the shut door teaching? She speaks thus for herself:—

"The excitements and false reformations of this day do not move us, for we know that the Master of the house rose up in 1844, and shut the door of the first apartment of the heavenly tabernacle; and now we certainly expect that they will 'go with their flocks', 'to seek the Lord; but they shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself (within the second veil) from them'. The Lord has shown me that the power which is with them is a mere human influence, and not the power of God". Ellen G. White, in "Present Truth", for March, 1850.

"I saw false reformations everywhere. The churches were elated, and considered that God was marvellously working for them, when it was another spirit." "Spiritual Gifts", Vol. 4, p. 172.

Efforts to Deny the Facts of the "Shut-door" Teaching, or to Evade their Significance.

It is exceedingly regrettable that these facts should have been covered up for many years,

denied, or explained away; so that our people generally, and the great body of our workers have not been acquainted with them. The present writer finds no pleasure in reviewing such items of past history, nor in discussing what he believes to be the mistaken course of those who have subscribed to the policy of preventing them from becoming generally known. This unpleasant task becomes a duty, however, in the present circumstances. Thousands have been taught to regard the sanctuary teaching as now held as having the authority of a divine revelation; whereas it has no such authority. The shut door teaching was the after-math of William Miller's mistake in preaching that Christ's second advent would take place in 1844. The present sanctuary teaching is the after-math of the mistaken shut-door doctrine of 1844 to 1851. The mistakes of the past have led on to the mistaken teaching of the present. The present erroneous views regarding the sanctuary are being assiduously taught to our children and young people, and thus passed on to another generation. It becomes the duty of Christ's ministers, when they become aware of these things, to speak out, and let the facts be known.

The darkest page in our denominational history is not that which records the mistakes of the Miller movement; nor that which records the shut-door teaching of subsequent years; but that which records an effort to cover up the facts of the past.

Most of the early Adventists (not the Seventh-day Adventists) frankly acknowledged that they had taken mistaken positions. Joseph Bates refers disapprovingly to this in an article contributed to the "Review and Herald" in December, 1850. He quotes J. V. Himes as saying, "We are free to **confess** that we have been twice disappointed in our expectations in the time of our Lord's advent". Joseph Bates then says, "After this, hundreds of others followed in confessions, in the two leading papers; and in their confessions . . . acknowledged that they were mistaken about the shut door view."

It is to be deeply regretted that our own pioneers did not follow the same commendable course,

when, late in 1851, or thereabout, they in turn gave up the shut door teaching.

In the "Review" for March 17, 1853, the editor, James White, quotes from the "Harbinger" a statement in which O. R. L. Crozier said that he understood the Seventh-day Adventists now disclaimed the doctrine of the shut door. Brother White then makes the curt rejoinder,—“On the above we will first remark, that as C. has informed the readers of the **Harbinger** that we disclaim the doctrine of the **shut door**, that paper should no longer reproachfully call us ‘**shut door Sabbatar-ians**’ ”.

Seeing that the pioneers taught the shut door so long and so emphatically, and so unsparingly reproached the other Adventists for giving up that doctrine, the editor of the "Review" should have voluntarily and frankly acknowledged the mistake, and should not have left it to "C", or anyone else, to "inform the readers of the Harbinger", and other interested persons, of the change of convictions.

There is one outstanding reason for this reluctance to acknowledge openly the mistakes of the past. Sister White had participated in the shut door teaching, and had related and published visions which supported it. When the visions were re-published in the form of "Experience and Views", in 1851, and again in 1854, some statements teaching the shut door were omitted entirely. Had they been retained, the conclusion would have been inevitable that they taught the shut door. In their "Preface to the second edition, after referring to the addition of several dates, and two dreams, the publishers went on to say:—

"Aside from these, no changes from the original work have been made in the present edition, except the occasional employment of a new word, or a change in the construction of a sentence, to better express the idea, and no portion of the work has been omitted. No shadow of change has been made in any idea or sentiment of the original work, and the verbal changes have been made under the author's own eye, and with her full approval."

It was not true that no portion of the original work had been omitted. The writer of the preface (if he knew of the omissions) may have satis-

fied his conscience by thinking of the publication of 1851 as the "original work"; but he must have known that the readers of his preface would understand him as referring to the visions as originally published. There were considerable omissions from the contents of the original documents when the visions were first re-published in 1851, and among them statements that undoubtedly taught the shut door. Even after the omissions were made, there still remained passages that could lead to no other conclusion than that the visions taught the shut door. Instances of these have already been given in preceding pages.

For many years Elder J. N. Loughborough occupied a position tantamount to that of historian to the denomination. Brother Loughborough went farther than to deny that Sister White taught the shut door: he stoutly maintained that it was not taught by Seventh-day Adventists at all.

After quoting Sister White's statement that "Adventists were for a time united in the belief that the door of mercy was shut", he says,—“In this quotation Mrs. White states the position taken by First-day Adventists. She does not even intimate that she believed it.” “Great Second Advent Movement”, p. 222.

On page 230 of the same book he writes:—

“Even as late as the year 1848, there remained here and there an individual who held that there was no more mercy for sinners. These, however, were not Seventh-day Adventists.”

Sufficient evidence has already been presented in preceding pages to demonstrate the utter falsity of these statements. The reverse is the truth, that the First-day Adventists early gave up the shut door doctrine, and the Seventh-day Adventists doggedly maintained it.

Joseph Bates, referring to Sister White's visions, wrote, in 1847:—

“I believe the work is of God, and is given to comfort and strengthen his ‘scattered’, ‘torn’, and ‘peeled people’, since the closing up of our work for the world, in October, 1844. “A Word to the Little Flock”, p. 21.

How does Brother Loughborough deal with a passage like this? He simply drops out the words “for the world”, and makes the passage read,—

"since the closing up of our work . . . in October, 1844". "Great Second Advent Movement", p. 263.

How does Brother Loughborough deal with James White's statement that the Lord showed Sister White in vision that she and all the band in Portland had fallen into error in having "given up the midnight cry and shut door as being in the past"? He simply omits the words, "and shut door", and makes the sentence read, "had given up the 'midnight cry' as being in the past." Ib. p. 264. Here he gives no indication that any words have been omitted.

This is a serious offense, for the clauses omitted from both the quotations above referred to are key phrases, the omission of which is calculated to keep the reader in ignorance of the fact that the pioneers taught the shut door, and that Sister White's visions taught that doctrine; facts that Brother Loughborough categorically denies in the book in which he makes these mangled quotations.

In the "Review and Herald" for June 11, 1861, there was published a conference address signed by a number of the leading brethren. The address read as follows:—

"If we go back to a period of from six to nine years ago, we find the believers in the third angel's message few in number, very much scattered, and in no place assuming to take the name of a church. Our views of the work before us were then mostly vague and indefinite, some still retaining the idea adopted by the body of Advent believers in 1844, with William Miller at their head, that our work for 'the world' was finished, and that the message was confined to those of the original advent faith. So firmly was this believed that one of our number was nearly refused the message, the individual presenting it having doubts of the possibility of his salvation because he was not in 'the '44 move'. Such things may seem strange to most of our readers, but they serve well to illustrate our proposition that many crude and erroneous views were entertained . . .

"And according to our views of the work we had to do, was our method of labour. As individuals would go scores and even hundreds of miles to present the truth to one or two who had been believers in the first message, so would the labourers go long distances to visit, to comfort, and to strengthen the scattered ones who had embraced the faith."

This conference address was signed by J. H. Waggoner, James White, J. N. Loughborough, E.

W. Shortridge, Joseph Bates, J. B. Frisbie, M. E. Cornell, Moses Hull, and John Byington.

Brother Loughborough, then, was a signatory of this address, and was indeed himself the "one of their number" referred to who was "nearly refused the message" because of doubts entertained as to the possibility of his salvation, seeing he was "not in the '44 move". And yet, knowing all this, Brother Loughborough has dared to deny in his book that Seventh-day Adventists taught the shut door during the early years of their history!

It is a thousand pities that the degree of candour exhibited in this 1861 conference address was not maintained and extended during subsequent years. It is an honour to a people as well as to an individual frankly to acknowledge mistakes, and to retract them. But this degree of candour was not maintained, the said conference address being apparently only a sporadic manifestation of that quality. And the chief reason for this reticence with reference to the early mistakes is that Sister White is involved in them, and the authority of the Testimonies is at stake.

This effort to clear the pioneers, and especially Sister White of the responsibility of teaching the shut door has been continued by denominational leaders right up to the present time. In the "Review and Herald", during April, 1926, Elder W. A. Spicer, then president of the general conference, and associate editor of the "Review," published a series of articles with that end in view. The following passages are extracted from the articles referred to:—

"So far from the shut door meaning to those believers that probation closed in 1844, the new view of the shut door and the Sabbath truth was an incentive to go out and work for the salvation of others." "Review and Herald", April 1, 1926.

"On the contrary, the record shows that the spirit of prophecy was ever calling the pioneers to shape their plans to carry the gospel message to sinners in every land. And all through those years Sister White herself was out preaching the gospel and seeking to save sinners."

"And mark this, all the time, from the very beginning, the spirit of prophecy was not only setting forth an open door, but was telling these pioneers of a great world-wide work of which they had little idea." Ib. April 15, 1926.

Brother Spicer does not bring any evidence from the early publications to warrant these statements. We have already seen that the records of the early years tell a very different story from that which our brother would have us believe. In the face of all this evidence, how can anyone conscientiously maintain that "all the time, from the very beginning, the spirit of prophecy was . . . setting forth an open door", and telling the pioneers of a "great world-wide work of which they had little idea"?

Still more recently, in a pamphlet entitled "The Shut Door and the Close of Probation", Elder A. G. Daniells reviews some of the early teaching of Sister White on this subject. Brother Daniells' pamphlet is a welcome departure from the policy followed by our publishers in the past, in two respects; first, in that it acknowledges that our pioneers "continued for a period to believe that salvation for sinners was past", and second, in acknowledging the fact that certain important passages had been eliminated from "Early Writings", and even in reproducing and discussing some of them. The object is kept in view throughout, however, of clearing Sister White of having taught the mistaken doctrine. We quote the following from Brother Daniells' pamphlet:—

"In the very nature of the case, as the time came, and for a short period thereafter, they [Seventh-day Adventists] believed that after their work for sinners was at an end . . . But while, after the passing of the time in 1844, they continued for a period to believe that salvation for sinners was past and that Christ would quickly appear, there was no statement from Mrs. E. G. White to the effect that it had been revealed to her that probation for the world had closed, and that there was no longer salvation for the unsaved. There is a vast difference between holding a personal belief regarding a question, and declaring that this belief had been obtained by a direct revelation from the Lord." "The Shut Door and the Close of Probation", p. 5.

Proceeding to examine some of the eliminated passages, Brother Daniells writes:—

"The one sure and satisfactory way of arriving at the truth of the question under consideration is by a careful examination of the published utterances of Mrs. White during that period." Ib. p. 6.

Concluding this review, Brother Daniells says that:—

"In all that was printed from the pen of Mrs. White during eight years—1844-1851—we find three statements so worded that two different and conflicting interpretations can be placed upon them . . . The writer believes . . . that there is no evidence that Mrs. E. G. White ever taught this error." p. 26.

In order to test the soundness of Brother Daniells' conclusion let us consider briefly one of the three statements to which he refers,—“It was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the City, as all the wicked world which God had rejected.” Of this sentence Brother Daniells says that he sincerely believes that it “does not, taken apart from the context, express the view of the author as clearly as was intended.” “This opinion”, he continues, “is strengthened by the action of Mrs. White when, in revising the printed message, she eliminated this sentence”. p. 15. No one suggests, however, that this sentence be “taken apart from its context”. We want it with its context, where it rightly belongs. It was “separated from its context” when Sister White eliminated it.

Brother Daniells asks,—“Is it exactly fair to take a single brief sentence from its context, and place a meaning upon it which makes it conflict with the document as a whole?” Ib. The sentence under consideration, whether taken apart from or with its context, does not at all conflict with the document as a whole. If it were in conflict with the message of the document as a whole, it would obviously never have been written in the first place. The statement is harmonious with its context, and with the general teaching of Sister White and the other pioneers of the time. It would be difficult to “place a meaning upon” the sentence other than that which stands out upon the very face of it. Let the reader read the passage once more, and see if this is not the case. “It was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the City, as all the wicked world which God had rejected.”

Brother Daniells asks again, “Is it not more reasonable and consistent to conclude that the wording of the sentence is not clear—that it does not express fully, and without possibility of mis-

understanding, just what the writer had in mind?" Ib. But the sentence is clear; uncompromisingly clear: it **does** express "without possibility of misunderstanding just what the writer had in mind."

In seeking a way out of the difficulty, Brother Daniells pleads that this and other passages are "so worded that two different and conflicting interpretations can be placed upon them. p. 26. No attempt is made to show **how** these conflicting constructions could be arrived at.

Speaking of Sister White's first vision (of which the particular passage under discussion formed a part), Brother Daniells says,—“It is plainly evident that this view revealed a great evangelical movement in operation throughout the world until the coming of the Lord”. p. 12. This claim is based on Sister White's repeated reference to the 144,000, a number of believers which Brother Daniells affirms was nowhere in sight at the time. This argument loses its force, however, when one knows that the Adventists influenced by the Miller movement were estimated to exceed that number, and these were the ones that Sister White and her associates were so diligent in searching out. Moreover, Joseph Bates, discussing the question of the 144,000 at that time, declared that he believed them to be already in existence. He published a 70-page pamphlet, entitled, “The Seal of the Living God. A Hundred and Forty-four Thousand of the Servants of God being Sealed, in 1849.”

The editor of the “Review and Herald”, Elder F. M. Wilcox, in closing a series of articles on “The Shut Door and Close of Probation”, says, in speaking of Sister White's writings:—

“There are two or three statements which, because of their ambiguity of expression, some have charged taught the shut-door doctrine.” “Review” for Jan. 30, 1930.

Why does Brother Wilcox speak of “ambiguity of expression” in connection with these statements? Brother Daniells uses similar terms, as we have already seen. He says “the wording of the sentence is not clear”,—that it “does not express fully, and without possibility of misunderstanding”, etc., and that these things “might have

been expressed more clearly". He speaks again of "the obscurity of the phrase".

The truth is that there is nothing either ambiguous or obscure about the statements referred to. Sister White said of the back-sliding Adventists, "It was just as impossible for them to get on the path again and go to the City, as all the wicked world which God had rejected." Where is "the obscurity of the phrase"?

She said again, that "if one believed, and kept the Sabbath, and received the blessing attending it, and then gave it up, and broke the holy commandment, they would shut the gates of the Holy City against themselves, as sure as there was a God that rules in heaven above." Where is the "ambiguity of expression" that Brother Wilcox speaks of?

In a chapter headed "The Open and the Shut Door", Sister White wrote,—“My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but could not see it; for the time for their salvation is past.” Is “the wording of the sentence not clear”?

Place this statement from Sister White parallel with a sentence from Brother Daniells' book, thus: and note that one is a direct rebuttal of the other:—

“There was no statement from Mrs. E. G. White to the effect that it had been revealed to her that probation for the world had closed, and that there was no longer salvation for the unsaved.” Brother Daniells' pamphlet, p. 5.

“My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners as used to be. I looked, but I could not see it; for the time for their salvation is past.” “Early Writings”, p. 45.

When Sister White wrote to Eli Curtis in April, 1847: “The Lord has shown me in vision, that Jesus rose up, and shut the door, and entered the Holy of Holies, at the 7th month, 1844”; and when she related another vision in 1850, in which she said, “I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness”; did she not express herself “fully, and without possibility of misunderstanding”?

Why do our leading brethren use their influence to persuade the church that such expressions as these; bold, clear, and uncompromising in their definiteness and outspokenness; are obscure and ambiguous? Sister White well knew how to say what she meant; and she certainly did not fail in these and other similar instances.

A Letter Recently Published.

In the "Review and Herald" for January the 14th, 1932, there was published a photographic reproduction of a letter written by Mrs. E. G. White to Elder J. N. Loughborough, relating to the shut-door teaching of the early years. The letter reads as follows:—

Battle Creek, Mich.,
Aug. 24, 1874.

Dear Bro. Loughborough:

I hereby testify in the fear of God that the charges of Miles Grant, of Mrs. Burdick, and others, published in the CRISIS is not true. The statements in reference to my course in fourty-four is false.

With my brethren and sisters, after the time passed in fourty-four I did believe no more sinners would be converted. But I never had a vision that no more sinners would be converted. And am clear and free to state no one has ever heard me say or has read from my pen statements which will justify them in the charges they have made against me upon this point.

It was on my first journey east to relate my visions that the precious light in regard to the heavenly sanctuary was opened before me and I was shown the open and shut door. We believed that the Lord was soon to come in the clouds of heaven. I was shown that there was a great work to be done in the world for those who had not had the light and rejected it. Our brethren could not understand this with our faith in the immediate appearing of Christ. Some accused me of saying my Lord delayeth His coming, especially the fanatical ones. I saw that in '44 God had opened a door and no man could shut it, and shut a door and no man could open it. Those who rejected the light which was brought to the world by the message of the second angel went into darkness, and how great was that darkness.

I never have stated or written that the world was doomed or damned. I never have under any circumstances used this language to any one, however sinful. I have ever had messages of reproof for those who used these harsh expressions.

The publication of this letter may be regarded as a very belated acknowledgment of the truth concerning certain matters referred to in this Appendix. The acknowledgment, however, both on the part of the writer of the letter and of those who now publish it, is only partial, and is entirely inadequate. Let us consider first of all the significance of the acknowledgments made, and then review the evidence that something more far-reaching is called for by the facts in the case.

Sister White states in this letter that "after the time passed in forty-four", she, in common with the brethren and sisters of the time, "did believe that no more sinners would be converted". This is an important admission, because the denomination has for many years sought to maintain the very opposite. Brother Loughborough declared that those who held such views "were not Seventh-day Adventists." Speaking of Sister White he wrote that "she does not even intimate that she believed it." See "Great Second Advent Movement", pp. 234, 222, 223. It makes one blush for Brother Loughborough to reflect that when he published these statements he had in his possession the very letter now reproduced by the "Review and Herald" in which Sister White makes the solemn asseveration (no mere "intimation") that she and the other pioneers **did believe** that doctrine. Provided of course that our brother actually received the letter. The "Review" speaks of it as being found among Sister White's old letters and documents. In any case, however, Brother Loughborough had access to all the information it contains, and much more.

Brother Loughborough is not the only one to appear in an unfavourable light as a result of the publication of this letter. A grave reflection falls upon Sister White herself. She must have known that a false representation regarding these matters was being made to our people, not only in Brother Loughborough's book, but also in other publications, including notes and prefaces in her own "Early Writings", and yet did nothing to prevent it. These things could not possibly have continued in the face of her direct and expressed dis-

approval. Her silence, or inaction involves her deeply in responsibility for the course so long followed by the denomination in this connection.

More than eighty years have expired since the close of that early period of "shut-door" teaching. The letter under consideration was itself written almost fifty-eight years before its recent publication. During all this time a wrong impression has been given our people. A grave reflection falls not only upon Sister White and Brother Loughborough, but upon all who, closing their eyes to the very evident facts in the case, have persisted in maintaining that impression.

Now that we have Sister White's own acknowledgment that she and the other pioneers "did believe that no more sinners would be converted", what will the ex-president of the general conference say, who in 1926, writing professedly in review of the evidences contained in the early documents, maintained in our leading church paper that "so far from the shut door meaning to those believers that probation closed in 1844, the new view of the shut door and the Sabbath truth was an incentive to go out and work for the salvation of others."? "Review and Herald", April 1, 1926. How will the same writer justify his assertion that "all through those years Sister White herself was out preaching the gospel and seeking to save sinners."? Ib. April 15, 1926. For how could Sister White and the pioneers work for the salvation of sinners when it was their firm belief that "no more sinners would be converted"?

What will the editor of the "Review and Herald" say, who in the January 30, 1930, number of that paper wrote that "We have no evidence that Mrs. White had the same idea about the work to be done as her associates", and that "her instruction to the church through all the years is definite and decided in presenting an open door of mercy to any and every penitent of every race and nation who would seek salvation in Christ Jesus."? For how could Sister White be so "definite and decided in presenting an open door of mercy" during the period in which according to her own

admission she believed the door was shut, and "no more sinners would be converted"?

We turn now to consider the evidence that a more far-reaching acknowledgment is called for than is furnished by the letter under consideration. Sister White here affirms that she "never had a vision that no more sinners would be converted". It seems that our sister must have written this sentence with certain mental reservations. She may not have related a vision in which it was said in so many words that "no more sinners would be converted"; but she did relate a vision in which it was declared that "the time for their salvation is past", and that such so-called conversions or "reformations" as were then being seen were only "from bad to worse"; and another declaring that it was "impossible" for "all the wicked world which God had rejected", or for Adventist backsliders to "get on the path" and "go to the City"; and another in which she was shown that "Jesus rose up and shut the door, and entered the Holy of Holies at the 7th month, 1844"; and another in which she "did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness"; and still other visions of the same purport and to the same effect. It is idle for Sister White and the defenders of her inspiration to maintain that these visions did not teach that no more sinners would be converted.

We must regretfully face the fact that Sister White was capable of writing very solemn statements with mental reservations such as that above suggested. In "Testimonies for the Church", Vol. 5, page 67, she wrote:—

"In these letters which I write, in the testimonies I bear, I am presenting to you that which the Lord has presented to me. I do not write one article in the paper expressing merely my own ideas. They are what God has opened before me in vision—the precious rays of light shining from the throne."

How can one reconcile this bold claim with the fact that such a book as Sister White's "Sketches from the Life of Paul" contained so much matter copied without acknowledgment from the well-known "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul" by

Conybeare and Howson, that the representatives of the latter threatened to bring suit against the Review and Herald Publishing Company for the plagiarism? Sister White's book had to be withdrawn from sale on that account. That was very discreditable, especially for one who made such high claims. Who, in this instance, received "the light shining from the throne"? Sister White, or Messrs. Conybeare and Howson?

There are other and numerous instances in which our late sister incorporated in her books passages copied from various authors without giving credits. It is difficult to imagine how she could conscientiously reconcile this wholesale unacknowledged appropriation of the writings of others, with the solemn assurance that she never even "wrote one article in the paper" except to convey "what God had opened before her in vision—the precious rays of light shining from the throne."

Sister White says,—**"With my brethren and sisters . . . I did believe no more sinners would be converted."** That is just what the early records show. She believed what the brethren at the time believed. But the records also show that she taught what they taught, even in the relation of the visions. Take, for instance, the following statements:—

"I saw that in Brother Rhodes' mouth there had been no guile in speaking against the present truth, relating to the Sabbath and the Shut Door." E. G. W., in "Present Truth" for December, 1849.

"The 'Present Truth', then, of this third angel's message, is, **THE SABBATH AND THE SHUT DOOR.**" Joseph Bates, in tract published in 1850.

"Then I was shown that the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus, relating to the shut door, could not be separated." March 24, 1849, "Early Writings", p. 42.

Nothing could be clearer than that in these statements Sister White agreed with Brother Bates in teaching that the Sabbath and the shut door were the present truth.

In the letter under consideration Sister White says further:—

"It was on my first journey east to relate my visions that the precious light in regard to the heavenly sanctuary was opened before me and I was shown the open and shut door."

What light was this? The opening and shutting of doors in heaven! Is that all? There is neither light, nor life, nor salvation in this theory of the pioneers relating to the doors of the sanctuary, either in the form in which they originally held it, or in the form in which they passed it on to us, and in which we are asked to pass it on to our children.

In his pamphlet, "The Shut Door and the Close of Probation", Brother Daniells solemnly argues that "in not one of the five references to the shut door does Mrs. White state that the door of the second apartment of the sanctuary in which Christ ministers as High Priest or Mediator for a lost world was closed in 1844." p. 26. Why does Brother Daniells specify "the door of the **second apartment**"? Sister White taught that the door was shut, but she did not say that it was the door of the **second** apartment! Profound distinction! As though sinners could gain access to the inner door, when the outer door was closed against them!

William Miller made a grievous mistake in preaching that Christ would come in 1844. Our pioneers decided that Brother Miller was quite right in preaching the time, that God's hand was in it, and that the mistake was only in the event that was expected to take place.

From 1844 to 1851 the pioneers taught that the door was shut, and that probation for the world had closed. When it became evident that they were mistaken in this, instead of dropping the shut door theory altogether, they only modified it. They had not been mistaken in teaching that the door was shut; it was only a question as to **which** door was shut!

"While it was true that that door of hope and mercy by which men had for eighteen hundred years found access to God was closed, another door was opened . . . There was still an 'open door' to the heavenly sanctuary". "Great Controversy", p. 430.

Sister White, in her letter to Brother Loughborough, protests further:—

"I never have stated or written that the world was doomed or damned. I never have under any circumstances used this language to any one, however sinful."

This may be quite true. Sister White may never have used these particular expressions. She has however made statements far more harsh, unwarranted statements, as the following extracts from her writings will show:—

"Said the angel . . . Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body." "Early Writings", p. 273.

"I saw that since Jesus left the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, and entered within the second veil, the churches have been filling up with every unclean and hateful bird. I saw great iniquity and vileness in the churches; yet their members profess to be Christians. Their profession, their prayers, and their exhortations, are an abomination in the sight of God. Said the angel, 'God will not smell in their assemblies' ". Ib. p. 274.

"I saw that if the false covering could be torn off from the members of the churches, there would be revealed such iniquity, vileness, and corruption, that the most diffident child of God would have no hesitancy in calling these professed Christians by their right name, children of their father, the devil; for his works they do." Ib. Old edition, p. 93, modified in new edition, p. 228.

There is a sense in which the world in departure from God is a doomed, lost world. Sister White would not have erred from the truth had she spoken of it as such. That would be very different from saying that "the time for their salvation is past". For although it is true that the world is a lost world, it is also true that "the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost". It is not true, however, that "Satan has taken full possession of the churches as a body", and our sister (partly excusable no doubt because of the fanatical "shut-door" viewpoint of her early years) erred greatly in attributing those words to the angel of God.

The admissions contained in the letter under consideration are therefore entirely inadequate. Let not the reader be deceived. The documentary evidence coming down to us from those early years, reviewed in this Appendix, is not so lightly to be set aside.

In dismissing this subject, I would earnestly caution the reader not to think that the questions discussed in this book are to be decided, Yea, or Nay, according to whether or not our pioneers taught the shut door, or as to whether or not Sister White related visions teaching that "no more sinners would be converted". These are entirely secondary matters. Let the mind turn again to the undoubted truth that Jesus Christ reached the holiest of all when He entered the unveiled presence of the Father, and that the sins of believing men are expiated through the merits of his shed blood. What is the Bible testimony concerning **these** things? That is the question. And it is a question that has already been sufficiently answered from the scriptures in these pages.

Conclusion.

During recent years some very unpleasant facts have been painfully pressed upon us. We have learned that vital passages teaching the shut door were eliminated from Sister White's "Early Writings"; we have seen that despite this, the publishers for many years assured us in their "Preface" that "no changes from the original work had been made", that "no portion of the work had been omitted", and indeed that "no shadow of change had been made in any idea or sentiment of the original work"; we have learned that for a period of seven years after 1844 our Seventh-day Adventist pioneers were the dogged defenders of the shut door doctrine, and the stern denouncers of the Adventists who in 1845 renounced that theory; and yet for many years a large volume, purporting to be a historic account of the early days of our movement, has been circulated among our people, falsely accusing the First-day Adventists of being the propagators of that error, and just as culpably denying that our own pioneers taught it; we have been made painfully conscious of a weakness on the part of leading brethren over a long period of time, in relating only that which seemed favourable, and not telling us "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth", concerning Sister White's experiences, and the early days of the movement.

Aside from the revelation of these facts, and quite independently of them, some of our godly and devoted brethren, both ministers and laity, have had misgivings as to the truth of the sanctuary teaching in the form in which we have received it. They see that the scriptural testimony is against us, in teaching that Christ did not reach the most holy place in heaven until 1844; that the Bible evidence is overwhelming that He reached that place at the time of his ascension. They see that the idea of a transfer of sins to heaven, and an investigative judgment almost a century long "for determining who are prepared for the kingdom of God" is entirely without warrant in holy scripture. The revelation of un-

pleasant facts referred to in the preceding paragraph confirms them in their conviction of the need for a reform of doctrine in connection with the sanctuary teaching.

The new views,* however, are a definite departure from those propounded so dogmatically by Sister White. What shall the denomination say, then, to its ministers and lay members who feel that they cannot any longer conscientiously accept and teach Sister White's views. The leaders will of course seek first of all to defend the accepted teaching from the Bible. Their best arguments from scripture are reviewed in the first seven chapters of this book. But what can be said with regard to the "unpleasant facts" referred to above? **It has been impossible to deny the charges so painfully pressed upon us!** Let the reader take due notice of the significance of this. There has been an effort by some to maintain the old ground, that the pioneers did not teach the shut door; but that effort has entirely collapsed. The endeavour now is to show that Sister White did not participate in the shut door view, or at least that she did not teach it on the authority of her visions. To establish this, however, the brethren must account for the numerous statements of Sister White that have been reviewed in this Appendix. How do they do this? They ask us to regard these passages as "ambiguous" and "obscure"! **Is this the best the brethren can do?**

What are God's people to do in these circumstances? There is only one thing to do. Let us get back to the Bible, and the Bible only as the rule of our faith. In that word we are exhorted not to despise prophesyings, but to prove them, and to hold fast only that which is good. God has given us in the Holy Scriptures the true norm, not only of Christian doctrine, but also of Christian experience. In her warfare in this world, the church is likely to be perplexed through the extravagances in experience of some of her children. It is not always possible to explain or account for the mistaken impressions and conviction of appar-

* They are not really new, but as old as the gospel itself, and have been held by evangelical Christians throughout the dispensation.

ently fervent and spiritually-minded Christians. We do not have to do that. We do not need to do it. Our responsibility and our safety is to get back to the Bible, and rely upon that sure word, both for teaching and for experience, whether we can account for the experiences of other Christians or not.

In declining to accept Sister Whites' testimonies as a direct revelation from God, we do not have to account for all her exercises, and explain how an apparently earnest Christian could be mistaken in such claims as she has made. It will be urged by some that the work must have been either wholly of God, or wholly of the devil. We are not bound to accept either alternative.

In the early publication referred to so frequently in these pages, "A Word to the Little Flock", James White reproduced the statement of a friend concerning the visions, that is of interest to us to-day. The following is the statement:—

"I cannot endorse Sister Ellen's visions as being of divine inspiration, as you and she think them to be; yet I do not suspect the least shade of dishonesty in either of you in this matter. I may perhaps, express to you my belief in the matter, without harm—it will, doubtless, result either in your good or mine. At the same time, I admit the possibility of my being mistaken. I think that what she and you regard as visions from the Lord, are only religious reveries, in which her imagination runs without control upon themes in which she is most deeply interested. While so absorbed in these reveries, she is lost to everything around her. Reveries are of two kinds, sinful and religious. Hers is the latter. Rousseau's, 'a celebrated French infidel', were the former. Infidelity was his theme, and his reveries were infidel. Religion is her theme; and her reveries are religious. In either case, the sentiments, in the main, are obtained from previous teaching, or study. I do not by any means think her visions are like some from the devil." p. 22.

Whether this brother's diagnosis of Sister White's condition in vision was correct or not we do not need to decide. His was at any rate a kindly and merciful view to take. Let us be just as kindly and just as merciful. There doubtless was, at any rate at that time, "no shade of dishonesty" in Brother and Sister White in this matter. It is not so easy to take that view, when, later on, passages were eliminated from the writ-

ings, and gross misrepresentation permitted such as has been reviewed in these pages. It is not so easy to overlook the part played by others in continuing these misrepresentations. The responsibility for the misrepresentations is a grave one, for by them the church has been prevented from obeying the injunction to "prove all things". Nevertheless we are bound in this instance also to take the merciful view. One of the characteristics of fanaticism is blindness. Very questionable things may be done by otherwise pious men in support of a claim they have come to believe to be as fundamental and essential as that of the inspiration of the Bible. And there has certainly been a degree of fanaticism manifested in the course followed by some, in their efforts to bolster up Sister White's claim to direct revelation. Let us leave it at that. And let us at the same time turn anew to the Bible, and to the God of the Bible, and his Son, our blessed Saviour, Jesus Christ. For my own part, I rejoice greatly in God my Saviour. My faith in Him, and in the promises of his word increases day by day. The blessed hope of Christ's soon-coming is more precious to me than ever before.

There was a great stir in America, when William Miller and his associates preached that Christ would come on the 22nd of October, 1844. So profound was the impression upon some, that even when the disappointment came, they still felt that the Lord was in the definite time preaching. They could not doubt the "experience" through which they passed in connection with that movement. One reads that over and over again in the early records. It was this very attitude of mind, in which they felt bound to justify their experience of the past, that led our pioneers to hold so tenaciously to the shut door theory.

Some took a wiser view, and followed a wiser course. One of them wrote thus to the "Voice of Truth", some eighteen months after the disappointment:—

"I believe it was a sincere, honest, human mistake, and it would have been an honour to anyone to confess it", and "not lay it up to the Lord." Quoted in "Advent Review", p. 34.

Seventh-day Adventists are in danger to-day of holding on blindly to a misinterpretation of prophecy, because they feel that so much of their past experience in the things of God must stand or fall with it. In this we have received our impressions from Sister White and the pioneers, a relic of similar impressions that led them to persist in a mistaken position some eighty years ago. Let us beware of reaping the results of their error, and passing them on to perplex the minds of our children, and to make faith difficult for them.

We have not been mistaken in cherishing the blessed hope of Christ's soon-coming. I would exhort the reader not to relinquish this hope, but to cherish it with increasing earnestness. God has light for us on the prophecies, light that is increasing more and more. And the light will continue to increase, unto the perfect day.

As for the sanctuary teaching that we have held for so many years, let us bid it an unregretful farewell. Let us not harshly judge any of the brethren, past or present, for the mistakes and wrongs that have led either to its inception or its perpetuation; but let us kindly say, with the brother who wrote to "The Voice of Truth" so many years ago,—“I believe it was a sincere, honest, human mistake”; let us regard it as “an honour to anyone to confess it”, and “not lay it up to the Lord.”

