

**The
Sanctuary Service**

THE BIBLE ADVOCATE
SALEM, WEST VIRGINIA

"THESE were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Therefore many of them believed; also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men, not a few."—Acts 17:11-12.

Reading the account given in Acts 17, we find Paul and Silas were sent to the people of Thessalonica with a message from God. Had it been a popular message, no doubt they would have gained permission to remain in their city much longer and many more would have received much light. But we find there a class of people, who had, as they thought, all the truth for all time, therefore stood in need of no study, no searching of the heart, no investigation, in fact they would not even consider to reason with these messengers, or to point from the scriptures wherein Paul and Silas were teaching an untruth as they believed.

As we read the account of these great missionaries, our hearts are made to burn with an understanding of their problem. Truly it is a master problem to get people to consent to an unbiased study of any subject, that may lead them to a separation of former opinions, beliefs and friends. We should always realize that a belief, no matter how much it may be cherished, or how long we have believed it to be true, unless it is sound Bible truth, it will not help us on the judgment day. We are reminded of a verse in Matt. 15: "But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." A genuine, earnest, sincere Christian will always be thankful when some "plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted" is pointed out to the individual, so it can be "rooted up." Christians will be always willing

to let the searchlight of Scripture reveal these "plants" and the sword of His Word cut them down. We must never allow church position, salary, or prestige, to interfere with this cleansing work. Would this not be a violation of the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me"?—Exod. 20:3.

Referring again to Acts 17:11, we find the Bereans were classed as more noble than those in Thessalonica (and for a definite reason) in that "they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily whether those things were so." We find as a result of this open minded investigation, which made them "more noble" that a certain decision was made, for verse 12 says "Therefore many of them believed. . . ." To day we find when anyone is possessed with the characteristic of searching the scriptures daily, they will not search in vain. God has promised "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth. . . ."—John 16:13.

It is for this Truth, based upon the Bible, and backed by the only infallible, inspired Word of God, that we must be willing to subject all our beliefs. It is to His Word, that every detail of our belief must be hewn. Let us build upon the Rock that cannot be shaken!

The Sanctuary Service is of great interest to all students of the Bible who have wondered how these ancient ceremonies looked in operation. This study will be even more interesting to all Seventh-day Adventists, as much of their belief is dependent upon their interpretation of what took place in these services.

It is the writer's sincere desire that you will be willing to go to the Bible, and with an unbiased mind, sit down to study these things out for yourself. Surely this is not asking too much of a people who claim to have "no creed but the Bible."

If, in your study you see some belief you once thought Bible sound swept away, you should rejoice that God has revealed this to you. Many these days are writing us asking for literature explaining these truths, therefore, we have no apology to make, as we study these vital subjects.

Many Seventh-day Adventists are not familiar with the denominational teaching of the sanctuary service. It may therefore be well to briefly state their belief regarding this service.

First of all, they teach that the earthly sanctuary was an exact duplicate of the heavenly sanctuary, and that as the priest did in the ancient sanctuary, so Christ is now doing in the heavenly sanctuary. They teach that when Christ ascended, he entered and remained in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary until Oct. 22, 1844, at which date He moved into the second apartment or Most Holy Place, to begin the final day of atonement. This latter work since 1844, is also called "Investigative judgment" or to "Cleanse the Sanctuary" to make "final atonement" and blot out sins. This teaching is derived from their understanding of the earthly sanctuary, which they teach was defiled by the confession of sin. For they teach, when an Israelite sinned he brought his offering to the tabernacle, placed his hand upon its head, confessed his sin, thus transferring the sin to the sacrifice, which was then slain, and the priest taking some of the blood, into the Holy Place, sprinkled it before the veil, or on the veil, as some teach. Thus was the sinner's sin kept on record until the yearly day of atonement. On the day of atonement, "the priest entered the Most Holy place, for the cleansing of the sanctuary." This was accomplished by the priest sprinkling goats blood "upon the mercy-seat above the tables of the law." The priest then took

all these sins, which through the year, were held on record and placed them upon the scape-goat, which was then turned loose in the wilderness—thus the sanctuary was cleansed from sin.

In like manner we are told by the denominational teaching that the heavenly sanctuary has been defiled by our sins being transferred there by the blood of Christ. They teach that only since 1844 has Christ been able to make full and final atonement for sin, for not before that date did He enter into the Most Holy place. That this is their teaching all well informed Seventh-day Adventists recognize. However, for those who may question our information we quote from "The Year Book of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination" 1946 edition, under Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists, page 5, No 13 "That no prophetic period is given in the Bible to reach to the second advent, but that the longest one, the 2300 days of Dan. 8:14, terminated in 1844, and brought us to an event called the cleansing of the sanctuary." Again we quote from No. 16 "That the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, synchronizing with the period of the proclamation of the message of Rev. 14, is a time of investigative judgment, first with reference to the dead, and secondly, reference to the living. This investigative judgment determines who of the myriads sleeping in the dust of the earth are worthy of a part in the first resurrection, and who of its living multitudes are worthy of translation. I Peter 4:17, 18; Dan. 7:9, 10; Rev: 14:6, 7; Luke 20:35."

Those who have only studied this from the denominational view, will seriously question our ability to produce Bible evidence to the contrary. The writer can feel and sympathize with such people, having studied and learned all of their beliefs in Seventh-day Adventist schools, and having been a member for many years, I can say it is

extremely difficult to even suggest to be a loyal Seventh-day Adventist, that any tenet of Seventh-day Adventism would not stand complete and full examination.

The writer is not suggesting that Seventh-day Adventism holds no truths. For all sincere Christian students of the Bible recognize the Seventh day as the only Sabbath day given to man. They recognize true baptism is only by immersion, that the return of Christ will be literal and visible, and that this event is not many years future. Sincere men and women everywhere are preparing for this greatest of all events. And how can we be ready to meet the Lord, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing (II Tim. 4:1)? The answer lies, first of all, in believing that Christ shed His blood on the cross of Calvary for you, and that this was sufficient to pay the price, as Rom. 5:11 states: "And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ by whom we have now received the atonement." Secondly, to ask of God wisdom to understand the teachings of the Bible, and then through the power of the Holy Spirit, to order one's life in harmony with these teachings.

This course may call for a sacrifice of position. You may lose many of your now considered friends and brethren, in the church. But what value are friends, and position if to hold these friends and to keep your position in church circles, you must depart from the plain Truths written for our learning? It is better to be in the right alone if need be, than to stand with the masses and remain in error.

As before stated, Seventh-day Adventists teach that the earthly sanctuary was an exact duplicate of the heavenly sanctuary, for says Mrs. White: "He presented before Moses a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary, and commanded him to make all things according to the pat-

tern showed him in the mount. " Spirit of Prophecy Vol. 1, p. 269. Also, "The sanctuary in heaven in which Jesus ministers in our behalf, is the great original, of which the sanctuary built by Moses was a copy." G. C. page 414.

From these quotations and the verse found in Exod. 25:40: "Look that thou make them after their pattern which was showed thee in the mount;" and also Heb. 8:5: "Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount." Some contend that God had shown Moses the heavenly sanctuary while in the mount. But where is the Bible proof it was the heavenly sanctuary he was shown? Such proof is lacking.

The Bible states definitely it was the "pattern" he was shown, and no doubt Moses did have a view of the completed tabernacle including every detail in its completed form and was shown just how it would look after the "pattern" was followed in erecting this important building.

If we believe God showed to Moses the heavenly sanctuary and this was the pattern he was to follow, we must also believe the heavenly sanctuary is a duplicate of the earthly sanctuary. In other words they must of necessity be constructed exactly alike. They must be identical. This would make it necessary to believe that the same material was used in making the heavenly sanctuary as was used in building the earthly one. But who would contend that in the heavenly sanctuary any use of "ram's ksin" or "goat's hair" was employed, or that it was necessary that such animals exist in heaven. If they used "rams skins" or "badger's skin" in building the heavenly sanctuary then death must also reign in heaven. Would

some one please explain who killed these heavenly animals, and skinned and tanned their pelts? Would not such a belief make the Lord's prayer a mere mockery, when we say, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven"? If death, the greatest enemy of man, reigns in heaven why should we pray to have such a kingdom established on earth?

May we ask who would advance the theory that in heaven there is a "laver" (Exod. 30:18), filled with water in which the angels must wash "that they die not" when they come into the tabernacle of the congregation? Every article which Moses was shown the "pattern" could likewise be used to show how absurd it is to believe the earthly sanctuary was an exact duplicate of the heavenly. One or two more is all space permits. In the earthly sanctuary was placed a table of "shew bread" on which twelve loaves of bread were kept and changed every week, also there was an altar of burnt offering "before the door of the tabernacle of the tent of the congregation"—Exod. 40:6. All these were "patterns" which were shown to Moses in the mount. See Num. 8:4; Exod. 25:9. Many other verses speak of the patterns he was to follow.

Let us be consistent in our search for understanding. Let us be ready to harmonize scripture, not to make it clash. Just where in the economy of the heavenly sanctuary, would an "altar of burnt offering" be fitted? If we believe Moses viewed the heavenly sanctuary and obeyed God in building the earthly one, then the "altar of burnt offering" must also have been an important part of the heavenly one. May we ask who used the heavenly altar of burnt offering upon which to sacrifice the slain bodies of "burnt offerings"? If the latter were not "patterns" or blue prints of things in the heavenly sanctuary (which we agree they were not) what right has anyone to

say Moses viewed any of the heavenly sanctuary, to build a duplicate of it for the earthly sanctuary?

The reader's mind may be directed to Heb. 9:23: "It was therefore necessary that the pattern of the things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." This text some use as proof that the earthly tabernacle was a direct pattern of the heavenly. To rightly understand this and to bring in harmony, which we must ever be willing to do, we must go to the Greek from which this is translated. Greek scholars tell us the Greek word from which the word "pattern" is translated, in this text, has not the meaning of the word "pattern" in our language. The Greek word is "hupodigma" and is found only six times in the New Testament, and in every case is translated "example." Had Paul wanted to convey the thought of the word "pattern" or model, he would have used the word "tupos" which is translated "pattern" in Heb. 8:5. The Critical English Testament in commenting on Heb. 9:23 says, "Therefore the conjunction implies that the things mentioned in verse 18 are, as a matter of fact, included in this passage. (Delineations—that is, types, symbols; not as Eng. Ver., patterns Alf)"

AN ILLUSTRATION

To further illustrate our point, let us suppose a certain doctor has decided to build a special five-hundred bed hospital. In due time an architect is called and the plans worked out. After all the blue prints are completed, word is sent to his contractor, who is to erect this new building. Let us suppose the doctor, in our illustration, uses these words as the last minute instructions to the contractor, "and look that thou make it after their pattern, which was showed thee in my office." Would it be consistent for anyone to say that the doctor

had shown to the contractor a duplicate of his own home? Surely this would be the height of absurdity. To contend that Moses was shown the heavenly sanctuary, as a model by which to build the earthly sanctuary, is no less absurd.

Another important factor to bear in mind is the two different lines of priesthood governing the two different sanctuaries. The earthly sanctuary was governed by the Levitical law, involving the Aaronic priesthood, while Christ came from the Melchisedec priesthood. This is plainly shown in Heb. 7; please read verses 11, 18, 26-28, note especially v. 27. We will remember the Levitical priesthood ceased to exist at the crucifixion. It was then that the law governing the earthly sanctuary offerings ceased to be recognized by God. This was evident when the veil "was rent in twain from the top to the bottom."—Matt. 27:51. This change of priesthood is plain to all. Then why do Seventh-day Adventists still insist on explaining the heavenly sanctuary services in terms of the old abolished Aaronic priesthood? To continue to teach this, only belittles the great and fundamental truths of the plan of salvation.

As before stated, the denomination teaches that when a man was convicted of sin, he brought his offering to the tabernacle, laid his hand upon the victim's head, confessed his sin, thus transferring his sin to the sacrifice. The animal was then slain, and the priest carried some of the blood into the holy place and sprinkled it before or on the veil. This they teach defiled the sanctuary.

Realizing that many Seventh-day Adventists of to day are unfamiliar with this phrase of their teaching, we quote from some of the outstanding leaders of the denomination. "The blood was sprinkled on the face of the veil.

The veil became in this sense a preserver of records. That is, the blood sprinkled on this veil preserved the record of the sins of those who had confessed, who had brought their offering, and who had been forgiven of their wrongs. The veil was a typical record book, having preserved on the face of it the acknowledgment of guilt. Sin had been confessed and forgiven." Messiah in His Sanctuary by F. C. Gilbert, page 56.

We also quote from a book entitled, Reply to Canright by William H. Branson, page 235 "The only way that sin can get into the sanctuary is by confession and the offering of a substitutionary sacrifice. Therefore only the sins of those who have accepted Christ as their redeemer are found there.. Thus all confessed sins are transferred to the sanctuary, and in this manner the sanctuary is defiled."

This same thought is confirmed by Mrs. White in Patriarchs and Prophets pages 354, 355. "The most important part of the daily ministration was the service performed in behalf of individuals. The repentant sinner brought his offering to the door of the tabernacle, and placing his hand upon the victim's head, confessed his sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice. By his own hand the animal was then slain, and the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the vail, behind which was the ark containing the law that the sinner had transgressed. By this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary. In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest, as Moses directed the sons of Aaron, saying, "God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation." Both ceremonies alike

symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary. Such was the work that went on day by day throughout the year. The sins of Israel being thus transferred to the sanctuary, the holy places were defiled, and a special work became necessary for the removal of the sins."

From the fore-going quotations we learn, first, only confessed sins could ever defile the sanctuary. Secondly, the sanctuary was defiled by the confession of sin. From the line of reasoning in the above quotations, are we not justified in concluding then, that had Israel never repented of their sin, the sanctuary would never have become defiled? Is not this only plain logic?

Let us see if it was the "confession" of sin that defiled the sanctuary, or was it the committing of sin that defiled the sanctuary. The writer invites those who have a concordance to read all the references given to the words "defile" and "defiled" and notice in every case it is the committing of the sin that defiles and never the "confession" that defiles. We shall consider a few examples. In Lev. 11:43, "Ye shall not make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby." One will notice it was the eating of this unclean food (v 47) that would defile the person, and most certainly not the confession, by an individual that he had eaten unclean things. A further example of the truth that the committing of sin defiled and not the confession, is found in Lev. 18:24, 25. "Defile not yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you. And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabit-

ants." It was the actual doing of the sins mentioned in all these cases that defiled, never the confession.

We shall consider two more references, where the committing of sin defiled. First, in Numbers 35:31-34. Please note verses 33 and 34. "So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are: for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. Defile not therefore the land which ye shall inhabit, wherein I dwell: for I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel." One will notice in this case when the murderer had shed his blood, paid the price of sin, it cleansed the land. In like manner when the blood of a lamb was shed in behalf of a sinner, it cleansed the guilty party of all sin. There is not the slightest inference that the Israelite's sins were not forgiven him when he offered his lamb as a sacrifice for that sin. There is no evidence that the sin was transferred anywhere, there to remain against him till some future date. He was forever free from that sin and its penalty, never to be required to face it again. The blood had made an atonement.

Our next reference where the committing of sin defiled, is found in Ezek. 5:11. "Wherefore, as I live, saith the Lord God; Surely because thou hast defiled my sanctuary with all thy detestable things, and with all thine abominations, therefore will I also diminish thee; neither shall mine eye spare, neither will I have any pity." There is no indication here, that the people of Jerusalem repented of their sins, and made confession, yet the text says "thou hast defiled my sanctuary." Again we say most emphatically it was in every case the committing of sin that defiled and never the "confession" of that sin.

To teach that the blood of Christ, in our day, defiles

the heavenly sanctuary is certainly a dishonoring accusation. The blood of Christ always cleanses from sin, never defiles. We are told in 1 John 1:7-9: "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." —1 John 5:11-13. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God."

Since we read in Heb. 9:22 "...without shedding of blood is no remission." we need only apply this law of the universe to the sinner of all ages, and we see clearly that when the blood of the sinner's substitute was shed, it always made full restitution for sin. It was always the connecting link, to bridge the gap, between the sinner and God. It made full and complete reconciliation or atonement. Thus the sinner was restored, by the shedding of the blood of his substitute as though he had never sinned. This is the joy of full salvation. The Bible teaches no other way. One is reminded of the quotation "when God forgives, He forgets."

There is no Bible proof that sins are kept on record against one's name, or that your good deeds must outweigh your evil deeds in order to be saved. If such were the case we would be saved by "works" and the sacri-

fice on Calvary would not have been required.

In order to maintain the teaching of the early pioneers, including Mrs. White, the denomination must of necessity hold to the error of the sins being transferred to the heavenly sanctuary and therefore not really forgiven or forgotten, but only held against one's name there to be dealt with at some future date. This is the denominational teaching, for says Mrs. White: "As the sins of the people were anciently transferred in figure, to the earthly sanctuary by the blood of the sin offering, so our sins are, in fact, transferred to the heavenly sanctuary by the blood of Christ." Great Controversy (any edition until the ninth) page 266. A similiar statement appears in the 1911 edition page 421. "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."

Can you, dear reader, find a parallel teaching anywhere in the New Testament? Can you picture the Apostle Paul teaching such a doctrine? Was he in doubt and did he wonder how he would make out in some secret judgment to be held some 1800 years after he passed to his rest? No, my friend, Paul knew the price had been paid, the great load of sin had been lifted, he knew the joy of full salvation. It was this assurance that carried him through his greatest trials, it was this great joy of knowing his salvation had been secured, that enabled him to write in 2 Tim. 1:12: "...for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." It was this full assurance that gave Paul the power to live

as Christ lived and to be the great missionary to the Gentiles, that Christ ordained he should be. It was this knowing that the blood of Christ was sufficient for every sin, that gave Paul the ability to put into living practice a verse found in Isaiah 12:3 "Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." This "joy" caused Paul and Silas to pray and sing praises unto God at midnight, in the cold Philippian jail. These living examples of the power of God had the assurance found in Rom. 4:25: "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."

This joy of knowing Christ met all the requirements on the cruel Roman cross, when His blood was shed for "who so ever will" has been the great possession of Christians down through the ages. This faith in the redeeming blood of Christ brings lasting joy to the heart of all who trust in Him. It was with definite assurance that Paul could thus declare, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."—2 Tim. 4:8. Should there be less confidence in the finished work of Christ among those who comprise "the remnant of her seed" than was so evident among the founders of the true Church?

There are many unanswerable questions, that arise from the denominational teaching of the sanctuary question. The writer would welcome a Bible explanation of how the "confessed" sins of God's people from Adam to Moses, were transferred to the heavenly sanctuary, as there was no earthly sanctuary to become defiled until Moses received instructions and details from God to build one. This was a period of about 2500 years. Just what be-

came of these "confessed sins", as you know the denomination teaches that Christ did not minister in the heavenly sanctuary until after His ascension? We read in G. C. page 428, "When the work of investigation shall have ended, when the cases of those who in all ages have professed to be followers of Christ have been examined and decided, then and not until then, probation will close and the door of mercy will be shut." May we ask how can the "cases of thoses in all ages" (from Adam to Moses) be investigated or examined when a record of their sins was never made in the holy place? Can you supply the answer?

To those who would minimize the importance of knowing this subject and the place it holds in the foundation of Seventh-day Adventism, we quote but a few statements, showing its vital position. "The subject of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment should be clearly understood by the people of God." G. C. page 488. "It is of utmost importance that all should investigate these subjects and be able to give and answer to every one that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them." G. C. 488-9.

"The subject of the cleansing of this sanctuary, then, is of most thrilling interest, especially to all Adventists. It is the key to the great Advent movement, making all plain. Without it the movement is inexplicable....

"Seventh-day Adventists can not spare the subject of the sanctuary, as it is the great centre around which all revealed truth relative to salvation clusters." James White, Life Incidents pp 308, 309. 1868.

"To day preaching of the doctrine of the sanctuary is the preaching of the most timely truth that could be presented to men." R. and H. May 27, 1937.

Just what then is their sanctuary teaching, that is so important? Do they not stand alone, in the religious field in teaching that your sins are not forgiven, but only transferred to the heavenly sanctuary? This teaching then is the one outstanding characteristic that places them in a religious class all by themselves. There are many churches that keep the true Bible Sabbath, that believe in the Bible standard of immersion in baptism, and many other Bible sound teachings. But Seventh-day Adventists stand alone in teaching the transfer of sins to the heavenly sanctuary.

Proof of the above is evident in much of their literature. We quote again from Reply to Canright by W. H. Branson page 235: "The only way that sin can get into the sanctuary is by confession and the offering of a substitutionary sacrifice.... Thus all confessed sins are transferred to the sanctuary, and in this manner the sanctuary is defiled."

Please bear in mind the position that is held by the one all Seventh-day Adventists have been taught to regard as possessing the "gift of prophecy" and having written everything she wrote by direct revelation from God. Of course we refer to the writings of Mrs. White.

In Patriarchs and Prophets pages 354-355 we read: "The most important part of the daily ministration was the service performed in behalf of individuals. The repentant sinner brought his offering to the door of the tabernacle, and placing his hand upon the victim's head, confessed his sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice. By his own hand the animal was then slain, and the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the vail, behind which was the ark containing the law that the sinner had trans-

gressed. By this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary. In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest, as Moses directed the sons of Aaron, saying, "God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation." Both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the "sanctuary."

Let us test the contents of the two above quotations by the Word of God, the Bible, and find out if what these quotations reveal, is "light" or will it fall in the other class and be called "no light." Isa. 8:20 tells us: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

The paragraph in P and P pages 354-355, contains three outstanding statements. Note them carefully, First, "the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place." Second, "In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest.." and third, "Both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary."

Let us compare the first statement "the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place" with the Bible record of the service performed in behalf of "any one of the common people"—Lev. 4:27-34. The Bible tells us in very plain, understandable language what was to be done with the blood of this sacrifice, read it in verse 30. "And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar." Please note carefully, the blood was to be put in "two" and only two places, namely: "upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering and shall pour out all the blood

thereof at the bottom of the altar." We all know the meaning of the word "all." It always means, as the dictionary states "the whole of; every bit of; the whole number or quantity." Therefore, if all the blood was used in these two places (horns of altar, and poured out at the base of the altar), how much remained to be "carried by the priest into the holy place"? The answer, of course, is absolutely none! No, not a single drop! Did you know, dear reader, that not a drop of goat's or lamb's blood was ever carried into the tabernacle except on the day of atonement? There are no exceptions.

There were three, and only three occasions, when any blood was carried into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil. First, when "the priest which is anointed" committed a sin and repented. Lev. 4:3-6. Second, "when the whole congregation of Israel sin"—Lev. 4:13-17. Third, on the day of atonement, Lev. 16:3-15.

So, what do we find so far in our study of the sanctuary service? Just this, that the writings of Mrs. White are out of harmony with the inspired Word of God. They do not agree. There is no way to harmonize the statement from Mrs. White: "The blood was carried by the priest into the holy place," and the direct statement in Lev. 4:30: "And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar."

Mrs. White knew and acknowledged this was untrue, when she wrote Patriarchs and Prophets, see note 9, page 760: "When, however, the offering was for a ruler or one of the people, the blood was not taken into the holy place" Still on page 354 she states: "the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place." The statement on

page 760 is true, for it agrees with the Bible. But the statement on page 354 is untrue in the full sense of the word. Still many of the writers for the denomination are taking this same stand, and for what reason? The only answer is that to tell the truth would upset the foundation of the church. Can you, as a fair-minded, and honest seeker after truth, endorse such an unscriptural stand as that taken by the church leaders and those who are responsible for it still being taught? True, some are trying to correct this error, but sad to say they are in the minority. We must continue to hope and pray that before long many honest ministers will dare to take their stand with the true worshippers of God, and stand alone upon the Bible which has so nobly withstood the test of time and investigation.

Many notable leaders in the Sevens-day Adventist Church are aware of the discrepancies in the writings of Mrs. White, and many know her works are not in harmony with the Bible. One or two quotations from one of their outstanding ministers, and a man who is certainly well informed, at least along denominational lines will suffice. We refer to Brother M. L. Andreasen.

BROTHER ANDREASEN TELLS THE TRUTH

In the Review and Herald of Nov. 22, 1945, page 9, we read: "When a ruler or one of the common people sinned, the blood was not carried into the sanctuary, as in the case where a priest or the whole congregation sinned, nor was it sprinkled before the veil, nor put on the horns of the altar of incense. It was not carried into the sanctuary at all." He also states on the same page "When a ruler or a common man sinned the priest put some of the blood on the horns of the altar of burnt offering out side in the court but did not carry the blood into the sanctuary."

In making these two truthful statements, Brother Andreasen places himself squarely against the writings of Mrs. White, but is in full harmony with the Bible. We would like to commend him for the effort made to correct this much taught and long standing error, of teaching that the blood of a common man's offering was carried into the holy place. We wish him the continued courage it will take to continue to teach "truth" in the face of certain opposition. Our sincere wish is that he may succeed.

Despite the fact that the Bible never taught that the blood of the offering made in behalf of the common sinner was carried into the sanctuary, and despite the fact that Mrs. White also recognized this was never done, and now some of the writers of the Review and Herald are openly teaching this truth, still from pulpit and class room alike this error is being taught to young and old.

That this error is being taught to children who attend Church schools is plain to all. We quote from one of their standard text books "Bible Lessons" Fourth Grade, published by Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, California. On page 153, we quote: "When a person knew he had sinned, he brought his offering to the tabernacle. He placed his hands on the head of the animal, and confessed his sin. He then slew the offering with his own hand, and some of the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil." Again on page 154: "In the daily service, by the blood of the offering and the faith of the sinner, the sins were taken by the priest into the sanctuary." This teaching is contradictory to the Bible, to M. L. Andreasen and to some of the writings of Mrs. White and therefore should never be taught to anyone. For it is teaching an untruth.

The writer is personally acquainted with many honest,

sincere Seventh-day Adventist parents who have made great sacrifices, and endured many hardships, so that their children may attend Church School. I ask you, are these sacrifices and hardships, warranted when your children must learn lessons not founded upon the Bible? Of course we know that such lessons are necessary to sustain their belief in the fundamental teachings of the Church, that is the sanctuary service, the investigative judgment, the 2300 day teaching, all of which are unscriptural.

Perhaps the reader is a teacher in one of these schools, and has been teaching this error to many classes through the years, being fully innocent of the fact that it is not Bible truth. Can you as a Christian afford to continue to teach this untruth to innocent children who have learned to respect and honor your word? Should you choose to still continue to teach this error, knowing it as such, may I ask, does your character, your word, your life merit any confidence? Can you stand before God with a conscience void of offence, if you do not do all in your power to correct this teaching?

May God grant you as an individual, the deep desire to study these truths for yourself. That in your heart will be found the first great requisite of a true Christian, as spoken of in 2 Thess. 2:10: "...because they received not the love of the truth, that they should be saved." This "love of the truth" will transcend all advice, and pleadings from the ministry, and others, that you burn this literature, and refuse to read and study even your own literature and the Bible. It is your own literature and the unpublished visions and writings of Mrs. White, the writer is asking you to read. Surely there is no wrong in this.

Since there was no blood of the offering made in be-

half of "any of the common people" carried into the sanctuary, it therefore remains that no sins were carried into the sanctuary, and since there were no sins carried into the sanctuary, it also follows that no sins were carried out of the sanctuary, on the day of atonement. This is plain logic.

Let us examine the other theory of how the sins of ancient Israel were transferred to the sanctuary. We quote from P and P, pages 354-355. "In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest, as Moses directed the sons of Aaron, saying, "God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation." Both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of sin from the penitent to the sanctuary."

Some are teaching that the priest ate some of the "common" man's sin offering in the holy place, and thus the sins were carried into the sanctuary in this way. Let us see if such was the case. That is if the reference to the "holy place" always refers to the first apartment.

We read in Exod. 29:31: "And thou shalt take the ram of the consecration, and seethe his flesh in the holy place." Is there anyone who would suggest that this meant the first apartment? Certainly not, for the first apartment was too holy, too sacred to be used as a place in which to prepare food. Lev. 6:27 tells us: "...thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place." Again we ask does this verse have reference to the first apartment? Would God instruct it to be turned in to a laundry? Please notice Lev. 14:13: "And he shall slay the lamb in the place where he killed the sin offering and the burnt offering, in the holy place..." Let me ask you, as a truth seeking reader, was any "sin offering and the burnt offering" killed in the first apartment? We will remember this first

apartment was not a very large room, and its contents did not include tools with which to kill and dress the animals used in these offerings. Can you not see that every time the term "holy place" is used it does not always refer to the first apartment? This important point must be firmly established in our minds, if we are to rightly understand the sanctuary service. Read Lev. 16:24. "And he shall wash his flesh with water in the holy place...." Again we see how utterly absurd it would be to contend that the first apartment was to be used as a bathroom. In Numbers 28:7 "...in the holy place shalt thou cause the strong wine to be poured...." No one who understands the sanctuary service would contend that the first apartment was a room used as a kitchen, a bath room, a place to pour out wine, and a room in which hundreds of animals were killed. Still the place where all this was done is called the holy place or a holy place. Just what then, is this "holy place", if it is not the first apartment? We shall let the Bible answer, for It tells us very plainly where the offering was to be eaten, read Lev. 6:26: "The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: in the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation." It was in this holy place, "in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation" where the ram was to be seethed, the clothes washed, the wine poured out, and the hundreds of animals killed, not in the first apartment.

There is no Bible ground to suggest that by the priest eating part of the offering out in the court of the tabernacle, that the sins of the individual who brought that offering to be sacrificed, were not forgiven, but only recorded on the veil. We quote from G. C. page 420: "A substitute was accepted in the sinners stead, but the sin was

not cancelled by the blood of the victim." Let us see if this is Bible truth.

In Lev. 4:27-35, where the offering is described for the common people, please note verse 31, last part: "it shall be forgiven him" and again verse 35, last part: "it shall be forgiven him." We must object to those who would deny the plain Word of God. The statement "it shall be forgiven him" is the promise made by God to the sinner, who through his faith in God's Word had brought his offering to be offered for his sin. To teach that the sinner was not forgiven of his sin, is a direct denial of the plain Word.

Let us suppose that no sins were forgiven until the day of atonement. How then, would an Israelite obtain forgiveness of sin should he die on any other day of the year, but the day of atonement? Can you not see, brethren, there would be but few Israelites saved in the kingdom, if this were so? For only those who died on the day of atonement would be forgiven of sin, and to teach they could obtain forgiveness after death is a denial of Mrs. White's writings, and the accepted belief of most Protestant churches.

A CONFUSED EDITOR

You will remember the article in the Review and Herald, of Nov. 22, 1945, by M. L. Andreasen, in which he truthfully states that no blood of the common people's sin offering was carried into the sanctuary. He uses these positive words, "It was not carried into the sanctuary at all."

Now the Review and Herald is teaching just the opposite. In the August 8th, 1946 issue, we read on page 6 an article by Taylor G. Bunch from which we quote: "From the altar in the court, the priest, the sinner's medi-

ator and representative, went into the holy place with the typical atoning blood to minister in the repentant sinner's behalf." This statement by Brother Bunch, is completely erroneous, as all students of the Bible know. It should never appear in print, for it may mislead some honest person.

One is alarmed to think that a paper which holds out so many high ideals, would allow such an unbiblical, and erroneous statement to mar its pages. We realize that any writer who undertakes to explain the sanctuary service from the denominational stand, is in a very difficult position, for should he agree with the Bible in stating that no blood of this offering was carried into the sanctuary, he would put himself squarely against the writings of Mrs. White who as we all know, is regarded as an "inspired writer," by the denomination. But, brethren, would it not be much better to build upon a sure and tried foundation, than upon the sinking sands of an unscriptural teaching? I would appeal to each reader of this article to cast your decision on the side of Truth, and a Faith that has the backing of the Bible. None other will stand before the Lord, on that day.

Let the reader be assured that none of your sins have been transferred, by the blood of Christ to the heavenly sanctuary, nor is there now a secret, investigative judgment going on in heaven to determine if you are worthy of eternal life. Such a discouraging teaching has no place in the plan of Salvation. None of the apostles ever believed, or taught such a doctrine. The Cross of Calvary, where the Great Atonement was made constitutes a complete and sufficient work.

Let us consider a few texts of Scripture, Luke 1:77: "To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remis-

sion of their sins." John 6:47 states: "Verily, Verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." Rom. 8:14: "For as many as are lead by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." 1 Pet. 2:24: "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye are healed." Scores of such texts could be quoted too in proof of the atonement being made on the Cross. There are no texts to prove that the atonement was not made until Oct. 22, 1844.

In response to many calls for some of the literature of the early pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the writer can now supply you with the following:

The Advent Review—An 1850 edition, to prove that probation closed for all the world in 1844.

The Present Truth—First appeared in 1849 (same shown on cover of Review and Herald June 28, 1945). They prayed for its success, but will not reprint it.

A Word to The Little Flock—Printed in 1847. Contains Mrs. White's first visions, compare it with Early Writings, and see the difference for yourself.

Mrs White's Will—Did she believe the end was near? She left property to grandchildren, who were then unborn.

The Jones Letter—This letter A. T. Jones wrote to Mrs. White, She never answered it—There is a reason,

The first three publications contain some of Mrs. White's visions which have never fully appeared in print, by the denomination. All five postpaid for only \$1.25.

All letters of correspondence, and orders held strictly confidential.

The writer will welcome any correspondence, and shall undertake to answer all mail as promptly as possible.