

Some Thoughts on Seventh Day Adventism For Those Who "Love The Message."

Seventh Day Adventism came into being as a separate denomination for a most specific reason. It stands for a teaching never before heard of in the Christian Church and which contradicts the whole tenor of gospel truth. It began this way.

In 1844 a band of Christian people from various denominations led by William Miller, a Baptist, expected Christ to come the second time and the world to end that year. Their expectations were based on their mistaken interpretation of a prophecy in Dan. 8:14. William Miller taught that the Sanctuary here mentioned was the earth, which as explained in 2 Peter 3:3-12, is to be burned with fire at the end of the world and thus "cleansed" to make way for "new heavens and a new earth," v. 13.

As the sanctuary of the Jewish dispensation was no longer in existence, the Millerites drew their own conclusions on the meaning of this verse in Dan. 8:14 and believed that at the end of the 2,300 day period mentioned in that chapter, the end of the world would come. When the year 1844 passed—they had wrongly assessed the time period of the prophecy—without the expected event coming to pass, most of the christians concerned recognised that they had made a mistake and went their several ways. A small number however kept puzzling over their "disappointment" and wondering just why things had worked out that way. One man, Mr Crozier, eventually came up with an article in which he set forth the idea that the "sanctuary" concerned in Dan. 8:14 was the heavenly sanctuary and that what had taken place in 1844 instead of Christ's coming to the earth as they had expected, was that He had moved from the first apartment in the heavenly sanctuary into the second apartment "into the immediate presence of God." [This in spite of the fact that the book of Hebrews teaches plainly that our Saviour's work was the anti-type of the work of the High Priest in the Mosaic Tabernacle, who once a year went into the second apartment—"the holiest of all" with blood of atonement—into the immediate presence of God (in type).]

When the Crozier's article and suggested explanation of the "disappointment" was read by Mrs E. G. White, who has been the 'inspired' leader of the S.D.A. movement, she had a 'vision' in which she said she was "authorised by God" to say that Brother Crozier had the right explanation and she recommended his article to the 'saints' as true light. See "A Word to the Little Flock," pp. 11, 12. See also Early Writings, pp. 45-50.

Upon this travesty of gospel truth the whole Adventist 'special message' is built. It is necessary therefore to go further into those particular errors developed as a result of this foundation fault.

Mrs White in one of her 'Testimonies' invited the S.D.A. people to "examine the foundations" and that is what I invite

you to do with this fundamental teaching. Does the bible teach that Jesus, our risen Saviour went into the immediate presence of God at His Ascension or does it teach that He had to wait for over 1800 years before that culmination of His work for mankind took place? In the Mosaic tabernacle, which was the **type** of the heavenly one, see Heb. 8:1-5, the Holy Shekinah, a glorious holy light above the mercy seat in the second apartment indicated the presence of God. This is taught by the S.D.A. denomination. See "The Great Second Advent Movement," pp. 50-51.

I would like here to quote Mr W. W. Fletcher, who was at one time a Seventh Day Adventist Bible Teacher and who was honest enough to renounce the doctrine when his increasing bible knowledge revealed its error. In discussing this particular foundation stone of the Adventist Sanctuary Teaching with an editor of the "Signs of the Times," an S.D.A. paper, Mr Fletcher writes:—

CHRIST, AT THE ASCENSION, ENTERED INTO THE "HOLY PLACE"

The "Signs" editor makes much of the fact that in the R.V. and the A.R.V. Christ is said to have entered the "holy place" in heaven; and endeavours to make it appear that there is quite a strong case in this for the teaching that Christ's ministry was as yet only in the first apartment when the epistle to the Hebrews was written. Accept no such conclusion, reader. There is no strong case for that theory at all, as a little examination of the evidence will plainly show.

We give here the instances from the epistle in which the R.V. reads "holy place" in referring to the heavenly sanctuary:

"The way into the **holy place** hath not yet been made manifest, while as the first tabernacle is yet standing." Ch. 9:8.

"Through His own blood, entered in once for all into the **holy place.**" v. 12

"For Christ entered not into a **holy place** made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself." v. 24.

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the **holy place** by the blood of Jesus." Ch. 10:19.

Conscious of the support of the whole Bible teaching on the subject, we confidently affirm that in each of these instances, where "**holy place**" is undoubtedly the correct translation, the writer of the epistle had definitely in mind **the most holy place**; that he expected his readers to so understand him, and that they certainly would so understand him.

The editor speaks of the author of the Hebrews epistle as "a very careful writer." We ask the reader to notice how the holy places are referred to by **another** very careful writer. Who would be more careful in the use of terms than the one through whom the law of the sanctuary was given, for the guidance of priests?

In the 16th chapter of Leviticus are given the directions concerning the entry of the high priest into the most holy place. This is the outstanding chapter of all the Bible on that subject. In this chapter the innermost apartment is seven times referred to as "**the holy place,**" and **never once** called the "**most holy.**" Here are the seven instances:

"**The holy place** within the veil, before the mercy-seat." v. 2.

"Thus shall Aaron come into the **holy place**; with a young bullock for a sin-offering." v. 3.

"And He shall make an atonement for the **holy place,**" v. 16.

"When He goeth in to make an atonement in the **holy place,**" v. 17.

"And when He hath made an end of reconciling the **holy place,**" v. 20.

"And Aaron . . . shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went into the **holy place.**" v. 23.

"The goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the **holy place.**" v. 27.

These passages all refer to **the most holy place**, as a careful study of the chapter will make clear to the reader; and yet in each instance the inner apartment is described simply as "**the holy place.**" The inner apartment is referred to again in v.33 as "**the holy sanctuary.**"

The reader should observe that in this chapter the first or outer apartment is uniformly described as "the tabernacle of the congregation" (R.V. "tent of meeting"). See verses 7, 16, 17, 20, 23, and 33. The altar referred to in verses 18, 20, and 33, was the brazen altar of sacrifice.

The atoning blood was applied first to the mercy-seat, within the veil (v. 15), next to the golden altar, in the tabernacle of the congregation, or first apartment (v.17 cp. Ex. 30:1, 10), and then to the brazen altar in the court (v.18, 19).

In verse 24 Aaron was directed to "wash his flesh with water in the holy place." This, of course, does not have reference to either the first or second apartments of the sanctuary. The R.V. reads, "shall bathe his flesh in water in a holy place." Such ablutions were carried out in the priestly court ("a holy place"), where the laver was situated, between the outer apartment of the sanctuary and the brazen altar, See Ex. 30:18.

We now ask the reader to weigh the significance of all this. The chapter which, above all scriptures, speaks the most specifically of the work done in **the most holy place**, never **once** refers to that apartment by that name; but **seven times** calls it "**the holy place**" and **once** "**the holy sanctuary.**" Has anyone ever arisen to maintain that Moses meant the first apartment and not the second, when he spoke so frequently of "**the holy place?**" Someone will perhaps reply that it is clear enough from the context that Moses meant the inner apartment, for he specifies "**the holy place within the veil.**" That is quite true. But it is equally true that Paul also declares "**the holy place**" of which he is speaking to be "**that within the veil!**" Heb. 6:19-20.

Why does not someone arise and say that Moses meant "**the first veil?**" and that consequently he meant the ministry in the **first apartment?** If such an idea were suggested, the reply would immediately be given, that Moses referred to the holy place within the veil, **before the mercy-seat.** But does not Paul do the same? Does he not call upon us to "come boldly unto **the throne of grace,** that we may obtain **mercy?**" And where, Christian reader, will you obtain mercy, except **at the mercy-seat?** And where are the mercy-seat and the throne but in the innermost sanctuary?

CLEAR PROOF IN THE HEBREWS EPISTLE ITSELF

There is moreover the clearest proof in the Hebrews epistle itself that the writer uses the term "holy place" in speaking of the second apartment of the sanctuary. Compare the 7th and 25th verses of the 9th chapter, and notice that there are four points of identification which show that the apostle speaks of the same apartment (the most holy) in each of the two verses:

"But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood." v. 7.	"As the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others." v.25.
--	--

The four points of identification are these: First, the high-priest; second, the annual entry; third, the blood; and fourth, the apartment in which the high priest ministered, which is called "the second" in verse 7, and "the holy place" in verse 25. No further proof is needed to demonstrate that the writer of Hebrews used the term "holy place" in speaking of the second apartment, just as Moses did so frequently in Leviticus 16. But that is not all. A further most important conclusion follows.

In this same chapter (Heb. 9) the apostle compares the annual entry of the high priest into the second apartment with the entry of Christ into the heavenly "holy place" "once for all."

"Into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood." v. 7.	"As the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others." v. 25.	"But Christ through his own blood entered in once for all into the holy place." v. 11, 12 R.V.
--	---	--

What the high priest did "with the blood of others," Christ did "by is own blood." What the high priest did "once every year," Christ did "once for all." Into the same apartment that the high priest entered "every year," Jesus Christ entered "once for all." And into what apartment is the high priest said to have entered? Verse 25 says it was "the holy place," and verse 7 speaks of that "holy place" as "the second" apartment. The conclusion is inevitable, therefore that when, in making this comparison the writer speaks of Christ having "entered in once for all into the holy place," he refers to His entry into heaven's "holiest of all."

I think you must agree that the overwhelming evidence supplied by Mr Fletcher, leaves no doubt at all that Mr Crozier's teaching—and therefore Mrs White's—is completely wrong.

For over 1900 years believers have rejoiced in knowing that their Saviour and Mediator was seated on the throne with the Father—God and that therefore they could "come boldly to the throne—to obtain mercy!" Any teaching built on a contradiction of this fundamental tenet of the gospel cannot be "of God." There is only one thing we can do if we find ourselves entangled in a proven error, and that is to "come out from among them and be ye separate." Let us love—not a mistaken "message" but a Saviour who has completed the work of redemption and brought us all the way back to God.