A REPLY - -

To Articles Published in the "Signs of the Times."

I.

A Defence Against a Charge of Misrepresentation

In the Australasian "**Signs of the Times**" for June 22, 1936, the editor makes reference to my book, "**The Reasons for My Faith,**" and charges me with misrepresenting the teachings of Mrs E. G. White. The charge of "either deliberate or intentional oversight or at least shocking carelessness" in quoting from Mrs White's writings is repeated many times. I am confident that a careful review of the actual facts in the case will convince the open-minded reader that these extravagant charges are wholly unwarranted.

In my book (p. 20), I quoted the following paragraph from "**Patriarchs and Prophets,**" p. 357.

"**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."

On this statement my book contains the following comment :

"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 the only 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 antitypical scapegoat, by what means are these sins finally brought to an end? Is it by the death of the scapegoat?" p. 20.

The editor of the "**Signs**" points out that the succeeding paragraph in "**Patriarchs and Prophets**" reads thus :

"In the great day of final award, the dead are to be 'judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.' Then by virtue of the atoning blood of Christ, the sins of all the truly penitent will be blotted from the books of heaven."

This statement, and some succeeding sentences, the editor maintains, prove my comment (quoted above) to be wholly unjustified.

I would point out in reply, that while I did not quote this particular statement, I had already reproduced what is practically an equivalent statement from **"The Great Controversy,"** p. 421, 422.

"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."** Quoted on p. 19 of my book.

This in itself sufficient refutation of the charge of wilful misrepresentation, or of endeavouring to cover up or avoid part of Mrs White's teaching. I will now go farther and show that the passages of my book under consideration contain **no misrepresentation at all,** either of Mrs White or of the Seventh-day Adventist teaching.

In that section of my book (p. 18-25) I discuss the denominational teaching that in the earthly sanctuary, sins were transferred from the people to the sanctuary by the blood of the sin-offerings; and then on the day of the atonement transferred again by the same means from the sanctuary to the head of the scapegoat, said to represent Satan. I maintain, on the contrary, that the services represented the **expiation** of sin, and **not** its transfer either into the sanctuary or out of that place. My argument is, that if the doctrine of transfer be true, sin cannot be said to be expiated until (according to the teaching) the death of the scapegoat is reached.

Now notice, reader, that Mrs White's statement (which the editor reproves me for failing to quote) does **not** say that sins are **cancelled** by the blood "in the great day of final award;" but simply affirms that "then by virtue of the atoning blood of Christ, the sins of all the truly penitent **will be blotted from the books of heaven."** Does that mean the final end of them? No indeed! Mrs White does not teach that. Let her explain her meaning in her own words :

"When Christ, by virtue of his own blood, removes the sins of his people from the heavenly sanctuary at the close of His ministration, **He will place them upon Satan,** who, in the execution of the judgment, must bear the final penalty." **G.C.,** 422.

That is just the point. According to the transfer theory, there is a continual passing of sins from person to place and from place to person, that reaches finality only in the supposed destruction of the scapegoat. The very passage the editor of the "Signs" condemns me for not quoting, proves this :

"As in the final atonement the sins of the truly penitent are to be blotted from the books of heaven, no more to be remembered or come into mind, so in the type they were borne away into the wilderness, forever separated from the congregation." **P. & P.** 358.

The reader cannot fail to notice here, that sins are "no more to be remembered or come into mind" **because they have been "borne away into the wilderness"** by the scapegoat!

We take the following paragraph from the **"Signs"** article :

"To quote Mrs White's exact words : 'Then by **virtue of the atoning blood of Christ,** the sins of the truly penitent will be blotted from the books of heaven.' That is to say, the sins of God's people would be completely **blotted out,** not even a record of the sins remaining. All would be **completely gone."**

But **where** would they be gone? The writer of **"The Great Controversy"** gives the following reply :

"When the work of the atonement in the heavenly sanctuary has been completed, then in the presence of God and heavenly angels, and the host of the redeemed, **the sins of God's people will be placed upon Satan."** p. 658.

According to this teaching, "The blood of Christ, pleaded in behalf of penitent believers, secured their pardon and acceptance with the Father, yet their sins still remained upon the books of record." **Ib.** p. 421. It is only a step farther to say that "by virtue of the atoning blood of Christ, the sins of all the truly penitent will be blotted from the books of heaven." **P. & P.** 357. In neither case is sin said to be cancelled, expiated, or made an end of by the blood. The editor of the **"Signs"** quotes the words "cancelled" and "expiated"; but Mrs White does not use them. According to her teaching, in the first instance the blood provides pardon, but leaves the record of sin intact. In the second instance, the blood blots out the record, but removes the sin to the head of the scapegoat.

In view of all this evidence, I maintain that the passages quoted from my book in the columns of the **"Signs"** do not at all misrepresent the teachings either of Mrs E. G. White or the Adventists.

A SYLLOGISM

Referring to the scapegoat, Mrs White writes :—**"Not until the goat had been thus sent away, did the people regard themselves as freed from the burden of their sins." P. & P.,** 355. Consider, reader, the inevitable conclusion that must be drawn from this statement, if it be true that the scapegoat represents Satan. The denomination takes an uncompromising stand on the necessity for an exact correspondence between type and antitype. We therefore construct the following syllogism, taking the major premise from Mrs White's writings, the minor premise from the columns of the **"Signs,"** and drawing the conclusion which we maintain is the only one that can be drawn if the major and minor premises be accepted :

Major premise : "Not until the goat had been thus sent away, did the people regard themselves as freed from the burden of their sins." **P. & P.,** 355.

Minor premise : "In regard to types the unfailing law of interpretation is that **type and antitype must agree."** (**"Signs,"** Nov. 26, 1934.)

Conclusion : Not until Satan (said to be the antitypical scapegoat) has been similarly sent away, may Christians (antitypical Israel) regard themselves as freed from the burden of their sins.

Neither the originators nor the present-day defenders of the sanctuary teaching intend to lead to this conclusion. I acknowledge that (See p. 21 of my book). The teaching leads to that destination, nevertheless, and therefore ought to be rejected.

THE SHED BLOOD IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE

I said in my book (p. 20) that the statement that "the blood of Christ . . . was not to cancel the sin" was one that had "troubled me very much." It did indeed trouble me. I was perfectly well aware that in other places Mrs E. G. White made more evangelical statements. I knew very well that in other places that writer taught that **later on** the **record** of sins would be blotted out, and the sins finally placed upon Satan; but this did not satisfy me. I do not see how any Christian can be permanently satisfied with that teaching. Deep in my heart there burned the conviction that the blood of Christ effectually expiated the sin of our lost race **the very moment it was shed.**

II.

Some Observations Concerning the Denominational Teaching with Regard to the Atonement

I was converted and joined the Seventh-day Adventist church just a few months before coming of age. At that time I read the denominational literature attentively and receptively. I was greatly impressed and inspired by Uriah Smith's writings. When, however, I read (in **"Looking Unto Jesus"**, p. 237) that Christ "did not make the atonement when He shed His blood upon the cross," I felt that I could not accept that view. Through the years since that time I have always believed that the atonement was a finished work, completed at the cross. I did not realise that this view was irreconcilable with the sanctuary teaching, held by the denomination as its pivotal doctrine. It seems strange that through many years spent in the ministry, this view never led me into conflict or controversy over the matter. I remember on one occasion, when conducting the morning Bible study at an annual session of the union conference council, one of the members interjected, "You believe that the atonement was made at the cross, then, do you?" I unhesitatingly replied, "Yes." "I am very glad to hear it," was the prompt and cordial response from the interjector. No member of the council demurred, or raised the slightest objection, either publicly or privately.

Since the burden has been laid upon me to point out the mistaken nature of the sanctuary teaching, however, a very different situation seems to have arisen. A steady succession of

denials that the atonement was made at the cross has been heard from responsible leaders and teachers . We present here a few representative statements :

"Sin . . . . will be finally atoned for, not at the cross, but in the true tabernacle in heaven." **Aust. Un. Conf. Committee,** April, 1930.

"Through the years, some have believed that the atonement was completed on the cross, and, sad to say, some are still holding to this erroneous view." **"Record,"** Sept. 19, 1932 (Contributed Article).

"It is claimed that 'the atonement for man was fully completed at the cross.' We deny this claim." **"Signs,"** June 4, 1934 (Article by the contributing editor).

"It is evident from several passages of scripture that Christ did not **complete his** substitutionary work on the cross." **"Record,"** Oct. 3, 1932 (Contributed article).

"With these facts before us, it is impossible to conclude that a complete work of atoning for sin was wrought upon the cross." **"The Atoning Work of Christ,"** p. 95 (Pub. 1934, Review & Herald).

To these expressions the editor of the **"Signs"** now adds his testimony :

"Hence it follows that Christ's atoning work was not completed on the cross, but is still in progress." "Signs," June 1, 1936.

Now the fact should be noted by the reader, that it is the defence of the old sanctuary teaching that leads to these denials of the atonement at the cross. Only when the sanctuary teaching is questioned is such a chorus of denials of a completed atonement heard. This fact alone is sufficient to demonstrate the falsity of the sanctuary teaching. Let the reader reflect upon it.

SOME STRANGE CONTRADICTIONS

Mrs E. G. White sometimes wrote most beautifully of the atonement accomplished at the cross. Take, for instance, the following passages from her writings :

"He (Christ) ascended to the heavenly courts, and from God Himself heard the assurance that **His atonement for the sins of men had been ample,** that through His blood all might gain eternal life." **"Desire of Ages,"** p. 790.

"When upon the cross He cried out, 'It is finished,' He addressed the Father. The compact had been fully carried out. Now He declares, 'Father, it is finished. I have done Thy will, O My God. **I have completed the work of redemption'."** **Ib.** p. 834. Emphasis mine.

If we compare these statements of Mrs E. G. White, when **not** setting forth the sanctuary teaching, with those of the editor of the **"Signs"** in **defending** that teaching, we have this seeming contradiction :

He (Christ) . . . . from God Himself heard the assurance that **His atonement for the sins of men had been ample made.**

"Now He (Christ) declares . . . . **I have completed the work of redemption."**

Mrs E. G. White.

"Hence it follows that **Christ's atoning work was not completed on the cross,** but is still in progress."

"Signs" Editor.

Do not, reader, blame either Mrs White or the editor of the "**Signs**" for this. It is the sanctuary teaching that comes to us from the disappointment and confusion of 1844 that is causing this confusion to-day.

A similar contradiction of this same statement of Mrs White's appeared in the "**Signs**" for June 11, 1934, in an article by the editorial contributor. The following extract from that article is compared with Mrs White's article in "**Desire of Ages**" p. 834.

Now He (Christ) declares . . . . **I have completed the work of redemption.**"

Mrs E. G. White.

". . . . **His work for our redemption was not completed** on the cross."

"Signs" Editor. Contributor.

A STRANGE CHALLENGE

There now issues from the "**Signs**" office this strange challenge :

"Never once, in the New Testament, are we told that the atonement was completed on the cross . . . If anybody challenges this statement, we invite him to produce a single text stating that the atonement was completed on the cross." June 1 issue, p. 7.

In response we first of all present these words of scripture : "**Who . . . . when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.**" Heb. 1:3.

That this passage speaks of the atonement, and places it prior to Christ's being seated at God's right hand, is beyond dispute. When compared with the description of the atonement in Lev. 16:30 there is found to be absolute agreement :

"For on that day shall the priest make atonement for you, **to cleanse you, that you may be clean from all your sins.**"

"Who . . . . **when He had by Himself purged our sins,** sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

Then think, reader, of the many other scriptures all viewing the atonement as a work already accomplished. See Rom. 3:25; 5:6, 8, 10; 2 Cor. 5:19; Col. 1:20-22; Heb. 9:14, 26; 1 John 3:5, etc.

Does someone say that these passages do not refer to the atonement? Well, if they do not, what N.T. scriptures **do** describe that work? This is an important question, reader. If you hesitate to recognise that the scriptures referred to above (and many others of similar import) are rightly applied to the atonement, **just take your Bible and make a list of other scriptures of a different nature,** which you consider **could** be rightly so applied. Will you find them? I believe not. And if you cannot find them, must you conclude that the atonement is not directly spoken of in the N.T. at all? What a preposterous and impossible conclusion that would be! Then I maintain that we are driven back to such passages as those referred to above,

for the Biblical description of the atonement. And these passages all view the atonement as a work accomplished at the cross.

The editor of the "**Signs**" brings forward Heb. 2:17 to support the view that "Christ's atoning work was not completed on the cross, but is still in progress." "It is distinctly stated in Heb. 2:17," he maintains, "that it is the work of Christ, in his capacity as our High Priest, ministering for us in the heavenly tabernacle, to make atonement for the sins of his people." (June 1, p. 7.) This comment would be quite correct if the words "**ministering for us in the heavenly tabernacle**" were omitted. The text does not contain them, nor warrant the insertion of them. The text reads thus :

"Wherefore it behoved Him in all things to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people." **R.V.**

According to this verse, the incarnation was the necessary antecedent to the making of the propitiation. His incarnation marks his advent into the world : He made propitiation when He offered Himself without spot to God upon the cross.

ATONEMENT TEACHING PERMEATES THE NEW TESTAMENT

The actual word "atonement" occurs but once in our English N.T., in Rom. 5:11, and even in this place the R.V. reads "reconciliation" instead of "atonement." The N.T. is nevertheless literally permeated with the **doctrine** of the atonement.

A Bible student of some note was once asked to submit texts proving the **deity** of Jesus Christ. He replied that whatever might be said about individual texts bearing on that subject, the **doctrine** of Christ's deity was in solution in the whole of the N.T., just as salt was present everywhere, in solution, in the ocean.

The same may be said of the doctrine of the atonement. It is present in solution in all the N.T., and always finding expression in harmony with the truth that the great work was accomplished at the cross.

III.

An Examination of the Theory that the Heavenly Sanctuary is Divided into Two Apartments

An editorial article under the heading "The Truth about the Sanctuary Question," appeared in "**The Signs of the Times**" for June 29, 1936. This article is wholly occupied with an endeavour to prove that the heavenly sanctuary is divided into two apartments. The editor states his argument thus :

"Inasmuch as the earthly tabernacle had two apartments, and is declared to have been 'a copy and a shadow' of the heavenly tabernacle it follows that the heavenly tabernacle must likewise have two apartments,

with an outer veil at the entrance of the holy place, and an inner or second veil separating the holy place from the holy of holies."

But now the scriptures give a very different interpretation of the meaning of the two apartments. We are told **in what way** the earthly things were " a copy and shadow " of the heavenly. Is it right to ignore all this scriptural testimony, and stick rigidly to the idea that because there were two apartments on earth there must necessarily be two in heaven?

" Never once in the New Testament are we told that the heavenly tabernacle has only one apartment," writes the editor of the **" Signs "** in the May 25, 1936, issue. To this the reply is simple and self-evident, to any thinking person. **Never once in the New Testament are we told that the heavenly tabernacle has two apartments.**

THE PURPOSE OF THE SANCTUARY

What was the purpose of the sanctuary in the wilderness? The Lord Himself tells us : " Let them make me a sanctuary; **that I may dwell among them."** Ex. 25:8.

In a message to David, just prior to the building of a more permanent temple, God said : " Since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day (I) have walked **in a tent in a tabernacle."** 2 Sam. 7:6.

The N.T. clearly indicates the Christ, primarily, is the antitype of that sanctuary or tabernacle. **" The Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us."** John 1:14 R.V. margin. " Encamped among us " (Ferrar Fenton). " Had his tent in our midst " (Weymouth). The allusion to the tabernacle in the wilderness is unmistakable and indisputable.

From the time of the exodus, God " walked in a tent and in a tabernacle." Through the incarnation, God " went in and out among us " (Acts 1:22) in the person of Jesus Christ. The Lord Jesus recognised and spoke of his own body as the antitype of the Jewish sanctuary. John 2:18-21.

Does this mean that there is no sanctuary in heaven? No, it does not; but it does mean that the truth about the sanctuary, whether in heaven or on earth, is revealed in the person and work of Jesus Christ. You will not find the light by rigid concentration upon the mechanical arrangements of the building. Look to Christ! His is the body which cast the shadow. **" The body is Christ's."** See Col. 2:17 R.V.

OLD TESTAMENT TEACHING REGARDING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TWO APARTMENTS OF THE SANCTUARY

When David contemplated the building of the temple, he said, " As for me, I had in mine heart to build an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and for the footstool of our God." 1 Chron. 28:2. The " house of rest for the ark " was the most holy place of the sanctuary. " The footstool of our God " manifestly must have been the less honoured apartment, i.e., the first apartment, or " holy place."

Ezekiel was given a vision of " the inner court " of the temple, and heard a voice saying to him, " Son of man, this is the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever." Eze. 43:5-7 R.V.

Compare Ezekiel's vision with the words of David : " The place of my throne " is the same as " an house of rest for the ark," and " the place of the soles of my feet " corresponds with " the footstool of our God." The allusions in both these scriptures is to the inner and outer apartments of the sanctuary.

The Holy Spirit, speaking through the prophet Isiah, makes the following reference to the two apartments of the sanctuary : " To beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious." Isa. 60:13.

In this passage " the place of my sanctuary " means the inner apartment, and " the place of my feet " the outer apartment. The term " sanctuary " is sometimes used with specific reference to the most holy place. See Lev. 16:33, where the inner apartment is called " the holy sanctuary."

In a later vision (Ch. 66:1) the word of the Lord came to Isaiah, saying, " The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool : where is the house that ye built unto Me? and where is the place of my rest?" This scripture combined with those previously quoted, shows that the two apartments represented heaven and earth; the place of God's throne, and the place of his footstool.

Christ, in the sermon on the mount, spoke of heaven as " the throne of God," and the earth as " the footstool of His feet." Matt. 5:34, 35 R.V.

Compare now the expressions used by David, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Christ, and note how they all agree, in revealing to us the significance of the two apartments of the sanctuary :

	The Inner Apartment	The Outer Apartment
David :	" An house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord."	" And for the footstool of our God."
Isaiah :	" The place of my throne."	" The place of the soles of my feet."
Ezekiel :	" The place of my sanctuary."	
Christ :	" Heaven . . . is the throne of God."	" The place of my feet." " Earth . . . is His footstool."

There is a sublime beauty in this wonderful teaching of scripture. The sanctuary was the meeting place of God and man; only the veil intervening between them. The most holy place was God's side of the veil, or " heaven itself;" and the holy place was man's side, or the earth.

HEAVEN AND EARTH MADE ONE IN CHRIST

It might seem to some reader that there is a contradiction of teaching, in viewing the tabernacle as a whole as representing

the incarnate Christ, and then regarding the two apartments as representing heaven and earth. There is no contradiction. It is a glorious truth that Jesus Christ unites heaven and earth in his own blessed person.

"That in the dispensation of the fulness of times **He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him.**" Eph. 1:10.

The earth, unholy in itself, is made a "holy place" through the blood of Christ. (cp Heb 9:21). "The heavenly things themselves" are cleansed from the scandal and offence of sin (v. 23) by the same precious blood. "Through the blood of his cross .... to reconcile all things to himself .... **whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.**" Col. 1:20.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VEIL

We are plainly told in the epistle to the Hebrews that the veil of the sanctuary represented the flesh of Christ :

"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.**" Heb. 10:19, 20 R.V.

This scripture sheds a flood of wondrous light on the meaning of the sanctuary and its two apartments. The veil was not intended to keep God and man apart, but to enable them to draw near one to another. God had not veiled His glory, He could not have dwelt among men. If it had not been for the veil, man could never have thus drawn near to God. The veil was thus the medium of approach between God and man.

This type was most strikingly fulfilled through the incarnation of Jesus Christ. In that body of human flesh, God dwelt among men; and through that body of flesh we now approach God. The incarnate Christ is the "one Mediator," or medium of approach, between God and man.

The veil of the temple was hung up between God and man. The incarnate Christ was "lifted up" between heaven and earth, on the cross of Calvary. There God meets man, and man meets God. There is no other medium of approach.

Since the ascension, Christ's body of flesh is the only veil intervening between God and man in the heavenly sanctuary. There is no other veil in that temple. Therefore it is directly contrary to this most blessed truth to teach that heaven is divided into two apartments.

How does the editor of the "**Signs**" seek to harmonise this great truth, that the veil represented the flesh of Christ, with the theory that there are two apartments in the heavenly sanctuary? It makes one feel grieved beyond measure to read in his article (June 29, 1936, p. 12) that "through Jesus' 'flesh', the flesh that was pierced and broken for Him on Calvary," the believer could ("when the book of Hebrews was written") "enter by **faith**" only "the **hagia**, or holy place" (which the editor has many times declared to be only "the first apartment"); and thus within "the first veil of the tabernacle." Ah, reader, you must not accept such teaching as this. Which veil was rent in twain when Christ was crucified, the inner or the outer? If in Heb. 10:19, 20 Christ's flesh is likened to the "first veil of the tabernacle" (as the editor of the "**Signs**" implies), why was the veil over the most holy place rent asunder at the crucifixion?

The scriptural designation of the curtain which the "**Signs**" describes as "the first veil of the tabernacle," is "the door of the tent" (Ex. 26:36), or "the hanging for the door" (Ch. 35:15). This outer curtain is never once in the Bible spoken of as "**the veil.**" Are we to believe that when the writer of Hebrews spoke of Christ's flesh as "the veil," he had reference to "the hanging for the tabernacle door" (Ex. 39:38)? The idea is unworthy of serious consideration.

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 is 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 fouth, 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 His 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.**"

ROTHERHAM'S TRANSLATION CONSIDERED

The editor of the "**Signs**" makes much of Rotherham's note on Heb. 9:2, in which it is said, "It would seem to be the safer course to render the simple plural **(hagia)** uniformly, in harmony with the distinction here drawn between the Holy place and the Most holy. Cp. the six occurences : 8:2; 9:8, 12, 24, 25; 10:19."

It cannot be argued from this, that Rotherham supports the idea that according to Heb. 9:12, 24, etc., Christ had entered merely the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. That writer advocates the uniform rendering of "the simple plural **(hagia)**" as "the holy place" in the various instances in which it occurs, saying that this would be **"in harmony with"** the distinction drawn between Holy and Most Holy in ch. 9:2 but **not** meaning that **the same distinction** must be insisted on in the other passages.

In proof of this we quote Rotherham's translation of verses 11 and 12, placing his own marginal note in brackets at the proper place, as follows :

"But when Christ approached (i.e., clearly **unto God**; ver. 24) as high-priest of the coming good things, through the greater and more perfect tent, not made by hand, that is, not of this creation, nor yet through blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, He entereth once for all into the Holy place, age-abiding redemption discovering."

This proves conclusively that Rotherham understood the **"Holy place"** referred to in ch. 9:12, 24 to be the holiest of all; for that is what he means by the marginal note, "clearly **unto God.**" This note by Rotherham himself, shows that the editor of the **"Signs"** seriously misrepresented that translator by claiming that he used **"Holy place"** "in Heb. 9 and later chapters" in the sense of a "distinction between it and the most holy place." See **"Signs,"** June 29, 1936, page 10, first coloumn.

It is interesting in this connection to notice Rotherham's translation of Heb. 6:19, and the reference he gives there in connection with "the veil." His translation reads, "which we have as an anchor of the soul, both secure and firm, and entering into the interior of the veil." Reference is then given to Lev. 16:2, 12, where we read, "within the veil before the mercy-seat," etc. It is very evident from this that Rotherham understood the passage to teach Christ's immediate entry into the holiest of all.

Moffat renders Heb. 6:19 thus "Anchoring the soul to it safe and secure, as **it enters the inner Presence behind the veil."**

"WITHIN THE VEIL," IN NUMBERS 18:7

In the **"Signs"** article under consideration, the editor maintains that "there is at least one Old Testament text in which the expression 'within the veil' plainly refers to the first or outer veil, namely, Num. 18:17." That passage is then quoted as follows :

"Therefore thou **and thy sons with thee** shall keep your priest's office for everything of the altar, and **within the veil**; and ye shall serve," etc.

The argument on this text is that inasmuch as it speaks of the duties of both Aaron and his sons "within the veil," that expression must necessarily refer to the first veil, because the sons were not permitted to enter within the second veil.

The text does not say, however, that Aaron's **sons** were to minister **"within the veil."** The combined work of Aaron and

his sons was to embrace "every thing of the altar," and also "that within the veil" (R.V.). The scriptures teach with abundant clearness that while the ordinary priests ministered at the altar, only the high priest might enter "within the veil." There is not the slightest scriptural ground for interpreting this to mean the **"first"** veil.

A Jewish Commentary on the Pentateuch, edited by Dr J. H. Hertz, the Chief Rabbi (published by the Oxford University Press, London), contains the following note on Num, 18:7 :

"**'That within the veil,'** The Holy of Holies, the innermost sanctuary of the tabernacle."

In "The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary," translated into English by Jewish scholars, the passage in Num. 18:7 is rendered thus :

"Therefore thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priesthood for every thing of the altar, and **within the partition veil."**

AN INTERESTING INTERVIEW

In an interview with Rabbi E. M. Levy, M. A., at the Great Synagogue, Sydney, on the first of July, 1936, I had opportunity to discuss with that gentleman the meaning of the scripture now under consideration.

When asked what veil was referred to in Num. 18:7, Mr Levy took his Hebrew Bible and read the passage, and replied, "That is the veil over the most holy place, where the presence of God was manifested."

"In that you agree with Dr Hertz," I remarked, reading the comment from the Chief Rabbi quoted above. "But," I continued, "what do the translators of 'The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary' mean by rendering the clause, **'within the partition veil'**? Which veil do they intend to indicate?" **"Certainly the veil dividing the holy place from the holy of holies,"** replied the rabbi, with great positiveness.

When I brought forward other published statements, implying that there was in this place no specific reference to the veil over the most holy, the rabbi gave an exclamation of mingled astonishment and impatience, and declared that there was no ground at all for such assumptions. They (the Jews) never on any occasion used the expression "within the veil" with reference to the hanging at the door of the tabernacle, and it would not even sound good sense in such a connection. The veil was called PAROKETH in Hebrew, and the hanging at the tabernacle door was MASAK. In Num. 18:7 the word used was PAROKETH, which, he said, could refer only to the dividing veil.

Pursuing the inquiry still further, I asked why Aaron and his sons were spoken of, when only the high priest ministered "within the veil." Reading the text over in Hebrew carefully once more, Mr Levy replied, slowly and thoughtfully, "The work of both Aaron and his sons is spoken of here, truly; but the clause 'within the veil' must undoubtedly be understood to refer to the work of the high priest alone."

AN ANGLICAN COMMENTATOR

We submit the testimony of still another competent scholar as to the true meaning of the text. The following is taken from "The Commentary for Schools," edited by Dr C. J. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol :

"'**And within the veil . . .** ' i.e., the veil which separated the holy place from the most holy. The word which is employed in this place (**parocheth**) is used only of the second veil. (See Lev. 16:12.) When the outer veil or **hanging** is designed to be understood, the word used is **masak.** The reference appears to be the whole of the priestly duties which were discharged by Aaron and his sons, from those connected with the altar of burnt offering to those which were performed in the most holy place." Note on Num. 18:7.

CONCLUSION

I do not write these things in any spirit of attack upon the Adventist people. I feel that I am a debtor to that people more than to any others on earth, to declare to them "the whole counsel of God." My endeavours to bring to them the light of truth in these matters is a proof of the love I have always had for them, and which burns undiminished in my heart to-day. It has not been an easy task for me to accept the burden thus laid upon me to bear witness for the truth; but I can truly say to my Adventist brethren that "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved." "Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.

In conclusion, I ask the reader not to be deceived as to the importance of these things. Do not evade the issue by weakly saying, "It does not matter;" for it **does** matter. Do not superficially dismiss these questions as a mere "war of words." God will not excuse you for dealing in that light way with the gospel truth. Do not ignorantly say that these things are "not essential to salvation" : for what could be more essential to salvation than the truth about the atonement and the heavenly ministry of our Lord? Beware of closing your eyes to the light. Victories for God and Christ and truth have never been gained by evading such issues as these. The completion of the atonement on the cross is denied? The immediate entry of our great High Priest into the heavenly "holiest of all" is disputed! **Perish** the theories that are responsible for this! You do not need to fear to relinquish them. Take heed to this, however, that you make this crisis the occasion for drawing near anew to Jesus Christ; for "washing your robes" once more, and "making them white in the blood of the Lamb." The atonement completed at the cross will do you no good unless you **"receive** the reconciliation," and **"receive not the grace of God in vain."** The ministry of the Lord Jesus "before the face of God" will avail you nothing unless you **indeed** "draw near unto God through Him."

W. W. FLETCHER.