

SEVENTH DAY

ADVENTISM

EXAMINED

By

HELEN APPLETON

WEGWEISER RESEARCH LIBRARY
and
INFORMATION SERVICE,
Bo-Bo Valley, via Ulong,
N.S.W. 2450. AUSTRALIA

Dear Readers of the following,

I wish to explain the reason for this question and answer treatment of the subject. I was recently asked the following three questions by Ministers of the Church of Christ and of the Baptist Church when S.D.A.'s were holding meetings in their town. I give the questions exactly as given to me and my reply exactly as I gave it to them at the time. I trust this little treatise will clarify your own thinking if ever you are brought into contact with the specious teachings of this cult. Here are the three questions:—

1. Does the whole of their Sabbath teaching stand or fall on the question of the Scriptural distinction between the moral and ceremonial law?
2. Do the S.D.A.'s deny the completeness of the Atonement made once and for all upon the cross?
3. Would you mind telling us something of your own experiences and tell us what is the best method to adopt when coming into contact with them?

In answer to these questions I would like to point out the fact of the unity of Scripture. By this I mean that there is a Divine harmony in the Bible so that there are no contradictions. If we think we

find such, we may be sure the trouble lies in ourselves or rather in our lack of knowledge or understanding of the passage under consideration.

I would like to point out also the Bible directions for our study. We are told in I. Cor. 2:13, to **compare** "Spiritual things with Spiritual." I plan to do so here. **S.D.A.-ism** as I knew it in the 18 or 20 years of my life among S.D.A.-ists teaches that the 10 Commandment law was given in Eden before the Fall and later the Ceremonial Law was added because of the Fall. This is how they explain the text in Gal. 3:19. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made." Their explanation sounds logical to those who have a very scant knowledge of the Scriptures, but we have only to read such Scripture as the following to realise that their explanation is quite contrary to Bible truth.

In John 7:19, "Jesus said, did not **Moses** give you the Law, and yet none of you keepeth the Law. Why go ye about to kill me?" This most evidently refers to the 6th of the 10 Commandments and here Jesus himself said that **Moses** gave that Law, this was long after Eden. Now read Neh. 9:13, 14, "Thou camest down also upon **Mt. Sinai** and spakest with

them from Heaven; and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and Commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath," etc. Again in Gal. 3:16, 17. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made and this I say, that the Covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was 430 years after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect. Four hundred and thirty years after the Covenant of Grace made with Abraham brings us to Sinai.

These verses are enough to show us that the law as known to the Jews was not given in Eden but at Sinai, so the first of the Adventist teaching here set out is disproved. **All** the law, containing as it did, moral precepts and ceremonial rites was given at Sinai. It is **one** law, **the law**, the law of God, or the law of Moses. Nowhere does the Bible say that the 10 C.'s are all moral precepts or that the rest of the law is all Ceremonial. That point has been **assumed** by more denominations than that of the Seventh Day Adventists.

In the midst of the 10 C.'s we have a Ceremonial and the most oft repeated one of all—The Sabbath. Now, were this a **moral** precept no one could ever break it and be blameless. I think that point is clear. No one at any time could kill, or bear false

witness or commit adultery and be blameless and yet Jesus said in Matt. 12:5 that the priests in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless "that they might perform the Ceremonial rites of the law." This is surely sufficient to show that the Sabbath is not a moral precept. S.D.A.'s teach that the book of the law, which was kept in the side of the Ark of the Covenant in the most Holy place, contained the Ceremonial Law but not the 10 Commandments, yet in Deut. 28 to 31 we have the account of God speaking **all** His Commandments, and His Statutes and Moses writing them in the book.

When our Saviour was asked by the Pharisees, "What is the great Commandment in the law," He quoted from this same book of the law as found in Deut. 6:5 and Lev. 19:18—Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy soul. This is the first and great Commandment and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, on these two Commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

There is a passage of scripture in Rom. 5:12-14 which I would like you to consider for a moment:—"Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. (For until the law, sin was in the world, but sin is

not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses.) Here we find there was sin before the Sinaitic law was given—yet as sin is not imputed where there is no law—it follows that from Adam to Moses there was a law which was not the same as that given through Moses, the breaking of which resulted in death. The words of Jesus in Matt. 22:26-40 show us what that law was, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God" . . . this is the **first** and **great** commandment. The **second** is like unto it. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." It was the eternal law of love to God and Man. On these two eternal principles Jesus said all **the law** and the prophets **hung**. In other words, the code of laws given to the Jews at Sinai hung on these two greater commandments. This explains what James says in Ch. 2:8, "If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' ye do well."

This makes it clear, I think, that the law given at Sinai is a **whole**, a unit built on the greater law of love to God and man. When we speak of the law of Moses or the law of God, we are referring to the same law or part of it. So it is not true to say that the term, "law of God" refers to the 10 C.'s only

and the term "law of Moses" refers to the Ceremonial rites of the law only. The Bible uses both terms for the same incident. This can be seen in Luke 2:22-24, when Mary and Joseph brought the baby Jesus to the temple to do to Him as it was written in the Law of the Lord and there follows the performance of Ceremonial rites. Similarly, in Neh. 8, we find these terms used interchangeably. Ezra brought the book of the **law of Moses (verse 1)** to read to the Congregation. Verse 8 says, "They read in the book of the Law of God" and verse 14, "They found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses that they should keep a certain feast, while verse 18 says that from the first day unto the last" Ezra read in the book of the Law of God. Could anything be clearer then, than that the Law which was added because of transgression included all that God spake unto Moses at Sinai.—It is a unit. The 10 Commandments are called in Scripture "The Covenant" which God made with those who came out of Egypt.

Read this in Deut. 5 when Moses, after having called all Israel together, said, "The Lord our God made a Covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this Covenant with our fathers but with

us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day," and then follows the 10 C.'s, and the rest of the Law. Here once more we are told that the 10 C.'s were given at Sinai and not in Eden and constituted a Covenant—which Covenant has since given place to the New Covenant of Grace not law. See Heb. 8:8-13.

Now we come to those Scriptures referring to the fulfilling "of the law" or the end of the dispensation of "the law." Let us read a number of statements to see just what is said of this matter. (1) "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10:4. (2) Luke 16:6. "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the Kingdom of God is preached." (3) Heb. 5:5-6, and Ch. 7:11-12, tells us that "Christ was a priest after the order of Melchisedec and not after the order of Aaron and goes on to say, "For the priesthood being changed there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (4) II. Cor. 3:5-14 states, "God hath made us able ministers of the new testament not of the **letter** but of the **Spirit** . . . but "if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious . . . how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather (i.e., more) glorious . . . for if that which is done away was glorious much

more that which remaineth is glorious. (5) Heb. 12, 18:29, "For ye are not come unto the Mount that might be touched and that burned with fire . . . and the sound of a trumpet and the voice of words (i.e., to Sinai) . . . but ye are come unto Mount Zion and unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem . . . and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant."

(6) Rom. 6:14, "Ye are not under the law but under grace."

(7) Gal. 5:18, "If ye be led of the Spirit ye are not under the law."

(8) Gal. 5:14, "All the law is fulfilled in one word even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

(9) Gal. 4:21-31, "Tell me ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? Abraham had two sons, one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman . . . which things are an allegory, for these are the two Covenants, the one from Mt. Sinai, which is Agar, for this Agar is Mt. Sinai in Arabia and answereth to Jerusalem, which now is and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem, which is above, is the Mother of us all . . . What saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and

her son for the son of the bondwoman (i.e., Sinai) shall not be **heir** with the son of the free woman.

(10) Gal. 3:24. The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ that we might be justified by faith, but after that faith is come we are no longer under a schoolmaster but are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Gal. 4:4-5. When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

(11) Heb. 1:1, 2. God who . . . spoke in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days, spoken unto us by His Son.

(12) Heb. 3:1-6. Consider . . . Jesus Christ. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house.

(13) Matt 5:21, 22. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, 'Thou shalt not kill . . . **but I** say unto you whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment.

(14) John 1:17. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

I think this is all very plain teaching that the old Covenant, built on the letter of the law and called in II. Cor. 3, the "ministration of death written and

engraved in stones" with Moses as its mediator, has given place to the new Covenant, the 'ministration of the spirit,' **not** the letter with Christ its mediator. Yet S.D.A.'s will not allow that the spirit of Christ in us and the law of love as delivered by Christ are sufficient guide for Christian living. To uphold their teaching, re Seventh Day Sabbath keeping and to obviate all the Scriptures showing how the law was superseded by the Gospel, they bring in the idea we have already discussed of a divided law. This position we have shown to be quite unscriptural and logically untenable.

There is one other point they endeavour to make from Gen. 2:2-3. On the 7th day God ended His work, which he had made; and rested on the seventh day . . . and God blessed the 7th day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His works. From this they teach that the Sabbath was given in Eden. If that were so, how strange that in all the history of the world up to Sinai nothing is said about the Sabbath. The people's sins were reprov'd again and again, but they were not once reprov'd for Sabbath breaking.

A careful reading of this text, however, shows that the blessing and the sanctifying of this day was sometime after the resting. (Note the verse

"because that in it He **had** rested.") We are not told in this passage how long after the resting it was before the blessing took place and we must look far ahead before the Bible mentions the Sabbath again. This is in the desert just three weeks before the law, as a whole, was given. The Children of Israel, when given the "manna" were told to gather a double portion on the 6th day because "Tomorrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord," they were here tested whether they had obedient hearts or not. Moses explained carefully and the result was as told in Ex. 16:30, "So the people rested on the 7th day." Later when the 10 C.'s were given they were told (see Deut. 5:15) to "remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence . . . **therefore** the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath Day. Here is proof positive that the Sabbath was given to those brought out of Egypt and to none other.

I think enough has been said to show that the only hope of establishing the Adventists 7th day sabbath is to close one's eyes and ears to the many Scriptures showing that the new Covenant with Christ its mediator and the Holy Spirit to lead us into all truth has superseded the Covenant of the law made with the Children of Israel at Sinai. A semblance of feasibility is obtained by their method of dividing the law, but only a semblance and that, as we have shown, is unscriptural (notice Heb. 8:8-13).

"A new Covenant will I make with the house of Israel . . . not according to the Covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, I will put My Laws into their minds and write them in their hearts, and I will be merciful to their unrighteousness and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that He said a new Covenant, He hath made the first old. Now to remind yourself of what that first Covenant was, read Deut. 4:13, where Moses speaking to the Children of Israel says, "He declared unto you His Covenant which He commanded you to perform—even 10 Commandments.

This does not mean as S.D.A.'s accuse us of teaching that we may kill, steal, etc., etc. in the new Covenant-relationship. Paul says in Romans 6:1-7, "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. Knowing this that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin, "For he that is dead is freed from sin."

Everything of **moral** teaching in the old Covenant is repeated and indeed magnified in the new Covenant. Jesus took Moses' moral teachings and brought them up to a higher level. We have already read from Matt. 5 the words of our Saviour,

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time." Thou shalt not kill **but** I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment. Jesus here sets Himself and his ministration above Moses and his ministration. We need not fear any lowering of moral standard when we follow the Mediator of the New Covenant in place of Moses who was the Mediator of the old Covenant.

Our Lord indeed "magnified the law and made it honourable" by fulfilling all its types and obeying all its demands. Under the old Covenant the people had a code of laws for their standard of living—under the new Covenant we have for our standard the perfect life of Jesus and His personal teachings with the Holy Spirit who has been given to convince us of sin, to lead us into all truth and to bring to our remembrance the words Jesus spoke while here on earth. Surely this is a higher standard than what obtained under the Old Covenants!

Sunday keeping is not a substitute for Sabbath keeping, which had its typical fulfilment in the Gospel. We have peace with God, the true Sabbath rest when we understand that our salvation is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord and is not dependent on our own works; we rest from our works as God did from His (see Heb. 4:10).

Jesus rose from the dead on the first day of the week in fulfilment of the type of the feast of **first**

fruits which was always observed on the morrow after the Sabbath (i.e., the first day of the week). See Lev. 23:11-14. He is become the first fruits of them that slept, I. Cor. 15:20. His resurrection was the guarantee to mankind that His atonement for the sins of the **world** had been accepted by the Father. Romans 4:25 says that Jesus our Lord was raised again for our justification.

Weymouth translates this as "because of" our justification, so Sunday the resurrection day represents the wonderful fact of an accomplished plan of redemption. It therefore speaks peace and rest to our hearts. There is no **law** demanding a ceremonial observance of the day—but we are privileged to have this regular reminder of what our Saviour has done for us. We may make much or little of our privileges according as we value the means of grace. So my friends do not be led astray by those who would bring you back under the yoke of bondage but be free in New Covenant relationship to follow your Lord under the guidance of the Holy Spirit in all matters of duty or service.

Let me conclude by reading Rom. 14:4, 5, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own Master he standeth or falleth . . . one man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

End of Q. 1.

Question 2. Do the S.D.A.'s deny the completeness of the Atonement made once and for all upon the cross?

There is a statement in one of the S.D.A. standard books, "Looking Unto Jesus" by Ureah Smith, to this effect: "Christ did not make the atonement when He shed His blood upon the cross." This view is absolutely necessary to their sanctuary teaching held by the denomination as its pivotal doctrine. Similar statements have been made from time to time, e.g., in April, 1930, the Aust. Union Conf. Committee issued this: "Sin . . . will be finally atoned for, not at the cross, but in the true tabernacle in heaven." In the "Signs of the Times" for June 4, 1934, we read: "It is claimed that 'atonement for man was fully completed at the cross.' We deny this claim.

In the "Record" for October 3, 1932, a contributed article reads: "It is evident from several passages of Scripture that Christ did not **complete** his substitutionary work on the cross."

In the book, "The Atoning Work of Christ," published 1934, we read "With these facts before us, it is impossible to conclude that a complete work of atoning for sin was wrought upon the cross." Again, in the "Signs of the Times," June 1, 1936, we find this: "Hence it follows that Christ's atoning work was not completed on the cross, but is still in progress."

This teaching, as I have said, is essential to their sanctuary teaching upon which hangs their claim to be God's especial people for these last days—having a special message (that of Sabbath reform and Investigative judgment for God's professed people) and arising "on time" at the end of the 2300 days of Dan, in 1844. Now that is all a most intricate matter to explain and something beyond the scope of this question but right here I would like to say that the time prophecy on which they estimate their 1844 date does not lend itself to their explanation of it and their message of judgment for God's professed people is also contrary to Scripture as, for example, John 5:24, "He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation (R.V., judgment) but is passed from death unto life" and again in II. Tim. 2:19, "The Lord knoweth them that are His," and in John 10:14, "I know my sheep and am known of mine." He does not need an "Investigation" to show who are His. As for 7th Day Sabbath keeping we have already shown that the Covenant of the **law**—the ministration of death—has been superseded by the New Covenant—the ministration of the spirit.

There is a move afoot among Adventists to-day whereby they hope to be accepted by orthodox churches as evangelicals. They—that is certain leaders—even go so far as to say they do not and

never have believed the strange doctrines of which they are accused. Only the "lunatic fringe" believed those things, they say. If this is so then all the writers of their standard books belonged to the "lunatic fringe." This is no way to correct a mistake in doctrine. The only honest way is to admit the mistake and renounce it, but if 7th Day Adventists surrendered their Sanctuary theory with its strange doctrines, they would have no reason for being a separate denomination.

End of Q. 2.

Question 3.—With regard to some of my own experiences!

I was "born and bred" a Presbyterian being taught to regard Sunday as "the Sabbath." When at the age of 22 I came home from the Country School where I was teaching, I found a Seventh Day Adventist tent mission in progress in my home village. Curiosity took me along to the tent where I heard some very wonderful prophetic teachings—all of which made me feel how little I knew of the Bible. A series of Bible studies in the home opened a wealth of Bible subjects to my mind and, not being expert in the Scriptures, I failed to see where the S.D.A. interpretations departed from the truth. When asked if I believed Christians should keep the 10 Commandments—I unhesitatingly answered, "Yes—of course." The next question as to what day was pointed out in the 4th Commandment as the

sabbath, brought the response "The 7th." Well, which day is that? was the next question and so I realised that in keeping the 1st day of the week and not the 7th, we were not obeying the 4th Commandment. In my ignorance of the passing away of the old Covenant and all it involved, and the bringing in of the New, I did not see that right here is the very evidence of the parting of the ways between these two Covenants. The sabbath being the "sign" between God and the Children of Israel under the old Covenant. When Israel rejected the Messiah and crucified Him—the kingdom was taken from them and "given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" as stated by Jesus Himself in Matt 21:33-46. Who would longer wish to have the "sign," which belonged to that unfaithful people?

But to get on with my story—I felt compelled to be true to the light that was in me and joined up with the 7th Day Adventists. The following year I accepted the position of Church Missionary and Sabbath School Secretary and Young People's Leader for South N.Z. This I retained for two years, after which I went over to their Sydney Sanitarium for training as a nurse with an eye to the Mission fields. Here I met my husband. After our marriage we were sent to Victoria to engage in the selling of books from door to door. This was to be a six month's training for us. It turned out that my husband became a good canvasser and the book de-

partment was loth to lose him to the Bible work—which had been promised as our next experience. At a camp meeting there we discovered with other young workers that there were more workers available than there were fields in which to place them and much "wire-pulling" was being done to get a place. This so upset our whole idea of devotion to a needy cause that we answered the call of my husband's home folks who were in desperate need of our help, and so we left the organised "work." However, at home, we took our place in the Church as burden bearers and teachers. In our private life we read the books of the denomination and tried our utmost to live up to the standard of the 10 Commandments—by which we were told we should be judged in the "Investigative Judgment," which the denomination teaches began in 1844. Of course, as the years went by we became more and more convinced that we could never attain to righteousness this way. Indeed we felt there was no assurance of salvation for us at all, because by this teaching we had to depend on our own works. There was a confusion of mind with us really, because the denomination does teach salvation by faith theoretically. Actually, however, their "special message" which they claim to have been raised up to give, teaches as I have said, that the professed people of God must be judged by the 10 C. law before the Lord comes so that He will know who are

to be saved when He does come. Those keeping the 7th day Sabbath then are marked out as His especial people.

About this time, when we were losing our confidence in our own hopes of salvation, there was sent to us by an ex-Adventist friend a book entitled, "Reasons for my Faith," by Pastor W. W. Fletcher, who had recently left the S.D.A. ranks. He had been a missionary in India for some years and was later appointed Bible teacher in their Missionary college in N.S.W. In his studies for this work he discovered to his dismay that the denominational "sanctuary teaching" upon which all their "special message" depends, was contrary to plain gospel facts. He took his problems to the heads of the Church in Australia and was later sent to America to confer with the world heads there in a "general conference" quadrennial session. His book was really a resume of these discussions. The two main points dealt with were (1) that Christ, at His ascension, entered the immediate presence of God in heaven, and (2) that "Blood" in the Bible always stands for atonement and remission of sin. Now this sounds simple truth, doesn't it, and so it is, yet there is enough in it to overthrow the whole Adventist Sanctuary teaching. Let me tell you briefly what that teaching is. The priests in the earthly sanctuary ministered in the 1st apartment all the year until the great day of atonement. On this day the

High Priest alone entered the 2nd apartment, the most Holy place where was the Ark of the Covenant, containing the law of the Covenant, with the mercy seat above it and the two cherubim above the mercy seat. It was here that the glory of God appeared "above the mercy seat," indicating His presence. The High Priest on this day alone of all the year came through the veil into this Holiest apartment with the blood of a sacrificial animal which he sprinkled on the mercy seat. He then went out to the court of the tabernacle and confessed over the head of the "scapegoat" the sins of the people. This goat was then led away into the wilderness. In Lev. 16:30 we read, "On that day shall the priest make an atonement for you to cleanse you that you may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." Notice in passing what "atonement" is here shown to mean, a **cleansing from sin**. Each day during the year there was a morning and an evening sacrifice when the priests slew an animal after having confessed the sins of the people over it—laying his hand upon the animal's head. The blood was poured out round the base of the altar of sacrifice, which was outside the Sanctuary proper. Some of the blood was put on the horns of this altar by the priest who dipped his finger into the blood. Also during the year if at any time a person sinned and repented he could bring an animal for sacrifice and the same thing was

done. In this way, as the Bible says in Lev. 1:4, it was accepted for him "to make atonement for him." In only two special cases, (a) when a priest sinned, or (b) when the whole congregation, including the priesthood sinned, the blood was taken inside the 1st apartment of the Sanctuary and sprinkled there. This is the point at which the Adventists make their mistake. They teach that in **all** sacrifices the blood was taken **into** the Sanctuary and thus the sins were **transferred** from the sinner to the Sanctuary until the day of Atonement at the end of the typical year—when they were again **transferred** to the head of the scapegoat and so sent right away from the Camp of Israel.

In the book, "Patriarchs and Prophets," written by the S.D.A. prophetess, Mrs. E. G. White, we read on page 355: "Not until the goat had been thus sent away, did the people regard themselves as freed from the burden of their sins." You can see that if any of the blood was not taken into the Sanctuary then the sins it represented were not taken there either and the whole idea collapses. The truth is that the shedding of the blood represented the atonement for sin wherever it was shed. Lev. 17:11. The life of the flesh is in the blood and I have given to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that

maketh an atonement for the soul. All these typical sacrifices pointed to Christ "the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." When his blood was shed upon the altar of sacrifice—the great atonement for the sins of the world was made. In the book of Hebrews we find a very clear explanation of what the Sanctuary services meant. They were to teach the people God's plan for their salvation. In other words they were to convey spiritual lessons.

Heb. 1:3 says that Christ "when He had by Himself **purged** our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. In chapter 8 we read, "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the Sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man. Here is another place at which the S.D.A.'s go wrong. Instead of understanding spiritual truths by this Sanctuary in heaven, they teach that there is in heaven a Sanctuary just like the one on earth with two apartments separated by a veil, etc. That this is not a correct understanding is shown in Heb. 10:19, 20, "Having then brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way through the veil, that is to say, **His flesh**, and having a High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near . . . in full assurance of faith."

Plainly here the **veil** is said to **represent** the incarnation of Christ so, of course, the whole Sanctuary on earth was **representative** only—it was not a replica of a **building** in heaven at all.

Now, if Christ is our **High Priest**, his work was typified by the earthly **High Priest**. The antitype must be true to the type. Now the earthly High Priest as we have already shown went once a year on the great Day of Atonement after the sacrifice had been made at the sacrificial altar outside the sanctuary proper into the **holiest** apartment through the veil, where was represented the presence of God himself above the mercy seat. So Jesus, after **He** had offered himself a sacrifice for the sins of the world, on the altar of sacrifice (the cross) went into the holiest of all in the heavenly sanctuary into the direct presence of the Father.

Note in passing the following scriptures:

Heb. 9:26, "Now, once in the end of the world, hath He appeared, to put away sin, by the sacrifice of Himself."

Heb. 10:10, "We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Christ once for all."

Heb. 9:15, "He is the Mediator of the New Testament that by **means of death** . . . for—redemption, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

These scriptures show that it was the **death** of Christ which secured our salvation and freedom from sin not some ceremony in heaven in 1844 and

afterwards. Christ, our "scapegoat", bore our sins on the tree. They are removed from us "as far as the east is from the west." Adventist teaching that the scapegoat represented Satan is quite wrong because as you will see in Lev. 6:5 and 7-10, the two goats used on the great day of atonement were "for a sin offering" and the scapegoat was presented alive before the Lord to **make an atonement with Him**, and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness. By these two goats was represented two phases of Christ's work—one the death on the cross and the other the forgiveness of sins, separating them from us as far as the east is from the west. The scapegoat could not possibly represent Satan—because God did not use him for a **sin offering** or **make atonement with him**.

Well—when we began to realise some of all this, we wrote to the **heads**, told them all about it and said we feared we would have to leave the Adventist Church unless they could come and show us if we were misunderstanding anything. Believe it or not—**no one** would come to talk things over with us—neither the State President nor the Secretary though we begged them again and again to do so. All this time we were discussing these many points among ourselves in the Church of about 70 members. Eventually we went to a camp meeting as a last effort to be sure we would not be making a mistake. You see in Adventism we are taught that

if we once "believe" and then give up the teaching we will be forever lost. So it was a serious step to take. At this camp meeting ministers from headquarters were the guest speakers and it was arranged that one of them would discuss matters with us. Over the 10 days we had some eleven hours' talk with him—but not once in all that time did he answer a direct question. He evaded a direct reply, endeavouring to have us take a "broad view" as he called it of the whole matter and to consider how the Adventist cause had arisen and grown so marvellously over the years. Well, at the end of the time, we were no wiser and had to go home to thresh the matter out for ourselves. We wrote to Mr. Fletcher asking if he had more literature on any other subjects concerning the Adventist teaching. He sent us several treatises which we found so completely scriptural and yet so utterly contrary to S.D.A.-ism that, to make a long story short, some forty members of our church finally separated from the Adventists. We formed ourselves into a properly organised Church body—inviting Pastor Fletcher to help in this matter. We were still sabbath keepers, but as the months went by and we continued our bible studies—one after another saw the truth on that matter, too, and united with the Orthodox Churches in our neighbourhoods—some becoming Baptists, some Presbyterians, some Methodists, Salvation Army, Church

of Christ, etc. Only one went back, not on doctrine, but for the sake of the friendships she had there. So that is my story in brief.

You ask what is the best method to adopt when coming into contact with S.D.A.'s. Over the years we have found that this varies with the individual. The more spiritual ones can be reached best, I think, with the truths of the Atonement and Judgment. Once there is a doubt of the truth of **any** of the whole system, we find a willingness to consider other points. Always, of course, **the Sabbath** has to be faced and this is the most difficult of all, because, you see, they teach that the Sabbath is the **Seal of God**, without which we cannot be saved when Jesus comes.

However, a true understanding of the Old and New Covenants puts this right, too—also a good look at the prophecy in Rev. 14 speaking of the Seal of God. Here we are told the Seal is God's name. Other translations show the Seal is the name of the Father and the Son and this is borne out in Rev. 22:3 and 4, also Chap. 3:12, which I now quote: John, speaking of the New Jerusalem, says: "There shall be no more curse, but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall serve Him—and they shall see His face and **His name** shall be in their foreheads." The other passage reads: "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God . . . and I will write

upon him the name of my God and the name of the city of my God . . . and I will write upon him **my new name.**"

So the **name of God and the Lamb** is the seal which indicates we belong to Him "that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." Surely this is the sign or seal of the New Covenant as the Sabbath was the sign or seal of the old. One is the type—the other the antitype. Christ is our true Sabbath. In Him we find **rest** as He said in Matt. 11:28, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest."

Finis.