

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON “WITHIN THE VEIL”

BY: PASTOR J. ISAAC RICHARDS
GOOD SHEPHERD BIBLE SABBATH FELLOWSHIP
AN INDEPENDENT SEVENTH-DAY BAPTIST CONGREGATION

Since publicly sending out my study on “Within the Veil” – a thesis based on Hebrews 6:19-20 and 10:19-20, where I defend the apostle’s original understanding that Jesus Christ entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, into the very presence of God at His ascension rather than in 1844 – I have received a flood of email responses, some positive, some negative, and some with simple questions. I have tried to keep up on my replies to this inundation of correspondence and to offer clear answers from the scriptures. The vast majority of these replies came from Seventh-day Adventists who hold Ellen White to be an inspired prophetess, or messenger of God; in contrast, I endeavor to expound clear reasoning and proofs from the Bible as God’s infallible word, and to show the folly of trusting to extra-biblical sources as divine articles of faith. I freely submit these answers-to-questions to the public in defense of the common Christian faith for their perusal and study, that the faithful Berean may be edified, enlightened, ennobled, and strengthened with the truths of scripture. May the truths of God’s Word prevail against the changeable reasoning of fallible men, and vindicate the work of Christ’s atonement for sin which is offered freely to all in its completion, and which is accepted and appropriated as a gift of God’s grace through faith. – *The Author*

To an SDA Pastor:

Greetings brother,

It has been quite amazing throughout this process, after announcing my stand on God’s Word in regard to Paul’s teachings of Christ entering “within the veil” - or “holiest of all” - at His ascension rather than in 1844. Truly I can sympathize with A.F. Ballenger when he said to Mrs. White:

“At my secret trial four years ago, three leading brethren were chosen to answer me...In private conversation with me one took the position that "within the veil" meant within the sanctuary, but did not refer to either apartment. Another asserted at the trial that the term applied to the first apartment as you have interpreted it. The third, compelled by the witnesses quoted above admitted in his answer that the term "within the veil" does apply to the holy of holies, but that it is spoken prophetically, and although the scripture says Christ IS entered "within the veil" we are to understand it to mean that he WILL enter in 1844. This babel of voices did not help me to see my error, if error it be.” – *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ, A.F. Ballenger, 1909.*

I have received such an array of varying responses that it would have been difficult to keep track of all the logic if I had not been responding to each one as quickly as they came in. Some have admitted that my position is right and that this was also their understanding as well! Others have committed to studying out these theories by comparing scripture with scripture. Still others have condemned me to hell and have claimed that I had some secret sin blinding my eyes to Ellen White’s prophetic ministry, and that it is only some secret sin I am cherishing (what secret sin they may be guessing is in me I have no clue) that is causing me to lose my way and to now have Satan as my master and father. And then others say I am still a Christian but need to be convinced on the truth of the old waymarks by offering clarification from their own studies.

Some of these so-called “clarifications” have included such claims as: Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews calling the hanging of the curtain separating the courtyard from the holy place a “veil” (although not one scripture ever proves that the hanging of the door is ever actually called a veil); another, that Christ only entered the holy place and remained there for 1810 years until 1844 when He then entered the most holy to commence a work of investigation and judgment; another, that Christ DID go into the most holy place at His ascension, but that this event was only to “dedicate the temple”, and that He then went back into the holy to wait until 1844; still another, that the Hebrew scriptures were not available to Paul when he wrote the book of Hebrews but only the Greek version of the Septuagint; one acknowledging that Ellen White was wrong on the events of 1844, but that it didn’t matter because her other books were ok, and that since her erroneous visions established the SDA church and gave purpose to the movement that her errors were justified and therefore able to be used as a basis for SDA theology (how God justifies deception to establish truth this person did not explain); and - my personal favorite - that that the words “vail” and “veil” are actually different things: the “vail” being the hanging between the holy and most holy place as a word used in the Old Testament, and the “veil” being the hanging between the courtyard and the holy place as a word used exclusively in the New!! This last argument I found to be, quite honestly, the silliest of them all, and representative of the lengths to which people will go to defend their cherished doctrines, lest they be compelled to acknowledge their error and thus yield to the truth and infallibility of God’s Word.

Yes, truly can I say with Ballenger that “this babel of voices did not help me to see my error, if error it be.”

For your own benefit, and for the benefit of the brethren who I would assume may be interested in my positions at this point (and in case they wish to compose an answer to these things as has been done in the past to others), I submit the following answers to all of the above ludicrous claims. It has been honestly strengthening for my own personal faith to be forced to answer these charges and claims by using the Bible as my defender and the man of my counsel. In some instances, I use Ellen White’s own writings to prove a point - not because I claim her as my authority, but to prove to those who do believe her to be inspired that she herself debunks their claims in certain cases. But in all points of faith, and as I claim in my thesis, the scriptures – that is, the Bible and the Bible alone - must be the Christian’s foundation, and sole rule of faith and practice.

The following three replies help to summarize many of my thoughts toward the aforementioned claims. As always, I sincerely wish you God’s blessings, my brother.

Yours in Christ,

J. Isaac Richards

Answer to the false claim that the hanging of the courtyard was called a “veil”:

Dear Brother,

You are right that the veil separating the holy from the most holy place is never called a “door” in scripture. Neither is the hanging of the court separating the courtyard from the holy place ever called a “veil”. You may choose the concordance of your choice and search the entire Bible, and yet you will never find anywhere in scripture where the “veil” or “vail” of the sanctuary is anything other than the article hanging and separating the holy from the most holy. You and I may wish to change this fact, but it is unchangeable. It is clearly written in the Word of God. Comparing scripture with scripture then, it is inevitable and conclusive that the “veil”, wither our forerunner is entered to present His blood before the presence of God, refers to the most holy place, and that Christ did enter the “holiest of all” prior to Paul writing his epistle to the Hebrews. Paul wrote this epistle before his death in 68 AD, which means that Jesus Christ had already entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary at least 1,800 years before Seventh-day Adventists claim this event took place. All of the argumentation and reasoning in the world does not change this fact.

Therefore, this brings us to another conclusion regarding the prophetic ministry of Ellen White who claimed the opposite of all of these aforementioned facts: the Bible clearly teaches that “the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets”. 1 Corinthians 14:32. If someone arises teaching contrary to the plainly revealed will and word of God as recorded in the scriptures of truth, then it is that so-called prophet that is in error, not the Bible. And that is my position regarding Ellen White. You may claim or believe that she holds equal authority with all of the other Bible prophets, but the Word of God is clear:

“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:20

“And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.” Deuteronomy 18:21-23

Clarification on Christ's holy place vs most holy place phases of ministry:

Greetings brother,

Good questions and thank you for sharing! If you use a concordance and look up every single reference in the Bible where the words “veil” or “vail” are used in connection with the sanctuary, it only refers to the veil that separated the holy from the most holy place. This is why nearly all Bible versions - including the King James Version - translate Hebrews 10:19 as “most holy place”, or “holiest of all”. Although it is true that the curtain hanging between the courtyard and the holy place was a sort of veil, yet the Bible never once calls it this. So if we use the Bible to interpret itself, then the scriptures are clear that Christ went “within the veil” - that is, the most holy place - in the very presence of God to make atonement with His blood.

The day of atonement in the Old Testament was a pattern or type - not a perfect representation - of what our Savior Jesus Christ would do in shedding His blood and making an atonement for sin in order to cleanse His people and to purge our consciences from dead works to serve the living God. Remember that Christ is of a different order of priesthood than the Levitical system – He is made after the order of Melchizedek – therefore, the type does not apply in every particular detail to the substantive reality. The sacrificial lamb offered daily for the congregation in the morning and evening sacrifice, the sin offerings offered up day after day, the trespassing offerings, the thank offerings, the multitude of animal victims – lambs, goats, bulls, pigeons, etc. – along with the seven Jewish feasts with their peculiar offerings; all pointed to the One great sacrifice for sin: Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. The Levitical system, along with the earthly tabernacle, was but an imperfect type of a heavenly reality; that is, that our Savior would offer His life as an atonement for sin – once for all – and take His blood into heaven to make satisfaction for the broken law and to purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

As far as why Jesus would go directly into the most holy place at His ascension instead of staying in the holy place: have you considered that there has always been a sanctuary in heaven? The earthly tabernacle was made after the pattern of the heavenly sanctuary which God showed Moses on the Mount. See Exodus 25:40; Hebrews 8:1-6. We also know that people could be saved in the Old Testament through faith in Christ, since Jesus is “the lamb slain from the foundation of the world”. The holy place ministration of Christ was active prior to the cross since it is evident that forgiveness and intercession were offered even back then to those who placed their faith in the coming Messiah. Isaiah even had a vision that confirmed this in chapter 6 where he saw the temple in heaven opened and an angel took a live coal from off the altar of incense (located in the holy place) to purge his sins. Therefore, after Christ actually shed His blood on the cross, then according to the writer of Hebrews, He took His blood into the most holy place, “within the veil”, to make atonement and to “appear in the presence of God for us.” Hebrews 9:7-14, 23-26; 10:19-20. This is why the veil of the temple was rent in twain when Jesus died on the cross and He cried out, “It is finished!”. Full atonement for sin had been made through His death – the Righteous One had given His life for sinners; the just for the unjust – and thus the way into the holiest of all, into the direct presence of God, was now open to all who would repent of their sins and come to God through Christ. What wonderful news! Truly this is the “good news” of the gospel.

Answer to claims of anointing most holy place at ascension, Greek manuscripts, and Ellen White's inspiration:

Hello,

Good to hear from you and thank you for your thoughtful and well written reply; I appreciate your time and effort to study the Bible and to present evidences you believe are substantiated from scripture.

I would like to comment on each point you raised for I think they are all important. The first point you mention is of the priest dedicating the sanctuary and entering into the holy of holies at the beginning of the inauguration of the temple, and you quote Exodus 40 and Leviticus 8 and 9 as proofs. This is an attempt to connect this Old Testament work and type to what Christ apparently did at His ascension in 31AD. The problem with this theory that presents itself right away, however, is that when one reads the scripture texts that you quoted, one does not see the high priest - or any priest who ministered in the earthly tabernacle for that matter - entering the most holy place at all. Nor does the priest of the sanctuary dedicate the temple. It is Moses who does this work, and not Aaron. In fact, from a careful reading of the chapters in question, Aaron and his sons who are to be anointed as priests remain in the courtyard before the congregation to be anointed in their presence. They never enter at all into the most holy place. Aaron is the type of Christ in this work, while Moses is a type of God the Father (see Exodus 4:14-16). I will explain more farther below where I contend that Christ did indeed need to minister in the holy place at a certain time, but that this was not at His ascension.

Continuing on to your reply I wish to make my second point where you claim that the Hebrew scriptures were not readily accessible to the apostles:

It is apparent even from Mrs. White's own writings that Jesus and the apostles had access to the Hebrew scrolls in their day and not just the Septuagint version. I will build my argument below:

"The child Jesus did not receive instruction in the synagogue schools. His mother was His first human teacher. From her lips and from the scrolls of the prophets, He learned of heavenly things. The very words which He Himself had spoken to Moses for Israel He was now taught at His mother's knee. As He advanced from childhood to youth, He did not seek the schools of the rabbis. He needed not the education to be obtained from such sources; for God was His instructor." - {DA 70.1}

"Much of the teaching was oral; but the youth also learned to read the Hebrew writings; and the parchment of the rolls of the Old Testament Scriptures were open to their study." - {DA 69.2}

"Seeking clearer knowledge, they [the Magi] turned to the Hebrew scriptures." - {DA 59.3}

I do not deny that the Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures was by then widely in use - especially in lands where the Jews were scattered within the Roman Empire.

"For hundreds of years the Scriptures had been translated into the Greek language, then widely spoken throughout the Roman Empire. The Jews were scattered everywhere, and their expectation of the Messiah's coming was to some extent shared by the Gentiles. Among those whom the Jews styled heathen were men who had a better understanding of the Scripture prophecies concerning the Messiah than had the teachers in Israel. There were some who hoped for His coming as a deliverer from sin. Philosophers endeavored to study into the mystery of the

Hebrew economy. But the bigotry of the Jews hindered the spread of the light. Intent on maintaining the separation between themselves and other nations, they were unwilling to impart the knowledge they still possessed concerning the symbolic service. The true Interpreter must come. The One whom all these types prefigured must explain their significance.” - {DA 33.2}

But it is abundantly clear from historical records, as well as from the scriptures themselves, that the Hebrew language was still widely used by the Jews of that time - especially in Judah and by the Jewish scribes and Pharisees, of whom Paul was formerly a part. Notice below:

“The Hebrew language was cultivated as the most sacred tongue in the world.” - {FE 97.3}

The majority of the early converts to the Christian church spoke and understood Hebrew, including Paul himself.

“And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration.” These Grecians were residents of other countries, where the Greek language was spoken. By far the larger number of converts were Jews who spoke Hebrew; but these had lived in the Roman Empire, and spoke only Greek.” - {7Red 28.1}

“And when he had given him license, Paul stood on the stairs, and beckoned with the hand unto the people. And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue.” Acts 21:40.

“And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith,) I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day.” Acts 22:2-3.

“And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.” Acts 26:14.

“And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.” Luke 23:38.

Therefore, based on the evidences above, it is at best inconclusive that Paul had to rely on the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Scriptures in order to compose the book of Hebrews, which was written to Hebrew believers, who understood quite clearly the Hebrew system of worship of the Old Testament which was written in Hebrew by Moses. Instead, this book was written in Greek simply for the reason that his epistle would also be read and shared among the other churches, as were his other epistles among the Gentiles. See 1 Thessalonians 5:27; Colossians 4:16.

Perhaps I should be more clear that I do believe that Jesus ministered in the holy place, but that His ministry in the first compartment was prior to His incarnation and death on the cross. Have you considered that there has always been a sanctuary in heaven? The earthly tabernacle was made after the pattern of the heavenly sanctuary which God showed Moses on the Mount. See Exodus 25:40; Hebrews 8:1-6; Psalm 102:19. We also know that people could be saved in the Old Testament through faith in Christ, since Jesus is “the lamb slain from the foundation of the world”. The holy place ministration of Christ was active prior to the cross since it is evident that forgiveness and intercession were offered even back then to those who placed their faith in the

coming Messiah. Isaiah even had a vision that confirmed this in chapter 6 where he saw the temple in heaven opened and an angel took a live coal from off the altar of incense (located in the holy place) to purge his sins. Isaiah 6:1-7. Therefore, after Christ actually shed His blood on the cross, then according to the writer of Hebrews, He took His blood into the most holy place, "within the veil", to make atonement and to "appear in the presence of God for us." Hebrews 9:7-14, 23-26; 10:19-20.

It is because the Adventist pioneers never understood this that they confused what actually happened at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14. Instead of recognizing that Christ entered the most holy place at His ascension to minister His shed blood in behalf of sinners - and that in 1844 the truth of His atonement would be "vindicated" (for this is the proper translation of the word used in Daniel 8:14) and understood by the world, after the casting down of the truth by the papacy for 1260 years and the little horn obscuring this high priestly work of Christ by replacing His work of atonement with a false system of earthly priests, confession, and the weekly sacrifice of Mass - the pioneers instead taught that forgiveness of sin was actually ended for the world in 1844, and the door of mercy forever shut! Even Ellen White herself taught this error for 7 years after 1844. In fact, Mrs. White taught her people not even to pray for sinners after 1844. I will again quote below:

"It was just as impossible for them [those who gave up their faith in the 1844 movement] to get on the path again and go to the city, AS ALL THE WICKED WORLD WHICH GOD HAD REJECTED. They fell all along the path, one after another." - Word to the Little Flock, page 14, 1847

"Then I saw that Jesus prayed for his enemies; but that should not cause US or lead US to pray for THE WICKED WORLD, WHOM GOD HAD REJECTED. When he prayed for his enemies, there was hope for them, and they COULD BE BENEFITED AND SAVED BY HIS PRAYERS, and also after he was a mediator, in the outer apartment for the whole world; BUT NOW HIS SPIRIT AND SYMPATHY WERE WITHDRAWN FROM THE WORLD; AND OUR SYMPATHY MUST BE WITH JESUS, AND MUST BE WITHDRAWN FROM THE UNGODLY...I saw that the wicked could not be benefited by our prayers now." - Vision in Camden, NY, June 29, 1851.

To further prove this point, that Ellen White and the early pioneers believed in a shut door and close of probation on the world in 1844, I submit the following statements. The first is what Ellen White said of those who professed to be converted to Christ after 1844 (again, remember that she did not believe anyone could be saved at first after 1844, and she continued to hold this belief for many years even though she claimed to be a prophet of God):

"I saw that the mysterious signs and wonders and false reformations would increase and spread. The reformations that were shown me were not reformations from error to truth, but from bad to worse; for those who professed a change of heart had only wrapped about them a religious garb, which covered up the iniquity of a wicked heart. Some appeared to have been really converted, so as to deceive God's people; but if their hearts could be seen, they would appear as black as ever. *My accompanying angel bade me look for the travail of soul for sinners, as used to be. I looked, but could not see it, for the time for their salvation was past.*" - The Present Truth, pages 21-24, August, 1849.

"I became acquainted with James White and Ellen Harmon (now Mrs. White) early in 1845. . . Ellen was having what was called visions: said that God had shown her in vision that Jesus Christ arose and on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, shut the door of mercy; had left forever the mediatorial throne; the whole world was doomed and lost; and there never could be another

sinner saved". - ("The True Sabbath," p. 72), Testimony signed by L.S. Burdick, San Francisco, CA.

"Our views of the work before us were then mostly vague and indefinite, some still retaining the idea adopted by the body of Advent believers in 1844, with Wm. Miller at their head, that our work for the world was finished, and that the message was confined to those of the original Advent faith. So firmly was this believed that one of our number was nearly refused the message, the individual presenting it having doubts of the possibility of his salvation, because he was not in the '44 move." - Review and Herald, June 11, 1861. Signed by 9 SDA ministers.

"I think we shall clearly see that there can be no other place for the shut door but at the autumn of 1844. . . When we came up to that point of time all our sympathy, burden and prayers for sinners ceased; and the unanimous feeling and testimony was that our work for the world was finished forever. . . The reason that the living branches felt that their work was done, was because the twenty-three hundred days were ended, and the time had come for Jesus to shut the door of the Holy and pass into the Most Holy to receive the kingdom and cleanse the sanctuary. . . At this very time when the faithful servant is giving meat to the 'household' [not to the unbelieving world], and is opposed by the evil servant, and when the Advent history marked out by the parable is fulfilled, and the shut door in the past, . . . He is still merciful to his saints and ever will be; and Jesus is still their Advocate and Priest. But the sinner, to whom Jesus had stretched out his arms all the day long, and who had rejected the offer of salvation, was left without an advocate when Jesus passed from the Holy Place and shut the door in 1844. The professed church who rejected the truth was also rejected, smitten with blindness, and now with their flocks and herds they go to seek the Lord, as still an advocate for sinners. But, says the prophet (Hos. 5:6, 7): 'They shall not find him; he hath withdrawn himself from them. They have dealt treacherously against the Lord, for they have begotten strange children.'" - James White, Present Truth, May, 1850

The fact that the pioneers believed this error and later corrected it is one thing, for our understanding of Bible doctrine is often times progressive; but the fact that Ellen White supported this error and claimed to have also seen it in vision is another thing altogether, for this casts doubts on her claims to divine inspiration and to status as a prophet or mouthpiece for God. Remember what the Bible teaches in this regard:

"And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him." Deuteronomy 18:21-22.

I choose as a Christian to believe the Bible as the Word of God. The Bible is my foundation, not the writings of fallible men and women.

As far as her other books are concerned, many of her published works are very beautiful. Works such as Desire of Ages, Steps to Christ, Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing, and many others, are indeed classic works. But it is also a fact of history that Mrs. White borrowed much of her material from other outside sources and authors, and also had a professional staff of editors, writers, and what she termed "copyists", or literary assistants, who helped her write much of her material. Fannie Bolton and Marian Davis are some of the more famous ones we know of; however, throughout her life and career she employed many, many persons to help her write her books. W.W. Prescott - former GC Vice President and long employed minister in the denomination - himself confessed to compiling and also writing much of Prophets and Kings - including the last several chapters - which is why this book was not even published until after

Ellen White's death. Even the book "Sketches from the Life of Paul" was removed from print and taken out of circulation by the Ellen White Estate because of problems and allegations of plagiarism brought by the publishers Conybeare and Howson, who published their book on the Life and Epistles of Saint Paul 30 years earlier. A.G. Daniells, GC President at that time, confessed to these difficulties:

"Now you know something about that little book, *Life of Paul*. You know the difficulty we got into about that. **We could never claim inspiration in the whole thought and make-up of the book, because it has been thrown aside because it was badly put together. Credits were not given to the proper authorities**, and some of that crept into *The Great Controversy* -- the lack of credits; and in the revision of that book those things were carefully run down and made right. ...Yes; and now take that *Life of Paul*, -- I suppose you all know about it and knew what claims were put up against her, charges made of plagiarism, even by the authors of the book, Conybeare and Howson, and were liable to make the denomination trouble **because there was so much of their book put into *The Life of Paul* without any credit or quotation marks**. Some people of strict logic might fly the track on that ground, but I am not built that way. I found it out, and I read it with Brother Palmer when he found it, and we got Conybeare and Howson, and we got Wylie's *History of the Reformation*, and **we read word for word, page after page, and no quotations, no credit**, and really I did not know the difference until I began to compare them. I supposed it was Sister White's own work. ...**There I saw the manifestation of the human in these writings.**" - GC Bible Conference, 1919.

May God bless and guide you as you make the Bible your foundation and the man of your counsel.

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20.

"Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage for ever: for they are the rejoicing of my heart. I have inclined mine heart to perform thy statutes alway, even unto the end. I hate vain thoughts: but thy law do I love. Thou art my hiding place and my shield: I hope in thy word." "How sweet are thy words unto my taste! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth! Through thy precepts I get understanding: therefore I hate every false way. Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? by taking heed thereto according to thy word. With my whole heart have I sought thee: O let me not wander from thy commandments. Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee."

Psalms 119:111-114, 103-105, 9-11.

Answer to claim that “vail” and “veil” are two separate things!

Hello brother,

I just got done reading your attachment on the veil since it was such a short read. I was honestly hoping for something more substantive than that. I was somewhat amused and perhaps a bit taken aback by the author’s over-simplification and strange views on a word study of “veil”. It is almost unbelievable to think that he honestly believes this. The word “vail” in the Old Testament, and “veil” in the New are synonymous terms with just a different spelling given by the English translators. To prove this, I offer the following definitions from Noah Webster’s 1828 dictionary which, as I am sure you aware, was written to preserve and defend the English language and original meanings of the King James Version of the Holy Bible. Here are Webster’s definitions of “vail” and “veil”. You will see that these are variances of the same:

VAIL, n. [L. velum, from velo, to cover, to spread over. *It is correctly written vail for e, in Latin, is our a.*]

1. Any kind of cloth which is used for intercepting the view and hiding something; **as the vail of the temple among the Israelites.** NWAD VAIL.2

VEIL, n. [L. velum.]

1. A cover; a curtain; something to intercept the view and lude an object. NWAD VEIL.2

2. A cover; a disguise. [**See Vail.** *The latter orthography gives the Latin pronunciation as well as the English, and is to be preferred.*] NWAD VEIL.3

So we see that these words are derivatives of the Latin - and are interchangeable in the English, although the author prefers the former. It is simply a different English spelling.

Now we reference Strongs to see the word “veil” as used in the New Testament (Hebrews 6:19; 10:19) and will notice that it is the same as “vail” in the Old:

Greek: καταπέτασμα

Transliteration: katapetasma

Pronunciation: kat-ap-et'-as-mah

Definition: From a compound of **G2596** and a congener of **G4072**; something *spread thoroughly* that is (specifically) the door screen (to the Most Holy Place) in the Jewish Temple: - vail.

KJV Usage: veil (6x).

Occurrences in Bible: 6

Occurrences in verses: 6

And so, my friend, it is the same and Ballenger was correct in his understanding on this point, as was the Review article which Eugene Pruitt referred to in his short study: that is, that not one scholar from Adventism has been able to answer Ballenger’s arguments from scripture since that time until this. And although the writer is correct that we all must be on guard from pride and self-exaltation, yet it is also equally true that as Christians we must stand on the Word of God, the Bible, as our foundation and sole rule of faith in matters of doctrine and practice. And if that position places us in conflict with the SDA church and Ellen White, then - although unfortunate - this must still be done if I am to stand on God’s Word alone.

Blessings to you as you honestly study and obey the Word of God.

Systematic answers to a series of questions received:

Hello brother,

I will try to answer your questions one at a time.

First, in regard to the word “ta hagian”, which is translated as “sanctuary”, “holy place”, “holy places”, and “holiest” or “holiest of all” in the book of Hebrews, it obviously depends on the context to determine how this word is used. In Hebrews 10:19 this word is properly translated as “holiest” because it is connected to the term “within the veil” which is only a term connected to the veil separating the holy from the most holy place. That is a fact. If you go back and actually read through my study I bring out every single scripture reference in the Bible that uses the phrase “within the veil”, and it ever only refers to entering the most holy place. So if you compare scripture with scripture as you mention, then you can only come to one single conclusion: that Paul is referring to the most holy place - “within the veil” - where Christ entered with His blood. And this is why virtually all Bible translations - including the King James - translate this verse as “holiest”, “holy of holies”, “most holy place”, etc. In the mouth of two or three witnesses a matter is established.

Secondly, no, Moses did not get it wrong. There were two compartments in the earthly tabernacle with two distinct aspects of ministry which the priest engaged in, just like there are two compartments in the heavenly sanctuary which also has two phases of work which Christ as our high priest engages in: the first was His ministry in the holy place from the days of Adam until His incarnation; and the second His ministry in the most holy place since His ascension until the close of probation. I refer you to my former email where I explain this:

“As far as why Jesus would go directly into the most holy place at His ascension instead of staying in the holy place: have you considered that there has always been a sanctuary in heaven? The earthly tabernacle was made after the pattern of the heavenly sanctuary which God showed Moses on the Mount. See Exodus 25:40; Hebrews 8:1-6. We also know that people could be saved in the Old Testament through faith in Christ, since Jesus is “the lamb slain from the foundation of the world”. The holy place ministrations of Christ were active prior to the cross since it is evident that forgiveness and intercession were offered even back then to those who placed their faith in the coming Messiah. Isaiah even had a vision that confirmed this in chapter 6 where he saw the temple in heaven opened and an angel took a live coal from off the altar of incense (located in the holy place) to purge his sins. Therefore, after Christ actually shed His blood on the cross, then, according to the writer of Hebrews, He took His blood into the most holy place, “within the veil”, to make atonement and to “appear in the presence of God for us.” Hebrews 9:7-14, 23-26; 10:19-20.”

Third, while there may be two veils in the sanctuary, yet I challenge you to provide me with even one scripture where the first hanging - the curtain that separated the courtyard from the holy place - is ever called a “veil” in the Bible. It does not exist. The writer of Hebrews is clear that Jesus Christ, at His ascension, entered heaven to present His blood before the presence of God (Hebrews 9:12, 24). You mention that Moses had it right as far as the pattern of the earthly tabernacle was concerned; therefore, I ask you the question: where was the presence of God located where the high priest sprinkled the blood of sacrifice to make atonement for sin? Whether in the daily ministrations, or in the yearly Day of Atonement, the location of God’s throne was the same; it did not change. Because the scripture above states clearly that Jesus was to “now appear in the presence of God for us”. Was God’s presence and throne in the holy place in the type? It is obvious to the honest mind that it was not; it was ever only located in the most holy place, “***within the***

veil". And this is where Christ as our Great High Priest had to appear to present His blood, "having obtained eternal redemption for us". And it is because of this that we now have access to "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Hebrews 9:12; 4:16.

Fourth, as far as a second witness goes for Hebrews, there are at least twelve witnesses in the Bible to prove that Paul means the most holy place when he speaks of Christ entering "within the veil". The following scripture proofs teach conclusively that "within the veil" is synonymous with going into the most holy place: Ex. 26:23; Lev. 16:2; Lev. 16:12; Lev. 16:15; Num. 18:7. While the term "without the veil" or "before the veil" clearly refers to the holy place: Ex. 26:35; Ex. 27:20-21; Ex. 40:22; Ex. 40:26; Lev. 4:5-6; Lev. 4:17; Lev. 24:1-3. There are, therefore, no less than twelve witnesses to this truth, and not just a "second witness".

Fifth, my explanation for the 2300 days and 490 "cut off" from the 2300 I address in my thesis. I would encourage you to read it instead of asking me these same questions. But out of Christian courtesy I will again briefly address this by quoting from my study, as well as from answers I have given to others:

"Point #9: The 2300 days

"The language of this prophecy states in the original: "And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be justified or vindicated or set right". The Hebrew word for "cleansed" is "tsadaq" which means:

צדק :Hebrew

Transliteration: tsâdaq

Pronunciation: tsaw-dak'

Definition: A primitive root; to be (causatively make) right (in a moral or forensic sense): - {cleanse} clear {self} ({be} do) just ({-ice} {-ify} -ify {self}) ({be} turn to) righteous (-ness).

*KJV Usage: **justify** (23x), **righteous** (10x), **just** (3x), **justice** (2x), **cleansed** (1x), **clear ourselves** (1x), **righteousness** (1x).*

Occurrences in Bible: 41

Occurrences in verses: 40

"You will notice right away that this word is only translated as 'cleansed' in the entire Bible; to 'justify' or make 'righteous' is the proper term. Furthermore, this is a different word entirely, both in meaning and in usage, than the word used in Leviticus 16 for the day of atonement cleansing. Used in Daniel chapter 8, it signifies that it was the sanctuary that needed justice or vindication from wrong, and does not point to a forensic cleansing of the sins of God's people on the day of Yom Kippur.

"In other words, after 2300 days God's sanctuary would be set right and vindicated from the activity of the little horn power which trampled it under foot and cast the truth to ground 'and practiced and prospered'. In fact, in every reference of a judgment sitting and books being opened, it is referring to judgment on the papal power and on the wicked in general, and to the vindication of the righteous. See Daniel 7:8-27; 8:14-25; Revelation 20:11-15. And it is the same with the 3 angels' messages of Revelation 14. In context, the judgment hour message of the first angel is connected with a declaration of judgment on Babylon and the consequences of worshipping the beast and his image delineated in the second and third messages.

“Our current understanding of the 2300-day prophecy, as far as starting and ending dates is concerned, hasn’t changed at this point. We still believe in the day/year principle and the starting date of 457BC according to Daniel 9 which brings the end date to 1844. But I believe the prophecy is misunderstood based on the text. The phrase ‘then shall the sanctuary be cleansed’ we have historically applied to the day of atonement when this is not possible given the context or language of the chapter. Again, the word used for ‘cleansed’ is not the same word used in Leviticus 16. The original says ‘then shall the sanctuary be justified or set right’. **The word for cleansed in Daniel 8:14 is the same word used in 2 Chronicles 29:15-18 when the temple was cleansed and set right from being defiled with pagan idolatry.** And this is what Daniel 8 is teaching as well. The question from the angel to Christ was, in effect: ‘how long shall paganism and papalism trample the sanctuary and host?’ And the answer is given ‘unto 2300 days, then shall the sanctuary be set right, or justified, or cleansed from pagan idolatry and papal errors’. So in 1844, the filth and errors of Rome would finally be purged from God’s church on earth, which work began with the Protestant reformation with Luther and the doctrine of justification by faith, continued through that time with the restoration of other truths such as baptism by immersion for believers, the true meaning of the Lords supper, the Sabbath, and completed with the truth of soul sleep in death, hellfire, the destruction of the wicked, and the understanding of Christ’s high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Incidentally, this was also the time period of the Second Great Awakening which began to reach its heights during this same time period: when thousands of Christians around the country flocked to camp meetings to seek spiritual revival and true conversion to Christ. The Second Advent Movement was only a very small part of a national trend at that time within Christendom.

“Point #5: The 70 week prophecy of Daniel 9:24.

“Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.”

“The word here used for ‘reconciliation’ is the Hebrew word ‘kaphar’, which is the identical word used in Leviticus 16 for ‘atonement’. Therefore, according to Daniel’s prophecy of the coming Messiah, Christ would bring ‘atonement for iniquity’ and also ‘anoint the most holy’ within the 70 weeks cut off from the 2300 days. The words ‘most holy’ are the combined Hebrew words ‘qodesh qodesh’ which taken combined only can refer to the most holy place of the sanctuary. It is a similar rendering in Hebrews 9:3 where the words ‘hagia hagian’ are used to describe the ‘holiest of all’ where the ark was placed. In fact, the Septuagint version uses this same phrase in Daniel 9:24 to describe the most holy which was anointed within the 70 weeks of Daniel’s prophecy. In other words, according to this prophecy, Jesus Christ would offer himself as an offering for sin, to make ‘atonement for iniquity’, and enter the most holy place to present his blood for cleansing in the presence of God, within the 70 weeks of the 2300 days. And the apostle Paul agrees with this when he writes the following: ‘For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.’ Hebrews 9:24.”

Sixth, to briefly answer your other questions: the prophecy of the 2520 is still valid and points to the trampling down of God’s people by paganism and papalism, from the scattering of Israel commencing with the destruction of the Northern tribes in 723 BC, and terminated in 1798 AD with the deadly wound given to the papacy; the 1260 is still valid and points to the papacy being the Antichrist; Revelation 9 and August 11, 1840, is still valid based on the context of the prophecy and the day-year principle.

All of these things can be clearly proven from the Bible by using the scriptures. An investigative judgment for the righteous commencing on October 22, 1844, based on an anti-typical day of atonement in heaven, I cannot show clearly from the scriptures. If you can show me this clearly and plainly from the Bible I would be happy to consider the evidence.

I hope I have answered your questions. God's blessings be with you as you search for truth and study your Bible, and as you allow the Word of God to dictate your faith as the man of your counsel.

Until then I remain, sincerely yours in Christ Jesus,

An appeal to reason: to a fanatic

Dear brother,

In place of a solid defense of your positions by using the Bible, you have a cult-like mindset to instead use scripture as a weapon to accuse and assault your brother. You have now claimed that I am of my father the devil and have confidently declared my apostasy complete. What have I done to sin? Is believing that Jesus Christ as my great high priest does minister His blood in my behalf in the heavenly sanctuary in the most holy place a sin? Is trusting the blood of the everlasting covenant to wash away sin and to purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God make a Christian a child of the devil? Your mind is warped, my friend. Again, I invite you to show me my error from the Word of God and to prove from the scriptures that I am in error. If you are unable to do so then you should simply state such in humility; but to possess the spirit of the great accuser of the brethren as you now show forth does nothing to gain respect from anyone that your position is right. As Luther defended himself before the papal diet, so I say to you: "if I have done evil, then bear witness of the evil...unless you can convince me from scripture and from reason...I cannot and will not recant anything. For to sin against conscience is neither safe nor right. Here I stand; I can do no other." May God help and defend me against the sinful unreasonableness of blind men who trust to tradition and the writings of extra-biblical sources, and refuse to use the scriptures as their defense. Amen.

You and your wife remain in our prayers. Be blessed, my friend, and take care.

(I never received a reply).

A judgment of the righteous?

Greetings brother,

Thank you for your thoughtful response. I skimmed through it just to get an idea of the arguments and evidence you are presenting and will also go back and take my time on each point to consider your points before responding. I did notice right off the bat that some of the points I raise are never actually addressed by your paper. In particular, you do not deal with how Moses, Enoch, Elijah, and those resurrected at Christ's resurrection can all be taken to heaven prior to their books being opened and cases decided and their sins blotted out in 1844. That's a big one for me. In my opinion, that contradicts the whole theory right there. Either God is consistent or He is not. You also do not touch the backbone of my study which is comparing all verses in the Bible where "within the veil" is used. If you do this, it is conclusive that Paul is speaking of Christ entering the most holy place. Everything else unlocks once you simply allow the Bible to speak for itself, and it becomes no longer necessary to do so many theological gymnastics in order to defend a doctrine that is not clear in scripture.

Quickly I will say (in order to correct the idea that I somehow do not believe in a judgment for the righteous) that I wholeheartedly believe that there is some phase of decision making and judgment for God's people, since Paul clearly tells us this in Romans 14:10 and 2 Corinthians 5:10. *Whether this is a judgment of reward verses a judgment of investigation, however, is an open question.* And when this judgment takes place is also an open question. Because Paul also indicates that Christ judges the "quick (living) and dead, at His appearing and His kingdom" (2 Timothy 4:1); and in another place states that "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment". Hebrews 9:27.

The bottom line is that God's people are declared righteous through Christ when they are justified by faith. Justification is the act of being legally "declared righteous" because of what Christ did for us in bearing our sins on the cross. That is Gospel 101 as taught clearly in the book of Romans. Luther understood it, the Christian church throughout the ages over the last 2,000 years understood it, while Adventists apparently do not.

While I go back and study through your paper and consider your points, I will forward to you my replies to other questions and points raised since some are similar. It has been interesting, however, to see how many different responses I have received and how wide a variety of belief SDA's really have. And it has honestly been amusing to see the lengths some will go to justify their positions - either by destroying the clear text and meaning of the Bible, or completely ignoring it altogether - in order to uphold their theories. It has always seemed much less complicated to me to simply allow the Bible to mean what it says and to allow it to speak just as it reads. It is this same spirit of mental and theological gymnastics, and the constant twisting and turning of the Bible and SOP to make it say something that it does not say when taken in context, that finally opened my eyes to Jeff Pippenger's fanaticism. And this same spirit of cult-like fanaticism may also be seen in other churches where the plain words of God are changed around to teach theology that is not plain and clear: the Roman Catholics, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Mormons all do this same thing with the Bible. And all claim also to be right and the only way to heaven. Seventh-day Adventists, I am afraid, may safely be added to this list of cults.

I will be in touch. My email replies to others will be following this. God bless and guide you, my brother.

Moses, Enoch, Elijah, and the special resurrection of the dead in 31 AD:

Greetings brother,

I received your email which did nothing to answer the questions I posed to you regarding the theological can of worms which SDA's never touch or mention: i.e.: God taking people to heaven prior to their cases coming up in a supposed investigative judgment in 1844 that is supposed to determine their destiny. To answer you directly, yes, I understand that Moses, Enoch, and Elijah were types. That is not my issue. My issue is that they, as well as others (those resurrected at Jesus' resurrection) were taken to heaven prior to the books being opened (as Adventists claim) and their sins being blotted out in a judgment that was supposed to begin in 1844. To the contrary, and in contradiction of SDA doctrine, these people were obviously all saved through faith in Christ who is "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world"! The point I was attempting to make to you is that if God could find them all righteous and forgive their sins and take them all to heaven prior to a supposed investigative judgment in 1844, then what is the point of having an investigative judgment at all for everyone else? Is God that inconsistent? So some have to have their cases investigated and others do not? And what about Ellen White's own words? I quote them below:

"At the time appointed for the Judgment—the close of the 2300 days, in 1844—began the work of investigation and blotting out of sins. All who have ever taken upon themselves the name of Christ must pass its searching scrutiny. Both the living and the dead are to be judged 'out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.'" – {GC88 486.1}

She says ALL who have taken upon themselves the name of Christ must pass the judgment that began in 1844. This includes all those who have ever lived since the days of Adam.

"As the books of record are opened in the judgment, the lives of all who have believed on Jesus come in review before God. Beginning with those who first lived upon the earth, our Advocate presents the cases of each successive generation, and closes with the living. Every name is mentioned, every case closely investigated. Names are accepted, names rejected." – {GC 483.1}

Ellen White states clearly that the investigative judgment of the righteous dead - beginning with those who first lived on earth - began in 1844. And she goes on to say that it is impossible for sins to be blotted out until after their cases come up in the judgment.

"The work of the investigative Judgment and the blotting out of sins is to be accomplished before the second advent of the Lord. Since the dead are to be judged out of the things written in the books, **it is impossible that the sins of men should be blotted out until after the Judgment at which their cases are to be investigated.** When the investigative judgment closes, Christ will come, and His reward will be with Him to give to every man as his work shall be." – {GC 485.2}

Her words are as plain as day:

- Investigative judgment begins in 1844 at close of 2300 days
- This judgment is for the righteous
- It begins with the righteous dead - starting with Adam and Eve - and concludes with the righteous living
- Sins cannot be blotted out until after their cases come up in the judgment and their books of record are investigated

- Once the saints pass the searching scrutiny of the judgment, their sins are blotted out, their names retained in the book of life, and then Christ comes to bring His reward: to resurrect the righteous and to translate the living saints and take them to heaven

And yet in the face this “inspired testimony” from Ellen White, according to the Bible a multitude of people are already found righteous enough to be taken to heaven prior to 1844! Perhaps this is because the Word of God teaches that “the Lord knoweth them that are His”! 2 Timothy 2:19.

So who is right? The Bible prophets, or the SDA prophet Ellen White? *Because it cannot be both in this case no matter how one tries to spin it, reconcile it, reason it away, harmonize it, twist and turn it, deceive oneself, or do mental gymnastics.* Moses, Enoch, Elijah, and a multitude of unnamed saints - representing all generations since the days of Adam to the time of Christ - can all be saved, and have their sins blotted out and taken to heaven prior to the cross; but since the time that Christ gave His life on Calvary and provided the omnipotent gift of the Holy Spirit to overcome sin, not one has been able to stand in Christ’s perfect righteousness as they? and now need an investigative judgment that begins in 1844? And yet – according to the prophetess Ellen White – multitudes prior to the cross also need this investigative judgment so God can know who to take to heaven, but certain others did not need this same work of investigation? How does this make any sense at all? Where is the logic or consistency?

I just cannot do this any longer, brother. The intellectual dishonesty and/or blindness by the SDA church has become too much. I am tired of the mental games and word games people play in order to justify and attempt to prove something that is unreasonable and contradictory. It should at least make sense and be consistent. I do not blame you for this since you are a product of SDA theology as I was. I just wish people could deal with these issues honestly and without viewing every point of doctrine through the myopic lense of Ellen White. Because - whether you know it or not, and whether you realize it or not - this is exactly what you are doing. You and others are unable to separate your thinking process from what the church terms “the spirit of prophecy” (the writings of Ellen White). It has become the governing principle in Bible interpretation - especially among “present truth” brethren. And that is why you cannot understand my questions on this point, and how this one issue alone absolutely destroys the theory of an investigative judgment for the righteous dead commencing in 1844. God does not need this judgment because it has already been demonstrated conclusively that He was able to take people to heaven long before 1844. These are the facts and the plain testimony of the scriptures - which is the Word of the living God - whether you, or I, or anyone else for that matter, wishes to face these facts or not.

I wish you nothing but the best, brother, I sincerely do. Whether we ever see eye-to-eye on these issues in this life I highly doubt, and that is ok. I respect your liberty of conscience to believe as you do, and I believe that you can be saved in God’s kingdom without having to believe exactly as I do. Other SDA’s, however, do not believe this about people like me, and are bigoted and narrow-minded to think that people must be saved through a correct understanding of theology and prophecy, rather than being saved through Christ Jesus, His blood, His intercession, and His righteousness. It is a sad fact of history that Seventh-day Adventism has produced some of the wildest fanaticism in the history of Christianity – from Millerism and the Great Disappointment, to the “holy flesh” movement, to so-called modern day prophets such as Ellen White and Victor Houteff, down to our day to people like David Koresh and the Branch Davidians, and Jeff Pippenger and his cult of prophecy.

To those fanatics who accuse me of apostasy from the truth, I wish to point out the greatest irony of all: that when you boil it all down and just read the Bible for what it says - I believe with all my heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, my Savior from sin, and that He intercedes for me as my

Great High Priest in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, where He offers His blood in atonement to pardon and blot out my sins. And is this not the whole crux of what SDA's term "present truth"?? And yet I am condemned to hellfire by bigots and spiritual charlatans because I simply believe what the apostle Paul wrote the Hebrew believers in his day: that this very atonement has been offered to all since Christ offered up His life on the cross and ascended to heaven to present his sacrifice in our behalf before His Father, "now to appear in the presence of God for us". Hebrews 9:24.

May God have mercy, and heal the blindness and bigotry of Seventh-day Adventists, and pardon me for ever having a part of this same mindset! I wish I could vomit out my whole experience with Jeff Pippenger and its poisonous miasma of fanaticism. And the saddest part of all is that this man is simply catching the spirit of Ellen White and the early pioneers who had the exact same mindset and theological stand toward the entire Christian world and all sinners in their day! There is no difference at all!! Go and read their writings and see what they actually believed and taught after the disappointment of 1844. It was virtually identical! They taught a shut door on all the churches and on all who rejected the so-called light of the "44 movement"; that only they were being sealed in the most holy place; that Satan had taken possession of the rejecters of the message of that time; that only those in the message and who followed all three steps could be sealed; that any who were not a part of the original movement could not be saved; that they were not to pray for sinners or for those who rejected the message....go back and read it! All SDA fanaticism today has its roots in Adventist fanaticism of the past; and all lay common claim to the possession of the prophetic gift – whether that means the emphasis and teaching of prophecy, or the claim to have a living prophet in their midst.

I am heart-sick and soul-sick over the whole mess. I gave my life in service to the SDA message and movement for over 21 years. My life, my heart, my soul was bound up in this "movement of destiny". And after all of this time of sincerely and honestly standing for what I believed to be right, I feel lied to by a dishonest and corrupt church, and condemned and accused by a blind church membership. I cannot stand it any longer. This is why I finally had to leave. I am tired of the fanaticism that Adventism breeds. It is a curse and a plague akin to what Jehovah's Witnesses do to cut off the ears of those who would otherwise listen to the gospel. I just cannot deal with it anymore. May God help me not to reject any truth that is of divine origin and that can be clearly established from the scriptures; but I cannot do the SDA denominational thing any longer. And the absolute cold-hearted, callous, and blatantly Satanic responses from many of the blind and deluded fanatics of Adventism has turned my heart as steel against SDA insanity. I am now convinced more than ever before that Seventh-day Adventism is a cult. I am open to the Bible, I am open to scripture and reason; but I am not open to anyone telling me I am lost and condemned to hellfire while failing to provide one shred of evidence from the scriptures to support their claims.

God bless, brother, my prayers and regards to you and your young family. May the good Lord help you to not to be one of those people.

Sincerely in Christ Jesus our blessed Savior,

Questions on timing of God's Judgment:

Greetings brother,

Thank you for taking the time to respond to my email and study. I read through what you wrote and do not disagree in the least that there is a judgment for the righteous and the wicked, and that these two judgments are separate. It is the time and nature of the judgment that is in question. SDA's claim that this judgment began in 1844, but I have yet to see any scripture proof of this. The New Testament authors point to different times and/or events which mark judgment periods:

Judgment for house of God begins in Peter's day:

"For the time IS COME that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" 1 Peter 4:17

Appointed for men once to die and then the judgment:

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but AFTER THIS the judgment." Hebrews 9:27

Judgment for living and dead to take place at Christ's coming:

"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead AT HIS APPEARING and his kingdom." 2 Timothy 4:1

So who is right? And where in the Bible does it say that judgment for the righteous begins in 1844 after the 2300 days? There is only one scripture in all the Bible that refers to the 2300 days and that is Daniel 8:14. Where in that whole chapter does it speak of judgment for the saints?

In the multitude of responses I have received from around the world, not one has been able to show this from the Bible.

(This letter also went unanswered).

The scheme of the “judgment hour message”:

Greetings brother,

Thank you for taking the time to respond to my email and study. I am including a response I just wrote to someone else since it also touches some things you mention in your email. I am going to send you L.R. Conradi's study since he actually documents conclusive evidence that Luther in his day did actually preach the first and second angels' messages, thus disproving the SDA claim that Miller and the Adventists were the first to proclaim the judgment-hour message. When one understands that the first angel was speaking of judgment on Babylon, and not on the saints of God, then it all makes perfect sense. The SDA preoccupation with declaring an investigative judgment on the saints, commencing in 1844, has blinded their eyes, and they are unable to recognize that their claims to a corner market on God's truth is invalid.

Continued below (from a previous response to another brother):

I read through what you wrote and do not disagree in the least that there is a judgment for the righteous and the wicked, and that these two judgments are separate. It is the time and nature of the judgment that is in question. SDA's claim that this judgment began in 1844, but I have yet to see any scripture proof of this. The New Testament authors point to different times and/or events which mark judgment periods:

Judgment for house of God begins in Peter's day:

“For the time IS COME that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?” 1 Peter 4:17

Appointed for men once to die and then the judgment:

“And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but AFTER THIS the judgment.” Hebrews 9:27

Judgment for living and dead to take place at Christ's coming:

“I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead AT HIS APPEARING and his kingdom.” 2 Timothy 4:1

So who is right? And where in the Bible does it say that judgment for the righteous begins in 1844 after the 2300 days? There is only one scripture in all the Bible that refers to the 2300 days and that is Daniel 8:14. Where in that whole chapter does it speak of judgment for the saints?

I also agree with you that Moses and Elijah are types, and that the special resurrection of those brought up from the grave at Christ's resurrection are now the 24 elders round about the throne. I have no issue with that at all. My point is that if a supposed investigative judgment for the righteous began in 1844 - and the sins of men could not be blotted out until that time when the books were opened - then how were they able to be resurrected and taken to heaven prior to a final decision being made on their cases? If God could take them to heaven prior to their sins being blotted out, then He can do the same for anyone else who has ever lived. And so it does not matter whether an investigative judgment began or not. Therefore, the whole emphasis that the SDA church and Ellen White places on 1844 is irrelevant. Obviously these people were all saved by God's grace, justified through faith in Christ, and deemed worthy of eternal life without ever having passed a so-called investigative judgment. So how is this doctrine relevant today? And how

can SDA's now claim they have a corner on the market in presenting this as a salvational truth when multitudes of people have already been saved without this knowledge? Yea, people are already in heaven saved who never passed its "searching scrutiny" (to quote Ellen White)!

The whole scheme is a sham. Especially when one understands that Ellen White herself never even believed this doctrine until 7 years after 1844 and taught something completely different during this time, all the while claiming angels and Christ as her instructors!

May God help to open the blind eyes of our brothers and sisters in Adventism!

The true reason why there is a disagreement of faith/SDA theologian states I am correct in the usage of the Greek words in the book of Hebrews:

Hello sister,

Of course I respect your freedom as a Christian to disagree with me on any and every point; however, it was and is my purpose to prove from the scriptures of truth and the facts of history that those who disagree with me do so based on their belief in Mrs. White's writings and SDA theology, and not because the Bible proves their positions. The plethora of responses I have received - all differing one from another, and in some cases contradicting each other - certainly has not bode well to prove any point conclusively to me, except to show that the Adventist position on 1844 is weak at best, and unprovable from a Bible standpoint.

I will refer to my previous emails and studies sent out to show that, indeed, my positions were proven from scripture. In your response to me you attempted to use Ellen White's writings to show me my error along with selected scripture removed entirely from its context in the chapters selected. I reject the premise that Ellen White's writings clarify the Bible, and instead contend - as the Reformers of old - that it is the Bible, and the Bible alone, which must prove our positions on any doctrinal point. In my original thesis I show every single scripture reference in the Bible - and there are twelve of them - to prove that "within the veil" can only refer to the most holy place, whither our forerunner has entered with His blood, and that this took place by the time Paul wrote the Hebrew believers before his death in 64AD. On this point alone not one person who has responded (and I have received replies from around the world) has been able to show me my error from the Word of God. Like you, many of them have attempted to use Ellen White's writings, but cannot show why this position is wrong from the Bible. And the truth is that they cannot; it is simply impossible, based on the simple fact that not one scripture exists in all the word of God that can show that "within the veil" refers to the holy place.

Finally, in response to your attempt to use Ellen White's writings as an authority in doctrinal matters, I simply responded with the facts of history to prove that she herself is an unreliable witness to any Bible doctrine since she taught error from the very beginning in regard to the "shut door". Whether one wishes to acknowledge this uncomfortable fact, it is nevertheless a fact of history that she and the pioneers did so teach. The fact that she later changed her position on this does not detract that she from the very beginning did teach this false doctrine (i.e.: that the world was lost and the door of mercy shut on sinners and all other churches in 1844), and that she claimed that God and Jesus and holy angels showed it to her. Is God a liar? Does God say one thing and change it later, and then advocate for the earlier visions supposedly shown to one His prophets to be later altered with whole sentences and paragraphs removed from later publications? Therefore, it is my contention that the SDA pioneers, along with Ellen White, are unreliable sources when it comes to establishing Bible truth, and that the Bible itself must be the Christian's foundation and sole rule in matters of faith and practice.

I am happy to respond further if that is your wish. Otherwise, I have respected your decision to remove you from my email list and am only replying to you out of Christian duty to defend the truth since you continue to contact me by email and to make unfounded charges that my previous replies have "no foundation in the Bible"; and yet you refuse, or are unable, to show me my error from the Word of God. If you have no appetite to do this I can understand; but I do not accept these charges when you have failed to prove your points from scripture, and when I have responded to each of your charges by using the Bible and history to prove my points.

One more point:

I was contacted yesterday by a professor of theology and doctor of Biblical languages - a Hebrew and Greek scholar - from the Adventist Theological Seminary in Bucharest, Romania. Although he still upholds 1844 and the SDA interpretation of an investigative judgment, even he acknowledges that I am correct in my understanding of Paul's term of "within the veil" referring to the most holy place, and that the language of the book of Hebrews supports that Christ entered the most holy place at His ascension. The way he reconciles this scriptural fact is by claiming that there is not a bipartite sanctuary in heaven (no two separate compartments of a holy and most holy place), so that Christ was able to enter directly into the presence of God to present His sacrifice. I thought it interesting that this theologian would accept part of Desmond Ford's argument that the earthly tabernacle represented heaven itself and not a literal sanctuary in heaven (a position I do not agree with), while attempting to defend the original Adventist interpretation of Christ entering into a separate work of judgment in 1844 that Ellen White and the pioneers are clear was supposed to also be connected with a literal move by Christ and God the Father into a literal most holy place in heaven.

So you see that SDA's themselves - from lay people to professors of theology - have such a wide array of interpretations on this point that it simply does injustice instead of just allowing the Bible to read plainly and clearly as it should.

However, I at least respect the professor for answering my questions from the Bible and from the Biblical languages instead of using Ellen White quotes.

Blessings to you,

I wish you well.

To an SDA theologian, seminarian, and doctor of Biblical languages:

Dear Sir,

Thank you for sharing your analysis. I believe you are correct when you say that the language and context of Hebrews supports the position that Christ entered the most holy place in 31AD rather than 1844. Of course this puts the traditional Adventist interpretation of an investigative judgment based on ancient Day of Atonement language thereby in question. It is my contention that when one understands the truth that Paul affirms in his book to the Hebrews - that the Day of Atonement, earthly sanctuary system, and Levitical priesthood stood only in types until the "times of reformation": when Christ would enter the true most holy place before the presence of God, to make full atonement for our sins by presenting His blood - then the rest of the New Testament makes perfect sense.

My main problem and area of concern is the multitude of interpretations that I have heard now from Adventists on this specific topic, for surely all of them cannot be correct since many of them contradict each other. One tells me that Christ only entered the holy place at His ascension and then moved to the most holy in 1844; another says that Christ entered the most holy at His ascension to dedicate the heavenly sanctuary and then went back into the holy place to await the judgment commencing in 1844; still another (your own view) says that there is no two part sanctuary in heaven but that Christ went into heaven itself into the presence of God and that the transition between compartments was all figurative, while the pioneers and Ellen White say the opposite, and that there are literal "holy places" in heaven and that Christ's move was a literal move into a separate compartment; others declare that there is no sanctuary at all; and then another view is that Christ ministered exactly according to the types, while others say this is not so. Can all of this be true at once? For to disagree with any of these views makes one a heretic in the eyes of their proponents! Can this Babel of voices convince me of my error? I should certainly think not when the Bible itself is clear in the book of Hebrews that Christ our forerunner entered "within the veil" to present His blood in atonement before God once it was shed "once for all". See Hebrews 10:10, 12, 19-20. The simplicity and purity of the gospel as held by the apostles of Christ could not be more clear or plain. Christ has brought us into covenant relation to God on an individual basis through His atonement, by virtue of the blood He shed on Calvary and through His high priestly intercession in our behalf. We are declared righteous - "justified" - through faith in the Son of God. This was the faith of the early Church, as well as the gospel of the Reformation which brought the Church out of the Dark Ages of Rome. It is the "everlasting gospel" declared to the world by the first angel flying in the midst of heaven in Revelation 14. And history bears out the truth that Luther even in his day preached the first and second angels' messages by condemning the purple harlot Babylon in his writings and theses. Ludwig Conradi brings out this point clearly in his book, "The Founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination". Conradi, who was a minister and church administrator in Germany for over 50 years, left the SDA denomination and joined the Seventh-day Baptists over these same issues: that is, after rejecting the unscriptural teaching of an investigative judgment commencing in 1844AD, and challenging the authority of Ellen White's writings which are termed "the spirit of prophecy" - a term which also the Mormons use to describe the body of writings which their prophet Joseph Smith penned for their church.

So how may one know which church has the true "spirit of prophecy"? Or whether either one is true or false? "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20.

I cannot in good conscience support or believe in Mrs. White as an inspired prophetess due to her unbiblical views on what she and the pioneers believed about the “shut door” in 1844 and her claims that angels told her these things that she later recanted and changed her mind about. Does God change like that? The scripture declares, “I am the Lord, I change not.” Malachi 3:6. Nor her unsubstantiated claims that Christ went to the most holy place in 1844.

Although you and I disagree on the theology surrounding the date of 1844, yet I consider you a Christian brother and wish you nothing but the best in Christ.

God’s blessings be with you as you continue to search for truth using the Word of God as your sole interpreter of faith.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Discussion on Clifford Goldstein and D.M. Canright:

Hello brother,

Thank you for your reply and for sharing these books. I read through "1844 Made Simple" and found some of Clifford Goldstein's arguments very interesting - especially his take on the language for the word "cleansed" as used in Daniel 8:14, and his argument that there is a connecting link to Leviticus 16 by way of linguistic association instead of the actual same word used. His other arguments, however, I found to be unbiblical and a far reach by way of argumentation and reasoning rather than clear convincing scripture proof. I was also surprised that when dealing with the book of Hebrews he never once touched on the crux of the argument that is often made against SDA theology on 1844 (including my own argument): that Christ went "within the veil" at His ascension, rather than in 1844, as the writer of Hebrews clearly teaches. This, to me, is the foundation of the Christian message - which also undermines and destroys SDA theology on this specific point - and which not one has been able to successfully disprove from the scriptures. I would be interested to know your thoughts on this, because, to date, not one has been able to answer this charge successfully. And that is a problem for me.

I did not read through the other book you sent, although I did skim over it. The reason being that I do not hold to Canright's positions on Bible doctrine, nor do I support the spirit that he held in regard to his own self-exaltation and pride of opinion. I have read two of his books and disagree strongly with his arguments where he tries to prove Sunday sacredness from scripture, and how he disparages those who supposedly fail to have a higher education and extensive learning. I believe he is very arrogant on those specific points.

I will say, however, that some of the facts he brings out regarding Mrs. White and her earlier visions on the shut door are verifiable, historic facts which cannot be disproved. On those points, as an honest Christian, I do have to agree with him, and I also reject Mrs. White's prophetic ministry since a prophet cannot contradict the Bible and still be a true prophet.

Thank you for your prayers in my behalf; I, too, pray that God will help you to clearly understand the sanctuary truth.

God bless and have a happy Sabbath.

An extensive dialogue with a brother on many different points in question:

Hello brother,

Thanks for your response. Of course I have to disagree with you on many of the points you raised, especially your inferences on my intents, since you are entirely ignorant of my intentions and motives as a human who cannot read hearts. I will also take your email point by point below by copying and pasting your comments and then answering each one. Your words will be in red. I have retained all emphasis the same as you originally included in your email.

Thank you Pastor Richards,

It has been a long time. I do appreciate some of what you have said in your response above, thanks. However, I also believe that there is some gross twisting of the truth, intent, and the timing of the information presented by EG White. I will begin with your first paragraph in your response above:

I'm not sure what you mean when you claim that there is "some gross twisting of the truth, intent, and timing" of information relating to Ellen White. I simply shared quotes directly from her pen that were dated by herself or James White. The intent of her messages are hers alone and explained by her own words.

Your supposition is that Christ entered into the most holy at his ascension. Consider the very text you submitted:

11 But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; **12** neither by the blood of goats and calves, **but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place**, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*.

It seems clear to me that Christ entered into the Holy Place. Please consider also, my interjected comments in the copy of the other text you submitted.

On this point you are incorrect. In my original study I submit my claims that Christ entered into the most holy place based on Hebrews 6:19-20 and 10:19-20 which says the following:

"Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that ***within the veil***; Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." Hebrews 6:19-20.

This verse plainly states that Christ went "***within the veil***". There are 5 texts that exist in the Bible with this exact language (ie: "within the veil"), and each and every one of them - without exception - refers explicitly and solely to the most holy place alone. Additionally, there are 7 texts in the Bible that use the language of "without the veil" or "before the veil", and in all instances – again, without exception – ever and only refer to being outside the most holy place and inside the holy. Paul clearly states that Christ went "*within the veil*" in his day; that is, inside the MOST HOLY PLACE.

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter **into the holiest** by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, ***through the veil***, that is to say, his flesh." Hebrews 10:19-20.

Again we have the clear statement that Christ went “***through the veil***” into the HOLIEST. It is as plain as day, my friend, and plain to see by all those who are not blinded by SDA indoctrination or the writings of Ellen White.

To continue on your commentary, however, of your claim that the word “holy place” in Hebrews 9:11-12 means only the first compartment of the sanctuary, I will here quote from a prominent SDA pioneer and scholar on this point:

“Thus when Paul says, as expressed in our common version (Hebrews 8:2), ‘A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man,’ it is literally in the original, ‘a minister of the holy places.’ And thus also when we read respecting the heavenly temple, ‘The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing,’ it is literally in the Greek, ‘the way of the holy places.’ Hebrews 9:8. So also where we read of the greater and more perfect tabernacle, in verse 12, that Christ ‘entered in once into the holy place,’ it is also literally ‘holy places.’ Again, in verse 24, we read in our common version the same thing, literally rendered, ‘the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true,’ which last word is plural in the original, showing that there are holy places in the heavenly temple. And again in Hebrews 10:19, the term ‘holiest’ is not, in the original ‘holy of holies,’ as in chap. 9:3, but simply ‘holy places.’ These passages form a most convincing argument that there must be two holy places in the heavenly temple. A fourth argument is found in the fact that each of the two holy places of the heavenly temple is definitely set forth in the description of that building not made with hands.” – *J.N. Andrews, “The Judgment, It’s Events, and Their Order”, page 66 (emphasis supplied).*

So while I may disagree with Andrews on some of the material contained in his book, he is correct in stating that the Greek word, “*ta hagia*”, in Hebrews is actually a plural word that can be translated as “holy places”; and is sometimes also translated as “holy place”, “sanctuary”, and “holiest of all” depending on the context. This is why many versions differ on the text you commented on and actually translate Hebrews 9:12 as “most holy place”, since it is nearly universally understood that Jesus Christ had to enter heaven into the presence of God to present His shed blood before His Father to make full atonement for sin. That God’s throne was and is in the most holy place in the Old Testament type is indisputable. It is ironic, therefore, that SDA’s work so hard to teach people around the world how important this type is - explaining it in graphs, pictures, prophecy lectures, and even constructing mini models of the earthy sanctuary - showing the ark of the covenant in the most holy place as God’s throne, and then claim that in the antitype, in heaven itself, God the Father is not in the most holy place at all but was instead in the holy place for over 1800 years!! They do this by claiming that God’s throne is moveable and has wheels; therefore (they claim), God moves His throne from the holy to the most holy in 1844 to fulfill the judgment scene of Daniel 7, and the cleansing of the sanctuary in Daniel 8:14!! But where in the type is God’s throne in the holy place for 359 days of the Jewish year, then only to move into the most holy place on the day of atonement on the 10th day of the 7th month?? You cannot have it both ways. Either the type is exact or it is not. If it is exact then the Father’s throne always was and still is in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary and is where Christ entered into, “within the veil”, to present His blood in atonement after His ascension to heaven. And this would thus fulfill the prophet’s words exactly, that the Messiah, within 70 weeks, would “make reconciliation (literally in the original “atonement”) for iniquity”. See Daniel 9:24. And, by contrast, if the type is not to be exactly fulfilled and can be altered at a whim to fit our peculiar theology, then how is Desmond Ford’s theology not true where he teaches that the earthly tabernacle simply represented heaven itself? Even a prominent theologian at a seminary in Romania contacted me and said my use of the Hebrew words was correct (he is a Hebrew scholar who still upholds 1844 and Ellen White’s ministry), and who also claims that there is no “bipartite”

sanctuary in heaven (meaning no heavenly sanctuary with two distinct compartments). So either way you have it, whether taking the earthly tabernacle as a type to be interpreted literally, or a type to be understood figuratively, you cannot show in either case that Christ went into the holy place to make atonement with His blood since God's throne is in the most holy place. So on this point, sir, you are incorrect.

I will continue:

23 *It was* therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; **(sacrifices of animals)** but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. **24** For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are* the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: **(Appearing in the presence of God does not necessarily mean Christ went into the most holy. The presence of God can easily be met in the Holy place).** **25** *nor* yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; **26** *for then* must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: (so, to me, Christ only once but now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. **(While there indeed was forgiveness in the old testament... it was only by faith as you said in a coming redeemer. If Christ failed all their forgiveness would have been wiped out... was it true and full forgiveness then?)** **27** And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: **28** so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

The cross of Christ looked back in time and sealed the forgives [sic] of all those who put their faith in him and then reached forward into the future to the end of the world, offering forgives [sic] to all who accept him.

Of course I agree with you that the cross of Christ is the central focus of human history, and that forgiveness of sin has always been offered through Christ and accepted by faith by those who looked forward to the cross, just as we look backward to the cross by faith for salvation. This is why Jesus is called "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world". Revelation 13:8. Yet your other statement above that "the presence of God could easily be met in the holy place" is without merit, foundation, or proof from the scriptures. Please show me where in the Bible it states that God's presence (that is, His literal presence; i.e.: the "shekinah glory"), or throne for that matter, were found in the holy place??

And finally...:

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, **(it seems to me that this text is saying WE are the ones who enter into the Holies of holies and "come boldly before the throne of God")** **20** by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; **(Jesus, at this time, consecrated the way for us by the sacrifice of His flesh).**

With all due respect, brother, and courteously I say to you, that you are substituting your own opinions for what the Bible plainly teaches. What "seems" to you to be teaching that it is only "we" who enter the most holy place (and I am assuming that you are referring to the "we" as those only who recognize Christ supposedly entering into the most holy place since 1844, which would only be Adventists and no other people in the world) plainly contradicts the fact that Paul wrote this book before his martyrdom in 64 AD, which means that this access to heaven "through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" was accessible by faith to every Christian believer who ever read his epistle.

Honestly, it never ceases to amaze me how SDA theology (remnant theology) can make the plainest truths dark and mysterious to the Christian world at large, and only understandable by SDA's themselves who, of course, have the special key of the "Spirit of Prophecy" (Ellen White's writings) to unlock what the Bible ACTUALLY means. I cannot disagree with you more fully, or in stronger terms, my brother.

Moving on now to your next paragraph regarding the "shut door theory" promulgated and taught by Ellen White through supposed vision, before later changing her views and then dishonestly hiding her former visions from the public at large:

I read the booklet 'A word to the little flock' and nowhere does it contain the small phrase interjected as you quoted: "**those who gave up their faith in the 1844 movement**". This is the sort of thing that is interjected by many critics of EG white who want to discount her ministry. I do believe that there was a closed door to those who opposed the 1844 movement. The entire vision, to me was given to Mrs. white as a **vision of events to happen even in our own future**. There indeed will come a time where the final close of probation happens and then the door will indeed be shut and that prayers then for the wicked will not be effectual.

Two points here: first, the comment in brackets was placed there by D.M. Canright to clarify this quote. It was not done in any sneaky fashion or in a dishonest way. That's why the comment is in brackets. It is clearly marked as the commenter's own words and not by the author of the quote itself. Secondly, it is 100%, absolutely, positively, factually accurate to clarify her quote as referring to those who rejected the 1844 movement. Just go back and read her original vision and subsequent testimonies, for this is exactly what she meant. I will here quote from Ellen White herself to prove this point. This is taken from her altered visions which were published later in 1851 in the book "Christian Experience and Teachings", after removing the more objectionable portions published in 1846 in "Word to the Little Flock":

"It was not long after the passing of the time, in 1844, that my first vision was given me. I was visiting Mrs. Haines at Portland, a dear sister in Christ, whose heart was knit with mine; five of us, all women, were kneeling quietly at the family altar. While we were praying, the power of God came upon me as I had never felt it before. I seemed to be surrounded with light, and to be rising higher and higher from the earth. I turned to look for the advent people in the world, but could not find them, when a voice said to me, 'Look again, and look a little higher.' At this, I raised my eyes, and saw a straight and narrow path, cast up high above the world. On this path the advent people were traveling to the city which was at the farther end of the path. They had a bright light set up behind them at the beginning of the path, which an angel told me was the 'midnight cry.' [See Matthew 25:6.] This light shone all along the path, and gave light for their feet, so that they might not stumble. If they kept their eyes fixed on Jesus, who was just before them, leading them to the city, they were safe. But soon some grew weary, and said the city was a great way off, and they expected to have entered it before. Then Jesus would encourage them by raising His glorious right arm, and from His arm came a light which waved over the advent band, and they shouted 'Alleluia!' Others rashly denied the light behind them, and said that it was not God that had led them out so far. The light behind them went out, leaving their feet in perfect darkness, and they stumbled and lost sight of the mark and of Jesus, and fell off the path down into the dark and wicked world below." – *Christian Experience and Teachings, page 57.*

It is as plain as day that she is making reference to those who were part of the 1844 movement who later denied that God was in it. She refers to the "advent band", the "midnight cry", etc. How you can deny these plain facts I do not know. To say that she was speaking of future events is either disingenuous or ignorant of early Adventist history. In sharing her original unedited vision,

it is plainly shown that she later altered it - along with the collusion of her husband, and later the church - in order to falsely claim that she had never taught a “shut door” on the world by vision. The facts prove otherwise, and show her to be just what she is: a false prophet and a liar.

To me.. that whole signed testimony you quoted by L.S Burdick is suspect. However, let's say that all the early pioneers indeed believed that the final close of probation happened in 1844. **So what?** not that I believe that... Remember, it was shown that God even had his hand over some important facts in william millers own study and presentation that led to the misrepresentation of the event in 1844. **So what?** This supposed error only shows me that no one is perfect and even mrs White was able to MISS INTERPRET the visions she saw. This in no way invalidates her entire ministry at the start. There are **so many** other 'visions' she saw as a prophet (meaning messenger, counselor etc and not predictions ...tho some of those happened also) that indeed did come to pass and God showed her ahead of what was going on behind closed doors etc. and that her messages and counsel arrived just in time. Ellens ministry met the conditions of a true prophet many many times.. unless you are going to take the stance that those writings were manufactured.

The testimony of L.S. Burdick is only one of dozens of witnesses who testified to the fact that Ellen White taught from vision that the world and sinners were lost in 1844. In my former correspondence I shared with you quotes from the pioneers themselves showing that this was a common theme and understanding for them. The issue at hand is not whether they taught error by mistake and later corrected their views; the issue is that Ellen White also taught this error while claiming that God showed this error to her. She then later changed her views along with the other pioneers and hid these earlier visions or altered them to make them say something different altogether. The scripture is plain on this point:

“And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.” Deuteronomy 18:21-23.

“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isaiah 8:20.

These scriptures are not conditional. They do not say that a prophet can be mistaken some of the time, or teach some error and some truth. The plain fact that Ellen White taught error on this point at the earliest stages of her ministry, and in her very first vision (which was later altered to try and cover this error up), forever disqualifies her from owning the title of “true prophet”. ***Period.*** And while you claim that she had many true prophecies, I can also show you many false and factually erroneous ones too: statements that the Ellen White Estate has had to do damage control over – from her scientifically inaccurate explanation of the planetary systems with the wrong number of moons around Jupiter and Saturn; to claiming there is life on Saturn; the absurd claim of amalgamation of man and beast both before and after the flood, thus giving rise to certain races of men today; to fanatical time-setting that she herself was involved in up until 1851 along with Joseph Bates. And there is much more! Her later denouncing of Pentecostal and charismatic worship practices ignores the fact that she herself was involved in the grossest fanaticism herself in those early days. Witnesses (see the Israel Dammon court case as quoted in the local newspaper of her day) state that she was involved in crawling on the floor, was worshipped and prayed to as “the Imitation of Christ”, and “prophesied” that people would go to hell if they did not believe her visions and were not baptized that very night. It is telling that many of the pioneers themselves who worked closest with her in labor eventually lost confidence in her so-called prophetic gift: Uriah Smith, J.H. Kellogg, A.T. Jones, E.J. Waggoner, W.W. Prescott, A.G. Daniells, A.F.

Ballenger, D.M. Canright, L.R. Conradi and many others. Here are a few more, as detailed by Canright in his book, "The Life of Mrs. E.G. White, Her Claims Refuted":

"J.B. Cook and T.M. Preble, the pioneers who started the movement, both renounced it; O.R.L. Crozier, Ann Arbor, Mich., has renounced the Sabbath; Elder B.F. Snook; Elder W.H. Brinkerhoof, of Iowa, has renounced the faith; Elder Moses Hull, the ablest speaker they ever had, and Elder Shortridge, a minister of much talent, has also gone the same way; Elders Hall and Stephenson, at the time very prominent in the work, went to the Age-to-Come party; C.B. Reynolds, of New York, Elder H.C. Blanchard, Avilla, Mo., renounced the doctrine; ditto T.J. Butler, of the same state; Elder L.L. Howard, Maine, H.F. Haynes, New Hampshire, left them; Nathan Fuller, Wellsville, N.Y., became a libertine; M.B. Czechowski; H.F. Case, Elder Cranmer and Philip Strong, all of Michigan, left them...

"Elder J.B. Frisbie, their pioneer and most efficient preacher for years in Michigan, finally left them. Dr. Lee, of Minnesota, who inaugurated the work among the Swedes, now opposes them. Elder A.B. Oyen, missionary to Europe, and editor of their Danish paper, has renounced the faith. Living right at the head of the work for many years, he had the best of opportunity to know all about its workings. Elder D.B. Oviatt, for many years president of the Pennsylvania Conference, renounced the faith, and is now a Baptist minister...

"So Elder Rosquist and Elder Whitelaw, both of Minnesota, left them and gone to the Baptists. Other ministers of the West have also gone over to the Baptists. C.A. Russell, Otsego, Mich., an excellent man, once preached that doctrine with me, but is now a Methodist. H.E. Carver, H.C. Blanchard, J.W. Cassady, A.C. Long, Jacob Brinkerhoof, J.C. Day, H.W. Ball, Goodenough, Bunch, and others, once members of that church, have written against it. Elder Hiram Edson and Elder S.W. Rhodes, noted pioneers in the work. The sad example of SDA leading ministers who have been guilty of adultery, proves that their church has nothing to boast of over other churches in the purity of its ministers and members." – *Canright*.

Now, your quote from the 9 SDA ministers shows clearly that there indeed was some confusion and even likely misinterpretation of God's messages ... The part that is left out of your quote follows right after in the text where the individual who feared he could never be saved was ministered to and pulled into the arms of Jesus in salvation.

Yes, and how do you think these men got confused over who could be saved after 1844?? From the false visions and testimonies of Ellen White, who told her people not even to pray for sinners who rejected the message!!

The next long quote you put in your response was from James white... and, again, his commentary shows that the early advent believers indeed thought that the world was coming to an end and that mercy was forever closed. However, as I brought out in my other comments above, the supposed visionary support from Ellen White is given out of context and out of time, but rather is to be used for their immediate generation and our future. Your comment about truth being progressive is right on and appreciated. And that is clearly what happened. The ministry of the Seventh Day Adventist Church is surrounded by innumerable evidences of Gods direction. Also, the ministry of many other denominations after the generation that rejected the 1844 movement is also full of evidence of Gods working and support as Jesus said.. "I have other sheep, not of this fold".

Contrary to what you claim, Ellen White's visionary support is not taken out of context or out of time; but rather it was universally understood in its proper context by her own contemporaries as

speaking to their own time and circumstances; which is exactly why James White and every other pioneer in her day - including the 9 ministers mentioned - all acted in that way: they were directly acting on Ellen White's "visionary" counsel. To claim otherwise is either dishonest or blind. What you accuse me of (taking Ellen White's counsel out of context) would better be leveled at her own husband James, if indeed he was acting and writing out of sorts from his wife's own counsel. But of course this is not the case at all. He printed and published her visions, and wrote out his views that were in harmony with her own. What proof can you furnish from history that Ellen White did not wish to be understood literally? Or that her visions of a shut door on the world in 1844 did not actually mean what she said? The burden of proof is on you, not me. I contend that she meant just what she said: that the world was lost, that sinners were not to be prayed for, and that the whole world was left in darkness in 1844. She then changed her mind nearly 7 years after the fact, and these statements were later removed and republished under the false pretense that she had never said these things at all. Again, all hallmarks of a false prophet, against which none can successfully defend, except it be by outright blind denial of the facts of history and the sworn testimony of those who surrounded her.

The SDA Church would have us all believe that the multitudes of those who saw her in vision and heard her speak with their own ears were all liars and that only Ellen White was telling the truth about her detractors. But nothing could be further from the truth. Even Jesus Christ Himself laid down a principle in the scriptures that "in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established". Matthew 18:16; Deuteronomy 15. The indisputable facts of history prove that, contrary to her own claims of inspiration and the heroic efforts and attempts by SDA apologists to change and reinterpret history, Ellen White was indeed a false prophet.

And now regarding your commentary about all EG Whites other works..It is evident in history that while the idea of plagiarism was a potential problem.. it is also true that there were no real heavy laws with penalties etc etc for using other literary works. It was not a crime to use others work in support of your own message.

Regarding the charges of plagiarism, again, you are simply wrong and incorrect on the facts. While the copyright laws may have been different in the late 1800's, the principles of plagiarism - ie: "literary theft" - was something which secular authors and authorities even in her day recognized as wrong, and as incompatible with the principles of Christian honesty. For your own benefit, I will include a link to an article found in the Healdsburg Enterprise, printed March 20, 1889, which also made this same claim and directly accused Mrs. Ellen G. White of being a plagiarist and literary thief. Below the link I will include only a small portion of the article mentioned.

<https://www.nonegw.org/egw77.shtml>

"Webster defines Plagiarist as follows: 'One that purloins the writings of another and puts them off as his own.' Plagiarism, according to the same authority, is: 'The act of purloining another man's literary works, or *introducing passages from another man's writings and putting them off as one's own*; literary theft. (Swift)' Italics our own...

"We desire in this article to compare a few extracts from the following books: 'History of the Sabbath,' (Andrews); 'Life of Wm. Miller,' (White); 'History of the Waldenses,' (Wylie); 'The Sanctuary,' (Smith); and 'History of the Reformation' (D'Aubigne), with corresponding extracts from Mrs. White's 'Great Controversy,' [*Spirit of Prophecy*] Vol. IV, in order to see if Mrs. White has 'introduced passages from another man's writings and put them off as her own.' **If she has done this, then, according to Webster, Mrs. White is a plagiarist, a literary thief.** (Emphasis supplied)..." - *Healdsburg Enterprise, March 20, 1889.*

The article then continues on to show, in great length, each passage that Ellen White copied from the aforementioned books and included in her book “Great Controversy” without ever giving any credit to the aforementioned works. In fact, this became such a problem and byword to the public that the Church had to republish her book in 1911 after much editing in order to include proper credits to the works that she had originally stolen from. And, unfortunately, “Great Controversy” was not the only book filled with stolen material. Her book, “Sketches from the Life of Paul”, was eventually taken out of circulation due to claims she had stolen her material from the publishers Conybeare and Howson; and even her famous “health reform vision” of 1863 and subsequent health and dietary counsels were taken directly from L.B. Coles book, “Philosophy of Health”, published in 1851 – 12 years **before** Ellen White’s supposed vision from God.

The article concludes:

“Eld. Healy would have the Committee believe that she is not a reading woman! And also asked them to believe that the *historic facts and even the quotations are given her in vision* without depending on the ordinary sources of information!!...Now we ask, would not any literary critic judging from the quotations adduced and a comparison of the passages indicated from the quotations indicated, conclude that Mrs. White in writing her ‘Great Controversy,’ Vol. IV had before her the open books and from them took both ideas and words? We ask the candid reader if we have sustained our position. Does she not stand convicted of ‘introducing passages from another man’s writings and putting them as her own’? If so, we have proved the point at issue, and, according to Webster, ***Mrs. White is a plagiarist, a literary thief.***” (Emphasis supplied). – [Ibid].

And so you see that even the secular authorities of her day proved her to be a plagiarist – i.e.: a “literary thief”.

Finally..Ellen White had a dedicated and talented team to help her in her writings, but this does not mean that they are the ones who wrote them. Ellen White herself would send out her work for review and revision and then would re-read and then pass any of the revisions or even additions that were done to her work. She was a research author and indeed found other literary works that supported the overall message in words that were true to the visions that she saw.

Yes, Ellen White did indeed have a team of literary assistants, who were termed “copyists” for her works. The fact that they also did help to re-write her books, inserting their own thoughts and ideas into various passages, is again indisputable. Marian Davis and Fannie Bolton plainly stated that they did this, and the Ellen G. White Estate acknowledges these facts. This is obviously a sensitive topic for Adventists who wish to remain true and faithful to what they term “the spirit of prophecy”; for, to them, to question Mrs. White’s inspiration in the least is to cast doubt on her ministry as a whole and to call into question other doctrines which she advocated as true. **The little known and unacknowledged fact is that the lynchpin to SDA “truth” is a consistent belief and faith in Ellen White’s writings as an inspired guide to understanding the scriptures.** However, many very honest men who were true and faithful to the SDA message and mission, were willing to look this issue plainly in its face, though it caused much wrestling of soul and conscience to be willing to follow where their conclusions and research eventually led them. I will again share a link below to just one article written on this issue (though there are many, many articles on this topic put out by the SDA church itself). This was written by Dr. Fred Veltman, Former Chairman of the Religion Department of Pacific Union College, who was asked by the SDA church in 1982 to examine the charges of plagiarism against Ellen White brought forth by Walter Rea in his book, “The White Lie”. His conclusions were surprising to say the least, and not at all what the church expected. Dr. Veltman showed in his research that Ellen

White used up to 23 different sources in order to compile and write her book “Desire of Ages”, and that up to 31% of this book was directly taken from these works in either direct quotes or paraphrases without giving proper credit to those sources (again, this is called “plagiarism” according to Webster). Although he himself remained a believer in Mrs. White’s prophetic gift, he went on to say:

“I must admit at the start that in my judgment this is the most serious problem to be faced in connection with Ellen White’s literary dependency. It strikes at the heart of her honesty, her integrity, and therefore her trustworthiness.” – *Dr. Fred Veltman, Ministry Magazine, December 1990.*

http://www.truthorfables.com/Desire_of_Ages_Veltman.htm

Pastor Richards..I feel that you are, for some reason, using some faulty, out of context sources in supporting your exit from Ellen White as an inspired prophet of God. What is the real reason you are throwing her whole ministry out like the baby with the bath water?

I am not sure what you are insinuating by your comment above. Do you mean to say that it is your belief that the evidences I have provided are not the real reason I have lost faith in Ellen White? Because, if so, again *you are wrong*. The evidences and proofs I have included for you are the exact reason why I have rejected her ministry. It is because she does not pass the Bible test of being a true prophet. I find it interesting that so many who have responded cannot see this. Instead, I have been accused of cherishing some secret sin as the real reason I have rejected Ellen White’s counsel, or some other sort of nonsense like this. No, my brother, I tell you the facts just as I have written them. The abundant evidence from historical data and facts, combined with the unfortunate fact that Ellen White contradicts the Bible when it comes to Christ’s high priestly work and ministry in heaven, compels me to deny her inspiration. I choose to instead uphold *the Bible, and the Bible alone*, as the standard and test of all doctrine and the basis of all reform. It is my prayer that you will choose to do the same.

You are denying the light behind you, pastor, and I plead for you to re-examine all the positive evidences that Mrs. Whites Ministry was and is of God. I can’t believe it is too late even though you took the initial step many years ago to leave the organized SDA church and now you are leaving also the light revealed in Mrs. Whites ministry.

Unfortunately, I have no such evidences as you suggest; otherwise I would love to have the simplicity of faith to believe. But I cannot. Has Mrs. White written many beautiful things? Yes, as any Christian author might. But to believe in her as an inspired prophetess of God with an infallible message of truth, I cannot. There is too much evidence against her. I leave you with one final piece of history. This is a link to a newspaper account including sworn courtroom testimony of witnesses for both the prosecution and defense in the case and trial of Elder Israel Dammon, an associate of Ellen White (then Harmon). Please read without prejudice her account, and then compare that with the sworn witness testimony of both her friends and enemies in court (including the sheriff who made the arrest) and see who is telling the truth. I cannot and will not, as a Christian, have anything to do with this sort of dishonesty (or perhaps self-deception) on her part whatsoever. Facts don’t lie.

<https://www.nonegw.org/israel.htm>

https://www.nonegw.org/israel_news.shtml

God Bless in your ongoing ministry and may His spirit guide you into all truth.

Thank you, brother. I also wish the same for you. Remember, however, that the Spirit of truth can and will only guide us into the scriptures of truth, and not into outside sources. John 16:13; 17:17.

Your brother in Christ,

God is consistent with His own principles/the blotting out of sin:

Hello sister,

Good to hear from you as always and thank you for sharing your thoughts. I appreciate your honesty and questions, although I obviously disagree with some of your conclusions.

The first thing I will comment on is your statement regarding the burning of your heart while studying present truth. I, too, was greatly blessed during those years of studying and preaching various scripture truths; however, I will say that it is the Bible, and not any feelings on our part, that establishes what truth is. The Mormons are very adamant and persuasive in encouraging their converts to pray and ask God for a “burning in the bosom” or a “witness of the Spirit” that the Book of Mormon is true, and as a result (in addition, of course, to their very aggressive missionary work and proselytizing) they are also one of the fastest growing churches in the world.

Continuing on the main issue at hand: that it is the Bible which must establish truth on each and every point of faith for the Christian; it is because of this reason - and this reason alone - why I am compelled to deny an investigative judgment commencing in 1844. The scriptures are abundantly clear and explicitly plain upon this point: that Jesus Christ did indeed enter the most holy place at His ascension, and not in 1844 as SDAs claim. The three-fold witness and account of the rending of the veil of the temple from top to bottom at the death of Jesus on the cross - as recorded in the synoptic gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke - should be evidence enough that the way into the holiest of all was opened to mankind through the death of God’s Only Begotten Son on the cross of Calvary; and indeed the book of Hebrews tells us this plainly and clearly enough:

“But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified...Having therefore, brethren, *boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus*, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, *through the veil*, that is to say, his flesh; And having an high priest over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.” Hebrews 10:12–14, 19-22.

Again, in simply looking at what the scripture says above, and not using any of our own human reasoning, opinions, feelings, or preconceived ideas (which we are all, unfortunately, prone to do), it is as plain as day that Jesus Christ went “*through the veil*”, “*into the holiest*” to stand as our high priest in the presence of God, and that He did this by the time Paul wrote his epistle to the Hebrews before his death in 64 AD, and not in 1844 AD as SDA’s claim.

I will here also address your other comment where you suggest that Christ may have gone into the most holy place but we have not...?? My dear sister, there is a serious fallacy in this comment of yours for several reasons which I will here briefly mention. First, if you did indeed seriously and actually believe this: that is, that Christ went into the most holy place at His ascension (which the Bible does abundantly prove), then you could no longer be a Seventh-day Adventist and would have to join me in my faith, for this is the exact reason why I left! It is because the official theology of the SDA church - along with the supposed visions of Ellen White - all teach the opposite of what you just said. They teach that Christ did not enter the most holy place at His ascension, but rather that Jesus had to tarry in the holy place for over 1,810 years until 1844, and this is taught as “the central pillar” of Adventist doctrine - the proverbially “glue” that binds the rest of the whole scheme together; while the Bible teaches that Jesus our Savior entered the “holiest of all” into the very presence of God “for us” at His ascension, and not in 1844! *It is impossible that both of these*

positions can be correct. Either the Bible is correct, or the SDA church and Ellen White are correct, but it cannot be both. I choose God's Word to establish my faith, and not the traditions of men.

Continuing to my second point, your comment that only Jesus could enter the most holy place but not us could not be further from the truth, and I will state why. Again, alluding to the scripture above, Paul states plainly:

“Having therefore, **BRETHREN**, BOLDNESS TO ENTER INTO THE HOLIEST BY THE BLOOD OF JESUS, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated **FOR US**, *through the veil*, that is to say, his flesh; And having an high priest over the house of God; **LET US** DRAW NEAR WITH A TRUE HEART IN FULL ASSURANCE OF FAITH, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.” Hebrews 10:19-22.

To the un-blinded eye, this is clearly speaking to: 1) the “brethren”; 2) to “us”; 3) to the “house of God”; 4) to those who have had their “hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience” and their “bodies washed with pure water”; etc. In other words, there is absolutely nothing in the text to suggest that the most holy place experience which Jesus entered into at His ascension was limited alone to Himself. To the contrary, the whole purpose of Christ presenting Himself in the presence of God was *for us*, *in our behalf*, and to grant us access to the very throne of God! Please read the following statements to show this fact, and to prove that Christ wishes for us to be with Him where He is (John 14:3):

“Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And *hath raised us up together*, and made us *sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*.” Ephesians 2:5-6.

“If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and *your life is hid with Christ in God*.” Colossians 3:1-3.

“Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. *Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace*, that *we* may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.” Hebrews 4:14-16.

“Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also *we have access by faith* into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.” Romans 5:1-2.

“For through him *we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father*.” Ephesians 2:18.

“In whom we have boldness and *access with confidence by the faith of him*.” Ephesians 3:12

“Having therefore, brethren, *boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus*, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, *through the veil*, that is to say, his flesh; And having an high priest over the house of God; *Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith*, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;).” Hebrews 10:19-23.

These are only a few of the many promises in scripture that assure the Christian *that we now have direct access to God* - to the throne of grace - through the sacrifice and mediation of Jesus Christ. Wonderful assurance for every believer in Christ!

Continuing on to your email and comments; yes, it is true that the SDA church does lay out doctrine in an orderly way - some of it truth, and some of it error - and this is one aspect that attracts many to study with Adventists and to overlook their errors. Specifically, there are many suppositions made in regard to an investigative judgment in 1844 (which the Bible never anywhere specifically teaches); therefore, much of SDA theology and Bible prophecy is made to fit into that assumption. For example, the judgment scene of Daniel 7 is overlaid in a "repetition and enlargement" model on top of Daniel 8:14 and the mention of the "cleansing of the sanctuary" - thus attempting to prove that this is one and the same event. But this cannot be. A simple unbiased reading of the text in Daniel 7 proves conclusively that it is not the saints, but rather the little horn power and fourth beast which is brought into judgment; whereby his "dominion is taken away" and his body is "given to the burning flame". The saints are not judged at all in this chapter as SDA theology claims (for indeed Adventists claim that the life record at that time is closely investigated, and every sin examined to see if it has been confessed and forsaken), but rather the saints are vindicated from the accusations of Satan through the little horn power, and the saints are given the kingdom! What a contrast in theology is this! On the one hand, the Bible speaks of the judging of the Papacy and the beast being cast into the lake of fire, and then the vindication of God's people from the long years of persecution by the papal little horn (Daniel 7:8-12, 21-22, 25-27); and on the other, SDA theology and the visions of Ellen White teach that it is not the beast being judged but God's people, where their sins are brought into remembrance before God and their lives closely scrutinized to see if they are worthy of eternal life! Again, the Bible teaches that this is a judgment on the Satanic little horn power; while Ellen White teaches that this is a judgment on God's people whom Christ has sanctified, and that God is now remembering all of their sins in order to find out who really belongs to Him! The contrast could not be more complete. And all of this in the face of the scriptures which clearly state the following:

"The Lord knoweth them that are His." 2 Timothy 2:19.

And again:

"Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; **AND THEIR SINS AND THEIR INIQUITIES WILL I REMEMBER NO MORE.** Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." Hebrews 10:15-18.

And then follows in the very next verses the reason why this can be:

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; And having an high priest over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Hebrews 10:19-22.

The Old Testament sanctuary, or earthly tabernacle, was simply a type of what Christ would do in accomplishing our salvation, and it was only to stand until Type met antitype in the death of God's Son on the cross for our atonement. The book of Hebrews is clear that Christ is of a better and higher order of priesthood - after the order of Melchizedek - and does not fit in exactly to the

Levitical types. That is to say, that the particulars of the earthly sanctuary system taught spiritual truths, but not every particular was a binding creed upon each action and movement of God and Christ in heaven. For example, there are not seven Holy Spirits bound to the holy place of a heavenly sanctuary (see Revelation 4:5); and neither was Christ constrained to remain quarantined in the holy place for 1,810 years until 1844. The claim to the contrary is unprovable from the Bible; especially given the fact that there are explicit scriptures which state the opposite: that Christ did go directly to the presence of God “into the holiest” at His ascension.

Even so, yet the three compartments of the earthly system still do represent eternal truths of which you mentioned: justification, sanctification, and glorification. But the sanctuary system is simply an illustration of truth; a type, and not the reality. The “weak and beggarly elements” (Galatians 4:9) of the gospel in symbols - as represented in the Jewish system - could but faintly represent the heavenly truth of the atonement and the completeness of the offering of Christ for sin which God provided to the human race. The fact that Jesus fulfilled all of the Old Testament types in His death, burial, resurrection, and high priestly ministry in heaven - where He intercedes in our behalf and presents His blood in atonement before His Father - is the true substance of the matter. This subject could go on in depth and yet never hope to reach the length, and breadth, and depth, and height, of this overwhelmingly profound subject of redemption and the infinite love of God toward His children!

Continuing, you asked a question also regarding how God’s forgiveness can allow for the backslider or for those who turn away from Christ after once believing. In other words, you are asking how God can atone for sin and seemingly blot those sins from the books of record, while trying to reconcile the fact that some can and do fall away and perish in their sins. Perhaps the following scriptures can help to shed light on this mystery:

“For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness **FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS THAT ARE PAST**, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” Romans 3:23-26

“But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. **All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him** [in the original Hebrew: “shall not be remembered”]: in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord GOD: and not that he should return from his ways, and live? But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done **shall not be mentioned** [in the original: “shall not be remembered”]: IN HIS TRESPASS WHICH HE HATH TRESPASSED, and IN HIS SIN WHICH HE HATH SINNED, in **THEM** shall he die.” Ezekiel 18:21-24.

“When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; **for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die.**” Ezekiel 18:26.

“Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.” Micah 7:18-19.

“Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; **And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.**” Hebrews 10:15-17.

“Remember these, O Jacob and Israel; for thou art my servant: I have formed thee; thou art my servant: O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me. *I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins: return unto me; for I have redeemed thee.*” Isaiah 44:22.

“Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, *when* [in the original Greek: “so that”] the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” Acts 3:19.

“And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.” Colossians 2:10-14.

“If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” 1 John 1:9.

From the scriptures quoted above, it would seem that the believer in Christ has remission, or forgiveness, of sins which are in the past; that those sins are cast into the sea and removed from God’s remembrance, having been blotted out by confession and repentance by the blood of the cross; and that if one falls away, it is for those sins which he or she has committed in transgression that they die for, and not for those which are past. But I speak by permission and not by commandment, for this is only supposition on my part and based on how I read what the Bible says. But I think there will be more evidence to support this position as we continue and as I address your last point.

Finally, to speak to your belief that God is not bound by His own rules, and that claim supposedly proving that Enoch, Elijah, Moses, and all the saints resurrected in Christ’s day, could be taken to heaven without first having their sins blotted out in a supposed investigative judgment; I deny this supposition, and instead present to you that this is actually proof of the points I raised above: that God does, indeed, blot out the sins of believers once confessed and forsaken. This is consistent with showing how God can take people to heaven prior to 1844 - it is because there is no investigative judgment or courtroom setting in 1844 at all! The Bible states that men are judged after their death (Hebrews 9:27), at the second coming of Christ (2 Timothy 4:1), and after the millennium (Revelation 20:11-15); but nowhere does the Bible teach of a judgment in 1844. How does Daniel 8:14 teach an investigative judgment?? Where in that verse, or in the context of the chapter, or in the language of the Hebrew, is anything shown or spoken of regarding a judgment on God’s people?? It is dealing plainly with the justifying, or “setting right”, of God’s sanctuary and church from the trampling down of the little horn - cleansing it from the errors of paganism and papalism; and has nothing to do with investigating and judging the saints. I plead with someone - anyone - to show me otherwise conclusively from scripture alone. It is simply not there!

So, in conclusion, and to answer your point, God is actually consistent with His own rules and not breaking them by taking people to heaven prior to 1844; precisely because there was no need to await a future judgment to determine whether their sins were confessed and forsaken. No, the Bible on this point is plain: they had their past sins forgiven (Romans 3:25); blotted out (Isaiah 44:22); cast into the depths of the sea (Micah 7:19); pardoned (Jeremiah 5:20); they had accepted the righteousness of Christ in their behalf (Isaiah 61:10), and had become reconciled to God by the death of His Son which was promised to them (Romans 5:10); they were justified by faith (Romans 3:28; 5:1); saved by God's grace alone through faith alone (Ephesians 2:8-9); and they rejoiced in God through whom they received the atonement (Romans 5:11)! Yea, God knew them that were His (2 Timothy 2:19); and they were found to be more than conquerors through Him that loved them and died to save them (Romans 8:37). Therefore, they washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb (Revelation 7:14); and were found worthy of everlasting life (1 Thessalonians 2:12); and now serve God day and night in His temple (Revelation 7:15).

Again I say that God IS bound by His own rules, including the Ten Commandments. He is the Only True God and does not worship any other God (Isaiah 44:8); He hates idols (Isaiah 2:18; 10:10-11; Ezekiel 30:13); He does not profane His own name (Leviticus 22:32; Ezekiel 36:22-23); He keeps the Sabbath (Exodus 31:17); Christ honored His Father (John 8:49); He does not murder (Ezekiel 18:31-32; John 8:44); He does not commit adultery but is instead pure (Habakkuk 1:13); He does not steal (Leviticus 19:11; Jeremiah 7:9; 23:30; Matthew 19:17-19; John 10:10); He cannot lie (Titus 1:2; Hebrews 6:18); and He does not covet anything that is ours since He owns all things (Isaiah 66:1-2; Psalm 50:9-12). God is consistent and does not change (Malachi 3:6; James 1:17). God did not bless people in the past for lying as you claim; but rather He winked at their ignorance and forgave their sin (for lying is a sin), and blessed them for protecting life (as in the case of the Hebrew midwives, and Rahab in hiding the spies). It is because God is merciful that He forgave them and blessed them in spite of their sinful weakness, and not because He violates His rules and countenances sin. "It is of the LORD'S mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness." Lamentations 3:22-23.

And now, what can be said to these things? Have I not proven all things from the scriptures of truth? Shall not the Holy Spirit be our divine witness and the Bible our infallible guide? I hope that some of this commentary will help open your eyes and help you to consider what the Bible actually teaches in regard to the things which you have spoken. It is my sincere prayer that God will help you to study these things as a faithful Berean; to "prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thessalonians 5:21); and to reject those things which cannot be clearly substantiated by the Word of God.

May God bless and guide you in my prayer, in Jesus' name.

Even so, come, Lord Jesus! The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.

Sincerely in Christ,

Pastor J. Isaac Richards