

# Was the blood of the sacrifice, in relation to God's sanctuary service depicted in the Bible, ever described as being defiled, or a medium for transporting sin into the sanctuary?

By Timothy Ward

This study is an exposition of biblical text that substantiates the theological position that the blood of the sacrifice was only ever considered to be Most Holy to God. In order to prove this theological position, it will be necessary to use a comparative study encompassing both biblical text and the writings of Ellen G White. Because it is my belief that the Bible has clear and precise instruction regarding the blood of the sacrifice, I will endeavor to allow the Bible to interpret itself wherever possible and therefore minimize my personal opinions upon the text.

The writings of Ellen G. White play a pivotal role for the SDA Church's position in relation to the sanctuary doctrine. Whilst Ellen G. White never presented a theological doctrinal position of her own, her writings are, however, used to substantiate and validate theological understanding presented to the church by other SDA pioneers. In order to show the church's position in relation to the blood of the sacrifice, it will be necessary to quote from her writings to substantiate theological positions held by the church. The necessity to quote from Ellen White's writings stems from the fact that biblical evidence, which should validate the blood of the sacrifice as being defiled with sin, has been, to my knowledge, impossible to render. I would like nothing more than to use line-upon line, precept upon precept, for both "for and against", in the exposition of the blood of the sacrifice, allowing the word of God to be its own interpreter. However, from a biblical exegesis, it renders to my own understanding, an impossible avenue of investigation.

I have, at various times past, asked SDA ministers to explain from the word of God biblical evidence for the blood of the sacrifice being defiled with sin. To this day I am yet to have a response.

The Seventh Day Adventist (SDA) sanctuary doctrine gives a twofold meaning to the blood of the sacrifice. The SDA understanding of Old Testament theology in reference to the "daily" sacrifice defiles the sanctuary, whilst the blood of the sacrifice, pertaining to the yearly Day of Atonement, cleanses the sanctuary. However, in the New Testament, the blood of the sacrifice in SDA sanctuary doctrine is depicted as Jesus Christ's blood which cleanses the sinner from all unrighteousness, yet also transfers sin to the Heavenly Sanctuary to defile the Most Holy Place.

It is important to note that this study and the following discourse of investigation is not to prove or disprove the Investigative Judgment doctrine held by the SDA church. This study is aimed at the key principle building blocks of the gospel of salvation and the truths that the Bible bears testimony to. If investigation of the scriptures cannot support the blood of the sacrifice as being defiled with sin, consequently that brings forth the logical conclusion that all other theological positions associated with this doctrine need to be brought back under biblical investigation.

Before we begin this scriptural inquiry, it is imperative to substantiate a clear and precise biblical fact, one that should not require explanation. However, I feel it necessary to clarify the issue right from the beginning. That is to say, that which is called by God as being *Most* 2

*Holy* cannot also be corrupt, defiled, polluted, or abominable in simultaneous action to its holiness, especially when referring to the blood of the sacrifice which encompasses the symbolic reference of the life of Jesus Christ. To put it simply, that which is *Holy* is by biblical definition, the complete opposite to that which is *defiled*.

**1. The meat of the sin offering as depicted in all biblical application is called by God as Most Holy**

The meat of the sin offering was also regarded by God as being Most Holy. This is substantiated by the witnesses within the following texts of the “*leaven*” which, by biblical definition is symbolic of sin in relation to the sacrificial offering, as this “*leaven*” was not to be mixed with that deemed Most Holy.

The Bible states in Lev 2:10-11

And that which is left of the meat offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': *it is a thing most holy* of the offerings of the Lord made by fire.<sup>11</sup> **No meat offering**, which ye shall bring unto the Lord, *shall be made with leaven*: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the Lord made by fire.

Lev 10:12

And Moses spake unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons that were left, Take the meat offering that remaineth of the offerings of the Lord made by fire, *and eat it without leaven* beside the altar: for it is *most holy*.

Lev 6:16-18

And the remainder thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat: with *unleavened bread* shall it be eaten in the holy place; in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation they shall eat it.<sup>17</sup> It shall *not be baken with leaven*. I have given it unto them for their portion of my offerings made by fire; *it is most holy*, as is the *sin offering*, and as the *trespass offering*.<sup>18</sup> All the males among the children of Aaron shall eat of it. It shall be a statute for ever in your generations concerning the offerings of the Lord made by fire: every one that toucheth them *shall be holy*.

Lev 2:5

And if thy oblation be a *meat offering* baken in a pan, it shall be of fine flour *unleavened*, mingled with oil.

Ex 34:25

Thou shalt *not offer* the *blood of my sacrifice with leaven*; neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the Passover be left unto the morning.

Gal 5:9

A little *leaven* leaveneth the whole lump.

Lev 2:4-53

And if thou bring an oblation of a meat offering baken in the oven, it shall be unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil.<sup>5</sup> And if thy oblation be a meat offering baken in a pan, it shall be of fine flour unleavened, mingled with oil.

In every possible and plausible way of synthesis, Jesus Christ was the fulfillment and the true substance of the peace offering to God. By all biblical accounts, we are to understand that the sacrificial offering was not mingled with sin, but was holy and separate and undefiled by sin. The following text is a witness to the belief that Jesus Christ was the fulfillment and ultimate substance of all sacrificial offerings. The unleavened cakes mingled with the oil as described in the text above, has as its true substance, through biblical application, the Most Holy blood of Christ, (Unleavened bread) who through the eternal spirit (oil) offered himself (sacrificial offering) without spot to God

The Bible states in Heb 9:14

How much more *shall the blood of Christ*, who through the *eternal Spirit* offered himself *without spot* to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

Heb 7:26

For such an *high priest* became us, who is *holy*, harmless, *undefiled*, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens

Col 1:19-20

For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; <sup>20</sup> And, *having made peace through the blood of his cross*, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

It is for this reason that Jesus Christ, (our sacrificial offering), cannot serve under the Aaronic priesthood, which the SDA sanctuary doctrine extraneously projects onto the Heavenly ministry of Christ. This ideology is permeated throughout the church's literature surrounding this doctrine. It is important to note that the blood of the sacrifice, as depicted in Old Testament scripture, was never defiled by sin- which is a belief that can withstand all biblical investigation and testimony. In addition, the Bible also bears witness that the first covenant, and its set of laws, was imperfect and faulty. It is for this reason Christ would follow a different priestly order and the law, through necessity, would also need to be changed. This sound biblical foundation needs to be considered when reading the following statement.

Ellen White states in Faith I Live By...

As the sins of the people were *anciently transferred*, **in figure**, to the earthly sanctuary by the blood of the sin offering, so our sins are, **in fact**, transferred to the heavenly sanctuary *by the blood of Christ*. {FLB 206.6}

Does such a belief withstand biblical investigation and testimonies from the word of God?

The Bible states in Heb 7:18-19

For there is verily a *disannulling of the commandment* going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. 19 For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

Heb 8:6-7

But now hath he obtained a *more excellent ministry*, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better covenant*, which was established upon *better promises*.<sup>7</sup> For if that first covenant had been **faultless**, then should no place have been sought for the **second**.

Heb 7:11-12

If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order *of Melchisedec*, and not be called after the order of Aaron?<sup>12</sup> For the **priesthood being changed**, *there is made of necessity a change also of the law*.

Luke 12:1-2

Beware ye of *the leaven* of the Pharisees, which is *hypocrisy*.<sup>2</sup> For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known.

Ellen White describes accurately the meaning of “leaven” in relation to the blood of the sacrificial lamb in the following statement.

The use of unleavened bread was also significant. It was significantly enjoined in the law of the Passover and was strictly observed by the Jews in their practice, that is, that no leaven should be found in their houses during the feast. In a similar manner the **leaven of sin** must also be put away from all who would receive life and nourishment from Christ. {PP 278.1}

The bible confirms this in 1 Cor 5:7-8

Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, *as ye are unleavened*. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: <sup>8</sup> Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the *unleavened bread of sincerity and truth*.

When the following statement made by Ellen White is weighed against the biblical evidence, a clear and distinct theological problem is evident to the thoughtful reader.

Ellen White states in, Faith I Live By:

By his own hand, the animal was then slain, and the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil, behind which was the ark containing the law that the sinner had transgressed. By this ceremony **the sin was, through the blood**, transferred in figure to the sanctuary. In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the 5

flesh was then to be eaten by the priest. . . . **Both ceremonies** alike *symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary.* {FLB 198.2}

Ellen White here states that, “*leaven*” symbolizes sin in relation to the Passover .The bible states that Christ is our Passover and that the blood of His sacrifice is not to be mingled with sin for it is Most Holy to God. (Ex 34; 25)

Furthermore, the meat of the Sin Offering, by all biblical investigation is “Most Holy” and bears testimony against the extraneous application of sin being transferred to the sanctuary by the most holy blood of the sacrifice to which Ellen White has theorized.

The Bible states in Lev 2:3

And the remnant of the meat offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': it is a ***thing most holy*** of the offerings of the Lord made by fire.

Num 18:9-10

This shall be thine of *the most holy things*, reserved from the fire: every oblation of theirs, every meat offering of theirs, and every sin offering of theirs, and every trespass offering of theirs, which they shall render unto me, shall *be most holy for thee and for thy sons.*<sup>10</sup> In the most holy place shalt thou eat it; every male shall eat it: *it shall be holy unto thee.*

Ezek 42:13

Then said he unto me, The north chambers and the south chambers, which are before the separate place, they be holy chambers, where the priests that approach unto the Lord *shall eat the most holy things*: there shall they lay *the most holy things*, and the meat offering, and the sin offering, and the trespass offering; *for the place is holy.*

Lev 22:9-16

They shall therefore keep mine ordinance, lest they bear sin for it, and die therefore, if they profane it: I the Lord do sanctify them.<sup>10</sup> There shall *no stranger eat of the holy thing*: a sojourner of the priest, or an hired servant, shall not *eat of the holy thing.*<sup>11</sup> But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house: they shall eat of his meat.<sup>12</sup> If the priest's daughter also be married unto a stranger, *she may not eat of an offering of the holy things.*<sup>13</sup> But if the priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child, and is returned unto her father's house, as in her youth, she shall eat of her father's meat: but there shall no stranger eat thereof.<sup>14</sup> And if a man *eat of the holy thing* unwittingly, then he shall put the fifth part thereof unto it, and shall give it unto the priest with the holy thing.<sup>15</sup> *And they shall not profane the holy things* of the children of Israel, which they offer unto the Lord;<sup>16</sup> ***Or suffer them to bear the iniquity of trespass, when they eat their holy things: for I the Lord do sanctify them.***

By all biblical accounts the ‘meat of the sin offering’ symbolizes the augmented purity and undefiled broken body of our atoning sacrifice. That is, the *Lord Jesus Christ*. Jesus Christ, by his perfect, holy, sinless and undefiled life, offered himself without blemish as full payment for our transgression and sins. This testimony holds true to all biblical investigation, as it is the foundation rock to which our salvation firmly rests. Our salvation is based upon 6

the ideology that by Christ's one offering, he put away sin, removing the enmity which lay between us and God, having paved the way for reconciliation through his cleansing blood.

The Bible states in Eph 2:13-18

But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are *made nigh by the blood of Christ*.<sup>14</sup> For *he is our peace*, who hath made both one, and hath *broken down the middle wall of partition between us*;<sup>15</sup> Having abolished in his flesh *the enmity*, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so **making peace**;<sup>16</sup> And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:<sup>17</sup> And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.<sup>18</sup> For *through him* we both have *access* by one Spirit *unto the Father*.

The Bible also states in Heb 10:12-14

But this man, after he had offered *one sacrifice for sins* for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;<sup>13</sup> From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.<sup>14</sup> *For by one offering he hath perfected for ever* them that are sanctified.

These two witnesses outline Christ's holy, undefiled blood and His supreme sacrifice as our atonement for sin, having paid the penalty by His death, that sin should no longer have dominion over us. This speaks contrary to the belief that sin can exist beyond the death of the sacrifice as well as the belief that sin may then permeate into the sacrificial blood and as a result defile holy places.

The Bible states in Eph 2:5-6

Rom 6:22-23

But now being made *free from sin*, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit *unto holiness*, and the end everlasting life.<sup>23</sup> For the *wages of sin is death*; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Rom 5:19-21

For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.<sup>20</sup> Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:<sup>21</sup> *That as sin hath reigned unto death*, even so might *grace reign through righteousness* unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

Gal 2:19-21

For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.<sup>20</sup> *I am crucified with Christ*: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.<sup>21</sup> I do not frustrate the grace of God: *for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain*.<sup>7</sup>

It is important to know the historical significance of the evolution of theological position found in Ellen White's writings throughout her life. Before the church accepted righteousness by faith in 1888, it is essential to consider, what righteousness was attributed to prior to this date? A works orientated theology is speckled throughout the SDA church's early theological literature, much of which has been removed from later published works. The sins of the people being transported to heaven through the blood of Christ is one such doctrine which was removed from The Great Controversy. It use to be found on page 266 of The Great Controversy but was then omitted in later editions after the ninth.

Fortunately, we have other renditions available to substantiate just how the theology behind the pollution of the sanctuary in heaven came into existence. This is a strange anomaly, as although the literature that substantiates the pillars of the belief has been systematically removed, the building still seems to stand. This legalistic approach towards salvation speaks contrary to that of the new covenant as testified throughout the pages of the Bible as indicated in this paper. It is important to consider what foundation of belief the following statements lay, as stated by Ellen White.

Ellen White stated....

Not one of us will ever receive the seal of God while our characters have one spot or stain upon them. *It is left with us to remedy the defects in our characters*, to cleanse the soul-temple of every defilement. Then the latter rain will fall upon us as the early rain fell upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost. {CET 189.2}

Ellen White stated in Appeal to the Youth ..

*The Lord loves those little children who try to do right*, and he has promised that they shall be in his kingdom. *But wicked children God does not love*. He will not take them to the beautiful City, for he only admits the good, obedient, and patient children there {AY 61.3}.

I have now written **the vision God gave me**. [Early Writings, pp. 43-44, "The Open and the Shut Door."] I am tired sitting so long. Our position looks very clear. We know we have the truth, the midnight cry is behind us; *the door was shut in 1844* and Jesus is soon to step out from between God and man. The sealing will then be accomplished--finished up. {5MR 200.2}

Anguish of spirit will seize them. *Dare they admit that the door is shut?* The sin against the Holy Ghost was to ascribe to Satan what belongs to God, or what the Holy Ghost has done. **They said the shut door was of the devil**, and now admit it is against their own lives. They shall die the death. Look ye at the Pattern. Follow Him, for He is meek and lowly in heart. Shut your eyes to everything but the present, saving truth.--Ms 11, 1850, pp. 3, 4. (Vision at Paris, Maine, December 25, 1850.) {5MR 204.3}

Ellen White initially believed that in 1844 only the advent people moved with Christ into the holy place. This was later amended to the Sabbath keeping Millerite's in 1846 who moved into the Holy Place retrospectively amending the 1844 date. Those that did not accept the Sabbath would become known as the First Day Adventists. The key to understanding this doctrinal position held by the early Adventist is the 'Atonement Shift', in which, prior to 1844, the Millerites believed the atonement was fulfilled on Calvary. According to the Bible though, in the last 1800 years Christians have already gained access through faith and the cleansing blood of Christ to the heavenly places.<sup>8</sup>

The Bible states in Eph 2:6

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

Heb 6:19-20

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

By perusing all the texts that substantiate the theological position that the blood of the sacrifice is depicted as Most Holy and cleansing, and which was never defiled, we can begin to grasp the interconnectedness of theological concepts. These texts support strenuously the concept that that which is deemed holy cannot be defiled. This then elucidates the fact that the sacrifice of Christ was pleasing and acceptable to God.

The following Bible verses are further testimonies that validate that the sanctuary being defiled by the blood or meat of the sacrifice is erroneous, for it speaks contrary to the word of God.

Lev 14:13-14

And he shall slay the lamb in the place where he shall kill the sin offering and the burnt offering, in the holy place: for as the sin offering is the priest's, so is the trespass offering *it is most holy*: 14 And the priest shall take some of the blood of the trespass offering, and the priest shall put it upon the tip of the right ear of him *that is to be cleansed*, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot:

The following quote made by Ellen White unfortunately does not contain the text in its entirety and consequently allows for a flawed conclusion. However, when weighed against biblical evidence which states that the blood and the meat of the sacrifice is Most Holy unto God, the citation listed below speaks contrary to Scripture.

Ellen White states in Great Controversy:

In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest, as Moses directed the sons of Aaron, saying, "God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation." [Leviticus 10:17.] *Both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary.* {GC88 418.1}

Does Aaron eating the meat of the sacrifice, by any biblical account, expound the theology that sin could be transported into the sanctuary by consumption?

The Bible states in Lev 7:6-7

6 Every male among the priests shall eat thereof: it shall be eaten in the holy place: *it is most holy*.7  
As the sin offering is, so is the trespass offering: *there is one law for them*: the priest that maketh atonement therewith shall have it.

Lev 10:179



Wherefore have ye not eaten *the sin offering* in the holy place, seeing *it is most holy*, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord? It is important to note that the meat of the sacrifice is a by-product of the death of the sacrifice. The sin sacrifice always pointed to its true substance, itself being only the shadow of Christ Jesus. Jesus Christ, by his own testimony, plainly stated that his flesh is meat indeed in reference to the Passover which he shared with his disciples just before his death. It may be argued that Christ died on the Passover not on the Day of Atonement, but all Christians including SDA believe unequivocally that Christ made atonement for our sins on Calvary. I have even asked SDA ministers the question “was ‘atonement’ made on that day?” The answer, a resounding yes. However, when further enquiry is made as to whether or not Christ's crucifixion was the actual Day of Atonement, a strange scriptural anomaly presents itself, one which I cannot reason nor justify from the word of God, as it speaks contrary to the biblical text.

The Bible states in Rom 5:10-11

For if, when we were enemies, we were *reconciled to God* by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.<sup>11</sup> And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we have now received the atonement*.

Ellen White states in Early Writings....

As the priest entered the most holy once a year to cleanse the earthly sanctuary, so Jesus entered the most holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of Daniel 8, in 1844, to make *a final atonement* for all who could be benefited by His mediation, and thus to *cleanse the sanctuary*. {EW 253.1 }

The question as to whether or not the Bible demonstrates the theological position that a final atonement began in 1844, is one that needs the most earnest consideration.

If Paul states “that we have *now received the atonement*” (Romans 5:11) and Christ testified on Calvary that *it is finished*, (John 19:30) is there any scriptural evidence, or Priestly ministerial sanctuary type reflected in the word of God to substantiate a belief that proves contrary to these biblical testimonies?

To my knowledge, there is no scriptural support that Christ's atonement on Calvary was anything other than complete. In the absence of any scriptural text to validate the belief that there was to be a final atonement at a later date, it is essential to ask, what scriptural authority does the above statement by Ellen White support in reference to biblical applications?

The ordinance service reminds us of the atonement made on Calvary with no reference whatsoever to a future final atonement or an atonement stage two. The finality of his atonement is found by Christ's own testimony referring to his cleansing blood, a receipt of his death and his unleavened body broken by death.<sup>10</sup>

1 Cor 11:24-26

And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, *which is broken for you*: this do in remembrance of me.<sup>25</sup> After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, *This cup is the new testament in my blood*: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.<sup>26</sup> For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, *ye do shew the Lord's death* till he come.

Ellen White stated in her book counsel for the church....

The blood of Christ, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, **was not to cancel the sin**; it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the final atonement; so in the type the blood of the sin offering removed the sin from the penitent, but it rested in the sanctuary until the day of atonement. {CCh 348.1}

The above statement made by Ellen White contradicts the passage of scripture below.

The Bible states in Eph 2:15

Having *abolished* in his flesh **the enmity**, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, **so making peace**;

To this clear and precise doctrinal position the word of God further testifies:

Eph 2:16-18

16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having **slain the enmity** thereby:<sup>17</sup> And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.<sup>18</sup> For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

John 6:53

Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and *drink his blood*, ye have no life in you.

Ellen White made the following statement...

As the sins of the people were anciently transferred, in **figure**, to the earthly sanctuary by the blood of the sin offering, *so our sins* are, **in fact**, transferred to the heavenly sanctuary by the *blood of Christ*. {FLB 206.6}

The above statement made by Ellen White is the SDA church's only authority to substantiate the belief that blood of Christ was mingled with the leaven of sin for the conveyance of sin to the sanctuary. (*If any were to argue contrary, the text itself clearly indicates that the blood of Christ is the medium by which sin is transported to the heavenly sanctuary.*) The reason for this is that there is not one biblical text that can support the blood of the sacrifice being defiled with sin. Furthermore, the meat of the sacrifice, produced when the sacrifice has rendered its life, as being portrayed as mingled with sin, is erroneous and extraneous to all biblical application which defines it as Most Holy.

The Bible states in Lev 24:911

And it shall be Aaron's and his sons'; and they shall eat it in the holy place: for *it is most holy* unto him of the offerings of the Lord made by fire by a perpetual statute.

Lev 6:25-30

Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, saying, This is the law of the *sin offering*: In the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin offering be killed before the Lord: *it is most holy*.<sup>26</sup> The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: in the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation.<sup>27</sup> Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy: and when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place.<sup>28</sup> But the earthen vessel wherein it is sodden shall be broken: and if it be sodden in a brasen pot, it shall be both scoured, and rinsed in water.<sup>29</sup> All the males among the priests shall eat thereof: *it is most holy*.<sup>30</sup> And no sin offering, whereof any of the *blood* is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire.

If we are to believe that sin permeated the meat of the sacrifice then we must also believe by all logical reasoning that sin reigns over the death of that sacrifice.

It would then explain the belief held by the SDA Church that the heavenly sanctuary is defiled by sin. This must then be proved by the belief that Christ's atonement on Calvary did not *cancel out* our iniquity and that sin was merely transferred, to be dealt with at a later date.

Ellen White made the following statement in support of such a belief.....

*The blood of Christ*, while it was to release the repentant sinner from the condemnation of the law, *was not to cancel the sin*; it would stand on record in the sanctuary until the final atonement; so in the type the blood of the sin offering removed the sin from the penitent, but it rested in the sanctuary until the day of atonement. {CCh 348.1}

The problem with this belief is that it speaks contrary to the Bible which in every account states that the flesh of Christ and the *blood of Christ*, is **always** Most Holy. We are, as conscientious Christians, encouraged to partake symbolically of his flesh and blood, having the knowledge that when he died once for all, He removed iniquity by his death, having taken our place as our Lord and Saviour. I seriously doubt whether or not anyone has partaken of the ordinance service and has honestly looked upon the symbols as being a medium for transporting sin, rather to the contrary. As we ponder Christ's sinless and spotless life, his supreme sacrifice (which we know was acceptable to God), we may claim it as our payment in full. Having removed this iniquity from us by his own pure blood, we may now have peace with God. If humanity's sin has been stored by the throne of God for over 1800 years waiting for a final atonement, how is it at all possible that we can claim peace with God?

The Bible states in John 6:54-58

Whoso *eateth my flesh*, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.<sup>55</sup> For *my flesh is meat indeed*, and my blood is drink indeed.<sup>56</sup> He *that eateth my flesh*, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.<sup>57</sup> As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: *so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me*.<sup>58</sup> This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: **he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever**.<sup>12</sup>

With the Bible as my testimony, I believe that there is no theological position to blend sin (*Leaven*) with the blood of (His) the sacrifice.

The Bible states in Ex 34:25

Thou shalt *not offer* the *blood of my sacrifice with leaven*; neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of the passover be left unto the morning.

Ellen White stated...

As in the typical service there was a work of atonement at the close of the year, so before Christ's work for the redemption of men is completed, there is a work of atonement *for the removal of sin from the sanctuary*. This is the service which began when the 2300 days ended. {GC88 421.2}

Note carefully that they are the actual sins and not a record, which defiles the sanctuary.

Ellen White Further states....

As anciently **the sins of the people** were by faith placed upon the sin-offering, and *through its blood* transferred, *in figure*, to the earthly sanctuary, so in the new covenant the sins of the repentant are by faith placed upon Christ, and transferred, **in fact**, to the heavenly sanctuary {GC88 421.3}

Note that Ellen White clearly states, that it is *through the blood* sins are transferred.

**2. The priest was given specific instruction to not defile the sanctuary in any way.**

We must ask the question, is it illogical to reason that God would take meticulous detail to explain the lengths Aaron was to go to in order not to defile the sanctuary, to then turn around and defile it by the blood of the sacrifice, which he carried in? This is extremely difficult to reason when viewed through scripture, which states 'If any man *defile the temple of God*, him shall God destroy; for *the temple of God is holy*, which temple ye are'. (1 Cor 3:17). It is also important to note that the blood or the meat of the sacrifice as previously mentioned is Most Holy, rendering it by God's own definition, undefiled by sin.

The Bible states in Lev 21:11-12

11 Neither shall he go in to any dead body, nor *defile himself* for his father, or for his mother; 12 Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, *nor profane the sanctuary of his God*; for the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him: I am the Lord.

The following text found in the New Testament uses the terminology, "which temple ye are", but the inference of the temple of God and its Holiness are firmly substantiated by Old Testament theology. The new covenant confirms that it was unconfessed sins that defiled the holy temple. However if the SDA sanctuary Doctrine is accurate (and a firm theological foundation), then consequently Aaron and the penitent sinner should or will be destroyed by God, because collectively they have defiled the sanctuary.

The Bible states in 1 Cor 3:17

If any man *defile the temple of God*, him shall God destroy; for *the temple of God is holy*, which temple ye are.13

The following statement speaks contrary to salvation as depicted by all biblical account.

Ellen White states in faith I live by...

Both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary. Such was the work that went on day by day throughout the year. The **sins of Israel** being thus **transferred to the sanctuary**, the **holy places were defiled** {FLB 198.2}

However the bible describes the defilement of the sanctuary as stated in

Ezek 5:11

Wherefore, as I live, saith the Lord God; Surely, because *thou hast defiled my sanctuary* with all thy **detestable things**, and with all **thine abominations**, therefore will I also diminish thee; neither shall mine eye spare, neither will I have any pity.

Furthermore Ellen White states in faith I live by...

And as the typical cleansing of the earthly was accomplished by *the removal of the sins by which it had been polluted*, so the actual cleansing of the **heavenly** is to be accomplished by the removal, or blotting out, of the sins which are there recorded. This necessitates an examination of the books of record to determine who, through repentance of sin and faith in Christ, are entitled to the benefits of His atonement. {FLB 206.6}

The following Bible verses give clear and precise testimony to the fact that sin has no place in the presence of God's glory. God, who dwelled in the Shekinah, hovered above the Mercy seat in the earthly sanctuary and demanded nothing less than perfection and holiness. Sin was dealt with at the altar of sacrifice and was never carried into the sanctuary through the blood. Through the cleansing blood of the sacrifice we are considered to be holy in his presence, and it is for this reason that all who approach Him if they are not clothed in "*His*" *righteousness*, will then have the shame of their nakedness revealed (Rev 3.18)

This was to be obtained through the *cleansing blood* of the sacrifice, and dealt with at the altar in the courtyard which was in type only the shadow of Calvary.

The Bible states in Lev 16:6

And Aaron shall offer his bullock of *the sin offering*, which is for himself, and *make an atonement for himself*, and for his house.

1 John 1:7

But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and *the blood of Jesus Christ* his Son *cleanseth us from all sin*.

Lev 6:27

Whatsoever shall touch the *flesh* thereof *shall be holy*.

Lev 21:2314

Only he shall not go in unto the veil, nor come nigh unto the altar, because he hath a blemish; *that he profane not my sanctuaries*: for I the Lord do sanctify them.

Lev 21:21

21 No man that *hath a blemish* of the seed of Aaron the priest shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the Lord made by fire: *he hath a blemish*; he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God.

Notice the great detail given by God to make sure that defilement does not make its way into the temple to pollute it.

Furthermore, the Bible states in Lev 21:18-20

18 For whatsoever man he be that hath a *blemish*, **he shall not approach**: a *blind man*, or a *lame*, or he that hath a *flat nose*, or *any thing superfluous*,<sup>19</sup> Or a man that is *brokenfooted*, or *brokenhanded*,<sup>20</sup> Or *crookbackt*, or a *dwarf*, or that hath a *blemish in his eye*, or be *scurvy*, or *scabbed*, or hath his *stones broken*;

Lev 22:2-3

Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel, and that they profane not my holy name in those things which they hallow unto me: I am the Lord.<sup>3</sup> Say unto them, Whosoever he be of all your seed among your generations, that goeth unto the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow unto the Lord, *having his uncleanness upon him*, that soul shall be *cut off from my presence*: I am the Lord.

Ex 29:43-46

And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and *the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory*.<sup>44</sup> And *I will sanctify the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar*: I will *sanctify* also both *Aaron and his sons*, to minister to me in the priest's office.<sup>45</sup> And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God<sup>46</sup> And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them: I am the Lord their God.

**3. The Sanctuary is Holy and Sin and Holiness cannot co-exist in God's Presence as defined by all Biblical exegesis.**

The biblical evidence for the belief that “sin or defilement” in the presence of God's glory within the sanctuary is met with His judgment withstands scriptural investigation and scrutiny. If there be any biblical evidence to substantiate the theory that the blood of the sacrifice was indeed defiled by sin, then the anathematic spirit which opposes any teaching contrary would be then validated. However, in the absence of any scriptural substance to validate the doctrinal position held by the SDA church in relation to the blood of the sacrifice being defiled with sin, we must ask the question, to what do we actually hang this pivotal doctrinal position upon?

The perception that sin has procured a place in the presence and divine glory of God, *by any means*, is alien to scripture and contrary to the gospel of our salvation. We have our eternal hope tethered to this divine truth, because Christ Jesus died in our stead and it was for this 15

reason that he cried out “Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me”? (Matt 27:46)

The following Bible verses bear testimony that all that is in the presence of God must be holy, cleansed and sanctified by Him, for Him and in Him. With this scriptural application of understanding, we may discern the evidence which in turn gives substance to the doctrinal position that through the blood the sacrifice removed the iniquity by payment of death and was *never* transferred to the sanctuary. The testimony as to why God Himself calls the “most holy place”, the Most “Holy Place”, bears witness to this doctrinal position.

By all reasoning if the second apartment of the sanctuary were to be defiled by sin how could it be called the “*Most Holy Place*”?

The process of purification found in the Lord Jesus Christ’s blood allows all sinners to come into the presence of God, free from guilt and shame, having their robes washed in his blood. For the Christian, their hope is anchored to Jesus Christ’s cleansing, purifying, holy and sinless blood which is the receipt of his atoning death, having paid in full our transgression of God's holy law, as our divine saviour when He took our place on Calvary. This is why Paul states that we now have “peace” with God.

Rom 4:24-5:2

But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;25 Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.5

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

In the following text, it is important to note that the cloud of incense was to rise up and cover the Mercy seat as in similitude to the cloud which rested upon Mount Sinai. As the text explains, the thick cloud of incense was to veil the glory of God so that Aaron died not.

The Bible states in Lev 16:12-13

And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it *within the veil*:13 And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, *that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat* that is upon the testimony, that *he die not*

Lev 22:3

Say unto them, Whosoever he be of all your seed among your generations, that goeth unto the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow unto the Lord, *having his uncleanness upon him*, that soul shall be *cut off from my presence*: I am the Lord.

The bells and pomegranates in the following text bear testimony to the fact that sin cannot be in the presence of God in the most holy place.

The Bible states in Ex 28:34-35

A golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate, upon the hem of the robe round about.35 And it shall be upon Aaron to minister: and his sound shall be heard when *he goeth in unto the holy place before the Lord*, and when he cometh out, *that he die not*. 16

It is significant that in the following text, God appointed a **day** for **atonement**, because the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, therefore this was a remembrance of sin every year. Christ, being of a better covenant ministry, so the Day of Atonement was for once and once only and has no continuance of time, as shadowed in the sanctuary service under the old covenant.

The Bible states in Lev 16:2

And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come **not at all times** into the holy place *within the vail* before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that *he die not*: for *I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat.*

Ex 29:35-37

And thus shalt thou do unto Aaron, and to his sons, according to all things which I have commanded thee: seven days shalt thou consecrate them.<sup>36</sup> And thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin offering for atonement: and *thou shalt cleanse the altar*, when thou hast made an *atonement* for it, and thou shalt anoint it, *to sanctify it.*<sup>37</sup> Seven days thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and *sanctify it*; and it shall be an altar *most holy*: whatsoever toucheth the altar *shall be holy.*

Ex 30:20-21

When they *go into the tabernacle* of the congregation, they shall wash with water, *that they die not*; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the Lord:<sup>21</sup> So they shall wash their hands and their feet, *that they die not*: and it shall be a statute for ever to them, even to him and to his seed throughout their generations.

Only the high priest was allowed access to the Holy and Most Holy Place in the temple, after he had meticulously followed the purification process of offering up sacrifices for his own sins and that of the people<sup>1</sup>. The penitent sinner was left standing near the door of the tabernacle, which is, in itself, a witness to the fact that sin has **no place** in the presence of God. Why? Because the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, therefore a remembrance of sin was before the people every year. The Day of Atonement came round every year, another goat was sacrificed and another goat was led out into the wilderness where they accumulated year after year.

<sup>1</sup>See Leviticus chapters 1 through to 17

When we look at the new covenant however, we begin to see a clear and precise differentiated distinction, which was also reverberated in the words of John the Baptist “*behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world*” (1 Cor 3:17)..

John saw the Lamb of God as one which removes the enmity between us and God. He saw Jesus Christ as our reconciliation, our peace offering, to bring us back into the presence of God.

The New Covenant echoes this sentiment by the testimony which states in 17



Jeremiah 31:34:

34 And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

It is in this knowledge, that Jesus Christ bore the iniquity of us all on the altar of the cross where he poured out his blood, and that by his stripes we are healed we can have confidence in Jesus' cleansing blood. It is also in the understanding of the cleansing purity of Christ's blood that the penitent sinner no longer needs stay anchored at the door of the tabernacle. For that which the blood of bulls and goats could not do, our high priest of the order of Melchizedek did once for all by offering up his own blood, something which the Aaronic covenant never symbolised in its priestly ministry. It is for this reason that the Bible states that a change of the law was necessitated.

The Bible also testifies that Christ made his way *within the veil*, (Heb 6, 19) to be seated at the right hand of Majesty in the heavens until his enemies are made his footstool, and further stated that in Christ Jesus we too, can sit in heavenly places. This is the key difference between the two covenants, the first could not take away sin as the barrier remained; "*the veil*" was necessitated for our well-being that we would not be consumed by the glory of God.

There is no biblical symbiosis between the glory of God and sin being present in the one place, substantiated by the echoing cry that Christ gave from Calvary "*my God, my God, why have you forsaken me*" (Matt 27:26). It is through this reasoning that we can understand why the veil in the second temple at Christ's death was ripped in two as Jesus Christ removed the enmity that lay between a sinful humanity and a Holy God, having paid in full the price of our sin by his atoning death and sinless pure life. By our High Priest's own blood, reconciliation was made, having removed our sins as far from the East as from the West and cast them in the depths of the sea, that there be no more remembrance of sin to which King David petitioned God for in the 51st Psalm.

Num 4:15-20

15 And when Aaron and his sons have made an end of covering the sanctuary, and all the vessels of the sanctuary, as the camp is to set forward; after that, the sons of Kohath shall come to bear it: but *they shall not touch any holy thing, lest they die*. These things are the burden of the sons of Kohath in the tabernacle of the congregation. 16 And to the office of Eleazar the son of Aaron the priest pertaineth the oil for the light, and the sweet incense, and the daily meat offering, and the anointing oil, and the oversight of all the tabernacle, and of all that therein is, in the sanctuary, and in the vessels thereof. 17 And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, 18 Cut ye not off the tribe of the families of the Kohathites from among the Levites: 19 But thus do unto them, *that they may live, and not die, when they approach unto the most holy things*: Aaron and his sons shall go in, and appoint them every one to his service and to his burden: 20 But they shall not go in to see when the holy things are covered, *lest they die*.

**4. How the Temple was defiled by a biblical exposition of the Scriptures**

18

Biblical investigation reveals that the children of Israel defiled the temple of God by their unconfessed sins and abominations that filled the land in which the Lord dwelt amongst them. The following text unequivocally states that the abominations were so great that the Lord consequently withdrew his presence from the temple.

The Bible states in Ezek 9:3-7

And the glory of the God of Israel was gone up from the cherub, whereupon he was, to the threshold of the house. And he called to the man clothed with linen, which had the writer's inkhorn by his side; And the Lord said unto him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that *cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof*.<sup>5</sup> And to the others he said in mine hearing, Go ye after him through the city, and smite: let not your eye spare, neither have ye pity:<sup>6</sup> Slay utterly old and young, both maids, and little children, and women: but come not near any man upon whom is the mark; and begin at my sanctuary. Then they began at the ancient men which were before the house.<sup>7</sup> And he said unto them, *Defile the house*, and fill the courts with the slain: go ye forth. And they went forth, and slew in the city.

Lev 15:31

Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in their uncleanness, *when they defile my tabernacle* that is among them.

The following texts bear witness to the scriptural belief that the temple of God was defiled by the abominations that were done in land. The Bible explains that it was their unconfessed sins which defiled the sanctuary and not the confessed sin.

The Bible states in 2 Chron 30:18-20

For a multitude of the people, even many of Ephraim, and Manasseh, Issachar, and Zebulun, *had not cleansed themselves*, yet did they eat the Passover otherwise than it was written. But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one <sup>19</sup> That prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. <sup>20</sup> And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people.

Zeph 3:1-5

Woe to her that is filthy and polluted, to the oppressing city! <sup>2</sup> She obeyed not the voice; she received not correction; *she trusted not in the Lord*; she drew not near to her God. <sup>3</sup> Her princes within her are roaring lions; her judges are evening wolves; they gnaw not the bones till the morrow. <sup>4</sup> Her prophets are light and treacherous persons: *her priests have polluted the sanctuary*, they have done violence to the law. <sup>5</sup> The just Lord is in the midst thereof; he will not do iniquity: every morning doth he bring his judgment to light, he faileth not; but the unjust knoweth no shame.

Ezek 43:7-8

And he said unto me, Son of man, the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name, shall *the house of Israel no more defile*, neither they, nor their kings, by their whoredom, nor by the carcasses of their kings in their high places.<sup>8</sup> In their setting of their threshold by my thresholds, and their post by my posts, and the wall between me and them, *they have even* <sup>19</sup>

*defiled my holy name by their abominations* that they have committed: wherefore I have consumed them in mine anger.

The following statement made by Ellen White describes the position held by the SDA church in relation to how the sanctuary became defiled.

Ellen White states in Faith I Live by..

Such was the work that went on day by day throughout the year. *The sins of Israel being thus transferred to the sanctuary*, the holy places *were defiled*, and a special work became necessary for the removal of the sins. God commanded that atonement be made for each of the sacred apartments, as for the altar, to "cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel." Leviticus 16:19. {FLB 198.3}

For the previous statement to be true, both theologically and logistically, **sin must reign beyond the death of the sacrifice** and consequently permeate into its blood and through the sprinkling thereof, defiling the holy places of God's Sanctuary.

The bible states in Acts 13:37-39

But he, whom God raised again, *saw no corruption*.<sup>38</sup> Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins:<sup>39</sup> And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from *which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses*.

Furthermore, SDA Sanctuary doctrinal position as previously stated would require the sacrificial blood not to cancel out the iniquity, but be the medium for transporting it to the sanctuary.

Consequently, the atonement in its entirety could not have been fulfilled on Calvary. The following biblical text reveals a dichotomy of thought as an ever widening chasm between the blood defiling the sanctuary and the cleansing life-giving properties described in the word of God.

The Bible states in Rom 6:7-10 *For he that is dead is freed from sin*.

If Christ died as my substitute, and paying the penalty of my transgression against the law, which is death and consequently having released me from the condemnation of the law, how then, by the grace imputed to me by his merit, can my sin be anything but buried with him?

Acts 2:31-36

31 He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that *his soul was not left in hell*, neither **his flesh did see corruption**.<sup>32</sup> This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.<sup>33</sup>

Therefore *being by the right hand of God exalted*, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.<sup>34</sup> For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,<sup>35</sup> Until I make thy foes thy footstool.<sup>36</sup> Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.<sup>20</sup>

The Bible states in Rom 5:11

And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we have now received the atonement.*

Rom 6:6-11

Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, *that the body of sin might be destroyed*, that henceforth we should not serve sin

More biblical witnesses that testify that the blood of the sacrifices cannot be a medium for transporting sin into the sanctuary

Heb 9:14-15

How much more shall *the blood of Christ*, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, *purge your conscience* from dead works to serve the living God?15 And for this cause he is the mediator of *the new testament*, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Rom 6:8-10

Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him:9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.10 For in that he died, *he died unto sin once*: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to *be dead indeed unto sin*, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Col 2:11-14

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:12 **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.13 And you, **being dead in your sins** and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, **having forgiven you all trespasses**;14 **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**;

The next text explains how the sealing of the Holy Spirit is united to the true Gospel of the Blood of the sacrifice and that which is not covered by the blood of the sacrifice defiles the sanctuary.

Eph 1:13-14

In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, **the gospel of your salvation**: in whom also after that ye believed, ye *were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise*,14 Which 21

is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the raise of his glory.

Rom 8:10-11

And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness.<sup>11</sup> *But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you*, he that raised up Christ from the dead **shall also quicken your mortal bodies** by his **Spirit that dwelleth in you**.

Heb 13:20-21

**Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus**, that great shepherd of the sheep, **through the blood of the everlasting covenant**,<sup>21</sup> Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

### ***5. A different priestly ministry***

Adventists, literature often reflects that Christ made atonement for them on Calvary. However, the difference is in believing whether or not the Day of Atonement was completed at Calvary, irrespective of the events that were fulfilled by Christ. It is my understanding that when Christ said “it is finished”, he echoed out a cry from the Ministry of Melchisedec, a different order, with a new law having finished the work that he came to do, confirmed by the apostle Paul’s statement “now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away” Heb 8:13

The Bible states in Heb 7:11-12

If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise *after the order of Melchisedec*, and not be called after the order of Aaron?<sup>12</sup> For the priesthood being changed, *there is made of necessity a change also of the law*.

A clear distinction between the Aaronic priesthood and that of the priesthood of Melchisedec is that at no point did Aaron use his own blood to make atonement for sin. The obvious reason for this is that Aaron's priesthood was not perfect but the latter was. As we have previously discussed in Ellen White's writings, Aaron in figure transferred sins to the sanctuary carrying sacrificial blood. But what Aaron did in figure, Christ did in fact. The logistics of how this was done I am unable to find a quote from her writings. However, when we looked at Christ's own words in telling Mary to refrain from touching him for he has not yet ascended to the Father, we must by all accounts, eliminate the conjunction of sin transfer with his post resurrected state. The reason for this is that it would defile the sacrificial offering which Christ was about to present before the Father in the heavenly.

The Bible states in John 20:16-17

Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master.<sup>17</sup> Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go 22

to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.

Ellen White herself substantiates this belief in her writings one such case is found in The Spirit of Prophecy volume three. This states....

For a moment she forgot in her joy that he had been crucified; she stretched forth her hands to him, saying, "Rabboni!" Jesus then said, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God." {3SP 201.2}

Jesus refused to receive the homage of his people until he knew that his sacrifice had been accepted by the Father, and until he had received the assurance from God himself that his atonement for the sins of his people had been full and ample, that through his blood they might gain eternal life. Jesus immediately ascended to Heaven and presented himself before the throne of God, showing the marks of shame and cruelty upon his brow, his hands and feet. But he refused to receive the coronet of glory, and the royal robe, and he also refused the adoration of the angels as he had refused the homage of Mary, until the Father signified that his offering was accepted. {3SP 202.1}

If Aaron, under the old covenant, logistically walked into the most holy place with the blood of others to make atonement and cleanse the sanctuary, how was this shadow fulfilled in fact by Christ's own blood? Herein lies a great dilemma for the current theology.

If we say that sins were transferred at Christ's death, we are literally saying that sin reigns over the death of the sacrifice to be carried by the blood that by all biblical exposition is Most Holy, but now in order to fit SDA Sanctuary doctrine is mingled with sin in transfer. The theology inverts what Christ did in life, to that which he did now in death. For it was in life in the Garden of Gethsemane, that Christ bore our sins as he sweated blood till Calvary, when the Lord cried out "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me"?

However, if we say that sin was transferred to the sanctuary at his first ascension in which He presented the sin sacrifice to God the Father, then surely the "leaven" of sin has been mingled with the blood of the sacrifice most holy, rendering the sacrifice unacceptable to God. (Exodus 34:25) This theological problem can only be resolved from the word of God, which not only makes the clear distinction between the two priestly ministries' but also the difference of the priests' mediatory role in the earthly Sanctuary as compared to the Heavenly.

The Bible states in Heb 9:24-28

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: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: but *now once in the end of the world* hath he appeared to *put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself. 27 And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment:23

28 So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation.

If Christ is to appear a second time apart from sin according to the text in Hebrews 9, another theological problem arises for the SDA Sanctuary doctrine. If sin has been transferred to the heavenly sanctuary “in fact”, by the blood of Christ to defile it as stated in Ellen White's writings, how then can sin be extricated from heaven? The problem is as follows. If Christ places the sins on Satan post Calvary, after an investigative judgement, how is this actuated? Remembering that Satan has no more access to the heavenly realm, and Christ cannot bring the sin out of the sanctuary in the type of the Aaronic Ministry because he appears apart from sin. I am yet to find an explanation for this in Ellen White's writings other than the following statements...

In that fearful time, after the close of Jesus' mediation, the saints were living in the sight of a holy God without an intercessor. Every case was decided, every jewel numbered. Jesus tarried a moment in the outer apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and the sins which had been confessed while He was in the most holy place **were placed upon Satan**, the originator of sin, who must suffer their punishment. {EW 280.2}

So Christ, at the close of His work as mediator, will appear, "without sin unto salvation," to bless His waiting people with eternal life. Ellen White states: As the priest, in removing the sins from the sanctuary, confessed them upon the head of the scapegoat, so Christ will place all these sins upon Satan, the originator and instigator of sin. **The scapegoat, bearing the sins of Israel**, was sent away "unto a land not inhabited;" so Satan, bearing the guilt of all the sins which he has caused God's people to commit, will be for a thousand years confined to the earth, which will then be desolate, without inhabitant, and he will at last suffer the full penalty of sin in the fires that shall destroy all the wicked. {FLB 213.4}

Ellen White also states: “Jesus tarried a moment in the outer apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, and the sins which had been confessed while He was in the most holy place were placed upon Satan, the originator of sin, who must suffer their punishment”. {SR 403.2}

“The intercession of Christ in man's behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross. By His death He began that work which after His resurrection He ascended *to complete in heaven*. We must by faith **enter within the veil**, "whither the forerunner is for us entered." Hebrews 6:20 {GC 489.1}

Ellen White uses the term “within the veil” and she makes reference to Hebrews 6:19 -20 to describe the Most Holy Place in heaven. This is true and accurate and can be proven from a thorough biblical investigation. However, the Bible **never** refers to the movement through the door of the tabernacle as “within the veil”. The first apartment of the sanctuary is referred to as “before the veil” or “without the veil” and that to which Ellen White refers is biblically described the “door of the tabernacle”. This is, in itself, another study that requires further biblical explanation. Yet it still is pertinent to whether or not the blood of the sacrifice was a medium for transporting sin to the sanctuary. For if Christ entered “within the veil” in 1844, as stipulated by Ellen White in referring to Hebrews 6:19-20, by her own testimony and by examining the verse at hand and their chronological context, we must conclude that Christ entered the Most Holy Place at his ascension. But Ellen White makes a contradiction to the meaning of “within the veil” not 24

only in correlation to the biblical definition, but by her own previous statement found in the very same book, which is as follows:

“The ministration of the priest throughout the year in the first apartment of the sanctuary, **“within the veil”** which formed the door and separated the holy place from the outer court, represents the work of ministration upon which Christ entered at his ascension. It was the work of the priest in the daily ministration to present before God the blood of the sin-offering, also the incense which ascended with the prayers of Israel. So did Christ plead his blood before the Father in behalf of sinners, and present before him also, with the precious fragrance of his own righteousness, the prayers of penitent believers. Such was the work of ministration in the first apartment of the sanctuary in Heaven”. {GC88 420.3}

The Bible never uses the term “within the veil” to describe the first apartment of the sanctuary. In surveying the chronological context of the Bible in relation to Hebrews 6:19- 20, we may deduce that through the blood of Christ, humanity gained access to the Holiest at Christ's ascension. The Bible gives firm doctrinal support to this testimony in the following verses...

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

Heb 9:8-12

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:9 Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience;10 Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.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.

Heb 10:19-22

Having therefore, brethren, **boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus**, 20 By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, **through the veil, that is to say, his flesh**;21 And having an high priest over the house of God;22 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.

Note that the KJV Bible uses the term “holy place” to describe the holiest of the sanctuary. In reference to this understanding of the term “holy place”, we need not look at the Greek or Hebrew meanings of the word as the texts themselves contains enough information to describe which apartment of the sanctuary is being mentioned.

Lev 16:225



And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place **within the veil** before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat.

From biblical analysis of the statements made by Ellen White in relation to the blood of the sacrifice being a medium for transporting sins into the sanctuary, she stated:

**“By this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary.** In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest, as Moses directed the sons of Aaron, saying, “God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation.” [Leviticus 10:17.] Both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary”. {GC88 418.1}

As the sins of the people were anciently transferred, **in figure**, to the earthly sanctuary by the blood of the sin offering, so our sins are, **in fact**, transferred to the heavenly sanctuary *by the blood of Christ*. {FLB 206.6}

There is no Biblical substance to these statements made by Ellen White which are esoterically necessary for the church’s teaching pertaining to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. As the word of God has repeatedly shown in this study, the SDA's sanctuary doctrine is currently contrary to the Gospel which renders the blood of the sacrifice pure and most holy and biblically cannot be mingled with the “leaven” of sin for a transference purpose.

In conclusion, the thoughtful reader will surmise that with no biblical support to say that sin has procured residency in the most holy place, as the “leaven for sin” cannot be mingled with the **blood of the sacrifice Most Holy**, it becomes evident that there is need for resolution.

It is imperative to understand that the theological pillars of this doctrine have evolved in transformation in their printed form. These slight theological shifts have been actuated in Ellen White's works by later omissions, adjustments and further readjustment. These theological pillars of support have been carefully and systematically removed in order to avoid further contention. Yet it is miraculous that in 2011, the basic structure of the sanctuary doctrine still stands despite its lack of biblical support. The current SDA Sanctuary doctrine as revealed by all biblical exposition is in disharmony with the word of God.

As a member of the Seventh Day Adventist Church and a committed Christian, I firmly believe that if the doctrines that we hold cannot withstand biblical investigation, we need to humble ourselves as a people and admit the error regardless of the consequences. Humility and open transparency was what God required of the Israelites of old. This form of repentance has been what God requires from us and has been that way from time immemorial and anything less means the error continues to adhere to us as a people. As a last word on this matter I ask that you take heed to the counsel stipulated in the following statement, which clearly indicates for us the best way possibly to resolve this contentious issue.

*We should never refuse to examine the Scriptures with those who, we have reason to believe, desire to know what truth is as much as we do. Suppose a brother held a view that differed from yours, and he should come to you, proposing that you sit down with him and make an investigation of that point in the Scriptures; should you rise up, filled with prejudice, and condemn his ideas, while refusing to give him a candid hearing?*

*The only right way would be to sit down as Christians and investigate the position presented, in the light of God's word, which will reveal truth and unmask error. To ridicule his ideas 26*

*would not weaken his position in the least if it were false, or strengthen your position if it were true. If the pillars of our faith will not stand the test of investigation, it is time that we knew it. There must be no spirit of pharisaism cherished among us. When Christ came to His own, His own received Him not; and it is a matter of solemn interest to us that we should not pursue a similar course in refusing light from heaven.*

Ellen White {CW 44.2}

Yours sincerely,

Timothy Ward

Note: All bible references in this document are from the King James Bible.