

4. Brother Ballenger was dismissed from the church for preaching Bible truth on the sanctuary question.

It is only possible to touch on the matters mentioned in the limited space of this pamphlet, but it is hoped that the questions raised will lead to thoughtful and prayerful consideration of the Sanctuary Question and that something will be done to show that the denomination is determined to base its teachings on the BIBLE and to reject that which is not supported by the sacred Word.

The author will be only too pleased to meet the leaders on the matters discussed in this pamphlet. Something must be done. Too long has open and frank discussion on this and other matters been avoided. I beg you, brethren, as others have begged in times past, show from God's Word how you can harmonise your beliefs on the matters mentioned in this pamphlet with divine inspiration. If this is impossible, then surely an admission is due to those disfellowshipped because they rely on the simple statements of Holy Scripture. No answer can only be taken to mean that you have no answer to give.

Replies should be addressed to—

R. F. Millwood.

236 Chapter Road,
Dollis Hill, N.W. 2.

*Contains references to
A. F. Ballenger*

In Stephen's Footsteps

OR

Questions Concerning the 2,300 Days

By R. F. Millwood, Jnr.

LONDON:
FORBES & CO.,
High Road, Willesden Green, N.W. 10.

PREFACE.

A few months ago no one would have been more surprised than the writer had it been suggested that circumstances would demand the writing of a pamphlet dealing with doctrines concerning the Saviour's mediatorial work as taught by his Seventh-Day Adventist brethren.

But such necessity has arisen. Bible studies have been held with a Seventh-Day Adventist minister and questions have been asked of other ministers and men holding official positions in the denomination with regard to certain beliefs held and taught by them. Instead of proof being produced from the Bible to substantiate their theories it became evident that the impregnable Word was not the foundation upon which the structure of S.D.A. sanctuary and 1844 ideas were built.

A short time ago it was the writer's privilege to act as a local elder to one of the London churches, but as soon as it was realised that holding that position meant standing for beliefs not to be found in the Bible the position was no longer held. Rumours have since been circulated to the effect that the writer has "left the truth."

It will still be a pleasure to preach the Denominational views on the Sanctuary Service and all that it involves if any of the ministerial brethren can prove the S.D.A. doctrine from the only Guide Book the Christian can accept—the Bible. Any other book than the Scriptures the follower of Christ dare not accept.

Correspondence from leading brethren will be welcomed.

R.F.M.

DID MR. A. F. BALLENGER LEAVE THE TRUTH?

When the author began to examine closely some of the doctrines which from early childhood he had been taught to accept as "the truth" for the last days it came as a shock to discover that certain of these so-called "Bible" doctrines had no foundation in Sacred Writ.

After having compared the Sanctuary Question as taught by the denomination with the Bible it became apparent that there was a lack of harmony. Following this comparison a Seventh-Day Baptist friend (Editor of the "Sabbath Observer") gave me a copy of Mr. A. F. Ballenger's book "Cast Out." It came as a pleasant surprise to find that that on every important point our findings in the Bible agreed.

It is well within recollection that a number of years ago there was a controversy between the leaders of the denomination and Mr. (then Pastor) Ballenger. His visits to the old Westbourne Park Company of S.D.As. were always a source of blessing. What happy recollections of his bright Christian ministry and how he was used to the salvation of souls!

When Brother Ballenger no longer visited the churches we were told that he had "gone out of the truth" on the Sanctuary Question.

His books convince one that rather than having "gone out of the truth" he revealed the truth.

How is it that although our brother was cast out of the

denomination for his beliefs he has never to this day been shown from the Bible where he was wrong?

Because he dared to accept the verdict of the Bible rather than that of human authors the leaders chose to erase his name from the church roll. Thank God they cannot erase names from Heaven's Books.

When the Bible says one thing and human beings say something else it is wiser to do what Brother Ballenger did, accept the Bible, even though it means persecution.

IN GOOD COMPANY.

Those who dare to oppose unscriptural theories advanced concerning the sanctuary service do not stand alone.

The first Christian martyr met his death because he dared to oppose the leaders of the Jewish theology on their mistaken ideas concerning the true import of the temple service.

When called to defend his unpopular beliefs, Stephen—with face reflecting the glory of heaven—made a bold and determined stand to uphold the work of the true High Priest.

What was the charge made against the heroic Stephen? In the language of Sacred Writ it was: "This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law." Here we have the secret of the bitter hatred shown against this stalwart who understood the real meaning of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus and His work in Heaven after His ascension.

Much more could be said of this experience of Stephen and the lesson it teaches. Suffice it to say here that one is in good company when upholding the true work of the

Great High Priest, for not only did Stephen bear testimony on this matter, but so also did Solomon, Isaiah, and others.

THE ATONEMENT.

WAS IT MADE UPON THE CROSS?

In a pamphlet written by Pastor A. S. Maxwell (Editor of "Present Truth") under the title of "Seventh-Day Adventism—A Reply to Critics," he states that "Seventh-Day Adventism stands four-square on the Holy Scriptures." If this is so from which part of the Bible comes the following idea concerning the atonement? Pastor Maxwell quotes from "Fundamental Principles of Seventh-Day Adventists," as follows:—

"Some people inconsiderately accuse us of rejecting the atonement of Christ entirely, because we dissent from the view that the atonement was made upon the cross, as is generally held. But we do nothing of the kind. We only take issue as to the *time* when the atonement is to be made. We object to the view that the atonement was made upon the cross, because it is utterly contrary to the type, which placed the atonement at the end of the yearly sanctuary service, not at the beginning."

"We object to the view that the atonement was made upon the cross."

Can it really be possible that any would dare to make such an assertion? Our Saviour's death did not begin but ENDED the whole sacrificial service. Matt. 27 : 51. John 19 : 30. Heb. 10 : 1-3, 9, 10, 12, 14-20.

William Jones, M.A., in his "Biblical Cyclopedia," says under article "Atonement". "The term in the Hebrew language which we translate atonement is *copher*. As a verb it literally signifies to cover; and, as a noun, a cover-

ing. Generally, wherever the word occurs, something of a state of discord, disunion, or irreconciliation is supposed ; . . . When applied to sin, it signifies to cover or to expiate it: to atone, or make satisfaction for it. Lev. 16:30, Psa. 32:1 . . . 1 John 2:2, 4:10 gives the true significance of the original word when applied to the atoning sacrifice."

Can man "cover" or atone for his own sin? No. The answer to Daniel's prayer concerning the atonement for the sins of his beloved people will be dealt with a little further on in this pamphlet.

According to the denominational view as expressed in the tract which has already been quoted the sacrificial death of Christ was NOT the atonement.

In "A Theological Biblical and Ecclesiastical Dictionary," by John Robinson, D.D., is the following—

"ATONEMENT, the satisfying of Divine Justice by the meritorious death and passion of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The first Gospel declaration on this subject is the exclamation of John the Baptist; when he saw Jesus coming unto him; behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' It seems plain that when John called our Lord the Lamb of God, he spoke with a reference to his being sacrificed, and to the effect of that sacrifice, as an atonement for the sins of mankind."

In the "Illustrated National Dictionary," we find: "ATONE, to expiate, to make satisfaction for." The Bible teaches that the only expiation that could satisfy was the death of the spotless Lamb of God. When Jesus DIED the atonement for sin was made.

How can my S.D.A. brethren harmonise their view with 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." This epistle was written by Tertius probably in the spring of A.D. 58, and yet he wrote at Paul's dictation ". . . We HAVE NOW RECEIVED the atonement." Again in Lev. 17:11 we read, ". . . For it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." This is plain enough, surely. The Bible and the denomination don't harmonise. What can one do but accept the Bible even at the cost of denominational disfavour.

Why do my S.D.A. brethren disagree with this belief? This question leads to another matter for consideration.

WHEN DID JESUS ENTER THE MOST HOLY PLACE—1844 OR PREVIOUSLY?

Among the prophecies of the Bible we have the one recorded in Dan. 8:14, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days (evening morning, Hebrew); then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

This prophecy—according to the denominational teaching ended in 1844, at which time the Saviour was supposed to enter the Most Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary. One is told that the explanation of Dan. 8:14 is to be found in Dan. 9:24, 25. But can anyone show one word in Dan. 9 that says anything about the 2,300 days? Do not all these verses point to the Saviour's death and to the end of the sacrificial system? In order to arrive at the conclusion that the verses in Dan. 9 refer to the 2,300 days of chapter 8 one is asked to accept the theory that the word rendered "determined" in verse 24 of chapter 9 means "cut off" and hence the seventy weeks (490 days) must be cut off

from a longer period; But no longer period can be found except the "2,300 days" and so one is asked to believe that the 70 weeks (490 days) is "cut off" from the 2,300 days.

That Daniel understood the 70 week period from a study of Jeremiah is evident from Daniel 9 : 2, but in verses 24-27 of this same chapter the first advent, work and death of Christ—which would occupy part of that 70 weeks—was clearly outlined to Daniel. The Jews in those days—as in the days when the Messiah Himself was upon earth fulfilling this very prophecy—failed to understand the true mission of the Promised One.

From Creation to Calvary the sinner was pardoned just as the sinner is pardoned to-day. Then he looked forward by faith to the death of Jesus, now we look back by faith; But while THE SINNER was then, and is now, pardoned, THE SIN was atoned for when it was laid upon the Redeemer. "He hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all."

In the old sanctuary service throughout the year the sinner brought his sin offering, which was a channel through which he confessed his sin, but his sin—in type—defiled the sanctuary until the day of atonement.

On the day of atonement the Lord did not leave the sinner to choose the offering, as he did during the year, but Himself chose the offering. The sinner was not permitted to lay his hands on this offering, for it symbolized the giving of God's Son.

The offerings during the year symbolized MAN'S ACCEPTING; the offering on the day of atonement represented GOD'S GIVING.

On the day of atonement when the goat was slain, the High Priest passed IMMEDIATELY into the Holy of Holies

To carry out the symbolism as soon as the Lamb of God was slain He, as the Great High Priest, must enter into the Holy of Holies in the Heavens. What is the view of the denomination on this point?

On page 82 of "The Sure Word of Prophecy," we find the following—

"... Christ began His ministration in the holy place and would continue His service there until the time came for Him to close His priestly work by cleansing the sanctuary on the great antitypical day of atonement.

"This work of judgment, or cleansing of the sanctuary, was to begin at the close of the 2,300 days of Dan. 8 : 14."

Again in a tract, "Heaven's Ultimatum," page 4—

"The hour of God's judgment was reached at the close of the great prophetic period brought to view in Dan. 8 : 14; 'Unto two thousand and three hundred days then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.' These prophetic days, so many literal years, ended in 1844. At that time Christ entered upon His priestly ministry in the holy of holies in the heavenly temple."

It is evident then from the denomination's own publications that they teach that Jesus did not enter the Most Holy place in Heaven till 1844. Putting the Saviour in the Holy Place, or first apartment, is to put Him in the position of the priest against whom the accumulated sins of the people were charged, and who was awaiting the day of atonement to unburden his load of sin.

My dear Adventist brethren, dare you load the Saviour again with the same sins for which He has already paid the penalty on Calvary? If up to 1844 Jesus was in the first apartment of the Sanctuary, between the time of Christ's ascension and 1844 man had NO HIGH PRIEST. What a serious thing it is to keep our Great High Priest out of

Heaven's Most Holy Place for over eighteen hundred years especially when the Bible declares otherwise.

Bible language is plain in pointing out that the way into the holiest became open at the death of the Lamb of God. Heb. 6 : 19, 20. Heb. 7 : 27. Heb. 9 : 24-26. Heb. 10 : 17-20.

"WITHIN THE VEIL."

TO WHICH APARTMENT DID IT REFER?

In "Looking Unto Jesus," page 134, we find the following statement—

"When Christ began His ministry above, on the throne of His Father, that throne was in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary."

Probably many who read the foregoing statement will wonder how the denominational leaders attempt to justify such a view. What in the old sanctuary service typified the throne of God in the heavenly sanctuary according to the recognized publications of the denomination is seen in the following statement taken from the Sabbath School Lessons for Feb. 1890—

"... The ark represented His throne; and from His throne He dispenses grace, or favour, or mercy."

But in the earthly tabernacle the ark was in the SECOND apartment, or Most Holy Place. How can you, my brethren, say and preach that the throne (which according to your own teaching was the antitype of the ark) is transferred to the FIRST apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. What a hopeless tangle you have made of the whole of the typical and antitypical sanctuary services.

In Heb. 6 : 19, 20, we read : "Which hope we have as

as anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that WITHIN THE VEIL; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus. . . ."

Now the question to be dealt with is, What is meant by "WITHIN the veil?"

Wherever the Hebrew word for "veil" as applied to the sanctuary service is used—25 times in the Old Testament—in every instance it applies to the SECOND veil. The term applied to the FIRST veil is "door of the tabernacle." Read Exod. 26 : 31-36. Exod. 30 : 1-6. Exod. 27 : 20, 21.

Compare Exod. 29 : 4, 11, 42. Lev. 8 : 31. Num. 12 : 5.

"WITHOUT THE VEIL."

If within the veil meant within the FIRST veil, what would without the veil mean unless it would mean outside the first veil. But can such an application be made. Read Exod. 26 : 35 and the impossibility of this suggestion will be obvious.

For believing that the term "within the veil" meant the Most Holy Place and that "without the veil" meant the Holy Place Brother Ballenger was deprived of church-membership.

Brethren, the Bible is clear on this matter and proves Brother Ballenger to be right. What are you going to do? Will you still stigmatize those who accept the plain teaching of God's Word in preference to denominational traditions? Or, will you, as Christians, acknowledge the mistake and do what ought to be done to those who have had sufficient courage to investigate the Bible for themselves and stand by the clear statements of God's Word?

Why is such stress laid on the point that the sanctuary means the second apartment, unless it is to cover the idea

that Jesus entered there in 1844. But, say the leaders of the denomination, how about the 2,300 days, they must be explained.

"THE 2,300 DAYS"—AN EXAMINATION.

The first question raised in the author's mind on reading the tract, "The 2,300 Days" is concerning the statement found on page 2, the last paragraph: ". . . by the sanctuary the Jew would understand primarily that part of the temple at Jerusalem answering to the most holy place in the tabernacle erected by the children of Israel in the wilderness."

To this definition objection is raised. William Jones, M.A., in his "Biblical Cyclopædia" says—

"Sanctuary.—Literally means a holy house, in which sense it is used by the inspired writers to denote the tabernacle which was built by Divine direction in the Wilderness Exod. 25 : 8. . . . And the Apostle Paul evidently uses the term to denote the whole of the tabernacle. Heb. 9 : 1

While there are a few instances in the Bible in which the word rendered sanctuary does apply to the Most Holy Place these are the exception and not the general rule.

Space forbids quotations from other learned scholars who agree with the foregoing conclusion.

By refusing a fulfilment of the 2,300 evening mornings which is accepted by many it is assumed that another fulfilment must be given. It is a better plan to acknowledge that one is not sure concerning the fulfilment of certain prophecies, especially when they are open to more than one interpretation. No interpretation was given to the periods mentioned in the closing chapter of Daniel. History is silent upon these two periods. But history is NOT silent upon the 2,300 evening mornings. Josephus deals with the

matter and declares that this prophecy met its fulfilment in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. There is certainly more reason to accept this interpretation which does no violence to other Bible texts than there is to accept an interpretation which, by placing Christ in the Most Holy Place AFTER 1844, DOES VIOLENCE TO OTHER TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

That this time-prophecy was fulfilled by Antiochus Epiphanes is believed by many commentators. Dr. Smith, LL.D., says: "The symbol (2,300 days) is commonly interpreted of Antiochus Epiphanes."

Daniel was concerned with the history of his own people and his remarkable prayer in Daniel 9 shows that he was anxious about the sins of his beloved people. While praying Daniel received a visit from Gabriel who told him of the wonderful sacrifice that was to "make an end of sins and to make reconciliation for iniquity." Then follows the prophecy concerning the Messiah Who would cause the sacrificial system to be not merely suspended for a time, as did Antiochus Epiphanes, but would abolish or end it. This Jesus did by His death caused by the very ones who refused to see in Him the Messiah.

Owing to lack of space it is impossible to go into details showing how remarkably Antiochus Epiphanes fulfilled this prophecy; but the author will be only too pleased to supply these to anyone caring to write for them.

Sufficient proof has been given, however, to show that—

1. The atonement was made at the death of Jesus.
2. Jesus entered Heaven's Most Holy Place centuries before 1844.
3. Within the veil could only apply to the second apartment.