

The priesthood of Christ commenced as soon as man had sinned. He was made a priest after the order of Melchizedek. The order had fallen and [they were] under the dominion of death, but they were made prisoners of hope; they were not left to become extinguished. Satan thought the Lord had given up His hold on man, but the Star of Hope lighted up the dark and dismal future in the gospel preached in Eden. The seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head and the serpent should bruise his heel. The other worlds that God had created were watching with intense interest the sad apostasy. "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." 1 Cor. 2:7, 8. See Rom. 16:25-27. {Ms43b-1891}

After the fall Christ became Adam's instructor. He acted in God's stead toward humanity, saving the race from immediate death. He took upon Him the office of mediator. Adam and Eve were given a probation in which to return to their allegiance, and in this plan all their posterity were embraced. {Lt91-1900}

Adam lived by the Law of spirit not a system of sacrifices but now he has broken the order of Melchisedek priesthood, this made it impossible for him to stand before God hence Christ put in effect the counsel of peace held by him and the Father (Zec 6:13). His blood that was to be shed stood as a surety as he began his mediatory phase which included the teachings which were new to Adam. **THE TWO COVENANTS WERE SET IN MOTION WHILE HUMANITY WAS PLACED UNDER A SECOND PROBATION.** When Israel sinned, the first thing was Moses to plead then Aaron to sacrifice, this mediatory phase of Moses is prefigured with Christ's work in the courtyard while the Aaronic act starts from Calvary. "Man could not stand a single minute without a priest". What Moses and Aaron were doing was already something that was done like money in a bank waiting only withdrawal on the side of fallen beings. This atonement though in force was ratified for confirmation in phases in Christ's life. Man was being given every opportunity to understand salvation by grace. Sinai was not a must but God adjusts to the condition of his people but without compromising the sin problem. He meets man at his lowest.

Lev 4:1 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying 2: Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a soul shall sin through ignorance against any of the commandments of the LORD concerning things which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them: 3: If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock without blemish unto the LORD for a sin offering. 4: And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD; AND SHALL LAY HIS HAND UPON THE BULLOCK'S HEAD, AND KILL THE BULLOCK BEFORE THE LORD. 5: And the priest THAT IS ANOINTED shall take of the bullock's blood, and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation: 6: And THE PRIEST SHALL DIP HIS FINGER IN THE BLOOD, AND SPRINKLE OF THE BLOOD SEVEN TIMES BEFORE THE LORD, BEFORE THE VAIL OF THE SANCTUARY. 11: And THE SKIN of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, 12: Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt. You Notice that the ANOINTED PRIEST had to carry the blood before the veil, Christ did not do this at the time of the fall, BUT BECAUSE HE IS THE LAMB SLAIN FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD, his blood to be shed was deemed to be already in sanctuary as he continued to plead before the Father when Adam fell. Instead of carrying the blood to the sanctuary, he proceeds to the next step, taking of the skin and instead of destroying it, makes the garments for Adam. The reason why the Lord clothed them with garments of skin appears to me to be this: because garments formed of this material would have a more degrading appearance than those made of linen or of woolen. God therefore designed that our first parents should, in such a dress, behold their own vileness, — just as they had before seen it in their nudity, — and should thus be reminded of their sin. Christ proceeds to the final stage of that first sacrifice which was to CONSUME THE OFFERING WITH FIRE as a token of acceptance of that sacrifice; hence in the Garden of Eden, everything that could be prefigured was performed at the fall of our first parents. Man was in a system that involved sacrifices though wholly based on the merits of grace which would be grasped by faith in the blood that was to be shed. The fall of man filled all heaven with sorrow. The world that God had made was blighted with the curse of sin and inhabited by beings doomed to misery and death. There appeared no escape for those who had transgressed the Law. Angels ceased their songs of praise. Throughout the heavenly courts there was mourning for the ruin that sin had wrought. Before the Father He PLEADED in the sinner's behalf, while the host of heaven awaited the result with an intensity of interest that words cannot express. Long continued was that mysterious communing--"the counsel of peace" (Zec 6:13) for the fallen sons of men. The plan of salvation had been laid before the creation of the earth; for Christ is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev 13:8); {PP 63.1, 3}.

THIS PLEADING IS WHAT I BELIEVE IS MEDIATION. THIS IS JUST THE FIRST PHASE OF A PRIEST. From Eden, we see a precursor of Sinai, man under two systems running concurrently, faith grasped in symbols and types hence Paul asserts that Christ is the end of the Law vis Christ is the embodiment of that Law. The Law represents, symbolizes and typifies; Christ becomes

the antitype. Now a candid question would be what precedes the other, the type or the antitype? Of course the antitype preceded the type.

Hebrews [9:12](#) (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.)

One of the major issues relating to the sanctuary was the suggestion that Christ went immediately into the Most Holy Place at His ascension in AD31, to begin his work of intercession [EGW Ibid pg 17]. This same issue is being resurrected amongst us a people and there is also an allusion that the heavenly sanctuary has no apartments but just one room and the ministry of Jesus is just a shift of phases in work but in the same room.

In detail, Brother Crosier had to combat this error by writing: "Hebrews 6:19, 20, is supposed to prove that Christ entered the Holy of Holies at His ascension, because Paul said He had entered within the veil. But the veil which divided between the Holy and the Holy of Holies is 'the second veil', Hebrews 9:3; hence there are two veils, and that in Hebrews 6, being the first of which he speaks, must be the first veil, which hung before the Holy, and in Exodus was called a curtain. When he entered within the veil, he entered His tabernacle, of course the Holy, as that was the first apartment; and our hope, as an anchor of the soul enters within the veil, i.e., the atonement of both apartments, including both the forgiveness and the blotting out of sins" [Ibid 17].

Debates and conjectures on the work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary continues from the past to date concerning the two apartments, the atonement both from without and within. Some even view them as face-saving arguments from SDA. Back in 1905 we had issues concerning the same from J.H. Kelog, A.F. Ballenger and a man referred to as Elder G. Elder Farnsworth reported Ballenger's teachings to the President of the General Conference, a claim that when Jesus ascended he went immediately into the Most Holy Place, and His ministry has been carried there ever since. Noted also was Ballenger's claim that in Hebrews 6:19, within the veil referred to the Most Holy Place [Adv Rev March 6, 1980 pg 4]

Such erroneous views were held by Elder G, of which Ellen White said "Elder G's proofs are not reliable. If received they would destroy the faith of God's people in the truth that has made us what we are. We are not to receive the words of those who comes with a message that contradicts the special points of faith. They gather together a mass of Scripture, and pile it as a proof around their asserted theories. This has been done over and over again during the past fifty years. If such application moves one pillar from the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, it is a great mistake [ISM 161.2]

The prophet did not agree with such notions which was destroying the faith of the people and the word of God was being construed. In his defence, Ballenger wrote: "I want to read to you now some of the misfits that I find in my attempt to place the first apartment work of the earthly sanctuary this side of the cross" . In his 'Nine Theses' he stated in each view of a certain feature of the sanctuary contrasted with what he called denominational view. In closing his Theses he said 'it is impossible for me to take that first apartment work of the sanctuary and apply it to a piece of plan of salvation without changing almost every cardinal point in the sanctuary' [The Nine Theses, Adv Rev Mar 6, 1980]

In regard to Ballenger's position, Farnsworth said, 'he sees clearly that his views cannot be made to harmonize with the testimonies, at least he admits freely that he is totally unable to do so, and even in his own mind, as far as he is able to see at present, there is an irreconcilable difference' [Ibid]. In 1905 Ballenger presented his views in a General Conference Session where Ellen White was presented and she stood to vindicate the truth [Manus 59, 1905 and Manus 62, 1905. A Warning against False Theories].

In her diary on October 31, 1905 EGW wrote "Elder Ballenger thinks he has new light, and is burdened to give it to the people, but the Lord has instructed me that he has misapplied texts of the scripture [Manus 145, 1905]. To Elder John Burden, two months later she wrote; "Elder Ballenger's proofs are not reliable, they do not prove that the past experience of God's people was a fallacy" [Letter to John Burden, Dec 11 1905].

In the past we have had D.M. Canright, W.W. Fletcher S. McCullough and others further their divisive views of the sanctuary. Still today there are some who still are bent on the same path. Some years not long ago, someone penned 'An argument frequently flows from the typology of the Israelite sanctuary suggesting that God dwells in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary. But typology is hardly sufficient basis upon which to establish a doctrine. Even if God were in the Most Holy Place, this does not define Jesus as being locatively proximate. Incidental descriptions of heavenly buildings

have theological value and are not of geographical or architectural import. An excessive interest in this realm which God has chosen not to reveal in any detail, results in futile speculation [God's Unseakable Gift. Australian Congress. Calvin W. Edwards pg 30]. Continued: 'The High Priest entered the Most Holy Place through the veil; we enter through the veil of Jesus' flesh. Thus the first apartment was a parable for the pre-Christian era when access to God was limited, but a fullness of access was foreshadowed in the Day of Atonement . Hebrews 9:8, 9. The Ministry that took place in that apartment found its fulfillment in the cross [Ibid 38]

Owen Crosier had met such unsound reasoning "The word in Hebrews 9:8, 10, 19 is Hagion 'of the Holies', instead of 'holiest of all'; and shows that the blood of Christ is the way or means by which He, as our High priest, was to enter both apartments of the heavenly tabernacle. Now if there be but one place in the heavens, as many say, why were there two in the figure? Perhaps those who despise the law and corrupt the covenant of Levi can explain this; if not, we advise them to abide by Paul's exposition of the matter" [The Sanctuary pg 17]. [I WILL COME TO THIS ISSUE LATER]

I may go on and on this matter but its worthy to note: -

*I believe the Sanctuary, to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, is the New Jerusalem Temple, of which Christ is a minister. The Lord shew me in vision, more than one year ago, that Brother Crosier had the true light, on the cleansing of the Sanctuary, &c; and that it was his will, that Brother C. should write out the view which he gave us in the Day-Star, Extra, February 7, 1846. I feel fully authorized by the Lord, to recommend that Extra, to every saint. I pray that these lines may prove a blessing to you, and all the dear children who may read them. * * E. G. White. {WLF 12.8, 9}*

With that in mind, let us go back Hebrews 9 and 6 and examine a little into these things

Through his own blood (dia tou idiou haimatos). This is the great distinction between Christ as High Priest and all other high priests. They offer blood (verse Heb 9:7), but he offered his own blood. He is both victim and High Priest. See the same phrase in Heb 13:12; Ac 20:28. Once for all (ephapax). In contrast to the repeated (annual) entrances of the Levitical high priests (Heb 9:7). Into the holy places (eis ta hagia). Here, as in verses Heb 9:8,24 heaven itself. Having obtained (heuramenos). First aorist middle (indirect) participle of heuriskō, simultaneous action with eisēlthen, and by or of himself "as the issue of personal labour directed to this end" (Westcott). The value of Christ's offering consists in the fact that he is the Son of God as well as the Son of man, that he is sinless and so a perfect sacrifice with no need of an offering for himself, and that it is voluntary on his part (Joh 10:17). Lutrōsis (from lutroō) is a late word for the act of ransoming (cf. lutron, ransom), in O.T. only here and Lu 1:68; 2:38 [2:38t](#) apolutrōsis elsewhere (as in Lu 21:28; Ro 3:24; Heb 9:15; 11:35). For "eternal" (aiōnian, here feminine form) see Heb 6:2. The holy place] Or sanctuary, ta agia, signifies heaven, into which Jesus entered with his own blood, as the high priest entered into the holy place with the blood of the victims which he had sacrificed. This entering in the holy place[s] was the means and key of unlocking the heavenly Holy of Holies. The High Priest could not enter the Most Holy Place before accessing or finishing the work in the Holy Place. If this were the case that he went to the Most Holy Place, it will destroy the typology. Having established "the Greek in Heb 9 vs. 12 "ta hagia" is plural thus it is translated literally as "the holy places." we can't escape the idea the heavenly sanctuary has two places. How all these turns into spiritual and not literal is still hard gospel.

Having accomplished his work in the Holy place, he entered into the Most Holy Place in 1844. As the Jewish high priest bore the blood of the animal into the holy of holies, and sprinkled it there as the means of expiation, so the offering which Christ has to make in heaven, or the consideration on which he pleads for the pardon of his people, is the blood which he shed on Calvary. Having made the atonement, he now pleads the merit of it as a reason why sinners should be saved. It is not, of course, meant that he literally bore his own blood into heaven--as the high priest did the blood of the bullock and the goat into the sanctuary; or that he literally sprinkled it on the mercy-seat there; but that that blood, having been shed for sin, is now the ground of his pleading and intercession for the pardon of sin--as the sprinkled blood of the Jewish sacrifice was the ground of the pleading of the Jewish high priest for the pardon of himself and the people.

the plural term "holies", sometimes translated "holy place", other times "holy places" (coming from "ta hagian" or "ta hagia" in Greek) is *AMBIGUOUS, and at times it means the sanctuary as a whole, sometimes the outer apartment, and other times the inner apartment, so it is CONTEXT that must be appealed to in order to ascertain meaning. This ambiguity of the Greek word is similar to the AMBIGUOUS word "law" in the Bible (from the Hebrew "torah", or the Greek "nomos"), and hence context is crucial. Now, interestingly, I found out (by doing a careful review of the Greek), that all places where it is claimed that Jesus "entered" [PAST TENSE] into the Most Holy Place into the presence of the Father is based on speculation, because THE EXPRESSION COMPLEX, "HAGIA HAGION" IS MISSING!! The expression used about Christ in the sanctuary in the presence of the Father is always

"hagion" or "ta hagia", which means simply either Heaven itself, or just the sanctuary on a whole (e.g. Heb. 9:8, and Heb. 10:19). Coupled with that is the fact that in the KJV Jesus is said to have "entered" into "the holy place" (singular) in Hebrews 9:12 and into "holy places" (plural) in Hebrews 9:24, with both expressions coming from "ta hagia". This further MAKES IT VAGUE AS TO WHICH COMPARTMENT HE "ENTERED" UPON HIS ENTRY INTO THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY...thus making the issue not as clear-cut as some think!! But by now it should be plain that "hagia hagia" or "hagia hagion" is used by the writer of Hebrews to specifically mean the inner apartment, and he used it only when he wanted to clinch that specific meaning, and so we cannot impose on the holy writ what the writer himself never chose to write. Thus SDAs are correct when we say Jesus started to serve in the sanctuary ("ta hagia") as a whole at first, but the inner apartment phase of his ministry came only later (i.e. in 1844). We are also on sound footing when we insist that Heb. 9:12 should be translated as he entering the "holies" or "the "holy places", or "the sanctuary" on a whole; not specifically the Most Holy Place/apartment phase of ministry. And he [Jesus] being said to enter "once" into the heavenly temple, as priest and high priest all in one, is simply comparative language in terms of this heavenly action being compared to the overall services of the earthly temple being repeated year after year. Jesus did not need to do the repeated yearly round of services year after year, but does everything once...both in terms of his sacrifice on the Cross outside the temple while on earth, his entry into the heavenly temple overall, his "purification" (Heb. 9:23) of the "things" [plural] in heaven (not just the later symbolic "purification" of the one item of furniture in the most holy place; the ark with its mercy seat), his ongoing intercession as the daily priests would have done but in (repeatedly yearly cycles), and also in terms of the distinctive and climaxing Day of Atonement service the high priest did (but repeats year after year).

Also, since the much debated expression, "the [temple] veil", needed a qualifying term by the very writer of Hebrews i.e. "*after [or within] the *SECOND veil" (Hebrews 9:3), so as to clinch a more specific meaning with reference to the "hagia hagion" ("the most holy place"), and since there were two veils to the temple, it is therefore not conclusive that Heb. 6:19 was referring specifically to behind the "veil" of the Most Holy Place when it was written. Even the writer of Hebrews SYMBOLICALLY uses the term "the veil" to mean Jesus' flesh (Heb. 10:20). It is obvious that to be in the Temple demanded that one pass through, and is behind or within the first "veil" to the door of the Temple. Thus the expression in Heb. 6:19 could be referring to being "within" or behind any of the two "veils", since Jesus was not a High Priest BEFORE his incarnation, as He must have been made human to even minister in the Heavenly sanctuary in the first place (Heb. 5). So his incarnation, obedience, and crucifixion opened the way, or gave Him the right to His ministry in the Heavenly sanctuary, that is, He earned the right via his state of being in the flesh (another type of "veil" as well; Heb. 10:20) to be minister "within the veil" or just simply the sanctuary itself. There is no evidence in the expression itself, i.e. "within the veil" in Heb. 6:19 that this meant SPECIFICALLY "The most Holy Place", and not just within the sanctuary itself!! In fact as we consider the earthly sanctuary we realize that the common people could only see the courtyard. They could not enter or see into the sanctuary itself; only the priests (i.e. the daily as well as the high priest). Thus when either the priest or high priest disappeared from their view he was entering through the first veil into the sanctuary as a whole, and only by faith they accepted what took place inside. Thus the expression "within the veil" can legitimately mean BOTH being in the temple as a whole, as well as being in the most holy place behind "the second veil" (Hebrews 9:3). The verses of the entire chapter of Hebrews 9, discuss all the services of the priests and high priests in their daily rounds, as well as that once a year event involving the High Priest going into the second apartment. The people could not see the priests in ANY of the work done in the "holy places" behind the veils of the sanctuary itself, whether it was in the holy place OR the most holy. In the same way, when Christ ascended to heaven we could no longer physically see Him. We must follow Him in faith as He ministers for us in the "Holy Places" with all its original "patterns" (plural) in the true sanctuary of heaven; not just in the Most Holy Place/apartment. While it is true Hebrews 9 makes reference to purification, bulls, goats, calves, heifer, sprinkling of ashes and blood, and refers to the high priest entering the most holy place once yearly, etc., and while it is true its mainly an imagery of the specific Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) and references the work in the most holy place, yet these descriptions are NOT ONLY about that. Bulls, calves and goats were used other days of the year, for instance (with blood entering the first apartment by way of the high priest on other crucial occasions like in Lev. 4:7, 17, 18), and the sprinkling of ashes of the heifer, and dedication or symbolic "purification" of all the vessels and furnishings of temple with blood (all acting as "patterns" of the heavenly "things" Jesus would relate to; Heb. 9:23) these all relate to other days in the yearly round of activities as well. This again debunks the claim of Dr. Desmond Ford that it was only the inner apartment work Jesus entered upon. And so the SDA position in its "Sanctuary Message" remains sound, despite the attempts of dissidents like Dr. Ford (notoriously the greatest detractor and misleading teacher in Adventism in modern times) to use ambiguous biblical references to try and overturn it.

The Lord gave me the following view in 1847, while the brethren were assembled on the Sabbath, at Topsham, Maine. We felt an unusual spirit of prayer. And as we prayed the Holy Ghost fell upon us. We were very happy. Soon I was lost to earthly things and was wrapped in a vision of God's glory. I saw an angel flying swiftly to me. He quickly carried me from the earth to the Holy City. In the city I saw a temple, which I entered. I passed through a door before I came to the first veil. This veil was raised, and I passed into the holy place. Here I saw the altar of incense, the candlestick with seven

lamps, and the table on which was the shewbread. After viewing the glory of the holy, Jesus raised the second veil and I passed into the holy of holies. In the holiest I saw an ark; on the top and sides of it was purest gold. On each end of the ark was a lovely cherub, with its wings spread out over it. Their faces were turned toward each other, and they looked downward. Between the angels was a golden censer. Above the ark, where the angels stood, was an exceeding bright glory, that appeared like a throne where God dwelt. Jesus stood by the ark, and as the saints' prayers came up to Him, the incense in the censer would smoke, and He would offer up their prayers with the smoke of the incense to His Father. In the ark was the golden pot of manna, Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of stone which folded together like a book. Jesus opened them, and I saw the ten commandments written on them with the finger of God. On one table were four, and on the other six... {EW 32.1-3}

To take indicative quotes and supposed Greek as grant evidence to land your feet on as a solid ground is to make a shipwreck of faith. Its destroying the sanctuary message, supposed evidence can not annul the inspired word. Daniel 7, debunks the one apartment but a shift of ministerial phase theories and Hebrews has to be harmonized with other passages in the Bible, it doesn't stand on its feet alone. The writer of Hebrews is writing in summation of the sanctuary message and in it's conclusive nature, whatever he is saying can't negate the other evidence prior. The playing of semantics by some to becloud minds in suggestive manner that seems to cast doubts about the holy place in the heavenly sanctuary is undoing the sanctuary message itself.

Critics cannot disprove the SDA viewpoint that Jesus ascended to heaven to relate to the entire heavenly sanctuary and its services as typified on earth in the earthly sanctuary; not just to relate to the inner apartment and its one item of furniture, the Ark of the Covenant. Jesus actually ascended and does/did a work related to all aspects, but in unfolding phases. Proof? Hebrews 8:2, 5 and Hebrews 9:18-24 make it plain (in the KJV and many other translations) that Christ was to relate to ALL the "PATTERNS" AND "THINGS" (PLURAL) IN "HEAVEN ITSELF", and not just one room of the Most Holy place, and its one item, the Ark of the covenant (BOTH SINGULAR SUBJECTS)'. Jesus is pictured as entered into "heaven itself" and into a place patterning the "holy places" (Hebrews 9:24) on earth, or he entered "once" into the sanctuary as a whole (Hebrews 8:2), and this sanctuary is also called "the holy place" (Hebrew 9:12) or "ta hagia" in Greek. IT WAS THE ENTIRE EARTHLY SANCTUARY THAT HAD ALL THE ITEMS "WHICH *ARE FIGURES [OR PATTERNS] OF THE TRUE", and this indicates that where Jesus started to serve as its counterpart "IN HEAVEN ITSELF" it has ALL THE PROTOTYPE "PATTERNS" [PLURAL] of the earthly sanctuary; not just the one room of the Most Holy place being a pattern (singular), as the true prototype.

It is certainly not evidenced in the literal words of New Testament Scripture that Jesus ascended directly to the Most Holy Place (Holy of Holies), but this theory must be assumed based on the argument that the Bible seem to suggest it. This assumption must be based on reading it into (eisogesis) either Rev. 3:21 or Psalm 80:1. However I have found that that is not conclusive since the Father's throne is indeed MOVEABLE (Ezekiel, chapters 1 and 10), and that God's shekinah glory did appear in the Old Testament sanctuary in other areas apart from the Most Holy place (e.g. by the door), and the cherubims followed. Therefore Psalm 80:1 is, by all intent and purposes it seems, a poetic expression of God "dwelling" between the cherubims, but not a literal statement of Him always being immovably fixed above the ark itself. GOD IS TOO BIG FOR THAT RESTRICTION!! Even in Heaven He is presented as not always sitting on His throne, but can come in from elsewhere, as in Daniel 7: 9, 10, to take up His position in a ceremony, AFTER HIS THRONE IS PUT IN PLACE. Also, since the Greek expression complex for the Most Holy Place (the Holy of Holies), "hagia hagian", was used only once in the entire New Testament (in Heb. 9:3), then we can easily track the use of the terms "hagian", used for the entire sanctuary itself or just a holy place like Heaven, and the use of "hagia", used only for the first apartment of the sanctuary. Now, interestingly, I found out (by doing a careful review of the Greek), that all places where it is claimed that Jesus entered into the Most Holy Place into the presence of the Father is based on speculation, because THE EXPRESSION COMPLEX, "HAGIA HAGION" IS MISSING!! The expression used about Christ in the sanctuary in the presence of the Father is always "hagian" or "tahagia", which means simply either Heaven itself, or just the sanctuary on a whole (e.g. Heb. 9:8, and Heb. 10:19). Also, since the much debated expression, "the [temple] veil" needed a qualifying term "after [within] the SECOND veil" (Hebrews 9:3) so as to clinch a more specific meaning, since there were two veils to the temple, it is therefore not conclusive that Heb. 6:19 was referring specifically to behind the "veil" of the Most Holy Place when it was written. It is obvious that to be in the Temple demanded that one pass through, and is behind or within the first "veil" to the door of the Temple. Thus the expression in Heb. 6:19 could be referring to any of the two veils, since Jesus was not a High Priest BEFORE his incarnation, as He must have been made human to even minister in the Heavenly sanctuary in the first place (Heb. 5). So his incarnation, obedience, and crucifixion opened the way, or gave Him the right to His ministry in the Heavenly sanctuary, that is, He earned the right to be minister "w ithin the veil" or just simply the sanctuary itself. There is no evidence in the expression itself, "within the veil", in Heb. 6:19 that this meant SPECIFICALLY, The Most Holy Place, and not just within the sanctuary itself!!

It is quite interesting that in Rev. 8:3, Rev. 1:4 and 4:5 the presence of the altar as well as the symbolic seven branched lamp (representing the Holy Spirit) are seen directly BEFORE (literally 'in front of') the Throne of God and the Lamb (the same throne as in Rev. 3:21). ON EARTH (A PATTERN OF THE HEAVENLY SANCTUARY) THIS "LAMP" WAS IN THE FIRST APARTMENT OF THE SANCTUARY, and this is compelling evidence that John's visions of Heaven before the arrival of the Judgment scene (of Daniel 7:9, 10, and Rev. 11:18, 19) seem to place God's throne in the first apartment of the Heavenly sanctuary. I also find it very gripping that only when the Judgment "TIME" was introduced in Rev. 11:18, 19 ("the TIME HAS COME") that John made reference to the Ark of the Covenant FOUND IN THE INNER APARTMENT, thus strongly indicating that this apartment was opened ONLY when Judgment arrived (which did not cover the whole Christian era). All the above described, along with the fact that the Godhead's 'Presence' can ALSO be represented by the showbread in the first apartment, makes compelling the established SDA viewpoint that prior to the Investigative Judgment of 1844 God probably moved His throne to the first apartment (probably since the incarnation, who knows?) to accommodate the proper sequencing of the work of Jesus the true High Priest in the Heavenly sanctuary. Thus the signal of it being probably put back in place in the Most Holy Place only at the fulfilled time of the Judgment scene in Daniel 7:9 does seem to have merit.

Another possibility is that His throne was never in this second apartment of the Heavenly, until the arrival of the Judgment scene, since the sanctuary was built around the salvation plan. Who knows? Remember that after salvation is complete there is no longer the need for the temple? John said in the New Earth he saw no temple!!! Think long and hard on that point, and consider that God needs no "Most Holy Place" at all times to fix His throne room. The writings of the 'inspired' writer (by SDA understanding), E.G. White, describes the movement as literally from one apartment to another in 1844, and because the Biblical evidence to FULLY disprove this possibility is just not there, and because the SDA argumentation to this effect is indeed compelling, then I will choose to believe that it may just have been so as 'SOP' writings described.

By the very reference to "FIGURES/PATTERNS" of the true, and to Jesus entering "HEAVEN itself" these expressions indicate that the place Jesus started to serve upon his ascension was filled with "FIGURES" OR "PATTERNS" [PLURAL]. No wonder Hebrews 9:23, when written in the first century, makes plain that it "should be" [future tense] all "THINGS" (PLURAL) in the heavenly sanctuary that "should be" (not "have been" but *SHOULD be") SYMBOLICALLY "purified" with Jesus' blood; NOT JUST THE ONE ROOM OF THE MOST HOLY PLACE, AND NOT JUST THE ONE ITEM OF FURNISHING IN IT (SINGULAR). The very language of Hebrews 9:23,24 makes plain Jesus was to serve in the entire heavenly sanctuary with all it "PATTERNS" (PLURAL); he was not just to serve in relation to one room, or one item of furnishing, but IN RELATION TO PLURAL SUBJECTS AND "THINGS" OR "PATTERNS". In addition to this, the very reference to "purification" of heavenly "things" and "patterns" refutes the claim that nothing "defiling" can be in heaven. It's clearly symbolic language at play, and so SDAs are on firm foundation to refer to symbolic "cleansing" of the heavenly sanctuary in our "Sanctuary Message". But the main point here is that Hebrews 9 makes sweeping descriptions of the overall temple and priestly services and ceremonies, and points to the heavenly ministry of Christ as their counterpart; Hebrews 9 is not just about the special event on the special Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur).

But the plan of redemption had a yet broader and deeper purpose than the salvation of man. It was not for this alone that Christ came to the earth; it was not merely that the inhabitants of this little world might regard the law of God as it should be regarded; but it was to vindicate the character of God before the universe. To this result of His great sacrifice--its influence upon the intelligences of other worlds, as well as upon man--the Saviour looked forward when just before His crucifixion He said: "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all unto Me." John 12:31, 32. The act of Christ in dying for the salvation of man would not only make heaven accessible to men, but before all the universe it would justify God and His Son in their dealing with the rebellion of Satan. It would establish the perpetuity of the law of God and would reveal the nature and the results of sin. {PP 68.2}

Not only man but angels will ascribe honor and glory to the Redeemer, for even they are secure only through the sufferings of the Son of God. It is through the efficacy of the cross that the inhabitants of unfallen worlds have been guarded from apostasy. It is this that has effectually unveiled the deceptions of Satan and refuted his claims. Not only those that are washed by the blood of Christ, but also the holy angels, are drawn to him by his crowning act of giving his life for the sins of the world. God's dealing with the rebellion of Satan is justified before the universe. The justice and mercy of God are fully vindicated, so that, through all eternity, rebellion will never again arise. Such is the import of His own words when for the last time teaching in the temple He said, looking forward to His approaching sacrifice, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."

Will draw all unto me--not only earth, but heaven; for of him "the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Ephesians 3:15. {BTS, December 1, 1907 par. 4}

John 1:29; Galatians 6:14; Hebrews 2:14). The Efficacy of the Cross.--The death of Christ upon the cross made sure the destruction of him who has the power of death, who was the originator of sin. When Satan is destroyed, there will be none to tempt to evil; the atonement will never need to be repeated; and there will be no danger of another rebellion in the universe of God. That which alone can effectually restrain from sin in this world of darkness, will prevent sin in heaven. The significance of the death of Christ will be seen by saints and angels. Fallen men could not have a home in the paradise of God without the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Shall we not then exalt the cross of Christ? The angels ascribe honor and glory to Christ, for even they are not secure except by looking to the sufferings of the Son of God. It is through the efficacy of the cross that the angels of heaven are guarded from apostasy. Without the cross they would be no more secure against evil than were the angels before the fall of Satan. Angelic perfection failed in heaven. Human perfection failed in Eden, the paradise of bliss. All who wish for security in earth or heaven must look to the Lamb of God. {5BC 1132.8}

In conclusion I would like to put here a conversation I had with my dear brother J.S.

QUOTE

Point 1: Thus far you have not addressed the verses in Hebrews (i.e Heb 1:3; 8:1; 9:6-8, 11-14, 24, 25; [10:19](#), 20; [6:19](#), 20) and the argumentation I made based on them. You also have not addressed the fact that the Greek of [6:19](#) is indicative of an entry into the most holy place as seen by comparing it to the Greek OT of Exodus 26:33, Lev 16:2, 12, 15.

MY RESPONSE

Hebrews 6:19

Within the veil, namely, to the Holy of Holies, veil--Greek, "catapetasma": the second veil which shut in the Holiest Place. The outer veil was called by a distinct Greek term, calumma: "the second (that is, the inner) veil." That which is within the veil (to esôteron tou katapetasmatos). The Holy of Holies, "the inner part of the veil" (the space behind the veil), in N.T. compare with Ac 16:24 (of the inner prison). I have not rejected what you said, coz the verses are clear. My point is that we cannot be dogmatic about there being no other apartment in heaven both views we have been discussing are probable. Since Christ's ascension, for us there is no veil as it was in the wilderness sanctuary because we have a direct access to the Father through the Son who is the Veil.

QUOTE

Now inasmuch as the video was actually a response to a question based on certain verses in Hebrews and that these verses are explicitly talking about Jesus in relation to the heavenly sanctuary, whereas Daniel 7 is not at least not explicitly, they carry a lot of weight for this particular subject. That just makes good logical sense. Therefore it would seem that the onus is really on you here friend. These are Bible verses my brother that are directly talking about Jesus and the heavenly sanctuary. If you do not address them then that would really seem to mute any argument you would make. We cannot ignore these passages but have to harmonize them.

MY RESPONSE

I don't think there is a burden on me to prove anything, coz I brought in Dan 7 just to show that the throne of God has wheels and there is a time it moved whether from one veil to another, its subject to another discussion

QUOTE

Point 2: Your comment about "ta hagia" (lit: holy places) seems self-defeating. Let me try to explain why I say that. The text directly says that Christ entered the holy places. Therefore you cannot say He entered only one of them (the holy place) when the text uses the plural of holy places. It seems to me that you've glossed right over that point. If we take the plural literally here then it puts Him as having entered the most holy place.

MY RESPONSE

You forgot I had written this "Having established "the Greek in Heb 9 vs. 12 "ta hagia" is plural thus it is translated literally as "the holy places." we can't escape the idea the heavenly sanctuary has two places." But I also added that when Paul is using that phrase, its also indictive that he is covering a grand time of the work inclusive of both apartment instead of mentioning one and going to another. Like I said, you can use the phrase "the time of the end" without going forth in specifics but you are covering different events under one phrase so your work is to know their chronology and purpose

QUOTE

Point 3: The argument that the two stacks on the table symbolized the presence of the Father and Son in the holy place seems to be contrived. Where in inspiration are you getting this idea from? I am genuinely curious and hope you will answer. As for now I would dispute that claim for the following reasons:

MY RESPONSE

I used the bread in connection with Matthew 4:4, Deuteronomy 8:3 and John 6:48-51. In the word is the presence of God and the bread symbolized word of God. Jesus says we must feed on his flesh John 6:53. This is something perpetual. When we are feeding on his word it has his presence, that germinating seed that makes us to be transformed in his image. That is what I meant by the bread of his presence.

QUOTE

c) Another salient point here is that the loaves were placed "without the veil" This is a contrast against Christ who is spoken of in Hebrews as entering "within the veil." Again as noted above the Greek here indicates entry into the most holy.

MY RESPONSE

I don't think that can because the work of sanctification even going on now is done by the word of God John 17:17, whichever apartment Christ maybe in, he is not disconnected to the word. In fact Jesus says the words I speak to you are spirit John 6:63. Is there a time the Spirit of Christ is not at work!

QUOTE

d) The whole focus of the sanctuary cultus is toward the most holy NOT toward the table of shewbread. For example take the altar of incense. When the priests would offer incense it was toward the ark of the covenant (the place where God's glory was manifest). The close connection here is the probable reason why the author of Hebrews places this altar as a part of the most holy place! The table of shew bread, on the other hand, does not have this type of function. Thus it seems a poor candidate to serve as God's throne. Again it really seems to me like this idea is the invention of necessity rather than exegesis of the text.

MY RESPONSE

If we have to agree also that the stacks of bread represents the word of God, we too remember that in the most holy in the ark we had Ten Commandments which was a sum totality of the word of God all serving the same purpose, sanctification and judgment. The table of showbread then is not obsolete because Christ is in the Most Holy place it will always remain our school master till translation. If am getting your point, its like you are saying that there are two places yet they are holiest coz its the presence of God that makes the place the most holy, so in actual sense, its just phases of the ministration from one most holy place to another most holy place. Thus spiritualizing the veil by quoting Hebrew 10:20. Christ being that veil then there needs no reason for partitions in heaven so when The Father moved in Dan 7, he moved just to another location but in the same room without veils or partitions.

NOTICE THIS CAREFULLY

Early Writings, pages 54-56

I saw a throne, and on it sat the Father and the Son. I gazed on Jesus' countenance and admired His lovely person. The Father's person I could not behold, for a cloud of glorious light covered Him. I asked Jesus if His Father had a form like Himself. He said He had, but I could not behold it, for said He, "If you should once behold the glory of His person, you would cease to exist." Before the throne I saw the Advent people--the church and the world. I saw two companies, one bowed down before the throne, deeply interested, while the other stood uninterested and careless. Those who were bowed before the throne would offer up their prayers and look to Jesus; then He would look to His Father, and appear to be pleading with Him. A light would come from the Father to the Son and from the Son to the praying company. Then I saw an exceeding bright light come from the Father to the Son, and from the Son it waved over the people before the throne. But few would receive this great light. Many came out from under it and immediately resisted it; others were careless and did not cherish the light, and it moved off from them. Some cherished it, and went and bowed down with the little praying company. This company all received the light and rejoiced in it, and their countenances shone with its glory. THIS IS DIFFERENT TO WHAT IS TO FOLLOW

NOTICE

I saw the Father rise from the throne, and in a flaming chariot go into the holy of holies within the veil, and sit down. Then Jesus rose up from the throne, and the most of those who were bowed down arose with Him. I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after He arose, and they were left in perfect darkness.

QUESTION TO PONDER

IF THE FATHER WAS NOT ON EARTH AND HE WAS NOT IN THE HOLY OF HOLIES (THE MOST HOLY PLACE) THEN WHERE WAS HE SITTING ON A THRONE?!!!

DIGRESS

ADDRESSING REVELATION 11:1, 2

I believe that if you study the structure of revelation well, you can not escape the fact that Rev 9 should end in Rev 11:14. Now if the events of the Trumpets are in chronological order, we believe the first six are in the holy place and the 7th in the most holy place, anything between Revelation 6-11:14 should be in the holy place with a parenthesis in Rev 10 to introduce the most holy place in Rev 11:15. That means Rev 10 if it was not for parenthesis nature should appear between Rev 11:14 and Rev 11:15

So as the trumpets deals with "executive" judgments of those who are in the courtyard that rejected the sacrifice of Christ, at the same time the "investigative" judgment is going on this who accepted him at the courtyard and entered by faith in the holy place hence Rev 11:1

Measure the temple <naos>

3485. naov naos, nah-os'

from a primary naio (to dwell); a fane, shrine, temple :--shrine, temple, central sanctuary itself. Compare 2411 (hieron)

2411. ieron hieron, hee-er-on'

neuter of 2413; a sacred place, i.e. the entire precincts (whereas 3485 denotes the central sanctuary itself) of the Temple (at Jerusalem or elsewhere):--temple.

The temple that is being measured is connected to the altar and it's the central of the sanctuary according to definition. That means the temple--Greek, "naon" (as distinguished from the Greek, "hieron," or temple in general), is non-other than the Holy Place, "of the sanctuary." The measuring denotes God's act of acknowledgment and approval; leaving unmeasured, his act of rejection. The temple and altar therefore, with their attendant worshippers, represent "the Israel of God," whom he owns as his true people; while the outer court of the temple and the city thronged with Gentiles, represent the multitude of both church officers and people who are Christian only in name. The whole symbol represents a period during which there would be some spiritual worshippers among the professed followers of Christ, while multitudes would be given up to spiritual darkness, idolatry, and death.

So why do the Adventists use it for the Day of Atonement?

I think that would be explanatory work and not explicit reference as to the verse being placed in time of 1844. What do I mean?

The authority of the intended revelation being declared, together with the necessity of that calling which was particularly imposed on John after which follows the history of the estate of Christ his Church, both conflicting or warring, and overcoming in Christ. For the true Church of Christ is said to fight against that which is falsely so called, over which Antichrist rules, Christ Jesus overthrowing Antichrist by the spirit of his mouth: and Christ is said to overcome most gloriously until he shall slay Antichrist by the appearance of his coming, as the apostle teaches in 2Th 2:8. So this history has two parts: One of the state of the Church conflicting with temptations until Chapter 16. The other of the state of the same church obtaining victory, thence to Chapter 20. The first part has two sections most conveniently distributed into their times, of which the first contains a history of the Christian Church for 1260 years, what time the gospel of Christ was as it were taken up from among men into heaven: the second contains a history of the same Church to the victory perfected. These two sections are briefly, though distinctly propounded in this chapter, but both of them are discoursed after in due order. For we understand the state of the Church conflicting, out of Chapters 12 and 13, and of the same growing out of afflictions, out of Chapters 14 to 16. Neither did John unknowingly join together the history of these two times in this chapter, because here is spoken of prophecy, which all confess to be but one just and immutable in the Church, and which Christ commanded to be continual. The history of the former time reaches to Re 11:2-14, the latter is set down in the rest of this chapter Re 11:15-19. In the former are shown these things: the

calling of the servants of God in Re 11:4 the conflicts which the faithful must undergo in their calling, for Christ and his Church, thence to Re 11:5-10 and their resurrection, and receiving up into heaven to Re 11:11-14. In the calling of the servants of God, two things are mentioned: the begetting and settling of the Church in two verses, and the education of it in two verses. The begetting of the Church is here commended to John by sign and by speech: the sign is a measuring rod, and the speech a commandment to measure the Temple of God, that is, to reduce the same to a new form: because the Gentiles are already entered into the Temple of God professedly, and shall shortly defile and overthrow it completely. As God measured those in the holy place and left those in the courtyard, he shall measure those in the most holy and leave those in the holy place. It's an indicative verse applying to both periods.

The altar--of incense; for it alone was in "the sanctuary." (Greek, "naos"). The measurement of the Holy place seems to me to stand parallel to the sealing of the elect of Israel under the sixth seal as the Day of Atonement will represent those sealed under the 7th seal. John's accurately drawing the distinction in subsequent chapters between God's servants and those who bear the mark of the beast, is the way whereby he fulfils the direction here given him to measure the temple. The design of this measuring seems to be the preservation of the church in times of public danger; or for its trial, or for its reformation. The worshippers must be measured; whether they make God's glory their end Rev 6:17, and his word their rule, in all their acts of worship. As those in the outer court, worshiped in a false manner, or with dissembling hearts, and will be found among his enemies so will those who worship in the holy place when they are supposed to be in the most holy place.

Blessings