

# CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE SABBATH SCHOOL QUARTERLY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

January – March of 2022

By Dr. Alberto R. Treiyer  
December 2021

Four books of the Bible are of special importance to the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and therefore we read more carefully the commentaries that are written on them. The first book is *Leviticus* with the laws of sacrifices and the Israelite feasts (we can include much of the rest of the Pentateuch because the Levitical laws appear scattered and complemented in the other books). The second book is the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, which is largely a complement to the book of Leviticus from the Christian perspective. Without that epistle our understanding of the ancient ritual laws from the New Testament perspective would have been greatly limited.

The other two books that depict these rituals in their apocalyptic setting are *Daniel* and *Revelation*. Our church was built on the study of such prophecies, and after the great disappointment of 1844, it had to turn its attention to Leviticus and Hebrews in a special way. So those four books complement each other. In Leviticus and Hebrews we have the doctrine of *the gospel of the sanctuary*. In Daniel and Revelation we see its fulfillment more definitively from the perspective of *the great conflict of the ages* between good and evil.

In my critical remarks to the *Sabbath School Quarterly on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, I will avoid the trap of some French brethren who years ago began each Sabbath School lesson by saying that they would have organized that lesson in a different way. Rather than concentrating directly on the actual content of the quarterly, they wore out their classes with discussions about how the topics should have been organized according to their particular opinion. And for the record, I could do the same, because I specialized in those very subjects, and the *Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* later published my studies on Leviticus and Hebrews, in the series prepared by DARCOM (Daniel and Revelation Committee).

## Positive points

Why don't I want to criticize the way the lessons are organized? For two reasons.

1. It is impossible in any small booklet to express all that can be said about that Epistle. Therefore, if I had been called upon to prepare that study guide myself, I would have fallen short too, wanting to have said much more. And someone would always complain that I did not study some issue more carefully.
2. I liked the organization of the material. The author, Félix Cortez, strives to explain the meaning of many expressions that appear in the epistle in their biblical context, so that church members will have an extraordinary synthesis on the importance of that epistle, and its value for the Christian faith. I also appreciated that although he does not quote me directly, he used several arguments that I used in my books, some of which no one had paid attention to until now.

I'm as happy to give this endorsement as I was to endorse last year's quarterly on Daniel, about which I also added my comments. I am glad to be able to speak well of such studies, overlooking the small nuances in which I might disagree. I say this because I couldn't speak well of the quarterly from two years ago about the book of Revelation. There I had to highlight a significant number of heresies that the liberal authors who prepared it introduced. What was more disconcerting to me regarding these Adventist heresies is that they were overlooked by those who reviewed the lessons, even though in a very few cases,

at the last minute, statements were corrected because the reviewers had received stern warnings in advance that there were serious problems with that quarterly.

<https://secureservercdn.net/104.238.71.109/m5i.cd6.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/documents/ApostasySSRevedfinal.pdf>

## **Negative points**

Despite the general positive trend of the quarterly on Hebrews, some few significant errors are unfortunately found not only from the biblical perspective, but also from the Adventist theological views expressed by our pioneers and confirmed by the Spirit of Prophecy. Fortunately these errors appear very briefly and do not constitute the bulk or the crux of the quarterly on the Epistle to the Hebrews. But they create serious problems in the apocalyptic chronology and in the understanding of the book of Revelation. These are errors that, for the most part, were taken from the non-Adventist theological pattern.

Let us enumerate them first with their location in the quarterly itself. Contrary to what Felix Cortez says in the Sabbath School Quarterly:

1. Jesus did not sit upon the throne of David when He ascended to heaven (see Thursday, January 13; Thursday, February 10).
2. The priesthood of Jesus is not eternal (see Tuesday, January 6; Wednesday, February 2; Wednesday, March 16), but ends when His mediation in the heavenly sanctuary concludes.
3. The rest God would give His people from their enemies through David is not available today (Saturday, January 22).
4. We cannot approach God in the sanctuary as priests, but as sinners who trust in the priestly ministry of our only High Priest, Jesus Christ. (Monday, January)
5. Jesus did not die on the day when the Paschal lambs were sacrificed (see Sunday, February 27).
6. There is no biblical reference to a presumable association of the law at Sinai with Pentecost (see Sunday, February 27).

Let's take a closer look at not only those errors, but also their consequences on understanding the biblical and Adventist apocalyptic theology. Contrary to what Felix Cortez says:

### **1. Jesus did not sit upon the throne of David when He ascended to heaven (see Thursday, January 13; Thursday, February 10).**

Félix Cortez wrote: "Jesus became the 'Son of God with power' when He was resurrected and seated at the right hand of God. It was at that moment that God fulfilled His promise to David that his Son would be adopted as God's own Son and His throne over the nations would be established forever (2 Sam 7:12-14)" (Thursday January 13). "According to the New Testament, both oaths [those of Abraham and David respectively] were fulfilled in Jesus, the seed of Abraham, who ascended and was seated on the throne of David (... Luke 1:31-33)" (Thursday, February 10).

**Answer.** What did E. G. White write? Exactly the opposite. Among the many definite affirmations of the Spirit of Prophecy, let's read how she interpreted Luke 1:31-33:

“He ‘shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne’ [Zech 6:12-13]. *Not now ‘upon the throne of His glory;’ the kingdom of glory has not yet been ushered in. Not until His work as a mediator shall be ended will God ‘give unto Him the throne of His father David,’ a kingdom of which ‘there shall be no end.’* Luke 1:32,33. As a priest, Christ is now set down with the Father in His throne. Revelation 3:21” (GC 416).

E. G. White does not affirm things without backing them up with the Bible. This quote shows categorically that when Jesus said in Rev 3:21, that “whoever overcomes will sit with me on my throne, just as I overcame and sat with my Father on His throne,” He was affirming that the throne of God on which He sat down is not the throne He was going to share with His church in the future. The throne that Jesus would share with the redeemed is the one that David His father had represented in old Jerusalem. Now that throne will be occupied by the second David, Christ Jesus, reigning over the New Jerusalem. That’s what Daniel and Revelation talk about when they say that the blessed who will be saved will “reign with Christ” eternally (Dan 7:18,22,27; Rev 20:4,6; 22:5).

*“The work of Christ as man’s intercessor is presented in that beautiful prophecy of Zechariah concerning Him ‘whose name is the Branch.’ Says the prophet: ‘He shall build the temple of the Lord; and He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His [the Father’s] throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between Them both.’* Zechariah 6:12,13” (GC 415-6).

In his (Sunday, January 2) entry, Félix Cortez mentions Rev 5 regarding the “Lion of the Tribe of Judah” and “Root of David”. Jesus is there portrayed as receiving the book of the kingdom which was given to the Davidic kings in ancient Israel, which was the Book of the Law as E. G. White and several other authors agree. Consequently, it was not appropriate to give Jesus that book when He sat down with the Father at the inauguration of His heavenly priesthood, but at the end when He is invested to be King, before sitting on the throne of the New Jerusalem. That is why E. G. White always places the moment of the deliverance of the book in the future, at the conclusion of Jesus’ reign of mediation, never at His past priestly inaugural enthronement at God’s right hand.

*“The time will come when all will praise him..., saying, ‘Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof..* Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing” (RH 6-4-95, 6).

In Rev 5 Jesus does not sit on the Father’s throne, but remains standing as in the vision of judgment in Dan 7. The effort of Andrews’ professors to imagine Him sitting on the Father’s throne in Rev 5 has been denied by the most recent and reputable authors commenting on the book of Revelation. What these authors at the Andrews University do not grasp is that the Son of David was to be, successively, first King-Priest on his Father’s throne according to the order of Melchizedek, and then King as David, but over the New Jerusalem. You can see more documentation on my website, in the article I have in both Spanish and English, entitled *The Two Successive Kingdoms of the Messiah*.

<https://seureservercdn.net/104.238.71.109/m5i.cd6.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/documents/Twosuccessivekingdommessiah-edit.pdf>

Let’s look at more statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, to see that despite being so clear and consistent in such numerous assertions about the two enthronements of Christ, modern authors at *Andrews University* and the *Biblical Research Institute* ignore them altogether.

“The throne of glory represents the kingdom of glory; and this kingdom is referred to in the Saviour’s words: ‘When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him,

then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory: and before Him shall be gathered all nations.’ Matthew 25:31, 32. This kingdom is yet future. It is not to be set up until the second advent of Christ” (GC 347).

Christ “comes to the Ancient of Days in heaven to receive dominion and glory, and a kingdom, which will be given to him at the conclusion of his work as a mediator” (GC 480). “Christ, as stated by the prophet Daniel, will receive from the Ancient of Days in heaven, ‘dominion, and glory, and a kingdom;’ He will receive the New Jerusalem, the capital of His kingdom, ‘prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.’ Daniel 7:14; Revelation 21:2. Having received the kingdom, He will come in His glory, as King of kings and Lord of lords, for the redemption of His people, who are to ‘sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,’ at His table in His kingdom (Matthew 8:11; Luke 22:30), to partake of the marriage supper of the Lamb” (GC 426).

Jesus referred to this throne in Rev 3:21, which He will share with His people, as seen above.

“This will not take place until Jesus has finished His priestly office in the heavenly sanctuary, and lays off His priestly attire, and puts on His most kingly robes, and Crown, to ride forth on a cloudy chariot, to ‘thresh the heathen in anger,’ and deliver His people” (Ellen G. White, *The Early Years*, I, 125-6; see also *EW* 281). This final act will occur “when the coronation shall take place, and Christ, our Advocate and Redeemer, becomes the king of his redeemed subjects” (*HM* 11-01-97, 7).

The most recent theologians in our church have been changing our Adventist eschatology on this important issue regarding thrones. We need to highlight the fact that Felix Cortez’s erroneous claim is shared by all Andrews University professors currently addressing the issue, and by members of the General Conference *Biblical Research Institute*, in open contradiction to the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. On that false foundation they have built theories about John’s visions in Revelation that bring confusion about the true purpose of those prophecies. They claim that when Jesus ascended to heaven to inaugurate the heavenly sanctuary, He sat on David’s throne. No, as already seen, He sat on His Father’s throne to be High Priest at His right hand! David’s throne was not to be granted to Him until the end, when His Father crowned Him King of the New Jerusalem, as David was in Old Jerusalem.

The pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church lived under the expectation of the Lord’s coronation as the true Davidic king of the New Jerusalem, an event they hoped would be fulfilled at the conclusion of the investigative judgment. But in recent years, several theologians at Andrews University have been confusing the kingdom of Melchizedek, who was king and priest, with the kingdom of David who was only king. And so they don’t know the real reason why there should be a second coronation. In addition to Felix Cortez those authors include, Ranko Stefanovic, Jacques Doukhan, and Richard Davidson. The Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference is about to publish a book by the latter, proving that they have not grasped the tremendous problem that this position presents for the apocalyptic understanding of our church. You can see more documentation on my website, in the article I have prepared in both Spanish and English, entitled *The Two Successive Kingdoms of the Messiah*.

<https://securservercdn.net/104.238.71.109/m5i.cd6.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/documents/Twosuccessivekingdommessiah-edit.pdf>

What contrast does Stefanovic see between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the book of Revelation, without understanding the underlying reason? He is struck by the fact that in the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is exalted as High Priest according to the order of Melchizedek, while the book of “Revelation puts a strong emphasis on ... His royal role” (*The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, 210). But by ignoring that there would be two successive kingdoms of Christ, the inaugural priestly first, then the Royal Davidic at the

end, he does not distinguish between the two different periods of time emphasized in both books.

Let's look at a few more statements which speak of a second coronation of the Son of God on the throne of David. Entering the Most Holy Place of the heavenly temple in 1844, Jesus says:

“Wait here—I am going to my Father to receive the kingdom; keep your garments spotless, and in a little while I will return from the wedding and receive you to myself” (*ExV*, 1851, 44; *EW* 55; cf. Luc 12:36). “The wedding garment is the righteousness of Christ, and represents the character of those who will be accepted as guests for the marriage supper of the Lamb” (*YI*, October 21, 1897). “Soon the garments of heaviness will be changed for the wedding garment. Soon we shall witness the coronation of our King” (*AH* 543).

**2. The priesthood of Jesus is not eternal, contrary to the quarterly guide on the Epistle of Hebrews (Tuesday, January 6; Wednesday, February 2; Wednesday, March 16). Rather, it comes to an end when His mediation in the heavenly sanctuary concludes in the Most Holy Place.**

Let us first consider statements of the author of the lesson. “The new covenant delivers what only a perfect, eternal, human-divine Priest can” (Thursday, January 6). We agree that Jesus is divine and eternal, but He does not have an eternal priesthood. Notice the subtitle for Wednesday, February 2: “An Eternal Priest,” and then, the statement of Félix below: “Jesus would be a priest ‘forever’ (Heb 7:21).” Later on he insists: “Hebrews also says that Jesus’ priesthood remains forever (Heb 7:3,24), as does the inheritance of the redeemed (Heb 10:34)” (Wednesday March 16).

**Answer:** Not so! The priesthood of Jesus is not eternal as is the inheritance of the redeemed. In that comparison you see Felix’s confusion. His error derives from his previous misconception concerning the moment when Jesus sits on the throne of David. This causes confusion about the distinction between the inauguration of the priestly kingdom or mediation of Christ in the year 31, and the Davidic kingdom at the end when He would cease to be a priest to become only King. This was made clear in previous statements of the Spirit of Prophecy, and more will be provided below.

But why does Paul say in Heb 7:3,21 and 24, based on Ps 110:4, that Jesus’ priesthood “remains forever”? What does that expression mean, which in Hebrew is *l’olam*? That term can mean something eternal which will never cease to be. But it can also mean something that remains standing until a person’s activity expires. Of the many examples found in the Bible let’s look at one of them, the case of the slave who is freed in the seventh year, but who prefers to serve his master “forever” (Ex 21:6: *l’olam*). It is obvious that this service will not be eternal, but as can be seen when studying the laws of the jubilee, it lasted until the jubilee year 50 years later, when the servant could grant his children and grandchildren an inheritance worthy of its name. That is if the servant did not die before, causing the expression “forever” to expire at an earlier time. So the text means that the priesthood of Aaron would be replaced by the priesthood of the Lord, and no other priesthood would take the Lord’s priesthood.

Let’s look at other statements of E. G. White that show that the royal priesthood of Christ represented by Melchizedek ends when He is invested as the promised Davidic King in the final events related to the Second Coming of Christ.

“As the high priest, after performing his service in the holy of holies, came forth to the waiting congregation in his pontifical robes; so Christ will come the second time, clothed in garments of whitest white... He will come in His own glory, and in the glory of His Father, and all the angelic host will escort Him on His way” (2 T 612).

“Then I saw Jesus lay off His priestly attire and clothe Himself with His most kingly robes. Upon

His head were many crowns, a crown within a crown. Surrounded by the angelic host, He left heaven” (*EW* 280; see Rev 14:14). “Christ says...: ‘On my coronation day, you will be a jewel in My crown of rejoicing’” (*HP* 267). “When the coronation shall take place, and Christ, our Advocate and Redeemer, becomes the king of his redeemed subjects” (*HM* 11-01-97, 7).

“The humblest can have a share in the work, and a share in the reward when the coronation shall take place, and Christ, our Advocate and Redeemer, becomes the King of His redeemed subjects” (*HM* 11-01-97, 7). “The Prince of heaven has placed man in an exalted position. His life has been valued at the cost of Calvary’s cross... From the depths of sin’s degradation, we may be exalted to become heirs with Christ, the sons of God, and kings and priests unto the Most High” (*RH* 2-28-88, 4).

### **3. Contrary to what the Quarterly claims, the rest God would give His people from their enemies through David is not available today.**

Felix says, literally: “The Davidic covenant promised that God would give the promised king and his people ‘rest’ from their enemies (2 Sam 7:10-11). This rest is available to us now that Jesus is seated at the right hand of God” (Saturday, January 22).

**Answer:** Not so. The author’s confusion here is once again due to his unawareness of the two successive kingdoms of the Messiah. Therefore this idea appears scattered throughout the SS Quarterly. It is true that we can obtain a spiritual rest today from Jesus because He is our High Priest who intercedes for us. But Jesus has not yet annihilated all His enemies who are still alive and well and quite active, and will be until the end of the world.

What rest did the Davidic covenant speak of? Of a future and definitive rest when the enemies would not afflict them anymore. “I will provide a place for my people Israel and will plant them so that they can have a home of their own and no longer be disturbed. Wicked people will not oppress them anymore... I will also give you rest from all your enemies” (2 Sam 7:10-11). But what does the Epistle to the Hebrews say? Did the enemies of the Lord and of His people disappear when Jesus sat at the right hand of God? No! David prophesied: “The Eternal says to my Lord: ‘Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet... You are a priest forever in the order of Melchisedek’” (Ps 110:1).

This shows us that the son of David whom David himself recognizes as his superior by calling him Lord, was first to be a priest according to an order different from David’s, before putting His enemies under His feet. This is the reason why the apostle Paul states in Hebrews that from the moment when Jesus sits at the right hand of God, He is waiting for His enemies to be placed under His feet (Heb 1:13; 10:12-13). In other words, the persecution would not cease when Jesus sat at God’s right hand in the year 31. Affliction would remain until the enemies of God and His people were defeated in the end, and placed under the feet of the Victor. When? At His Second Coming.

Jesus also warned us not to be surprised by the persecutions we would experience from our enemies. He literally said: “In the world you will have tribulation. But take heart; I have overcome the world” (John 16:33). David could not bestow the spiritual rest that only a second Melchizedek could bestow by being not only a king but also a priest. However, a son of David who was going to be both at the same time could do it.

There is “today” a spiritual battle wherein we can obtain rest, thanks to the fact that it is fought under the priestly or mediatorial kingdom of Jesus as the second Melchizedek (Matt 11:28-30; Heb 7:25). But we are still waiting for His coming to literally defeat the enemies as the first David did in ancient Israel, now

to give us a definitive rest as a second David (Rev 2:27; 12:5; 19:15; cf. Ps 2:7). This is the reason why the apostle Paul likewise affirms that “there remains a rest for the people of God,” the heavenly one, which is illustrated and anticipated in the weekly Sabbath rest as Félix also agrees later (Heb 4:9-11).

#### **4. We cannot approach God in the sanctuary as priests, but as sinners who trust in the priestly ministry of our only High Priest, Jesus Christ (Monday, January 5).**

Felix Cortez wrote: “We—believers in Jesus—are called ‘a royal priesthood.’ This role implies incredible privileges. Priests could approach God in the sanctuary. Today, we can approach God through prayer with confidence (Heb 4:14-16; Heb 10:19-23)... He also wants us to offer sacrifices of praise and good works”

**Answer:** Félix again introduces a subject that is not given consideration in the Epistle to the Hebrews. He reflects the bias of several teachers at Andrews University, who want to find Bible support for the ordination of women to pastoral ministry, using a misinterpretation of the Protestant argument known as “the priesthood of all believers.” They overlook that the Old Testament people of Israel were also called “a royal priesthood” (Exod 19:5-6), but this didn’t allow them to officiate within the temple, where only the sons of Levi were permitted to officiate. Neither did that royal priesthood qualify women to become patriarchs or “heads” (chiefs) in the midst of the people.

What the apostle Peter says is that the privilege of being a royal priesthood of ancient Israel was transferred to us as the new Israel in the Christian dispensation. Neither in the old nor in the new order did the “royal priesthood” of the people as a whole empower the Israelites to officiate within the temple. They offered their sacrifices as sinners, not as priests. They came to the temple to be forgiven or to thank God for His mercies (Heb 7:25; 13:15).

In what way could the people of ancient Israel, as well as Christians of the New Testament dispensation legitimately become a royal priesthood? In sharing the gospel of the sanctuary to the nations with faith (Heb 4:1-2), mediating between God and the world. “That you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light” (1 Pet 2:9). As a matter of fact, the sacrifices of praise and good works were also offered by the people in the Old Testament. In those sacrifices, they offered themselves to the Lord. Only through the Aaronic priesthood and now through the priesthood of Jesus, can our sacrifices be offered before God. For more documentation, see in my web page:

<https://secureservercdn.net/104.238.71.109/m5i.cd6.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/documents/Typordinationchurchstructure.pdf>

#### **5. Contrary to what Félix says (Sunday, February 27), Jesus did not die on the day when the Paschal lambs were sacrificed.** This is what the lesson says, literally: Jesus “died on the day for the preparation of the Passover at the ninth hour, the moment in which Passover lambs were sacrificed (John 19:14; Matt 27:45-50).”

**Answer:** Not so. Jesus did not die when the Paschal lambs were sacrificed, but when the vesper sacrifice took place. First of all, there was not a preparation day for the Passover, but a preparation day for the weekly Sabbath which was always Friday, the former day, and which in that occasion, fell on the Passover’s week.

“Now it was the day of Preparation, and the next day was to be a special Sabbath” (John 19:31).

“When the loud cry, ‘It is finished,’ came from the lips of Christ, the priests were officiating in the temple. It was the hour of the evening sacrifice” (DA 756).

This might seem like a minor detail without much relevance. But if I had made this statement, I would be criticized by those who know the implications, such as the engineer Juárez Rodríguez de Oliveira, who studied the chronology of the 70 weeks and the 2300 days/years from the biblical, historical and astronomical perspective. De Oliveira wisely demonstrated how some expressions of the gospels are misinterpreted regarding the Easter events related to the Passion Week. If Jesus would have died when the Passover lambs were sacrificed every year, then His death on Friday could not have taken place in the year 31, and the whole prophetic scope of the 70 weeks and 2300 years would be broken.

According to the Bible, the Passover lambs were sacrificed each year on the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisan before sunset, and the Passover meal took place after sunset already on the 15<sup>th</sup> of Nisan, according to the biblical computation. According to astronomical data, in the year 31 the Passover sacrifice must have occurred on Thursday, (not Friday), and the Holy Supper took place moments later, after sunset, at the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> Nisan. This fits perfectly with the gospel account, and the statements of E. G. White. For a detailed analysis of these aspects, you can see the study I wrote and placed on my website in both Spanish and English:

<https://secureservercdn.net/104.238.71.109/m5i.cd6.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/documents/Chronopassoverpaper.pdf>

#### **6. Pentecost didn't celebrate the barley harvest, and there are no biblical references to an alleged association of the law at Sinai with Pentecost (Sunday, February 27).**

Félix Cortez wrote: "Pentecost celebrated the barley harvest, and by the time of the New Testament, it was associated with the giving of the law at Sinai" (Sunday, February 27).

**Answer:** Not so. Pentecost celebrated the wheat harvest. See my book, *The Apocalyptic Times of the Sanctuary*, chapter 2. The barley harvest was celebrated in the first month.

Some have tried to associate Pentecost with the proclamation of the law at Sinai in order to link it to the vision of the throne of Rev 4 and 5 which they suppose to have taken place in that inaugural feast. But there are not biblical references for that presumable association. And the vision of Rev 4-5 does not speak about a second Moses, but about a second David. What we see in Rev 4 and 5 is not a call to come up to a mountain, but to the Most Holy Place which was higher than the Holy Place where John had seen Jesus in the former vision.

I have extensively replied to that unsubstantiated proposition in some of my books like *The Final Crisis in Revelation 4 and 5*, and *The Apocalyptic Expectations of the Sanctuary*. Rather than seeing a second Pentecost in Rev 4 and 5, we see there clearly represented an antitypical Day of Atonement which culminates with the investiture of Christ as the second David. As a matter of fact, the only feasts that can be clearly seen represented in the book of Revelation are the last feast of Autumn.

#### **Conclusion**

Again I insist that apart from these incorrect details of the SSQuarterly on Hebrews, I find it very informative and useful for the church. The question, however, arises of knowing why errors of this nature continue to creep into the Sabbath School quarterlies. The most obvious answer is that many doctors of theology today do not care to read and study the books of the Spirit of Prophecy. It is very good to go and study in non-Adventist theological centers. I did it myself and it was very useful to me. But before I went to the University of Strasbourg, I spent years studying the Spirit of Prophecy along with the Bible, especially the Pentateuch.



Many who attend outside institutions to obtain a doctoral degree in theology without a strong foundation in the Spirit of Prophecy accept a theological mold from which they cannot later detach. And when they encounter statements of the Spirit of Prophecy that go against that foreign mold, they say that God called her for a pastoral, but not a theological purpose. They increasingly limit the function of the Spirit of Prophecy until they can be freed from it altogether, in order to keep their discordant theological positions. Not all theologians do this, but we can see it even in some who are considered and consider themselves conservatives. Not to mention the liberals who believe that they have discovered the pearl of great price in what they found outside, and think that they must correct our distinctive messages!

If you ask them if they believe in the Spirit of Prophecy, they will categorically say yes. And in order to give that impression, they search the CD of her writings for statements that they think can confirm their deductions. But they don't bother to study in depth all that E. G. White wrote about a particular subject, and they even discard statements that contradict their preconceived ideas obtained from their outside study. But let us move on, because God is at the helm of the church, and the truth will triumph. God has His timing to straighten out what is wrong, so let us trust Him. We are all sinners and fragile, but heaven is in charge of putting us on the right path when the moment comes to do so. Enjoy this booklet on the Epistle to the Hebrews, because in general, it is a good document for the church.