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One of the major problems in the study of the doctrine of redemption is that it has been linked to the cross while overlooking its etiological and eschatological perspectives. This has caused many to dissociate creation and redemption, leading to the acceptance of an evolutionistic approach to theology, and redemption and eschatology, leading to the mitigation of the connection of the two in the New Testament.

While other Christian traditions emphasize the atoning death of Christ, Adventist theology has tended to overemphasize its eschatological significance. Thus, in Adventism, there is need to present a more balanced view of redemption. Edward Heppenstall was chosen as the subject of this dissertation since he more comprehensively deals with this doctrine.

Factors that shaped Heppenstall's particular understanding of redemption are presented in a brief biographical, historical, and
theological overview in chapter 1. His view on the scope and the need of redemption, the nature of man, and sin are discussed in chapter 2. Chapters 3 through 6 encompass Heppenstall's scheme of redemption, namely: its promise, its act and results, and its work of judgment. Each chapter analyzes the way Heppenstall links God, sin, law and covenant, Christology, salvation, and eschatology to his general view of redemption. In chapter 7, a comparison of his understanding of redemption is made to the views of other Adventist writers and with E. G. White.

The final chapter evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of Heppenstall's model for describing redemption. It was noted that he did not develop a biblical foundation to support his view of the "great controversy." However, it was found that this motif is a valid biblical model for understanding the doctrine, since it forms an adequate foundation for a more comprehensive view of redemption. In relationship to his theology of redemption, it was pointed out that he gave little attention to some aspects of anthropology, and ecclesiology. At the same time serious questions are raised concerning his understanding of some aspects of the doctrine of the sanctuary. Positively, Heppenstall introduced new aspects in the biblical concept of the covenant and reemphasized some neglected aspects in the understanding of law, Christology, soteriology, and the sanctuary doctrine.
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INTRODUCTION

Redemption is the core of Christian religion. This word clusters the doctrines that are the pillars of Christian theology.\(^1\) Redemption is a theological term used to convey the idea of something that was lost and recovered.\(^2\) It presupposes four aspects: an

\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}Namely: God, Christology, soteriology, hamartiology, anthropology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. It is related to the doctrine of God, because He is the author and consummator of the plan of redemption; with anthropology, because man is the object of that plan; with sin, because it caused the need for the plan of salvation; with Christ, because He incarnated, lived and died for man, in order to redeem humanity from the power of death and sin; with the church, it is related because the redeemed are brought in, rescued from the dominion of sin, and prepared to preach the message of redemption to others who are still in need of being rescued; and with eschatology, because God's redeeming activity centers on that final event when all the redeemed will be united in a world without sin, to enjoy with the Redeemer the benefits of the work of redemption.}
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etiological event, two factual events, and an eschatological event.¹ Knudson holds that in order to arrive to an adequate understanding of what redemption means, one needs to know what Christianity teaches concerning the physical world, man, freedom, suffering, and sin.² E. G. White, equating education with redemption,³ holds that in order to comprehend the work of redemption, one needs to consider "both the nature of man, and the purpose of God in creating him, the change in man's condition through the coming in of the knowledge of evil," and God's plan for still fulfilling His purpose of the human race.⁴

Therefore, to have a clear understanding of the doctrine of redemption, one needs to consider at least the interrelationship of the doctrines closely related to the topic and the chronological development of the doctrine; i.e., when the need of redemption began, God's plan of redemption, the factual act of redemption at the cross, its application to human need, and its eschatological fulfillment.⁵

¹Etiological, because it looks for the original cause of man's present situation and implies a point where it was possessed and was lost. As Albert C. Knudson says, it "presupposes a suffering and sinning world from which man seeks or needs to be redeemed" (The Doctrine of Redemption [New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1933], 19). Two factual events, because they point to the moment when that liberation was realized in Christ in history and at the moment of conversion of the individual. Eschatological, because it points to the final results of that redemptive act, a "new creation or ontological newness in the future" (Ileana Marcoulesco, "Redemption," Encyclopedia of Religion, ed 1987, 12:229).

²Knudson, ibid.

³"In the highest sense the work of education and the work of redemption are one," Education (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1952), 30.

⁴Ibid., 14-15.

⁵The interrelationship of the doctrines and the chronological development can be explained thus: in the etiological aspect, it is necessary to discern God's original purpose in creating man and the way his fall affected his condition, here anthropology, hamartiology, law and God's covenants play the key role to help in the understanding of God's plan of redemption. The factual act of redemption is essential in helping us to comprehend God's work of redemption through Jesus Christ, thus Christology is central in this aspect. In the application to the human need, Soteriology is important in order to grasp the application of God's redemption to our personal experience. Ecclesiology is also relevant to understand the social dimensions of salvation and the way...
Statement and Justification of the Problem

This present dissertation attempts first to set forth Edward Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption and the way he interrelates the different doctrines closely related to the doctrine of redemption in his chronological scheme of redemption. The second objective is to evaluate Heppenstall's model of the doctrine of redemption. Heppenstall in many ways is one of the most important theologians in Adventist circles. He has published more in the area of redemption than any other Adventist theologian. He had a central role in shaping current Adventist theology, not only through his writings but through more than a decade of teaching in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in an era in which virtually all SDA scholars attended that institution. Many of those scholars were the first generation of Seventh-day Adventists to be professionalized up through the doctoral level. Heppenstall was also important because those who did not agree with his theology had to react to him, especially was this true among those Adventists who were concerned with sinless perfection. Thus for many, his theology became something that they have to react against. Moreover, Heppenstall is important because in dealing with the doctrine of redemption, he seems to have a comprehensive view that encompasses the different doctrines related to redemption and also he is the only one that presents and develops a chronological scheme that encircles most of the aspects of redemption. Furthermore, he presents a cosmic dimension as the basis to understand his scheme of redemption, which seems to offer a better way to understand the doctrine of redemption.

One of the major problems in the study of the doctrine of redemption is that Christian theologians tend to treat and emphasize certain elements of the doctrine and leave others inadequately treated.

One can collaborate with God in His work of redemption. Eschatology is necessary to know the final accomplishment of God's purpose of redemption. Finally, one can say that the doctrine of God is the doctrine that integrates all the others to help us in a better understanding of the doctrine of Redemption.
or ignored. The doctrine of redemption has been circumscribed by many scholars to the factual act of redemption at the cross and its implications to the believer, overlooking the etiological and eschatological perspectives in many cases. They concentrate their study on the work of Christ and its application to the believer, disregarding in many instances the relationship that Christ's redemption has with God's purpose for man at his creation and the results of his fall. This has


2Philippe de la Trinité comments on this fact thus: "The scandal of the cross follows on the scandal of the original sin. This last dogma is not to be minimized on the erroneous pretext that redemption must be understood in the terms of personal sin. . . . It is curious that now, when humanity is becoming increasingly aware of its dimensions as a community, it should still reject the dogmas of a sin and a redemption on such universal scale" (What is Redemption? [New York: Howthorn Books, 1961], 38). P. T. Forsyth calls attention to the effects of individualism on the Christian view of redemption, when he says that "Individualism has done its work for Christianity for the time being, and we are now suffering from its effects. We do not realise that we are each one of us saved in a racial salvation. We are each one of us saved in the salvation of the race, in a collectivist redemption. What Christ saved was the whole human race. . . . If you reduce or postpone Christ's effect upon the totality of the world, you are in the long run preparing the way for a poor estimate of the human soul"
caused many to disassociate the relationship between creation and redemption, leading to the acceptance of evolutionistic approaches to Christian theology. The same phenomenon is true in its relation to eschatology. The eschatological aspect has too often not been seen as an integral part of God's plan of redemption. The lack of this connection has led many to overlook the eschatological relevance of redemption which is a prominent concept in the New Testament.¹

One may argue that Christ's death on the cross is the crucial event that gave meaning and value to redemption. Thus, it became the center of the whole process of redemption. Moreover, the present personal need of redemption may seem to overshadow the need for the cosmological and eschatological aspects of redemption. This reasoning has caused scholars to center in a parochial view of redemption overlooking the aspects previously mentioned. However, this negligence does not diminish the importance for a proper and wider understanding of redemption.

From the perspective of Adventist theology, we can observe the same problem, but the emphasis leans in another direction. While Seventh-day Adventists have written many books on eschatology, they have


written significantly few on certain other aspects of redemption.¹

Moreover, to this date there is no formal study providing an analysis of Heppenstall or any other SDA theologian regarding the adequacy of the doctrine of redemption and its implications.²

¹Even though there are several doctoral dissertations and scholarly books written by Seventh-day Adventists which have dealt with issues related to the doctrine of redemption, no critical study has been made of the way in which the Seventh-day Adventist Church has expressed itself on this central theological locus. Some examples are: On the doctrine of sanctuary: Edwin Harry Zackrison, "Seventh-day Adventists and Original Sin: A Study of the Early Development of the Seventh-day Adventist Understanding of the Effect of Adam's Sin on Posterity" (Ph. D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1984). Zackrison reaches the conclusion that the SDA treatment of original sin was developed along Arminian and conditionalist lines and emphasized actual sin more than the Augustinian and Reformed ontological view of sin. Nevertheless, SDAs expressed a doctrine that is definable as a doctrine of original sin by theological and historical models.

On the person of Christ: Eric Webster, Crosscurrents in Adventist Christology (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1984). He compares and contrasts the Christology of four SDA writers and as well brings them into relation with Christological views in the Christian church outside of Adventism. He concludes that it is possible to have a multi-faceted Christology, drawing on all the NT models concerning the person and work of Christ, while also upholding the full divinity and full humanity of Christ without falling into contradiction.

On righteousness by faith: Arthur Leroy Moore, Theology in Crisis or Ellen G. White's Concept of Righteousness by Faith as it Relates to the Contemporary SDA Issues (Corpus Christi, Tex.: Life Seminars Incorporated, 1980). He attempts to derive from the writings of E. G. White a unified doctrine of righteousness by faith. He uses a systematic development of the doctrine of the nature of man trying to integrate the soteriological, Christological, and eschatological concepts which are involved in the doctrine of righteousness by faith. He concludes that the forensic position of the reformation as is stated in the Formula of Concord is not consistent with the view of E. G. White that held the view of justification by faith as encompassing both righteousness and sanctification by faith.

Roy Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1981). Here Adams compares and contrasts three major interpretations of the sanctuary that have appeared in the SDA church. He presents an interpretative-evaluative assessment of their contribution. He makes also some suggestions for theological refinement in the Adventist understanding of the doctrine.

George R. Knight, My Gripe with God, a Study of Divine Justice and the Problem of the Cross (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1990). He discusses the broad spectrum of topics raised by the problem of sin and God's work in Christ to resolve the problem using the framework of the cosmic conflict.

From both perspectives, Christian theology in general and Adventist theology in particular, there is an evident need to present a more balanced and comprehensive view of the doctrine of redemption. While other Christian traditions emphasize the atoning death of Christ, reducing the etiological and eschatological implications of redemption, Adventist theology has overemphasized the eschatological significance of redemption. From the previous observation, it is established that the reason for an analysis of Heppenstall's understanding of the doctrine of redemption is to determine what can be learned from him in order to have a better understanding of this doctrine.

Scope and Limitations

In this study, Heppenstall's understanding of the doctrine of redemption is analyzed and evaluated. The structure of his own scheme of redemption—namely, the promise of redemption, the act of atonement at the cross and its subsequent proclamation and the work of judgment—is employed and followed. This process of objective description is followed by an analysis of and relation to the way Heppenstall links God, sin, law and covenant, Christology, salvation, and eschatology to

---


1 Heppenstall, OHP (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1972), 14. The promise of redemption corresponds to the etiological aspect of redemption. The act of redemption at the cross, corresponds to the first factual act of redemption. The proclamation corresponds to the second factual act of redemption where eccesiology and soteriology play an important role. The work of judgment corresponds to the eschatological aspect of redemption. For obvious reasons, this dissertation follows Heppenstall's terminology and scheme of redemption.
his general view of redemption. His views are compared with other Adventist theological writers. Finally, the way he relates the various other doctrines to the doctrine of redemption is evaluated, along with the manner in which he relates his cosmic conflict model to his scheme of redemption. However, an exhaustive evaluation is not finalized. Even though sin, original sin, Christ's human nature, righteousness by faith, and Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary are studied in relation with redemption, these specific areas require further study in relation with other issues. The historical material deals with what is relevant to the topic and is not meant to be an exhaustive historical study.

Methodology and Outline

In this research, Heppenstall's literature was analyzed in chronological sequence. This has assisted in deducing his presuppositions and the factors which led him through the various stages of his personal interpretation of redemption. This also revealed which influences were at work in the development of Heppenstall's view on the subject. To attain this objective, all available sources were examined: published and unpublished documents (papers, transcripts, recorded speeches, syllabi and correspondence). Personal contacts and conversations with the author were helpful in clarifying and specifying various areas of the study. In addition to these primary sources, relevant secondary sources were taken into consideration in order to provide different perspectives.

Based on the information and analysis of the gathered material, the following outline has been chosen: Chapter 1 includes a brief biographical, historical overview which serves to identify some of the reasons that led Heppenstall to shape his particular understanding and elucidation of the doctrine of redemption. An overview of Heppenstall's theological system is also presented in order to give a general sweep of his theology.
Chapter 2 analyzes the definition and the scope of Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption. His basic presuppositions, his view on the nature of man, sin and its transmission are described.

Chapters 3 through 6 of this study encompass Heppenstall's scheme of redemption, namely: the promise of redemption, the act of redemption, the results of redemption, and the work of judgment or the consummation of redemption. In these chapters, his understanding of the doctrine of redemption is laid out as accurately, fully, and precisely as possible from a descriptive point of view, followed by an analysis of the way Heppenstall links God, sin, law and covenant, Christology, salvation, and eschatology to his general view of redemption.

In chapter 7 Heppenstall's theology is analyzed and compared to other Adventist theologians and to E. G. White.

In the final chapter, the strengths and weaknesses of his understanding of the doctrine of redemption are evaluated in the light of historic Seventh-day Adventist view of redemption appraising his major doctrinal contributions in order to bring out some implications for Adventist Theology.
CHAPTER ONE

EDWARD HEPPENSTALL: THE MAN, HIS TIME,
AND HIS THEOLOGY

Edward Heppenstall was born in Rotherham, Yorkshire, England, on May 8, 1901. His parents were in business operating a china shop. They were of non-conformist persuasion, belonging to the Congregational Church. Unfortunate family circumstances led him to drop out of school to help his family.¹ In those early days, Heppenstall learned the importance of application to the task at hand.

In 1923 a very important event took place in Edward Heppenstall's life: He became a Christian, was baptized, and joined the Seventh-day Adventist Church.² As Eric C. Webster remarks: "This apparently insignificant act was to have far reaching influence on Adventism in the second half of the century."³

¹When he was ten, his father died, leaving his mother destitute with her two children. At thirteen, Edward had to leave secondary school to help his mother. He worked twelve hours a day, six days a week, in a steel factory producing steering shafts for submarines. See Margit Heppenstall Letter to Sandra Doran, June 14, 1979. Adventist Heritage Center, James White Library, Andrews University. See also W. G. C. Murdoch, "Edward Heppenstall," in The Stature of Christ: Essays on Honor of Edward Heppenstall, comp. and ed. by Vern Garner and Gary Stanhiser (Loma Linda, Calif.: Privately printed and published, 1970), 1-3; Eric Claude Webster, Crosscurrents in Adventist Christology (New York: Peter Lang, 1984), 248-253.

²At the age of twenty-two, Edward still working in the engineering line in a machine shop, was an avowed agnostic. Although his mother had become a Seventh-day Adventist, he made only intellectual contact with Christianity. Working along with him in the machine shop was a Christian who introduced Edward to a living relationship with Christ. After a time of struggle, Edward became a Christian and was baptized. See Murdoch, 1-2, and Webster, 249-250.

³Webster, 250.
Heppenstall lost his job when he decided to become a SDA Christian. This problem made him feel the need for further education. He went to Stanborough Seventh-day Adventist College where he studied for five years. Upon graduation and due to his outstanding performance as a student, the board of the college invited him to join the faculty. The teaching of Logic was a contributing factor to the sharpening of his theological thought.

With commendable appetite for further education, Heppenstall left England in 1931 to attend Emmanuel Missionary College in Michigan, USA. He was profoundly influenced by his Bible teacher, W. W. Prescott, who emphasized a Christ-centered approach to Christianity and firmly believed in righteousness by faith. This encounter with Prescott had an important formative influence on Heppenstall's theology.

In 1934, Heppenstall completed an M.A. in Medieval History and Semitics at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Afterwards, he

---

1 See Margit Heppenstall, 1.

2 From 1923-28, Edward earned his way through school by selling books on Sundays and during summer vacations. He immersed himself in the arts, sciences, theology, and studied Greek and Hebrew. See Murdoch, 2.

3 He was asked to teach English, Logic, Greek, and, in addition, to serve as dean of men. He occupied this position for three years (1928-31). See Margit Heppenstall, 1; and Webster, 250.

4 Webster, 250.

5 Emmanuel Missionary College is the forerunner of Andrews University. In two years he completed his B.A. degree, majoring in English literature. He also pursued studies in Science and Theology.

taught and did evangelistic and pastoral work in the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. He was subsequently appointed to the post of youth director in the same conference. In 1938 Heppenstall was married to Margit Strom who had come to America from Norway. Margit had been a college teacher in Norway and throughout their years of married life, she has been a solid companion to her husband intellectually as well as in other ways.

In 1940 Heppenstall was asked to join the faculty at La Sierra College in Arlington, California. He taught there for fifteen years (1940-1955), much of the time as chair of the Department of Theology. While teaching he also pastored the La Sierra College church. This gave him the opportunity to express his theology within the practical context of church life. "Here," W. G. C. Murdoch writes, "he became one of the foremost Bible teachers the denomination has produced." Over a protracted period while at La Sierra, Heppenstall took time to pursue his studies at the University of Southern California. He earned a Doctor of Philosophy degree in the field of Religious

---

1 In 1934-35, he was teacher and boy's dean of Adelphian Academy in Holly, Michigan.

2 He held this position from 1936 to 1940. He was instrumental in purchasing the first denominationally owned junior camp site at Gull Lake from Dr. J. H. Kellogg. See Margit Heppenstall, 1, and Murdoch, 2.


4 This is called the "La Sierra Period." During this period, Heppenstall's theological system reached its maturity. Practically all his theological insights can be found in his Syllabus for Bible Doctrines (two volumes). The following years would bring his initial thinking to its final mature state.

5 W. G. C. Murdoch, 2.
Education in 1950, receiving a Phi Beta Kappa award in recognition of the excellence of his work.¹

In 1955 Heppenstall was invited to teach systematic theology and Christian philosophy at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.² He remained there for eleven years, serving as chair of the Christian Philosophy department for all but two years. By this time, his influence had become world-wide. He taught teachers and ministers from all parts of the world. His commitment to Christian principles and his influence were felt whenever he came on the campus.

Heppenstall is described as having a dynamic personality,³ a man eager for action⁴ leading others to a serious search for truth in the area of Biblical thought.⁵ His practical outreach was important as

¹The title of his doctoral dissertation reads: A Functional Approach to the Study of Religious Education in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges (University of Southern California, 1951).

²The SDA Theological Seminary was located at that time in Takoma Park, Washington, D.C.; it was later moved to Berrien Springs, Michigan.

³Murdoch, I. Murdoch adds: "He is a man of courage and conviction, championing always the cause of right whether popular or unpopular. He is broadminded, holds a high standard, and is loyal to what he considers to be right. He is the stuff of which martyrs are made. He stands for the right at any cost, whether it is going to be unfavorable to his present or his future development does not make any difference. He stands by it if it is right, and if it is wrong, he does not defend it" (p. 3).

⁴Norval Pease describes Heppenstall thus: "Dr. Heppenstall could never be described as a calm, phlegmatic personality. He has been like a race horse—prancing, chewing at the bit, eager for action. He is always ready to match wits with anyone who wishes to discuss a significant idea. In debate on theological issues he is a formidable opponent. But there is another side of Dr. Heppenstall's personality that must not be overlooked. He has demonstrated a tremendous ability to inspire enthusiasm and confidence. Students have been attracted by his brilliance and inspired by his dedication. Many have looked to him as a counselor." "Edward Heppenstall: A Personal Tribute," in The Stature of Christ. Essays in Honor of Edward Heppenstall. comp. and ed. Vern Carner and Gary Scanhiser (Loma Linda, Calif.: Privately published and edited, 1970), 7-8.

⁵Note the following: "Dr. Heppenstall in his teaching, preaching and writing raises issues which lead others to a serious search for truth in the area of Biblical thought. His personal search for understanding has encouraged others to assess and express their own positions on doctrine and theology. . . . Dr. Heppenstall encouraged independent,
he conducted weeks of Spiritual Emphasis in colleges and academies, spoke at youth rallies, Bible conferences, campmeetings, retreats, and ministerial institutes in addition to regularly occupying some pulpit almost every week. Of this period Norval Pease writes: "These were the years of his greatest outreach." The impact of his teaching was further extended by conducting seminary extension schools in Australia, the Philippines, California, and England.

He wrote numerous articles for denominational periodicals and made contributions to the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary and Questions on Doctrine.


His wife makes the following remarks: "As far as I recall, there was never a year when in fulltime teaching, that he did not conduct two weeks of prayer in boarding schools, both fall and spring, either in an academy or a college. One of the reasons why his activity as a writer had to be postponed until his retirement years was that during his 40 years of working with young people, there was so much demand on his time for counseling" (M. Heppenstall, 3).

Heppenstall wrote a report of the 8-week extension school he held from December 8, 1957 to January 30, 1958, at Avondale College. See "Theological Seminary Extension School in Australia," Review and Herald, March 13, 1958, 23. Here Heppenstall taught two courses, one on the Sanctuary and the other in Grace and Law.


The extension school in California was held during the school year 1962-63. There Heppenstall taught Righteousness by Faith, Law and Covenants, the Doctrine of the Sanctuary, and the Doctrine of Revelation and Inspiration. See his report, "SDA Seminary Western Extension School," Review and Herald, April 11, 1963, 20.


Murdoch, 3. See also Selected Bibliography on Edward Heppenstall.
In 1967 Heppenstall was invited to leave the Theological Seminary to join the faculty of Loma Linda University where he taught in the Division of Religion until his retirement from active teaching in 1970. Since that time he has concentrated on writing.\(^1\) He now lives in retirement with his wife in Redlands, California.\(^2\)

**Edward Heppenstall's Time**

Heppenstall's theological development should be envisioned in relationship with the internal and external tensions that the SDA church experienced in his time of active endeavor (1928-1980s). In this study I analyze Heppenstall's time in relationship to the different periods the Seventh-day Adventist church passed through during his years of service. These years can be divided into five periods: The period "Prior to the Dialogue" (1930-1955),\(^3\) the period of "Dialogue with Evangelicals" (1955-1960), the period of the "Brinsmead Controversy" (1960-1970), the period of the Sanctification-Justification Tension (1970-1980), and the period of the "Sanctuary Crisis" (1980-1985).

---


\(^2\) The Heppenstalls have two married children. Malcolm, an orthopaedic surgeon, has two children; Astrid, a pediatrician, and her cardiologist husband have three children.

The Period Prior to the Dialogue (1930-1955)

After 87 years of conflicting viewpoints over the Deity of Christ, the Trinity, and the personality of the Holy Spirit, a unified position came to be accepted as part of the fundamental beliefs in the SDA church. These doctrines were placed in a section entitled "Fundamental Beliefs" in the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook. Later, they were included in the "Baptismal Covenant" and "Vow" in certificate form (1941), and in "Fundamental Beliefs" in the Church Manual, which confirms the general acceptance of these doctrines. Further changes and corrections in different books with the erroneous views were made. These steps led other Protestant traditions to view Adventism in a different light.

Heppenstall's La Sierra Period corresponds to this time. That Heppenstall supported these changes is evident in his Syllabus for Bible Doctrines produced during this time. During this period,


4The influence of the teachings of J. W. Westphall, Oliver Montgomery, and especially W. W. Prescott and A. G. Daniells, among others can be seen in these changes. See Froom, 375-419, also Reynolds, 180-181.

Heppenstall's theological system reached its maturity. The most important contribution he made in this period was his presentation on "The Covenants and the Law" in the book Our Firm Foundation.


After these changes occurred within Adventism, a succession of invitations to dialogue came from other Protestant churches. The most significant of these encounters was the dialogue with Walter R. Martin and Donald Grey Barnhouse. Martin had a series of questions regarding doctrines held by the SDA Church. The inquiries were answered with cooperation and comparative frankness by the church leaders in dialogue. As a result, Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine was published to respond to the questions raised by Martin. This was a historic meeting for Adventism. It was the first meeting of

---

1 This period encompasses Heppenstall's college years and La Sierra period (1940-1955). After this, he went to teach at the SDA Theological Seminary.

2 The book is a compilation of the different lectures presented at the Bible Conference that was held in Takoma Park, Washington, September 1-13, 1952. The lectures were presented orally and later were put in print and entitled Our Firm Foundation, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1953). This Bible Conference was held for three reasons, according to William H. Branson, president of the General Conference of SDA. "The Bible Conference," The Ministry, July 1952, 4-5. K. D. Reynolds mentions other reasons in Adventism in America, 182-183. In this Bible Conference, Heppenstall presented a new perspective on the covenant. OFF, 1:437-492.

3 See Froom, Movement Of Destiny, 465-475.


5 They were L. E. Froom, R. A. Anderson, and W. E. Read.

6 Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957), hereinafter Questions on Doctrine. In this book the sinful nature of Christ is repudiated, the deity of Christ and the complete work of the atonement at the cross are affirmed. Before this book was published, the manuscript was reviewed by editors, Bible teachers, and administrators. See Questions on Doctrine, 8.
its kind since the inception of the movement, and its results had a significant impact on the church.

*Questions on Doctrine* marked the beginning of a series of tensions and controversies within the church which have been playing out over several decades.¹ This tension tended to create two trends within Adventist theology: the Pre-1950s group² and the Post-1950s group.³


²Pre-1950s Adventists and Post-1950s Adventists were the names suggested by Dr. Mervin Maxwell. Paxton refers to the Pre-1950s as "perfectionists" because they believe in a present possibility of sinless perfection, Christ's assumption of sinful flesh, and justification by faith as including both justification and sanctification. See Paxton, 95, n. 40. The Pre-1950s group refer to themselves as conservatived and traditionalists. Among the most prominent representatives of this trend are Herbert B. Douglass, Kenneth Wood, Joe Crews, Colin Standish, Robert Wieland, Thomas A. Davis, Ralph Larson, Dennis Priebe, and Ron Spear. See A. Leroy Moore, *The Theology Crisis* (Corpus Christi, Tex.: Life Seminars Incorporated, 1980), passim; Standish and Standish, passim; Gordon Collier, letter to denominational leaders, (Hopeland Calif.: Closing Events Research Foundation, June 19, 1986), personal files.

³To this group belong those who accept the concepts expressed by the book *Questions on Doctrine*. Their theology is referred to by the Pre-1950s group as the "New Theology," see Standish and Standish, passim, and they are referred to as the "Reformationists." See Moore, passim. This trend repudiates sinless perfection, denies Christ's assumption of sinful flesh, and restricts the doctrine of justification by faith to purely forensic events. See Moore, 29. Among the more well-known representatives of this trend are Edward Heppenstall, Hans K. LaRondelle, Desmond Ford, Raoul Dederen, Morris Venden, and the mainstream of the Adventist leaders. See Ministerial Association, *General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Believe...* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1988), v, vi.
Heppenstall's participation in this dialogue was not direct. However, he was one of those who reviewed the answers.\textsuperscript{1} When Walter Martin wrote \textit{The Truth about Seventh-Day Adventism}, Heppenstall was requested to reply to Martin's chapter on law, grace, and salvation.\textsuperscript{2} He was asked to respond also to the chapter on the "Remnant Church."\textsuperscript{3}

\textbf{The Period of the Brinsmead Controversy (1960-1970)}

In 1959, the Australian "Awakening" movement commenced.\textsuperscript{4} Robert D. Brinsmead, an Australian student of theology, following Andreasen's views on the Sanctuary and on the nature of Christ,\textsuperscript{5} protested what he saw as the neglect by the SDA church of Daniel 8:14, the investigative judgment, and other unique Adventist doctrines.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{1}Several articles that Heppenstall wrote during that period reveal the spirit of the moment and the need for a firm foundation in Adventist doctrinal beliefs: "The Foundation of the Adventist Faith," \textit{Ministry}, August 1956, 29-32; "Daniel 8:14 in Perspective," \textit{Ministry}, October 1956, 29-31; "Constructing a Sound Theology," \textit{Ministry}, April 1957, 18-22.


\textsuperscript{4}Brinsmead's followers became known as "awakeners" following their selection of the title \textit{Sanctuary Awakening Fellowship} for their semi-organization. The awakeners themselves, although content to remain Seventh-day Adventists, did undertake activities which were schismatic, at least in part. This movement, however, got strength in the 60s when it spread throughout the SDA churches in North America. See Schwarz, 456-461.


\textsuperscript{6}Brinsmead believed that Christ would soon close His work of mediation and that all must then stand in a miraculously imparted sinless nature by virtue of God's act in the investigative judgment of the living, and be found in absolute harmony with that which the law demanded, perfect truth and righteousness in the inward parts. This teaching could not help but make conscientious Adventists view the
Heppenstall was one of the major opponents of this movement. It is during this time that he wrote and developed his views on perfection, righteousness by faith, original sin, the sinless nature of Christ, and the sanctuary; all issues were related to the Brinsmead controversy. After his retirement, these concepts became the basic components of his books.


1 See Land, 216; Ford and Ford, 22; Moore, 30.

2 In the later stages of this movement, Heppenstall had a personal controversy with the Brinsmead group regarding the publication of his class notes, used without permission by the Brinsmead movement, see [Edward Heppenstall] and Jack Zwemer, Evaluation of the Brinsmead Doctrine, ed. Paul Freeman (Santa Ana, Cali.: n. p. 1969) (personal files). For a reply to this publication, see Edward Heppenstall to Dr. Jack Zwemer, Dr. Fred Metz, Robert Brinsmead (Riverside, Calif.), November 25, 1969, letter located in Adventist Heritage Center, James White Library, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.

3 His syllabi and several articles in denominational periodicals attest the fact that he wrote on these issues with the purpose of meeting the Brinsmead controversy: Syllabus for Righteousness by Faith, no. 2 ([Berrien Springs, Mich.]: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1963), located in Heritage Center, James White Library, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., (Typescript); Syllabus for Righteousness by Faith, no. 3 ([Berrien Springs, Mich.]: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, August, n.d.), located in Heritage Center, James White Library, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., (Typescript); Is Perfection Possible? (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, [1964?]); "Is Perfection Possible?" Signs of the Times, December 1963, 10-11, 30; "Getting Rid of Sin," Signs of the Times, November 1963, 10-11, 30.
In 1970, Brinsmead, through his study of the Protestant Reformers, particularly Luther, repudiated many of the features of his own theology. With this event, the Brinsmead controversy ended, but the way was open for a new tension to be felt within Adventism.


Simultaneously with the Brinsmead reversal, in the early 1970s, the leadership of the SDA Church began a call for reformation and revival. Pastor Robert Pierson, then General Conference president, initiated the movement. The *Review and Herald*, with two new editors on its staff, took up the challenge. These editors began to set forth

---

1. Brinsmead's controversy ended after ten years of discussion. Brinsmead accepted Heppenstall's views on perfection and the sinful nature of Christ. See Ford and Ford, 22. Desmond Ford was one of the most important opponents of Brinsmead. Ford recognizes his indebtedness to Heppenstall. See also Standish, 1:70, 90-93; Paxton, 105-120; Moore, 30.

2. These "calls" reached their peak in the 1973 and 1974 Annual Councils of the General Conference of SDA Church. In those years a plea was made to the world church to stress the views of the Pre-1950s group. See World Departmental Advisory Committee, "An Earnest Appeal from the Annual Council," *RH*, December 6, 1973, 1, 4-5; World Departmental Advisory Committee, "World Leaders in Annual Council Speak to the Church," *RH*, November 14, 1974.

3. The *Review and Herald* is regarded as the official organ of the SDA Church. As such, it has considerable weight in influencing the theological thought of Adventism. This periodical went through several changes in nomenclature. At its inception in 1850, the name was *Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*; in 1851 the name was changed to *Advent Review, and Sabbath Herald*; in 1861, to *Review and Herald*; in 1971, back to the old name *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*. Finally in 1978, it assumed its current name, *Adventist Review*. Perhaps the name most widely used to identify the magazine in the United States is *Review and Herald*, quoted in this paper as RH.

the theology which was actually a reaffirmation of the teachings repudiated in the 1950s in the book Questions on Doctrine. A special issue of the Review and Herald was distributed worldwide in 1974 presenting the Pre-1950s group views.1 This and other editorials and articles2 stirred a reaction among other Adventist theologians. Desmond Ford became a central figure in this debate.3 Increasing controversy over the Review and Herald's emphasis on perfection and Christ's sinful nature led ultimately to the Palmdale Conference.4 Nothing was settled; in fact, the debate spread throughout the United States.5 An official committee was appointed to study the problem.6 A


1Undated, it was issued May 16, 1974. Here the victory-life piety, the development of sinless-demonstration people in the last generation, the example of Christian sinless living, and the sinful human nature of Christ were emphasized. All these features were stressed by the Pre-1950s group.


4This meeting, involving both administrators and theologians, took place April 23-30, 1976, in Palmdale, Calif. Although Ford believed that the "Palmdale Statement" had adopted his (and Brinsmead's) view, that righteousness by faith involved only justification, Kenneth Wood, editor of the RH, in commenting on the statement in the RH, interpreted it as reaffirming the Pre-1950s group position. See Ford and Ford, 23; K. H. 'Wood, editorial, "F.Y.I." RH, October 21, 1976, 2. See also Land, 216-219; Standish and Standish, 1:94-98, 121-129; Paxton, 121-145; Ford and Ford, 22-24; Moore, 26-56.

5It was intensified in three ways: First, by Herbert Douglass' Adult Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly of 1977, entitled "Jesus, The Model Man," in which the Pre-1950s group views are presented; second, the publication by an Anglican minister, Goeffrey J. Paxton, of The Shaking of Adventism, which exposed the discrepancy of Adventist teachings on righteousness by faith, supporting Ford's and Brinsmead's position; and third, Ford's move from Australia to Pacific Union College in California to serve as a visiting professor, which gave him the opportunity to lecture throughout the churches in United States, increasing the tension already existing there.
statement was issued that addressed the righteousness by faith contention by analyzing the theological terms involved, attempting to bring together all elements of the subject and placing the whole within an Adventist eschatological context. This declaration included an emphasis on sanctification; however, it was now one of the several elements instead of being the most important. By offering an enlarged understanding of salvation, the statement appeared to provide room for both sides, in this way the sanctification-justification tension seemed to be settled.¹

For Heppenstall, this was the most productive period as far as his writings were concerned, even though he had retired from active teaching in 1970. In his books, he addressed the sanctification/justification issue and its existing tensions, particularly those related to righteousness by faith.² Thus, while the debate regarding righteousness by faith and perfection was seemingly over, it slowly gave way to a new issue: the sanctuary doctrine.

¹The consultation on righteousness by faith took place on October 3-4, 1979; see RH, November 22, 1979, 23.

The Period of the Sanctuary Crisis (1980-1985)

The doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary and the investigative judgment is one of the unique features of Seventh-day Adventism. Throughout the years, it has been an object of criticism not only from evangelicals but also from within Adventism. The doctrine became a public issue when the already controversial Desmond Ford openly rejected the traditional formulation. This new interpretation raised immediate opposition. Ford was given a six-month leave to research the topic of the sanctuary and related issues. He completed a manuscript entitled "Daniel 8:14, The Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment." In this document, he denied the traditional Adventist teaching that Christ entered into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844. Ford was called upon to meet with members of a committee to study his position. The committee drafted two statements which rejected Ford's views. A few weeks later, Ford's ministerial credentials were

1 See Martin, 174-188. See also: Albion Fox Ballenger, Cast Out for the Cross of Christ (Riverside, Calif.: The Author, [1911?]); idem, An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement: A Review of the Work Which "Fully Explains the Sanctuary Question as Understood by the (Seventh-day Adventist) Denomination" (Riverside, Calif.: The Author, [1913?]). For a discussion of the different views on the doctrine of the sanctuary within Adventism see: Roy Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh Day Adventist Church (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1981).

2 This happened in a lecture given to the Adventist Forum at Pacific Union College in October of 1979. Ford argued that the Bible did not support such notions as the literal heavenly sanctuary and Christ's confinement to the Holy Place until 1844. Cf. Land, 223-225; Standish and Standish, 2:277-356.


4 These meetings were held at Glacier View Ranch (a denominational youth campground) in Colorado, August 10-15, 1980. For a denominational perspective of this view, see: William G. Johnsson, "Overview of a Historic Meeting," RH, September 4, 1980, 4-7. For Ford's perspective on the meeting see: Ford and Ford, Adventist Crisis of Spiritual Identity, 55-80.

This action kindled considerable controversy. Today, the crisis hardly exists any longer.

Apparently, the outcome of this crisis has had positive results on Adventist theological thought on the sanctuary.

Though Heppenstall's participation in this crisis was secondary, it inspired him to write a number of articles about the issue.

Clearly most of Heppenstall's writings are closely related to different tensions that the church faced during his time. At the same time, through the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, Heppenstall by his teaching and writing came to be regarded as one of the most influential theologians within the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

---

1Kenneth H. Wood mentions that Ford's credentials were revoked on September 18 by the Australasian Division, "F. Y. I.," RH, November 20, 1980, 11-12. See also, Land, 225.

2Land writes: "Several 'Evangelical Adventists' churches were formed, a number of ministers either left their positions or were fired after publicly opposing the Ford decision, and a new magazine—Evangelica—emerged that defended Ford's theology," 225. Some materials of protest from different individuals against the decision to revoke Ford's credentials and also supporting Ford in the sanctuary issue written to the Adventist leaders can be found in Ford, Adventist Crisis of Spiritual Identity, 37-52.


Edward Heppenstall: His Theology

To better appreciate Heppenstall's understanding of the doctrine of redemption, it is necessary to make plain the way in which he relates it to his overall theological system. Let us first consider the basic presuppositions of Heppenstall's theological system.

Basic Presuppositions

In brief, the existence of God is Heppenstall's first basic presupposition. Next comes God's self-revelation. Heppenstall sees revelation as a supernatural phenomenon, both a disclosure of facts, events, information, propositional truths and of God Himself, above all in the person of Jesus Christ. Heppenstall accepts the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God along with the historicity of the events they contain. He sees faith as vital in accepting God's revelation in Christ and His Word. He also perceives reason as the channel leading

---

1 Heppenstall declares: "The existence of God is a first truth. That is, it precedes and conditions all our thinking, our observation and knowing. That is the reason why mere thinking can never find out God" (1SB, 8).

2 Notice these two emphases when Heppenstall writes: "Revelation is communication from God, either by the disclosure of Himself, by events in History, or by the spoken and written Word" (unpublished manuscript, "The Nature of Revelation," 1). For a full discussion about Heppenstall's concept on revelation, see Webster, 253-260.


4 This faith is a reliance upon, a trust in, and a commitment to a person, Jesus Christ. It has no merit in itself and earns nothing, for it is a gift of God. Faith is not simply a passive virtue but demands an active participation and involvement with the subject towards
ultimately to faith and acknowledgment. God makes His revelation known in such a way that it can reach human minds and rational capacities, not simply the emotions.¹ For Heppenstall, however, reason is limited.² Unless guided by the Holy Spirit and yielded to Christ in faith, it does not fully understand spiritual truth.

When it comes to the question of authority, Heppenstall holds that God has given the Scriptures, with their objective authority, to the humans in this world of sin. Still Christ remains the ultimate authority.³ From these basic presuppositions, let us move to Heppenstall's overarching theological scheme.

¹Notice his words: "But the belief and faith cannot be made nonintellectual. True faith is based on true knowledge, Rom. 10:17." "Constructing a Sound Theology," Ministry, April 1957, 19. Moreover: "The demand today is to build our theologies on critical scholarship. God does not put a premium on ignorance" (ibid., 21). He acknowledges that revelation has a rational and a propositional nature. See Heppenstall, "The Doctrine of Revelation and Inspiration," Ministry, July 1970, 17.

²See 1SBD, 6. He states that we must recognize "the limitation and incompetence of human reason" in determining what is truth and that reason can only be fruitful when directed by the Holy Spirit. See "Constructing a Sound Theology," Ministry, April 1957, 21. Furthermore, the mind of man "partakes of that depravity under which he has no escape except through special revelation" (Access to God, 5).

³See "The Foundation of the Adventist Faith," Ministry, August 1965, 3-6, 13. Here he states that revelation is given historically in Christ when on earth and in the Scriptures. He cautions against subjective experience without the objective authority of the Word. See also "Creed Authority and Freedom," Ministry, April 1979, 13-14.
Heppenstall's Theological System

Heppenstall holds that "the redemption wrought out by Christ must always be seen in the context of salvation history, from the time sin entered to its final eradication."\(^1\) The doctrine of redemption is directly related to the moral and spiritual crisis that sin brought to the universe.\(^2\) From its inception, sin has involved every man and woman. It has caused death and separation from God.\(^3\) God, however, longs to remain our Father. He still claims all men as His children. Thus He determined to restore the relationship at any cost to Himself. He chose to solve this problem, not by force, but by love, by giving Himself in the person of His Son to redeem humankind.\(^4\) He determined to solve man's deepest problems through Jesus Christ and sent His Son

---

\(^1\)OHP, 16. See also pp. 30, 43, 141, 163, and 1SB, 32. He also declares that the atonement of Christ involves God, man, the angels, and the whole universe. Ibid., 34.

\(^2\)Heppenstall believes that of all the inhabited worlds, ours is unique because there is sin and death here. No one has escaped. OHP, 13.

\(^3\)About the consequences of Adam and Eve's sin, he says: "[They] separated themselves from the life of God. Their whole natures were corrupted. A physical, mental, and spiritual change passed over them by virtue of the fact that they had fallen into sin. Consequently, all of Adam's descendants born thereafter have inherited the result and the consequences of Adam's sin: separation from God. Babies die, not because they have actually sinned or are punished by God, but because they are now part of this alienation from the Source of life. All men were born self-centered, not God centered. This is the beginning point of all sin, a life apart from God, where self is king rather than God" (SU, 12). He adds that sin has perverted and disorganized man's nature, and that sin not only brings disease and bondage but divine condemnation and judgment. SU, 13. See also pp. 14-25.

\(^4\)As soon as sin entered the world, Heppenstall says that God announced His purpose to deliver guilty man from the power of sin (Gen 3:15). Ibid., 30. Further, Heppenstall adds that the sacrificial system was also immediately introduced, later the passover lamb, and the sanctuary of the Jewish system. All were an impressive lesson concerning the deliverance from the bondage of sin through the offering of a life. See Heppenstall, MMO, 28-29. See also "Can You Stand Persecution?" These Times, July 1968, 5, where Heppenstall writes that Jesus Christ offered to the world "the only solution to the sin problem"; and "Things Which Cannot Be Shaken," These Times, January 1972, 4, where he says: "The universality of sin requires a divine answer and a plan of salvation."
"to provide an answer to the sin-and-death problem, and to win man back to fellowship with Him."

Heppenstall holds that the divine plan to restore man and the universe back to fellowship with Him, as revealed in the Bible, has three important aspects: "The promise, with which the Old Testament is largely concerned, the act of redemption at the cross and its subsequent proclamation, and finally, the work of Judgment."

Speaking of the Promise of Redemption, the first aspect of the divine plan of restoration, Heppenstall emphasizes that the program began with an announcement of redemption (Gen 3:15). Later, the promise was more fully set forth to Israel when God came down on Mount Sinai and revealed to them both law and gospel. Further, Heppenstall affirms that God not only spoke from Sinai but continued to speak from the inner shrine or Most Holy Place of the Levitical sanctuary. This was because in the typical and sacrificial system of the earthly sanctuary God was sharing with sinners the divine method for the redemption of the human race and the eradication of sin.

Regarding the Act of Redemption, the second aspect of God's plan which he calls "the bridge of salvation," Heppenstall sees four spans in this "bridge" necessary to man's salvation: Incarnation, 

---

1"How God Works to Save Us," These Times. February 1973, 12.
Again Heppenstall says: "He came to provide a solution to the problem of sin." "The Invitation," These Times. March 1963, 4. See also "God 'Acquits the Guilty,'" in SU, 44-63.

2OHP, 14. By using this scheme introduced by Heppenstall himself, I develop his understanding of the doctrine of redemption.

3This announcement "promised ultimate recovery and restoration of all that had been lost by sin and the final defeat of all those who warred against the God of heaven" (OHP, 15).

4Ibid., 15.

5Ibid. "The revelation of the sanctuary centered in Jesus Christ. It foretold His atoning death and His high-priestly ministry in heaven and the final judgment. All the typical services in the earthly sanctuary pointed to this. The sanctuary revealed the scope of redemption and judgment, the love of God for sinners, and the determined opposition of God to the satanic forces" (ibid., 16).
The preliminary purpose of the incarnation of Christ was to reveal the Father and to show God's ideal for man in the person of Himself. Its primary purpose was in relationship to man, because the plenary purpose of the incarnation was reconciliation. Regarding the crucifixion, Heppenstall comments that the death of the Son of God is the central and fundamental truth of the Plan of Redemption. The cross not only made redemption available to every man but also made possible the destruction of the power of sin. Through the resurrection, Christ has become the head of a new order of beings, the progenitor of a new race of redeemed men, the Head of a new company whose life on earth is to be transformed. Now,

1SBD, 25.

"As Son of God He knew the Father perfectly. As Son of Man He revealed the Father perfectly. The invisible Father became visible in the person of His Son who made a perfect revelation of the Father (John 14: 8,9). ... Through sin man lost all true knowledge both of God and of himself, as God meant him to be. ... But in the man Christ Jesus, God revealed His perfect man, the divine ideal. In Him not only was found all that He could ever want in God, but all that God could ever want in man" (1SBD, 26). See also: "How God Works to Save Us," These Times, February 1973, 12-15; OHP, 13-23.

Concerning this, Heppenstall notes: "God was faced with two necessities: first, the sending forth of a second Man who would fulfill His original intention in man's creation; second, the providing of another Adam who would act representatively for the human race as the Head of a new order. God's second man must succeed where His first man failed and He must succeed under the same circumstances and limitations" (1SBD, 27).

By plenary Heppenstall means that Incarnation was not an end in itself. Incarnation was only a part of the divine plan to reconcile to Himself all things in heaven and earth (Col 1:20; Eph 1:10). The need of reconciliation was because incarnation was not enough to solve sin's problem, therefore, he asserts: "Incarnation brings God to man but it does not bring man to God" (1SBD, 28).

The cross is the goal of the Incarnation, Heppenstall affirms, because "in itself, the Incarnation had no redemptive value, but it paved the way for his death which alone has redemptive value" (1SBD, 32).

The cross brought several results to man: Man receives Adoption (1 John 2:2), the sentence of death (Rom 5:18), and the guilt and sin (Acts 13:38) are removed. Man has now a new status (Rom 8:16, 17), new life (Heb 10:10), and eternal life (John 3:15, 16; Heb 9:28). 1SBD, 34.
Heppenstall declares, the believer leaves the sphere of sin, death, darkness, and disorder and enters the sphere of righteousness, life, light, and liberty.¹

Christ's ascension and exaltation is the fourth span on the bridge of salvation. Not until His ascension and exaltation could Jesus Christ actually perform His work as Head of the church. His ascension had the purpose of initiating His threefold office and ministry in heaven.²

According to Heppenstall the work of reconciliation and unity of the world completed by Christ is accomplished in three stages: The first is the atonement at the cross when Christ brought redemption to sinful man; the second is the priestly ministry of Christ in heaven;³ and the third is the atonement through judgment.⁴ Heppenstall affirms that without all these there can be no end to sin, no immortality for man.⁵

---

¹ISBD, 48, 49.

²His threefold office is as Prophet, Priest, and King. As Priest, He has a twofold ministry: Sacrifice and Intercession (ISBD, 51, 52). Heppenstall's book, Our High Priest, deals extensively with the priestly ministry of Christ in heaven.

³Heppenstall compares Christ's ministry to the daily ministry of the levitical priesthood, where he finds several parallels. He includes in this ministry Christ's intercession and representation before the Father on our behalf, and His guidance of the church to its ultimate triumph (OHP, 31). He points out four reasons for the necessity of the mediatorial work of Christ: Because of the origin of the evil and world-wide apostasy from the truth from God; The mediatorial work of Christ will ultimately (1) crush the revolt and rebellion of Satan, his host, and followers, and redound to the glory of God; (2) present a true representation of God and His character; (3) bring about the reconciliation of man to God; and (4) enable man to "worship him" and "give glory to Him," the only true God. ZSB, 15.

⁴A difference between the victory of Christ gained at Calvary and the work of judgment in and from the heavenly sanctuary is pointed out by Heppenstall: "The living Christ ministers until death and sin are no more. For the world still in sin, the final overthrow of evil can never be accomplished simply and only by an event that happened on the cross two thousands years ago. Both the triumph at the cross and the work of Christ as priest in heaven are the hope and pledge of final renewal and atonement" (OHP, 31).

⁵Ibid.
understood within this wider perspective, explains Heppenstall, granted that all this is "in Christ" and realized through Him.\(^1\)

In regard to the Judgment, the third aspect of the plan, Heppenstall develops his concepts by interpreting the types and symbols of the earthly sanctuary. In the Levitical order of the earthly sanctuary, in any given year, the priestly ministry was comprised of two important aspects: the daily and the yearly. The daily or "Continual" ministration was performed every day throughout the year. The yearly came at a fixed time and ended within the limits of one natural day. It was called the Day of Atonement.\(^2\) After considering the issue of whether atonement had indeed been made all during the whole year as daily sacrifices were offered, Heppenstall asks, Why did sin require a further act of atonement? His answer underlines the fact that there must have been some aspect of the sin problem that had not yet been dealt with. At this point he asserts that the rituals of the Day of Atonement indicate a removal of sin that was not accomplished by the daily services. In Heppenstall's view, the ceremony on the Day of Atonement involving the two goats clearly set forth two different

\(^1\)Ibid., 32. "It may be that the failure to grasp the whole work of our Lord, both in the cross and from the heavenly sanctuary, leaves man with less than a complete knowledge of all the truth the Bible reveals as to the full meaning of the atonement" (ibid., 31). Heppenstall also points out the following: "Limiting the atonement to the cross does not allow for the total process of the blotting out of sin and the final purification of the universe from sin. If we limit atonement, or 'reconciliation,' wholly to the work of Christ at the cross, then the scope of the sanctuary message is understood in part" (ibid., 96).

\(^2\)On this day the high priest alone went into the most holy place in the presence of God to make a final atonement for the children of Israel and for the sanctuary. The great significance, for the services on that day, is that it taught a final judgment. Every sin committed and every confession made, every service rendered since the previous Day of Atonement, bore witness before God and constituted final evidence for that one day (OHP, 77). Heppenstall declares: "The cleansing of the Levitical sanctuary on the Day of Atonement has its counterpart in the heavenly sanctuary. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the correct interpretation is given by comparing the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries and their priestly ministrations" (OHP, 83).
aspects of dealing with the sin problem:¹ Christ's ministration goes beyond Calvary, including the final solution of the sin problem.² The righteousness of God requires a final judgment, a final vindication of His sovereign rule and character.³ Judgment climaxes at the end of the millennium. The truth about the character of God will be realized by both saints and sinners alike. The solution to the sin problem will be a reality. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. From one end of the universe to the other there will reign eternal reconciliation.⁴

In this way Heppenstall understands and sets forth the doctrine of redemption. The Cross of Christ is uplifted in the center of the controversy with sin as a memorial to the price paid for our redemption and as an eternal remembrance that God is Love.

Heppenstall's understanding of the doctrine of redemption helps him to avoid limiting Christ's death on the cross to a mere man-centered perspective. Such a limitation disassociates the ministry of Christ in heaven and raises the questions: What is He waiting for? Why is Christ's coming taking such a long time? Heppenstall's perspective of the doctrine of redemption helps one to have a better understanding

¹ Much of the confusion regarding the Day of Atonement services, our author points out, has risen from the tendency of Biblical interpreters and theologians to believe that the two goats both represented the work of Christ at the cross. But he remarks: "These two goats symbolize two separate and distinct aspects of God's dealing with sin. The first goat, whose blood was shed, pointed to the atonement made by Christ for our sins. The second goat, whose blood was not shed, had no part in effecting personal redemption. Instead it pointed to the final and total eradication of sin consequent on Christ's redemption" (OHP, 79).

² The blotting out of sin involves more than forgiveness. It involves also the banishment of sin (OHP, 81). The Day of Atonement teaches that God is concerned with both the triumph of righteousness and the overthrow of evil. The final victory comes only as a result of Christ's ministry both of redemption and judgment (ibid., 82).

³ Heppenstall divides the judgment into three stages: the pre-advent judgment (see OHP, 107-217); judgment during the millennium (2SBD, 77, 78); and, the final judgment at the end of the millennium (see OHP, 100-105).

⁴ OHP, 100-105.
of Christ's work and attempts to answer the question of the problem of sin. Furthermore, in Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption the problem of sin, the rites and ceremonies of the earthly tabernacle, Christ's incarnation, His heavenly ministry, and the final solution to the problem of sin are closely linked in a meaningful way giving the proper perspective in understanding God's plan of salvation prepared before the foundation of the world and revealed in the Scriptures for our sake.

It should also be noticed that Heppenstall's system follows the theological concepts of the writings of Ellen G. White, who gave Heppenstall the basic features for his view on the doctrine of redemption.¹ As was pointed out above, W. W. Prescott inspired Heppenstall to present a Christocentric approach to all doctrines. Influences from other theological trends can be detected in his views.²

¹See chapter 7, pp. 228-237.

²I.e., P. T. Forsyth in his concept of the justification of God. Covenant theology has affected his position on the covenant. W. G. T. Shedd on original sin. Indirect influences can also be noticed on him, such as Luther's understanding of righteousness by faith; Anselm, Grotius, Abelard, and others all influenced his perception on atonement. Ballenger and Andreasen indirectly stimulated his views on the sanctuary.
In order to appreciate Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption, it is necessary to discuss the way Heppenstall understands and defines this doctrine. It is also necessary to analyze his view on the nature of man and his concept of sin because these constitute the foundation of what he considered a proper interpretation of the doctrine of redemption. He remarks that one's view of man's nature determines the nature of salvation to which one aspires. He states that one's view of sin determines one's concept of the divine remedy to solve it. Therefore, it is important that before one considers his scheme of redemption, one should properly understand Heppenstall's definition and the view of the scope of redemption, concept of the nature of man and sin.

1It is important to notice that the nature of man in Adventism has not received a great deal of study. The issue has come up as the result of Christological concerns. The discussions with Brinsmead on perfection led Heppenstall and others to consider some aspects of this issue in relation to eschatology. Discussions of Christology and soteriology between the Pre-1950s group with the Post-1950s group led them to give closer consideration to anthropology. The question was what kind of human nature did Christ have? In order to answer that question, a definition of what kind of nature man has was necessary. This development can be traced in Heppenstall's writings. Heppenstall in his ISBD (1955) pays little attention to this aspect. In the discussions with Brinsmead, he included the subject in the issue of perfection. In (1974), when he wrote his book SU, he devoted one chapter to the consideration of the nature of man. In 1977, when he wrote his book MWG, he devoted three chapters to a discussion of Christ's human nature: "Christ and Sin" (107-128), "The Sinlessness of Christ" (129-150), and "The Temptations of Christ" (151-172). Even though Heppenstall recognized the importance of the issue, he gave no further consideration in other writings, therefore, there is not much development in Heppenstall's doctrine on man.

2SU, 25.
For Heppenstall, "redemption is reconciliation to God and restoration of man to the image in which God created him." According to this definition, redemption has two aspects, the first is in relation to God, the second is in relation to man. In the first aspect, the key word is reconciliation; in the second, it is restoration. Regarding the concept of reconciliation, Heppenstall indicates that sin alienated man from God, therefore, the need of redemption was caused by sin. When sin came in, death followed. "From then on," he says, "sin and death has involved every man and woman born into this world." Here is where the second aspect of Heppenstall's definition enters. Death and sin brought destruction. Therefore, in order to provide an answer for the sin-and-death problem and to win men back to fellowship with their Maker, God "set into operation a divine scheme of redemption, foreordained and formulated in the secret counsels of the Most High from before the foundation of the world."2

There is still another aspect of redemption in relation to what he defines the atonement. Heppenstall equates reconciliation with atonement "at-one-ment."3 Sin not only alienated man from God but also ruptured the oneness and unity that God had created, and destroyed the harmonious relationship between God and His creatures.4 Heppenstall uses the word atonement to describe God's way of bringing about a reconciliation. Atonement, for him, is "an expression of the divine

---

1SU, 24.
2Ibid. 14.
3Ibid., 25. It is important to notice that Heppenstall uses atonement in three different senses: first, in a very definite way to refer to Christ's act of atonement on the cross (OHP, 14); second, to refer to the personal experience of reconciliation of men to God (OHP, 29); and thirdly, to the process of reconciliation of the world to Christ (OHP, 31). It is in this last sense that reconciliation and atonement are synonymous.
4OHP, 25.
intention to destroy sin that ruptured the universe. Therefore, we can deduce that for Heppenstall reconciliation or atonement not only refers to God's purpose with regards to man but also His purpose with regards to sin.

Regarding the view of the scope of redemption, Heppenstall considers the subject from two perspectives: The first is his scheme of the plan of redemption which has three stages: (1) the promise of redemption, (2) the act of redemption and its subsequent proclamation, (3) the work of judgment. The second perspective deals with the process of atonement, which is also accomplished in three stages: The first is the atonement at the cross when Christ brought redemption to sinful man. The second is atonement through the priestly ministry of Christ, His intercession and representation before the Father on our behalf and His guidance of the church to its ultimate triumph. The third is the atonement through judgment.

We notice that both perspectives have two similar stages: the acts of atonement and judgment. In his scheme of the plan of redemption, however, Heppenstall mentions first the promise of redemption, second, the act of Christ's atonement and the proclamation of the gospel, and third, the judgment. In the perspective of the process of atonement, the act of atonement, is first. Second, he mentions Christ's priestly ministry, His mediation, and His guidance of the church to its ultimate triumph, and third, the judgment. We can notice that although these two plans are slightly different they are basically the same. The perspective of the plan of redemption has man's

---

1Ibid., 29.
2Ibid.
3Ibid., 31.
4OHP, 14.
5Ibid., 31.
salvation in mind. While atonement focusses on the work of Christ. Heppenstall's view of the plan of redemption has a broader scope than the process of atonement, because in the plan of redemption Heppenstall encompasses salvation history, "from the time sin entered to its final eradication";¹ whereas the perspective of atonement began when Christ started His work of reconciliation and continues to the end of that process. Therefore, one can assert that, for Heppenstall both designs are basically the same in purpose, if not in extent.

It is significant to notice that Heppenstall believes that the scope of redemption is revealed typologically in the earthly sanctuary/temple services.² This is why he gives ample consideration to the sanctuary. For him, the doctrine of the sanctuary is basic to an understanding of the plan of redemption.³ It is for this reason that he says that God's "movements from the sanctuary should be thoroughly studied and understood."⁴

There is still another aspect in Heppenstall's scope of redemption. For him the key figure in the plan of redemption is Jesus Christ.⁵ He came to fulfill God's plan of redemption. Moreover, Heppenstall wants to make clear that God is not responsible for sin. So redemption for Heppenstall is also a plan to vindicate God from the responsibility of sin.⁶

¹OHP, 16.
²All the typical services in the earthly sanctuary, for Heppenstall, foretold Christ's atoning death and His high-priestly ministry in heaven and the final judgment (OHP, 16). "The sanctuary revealed the scope of redemption and judgment, the love of God for sinners, and the determined opposition of God to the satanic forces" (ibid.).
³"The key to the divine program for the destiny of our world and the salvation of men still resides in the sanctuary" (ibid.).
⁴Ibid., 18.
⁵OHP, 14.
In summary, we can say that redemption for Heppenstall is a divine program foreordained and formulated before the foundation of the world with the purpose of dealing with the problem that sin brought to God's government. Redemption has three purposes, first, to win back men to fellowship with God and to restore him to God's image; the second, is to destroy sin that ruptured the oneness and unity of the universe; the third, to vindicate God's character before the universe, and from the responsibility of sin. This is the reason the scope of the plan of redemption comprehends the entire range of salvation history, from the inception of sin until its final eradication, because only in this way God's character can be vindicated, sin eradicated and man restored to the original state God created him. We consider his doctrine of redemption following his own scheme. However, as was mentioned previously, it is necessary to examine Heppenstall's view of the nature of man and his concept of sin. We analyze the subjects on that order.

Nature of Man

Heppenstall's View of the Nature of Man

Heppenstall considers it crucial to have a correct knowledge of the nature of man. However, in order to understand his view on the topic, one must be aware of some of his basic presuppositions. He asserts that the existence of God is a first truth. Second, evil had no part in God's original creation (Gen 1:31). Third, God has

---

1 SU, 25.

2 SBD, 8. The existence of a personal living God (Jer 10:10) is basic for Heppenstall. God is the Creator of the universe (Ps 19). Creation is an act of a triune God; each member of the Godhead participated (SBD, 10). Heppenstall also believes that God, to some extent, has placed that first truth within every man, adding: "The very fact that all men assent to this first truth is proof of the Scripture statement" (ibid., 8). His understanding is based on Rom 1:19-21; John 1:9. See also "Things Which Can Not Be Shaken," These Times, January 1972, 3.

3 SBD, 14.
authority over created intelligent beings\(^1\) to whom He has granted free-
dom.\(^2\) God created Adam and Eve as free moral agents capable of a right
response and a clear recognition of personal responsibility to Him who
created them.\(^3\) God made them perfect in a perfect world, with perfect
freedom to respond to Him in love.\(^4\) We can notice from the start that,
for Heppenstall, it is crucial to understand man's freedom. The reason
is decisive for him, because from it depends our concept of God,
especially in His responsibility with the origin of sin. Who is
responsible for sin is a crucial question in his doctrine of redemption.

Regarding the nature of man, Heppenstall states that because
man is created in the image of God, man is of moral value to God.\(^5\)
Furthermore, it implies man's responsibility to his fellow men, since

\(^1\)Creation is related to preservation and providence, asserts
Heppenstall. Ibid., 12.

\(^2\)Ibid., 70. However, our freedom depends on our complete
dependence on God as Lord. Heppenstall says: "The Creator is Lord. Man
has no right and no power which has not been bestowed upon him by God.
Thus when we speak of Christ (as) Lord in our lives, we must admit
entirely Creation; that while God created man for Himself, He endowed
him an independent being; yet never independent of God. Man's freedom
is based upon his dependence on God as Lord, so that a maximum of
freedom is at the same time a maximum of dependence upon God. Man is
the more free, the more he lives on dependance upon God. The less free
he is the more he denies this lordship of Christ and seeks to withdraw
himself from it. Complete dependance upon God is at the same time true
freedom" (1SBD, 70, 71). See also SU, 8, 11, 14, 23-24, 184.

\(^3\)SU, 8. God put man under probation (Gen 2:9). This probation
had the purpose of developing the character of man. It was to lead man
to maturity so he would be assured of immortality. 1SBD, 16.
Heppenstall declares that "freedom does not, and cannot, mean indepen-
dence from God. Man may be free in the only way a created being can be,
to follow the God-given nature, but not free from His Creator" (MWG,
119).

\(^4\)SU, 11. After the fall, the whole man has been infected by
sin. His will, his feelings, and reason were adversely affected by sin.
See SU, 15.

\(^5\)SU, 7. The Image of God included physical, mental and spiri-
tual likeness. 1SBD, 16. Heppenstall rejects evolutionistic concepts
on the origin of man. He speaks of man thus: "Made in the image of God,
a son of God, a godlike being with capacity for fellowship with God. He
is a child of God's creation, made to respond freely as an earthly son
to his father. He is the original prince of this world, responsible
only to God himself" (SU, 8).
all men share in the divine likeness. God gave man life; only God has life in himself. This is an important aspect for Heppenstall, because for him, man is not immortal; neither does he have an immortal soul.\(^1\)

Regarding his nature, he believes that man is not made of two or three distinct entities such as body, soul, and spirit. For Heppenstall, those and other terms refer to different functions of the whole man.\(^2\)

Therefore, we can say that for Heppenstall, in relation to his mental abilities, man is an intelligent being. In relation to the duration of his existence, man is not immortal. Regarding his will, man is a free moral agent capable of a right response and a clear recognition of personal responsibility to God. Concerning his nature, man has not two or three entities but he is one unity. From these basic concepts, we examine Heppenstall's concept of man and the way he relates it to man's fall.

**The Fall of Man**

Heppenstall states that Adam and Eve, the first parents of all living beings on earth,\(^3\) refused to obey God's will and put

---


\(^3\)Some regard the creation narrative as a myth or a symbol. See Tillich, 40; Niebuhr, 133. However, Heppenstall believes in the historicity of the creation narrative, and asserts that "In view of the fact that man is a historical being, God must enter into human history and become part of the historical process if man is to be saved. God's invasion into our world on a rescue mission, occurred in the person of God's Son, Jesus Christ. These are supreme historical realities, not illusions. Because they are facts that belong to the history of man, man must pay attention to them" (SU, 21).
self-will in its place. As a result of his sin, man's nature was 
corrupted. A physical, mental, and spiritual change occurred in Adam 
and Eve by virtue of the fact that they had chosen to sin. 
Consequently, all of Adam's descendants have inherited the results and 
the consequences of Adam's sin: separation from God. All men and women 
are born self-centered. This is the foundation of all sin. It is a 
life apart from God, where self is king rather than God.¹ Man's fall 
introduced sin into the world. The consequence of sin and the manner in 
which it is transmitted is of critical importance in Heppenstall's 
doctrine of redemption, because sin introduced the need of God's redemp-
tion. It is necessary at this point in our discussion, therefore, to 
analyze Heppenstall's concept of sin.

Heppenstall's Concept of Sin

The Nature of Sin

In answer to the question "What is sin? - is it a spiritual 
thing?" Heppenstall holds that it is "not something physical; the 
effects are physical; but sin is not something transmitted by genes or 
chromosomes."² Sin is more than the violation of moral principles. It 
involves man's standing with God and is therefore religious in nature.³ 
It refers primarily to what has happened in man's personal relationship

¹ SU, 12.

² SRF3, 34. He further adds that the sin of Adam and Eve was 
disobedience, desire for life apart from God, egoism, self-exaltation 
(ibid). Heppenstall does not accept the idea that sin is only a 
biological problem, because this tends to throw the blame upon our 
organic system rather upon the whole man as he stands before God. There 
would be no problem in our physical structure, including the glands, 
genes, and chromosomes with all their biological and physiological 
possibilities if it were not for the perverseness of our minds. He 
insists that we do not commit sin by some mechanical action of the genes 
of the flesh. Man's broken relationship with God is not something 
inherited biologically. However, man becomes limited and crippled in 
mental capacity owing to the weakening of the genes. The effects of sin 
are seen primarily in the brain and its functions (MWG, 123).

³ MWG, 107. Sin exists in the whole person because it is a 
spiritual thing which permeates the whole being (SRF2, 6).
to God, His Lord and Creator. Heppenstall affirms that sin is not an “entity,” it is a life apart from God and from obedience to His will.

First, disbelief comes and, then, disobedience follows. Sin for Heppenstall is the wrong use of freedom. What are the consequences of sin? This is the next subject.

Consequences of Sin

Our author points out that there are two aspects to sin: man’s personal acts of transgression for which he is responsible, and the sinful state or condition into which he is born as a member of a sinful race. He asserts that the act of sin springs from our sinful

1MWG, 107. Sin is the refusal to live in a right relationship. The relationship is one of love. Love requires dependence as well as independence (SRF2, 6). He further adds: “Sin means self-love, self-exaltation, self-glorification. Sin is egoism, self-centerness. Not a man on skid-row but a man who refuses to acknowledge his need for God. Refusal to acknowledge finite existence” (ibid.).

2Adam and Eve’s sin consisted in choosing to gratify themselves rather than to trust and obey God. Their sin involved not so much eating the fruit as gratifying themselves contrary to God’s will. The fruit was good in itself, since God created it. But it became the means for our first parents to please themselves, to assert their independence from the will of their Creator (MWG, 118-119).

“The same principle holds true in most things in life. There is nothing wrong with acquiring of wealth; but when it is done for the sake of self-gratification, for the worship of self, for the expression of selfish desires, and not for the glory of God, then it is sin” (ibid.).

3The process in sinning is as follows: First, Eve was tempted first to disbelieve God. Second, disobedience followed. The consequence was alienation from God (MWG, 165).

4MWG, 119. In order to vindicate God in regard to the problem of sin, Heppenstall looks for an interpretation that makes Adam and man responsible for sin rather than God. Asserting man’s free choice, Heppenstall solves this problem. In this aspect, Heppenstall agrees with the view of Tillich and Hendrikus Berkhof who stress the same concept, see: Tillich, 44-59. Hendrikus Berkhof, Christian Faith (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1986), 194-195.

5The monistic or holistic concept of the nature of man held by Heppenstall has its implications in his view of original sin. For him: “Man is a single unit—body and soul. Both physically and psychically. The soul is not a separate part from the body. Did God not create Adam and Eve with the invisible substance of all the succeeding generations of men, both as to the soul and body? The entire unity of man—body and mind—which became the living soul was involved” (SRF3, 34). Therefore, concludes Heppenstall: “Adam not only transmitted the physical effects
state. The state of sin is the direction of the will and of the whole being which is contrary to the will of God.\footnote{"Sin is the intent to be like God without God and self-contained and self-sufficient" (SU, 17-18).} Man is not born free to do righteous things on his own.\footnote{MWG, 107. He uses the assertion of William Shedd: "original sin is one; actual sin is manifold" (ibid., 108). Cf. W. G. T. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, 3 vols. [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889-1894, 2:256.} Heppenstall asserts that when Adam and Eve sinned, their relationship with God was lost, not only for themselves but for their descendants. As a result, all men are born in a state of separation from God,\footnote{MWG, 109.} subject to sin and death, unable of themselves to return to innocence.\footnote{MWG, 121. Sinfulness does not consist in the lack of capacities. It is the perversion of them owing to one's separation from God (SU, 123). Propensity or proclivity to sin are qualities or characteristics of a life apart from God. From this state grows every other form of sin (MWG, 124).} This alienation from God is marked by two fatal consequences: man is without righteousness\footnote{MWG, 123. Sin lies, not on the periphery of a man's life, points out Heppenstall, but at the very center of his being, his depth dimension (ibid.). Sin has corrupted the very center and highest part of man. Sin is man's affirmation to please himself, free from divine control (ibid., 120).} and under the sentence of death.\footnote{SU, 26.} He is spiritually fallen. Apart from a right relationship with God, he cannot obey Him. Observation and experience bear out this fact.\footnote{MWG, 120. The Biblical evidences for men's sinfulness are: "By nature children of wrath" (Eph 2:3); the "carnal mind is enmity against God" (Rom 8:7); "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor 2:14) (ibid.).} In sin, the human capacities are impaired.\footnote{PP, 70. Even though man's intellect, will, mind, and affections still function since the Fall, these are so changed and reduced in power and ability that they no longer function as God intended them to (ibid.). Man's power of thought and vision is not destroyed, but the mind is disabled and blinded by self and sin (ibid., 74).} All
of man's faculties now function on the natural, carnal level outside of a right relationship with God.¹ Man idolizes himself and prides himself on his ability and power. He is more concerned to display his sense of superiority and self-sufficiency than to win the praise of God.² Besides that, much of sin offers men both delight and pleasure. The wages of sin are not always seen in the light of failure and wretchedness. Heppenstall affirms that often men come to believe that sin is terrible only when it results in disease, poverty, prison, extended sufferings, and death; but sin is never more perilous than when it is successful.³ There remains an aspect that still needs our attention, How sin is transmitted? Let us examine Heppenstall's view on original sin.

Original Sin

For Heppenstall the state of sin into which all men are born is called original sin—not in the sense of inherited guilt but of an

sin is separation from God, from this follows the sequence of separation and death. The aftermath of this separation in regards to understanding is spiritual blindness (Rev 3:17; 2 Cor 4:4); sin blinds and darkens the mind—destroys the consciousness of divine things. Concerning the effects of sin on the conscience, it is insensibility; conscience is stupefied, affected by guilt. Pertaining to the effects on the will, it is enmity against God, hardness of heart, obstinacy (SRF, 34).

¹SU, 121. God created Adam to live in harmonious fellowship with and dependence upon Him. This relationship predisposed Adam to right thinking, right feeling, right conduct, and to love God with all his heart, mind, and soul. But Adam fell into sin (MWG, 118).

²MWG, 120. Man is deeply fallen. The natural qualities and power with which God endowed him at creation are not sufficient to save him. They do not lead man back to God. It is possible to build a desirable moral and social order and still ignore God. Man in his fallen condition tends to dedicate God's gifts mostly to the worship of self (SU, 17).

³"Sin is never more perilous than when it is successful," says our author. "It is never more costly than when it pays off. It is never more disastrous than when it appears attractive. It is never more deceptive than when people find so much satisfaction with it" (SU, 19).
inherited disposition to sin (the concept of total depravity). In this state, he is referring to the sinful condition of all humans before they are actually guilty of committing sin. He maintains that in order to understand original sin, one must seek its meaning in man's life apart from God. To lack oneness with God is to be deficient as a person, to be wrong in heart and mind. Original sin is not per se

---

1Heppenstall denies biological transmission of sin. Total depravity describes the sinner in his lost condition. It does not necessarily mean total wickedness or sinfulness. Sin does not manifest itself in every man in the same manner or to the same degree. The word total simply has reference to the whole man as being infected with sin. No part of man is exempt. Man's alienation from God has adversely affected all his parts: his will, feelings, reason (SU, 15). The description of total depravity, used by our author, is the same that the reformers used. However, Heppenstall denies the bondage of the will. In this aspect, his position is closer to Arminius. Cf. John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, vol. 1, trans., Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 1983), 1:11. 2-11. Cf. Martin Luther, Luther's Works, vol. 25, Lectures on Romans, ed. Hilton C. Oswald (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972), 296-303; Martin Luther, Luther's Works, vol. 12, Selected Psalms I, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955), 347-351. See also Paul Althaus, The Theology of Martin Luther, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 157-160. For Arminius, see The Writings of James Arminius, 3 vols., trans. James Nichols (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), 1:252-253; 523-531.

2MWG, 107-108. Original sin is a doctrine, not primarily respecting individuals in their individual capacity and responsibility. It is a doctrine that affects all the members of the human race. Just as the atonement of Christ and His redemption is said to be for the whole race, original sin involves mankind (SRF3, 28b). Heppenstall explains the extent of original sin thus: "Original sin refers to the sin which belongs to all as result of Adam's sin. . . . This original sin remains in Christians and non-Christians until they die or are translated" (SRF3, 28a). Furthermore, he adds: "Adam's sin was the sin of the race, the death of the race, the condemnation of the race. Adam's descendants are involved in sin and death because of Adam's sin." He speaks of solidarity between Adam and the race, using Rom 5:12 to prove that all sinned, and Rom 5:19 to stress the fact that many were constituted sinners (ibid., 28a-28b).

3Heppenstall writes: "The nature of man's sinful state cannot be determined except by knowing its origin--hence the term original sin. Actually, the designation 'original' refers to Adam's first sin. It implies that the origin of this sin is a feature that is vital to the understanding of it. That the nature of it cannot be determined but by its first source" (SRF3, 28a).

4MWG, 122.
wrong doing but wrong being.\(^1\) This state of man's original sin at birth is taught by the Scriptures.\(^2\)

Analyzing the different interpretations of the transmission of sin, Heppenstall rejects the position of Augustine who saw original sin as universally inherited in the human race.\(^3\) If this position were true, it would mean that Jesus Christ inherited original sin by natural generation.\(^4\) He also refutes the Pelagian view of original sin that

\(^1\)Ibid. Original sin is neither a genetic nor a physiological problem. Heppenstall says: "Trying to locate sin or the transmission of sin genetically simply misses the real problem. The issue is a spiritual one and not something in a gene. Sin is not transmitted from parent to children. Sin must not be reduced to something physical. Man feeds on himself as the center of importance. He seeks glory from men and gives none to God. His self-centeredness remains hidden from man himself. Consequently, he is unable to sense any need of God. He becomes his own frame of reference. Consequently, God cannot have the right place in his life" (MWG, 122-123).

\(^2\)He quotes Eph 2:1-3; Isa 48:8; Ps 58:3; 51:3. Then he writes: "The key biblical texts for the doctrine of original sin are found in Romans 5:12-21. The whole passage, which is a unity, teaches the solidarity that exists between one man, Adam, and all other men. The reason for the solidarity passed upon all men is that all are sinners by virtue of Adam's fall" (MWG, 109). See also SRP3, 30. The Christian church has held the solidarity of the human race in the sin of Adam. However, the difference in interpretation arises in seeking to explain how the sin of Adam caused all men to be involved in his sin (MWG, 110). In SRP3, 30-33, Heppenstall analyzes the pros and cons of the mediate and immediate imputational theories of sin.

\(^3\)MWG, 112-113. Heppenstall argues against Augustine's interpretation of the Scripture because he sees it as incorrect. Augustine deduced original sin from the sin of the first pair. His interpretation of Romans 5:12 is obviously false because Paul does not say that all have sinned in the person of Adam, that all the posterity of Adam consequently begin their individual lives inheriting sin itself. Paul speaks of the results of sin and death that flowed from Adam. As an outcome of Adam's sin all men have a sinful and selfish bias. Paul does not explain how this came to be (ibid). For further study on this issue see: Augustine, Saint Augustine's Anti-Pelagian Works (NPNF, 5:15-552); Augustine, The City of God (NPNF, 2: XV.15-24); see also Norman Geisler, ed., What Augustine Says (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1982); Gerald Bonner, Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism, ed. Robert P. Russell (Wetteren, Belgium: Villanova University Press, 1972).

\(^4\)His arguments against this view are: "Mary, the mother of our Lord, died. There is no evidence whatever that she was translated. Her mortality can be accounted for on the basis that she was a sinner. She, too, needed salvation and atonement made by her Son, Jesus Christ. If she were sinless, no judgement of death would follow. 'For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive' (1 Cor 15:22)" (MWG, 113).
holds that the effect of Adam's sin was no more than that of a bad example. Pelagius' position, he maintains, is also a misinterpretation of the teachings of Scripture. Calvin's concept of original sin as a malady is rejected by Heppenstall because it makes God responsible for sin and does not do justice to His character. Who is responsible for sin, is the crucial question of the doctrine of original sin.

Heppenstall also dismisses the Arminian position on original sin. Arminius holds that universal justification is necessary to counteract the injustice of universal original sin and its resultant

---


2 The following arguments are used to refute the Pelagian position: Paul specifically states that sin and death passed on all men by virtue of Adam's sin against God. Children may die before they voluntarily transgress God's law; their death can be accounted for only as the result of Adam's sin, as God's word declares. Paul compares the first Adam and Jesus Christ, the second Adam; both stand at the head of the race and affect the entire race. By the sin of Adam, sin and death entered the lives of all men; by Jesus Christ, righteousness and the life of obedience enter the lives of all who believe in Him. Therefore, Pelagius' view is contrary to this analogy. MWG, 111. See also SRF3, 288-29.

3 Any position that makes genetically inherited sin or its moral consequences the specific ground for the condemnation of the race, involves God in the responsibility. In Heppenstall eyes, this is unacceptable because once solidarity with Adam is interpreted to mean transmission of sin by a procreated posterity, responsibility is placed upon the Creator. He points out that Calvin fails to clear God of the responsibility for making sin possible. His interpretation does not form a proper basis for doing justice to the character of God. This, for Heppenstall, constitutes the crucial issue in the doctrine of original sin. MWG, 116.
condemnation.¹ For Heppenstall, this also has certain implications regarding the character of God that cannot be accepted.²

Neither the Calvinistic nor the Arminian positions extend any real vindication of God. In both views, he sees God very much as a partner in the universal condemnation of man. At stake is God's character of justice, love, and righteousness.³

The only basis for vindicating God's character in the doctrine of original sin, remarks Heppenstall, is to find an interpretation that makes Adam and man responsible for sin rather than God.⁴ He points out that there are two factors that we need to acknowledge for a proper interpretation of the solidarity of the human race in regards to original sin: the nature of sin that Adam transmitted to his posterity

¹Heppenstall recognizes that the Arminian position differs sharply from Calvin's doctrine of election and a limited atonement. Heppenstall says: "Arminius gives priority to salvation by grace for all men. He deals with the race on the basis of a universal atonement, not on the basis of election. Thus all are born free. The only sins for which man can be judged and condemned when he arrives at the age of accountability are his own. Therefore, all babies and infants who die before that time will be saved. From birth man must learn to cooperate with God. Grace is resistible" (MWG, 117). Cf. James Arminius, The Writings of James Arminius. 3 vols. trans. James Nichols (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), 1:317-321; 2:74-79.

²The Arminian position implies that God ordained condemnation and provided justification. Heppenstall replies: "How can God balance His injustice of universal condemnation on the one hand and with His universal justification on the other? If God is right with His first judgment, He does not need another act to justify Himself. On the other hand, how could God commit an act of injustice and later balance it by another act?" (MWG, 117-118). In SRF3, 30, he adds: "But if this justification is a reality, then the guilt or original sin must also be a reality; guilt must precede its cancellation. A real justification of the race in Christ means a real condemnation and guilt of the race on account of Adam."

³Heppenstall maintains that "a loving, righteous God can not impute guilt or inflict depravity and condemnation upon anyone who has not, by his own choice, made himself a transgressor. How can God, as Calvinism implies, hold a baby or a child responsible for the sin he is born with? How can the child be blamed for giving expression to a sinful nature when that is the only nature he has? He did not ask to be born in a sinful world. We had no choice in the matter" (MWG, 118).

⁴Ibid., 118.
and the consequences of God's withdrawal from the human race.\(^1\) We have considered previously the nature of sin, let us examine the second aspect.

 Withdrawal of God from the Human Race

Since God respected Adam and Eve's choice to live independently from Him, and since their moral powers were weakened, there was no way they could bring their children into the world in a restored relationship with God.\(^2\) The children inherited the results of their parents' sin, separation from God.\(^3\) How could God cause billions of people to suffer for Adam's one sin? Heppenstall answers that God does not punish men for the sin of Adam; but separation from God followed as a result of the sin of one men.\(^4\) Heppenstall points out that God must reveal his attitude towards sin and show His reaction. This reaction is the sequence of sin bringing death—sin must be either separated from God and the universe, or God must accept it.\(^5\) This judgment of God on

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)In William G. T. Shedd's words: "The doctrine in question (original sin) does not imply that fallen man is unable to be moral; but that he is unable to be spiritual, holy, and religious" Shedd, 2:214.

\(^3\)MWG, 120-21.

\(^4\)MWG, 121. On this point Heppenstall follows the position of William Shedd who made the following observation: "To suffer in consequence of the sin of another, is not the same as to be punished for it" (Shedd, 2:187, quoted in MWG, 110). See also SU, 36. God did not impute either guilt or punishment to Adam's posterity. First, Heppenstall clarifies that death is not penalty—but the consequence of sin. We are not guilty of Adam's sin; we are not punished for his sin. Nevertheless, we are exposed to and affected by his result—spiritually, mentally, physically. God will not impose on sinners any penalty for Adam's sin but for their own. SRF3, 35.

\(^5\)SRF3, 35. Heppenstall adds: "Man would have died immediately had God not yet by special grace kept man alive and still does—in order that man might have a second trial, a second chance. This was necessary if God's answer to the sin problem was to be revealed and worked out; with everyone dead—the only problem God would have would be with the rest of the universe—the sin problem would not be solved" (ibid.).
sin is seen, therefore, in everyone who is a sinner. If this is man's condition, what is the solution for man's sin?

Pointers to a Solution

In order for man to be saved, affirms Heppenstall, God needs to do two things: remove the death sentence and provide a perfect righteousness as well as the divine power that brings men into a right relationship with Himself. The first God accomplished by Christ's death, the second by His righteous life on earth. Man's only hope lies in a return to God through Jesus Christ and a commitment of his life to Christ to be led by the Spirit, rather than to govern and serve himself.

Therefore, we can conclude that Heppenstall takes a different stand in his view of sin in relationship with other theories. He agrees

1The act of God in separating himself from the human race to this degree has brought the sequence of sin and death. The unknown factor in original sin is how it has affected not only Adam but Adam's being as the Father of the race and his power to transmit to his offspring no more than what he had. SRF3, 35.

2SU, 26.

3MWG, 120. Through Jesus Christ, God seeks to reconcile man with Himself. The sinful situation of a person is changed when he is born again of the Holy Spirit and reconciled to God and His will. The presence of the Holy Spirit imparts new spiritual capacities, tastes, tendencies, sympathies, and predispositions. Man's life style and center are now toward God. The total man is made right with his Creator (ibid.).

4MWG, 125. Man's surrender to God and to the Holy Spirit does not mean that he now has changed his genes or simply improved his propensities. God seeks control of the whole person. He adds: "Crucifying the flesh does not mean that one denies to himself certain undesirable and unchristian things. The issue involves shifting one's whole center from self to Christ. This requires the conscious, willing commitment of the whole person. . . . When this happens his tastes, tendencies, proclivities, predispositions, are given a new spiritual capacity by the control of the Holy Spirit in the life. The whole man now comes into a right relation to God" (ibid.).

5Heppenstall recognizes that modern man is reluctant to diagnose his problem in terms of his need to repent and return to God. However, he affirms that a shift in our center of reference is needed. Our motivations and commitments need to be Christ-centered. We have no way of survival or recovery from sin unless we have a deep involvement of our whole lives with Christ. MWG, 124-125.
with Augustine and Calvin (in the concept of total depravity of man),
but he rejects the bondage of the will that they held. In this aspect,
he is closer to the views of Arminius and Pelagius. However, he rejects
Pelagius' positive concept on the nature of man. He also rejects both
the Arminian view of universal justification and Calvin's view of
universal condemnation because both concepts made God responsible for
sin. Heppenstall's position, therefore, is unique in the sense that he
holds that Adam and not God is responsible for sin.\(^1\) Man is depraved
but still able to choose.\(^2\) Adam's guilt and condemnation for his sin
are not transferred to humankind.\(^3\) However, man receives the con­
sequences of Adam's sin, i.e., separation and death.

In summary, we can say that, for Heppenstall, God is not
responsible for sin. Sin is the wrong use of freedom. When Adam placed
self-will ahead of God's will, he separated himself from God. This act
brought dramatic consequences to the whole human race. Original sin is
the state of separation from God in which the human race is found as a
consequence of Adam's sin. From this follows death. Death is not the
result of God's punishment, but the consequence of Adam's separation
from God.

**Conclusion**

Therefore, we can say as a matter of conclusion that the
nature of man and original sin in Heppenstall's system became the
foundation of his understanding of the doctrine of redemption. Without
a proper perspective on the nature of sin, according to Heppenstall, one
is not able to perceive the wretchedness of man's sinful condition. At

\(^1\) Calvin's view on predestination led him to teach that God
foreordained man to sin, see John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian

\(^2\) In this sense Heppenstall is different from Augustine, Calvin,
and Luther who hold a total depravity and bondage of the will.

\(^3\) As is the case in Augustine's doctrine of original sin.
the same time, one is also unable to appreciate God's work of redemption. An adequate understanding of man's nature and sin gives a better foundation from which to understand Christ's redemption. Moreover, we can have a better understanding of Christ's human nature and His temptations.¹ At the same time it gives a clear panorama of righteousness by faith and Christian perfection.

Even though sin is man's culpability, God's grace made feasible another opportunity for man. How was this made possible? It was made possible through His plan of redemption. What does redemption consists of, for Heppenstall? Let us now turn our attention to this question.

¹Heppenstall was well aware of the implications the nature of man and sin have, especially when they are related to Christ's human nature. He says: "Let a man state his understanding of the nature of man and he will state what he thinks of Jesus Christ and His work. Both truths stand or fall together. Where a man is able to redeem himself, he is no longer in need of a divine Redeemer" (SU, 25).
CHAPTER THREE

THE PROMISE OF REDEMPTION

It was mentioned above that Heppenstall's plan of redemption, which is the divine plan to restore man back to fellowship with Him, has three important aspects: The promise, the act of redemption at the cross and its subsequent proclamation, and finally, the work of Judgment.\(^1\)

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the Promise, the first aspect of the divine plan of redemption. Heppenstall states that after the fall of man, God set out the program of redemption. He points out two occasions where this promise was presented by God; first was the announcement of redemption (Gen 3:15), at the beginning, after man's fall. In this announcement God "promised ultimate recovery and restoration of all that had been lost by sin."\(^2\) It is interesting to notice that Heppenstall only mentioned this aspect; he never developed it further as he did the other ones.

Second, the promise was more fully set forth to the people of Israel when God came down on Mount Sinai and made a covenant with His people. In this covenant at Sinai, God revealed to them both law and gospel.\(^3\)

Moreover, Heppenstall affirms that God not only set forth at Eden and at Sinai His promise, but He displayed it on a permanent basis through the Levitical sanctuary. In the typical and sacrificial system of the earthly sanctuary, God shared with sinners the divine method for

\(^1\)OHP, 14.
\(^2\)OHP, 15.
\(^3\)Ibid.
the redemption of the human race and the eradication of sin from the universe.¹

Turning our attention to the second aspect of the promise, we have mentioned that Heppenstall affirms that sin caused the need of redemption. The law is basic in Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption because it reveals sin. It is necessary, therefore, to see how he relates law to sin and to the plan of redemption. He remarks that the supernatural activity of God, as represented by the terms 'grace' and 'law,' must be understood in the light of the whole panorama of redemption. For him, covenant, law, and gospel must be seen "as the basis and medium of redemptive revelation into which the other vital aspects and teachings of Scripture will fit and make of the truth a vital whole."² We can notice then that, for Heppenstall, covenant, law, and gospel are the basis for a clear understanding of the plan of redemption. We discuss first Heppenstall's concept of the law and after this we examine his view of the covenant.³ The reason for this shift is that Heppenstall developed first his concept of the law and this concept led him to his position on the covenant.⁴

Heppenstall's Concept of the Law

As early as the Syllabus for Bible Doctrines,⁵ Heppenstall presented the basic aspects of his position regarding the law.⁶ Yet,

¹Ibid. Further consideration is given to this last section in chapter 6 of this dissertation, since the issues of that chapter are closely related to this last part.

²SGL, i.

³Heppenstall's view of the gospel and how he relates it to the plan of redemption is the subject of study of the following chapter.

⁴See below pp. 70-84

⁵It should be noted that this syllabus is the product of the La Sierra College teaching period (1945-1955).

⁶See 1SBD, 68-79.
it is only after the "dialogue with Evangelicals" that he began to write more on this issue, elaborating and reinforcing his previous position.1

Before discussing why God gave the law to man, according to Heppenstall, it is important to highlight some features of his view of the law. First, he recognizes that the term "law" has a broad perspective and scope.2 Second, the nature of the law of God is characterized by love since the law is the revelation of God's eternal character.3

As such, the principles of the moral law are eternal and were in existence prior to the creation of man.4

Regarding why God gave the law to man, Heppenstall declares that even though, these principles were in existence before the creation of man, these principles were worded to meet man in his fallen

1When the SDA leaders' dialogue with the evangelicals took place, Heppenstall was teaching the course Grace and Law at the SDA Theological Seminary. Later, when Walter Martin wrote the book The Truth about Seventh-day Adventists (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960), Heppenstall was asked to respond to Martin's criticism on the section dealing with the Law. Heppenstall's response first appeared in an article: "The Law in Adventist Theology and Christian Experience," Ministry, June 1960, 4-11. Later it was printed in book form with the responses of other Adventist writers in DD, 12-24. It is apparent that this experience gave him the opportunity to write about this issue in different Adventist periodicals. It should be noted that the experience of responding to Martin's criticism made an impression on Heppenstall. Most of his writings on the issue defend aspects criticized by Martin and other Evangelical theologians. See "Should Christians Keep the Ten Commandments?" parts 1 and 2, Signs of the Times, September 1962, 21-23; October 1962, 20, 21; "Why Don't We Delight in God's Law?" These Times, September 1965, 24-26; "Law and Covenant at Sinai," Andrews University Seminary Studies 2 (1964):18-26; "Getting Rid of Sin," Signs of the Times, August 1965, 12-13; "In Spirit or in Letter," Review and Herald, August 25, 1966, 8-9; "Does Gospel Nullify Law?" Signs of the Times, August 1967, 12-14; "Should Christians Obey the Law of God?" These Times, March 1969, 10-13.

2SGL, 1. In one sense it is a division of the Old Testament (Luke 24:44); in another it means the moral law of the Ten Commandments (Deut 4:12, 13); and yet again it is the Shema (Deut 6:4-9) or the ceremonial law (Heb 9:9, 10); and there is also the law of sin (Rom 7:23) and the law of spirit of life (Rom 8:2). Heppenstall sees the law of Moses as incorporating both the ceremonial laws and the permanent moral law (ibid.); see also ISBD, 68-74. It is the context that determines the sense of the word.

3SGL, 3.

4Ibid.
condition. Then, man's sinful state made more necessary the moral law, because unregenerate men feel that any demand for a strict obedience to the Decalogue is a denial of personal freedom. Man in his fallen condition is so adverse to the law of God, that, left to himself, he will not obey it. However, the fact that man cannot by himself now live in harmony with God's law does not mean that God must come down to man's level. Heppenstall argues that if the law, as it came from the hand of God, was perfect then any change would make it imperfect. Furthermore, if one says that God requires obedience to a law which was designated for man's sinless state and which is no longer valid today because man has sinned, one makes God responsible for sin itself.

Regarding the place of the law in the plan of redemption, Heppenstall observes that in the giving of the law to the Israelite nation, the Decalogue is not given in isolation from Christ the Redeemer. The act of redemption was the prelude to the giving of the law. God's mighty deliverance at the Red Sea was not a reward for Israel's previous obedience to the law, but the inspiration for future obedience. Therefore, in the giving of the law at Sinai, Heppenstall envisions the moral law of the Ten Commandments taking its place in God's plan of redemption, a place where for him, it belongs eternally. This is the reason why for Heppenstall, obedience to the law is not a condition of eternal life, but it is a grateful return for the gift of

---

1Note that Heppenstall finds this thought in Ellen G. White, Signs of the Times, April 15, 1875. See SGL, 2.

2SU, 211. Heppenstall points out that while the moral law of the Ten Commandments only entered in a codified form at Sinai, these basic principles defined sin from the time of Adam (SGL, 2), implying with this that the law was known since the fall of man.

3SU, 219. Heppenstall points out the extent of Christian freedom: "Christian freedom is freedom to obey the commandments, not freedom to disobey. The type of freedom that wants only the feeling of love and the right to express it any way men please, without restraint and self-control, is a counterfeit" (ibid., 232).

life, the natural spontaneous response of love that the rescued sinner must feel towards his Savior.¹ This is why he says that grace comes before law.²

Relating the law to Christ, Heppenstall says that when Jesus came to this earth, He revealed the depths of the requirement of God's law and exposed the evil of man's heart in relation to God's requirement. Christ gave full honor to the law of God both in life and death.³ Christ's obedience to the law is the counterpart of Adam's disobedience, which brought sin into the world.⁴ He demonstrated that the basic nature of the law is to love God and man.⁵

Regarding the concept that the law was abrogated, Heppenstall maintains that God never speaks in His word of changing or abrogating the law. On the other hand, He does emphasize over and over again the fulfilling of the law. Moreover, nothing is said or inferred by Christ that the law of God was abrogated. On the contrary, the whole emphasis is upon fulfillment.⁶

¹Ibid., 214-215.

²SU, 213. The giving of the law must not be separated from the divine Deliverer and Lawgiver. From the beginning, Israel was to know their Lawgiver. God's act of redemption is the prelude to the giving of the law. God made Himself known first, then asked for their loving response to Him in light of what He has already done for them. Heppenstall indicates that the belief that God at Sinai gave them a dispensation of law to be replaced fifteen hundred years later at the coming of Christ by a dispensation of grace is entirely un-Biblical (ibid.).

³Heppenstall declares: "While providing salvation for man, He at the same time established the majesty and perpetuity of the law of God. He declared that He came 'to fulfill' the law, not to destroy it. One of the purposes for His coming into the world was to honor the law by showing its essential place in the Christian life" ("Should Christians Keep the Ten Commandments?" Signs of the Times, September 1962, 21).

⁴Ibid., 22. Here Heppenstall appeals to Matt 22:36-40 for proof of this.


Furthermore, while Scripture, particularly the New Testament, exalts the law of God as the standard of righteousness, it at the same time opposes man's use of it as a method to gain merit and standing with God.\(^1\)

Additionally, Heppenstall holds that Christ clearly showed the difference between His concept of the fulfillment of the law and that of the Pharisees.\(^2\) The tragedy of the Jews was that in their pursuit of obedience to God's law, they became the greatest violators of it.\(^3\)

Commenting on the consequences of the failure to distinguish between the proper and improper function of the law, Heppenstall states that the tragic result of this thinking has been that many professed Christians were led to believe that strict obedience to all of the commandments is no longer expected by God.\(^4\)

\(^1\)SU, 40. Regarding this aspect, Heppenstall affirms that many theologians, Bible interpreters, and other church leaders throughout Christian history have interpreted the New Testament opposition to the wrong function of the law as opposition to the law itself, and to its moral contents. SU, 225. Heppenstall remarks that the failure to distinguish between the proper and improper function of the law, the Christian church, through the centuries, has been tempted to negate law altogether, and thereby became guilty of antinomianism" (The Law and the Covenant at Sinai," AUSS 2 [1964]: 24).

\(^2\)Heppenstall holds that in the fifth chapter of Matthew, Christ set forth the true fulfilling of the law over against the false attitude of the legalistic Jews. He did it in a series of six contrasts. "On the one hand, He exposed the traditional legalistic fulfillment of the law by the Pharisees; on the other, He stated the only true fulfillment acceptable to God. In each case the same commandment was involved. . . . The one reaches down to the motives and to the innermost parts of a man's life; the other has no reference to the state of a man's heart. What Christ meant by fulfilling the law is that a man should become deeply obedient within. A man must be obedient all the way through, and not simply conform outwardly to the letter of the law" ("Should Christians Keep the Ten Commandments?" Signs of the Times, September 1962, 23).

\(^3\)Heppenstall expresses the reason thus: "Instead of regarding the people with love, they insisted upon a 'holier than thou' attitude. Their crusade for obedience to the law was simply a campaign for mental and spiritual domination over others" (ibid., 21).

\(^4\)Ibid., 225.
However, Heppenstall comments that man's problem today is not to be found in his trying hard to obey the law, but in his desire and determination to be free from the law.¹ To believe as some do that Christ's atonement means freedom from obedience to the law of God can mean only utter moral confusion even greater than the legalistic obedience of the Jews.² What man needs today is not a change of the law of God, but a change of the heart and mind. This, only God can produce (Heb 8:10).³

With this in mind, let us consider the different usages of the law according to Heppenstall's understanding. Later, we will consider how Heppenstall relates law with gospel.

Purpose of the Law

Heppenstall, we notice, affirms that the law may be used in two different ways: First, as a standard of life (what Heppenstall sees as its true function);⁴ and, second, as a method of either bondage or salvation (the wrong use of the law).⁵

¹Ibid., 224.

²"Should Christians Keep the Ten Commandments?" Signs of the Times, September 1962, 21.

³Ibid. Heppenstall emphasizes the following: "Man's sin problem is not resolved by changing or abrogating the law, but by having the Holy Spirit write God's law in man's entire being. Then enmity is changed to love. The heart is changed, not the law. There is no lessening of man's responsibility to obey the law. Rather it is more clearly defined and accepted. Christ so reigns in the Christian's life that he has no conflict with the law of God" (SU, 220).

⁴In fact, Heppenstall mentions several functions: The law "expresses the mind of God (Ps 40:8; Rom 2:18); declares the whole duty of man (Ps 19:7, 8; Eccl 12:12, 13); reveals sin (Rom 3:20; 7:7); pronounces sentence upon the sinner (Rom 7:9); and leads us to Christ (Gal 3:24)" (1SBD, 72-73). See also 1QFF, 461-462.

⁵Speaking about salvation, he writes: "At this point the distinction must be kept in mind between the law as a standard of righteousness and the law as a method of salvation. . . . In studying passages of Scripture on the law this distinction between law as a standard and law as a method should be borne in mind and ascertained what is the point at issue" (1SBD, 75). See also 1QFF, 464, where he states the following: "The problem becomes acute at the point where professed Christian men and women want salvation by grace at the expense
The Law as a Standard

Heppenstall's view of the law prior to sin, is that it was ordained to life (Rom 7:10). Following the fall of man, however, life cannot be obtained through obedience to the law. The true function of the law is to serve as a standard of right and wrong and of God's righteousness. Its purpose is to lead the sinner to Christ. This standard is necessary to reveal sin and should be used along with the method of throwing out both the law as a standard and the law as a method. The result is antinomianism. On the other hand, the effort to keep the law both as a method and as a standard leads to legalism and Pharisaism. In both cases there is what Paul calls "another gospel." See also 461-474. Heppenstall observes that the problem of dispensationalism, and even of churches more generally, is that they "fail to distinguish between the proper and improper function of the law. That opposition to law is manifest in the New Testament is clear; but the opposition is against the improper function of the law" ("The Law and the Covenant at Sinai," AUSS 2 [1964]: 24).

1Heppenstall here echoes Paul's words in Rom 7:10: "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." He comments about this thus: "'Obey and live, disobey and perish' is still the method of the law of God. The law is suited to produce holiness and happiness in the soul of any and every one who lives in harmony with it. So far as the purpose of God is concerned, the Ten Commandments are perfectly adapted to fill the soul with peace and purity provided everything in man had remained as it had been created" (JOFF, 462).

2Ibid., 461. Original conditions no longer prevail. Man still must continue to accept the law as a standard of righteousness, but he can no longer use the law as a method of becoming righteous. Ibid. There are only two ways to bring about harmony in the soul of man who is out of harmony with God's law; posits our author: "One is to alter the divine law so that it would agree with man's sinful inclination, and thus remove the cause for inner conflict. This would transmute the law of holiness into a law of sin. It would make evil good. It would destroy the eternal distinction between right and wrong. This is impossible. There can be no transmutation of the law of God or any part of it as a standard of righteousness. The other method of bringing harmony between man and the law is to change the sinful nature of man, so that it becomes again in accord with the divine law. There is only one method by which this can be done. That is the method of free grace, or righteousness by faith" (ibid., 464).

3Heppenstall writes: "First, law is God's standard of obedience to the will of God" (ibid., 461).

4Note again: "On the positive side of Galatians 3:19-26 shows that the law leads us to Christ, by shutting us up to the one method of salvation, faith in Christ" (ibid., 468).
gospel in revealing man's sinful condition.¹ Heppenstall holds that Christ must always be presented in the law. It is the combination of the law and the gospel which can bring the sinner to conviction.² Even until now, the moral law remains as a standard of righteousness.

The Law as a Method of Salvation

Heppenstall sees a perversion of the true function of God's law when it is considered as a method of salvation.³ This perversion accounts for Paul's apparent animosity towards the law.⁴ The law has no power to forgive the sinner or to bestow righteousness upon him since its function is to show him his sins.⁵ The purpose of the gospel is to take away sins.⁶ The conflict is not between the law and the gospel, but between legalism and the gospel.⁷ Therefore, law and gospel are


²"To see Christ in the law leads to repentance and salvation, because it leads to trust and faith" (JOFF, 470).

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., 460.

⁵The law has its limitations, according to Heppenstall, because it cannot compel to obedience (Rom 7:14; 8:3); it cannot ignore sin (Rom 7:10, 11); and it cannot save (Rom 3:19, 20). JSBB, 73.

⁶The contrast of functions between the law and the gospel is expressed thus: "The purpose of the law is to show our sins. The purpose of the gospel is to take away our sins. We are not to apply the law where the gospel is to be applied. The law of God does not fail. Nor does it lay aside the claims for obedience. Granted that the moral law can be obeyed only by the man in Christ. The law of God is spiritual. It is addressed to spiritual persons" (SU, 226).

⁷SU, 226. There is a difference between obedience and legalism: strict obedience to the law is not legalism. The Christian should have no difficulty in rendering honor to the law by his obedience to it. The fact that a man insists on obeying all of the Ten Commandments does not make him a legalist. When a man obeys the law in order to gain acceptance and a standing with God then he is a legalist. Jesus Christ is antilegalist. But He is not antinomian (ibid.). To dilute God's law obscures the sinfulness of man and diminishes the need for the saving work of Christ. The law cannot restore a man to righteousness and obedience, but the gospel and the Holy Spirit can. If the law of God has been changed or abrogated, then no longer is sin that serious. And
complementary. To use the former as a method of obtaining righteousness can only lead one into legalism and Pharisaism.¹ Heppenstall affirms that the method of salvation by works of the law has always been the mortal enemy of the Gospel. Salvation by works and salvation by faith are never complementary; they are mutually exclusive.² He sees "Christ as the end of the law for righteousness" (Rom 10:4) and by this he understands Christ to be the purpose of the law and the end of any method of trying to obtain righteousness by means of it.³

The Law as a Custodian

Heppenstall makes a distinction between the moral law and the ceremonial law or sacrificial system.⁴ In the light of Heppenstall's position on the moral law, let us now consider his understanding of the ceremonial law. He defines the ceremonial law as a system made up of symbols pointing to Christ, His sacrifice, and His priesthood.⁵

If the law could be changed, then it was not necessary for Christ to die for sin. Christ died for our sins because there was no way to lessen the penalty for sin by lessening man's transgression of the law without at the same time diminishing the urgency of the gospel. Ibid., 226-227.

¹See SGL, 2, 3.
³SBD, 76-77. The core of the gospel is that Christ Himself, as the Crucified, must fulfill the law. Heppenstall remarks that Jesus Christ fulfilled the law in three ways. First, Christ alone did what the Law requires, unconditionally, without any diminution. Second, Christ took the consequences of the transgression of the law. Christ carried away the sin of the world by bearing it Himself. Third, He reveals the meaning of holiness and goodness and righteousness. He himself reveals that love at its height is not to be found in the law alone. Now as the Risen Lord, He can give the grace of God to obey the Law. Thus Christ's Gospel is both the fulfillment of the law as a standard and the end of the law as a method. Ibid.
⁴1QFF, 460.
⁵SBD, 10. This definition is taken from White, Patriarchs and Prophets, 365.
Although the sacrificial system existed before Sinai, it was given at Sinai to the entire Jewish nation as part of the law of Moses. The ceremonial law differed from the moral law in at least three aspects: the ceremonial law was a shadow of things to come, while the moral law is a revelation of God's character; the former was for a limited time, while the moral law is eternal. The ceremonial law was placed beside the ark of the covenant while the tables of the ten commandments were put within the ark.

The ceremonial law had several purposes relative to Christ's redemptive work: vindication of God's moral law and revealing the faith and duties of the people of God. Even though it had its purposes:

1SBD, 78. The first usage of the sacrificial system was in Gen 4:4, 5. Heppenstall indicates that the true significance of the sacrifice was "to make satisfaction to an offended God." This is not a bribe. This means that there is in God both an attitude and a conviction which does not simply refuse sin passively, but opposes sin actively. God has a wrath which is inevitably against sin. Another purpose of the sacrifices was to teach the substitution of suffering and death of the part of the innocent for the guilty. Finally, the sacrifice aimed to create a consciousness of sin on the part of the worshiper, as he brought the victim to be slain for the atonement of his sin. Ibid.

2Ibid. Cf. 2 Chr 23:18; Ezra 3:2; Exod 35:4; Num 8:26.

3SBD, 78. Cf. Heb 10:1; Col 2:17.


Namely, to point to Christ; to show forth the death of Christ, and to point to a coming Messiah. SBD, 10.

"The symbolic system of ceremonies worked to one end, to vindicate and uphold the Law of God." Ibid.

There were several aspects related to this purpose: To reveal the communion of God and men; to preach the gospel to the whole world; to develop a living faith; to keep faith alive in the hearts of men; to lead people to confess and receive pardon for sins; and to reveal need for a Savior. Ibid.
limitations, the ceremonial law was full of vitality and spiritual beauty. This ritual law, with its sacrifices and ordinances, was to be performed by the Hebrews until type met antitype in the death of Christ. At that time, all the sacrificial offerings were to cease.

At Sinai, the law, which was entrusted to Israel in its moral, ceremonial, and civil aspects, was given to the nation to serve as a custodian to guard them and lead them until the Seed should come. Heppenstall sees this as an historical development and states that when Jesus Christ came, faith which was revealed by this aspect of the guardianship of the whole Jewish legal system came to an end. In this

1The following limitations are indicated: It had no value apart from Christ, it was meaningless without a living faith in God; it had no value unless one discerned the Savior from sin; it could not cleanse the conscience—provide complete cleansing; and finally, it was but a representation of Christ. Ibid.

2Ibid. The ceremonial law shadowed forth truths vast and profound, led the minds to the Savior, revealed Christ and God the Father, led the Israelites to sense the need of a Savior, and gave them the Gospel when they understood it aright. Ibid.

3According to Heppenstall, the prophecy of Dan 9:27 pointed out the exact time when the ceremonial law would come to an end. This happened when Christ died at the cross (Matt 27:50, 51; Eph 2:15; Col 2:14). Ibid. It is interesting to notice that Heppenstall deals with this subject in the first volume of his Syllabus for Bible Doctrines, 78-79. This syllabus is undated, but obviously was printed previous to 1952 because his position of the covenant is still the traditional Adventist interpretation. The second volume of his Syllabus for Bible Doctrines is dated in 1955. In this syllabus, Heppenstall presents the same subject but with a different emphasis. In the first volume his emphasis was on the difference between moral and ceremonial law, and in the fulfillment and abrogation of the ceremonial law. In the second volume, the emphasis is in its Christological purpose, its limitations, and in the Jewish perversion of the ceremonial system. 2SBD, 10-13.


5In 1960, Heppenstall took the position that "There is a time element involved, where one is said to be 'no longer under the law.' . . . One cannot dismiss the time factor by saying that this applies only to personal experience" (DD, 12, 13). Interestingly enough
sense, God's people were under the law until the historical achievement of Christ was fulfilled. In this jurisdictional sense, the purpose of the legal system was, first, to expose the true character of sin (to prove this Heppenstall refers one to Gal 3:19) and, second, to show man his constant need of a Redeemer. Unfortunately, the divine purpose was perverted by the Jewish people. They misinterpreted the rites and ceremonies, mingled them with defective human plans, in this way putting a veil over their minds for 1500 years, and leading them to reject the antitype. This was the cause of Israel's failure.

Law as Bondage

Heppenstall sees still another meaning in the phrase 'under the law,' namely, a life lived under the domination, the driving power and the motive of the law. This is opposite to a life dominated by grace. The carnal nature and the life in the flesh is lived 'under the law' and is also characterized by a slavish attachment to the 'letter' of the law (which kills). Heppenstall remarks that the Christian does not live either under the dominion of sin nor under the dominion of the law. He asserts that there is not the slightest hint of any change in

Heppenstall seemed to take a different approach in his treatment of Gal 3:19-25 at the 1952 Bible Conference. Then he said: "Paul is not speaking of a fixed definite point of time when faith came" (LOFF, 473). See the whole treatment, 468-474. I feel that the 1960 position is an improvement on the 1952 explanation.

1DD, 15.
2SBD, 11-12.
3DD, 16-18. In this condition, the condemning power of the law over the carnal nature is apparent. Ibid. See also LOFF, 466.
4SGL, 5, 6. Here he discusses the problem of the "letter" versus the "spirit" as found in 2 Cor 3.
5Analyzing Rom 6 and 7, Heppenstall concludes that in Rom 6 the Christian is freed from the dominion of sin, and in Rom 7 the believer must also obtain freedom from the dominion of law. The dominion of law is the same as "under the law." In order to escape from dominion of law, one has to die to sinful nature. The part that dies to law, however, or the dominion of law, is not the inner or new man, but "the flesh," described in Rom 7:1-3 as the first husband of the "old man" of
the law, in its operation, and its claim upon the individual. The change is not in the law but in the believer. The believer dies with Christ and rises to live with Christ. For Heppenstall, the difference is definitive. To fail to understand the simple difference between "law" as the revelation of God's will and "under the law" as man's life situation in the flesh when brought under its dominion is tragic.2

Law and Gospel

Heppenstall perceives a new relationship between the saint and the law when the former accepts Christ's salvation by faith. As was mentioned above, Heppenstall asserts that there is a change not in the law but in the believer. Now, the law is written in the heart of the believer and obedience to the law becomes the fruit of salvation rather than a method of salvation. For Heppenstall, it is the Holy Spirit who unites both the law and the gospel. Love is the constraint of the sin. The new man is in harmony with the law of God because he is born of God. See DD, 17-19.

1According to Heppenstall, Paul is very emphatic in maintaining the integrity of the law of God. Every time Paul perceives the slightest possibility that his hearers might conclude that there is any change in the law he cries out, 'God forbid.' 'Do we make void the law through faith?' God forbid: yea, we establish the law' (Rom 3:31; 7:7; Gal 3:21) (DP, 18-19).

2Ibid., 19.

3Regarding the law, there is not the slightest hint of any change in its operation, or its claim upon the individual. That change is in the believer's relation to the law. The believer dies with Christ and rises to live with Christ. In this new life in Christ, Paul exclaims: "I delight in the law of God after the inward man" ("The Law in Adventist Theology and Christian Experience," Ministry, June 1960, 7). Cf. DD, 18. Heppenstall holds that the Christian is now "in law" to Christ and not "under the law," in a sense of bondage and dominion. See DD, 19, 20.

4SU, 235. When the Spirit writes the law in our hearts, the heart desires and delights in that law. Man's inmost life is changed and expressed in terms of harmony with and obedience to the law. Ibid.

5Ibid. "Love born of the Holy Spirit is the supreme spiritual quality and experience that we can know. It defines the nature and quality of our response and our involvement with God and man. We now 'delight in the law of God after the inward man' (Rom 7:22)."
new life.¹ When we receive the gift of salvation in Jesus Christ, we come to a new relationship to the law of God, i.e., one of obedience.² Heppenstall ties obedience to the will of God and our fitness for the new earth together. He affirms that the preparation time to inherit the earth made new is now. Christians are continually being renewed in holy obedience and conformed to the image of God's Son. By their lives they establish the right and fitness to dwell in the City of God.³ This does not mean that he is working for his own salvation⁴ but that man obeys the law with the single purpose of honoring God. This constitutes proof that he truly belongs to Christ and is becoming suitable for heaven.⁵ Thus God has connected man's loving and loyal obedience with his eternal security.⁶

Thus far, it can be noted that Heppenstall correlates the law with the character of God that is love. This correlation is foundational for the immutability of the law in Heppenstall's view. The law

¹Heppenstall recognizes, however, that "love is not motivated or bound by law. Love never puts limits on our obedience and commitment with the idea the we have done enough" (ibid.).


³"Should Christians Obey the Law of God?" These Times, March 1969, 11. The ultimate purpose of the gospel, according to Heppenstall, "is to restore the image of God in man. If a man does not desire to seek this, he is not fitted for the kingdom of heaven. The fight is not found in man's obedience. That fight was won by Christ. But obedience through the Spirit proves they are in possession of that right. Without this, there is no evidence in the life of the saving power of the gospel" (ibid.).

⁴"It does reveal whether or not Christ is truly Lord. Obedience is evidence of a heart seeking harmony with the will of God" (ibid.).

⁵Ibid.

⁶Christ's love has labored that He might take transformed, rebellious sinners and make them suitable for the new earth wherein dwells righteousness. The gospel is salvation from sin. There can be no eternal life unless Christ's work guarantees the complete solution to the sin problem. Christ's salvation fits the Christian for eternal life. That fitness involves restoration to the likeness of Christ. Ibid., 12.
is eternal, as is God. After the fall, the eternal law of God was not dismissed but adapted for the new state of man. It is now the standard of God's righteousness. Its function still is to reveal man's sinful condition and lead the sinner to Christ. Christ came to magnify and fulfill the law.

Regarding law and gospel, Heppenstall envisions them working together for bringing sinners to conviction. For him, law and gospel are complementary. This is how law and redemption are related in Heppenstall's system.¹

Concerning righteousness by faith, he associates it with the law in the sense that the spontaneous response to God's deliverance should be obedience to the law. For him, the divine solution for the problem of sin is not the dismissal of the law, but transforming the hearts of rebellious sinners by the power of the gospel into obedient and loyal children.

In this way, God is both the just God and the justifier of the sinner solving the tension between the holiness and the justice of God. Thus, His law and government stand firm, and at the same time He is able to redeem the sinner and solve the problem of sin. How has God promised to accomplish His purpose? This leads us to consider the covenant and its role in God's plan of redemption.

Heppenstall's Understanding of the Covenant

Heppenstall's Earlier Position on the Covenant

Heppenstall's distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law led him to develop his earlier position on the covenant.²

¹He relates the law to the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt and also to Christ's work of deliverance from one's sin.

²As mentioned above, Heppenstall makes a distinction between the right and wrong usages of the law (as standard and as a method of salvation) and the functions of the moral law and those of the ceremonial law. On the other hand, he apparently holds that the moral law is eternal, unchangeable, and was not abrogated at the cross, while the
Prior to 1952, Heppenstall held that there are two covenants which God presented to man. One was the everlasting covenant formulated from the days of eternity and offered to man when he fell into sin (Gen 3:15). The other covenant was the old covenant which God offered to the children of Israel at Sinai.

Heppenstall's New Position on the Covenant

At the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Conference in 1952, Heppenstall presented his new position on the question of the covenants. The problems and issues connected with the law and the gospel ceremonial law was discontinued at the cross.

1SBD, 82-84. This was the covenant of grace extended to the patriarchs, including Abraham. Circumcision initially was a sign of this covenant of grace. While it was thus operative from the beginning of the world, it was only ratified by the death of Christ on the cross. This covenant was renewed by Christ and is the new covenant spoken of by the writer of Hebrews (Heb 8:8-10). Ibid.

2This covenant was given when His people rejected the everlasting covenant through self-confidence (1SBD, 81-82). This was considered the traditional interpretation of the two covenants held by most pioneers and Adventist writers, see Thorilf Gunn Paulson, "The Two Covenants" (M.A. thesis, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1952); F. D. Nichol, Answers to Objections (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1952), 19-20; M. L. Andreasen, The Book of Hebrews (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1948), 280-281, 304-305.

3This represents the basic direction of his teaching. For Heppenstall's treatment of the two covenants, namely, the old covenant offered at Sinai and the everlasting covenant, see his 1SBD, 80-85. This was his pre-1952 position. In 1952, Heppenstall presented the perspective of only one covenant from God's part, the everlasting covenant. He presented his new perspective at the Bible Conference that was held in Takoma Park, Washington, D.C., September 1-13. The lectures were presented orally and later put in print under the name of Our Firm Foundation, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1953), 1:437-492. This book has an important place in the development of Adventist theology. Since 1919, when the last Bible conference was held, a new generation of clergymen had come to the scene; therefore, it was necessary to define and identify the Adventist doctrines in order "to maximize the effectiveness of the truth in changing times" (William H. Branson, "The Bible Conference," Ministry, July 1952, 4-5).

Heppenstall in his second volume of Syllabus for Grace and Law (1958), 6-36, deals extensively with his new perspective on the covenant. In 1964, he presented the same perspective in "The Law and Covenant at Sinai," AUSS 2 (1964): 18-26. Apparently this new perspective was greeted with mixed reaction; some having open opposition to his view. See Webster, 266-267. Heppenstall's perspective is now supported.
had led him to study the covenant more carefully. He found that the Bible describes two covenants: one everlasting, the other temporal; one new, the other old; one perfect, the other faulty. The problem for Heppenstall was whether these revealed two methods of God in dealing with men. This position raised certain questions. Does the NT interpretation of Sinai arise from the perversion of law and covenant by Israel throughout its history? Or did God actually give them at Sinai a

and presented as official, see (Ministerial Association, Seventh-day Adventist Believer, 93-96). See also Gerhard Hasel, Covenant in Blood (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1982). In this book Hasel presents his study on the covenant, reaching the same conclusions as Heppenstall. Arnold Wallenkampf, Salvation Comes from the Lord (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983), 84-90, presents the same perspective as Heppenstall on the covenants.

1 Eric Webster remarks: "Heppenstall reported in one of his classes how he locked himself away for several weeks with his Bible and studied and wrestled out his concept," (Crosscurrents in Adventist Christology, 267). In a personal interview we had with Heppenstall, we asked him how he reached that conclusion, whether by reading other authors or by personal research. The answer was that he found it by personal study. However, in chapter 7 we will discuss possible influences from Covenant theology.

210FP, 437.

3 Ibid. Heppenstall relegates this position to dispensationalism which speaks of two dispensations—one, a dispensation of law which continued until the cross; the other, a dispensation of grace, when Christians are no longer under the law but under grace. For further study on this view, see Ryrie, 110-155; Oswald Allis, "Modern Dispensationalism and the Law of God," Evangelical Quarterly 8 (July 1936): 272-284; M. R. DeHaan, Law or Grace (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1965). The specific implication of this view, Heppenstall remarks, is that God has two methods of dealing with His people, one of law and the other of grace ("The Law and Covenant at Sinai," AUSS 2 [1964]: 19).

4 In SGL, 7, Heppenstall begins his study on the covenant raising these significant questions: "Does God present one or two covenants in His covenantal relationship to Israel? Is there basically one covenant or are there several which are distinct in their purpose and function in respect of the divine plan of redemption? Does God have two principal covenants or just one? What constitutes the old covenant at Sinai? Is it something different from the everlasting covenant or does it represent Israel's perversion of God's covenant? Do the two covenants represent two dispensations; two different modes in God's treatment of His people? Does the old covenant invalidate grace, faith, promise, or does it effect, aid, or complement them? Undoubtedly, these were the same questions that he himself had to wrestle out and assist in determining his conclusions.
covenant of works-righteousness (the law in its improper function) and, therefore, involve them in a system of legalism which dominated their entire history? The answer is crucial for Heppenstall. If the first is true, then the Jewish system as they taught and lived it was never part of God's program. If the second is true, then Israel lived up to the revelation and merited praise, not condemnation.¹

It is incredible to believe, Heppenstall writes, that God could be held responsible for laying the groundwork at Sinai for what followed in Jewish history. It is equally monstrous to believe that God would stoop at Sinai to betray the people He had delivered from Egypt only to lead them into another bondage of the spirit that finally deprived them of the last vestiges of freedom and brought about their destruction as a nation.²

Definition of Covenant

For Heppenstall, covenant in the Bible is the expression of the loving and gracious relationship existing between God and His people.³ It has a variety of meanings.⁴ The meaning depends upon where the stress is laid as seen in the context and purpose of the

¹"The Law and Covenant at Sinai," AUS 2 (1964): 20. He comments further: "The issue is whether God gave Israel the truth of salvation by grace or whether the Jewish system of righteousness by works grew out of their being given a covenant of works in the first place" (ibid.). This issue is crucial for Heppenstall because if dispensationalism is correct, it follows that the decalogue was abrogated at the cross and is part of that covenant which "gendereth to bondage" (10FF, 438).


³SGL, 9.

⁴The following meanings are presented by him: First, disposition of property by will or otherwise (Heb 9:15-17); second, an obligation undertaken by a single person on behalf of another or others (it is also used as an alternative to God's promises Gal 3:15-18; Heb 7:22; 8:6, 8, 10; 10:16; to the assurance given by God after the flood, Gen 9; Jer 33:20); third, an obligation imposed by a superior upon an inferior, and fourth, maintenance of friendly relation between nations, individuals, God and man is assured by the establishment of solemn covenant (Gen 21:31; 1 Sam 18:1-5; 1 Kgs 20:34). Ibid., 7-8.
biblical writer. Heppenstall also points out that Biblical covenants had certain elements. But the essential characteristic of the covenant is that of personal relationship with God. Another is the Lordship of God.

1Heppenstall expresses that the stress could be first, on the Divine promise—then covenant could be equivalent to the promise; second, on human obligations (Deut 4:23; 5:2, 3; 17:2; 29:1; 31:16, 20; 33:9); third, upon the terms—the ten words (Deut 4:13); fourth, upon the oath.

In relation to the Divine promise, in 1SBD, 82, he explains: "Because of the relation between God's covenant and God's promise, these two words are used interchangeably. . . . Acts 26:6-7 Paul describes it as the 'hope of the promise made of God unto our Fathers,' and he speaks of the twelve tribes as hoping to attain to this promise; not promises, but promise; not a promise; but the promise" (see previous note). Heppenstall remarks: "In each case the particular point of stress becomes equivalent to the covenant itself, in that particular context, and for the purpose of fulfilling the purpose of the inspired Bible writer" (SGL, 8).

2Namely, the terms agreed upon (Gen 26:28-29; 31:50-52; Deut 4:13); the oath (Gen 26:31; 31:48-53; Ezek 17:13; Heb 7:20-22); the curse personally invoked in case of wilful violation of the agreement (Deut 27:15-26). Formal ratification by: sacrificial meal (Gen 31:54); sprinkling of blood (Exo 24:4-8; cutting animals into two parts and passing between the two portions (Gen 15:9-18; Jer 34:18); use of a kiss (1 Sam 10:1); handshake (Ezek 17:18; eating salt (Num 18:19); setting up a stone (Gen 31:45-46); making a sacred place (Jer 34:15,18; 1 Sam 23:18). Immutability of a covenant—everywhere it is assumed in the Bible, and its violation is fraught with the most serious consequences (Gal 3:17, Heb 9:17; 10:29; Jer 33:15-26). Rewards and penalties—fulfillment of the promised blessings of the covenant for obedience and penalties for disobedience (Deut 27 and 28). Ibid., 9-11.

3However, in OFF, 439, Heppenstall presents Lordship as the first and fellowship as the second. It seems that Heppenstall recognized later that first it is necessary to have fellowship with God before recognizing God's Lordship. Heppenstall says "The fundamental reality of the covenant relationship is that men enjoy the favor and love of God irrespective of their past activities or sins, without discharging any formal debt or performing any specified work. God is extending His loving favor to all by virtue of His own gracious character. Eph 2:12-13. Exo 19:5-6; 1 Cor 11:25" (SGL, 8).

4God's covenant is an expression of His sovereign will, not man's. It is man's responsibility to listen and to respond. When God reveals His covenant anywhere in the Bible there is the voice of God calling to unreserved obedience and surrender. God leaves no room for a bargaining relationship. Ibid., 9.
The Everlasting Covenant

Heppenstall stresses that, essentially, God has only one covenant, an everlasting covenant, which He offered not only to the patriarchs and Abraham but also to His people at Sinai. God was offering Israel the same eternal covenant of grace only in different trappings. He states five arguments to substantiate this assertion.¹ First, the covenant that God planned to make with Israel at Sinai was none other than the covenant He made with Abraham.² Second, the Lord was pleased with the response that Israel made at Sinai (Exod 24:7; Deut 5:27-28). Third, the whole tenor of God's approach, His attitude, and relationship definitely indicated that the covenant presented to Israel at Sinai was the everlasting covenant in an adapted form.³ Fourth, the

¹ His argumentation is better presented in 1QFF where he presents first the everlasting or new covenant and then discusses the old. I follow mainly the arguments used in 1QFF. Even though his view on the covenant is presented extensively in his SGL, it deals mainly with the historical development of the covenant in the OT and the NT interpretation of the old and new covenant. Pp. 11-29. In this syllabus, he first teaches the development of the old covenant, then discusses the new covenant.

² Three times in Gen 17, the covenant made with Abraham is called the everlasting covenant. Nine times it is designated "my covenant." The occasion for God's plan to deliver Israel from bondage is that "God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob" (Exod 2:24). In calling Moses to lead the children of Israel, He states that His purpose in delivering is to establish "my covenant" (Exod 6:3-5). Moreover, the OT knows nothing about covenants in the plural. The word is always found in the singular. There is constant reference to one covenant designated by God as "my covenant," "his covenant," phrases that occur throughout the Bible. OFF, 441-442.

³ Heppenstall uses several arguments to prove this assertion: First, before any revelation of the law was given, Israel was reminded of God's gracious dealings with them. Even in Exod 20:1, before God began to speak the words of the decalogue, Jehovah reminded them that He is their Redeemer who brought them out of the land of Egypt. But the fulfillment of God's promises was conditioned by obedience. Thus the gospel precedes obedience. The principles of salvation and of becoming children of God are the same here as they have always been. It is imperative that grace conserve law. Second, the covenant was entirely reasonable. Nothing was forced upon them or done in haste. Third, the fulfillment of the terms of God's covenant was not impossible or exceedingly difficult. God had done everything to render it possible for fulfillment. Fourth, the testimony of the writers of the OT is that Sinai was a glorious demonstration of the love of God. Therefore, to say that God is responsible, even indirectly, for the faulty response of the people which led to a hopeless covenant of works makes God also
covenant which God sought to make with Israel at Sinai and with which He
confronted His people was based upon righteousness by faith.\footnote{1} Fifth,
the numerous appeals by leaders and prophets to return to God's covenant
were but a call to renew the original covenant made with God at Sinai
and previously made with their fathers, the patriarchs. All were in
harmony in seeking to lead the people in righteousness under the holy
covenant of the Lord.\footnote{2} Finally, Heppenstall concludes that since God's
attitude and approach are identically the same in both covenants, why
not say that in the mind of God there is but one covenant? The covenant
is none other than the one everlasting covenant.\footnote{3}

The Old and the New
Covenant Compared

After these conclusions, Heppenstall recognized that certain
questions remained: Does not, for example, Paul testify in Galatians to
an old covenant "from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage"? (Gal
4:24). Again does not the author of Hebrews state, "In that he saith, a
new covenant, he hath made the first old" (Heb 8:13)? Heppenstall then

\footnote{1}Regarding this assertion, Heppenstall notices that Moses was
as much enlightened on righteousness by faith and righteousness by the
works of the law as was Paul. "One of the great passages in this theme
is found in Deuteronomy 30:11-14. Paul quotes this entire passage in
Romans chapters 9 and 10 in explaining Israel's failure, as support for
the doctrine of righteousness by faith. (See also Deut 9:1-6)" (ibid.,
445).

\footnote{2}Heppenstall asks: "If the covenant at Sinai was but a covenant
of works, and this is how it is interpreted by the NT writers, how could
Israel hope to produce any other kind of record than the one they had?
Men become like what they hear and what they think. If the leaders and
the prophets were continually calling them back to the old covenant,
then why blame the Jews and Israel for making such a failure?" (ibid.,
446).

\footnote{3}Ibid., 449.
Heppenstall's answer to the last question is fourfold: First, since the new covenant writes the law of God on the heart, it must be concluded that under the old covenant the law was not written on the heart. Second, the old covenant is based upon works of the law, the new covenant is based upon faith. Next, the old covenant stands upon the faulty promises of men, whereas the new covenant stands upon the eternal promises of God. And fourth, those who leave the new covenant to live under the old covenant fall from grace. As long as they remain under the new covenant they are under grace.

When Did the Old Covenant Originate?

When and how did the old covenant originate? Heppenstall affirms that it originated in Eden with Adam before his fall. The

---

1Ibid., 450.

2Heppenstall adds: "Paul defines this condition in 2 Corinthians 3, indicating that the old covenant was of the letter and not of the spirit. Under the old covenant man's heart was not right with God. This was remedied under the new covenant" (ibid., 450).

3Ibid.

4Under the new covenant, remarks our author, God promises to do all: to keep the heart, to give all power to men, in order that they might obey His will and His law. Under the old covenant, man endeavored of himself to attain righteousness. Ibid.

5For Heppenstall, grace means two things: "The quality of Christ's character and the divine power of that character of which God makes available for the salvation of men. When man lives according to the old covenant, he is under the condemnation of the law, because of his own failures. To live by the covenant of grace means to enter into personal fellowship with God" (ibid., 450-451).

6Based in Hos 6:7, Heppenstall holds that God made a covenant with Adam. Then he says: "This covenant with Adam was a covenant of works. It is called a commanded covenant, also a covenant of life. A covenant of works before sin entered would be both acceptable and in harmony with the character of God and the nature of man. There would be no conflict between the law of God and the nature of Adam. It is called the covenant of works, because by the terms of it man was to have life or death in accordance with what he did" (ibid., 451).
entrance of sin still left man face to face with God's requirements of obedience but with no power to obey. Even with this loss of freedom and the corresponding loss of his ability to do what God commanded, man still possessed a strong desire to be justified by his own efforts. But more important than this, declares Heppenstall, is the fact that Satan is the originator of the spirit of the old covenant.\(^1\) The Sinaitic covenant, then, asserts Heppenstall, is based from the manward side upon the will to owe man's life to himself, and is manifested in that pride which does not want to live by grace but by man's own doing. This is the phase of the old covenant that Paul calls the righteousness of the law.\(^2\)

Why a "New Covenant"?

Heppenstall explains that during Israel's two hundred years of slavery in Egypt, sin had almost obliterated the impressions of the law written in their hearts and the instructions and laws of their fathers had almost faded from their minds. When such a thing happens, holds Heppenstall, the commandments of God become a stern command, not a delight. This led God to disclose to Israel the eternal covenant, the covenant made with Abraham, which included the eternal law, in order to compel them to come to Christ for salvation.\(^3\) The question then

\(^1\)In Heppenstall's eyes, "the basic premise of sin itself is the work of Satan in leading Adam to place his own ego at the center of his existence instead of Christ" (ibid.).

\(^2\)Heppenstall acknowledges that this spirit is deeply ingrained in all men and that "it is not the sole prerogative of the Israelites. They are but an illustration of what can happen to any man and in fact to every believer. And until self is crucified, it will inevitably happen. This spirit of pride, and independence and self-effort toward the law was the outstanding sin of Israel. The revelation of the law at Mount Sinai was to lead them to Christ. This was in harmony with God's plan, even as today. But salvation by works never was" (ibid., 452).

\(^3\)This particular function of the law is just as significant today as in the days of Israel. At Sinai, God provided His people with the opportunity of making a response by promising to keep His law. However, the nature of that response is completely the responsibility of man. Ibid., 453.
arises: If the law presented at Sinai was intended to lead them to Christ, why did Israel fail, and fail so continually through its history? It was Israel's stubborn unbelief. Heppenstall states that, the unfortunate attitude of Israel toward the ceremonial law representing the gospel was the same they had toward the Decalogue. They rested in the works of the law, both moral and ceremonial. Failure to see Christ in the law is a failure of faith.¹ The sin that destroyed them was "that in the face of all that God had done and revealed to them, the leaders molded a people in the rigid orthodoxy of pharisaical righteousness."²

If the covenant mentioned in the OT from Sinai to Malachi is none other than the everlasting covenant, why should there be need for those days spoken of by the prophet Jeremiah, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel"? (Jer 31:31). Surely this indicates that the covenant existing in Jeremiah's day was to be abrogated by the coming of the new covenant. Otherwise, why not continue with the same one found all the way through the OT? What is the force of words of the author of Hebrews in chap 8:13?³

In Heppenstall's opinion, the answer is contained in the correct understanding of the term "new covenant" and more particularly the use of the word "new." Regarding the understanding of the concept "new covenant," Heppenstall comments that in Heb 8:8 the word for "new" is kainos. Its meaning is not "new" in point of time, that is, "new for the first time," but "new" in reference to quality, renewed and restored

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., 454-455.
³Ibid., 455-456.
to its original condition. As to why it was called new, Heppenstall points to three things: First, it is called new covenant because it was ratified by the blood of Christ at the cross; second, this covenant is called new because God's everlasting covenant had been so completely lost sight of that it appeared to be an entirely new covenant; and third, the use of the term "new covenant" is motivated by a new revelation that came with Christ's incarnation, life, death, and resurrection.

1"Law and Covenant at Sinai," AUSS 2 (1964): 25. Heppenstall mentions the usage of this word with the same meaning in 2 Cor 5:17, where "new creature" means man renewed in the image of God; and in Rev 21:1, "a new heaven and a new earth" means not new in point of time, but restoration to its original Edenic condition. See also SGL, 30.

2Daniel, the prophet, declares that Christ "shall confirm the covenant with many for one week" (Dan 9:27). About this Heppenstall comments: "The word 'confirm' means to cause to prevail. During the brief period of His earthly ministry, Jesus fulfilled the terms of the ancient covenant made with the seed of Abraham. Paul says of this: 'Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto our fathers' (Rom 15:8). Thus Christ secured the benefits of the ancient covenant to 'many,' that is, to the believers in Israel" (IOPP, 456).

3This text (Heb 8:8), explains our author, is taking cognizance of the fact that while both God and His servants, the prophets, thought mostly in terms of the everlasting covenant, the nation of Israel thought in terms of the old covenant of works. Further, he adds: "The Jews lost sight completely of the everlasting covenant. The new covenant was to write the law of God in their hearts, but writing the law of God in the hearts of men was not new. Isaiah spoke of it as sealing "the law among my disciples" (Isa 8:16). The whole of Heb 11 is a historical record of it. . . . The New Testament writers are compelled under the circumstances to press home the differences on account of Jewish errors and the hardness of their hearts. The real battle of Christ, John, and Paul was to deliver the church from every shred of Jewish legalistic bondage that had been fastened on Israel during the previous fifteen hundred years" (ibid., 456-457).

4Ibid., 457.
Relation of the Covenant with the Law and the Gospel

For Heppenstall, the unity of the law and the gospel\(^1\) constitutes the major premise of the new covenant;\(^2\) for indeed the new covenant contains blessings of the highest value. In its negative aspect, it removes the weakness and faultiness of the old covenant.\(^3\) The first blessing of the new covenant is to take away all self-righteousness. Another positive aspect of the new covenant is that the unity of the law and the gospel makes very specific the work of Christ for man: "I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be my people" (Heb 8:10).\(^4\) This writing of the law upon the mind and heart means, for Heppenstall, that through the work of the gospel the law comes to have a more vital connection with the life of the Christian than hitherto.\(^5\) It also implies that "the law is spiritual," "and the commandment holy, and just, and good" (Rom 7:14, 12). The law is seen in all its spiritual and vital meaning. It is no longer rendered in external forms.\(^6\) Therefore, under the new covenant, the law of God becomes united to the gospel by the Holy Spirit.\(^7\) The fact that the Holy

---

\(^1\)Gospel in this context is the message of salvation by grace through Jesus Christ.
\(^2\)LOFF, 4/8.
\(^3\)For Heppenstall, this weakness was in man, "in his promises to keep the law. Man was depending upon his own will power, which led to failure and condemnation. Man could not fulfill what he had promised to do, to keep the commandments" (ibid.).
\(^4\)This law, for Heppenstall, is the decalogue (ibid., 479).
\(^5\)"Previously, it has been written merely on stone. Now, it is stamped into the life" (ibid., 481).
\(^6\)Ibid., 482.
\(^7\)Heppenstall explains: "Obedience is no longer a mechanical process, but a complete fulfillment through faith which works by love. The law and the gospel become inseparable as light and heat in the sun. God demands obedience under the law. God works obedience through the gospel. The law of God demands holiness of men. The gospel works
Spirit writes the law of God on the mind and heart proclaims in no uncertain terms that this experience comes only by supernatural means and never by naturalistic means.\(^1\) Besides, to have the Holy Spirit write on hearts the law of God means that people have shifted from self as the center of their lives to Christ.\(^2\) This, for Heppenstall, is the crux of the everlasting covenant.\(^3\)

Our author finds that in God's law the Sabbath commandment sets God's seal upon the everlasting covenant. At the same time, it becomes the symbol and test of the new covenant experience.\(^4\) He affirms that the Sabbath commandment, more than any of the other nine, signifies the unity of the law and the gospel.\(^5\) Heppenstall underlines that the principal book in the NT concerned with the new covenant is the book of Hebrews. At the heart of it is found the message of the rest of God, signified by the seventh-day Sabbath.\(^6\) Analyzing Heb 4, Heppenstall holds that a most serious warning is given against failing holiness in man. As long as the law remains written merely on stone, men find the commandment hard to obey. While the heart is stony, the commandments appear stony" (ibid., 484).

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid., 485.

\(^3\)He explains: "The greatest enemy of God is the pride of self-righteousness. The root problem of all self-righteousness is the inordinate importance that man attaches to himself. He magnifies himself, and consequently fails to magnify Christ" (ibid., 485).

\(^4\)Quoting Isa 56:1-4 he says: "Isaiah's reference here is to the everlasting covenant. The Sabbath is connected in some way to the righteousness of Christ that is to be revealed with His coming, and is an indispensable part of the covenant" (ibid., 486-489).

\(^5\)The reason given by our author is that "It signifies the rest of the completed work of God in the soul, the rest of righteousness by faith. It is the seventh-day Sabbath that is appealed to throughout Israel history as the test of the work of the Spirit through the everlasting covenant" (ibid., 489).

\(^6\)Ibid.
to enter into the rest of God.\(^1\) The rest of God (of Heb 4:3-4), in which the Christian is to enter, is related to faith (one cannot find this rest without faith), to the creation week, and to the seventh-day Sabbath.\(^2\) Christians are to enter into that rest—a rest like unto God's.\(^3\) This chapter states that God has offered this rest from the very beginning of creation through all time, including the rest as set forth from the first Sabbath at creation. God has offered it every day since.\(^4\)

Relating the rest of God signified by the seventh-day Sabbath, Heppenstall points out that it is at the cross that Christ completed the work of re-creation.\(^5\) Accordingly, the Christian is to enter into the finished work of redemption and cease entirely from his

\(^1\)Ibid. Commenting on Heb 4:1, he says: "Failure to enter into God's rest is here considered of the greatest concern, so much so that it called down the wrath of God. (Heb 4:3). God is not rejecting people for not attaining to perfection. Something else is primary, that of entering into the rest of God; for this rest is the highway to perfection and to Christ's righteousness" (ibid.).

\(^2\)Ibid., 489-490. Our author asserts that this is not merely a matter of keeping holy the seventh day of the week. Commenting on Heb 4:9-10, he writes: "The text declares that the significance of the Sabbath is related to the completed works of God at creation. God completed His work of creation in six days with nothing more to add to it. Then God rested. God's rest, then is the rest of the completed work of God either in creation of the world or in the recreation of the human soul" (ibid.).

\(^3\)Referring to Heb 4:9-11, he points out that Christians enjoy the rest of God when they enter by faith into the finished work of God for them. When they rest and trust in His completed work of salvation, and when they cease from their own works as God did form His, they enter also in God's rest. Ibid.

\(^4\)It is more than keeping a day. Israel had kept the seventh-day Sabbath throughout their history, yet they had failed to enter into the rest of God. The reason for Israel's failure is indicated plainly: They did not rest in God, they rested in the law (Rom 2:17). They tried to add to God's work; they sought it not by faith but by works of the law. Consequently, they did not enter into God's rest because of their sins of immorality and idolatry. He charges them and holds them responsible for not entering into that rest of faith, righteousness by faith. Ibid., 491.

\(^5\)"Just before the sun went down on Friday, Christ cried out: 'It is finished.' Then He rested in the grave on Sabbath according to the commandment. Nothing more was to be added to the work of redemption. It was completed and once for all" (ibid.).
own works. When Christ imputes and imparts His righteousness into someone, He sees in that person at that moment the completed work of redemption. Then that individual can rest in God, because He will complete the work He has begun. The rest of God, signified by the Sabbath, means continual communion. Since Christ's completed work of re-creation is not yet fully realized in one's soul, there is need for a continual fellowship and communion. Therefore, the seventh-day Sabbath stands for eternal communion, where one finds relief from all anxiety, fear, and struggles, entering into God's rest.

Heppenstall's perspective of one divine eternal covenant helped him to harmonize the law/Gospel conflict within Adventist theology. For dispensationalism and covenant theology, this tension produces a very controversial issue which does not admit of an easy

---

1 "As the Christian enters into the completed work of Christ, God guarantees to complete the work in him. Perfection is not arrived at all at once. But we have confidence in the great Redeemer, who always completes His work. He has never left incomplete any work that He has begun" (ibid., 122).


3 Covenant Theology holds that God's plan of salvation, through which Christ offers a redemption, is equally effective for the saints of both dispensations. Hodge says that "The plan of salvation has always been one and the same; having the same promise, the same Savior, the same condition, and the same salvation" Systematic Theology, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1981), 2:368; See also ibid., 354-377; John Murray, Covenant of Grace: A Biblico-Theological Study (London: Tyndale Press, 1954).
solution. In chapter 7, Heppenstall's views are compared with both positions.

It can be observed that there are some particular features regarding Heppenstall's view on the covenant. For him sin is the basis of the covenant of works. The new covenant is the shift from self-centeredness to God. He speaks of the law as an integral part of the eternal covenant in revealing sin and leading man to Christ. It is through faith that man enters into a covenant relationship with God. In the new birth, God writes the law in the believer. Righteousness by faith, then, has an important part in the application of the benefits of the eternal covenant to the believer.

Conclusion

Thus far, we can see that for Heppenstall the doctrine of man, the doctrine of sin, and the law and covenant play an important role in his interpretation of the doctrine of redemption. Heppenstall points out, from the human side, the fact that man, since the fall, is born in a state of separation from God, unable either to return by himself to a right relationship with God or to overcome sin by himself. From God's side, the moral law, which is the revelation of His eternal character, required a judgment on sin. Heppenstall, therefore, places law and sin at the foundation of his understanding of the doctrine of

1See Fuller, 1-64.
31QFF, 451-452. The covenant of works has its roots in the spirit of pride, independence, self-centeredness, and self-effort of man.
4It is here where the new birth enters into the new covenant. It is in the new birth that the writing of the law in the heart of man takes place. Through the new birth the law comes to have a more vital connection in the life of the Christian.
5He makes special effort to present the different functions of the law because the proper functions of the law play an important role in the covenant. For Heppenstall the covenant of works is a human perversion of God's plan of redemption.
redemption. The link with salvation is established when Heppenstall says that God's moral law was given with the purpose of revealing sin and leading the sinner to Christ. The tension presented by the problem of sin and God's righteousness is solved by the plan of redemption. This plan is God's way to give man another opportunity. At the same time, it vindicated His law and government. Here we can observe that Heppenstall equates the plan of redemption with the eternal covenant. This is done because in both, it is God's purpose to restore man to fellowship and to resolve the problem of sin. God's plan of redemption and the eternal covenant are typified in the sacrifices and ceremonies of the earthly sanctuary. The symbols of the sacrifices and rituals of the earthly sanctuary point to the promise of final redemption. God's plan of redemption was accomplished through Christ's Incarnation and sacrifice. How this was realized is the concern of the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE ACT OF REDEMPTION

In the previous chapter it was mentioned that Heppenstall holds that God, in order to restore man to fellowship with Him, started a plan that has three important aspects: the promise, the act of redemption at the cross and its subsequent proclamation, and the work of judgment.\(^1\) Heppenstall's understanding of the promise has been analyzed. This chapter takes up the second aspect of his understanding of the plan of redemption, i.e., the act of redemption.

In Heppenstall's theological system, Christ is the center in the doctrine of redemption.\(^2\) The person of Christ is closely related by our author to his doctrine of redemption. Christ's human/divine nature plays an important role in Heppenstall's understanding of Christ's redemptive work.

It has been pointed out previously that the concept of sin and its transmission has a prominent position in Heppenstall's theology. This interest may be due, in part, to his discussions with the Pre-1950s group, in the way that sin affected Christ's human nature and how He

\(^1\) OHP, 14.

\(^2\) In chapter 1 we noted that Heppenstall's Christological interest was awakened by W. W. Prescott. At the end of the last century, E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones started a movement in the SDA Church trying to shift the legalistic tendency of the church to a more Christological perspective, stressing righteousness by faith and the centrality of Christ. This movement was continued into this century by several church leaders. Among them were W. W. Prescott, A. G. Daniells, O. Montgomery, J. W. Westphal, L. E. Froom, among others. See Froom, 375-442. Heppenstall was influenced by this trend which became a major component of his theology. See Webster, 250.
resisted temptation. This issue is correlated to the way the Christian should withstand temptation and sin. Hence, before analyzing Christ's work, we need to briefly consider Heppenstall's view of Christ's human/divine nature. Second, we must discuss the act of redemption which he calls the "bridge of salvation." Regarding the latter, Heppenstall sees four spans as indispensable to man's salvation: Incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension.  

Christ's Divinity

Christ's divinity and humanity are crucial in Heppenstall's system, because for him, only a God/man could save the human race from its lost position. Our theologian supports Christ's preexistence in order to uphold His divinity. When God became man in Jesus Christ, He retained His divinity. Christ was fully God while also being fully man.  

---

1 One of the influential trends within SDA theology regarding the nature of Christ has been the stress on the fact that He had a "sinful flesh," i.e., that He had the sinful nature of man after the fall. See for example, Ralph Larson, The Word Became Flesh (Cherry Valley, Calif.: The Cherrystone Press, 1986), passim. Another significant trend has been the position of some Adventist theologians who advocate a more Christological perspective of the Adventist doctrines. They proffer a different position, namely, that Christ had a sinless moral nature, but with the physical infirmities of man after four thousand years of deterioration. See, for example, Froom 427-428, 470-475; George Knight, From 188 to Apostasy: The Case of A. T. Jones (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1987), pp. 140-145. During the dialogue with the Evangelicals, one of the issues raised by Martin and his associates was regarding the nature of Christ. See Questions on Doctrine, 50-65; 647-660. Strong reaction resulted from the position taken by the editors of Questions on Doctrine, i.e., that Christ was a sinless being. Since then, the tension has hardly abated. M. L. Andreasen was one of the first to oppose this view. Later, Brinsmead and his associates rejected it. Currently, the Pre-1950s group has taken up the issue eager to bring the church back to the "traditional teachings" of the pioneers. See Standish, Conflicting Views, passim; Moore, 243-279; Vance Ferrell, The Nature of Christ (Beersheba Springs, Tenn.: Pilgrim's Tractbooks, 1989). In chapter 7 Heppenstall's view is compared with that of the Pre-1950s group.  

2 1SBD, 25.  

3 From the "La Sierra period," Heppenstall has taught the full deity and full humanity of Jesus Christ. See 1SBD, 19-24. This position lasted till the present. See MWG, 25-28; 129; ITWG, 35, 64, 154, 217.
This raises the question of what Heppenstall held about kenosis. In addressing this issue, he continually stresses the fact that Christ abandoned none of His divine attributes but remained fully God while on earth. However, he offers the suggestion that while Christ did not lay aside His deity, He did manifest it in another form.

After establishing the concept of the full divinity of Christ which He had by nature, Heppenstall makes room for a voluntary limitation of the use of Christ's divinity. This surrendering of the use of

---

1 The kenosis problem is considered in MWG, 67-83. It seems that Heppenstall accepted some form of kenosis. He rejects the kenotic theory which would call for Christ to part with His divine nature or any of its attributes. For him this would mean a shrunken divinity. Christ would not be fully God. Nor does he accept the view that Christ retained the full conscious and active deity in Himself but that while on earth He acted as if He did not possess these. Heppenstall's kenosis seems to favor Jesus as fully God and fully man, but surrendering the use or function of certain divine attributes to His Father, which thus became latent or quiescent while He lived on earth. For a further discussion on Heppenstall's view on this issue, see Webster, 284-289. For other views on the kenotic theory see: G. C. Berkouwer, The Person of Christ (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1954), 27-31; D. M. Baillie, God Was in Christ (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), 94-98; Louis Berkhof, Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1939), 327-329.

2 In correlation with this aspect, Lightfoot is quoted by Heppenstall as follows: "Our Lord divested Himself, not of His divine nature, for this was impossible; but of the glories, the prerogatives of Deity." B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, 112, quoted in MWG, 75. "In Him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (ITWG, 22).

3 He did not lay aside His deity; His deity was manifested in another form, the form of a "slave" (MWG, 73). For a discussion of this concept, see MWG, 71-73. Regarding this view, there is a shift in Heppenstall's view of how Christ manifested His divinity. In chapter 7, a further discussion is given to this subject.

4 MWG, 69. In some way there was a limitation so that the deity of Christ did not overwhelm the human aspects of His personality. Heppenstall "cannot think of Christ's becoming a man without His having in some way limited His deity" (ibid.). He says that Christ did not resign His divine attributes. He surrendered their use and function into the hands of the Father. This means that there is only one single consciousness functioning in Jesus Christ in the Incarnation: the human
the divine attributes did not mean that Christ gave them up, since this would have meant the end of deity.\(^1\) Christ simply chose to live as a man and to become subject to the limitations of humanity. While still God, Heppenstall saw Christ as limited in knowledge, subject to temptation, and requiring the aid of the Holy Spirit.\(^2\) Jesus Christ exercised no power unavailable to other men.\(^3\)

Christ, being fully God, had to become a man in order to achieve the objectives of redemption: to reveal God to man, to solve the sin-and-death problem, and to win men back to fellowship with Him.\(^4\) We can conclude that Christ's human/divine nature was important for Heppenstall because only in His combined natures could Christ achieve redemption and reconciliation. Let us consider the Incarnation, which is the first span in Heppenstall's bridge of salvation.

**The Incarnation**

Christian faith is a religion of redemption, declares our author; furthermore, he says that it is a supernatural rescue.\(^5\) Incarnation is the departing point of this plan. For him, the Incarnation had several purposes in relation with God, man, and sin.

---

1 MWG, 91. There is a difference between surrendering these attributes and leaving them aside. Concerning the latter, Heppenstall writes: "Christ could not abandon any of His attributes without losing His deity" (ibid., 79).

2 There is no proof that Jesus had the fullness of divine knowledge during His life on earth" (MWG, 92). Furthermore, Christ "performed His miracles by the power of the Holy Spirit and angels" and He "was not turning off or on His divine nature" (ibid., 96). "Never by His own inherent power did Jesus perform any of His miracles" (SU, 140). See also ITWG, 24.

3 MWG, 90. Webster suggests that it would be better to say that Christ surrendered the independent use of His divine attributes. He did use His divinity in forgiving sin and in performing His miracles. Christ used His divine attributes in submission to His Father and never on behalf of Himself for His own benefit. See Webster, 289.

4 OHP, 14.

5 MWG, 13. Sin is the cause of God's plan of redemption. Incarnation is the departing point of this plan. For him, the Incarnation had several purposes in relation with God, man, and sin.
nation is the starting point of this saving operation. Therefore, Incarnation for Heppenstall is the central fact of Christianity. He defines it as the indissoluble union of the divine and human. The eternal Son of God, who existed from eternity, actually took on flesh in the form of humanity and became a real man. This union of the divine with the human resulted in two natures in one person. When Christ took upon Himself human nature, He did not cease to be God. Thus, Heppenstall sees the Incarnation as the greatest miracle of all time and eternity.

Purposes of Incarnation

According to Heppenstall, Incarnation has several objectives. These objectives are related with God, man, and the universe. In relation to God, he indicates two objectives: first, by becoming man, Christ was able to reveal God's character to all men. By beholding Christ and His manner of life, one can come to a clearer concept of the

---

1There is no way to get rid of the Incarnation without getting rid of Christianity. In the Incarnation the very God of heaven invades our world in disguise. If one does not believe in the Incarnation, then it is impossible to understand what the Christian faith stands for" (MWG, 21). See also LSBD, 25; MWG, 7; ITWG, 300.


3The historical reality of the salvation events is strongly emphasized by Heppenstall: "In view of the fact that man is an historical being, God must enter into human history and become part of the historical process if man is to be saved. God's invasion into our world on a rescue mission occurred in the person of God's Son, Jesus Christ. These are supreme historical realities, not illusions" (SU, 21). See also MWG, 7; OHP, 71.

4MWG, 22.

5"It cannot be fully comprehended. It can only be received in grateful adoration" (MWG, 20, 21). See also ibid., 28-46.

6The problem of sin is seen by Heppenstall in a cosmic perspective. This cosmic perspective is referred to here by Heppenstall. In chapter 8 this perspective is examined more extensively.
love of God. Second, the Incarnation vindicates God's character and government before this planet and the entire universe. Christ became incarnate so that every doubt about the Father's character might be removed. God came in the person of Christ and through His redeeming love to settle the issues raised in regard to His character. Thus would the Incarnation vindicate the Father. Christ would continue to reign until He has settled every dispute. In the end, He will fully establish the justice, mercy, and authority of God.

Heppenstall denotes that Incarnation is also related to the fallen condition of man. Sin caused separation and estrangement. Man was lost and in need of redemption. Only the God who created could redeem him. Christ adopted humanity in order to offer himself a sacrifice for sin. "The Son of God took upon Himself humanity in order

1 "All that is attractive in grace and beautiful in character in the Father is revealed in Jesus Christ that sinful creatures might have a knowledge of God attained in no other way" (MWG, 29). See also "Who Will Plead My Case?" These Times, May 1975, 13; Access to God, 11; MWG, 29-32; ITWG, 13; "Can Man Be Really Free?" These Times, February 1967, 10.

2 In relation to the vindication of God's character, it is important to notice that Heppenstall stresses the importance of God's eternal law as one of the aspects to deal with in the Incarnation (see MWG, 33-34). The law is eternal and unchangeable, because he says that the "absolute integrity of these moral principles has its foundation in the moral nature of God. All these commandments are evidence of His moral perfection" (SU, 212). See also ibid., 220-231. For Heppenstall, God's character and the eternity of the law are important for solving the problem of sin because for him "the unchanging obligation of the law of God is essential if the nature of sin is to be understood" (ibid., 228). If Christ came to solve the problem of sin, then, He had to uphold God's righteousness (Matt 5:17-18).

3 MWB, 27. Heppenstall comments that "Created beings can settle nothing relative to the sin problem. God alone can justify Himself before created intelligences. Christ came to remove every doubt about God" (MWG, 32). See also MWG, 32-35.

4 The Incarnation and the cross are closely linked by Heppenstall with the continuing work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. There Christ performs the last phase of "priestly work leading to the vindication of God and His people, and the eradication of sin and Satan" (QHP, 157). Chapter 6 considers Heppenstall's view of Christ's heavenly ministry.

5 MWG, 38. This redemption could not be accomplished by an angel or a created being. Ibid. See also MWB, 28; MWG, 35.
to bear God's Judgment on sin."¹ Because God cannot die, He came in the form of humanity in order to bear the punishment for sin.² Christ, then, brought redemption from sin within the grasp of all who would believe in His atoning death.³

Heppenstall declares that the second purpose of Incarnation is that Christ became a man in order to fulfill the role of the second Adam. Two Adams stand as representatives of men under whose banner all mankind rests.⁴ Through the first Adam, sin reigned on the earth. Through Christ, the second Adam, sin's power is destroyed and the reign of grace and righteousness became a reality.⁵ The third purpose of Incarnation in relation with man is connected by Heppenstall with judgment. Jesus Christ is the faithful judge of all mankind because of His Incarnation and of His being one with man.⁶ He is able to feel with man because He Himself has experienced the human lot. Never will the universe be able to say that God was arbitrary in His judgment on

¹MWG, 35.
²MWG, 35. See also SU, 54, where he states: "For divinity cannot die."
³SU, 32. "God alone, in a unique act of redemption, has brought to bear upon man's lost condition a revelation of His saving power and righteousness" (SU, 32). See also SAt, 673.
⁴Comparing the two Adams, Heppenstall stresses the fact that "The entire race shared in the results of the first Adam's disobedience and separation from God. All men by virtue of their solidarity with the first Adam start life 'without God,' in alienation from God (Eph 2:12)" (MWG, 40).
⁵"Jesus Christ is called the second Adam because to Him was entrusted the task of redeeming man from the first Adam's fall and separation of God" (SU, 122). The second Adam came to give eternal life, obedience instead of disobedience, justification instead of condemnation, righteousness instead of unrighteousness. In this way Christ communicates spiritual life to all who receive Him. Ibid., 123. See also MWG, 40; MWG, 39-42; ITWG, 120; 359.
⁶Commenting on John 5:22-27, Heppenstall writes: "The fact that Jesus Christ was the incarnate Son of man is given as the reason why He will be our judge. God the Father has not given the judgment into Christ's hands because He is the son of God, but because He is the son of man" (MWG, 42).
mankind. The Incarnation has provided a faithful and righteous Judge. Incarnation indeed is the first step in God's "bridge" to redeem man.

Thus far we have seen that the Incarnation was an important part in the process of redemption. It was necessary from God's side to reveal Him to man and vindicate His character, opening the way to bring man back to fellowship with Him. From man's side, the Incarnation had the purpose to bear man's judgment on sin, to become man's representative, and to become a merciful mediator and a righteous judge. There remains one question to be examined: How real was Christ's Incarnation? How human was Christ's humanity?

The Reality of Christ's Humanity

The reality of Christ's humanity is one aspect to which Heppenstall gives considerable attention. It plays an important role in his system. Heppenstall accepted the full humanity of Jesus Christ, rejecting any docetic tendency. In adopting human flesh, Christ

---

1 In Jesus, as the second Adam "is revealed the true man. Anything less than what we see in Jesus Christ is abnormal and unnatural. All sin, disobedience, and unrighteousness have no rightful place in us. They are a perversion of man as God intends him to be" (MWG, 41).

2 Note his affirmation: "From His priestly throne in the heavenly sanctuary Christ administers redemption and judgment" (SU, 244). See also MWG, 42.

3 Christ's human nature is intimately related with the nature of man and sin in Heppenstall's system. The nature of man and sin determine the concept one has of Christ's Incarnation and His human nature. Heppenstall's interest in this issue was the result of the theological tensions within the SDA church concerning the sinful/sinless human nature of Christ between the Pre-1950s group and the Post-1950s group.

4 The reality of Christ's humanity was taught by Heppenstall since the La Sierra period: "The flesh and the blood which the Lord Jesus Christ took showed that He became truly God and really Man." He does not think of Him as merely appearing as a man, or as being a man only in His body. Heppenstall repudiates Docetism, "the doctrine that our Lord had a body like ours, only in appearance, not in reality" (ISBD, 22). This has consistently been Heppenstall's view. See also MWG, 71.
accepted the limitations of humanity.\(^1\) The humanity of Christ was real in that it truly followed the natural process of development from childhood to manhood.\(^2\) Throughout His life He lived as a man, thought as a man, ate and drank as a man, slept as a man, and demonstrated the mental and emotional activities of a man.\(^3\)

To emphasize the reality of the humanity of Christ, Heppenstall addresses the concept of the center of Christ's consciousness.\(^4\) He does not believe that Christ operated with two wills and two separate consciousnesses. Christ had but one consciousness, "every act and decision was a human act and decision."\(^5\) With a true man-consciousness, Jesus Christ was not omnipotent, omnipresent, or omniscient during the Incarnation.\(^6\)

It was mentioned earlier that Heppenstall makes a distinction between sin and the consequences of sin.\(^7\) He emphasizes the fact that Christ did not have the unaffected humanity of Adam before the fall.\(^8\)

\(^1\)MWG, 68. This limitation meant for Heppenstall that Christ, during the Incarnation, was neither omniscient, omnipresent, nor omnipotent. Ibid., 91-100. In chapter 7 the discussion notes a shift taken by Heppenstall regarding this position.

\(^2\)ISBD, 23. See also MWG, 85-86.

\(^3\)In his ISBD, 22, Heppenstall underlined that "Christ experienced weariness, hunger, temptation, suffering, and sorrow, thus sharing the common lot of humanity." See also "Who Will Plead My Case?" These Times, May 1975, 13; ITWG, 27, 256; MWG, 86.

\(^4\)Heppenstall's view regarding Christ's single consciousness is spelled out clearly in MWG, 84-106.

\(^5\)Ibid., 90.

\(^6\)Heppenstall cannot accept that in the same Person there could have been both knowledge and ignorance of the same events. He sees the Gospels as defining the center of Christ's consciousness and mental process as human rather than divine. MWG, 91.

\(^7\)See ibid., 116-125. Heppenstall says basically that sin is separation from God. Children inherit the results of their parents's sin, separation from God. From this follows the sequence of sin and death.

\(^8\)Of Christ he writes: "He took a weakened human nature, not the perfect nature of Adam before he sinned" (MWG, 74).
Christ had the human (physical) nature of the fallen men.\(^1\) However, Christ had a sinless nature and lived a sinless life.\(^2\) He possessed "a perfection of mind and ability above that of sinful man."\(^3\) The best evidence that He had a sinless nature was His denial of himself and His total dependence on God.\(^4\)

The reality of Christ's humanity leads Heppenstall to wrestle with the problem of Christ's temptations, not to mention the issue as to how Christ's dual nature affected His encounters with temptation.

Heppenstall sees the temptations of Christ as more real and filled with the possibility of a wrong choice.\(^5\) He holds that the

\(^1\)Because He was man, He shared man's physical nature but not his sinfulness. "He could inherit from Mary only what could be transmitted genetically. This means He inherited the weakened human physical constitution, the result from sin that we all inherit. As concerning all other men, they are born without God. All men need regeneration. Christ did not. Here lies the great difference between Christ and ourselves" (ibid., 126). This statement reveals the reason Heppenstall emphasized the non-genetical transmission of sin. If sin is transmitted genetically, then Christ was born with a sinful nature. Heppenstall had the disjunctive to choose the view of the Pre-1950s group that there is not a "state of sin" or to accept Augustine view of original sin. For him neither one was Biblically supported. Further consideration on this issue is given in chapter 7 of this dissertation.

\(^2\)In considering the sinlessness of Christ, the issue centers not only in the fact that He lived a sinless life but also that He was born of a sinful woman, yet was without sin. Heppenstall makes a distinction between living a sinless life and having a sinless nature; Christ had the same human nature we have without the tendencies to sin. MWG, 131.

\(^3\)MWG, 92.

\(^4\)Heppenstall makes the following comparison: Christ was conceived of the Holy Spirit. We are not. He did not begin life with a tendency toward independence from God as we do. From birth to the resurrection, His tendency was total harmony with, and dependency on, the Father. There was not the slightest taint of sin on Him. The self-centered spirit of the fallen Adam and Eve was totally absent in Christ. Always, from the dawn of consciousness, He delighted to do God's will. He was never selfish as all other men are. MWG, 127. Here we can notice the important role Heppenstall's understanding of sin has as independence from God. It is in this way that he can maintain Christ's sinlessness in contrast with man sinfulness.

\(^5\)Heppenstall thus sees sin as a possibility for Christ in His human nature. Furthermore, Heppenstall sees Christ facing temptation more strongly than even Adam. "The possibility of His being overcome was greater than Adam's" because Christ inherited a physical constitution weakened by the increasing degeneracy of the race. MWG, 154.
temptations He faced were directed to His humanity rather than to His divinity. If temptation had been directed at Christ's deity, it would have been pointless since God cannot be tempted by evil.

The secret of Christ's victory over temptation, for Heppenstall, did not lie in hidden resources within Himself or in a reliance upon His divine nature, but rather in a life of total dependence by faith in His Father. Because independence from God is the real problem, Heppenstall sees Christ choosing the path of utter dependence upon God rather than living in self-dependence based on His own inherent power. Christ's total dependence was the key for His victory over sin and temptation.

---

1Heppenstall sees temptation coming to man in two ways. See MWG, 151-152. It comes to the inner man in his sinful condition and with its inherent bias toward sin. From this avenue, temptation had no hold on Christ for He Himself said: "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" (John 14:30). In this respect, Satan could find no foothold in Christ. Temptation may also come to us from outside. To suffer temptation, one does need to have a sinful nature or an inner bias to evil. Adam and Eve were tempted before they fell into sin, and unfallen angels and beings have been tempted without yielding to temptation. The possibility of being tempted exists for sinless as well as sinful beings. The temptations of Christ came not from inner corruption but from external pressure upon His normal human faculties. Ibid., 152. See also 1SBD, 23.

2(James 1:13). At this point Shedd is quoted approvingly when he states that the divine nature is intemptable and impeccable but the human nature is both temptable and peccable. Taken from Shedd, 2:332. Cf. MWG, 152.

3See MWG, 151; 1SBD, 23.

4Comments Heppenstall: "Christ voluntarily committed the use of His divine attributes into the Father's hands and refrained from exercising them without His Father's express permission during His earthly life" (MWG, 153). Heppenstall wished to make certain that Christ's deity never superseded His human faculties. The temptation was always present for Christ to exercise His divine prerogatives. The greatest temptation was for Christ to forsake the level of humanity which He had chosen and to assert His divine nature. Ibid., 163.

5"Christ resisted that temptation over which Adam and Eve fell. They accepted the devil's suggestion to free themselves from dependence on, and trust in, God and from obedience to His will" (MWG, 157). If sin, for Heppenstall, is independence, distrust, and disobedience to God's will, then Christ overcame sin, keeping His total dependence and obedience to God's will. It is here that we can observe the importance that sin has for Heppenstall's system.
It already has been mentioned that the core of Heppenstall's discussions with Brinsmead and the Pre-1950 Group was regarding Christian perfection. The reality of Christ's human nature became Heppenstall's basis for his understanding of Christian perfection. The way Christ overcame sin in His human life is closely related to the way the believer can overcome sin in his Christian life. Here we can find the reason why Heppenstall gave substantial consideration to the human nature of Christ.

Thus far, in our analysis we have established that the Incarnation, for Heppenstall, is essential in order to understand Christ's work of redemption. First, we can notice that Heppenstall links God's moral law with the Incarnation when he says that the primary purpose of the Incarnation was to reveal His character and to demonstrate to all other worlds that God's law is unchangeable. Christ's righteous life on earth and His death fulfilled this objective. Second, it has been shown that sin is correlated with the Incarnation by Heppenstall when he stresses that it caused the need of redemption. Christ's Incarnation had the purpose of paving the way to a solution to the problem of sin. However, Incarnation was not enough to solve sin's problem. There was still the need of reconciliation, because Incarnation brings God to man but it does not bring man to God. The goal of the Incarnation was reconciliation. It is here that Heppenstall links the atoning death of Christ to the process of redemption, making reconciliation possible.

Regarding the results of Christ's redemption, Heppenstall indicates that Christ, through His perfect and sinless life that He lived on earth, can provide a perfect righteousness and the divine power

11SBD, 27.

2Heppenstall asserts that in itself, "the Incarnation had no redemptive value, but it paved the way for His death which alone has redemptive value" (1SBD, 32).
to bring man into a right relationship with God. The judgment is still another aspect that is connected to the Incarnation by Heppenstall. He declares that through the Incarnation, God provided a faithful and righteous Judge. Since He is a faithful and righteous Judge, Christ is able to feel with man because He Himself has experienced the human lot. It is in this way that Heppenstall correlates the different aspects of the doctrine of redemption.

The purpose of Incarnation was reconciliation. It was achieved by Christ at the cross. This leads us to consider Christ's atoning sacrifice at the cross. For Heppenstall, it is the second step of the bridge of salvation.

Christ's Atoning Death

Christ's death is the center of the doctrine of redemption. Man's redemption was only possible through Christ's atoning death. Christian religion finds its basis in the work of Christ at the cross. For Heppenstall the cross constitutes the climax of the doctrine of redemption. In the following section, this study considers, first, the importance that the death of Christ holds for Heppenstall's theological system, how he interprets the biblical passages dealing with the atonement, and finally, his interpretation of the meaning of the death of Christ.

The Importance of Christ's Death

For Heppenstall, all lines of salvation history meet at the cross. ¹ The cross occupies the central place in salvation history and is the climax of Christ's work.² The finality of the death of Christ

¹SU, 43.

²The cross is the moral center of all things. It is the most stupendous event in history of man, the only event in the history of God. "A bygone eternity knew no other future; an eternity to come shall know no other past. It is the heartbeat; it is life-blood" (1SBD, 33). Heppenstall is emphatic: "Christ crucified is central" (OHP, 21). Also: "The Cross constitutes the climax of Christ's work for the salvation of
at the cross leaves no room for vague questions. Heppenstall affirms
that Christ's sacrifice is the solution to the problem of sin.¹ The
universe revolves around Christ's work for man's redemption and the
final victory over all sin.²

The Necessity of the Cross

The intrusion of sin threatened the security of the universe,
including the government of God. As the moral Ruler of the universe,
God is morally bound to take action against it.³ To solve the problem
of sin, God initiated the plan of redemption.⁴ The key figure in this
universal drama is Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The most shocking
thing is that to rescue and redeem the lost, Christ had to suffer the
most violent death: crucifixion.⁵ Christ knew the absolute necessity
of His going to the cross.⁶ Yet, why did He have to die?

---

¹OHP, 36. He adds: "Jesus is not one of many solutions. He is
the only solution" (ibid.).

²Ibid., 36.

³In Heppenstall's view, a holy and righteous God had to react to
sin. It is not possible for God to dismiss sin or to assign it to
oblivion. God must either judge sin and banish it or He must tolerate
it and therefore side with it. Unless God dealt with sin, His law would
be overthrown and men and devils would be emboldened in rebellion. OHP, 39.

⁴OHP, 14.

⁵Ibid., 38. Heppenstall recognizes that the substitutionary
death of Christ is a shocking element that has led some people to reject
this interpretation as is the case of Faustus Socinus and his views
expressed in the De Jesu Christo Servatore: hoc est cur & qua ratione
Jesu Christo nostro servatore fit (Rakaw: Alexii Rodecii, 1594), micro-
form from the original copy in the Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, 1981; see
also Thomas Rees, ed. and trans., The Racovian Catechism (London: n.p.,
1818), 297-320.

⁶He quotes John 3:14; Matt 16:21; Heb 8:3, in OHP, 37.
Completeness of the Atonement

Heppenstall explains that atonement in the Bible centers around a basic meaning: that God created man to live in a state of unity and oneness with Him and, in all respects, to enjoy a harmonious relationship with Him and with his fellow men. However, sin ruptured this oneness and wrought disharmony everywhere. The atonement is God's way of bringing about a reconciliation, of winning back man to Himself. Hence, the English word "at-one-ment." The key word for Heppenstall is reconciliation.

In a sense, atonement, reconciliation, and the process of redemption for Heppenstall are synonymous. However, our theologian recognizes that a distinction needs to be made in the meaning of the word atonement. One of its meanings can refer to the redemption price paid for the sin and sinners, the actual redemption of the human race in the heart and mind of God. This is what is meant by Christ's declaration, "It is finished." When one thus speaks in this sense, the atonement was completed at the cross.

1OHP, 25.
2Ibid., 25.
3Remember here that God's character plays an important role in Heppenstall's theology. Reconciliation is the word that best describes God's purpose for restoring unity and harmony in the universe.
4Ibid. It was mentioned previously that Heppenstall uses the word atonement in two different but related ways: as synonymous with the process of reconciliation, and in the restricted way to refer to Christ's atonement at the cross. Reconciliation and the plan of redemption are basically the same because in both the idea of restoration to unity is implied.
5The completeness of the atonement from this angle is supported by Heppenstall using the following arguments: First, the proof from the "once for all" concept of Hebrews (Heb 7:25; 9:12, 25, 26, 28; 10:11-12, 14). Second, the proof of the removal of sin by the death of Christ. Christ does not suffer twice (Heb 9:26). The conception of a finished work of Christ is presented in the book of Hebrews. It is something done in regard to sin once and for all, whether any given soul responds to it or not. The author of Hebrews does not conceive of an atonement done and completed in the lives of men. It is not discussing this. But it is complete in the mind of God. Third, the proof from the fact that reconciliation is an accomplished fact in the mind of God. (Cf. 2 Cor
Another meaning deals with the complete reconciliation of all things unto God and the complete eradication of sin. This was represented by the typical day of atonement which included the banishment of Azazel. In this case obviously the atonement is not complete at the cross. Heppenstall believes that both aspects of the atonement have their value. This brings the question, How does he understand and relate the Biblical teachings on atonement with the doctrine of redemption? We turn our attention to this aspect.

Atonement in the Bible

Heppenstall recognizes that the concept and truth of atonement is so all-encompassing and transcendent that it is impossible to communicate it or properly understand its meaning simply by the study of isolated words used to convey the idea of atonement. Nevertheless, he gives attention to certain specific words around which the biblical

5:19, 20; Rom 5:10; Col 1:21.) Our acceptance of atonement does not in any way add to the completion of atonement. We receive it as a gift by faith. God has done it all. Fourth, the proof from the truth and principle of substitution (1 Pet 3:18; 2 Cor 5:14, 15; 1 Cor 1:13; Matt 20:28; Rom 5:6-8). The substitution took place on the cross; He is not our substitute for sin now; He is our representative, our mediator. Substitution is not now going on in heaven. Fifth, the proof from the resurrection of Christ (Rom 4:25). The resurrection of Christ was the consequence of His death having proved efficacious in securing the justification of sinners. Paul points to our justification as the reason for Christ resurrection. Sixth, the proof from the bearing of sin. Bearing sin is something that Christ did by His death (Heb 9:28; 1 Pet 2:24; Gal 3:10; 2 Cor 5:21; Rev 5:9). Finally, the proof from the death of Christ as the sum of the Gospel, that this is Christ's supreme purpose in the world to accomplish the redemption of mankind by His death. (1 Cor 2:2; 15:13; Gal 6:14; Rom 6:3). SDAt, 7-8.

1SDAt, 6. Atonement is something which is done. Yet there is also an atonement which is in process. Atonement has its basis in the finished work of Christ. It is in virtue of something already consummated on the cross that God offers to us as a gift a completed work. None of the responsibility rests on man. The whole of the Christian's faith lies in a response to the love shown in the death of Christ. The function of that response of faith that works by love is not adding anything to the work of Christ to render it more complete, but is a reliance on a work already perfected. And it is holding fast to this eternal reality revealed in Christ and not some phase of identification with Him that determines the Christian faith and Christian experience. SDAt, 7.
doctrine of Atonement is centered. First, he considers the most relevant word in the OT, then the three most important words in the NT.¹

Atonement in the OT

The principal word for atonement in Hebrew is Kaphar.² Heppenstall finds in the OT four forms of this root. The first speaks of a ransom.³ The second is translated "to cover over" in a figurative sense, that is, to propitiate or conciliate.⁴ Third, the plural form in the word kippurim is used to designate the "day of atonement" (Lev 23:27), the modern "Yom Kippur."⁵ The fourth use of the word refers to the top of the ark, or the mercy seat, as the place of atonement or propitiation.⁶ In all these cases, says Heppenstall, the underlying idea is that of effecting a reconciliation with God by some appropriate

¹OHP, 26-30.

²The original meaning of this word is difficult to ascertain, according to Heppenstall. Scholars have traced the word back to the related Arabic root meaning of "to cover" or "to hide" or to an Aramaic root meaning of "to wash away," "to rub off," "to eradicate." The Old Testament stresses the idea of covering one's sin by some form of expiation or conciliation. The word has the basic idea of making reconciliation by purging away sin; hence it is frequently translated by the word reconcile. OHP, 26-27. Cf. Friedreich Büchsel, "Hileos, Hilaskomai, Hilasmos, Hilasterion," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, tr. and ed., Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964), 3:300-323.

³The usage of the word in this sense is found in Prov 13:8 RSV. OHP, 26.

⁴He demonstrates this usage by appealing to Gen 32:20 when Jacob sought to propitiate or "cover" his earlier injustice to his brother Esau by a bounty of gifts. Ibid.

⁵Exod 30:15-16 speaks of atonement money, half a shekel, to be paid by every Israelite "to make an atonement for your souls." Heppenstall says: "By virtue of His act in redeeming Israel as belonging to Him; hence, man recognizes this by paying the price of a half shekel. The Israelite thus acknowledged God's calling on his life, that he belonged to God" (ibid.).

⁶Exod 15:17. The significance of the use of this word marks the place where the judgment or wrath of God against sin is "covered over" or "conciliated" symbolically by animal sacrifices typifying the sacrifice of Christ to come. Ibid.
The Levitical sacrifices pointed to the sacrifice of Christ, by which men would truly be redeemed from sin. Alienation was removed. Reconciliation of God and man was accomplished.

Atonement in the NT

The NT, according to Heppenstall, uses three specific words in seeking to interpret Christ's death upon the cross: ransom, reconciliation, and propitiation or expiation. In all cases, God the Father takes the initiative in the work of atonement. In all these words, the reference is to the objective, finished work of atonement on the cross. The atonement occurs nowhere else. Heppenstall finds that atonement is something objective and external to man himself. It was completed when Christ cried out from the cross, "It is finished." It cannot be repeated in us or by us.

Atonement as redemption

Heppenstall mentions that two Greek words underscore the idea of ransom. The more important for him is *lutron*, "ransom"—the redemption or release of a person by the payment of a price. In order to deliver the sinner from the judgement of the law, which is the penalty of sin, the ransom must be paid. When the Bible speaks of Christ ransoming the lost sinner, the emphasis is upon the price paid by Him.

1Ibid.
2Thus, whenever the Israelites in the wilderness approached God, they brought an animal and offered a personal sacrifice as a continued affirmation on their part that the rupture had been healed and they were at one with God. Ibid., 27.
4SAT, 683.
5Ibid., 684.
death to save man. In this case, the cost would be the blood of Christ, for "without shedding of blood is no remission of sin" (Heb 9:22).\(^1\)

The other word \textit{exagorazō} means to "buy back" and is translated to "redeem."\(^2\) The sacrifice of Christ as a ransom and a moral satisfaction to the law and to the righteousness of God would have been necessary had there been only one to be saved.\(^3\)

\textbf{Atonement as Reconciliation}

The word reconciliation is used to translate the Greek word \textit{katallage}. Heppenstall points out that the Greek meaning is that two parties are at variance, being reconciled by one making satisfaction to the other.\(^4\) While God is never spoken of as the object of reconciliation, yet this does not mean that the sinner takes the initiative. This reconciliation is effected by Christ's atoning death and the removal of God's judgment against the sinner.\(^5\) Heppenstall notes that in Christ God does the reconciling "to himself." When Christ died on the cross, reconciliation was accomplished. Men now are called to receive the reconciliation.\(^6\) The reconciling work by God in Christ took place

\(^1\)\textit{OHP}, 28. See also Matt 20:28; Titus 2:14. In other texts the form used has in mind the buying back of a captive, the deliverance from bondage by the sacrifice, Christ. See Luke 1:68; Heb 9:12; Rom 3:34. Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid. See Acts 20:28; 1 Cor 6:20; Gal 3:13.

\(^3\)\textit{SAT}, 684.


\(^5\)\textit{SAT}, 685.

\(^6\)Ibid., 685; 2 Cor 5:20. In response to God's initiative in Christ, man is called upon to accept the accomplished reconciliation from God's side. One should notice that Heppenstall's view of sin as separation from God helps him to understand the meaning of the word when he declares: "If alienation from the Father be the root of all sin, there can be no reconciliation in any other way than returning to the Father" (ibid.).
before any change had taken place in man.\textsuperscript{1} Reconciliation is something that God accomplished at the cross.\textsuperscript{2}

**Atonement as Propitiation**

The third Greek word connected by Heppenstall with the atoning work of Christ is *hilasterion*, often translated as "propitiation" or "expiation." The Greek word is derived from a word meaning "to show mercy."\textsuperscript{3} This word is closely related to the biblical concept of the wrath of God.\textsuperscript{4} Heppenstall explains the wrath of God as intense displeasure and condemnation of sin. It issues from the divine government and constitution that prevails throughout the universe. He explains that the wrath of God is not to be understood in terms of

\textsuperscript{1}Those who hold the subjective view of atonement assert that the change should be only in men not in God. However, Heppenstall has a different perspective. He maintains that the objective act effected through Christ for the whole world is to be followed by the subjective act in each individual. For Heppenstall, then, the objective act is first. The subjective act is second and a very different act. SAT, 686.

\textsuperscript{2}The reconciliation made through Christ at the cross is different from the reconciliation effected in each individual. Individual reconciliation is effected through the ministry of reconciliation, and "the word of reconciliation" is calling to us: "Be reconciled to God." Ibid.

\textsuperscript{3}OEP, 39; see Luke 18:13. In classical Greek the word *Hilasterion* is used for appeasing or propitiating the gods by means of gifts and sacrifices. Ibid., 29. Cf. Büchsel, "Hileos, Hilaskomai, Hilasmos, Hilasterion," J:310-312. The implications of the meaning of the word are difficult to interpret. As Leon Morris has pointed out when speaking of propitiation: "We are saying that God is angry when people sin and that, if they are to be forgiven, something must be done about that anger. We are saying further that the death of Christ is the means of removing the divine wrath from sinners," Leon Morris, The Atonement, 152.

\textsuperscript{4}SAT, 679. The use of the word wrath is difficult when it refers to God. Heppenstall recognizes this fact. He mentions that it could be that it is due to the connotation of the word. The word wrath suggests a loss of self-control, and an outburst which is irrational. But when Scripture speaks of God, it does not imply that the limitations and imperfections which pertain to the personal characteristics of sinful creatures belong to the corresponding qualities in our holy Creator. Ibid.
passion and anger manifested by sinful man.\textsuperscript{1} The term denotes the necessary opposition of a holy God to sin and the execution of an adequate judgment before the universe on that sin.\textsuperscript{2} What the atonement effects is not a change in God but the change in the exercise of judgment upon the sinner, and, therefore, a change of relation between God and repentant sinners. It is a change in the sinner's relationship to God, a change from condemnation to exoneration.\textsuperscript{3}

The atonement affirms that sinners are delivered from condemnation and the sentence of eternal death because of the perfect satisfaction given to the justice of the Godhead by the suffering and death of Jesus Christ. If there is no wrath against sin, Heppenstall concludes that the love of God is deficient of moral content; the cross then becomes an exhibition of cruelty and injustice, which cannot be the action of a truly loving, let alone perfectly holy God.\textsuperscript{4} Therefore,

\textsuperscript{1}For Heppenstall, God's wrath in the Bible is never the capricious, self-indulgent, irritable, morally ignoble thing of human anger. It is, he says, quoting the words of Packer: "A right and necessary reaction to objective moral evil. God's wrath in the Bible is always judicial, that is, it is the wrath of the Judge, administering justice" (Packer, 136, quoted in SAT, 680).

\textsuperscript{2}SAT, 681. The wrath of God is by no means a contradiction of the love of God. Moral righteousness is as essential an attribute of God as is love. It is erroneous to represent God as operating from love one time and from justice another time. Heppenstall sees no contradiction in God's love and wrath. The exercise of divine justice never means the suspension of His love. Justice and judgment deal with sin in the universe and can never represent God in an unfavorable light. Heppenstall affirms that "It is a gross mistake to believe that the expression of God's love and the satisfaction of His justice represent two opposing moods in the heart of God. The truth is exactly the reverse. The love of God is the cause; the satisfaction is the effect" (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{3}SAT, 679. The death of Christ makes possible a change in the way God executes His justice when dealing with repentant sinners. No sin is forgiven that has not been judged by God in the light of His Son's death on the cross. All members of the Godhead have assumed the judgment that should have been executed on man. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., 681.
expiation is the very opposite of exacting punishment. Expiation is God taking punishment upon Himself.  

Substitutionary Atonement

The death of Christ for sinners can be understood only in terms of substitution. Heppenstall argues against the concept that the proposition "for" means "for our benefit" rather than "in our place." Christ bore the penalty for our transgression of the law of God. Christ "bore our sins" not in an expression of sympathy with us but because it was necessary for our forgiveness, salvation, and redemption.

We can summarize that Heppenstall finds that atonement in the OT, and the NT conveys the idea of man's redemption from sin, reconciling God with man, and judgment on sin. This is achieved by Christ's substitutionary death at the cross, paying the price for our redemption, removing God's judgment against the sinner, and satisfying God's justice.

---

1Ibid.

2By substitution, Heppenstall means that Christ voluntarily substituted Himself in man's stead. Here lies, he says, the importance of Christ's sinlessness. Christ had no sin or guilt of His own. The Father and Christ suffered together their own judgment on sin. The sins of all men were imputed to Him, in order to make atonement by His death. Ibid., 681-682.

3Ibid., 682. Heppenstall denotes that two Greek prepositions are used in the frequent phrase that Christ died for us. The first is anti, which invariably means "instead of." The second preposition used more frequently in connection with Christ's death for us is huper. It can have two meanings: "for our benefit" and "instead of." Our author rejects the views of those who hold that Christ's death was for our benefit instead of our place. See Hastings Rashdall, The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology (London: Macmillan and Co., 1919), 3-56, passim. For Heppenstall the notion of substitution is plain. He infers that if Christ died in the stead and place of the "all," then the "all" are reckoned to have died. It would be nonsense to say that "if one died for the benefit of all, then all died" (SAT, 682). He rejects this idea because it leads to the conclusion that Christ's substitution was not necessary, therefore, Christ's death was only with subjective purposes. Heppenstall firmly believes in Christ's substitutionary atonement.

4SAT, 683.
We can conclude that Heppenstall's Biblical understanding of the atonement induced him to believe that Christ's death had different purposes, not merely to save man from sin. What are these purposes? This is the next aspect to address.

**Purpose of the Atonement**

The purposes of the atonement are very similar to those of the Incarnation because the death of Christ on the cross is the climax of the whole system of redemption.\(^1\) Sin is the most tragic reality that ever invaded God's domain. God is the primary person affected by sin in the universe. Christ is the key figure to solve this widespread tragedy. While the universe is a spectator, God and man are deeply involved by the drama of sin. Heppenstall holds that the purpose of the death of Christ is related to God, man, and the universe.\(^2\) We analyze the objectives of the cross in this order.

**God and the Atonement**

Sin disturbed the whole cosmos. God cannot dismiss sin, either forgetting it or assigning it to oblivion. There are some aspects of God involved in the problem with sin: His character, His law, and His government.

**God's Character and the Atonement**

As a moral being, God is love and justice. A true interpretation of Calvary must reveal the moral character of God in His attributes of love and justice.\(^3\) Heppenstall declares that God had to come

\(^1\)The cross is the goal of the Incarnation, because "in itself, the Incarnation had no redemptive value, but it paved the way for his death which alone has redemptive value" (JSBD, 32).

\(^2\)JSBD, 33-34.

\(^3\)OHP, 40. In dealing with sin, observes Heppenstall, God is found in a dilemma: "Since He is just, and true to His law, how can He avoid executing the penalty of death on all sinners? Since He is love and mercy, how can He execute the wages of sin upon His children?" (OHP, 38).
to grips with the problem of sin on two planes. One is the plane of law and justice. The other is the plane of grace and redemption.¹ God solved the problem in Christ.² Through Christ, God revealed the divine capacity for love.³

The moral necessity for the sacrifice of the Son of God is based not only on God's love but also on His righteousness.⁴ Until the cross, God had not sufficiently dealt with sin.⁵ Consequently, this brought the moral character and government of God under suspicion of injustice, of leniency toward sin. Therefore, God sent His Son as a propitiation in order to demonstrate His justice.⁶ In this way the sacrifice of Christ satisfied the necessities within the Godhead itself.

¹OHP, 38-39. The sacrifice of the Son of God as the divine solution to the sin problem is, first of all, the account that God gives of His character of righteous love. Sharing the view of E. G. White, Heppenstall quotes the following: "Through disobedience Adam fell. The law of God had been broken. The divine government had been dishonored, and justice demanded the penalty of transgression be paid... He [Christ] pledged Himself to accomplish our full salvation in a way satisfactory to the demands of God's justice, and consistent with the exalted holiness of His law" (Selected Messages, 3 vols. [Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958-1980], 1:308-309).

²OHP, 43. God had to execute judgment on all sinners or He had to assume it Himself. The members of the Godhead chose the latter, honoring the law while justifying the guilty. The law is honored either by complete obedience of man or by an adequate judgment on the violation of it. In this way the righteousness of God is manifested in the midst of man's sinfulness. Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., 41. Paul declares that the cross to be the revelation of God's justice, in order that He Himself might be just (Rom 3:25-26). Ibid.

⁵OHP, 42. Heppenstall explains that during OT times, God's justice had been obscured and misunderstood because an inadequate judgment had been executed on sin for four thousand years. In the ages prior to the coming of Christ, God accepted and forgave repentant sinners as they offered animal sacrifices. The sacrifice of animals never did bear or take away sin, or make an adequate atonement. See Heb 10:3-4. Heppenstall argues that if God's reaction to sin had been revealed merely by the sacrifices of animals, then He would not be a righteous God. Justice must deal adequately with sin. Ibid. See also SAD, 673-674; SU, 48-52.

⁶OHP, 42.
God's Government and the Atonement

The atonement wrought by Christ upon the cross is a vindication of a righteous God and vindication of the moral law. \(^1\) God revealed Himself as just and loving in dealing with the sin problem. All God's dealings were shown consistent with His righteous character. As the moral Ruler of the universe, God is morally bound to take action against sin. Sin can never be banished unless God does it Himself. By the very nature of His character, God has only certain ways of dealing with sin. He cannot use force and still hold the universe together. Yet He must condemn it and establish the right to eradicate it. Sin can only be forgiven by an act of God that passes judgment on it at the same time. God can maintain His government and His law only as sin is rightly condemned and banished. The cross revealed this righteous judgment before the universe when the Godhead assumed their own judgment on sin at the cross. \(^2\) Therefore, the cross is the marvelous revelation of the loving and righteous character of God. It is God's own answer to the sin problem. It is God bearing His own judgment on sin rather than His executing it upon sinners.

\(^1\) OHP, 44.

\(^2\) OHP, 45-46. When suffering under divine justice as the substitute and surety for sinful man, Christ felt the unity with His Father broken. Christ feared that sin was so offensive to God that their separation was to be eternal. The agony was felt not only by Christ but also within the Godhead. All the anguish of that separation that Christ expressed in those terrible words "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" is experienced also within the Godhead. But the unity of the Trinity remained unbroken. Ibid., 47. See also SU, 52.
III

Cosmic Dimensions of the Atonement

The sin problem caused God to be misunderstood before the universe. Furthermore, it threatened the security of God's creation. God had to vindicate His character before all his moral creatures. On behalf of all the members of the Trinity, Christ became man in order to assume the judgment on sin in its ultimate fullness at the cross. God's judgment on sin at the cross brought not only the redemption of man but also the vindication of God's government before the universe. The cross is not the infliction of a penalty on an innocent man but a revelation of divine justice. Here sin is publicly judged in the presence of all intelligent beings. On the cross God rests His case. Christ's atonement satisfies the Godhead, the universe, and those who believe.

Man and the Atonement

The Scripture's teaching on the atonement is linked with the fall of man and the necessity for an atoning sacrifice. Mankind by virtue of its solidarity with the first Adam begins life "without God," i.e., in alienation from God. Christ became a man in order to bear

1It was mentioned earlier that Heppenstall understands atonement as having cosmic dimensions not just human and divine dimensions. In chapter 8 a further explanation is given to the way he relates this perspective with his theological system.

2OHP, 45.

3Ibid., 39, 44. "Atonement is an expression of the divine intention to destroy sin that ruptured the universe" (ibid., 29).

4SAT, 687.

5SAT, 686-687. See also OHP, 44.

6SAT, 689. See also MWG, 35.

7SAT, 690.

8Ibid., 670.

9MWG, 40.
the penalty for man's sin.¹ No member of the Godhead could bear the penalty for man's sin without taking human nature; for divinity cannot die.² Christ came to redeem man from sin and death. He bore the penalty for sin, but in so doing, He is not a sinner.³ Christ's sacrifice provides the basis for acquitting the sinner.⁴ His sacrifice is the gift of His life for mankind. It is as eternal as Himself, and it cannot be repeated.⁵ On the cross of Calvary, Christ paid the redemption price for the race, and thus He gained the right to take the captives from the grasp of the great deceiver.⁶ Besides the former, His death brought different benefits to man.⁷

Christ's sacrifice has still another dimension in relation with men. Heppenstall declares that God's gift, His Son as atonement, must satisfy not only His justice but also the human need. Since the destiny of man is wrapped up with the atoning sacrifice of Christ, the moral strength and spiritual efficiency in men's lives, by means of that atonement, must hold a vital place.⁸ Heppenstall recognizes that the work of atonement must transcend a forensic adjustment of man toward

¹SU, 52. On the cross, Christ stood before God. He assumed the penalty that should have come upon all men in all ages—not only the sins of those who sleep on the dust of the earth but also the sins of all generations to come. Ibid.

²Ibid., 54.

³SU, 54. The Father does not consider His Son guilty of sin or meriting condemnation. The fact that Christ bore our sins does not involve Him in the sin itself. Ibid.

⁴Ibid., 51. The implication is that God would not have been just if He had acquitted the guilty sinners without the sacrificial death of Christ. Ibid.

⁵OHP, 34.

⁶Ibid., 33.

⁷ISBD, 34. In the first place, man receives Adoption (1 John 2:2). Second, the sentence of death (Rom 5:18), the guilt and sin (Acts 13:38), are removed. Finally, man has now a new status (Rom 8:16, 17), new life (Heb 10:10), and eternal life (John 3:15, 16; Heb 9:28). Ibid.

⁸SAT, 670.
God. Christ's life and death are of infinite value for man's personal relation to God.\(^1\) It restores the sinner to oneness with God. The whole world needs this revelation of the loving attitude of God in order to break through into human hearts and lives.\(^2\) Christ's death on the cross is a divine power by which God subdues all things to Himself by the revelation of both His love and His righteousness.\(^3\)

Heppenstall does not underestimate the importance of the subjective aspect of the atonement. He wishes to balance God's justice with His love.\(^4\) For God to permit His Son to be crucified merely to reveal His love for men does not explain why the sacrifice of Christ is really indispensable.\(^5\) If the value of the cross is simply to secure from the sinner a right response, then why is sin considered so deadly as to require such a sacrifice?\(^6\) Sin is not evil simply because man feels bad about it. Most men do not react thus to sin.\(^7\) This view posits another problem: a naked demonstration of love can benefit only

\(^1\)Ibid. Jesus did not operate simply in the juridical realm. Our author admits that the terms legal, penal, and forensic are not found in Christ's life and discourses. Ibid. Still, it is impossible to accept the accuracy of the subjective theory as a complete explanation of the atoning death of Christ. Ibid., 669.

\(^2\)Ibid., 669. However, to give the impression, or to believe, that God did not send His Son to bear our sins on the cross as an act of divine judgment on sin but simply to supply us with the right information about the character of God is to distort the truth. Ibid.

\(^3\)Ibid. The drawing power of Christ's revelation of His Father to man is essential. But at the same time, Heppenstall says, the Scriptures emphatically declare over and over that in His death, Christ was our Substitute, a propitiatory sacrifice. Jesus took our place, He came to die for us. Ibid., 670.

\(^4\)Ibid., 671. A naked demonstration of the love of God by dying on a cross is not necessarily redemptive or saving. Heppenstall does not find saving power in Christ deliberately sacrificing His life, merely as a demonstration of His love (ibid.).

\(^5\)OHP, 41. Cf. SAT, 671.

\(^6\)OHP, 41.

\(^7\)Ibid.
those who have lived this side of the cross. What about all those who lived and died before Christ's first advent?  

Finally, to advocate a subjective view alone is clearly inadequate. It fails to give expression to the inevitable opposition of God to sin. God never offers salvation apart from the remission of sins that Christ made possible at Calvary. Christianity without the vicarious death of the Son of God is no real gospel to lost men. To lose sight of God's supreme act of redemption by the sacrifice of Christ can have the most serious consequences for the everlasting gospel. Therefore, Atonement is both objective and subjective.

How does Heppenstall relate the doctrine of redemption to the atonement? Heppenstall declares, God had to come to grips with the problem of sin on two planes. One is the plane of law and justice. The other is the plane of grace and redemption. Regarding the first, Heppenstall says that since the problem of sin threatened the security of the universe, including God's government, God as the moral Ruler of

1Ibid.

2SAT, 672. It is inconceivable to believe, affirms our author, that Christ came to earth simply to reveal the love of God as if that actually redeemed a lost world. To affirm that all that is required of man is to take note of what God is like and seek to respond to that does not deal with the sin problem at all. Ibid.

3Ibid. "In Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of His grace" (Eph 1:7).

4SAT, 672. Man may admire the spotless life of Jesus, rejoice in His wonderful revelation of God's love, weep over His undeserved fate, but this alone will not suffice. This, affirms Heppenstall, distorts the biblical teaching on the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Ibid.

5Ibid., 673.

6Ibid., 671. The idea of Anselm that the sacrifice of Christ must make satisfaction to God's justice in relation to the sin problem is regarded by Heppenstall as part of the truth. Abelard and Anselm's concepts do not stand in opposition, they complement each other. Any comprehensive understanding of the atonement must move towards the acceptance of both aspects. The two perspectives best reflect the true character of God, SAT, 667. Cf. Anselm of Canterbury, 64-163.
the universe is morally bound to take action against it. The perfect satisfaction given to the justice of the Godhead by the suffering and death of Jesus Christ delivered sinners from the condemnation and the sentence of eternal death. Christ is seen by Heppenstall as a ransom and a moral satisfaction for the law and for the righteousness of God. In this way the sacrifice of Christ satisfied the necessities within the Godhead itself.

On the second plane, the cross is the marvelous revelation of the loving and righteous character of God. It is God's own answer to the sin problem. It is God bearing His own judgment on sin rather than His executing it upon sinners. Christ's death was an absolute necessity because it is God's way of bringing about reconciliation, of winning back man to Himself.

God's judgment on sin at the cross brought not only the redemption of man but also the vindication of God's government before the universe. Christ's atonement, therefore, satisfies the Godhead, the universe, and those who believe. In this way, Christ's sacrifice was the solution to the problem of sin. Since Christ's atoning sacrifice is for Heppenstall, the climax of redemption, how does he relate the resurrection and the ascension with redemption in this bridge of salvation?

Resurrection and Ascension

Christ's resurrection is the third span in the bridge of salvation of Heppenstall's understanding of the act of redemption. It was foretold in prophecy (Ps 16:9) and by Jesus Himself (Matt 17:22-23), and was witnessed by the disciples (1 Cor 15:1-11). The transformation of the disciples was a clear evidence of Christ's resurrection (Matt 27:56; John 20:19; Acts 2-4). Paul's conversion came through his encounter with the resurrected Jesus (1 Cor 15:8-10; Gal 1:13-16). Heppenstall notes the relation of the Incarnation with resurrection when he states that through the perfection of His incarnate manhood, God's
second Man has qualified Himself to become the Head of a new creation.¹

It is through the resurrection that the benefits of the atonement are effective on the believer. Through Christ, the believer leaves the sphere of sin, death, darkness, and disorder, and enters the sphere of righteousness, life, light, and liberty.² Christ's resurrection offers the believer deliverance from sin (1 Cor 15:12-20), assurance of the resurrection power (Phil 3:8-11), and eternal life (John 6:40; 1 Cor 15: 20-24, 52, 55).³

Ascension is the fourth and last span in the bridge of salvation. Heppenstall explains that even though at the resurrection Christ became the progenitor of a new order of beings, it was not until His ascension and exaltation that He could actually be initiated into His work as Head of the church.⁴ Christ's return to heaven had the purpose of sending the Comforter (John 16:7), beginning His intercessory work (Rom 8:34), and preparing dwelling places for the redeemed (John 14:2-3).⁵

Conclusion

In reviewing Heppenstall's understanding of the atonement in relationship with the doctrine of redemption, we can observe that the different controversies within the church led him to dedicate more time

¹SBD, 48. Through the victory of His crucifixion He has put an end to the old creation. Now through the power of His resurrection a new order of beings is formed of which He is appointed the Head; as firstborn from the dead He becomes the Progenitor of a new race of redeemed men, the Head of a new company of people whose life in earth is going to be transformed. Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 48-49.

⁴Ibid., 49. After Christ's sacrifice, He ascended to the right hand of God to minister in the heavenly sanctuary as High Priest and Mediator between God and man. In both aspects of His ministry, affirms Heppenstall, Christ is engaged in the work of reconciliation or atonement. OHP, 49.

⁵Ibid. This last aspect of Christ's ministry is considered in chapter 6 of this dissertation.
to soteriology and eschatology and Christ's human nature than to the atonement on the cross. Nevertheless, Heppenstall's view of the atonement is clear. He relates it to the doctrine of redemption in a consistent way. Next, we consider the way he relates the act of atonement to the other doctrines connected with redemption.

Incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, and the ascension, the four steps of the bridge of salvation, are closely correlated and at the same time interlocked with the doctrine of sin, the law, and judgment, the other parts of Heppenstall's scheme in the doctrine of redemption.

The basic elements in Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption are the problem of sin, the vindication of God's character, the eternity of the law, and the reconciliation of man to God. Therefore, the purposes of the redemption are to reveal God to man, to solve the sin-and-death problem, and to win men back to fellowship with Him. The bridge of salvation was God's way to achieve these objectives.

Through the Incarnation, Christ revealed God's character to man, opening the way to bring the human race back into fellowship with Him. The atoning death of Christ was the climax of the process of redemption where reconciliation was made possible. Christ's death condemned sin, upheld God's eternal law, and bore man's condemnation upon himself, changing in this way the relation between God and repentant sinners. They went from condemnation to exoneration.

---

1 His book MWG is completely devoted to issues related to the human nature of Christ. SU deals with soteriological issues. His section in PIP deals with the issue of Christian perfection. OHF, which deals extensively with Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, contains only two chapters considering the act of atonement at the cross (chaps. 2-3). In his articles he deals with a number of different issues, but very few consider directly the atonement on the cross. Even in his syllabus SDAT he deals more with issues related with the sanctuary than with the act of redemption at the cross. It is apparent that he spent more time on the areas of current discussion within the church. The death of Christ became an issue of concern for Heppenstall when some Adventist scholars (i.e., Jack Provotssha and C. Maxwell) presented the subjective view of atonement in the 1970s. The tension became apparent in the 1980s. It was not until this time that he wrote a chapter in SAT, where he discusses more extensively the objective and subjective aspects of the death of Christ. In this chapter, he opposes strongly the subjective view.
Regarding the results of Christ's redemption, Heppenstall indicates that Christ, through His perfect and sinless life on earth, can provide a perfect righteousness and the divine power to bring man into a right relationship with God. Since Christ is able, through the Incarnation, to feel with man because He Himself has experienced the human lot, He is a merciful mediator and a faithful and righteous judge. In this way, the redemption promised by God through His covenant and symbolized in the levitical sanctuary was ratified and fulfilled at the cross. How is this redemption applied to the believer? This is considered in chapter 5.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE RESULTS OF REDEMPTION

In the previous chapter, Heppenstall's understanding of the act of atonement (the second stage in his scheme of redemption) was discussed. The act of redemption and the proclamation of the cross form part of the same stage.¹ In this chapter, we further examine the proclamation of the cross, which is the practical application of Christ's atonement in the believer.

The first part of the chapter, addresses the process of salvation as presented by Heppenstall: righteousness of God, justification, regeneration, sanctification, and Christian growth.² Also considered is the role of the Holy Spirit in His relation to the application of these aspects to the believer. Since Heppenstall begins his doctrine of salvation by examining God's righteousness, let us turn our attention to this subject.

God's Righteousness

Heppenstall states that the plan of redemption is God's answer to the problem of sin. He ties the word "righteousness" to God's answer to the sin problem. He explains that God's plan to redeem man stands in

¹Cf. OHP, 14.

²Since the "La Sierra Period," Heppenstall has been consistent in the way to present the doctrine of salvation. He discusses the issues in the following order: God's righteousness, faith, the doctrine of sin and the nature of man (considered together), righteousness by faith, repentance, new birth, sanctification, the work of Holy Spirit and the obedience of faith. Cf. SRF1, SRF2, SRF3, SU. His views on sin, the nature of man, law, and obedience were dealt with in chapters 2 and 3 of this dissertation. The other issues mentioned are considered in this chapter.
contrast to the human race, where none is righteous. He emphasizes the concept of man's total depravity and then he asks: How can man get right with God? How can man be restored to the image of God and to His likeness? For Heppenstall, God's answer to the sin problem is the revelation of His righteousness—what righteousness means to our author. It is, therefore, important to understand Heppenstall's view.

Righteousness in the Bible is used in different ways, according to Heppenstall. First, it is spoken of as an attribute of God, a specific quality of God's own character. Second, it is also used to describe the uprightness of men, the morality of those who seek to live righteously in this present world.

Third, the righteousness that saves is the "righteousness of God" revealed to man in the life and death of the Son of God. This saving righteousness is not an attribute of God or an ethical requirement demanded by Him. It is a divine act that reveals in historical events God's power to save man. To be saved, man needs a revelation from God not a new set of requirements. The divine source of saving righteousness is Jesus Christ, His person, and His work on earth. Here alone God has revealed the righteousness that man needs.

---

1 *SU*, 27-29.

2 *SU*, 29. Heppenstall holds that righteousness in this sense does not save men. On the contrary, were God to manifest Himself openly to sinners in His untrammeled righteousness and perfection, man would be destroyed. See also *SRF1*, 3; *SRF2*, 1; *SRF3*, 1.

3 *SU*, 29. This human uprightness and morality does play a significant part in maintaining the social and civil order of the nation. But again, says Heppenstall, this does not save man since man cannot obey the law of God perfectly in himself. It certainly is desirable, but it does not save man. Ibid., 30.

4 *SU*, 31. Heppenstall believes that the historical act of the cross changes the hopeless situation of mankind whether men believe and accept salvation or not.

5 Ibid., 32-33. Saving righteousness is called the righteousness of Christ because it belongs to Him alone. It comes from Him and not from the law. Ibid., 34. God's action in Christ provides man the power which he could never produce for himself for salvation, redemption, transformation, and reconciliation with God. Ibid., 35.
Heppenstall relates saving righteousness to the law. He says that saving righteousness involves the fulfillment of the law, though it is not achieved nor produced by the law. Saving righteousness proceeds from a right relationship to Christ and not out of a man's relation to the law. The later relationship comes as a result of the first.¹

There is a difference between God's righteousness and man's righteousness. While God's righteousness saves, man's righteousness does not remake or recreate a new nature in man.² Mankind has no right or reason to choose its own conditions for salvation. However, a man's will does play a role in his salvation. Repent, believe, and obey are part of man's response to God.³ These are man's responsible acts and attitudes to the gospel. Thus, all men's hopes for peace, righteousness, justification, sanctification, and joy are anchored in Christ, who is man's all-in-all.⁴

Thus we can say that from the outset Heppenstall ties sin and man's total depravity to his view of salvation. In dealing with God's righteousness, the law also takes an important role. Heppenstall makes clear that in salvation, man's righteousness is insufficient. God is the only source of saving righteousness. How can man have this righteousness? It is here where Heppenstall presents justification that comes from God as the answer to that problem.

¹Ibid., 38.

²Man cannot be born again by his own power nor can he by his own power keep the law. Heppenstall observes that usually, "its [law] effects is to make man more self-satisfied, more complacent, less conscious of the need of the gift of Christ's righteousness" (ibid., 41).

³Ibid., 41-42; 97. It is here where Heppenstall's view of the nature of man is important to notice. He speaks of total depravity but he accepts an active role of the human will in salvation.

⁴SRF³, 4.
There are two sides, according to Heppenstall, which need to be considered when speaking of justification, the divine and the human side. From the divine side, Heppenstall says that God created His creatures to live in righteousness. He instructed them that any departure from righteousness would be considered rebellion against Him. The penalty would be separation from God and death instead of eternal life.¹

When men rebelled, the basis for man's acquittal and restoration to favor with God is found in the merits of Christ's righteousness and in His bearing of sin's penalty. In this way, the law is honored and the righteous character of God revealed. God's plan of redemption neither palliates sin nor diminishes the claims of the law of God.²

At this point Heppenstall raises a major question: How far is the believer involved? Is justification something done for the believer or in him? Is it simply a change in man's standing with God, or does it includes a change in the believer's character?³

He answers that in Scripture the emphasis is on God's declaring a man just and the passing of a favorable verdict.⁴ Obviously the believer is not made righteous in the sense that he is no more a sinner. Justification does not restore man to that perfect state as God originally created him. The justified man is still in his sinful state.⁵ God does not proclaim the sinner sinless, for that would be a

¹SU, 47.
²Ibid., 53-54. Here we can also note that Heppenstall's concern is for God's character and the immutability of the law and Christ as the one who fulfilled the law and revealed God's character.
³Ibid., 55.
⁴SRP2, 12. See also SRP2, 6-10, 56.
⁵Regarding Heppenstall's view of sin and state of sin, see chapter 2, pp. 42-53.
lie. The Christian, therefore, is a justified sinner. God regards him as righteous, as though it were really so.

As to the basis on which God declares the repentant, believing sinner righteous, Heppenstall answers that God declares all believers righteous by virtue of their relationship to Christ, who kept the law perfectly for them. The verdict of acquittal is reckoned to them because Christ paid the penalty for sin. Accordingly, God no longer deals with men as under the law, but as they are in relation to Christ.

The Human Side of Justification

From the human side of justification, Heppenstall comments that there are certain responses that man must make to God, such as faith, repentance, and obedience. Without these, it is impossible to become a Christian.

The first is the response of faith. Faith is the believer's right attitude. It makes him right because God is at the center of his life. Faith never leaves the believer with the idea that nothing needs to be done.

---

1SU, 56. As a sinner, the believer is no less deserving of condemnation. Justification does not change the nature of the offense. God does not come to show the sinner that he has not done wrong. Heppenstall says: "Sin does not reign, but it remains" (ibid.).

2Here Luther's concept of "simulus just et peccator" seems to be stressed by Heppenstall.

3Ibid., 56. The justified man does not believe something about himself which is not true, says Heppenstall. He knows himself an acquitted sinner. The believing sinner is made right with God. Ibid.

4Ibid., 56-57.

5Ibid., 97. Cf. Ibid., 41-42.

6SU, 58. Heppenstall remarks that justification is not automatic. It involves a reciprocity between God and man. Faith in this sense is that which desires Christ's righteousness as one's own. See also SU, 64-96, where Heppenstall discusses other aspects of faith. For further discussion, refer to SRF1, 3-4; SRF2, 3-5.
Man's second response is repentance. Both faith and repentance are closely related in the Christian response to God. Faith involves the person with Christ and His claims upon the human heart. Repentance identifies the Christian with the mind of Christ in relation and reaction to sin. Both require the total response to Christ's purpose and will. God desires the changing of the mental patterns in order to secure a transformation of the whole life. True repentance includes the idea of sorrow for sin, but this is not its main thrust. True repentance involves a permanent change of attitude. It has in mind a turning point from sin to God. This involves the whole self. Repentance is the most costly business in the world. It cost God everything to forgive men, and also costs man everything to be reconciled to God. Repentance requires that men seek personal integration on a level of life away from self and sin and toward God. It also means a decided preference for God's way of thought and life. It is a decided break with everything that God calls sin and transgression. This cannot be realized without the action and influence upon the mind by the Holy Spirit and the word of God.

Heppenstall points out that repentance has a triple perspective in relation to time. Repentance is not only a matter of past sins. It aims to deal with the "now" situation. The believer comes to see his sinful tendencies as they are in the present, with a view to their possible future manifestation and power. God intends that repentance will lead a man to regard his wrong attitudes and react to such attitudes as they would react to the evil deeds themselves. It is

---

1SU, 98. He makes a distinction between repentance and change of mind. He believes that the meaning of the Greek word metanoia essentially involves a change of heart, mind, and will. See SU, 98-101.

2Ibid., 105.

3Ibid.

4Ibid., 106.
intended to condition the believer with the insight and judgment to
discern between right and wrong before such thoughts are manifested in
deeds.\footnote{1} Repentance, therefore, requires the integration of the mind
of man with the mind of Christ. How can this integration be a reality
in man? This is done through the new birth, which is the next subject
of our consideration.

**New Birth**

Heppenstall indicates that when God put man and woman on this
planet He gave them life. Man's life continued by virtue of his union
with God. When Adam and Eve sinned, this relationship was broken. Life
from God was withdrawn. Physically, they began to die. Spiritually,
they were cut off from God.\footnote{2} Everyone since then has experienced
death. Man's life is permeated by sin, self-seeking, and death. God
did not make man to be that way. Christ came to change that, to give
new life, spiritual life. Christ's work alone radically transforms
human nature. It involves the integration of the whole human per­
sonality with Jesus Christ. All impulses, instincts, desires, and urges
pulsate with the new life from Christ.\footnote{3} This radical change is called
new birth.\footnote{4}

\footnote{1}The reason is that sin is not only an act but also an
attitude. Sin is lust; repentance is the judgment on lust in terms of
its end product, adultery. Sin is hatred; repentance is the reaction of
the mind to hatred as though it were murder. Sin is deceit; repentance
is the rejection of crooked thinking as though it were dishonesty and
stealing. Ibid., 109-110.

\footnote{2}Ibid., 121. By their own choice of a life independent of God,
they were banished from His presence. They became alive to sinning, but
spiritually dead. Heppenstall explains thus: "All of man's faculties
now functioned on the natural carnal level, outside of a right relation­
ship with God" (ibid.).

\footnote{3}Ibid., 122.

\footnote{4}Regeneration and conversion are other words used to describe
the new birth. Heppenstall recognizes that it has been argued that
there is a difference between regeneration and conversion. The first is
considered the divine side of new birth, the second the human side. For
reasons of simplicity, he prefers to use them as synonyms. Ibid., 125.
He also remarks that the Greek word *kainos* means not new in point of
Heppenstall recognizes that it is not possible to analyze the new birth and all that it involves nor how it is brought about because it is a miracle by the power of the Holy Spirit. However, he finds a parallel between new birth and the natural world. Life in the physical world and in nature is dependent upon a direct connection with God, who continually exercises His power and energy. So it is in the spiritual life. In regeneration, a bond of union is created between the human and the divine. Man is restored to a vital relationship with God, which makes fellowship between God and man possible. The regenerative communication of the power of Christ occurs in a vital relationship with Christ. Heppenstall looks at regeneration as a reversal of the original break that sin caused between God and man. With the new birth, we are once again united with God. We live within the life and control of the Spirit. The Spirit does not abrogate or absorb man's individuality, but strengthens, purifies, renews, frees, and enlightens it.

What is the response required of man in order to experience the new birth? Heppenstall answers that the characteristic of the natural man is his inclination to exercise self-will and stand independent against God. The great enemy, then, is self-will with all its time, but renewed, new in quality. See also: SRF1, 10-13; SRF2, 17-20; SRF3, 64-70.

1 SU, 128. However, our author points out that we must not interpret this analogy to mean that God operates mechanically or that His action is impersonal. Just the opposite is true. Ibid.

2 Ibid., 130. To be in Christ or in the Spirit means that the whole man is on the side of Christ, living under the control and direction of the Holy Spirit. It does not mean that the Spirit becomes incarnate in the believer, argues our author. The Holy Spirit "ever remains distinct from ourselves. He never fused or amalgamated with our spirit. He never takes over our human personality. Surrender to the Spirit leading means control by the Spirit not replacement" (ibid., 131).

3 He contrasts this control by the Spirit with the control by the evil spirits who throw their victims into ungovernable ecstasies, casting them to the floor, taking away their self-control. Ibid., 132.
attendant forms: self-love, self-exaltation, self-sufficiency.\(^1\) Christ made it clear that if any man chooses to become His disciple, he must be prepared to make a total surrender.\(^2\) However, surrender and commitment often involve a struggle with self-will. The self-willed life does not give up easily.\(^3\) There is no such thing as an incomplete surrender or partial conversion. We are either surrendered as completely as we know how or we are not. The Christian life does not consist in only giving up a few bad habits. It involves the dedication of our lives to Christ, saying "yes" to Him in everything.\(^4\) The way Christ lived in submission to the Father's will and in dependence upon the Holy Spirit demonstrates to the believer how to live in submission to Christ. Christ is the supreme witness to what commitment to the will of God means. His relation to His Father in trust and daily surrender must be our example.\(^5\) How does Heppenstall apply Christ's experience of surrender and submission to the believer? It is through the process of sanctification.

**Justification and Sanctification**

**Imputed Righteousness**

Heppenstall writes that the doctrine of righteousness by faith is frequently described theologically in terms of justification and sanctification or in other words such as imputed and imparted righteousness. He explains imputed righteousness as the reckoning of Christ's own perfect righteousness to the believer whereby he stands justified, and acquitted before God. At the same time, the believer is born again and restored to all the rights as a redeemed son of God.

\(^{1}\) Ibid., 133.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., 135.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., 134, 138.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., 136-137.
\(^{5}\) Ibid, 139, 143.
Salvation is from the guilt, the condemnation, and the power of sin. When man is justified he is delivered from the guilt and the condemnation. Freedom from condemnation comes first. It constitutes the pledge of the deliverance from the power of sin.\textsuperscript{1} For him, justification and sanctification belong together. From the beginning to end of the whole Christian life, life is lived by faith alone. Justification, regeneration, and sanctification are all part of the ongoing Christian experience.\textsuperscript{2} Salvation is not something that occurs once for all. It is an experience through which we are continually being saved.\textsuperscript{3}

Imparted Righteousness

Heppenstall explains that there are two possible interpretations of the phrase "imparted righteousness." The first refers to an entity called righteousness that is actually imparted so that one becomes more and more intrinsically righteous in its own person. This would make the progressing Christian increasingly independent of Christ's objective righteousness. Sanctification as the work of a lifetime would mean progress toward personal perfection. The conclusion is that given enough time and Christian effort the believer would reach a state of perfection comparable to that of Christ.\textsuperscript{4} Heppenstall affirms, however, that the actuality of an intrinsic righteousness, or...
an imparted righteousness, that God gives apart from Himself is found nowhere in the Bible.¹

The second interpretation of "imparted righteousness" means increased participation in the very life of Christ through faith. We become increasingly dependent on Christ. Regeneration brings us into the new life, united with Christ.² Sanctification grants one a fuller share in Christ's own life.³

In order to better understand the denotation of sanctification, Heppenstall analyzes its Biblical meaning.⁴ He finds that sanctification is the process that restores that separation caused by sin, because it is to be set apart or separated from sin unto God.⁵ The

¹He argues that a sanctified life is not something outside of us put to our account (imputed righteousness), and something that intrinsically belonging to us as Christians (imparted righteousness). He argues that "Adam's primal sin was choosing life apart from God. Sanctification as imparted righteousness can never mean choosing a life apart from God. Ibid., 149.

²Heppenstall recognizes that "what is imparted to us is the Holy Spirit's control. Christ's righteousness is never ours in any sense apart or independent of the Son of God. He adds: "It always belongs to Christ in a sense that never belongs to us. Daily surrender and commitment is the measure of the Spirit's control in the life" (ibid., 148, 149).

³Ibid., 148.

⁴Ibid., 150. Whatever is set aside or set apart for God's use and service is said to be holy or sanctified. Though the thing or the person in itself is not intrinsically holy or sanctified. It is sanctified in virtue of its nearness to God. This belonging, this dependence on God, is of the greatest importance as to what sanctification means. Ibid. See also: SRF1, 23-24; SRF2, 14-16; SRF3, 75-82.

⁵SRF3, 76. Holiness expresses a relation which consists negatively in separation from common use and positively in a dedication to the service of God. Ibid. Heppenstall finds that in the OT there are two types of holiness. First, ceremonial holiness corresponding to that of impersonal objects and depending upon their outward service to God. The second is ethical and spiritual holiness. This second one emerges out of this ceremonial holiness. Ibid. When "to sanctify" is applied to God, its meaning is not primarily ethical; the Lord's holiness is His supremacy, His sovereignty, His glory His essential being as God. The sanctification of God is thus the assertion of His being and power as God just as the sanctification of a person or object is the assertion of God's right and claim on the same. Ibid., 77.

In the NT, Heppenstall finds that the distinct feature of holiness is that its external aspect has almost entirely disappeared, and the ethical meaning has become supreme. While the ceremonial idea of
sanctified life brings everything into a right relation with God.\(^1\)

While sin is independence of God, sanctification is an acknowledgment of the claim of God's ownership of all one is and has. The sanctified Christian never elbows Christ or the Spirit out of control of his life. What is invincible is God's hold on us, not our hold on God.\(^2\) Then sanctification is more than an ethical matter as one cannot be sanctified regardless of how morally good he may be.\(^3\)

Heppenstall declares that in the Scripture, sanctification is both a completed and a continuing work.\(^4\) Sanctification is illustrated in the Bible by a marriage relationship, a lifetime of belonging.\(^5\) Sanctification always signifies a total experience of God's ownership. This total ownership is complete at conversion and should continue this way. But, the continuing work is not toward sanctification but in sanctification. The growth is always within a relationship, never outside of it. To grow in sanctification is to walk with Christ and to become increasingly like Him.\(^6\)

Holiness persists in Judaism, Jesus proclaimed a new view of morality. Men are cleansed or defiled, not by anything outward, but by the thoughts of their hearts (Matt 15:17-20). Ibid., 78.

\(^1\)SU, 152. The people who give total allegiance will live in harmony with Christ. Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid., 152.

\(^3\)Ibid., 151.

\(^4\)Ibid., 153, 154. He points out that the use of the Greek aorist tense in the different passages dealing with sanctification in the NT suggests a completed work. Moreover, the same tense affirms no partial sanctification, no partial dedication, and no partial belonging to God. On the other hand, the use of the present tense in the Greek verb speaks of a continuing work. Ibid. Cf. SRF3, 83.

\(^5\)SU, 153. There is no such thing as a partial belonging when considering one's relationship to God any more that there can be in marriage. In comparing sanctification with marriage, he ironically remarks: "To belong to one's husband or wife one day out of the week is no marriage. To belong to God one day out of seven is no sanctification" (ibid.).

\(^6\)Ibid., 154.
Only to the degree that we acknowledge the divine ownership and sonship does moral change have any Christian factor about it. Sanctification is participation by faith in the life of Christ through the Holy Spirit. From this, the Christian takes his motivation, his purposes, and his life-style. Christ is the supreme object of our love and devotion.¹

Heppenstall exposes the dangers of the false views of sanctification: antinomianism,² perfectionism,³ and the idea of "once saved always saved."⁴

In the Christian life as we daily consecrate our lives to Christ, we increasingly sense the sinfulness and selfishness of what lies deep within us. The closer we come to Christ the more sharply we feel the guilt of a sinful action.⁵ However, there should be no despair or consternation.⁶ The presence of Christ and of the Holy

¹SBD, 63-67. Here is where the study of the Word and prayer have an important role. See also "Let the Bible Be Studied," These Times, December 1975, 24-26.

²Objections to this belief have been considered in chapter 3, (55-69) where Heppenstall's view of the law was discussed.

³See the discussion on Christian perfection below.

⁴Regarding this view, Heppenstall affirms that the Scriptures teach that salvation comes only to those who continue in a state of grace. To this voluntary continuance he attaches the term perseverance (John 10:28, 29; Rom 11:29; 1 Cor 13:7-13, and others). Our author believes that it is possible to fall away after being converted (SBD, 46-47). There are also dangers in the Christian life that we should avoid in order to grow in sanctification. There is, for instance, procrastination in the things of God. Another danger is the difficulty of letting God be God in our lives. Still another is self-praise and self-seeking. For Heppenstall, the great tragedy for man is not the tragedy of the cross, but the moral and spiritual fall from righteousness and the refusal to make Christ and His cross the way to eternal life. See SU, 157-160.

⁵Heppenstall mentions that one's sinfulness and selfishness always bring disquiet, but for a good reason: "The Christian now finds himself in the very presence of One who abhors sin" (ibid., 170).

⁶"But in the hour of discovery," advises our author, "let us not give way to discouragement and make rash decisions that lead to further sin. On the contrary, let us cast ourselves before the Lord, who loves us and who came to save us from sin. Let us plead the merits and the righteousness of Christ. Let us continue to die to self and to
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Spirit when clearly understood increasingly overcomes anxiety and fear. Nothing is more wholesome for the Christian than the effect of the Spirit's presence upon the life and the mind, for He causes the beauty of Christ and His character to be seen and desired. To do this with sincerity of heart speedily brings victory and releases from the guilt and the power of sin. Sanctification as a process leads, then, to victory over sin, but to what extent? When is perfection of character and victory over sin reached? How does Heppenstall understand Christian perfection?

Christian Perfection

Christian perfection is one of the theological topics that Heppenstall has given ample consideration to in his writings. His interest in this matter was motivated mainly by the different tensions within the SDA church during his time. Considering the subject of perfection, our author points out that the truth about this topic is that which does justice to the Biblical meaning and use of the word. He holds that perfection must be possible within the framework of the Christian life here on earth, otherwise there would be no point to the Bible writers urging perfection upon believers.

Heppenstall underlines the fact that most of the problems with perfection start with the translation and use of the original word. All modern teachings on the subject are based on the English meaning of perfection, which describes it as an ideal state where sin no longer exists and all is in complete harmony with God. From this derives the

sin under the leading of the Holy Spirit" (ibid., 170).

1Ibid.
2In chapter 7, Heppenstall's view of Christian perfection is compared with that of the Pre-1950s group.
3PIP, 61, 62.
4PIP, 62.
teaching that it is possible for man to attain and maintain moral and spiritual perfection in this life. This teaching is considered by Heppenstall as perfectionism.1

In the course of the development of the idea of perfection, two qualifying terms have arisen to mark the distinction between God's perfection and that of the Christian. God's perfection is absolute.2 The Christian's perfection is relative; it is used to describe his development and growth from sin to righteousness.3 Nowhere does the Bible equate perfection with sinlessness when speaking of the child of God.4 Heppenstall concludes that these are only degrees, not different kinds of human perfection.5

Turning to Scripture, Heppenstall finds that the OT speaks of men as serving the Lord with "a perfect heart," that is, undivided in its loyalty, single minded in its devotion, not turning from the way of the Lord.6 In the NT, the most important word translated "perfect" is the Greek word teleios. The word envisions a definite stage of spiritual development for Christians of all ages. Almost invariably the word describes the achievement of spiritual maturity, established and

1 _PIP_, 62.
2 _PIP_, 62. God, in His entire person, character, and actions is perfect. In every way, morally and spiritually, nothing is deficient. Ibid. Heppenstall points out that when God created Adam and Eve, they were created perfect. Had they remained perfect in this state, they would have continued to develop in knowledge and in character. Ibid., 63. Absolute perfection is that all-inclusive, all comprehending finality of righteousness which we see in Jesus Christ. Ibid., 76.
3 Heppenstall continues by claiming that perfection is relative in various ways. For example, perfection in ability; in knowing, and in physical growth. _PIP_, 63.
4 Ibid., 63.
5 Ibid., 63.
6 Ibid., 64. Cf. 1 Kings 15:14; 2 Kings 20:3; Gen 6:9; Job 2:3. At the same time, Heppenstall points out that Scripture speaks of Solomon as a man of divided allegiance, as not being perfect with the Lord His God (1 Kings 11:4, 5). Ibid.
unmovable in the faith. The word does not depict sinlessness within the bounds of its internal meaning.

Heppenstall points out that the NT uses another term as well, namely: katartisein. Its meaning is that of being fully equipped and fitted for service in the work of the church and in the cause of God.

Heppenstall says that the word distinguishes between what is fitted and unfitted for the service of God. A Christian when fitted is not sinless, but he is brought into that full and efficient adequacy whereby God can use him in His service to His own glory.

In order to establish his position on what perfection means, Heppenstall begins from the perspective of the problem of sin. If sin

---

1Ibid., 64-65. The word is used to contrast mature Christians with those who remain spiritual babes. Cf. 1 Cor 2:6; 3:1-3; 14:20; Heb 5:12-14; 6:1-3. To refer to the aim of obtaining maturity of character Eph 4:11-13; Phil 3:13-15. It is used also to point to the achieving of some single step toward the ideal, James 3:2; Matt 5:43-48. It speaks also of a perfect heart to love the Lord and one's fellowmen with the whole heart. Cf. Col 3:14; 1 John 4:18. Ibid. See also PIP, 65-67.

2Ibid., 67. Heppenstall remarks that nowhere in Scripture is there found a believer claiming to have reached sinless perfection, even though they are designated as perfect (mature). Ibid.

3Ibid., 68. The Bible writers used this word and its cognates in addressing their hearers relative to their fitness and responsibility as Christians in the work of the gospel and in living the Christian life. Cf. Eph 4:11, 12; 1 Pet 5:10; 2 Tim 3:16, 17. Ibid., 68-69.

4"A mind that is unfitted for serving God is a divided heart, a mind weakened and its effectiveness destroyed by prevailing sin. A heart fitted for the service of God is one delivered from the power and the slavery of sin. Sin does not reign, but it does remain. Continually we allow Christ to complete and fit our lives with those attitudes and qualities that make usefulness and service effective" (ibid., 69).

5Ibid.

6As mentioned earlier, for Heppenstall, sin involves both state or condition of life and acts contrary to the will of God. In addition, man's sinful condition into which all men are born is the self-centeredness and the consequent self-will resulting from our separation from God. From this condition proceed all sinful thoughts, propensities, passions, and actions. Cf. PIP, 63. Our author declares that it is a defective view of sin that leads to a wrong understanding of perfection. He says: "If sin simply means deliberate, willful doing of what is known to be wrong, then no Christian should commit this kind of sin. But if it includes also a man's state of mind and heart, man's bias toward sin, sin as an indwelling tendency, then perfection presents a totally
is separation from God and self-centeredness, salvation begins when we accept Christ instead of self as the center of our lives, i.e., when we acknowledge Him as our Savior and Lord.¹ Sinless perfection is God's ideal for His children. Sinlessness is possible only under the condition of complete harmony with God which includes both moral and spiritual aspects. All righteousness and sinlessness spring from harmony with God. All sin springs from separation from God. Separation from God is reversed when the new birth takes place.²

As a Christian, one enjoys conscious deliverance from known sin by the power of the Holy Spirit.³ The ability to discern good and evil becomes clearer as we grow in the grace and in the knowledge of God. This does not mean, however, that we can reach a point in our spiritual development where growth is no longer needed.⁴ The closer we come to Christ, the more clearly we see our distance from the absolute perfection of God. But, God in His mercy, does not give us a full view of our sinful hearts lest we be crushed by that knowledge. He allows different picture" ("Is Perfection Possible?," Signs of the Times, December 1963, 10). See also Is Perfection Possible? (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, [1964?]), 4-5.

¹PIP, 63.

²Ibid., 64. Reconciliation is the basic fundamental of the Gospel. Heppenstall also remarks that where man is separated from the presence and reality of God in any way and to the slightest degree, there sin exists in some form. Ibid.

³Victory over all sin does not mean sinlessness according to Heppenstall. It means the glorious opportunity to strive successfully against all sin and overcome it. But it is an experience that must be maintained day by day through fellowship with and surrender to Christ ("Is Perfection Possible?" Signs of the Times, December 1963, 10-11).

⁴PIP, 77. By virtue of our physical limitations, imperfection persists, not in the sense of committing willful sin, but in the sense of coming short of the ideal in Jesus Christ. Our author affirms that there will never come a time when we do not need to repeat the Lord's prayer: "forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us" (ibid.).
the view of how sinful we are to be seen gradually as we are able to bear the truth about ourselves.¹

From conversion on, every step in our Christian life can be "perfect" in the sense that we are responding and cooperating with God to the extent and measure of the Spirit's leading in our lives.² Our transformation cannot progress beyond our discernment of the truth and of ourselves.³ In this growth, we aim at the stature of Christ, and at the same time we come face-to-face with moral and spiritual hindrance, physical paralysis, and self-assertion.⁴ We have to be aware that there are attainments which are possible only when an agelong growth and development are behind us. The ideal perfection is always before us.⁵

Christian growth presents one with paradoxes. At the beginning of our experience with Christ, we felt "no condemnation." But with the passing of time, we become more aware that we have not done all we meant to do. We have not been all we meant to be, not because we are less pure than formerly but because the Spirit is opening our eyes, refining

¹Ibid., 78. Heppenstall asserts that any sudden and total revelation from God of all that we are in His sight would shatter us beyond our ability to recover and to function. Thus he writes: "All is not revealed at the start of the Christian life. If it were, our sinfulness would overwhelm, perplex, and paralyze us. So the Spirit leads us more and more into the truth about God and ourselves" (ibid.).

²Ibid., 78.

³Ibid. As we advance in full harmony with God, we must proceed to rise to better and purer motives, aspirations, purposes, and spiritual achievement. Our mental and spiritual apprehension must continue from one step to the next, from dependence on ourselves to dependence on Christ and His righteousness. Ibid., 78.

⁴Ibid., 79. In experiencing the saving power of Christ, we see the powerlessness of our resolves and the need to realize our frailty, trusting fully and depending entirely upon the power of redeeming grace. Ibid.

⁵Heppenstall points out that God's method of salvation is not eradication of a sinful nature, but the counteraction of it by divine power through the Holy Spirit ("Is Perfection Possible?," Signs of the Times, December 1963, 10-11). Thus he writes: "Only through the continual, day by day operation of the Holy Spirit is our sinful nature counteracted. The sinful nature is not eradicated until the day of the resurrection" (ibid., 11).
our taste, and heightening our sensibility.\footnote{Faults once hidden are now discovered. Secret sins once overlooked or not understood are now keenly felt. The purer taste exposes that which once was unsuspected. The consciousness of sin has come to us, not because evil has been gaining ground upon us, but because our love of righteousness has become more intense. Moral weaknesses and deformities will never give us more anguish than when we have drawn closer to Christ’\textsuperscript{(PIP, 80).}} It is not the most imperfect Christian who feels imperfection most, but the Christian who is daily becoming more like Christ.\footnote{Ibid., 80.} This dissatisfaction with our moral and spiritual state at any point along the way to the kingdom is the result of stronger aspirations and deeper spiritual desires.

Turning our attention to God’s grace and its relation with perfection, our author finds that grace is entirely apart from every assumption of human worth and sinless perfection. He holds that grace is the eternal and free favor of God manifested toward the weak, the guilty, and the unworthy.\footnote{Ibid., 82. Grace belongs where human sinfulness exists. It super abounds over human weakness. Sinners are the only persons with whom grace is concerned. Every moment, we live by and are saved by God’s inexhaustible grace. \textsuperscript{Ibid., 81-82.}} Saving grace summons us to confess our sinful state until we see Christ face to face. Heppenstall comments that what is sure in salvation by grace is not that our lives are magically transformed into sinlessness, but rather that victory is made complete in our weaknesses.\footnote{Ibid. Salvation by grace means being shaken loose from the folly of implanting our ego at the center with the belief that we must arrive at sinless perfection to be sure of salvation. \textsuperscript{Ibid.}}

The command to be perfect centers in our capacity to love as God loves. Heppenstall attests that in order to love God with all our hearts and our neighbors as ourselves, we must be partakers of Christ’s perfect love.\footnote{Ibid., 83. To manifest this love means we share in the essential life and quality of God’s love. Those who have this love are in complete harmony and oneness with Christ. \textsuperscript{Ibid.}} Perfection in love envisions our living in Christ and Christ living in us. To interpret perfection to mean “sinlessness” has
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the tendency toward conformity to norms, rules, commandments. It brings
distress and anxiety.¹ In contrast, the love of Christ awakens love in
our hearts, makes us sharers in His ideal, His purpose, and His mission
to save the lost. Christ's presence in our hearts causes us to reach
forward from what we are to what we ultimately will be.²

Heppenstall calls attention to the importance of avoiding
rigid, legalistic interpretation when speaking of perfection.³ It must
be centered in Jesus Christ. Our supreme goal is found in the gospel of
salvation, in righteousness by faith. Therefore, the doctrine of
perfection must not be derived from an analysis of men, but rather from
the character of God and the person of Jesus Christ.⁴

Therefore, for Heppenstall, Scripture teaches that spiritual
maturity and stability is possible in this life, but not sinless
perfection. Perfection in the Bible describes a right relationship to
God, a full commitment, a mature and unshakable allegiance to Jesus
Christ. It means to walk with God so that we are never alone in our
lives. It is to let the Holy Spirit flood our lives with God's love so
that we hold holy communion with Christ and our lives are poured out in

¹Ibid., 85. Following this conception, religion tends to be
filled with anxiety and a sense of guilt at every infraction of the
rule. This can easily lead to communication of displeasure, disap­
proval, rejection of those who differ from us and do not do exactly as
we think they should do. Heppenstall mentions that those who stress
this perspective are more concerned for what people should do and should
not do than for what they really are as whole persons and children of
God. Ibid.

²Ibid., 86. Speaking about Christ's ideal and purpose for us,
Heppenstall explains that it is too great to be grasped and understood
at once. Our possession of Him and His possession of us brings hope to
our hearts, causing us to reach forward from what we are to what we
ultimately will be. We are saved by hope. Ibid.

³He refers to a slavish following of the letter or obedience to
a checklist.

⁴Ibid.
This raises the question, What is the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer?

The Function of the Holy Spirit

Heppenstall recognizes the vital importance of the coming and the work of the Holy Spirit. Since Christ's resurrection and ascension, there was to be in the world the presence of the Third person of the Godhead. Heppenstall believes that we need to give the Holy Spirit His rightful place. He is convinced that no other power is available to us to help overcome sin than the power of God's Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit who applies the benefits of the work of Christ to man. Men come under either the control of the Holy Spirit or under the control of demonic powers.

As Christ's substitute on earth, the Spirit is to be the Captain of our lives, to inspire courage and total allegiance, a power for triumphant living. The work of the Holy Spirit was not to diminish the work of Christ, but to effect in the lives of men the reality of who Christ is and what He wrought in His own person. Only the Spirit can bring the saving knowledge and power of Christ to man. Without the work of the Holy Spirit, Jesus remains to us just a figure of history who lived two thousand years ago. The Spirit makes Christ's victory become part of our life and experience.

How does the Holy Spirit work in men? The Christian should live his life wholly involved and dependant upon the presence and control of the Holy Spirit. However, Heppenstall recognizes that the

---

1Ibid., 88.
2Ibid., 176.
3It is important to notice that the failure to experience the fullness of the Holy Spirit explains the failure of Christian living and service. Heppenstall remarks that the neglect of the Holy Spirit is as disastrous as the neglect of Christ when He was on earth. Ibid., 176.
4Ibid., 180.
Christian retains his moral autonomy.\(^1\) In his view, the Spirit is no blind force working on emotionally misguided recipients overwhelming the mind.\(^2\) The work of the Spirit is to bring back to the disciples' mind all the things that Jesus taught. The Holy Spirit takes truths about Christ, His work, and His Word and produces an experience in agreement with, and obedience to that Word.\(^3\) The Spirit leads the believer to experience a deeper and a more diligent study of God's word and obedience to it. He adds nothing new to Jesus Christ or to the Word of God. He adds everything to the disciples. He gave their lives meaning and purpose. He is God's power which man needs to overcome sin.\(^6\)

The presence of the Spirit in the lives of the believers empowers them to convert people, not to startle them.\(^5\) For those who put their trust in Him, it is impossible that they should be lost and defeated at last.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) He points out that the leading of the Spirit is not removed from the normal process of the thinking mind. In all the leading and teaching of the Holy Spirit, the human mind is to be preserved. Ibid., 185.

\(^2\) Ibid., 182. (Eph 4:30; 1 Thess 5:19). Heppenstall believes in God's respect for man as a rational and responsible being. God respects the freedom of choice. He says that God can use no methods or bring no pressures to bear that vitiate man's personal integrity and freedom of choice. The Christian faith is supernatural but it is never irrational. Ibid., 184.

\(^3\) Ibid., 183-185.

\(^4\) The power of Christianity is the power of the Holy Spirit. Without spiritual power, religion is only a form. Sin in the life is a power, not a form. The form of religion cannot possibly meet the power of sin. There must be a corresponding power to meet sin. This power is the Holy Spirit. Ibid., 198-199.

\(^5\) The power the people most need, Heppenstall observes, is to find the divine resources adequate for daily living, to forget themselves in loving concern for the lost, to bear witness to their Lord even to death and face it all with a sense of assurance, peace, and security. Ibid., 198.

\(^6\) Ibid., 205.
Conclusion

In summary, we can say that regarding the results of the act of redemption on the believer, Heppenstall finds that justification, new birth, sanctification, and Christian perfection are part of the divine process to restore man from sin to oneness with God. The Christian, in order to overcome sin, has to work in the opposite way that sin works. If sin is independence from God, he has to surrender completely to God. He has to accept God's saving righteousness. Heppenstall understands the meaning of justification to be to declare a person righteous not to make the person righteous. This is the reason that sanctification is important. Sanctification is the experience of continual growth in the likeness of Christ. In becoming like Christ, the believer achieves Christian perfection. However, Heppenstall understands Christian perfection in the sense of maturity and surrender to God. He holds that the believer never can reach a time that he can say that he attained a sinless life. It is only at Christ's second coming that this kind of perfection will be possible. The power that enables the Christian to live a holy life in maturity and in complete harmony with God comes from the Holy Spirit. It is through His power that sin can be overcome. For those who put their trust in Him, Christ's victory becomes part of their life and experience and complete salvation will be the final result.

It should be noticed that Heppenstall devoted a large portion of his writings to the discussion of subjects related to salvation as well as Christological issues. The theological debates of the times were responsible for this. Furthermore, it can be inferred that

---

1 The discussion with Martin was whether the law is a bondage for salvation. The debate with Brinsmead was on the eschatological dimension of salvation. The issues with the Pre-1950s group were in relation with Christian perfection here and now. Even the debate on the sinful/sinless nature of Christ was in relation to the way one can overcome sin just as Christ did. The death of Christ has greater relevance because it gives the assurance of salvation.
salvation was the doctrine that led Heppenstall to appraise his views on the law and covenant, sin and original sin.¹

Because of the manner in which Heppenstall relates redemption to the doctrine of sin, the groundwork for his understanding of salvation is laid. It was mentioned earlier that the doctrine of sin and the nature of man are foundational in the consideration of Heppenstall’s system.² In order to understand Heppenstall’s soteriology, one needs to be aware that salvation is closely related to his views on sin and the nature of man.³ Heppenstall remarks that the plan of redemption is God’s answer to the problem of sin. He ties the word “righteousness” to God’s answer to the sin problem. He explains that God’s plan to redeem man stands in contrast to the human race where none is righteous. Here is where his view of the nature of man enters into consideration. He underscores the concept of man’s total depravity. This directs him to seek in God’s righteousness the answer to the sin problem. Here is where Christ becomes the center of man’s salvation.

For Heppenstall, the divine source of saving righteousness is Jesus Christ, His person, and His work on earth. Here alone God has

¹The questions raised when analyzing his view on the covenants were directly related with the purpose and function of the divine plan of redemption. When he discussed with W. Martin the law as a bondage, the issue was salvation. When he was disputing with Brinsmead the eradication of sin in the human soul, the issue was salvation. When he argued sinless perfection against the Pre-1950s group, the issue was in the same area. Thus, it can be inferred that salvation was Heppenstall’s departure point for the conclusions he reached on law, covenant, sin, and original sin.

²It is interesting to notice that in his SRF1, SRF2, SRF3, Heppenstall considers the issue of sin together with the other issues of salvation. However, in his book SU, he deals with sin briefly and pays more attention to the nature of man. The issue of sin and original sin is dealt with more extensively in his book MWG. The reasons for this shift are considered in chapter 7.

³The way salvation is understood depends on his concept of sin. In the same way, one’s view on the nature of men determines the understanding of the way how sin has affected man’s faculties and the method of his salvation. Heppenstall was clear of this fact. In his syllabi and his book SU, the first issues discussed are sin and the nature of man. The process of salvation is discussed afterwards.
revealed the righteousness that man needs. To be saved, then, man needs a revelation from God, not a new set of requirements.

He says that saving righteousness involves the fulfillment of the law, though it is not achieved nor produced by the law. Saving righteousness proceeds from a right relationship to Christ and not out of man's relation to the law. Our obedience to the law comes as a result of our saving relationship with Christ.

For Heppenstall, justification, new birth, sanctification, and Christian perfection are part of the divine process to restore man from sin to oneness with God. The Christian, in order to overcome sin, has to work in the opposite way with sin. If sin is independence from God, the victory over sin is total surrender and dependence upon God. It is here where the work of the Holy Spirit takes a crucial role. He is convinced that no other power is available to us to help overcome sin than the power of God's Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit who applies the benefits of the work of Christ to man. He is the power of God which is needed to overcome sin.

Even though Heppenstall believes and appreciates the results of Christ's redemption, there still remain some questions he has to answer. If Christ died and fulfilled His mission, Why then does sin still exist? When will the conflict with sin terminate? When will the plan of redemption be completed? When will the Christian be completely delivered from the presence of sin? Where is Christ and what is He doing? These are the issues of our next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX

THE WORK OF JUDGMENT: CONSUMMATION OF REDEMPTION

Thus far two parts of God's plan of redemption in Heppenstall's system have been analyzed, namely, the promise and the act of redemption at the cross and its results. The third part of his plan, the work of judgment, is considered in this chapter. We noted previously that for Heppenstall redemption and reconciliation are closely related. According to our author, the work of reconciling the world to Christ is accomplished in three stages. The first one is the atonement at the cross where Christ brought redemption to sinful man; the second is the priestly ministry of Christ in heaven; and the third, is the work of judgment. The subject of our attention in this chapter is to see how Heppenstall grasps Christ's mediatorial ministry and His work of judgment. Before doing this, it is necessary, however, to consider the way Heppenstall relates the aspects previously mentioned to the doctrine of the sanctuary. This is necessary because he derives from the types and symbols of the earthly sanctuary the elements to establish his views on Christ's heavenly ministry and the work of judgment. In Heppenstall's theological system, the sanctuary plays a

1 For an analysis of the difference and the scope of redemption and reconciliation, see chap. 2, pp. 36-39.

2 OHP, 29-30.

3 He asserts that the revelation of the sanctuary is centered in Jesus Christ. It foretold His atoning death and His high-priestly ministry in heaven and the final judgment. He points out that all the typical services in the earthly sanctuary pointed to this. Furthermore, he adds that the sanctuary revealed the scope of redemption and judgment, the love of God to sinners, and the determined opposition of God.
key role, and it is the subject of many of his writings. It is necessary to describe the services of the earthly sanctuary in order to see how Heppenstall correlates them with the priestly functions of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary and the work of judgment.

to the satanic forces. For him the key to disclose the destiny of the world and the salvation of man still resides in the heavenly sanctuary (OHP, 16). He asserts that "God's battle plan and movements from the sanctuary should be thoroughly studied and understood" (ibid., 18).


2 From an Adventist perspective, the traditional method of studying Christ's heavenly ministry is, first, to study the earthly sanctuary and its services and from this to analyze Christ's ministry in heaven. Heppenstall follows the traditional way in his syllabi. However, in OHP, he develops his views addressing questions commonly raised when studying these doctrines. In some way, it seems that the criticism of Walter Martin and others caused him to address the issues following this approach. In discussing this aspect, we follow the traditional way because it is more logical to follow the subjects.
The Purpose of the Earthly Sanctuary

Heppenstall points out that the central and supreme purpose of the earthly sanctuary was that God might dwell among the people of Israel.\(^1\) God's plan was that through the sacrificial services of the sanctuary performed by His chosen people His character would be revealed to the world.\(^2\) Through the typical and sacrificial system of the earthly sanctuary, God brought within the reach of the sinner the divine method for the redemption of the race and the eradication of sin.\(^3\)

Christ and the Earthly Sanctuary

The Levitical sanctuary, according to Heppenstall, was far more than Israel's meeting place of worship. Its very structure and services symbolized the heavenly sanctuary in which God dwells.\(^4\) It also symbolized the Incarnation of Christ.\(^5\) The sanctuary's location in the center of the camp of Israel signified God's presence in their midst. It had the purpose of giving man access to God.\(^6\) The outer

\(^1\) 2SBD, 4. He bases his assumption on the following Scriptural references: Exod 25:1-10; 29:45; Lev 26:11-13; 2 Sam 7:13; 1 Kgs 6:12-13; Zech 2:10; 2 Cor 2:16; Rev 21:3.

\(^2\) He says that "by means of sacrifices and priestly ministrations God promised and revealed the divine method of redemption that was to come in and through Jesus Christ. In this way Israel was to be a light to the nations, that the gospel might go to the ends of the earth. Israel had been elected to prepare the world for the coming of Christ" OHP, 15-16. Cf. 2SBD, 4.

\(^3\) OHP, 15-16.

\(^4\) OHP, 15, 19.

\(^5\) 2SBD, 4. Cf. John 1:14. Heppenstall holds also that it represented "the twofold nature of Christ. The external plainness in contrast with the internal beauty and glory of the tabernacle signified the lowliness of Christ's humanity and earthly state, and yet the beauty and glory of His character and holiness of His inner life (ibid.)."

\(^6\) Ibid.
court, the materials, the furniture, the garments, and the holy and most holy places were all types of Christ's ministry.¹

Heppenstall remarks that the earthly sanctuary should be studied in the light of the heavenly and not vice versa.² Although he accepts the reality of a heavenly sanctuary,³ he also stresses that the heavenly sanctuary is not a replica of the earthly.⁴ No amount of the knowledge of the earthly sanctuary can adequately reproduce God's work upon His throne.⁵ In this heavenly sanctuary, Heppenstall sees Christ


²SDAT, 1. Even though he recognizes the importance of studying the services and symbols of the earthly sanctuary, he tries to avoid the danger of literalism in the interpretation of these symbols. He points out that if one takes the earthly as the exact yardstick to measure the heavenly, one can fall in grave errors in the conclusions. Heppenstall, instead, proposes to study the sanctuary doctrine with the purpose of comprehending the spiritual truths and overall truths of the great plan of salvation (ibid., 2).

³He points out that there is a specific location and a specific temple in heaven, a specific place of the presence of God as distinguished from the idea of omnipresence. Christ ascended to be seated at the right hand of the Father, in a real sanctuary (Heb 8:2, 5; 9:9, 23-24; 1:3) and on a specific throne (Acts 7:49; Ps 11:4; Ezek 1 and 10) (SDAT, 1).

⁴SDAT, 2. Heppenstall argues that Moses did not see the earthly as the exact replica. The words used in the Bible in reference to the earthly sanctuary are "pattern," "example," "figure," and "type" (Exod 25:8; Heb 8:1-5; 9:9; 10:1). Moreover, the word used in Heb 10:1 is skia which means "not the very image," but only the shadow, something opposed to the actual thing itself (ibid.).

⁵OHP, 20. "We see in the earthly sanctuary no full and decisive revelation of our great High Priest in heaven. Christ is not engaged in lighting lamps, turning over loaves of bread, or swinging incense burners. The realities do not reside in places, materials, or architectural design, but in divine activity brought to bear upon the living situations of the great controversy itself" (ibid.).
engaged in the work of a High Priest. The question now arises as to what the nature of this work is? This is the subject of our next section.

The Heavenly Sanctuary

Christ's Ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary

The earthly sanctuary in any one year had two important aspects: the daily and the yearly services. The daily or "continual" ministration, explains Heppenstall, was performed every day throughout the year.¹ The yearly came at a fixed time and ended within the limits of a natural day.² In point of time, he locates the daily ministry of Christ beginning after the cross and terminating at the end of the prophecy of the 2300 days of Dan 8.³ With regards to place, he locates the daily ministration of Christ in heaven, on the throne at "the right hand of the Father."⁴

¹Because the regularity of its succession, this daily burnt offering was called the "continual" or the "daily." Cf. Exod 29:39-42; Num 28:6, 2SBP, 21-22.
³2SBP, 24. Heppenstall substantiates his views as follows: The work of Christ supersedes the work of the earthly sanctuary. The earthly sanctuary and the Aaronic priesthood ceased at the cross (Dan 9:27; Matt 27:51; Heb 2:17; 4:14-16; 6:19-20; 7). Christ's ministry could not begin in the heavenly sanctuary before the cross or before His ascension since in order to be our mediator and priest Christ needed to take on human nature and present Himself as a sacrifice at the cross (Heb 9:11-28) (ibid.). Besides, the heavenly sanctuary, like the earthly, must be anointed before the services could begin. Heppenstall interprets the expression "to anoint the most holy places" of the prophecy of the 70 weeks of Dan 9 as the anointment that Christ had to perform in the heavenly sanctuary before beginning His heavenly ministry. See OHP, 141-155. The prophecy of the 2300 years in Dan 8 and about the 70 week of Dan 9 is discussed in a further section of the present chapter.
⁴2SBP, 24. The difference of interpretation in the location of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary between Heppenstall and other Adventist theologians is discussed in chapter 7.
Heppenstall correlates the daily or continual services performed in the Levitical system to that of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.¹ In the former, the priests offered the daily offering every morning and evening.² Heppenstall points out that this ceremony was significant since it "symbolized the daily consecration of the nation and their constant dependence upon the atoning blood of Christ."³ The daily sacrifice was a "provisional atonement" until the person could personally appear at the tabernacle and offer his individual sin offering.⁴

Besides the continual sacrifice, there were also daily individual sacrifices.⁵ Heppenstall notes that in these sacrifices a pouring forth of the life-blood was made before the Lord. A legal atonement was before Him. The covering or atonement provided by such

¹A contradiction seems to exist in relation to the previous statement that the earthly sanctuary should be studied in the light of the heavenly and not vice versa. However, it seems that Heppenstall understood this statement in the sense that the Jewish sanctuary/temple should be understood in the light of the information revealed in the Scriptures especially in the NT and not to try to find interpretations starting from the types and symbols of the earthly sanctuary.


³This is a quote from E. G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, 352.

⁴Here Heppenstall follows M. L. Andreasen who wrote: "When an Israelite had sinned he was to bring an appropriate offering to the temple and there confess his sin. It was not always possible, however, to do this. An offender might live a day's journey, or even a week's journey, distant from Jerusalem. It was impossible for him to come to the temple every time he sinned. For such cases, the morning and evening sacrifice constituted a substitutionary and temporary atonement. It provided a covering until such a time as the sinner could personally appear at the tabernacle and offer his individual sin offering." Andreasen concludes that the daily sacrifice provided for "unconfessed sins." See M. L. Andreasen, "The Daily Service," Review and Herald, October 25, 1945, 12.

⁵In this case there were voluntary offerings in contrast to mandatory offerings such as the sin and trespass offerings. Four classes of sin and trespass offerings are mentioned in this text, SBD, 21-22. Cf. Lev 5-6.
sacrifices symbolically foreshadowed the blood of Christ and the covering for sin provided by the sacrifice of Christ.¹

Concerning the transfer of sin into the sanctuary, Heppenstall addresses the question whether if sins went into the earthly sanctuary or a record of those sins went into the sanctuary of old. Did the record of all sins go into the OT sanctuary? In his view the record of sin is kept, not the actual sins; the record of sin went into the sanctuary. The sanctuary is defiled by the sinning of the individual not by his confession.² Then, sins were not transferred by means of the blood of the sacrificial offerings.

The typology of the earthly tabernacle leads Heppenstall to ask a further question, i.e., How are sins transferred into the heavenly sanctuary? He recognizes that all sins are recorded in the heavenly sanctuary.³ However, sins are not transferred by blood, since not all

¹The Lord accepted the life of the animal as a valid substitute for the life or blood of the penitent believer. No longer was the sinner the object of the wrath of God, 2SBD, 22. Cf. Lev 16:16; Heb 9:22-23.

²He opposes the view of Andreasen that sin is transferred by the confession of the sinning individual. Heppenstall asserts that if this were so, the sins of the congregation not taken care of before the day of atonement would not be blotted out. Furthermore, there is no provision for Satan’s personal sins, since if all sin is transferred by blood, no blood is shed for Satan (2SBD, 22-23), cf. 26. Cf. Andreasen, The Sanctuary Service, 179.

³2SBD, 26. Heppenstall holds that the Scriptures clearly teach that the recording of all sins during the OT times went into heaven, even though this is not in all respects typified in the earthly tabernacle. This is part of the Jewish concept of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16, 23). Dan 7:9-14 mentions that there exist books of records in heaven. Moreover, the NT writers give testimony that every one has to give an account of his deeds (Acts 17:31; Rom 2:16; 14:10; 1 Cor 4:5; 2 Cor 5:10; Matt 12:36). Paul mentions that there are sins that go beforehand to judgment and there are those that come after (1 Tim 5:24-25; Acts 3:19-20). This includes confessed and unconfessed, and even Satan’s sins (Eccl 12:13-14; Jer 17:1-2) (ibid.). See also SDAt, 10.
sins are atoned for.\textsuperscript{1} Sin is not cancelled, the sinner is only released from the condemnation of sin.\textsuperscript{2}

If sin is typologically transferred by blood which defiles the sanctuary, he raises the question, Does the blood of Christ defile or cleanse the sanctuary? Here our author asserts that the blood of Christ does not defile the heavenly sanctuary.\textsuperscript{3} He asserts that the blood does not record but it makes the recording valid. Sins are recorded when they are committed, not when they are confessed.\textsuperscript{4} Therefore, God has to discriminate between the righteous and the wicked in judgment in order to at the same time justify one and condemn the other.\textsuperscript{5}

The purpose of the records of the believer that are kept in heaven will vindicate God and His government in the judgment. These records, at the same time, will hold Satan responsible for sin. It will also give God the right to eradicate sin as well as Satan from the

\textsuperscript{1}2SBD, 26. To justify his view, Heppenstall explains that a transfer of sin would require that the individual sinner go along, since sin is not something distinct or separate from the sinner. Furthermore, sin cannot enter heaven and remain in the presence of a holy God and holy angels (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{2}This assertion is made following the thought of K. G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, 357.

\textsuperscript{3}2SBD, 26. He affirms that "the NT always speaks of the blood of Christ as exercising positive action. Nowhere does the blood of Christ defile. Only sin defiles" (OHP, 58). Heppenstall affirms that the blood is central in the work of salvation, since it cleanses (1 John 1:7; Rev 1:5), it justifies (Rom 3:24-25; 5:9), it reconciles (Eph 2:13), it redeems (Eph 1:7; Col 1:14; Rev 5:9), and it sanctifies (Heb 10:29; 13:12), (ibid.). See also SDAt, 11-12.

\textsuperscript{4}2SBD, 26. "The sanctuary is not defiled by the confession of the sinning member but by the sinning of the individual. The cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven is not from sin but from the record of sin" (ibid.). Heppenstall differs in this respect with other Adventist theologians. This issue is further discussed in chapter 7.

\textsuperscript{5}Heppenstall interprets the transfer of sins both from a divine and a human perspective, because the judgment judges both God and man. From the divine perspective, it must prove indeed that God has the answer to the sin problem, both in regards to this government and in the lives of His subjects as well. From the human perspective, the believer must be shown to be righteous through the blood (i.e., righteousness is both imputed and imparted), SDAt, 12.
All this must be done in the judgment previous to His second coming. This is the reason why, in Heppenstall's view, the judgment precedes Christ's second coming.  

Christ's Mediatorial Ministry in Heaven

Heppenstall relates the function of the high priest of the earthly sanctuary to that of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. The function of a high priest was to mediate between God and man. The word mediator is defined by Heppenstall as referring to the office of the Son of God, which is the medium and agent of the divine work of God in behalf of men. The basis on which Christ mediates is spoken of in the Bible as the covenant or agreement. Thus Christ is the mediator of the everlasting covenant. He is the one and only mediator between God and man.

1 Heppenstall says thus: "It is the record that is kept of the believer, the judgment or examination of that record proves that God does have the true answer to sin, that He is not responsible; that Satan alone is responsible. Once this is done the charges of Satan will be completely refuted; sin and the originator of sin can be completely eradicated. This is the central truth of the day of atonement, the right for God to eliminate sin and Satan from the universe," SDAt. 12.

2 Ibid. It is important to note that, for Heppenstall, the process of judgment has three stages. The first is the judgment that is previous to Christ's second coming; this is called by Heppenstall the pre-Advent Judgment (OHP, 201-217). The second stage of the process of judgment is realized after Christ's second coming during the millennium; this is done by the saints, and it is of an investigative nature (2SBD, 77). The last stage of this process is realized after the millennium in order to execute judgment upon the wicked and bring Satan and sin to a final end. After this God will create a new earth (2SBD, 75). A further discussion on these stages is given below.

3 OHP, 51.

4 2SBD, 14. See also SDAt, 3.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The alienation that resulted from sin, explains Heppenstall, brought the need for this mediatorial system both in type and anti-type.\(^1\) Besides, mediation is necessary for a true representation of God's character,\(^2\) and for the reconciliation of man to God.\(^3\) This mediation by which pardon and salvation is offered to man is due solely to the loving character and grace of God.\(^4\)

Regarding Christ's mediation, Heppenstall affirms that it is eternal.\(^5\) Christ has pursued this mediation in preserving all things, through the Incarnation, in redemption, and in the heavenly sanctuary.\(^6\) The priestly ministration in the earthly sanctuary was a type of Christ's ministry, although some basic differences remain. In the Levitical ministry, the sacrifices had to be offered continually. The priesthood was not permanent since all priests were mortal. Nor could the sacrifices be sufficient since they could not cleanse from sin. The

---

\(^1\)\textit{OHP}, 51. Heppenstall remarks that the need for a mediator must be understood not only in the light of sinful man but also in relation to heavenly beings. Since the work of Christ the Mediator is to bring all holy beings into perfect union and fellowship with God, Heppenstall believes that the work of Christ as the One Mediator engrosses the attention of terrestrial and invisible witnesses (\textit{2SBD}, 14).

\(^2\)Christ reveals the Father, His person, and His character. In Christ alone Deity is revealed. Cf. Heb 1:3; John 1:14; 18; 14:8, 9, ibid., 15.

\(^3\)Ibid. "All men are born 'without God in the world' (Eph 2:12). In this lost estate man stands apart from God. Christ came to restore that relationship, to make possible access to the living God. Without this priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, man could harbor only 'a certain fearful looking for judgement' (Heb 10:27). The nature and depth of the sinner's need requires a corresponding supernatural mediatorial ministration" (\textit{OHP}, 52).

\(^4\)Ibid.

\(^5\)\textit{2SBD}, 15-16. Cf. \textit{SDAt}, 4. This view is held also by E. G. White whom Heppenstall quotes thus: "Christ was appointed to the office of mediator from the creation of God, set up from everlasting to be our substitute and surety. Before the world was made, it was arranged that the divinity of Christ should be enshrouded in humanity," E. G. White, \textit{Review and Herald}, April 5, 1906, 9.

\(^6\)\textit{2SBD}, 15-18; \textit{SDAt}, 4.
priests' access to God was restricted due to the sin of the people.¹
In Christ, however, we find a once-for-all sacrifice, an everlasting priesthood, a fully complete atonement for sin, and a continual presence before God.² Because He is the Son of God who became man, He is fitted in all ways to be man's savior and Advocate before our Heavenly Father.³ As our Advocate He promotes God's glory, the good of His people, and the honor of the law.⁴

The Importance of Christ's Heavenly Ministry

The ministration of Christ in and from the heavenly sanctuary is vital to Heppenstall's understanding of the divine process of reconciliation. According to our author, as we have seen, the work of reconciliation and the reunion of the world with Christ is accomplished in three stages. The first of these is the atonement at the cross where Christ brought redemption to sinful man. However, for Heppenstall,

¹The earthly sanctuary was only a lesson book, comments our author, who adds: "The sacrifices of animals never took away sin. Hebrews 10:4. The lamps never lighted men's minds. The loaves of bread never fed men's spirits. The blood of bulls and goats never redeemed a soul. All was typical of Christ and His work of redemption," Heppenstall, "Anchored to Christ," Signs of the Times, June 1966, 15.

²The differences are pointed out by Heppenstall making the following contrasts: In the Levitical services, animals were sacrificed; they had no choice. Christ gave Himself in sacrifice. The Levitical sacrifices were never complete, but were repeated day after day, year after year; Christ died but once. The Levitical sacrifices cleansed only externally and ritually, but Christ atoned completely for the sin of the world. The Levitical priests were mortal men; but Christ has an incorruptible priesthood and a power of an endless life. The Levitical priesthood functioned always from a distance, with Deity veiled, but Christ has entered into the sanctuary to appear before God on our behalf (OHP, 52-53). See also, SDAt, 5.

³OHP, 53-55. Heppenstall explains why Christ is our mediator before God: He knows the Father as no other being does. Since He became man, He knows well the situation of His brethren here on earth. Our wants, our necessities, sins, temptations, trials, infirmities are better known to Him than to ourselves. He also has full understanding of the law of God, which all men have broken. Moreover, "He gives repentance. He ministers forgiveness and takes away sin. He offers what man desperately needs. He alone meets the spiritual wants of man" (ibid., 54).

⁴Ibid., 55.
restoration to oneness was not consummated at the cross. The sin problem had not yet been resolved. The cross is the supreme act of God for man's redemption, but is only one aspect of Christ's work toward the final at-one-ment. Reconciliation, for Heppenstall, has two perspectives. The first one has a general scope related to the final process of atonement. The second has a particular and existential dimension, and it is related to a process that is effected in the present by the living Christ in the believer.

Heppenstall relates Christ's death with His heavenly ministry when he says that by His death Christ began a work of reconciliation which after His resurrection He ascended to complete in heaven. Therefore, the Christian must live in terms of two perspectives: what Christ did for man on the cross, and the continued ministry of redemption and judgment from the heavenly sanctuary. This is the reason why, for Heppenstall, Christ's intercession in man's behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death on the cross. This is why the second stage, that is, the

1 OHP, 29.
2 OHP, 29. The offering of Himself as a sacrifice and the entering upon His priestly ministry in heaven belong together, because, in both aspects, Christ is engaged in the work of reconciliation or atonement (ibid., 49).
3 OHP, 29-30. Heppenstall presents an existential perspective of the process of reconciliation, when he writes: "At-one-ment is experienced only as men daily live a life of trust and dependance on Him. The ultimate redemption of all things unto Himself can never be achieved until man is won to a life of unwavering faith and obedience. It is the living Christ of the present who saves, redeems, and reconciles" (ibid.). However, Heppenstall maintains a balance in this perspective when he comments that "it is important to distinguish between the action and direction of God in and from the sanctuary above and their effects upon human understanding" (ibid., 22).
4 Ibid., 23. He does not deny in any way the complete atonement for sin made once for all at the cross. He recognizes, however, that "following the work of Christ on earth there is another vitally important work in heaven before the sin problem can be resolved" (DD, 164).
5 OHP, 23.
reconciliation process, i.e., the priestly ministry of Christ in heaven is necessary.¹

The successful accomplishment of the purpose of God through Christ's priestly ministry makes possible the eradication of sin and Satan and the establishment of the kingdom of God.² This aspect is part of the final reconciliation which still remains to be realized, not only in every believer but also in this earth and the universe.³ The third stage of the reconciliation process Heppenstall calls the work of judgment.⁴ However, before discussing this last stage, it is necessary to consider what are his concepts regarding the nature of this heavenly ministry.

Nature of Christ's Priestly Ministry

Because Christ is a priest forever, it is important to understand what the priestly work that He continues to perform amounts to. It cannot be to offer sacrifices since He did that once for all on the earth.⁵ His work is that of intercession.⁶ In that work of

¹OHP, 31. He affirms that it is a theme that the NT writers refer to repeatedly. Heppenstall quotes Heb 8:1; 7:25; Rev 1:12-13, 20; 1 Tim 2:5; 1 John 2:1, etc. (OHP, 17). This stage includes His intercession and representation before the Father in our behalf, and the guidance of the church to its ultimate triumph.


³OHP, 30. "Sin still manifests itself in the hearts of moral and spiritual creatures, the work of reconciliation must go on. In one sense, the atonement has been made. In the sense of universal harmony it is still to be realized. The moral and spiritual victory of Christ on the cross was not immediately apparent in the eradication of sin. The world still requires direction from God until neither sin nor death prevails" (ibid., 30-31). See also: "Anchored to Christ," Signs of the Times, June 1966, 15; "How God Works to Save Us," These Times, February 1973, 12-15.

⁴This aspect is dealt with below.

⁵This is not to say that Christ's sacrifice on earth has no further significance in heaven. On the contrary, Heppenstall remarks that Christ entered upon His work as High Priest in heaven in the power of His sacrificial offering at the cross. Then he explains: "redemption took place at the cross. The efficacious application of that redemption
intercession, His shed blood plays a key role since it is at the
foundation of Christ's work in heaven. The cross is the basis of all
negotiation and redemptive activity.¹ It is the basis for all our
appeals.²

Christ is also our advocate.³ Always at the right hand of
the Father, He waits for His children to call upon Him. In addition,
part of Christ's intercessory work is to protect His people against the
temptations and accusations of Satan.⁴ They may rely on Him with
perfect confidence.⁵ How Christ's intercession is conducted, in what
in the life of the believer is realized by Christ's work in heaven,"
OHP, 55.

¹The literal meaning of the word intercession is "to pass
between." To Heppenstall the word denotes mediating between two parties
with a view to reconciling differences. It includes also every form of
acting in behalf of another, particularly, the pleading in behalf of man
to God (OHP, 55-56). Cf. A. Oepke, "Mesitiæ, mesiteïco," Theological

²He writes thus: "The repentant sinner cannot appeal to any­
thing else, for nothing else is available. Before God, men can plead
only the merits of Christ's sinless life and His perfect sacrifice"
(ibid., 58-59).

³This is a legal term, explains Heppenstall. An advocate is
one who appears in a court of justice to represent the person accused,
an attorney for the defense. "Christ our Advocate does not plead our
innocence before God, for no man is innocent before God. He does plead
His merits because the sinner can make no claim on His own behalf. So
Christ is said to 'appear in the presence of God for us' (Heb 9:24)"
(OHP, 56).

⁴Ibid., 61. Christ came to destroy the work of the devil (Heb
2:14-15). He defeated Satan at the cross (John 12:31-32). In the heav­
enly sanctuary, Christ continues the same work, refuting the accusations
of the adversary. For those who claim the merits of Christ, there is no
condemnation. Inspired and strengthened by the intercession of Christ,
they are victorious over the prince of darkness (ibid.).

⁵OHP, 56. "When they sin and repent He will plead for pardon.
When they are accused He will proclaim their vindication. When they are
tempted He will pray that their faith fail not. He is a merciful and
faithful High Priest. In Him all the love of God flows out to men. He
form He advocates for us, Scripture does not say, comments Heppenstall. With whom is Christ interceding? Does He need to plead with His Father in order to persuade Him to do something He is reluctant to do? Obviously not, affirms Heppenstall. Evidently, intercession is part of Christ's unique role in the plan of redemption.1

Benefits of Christ's Intercession

Christ's mediation holds further benefits for sinners. It grants us perfect security2 and helps us to develop moral purity in our lives.3 Because faith that works by love is our response to the living God, obedience to His will and to His Word is involved.4 The living is the same in the heavenly sanctuary as He was upon the earth" (ibid., 57).

1Explainiong this aspect, Heppenstall says thus: "Each member of the Godhead has specific functions to perform. Ever since sin entered the universe Christ has voluntarily chosen a subordinate position. Christ came to bear witness to the Father. The Holy Spirit bears witness to Christ. Each is concerned to reveal complete trust and confidence in the other. Christ's work of intercession is part of the original arrangements, as was His sacrifice. By this arrangement Christ honors the Father and the Holy Spirit honors the Son" (ibid., 61-62).

2By His intercession Christ mediates eternal life in spite of our decay. Our final salvation in Christ is rendered secure, not by self-confidence in one's righteousness but in humble dependence on our divine advocate with the Father. The heavenly sanctuary is the place of hope for all who follow Christ in His work of intercession (ibid., 63).

3"By means of Christ's intercession, believers turn from sin to righteousness, learn to love what God loves and hate what He despises. The expulsion of sin from life is the result of the communication of Christ's very life within us. Victory over sin proceeds from this divine source" (ibid., 65).

4Ibid., 72-73. As it was previously mentioned, Heppenstall holds that obedience to the revealed Word is part of the evidence that faith is genuine. Salvation by faith is not an escape from obedience to the law of God. Rather it is proof that we have chosen freely to live in harmony with Him at every point where His Word speaks to us. That is the reason why faith is inevitably linked up with the Word of God (ibid.). In order that faith may be able to make a complete commitment to obey the word of God, it necessarily involves knowledge. That kind of knowledge requires the grasp of eternal truths. Heppenstall recognizes that it is possible to reduce this knowledge to mental understanding and no more. However, he remarks that nowhere in the Bible does intellectual understanding of the Word stand in opposition to saving faith. Faith involves the affirmation of the intellectual objective truth of the Word as well as total commitment to obey the word of God.
Christ quickens the whole being to live in harmony with Him. This obedience is made possible by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.¹

Thus far, we have discussed Heppenstall's understanding of Christ's mediatorial ministry in the light of the earthly sanctuary. We have noticed that the sanctuary is the basis of understanding Heppenstall's view of Christ's heavenly ministry. Christ's heavenly ministry applies the benefits of Christ's act of redemption. One is the complement of the other. Christ's ministry in heaven still has the same purpose of reconciliation and redemption. The problem of sin is the basic issue of contention. Through Christ's mediation the promises of the eternal covenant are fulfilled in the believer. The law is written in the heart of the believer and Christ is directing the church toward the final reconciliation and the eradication of sin. How will Christ achieve this purpose? This is the subject of our following section.

**Christ's Work of Judgment**

It has been mentioned above that Heppenstall considers the sanctuary doctrine the key to understand the whole scheme of the plan of redemption.² It is in this doctrine that he finds also the basis for understanding the last stage of the work of redemption and reconciliation, i.e., the work of judgment.³ Since the sanctuary is of major importance in God's dealing with the sin problem and redemption,⁴ Heppenstall affirms that it is the object attack from Satan and his

¹OHP, 73-74.
²Ibid., 16. "If one wishes to understand the whole truth about God's plan of redemption from the entrance of sin to the ultimate destruction of it, one has only to study God's work in the sanctuary in heaven and the type here on earth" (DD, 163).
³Ibid., 14.
⁴OHP, 141.
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human agencies on earth. He remarks that it is significant that both Daniel the prophet and John the apostle declare Satan's opposition to be directed against the sanctuary of God. This is the reason he addresses the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation in order to understand God's final movements in the eradication of sin. Moreover, the prophecies unfold "to men the last phase of Christ's priestly work leading to the vindication of God and His people." To better understand Heppenstall's perspective, it is necessary to briefly set forth his interpretation of these prophecies.

1 He writes thus: "It becomes apparent at once that Satan's warfare against God focuses upon God's sanctuary and God's throne, and thereby upon His sovereignty" (ibid.)


3 OHP, 157. Heppenstall acknowledges that the prophecies of Daniel predict and interpret the events in historical perspectives. In these visions, the prophet beheld salvation history, the development of the great controversy between Christ and the forces of evil. These visions contain a definite sequence throughout, leading up to the "time of the end," which Daniel emphasizes as essential to the eschatological picture (ibid., 141). Heppenstall finds that this is true in the visions of the great image (Dan 2), the four beasts, the horns, the 1260 years, and the judgment of Dan 7; the ram and the he-goat, the little horn, the 2300 days and the 70 weeks of Dan 8 and 9. It is important to notice that Heppenstall finds that these prophecies parallel many of those found in the book of Revelation, and also predict events preceding Christ's second coming. About the book of Revelation, Heppenstall comments that it "is the book of the lamb; but the lamb is not upon the cross. He is on the throne in the heavenly sanctuary" (DD, 163). Both books, he points out, in their visions, cover salvation history. Expressing these thoughts through figurative language and symbols, Daniel and John saw the events and nations as they were related to the kingdom of God. This kingdom was to triumph over every opposing force that set itself against the divine government. In this way, they anticipated the consummation of the great controversy to be realized at the end of time, when the God of heaven will establish a kingdom that will stand forever (ibid., 141-142). See also DD, 160-163; "The Year-Day Principle in Prophecy," Ministry, October 1981, 16-19.

The Preadvent Judgment of Daniel 7

Heppenstall regards the vision of Dan 7 as presenting the history of the world from the time of Daniel to the final triumph of the people of God and the establishment of God's everlasting kingdom. Following the historical sequence of the various powers that arise one after another, Heppenstall determines that the time when the judgment begins is the period during which Papal Rome exercised supremacy on the earth. It coincides with the time when the thrones were placed and the Ancient of days did sit (Dan 7:9-10). It is when Christ, the Son of man, "approached the Ancient of days and was presented to Him" (Dan 7:22). This coming of Christ to the Father, explains Heppenstall, does not refer to Christ's return to the Father at His ascension, nor to His


1 OHP, 114. Heppenstall points out that Dan 7 is structured in three parts: First, the vision is declared and recorded as Daniel saw it (1-14). Second, Daniel is disturbed by the vision, and the angel responds with an interpretation (15-22). Third, again the angel returns and interprets the disturbing aspects of the vision (23-27). The references to the judgment climax the three parts of the explanation of the vision. Cf. Dan 7:10, 22, 26. (OHP, 110-11). In this vision, the kingdoms and powers of the world, symbolized by these wild beasts and horns, exercise dominion in succession on the earth until the divine court holds judgment (ibid.).


3 This judgment throne was set at a very special time. Our author claims that in the biblical text the coming of the Ancient of Days, God the Father, His being seated on the throne, reveals the beginning of a great assize when God calls the judgment into session. In addition to the throne of God, thrones in plural are mentioned. Evidently, this is a court scene with the celestial jury also involved in the work of judgment. He concludes that since this court scene takes place in the heavenly sanctuary, we must look for the beginning of a new phase of the sanctuary ministration that involves a work of judgment (OHP, 111-112).
second coming.\(^1\) It refers to the beginning of the judgment in the heavenly sanctuary before Christ’s second coming.\(^2\) Heppenstall finds that the beginning of this judgment in the historical sequence of Daniel’s prophecy is quite conclusive.\(^3\) The judgment comes after the 1260 years of papal supremacy and persecution of the saints, then locating the beginning of judgment soon after 1798.\(^4\) It does not say, however, when it will end or how long it will last.\(^5\) It is in this prophecy of Dan 7 that Heppenstall finds the basis of his understanding of the judgment.

\(^1\)OHP, 112. It cannot refer to the Christ’s ascension because no books were opened and no judgment began at that time. The judgment time in Daniel comes after the long period of persecution of the church. Christ’s second coming can be neither, Heppenstall says, because Christ’s second coming is to the earth not to the Father (ibid.).

\(^2\)Ibid., 117. This vision does not picture God as executing judgment on the earth but refers to a judgment taking place in heaven. Heppenstall believes that the reason for this judgment which takes place in the “most holy place” of the heavenly sanctuary is because judgment belongs to God. He will make sure of a righteous judgment, something that no man can do (ibid.). The results of this judgment is a verdict in favor of the saints. The saints inherit the kingdom as a result of this judgment (Dan 7:22). Therefore, affirms Heppenstall, this judgment is prior to the time when the kingdom shall be given to the saints of the Most High (Dan 7:29); that will happen when Christ returns (ibid., 112).

\(^3\)Ibid. Daniel in 7:25 and John the Revelator in Rev 12:14 locate the time of the judgment by the phrase “a time, and times and a half a time.” John uses this phrase interchangeably with “a thousand two hundred and threescore days” and “forty and two months” (Rev 12:6; 13:5) (ibid.).

\(^4\)Ibid., 113. Heppenstall remarks that Daniel places the rise of the “little horn” within its 1260 years of dominance. Its rule began after the rise of the “ten horns,” which came about as a result of the breakup of the Roman Empire, a breakdown which occurred shortly after the last of the Roman emperors in the west in A.D. 476. The time of its raising is further indicated when the “little horn” uprooted three of these ten horns that came into power as a result of Rome’s collapse in the west.

“This apostate power was to rule for a period of 1260 years. The period of papal supremacy began when the emperor Justinian, in A.D. 533, decreed the pope to be supreme in temporal and religious authority in the Western world. This became effective in A.D. 538. This period terminated when the pope was taken prisoner in 1798” (ibid.).

\(^5\)Ibid., 114.
In seeking to understand the nature of this judgment, Heppenstall points out that this heavenly assize involves both sides in the controversy and predicts the triumph of God's people as well as the overthrow of the powers hostile to God.\(^1\) With the opening of the books of heaven (Dan 7:10),\(^2\) God affirms not only the triumph of His people and the destruction of the hostile powers but that a new order is being established.\(^3\) The judgment will vindicate God's decisions and His character.\(^4\) This judgment also determines who has the right to rule

\(^{1}\text{OHPE, 115. Cf. Dan 7:22, 26-27. "There are clearly two parties and aspects of this judgment--judgment is against the enemies of God and for the saints. Any interpretation of this judgment that follows the 1260 years must therefore include both of these aspects" (ibid.). This judgment of God from His sanctuary will reverse in favor of the saints the verdict of history. The divine verdict carries with it the promise of vindication, because of the long period of the horn's monstrous activities against God and His people, and because the saints have been so long the object of man's condemnation and persecution. It also will "carry world dominion, everlasting salvation, and the kingdom of God" (ibid., 115-116).}\

\(^{2}\text{The role of the books in the judgment is not merely incidental but they constitute God's records. They constitute the major part of the evidence before the court. Our author points out that only twice are the books of judgment opened: the first time, following shortly after the 1260 years. The second time will occur at the end of the millennium (Rev 20:11-13). Heppenstall explains that in Dan 7 the opening of the records are prior to Christ's coming in order to render a final verdict that will vindicate the saints. In Rev 20 the opening of the books is in connection with the judgment and final destruction of the wicked. "Both judgments require an opening of the same books. The first opening involves the destiny and the reward of the righteous; the second involves the destiny and the punishment of the wicked. In both cases God condescends to let the facts be known" (ibid., 118).}\

\(^{3}\text{Ibid., 117.}\

\(^{4}\text{Ibid., 118. Another reason for the opening of the books, according to Heppenstall, is that it is God's answer to the warped record of history (ibid., 122). The saints have suffered opposition and persecution for 1260 years by the apostate power of the little horn. During this time, righteousness has been suppressed, error has been triumphant, and millions of Christians have been unjustly condemned and slain. Unless God intervenes, the saints stand in jeopardy. God's answer to their plea is a judgment that will reverse the verdict of men. In this judgment God contradicts the decisions of men and the false claims of the religious powers are rejected (ibid.).}
over the peoples of the world.¹ What ultimately assures dominion to Christ is the universal acknowledgment of God's character of righteousness and love.²

But if the righteous are to be at the judgment bar, how is it that Jesus announced for the believer freedom from judgment?³ To Heppenstall, Christ did not promise freedom from judgment but freedom from condemnation. The records will reveal the saving relationship that has existed between Jesus Christ and the believer.⁴ The judgment will show who has stood loyal to God and to His truth in the midst of the demonic and apostate powers that have sought to destroy the earth.⁵ In the penitent's case, no condemnation is involved, the opening of the books can only contribute to their joy and security.⁶

¹The word Sholtan is a key word in Dan 7. It means the "right to rule," explain our author. This chapter contrasts the rule of various world powers with the sovereign rule of God. The nations and powers had wrestled one another's kingdoms by sheer force of arms. This power complex is finally changed, not by a further show of force and physical might, but by a divine judgment (ibid., 123).

²If the issue were one of force, the controversy would have been settled when sin arose, comments Heppenstall, for God is omnipotent. Satan and his representatives lose because their characters and lives are utterly at variance with God. Both the righteous character of God displayed throughout the struggle between Christ and Satan and the character revealed in His people make possible a verdict that dominion, the right to rule in the earth, belong to them (ibid., 123-124).

³Heppenstall makes reference here to the statement of Jesus in John 5:24.

⁴OHP, 121. The certainty of a verdict in the believer's favor arises in behalf of the repentant sinner. The Christian is able to stand before judgment only as his life is hid with Christ in God. Ibid., 120. Relating this to Daniel, Heppenstall declares that nowhere in Dan 7 do the saints appear to stand in jeopardy before the bar of God. The result of this judgment will be the fulfillment of all that God promised them in Christ. It will be a judgment in their favor. The Son of man stands before the Father in defense of the saints (Dan 7:21-22) (ibid.).

⁵OHP, 124-125.

⁶Ibid., 125. Heppenstall underlines that for the saints this pre-Advent judgment will result in a true and blessed verdict for eternal life, a verdict that gives Christ the right to lead His people into their inheritance when He returns to share with them the dominion and the kingdom (ibid.).
Focusing the attention on what aspects are considered in the judgment, Heppenstall points out that in the Scriptures, the judgment is invariably according to works. This assertion evidently raises questions that Heppenstall himself points out: How is man to be saved by grace and by Christ's righteousness? What possible place can works have in the judgment? Furthermore, "if judgment is according to works, does this not require the life devoted to good works rather than to one's relationship with God?" Does not this approach negate salvation by grace alone and make of no effect the forgiveness of God?¹

Heppenstall tackles the issue asserting that the Bible says two things about works: on the one hand, there is no salvation by works²; on the other, good works are an essential part of the Christian life and basic to the righteous judgment of God.³ Thus good works are in no way opposed to the gospel; they are part of it.⁴ Judgment according to works means judgment according to both the law and the gospel.⁵ Our author explains that if works are so crucial and decisive, it is because they involve the whole man. They form a clear basis of evidence in the judgment. They are the measure of one's whole life.

¹Ibid., 131-132.

²Heppenstall quotes Gal 2:16; Eph 2:8-9; Rom 4:2, 4-5; 9:31-32; 11:16 (ibid., 132).

³He uses the following texts: Eph 2:10; 5:1-11; Matt 5:16; 1 Pet 2:11-12; Titus 1:11; Rom 13:12-14 (ibid.).

⁴Ibid. However, when works are regarded as the means to gain merit before God and achieve salvation, they are at variance with salvation by grace (ibid.).

⁵Heppenstall refers to: Jas 2:10-12; Rom 2:12-16; John 14:15; 1 John 5:3. He comments that there is nothing vague and obscure about these passages. They demand obedience to the commandments. Love is the fulfilling of the law, not its denial or neglect. There is nothing that so completely destroys man's relationship to God as disobedience (ibid., 133).
The deed is better or worse than the idea. In order to enter into the kingdom of God, a certain quality of life is required. This is in contrast to those who are ultimately condemned.

In relation to the time of this judgment, Heppenstall observes that obviously a man's fitness must be determined before Christ returns. If a man's life is not changed here and now, it will be too late then. The pre-Advent judgment will reveal what a man has become here in relationship to the will of God; whether he loves light more than darkness. Loyalty to God is essential. Loving obedience honors God. Disobedience dishonors Him. The judgment will declare who did or did not obey God. In the judgment, Christ cannot proclaim a verdict contrary to the facts. God's demands are not impossible, since He has granted the power of the Holy Spirit to transform sinners into Christ's likeness and to fit them for the new earth where there is only righteousness.

1Ibid., 134-135. Thus the deed of adultery brings consequences that nothing can eradicate. The actual adultery injures lives more than does lust. Stealing is more disastrous than covetousness. Likewise, the effect of good works exceeds altogether the simple desire to do good. Loving thoughts are good for the one thinking them, but loving works produce more loving relationships. Good or evil works are a clear testimony of the choices a man has made and will make. These good or evil works will inevitably determine his destiny at the bar of God (ibid.).

2Ibid., 136-137. Heppenstall recognizes the fact that the right of God's people to the kingdom is not founded in their works of faith and love. That right was won by Christ. However, he argues that obedience through the Spirit manifested in works of faith prove that they are in possession of that right (ibid.).

3Ibid. "If a man does not delight in the law of God now, he will not delight in it then. If a man will not submit to the Lordship of Christ here, he will reject Christ's sovereign rule then" (ibid.).

4Ibid. For Heppenstall, it is unthinkable that whereas Christ magnified and honored the law by His perfect obedience (Isa 42:21), the Christian will dishonor it by disobedience. Christ's perfect righteousness releases the believer from the law's curse and condemnation, but not from obedience to it. Faith does not make void the law (ibid., 138).

5Ibid.
In conclusion, Heppenstall's view of the significance of the prophecy of Dan 7 lies in its application to the very age in which we live. For him, the judgment message is important because it is the call of God to all men to righteousness of life, to personal responsibility and preparation for the return of Christ.¹ The intense power of moral and spiritual laxity in our time has brought the world to the verge of total disaster. In the midst of this departure from God, the believer should make a new commitment to prepare himself for the Day of the Lord so that God's truth and grace may not have been granted to us in vain. It is in Christ's second coming where the hope of God's church rests.² Dan 7, therefore, is the first aspect that leads Heppenstall into the understanding of the judgment which is the final phase of salvation history that climaxes with Christ's return. However, Heppenstall also finds that two other chapters of the same prophet shed light on the same issue; consider Dan 8 and 9.

The Seventy Weeks' Prophecy

Following the analysis of Daniel's prophecies in chap. 7, Heppenstall points out that in Daniel 8 and 9 most of the attention and the action revolve around the sanctuary. The work of Christ our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary is pictured from two perspectives, the one beginning at the end of the 70 weeks and the other at the end of the 2300 days. The first is climaxed with the words "to anoint the most

¹Ibid., 126. This final message is also found in Rev 14. Heppenstall indicates that here too the text clearly shows that this is a pre-Advent judgment. This judgment message confronts the world with the last warning prior to Christ's return. Only those who stand the full light of God's investigation will emerge victorious and effectual (ibid.). See also DD, 170.

²OHP, 128. The purpose of the judgment message of Rev 14 is to direct the people of God to pierce with the eye of faith through the mist and darkness of our time to the throne of God in the sanctuary, to maintain their loyalty to Him in the hour of temptation that shall come upon all the world (ibid.).
Analyzing the prophecy of the 70 weeks, Heppenstall asserts that all the events stated in this prophecy were to take place within the Jewish nation and history (cf. Dan 9:24). The seventy weeks of years were the time left to the Jews as a nation to fulfill God's original purpose in making them His people. Within this period God had fixed the time for the first advent of Christ and His redemptive work on the earth. The events of the final week described in Dan 9:24

1OHP, 142. See also "Daniel 8:14 in Perspective," Ministry, October 1956, 29-31; 2SBD, 37-38.

2To Heppenstall, the "seventy weeks of years" as the Revised Standard Version translates, actually means 70 periods of 7 years each or 490 years. This long period reaches from the restoration of the Jews to the time of Christ. While the 70 years of captivity were a judgment of God upon an idolatrous nation, the 70 weeks of years promised deliverance and an opportunity to fulfill God's plan for them. This prophecy, therefore, was a message of hope for Israel. This historical perspective included not only Israel's return from captivity but also the realization of the Messianic hope during the 70th week (OHP, 144).

3Ibid., 142. As indicated by Gabriel, "Seventy weeks of years are decreed concerning your people and your holy city" (Dan 9:24). Daniel's concern throughout the chapter is largely with the return of the Jews to the land of Judah and with the restoration of the sanctuary and the city of Jerusalem. This is why all the events stated in this prophecy were to take place within the Jewish race and history (ibid., 143).

4Ibid. From the time of Abraham, the people of Israel were part of God's great design in the world. Through them the revelation of God was to be disclosed. To this end, God had brought them out of Egypt; and again He returned them from their Babylonian captivity (ibid., 146). "God chose and sought to fashion the Jews to be His supreme instrument in proclaiming the law and the gospel and to prepare the world for the coming of the Messiah" (ibid., 147). In spite of all their history of rebellions and frequent repentance, God's purpose remained the same until the coming of Christ. Jewish history was the core of salvation history. It was concerned with the coming of the Messiah. Repeatedly, the Jews thwarted God's purpose (ibid.).

5Ibid., 144. The 70 weeks were divided into three periods, explains our author. The first of 7 weeks; the second of 62, and the third of one week. The 7 weeks and the 62 weeks reached "unto Messiah the Prince." The third period of one week of years included events that involved the supreme act of God for the redemption of man (Dan 9:26-27, 24). Christ was to die sometime during the 70th week (ibid.).
were determined by God to accomplish His purpose through His Son.\(^1\)

Eventually, however, the Jews rejected Christ and refused to be God's ministers for the life and salvation of the world.\(^2\) Following their rejection of Jesus Christ as the Messiah and their refusal to accept the gospel proclaimed by His disciples, the Jews were subject to the final judgment under the Romans.\(^3\) The 70 weeks of years came to end and the nation lost its opportunity. Apart from Christ, the Jews have no future in the divine plan.\(^4\)

Apart from the Jews' role in the plan of redemption, the prophecy addressed specific issues relative to the sanctuary. Thus Christ caused the "sacrifice and the oblation to cease" (Dan 9:24). He also was to "anoint the most Holy" (Dan 9:24),\(^5\) a reminder of a ritual

---

\(^1\)Namely, to finish transgression, to put and end to sin, to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Heppenstall explains that the first three involve Christ's atonement, the fourth the gift of righteousness in the life of Jesus Christ, the fifth to seal vision and the prophet, that is to confirm the 70-week prophecy in particular, attesting it as true and genuine. He points out that all these events belonged to the messianic hope and were realized in the redemptive work of Christ on earth. The return of the Jews from the exile only began the fulfillment of the prophecy. The 70th week was the turning point of Jewish history as a nation. This was the day of their visitation (ibid., 148).

\(^2\)Ibid. The Jewish people had looked for this day and for a King and Savior. When He came, they crucified Him because He was not the Messiah they wanted. Christ was the central truth to which the 490 years pointed. Apart from Him, the earthly sanctuary at Jerusalem with its elaborate religious rituals and carefully constructed ceremonies had no purpose (ibid., 149).

\(^3\)Ibid., 150. The end of the 70 weeks proclaimed the judgment of God, not only on Israel but also on their earthly sanctuary (Dan 9:26-27). Heppenstall explains that "in A.D. 66 they rose in revolt against their Roman rulers. Jerusalem fell in A.D. 70. The Temple was totally destroyed; the services of the earthly sanctuary were no more. Rising again in A.D. 132, they were put down with savage brutality and almost wiped out. All Jews were banished from Jerusalem, and many thousands were sold as slaves throughout the empire. These revolts led to their end as a nation" (ibid.).

\(^4\)Ibid., 149.

\(^5\)The Hebrew expression used here is \textit{godesh godashim}, the plural form meaning "holy places." Heppenstall finds that in the OT this expression refers to the various aspects of the holy and most holy apartments of the sanctuary. (Cf. Exod 29:30, 36; 30:25-28; 40:9-15; Lev
which took place at the beginning of the priestly ministration in the sanctuary. All the parts of the sanctuary and its priests had to be anointed before the services started. According to Daniel's prophecy, Christ was to anoint the holy places within the 70th week. If indeed the earthly sanctuary was about to come to an end, the one to be anointed prior to the start of Christ's priestly ministry was none other than the sanctuary in heaven. The 70 week prophecy establishes a transition from the earthly to the heavenly sanctuary. The anointing of the heavenly sanctuary took place following Christ's ascension with a view to the beginning of Christ's priestly work. The book of Hebrews affirms time and again that Christ was "made" a high priest. In the Levitical system, in addition to the offering of the sacrifice on the altar, there was the presentation of its blood before God in the sanctuary. In the same way, affirms Heppenstall, Christ, following His sacrifice on the cross, enters into the presence of the Father, henceforth man's representative and High Priest. For Heppenstall, the prophecy of the 70 weeks is of enormous importance. It is the link that helps to understand the transition from the levitical ministry in the earthly sanctuary to the heavenly ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. However this prophecy of the 70 weeks is linked to that of 8:10-12; Ezek 43:12). The phrase is used 44 times. In the OT it refers to the place of the sanctuary not to a person or persons (with only one exception 1 Chr 23:13). He argues that it is a poor exegesis to adopt one doubtful use that differs from other 43 uses as a basis to say that this phrase in Daniel refers to the person of Christ (ibid., 151).

1Ibid., 152.
2Ibid., 153.
5Ibid., 155.
the 2300 days of Dan 8. What is their relation? This is the subject of our next section.

Daniel 8 Prophecy

Before considering this aspect, it is important to notice that Heppenstall finds that the prophecy of Dan 7 and that of chap. 8 are historically and prophetically related. Not only is the prophecy of chap. 8 closely related to the vision of chap. 7 it further amplifies it. The vision of Dan 7 revealed that God would end the historical succession of powers and thus of the little horn by a work of judgment proceeding from the heavenly sanctuary beginning at the end of the 1260 years. In Dan 8, the divine intervention occurs at the close of the 2300 years, when the holy place was to "emerge victorious" (Dan 8:14 NEB).

Heppenstall expounds chap. 8, pointing out that after briefly interpreting the vision of the ram and the he-goat, Gabriel quickly moves to the central theme of the vision, namely, the little horn's offensive against the God of heaven. Strong language and superlative

---

1In fact, the prophecies of Dan 7-9 are intimately related. Heppenstall points out that "the sanctuary in heaven, its anointing, the inauguration of Christ's ministration represented by the "daily" and the yearly, are the central theme of Daniel's visions. Dan 9:24 reveals its anointing and setting up; chap. 8:11-14 its casting down; and Dan 7:9-14 and 8:14 its restoration and cleansing" ("Daniel 8:14 in Perspective," Ministry, October 1956, 30).

2OHP, 160. Heppenstall indicates that the repetitions and similarities between the two chapters are evidently intended as additional elucidation and emphasis. This is indicated in part by the deep anxiety that Daniel feels over the monstrous activities of the little horn against God and His people that Daniel did not understand (Dan 7:28). Daniel's desire was to understand the work of the little horn, particularly as his work affected the sanctuary of God (ibid.).

3Ibid., 160-161.

4Ibid., 161. Its offense is fourfold: first against Christ, "the prince of the host" (8:11); second, against the truth of God, "it cast down the truth to the ground" (8:12); third, against the saints of the holy people (8:24); and fourth, against the sanctuary of God, "that divine center where God reigns and ministers salvation, treading down the sanctuary and its services (8:11, 13)" (ibid.).
comparisons are used to describe the overpowering apostate activities of the little horn.\textsuperscript{1} Heppenstall rejects the interpretation that this little horn could be Antiochus Epiphanes.\textsuperscript{2} It refers to pagan and

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Ibid.}, 161. "Exceedingly great," "even to the host of heaven" (8:9-10), "magnified himself even to the prince of the host" (8:11), "it practiced and prospered" (8:12), "transgression of desolation" (8:13), "king of fierce countenance" (8:23), "destroy wonderfully" (8:24). Heppenstall comments that this description is an appalling picture of a religious power in opposition to God. No wonder that all this brought great anxiety to the prophet (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{2}\textit{Ibid.}, 162. Biblical scholars have interpreted this "little horn" as Antiochus Epiphanes. For a historical description of the different interpretations of this prophecy see: Samuel Nuñez, "The Vision of Daniel 8: Interpretations from 1700-1900" (Th.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1987), 12-394. Heppenstall finds several reasons why Antiochus Epiphanes cannot be the little horn of Dan 8. First, Christ, in Matt 24:15, applied the term "abomination that maketh desolate" to the Roman armies which did destroy both the city and the sanctuary in A.D. 70. Here Heppenstall comments that Jesus Christ at least included pagan Rome in this perspective, extending far beyond any literal interpretation of the 2300 days. Next, Antiochus did not completely destroyed the city or the sanctuary. He left them standing (Dan 8:13;9:26). Third, the little horn was to exercise his destructive power until the close of the 2300 days. These 2300 evenings and mornings for some mean literal days, for others 1150 days. Neither of these periods of days reaches from the time when Antiochus Epiphanes invaded the sanctuary and stopped its services to the time when they were restored; the historical record is very clear and specific. Fourth, the little horn is said to "wax exceedingly great" (Dan 8:9). Antiochus ranked less than "exceedingly great" when compared with either Medo-Persia which "became great" (8:4) and Alexander who "waxed very great" (Dan 8:8). Fifth, the little horn is said to arise "in the latter time of their kingdom" (8:23), that is the latter time of the four kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was divided. They lasted from 301-31 B.C. Antiochus ruled from 175-163 B.C. Within its own dynasty, he is located about the middle of the years of this kingdom. Sixth, the little horn is said to stand up against Christ, "the Prince of princes" (8:11-25). If the reference is to Antiochus' opposition to God's kingdom on earth, Antiochus was not successful. Because the outcome of his war with the people of Judah was an independent Jewish nation. The desecrated temple was restored and independence won within twenty years. Seventh, the vision is stated to be for the "time of the end" (8:17, 19). What end could this mean?, asks Heppenstall; obviously, the vision as applied to him, could not mean the Seleucid kingdom, or the end of the Jewish independence, or the end of the age. The phrase seems quite meaningless when applied to Antiochus. These are the actions and the characteristics which Heppenstall holds have nothing that correspond to Antiochus, and which are in fact contradictory to his character and rule (OHP, 162-164). See also "The Year-Day Principle in Prophecy," \textit{Ministry}, October 1981, 16-19.\textsuperscript{3}
Heppenstall indicates that the most striking feature of the little horn's apostasy and opposition is its attack upon the sanctuary and its services (Dan 8:11, 13). Our author connects the expression "the daily" of the former verses to the daily services of the sanctuary. He explains that an attack upon the "daily" is an attack upon the sanctuary. There being only two sanctuaries, one on earth and the other in heaven, the "daily" referred to must refer to either one. In Heppenstall's view, the prophet is speaking of the heavenly. All the

1SBD, 27-32. Pagan and papal Rome, with special emphasis upon the latter, are described by Heppenstall as the "little horn" for several reasons: The Papacy has substituted a false mediatorial system by inaugurating an earthly priesthood in place of the heavenly ministry and priestly work of Christ. It also claims to mediate salvation through sacraments, particularly the mass, opposing the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit and the work of Christ as only Mediator. Its appeal to the worship of Mary and its emphasis on prayers to the saints add to its misrepresentation of Christ's work (ibid.). See also OHP, 176-177.

2SBD, 27. The word "daily," comments Heppenstall, occurs no fewer than 102 times in the OT and has reference almost invariably to the daily or continual ministration in the sanctuary service. The expression is used to distinguish the regular or daily service of the sanctuary from the yearly as seen in Exod 29:37; Num 28:3; 1 Chr 16:39-40; Heb 7:27 (ibid.). Heppenstall explains that the emphasis is not upon the sacrifice, but upon the continual nature of the priestly ministration. It refers to the whole temple service offered daily by the priests to mediate forgiveness and redemption. The "daily" services, he writes, typified God's continual and complete provision in Christ's priestly work for those who come seeking forgiveness and salvation (OHP, 168).

3SBD, 27. In support of his views, Heppenstall explains that when Daniel speaks of the "daily," the "sanctuary," and the 2300 "evenings and mornings," he uses the language of type, as other Bible writers do, though this does not exclude the heavenly sanctuary as part of the vision. Besides, Jesus identified the "abomination of desolation" description of the little horn with pagan Rome and its destruction of the city and the sanctuary in A.D. 70, from which it has never recovered nor been rebuilt. In addition, the prophecy and the divine perspective are eschatological. Phrases such as "the time of the end" and "many days" point to the far distant future. The only sanctuary to be involved beyond A.D. 70 is the heavenly sanctuary. Next, the "taking away the daily" and "casting down the sanctuary" are found in all the prophetic time periods of Daniel. In Dan 8, they are tied to the 2300 days. In Dan 11, they are tied with the persecution of the saints (11:31-36). In Dan 12, taking away the "daily" is linked with the 1260, 1290, and 1335 years. All these statements have at least one thing in common: they involve the attack on the sanctuary and its ministry and are inevitably tied to these prophetic time periods that extend to the
sanctuary services pointed forward to Christ our High Priest, to both His sacrifice on earth and His priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Daniel, when speaking of the "daily" and the sanctuary and the 2300 "evenings and mornings," is using the language of the type. This, however, does not exclude the heavenly sanctuary as part of the vision.\(^1\)

As far as the duration of the prophecy is concerned, Heppenstall holds that the 2300 days symbolize years not literal days. It appears impossible, indeed, to explain satisfactorily the great issues portrayed in these visions in literal terms.\(^2\)

It is remarked by our author that the cleansing of the sanctuary is the major issue in Dan 8. Heppenstall finds that vindication of God's character is closely related to the cleansing of the sanctuary. The Hebrew word used in Dan 8:14 for "cleansed" is **Tsaddq**.

---

1\(^{Ibid.}, 166.\) Other Bible writers also use the language of the type when speaking of the heavenly sanctuary and Christ's ministration there. Thus John, twenty years after the destruction of the earthly sanctuary in Jerusalem, saw different features of the sanctuary. The only sanctuary in existence when John wrote the book of Revelation was the one in heaven, yet he uses the language of the type to describe it (ibid.). Cf. Rev 1:12, 20; 5:6; 8:3; 11:19. Heppenstall also adds that salvation history begins with the earthly and moves to the heavenly as antitype fulfills type. This is apparent in the sacrifice and ministry of the Levitical priests as compared with Christ's sacrifice and priestly ministry. Daniel's vision embraces both, for they are part of the plan and purpose of God in Jewish and Christian history (ibid., 173). See also "The Year-Day Principle in Prophecy," Ministry, October 1981, 16-19.

2\(^{OHP, 173.\) Here he recognizes that there are two different interpretations regarding the time period of this prophecy. One group that believes in a literal time period referring to the earthly sanctuary. This group interprets it as meaning a literal defilement of the earthly sanctuary by an invasion to its sacred places, by erecting idol shrines to pagan gods, and by stopping the Jewish daily services for a literal period of 2300 or 1150 actual days. The second group believes that it refers to the heavenly sanctuary holding that the time period is prophetic (one day equals one year or the year-day principle). They assert also that the sanctuary and the "daily" refer to the heavenly sanctuary. This group sees the issues in terms of a conflict between opposing religious systems, ideas, and doctrines. The controversy is between Christ and the antichrist (ibid., 172-173).
Its basic meaning is "to justify." Thus, the sanctuary is to be justified or shown to be in the right. Our author explains that out of the struggle with the little horn, "God will be justified in His dealing with the sin problem. Also, the true saints of God will be manifested, justified, and revealed as righteous." How will the sanctuary of God emerge victorious and be ultimately justified? Not by an arbitrary action of God, answers Heppenstall. God condescends to make His decisions and judgments public and available throughout the universe. This is why, as we noticed earlier, God opens the books of heaven for all to see. To this action, the prophecy of Dan 8 refers as the "cleansing" or the "justifying" of the sanctuary. It is in this prophecy that Heppenstall finds the time for the starting of the "investigative" or pre-Advent judgment. For Heppenstall, then, the "investigative" or pre-Advent judgment starts at the close of the 2300 years.

In relation to the nature and meaning of this judgment, Heppenstall says that the pre-Advent judgment is a loving revelation from Christ of the righteous decisions in favor of those who have

---

1Ibid., 159. According to Heppenstall, the word is used 41 times in the verb form in the OT. It is rendered "cleansed" only in this verse. From the Hebrew root word and other derivations come the ideas of justification, vindication, to be in the right. It describes a righteous judgment or verdict (see Job 29:14; Ps 37:6; Isa 32:11). Eighteen uses of the verb have the meaning of "to be in the right, justified" (see Isa 43:9, 26; Ps 51:4, 6); or of a judge giving a person the verdict of being just or righteous (Deut 25:1; 1 Kgs 8:32; Isa 5:23; Prov 17:15) (ibid.).

2OHP, 159-160.

3Ibid., 177. By this revelation from the sanctuary, says Heppenstall, the decision of the apostate power of the little horn over the lives of men will be proved false. Their decisions will be reversed. From the divine headquarters comes the whole, perfect action of the Godhead concentrated in forgiveness and judgment by one person: Jesus Christ (ibid., 178-179).
trusted in Him.\(^1\) It will give satisfaction and everlasting certainty to all creatures, as well as assurance that sin shall not rise again.\(^2\) The cleansing or justification of the sanctuary also means that God has taken action into His own hands to judge His people and decide their destiny, thereby exposing the falsity and worthlessness of this apostate system.\(^3\) The restoring of the sanctuary is a victory of God's judgment over that of men. This explains the emphasis of Dan 8 upon the cleansing, the restoring, and the triumph of the sanctuary.\(^4\) However, there are still other aspects about the judgment that still need to be considered.

The Hour of Judgment of Revelation 14

The issue of judgment brings new aspects to be considered in Heppenstall's theological system. Heppenstall does not rely only on Daniel's prophecies, but also relates the judgment of Dan 7\(^5\) and the

\(^1\)Ibid., 179. After the saints have stood, as it were, before that judgment seat in the splendor of Christ's righteousness, they will be raised and translated to live and reign with Christ for a thousand years. This is why Heppenstall holds that the judgment must take place prior to the return of Christ. The pre-Advent judgment is the gateway that leads beyond the grave to the first resurrection, which is reserved for all who have been vindicated at the bar of God (ibid., 184-185).

\(^2\)Ibid., 182.

\(^3\)Ibid.. This is for Heppenstall "the divine answer to the machinations of demons and men and the powers of darkness, the answer to those who have set themselves against God, who have cast the truth to the ground, who through the centuries have sought to destroy the people of God, and who had taken away the daily ministration of Christ from the minds of men, and trodden down the place of His sanctuary. The divine judgment is implicit in the statement 'he shall be broken without hand' (Dan 8:25)" (ibid., 183).

\(^4\)Ibid., 184.

\(^5\)Ibid., 195. Heppenstall remarks that it is more important to notice that John's picture of the pre-Advent judgment stands side by side with that of Dan 7. According to Daniel's prophecy, "the judgment shall sit," follows the wearing out of the saints. In Dan 7:21, 25, the horn is described as carrying on war with the saints and the saints being delivered into his power for a time and times and a half a time. Dan 7:22, 26 refers to the judgment that follows the 1260 years of the church's oppression and persecution. Here the time sequence is very important. While in Dan 7 the return of Christ is not specifically mentioned, it is implied in the words of vs. 27. Heppenstall mentions
cleansing of Dan 8 to the judgment mentioned in Rev 14:6-7. The
eschatological visions of the books of Daniel and Revelation simply
point to the ultimate triumph of the church of God. More than any book
of the NT, says Heppenstall, the book of Revelation affirms that "prior
to the return of Christ, by a judicial procedure, in the heavenly
sanctuary, God will clearly separate the righteous from the wicked, the
true from the false." Rev 14 is thus another element that helps
that the Father and the Son have come to judgment prior to the giving of
the kingdom to Christ and His people. The two pictures of and
references to the judgment are complementary and should be studied in
the light of each other. In both visions Christ comes to the judgment
to effect the final purpose of God and to consummate the plan of
redemption (ibid., 196).

1Ibid., 196. In the vision of Dan 8, the cardinal feature is
the cleansing or the justifying of the heavenly sanctuary at the end of
the 2300 years. The prophecy brings the terminal date of the 2300 years
to the year 1844. "Beginning in 1844 the priestly ministry of Christ
and the sacredness of the law of God will be seen as the one righteous
solution to the sin problem. Thus the heavenly sanctuary would be
restored to its rightful state (vs. 14, RSV). It would then begin to
'emerge victorious' (NEB). Christ will vindicate Himself and His people
by so doing" (ibid., 197).

2Ibid., 187. The relationship of these chapters is very close
according to Heppenstall. He says that Rev 14:6-7 is the counterpart of
Dan 8:14 (2SBD, 45). Explaining the word "judgment," Heppenstall says
that the two most important words translated as "judgment" are krisis
and krima. Krisis refers to the act or procedure of judging, usually
independent of the verdict to be rendered. The root meaning is to
"separate," to distinguish between the righteous and the wicked. Krima,
on the other hand, is the verdict, the decision arrived at as the result
of the judicial process. Heppenstall says that krisis is the word used
in Rev 14:7. It refers to the hour of God's judging or separating the
saved and the lost (GHP, 190).

3Ibid., 190. Rev 14:7 declares: "The hour of judgment has
come." For Heppenstall the Greek aorist tense means that the judgment
is now, not some time in the future. God is now in the process of
judging. He also alleges that there would be no point to God's appeal
to men were it not for a pre-Advent judgment. The judgment-hour message
calls to all people to turn to Him before it is too late (ibid.). Our
author points out that church leaders and religionists toward the close
of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries
interpreted these time prophecies regarding the judgment and the
sanctuary as pointing to the end of the world and the return of Christ
by 1844. They were mistaken. Heppenstall affirms that Seventh-day
Adventists believe that they refer to the beginning of the "hour of
God's judgment," which began in the heavenly sanctuary at that time
(ibid., 197).
Heppenstall to believe in a pre-Advent judgment. This leads us to give attention to the subject of the investigative or pre-Advent judgment.

The Investigative Judgment

The teaching of an investigative judgment in heaven reserved for the people of God has aroused discussion and opposition among friends and critics of Seventh-day Adventism. For some, this doctrine destroys all assurance here and now, leaving one's standing with God uncertain. Addressing this view, Heppenstall points out that there is ample evidence in Scripture affirming the security of those who commit their lives to Christ. He argues that no book equals the Apocalypse in scope and intensity as to the nature of divine judgment that is to take place upon mankind in these last days. At the same time, no book assures so categorically the security of the saints. The Scriptures state clearly that no one escapes the coming judgment. All come under the most searching scrutiny of the judge of all men. The saints are involved in the judgment. This is evidenced by the opening of the books. In addition, Rom 8:1 affirms that there is "no condemnation for those who are united with Christ Jesus."

Another objection that Heppenstall tackles is: How can such a thing as books and records exist in a spiritual world? He concedes that

---

1See Walter Martin, The Truth about Seventh-Day Adventism, 178-184. Heppenstall wrote two articles in the Ministry magazine that later became part of a book that defended Adventists doctrines from Martin's criticism. See "The Hour of God's Judgment Is Come," in Doctrinal Discussions, 159-186. In OHP, chaps. 5-10, Heppenstall deals with the same issues in a more extensive manner.


3Ibid. He uses Rev 7:9, 13, 14; 14:1-5; 15:2-4; 19:1-9; 20:4-6.

4Ibid., 204. See Dan 7:10. This includes the book of life with the names of all who professed the name of Christ. See Mal 3:16; Phil 4:3; Rev 3:5; 13:8; 20:15; 22:19 (ibid.).

5Ibid., 203. Cf. 2 Cor 5:10; 4:3-5; Eccl 12:13-14; Rom 14:11-12; Matt 12:36; Luke 16:2; Heb 13:17; 1 Pet 4:3-7.
they may not be literal books; however, he insists that there can be something that corresponds to what we know as books, something that shall make everything known and evident.¹ Furthermore, the judgment is presented in the Bible in such a way that all men feel its veracity. For judgment does not consist simply in condemning the wicked. The process of judging distinguishes between the righteous and the wicked. For thousands of years the divine verdicts of God have remained unknown. But this judgment uncovers all and affirms the righteous character of God. Far from undermining one's confidence in God, the pre-Advent judgment should strengthen the confidence and the trust of God's people.²

But how is this investigative judgment of God's people to be understood? In Heppenstall's view, such a judgment can hardly mean that God needs such an investigation on the assumption that He is ignorant of the facts about His people.³ There can be no doubt or question in the mind of God concerning those who have kept the faith. In that case, why have one? What is the purpose of the investigative phase of the judgment so far as God's people are concerned?

One of the reasons for that judgment, in Heppenstall's view, is related to Satan, the enemy of God and His people. He points out

¹Ibid., 204. In these records, every man's life will appear in all its true dimensions open not only to God but to the entire universe of intelligent beings (ibid.). In one sense, the judgment is a revelation and a separation, says Heppenstall. The judgment provides the whole universe with the perfect knowledge of the truth about every man. God's judgment also involves a sifting process which separates those who have stood with Christ from those who have not. Heppenstall, "Who Will Plead My Case?" These Times, May 1975, 12.

²OHP, 216. Naturally, writes Heppenstall, "we feel awe and concern when we realize that we will be judged by God before the heavenly court, too; that the God who directs the investigation of our lives loves us and will do everything possible to give us life. . . . For the children of God, judgment is the time of rejoicing, because Christ's verdict in their favor will bring everlasting vindication before all God's universe," "Who Will Plead My Case?" These Times, May 1975, 12.

that it is part of the spirit and work of Satan to accuse all repentant sinners and make a claim for them as belonging to him.\(^1\) Our author says that it is implied that the records of the lives of all are known both to Christ and Satan. The claims of Christ for His redeemed are disputed by Satan to the very end.\(^2\) This "investigation" is no hasty judgment. The vindication of the saints of God is no play acting. On the bare record, no man can possibly meet the charges or silence the accusations of Satan. Unless those who profess to follow Christ are clothed in the garments of Christ's righteousness, the claims of Satan will be upheld. The issue of the judgment, therefore, is between Christ and Satan, between the holy character of God and the unrighteous character of the devil.\(^3\) What Jesus did at the cross gave Him the right to claim the human race as His property. But the final triumph of Christ and His saints, says Heppenstall, is not complete until the judgment has vindicated both.\(^4\)

The vindication of God's character is another reason for the judgment, according to Heppenstall. Moreover, God will uphold the honor

\(^1\)Ibid., 211. The case of Joshua the high priest in Zech 3:1-5 and the case regarding the dispute about the body of Moses in Jude 9 are pointed out as examples of Satan’s efforts to accuse God’s people (see ibid., 211, 213). Speaking about Joshua, Heppenstall quotes E. G. White when he writes thus: “As Satan accused Joshua and his people, so in all ages he accuses those who seek the mercy and favor of God. ... Over every soul that is rescued from the power of evil, and whose name is registered in the Lamb’s book of life, the controversy is repeated. Never one is received into the family of God without exciting the determined resistance of the enemy” (Prophets and Kings, 585).

\(^2\)Ibid., 212. “If Satan’s claims were to stand, the plan of redemption would have failed. Satan would have been right in his charges that free creatures could not obey the law of God and fulfill His requirements, that left to themselves to make their own choice they would all have followed him” (ibid.).

\(^3\)Ibid., 214. Each claim for the right to decide the eternal destiny of men (ibid.).

\(^4\)OHP, 214. The purpose of this judgment, according to Heppenstall, is not merely to provide the saint with so many crowns or acres in his heavenly vineyard. This judgment has the purpose to vindicate God, His everlasting gospel, His divine government in the controversy with Satan (DP, 185).
of His character, reflected in the mirror of His holy law, because the judgment must rest on an all-sufficient ground. The blotting out of sin will mean no less than the silencing of all the accusations for eternity. Jesus, however, affirms that there is no condemnation for His people. At the same time, He will not excuse anybody from judgment. God's judgment will be true and will stand forever. Even though no one will be excused from judgment, there is no reason to think that this judgment endangers the assurance of God's people, because for the saints of God, the judgment means fulfillment, not apprehension. Christ will stand up for His people. The security of God's people resides in the presence of their Advocate before the presence of the Father. Jesus will make known His sheep. The investigative judgment, then, is a revelation of the love and loyalty to God at its best.

The prophecies of Dan 7, 8, and 9, therefore, form an important part in Heppenstall's system. Dan 7 makes clear that there is a pre-Advent judgment. Dan 8 gives the key to the time when the judgment starts, while Dan 9, by explaining the transition from the levitical ministry in the earthly sanctuary to the heavenly ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, makes clear that the pre-Advent judgment is

---

1 OHP, 214. "God will show in the judgment that there can be no tolerance of any departure from His will either by man, church or devil. There will be no hushing up of unsettled accounts" (ibid.).

2 Ibid., 214. "Jesus rests the investigative judgment on the firm foundation of what each man is in the sight of all heaven when clothed with His righteousness. He stands before His Father and the angelic hosts with complete certainty of His redeemed." Further, he adds that in Christ's parable, the only guest at the wedding feast who stood in jeopardy was the man without a wedding garment (Matt 22:1-14). The five virgins who took oil in their lamps went into the marriage. There was no chance of their being excluded. They were secure. But the five foolish virgins who made no preparation were shut out from the marriage (Matt 25:1-13) (ibid., 215.)

3 Ibid. The pre-advent judgment is a genuine event remarks Heppenstall. The Judge will judge righteously. Nothing will be arbitrary or one-sided. There will not be the slightest compromise with God's holiness (ibid.).

4 Ibid., 216.
realized in heaven. Rev 14 confirms the evidence for Heppenstall that this judgment is previous to Christ's second coming. And finally, in Heppenstall's view, the investigative judgment does not constitute a threat to the salvation of the people of God. This judgment has the purpose of vindicating God's character before the universe, to silence Satan's accusations, and finally honoring His holy law.

In conclusion, we can see that the prophecies of Dan 7, 8, and 9, the book of Revelation, especially chaps. 13 and 14, and the relationship they have with the doctrine of the sanctuary constitute for Heppenstall the foundation of his understanding of Christ's heavenly ministry and His work of judgment. However, there is still a remaining aspect in relation to the doctrine of the sanctuary that must be examined. This has to do with the way Heppenstall relates Christ's heavenly ministry to the Day of Atonement of the earthly tabernacle. This aspect leads us to review the last stage of the work of judgment.

The Judgment: The Consummation of the Plan of Redemption

Christ's Yearly Ministry

According to the symbolic ritual, the Levitical sanctuary in all its parts was defiled by the sin and guilt of the Israelites as atonement was made and sins were confessed. There were two cleansings: one for the individual when he presented his personal sacrifice and confessed his sins, for which the sanctuary thereupon assumed responsibility, and one for the cleansing of the sanctuary itself upon the day of atonement. Both cleansings were essential. The second cleansing, the cleansing of the sanctuary, was performed in the yearly service on the Day of Atonement. The Day of Atonement was the climax of the whole Levitical system. The ritual performed on that day was unique and centered on the ceremony of the two goats. On this day, the high priest alone went into the Most Holy Place, into the presence of God. With the blood of the first goat he was to make final atonement for the children.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
of Israel and for the sanctuary. If atonement had been made all
during the year, why did it require a further act of atonement?
Heppenstall underlines that some aspect of the sin problem, obviously,
had not yet been dealt with. The Day of Atonement performed a removal
of sin not accomplished by the daily services.

The ceremony involving the two goats clearly set forth two
different aspects of dealing with sin. Regarding the second goat for
Azazel, Heppenstall comments that it was neither sacrificed nor its
blood sprinkled before the mercy seat in the Most Holy Place. The sins
atoned for by the blood of the first goat were now confessed over the
head of the second goat, which was led into the wilderness bearing the
iniquities of the people. What is taught by means of the two goats,
says Heppenstall, is more than an offering for sin. What is involved is
the eradication of sin symbolized by the complete isolation of the
second goat which symbolized Satan. Azazel, explains Heppenstall, is
a personal being. This second goat, for Heppenstall, plays an
integral part in the solution of the sin problem. It is to bear sin

1 OHP, 77. On this day, "every sin committed and every confes-
sion made, every service rendered since the previous day of atonement,
bore witness before God, and constituted final evidence for that one
day." The services of this day taught a final judgment, a verdict from
the throne of God. Hence, its great significance (ibid.). Cf. Lev

2 Ibid., 78.

3 Ibid., 78-79.

4 Ibid., 79. There has been a controversy among biblical
scholars regarding the identity of Azazel. Some think that it repre-
sents Christ, others hold that it represents Satan. For a further study
in this issue see: Questions on Doctrine, 391-401.

Heppenstall mentions two factors that favor Azazel as a personal
being. One is the large number of Biblical scholars and interpreters
who hold this view. The second is the evidence from the Hebrew text
itself. "The parallelism involved in the text strongly suggests that
Azazel is a personal being who stands over against the Lord who is a
personal being. The casting of lots shows that both goats are equal and
parallel in this respect, both are an integral part of the sin problem,
one to serve as the goat for the Lord and the other for Azazel" (OHP,
79).
into a place of total isolation and separation. Why is sin borne by
the second goat? Why is there an atonement with him as well as with the
first goat? In Heppenstall's view, the Scriptures state that atonement
is made with both goats (Lev 16:10, 15-19), the one where blood was
shed, the other who did not die sacrificially. Under the symbol of the
goat that was sacrificed, Christ bore our sins. The role of the second
goat is not redemptive since no blood is shed. The bearing of sin by
the second goat reveals how sin is to be finally eradicated, for the
goat was never seen again. With the transfer of sin from the sanctu­
ary, all responsibility for sin now belonged to the scapegoat. All
defilement was expunged. Both the sanctuary and the people were clean.
Thus sin's removal is the final step in the final reconciliation of all
things. Only to the degree that he bears responsibility for sin is an
atonement said to be made by the scapegoat.

The cleansing of the Levitical sanctuary on the Day of
Atonement is very important for Heppenstall because it has its counter­
part in the heavenly sanctuary. He asserts that in the Epistle to the
Hebrews, the correct interpretation is given by its author in comparing
the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries in their priestly ministrations
(Heb 9:21-23). The initial cleansing is effected by the blood of
Christ and by the application of the blood to the life and experience of
the believer. The second cleansing has to do with the eradication of
sin.

---

1 Our author bases this assertion on certain facts mentioned in
Lev 16:10, 21, 22, where an atonement is made with the second goat.
Besides, the goat is to bear sin, the sins that are brought out of the
Most Holy place and confessed over him (OHP, 92-93).

2 OHP, 93.

3 Ibid.

4 Chapter 8 of this study discusses this issue further.

5 Ibid., 82-83.
The service was not only an atonement for the people but for the sanctuary. This implied a total cleansing, a complete removal of sin.¹ The symbolism and the typical services in the Levitical sanctuary are meant to point to the realities of the High priestly work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. The day of atonement taught the truth of Christ's ministration, a ministration that goes beyond Calvary to the final solution of the sin problem.² It points also to Christ, who in His priestly ministry is seen as both Redeemer and Judge. The work of redemption and the work of judgment are ministered by the same High Priest.³ God is concerned with both the triumph of righteousness and the overthrow of evil. The final victory will come as a result of Christ's ministry of both redemption and judgment. This is what was taught on the Day of Atonement.⁴

If this is so, then the question is raised: How and when will the final end of sin and Satan be brought about? This leads one to consider several elements that Heppenstall places in relation with judgment: the second coming of Christ, the millennium, and the final eradication of sin.

Christ's Second Coming

Following the typology of the Day of Atonement, Heppenstall considers that the coming out of the high priest (Lev 16:17) pointed to

¹Ibid., 80. Cf. Lev 16:30-34.

²Ibid., 81. The blotting out of sin involves more than forgiveness. The gracious purpose of God is not only to forgive sin but to triumph over it and eradicate it. Heppenstall notes that the purpose of God did not fail at the cross. His sacrifice must ultimately effect Satan's end and final destruction. Christ's ministry will not stop short until all sin is blotted out from the universe. This is the truth taught and symbolized in the service of the Day of Atonement (ibid., 81).

³Ibid., 82. God had committed all judgment to the Son (John 5:22). The eternal mercy and grace of our Lord, the certainty of judgment for weal or woe, belong together as one truth from the sanctuary (ibid.).

⁴Ibid.
an event in the priestly ministry of Christ. Christ leaving the sanctuary follows the close of His ministry of intercession on behalf of His people.\(^1\) This is the time when Christ returns to the earth; when the final reconciliation is accomplished.\(^2\) This means that Satan has no part in the work of redemption, for that work is exclusively Christ's.

For six thousand years, the people of God have lived and worked in the confident assurance and eager anticipation of the speedy return of the Lord they loved.\(^3\) In the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation, God is revealed directing the final events in our world toward that ultimate victory.\(^4\) Because of its suddenness and catastrophic force, Christ compared the end of the world to the destruction of the world by the flood and the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire.\(^5\)

Christ's second coming will be a visible, audible, and personal coming.\(^6\) At His coming, the righteous will be resurrected.\(^7\) The return

---

1Ibid., 94. "The climax of our world occurs when Christ Jesus leaves the heavenly sanctuary and returns to earth" (ibid., 219).

2Ibid., 94. What Jesus began at the cross, He will finish as our divine High Priest. Heppenstall remarks that the Levitical Day of Atonement foreshadowed the ultimate and final triumph of Christ over Satan (ibid.).

3SBD, 80. This hope has possessed the minds and lives of Christ's believers since Jesus' ascension. Heppenstall affirms that throughout all the NT Christ's second advent is taught. It is mentioned 318 times; one verse out of every twenty five is devoted to it (ibid.).

4OHP, 219.


6Christ's coming will be personal (see Acts 1:11; 1 John 3:2; 1 Pet 1:13). It will be visible, not secret (2 Thess 1:8; Matt 24-27, 30). It will be accompanied with audible manifestations (1 Thess 4:16; 1 Cor 15:51-52). Heppenstall denies the interpretation of a secret rapture (SBD, 82). For an additional discussion on the Adventist perspective of Christ's second coming, see Questions on Doctrine, 449-464.

7SBD, 84. He quotes 1 Thess 4:16; 1 Cor 15:52; John 5:25-29 (ibid.).
of Christ will bring everything to a full stop, even sin. Christ's second coming, then, brings a stop to sin and Satan's work. However, it does not solve completely the problem of sin or eradicate sin in the universe. There remains one issue: How God will deal with sin and eradicate it from the universe? This is our next subject.

The Millennium and the Final Eradication of Sin

The beginning of the millennium, for Heppenstall, is started with Christ's second advent. The resurrection of the righteous occurs simultaneously with Christ's second coming. The resurrection of the wicked happens at the end of the millennium. The millennium, then, for Heppenstall, is that period between the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked. He points out that there are two comings of Christ in connection with the millennium, the second

1OHP, 229. "All business, pleasure, labor, and education will cease. All social, political, national, and international activity will be paralyzed. Men will have neither desire nor time to eat, to play, to work, or to fight. Men behold Jesus Christ. 'Behold He cometh in the clouds; and every eye shall see Him' (Rev 1:7). The veil of heaven will be rent. He will be seen. He will be heard with the voice of the trumpet that wakens the dead" (ibid., 229-230).

2Regarding the millennium, Heppenstall is aware of the existence of different interpretations, i.e., premillennialism, postmillennialism, amillennialism (2SBD, 73). His view is that of a premillennialist.

3He holds that there are two resurrections (John 5:28-29; Acts 24:15). The first resurrection is blessed (Rev 20:6) because it is for eternal life (John 5:28), to immortality and incorruption (1 Cor 15:52-53). It includes all who until the millennium have died in the Lord, the second death will have no power on them (Rev 20:6). The first resurrection takes place in order that the resurrected may spend the millennium with Christ (Rev 20:6).

4The second resurrection, far from blessed, is for damnation. It is for final judgment, punishment, and destruction (Rev 20:11-15). The people resurrected are the persecuting foes of Christ and His people. Heppenstall explains that Rev 20:5 "implies that they are to live again, and that at the end of the 1000 years, therefore, there must be a resurrection at the close." They are described as "not having lived until the 1000 years are accomplished" (Rev 20:5, 7-9, 12-13). They will rebel against God (Rev 20:7-9), but they will be destroyed (Rev 20:11-15) (2SBD, 74).

52SBD, 75.
advent at the beginning of the millennium and the third advent at the close.¹ During the millennium the saints will be in heaven, not on earth.² The saints during the millennium will live with Christ.³

With reference to the millennium, Satan is represented as not yet destroyed but bound.⁴ After that period, Satan will break forth again with new energy and rage.⁵ He will try to vanquish the holy city, but will meet the fate that truly belongs to him as the originator of sin.⁶ At this time, all who have lived upon the earth will stand personally before God.⁷ God's moral righteousness in dealing with the rebellion of Satan and his followers will be settled.⁸ The judgment before the great white throne is the final adjustment before the universe. It is here that the moral measure of everyone is revealed,

¹The third advent at the close of the millennium is necessary "in order to execute judgment upon the wicked, bring Satan and sin to a final end, and to create a new earth" (ibid.).

²2SBD, 76-77.

³2SBD, 77. Christ promised to take them with Him to heaven (John 14:1-3; John 13:36). This will happen when, at His second coming, they will be taken up to heaven (1 Thess 4:16-17; 1 Cor 15:40-49). They will live and reign with Christ (Rev 20:4, 6). Judgment will be given to them (Rev 20:14). They will judge men and fallen angels (1 Cor 6:2-3; Jude 6). This judgment will be of an investigative nature (ibid.).

⁴OHP, 101. This binding is not literal. The chains referred to here are a figurative expression. See Mark 5:14; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6. The chain which binds Satan are those conditions on the earth which prevail for 1000 years whereby Satan's devilish work will be rendered inoperative (2SBD, 77).

⁵OHP, 101. See also 2SBD, 78-79.

⁶OHP, 101. This takes place from the great white throne located over the Holy City, the New Jerusalem, which is at that moment on this earth (ibid.). Cf. Rev 20:11.

⁷Ibid. "The righteous inside the Holy City, the wicked outside. Every person, including Satan will see his place in time and destiny" (ibid.). See also 2SBD, 78.

⁸Ibid., 101. The heavenly beings are portrayed in the Scripture as having intense interest concerning the morality and integrity of God's government and character. It is for this reason that in the book of Revelation when God's judgments leading to the final consummation are referred to, they are occasions of rejoicing and praise to God (see Rev 11:18; 15:4; 16:5, 7; 19:2) (ibid., 101-102).
including that of Satan. This final judgment pictured in Rev 20 is not concerned primarily with the redeemed. It is the final working out of sin and righteousness in the history of the problem of sin. This judgment will be done on a public and universal scale.\(^1\) It is God's answer to the most despicable rebellion. The fire falls. Sin and sinners are forever eradicated from the universe.\(^2\) Without this judgment which magnifies God, no true end to sin can be realized. This is the climax in the agelong controversy that is decisive for eternity in favor of the God of heaven.\(^3\) This will be the occasion for universal rejoicing, for sin shall never rise again. The solution to the sin problem is now reality. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. From one end to the other reigns eternal reconciliation.\(^4\) Christ will live with His redeemed throughout eternity in a sinless universe and in an earth made new.\(^5\)

**Summary**

Even though the cross brought eternal results with respect to both God and man, some aspects of the sin issue still need to be addressed. Though Christ ascended to heaven to continue His work of reconciliation, Heppenstall remarks, the struggle with sin continues with aggravated fury. Christ's heavenly ministry has the purpose of finishing with the issue of sin. This heavenly ministry has two stages, the mediatorial work and the judgment. The mediatorial ministry was started when Christ ascended to heaven after His resurrection. In 1844, (ibid.)

\(^1\)OHP, 102.

\(^2\)2SBD, 79.

\(^3\)OHP, 103. This is the eschatological moment to which the Day of Atonement pointed, the final confrontation between Christ and Satan (ibid.).

\(^4\)Ibid., 102-104.

\(^5\)In 2SBD, 88-89, Heppenstall describes the earth restored and the blessedness of the saints according to the biblical promises.
He started the judgment, which is the second stage of His heavenly ministry.\(^1\)

The earthly sanctuary is the key to understand Heppenstall's view of Christ's heavenly ministry. The daily services of the earthly sanctuary represent the mediatorial ministry of Christ. This mediation included His intercession and representation of the believer before the Father and the guidance of the church to its ultimate end. The yearly services represented the judgment, the second stage of Christ's heavenly ministry.

The prophecies of Dan 7, 8, and 9 and Rev 14 constitute for Heppenstall another foundational element in understanding Christ's heavenly ministry. These prophecies point out also the work of opposition of evil powers, God's dealings with the controversy, and the final vindication of His people and His government. The vindication of God and His people comes as the result of the pre-Advent judgment. God's judgment started in 1844, according to the 2300 day prophecy. This pre-Advent judgment will end before Christ's second coming.

Christ's second coming brings to an end the oppressive work of God's enemies. Satan is bound, the wicked are destroyed, and the saints are taken with Christ for 1000 years. During the millennium, the saints participate in the judgment of the wicked and of the evil angels. At the end of the millennium, Satan, his angels, and all the wicked are judged before the universe. God is vindicated when saints and sinners recognize His justice in His dealings with the problem of sin. Sin and sinners are annihilated. In this way the agelong controversy against Satan and the problem of sin in the universe is concluded. The saints reign forever with Christ in the new earth enjoying the eternal result of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross.

\(^1\)This is in accordance with the 2300 day prophecy of Dan 8, according to Heppenstall.
Conclusion

In this chapter we noted that Christ's heavenly ministry is divided into two parts, His mediatorial work and the process of judgment. This two part ministry is for Heppenstall the last stage of the plan of redemption. In this phase, we noted also that Heppenstall integrates the doctrine of God, man, sin, law, covenant, Christ, and salvation with the plan of redemption. Regarding God, Heppenstall is consistent in his stress on the vindication of God's character. In this phase Heppenstall points out that one of the purposes of Christ's mediatorial work and of the process of judgment is to vindicate God's character and government. This vindication is achieved when the believer in his life upholds the principles of God's moral law. The judgment also vindicates God's character when He vindicates the saints from the unfairness of the human judgments and, at the same time, executes judgment on those who oppose God and His people. And finally, God's vindication is complete when sin and sinners are eradicated. The eradication of sin is the final act of the process of judgment.

We noted also that the sanctuary occupies a central place in the process of mediation and judgment, because Christ's heavenly ministry is, for Heppenstall, the fulfillment of the promises of the eternal covenant. The types and symbols of the earthly sanctuary, which is the symbol of the eternal covenant, find their accomplishment in the work of Christ in the cross and in His heavenly ministry. It is in this heavenly sanctuary where the promises of the eternal covenant are made reality in the life of the believer. It is here where the believer can approach God by faith to find the strength to overcome temptation and sin. Finally, Christ's work of judgment assures eternal life to those who believe in God and accept His redemption. This eternal life becomes a reality at Christ's second coming. Moreover, Christ's second coming puts an end to sin and starts the second phase of the judgment. The final stage of the judgment is when sin and sinners are annihilated.
With this act, the plan of redemption is accomplished. On one hand, God is vindicated before the universe. His government is eternally secured. On the other hand, the believers relish the benefits of God's redemption: life eternal in a new earth.
Thus far, in previous chapters, we have analyzed Heppenstall's scheme of redemption: the promise, the act of redemption at the cross, the results of redemption, and the work of judgment. However, in order to evaluate Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption, it is necessary to relate his views on the subject to Adventist theology, in general, and to those of E. G. White, in particular, because they constitute the context for Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption. In regards to Adventist theology this comparison will be made primarily with those who opposed or differed with Heppenstall's views on the issues involved in this study, particularly those who are representative of divergent theological schools within Adventism. This would include Herbert Douglass on the human nature of Christ, on Christian perfection, and on sin; Ralph Larson on original sin; Jack Provonsha on the atonement; and some of the individuals who constitute the Daniel and Revelation Committee of the 1980s and 1990s on issues regarding the Sanctuary.

Since Heppenstall recognizes E. G. White as an authority, we must evaluate his use of her writings. This evaluation will be done

---

1OHP, 14.

2A comparison will be made with Herbert Douglass on the nature of Christ, and Christian perfection, because he opposed Heppenstall's views so strongly. Ralph Larson's view of original sin contested Heppenstall's position on this issue. Heppenstall has vigorously taken Jack Provonsha to task on Provonsha's view of the Atonement. While the issues raised by the Ford crisis have been the primary concern, some of the individuals of the Daniel and Revelation Committee have had to deal with and clarify issues raised by Heppenstall's understanding of the Sanctuary.
from the SDA perspective, which holds her writings to be a continuing and authoritative source of truth which provide for the church comfort, guidance, instruction and correction.¹

In relation to Adventist theology, Heppenstall can be appraised from two perspectives: First, as an innovator, that is, where Heppenstall presents a new perspective that has been accepted generally in SDA theology. Second, he can be seen as a stimulator of Adventist theology.² We consider first his position as an innovator and then as a stimulator.

Heppenstall as an Innovator of Adventist Theology

As an innovator, Heppenstall has made a doctrinal contribution to Adventist theology. He introduced to Adventist theology the idea of one covenant. I want to remark that in this respect his position has been accepted in the SDA church as a better perspective in the interpretation of the two covenants.³

In the description of Heppenstall's view of the covenant, it was mentioned that he made a notable change.⁴ This shift seems to be more the result of his personal concern for the way Adventist theology understood this doctrine rather than for the controversies within or

¹This is in accordance with Fundamental Belief 17 of the SDA church. See Seventh-day Adventists Believe..., 216.

²Stimulator in the sense that he either contributed to enhance and sharpen some doctrinal positions in Adventism, or where his viewpoints were seen as a departure from the traditional interpretation of Adventist doctrines.

³Heppenstall's perspective is now supported and presented as official, see Seventh-day Adventists Believe..., 93-96. See also Hasel, Covenant in Blood. In this book, Hasel presents his study on the covenant, reaching the same conclusions as Heppenstall; Wallenkampf, Salvation Comes from the Lord, 84-90, presents the same perspective as Heppenstall on the covenants. Even though Heppenstall's view of the covenant has been accepted by the Adventist church, some still hold the old concept of the two covenants; i.e., see Standish and Standish, Adventism Unveiled, 28-34; R. J. Wieland, The 1888 Message: An Introduction (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1980), 93.

⁴See chapter 3, pp. 69-85.
outside the SDA church. Heppenstall's position appears to be a departure from the traditional view of the two covenants held in Adventist theology. Distress was caused by the thought that in His dealings, God was acting in a way contrary to His character.¹ This led Heppenstall to ponder a better answer to the questions raised when he attempted to understand the traditional perspective of the doctrine of the covenants.² After wrestling with this issue, he came to the singular view of only one covenant instead of two covenants, that for him, solved the difficulty raised by the traditional Adventist explanation—an interpretation which, to him appeared to lean towards dispensationalism. Heppenstall's disagreement with the dispensational explication of the covenant led him to look for a different perspective in the understanding of the issue in question.

I wish to highlight that Heppenstall's view of only one covenant is very similar to that of Covenant theology. It is evident that in his research on the topic, Heppenstall read some Covenant theologians, and in some way he was influenced by their views.³

¹The justification of the character of God in His dealings with sin in the great controversy is a crucial aspect in Heppenstall's theology. Therefore, it was inconceivable for him to accept that God has two ways of salvation, one of grace and one of works. This aspect is considered in chapter 8, pp. 241-245.

²See chapter 3, pp. 69-85. As mentioned in the third chapter, Heppenstall found it incredible to believe that God could be held responsible for laying the groundwork at Sinai for what followed in Jewish history. It is equally monstrous, he said, "to believe that God would stoop at Sinai to betray the people He had delivered from Egypt only to lead them into another bondage of the spirit that finally deprived them of the last vestiges of freedom and brought about their destruction as a nation" ("The Law and Covenant at Sinai," AUSS 2 [1964]: 20-21).

³Eric Webster remarks that "Heppenstall reported in one of his classes how he locked himself away for several weeks with his Bible and studied and wrestled out his concept," (Crosscurrents in Adventist Christology, 267). Also in a personal interview I had with Heppenstall, I asked him how he reached that conclusion, whether by reading other authors or by personal research. The answer was that he found it by personal study. However, there may be possible influences from Covenant theologians, because in the bibliography of ISBD, he mentions Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, vols. 1-4; in MWG, he quotes W. G. T. Shedd, Systematic Theology, both of them hold the same view on the covenant. See also G. C. Berkouwer, Faith and Justification, trans. Lewis Smedes.
Moreover, Heppenstall shares the same position in several aspects with Covenant theology.\(^1\) When Heppenstall rejects the idea of dividing redemptive history in different periods, as is held by Dispensationalism, he supports the views of Covenant theology.\(^2\) Even though Heppenstall agrees with some aspects in Covenant theology, he also holds some basic differences.\(^3\) It seems that Heppenstall is more consistent than Covenant theology because he is closer to the biblical teachings of

\(^1\)Both share the view of only one covenant. They both speak of the covenant of works made with Adam. They both say that the parties and the promise are the same. Moreover, Heppenstall uses basically the same arguments that Covenant Theology uses to stress the concept of one covenant. See: "The Covenant and the Law," in Our Firm Foundation, 439-474; "Law and Covenant at Sinai," AUSS, 2 (1964): 18-26, cf. Shedd, 2:353-367; Louis Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 262-301; Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, 2:354-377; O. Palmer Robinson, The Christ of the Covenants (Phillipsburg, N. J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980), passim.


\(^3\)Even though proponents of Covenant theology accept only one covenant, they make a distinction between the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace. The covenant of redemption was made between the members of the Trinity. The covenant of grace was made between the Father and the elect sinners. They place election as preceding redemption. This is because of their concept of predestination and the restricted view of salvation; therefore, the covenant is only for the elect. This is related to the understanding of the logical order of God's decrees, the much debated issue of supralapsarianism and infralapsarianism in Reformed theology. Supralapsarians and infralapsarians hold that God's decision to save some (i.e., the elect) logically precedes his decision to provide salvation through Christ; then the atonement is limited to providing salvation to the elect. The supralapsarians hold that the decision to provide salvation logically precedes the decision to save some and allow others to remain in their lost condition; then, the death of Christ was unlimited or universal in its intention. See Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 825-835; Louis Berkhof, 118-125; A. H. Strong, Systematic Theology (Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1907), 1:777-779. Heppenstall, however, holds the Arminian view of predestination, which stresses that salvation is for all those who accept the calling of the gospel. Therefore, Heppenstall holds that there is only one eternal covenant and that the extent of the covenant is for humankind. There is also a terminological difference; while Covenant theologians use the expression covenant of works to refer the covenant with Adam, Heppenstall uses it not only in this way but also to refer to the human effort to attain salvation by works. For the Covenant's theology position, see: Berkhof, 272-277; Hodge, 363.
God and salvation. ¹ Heppenstall's view on the covenants has been widely accepted in the SDA church. But the question is raised as to how Heppenstall's interpretation of other aspects of his doctrine of redemption are related to Adventist theology? We consider now his views in relation to his role as stimulator to Adventist theology.²

**Heppenstall as an Stimulator of Adventist Theology**

For the Post-1950s group, Heppenstall's efforts to give a stronger biblical basis to Adventist doctrines can be considered as a boost to Adventist doctrines. From the other side, for the Pre-1950s group he is seen as one of the champions of the “New Theology.”³ We will compare his contributions to Adventism in the area of law, sin, salvation, Christology, and sanctuary.

**Heppenstall's Contribution to the Doctrine of the Law**

God's moral law has a prominent role among the Adventists. Traditionally, Adventist writers made a distinction between the ceremonial law and the moral law (or the decalogue). They stressed that the ceremonial law was abolished at the cross, while the decalogue was

¹Covenant theology holds that God decreed the allowance of the existence of sin, ascribing in this way the responsibility to God for the problem of sin. See Erickson, 826, also 411-432; Clark, Religion, Reason and Revelation, 221-240. Whereas, for Heppenstall God gave intelligent beings free will, and it was their own responsibility to sin or not (SU, 7-14). Here we can notice that his efforts are to vindicate God from the problem of sin. On the other hand, Heppenstall’s view solves the problem that dispensationalism creates when it presents God as having two methods of salvation. For Heppenstall the dispensationalist solution is neither biblical nor consistent with God's immutability.

²The purpose of the following section, is to show the positions of the different groups with whom Heppenstall theologically interacted. To enter into an extended discussion of these problems is beyond the scope and purpose of this present study.

³This rather pejorative expression has been used by the Pre-1950s group to refer to those who in their view depart from the “traditional” interpretation of the Adventist doctrines. See Standish and Standish, Deceptions of the New Theology, 7-8. See also Kenneth R. Samples, “The Recent Truth about Seventh-day Adventism,” Christianity Today, February 5, 1990, 18-21.
eternal. From this perspective, the importance of the observance of the moral law was stressed. This emphasis was mistaken by other Christian traditions who categorize Seventh-day Adventists as legalist. One of Heppenstall's goals was to present a proper Biblical understanding of the law. He presented a new perspective of the law, expanding the previous classification. He introduced the view of the law as a method of salvation. He accepted that God's law was abolished as a method of salvation, but not as a standard of righteousness. He saw a perversion of the true function of God's law when it is considered as a method of salvation. Commenting on the consequences of the failure to distinguish between the proper and improper function of the law, Heppenstall states that the tragic result of this thinking has been that many professed Christians were led to believe that strict obedience to all of the commandments is no longer expected by God. Thus, with the concept of the moral law used with a wrong purpose, as a method of salvation, Heppenstall introduces a new dimension in the understanding of the moral law to Seventh-day Adventism.

Heppenstall regarded the ceremonial law not as a part of a different method of salvation but as an illustration of God's plan of redemption. It was the gospel in type. It then becomes a complement of the purposes of the moral law. They work together in bringing sinners to conviction. Therefore, he emphasized the Christological purposes

---

1 This came from the interpretation that there were two methods of salvation, one for the Jews, the other for the Christians. The ceremonial law belonged to the Jews, therefore it was abolished at the cross. The moral law was eternal, thus, it was binding for all.

2 This concept seems to be consistent in Heppenstall from the "La Sierra Period." He remarks that there must be a distinction between the law as a standard of righteousness and the law as a method of salvation (JSBD, 75).

3 He points out that Paul in Rom 3:31 says that the law as standard is established; but law as a method is not valid (Rom 3:20-21), (ibid.).

4 IOFF, 470.

5 Ibid., 225.
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rather than its differences with the moral law. ¹ In this respect, Heppenstall differs from previous views on the question.²

Another dimension given by Heppenstall to the law was that of a custodian. He observes that at Sinai the law, which was entrusted to Israel in its moral, ceremonial, and civil aspects, was given to the nation to serve as a custodian to guard them and lead them until the Seed should come.³ God's people were under the law until the historical achievement of Christ was fulfilled. This also is a new perspective introduced into the doctrine of the law by Heppenstall.

Heppenstall sees still another meaning in the usages of the law, that is the law as a bondage, i.e., a slavish attachment to the 'letter' of the law (which kills).⁴ This is opposite to a life dominated by grace.⁵ For Heppenstall, the difference is conclusive. To fail to understand the simple difference between "law" as the revelation

¹First, he followed the Adventist emphasis on the differences between both laws. Later he pointed instead to the limitations, and in the Jewish perversion of the ceremonial system, cf. 1SBD, 78-79, with 2SBD, 10-13.


⁴SGL, 5, 6. Heppenstall remarks that the Christian does not live either under the dominion of sin nor under the dominion of the law (DP, 17-19).

⁵He asserts that there is not the slightest hint of any change in the law, in its operation, and its claim upon the individual. The change is not in the law, but in the believer (DP, 18-19).
of God's will and "under the law" as man's life situation in the flesh when brought under its dominion is tragic.¹

Thus, Heppenstall brought to Adventist theology new dimensions in the doctrine of the law. It was no longer the moral law set over against the ceremonial law. Now the moral law was seen with other perspectives as a standard, as a method of salvation, and as a bondage. Both ceremonial and moral law were considered custodians to lead God's people to Christ. Heppenstall presents the ceremonial law as a figure of the plan of redemption and as a complement of the moral law. The moral law points to sin, the ceremonial to the Savior from sin. This leads us to consider his views on the doctrine of sin.

Heppenstall's Contribution to the Doctrine of Sin

The first thing to consider is the distinctive view of the doctrine of sin that previously had been presented differently from the way he presented it.² Regarding this doctrine, we can say that Heppenstall does not consider sin as a "lack of conformity to the moral law of God, either in act, disposition, or state."³ Neither does he

¹Ibid., 19.

²Heppenstall's basic concept of sin seems to be consistent since the "La Sierra Period." However, it can be noticed that he expanded his views through the development of his dealing with righteousness by faith and the nature of Christ. In 1950D (1955?), he devotes pp. 17-18 of his syllabus to deal with the concept of sin. In 1951F (1959), he dedicates p. 5 only. In 1952F (1963), when Brinsmead's controversy was starting in America, he devotes pp. 5-8; in this syllabus he dedicates more to deal with the concept of sin, but nothing is mentioned about original sin. However, in 1953F (1967?), when the controversy with Brinsmead was reaching its peak, he devotes pp. 15-28 to deal with the concept of sin, and pp. 28-35 to original sin. The reason for this emphasis can be found in the controversy with Brinsmead. Heppenstall reacted to that concept stressing that God's method of salvation is not eradication of the sinful nature, but the counteraction of it by divine power through the Holy Spirit. "Only through continual, day by day operation of the Holy Spirit, is our sinful nature counteracted. The sinful nature is not eradicated until the day of the resurrection," "Is Perfection Possible?" Signs of the Times, December 1963, 10-11.

³Strong, Systematic Theology, 549;
consider it as pride (superbia) or desire (concupiscencia);¹ nor as an absence of good and love of self.² For him, sin is separation from God, to act independent of His will. Those aspects previously mentioned, in Heppenstall's view, are manifestations or the results of sin rather than sin itself. However, his concept of sin differed from other Adventist views. These divergences were the product of different tensions within the church.

Herbert Douglass defines sin as a sick or fractured relationship.³ Larson denies the idea of sin as a state.⁴ For him sin is a choice. Others of the "Pre-1950's" group⁵ hold that sin is an act of the will, that it is "transgression of the law."⁶ All of them hold

2 Thomas Aquinas Summa Theologica 1.2. q. 77, art. 4.
3 "Sin is a blighted relationship that can be healed by faithful, loyal cooperation with the grace of God." Herbert Douglass and Leo Van Dolson, Jesus - The Benchmark of Humanity (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1977), 29. In referring to Christ he states: "The majesty of Jesus is demeaned when we lessen His real victory as the Sinless One by making it to appear that He did not descend to the level of our sinful, fallen nature and faced temptation as all other men have." (PIP, 39). It can be inferred that he does not accept total depravity, however, he does maintain that all men are born fallen with sinful natures.
4 Larson, 342. See also 330-350.
5 Adventism, even though it has its basic and fundamental beliefs, theologically has its differences. It was already mentioned that there are three basic trends within Adventism. The bottom line in these differences involves the disagreements that exist in the understanding of the doctrine of sin and the sanctuary. Heppenstall is considered to belong to the Post 1950s group. The differences between the Post-1950s group and the Pre-1950s group are in the area of sin, Christ's human nature, justification and perfection. The differences between the Post-1950s group and the "liberal" wing of Adventism are in the area of creationism, sin, Christ's atonement, and the sanctuary.
6 Standish and Standish, Deceptions of the New Theology (Rapidan, Va: Hartland Publications, 1989), 63-87; Moore, 100-125; Dennis F. Priebe, Face-to-Face with the Real Gospel (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1985), 22-41. Even though they agree with Heppenstall in their view on the 'monistic' nature of man, Douglass, Moore, Priebe, and the Standishes accept, as Heppenstall does, the concept of human fallen nature, that man is not guilty of the sin of Adam, and that the guilt of sin is not transmitted biologically. The main difference between Heppenstall and all of them lies in the extent of the concept of sin. While they hold that sin is a deliberate choice

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the concept that sin is a deliberate choice of wrong acts in thoughts, word, and deed. Heppenstall’s view of sin is broader than those of the Pre-1950s group,¹ because his view encompasses the former. He recognizes that sin is more than acts, since he views it as more especially related to an attitude and a state of being. It is a state of separation from God, an attitude of independence from His will and government. It is a dependence on one’s own strength and wisdom rather than on God’s.² Heppenstall’s view of sin as a condition led him to reappraise his views on the sanctuary.³

Regarding the transmission of sin, Desmond Ford’s and Olson’s position, accept the concept of original sin and admit the idea of inherited guilt and depravity.⁴ Douglas, Larson and the others of the "Pre-1950s" group deny inherited guilt and even the use of the word original sin.⁵ Larson’s view is closer to that of Pelagius, as he

¹They hold the concept of sin as a choice. See Standish and Standish, Deceptions of the New Theology, 63-87; Moore, 100-125; Priebe, 22-41.

²MWG, 107-110; also SU, 10-14.

³See pp. 224-237, of this same chapter.

⁴Robert W. Olson concludes in his study that the Bible and E. G. White writings teach that due to the results of Adam’s sin, insofar as it pertains to us, we are born in a state of guilt inherited from Adam, we must die as a consequence of this condition, and we are born with natural tendencies to evil. See "Outline Studies on Christian Perfection and Original Sin," Ministry, October 1970, 48-54. Desmond Ford’s view of original sin accepts the idea that we are born sinners because of our inherited depravity, sin exists even prior to our own consciousness of it. See, "The Relationship Between Incarnation and Righteousness by Faith," in Documents from the Palmdale Conference on Righteousness by Faith, Heritage Room, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 28. See also Zackrison, 335-336.

⁵They reject Olson’s and Desmond Ford’s view. Douglass, the Standishes, Priebe, and Moore reject the idea of guilt or condemnation. They accept the view that man inherited evil propensities but not guilt; therefore the nature of man has tendencies to evil propensities but it is not inherently sinful nor guilty of sin. Douglass states: “Sin is a state of being, yes, but in the sense of a state of rebellion. The results of sin are surely a human condition given to each baby at birth,
denies total depravity, and that there is no transmission of propensities to sin.¹ Douglass accepts the transmission of propensities to sin, but not propensities of sin.² Heppenstall in this case stands alone, in some respects, because he uses the concept of original sin, but not in the way Augustine and the Reformers used it. For him there is no genetic transmission of sin, as they asserted.³ One receives the consequences of the sin of Adam: separation from God. We are born separated from God, self-centered, and with a tendency to act independently from Him.⁴ From this state flow the sinful acts. Therefore, the acts and attitudes are sinful because of our separation from God. Heppenstall's view is midway between both opinions; his stand is unique in this respect. However, there are some details in reference to the topic that need to be observed.

₁Ibid., 347. See also ibid. 330-348.

₂Douglass has a two-fold view of the propensities of sin with reference to Christ. The first one is a propensity to sin which all men including Christ inherit. In this sense all men have sinful human natures, natures which are able to yield to temptation. The second class of propensity are propensities of sin which means that an individual has yielded to temptation and has committed sin. Hence, a propensity of sin has been cultivated. See Douglass, "An Historical Note on the 1895 Baker Letter," (Washington, D. C.: Biblical Research Institute, April 12, 1975), 1-6; as quoted by Webster, 363.

₃In this aspect he agrees with the Pre-1950s group, as both reject the idea of inherited guilt. However, the Pre-1950s group accepts biological inheritance of tendencies to evil, while Heppenstall denies that fact.

₄MHG, 122-123. See chapter 2 of this dissertation pp. 42-52. The difference between Desmond Ford and Heppenstall in relation to man's sinful state, is that Heppenstall denies the idea of sin as being inherited or transmitted genetically; whereas Ford accepts sin as being inherited.
First, the development of his view on the subject can be traced in relation to the theological tensions with other trends within Adventism.¹ Second, regarding the issue of sin and its transmission, there is one perspective to note. He does not start, as in other cases, establishing the issue from a biblical viewpoint. In this case, he uses instead different views on sin from other theologians.² It may be that he thought that they conveyed the biblical understanding of sin properly. Nevertheless, it would have been better for him to present his understanding of sin starting from the Bible and then use the other sources in support of his conclusions.

Third, he asserts that man is not guilty of his sinful state in which he was born but that he has inherited a disposition to sin.³ To support this view, he uses several texts.⁴ However, he does not give a careful consideration to Eph 2:3, even though he uses that

¹Heppenstall’s development in his view of original sin, can be traced in his writings. In his 1SBP (1955?), 17, 18, Heppenstall uses the subheading “The Original Sin of Adam,” but deals only with the definition and consequences of sin. It seems that he was more concerned with the concept of “total depravity,” i.e., the whole man as being infected by sin in all his parts: will, feelings, and reason. However, he evidently holds the federal view of immediate imputation, because in the only paragraph he writes about this issue he states: “God imputes the sin of Adam immediately to all his posterity, in virtue of that organic unity of mankind by which the whole race at the time of Adam’s transgression existed, not individually, but seminally, in him as its head. The total life of humanity was then in Adam; the race as yet had its being in him” (ibid., 18). In the 1960s, when the controversy with Brinsmead was intense, one of the discussions was on original sin. Heppenstall addresses sin and original sin and presents his position regarding the matter in SRF3, (15-35) (1966?). This section was the basic material for the chapter “Christ and Sin” in MWG, 107-128. When he wrote MWG (1977), the Brinsmead controversy was over. However, the discussion was now on the human nature of Christ with the Pre-1950s group. This led Heppenstall to include the section dealing with original sin in MWG where he presents his Christology. The rest of the material of SRF3 was used in SU where Heppenstall presents his understanding of the doctrine of salvation.

²See MWG, 108; SU, 10-14. We can demonstrate that his views on sin are mainly those of E. G. White and G. C. Berkouwer. Regarding original sin, his views are those of W. G. T. Shedd. See E. G. White, Patriarch and Prophets, 33-62; G. C. Berkouwer, Man the Image of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 32-33; also, Shedd, 169-257.

³MWG, 109.

⁴Isa 48:8; Ps 58:3; 51:5; and Eph 2:3. MWG, 109.
passage to prove his views. He explains that "'by nature' [Paul] designates the unregenerate and sinful condition of all man." He adds "that they have no righteousness that is acceptable to God." This text and the other texts quoted by Heppenstall to support his position, are used by others to assert genetical inheritance of guilt and sin. Moreover, this text, instead of confirming his assertion that there is no genetic transmission of sin, seems to contradict his position. The Greek word usage denotes that by natural descent, from birth, we were subject to wrath, and the wrath of God is only against sin. Thus, we can see that his view on the transmission of sin has a questionable biblical foundation. His view also seems to be in contradiction to that of E. G. White.

However, it should be observed that his concept of sin and its transmission is an aspect that has not been sufficiently examined in

1In this passage it seems that the apostle implies genetic inheritance of sin. The text reads thus: "... Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath."

2MWG, 109.


5In chapter 8 we discuss the implications of his position for Adventist theology.

6This aspect is considered below in pp. 233-234.
Adventist theology.¹ This point was raised in the contention about the human nature of Christ, an aspect that we now analyze.

Heppenstall's Contribution to the Doctrine of Christ

Another area which Heppenstall has championed is his perspective on the human nature of Christ.² This is the issue that has separated Adventism into two groups. The Post-1950s group holds that Christ had the moral human nature of the "unfallen Adam" and the

¹The question of original sin was raised by Brinsmead in his eschatological view of perfection. When he asserted that God had to work a special miracle to eradicate our sinful propensities before the time of trouble, Heppenstall explored the issue and came to the conclusions we have already discussed in chapter 2. After Heppenstall, there has been little study on this subject. Zackrison recognizes his indebtedness to Heppenstall in writing his dissertation dealing with the pioneer's views of original sin until 1900s. He reaches the conclusion that the SDA treatment of original sin was developed along Arminian and conditionalistic lines and emphasized actual sin more than ontological sin, as Augustine and the Reformers had. Nevertheless, SDAs expressed a doctrine that is definable as a doctrine of original sin by theological and historical models, see Zackrison, passim. Moore and Whidden devote a section of their respective dissertations to the consideration of the view of E. G. White on the topic, see Moore, 102-125, and Whidden, 129-142. Larson wrote in an appendix of his book, The Word Became Flesh, a chapter attacking Heppenstall's view on original sin. His position is closer to that of Pelagius, see Larson, ibid. Lately Norman Gulley wrote an article analyzing different views on the question trying to present some solutions, see "Preliminary Consideration of the Effects and Implications of Adam's Sin," Adventist Perspectives 2 (Summer 1988): 28-44. However, there is still ample ground to cover on the subject.

²In considering the sinlessness of Christ, the issue centers not only in that He lived a sinless life but also that He was born of a sinful woman, yet was without sin. This tension is caused by different interpretations of E. G. White statements about the topic. See Desire of Ages, 117; Selected Messages, 2:267-268; Early Writings, 150; SDA Bible Commentary, 5:1128-1131; Story of Redemption, 44. Larson made a lengthy study of many of the quotations of E. G. White and other Adventist writers on the subject in his book The Word Was Made Flesh, from the perspective of the Pre-1950s group. From the Post-1950s side Eric Webster has made a challenging interpretation of E. G. White's understanding of Christology. See Webster, 56-156. Also Woodrow Whidden has made a rather detailed developmental study of E. G. White's Christology, especially concentrating on her understanding of His humanity, "The Soteriology of Ellen G. White: The Persistent Path to Perfection, 1836-1902." (Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University, 1989), 156-238.
physical nature of fallen man.\textsuperscript{1} Douglass and the Pre-1950s group holds that sin is an act of the will and, as such, is not transmitted biologically. Human nature transmits its physical weaknesses and tendencies, but the person is not sinful or guilty of sin when he is born because he/she has not committed any sinful act. Therefore, Christ had our fallen human nature because it is not sinful to be human as we are.\textsuperscript{2} In this issue, Heppenstall makes a distinction between living a sinless life and having a sinless nature. Christ had the same human nature we have, without the tendencies to sin.\textsuperscript{3} His reasoning is as follows: sin is to act independently of God. Sin is not transmitted genetically. Consequently, Christ only received the physical effects of Adam and Eve's sin.\textsuperscript{4} Christ, from His mother's womb, had a close unity with the Father that never was broken. He was born, therefore, sinless. Christ had the same basic desires we have, otherwise He could have not been tempted as we are. In His earthly life, He acted always in full dependence and according to God's will. He never sinned and never developed propensities to sin as fallen human beings do, because they are born in separation from God and act independently from God's will. Therefore, we could say that even though Christ was born with our human nature, he did not have propensities to sin because he was born in close

\textsuperscript{1}They assert that to teach that Christ was possessed of sinful propensities is to teach that He himself was a sinner and in need of a savior. Among those who stress Christ's sinless nature are: Seventh-Day Adventist Answer Questions on Doctrine, 50-65; 647-660; LeRoy Froom, Movement of Destiny, 497-499; Norman Gulley, Christ Our Substitute (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1982), passim.

\textsuperscript{2}Herbert Douglass, PIP, 35-45. Among those who stress Christ's fallen nature are: M. L. Andreasen, Letters to the Churches, passim; R. J. Wieland and Donald K. Short, 1888 Re-Examined, passim; Ralph Larson, passim; Arthur Leroy Moore, passim; Standish and Standish, Deceptions of the New Theology, 45-61; Dennis E. Priebes, 42-64.

\textsuperscript{3}MWG, 131.

\textsuperscript{4}The results of Adam's sin is separation from God, from this follows sin and death. He says of Christ: "The effect of Adam and Eve's sin, while it affected His physical constitution, did not reach Him morally and spiritually as it reaches us" (MWG, 133).
unity with God and never was separated from Him. He was sinless and He overcame sin with God's power.¹

Here we notice that Heppenstall agrees with the Post-1950s group when they assert that Christ had a sinless nature, but does not agree with them when they hold that sin is transmitted by heredity and that we are born guilty of sin.²

With Douglass and the Pre-1950s group, he agrees when they claim that Christ did not inherit sinful tendencies from His mother. However, he does not agree with them when they declare that Christ had the natural propensities of the human nature.³ Heppenstall has a unique position in this matter.⁴ There are many aspects to clarify about this issue; Heppenstall's view on the nature of Christ, however, is an option that needs to be pondered to help to determine an Adventist perspective on the human nature of Christ.

¹See a full discussion on MWG, 107-172.

²The "Post-1950" group held to the biological transmission of sin. Thus, they emphasized Christ's human nature as that of Adam's before the fall. This permitted them to avoid the problem of giving Christ equal tendencies to sin as the other human beings. See Froom, ibid. Cf. Questions on Doctrine, 647-660.

³Here they mean to have the tendencies or weaknesses all humans have but these tendencies are not sinful, see Douglass, Jesus-the Benchmark of Humanity, 27-28; Ibid., Why Jesus Waits, 7-10; Priebe, 52-57; Standish and Standish, Deceptions of the New Theology, 55-60.

⁴Recently, there appeared a position that integrates elements of both views trying to conciliate both positions. Tim Poirier wrote a paper presenting his findings in a comparison between E. G. White writings with other contemporary writers on the subject. See Tim Poirier, "A Comparison of the Christology of Ellen G. White and Her Literary Sources," (unpublished MS, October 15, 1986, Ellen G. White Estate Inc., General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.). Poirier presents the position of Henry Melvill as a pointer for a solution of the tension: "Christ's humanity was not the Adamic humanity, that is, the humanity of Adam before the fall; nor the fallen humanity, that is, the humanity of Adam after the fall. It was not the Adamic, because it had the innocent infirmities of the fallen. It was not the fallen, because it had never descended into moral impurity. It was, therefore, most literally, our humanity, but without sin." Henry Melvill, Sermons by Henry Melvill, B.D., ed. C. P. McIlvaine (New York: Stanford and Swords, 1844). This agreeable position apparently seems to be the officially accepted in SDA church, see Seventh Day Adventists Believe..., 46-49, 57.
The completeness of the atonement is another aspect of Christology which has a polemic element. Regarding this subject, it should be mentioned that there has been a development in the understanding of the meaning of the atonement in Seventh-day Adventist theology. Actually there are two trends within the SDA church that differ in the understanding on the completeness of the atonement. The Post-1950s group maintains that Christ's act at the cross made a complete atonement. While the Pre-1950s group hold that Christ's mediatorial work in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary was part of the atonement, therefore, the atonement has not been completed. Consequently, to speak of the completeness of the atonement at the cross is considered by them as a betrayal of the traditional Adventist teachings.

First, the position, which we call the "pioneer," limited the term "atonement" to the mediatorial work of Jesus as High Priest in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary after 1844. The death of Christ on the cross was considered as a "Sacrifice" and the mediatorial work of Christ as the "Atonement." This position was held by J. M. Stephenson, The Atonement (Rochester, N. Y.: Advent Review Office, 1854; Microfilm Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International, 1977); Joseph H. Waggoner, The Atonement: An Examination of a Remedial System in the Light of Nature and Revelation (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1884); Uriah Smith, The Sanctuary and the Twenty Three Hundred Days of Daniel 8:14. Cf. Froom, 167-175. In some aspects, this position is still held by the "Pre-1950's" group.

E. G. White in her writings introduced a broader view of the atonement. She held the idea that the atonement involved the provision as well as the application of the merits of Christ. For further discussion on the issue, see Froom, 327-342; 409-428; and Schwarz, 168-169.

The book Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine presents a new perspective; it includes a vast sweep for atonement: Christ's Incarnation and sacrifice; salvation for the believers, and their glorification at his second coming. It sets the difference between the atoning act of Christ in the cross as a forever completed sacrifice and His work in the sanctuary as officiating high priest ministering the benefits of that sacrifice. What He did on the cross was for all men. What He does in the sanctuary is for those only who accept His great salvation. Both aspects are integral and inseparable phases of God's infinite work of redemption (ODP, 352-354). This is the position held by Heppenstall and the "Post-1950s" group see Froom, 493-517; R. A. Anderson The God-Man: His Nature And Work (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1970), 116-156.

The "Pre-1950" group are the followers of those who hold that atonement was not completed at the cross. They stressed that this was the pioneers' position. The reason they held this idea was that following the rituals of the earthly sanctuary, they came to this
Heppenstall, to clarify the problem, observed that a distinction needs to be made in the meaning of the word atonement. One of its meanings can refer to the redemption price paid for sin and sinners, the actual redemption of the human race in the heart and mind of God. This is what is meant by Christ's declaration, "It is finished." When one thus speaks in this sense, the atonement was completed at the cross.¹

The other meaning deals with the complete reconciliation of all things unto God and the complete eradication of sin. In this case obviously the atonement is not complete at the cross. Then, the atonement is a process where both perspectives have their value. In this way, Heppenstall unites both perspectives and offers a wider perspective on the issue.

Another aspect that Heppenstall confronted regarded the demonstrative or subjective concept of the death of Christ that was taught by some Adventist theologians who hold the moral influence theory of atonement which place them in tension with those who held to the substitutionary view of the atonement. Even though Heppenstall partially accepts the value of this concept as presented by Jack W. Provonska,² he believes conceiving the atonement merely as a conclusion when they differentiated between the daily sacrifice on the altar that was a partial atonement, and the sacrifice of the day of expiation that was the final atonement. This problem is more of semantics than of theology.

¹For a discussion on the way Heppenstall supports his view of the completeness of the atonement, see chapter 4, pp. 133-134.
²See J. W. Provonska, You Can Come Home Again, passim; idem, God Is with Us (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1974). He follows the concept held by Horace Bushnell which is called the "moral power" or influence (see The Vicarious Sacrifice: Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation [London: R. D. Dickenson, 1892], 184-230). Bushnell's view was based on that of Abelard which stresses the death of Christ as a demonstration of God's love. See Abelard, "Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans," A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham, ed. and trans. Eugene R. Fairweather, The Library of Christian Classics, ed. J. Baillie et al., 26 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953-69), 10:282-283. Even though Provonska follows the basic aspects of this theory, he presents it in the perspective of the great controversy. This is an aspect that also Heppenstall uses. Besides Provonska, G. Maxwell and Dick Winn hold the same views. See Dick Winn, God's Way to a New You (Mountain View,
manifestation of God's love for the human family and not God's objective solution to the sin problem is to set forth only a partial interpretation of the truth. He argues strongly against the subjective perspective of atonement that exclusively presents the view that the sacrifice of Christ is primarily a revelation of the love of God for man. He argues against the evidence presented that the proposition "for" means "for our benefit" rather than "in our place," because, for him, the death of Christ for sinners can be understood only in terms of substitution. Here is where God's justice had an important role in


This view denies the manifestation of the wrath of God against sinners. It also rejects the concept of propitiation and substitution in the death of Christ. Moreover, he adds: "The belief that Christ came simply to influence us to return to God, does not and cannot redeem us from sin. . . . Such an interpretation tends to say that the natural man has sufficient power to make the right response to God once he is given the right information about God" (SAT, 671-672).

Two Greek prepositions are used in the frequent phrase that Christ died for us. The first is anti which invariably means "instead of." The second preposition used more frequently in connection with Christ's death for us is huper. It can have two meanings: "for our benefit" and "instead of." Our author rejects the views of those who hold that Christ's death was for our benefit instead of in our place. This was presented by Hastings Rashdall, in The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology, 3-56, passim. For Heppenstall the notion of substitution is plain. He infers that if Christ died in the stead and place of the "all," then the "all" are reckoned to have died. It would be nonsense to say that "if one died for the benefit of all, then all died" (SAT, 682).

By substitution, Heppenstall means that Christ voluntarily substituted Himself in man's stead. Here lies, he says, the importance of Christ's sinlessness. Christ had no sin or guilt of His own. The Father and Christ suffered together their own judgment on sin. The sins of all men were imputed to Him, in order to make atonement by His death, (SAT, 681-682). In dealing with substitution, he also explores the concept of ransom, the idea stressed by the early fathers. However, he does not comply with their radical views, which underscored that the ransom was paid to the devil. Cf. Origen "Ezekiel Homilie," Opera Omnia, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: 1862), 13:663-767; Gregory of Nyssa The Catechetical Oration, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 5:22-26; Ireneus Adversus Haereses, Ante Nicene Fathers, 1:315-567. Heppenstall understood that Christ bought us back from the curse and the condemnation of the law by the sacrifice of Himself, (OHF, 28).
Heppenstall's view, and this is why in dealing with God's justice, he sees in Christ's atoning death the removal of God's judgment against the sinner. This judgment is called the wrath of God. However, propitiation is the very opposite of exacting punishment, because propitiation is God taking punishment upon Himself. In this respect, Heppenstall's view harmonizes with the views of the Pre-1950s and Post 1950s groups.

Heppenstall's view on the nature and work of Christ has an application in Christian experience. This area we consider now in the doctrine of salvation.

1Heppenstall follows the views of Anselm and Luther and Calvin in his emphasis on justice. However, Heppenstall points out that Anselm emphasized that the honor of God must be satisfied; Luther and Calvin, the justice of God. Even though they gave place to God's love in the atonement, justice appears to have the priority. Therefore, for them, Christ's death was for the purpose of appeasing the wrath of God. This concept came to be accepted by many post-reformation theologians. Heppenstall rejects this extreme concept (SAt, 675-681). Cf. Anselm of Canterbury Why God Became Man, trans. Joseph M. Colleran (Albany, N. Y.: Magi Books, 1969), 64-163; Martin Luther, Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (London: James Clarke, 1953, original ed. 1535), passim; Letters of Spiritual Counsel, Library of Christian Classics, vol. 18, ed. Theodore G. Tappert (London: SCM Press, 1955), passim; John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 1:2-10, 207-386.

2It is interesting to notice that Heppenstall uses only one paragraph to allude to this Greek word in his book Our High Priest (1972). It is possible that he attempted to avoid misunderstanding. It seems that after the publication of other books by Adventist writers presenting the subjective perspective of atonement, Heppenstall gave more consideration to the issue in the chapter "Objective and Subjective Aspects of Atonement" in SAt. 667-693.

3Notice that Heppenstall refrains from the use of the word 'wrath.' He explains that he uses instead the word "judgment" to avoid controversy and misunderstanding, (SAt, 679). On this point, Heppenstall shares the view of James I. Packer Knowing God (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-varsity Press, 1973), 134-136. Heppenstall follows the perspective of Morris and Denney who oppose the idea of C. H. Dodd who prefers the translation of the word ἰλασσόμαι as "expiate" rather than "propitiate" or "placate." Cf. Charles Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1954), 82-95. See also: James Denney, The Death of Christ, ed. R. V. G. Tasker (London: Tyndale Press, 1951), 150-151; Morris, The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, 144-213;

Heppenstall’s Contribution to the Doctrine of Salvation

The other important doctrine to consider is righteousness by faith. This doctrine is related to sin, because one’s attitude toward sin determines what kind of salvation is needed in order to be restored to fellowship with God. Adventist theology has traditionally placed its emphasis on sanctification and the perfection of man. This accent was reinforced in Heppenstall’s time, when M. L. Andreasen introduced the idea of the “last generation.” Afterwards, this view was taken up by Brinsmead and, subsequently, by Douglass and the Pre-1950s group, which gave stronger stress to perfection, emphasizing the imitation of Christ’s character. The Post-1950s group has placed its stress on

1In this view, he stressed that God wants to demonstrate to the universe that His law can be kept perfectly by His people. This plan is to be realized by the last generation of believers on the earth before Christ’s second coming. With this God plans to silence forever Satan’s charges. He says thus: “Through the last generation of saints, God stands finally vindicated. Through them He defeats Satan and wins His case. They form a vital part of the plan of God. They go through terrific struggles; they battle the unseen powers of high places. But they will not be ashamed” (The Sanctuary Service, 319). See also ibid., 299-321.

2Brinsmead related original sin with eschatology. Like many evangelicals, Adventists believe that the great tribulation will precede the visible coming of Christ. Adventists believe that this “time of trouble” begins at the close of the human probation, or the end of the time of grace, when there will be no Intercessor in the heavenly sanctuary—not even for the saints. It is generally held also that only those who have reached a state of moral and spiritual perfection would be able to pass through the time of trouble. Brinsmead was convinced that the reaching of perfection was futile and impossible. He started to develop a doctrine of the eradication of the sinful human nature by a miraculous act of God. This eradication will take place at the moment of one’s vindication in the investigative judgment. It will be imparted with the purpose of the saints being found in absolute harmony with that which the law demanded—perfect in truth and righteousness in the inward parts. For a full discussion on Brinsmead’s view on original sin, see his Sanctuary Institute Syllabus IV: Original Sin, 5-108.

3This group places their emphasis upon complete sanctification and character’s perfection. They assert that Christ did what man can do with God’s help. The final vindication of God, before the universe, does not lie in Calvary or Christ’s life, work and death, but in man’s demonstration of Christ-life. Among those who stress this view are: H. B. Douglass, Why Jesus Waits, ed. Thomas A. Davis (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1976), passim; idem, PIP, 13-52; Andreasen, The Sanctuary Service, 299-321; Hervyn Maxwell in PIP, 141-200; T. A. Davis, Was Jesus Really Like Us? (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1979), passim. For a further
justification.¹ Heppenstall has attempted to counteract the emphasis of the Pre-1950s group by pointing out the dangers of perfectionism and imitation theology.² He indicates that this can lead to a reduction of Christian living to a system of ethics and moral achievement.³ This has enticed many believers to envision the Christian life as an effort to attain perfection in a sense of sinlessness. Thus, Heppenstall has emphasized righteousness by faith and fought the trend that presents Christ's imitation as a way to achieve character perfection.⁴

discussion of Douglass's views on Christology and perfection, see Webster, 347-428.

¹The gospel then is justification, the righteousness of Christ credited to our account. Righteousness by faith becomes justification only. We are declared, not made righteous. Among those who hold this view are: Desmond Ford, "The Scope and Limits of the Pauline Expression 'Righteousness by Faith,'" in Documents from the Palmdale Conference on Righteousness by Faith, 1-13; H. K. LaRondelle, PIP, 93-136; idem, Christ Our Salvation, 40-52; and Heppenstall.

²Heppenstall's radical view of the nature of sin and his view of the sinless nature of Christ and His unique work as substitute and surety set the road to a new emphasis on righteousness by faith. His stand on sin and his view of the work of Christ on the cross are the reasons for his insistence on the primacy of justification by faith. Heppenstall's effort and emphasis on the topic has been consistent throughout his life. Since he started writing his emphasis has been the same issues of righteousness by faith. In 1SBD (1955), he develops justification, regeneration, and sanctification. After considering the work of the Holy Spirit, he deals with righteousness by faith and Christian experience. In his syllabi SRF1 (1959), SRF2 (1963), and SRF3 (1966), and in MWG (1977), he presents these topics with a slight difference: he deals first with the section on righteousness by faith, and then the other topics mentioned.

³He said: "The tendency on our part of some to reduce Christian living to a system of ethics and moral achievement reduces the gospel to a concentration upon self. The highest ethical imitation of Christ, and the most sincere belief in Him as a perfect example, fails to do justice to the sinner's hopeless condition, regardless of how hard he may try to be like Christ. Such religion creates the peril of independence by relying upon ourselves" (MWG, 149). Then he adds: "There is one sense alone in which imitation applies: to imitate Christ in His living by faith in the Father and to depend on His Son our Lord Jesus Christ. And even faith is the gift of God, not something realized by any effort of ours to imitate or copy" (ibid., 147-148).

⁴Heppenstall pointed out objections to perfectionist views since the La Sierra period. See 1SBD, 46. During the Brinsmead controversy, Heppenstall wrote several papers and articles facing Brinsmead's view on perfection: see Is Perfection Possible? (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, [1964?]); "Is Perfection Possible?" The Signs of the Times, December 1963, 10-11, 30; "Getting Rid of Sin," The Signs of the Times, August 1965, 12-13;
The Pre-1950s group attack the view of righteousness by faith of the Post-1950s group as leading to license in Christian life.¹

Heppenstall’s position has been supported by mainstream Adventist theology, and his view on the subject has been considered an asset.²

However, one may wonder if Heppenstall’s emphasis on righteousness by faith is not related to his view on the transfer of sin. If this is true, then the penitent sinner does not need to worry about his stand in the judgment, since his confession has cleared the records of sin. This tends to diminish the importance of sanctification. Even though we cannot notice this emphasis in Heppenstall’s view on righteousness by faith, the implications of his concept on the transfer of sin can lead in that direction. Let us now consider the doctrine of the sanctuary in Heppenstall’s understanding.

Heppenstall’s Contribution to the Doctrine of the Sanctuary

The sanctuary is a distinctive doctrine of Adventist theology. Adventist theology gives an important place to this doctrine because the rituals and symbols of the sanctuary are the basis for interpreting

---

¹See Claudia Burrow, Unrighteousness Uncovered (Killen, Tex.: Fred and Claudia Burrow Publications, 1989), 57.

Christ's heavenly ministry. This is the doctrine that has received the harshest criticism from people outside the SDA church. At the same time, within Adventism and throughout its history, there have been those who have a feeling of unrest regarding several aspects of this doctrine. It is evident that Heppenstall was conscious of the problems and tried to find biblical answers to them. Let us note the ways he dealt with this doctrine.

The first aspect regards the transfer of sin and the defilement of the heavenly sanctuary. The general concept among Adventist theology has been that blood defiles. This is seen as the intent of the symbolism of the sanctuary service. The idea is based on the earthly sanctuary ritual, where sins were transferred figuratively from the individual to the sanctuary through the blood of the sacrifice. This defilement demanded a 'cleansing' of the sanctuary on the day of atonement. Heppenstall rejects this idea, because when applied to Christ, he asserts, Christ's blood cleanses, justifies, reconciles, and redeems but "nowhere does the blood of Christ defile. Only sin

1 This is the case of Hoekema, The Four Major Cults, 112; Walter R. Martin, The Truth about Seventh-day Adventists, 9.

2 Among the first to reject some views of this doctrine was D. M. Canright, Adventist Renounced (New York: Fleming & Revell, 1889), 117-123; Ballenger, Cast out for the Cross of Christ, passim; E. J. Waggoner, Confessions of Faith ([n. p.], [1916]), pamphlet in Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University, 14-20; W. W. Fletcher, Reasons for My Faith (Sydney: William Brooks and Company, 1932); L. R. Conradi, in Desmond Ford, Daniel 8:14, The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment, 47-49; and Desmond Ford, ibid.

3 He belonged to a commission appointed to study the problems of the book of Daniel, see Ford, Daniel 8:14, The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment, 62.

defiles."¹ Heppenstall points out that the shedding of His blood makes valid the recording of man's sins, because Christ's sacrifice is the basis of God's judgment upon us.² We can infer at least three reasons why he could not accept the transfer of sin by means of the blood. First, he rejected the idea of sin as an entity. He holds that in heaven there are only records of sin, not sin itself.³ In this respect, Heppenstall's view is confirmed by E. G. White when she speaks of the records of sin in heaven.⁴ The usage of sin in an objective manner by Adventist writers is not intended to convey a reality. However, it may lead others to think that way. In this respect, Heppenstall's stress is correct.

The second reason is, for him, the blood of Christ cleanses, not defiles.⁵ Other Adventist scholars have rejected Heppenstall's

¹OHP, 58. "Sin defiles. Blood cleanses" (ibid., 83). Heppenstall was beginning to think this way during the "La Sierra period" (1940-55). Note his question and observation: "Does blood cleanse or does it defile? - not defiled by confession of the sinning member but by sinning of the individual" (2SBD, 26). It is interesting to notice that this view was previously presented by Waggoner when he confessed that his view of one eternal covenant of grace and his view that "sin is not an entity but a condition that can exist only in a person, made it clear to me that it is impossible that there could be any such thing as the transferring of sins to the sanctuary in heaven, thus defiling that place; and that there could, consequently, be no such thing, either in 1844, A. D., or at any other time, as the "cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary," Confessions of Faith, 14-15. The same view was held by A. F. Ballenger, in Cast Out for the Cross of Christ, 58-66; Heppenstall uses Ballenger's arguments to support his view, cf. SDAt, 10-12; however, he did not reach their conclusions. He accepted that there is no defilement through the blood. The defilement was done through the sinning of the person. He said thus: "The blood does not record but it makes valid the recording. Obviously, sins are recorded when they are committed, not when they are confessed" (SDS, 11). See a more extended treatment in SDS, 10-12, as he established his views on this question.

²SDAt, 11.

³"The cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven is not from sin but from the record of sin" (2SBD, 26). See SDAt, 10-12. See also chap. 6 of this study, pp. 149-152.

⁴See White, The Great Controversy, 486-491; idem, Patriarch and Prophets, 357-358.

⁵2SBD, 26. He affirms that "the NT always speaks of the blood of Christ as exercising positive action. Nowhere does the blood of Christ defile. Only sin defiles" (OHP, 58). See also SDAt, 11-12.
objections on the subject. They stress the view that if in the sanctuary there was a cleansing/defiling activity, then the sins of the repentant sinner are transferred by the blood to the sanctuary.¹

H. W. Wiggers also finds the defiling/cleansing function not only in the OT but also in the NT in reference to Christ.²

The third reason, is that in this view, Heppenstall does not find a place for Satan's sins and the unconfessed sins of the people in

---

¹Hasel demonstrates that in the Levitical sacrifices the blood had a defiling/cleansing function. See Gerhard Hasel, "Studies in Biblical Atonement I: Continual Sacrifice and Defilement/Cleansing of the Sanctuary," 87-114. Rodriguez, on his part, has also demonstrated that there is such a thing as the transfer of sin through the blood, and in this way defiling the sanctuary. See Angel Rodriguez, "Transfer of Sin in Leviticus," 70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Series, vol. 3 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1986), 169-197. Alberto Treiyer also studied the different ways to defile the sanctuary, concluding that the sins atoned for were those transferred by the blood only. The illegal way of defiling the sanctuary was not atoned by sacrifice but with the death penalty. "The Day of the Atonement as Related to the Contamination of the Purification of the Sanctuary," 198-256; See also idem, El Día de la Expilación y la Purificación del Santuario (Buenos Aires, Argentina: Asociación Casa Editora Sudamericana, 1988), passim.

²Wiggers asserts that the epistle to the Hebrews describes Jesus as going to heaven with sin. He argues that in the translation of Heb 9:28, it should read "to bear the sins of many," then he says: "He was (past tense) offered 'to bear' (present tense) the sins of many. In other words, His sacrifice had the purpose to load Him with sin. That is exactly what Paul says in 2 Cor 5:21. In dying for us He was made sin. That is exactly what happened in the O.T. sacrifice. Every sacrifice, eaten or not eaten, loaded the priest with sin Lev 10:17" (H. W. Wiggers, The Ford Issue and the Sanctuary Debate [Payson, Ariz.: Leaves of Autumn Books, 1986], 15). Moreover, the priest could bring his offering the whole year through, but he was not atoned for and was not forgiven. He mentions two reasons to support his view. First, Lev 4:1-12 deals with the sin-offering of the priest; in this section the words atonement and forgiveness are omitted. This is not the case of the sin-offerings of the other persons (Lev 4:13-35). Second, one of the purposes of the Day of Atonement was to unload the priest from sin and to make atonement for him (Lev 16:6, 11). From this, he infers that the author of Hebrews had this in mind when he mentioned that when Christ "comes a second time it is without sin." The last sentence in Heb 9:28 would be nonsense if He had not gone to heaven with sins. Therefore, he concludes that Christ went to heaven with sin. Wiggers misinterprets the tense of the verb "to bear" in Greek, because it is not present, but it is an aorist infinitive; however, his point in relation to the sin-offering of the priest is an aspect to consider seriously.
the day of atonement.1 Regarding this objection presented by Heppenstall, Treiyer answers that in the Day of Atonement, two functions were realized— one of cleansing and the other of destruction. The cleansing function is for the believers; the destructive one is for the rebels; consequently, both are included in the Day of Atonement.2

The previous concept of no transfer of sin by means of the blood led Heppenstall to believe that there is no relation between the prophecy in Dan 8 and the day of atonement of Lev 16.3 Thus, he gives little consideration to the judgment of the saints in dealing with Dan 8.4 The defilement of the sanctuary in the context of Dan 8 refers only to the judgment of the "Little Horn," implying that it is this

---

1Heppenstall asserts that if this were so, the unconfessed sins of the congregation would not be blotted out. Furthermore, there is no provision for Satan's personal sins, since if all sin is transferred by blood, no blood is shed for Satan (2SBD, 22-23).

2The cleansing function is for the people of God, when all their sins are blotted out. The destructive function is for the unbelievers because in the type of the sanctuary, God did not assume the unconfessed sins of the rebels during the year. Their names, therefore, are not registered in the "book of life" (cf. Rev 13:8; Dan 12:1). God made no compromise for their salvation. Then, only the death penalty can vindicate God's justice (Isa 5:13-16). Treiyer, El Dia de la Expiación y la Purificación del Santuario, 325-326.

3This objection of Heppenstall has been answered by other Adventist scholars demonstrating that there are various terminological and conceptual links and associations between Dan 8 and the Hebrew cultus (Lev 16). See Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints, and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," SAT, 199-208. See also Treiyer, El Dia de la Expiación y la Purificación del Santuario, 317-321.

4Even though Heppenstall uses the word cleansing at the beginning and in other parts of the chapter, "The Pre-Advent Judgment" in OHE, 107-129, it is evident that he does not emphasize the judgment of the saints. There are two occasions when he mentions the judgment of the saints, and he says thus: "The cleansing or justification of the sanctuary also means that God has taken action into His own hands to judge His people and decide their destiny, and thereby expose the falsity and the worthlessness of this apostate system" (OHE, 182). Thus, we can note that even this mention is made to emphasize the vindication of God's judgment on the apostate system. The other only mentions that the "cleansing" or the "restoring of the sanctuary" means "that a righteous judgment that considers the cases of men in the heavenly sanctuary is the only one that counts" (ibid., 184). The same thing can be said in relation to Dan 7; the whole chapter emphasizes the vindication of God and His people and the overthrow of their enemies. The judgment of the saints not only received little emphasis but in all probability was just plain overlooked. Cf. 107-129.
power that defiles the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{1} Treiyer holds that both the judgment of the saints and of the "Little Horn" are in the context.\textsuperscript{2}

It seems that Heppenstall is correct in stressing the vindication of God and His people, the judgment of the persecuting forces, and the eradication of sin, because it gives us a broader dimension of the whole process of the judgment. However, the judgment of the saints can also be considered as part of the issue in the Dan 8 prophecy. Both aspects can be conciliated, because it was the apostasy of the people of God that defiled the sanctuary and which gave the enemies of God’s people opportunity to persecute them and destroy the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{3} In this way, Heppenstall's objections have been refuted by other Adventist scholars.

Another issue regarding the sanctuary is that since the beginning of the Adventist movement, there has been a consistent tendency to stress a literal relationship between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary.\textsuperscript{4} Following the typological interpretation of the sanctuary, Adventism has presented the work of Christ after 1844 as performing the activities represented by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}OHP, 159-185. Desmond Ford also follows Heppenstall's position that the sins of the believers are not in the context of Dan 8, see Ford, Daniel 8:14. The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment, 215-229. Hasel agrees that the vindication of the saints is in view; however, he only accepts an indirect defilement by the little horn. See Hasel, "Studies," ibid., 193, 206.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Treiyer says that the sins of God's people caused the desolation and the trampling of the sanctuary and the people of God (Dan 8:12; 23). Then, this cleansing, restoring, and vindication is for both, as was in the case of the Day of Atonement. Treiyer, 325-326. See also Wiggers, 14-23.
\item \textsuperscript{3}See Treiyer, El Día de la Expiación y la Purificación del Santuario, 317-333. See also Wiggers, 14-23.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Cf. Uriah Smith, Looking into Jesus; or Christ in Type and Antitype (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1897); The Sanctuary and the Twenty Three Hundred Days of Dan. VIII, 14; J. H. Waggoner, The Atonement: An Examination of a Remedial System in the Light of Nature and Revelation; Andreasen, The Sanctuary Service. E. J. Waggoner's criticism illustrates this fact: "Look over the literature from the beginning, and it will be apparent that they have transferred the Jewish sanctuary and its ceremonies into Heaven, and they have made the atonement itself only ceremony. Everything must be made to "fit the type," as though the shadow of a thing were more important that the thing itself," Confession of Faith, 20-21.
\end{itemize}
Atonement, that is, a work of judgment. This investigative or pre-Advent judgment consists in the analysis of the records of the sins of the professed believers. This aspect has caused criticism from outside the church because it is alleged that there is no biblical basis for this idea. Moreover, it is said that it threatens the assurance of salvation on the part of the believer. This claims have also been used by Adventist dissidents.

Heppenstall presented a new emphasis on the subject. He placed the stress on the vindication of God and His people, on the judgment of the powers that opposed and persecuted the saints, and on the coming of a new order. For him the judgment of the saints is merely an implication rather than the main thrust of the doctrine. In this way, he recognized at the same time both the judgment of the saints and the wicked. He presented a wider outlook that gave the believer ground for his assurance and to see Christ's work of judgment as a way

1The Biblical basis for this concept is found in the prophecies of Dan 7 and 8 and in the typology of the sanctuary, specifically to the day of atonement.


5He declares that in the investigative or pre-Advent judgment, "God affirms a righteous judgment, a verdict in favor of His people, the overthrow of their enemies, and the coming of a new order" OHP, 117. This is the notion of his presentation in OHP, 107-129, and in "The Hour of God's Judgment Is Come," DD, 158-186.

6He recognizes that "not only the wicked with his evil deeds but also the righteous with his good deeds will be brought to judgment," OHP, 119. See also ibid., 118, 201, 205.
to bring an end to his anxieties and struggle with sin.\textsuperscript{1} Heppenstall called for a widening of the scope of this pre-Advent Judgment. This widening of scope has been followed by a number of present day Adventist scholars, however, not in the sense that Heppenstall understood it.\textsuperscript{2}

In regards to the investigative judgment, we notice that there are two basic elements that have led Heppenstall to his views on the subject. His view on sin as a condition rather than an entity led him to hold the view that there is no transfer of sin into the heavenly sanctuary.\textsuperscript{3} This idea led Ballenger and Waggoner to hold that if there are no sins to be cleansed, then, there is no need of atonement for sins, therefore, there is no need for an investigative judgment.

However, Heppenstall, instead of following Ballenger's conclusions, tried to find a solution to the problems posed by Ballenger. His idea of the investigative judgment as the vindication of God and His people and, at the same time, the judgment of the "little horn" is his solution

\textsuperscript{1}In referring to this judgment, he said: "Both sides of the controversy are to be seen in proper perspective. . . . It is the restricted concept that often throws the picture out of focus and gives ground for criticism of our position" (DP, 169); furthermore, he said that this "is no contradiction of our previous position, but a widening of the perspective" (ibid., 172).

\textsuperscript{2}William Shea, from a historico-grammatical perspective holds: "This symbol [little horn] has generally been taken to apply to the papacy in particular as the governing head of religious communion. But the leadership has had millions who have followed its lead. It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that, any judgment of this professed Christian power would also involve those who have followed and supported its lead. Thus a judgment of the little horn would appear to involve a judgment of the millions of people who have attempted to follow God through allegiance to this alleged earthly representative of His." (Shea, 124-125. See also Ibid., 123-131). Notice that even though Shea includes the little horn in this judgment, he does so because the little horn is considered to be among those who belong the people of God. Heppenstall considers the little horn as not belonging in to God's people. See also Seventh-day Adventists Believe... , 325-327; Arthur J. Ferch, The Son of Man in Daniel Seven (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1979), 175-180.

\textsuperscript{3}Undoubtedly he got the idea from Ballenger, and possibly, from Waggoner also. In any case, he presented the same arguments used by Ballenger. See above pp. 216-217.
to Ballenger's problem. The vindication of God, then, is basic for
Heppenstall's system, because it clarifies his doctrine of redemption.

There is another point that needs highlighting in regards
to Azazel or the scapegoat. Adventists have repeatedly been charged
with making Satan their sin-bearer and Savior. This charge mainly
stems from some quotations of E. G. White which could lead one to think
that way. Some Adventist theologians have been embarrassed by these
statements. In order to escape this charge, they have sought to explain
this scapegoat transaction in a way that would be more acceptable to
non-Adventist theologians. M. L. Andreasen, even though he recognized
that Christ is the only bearer for man's atonement, proposed the concept
of "shared responsibility," that is, that justice demands that the

1The cleansing of the sins was the basic problem for Ballenger.
Heppenstall explained the investigative judgment from the perspective of
the vindication of God and His people, instead of the cleansing of the
sanctuary. This is why in his explanation of the investigative judg­
ment, he stresses the meaning of "justified" in the Hebrew word tsadaq
in Dan 8:14. Also, Heppenstall does not relate Dan 8:14 with Lev 16,
neither in OHP nor in other writings. Heppenstall's solution led him to
implicitly reject the idea of a judgment of the people of God. This
aspect placed him a perplexing situation in comparison with the views of
E. G. White. This is considered below.

2In the dialogue with Barnhouse and Martin, one of the ques­
tions concerned this issue. It says thus: "What is the actual teachings
of the Seventh-day Adventists regarding the 'scapegoat' in the sanctuary
service? Do you hold that the sins of the righteous are rolled back on
Satan, so that in the ond he becomes your sin bearer?" Questions on
Doctrine, 396.

3Referring to a council Satan held with his angels, White says:
"He had prevailed nothing against the Son of God, now they must increase
their efforts and with their power and cunning turn to His followers.
They must prevent all whom they could from receiving the salvation
purchased for them by God. Also it would be for his own interest to keep
from Jesus as many as possible. For the sins of those who are redeemed
by the blood of Christ will be at last be rolled back upon the origina­
tor of sin, and he must bear their punishment, while those who do not
accept salvation through Jesus will suffer the penalty of their own
sins," Early Writings, 178. Elsewhere, speaking of the scapegoat and
its banishment, she says thus: "In like manner, when the work of
atonement in the heavenly sanctuary has been completed, then in the
presence of God and heavenly angels, and the host of the redeemed, the
sins of God's people will be placed upon Satan; he will be declared
guilty of all the evil he has caused them to commit. And as the
scapegoat was sent away into a land not inhabited, so Satan will be ban­
ished to the desolate earth, an uninhabitable and dreary wilderness,"
Great Controversy, 658.
master criminal be punished for his part in causing his accomplices to commit the crime.\textsuperscript{1} The authors of Questions on Doctrine endorse Andreasen's "shared responsibility" concept.\textsuperscript{2}

However, Heppenstall presented another alternative: the scapegoat typology is primarily figurative, i.e., it teaches the "very destruction of evil and the originator of it."\textsuperscript{3} It is an indication of the surety of the eternal eradication of sin.\textsuperscript{4} Here again, we observe Heppenstall's concern for God's vindication when he presents the issue in the cosmic perspective, within the background of the great controversy, where the question is who is ultimately responsible for sin. The significance of the scapegoat for Heppenstall is to assert that Satan, as the originator of sin, will be destroyed forever. Sin will also receive the same fate.

We can see that while Andreasen emphasized the view of the scapegoat or Satan as the instigator of sin, Heppenstall emphasizes

\textsuperscript{1}See Andreasen, Sanctuary Service, 193-210. F. D. Nichol also holds the same view, see Answers to Objections, 410-411.

\textsuperscript{2}The authors take the stand that "Christ provides the sole propitiation for our sins," and concerning the two goats used in the day of atonement; one represented Christ who made atonement for our sins on the cross; the other, in antithesis, symbolized Satan "who must bear the responsibility not only for his own sins but for his part in all the sins he has caused others, both righteous and wicked, to commit" ibid., 396-401.

\textsuperscript{3}OHP, 81. We can also notice that he links the eradication of the "originator of evil" to the purpose of the Day of Atonement that was "the final vindication of both the sanctuary and the people" (ibid., 80). Then for him, the scapegoat is related to the vindication of God and His people; vindication of God because He is not the originator of sin. Vindication of God's people because they have been cleansed of sin.

\textsuperscript{4}He elaborates this point thus: "The first goat, whose blood was shed, pointed to the atonement made by Christ for our sins. The second goat, whose blood was not shed, had no part in effecting personal redemption. Instead, it pointed to the final and total eradication of sin consequent of Christ's redemption. What is taught by means of the two goats is more than an offering for sin. What is involved is the banishment of Satan and his followers, the eradication of sin, as symbolized by the total isolation of the second goat, which symbolized Satan" (OHP, 79). He says that "the blotting out of sin involves more than forgiveness, it involves also the banishment of sin and Satan" (ibid., 81).
the view of Satan as the originator. It seems that both positions are complementary and E. G. White stresses both aspects.

Related to the previous concepts is the location of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Traditionally, Adventists have taught that Christ was ministering in the holy place from His ascension until 1844. This assertion has been considered by many as a contradiction to several Biblical passages which state that Christ is "at the right hand of the Father." From this tension, three different views within Adventism have been offered to explain the problem. The first has the tendency to interpret literally the types of the sanctuary. They believe that there is a real and literal sanctuary in heaven, all the anti-types are represented by the types on earth, that Christ is performing His ministry according to the earthly types. They hold that Christ, since His ascension until 1844, was in the holy place and after this, He moved into the most holy place to start the investigative judgment. To solve the problem of Christ being isolated from the presence of the Father, they speak of a "movable throne," that is, the Father was with Christ in the holy place, and from there, He moved into the most holy place in 1844.

The second denies Christ performing a two-part ministry in the sanctuary in heaven. This group is represented by those who stress that there is no Biblical support for the teachings of the investigative judgment in Dan 8:14. They find difficulties in

---

1See Heb 8:2, 5; 9:9, 23-24; 1:3. The tension is raised when they conclude that the Father's throne is in the most holy place following the types of the sanctuary.

2In reality we can speak of a fourth one, but this is to refer to those who rejected the concept and departed from the church as was the case of Canright, Ballenger, Waggoner, Conradi, and Fletcher, among others.

accepting the idea of Christ having two ministries in the heavenly sanctuary, based on the epistle to the Hebrews. Heppenstall represents the third trend in the interpretation: He accepts the two part ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. However, he speaks of Christ's heavenly ministry in a functional sense, that is, instead of speaking of Christ as performing His ministry in the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary following literally the earthly type, he prefers to say that Christ is in the most holy place, performing the functions represented by the first apartment. However, this interpretation places Heppenstall in a difficult situation, because, traditionally, the SDA church has taught that from His ascension to heaven until 1844 Christ was in the holy place of the sanctuary. This view is followed because

1 See Desmond Ford, Daniel 8:14, The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment, passim; Adventist Crisis of Spiritual Identity, 55-114.

2 The basis of this assertion is that the idea of Christ ministering in the holy place is not mentioned in his syllabi and books. When he dealt with Christ's ministry in the holy place, he preferred to speak of Christ's mediatorial ministry (not stating where this mediation was performed), or when he had to mention the place where Christ was performing his mediatorial ministry, he used the expression: "At the right hand of the Father." He says that Christ ascended to be seated at the right hand of the Father, in a real sanctuary (Heb 8:2, 5; 9:23-24; 1:3) in a specific throne (Acts 7:49; Ps 11:4; Ezek 1 and 10) (SDAt, 1). In 2SBD, 19, when dealing with Christ's mediatorial place, he places the type and says that, in respect to time, it was done every day of the year, and as to place, he says that it was performed in the first apartment or the holy place. Speaking of the antitype, in respect to time, he declares that it was from the ascension to 1844; however, when referring to the place, instead of asserting that it was made in the first apartment or the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary he writes: "as represented by the first apartment." Afterwards, when dealing more specifically with the location of the place of the daily ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, he writes: "His position and place since the ascension: 'at the right hand of the Father" (2SBD, 24). Here we can notice that Heppenstall was not comfortable with the idea of having Christ separated from the Father for 1800 years or moving God's throne into the holy place as others have suggested.

3 The implications of this concept are of crucial importance for Adventist theology, because in the sanctuary type, it is believed that the throne and the presence of God are in the most holy place. Then, to hold that Christ was in the holy place since His ascension until 1844, is to affirm that He was not in the very presence of God until that time. This is to contradict the biblical teaching that Christ is at "the right hand of the Father" see Heb 1:3; 8:1-2; 10:12-13; Acts 2:33; 5:31; 7:56; Eph 1:20; 1 Pet 3:22. This aspect was one of the basic Ballenger contentions. He alleges that Christ at His ascension went directly to
of the typological interpretation of the sanctuary—the daily
ministration was performed in the holy place, and the yearly service at
the most holy place. Moreover, this was held by E. G. White who is con-
sidered by the SDA church to have had a prophetic gift, and hence, her
views have authority.¹ To believe something different from her views
is considered unorthodox. Undoubtedly, this tension has led Heppenstall
to consider a solution that he feels is closer to the Bible and still
keeps the main thrust of E. G. White's teachings. Evidently,
Heppenstall was aware of the implications of pushing too hard on the
issue, hence, rather than to put SDA church under stress, he has kept
silent on the subject. Perhaps this is the reason that he propounded a
functional instead of a more literal understanding of the sanctuary
doctrine.²

In summary, we conclude that Heppenstall's contribution
to Adventist theology has been positive in many ways. He has introduced
new elements into Adventist theology, as in the case of his views on the
Covenant, the law, and perfection. He has given some useful insights in
helping to clarify perplexing questions about several doctrinal posi-
tions: original sin, the human nature of Christ, and the investigatory
judgment. He has given alternatives to theological problems within
Adventism, as in the debate on the human nature of Christ.

However, some of Heppenstall's views on the sanctuary
doctrine have given the occasion to question his orthodoxy. This latter
point is very much connected with other Adventist theologians and E. G.

¹See Great Controversy, 409-432; Early Writings, 54-56, 92.
²With the functional interpretation of Christ's heavenly
ministry, the tension is solved for him, because Christ is at the "right
hand of the Father" (that is, in the most holy place) performing the
ministry represented by the first apartment. However, this perspective
is against the clear statements of E. G. White who teaches that Christ
stood in the holy place until 1844. From the holy place, Christ moved
into the most holy place in 1844, see Early Writings, Washington, D. C.:
Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1945), 54-55, 92.
White's views on the subject that we have mentioned in this section. This leads us to wonder about Heppenstall's relation to E. G. White.

Heppenstall's Relationship with E. G. White

E. G. White can be considered as one of the persons who had the most impressive influence on Heppenstall's theology. The profuse use of quotations and ideas of E. G. White in Heppenstall's writings demonstrates the deep knowledge of her writings and views.¹ Moreover, Heppenstall, as a SDA believer, recognized her writings as authoritative, because he considered her writings as the disclosure of God's will.² Thus, it becomes imperative to relate Heppenstall's views to those of E. G. White. Analysis of this subject comes from three different perspectives: First, in the areas where He follows and supports E. G. White views; second, in areas where Heppenstall prefers to keep silent and does not compromise his position but where he seems to feel uncomfortable with E. G. White's position; and third, in areas where his views differ from her teachings.

Areas of Agreement

Heppenstall agrees with E. G. White in almost all doctrinal areas. One of the most important aspects where Heppenstall follows E. G. White's views is the concept of the great controversy, which is basic for Heppenstall's scheme of redemption. This notion has

¹In Heppenstall's syllabi, articles and printed books, besides the quotations from the Scripture, quotations from E. G. White are the most numerous. Just one example of his extensive usage can be seen in his book OHP, where he used 67 quotations from different E. G. White writings.

²He writes thus: "The writings of E. G. White are for the disclosure of God's will and purpose to the remnant church. There cannot be idolizing of man and woman. The Word of God to the remnant church has divine authority. That fact gives the Word certainty and power. And because the message given through Ellen G. White is Christ's own testimony, we accept it" (SU, 250). See also SU, 249-252; "The Inspired Witness of Ellen G. White," Adventist Review, May 7, 1987, 16-17;
its source in White's writings.¹ It should be noticed that in all Heppenstall's syllabi, articles, and books, his assertions and views are based on the Bible teachings and on E. G. White's writings. He quotes her profusely, and in other parts even though she is not quoted, her views are stressed. However, a few aspects where Heppenstall appears to feel uneasy with her views, he opts to remain silent about the subject.

Areas of Silence

Two aspects are considered in this section. One regards the place of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (that we have considered in the previous section). Here Heppenstall seems reticent and reluctant to accept E. G. White's position on the location of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. The second relates to Christ's divinity as one of the causes for Satan's rebellion. This position was held at the beginning by Heppenstall in accordance with E. G. White, but was later discarded.

Regarding Christ's divinity in the great controversy, Heppenstall (in his 1SBD) follows the idea of E. G. White that one of

¹Heppenstall's understanding of the concept of the great controversy has its source in E. G. White's writings. He writes of her thus: "Ellen White presents the larger view of the issues in the great controversy between Christ and Satan" (SU, 251). She wrote extensively on this issue, the most important works dealing with the great controversy are the following: Conflict of the Ages Series, vol. 1, Patriarchs and Prophets; Conflict of the Ages Series, vol. 2, Prophets and Kings; Conflict of the Ages Series, vol. 3, The Desire of Ages; Conflict of the Ages Series, vol. 4, The Acts of Apostles; Conflict of the Ages Series, vol. 5, The Great Controversy; Early Writings; Spiritual Gifts, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1944); Selected Messages, 3 vols.


Heppenstall is acquainted with Gustaf Aulén's concept of the victorious struggle against the evil forces in the process of reconciliation. However, Aulén does not present the perspective of starting the controversy between Christ with Satan in heaven, an aspect that for Heppenstall is basic in the understanding of the doctrine of redemption. The basic difference between them is that Aulén presents the concept of the struggle of Christ with the evil forces from the Incarnation to the atonement and its consequent application to the believer (see Aulén, 4-7), while Heppenstall's great controversy view starts with the origin of sin before the fall of man and extends to the final eradication of Satan and sinners after the millennium.
the reasons for Satan's rebellion in heaven was that he questioned Christ's divinity. Afterwards, Heppenstall does not mention this view. The only way to explain this change is that Heppenstall did not see biblical reasons to support this assertion. Since the great controversy lies at the foundation of Heppenstall's theology, it would have been helpful for him to reflect more on this aspect. Some passages in Scripture could have shed light on the topic.¹

Would it be enlightening if Heppenstall had given more careful analysis of the following passages: i.e., Isa 14:12-14 where it seems that the king of Babylon personifies Satan defying God's divinity when he asserts himself to raise his throne "above the stars of God" and to make himself "like the Most High"; Rev 12:7-9 where it is mentioned that Satan rebelled against God's sovereignty; in Christ's temptation in the wilderness, when Satan offered all the kingdoms of the world "if you will bow down and worship me" implying that in Satan's claim of his superiority he did not recognize Christ's divinity when he offered all the kingdoms of the world if Christ would adore him (Matt 4:8-11; Luke 4:6-8); in Paul's epistles where Christ's preeminence is stressed? The question is, Why was Christ's and not God's supremacy stressed? Is there any problem with Christ recognition of His divinity and supremacy? (see Eph 1:9-10; 1:20-23; Phil 2:9-11; Col 1:15-20; 3:1)? In 1 Cor 15:20-28, Paul applies to Christ the passage of Ps 110:1: "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet" implying that the rebellion was in some way connected with Christ's position in the Godhead. The same aspect is observed in Phil 2:5-11 where after His humiliation, God exalted Christ to "the highest place and gave Him the name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord, to the glory of the Father."

In the book of Revelation, the controversy is between the satanic powers opposing Christ's authority. This controversy helps us to answer: Why did Christ have to overcome to have the right to be sat down on His father's throne (Rev 3:21)? Why in Rev 4 and 5 is Christ asked who is worthy to open the books and to read thereon (Rev 5:1-2)? In the songs following this scene, one can pinpoint the reasons: At first, in the song of the four beasts and the 24 elders, is mentioned that Christ's sacrifice made possible a kingdom of priests with all the redeemed (Rev 5:8-9). Later, the angels sang that because He was slain, Christ was worthy "to receive power," and subsequently, all living creatures said: "blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto God and the Lamb" (Rev 5:11-13). With a background of the great controversy, it is obvious that the Father's place in the Godhead was not questioned, but Christ's was. It was through Christ's redemptive sacrifice that He vindicated God's character and made Himself "worthy" before those who questioned His authority to receive the power and the right to be one with God. When He comes to destroy the evil forces, He is described in Rev 19:16 as "King of Kings and Lord of Lords," because Christ has won the battle against the forces that opposed His authority He is called "King of Kings", and because He is the "Word (logos) of God" (cf. John 1:1-3), He is called "Lord of Lords." In God's eternal kingdom, the throne of God and the Lamb are mentioned to stress Christ's equality with the Father (Rev 22:3). With these passages we can assume that Christ's place in the Godhead was one of Satan's arguments for his rebellion in heaven.

¹Would it be enlightening if Heppenstall had given more careful analysis of the following passages: i.e., Isa 14:12-14 where it seems that the king of Babylon personifies Satan defying God's divinity when he asserts himself to raise his throne "above the stars of God" and to make himself "like the Most High"; Rev 12:7-9 where it is mentioned that Satan rebelled against God's sovereignty; in Christ's temptation in the wilderness, when Satan offered all the kingdoms of the world "if you will bow down and worship me" implying that in Satan's claim of his superiority he did not recognize Christ's divinity when he offered all the kingdoms of the world if Christ would adore him (Matt 4:8-11; Luke 4:6-8); in Paul's epistles where Christ's preeminence is stressed? The question is, Why was Christ's and not God's supremacy stressed? Is there any problem with Christ recognition of His divinity and supremacy? (see Eph 1:9-10; 1:20-23; Phil 2:9-11; Col 1:15-20; 3:1)? In 1 Cor 15:20-28, Paul applies to Christ the passage of Ps 110:1: "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet" implying that the rebellion was in some way connected with Christ's position in the Godhead. The same aspect is observed in Phil 2:5-11 where after His humiliation, God exalted Christ to "the highest place and gave Him the name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord, to the glory of the Father."
Areas of Divergence

This section is divided into three different aspects. First are areas of minor disagreement, where Heppenstall diverges from E. G. White in less important areas. The second are areas of interpretational tension, where Heppenstall seems to disagree with E. G. White, but where this disagreement is related to an issue that involves a more serious difference of interpretation of her views, thus causing a tension within the church. The third section concerning areas of theological tension examines aspects where Heppenstall’s views seem to be in partial disagreements with E. G. White which have caused significant tension in Adventist theology.

Areas of Minor Divergences

This first aspect is related to a small shift in Heppenstall’s position regarding the use of Christ’s own divine power. In his early writings, Heppenstall taught that Christ used his divine power only for the benefit of others. However, he later changed this position and taught that Christ very rarely actually exercised His divine attributes. Even though this is an insignificant shift, it is

1During the earlier "La Sierra period" Heppenstall appeared to give proofs that Jesus was divine in His claim of omnipotence (Matt 28:18) and omniscience (Col 2:3). He also asserted that Christ’s divinity was manifested in His life by His miracles, His divine prerogative to forgive sins, and by possessing the power to give life (ibid, 19, 20). Elsewhere, Heppenstall maintained that Christ “held in abeyance His divine power for His own benefit and life and voluntarily made Himself dependent upon the Father” (ibid, 23); also, “Jesus knew and taught and performed only what the Spirit permitted and directed. Matt 3:16; John 3:34; Acts 1:2; 10:38; Heb 9:14. But when thus permitted, He knew, taught and performed, not like the prophets, by power communicated from without, but by virtue of His own inner divine energy” (ibid, 24).

2Between 1950 and 1977, there was a shift in Heppenstall’s thinking towards a more radical view of Christ limiting His divine attributes and a greater role played in His human nature. He wrote: "When Christ took human flesh He accepted the limitations imposed by His life on earth” (MMG, 68). This limitation meant for Heppenstall that Christ, during the Incarnation, was neither omniscient, omnipresent, nor omnipotent (ibid., 91-100). It is possible that it was due to the discussions with Brinsmead and later with the Pre-1950s group. Whatever the reasons, Heppenstall reappraised his thought in order to preserve the reality of Christ humanity. These groups stress the imitation of
important because in this matter Heppenstall differs from E. G. White. She teaches that Christ did use His divine power, but used it only for the benefit of others, not for His own benefit. Heppenstall's former position is E. G. White's view. However, in changing his conviction on this subject, he diverges from her view. Heppenstall's former view is closer to the gospel narrative, especially that of the fourth Gospel where the miracles are John's argument as the evidence for Christ's divinity. The same can be said of the other gospels when they speak of Christ's miracles. The narrative was intended to lead the reader to believe in Christ's divinity. He performed miracles receiving power from God as the prophets did in ancient times or as the apostles did later. Nevertheless, this is not as crucial an element as those that follow.

Christ's character while Heppenstall emphasizes total surrender and complete dependence on Christ by faith. For Heppenstall's view, see SU, 154-174. For the Pre-1950s group's views, see: Herbert E. Douglass, "Man of Faith--The Showcase of God's Grace," PIP, 43, 45; idem, "The Demonstration That Sets Everything," Review and Herald, January 6, 1972, 13-14; idem, "The Humanity of the Son of God Is Everything to Us," Review and Herald, February 24, 1972, 3; idem, Why Jesus Waits.

1Speaking of Satan's suggestion to work a miracle, White wrote thus: "Christ was not to exercise divine power for His own behalf... Neither here nor at any subsequent time in His earthly life did He work a miracle on His own behalf. His wonderful works were all for the good of others" (Desire of Ages, 119).

2For John Christ's divinity was attested when He gave Nathanael evidence of His divine knowledge (John 1:47-51); in changing the water to wine (John 2); when John declared that He "needed not that any should testify of man: for He knew what was in man" (John 2:25); in knowing the secret life of the woman of Samaria (John 4:17-18); the resurrection of Lazarus to confirm the truth that He is the "resurrection and the life" (John 11:25).

3Cf. when Christ healed the paralytic the question the Pharisees raised was: did He have divine authority to forgive sins? Christ revealed His divinity in two ways: first, by reading their thoughts, and secondly, in healing the paralytic. With this, He demonstrated them that He had not only divine authority to forgive sins but also divine power to heal the man (Luke 5:17-25). Cf. Mark 2:1-12. This also was the case when He walked on the waters; after this experience, the disciples worshiped Him, saying, "Truly you are the Son of God" (Matt 14:22-32). This miracle was not seen by the disciples only as an evidence of God's power but also as an evidence of Christ's divinity.
Area of Interpretational Tension

In relation to Original sin, we have said previously that Heppenstall denies genetic transmission of sin, therefore, he denies inherited guilt. It is interesting to notice that usually he supports his views with E. G. White's statements. But in this case, he does not use any quotation from White to support his views on the subject. This raises the question as to why he does not use her to support this view when he does so in others. Three answers are possible: First, it seems that he tried to avoid being attacked for the misinterpretation of her writings, because there is a tension in the interpretation in E. G. White's statements. She seems to present an opposite view on the inheritance of sin as Heppenstall.¹ Second, he may be aware that his position was not in harmony with her views, so he simply omitted her views. Here, for Heppenstall, if he accepted E. G. White's view, he would have to accept that God is not righteous for imputing guilt on those who have not yet committed any act of sin. For him the essence of the great controversy between God and Satan is who is responsible for sin. Here, then, for Heppenstall, it is more important to hold to the vindication of God's character that to agree with E. G. White. The third possibility is that Heppenstall studied White's views carefully and saw that she was in agreement, however, he did not want to be misinterpreted, therefore, he did not use her statements.

¹"As related to the first Adam, men receive from him nothing but guilt and the sentence of death" (E. G. White Comments on S.D.A. Bible Commentary, ed. F. D. Nichol (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1953-1957), 6: 1074). Speaking to the parents, she says thus: "Always bear in mind that they have received their perversity as an inheritance from the father or mother. Then bear with the children who have inherited your own trait of character. Parents must trust implicitly in the power of Christ to transform the tendencies to wrong which have been transmitted to their children" (E. G. White, The Adventist Home [Nashville, Ten.: Southern Publishing Association, 1952], 174). Olson in his study compiles the most important statements of E. G. White on the subject. See Robert W. Olson, "Outline Studies on Christian Perfection and Original Sin," Ministry, October 1970, 48-54. Considering the same issue, Moore reaches to the opposite conclusion that E. G. White taught that we did not inherited guilt from Adam, he emphasizes that we inherited only physical weaknesses and disposition or tendencies to sin. See Moore, 102-123.
Notwithstanding the reasons, this issue leads one to think that Heppenstall was selective in the usage of E. G. White views. The implications of this aspect are appraised in chapter 8. Now, we consider the area of theological tension with her views.

Areas of Theological Tension

This section deals with three basic issues—all related to the sanctuary: the transfer of sin to the sanctuary, the investigative judgment and Dan 8:14, and the scapegoat. These aspects have been previously examined when comparing Heppenstall with other Adventist scholars. They are considered now in relation to E. G. White's views.

Regarding the transfer of sin to the sanctuary by means of the blood, Heppenstall seems to have difficulty in accepting E. G. White's teaching that only the sins of the believers were considered in the investigative judgment. For him, this was puzzling because an important aspect of the Day of Atonement was the eradication of sin and Satan, and in this view both aspects were out of consideration. Probably for this reason he rejected the transfer of sin through the blood and tried to find a better solution. In his opinion, sin is recorded when it is committed, and the blood makes valid the recording. However, this idea contradicts E. G. White's teaching.

Heppenstall's conviction led him to change his emphasis on other aspects of the doctrine of the sanctuary, especially the investigative judgment and the prophecy of Dan 8.

---

1 SDAt, 10-12.

2 She says thus: "In the typical service only those who had come before God with confession and repentance, and whose sins, through the blood of the sin offering, were transferred to the sanctuary, had a part in the service of the Day of Atonement. So in the day of the final atonement and the investigative judgment the only cases considered are those of the professed people of God. The Judgment of the wicked is a distinct and separate work, and takes place at a later period" (White, The Great Controversy, 480).
In this new perspective, Heppenstall emphasized that the main purpose of the investigative or pre-Advent judgment, according to Dan 7 as well of Dan 8, was to vindicate God and His people and to judge the opposing forces. These prophecies may have helped him to reinforce his views on the subject. His conviction in this case is broader than the traditional view; thus, this new stress was accepted because it has a Biblical foundation and it did not have negative implications. However, Heppenstall's emphasis on the judgment in behalf of the saints and in the vindication of God led him to neglect the judgment of the saints stressed by E. G. White and traditional Adventist theology.

The third aspect that needs highlighting is in relation to the scapegoat. As mentioned above, this issue has caused criticism from other Christian traditions. This is why Andreasen emphasized the view of "shared responsibility." Satan, thus, was punished because he was the instigator of sin. Heppenstall, however, emphasized the view that Satan was punished because he was the originator of sin. E. G. White stresses that all the sins of the saints will be rolled back over Satan, because he is both the originator and the instigator of sin.1 Heppenstall emphasizes only one aspect and neglects the other. Here, once again, this aspect leads us to observe Heppenstall's selectivity in the usage of E. G. White's teachings.

Our question is: Why does Heppenstall differ from E. G. White's views? One wonders if his commitment to the Scriptures as the Word of God are the reason he departs from her views. It seems that, in his view, the Biblical evidence supported his position, while E. G.

1Referring to the banishment of the scapegoat and its relation to Satan, she says: "Since Satan is the originator of sin, the direct instigator of all the sins that caused the death of the Son of God, justice demands that Satan shall suffer the final punishment. Christ's work for the redemption of men and the purification of the universe from sin will be closed by the removal of sin from the heavenly sanctuary and the placing of these sins upon Satan, who will bear the final penalty. So in the typical service, the yearly round of ministration closed with the purification of the sanctuary, and the confessing of the sins on the head of the scapegoat" (White, Patriarchs and Prophets, 358).
White's position did not. Another possible reason is that at the time of his writing, few could face the scholarly challenge. Heppenstall then, did his best to answer the objections. But it seems that he took the freedom to introduce into Adventist theology certain theological aspects which appear to differ from the views of E. G. White. His selective use of E. G. White, for whatever reason he chose, may have contributed to an attitude which questioned her role in Adventism. We shall return to this issue in chapter 8 when discussing Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption and his contribution to Adventist theology.

Conclusion

Thus far we have analyzed and compared Heppenstall's place in Adventist theology and his relation with the teachings of E. G. White. The first aspect to observe is that his views introduced some elements that produced a tension in doctrinal points, especially certain aspects in the doctrine of the sanctuary such as the transfer of sin by the act of sinning rather than by the blood; the defilement of the sanctuary by the sins of believers and unbelievers, rather than of the believers only; the location of Christ since His ascension in the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, performing the "functions" of the first and second apartment, instead of the two-phase ministry in both the holy and the Most Holy place of the heavenly sanctuary; his emphasis on investigative judgment as vindication over that of both judgment and vindication of the saints; and the scapegoat as originator negating the aspect of instigator. The differences in these aspects were not only in relation to other Adventist writers but also in tension with E. G. White's teaching on those points. Heppenstall's relation with E. G. White is important in this case because he acknowledges her prophetic gift. Hence, one expects congruency between his belief in her authority and his practice in the use of her testimonies. However, he leaves the impression that he is not completely consistent because of his selective utilization of her writings.
We have to recognize Heppenstall's efforts to deeper Biblical foundation of SDA message of salvation; these efforts are of vital importance. His views have contributed to Adventist theology in clarifying different doctrines; at the same time they have stimulated others to perceive other nuances of the truth. His contribution in the understanding of the covenant, the law, Christology, righteousness by faith, and the general views of the sanctuary have been valuable and have boosted Adventist theology in its perception and articulation of these issues. Yet, there remains an aspect to consider in relation to Heppenstall's theology. What is his contribution to historic Adventist view of the doctrine of redemption? What is his legacy and its implication for Adventism? This is the subject of our last chapter.
CHAPTER EIGHT

EVALUATION OF HEPPENSTALL'S DOCTRINE
OF REDEMPTION

Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption has been analyzed. His relation with Adventist theology and E. G. White has been evaluated. Now, the task is to consider his theological contribution. In regard to this task, one has to recognize that the evaluation of a theologian is an intricate process due to the subjectiveness of the enterprise. However, I now attempt to assess the contribution of the author in various aspects. First, his major contribution in this doctrine to Adventist theology in particular and in some respects to general Christian theology is analyzed. Second, the weaknesses and strengths of his doctrine of redemption are proposed. Third, his major doctrinal views are appraised in order to bring out some implications for Adventist theology.

A Summary of Heppenstall's Doctrine of Redemption

I started my description of Heppenstall's doctrine of redemption in chapter 2, discussing the definition, scope, and the need of redemption. For Heppenstall, redemption is a divine program foreordained and formulated before the foundation of the world with the purpose of dealing with the problem that sin brought to God's government. This plan of redemption has three important aspects: "the promise, with which the Old Testament is largely concerned, the act of redemption at the cross and its subsequent proclamation, and finally,
the work of Judgment."1 Regarding the purpose, redemption has three: first, to win men back to fellowship with God and to restore him to God's image. Second, to destroy sin that ruptured the oneness and unity of the universe. Third, to vindicate God's character before the universe. This is the reason that the scope of the plan of redemption ranges from the inception of sin to its final eradication. Only in this way can God's character be vindicated, sin eradicated, and man restored to the original state God in which created him.

Chapter 2 also mentioned that the central concern of Heppenstall is to demonstrate that God is not responsible for sin. He defines sin as the wrong use of freedom, placing self-will ahead of God's will, separating oneself from God, acting independently from his will. Sin brought dramatic consequences to the universe and the whole human race. The consequences of Adam's sin is the state of separation from God in which man is found. From this follows death. Death is not the result of God's punishment but the consequence of Adam's separation from God. From this state, comes the need for redemption.

In chapter 3, we noted that when Heppenstall deals with the nature of man, he points out that man, since the fall, is born in a state of separation from God, unable either to return by himself to a right relationship with God or to overcome sin by himself. This situation is aggravated when from God's side, the moral law, which is the revelation of His eternal character, requires a judgment on sin. God's moral law, among other purposes, was given to reveal sin and to lead the sinner to Christ. However, the law has been used by man with a wrong purpose. This has created a problem of properly understanding the place of the law in the plan of redemption. The same thing has happened to the eternal covenant. God's covenant is one, not two. It is equated by Heppenstall to God's plan of salvation, which was typified by the sacrifices and ceremonies of the earthly sanctuary. These symbols

1 OHP, 14.
pointed to the promise of final redemption through Christ's act of redemption.

In chapter 4, the act of redemption, which Heppenstall called "the bridge of salvation," was discussed. This is a process that has four parts: Incarnation, death, resurrection, and ascension. Through the Incarnation, Christ revealed God's character to man, opening the way to bring the human race back to fellowship with Him. Through His atoning death, Christ made reconciliation possible, condemned sin, upheld God's eternal law, and bore man's condemnation upon himself. Through Christ's resurrection all the benefits of the atonement are effective in the believer. Through the ascension, Christ initiated His work as Head of the church, sent the Comforter, and began His intercessory work for the redeemed.

Regarding the results of Christ's redemption for the believer, considered in chapter 5, Heppenstall indicates that the divine source of saving righteousness is Jesus Christ—His person and His work on earth. Here alone God has revealed the righteousness that man needs. To be saved, then, man needs a revelation from God, not a new set of requirements. Justification, new birth, sanctification, and Christian perfection are part of the divine process to restore man from sin to oneness with God. It is here that the work of the Holy Spirit takes a crucial role, because it is the Holy Spirit who applies the benefits of the work of Christ to man. He is God's power which man needs in order to overcome sin.

The judgment, which is the last stage of the plan of redemption, is the subject of chapter 6. Christ's heavenly ministry is divided into two parts: His mediatorial work and the process of judgment. In this phase Heppenstall points out that one of the purposes of Christ's mediatorial work and of the process of judgment is to vindicate God's character and government. It also vindicates the saints of the unfairness of the human verdicts. This assize, according to the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation, is realized previous to His advent.
and fulfilled at Christ's second coming. A third purpose of Christ's heavenly ministry is to punish those who oppose God and His people. God's vindication is complete when sin and sinners are eradicated at the end of the millennium. With this act, the plan of redemption is accomplished, God is vindicated before the universe, His government is secured eternally, and the believers relish the benefits of God's redemption: life eternal in a new earth. It is in this way that Heppenstall explains his scheme of redemption.

However, one can ask: What is Heppenstall's basis for such a scheme? His answer is that "the redemption wrought out by Christ must always be seen in the context of salvation history, from the time sin entered to its final eradication." The inception of sin for Heppenstall is not when it began on this earth. Rather, he refers us to the time when sin began in heaven. He explains that the fall of man was not an isolated event in history, but a continuation of the rebellion that started in heaven. Redemption is related, then, according to Heppenstall, to the moral and spiritual crisis that sin brought to the universe.

The problem of sin in heaven or the cosmic conflict between Christ and Satan and the necessity of God's redemption are closely tied together. Christ's work of redemption responds to this great controversy. In the light of the heavenly conflict, then, Heppenstall's scheme of redemption takes into consideration the problem of sin and finishes with its eradication. This raises the question of how the cosmic conflict is related to his scheme of redemption. Let us consider first his understanding of the great controversy. Then, we relate it to the plan of redemption.

---

1 OHP, 16.
2 SU, 11. See also OHP, 13.
3 See OHP, 30, 43, 141, 163, and_ISRBD, 32.
4 OHP, 16-17, 30-31, 34, 39.
There are some basic concepts that we need to be aware of before we start to consider the subject of our discussion. First, Heppenstall asserts that the existence of God is a fundamental truth. Second, he claims evil had no part in God's original creation (Gen 1:31). Third, he says God has authority over created intelligent beings, to whom He has granted freedom. This perspective indicates that Heppenstall has a high concept of God's sovereignty. He denies a dualistic view of the existence of good and evil and double predestination. Let us now consider the relationship of God's

---

1 SBD, 8. The existence of a personal living God (Jer 10:10), is basic for Heppenstall. God is the Creator of the universe (Ps 19). Creation is an act of the triune God. Each member of the Godhead participated in creation (SBD, 10). Heppenstall also believes that God has placed that first truth within every man to some extent, adding: "The very fact that all men assent to this first truth is proof of the Scripture statement" (ibid., 8). His understanding is based on Rom 1:19-21; John 1:9. See also: "Things Which Can Not Be Shaken" These Times, January 1972, 3.

2 SBD, 14.

3 Creation is related to preservation and providence, by Heppenstall (ibid., 12).

4 Ibid., 70. However, our freedom depends on our complete dependence on God as Lord. Heppenstall writes: "The Creator is Lord. Man has no right and no power which has not been bestowed upon him by God. Thus when we speak of Christ [as] Lord in our lives, we must admit entirely Creation; that while God created man for Himself, He endowed him an independent being; yet never independent of God. Man's freedom is based upon his dependence on God as Lord, so that a maximum of freedom is at the same time a maximum of dependence upon God. The less free he is the more he denies this lordship of Christ and seeks to withdraw himself from it. Complete dependence upon God is at the same time true freedom" (SBD, 70-71). See also SU, 8, 11, 14, 23-24, 184.

5 We have mentioned several times in previous chapters that God's justification from the existence of evil and in the dealings with sin is one of the great concerns of Heppenstall, see chapter 4, pp., 90-92; 98-100; 107-111; chapter 6, pp., 154-156; 163-164; 174-175; 180-181; 185-189; chapter 7, pp., 195.

6 This concept is closely related to the existence of evil in the universe. Heppenstall reacted strongly against the Calvinistic view of double predestination, especially in relation to original sin. See chapter 2, pp. 49-53.
character and the great conflict between Christ and Satan, which rests on the foundation of Heppenstall’s scheme of redemption. Note that this perspective links all the aspects of his structure of redemption.

The Great Controversy and God’s Character

In Heppenstall’s view, there are two basic attributes in God’s character when dealing with intelligent beings: love (1 John 4:8) and holiness (1 Pet 1:16). He asserts that love is that virtue by which God is eternally moved to self-communication. Holiness or righteousness is the ground and reason of moral obligation. This is the basis of God’s law, for law without a lawgiver or a law enforcer means no obligation for those who are supposed to be governed by it.

Moral and spiritual laws, according to Heppenstall, are the standard of God’s own character and His will for all created intelligent beings ordained for the happiness and welfare of all. The law of God, therefore, is eternal, being a revelation of His eternal character. It consists principally of two things: a standard of what is right and true, and the universal principles by which God runs His creation.

---

1SBD, 9. He also stresses that the law existed before man was created. It was adapted to the conditions of holy beings; even angels were governed by it (ibid., 73).

2SBD, 69.

3SBD, 68. In Heppenstall’s perspective, law encompasses at least seven different usages (see SGL, 1). The Law as revelation of the will of God and standard of righteousness; and the law as a method by which God works and operates in nature and in man are the two aspects that we refer to in this section; the other usages were considered in the section dealing with Law and Covenant, chapter 3, pp., 55-69.

4SBD, 69. Heppenstall quotes: Ps 19:7,8; Rom 7:12; Eccl 12:13; Rom 2:18; Ps 119:142-43, and then he asserts that here is the ultimate appeal as to what is right and wrong (ibid.).

5For him, law cannot run anything; it never sets anything in motion. It merely explains how a thing works. Law is merely the revelation of universal principles by which God works, runs the universe, and created and sustains men. The ten commandments are just ten of those principles (ibid.).
The law was kept in heaven, not in the spirit of legality but as a service and obedience to God and a fruit of the Spirit.¹ Perfection and harmony reigned in heaven. If all was perfection and harmony, how did the controversy originate? In Heppenstall’s view, it started with Satan who sought to usurp the place of God (Isa 14:12-13).² Satan dethroned God in his life and put himself there. This claim to a life independent of God was a declaration of war against the Creator.³ This issue was a puzzling one for the angels. Even Satan was confused.⁴ Heppenstall holds that the focal point of the issue arises between the

¹ISBD, 69-70. Heppenstall uses Gal 5:22-23, meaning that the fruits of the Spirit were the fruit manifested by the heavenly beings. He quotes the following statement from E. G. White: "But in heaven, service is not rendered in the spirit of legality. When Satan rebelled against the law of Jehovah, the thought that there was a law came to the angels almost as awakening to something unthought of (emphasis his).” Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1941), 161.

²Heppenstall quotes E. G. White: "Little by little, Lucifer came to indulge the desire for self exaltation... Though all his glory was from God, this mighty angel came to regard it as pertaining to himself. Not content with his position, though honored above the heavenly host, he ventured to covet homage due alone to the Creator” (Patriarchs and Prophets, 35).

³Describing the deceptive work of Satan among the heavenly beings, Heppenstall once more adopts E. G. White’s approach: "He had artfully presented his side of the question, employing sophistry and fraud to secure his objects. His power to deceive was very great. By disguising himself in a cloak of falsehood, he gained an advantage. All his acts were so clothed with mystery so that it was difficult to disclose to the angels the true nature of his work. Until fully developed, it could not be made to appear the evil thing it was; his dissatisfaction would not be seen to be rebellion. Even the loyal angels could not fully discern his character or see to what his work was leading” (ibid. 41). See also SU, 11.

⁴Heppenstall asks: "Is rebellion the initial stage or is it something else that ripens into rebellion?” For Heppenstall, it ended in rebellion rather than started with rebellion. The initial step in the wrong direction is self-exaltation (SRF2, 5). Then he uses E. G. White’s words: "In great mercy, according to His divine character, God bore long with Lucifer... Lucifer himself had not at first been acquainted with the real nature of his feelings. For a time he had feared to express the workings of his mind, yet he did not dismiss them. He did not see whither he was yet drifting. But much effort as infinite love and wisdom only could devise, were made to convince him of his error” (Patriarchs and Prophets, 39). "God permitted Satan to carry forward his work until the spirit of disaffection ripened into active revolt” (ibid., 41).
relationship of authority, law, and freedom. The controversy, at first sight, seems to be a conflict between law and liberty, while in reality it is a conflict between two sources of authority. The magnitude of the tragic nature of sin began when Satan conspired to destroy faith in God, to usurp God’s throne. He refused to be subject to God, thus calling into question before the universe God’s authority. God’s authority, His will, and His laws were declared to be unjust. Satan’s attitude brought war in heaven. Satan and his followers were expelled from heaven, but the war was not over. Heppenstall explains that God did not annihilate Satan because this act could have caused misunderstandings among the heavenly beings. This led God not to depend upon the use of force to destroy those who rebelled against Him. Sin, as rebellion, is not adequately dealt with by punishment or destruction. Punishment leaves the rebel unchanged in attitude. Had Satan been

1He writes: "It is evident that the issue comes to the light at the place where God exercises authority. Heavenly beings are suddenly made conscious that a supreme God exercises authority over them, by the way he runs things and the standard of living for all created beings. Satan sets up his own authority above that of God and declares that anyone who is free should not be subject to such authority. Hence, the importance of the temptation in the garden of Eden—Gen 3:5. 'Ye shall be as gods,’ and with Christ—Matt 4—'Fall down and worship me'" (1SBD, 70).

21SBD, 70.

3MWG, 32.

4Ibid.

5Satan dethroned God in his life and put himself there. This claim to a life independent of God, says our author, was a declaration of war against the Creator of heaven and earth (MWG, 11).

6"Ultimate victory over those who rebel against God does not depend upon the use of force, otherwise God should have eradicated it at the start" (MWG, 33). He explains that if God could not destroy Satan and his angels in the beginning, because of the misunderstanding of the loyal angels, He would not do so until they understand. For Heppenstall, only the revelation of God’s character in and through the Son could prove the Father to be worthy of the allegiance of His creatures (ibid.).

7Punishment is not calculated to win the loyalty of the universe, to heal the alienation between God and man. The divine solution to the whole sin problem is found in the redemptive sacrifice of God in
immediately blotted out of existence, some would have served God from fear rather than from love. Moreover, Satan’s influence would not have been fully destroyed, nor the spirit of rebellion have been utterly eradicated. Thus, for the good of the entire universe, Satan was left to develop fully his principles, that his charges against the divine government might be seen in the true light by all created beings and that the justice and love of God and the immutability of His law might be forever placed beyond all question. Thus, the controversy in heaven between Christ and Satan continued on earth. For Heppenstall, the continuation of the controversy on this earth is basic to one’s understanding of God’s dealings with humankind. This is why Heppenstall grounded his theological system within the concept of the cosmic controversy that started in heaven and continued here on earth. It is in this framework that his doctrine of redemption must be understood. From this perspective, let us consider how Heppenstall relates the cosmic controversy to man’s fall and God’s own scheme of redemption, namely: the promise, the act of atonement and its results, and the judgment.

The Great Controversy and the Fall of Man

Heppenstall asserts that the rebellion that began in heaven spread to this earth when Adam and Eve sinned.¹ He maintains that Satan did not infuse them with an entity called ‘sin.’ He led them into a life apart from God and from obedience to His will.² When Adam and Eve listened and accepted Satan’s offer to help them become gods in their own right, they asserted their independence from God (Gen 3:5).

Christ. The incarnate Son removes all alienation from God. Heppenstall sees in the Incarnation, the full exposing of sin and rebellion for which there is no possible excuse. In it, Christ broke the power of Satan and disproved all charges made by Satan. There was now no possibility of Satan’s refutation (MWG, 33-34).

¹SU, 11.
²MWG, 118-119.
Searching for freedom, they found themselves captives of Satan, who declared himself the prince of this world. In this way, Adam and Eve lost their sovereignty.\(^1\) From this, sin and death entered into this world. Here is where God “set into operation a divine scheme of redemption, foreordained and formulated in the secret counsels of the Most High from before the foundation of the world.”\(^2\)

It is clear, for Heppenstall, that Satan had a significant part in the fall of man and in the inception of sin into this world. Where does Heppenstall see this controversy fitting into his scheme of redemption?

The Great Controversy and the Promise of Redemption

After Adam and Eve sinned, God announced a plan of redemption (Gen 3:15). In this announcement, explains Heppenstall, God not only “promised ultimate recovery and restoration of all that had been lost by sin” but also “the final defeat of all those who warred against the God of heaven.”\(^3\) This plan is disclosed in the Scriptures from the beginning of history until Abraham and his descendants. This plan is disclosed further to the Israelite nation when God made His covenant and gave them His law. The redemption plan was unveiled especially in the types and symbols of the earthly tabernacle.

The law and the covenant Heppenstall relates to the great controversy, when he declares that these truths must be understood in the light of the whole panorama of spiritual redemption.\(^4\) In

---

\(^1\) *SU*, 11, 12. Man’s sovereignty was lost, in the sense that Adam was the “original prince of this world, responsible to God Himself” (*SU*, 8).

\(^2\) *OH*, 14.

\(^3\) *OH*, 15.

\(^4\) *SGL*, 1. He also points out that “The history of the great controversy between Christ and Satan. . . . reveals the critical importance of these truths in the plan and purpose of God,” and that “grace, law and covenant must be seen as the basis and medium of redemptive revelation into which the other vital aspects and teachings of Scripture
connection with the moral law, Heppenstall asserts that the moral standard and claims of God's law have been greatly obscured because man and Satan have conspired against the law of God. He also shows that the great controversy between God and Satan is also manifested in Satan's efforts to make legalism a forgery of obedience to God's law. He led the people to pervert righteousness by faith by encouraging righteousness by works.1 The same thing happened with the eternal covenant when he came up with its counterfeit, namely, the old covenant.2

Heppenstall not only associates this controversy with the moral law but with the ceremonial law as well, which, besides the Christological and soteriological purposes previously mentioned,3 illustrates also the closing events of the great controversy between Christ and Satan.4 Thus, we can observe how Heppenstall links the great controversy with the first part of his scheme of redemption, namely, the promise of redemption. How does he involve the great controversy with his second stage of his scheme—the act of atonement?

will fit and make of the truth a vital whole" (ibid.).

1SU, 220. Heppenstall affirms that for the duration of the great controversy, it has been Satan's purpose to destroy the authority of God by casting His law aside. At the same time he points out that Satan tries to pervert the righteousness of God by distorting the truth about the law. He has sought to do this in two ways: "First, by an antinomianism brought about either by an out-and-out reaction of the law or by the erroneous concept of the dispensation of law as opposed to the dispensation of the Gospel. Second, Satan has through the principle of salvation by works not allowed the law to function according to God's design" ("The Covenants and the Law," 1OFF, 458). See also ibid., 438.

2The expression "old covenant" is used by Heppenstall to refer to the human efforts to meet the requirements of God's eternal covenant. Heppenstall says thus: "Satan is the originator of the old covenant. The basic premise of sin itself is the work of Satan in leading Adam to place his own ego at the center of his existence instead of Christ" (OFF, 451).

3See chapter 3, pp. 63-66.

4"The ceremonial law had the purpose to reveal the closing events of the great controversy between Christ and Satan, the judgment" (OFF, 451). This has been explained in chapter 6, pp. 148-152; 163-164; 191-194.
The Great Controversy and Its Relation to the Bridge of Salvation

The work of Christ on earth also has its implications for the great controversy. Heppenstall declares that among the purposes of the Incarnation, Christ came to encounter Satan in the arena of temptation and suffering.\(^1\) His purpose was to disclose to the universe the true character of Satan while vindicating the character of God.\(^2\) Heppenstall asserts that because Christ came to destroy Satan's dominion, "all the forces of evil conspired to destroy His work and His person."\(^3\) Christ's Incarnation is significant for the plan of redemption because it pledges the triumph of God in the great controversy and the vanquishing of sin in the universe.\(^4\) Yet, it is only one aspect of the work of Christ in relation to the great controversy.

The Great Controversy and the Atonement

Heppenstall asserts that Christ came to the earth not only to bear the sins of men on the cross but also to face the crisis of the world's destiny. The battle Christ fought while on earth was not

\(^1\)Redemption cannot be done by a universal decree from heaven. "Jesus Christ," writes Heppenstall, "must confront Satan and defeat the prince of this world in the arena of human temptation and suffering" (\textit{MWG}, 37).

\(^2\)\textit{MWG}, 33-34. Satan charged God with injustice and unfairness. By the Incarnation, sin and rebellion stand exposed without any possible excuse. In it, Christ broke the power of Satan and disproved without the possibility of refutations all charges made by Satan (ibid.). Through Christ's life of self-sacrifice and service "He vindicated God before the angels and the universe, and brought redemption to man. The self-sacrificing-servant spirit is the way of God. The self-centered, self-exalting life is the way of Satan—a life without God" (\textit{MWG}, 81).

\(^3\)\textit{SU}, 43. Satan, sin, and death is the triad that Christ came to destroy. Our author states that Christ became flesh and blood to ransom those who were in bondage to sin, death, and Satan. Satan held the dominion of sin and death over all men. Christ, through His death, destroyed the rule of Satan, of sin, and of death (\textit{MWG}, 36).

\(^4\)"Jesus knew that one sin anywhere in the universe not borne by Himself and un conquered, was more than God could endure and still remain as sovereign Lord. That the Incarnation guarantees an eternal and triumphant consummation to the great controversy between Christ and Satan is no romantic illusion" (\textit{MWG}, 30).
limited to the human race. In His conflict with sin, God lost a third
of the angels and millions of human beings on earth, all of whom were
His creatures and His children.\(^1\) Heppenstall sees the battle of Christ
on earth as the continuation of the war that began in heaven when Satan
was cast out.\(^2\) The death of Christ on the cross, for Heppenstall, was
far more than a mere gesture of love. It had the purpose of breaking
the power of Satan and sin in the whole cosmos of God.\(^3\) Christ's
death, however, did not solve the controversy with demonic powers. This
controversy continued after Christ's ascension to heaven.

The Great Controversy and Christ's
Heavenly Ministry

As mentioned above, for Heppenstall, restoration to oneness
was not consummated at the cross, because at the cross, the sin problem
had not yet been finally resolved.\(^4\) What Jesus began at the cross, He
will finish as our divine High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary.

Christ's mediatorial work in the heavenly ministry, among other objec-
tives, is to crush Satan's revolt, his hosts, and his followers.

Christ's intercessory work protects His people against the temptations

\(^1\) OHP, 38-39.
\(^2\) OHP, 30.
\(^3\) OHP, 30. Heppenstall affirms that not only the sins of men
were borne at the cross, but that the death of Christ was far more than
a mere divine gesture of love. It broke the power of Satan and sin. He
recognizes, however, that "the final at-one-ment still remains to be
realized, not only in each believer but also in the world and the
universe. In one sense, the atonement has been made. In the sense of
universal harmony it is still to be realized" (ibid., 30-31). Gustaf
Aulén has the same perspective on Christ's atonement; his "classic" view
of Christ sees Him as the victor over the evil powers of the world. The
difference is that Heppenstall integrates the penal-substitutionary,
the subjective, and Aulén's "classic" view of atonement, while Aulén
advocates only his "classic" view. See Gustaf Aulén, Christus Victor,

\(^4\) OHP, 29. After the cross, Heppenstall comments, Satan refused
to concede defeat, thus the battle continues with aggravated fury.
Christ now directs events not from the cross but from the heavenly
sanctuary. The great controversy between Him and Satan has entered
and accusations of Satan.¹ We should remark here that in Heppenstall’s perspective, this controversy has both human and cosmic dimensions. This is a struggle that is leading toward a final encounter between Christ’s people and Satan’s followers; this will occur just prior to Christ’s second coming.

According to Heppenstall, the great controversy makes Christ’s heavenly ministry more meaningful for the believer. Let us turn our attention to that subject.

The Great Controversy and the Believer

In Heppenstall’s perspective, Satan’s controversy is not only against Christ, it is related to the believer. Our author sees the great controversy between Christ and Satan in man’s decision for salvation when he says that in repentance “two powers are in deadly conflict: Christ and Satan, the world of God and the world of evil.”² Moreover, in the process of sanctification, he remarks that the issue at stake is the control of the whole man by God or by Satan. The whole person surrenders or refuses to surrender to God.³ Regarding this controversy in the lives of men, Heppenstall makes clear that he is not talking theory or moving in a world of unreality. All men in the world are enveloped and involved in those tragic words “sin” and “Satan.”

There are two spheres in which man may live, two masters which he may choose to serve. They are radically opposed to each other. The choice of one master implies eternal death; whereas, the choice of the other implies eternal life. As far as man’s destiny is concerned, the

¹OHP, 61. Heppenstall points out that Christ came to destroy the work of the devil (Heb 2:14-15). He defeated Satan at the cross (John 12:31-32). In the heavenly sanctuary, Christ continues the same work, refuting the accusations of the adversary. For those who claim the merits of Christ, there is no condemnation. Inspired and strengthened by the intercession of Christ, they are victorious over the prince of darkness (ibid.).

²Ibid., 98-99.

³Ibid., 162.
issue is final. Not to choose Christ is to choose the devil. To side with sin and Satan carries with it total impotence, helplessness, and ruin.\(^1\) Man's decision determines his eternal destiny, this is finally established at Christ's second coming. Let us turn our attention to the way Heppenstall links the great controversy with Christ's second coming.

The Great Controversy and Christ's Second Coming

The closing of Christ's mediatorial intercession on behalf of His people\(^2\) is the time when Christ returns to the earth, when the final work of reconciliation is accomplished.\(^3\) Connecting the typology of the earthly sanctuary with that of Christ's heavenly ministry, Heppenstall remarks that the Levitical Day of Atonement foreshadowed the ultimate and final triumph of Christ over Satan. The ritual of the two goats teaches the destruction of evil and its originator. The role of the second goat is not redemptive since no blood is shed.\(^4\) The bearing of sin by the second goat reveals how sin is to be finally eradicated, for the goat was never to be seen again.\(^5\) With the transfer of sin from the sanctuary, all responsibility for sin now belonged to the

\(^1\)Ibid., 163.

\(^2\)Ibid., 94. "The climax of our world occurs when Christ Jesus leaves the heavenly sanctuary and returns to earth" (OHP, 219).

\(^3\)Ibid., 94. What Jesus began at the cross, He will finish as our divine High Priest. Heppenstall remarks that the Levitical day of atonement foreshadowed the ultimate and final triumph of Christ over Satan. The vindication of God's sovereign person and rule are part of the divine purpose (ibid.).

\(^4\)OHP, 93. The reason, Heppenstall asserts, why Azazel bears the sins, is in the sense of legality, not in the sense of redemption. It is the legal and judicial aspect of sin reverting back to the originator of it (SDAt, 15). From the point of view of atonement, Satan's bearing of sin is not a saving act as contrasted with that of Christ. There is nothing meritorious or efficacious in the final act of Satan's bearing of sin (2SBD, 41-42). See also SDAt, 13-15.

\(^5\)OHP, 93. At the cross Christ bore sin's penalty for every man, but the cross does not eradicate sin. It laid the foundation for its ultimate annihilation. Satan is still active, sin still reigns throughout the world. Satan is far from being isolated from the world of men and events, but knows that his time is short (Rev 12:12) (ibid.).
scapegoat. Therefore, for Heppenstall, the Day of Atonement taught the truth that Christ's ministration goes beyond Calvary to the final solution of the sin problem. From this we can conclude that the great controversy is the motif that provides Heppenstall the structure for his doctrine of redemption. It is the binding element that makes his scheme of redemption a unity. Now I go on to discuss the value of this motif as a model for the understanding of the doctrine of redemption.

**Evaluation of Heppenstall's Great Controversy Motif**

**Weaknesses in the Great Controversy Motif**

The first element that one notices in this pattern is that it is based strongly on the views of E. G. White rather than on Scripture. This does not mean that his view does not have biblical support, but

1 All sins are recorded and retained in the heavenly sanctuary. Heppenstall classifies sins in three groups: the confessed sins of repented sinners; the unconfessed sins of lost men and women and Satan’s personal sins and those of his angels (2SBD, 39). Satan is made responsible for his own sins, for the unconfessed sins of the lost men and women, and for the sins of the righteous which he caused them to commit. The reason he gives is that Satan as the originator of sin will bear the penalty of those sins. He is the only one responsible for the existence of sin in the universe (2SBD, 41-42).

2 OHP, 81. The blotting out of sin involves more than forgiveness. The gracious purpose of the Lord is not only to forgive sin but to triumph over it and eradicate it. Heppenstall notes that the purpose of God did not fail at the cross. But in the face of the finality and efficacy of that sacrifice, it must ultimately effect Satan’s end and final destruction. Christ’s ministry will not stop short until all sin is blotted out from the universe. This is the truth taught and symbolized in the service of the day of atonement (ibid., 81).

3 Webster is correct in pointing out that Heppenstall emphasizes the central place occupied by Christ and the cross in the plan of God and the drama of ages, and that “redemption is central and points primarily to the events surrounding the cross of Calvary. The promise in the Old Testament pointed forward to the redemption of the cross and the judgment looks back and is based on the accomplishments of Calvary” (Webster, 304-305). However, the underlying purpose of Christ’s work and sacrifice at the cross, is not only salvation but also the vindication of God’s character in the cosmic conflict with the evil forces. It has been demonstrated in this study that Christ is the central figure in the great controversy in the sense that He vindicated God’s character in His ministry, in His atonement at the cross, in providing salvation for man, in His mediatory ministry in heaven, and finally in eradicating sin from the universe. This is an aspect that Webster also recognises, see Webster, 310, 318-319.
that Heppenstall did not judge it necessary to establish his view of the great controversy upon biblical evidence. We emphasize the need of a Biblical foundation because the prophetic gift of E. G. White is not widely accepted outside Adventism. Why is this perspective not presented by other Christian theologians?

Heppenstall offers an explanation. He perceives two attitudes in relation to Christ's atonement and redemption. The first attitude limits the atonement to the cross. Heppenstall points out that this attitude does not allow for the total process of the blotting out of sin and the purification of the universe from sin.1 The second attitude limits Christ's priestly work to the "daily" ministration of intercession. This attitude does no justice to the whole plan of redemption.2 Heppenstall's perspective of atonement has cosmic dimensions because it includes not only humankind but also heavenly beings.3 For Heppenstall, atonement is the elimination of sin to the satisfaction of the moral universe. Underlying and basic to all this is the vindication of God's character in the face of the reality of sin.4 Therefore,

1OHP, 96. He remarks that to limit atonement, or 'reconciliation,' wholly to the work of Christ at the cross, is to only partially understand this message. He points out that "this broad picture of salvation history to its ultimate consummation as seen within the truth of the heavenly sanctuary gives Seventh-day Adventists a distinctive message for our time" (ibid.).

2OHP, 94. This perspective, he argues, should not deter us from a wider perspective that does justice to the whole plan of redemption (ibid.).

3"The work of Christ the Mediator is to bring all holy beings into perfect union and fellowship with God. The Godhead planned the most stupendous measures and intervention in and through Christ in order to exhibit the full character and universal government of God. The unfallen angels and beings are earnest spectators of this great controversy. The work of Christ as the One Mediator engrosses the attention of terrestrial and invisible witnesses" (2SBD, 14).

4OHP, 94-95. The eradication of sin and Satan is part of Christ's final work as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary. "The heavenly sanctuary is the divine center from which all acts in the great controversy between Christ and Satan are executed and resolved" (ibid.). It has been pointed out before that the vindication of God's character is a crucial aspect in Heppenstall's theological system. He indicates that the cleansing of the altar, the holy places, and the tabernacle includes the vindication of God, His government, and His character.
for Heppenstall, sin is the reason for the plan of redemption and its eradication is one of its purposes.

In addition to Heppenstall's explanation, we can also apply the four reasons given by Gustaf Aulén for the neglect of his "classical" theory. Adapting Aulén's reasons, we can say that: first, the controversial background since the time of the Enlightenment—the distinction between the subjective and objective views of atonement—has caused theology to neglect the wider theme of the great controversy as a possible perspective to understand the atonement and the doctrine of redemption. Second, there has been confusion of this perspective with the substitutionary-penal interpretation of Christ's redemptive work which has several similarities with the great controversy motif. The substitutionary-penal theory has been repudiated by liberal theologians. This repudiation has led theologians of both sides to ignore the great controversy theory or, at least, to place it in a wrong perspective. Third, both liberal and conservative theologians consider the great-controversy—between-Christ-and-Satan theory as irrational and as representing a lower theological level. Because it was not fully

(ibid., 98). Satan has sought to misrepresent the character of God and of His government. He observes that "God must produce a final, incontrovertible answer to Satan's charges. Sin is not eradicated by force, otherwise God could have taken care of sin from the beginning. The universe must forever come to serve God from love and not by fear. . . . The very security and honor of God's government have been in jeopardy because of sin. The cleansing of the sanctuary, the removal of sin from the sanctuary, in part, connotes the vindication of God" (ibid. 99).

The first reason is related to the controversial background between the "objective" and the "subjective" views of the atonement where the disputants had little attention to spare for what lay outside of the scope of these views. The second is related to the tendency to confuse the classic idea with the Latin view. The third one refers to the natural unwillingness in both theories to give consideration to the classic idea because it was considered irrational from the "conservative" side and mythical from the "liberal" school. The fourth reason is due to the unpopularity of dualism, especially in the Liberal Protestant theology, and that the leading theology from the time of the enlightenment to the nineteen century lay under the influence of idealistic metaphysics, and was definitely monistic and evolutionary. It had no place for the dualistic element in Christianity, therefore, this theological attitude reacted on the studies of the history of dogma in the New Testament and the patristic period (Aulén, 7-12).
developed by the early church fathers, they think, it cannot be considered seriously. Fourth, since the enlightenment, dualism has not been popular because it is considered as demonological and mythical. It has been linked with Zoroastrian influence, specifically in philosophical and theological trends.

It would have been desirable if Heppenstall had developed the concept of the great controversy with further biblical evidence to support this view. Because, as Aulen noticed, even in conservative circles Satan's existence is not considered seriously. The tendency is to ignore it. On the one side, among the liberals, the tendency is to deny the personal existence of Satan. Heppenstall's contribution to this aspect could have been very useful if he had given a Biblical foundation for his view. It is evident that since this was not an issue at that time, there was no need for further analysis.

There remains a need for establishing a more Biblical foundation to his concept of the vindication of God's character, the main concern in his doctrine of redemption. He stresses God's vindication. However, he does not make any effort to demonstrate that his assertion is based in the Scripture. Here again he uses E. G. White's perspective.

1 Other groups recognize the existence of Satan and demonic powers, but they do not link Satan with the origin of sin. They assert that the origin and "the nature of their sin is not revealed" (see Hodge, 1:643; Louis Berkhof, 219-220; Strong, 454-459).

2 Tillich considers the fall of man as a myth. For him, sin is the symbol used to convey the leap of man from essence to existence. Regarding the fall of Satan, he says that it does not help to solve the riddle of existence. Satan's existence, for Tillich, is unacceptable (Tillich, 29-44). Hendrikus Berkhof, explains sin as "the mysterious misuse of freedom." For him, Satan is the cultural way to express the infra and supra personal powers (social institutions, codes of behavior, taboos, and traditions) that drive (not force) man in the direction of sin. Therefore, for him, there is not a personal being, but an image that pictures the latter concept (Hendrikus Berkhof, Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of Faith, 192-215). See also Reinhold Niebuhr, Nature and Destiny of Man, vol. 1, chaps., 7-8.
Strengths of Heppenstall's Great Controversy Motif

The great controversy motif, as presented by Heppenstall, can be a helpful model for the understanding of the doctrine of redemption. This is so because, in general terms, the great controversy motif is the link that integrates etiology, Christology, soteriology, and eschatology in a very meaningful unity. Other perspectives that relate only Christ's atonement and redemption to His sacrifice at the cross and its benefits to the believer leave etiology and eschatology out of the scope of redemption. The result of this position is that these perspectives create a vacuum that makes the etiological and eschatological aspects meaningless for the doctrine of redemption. Thus, Heppenstall's perspective gives a different outlook because it correlates all the previous elements.

Moreover, his perspective is not only comprehensive but also has Biblical evidence for its usage. At the same time, it answers some questions that other views do not solve. Some of the reasons why I consider it to be a good model for the doctrine of redemption are the following: First, it provides a broader basis to explain the existence of sin in the universe. Second, it demonstrates that Satan, not God, is the originator of sin and ultimately responsible for it. Third, it explains the relation of the law in both aspects, moral and ceremonial, with the plan of redemption. Fourth, it explains the connection between the covenant and Christ's sacrifice and its application to the believer. Fifth, it makes it possible to integrate the different views of Christ's death on the cross. Sixth, it answers the question raised by some: If Christ died to save us from sin, the world and death, why is there still sin, why are we still in this world, and why is there still death? Seventh, it resolves the tension of why a final judgment is necessary.¹

¹Because, some hold that one's salvation or condemnation is determined at the moment when one accepts or rejects Christ following the gospel of John (John 3:17-18), and others, based in the epistles, claim that the judgment is according to works and is still in the future.
Eighth, it extends the perspective of Christ's heavenly ministry from a pure mediatorial function on behalf of the believer, to a cosmic perspective where the judgment and the reconciliation process are considered. Ninth, it explains Christ's seeming delay and the purpose of His coming. Tenth, it illuminates the final events and the reason of this world's opposition to God's purposes.

Therefore, Heppenstall's great controversy motif is a valid model for understanding the doctrine of redemption. Since it is fully biblical, it links all the elements necessary for an adequate foundation to the all-comprehensiveness of God's plan of redemption. It answers the questions that other perspectives are not able to solve. Finally, it has a Christocentric basis. This is why Heppenstall and other Seventh-day Adventist theologians have accepted this perspective.¹ Now we must focus attention on Heppenstall's theology and its legacy to Adventist theology.

Critique of Heppenstall's Theology

With the great controversy motif, we have considered Heppenstall's understanding of the doctrine of redemption: His definition and scope, his scheme, and his all-encompassing motif. The following task is to point out the valuable features and some perceived weaknesses of his theology. The section is divided in two parts: the analyses of the weaknesses or my objections to his views, and the analyses of his strengths and positive contribution to Adventist theology.

¹The great controversy motif is one of the 27 fundamental beliefs of the SDA church, see Seventh-day Adventists Believe, 97-105. See also Provonsha, God Is with Us; idem, You Can Come Home Again; Dick Winn, His Healing Love; idem, If God Won the War, Why Isn't It Over?; and George R. Knight, My Gripe with God, a Study of Divine Justice and the Problem of the Cross.
Weaknesses of Heppenstall's Theology

Structural Weaknesses

Anthropology is an area that Heppenstall gave little attention to. He did not develop extensively this doctrine, as is the case with the others, because when Heppenstall was addressing this issue, anthropology was not a matter of discussion. However, he was aware of its importance.¹ One does have to recognize, however, that he deals with the basic topics of that doctrine.² This weakness is understandable because in Adventism, the question of the nature of man results from Christological concerns. The problem is: What kind of human nature did Christ have? In order to answer that question, one needs a definition of what kind of nature man has.³ The latest discussions on Christology and soteriology of the Pre-1950s group with the Post-1950s group has forced both groups to give closer consideration to anthropology.⁴ This is an aspect that still is being considered and not yet received extensive study. The importance of this aspect is accentuated when one realizes that the concept of the transmission of sin is closely related to this doctrine, and it is one of the issues where Heppenstall is in tension with both trends of Adventist theology.

¹See SU, 9, 25.

²In ISBD (1955), he pays little attention to the subject. It was not until 1974 when he wrote SU, that he devoted one chapter to a consideration of the nature of man. Some aspects of this doctrine are dealt with only in the way it is related to the doctrine of Christ in MWG and to the concept of perfection in PIP.

³In 1977, when he wrote MWG, some aspects of the doctrine of man related to Christology entered into the arena of discussion. He devoted three chapters to the discussion of the human nature of Christ in relation to sin (107-128), the sinlessness of Christ (129-150), and the temptations of Christ (151-172).

⁴One can trace in Heppenstall's books, the direction followed by the discussions. First, in 1972, he wrote OHP, which deals with eschatological issues. Later in 1974, he wrote SU, which deals with salvation (the issue in discussion was righteousness by faith). Then, in 1976, he wrote PIP, dealing with his view of Christian perfection. Finally, in 1977, he wrote MWG, dealing with Christological issues, especially the human nature of Christ.
Another doctrine Heppenstall could have developed further was his ecclesiology. In SU, he devotes one chapter to discussing the mission of the church in relation to the message of salvation.\(^1\) In OHP, he addresses the issue of which is the true church.\(^2\) Besides these two chapters, ecclesiology does not play a role in his writings. As noted above, Heppenstall's writings are the product of the discussions on the different theological disputes within the church. Ecclesiology was not an issue of discussion when he was writing, thus, he gave little attention to it. However, the scarcity of discussion on this field reflected its impact on Heppenstall in various aspects.

First, he gave more attention to the vertical relation of the Christian to God than to the horizontal aspect of the Christian religion. The reason for this can be found in the fact that the tendency of the SDA church has been to give more missiological and social emphasis than to a vertical relation to God in regards to the doctrine of the church. It may be that Heppenstall, in his writings, tried to balance this emphasis, stressing more the existential and personal relation with God than the responsibility in the preaching of the gospel. However, this vertical emphasis tends to create a tendency toward individualism, while the horizontal emphasis tends to institutionalism. Hence, the importance of having a balanced perspective on this subject.

Second, the impact of this is seen in the absence of relating the sacraments to his doctrine of redemption, when there is a close connection between these and the new covenant. This leads to an isolation of the sacraments. The sacraments are the objective elements to help the Christian to appropriate Christ's work of redemption and to keep his/her covenant relationship with Him.

Third, another effect may be seen in the overemphasis he gives to the church and its part in the vindication of God's character. This

\(^{1}\text{SU, 237-254.}\)

\(^{2}\text{OHP, 235-254.}\)
overlooks the militant church in its terrestrial mission. This may lead us to forget the importance of our responsibility in participating in the solution of human needs.

Fourth, the last aspect considered here is his lack of Biblical support for the great controversy motif. We have already noted that he assumed it was not necessary to justify his position. However, it would have been very beneficial to present a solid justification of his perspective in order to give a more solid basis for his views. Let us consider some distinctive features where there seems to be some difficulties to harmonize his views with historic Adventism.

**Weaknesses in Specific Features**

The first particular feature to be mentioned is his definition and interpretation of sin. When he studies the issue of sin,¹ instead of giving a Biblical definition, as he did in other subjects, he uses the definition of other theologians. This point coupled with his shortage of study on the nature of man may be what led him to reach conclusions that strained his views with other Adventist scholars.

The area that has caused the most distress in Adventist theology is Heppenstall's doctrine of the sanctuary. In chapter 7, we analyzed and compared Heppenstall's views on the subject with other Adventist writers. As noted above, the critical issues in contention are the transfer of sin, the defiling of the sanctuary by means of the blood, the location of Christ in his heavenly ministry, and the role of Azazel or the scapegoat. Also of concern are Heppenstall's lack of relating Dan 8 with Lev 16, and his functional interpretation of the sanctuary. The emphasis laid on some issues and the disagreement in others have generated tension among Adventist theologians.

First, Heppenstall’s accent on the vindication of God to the detriment of the judgment of the saints in the investigative judgment in

---

¹See SU, 10-25; MWG, 107-128.
Dan 7 and in the Dan 8 prophecies has led him to emphasize only one side of the truth. Second, his functional interpretation of the sanctuary has inclined some to "spiritualize" the concept of the heavenly sanctuary. The ultimate result of this tendency is the total denial of the doctrine of the sanctuary. Third, his ideas have put a stronger emphasis on the death of Christ in contradistinction to His heavenly ministry. Fourth, the same thing has happened in relation to the emphasis of salvation, an ardent emphasis on righteousness by faith and a dispassionate sanctification. Fifth, his overemphasis on the vindication of God and His people has led some to distrust the investigative judgment in relation to the blotting out of the individual's sins. Moreover, the effects are not only in the doctrine of the sanctuary; it has ramifications in other areas, as, for instance, in the prophetic role of E. G. White.

The common element in all the previous issues is Heppenstall's discrepancy in the interpretation of some views and his selectivity in the usage of E. G. White teachings. One wonders why he went in the direction that led him to depart from the traditional views. It may be that he confronted the dilemma of accepting E. G. White's views which he felt were against what he believed was the Biblical teachings on the subject, therefore, he decided to ignore her or to chose to disagree with some of her views.

Whatever may have been the reason, one thing is clear, there remains a tension between his belief in E. G. White as an authority and his use of her writings to determine certain aspects of his own doctrine of redemption. This selective use may have provided a milieu in which doubts could be raised regarding E. G. White's authoritative/prophetic role in the formulation of Seventh-day Adventist doctrine. Taken to its logical conclusion, this could lead one to view her writings as "pastoral or homiletic" guidance rather than as a "continuing and authoritative source of truth which provides for the church's comfort,
guidance, instruction, and correction."1 Nevertheless, Heppenstall's legacy is not all questionable as there are many aspects where his views have fortified and expanded Adventist theology.

Strengths in Heppenstall's Theology

Heppenstall's contribution to Adventist theology has been positive in many ways. First, he introduced new elements in Adventist theology, such as is the case of his view of one covenant. This solves the tensions caused by the dispensational view on the matter. Second, he presented a distinct classification in the doctrine of the law, helping to differentiate its functions, nature, and purposes. Third, his views reinforced the understanding of the relation between the law and the gospel. Fourth, he gave useful insights to clarify perplexing questions about diverse doctrinal positions, such as original sin, the human nature of Christ, Christian perfection, and the investigative judgment. Fifth, he has given alternatives to theological problems within Adventism as seen in the debate of the human nature of Christ. His view on the atonement as an act and as a process, is still another benefit that we have from his view of the work of Christ. Sixth, he pioneered the emphasis on aspects of doctrine that the church had neglected, as is the case of righteousness by faith, the investigative judgment, with its emphasis on the vindication of God and His people and on the judgment on the little horn. This positive aspect must be underscored. Before Heppenstall, it had not received the strong emphasis that he placed on the topic. Seventh, he gave a broader perspective in the understanding of different doctrines such as the atonement of the death of Christ, sin, Christ's heavenly ministry, the investigative judgment, and the great controversy. Eighth, he has pointed to some aspects in Adventist theology that have clarified or corrected some views on the transfer of sin. Heppenstall is correct in

1Seventh-day Adventists Believe..., 216.
clarifying that sin is not an entity and only records of sin can be in heaven.

Thus, Heppenstall's contribution to Adventist theology has been both positive and questionable. One must recognize that most of the aspects where he differed from traditional Adventism were due to the issues under contention. If he failed, he did it trying to give meaningful answers to these difficulties. He did his best to prepare the church for its most cherished event, the Adventist hope: Christ's second coming.

Finally, we must acknowledge that Heppenstall is a trendsetter, a stimulator of new dimensions in Adventist theology. Even though some consider some of his views unorthodox Adventism and that he has led the church into doctrinal controversy, I believe Heppenstall to be a sincere theologian who in his love for the truth has dug deeply into the mines of God's word trying to give the church he loves a solid biblical foundation. His views should be considered seriously and compared with the Scriptures to learn from his insights and to avoid his onesidedness. This provides a wider ground on which to base our theological views.
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