

Editorial

Last time I discussed the sanctuary symbolism of Heb 6, arguing that it does indeed derive from the second apartment (see "The Case for Metaphor in Heb 6:19-20"). Those critical of the Seventh-day Adventist position often make this same point, because they want to show that Christ entered the second apartment in A.D. 31 rather than 1844. But they have missed something.

In Heb 6:19-20 there are no fewer than three different metaphors – one based on shipping (the anchor), one based on racing (the Forerunner), and one based on the sanctuary (the veil). So, whereas in the past we have tried to protect ourselves from a second apartment application of chap. 6, my point is that there is nothing to protect ourselves from – when we interpret the veil in the same context as the anchor and the lead horse. For the author to mean that Christ was already entering the literal second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary in A.D. 31 he would first have to be talking about the literal heavenly sanctuary. But he is not. Thus, the basis for implying that Christ did not enter the second apartment of the antitypical heavenly sanctuary in 1844 is simply not there.

In this issue I discuss the sanctuary symbolism of Heb 8-9, arguing that the term *ta hagia* (lit. "the holies") is not limited to the second apartment (see "Sanctuaries and Covenants in Heb 8-9," below). The emphasis is not on individual apartments but on entire systems of worship as governed by different covenants. The author describes the layout, furnishings, and uses of both apartments of the earthly sanctuary. And he consistently speaks in analogical terms implying that the sanctuary in heaven is substantially similar to the one on earth. When he contrasts the two it is not for the purpose of destroying the analogy he has developed but to show that the place where Christ ministers is "greater and more perfect" (Heb 9:11). It is the widely different order of magnitude and not the form of the respective sanctuaries that he is contrasting. In chap. 9 Christ enters a greater and more perfect sanctuary, not a greater and more perfect apartment.

Is there any contradiction between chaps. 6 and 8-9 in saying that the one draws on second apartment symbolism while the other does not emphasize it? None whatever. Actually the situation is just the reverse. The distinction between apartments is not systematically introduced until chap. 9. The author develops his argument gradually and he uses sanctuary symbolism in more than one way. There is nothing inconsistent in this because, although he is saying different things in chaps. 6 and 9, he says them in ways that are not directly comparable. Until we realize this basic fact we have not learned what the book of Hebrews has to tell us. The author's different uses of sanctuary symbolism must confront us. As I hope to show in the next issue, he uses sanctuary symbolism yet another way in chap. 13.

Frank W. Hardy
Editor