

The Case for Metaphor in Heb 6:19-20

Copyright (c) 2007 by Frank W. Hardy, Ph.D.

(19) Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil;

(20) Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. (Heb 6:19-20, KJV)

(19) We have this hope as an anchor for the soul, firm and secure. It enters the inner sanctuary behind the curtain, (20) where Jesus, who went before us, has entered on our behalf. He has become a high priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek. (Heb 6:19-20, NIV)¹

Prologue

When Heb 6:19 says "behind the curtain," that does not mean the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary or the first--in the primary meaning of the passage.² One reason for this is that the distinction between two apartments is not systematically introduced until chap. 9. The thought that the author develops in his book is developed over the course of the entire book and at this point in his argument the distinction we have become accustomed to seeing there is out of place. The passage can be adapted to refer to the antitypical sanctuary with its different veils and apartments but when doing so we should realize that we are adapting it.

Let me clarify at the outset that Heb 6:19-20 does not describe a heavenly sanctuary devoid of apartments either. There is a sanctuary in heaven and it has two separate apartments. Christ ministers in both of them. His second apartment ministry began in 1844. But the passage before us has something different in view. It does not describe the sanctuary at all.

The author's thought is laid out in a number of clearly defined stages. (1) The irreducible starting point for everything he says is that Christ is in heaven. (2) Having established this fact in chap. 1, the author next shows that, although Christ is there rather than here, He is still ministering to human need. His work was not cut short by the ascension but merely entered a new phase. His death on the cross, being all-sufficient the first time, does not need to be repeated. Once was enough. His role is no longer that of Sacrifice but of High Priest, ministering blood that has already been shed. That is the reason why it was shed--so He could minister it on our behalf. (3) Next the author asserts that Christ's high priestly ministry takes place--appropriately enough--within a sanctuary. (4) And finally, he shows that the analogy between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries is not confined to broad generalities but that the earthly tabernacle was intended to show us in some detail what the heavenly sanctuary is like.

The above facts are presented in chaps. 1-2, 3-6, 7, and 8-10 respectively. In chap. 6 we are just coming to point (3) in this progression. We are not yet at point (4). Thus, Heb 6:19-20 should not be required to answer the questions that pertain to point (4). It is inappropriate to make Heb 6 tell us which apartment Christ went to first upon arriving in heaven. He went and,

having gone, He ministers. These are the points to grasp here. In chap. 9 we will have occasion to talk more about the different apartments.

Introduction

In this paper I argue that Heb 6:19-20 (along with Heb 10:19-20) uses a metaphor. There are passages in Hebrews that do not use metaphors, but this one does. And it says something different from those passages that are not metaphorical. In the example before us heaven itself is compared to the second apartment as being the holiest place in the universe, the place where God dwells.

The above proposal explains on one level how the author can use second apartment imagery without talking about the second apartment. A different level of usage is involved. It also explains how the passage can say what it obviously does and yet not contradict other passages which say something different. Nor does the present model weaken the historic Seventh-day Adventist interpretation of the heavenly antitype. It does not begin to. On the contrary, it protects that interpretation, as I hope to demonstrate below.

Around the turn of the century Albion F. Ballenger wrote extensively on the present passage and concluded that Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary theology was fundamentally misconceived. I believe he was wrong. The problem is not that he chose the wrong veil but that he interpreted a metaphorical passage literally.

Expanding on various aspects of the discussion below are a series of five appendices. These deal with Ballenger's linguistic argument (appendix 1), the tearing of the temple veil in Matt 27:51 (appendix 2), extended uses of sanctuary terminology by inspired writers (appendix 3), Ellen G. White's uses of Heb 6:19-20 (appendix 4), and the relationship between the sanctuary and apocalyptic (appendix 5).

Where Did Ballenger Go Wrong?

Ballenger is not a person we can ignore. Every Seventh-day Adventist writer after him who has dealt with the same topics in enough detail to show that he understands what the issues are has in some way felt the force of Ballenger's argument.³ No one today accepts a fraction of the model Ballenger built around his data. But the data themselves give every appearance of being irrefutable. Here I have special reference to his claims about the expression "within the veil" (KJV) as used in the Old Testament. The issues he raised must be addressed. If he was right, we need to admit it. If he was wrong, we need to know why.

Which veil?

Ballenger amassed a good deal of textual information to support his theory that the "curtain" (NIV) or "veil" (KJV) in Heb 6:19 is the second one, that it is physically located in the heavenly sanctuary, and that the significance of Christ's going beyond it at His ascension is that His antitypical second apartment ministry began then rather than in 1844. The question for Ballenger, and indeed for most of those who have challenged him, is: Which of two antitypical veils is the author talking about--outer or inner, first or second? This is the wrong question. Before raising it we should first establish whether the author has the antitypical sanctuary in view. In later chapters he does, but here he does not.

Below we discuss the work of three men who have studied Ballenger extensively--Roy Adams, William G. Johnsson, and George E. Rice. These scholars approach their topic in different ways, but one point they all hold in common--with each other and with Ballenger--is that the veil of Heb 6:19 is located somewhere in the antitypical sanctuary in heaven.

Roy Adams. According to Roy Adams, Ballenger is right by a technicality but has overstated his otherwise substantially correct claims. Having presented some of the arguments brought against Ballenger he states:

However, these objections leave virtually untouched his major contentions (1) that the first curtain in Leviticus is never termed a veil in the Septuagint; (2) that in the Septuagint the expression "within the veil" always applies to the holy of holies; (3) that in the Septuagint the terms "before the veil" and "without the veil" always apply to the first apartment of the sanctuary; and (4) that the twenty-two Leviticus references to the first curtain in the Septuagint are always to "the door of the tabernacle, in distinction from the second curtain which in every instance (seven times) is referred to as *the veil* in such expressions as 'the veil,' 'the veil of the sanctuary,' 'within the veil' and 'outside the veil.'" Ballenger's conclusions with regard to the meaning of "the veil" and "within the veil" in the Old Testament also remain substantially intact.

Unless the author of Hebrews radically departed from this (almost) universally accepted usage, then it is clear that Ballenger is correct, and "within the veil" in Heb 6:19 does point to the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.⁴

Notice in particular the second paragraph above. If Ballenger is right on the matter of which veil the author is talking about, it must follow--according to Adams--that Heb 6:19 "does point to the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary." This logic sounds all very plausible, but a conclusion can only follow from a premise. If the premise is flawed, it does not matter what follows from it. What Adams has done is to draw Ballenger's conclusion from Ballenger's premise, accomplishing nothing.

Elsewhere Adams states, "Ballenger's treatment of Heb 6:19, 20 is so strong, exegetically, that it has to be regarded as a significant movement towards a closer affinity to the biblical testimony in regard to the meaning of the phrase 'within the veil.'"⁵ It is true that Ballenger's exegesis has an appearance of great strength. And yet Adams' assessment cannot be right. Or if it is, Ellen White's assessment cannot be right when she says, "So you see it is impossible for us to have any agreement with the positions taken by Brother A. F. Ballenger; for no lie is of the truth."⁶

Something in Ballenger's theory is not as it seems. It is a mixture of useful information and something misleading. "The words are right but misapplied to vindicate error."⁷ There is a

question how Ballenger could be so wrong while saying so many things that appear to be right. Below I hope to provide an explanation for these seeming contradictions.

William G. Johnsson. Let us now examine in greater detail what Ballenger's argument was. What did he claim? Among other things he claimed that in twenty-five out of twenty-five cases where the second veil is referred to in the Old Testament the Hebrew word *pārôket* is used to refer to it. He then read Heb 6:19-20 in view of this proposed fact. William G. Johnsson corrects Ballenger's tally to twenty-three out of twenty-five cases, but even so, twenty-three out of twenty-five is still impressive. According to Johnsson, it was Ballenger's claim that:

In every case the [Hebrew] term *paroketh* ["veil"] applies to the second curtain, the one that separates the holy from the most holy. By contrast, the first curtain throughout the OT is called the "door of the tabernacle." Ballenger quotes the 23 references to *paroketh* in support (Ex 26:31, 33, 35; 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 36:35; 38:27; 39:34; 40:3, 21-22, 26; Lev 4:6, 17; 16:2, 12, 15; 21:23; 24:3; Num 4:5; 18:7; 2 Chr 3:14).⁸

Johnsson's correction involves two minor points. First, not every example of Hebrew *pārôket* refers to the second curtain. There are two cases where the author's intent is unclear: ""he must not go near **the curtain** or approach the altar"" (Lev 21:23); ""But only you and your sons may serve as priests in connection with everything at the altar and inside **the curtain**"" (Num 18:7). The other examples all speak unambiguously of the second veil. That is one point. Johnsson also shows that "the second veil is not always designated simply as 'the veil,' i.e., by *pārôket* without amplification. In some cases additional words are used along with *pārôket* (see Exod 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 40:21; Lev 4:6; 24:3; Num 4:5).

Thus, although the data of the OT support Ballenger's point here, he has overstated his case by arguing that "the Lord invariably applies the term ['veil'] to the curtain separating the holy from the most holy. Never has he called the first curtain 'the veil' in the Hebrew Scriptures . . . the Lord was careful, in naming the two curtains, to give the first one the name of 'the *door* of the tabernacle,' and the second one the name of 'the veil.'"⁹

So far both Adams and Johnsson allow the reader to assume that Ballenger has a good point to make but that it is not as strong as he thought. He has overstated his case by a small margin. Instead of the Hebrew Old Testament using *pārôket* to refer to the second curtain every time without exception, it does so with a probability as low as 91% (assuming Lev 21:23 and Num 18:7 both do not speak of the second veil). Thus, the student of Heb 6:19-20 should come to his passage expecting with at least 91% certainty that the Greek equivalent of the above term (*katapetasma* "veil") will refer to the second veil, while understanding with no more than 9% certainty that it could refer to the first.

George E. Rice. George E. Rice seeks to show that Ballenger has not merely overstated his case but has grossly misrepresented the lexical evidence and is wrong not only in his conclusions but also in his data.

Certainly, *katapetasma* is used *almost* exclusively for the inner veil (23 out of 25 times). But the same can be said for the courtyard veil (five out of six times)! *Katapetasma* is also the majority choice for the first veil of the sanctuary as well (six out of eleven times).

In other words, out of the 42 references in the LXX to the three veils of the wilderness sanctuary, *katapetasma* is used 34 times. Or put another way: In only eight instances among these

42 references to the sanctuary veils is *katapetasma* not used by itself. Furthermore, in two additional instances *katapetasma* is combined with *kalumma* ["covering"], thus leaving only six instances out of 42 where the word does not appear.¹⁰

This last assertion is a flat contradiction of one of the key components in Ballenger's argument. He claimed that the first veil is always called a "door" (Hebrew *pétaḥ*, Greek *thura*) and that only the second veil is called a "veil" (Hebrew *pārōket*, Greek *katapetasma*). Thus, whenever we read *katapetasma* in the book of Hebrews without further qualification, the reference must be to the second veil and not the first. Rice seeks to show that this powerful argument is simply wrong. Ballenger did not do his homework so well as we had imagined. The facts of the case are other than he supposed.

It should be pointed out, however, that Rice has not really met Ballenger's argument. He has refuted Ballenger selectively, confining his attention to words translated "veil" but saying nothing about the sixty-three uses of Hebrew *pétaḥ* "opening" (Greek *thura* "door") in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, fifty-six of which refer to the first or outer veil of the tabernacle. But this body of other references is a major component of Ballenger's argument. It was precisely his point that the first veil is called a "door," with the result that whenever we find something called a "veil" we can be sure it is the second veil and not the first. So however welcome Rice's efforts might be, he does not accomplish his objective and in fact he contradicts Ellen White in the process. What she says is, "The words are right but misapplied to vindicate error."¹¹ Rice sets out to show that the words also are wrong.

There is a solution to the problem before us but it does not require us to show that Ballenger counted incorrectly. According to Ellen White the nature of the problem is that "His proofs do not belong where he places them, . . ." ¹² It is not internal to the proofs but resides outside them in the matter of what he uses them to prove. If that is the problem, then any effort to resolve it by correcting the manner in which Ballenger counted his data is doomed from the outset. Ballenger did do his homework and he did it more or less accurately. See appendix 1.

Which sanctuary?

All three of the men whose work is considered above make valuable contributions to our understanding of the present topic, but none has removed the threat that he set out to deal with. Even Rice, who takes a more aggressive approach and goes into more detail than the others, cannot be considered successful. But let us say for argument that he was. What position would such an argument have the potential to establish? Is it the case, if the sanctuary is referred to by certain easily recognizable terms, that whenever those terms are used we are referring to the sanctuary? Does the link extend equally in both directions? More specifically, does it follow from anything said so far that the word "veil" in Heb 6:19 refers to some part of the antitypical sanctuary in heaven, leaving open for now the question of which part? Not for a moment.

Rice's claim that the word in question has as much chance of referring to the first veil as the second, even if successful, does not bring the expected flood of insight. The thought conveyed in the passage is not that our faith extends to an outer chamber, beyond which only one more barrier (the second veil if *katapetasma* is the first) remains. In the person of Christ our faith extends beyond all barriers into the very presence of God. See appendix 2. So what would we gain by refuting Ballenger in the above manner, even if no further difficulties remained? After we finish making our case, what case have we made?

There is widespread agreement that a literal interpretation of the word "veil" in Heb 6:19 is required. I submit that this is a false assumption, but whether or not it is false we should at least be very clear that it is an assumption. The degree to which we agree with Ballenger's assumptions is the degree to which we will be perplexed by his conclusions. He was wrong, but as a rule he was not inconsistent. So we must make a clean break. When we do this, any similarities between his theory and what follows will be seen to be truly superficial.

Discussion

In my view the question is not whether *katapetasma* in Heb 6:19 uses second apartment imagery. It does. But we should not ask which veil until we have established very clearly which sanctuary. According to Edward Heppenstall there are only two to choose from.

The Word of God speaks of only two sanctuaries: one on earth and the other in heaven; one in type and the other the antitype. They both teach that the central truth and activity of the sanctuary is that of the mediatorial ministration of our great High Priest; that this ministration is twofold, spoken of as the "daily" and the "yearly," or day of atonement.¹³

Heppenstall is right. There are only two sanctuaries. More than this, at any given time in history there has been only one sanctuary. The earthly does not compete with the heavenly or vice versa. The one replaces the other. And how many choices are there? If what we are talking about is time, there is the time before the cross and the time after the cross. If what we are talking about is space, there is earth and there is heaven--the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary. And yet there is a difference between directing language to the sanctuary and drawing language from the sanctuary.

This latter distinction must be grasped before going on. It is crucial to our understanding of an entire class of otherwise only dimly explicable passages. For example, when Jesus tells the Pharisees, "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days," they reply, "It has taken forty-six years to build this temple, and you are going to raise it in three days?" (John 2:19, 20). Using the logic we have traditionally applied to Heb 6 our response would have to be: Yes, how are you going to do that? (There are only two sanctuaries and He is not talking about the one in heaven.)

Along this same line, when Paul asks, "Don't you know that you yourselves are God's temple and that God's Spirit lives in you?" (1 Cor 3:16), which of the two sanctuaries does he have in mind--the one in heaven, or the one in Jerusalem? And what does Ellen White mean when she tells us, "The house is the sanctuary for the family, and the closet or the grove the most retired place for individual worship; but the church is the sanctuary for the congregation"?¹⁴ If Jesus' body, our bodies, our houses, and our church buildings can all be described using sanctuary language, how dogmatic should we be in saying that the author of Hebrews has not used a similar figure of speech? See appendix 3.

I submit that Heb 6:19-20 and 10:19-20 are in exactly the same category as the passages quoted above. The language is metaphorical in each case. It is drawn from the sanctuary but does not refer to the sanctuary. I return to this matter below. The author's point, both in chap. 6 and in chap. 10, is that Christ has ascended to heaven and that once there He continues to minister. Some still living remembered seeing Him before He left. But now He is gone. That is the fact that needs explaining in a mid-first century context. Moreover, when we understand what He is doing for us now, after the ascension, that knowledge will have a

stabilizing influence on our entire experience. It will be as an anchor for our souls. This is the way Ellen White applies Heb 6:19-20 in all but one notable quotation. See appendix 4.

Making the present verses tell us what part of heaven Christ went to first after His ascension or when He started doing this task as opposed to that--which is the information Ballenger wants us to draw from it--is on the same level as deriving our concept of the physical appearance of heaven from Christ's parable about the rich man and Lazarus (see Luke 16:19-31).

Context Argues Against Ballenger

We must maintain a sense of proportion, bearing in mind the contextual constraints imposed by the rest of the passage, the rest of the book, the age in which it was written, and what the rest of the Bible says on the same topic.

There are two other figures of speech in Heb 6:19-20 to account for, apart from its "veil" imagery, and these provide the immediate context for the proposed metaphor. There is also a chiasmic parallel to Heb 6:19-20 in 10:19-20, so these passages must be studied together. There is the matter of what questions the author's contemporaries would bring to the epistle as they read it for the first time. And there is the matter of what other books of Scripture, such as Daniel, contribute to our understanding of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary. If the author of this epistle has anything to say, it is because the Holy Spirit inspired him to say it. But this raises the question of what the same Spirit inspired others to say.

The context of other verses in
the same passage

I submit that the distinction presupposed by Heb 6:19-20 is entirely simple and straightforward. It is between heaven and earth (see Heb 9:24), not between this apartment or that within a sanctuary located in heaven--although there is such a sanctuary and it does have two apartments. The author is talking about spiritual realities. He is inviting a contrast with the earthly types. But he is not describing the antitype as it relates to the physical sanctuary structure in heaven. There are a number of reasons for saying this.

The anchor. Consider the anchor of vs. 19. First, it is "an anchor for the soul." This is a metaphor. If it is not, then how can we visualize what the author is saying in nonmetaphorical terms? Indeed, how can we visualize what he is saying metaphorically? First, is there any Christian to whom the figure does not apply? And is there any place on earth where Christians might not be at any given time, fulfilling the conditions of the anchor motif? The first readers of the epistle were being buffeted by doubt and the author is saying that maintaining an awareness of Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven can make their experience stable.

Jesus is no longer here except by His Holy Spirit. But His absence was being misinterpreted. He did not merely go away. That is not the special significance of what happened at the ascension. He is just as actively involved in the work of saving us now as He was before in His earthly life and death. If He had forgotten about us, it would be appropriate for us to forget about Him. But He has not done this. As our great High Priest He remains involved with us and as the beneficiaries of that ministry we must remain involved with Him. In this way

our knowledge of what Christ is doing in the heavenly sanctuary serves on a spiritual level the same function that an anchor does for a ship near harbor, i.e., it keeps the ship from drifting away until it can be safely gathered in.

Anchors extend down, not up. By applying the figure in this way we get yet another example of biblical rock symbolism.¹⁵ Christ is the solid Rock beneath our ship to which our souls' anchor extends. He is as much more stable than us as rock is more stable than water. This is vertical imagery. On a horizontal plane we could point out that Christ has entered the harbor before us. Thus, where He has gone we will go. And the fact that He has gone there is our best evidence that one day we will follow Him (see Heb 11:1), in fulfillment of the promise "that you also may be where I am" (John 14:3).

It would be a gross misuse of the anchor metaphor to attempt to prove by means of it that there is no tangible sanctuary in heaven. But it would be equally inappropriate to use the same passage to prove that there is. The author is not seeking to demonstrate either position. So let us get out of the passage what he put into it, i.e., that Christ's presence in heaven must be seen in the context of His ongoing ministry for humankind.

Thus, the biblical basis for the perseverance of the saints --the factor that alone can make their experience stable and consistent--is the high priestly ministry of Christ, the fact that in every generation He lives and continues to minister (see Heb 7:25). The present controversy over Heb 6:19-20 has robbed us of the practical sermons that should be preached on this passage. The church does not hear or benefit from them because by some unwritten convention these verses are reserved for out-of-pulpit polemics. This is a tragedy.

The Forerunner. In the NIV rendering of Heb 6:20 the single word *prodromos* ("forerunner," KJV) is translated by a clause ("who went before us"). But the KJV rendering is literal and accurate. It does not need to be improved upon. Our Forerunner by definition goes somewhere before us. Where He goes is the question at issue in Heb 6:19. This question can be answered in part by showing where He will eventually cause us to follow Him. Where He goes first, we will go later. When He comes again will we go directly to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary and stay only there throughout eternity? It would become a prison to us. On the contrary, we will walk on the golden streets (see Rev 21:21). We will pick fruit from the tree of life and drink from the river that flows out through the city to bless the surrounding area (Rev 22:1-2)). We will inherit all heaven because Christ, who went there before us, has inherited all heaven. All will be ours, omitting nothing, because all is His.

These things are real, and yet the word *prodromos* ("Forerunner," KJV) in vs. 20 is just as rich in metaphorical associations as the word *agkuran* ("anchor") in vs. 19. Dennis Hamm comments as follows on Heb 12:1 ("let us run with perseverance the race marked out for us"):

The image of faith as something which involves leaving something behind and focusing ahead on a physically invisible goal, an image already strong in the faith portraits of Abraham and Moses, is here expressed in the metaphor of the racetrack (a motif already struck when Jesus is called *prodromos* ["forerunner"] in 6:20). The focus is now Jesus. The titles used for him, *archēgos* and *teleiōtēs* of faith, have rich connotations. First, the *arch/tel* pairing (see the similar pairing at 2:10, 6:1, and 7:3) evokes spontaneously the sense of "beginner and ender," or "starter" and "finisher."¹⁶

The author's racetrack imagery--which supplies the context for the word *prodromos* in Heb 6:20--is a metaphor. This does not mean our Forerunner is unreal. And in the same way, the heavenly sanctuary is real but the sanctuary language of Heb 6:19-20 is not literal. Instead it is comparable to the figures of an anchor (where people are compared with ships) and a racetrack (where people are compared with horses). When the author says "veil" or "curtain," if he is talking about the literal "veil" or "curtain" of the antitypical heavenly sanctuary, how is that a metaphor? And if it is not, how is his veil imagery comparable to his anchor and racetrack imagery? If the terms are not used in similar ways, how do we explain the fact? The author is not talking about any physical feature of the sanctuary in heaven in vs. 19. He is talking about heaven itself.

Reasoning from what we can be sure of (the anchor and racetrack are metaphorical) to those features where there might be a question (the meaning of the veil), it is sufficiently clear that "the inner sanctuary behind the curtain" or "veil" refers to something other than the literal area behind a literal veil--although if we were talking literally about the heavenly sanctuary there would indeed be such a veil, so far as we can gather from the ancient types. Nor does any of this constitute explaining the passage away. My purpose is not to remove a literal meaning that is there but to prevent the reader from bringing to the passage a degree of literalness that the author never had in mind. Even the exercise of asking whether he was being this literal or that literal points us in the wrong direction. The correct answer is none of the above. He is not talking about the heavenly sanctuary. He is talking about the ascension in the context of the sanctuary, which is another matter. The curtain in Heb 6:19-20 is the physical distance between heaven and earth and the area beyond it is heaven. In transcending that distance Christ went beyond the veil, thus entering the presence of God. From other passages we know that there is a real sanctuary in heaven, that it has two apartments, and that Christ ministers in both of them. But the antitypical sanctuary is not what the author is talking about here.

The context of other passages in
the same book

Heb 6:19-20 must be interpreted in a manner compatible with other similar passages. The closest parallel to Heb 6:19-20 is Heb 10:19-20.¹⁷ The word "curtain" (genitive *katapetasmatos*) is the same in both passages and the ideas of entering and of traveling are both brought to mind by such terms as *eiserchomenēn* "enters" (6:19), *eiselthēn* "entered" (6:20); *eisodon* "to enter" (lit. "way into") (10:19), "way" (10:20). These related terms provide an extended thematic parallel between the two passages.

Johnsson emphasizes that the clause, "by a new and living way opened for us through the curtain, that is, his body" (Heb 10:20), can be interpreted in either of two ways. The most obvious meaning in English translation is that the words "his body" refer back to "the curtain." But in the Greek it is equally possible to understand "his body" as referring back to "a new and living way." Johnsson argues for the latter alternative and is correct in doing so.¹⁸ Without pressing the language too hard for literalness in the matter of physical appearance, what he draws from this is that the text of Heb 10:20 does not reduce the curtain in the heavenly sanctuary to the level of a figure of speech. Heb 10:20 does not compromise the tangible reality of the sanctuary in heaven. This is Johnsson's point.

I agree with much of what Johnson says, and certainly with his intent, but submit that the passage does use metaphor and does not have anything whatever to say about the appearance or physical makeup of the antitypical sanctuary in heaven. The curtain is not Christ's body.

Instead the way into heaven is His body. How literal is that? A possible parallel would be with Jacob's ladder in Gen 28:10-17. But this is not the sense of Heb 10:20.¹⁹ Johnsson has not led us from a metaphorical interpretation to a literal (or literalizing) interpretation. Instead he has exchanged one metaphor for another. Whether Christ's body is the veil in heaven or the way to heaven we are still left with a metaphor--in precisely the same manner as in Heb 6:19-20. The two passages are closely parallel.

Actually, there is a point at which the distinction breaks down between saying that Christ's body is the curtain (separating us from heaven) or the way (leading us to heaven). Both curtains of the sanctuary simultaneously kept some people out and let others in. Here is one aspect of the distinction between *petah* "opening" (Greek *thura* "door") and *māsāk* "covering" (Greek *kalumma* "covering"). See appendix 1. The difference between barring and granting access does not have to do with the nature of the curtain but with the identity of the one standing before it. Christ says, "I tell you the truth, I am the gate for the sheep" (John 10:7). The same gate that keeps robbers out lets sheep in (see vs. 8). Here the comparison is with the "curtain" (Heb 10:20). Elsewhere He tells us, "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6). Here the comparison is with the "new and living way" (Heb 10:20). Thus, He is both the "curtain" and the "way." Christ's gate imagery in John 10:7 and His road imagery in John 14:6 should both be understood in the context of the sanctuary.

The historical context

This could be made into a long section, but let me merely point out that the question on the minds of first century Christians would not be, "What part of the sanctuary is Jesus in?" Until the book of Hebrews was written many of them would not have known there was a sanctuary in heaven. Instead their question would be geocentric: "I saw Jesus myself only a few years ago. He is no longer here. Where is He relative to where I am?" The author answers this question by describing Jesus' location relative to where God is. But one could easily lose sight of what he is trying to communicate by doing this. Is God in the second apartment or the first? One could ask the question that way. But where is the sanctuary that those rooms are part of? This should be our starting point.

If we say that our Forerunner passed from the first apartment to the second, how many feet or yards worth of motion would that require? But if we say that our Forerunner passed from earth--where He had lived for thirty-three years--to heaven, then there we are talking about distances measured in light-years. But even without knowing where heaven is, which of the two actions on Christ's part would be more likely to capture the imagination of a first century Christian--let us say one who had seen Jesus personally? When we finish answering that question, let us apply the insights we gain from it to Heb 6:19-20.

The context of other books written in different periods of history

In Dan 8:9-14 something is taken away from the Prince of the host--not an object of some sort but a function or ministry appropriately described in Hebrew by the adjective *tāmîd* ("daily" or "continual"). If Christ were not actively ministering the "daily" at this time in history, why was that the ministry that the little horn tried to take away from Him? Let me ask the question a different way. If Christ began ministering the yearly already at His ascension, how is

it that He was still ministering the "daily" five hundred years later when the little horn started trying to appropriate that function to itself?

We must apply Dan 8:9-14 to a time after Christ's ascension. Otherwise He would not be ministering at all. And when we do this we must conclude that the correct sequence of events in the heavenly sanctuary is "daily" first and then yearly second. When Christ first began to minister on His arrival in heaven, the ministry He started with was not the yearly but the "daily." At least that is what Daniel teaches.

When did the yearly begin? "Unto three thousand and two hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (Dan 8:14, KJV). The yearly counterpart of the "daily" ministry referred to in vs. 11 starts in vs. 14 at the end of the 2300 days in 1844.

It is not inappropriate to consult Daniel when interpreting Hebrews. Why would we wish to separate them? And how would our results be affected by studying them together? Whatever the answer to this last question is, those are the results I want to achieve. It is unsafe to ignore any part of what God tells us. We must bring the whole the Bible to bear on the discussion.

The Limits of Metaphor

In Heb 8-9 we have an entirely different situation from that which has occupied us so far in chaps. 6 and 10. The context in chap. 9 is one of describing how the various parts of the earthly sanctuary looked and functioned. Here the author's language can be interpreted with all desired literalness. We can see the spiritual meaning in John 10 and 14 and in Heb 6 and 10 without compromising the tangible reality of the sanctuary in Heb 8-9 and other similar passages. That is, we can do this if we make the necessary distinctions. It is not the case that if one passage in Hebrews is metaphorical, they all are.

In a paper entitled, "The Heavenly Sanctuary--Figurative or Real?" Johnsson raises the following question:

How shall we regard the references to the heavenly sanctuary in the book of Hebrews? Does the heavenly sanctuary have an objective existence, or is it only an idea?²⁰

Johnsson argues for a literalizing (rather than metaphorical or literalistic) position, thus preserving the objectivity of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary without over-specifying the details of that structure's physical appearance. In this he is largely correct. But in making a case for realism throughout the book of Hebrews he appears to rule out all metaphor in every part of Hebrews. Here he is wrong.²¹ Not all passages in this epistle have literalizing intent and not all are metaphorical. There is variety of usage.²² The author also has expressed himself "in various ways" (Heb 1:1).

In any event, to the extent that Johnsson is successful in ruling out metaphor anywhere in the epistle he defeats his own purpose, because in his model chaps. 6 and 10 must be interpreted in the same way as chaps. 8 and 9. Johnsson has no reason to want chaps. 6 and 10 to be literal. What he does want to be literal is chaps. 8 and 9. So for him a best case scenario would be to have some rigorous method for distinguishing between the two sets of passages. The present model offers one. When it is implemented there is no conflict either within Hebrews itself or between Hebrews and Daniel. And at the same time it gives us insight

into other uses of sanctuary language elsewhere in the New Testament that would remain obscure apart from such a model.

The Nature of This Particular Metaphor

It is not enough merely to assert that some chapters of Hebrews use metaphor while others do not. Granting that some do, what is the nature of the metaphor? The nature of the metaphor (in those passage where it appears) is that the first apartment is the earth. We have been afraid to say this in the past because of William Miller's mistake in the years leading up to 1844. Out of that experience we learned at great cost and amid public ridicule that the sanctuary is not the earth, that the antitypical sanctuary is in heaven. Does what I am saying take us back over this same ground again? It does not--in any way whatever.

There are two reasons for saying this. First, because what we are talking about here is not the antitypical sanctuary or any other. And second, because even under a metaphorical interpretation the earth is not the second apartment. Miller's mistake was to misidentify the object cleansed at the end of the 2300 days. He felt that the sanctuary, with special reference to its second apartment, was the earth.²³ By contrast, when the author of Hebrews uses sanctuary language to say that Christ has ascended, the second apartment is "heaven itself" (Heb 9:24), which is a concept that we have all done battle with in the course of studying what our detractors write on the book of Hebrews. This much is all very familiar.

Here I merely point out that there are two poles to this comparison and that in the other one the first apartment is the earth. (I am talking about the first apartment in the metaphor, not the first apartment of the antitypical sanctuary.) This is not a point to be made apologetically. It should be actively embraced. There are positive insights to be gained from extending our sanctuary model in this way. Below we consider two examples. The first provides a sanctuary-based framework for understanding the everyday life of the church and the second provides a rigorous framework for understanding the worldwide work of the church --its concept of mission or outreach, which is the primary reason why it exists.

Life of the church: spiritual significance of the first apartment

In the ancient tabernacle one of the functions of the first apartment was to convey some idea of what we would see in heaven if we could go there to see it. But there is another function and that is to portray the life of the church on earth during the time between Christ's two advents. The sanctuary throughout teaches us about Jesus but it also teaches us about ourselves in relation to Jesus.

Bread. On his right as he enters the outer room of the sanctuary the priest would see a table with two stacks of consecrated bread (Exod 25:23-30; 37:10-16; 40:22-23).²⁴ It is customary to point out that the bread represents Christ, who says, "I am the bread of life" (John 6:35, 48). This is the main point of the symbol. What I wish to emphasize, however, is that the church feeds on Christ not in any physical way (John 6:52-62),²⁵ and spiritually not only in the eucharist (1 Cor 11:23-24), but also by studying the words of Christ as preserved in Scripture. "The Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing. The words I have spoken to you are spirit and

they are life" (John 6:63). The healthy and growing Christian takes on spiritual nourishment at the beginning of each day and as a result has strength to meet his daily spiritual needs (see Matt 6:11).

Incense. Continuing counterclockwise around the room, the priest would next come to the altar of incense (Exod 30:1-10; 37:25-29; 40:26-27). The incense represents first and foremost the fact that Christ's person, character, and work are pleasing and acceptable to God.²⁶ The Christian can approach God on this basis. Thus, the incense itself represents Christ, but the offering of incense represents prayer. Because God accepts what Christ has done, and because we approach God through Him, we are accepted along with Him and can freely approach the Father. The Christian studies, but he also prays.

Light. Finally, on the left side of the room the priest would see a golden lampstand with seven branches (Exod 25:31-36; 37:17-24; 40:24-25). Christ says, "I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life" (John 8:12). In another place He says, "While I am in the world, I am the light of the world" (John 9:5). While I am in the world. And after He ascends to the Father? "You are the light of the world. A city on a hill cannot be hidden" (Matt 5:14). Light is an appropriate symbol for witness. While Christ was still on this earth He personally represented the Father's character of love to mankind. He showed what God is like. After His return to heaven it became the church's responsibility to bear a similar witness, aided by the Holy Spirit.²⁷

As regards bread, Christ never delegated His status as the bread of life, and as regards incense, we have no other basis for approaching the Father (Acts 4:12), but every member of Christ's spiritual body has a responsibility to serve as an ambassador for God to a world that does not know Him. Every Christian, therefore, has the privilege and responsibility to study, pray, and bear a consistent witness to Christ. These are the three parts of a well rounded program for spiritual health and well being. They are a description of the life and activity of the church on earth.²⁸ The symbols which describe them are in the first apartment. Thus, there is a metaphorical sense in which the first apartment is the earth--the place where Christians live and minister. This is different from but coexists with the antitypical sense in which the first apartment is one part of a structure in heaven.

Let me emphasize that what I am saying does not detract from the literal heavenly sanctuary taught by Seventh-day Adventists all these years. In the one case we are speaking of spiritual things metaphorically, while in the other we are speaking of things that have a literal and tangible existence. The two will compete with each other only to the extent that they make comparable claims. In my view the claims made at these two widely different levels of interpretation are not directly comparable and so have no basis on which to compete. We can have both.

Work of the church: priesthood
of all believers

An implication of the above model is that those who believe in Christ occupy a priestly role. If the spiritual life of the church depends on study, prayer, and outreach, and if we attempt to relate these things systematically to the sanctuary, then the work of the church as it relates to the above factors is priestly in nature. Bread, incense, and light come together only in the first apartment. And the only ones who could enter the first apartment were priests.

There is nothing new in pointing out the priestly role of those who believe in Christ. Luther emphasized this same fact about lay people but approached it in the context of the hierarchical priesthood of the church in his day. I approach it in the context of the sanctuary. All believers, and not only a professional clergy, have the privilege of approaching God for themselves through Christ. This was Luther's point. My point is that believers approach God on behalf of others besides themselves and that they must also approach those individuals on behalf of Christ. Here is the context for Paul's saying:

(15) I have written you quite boldly on some points, as if to remind you of them again, because of the grace God gave me (16) to be a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles with the priestly duty [*hierourgounta*] of proclaiming the gospel of God, so that the Gentiles might become an offering acceptable to God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit. (Rom 15:15-16)

Paul considered his work of "proclaiming the gospel of God" to be a "priestly duty." This corresponds with the Old Testament concept that priests should be a source of instruction for the people.

"For the lips of a priest ought to preserve knowledge, and from his mouth men should seek instruction--because he is the messenger of the Lord Almighty." (Mal 2:7)

Not everyone can preach, but every believer can share "the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God" (Rom 11:33); see Mark 5:18-20), to the extent that he possesses them. There is no forgiving of sins here or creating of a separate human priesthood in the Roman Catholic sense. The present model does not introduce separation among believers. Christian witness involves every member of the church. Our ministry is to call people's attention to Christ's ministry. Doing so does not compete with what Christ is doing for us but makes it more prominent. Here we have the basis for a very powerful theology of Christian outreach.²⁹

Bear in mind that anciently there was one priest primarily--the high priest. Common priests served only as his assistants. In the same way, when we bring Christ to people or people to Christ, we serve as His assistants on earth. Thus, our ministry is an extension of His ministry and in doing such things we carry out His will.

The Scriptures should be allowed to say what they obviously intend. We should do this anyway, even if it were not to our advantage. But in fact it is to our advantage. We have thought that by allowing any passage to speak of spiritual realities in the context of the sanctuary but not in the context of what happened in heaven in 1844 we would be compromising our loyalty to the experience that has brought us this far.

In the present context, just the opposite is the case. By locking Heb 6:19-20 into the same room with Dan 8:13-14 and Heb 8:2 we turn these texts upon each other. The problem is that none of them can ever lose, for they are the words of God. If we force them into conflict, they will destroy not each other but us, as we see happening at the present time. That is why I am writing this paper and why so many others are busy writing their own papers on the same topic. The challenge before us is to expand our model in such a way as to make both sets of passages our friends. Then we can hope to avoid splitting the church into Hebrews Adventists and Daniel Adventists. What we need more than these are Bible Adventists. One gets just as wet falling out of a boat on the one side as on the other. Let us find ways therefore to avoid the problems that accompany either extreme.

Discussion: Richard M. Davidson on Heb 6

Richard M. Davidson has made a major contribution in the area of biblical typology and thus to our understanding of Heb 9. He summarizes some of his findings in a paper entitled, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews."³⁰ In the above paper he spends much less time with chap. 6, however, and his results in that chapter are correspondingly weaker. In Heb 6 his position is reminiscent of both E. E. Andross and M. L. Andreasen--simultaneously. This is an uneasy combination. For the reader's convenience I summarize the main thrust of what these and other Seventh-day Adventist expositors have taught about Heb 6. See table below.

Table
Summary of Seventh-Day Adventist Views
on the Veil in Heb 6:19

Source	Sense	Imagery	Event
Smith	Literal First veil	Start of ministry	
Ballenger	Literal	Second veil	Start of ministry
Andross	Literal	Second veil	Dedication ceremony
Andreasen	Literal	Either	Start of ministry
Davidson	Literal	Either	Dedication ceremony
This paper	Metaphorical	Second veil	Ascension

Andross argued that Christ at His ascension did indeed enter the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, thus fulfilling Heb 6:19, but that after doing so He came back out again to minister in the first apartment until 1844.³⁰ Andross' purpose was to silence Ballenger, to be sure, but this did not prevent him from being convinced by the latter's argument that "within the veil" meant within the inner veil, i.e., within the second apartment.³¹ Andreasen, on the other hand, took no position on which veil is referred to. He would neither assert that it was the first, nor deny that it was the second.³² The reason why these positions do not mix well is that if we know enough about where Jesus went on His ascension to assert that He entered the second apartment to dedicate it, it makes no sense to deny knowing which apartment He entered. We either do or do not. According to Davidson,

George Rice has shown that Hebrews 10:19, 20 is part of a chiasmic structure (encompassing 6:19-10:39) and that Hebrews 10:19 and onward (the second limb of the chiasm) is the explanatory development of the parallel or first limb of the chiasm, Hebrews 6:19. Therefore, in the light of the clear reference to the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary in 10:19, 20, it appears possible to conclude that the same event is in view in the description of Jesus' entrance into the heavenly sanctuary in 6:19, 20. Regardless of which veil(s) the author has in mind in these passages, the continuity between type and antitype is maintained, inasmuch as the entire sanctuary was inaugurated at the commencement of its services.³³

It is not our first task to maintain the continuity between type and antitype, as valuable as that is. Instead we must use what we know or can learn about such continuity to resolve exegetical problems, such as the one before us. What Davidson buys with his argument in regard to

typology is the ability to say that the link between type and antitype remains in place throughout Hebrews. This is a good and useful point. But what he buys in regard to the specific problems facing us in Heb 6:19-20 is the ability to set them aside. That is what the word "regardless" accomplishes. It does little good to keep our critics from making their point if we have nothing to take its place.

Let us stop launching verbal feints in the general direction of what we really want to say. According to Gerhard Hasel, "It becomes apparent from various philological considerations that the references to entering within the veil in 6:19 and 10:20 may encompass something broader than just the veil before the Most Holy Place; at the same time, it is seen that the presence of God is not limited to the Most Holy Place."³⁴ What Hasel (and Andross, and Andreasen, and Davidson, and Rice, and others) would like so much to say is that the veil in Heb 6:19 is the first veil and not the second. So let us just say so. It is the first veil. But at the same time we should be asking why we need to say that and what kind of exegetical equipment will be needed to maintain such a position once we have adopted it.

Ellen White does explicitly apply Heb 6:19 to the first veil. What makes this interesting instead of frustrating is that she applies the same passage in other ways as well. For both Smith (first veil) and Ballenger (second veil) there is only one interpretation. But for Ellen White there are at least three interpretations (first veil, second veil, and a spiritual application without reference to which veil). See appendix 4.

The solution to the problem which has confronted us all these years in Heb 6:19-20 lies in recognizing that the second apartment imagery of chaps. 6 and 10 refers, as it were, from the sanctuary rather than to the sanctuary. If it refers to the sanctuary, there can be only one application (the sanctuary). If it refers from the sanctuary, there is a question what it refers to. It is something we need to find out. Seventh-day Adventists are under no obligation to prevent the veil in Heb 6:19 from being the second veil within the context of that passage. If the second apartment imagery spoken of in Heb 6 (and again in Heb 10) has in view something other than Christ's position within the sanctuary, there is no conflict. The one group of passages (Heb 6, 10) is on a different level of usage from the other (Heb 8-9), which does speak of those apartments. My point is that both groups of passages can say what they obviously do say without confronting or contradicting each other once we realize that they form two groups rather than one.

Conclusion

The passages Ballenger assembled from the Old Testament can be applied to Heb 6:19-20 in a straightforward manner without compromising either the literalness of "the sanctuary, the true tabernacle set up by the Lord, not by man" (Heb 8:2) or the timeframe for the antitypical day of atonement within it at the end of the 2300 days in 1844. But such results follow only when we acknowledge that there are two categories of usage in the book of Hebrews.³⁵ If there is only one category (with its two physically real sanctuaries--one on earth, the other in heaven), then we should reconcile ourselves early on to the idea that the book of Hebrews will disagree both with Daniel and with itself.

The proposed alternative solution, by contrast, is reasonable in each passage where it has been applied and does not threaten one stick or pin of historic Adventist sanctuary theology. On the contrary, it prevents Heb 6:19-20 from doing so. It is not merely benign to the best

features of our earlier sanctuary theology in some passive sense, but gives one illustration of the only potentially adequate class of defenses for our position of which I am aware. When the problem has two dimensions no one-dimensional solution--however carefully or professionally it may have been crafted--will suffice.

In the past we have been afraid to say "metaphor" anywhere in Hebrews because our critics are so eager to tell us there is no sanctuary in heaven and because our entire sanctuary theology is based on the premise that there is one and that it is just as real as the High Priest who ministers in it. Bringing in such concepts here is not inimical to the reality of the sanctuary, or to 1844, or to any feature of our historical sanctuary theology. In trying to protect our position as to the reality of the sanctuary we have instead protected ourselves from the best defense of that position.

It is true that the book of Hebrews speaks of Christ's ascension to heaven in terms borrowed from the second apartment and it is also true that once He arrives there Christ ministers in both apartments of the antitypical sanctuary. Both lines of thought are true and accurate, even though they are different. Both can be true without conflict because they operate on different levels--the one metaphorical, the other literal. Being different, they need not challenge each other or compete for the same theological space. There is room enough in Scripture for both forms of usage. And it is just as well, because they are both very definitely there.

Epilogue

After the resurrection present truth was that Christ is alive. He is not still in the tomb. After the ascension present truth was that Christ is ministering for us in heaven. Here we have the message of the book of Hebrews. After 1844 present truth was that Christ has entered the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary to finalize the atonement, which tells us He is preparing to come again. Very soon present truth will be that Jesus is here--in the clouds, with glory, and surrounded by all the angels of heaven (see John 14:6).

Earlier truths always continue being true. The fact that Christ became a man, that He lived a perfect life, died on the cross, and rose again the third day--these things will never grow old with retelling. But the events that follow the millennium, for example, are of no more than academic interest at present. Thus, an earlier generation's point of special emphasis will always be of interest, but the next generation's point of special emphasis might not be.

Applying the principle now, what the book of Hebrews says about Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven would have made less impact if it had been written before He went there. Until the event had occurred, present truth was that He is alive--not that He would someday minister in the heavenly sanctuary. And in the same way, what our pioneers discovered about the beginning of the judgment in 1844 would have made less impact in the first century than it did in their own day when the events were unfolding before their eyes. The author of Hebrews does not set out to tell people what Christ would do nearly two thousand years later. It is not a book of prophecy but has present realities in view. But the sanctuary itself is another matter. In the sanctuary itself there is a strong apocalyptic element. See appendix 5. In any case, it is not the author's intent to make apocalyptic claims. That is my point here.

There might well be more to learn from the sanctuary than we have seen so far. But truth is always progressive and we have not done any too good a job of digesting what our pioneers learned a century ago. So how is the Lord going to teach us more if the further insights He wishes to convey build on a model that we as a people have not yet fully finished assimilating? It is always a characteristic of present truth to build on past truth.

Having issued this caution, let me state that if there is anything more to learn from the sanctuary, no one is in a better position to learn it than Seventh-day Adventists--precisely because of all the hopes and disappointments of 1844. Just here let me propose a specific technique for approaching the task of learning new things about the sanctuary: Sink deep roots in what God has already revealed. If there is more He wishes to show us, it will grow from this soil. Striking out in new directions, on the other hand, would be like pulling the plant up altogether. And then what will nurture it--the bitterness of those who reject the sanctuary message outright? What we have already learned could be placed in a strengthened and expanded context by further study if we could ever finish accepting it in the first place. We have certainly not exhausted the topic. Rising to this larger challenge will provide ample opportunity for continued scholarly reflection until Jesus comes.

Note: All Scripture quotations in this paper, except when noted otherwise, are from the Holy Bible, New International Version. Copyright (c) 1973, 1978, 1984 International Bible Society.

¹What NIV renders "the inner sanctuary behind the curtain" KJV gives as "that within the veil" (KJV). The Greek has simply *esōteron tou katapetasmatos* (lit. "the inner of [i.e., beyond] the veil"). In English, as in Greek, "inner" is an adjective and so to stop after "the inner" leaves the reader asking, the inner what? Grammatically a noun is expected, which NIV supplies ("the inner sanctuary"). KJV does not. But NIV's solution is grammatically more straightforward than that found in KJV. KJV makes the article *to* ("the") into a demonstrative pronoun ("that") and changes the adjective *esōteron* ("inner") into a preposition ("within"). In NIV the article remains an article and the adjective remains an adjective, but a noun is added. This approach takes fewer liberties with the text and conveys the sense of the original more clearly. In Greek, incidentally, the noun understood to follow *to esōteron* must be *hagion* because the article *to* is singular and neuter. The only other word to consider is *skēnē*, but that is feminine. In Acts 16:24 the adjective in question precedes a feminine noun, thus taking the feminine form *esōteran* ("he put them in the inner cell [*eis tēn esōteran phulakēn*] and fastened their feet in the stocks").

²The present model explains rather than contradicts Ellen White's use of Heb 6:19-20 in *Great Controversy*, pp. 420-21. See appendix 4.

³A possible exception is Salim Japas' excellent little book entitled, *Cristo en el santuario* [Christ in the Sanctuary] (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1980). Japas discusses virtually every aspect of sanctuary structure and symbolism but mentions Heb 6 only once (p. 49) and then in connection with Melchizedek.

⁴Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1981), p. 145.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 245.

⁶Letter no. 50, January 30, 1906; quoted in William G. Johnsson, "The Significance of the Day of Atonement Allusions in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner, eds., *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1981), p. 393, n. 28.

⁷MS Release #737 (May 20, 1905); quoted in *ibid.*, p. 392, n. 28.

⁸Ibid, p. 382.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰George E. Rice, "Hebrews 6:19, Analysis of Some Assumptions Concerning *Katapetasma*," in Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 4 (Hagerstown, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), appendix B, pp. 231-32.

¹¹MS Release #737 (May 20, 1905); quoted in Johnsson, "Day of Atonement Allusions," p. 392, n. 28. See n. 7 above.

¹²Letter no. 50, January 30, 1906; *ibid.* See n. 6 above.

¹³Heppenstall, in *Doctrinal Discussions* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, n.d.), p. 160.

¹⁴White, *Child Guidance* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1954), p. 541. For further discussion of Ellen White's varied use of the term "sanctuary" see P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Ellen G. White's Use of Scripture to Explain the Sanctuary Doctrine," in Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 5 (Hagerstown: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), appendix B, pp. 190-91.

¹⁵See Hardy, "The Old Testament Basis for New Testament Rock Symbolism," *Historicism* No. 4/Oct 85, pp. 16-38; "Christ's Use of Rock Symbolism in Matt 16:13-20," *Historicism* No. 17/Jan 89, pp. 18-36.

¹⁶Dennis Hamm, "Faith in the Hebrews to the Hebrews: The Jesus Factor," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990), pp. 286-87.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 279. Here is the context for Heb 11:1 and with it the rest of the faith chapter.

¹⁸"At 10,20 the 'flesh' (*sarx*) of Jesus is the 'way' through the veil into the Holy of Holies, not the veil itself. The 'way' into the sanctuary was made manifest only with the sacrifice of Christ (9,8.26), and Christ himself entered the sanctuary 'through' his glorified body which was the victim offered in that sacrifice (9,11). It is the body which is the 'way' and the veil which is the obstacle" (James Swetnam, "Christology and the Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Biblica* 70 [1989]: 89).

¹⁹One could argue that it is. What Jacob saw was not literal but symbolic. The ladder was Christ, who bridges the gulf between heaven and earth in a spiritual rather than physical sense. The language of Heb 10:20 is similar to that of Gen 28:10-17.

²⁰Editorial synopsis to Johnsson, "The Heavenly Sanctuary--Figurative Or Real?" in Holbrook, *Issues in Hebrews*, p. 35.

²¹See the body of the above paper, *ibid.*, pp. 35-52.

²²"The quality of mercy pertains to the high priest's relationship with humankind and the quality of *pistos* to his relationship with God the Father--an apt way to employ two adjectives to underscore both dimensions of the mediatorship on the occasion of the author's first use of the image of high priest" (Hamm, "Faith," p. 282). "Among the verses important for understanding how the author of Hebrews views the *kainē diathēkē* are 9,15-18. These verses constitute a classic crux, for they use *diathēkē* in two senses: in the sense of 'covenant' (9,15.18) and in the sense of 'testament' (9,16-17). This is another instance of the author's play on words. The explanation of how he can go from one meaning to another with such insouciance seems to lie in the fact that he views the *diathēkē* which he has in mind as a concrete reality, so that the attributes of both a covenant and of a testament can be predicated of it without contradiction: the eucharist is both a covenant and a testament. Christ can accordingly be presented as a successor to Moses in giving a new Torah which is also a testament" (Swetnam, "Eucharist," p. 88).

²³According to Damsteegt, "Because of the pagan and papal dimensions of the little horn, it was impossible to interpret the sanctuary against which its activities were directed as the Jewish sanctuary in Jerusalem, for such a view had no relevance for the papal dimension.

Miller, therefore, viewed the sanctuary of Dan. 8:14, which was to be 'cleansed' or 'justified,' as the church, 'the people of God in all the World, and among all nations.' . . . The sanctuary of 8:14 Miller interpreted as 'the true sanctuary which God has built of lively stones to his own acceptance, through Christ, of which the temple at Jerusalem was but a type.' . . . Separate from this cleansing of the sanctuary, he distinguished a cleansing of the earth by fire when Christ returns" (*Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977], pp. 33-34). It is easy to forget the first part of what Miller said. He did not just talk about the cleansing of the earth but also of the church. Eventually the two concepts were brought together as one. "He concluded that only two things could be called a sanctuary: 'the EARTH and the CHURCH: when these are cleansed, then, and not until then, will the entire Sanctuary of God be cleansed and *justified* (as it reads in the margin).' The earth, he felt, would be cleansed by fire when the Lord should come, and at that time the saints would be cleansed or justified, and presented without spot or wrinkle [Eph. 5:27], and will then be clothed with fine linen, clean and white [Rev. 19:8]. . . . 'Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,' when the will of God is done in earth as in heaven.' Thus by expanding the concept of the sanctuary, he unified his previous separate cleansings of the church and the earth. This seems to have become the predominant view among the Millerites" (ibid., p. 34; emphasis in original).

²⁴In Old Testament times the twelve loaves of consecrated bread represented the twelve tribes of Israel. In New Testament times we could extend the symbolism to refer to the twelve apostles, and therefore the church. But when Christ speaks of bread in spiritual terms, He applies the figure to Himself. He never delegates to the church His status as the Bread of life.

²⁵First-century Romans accused Christians of crimes too dark to mention. See Minucius Felix, *Octavius* viii.3-xii.6, quoted in Naphtali Lewis and Meyer Reinhold, *Roman Civilization, Sourcebook II: The Empire*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 585.

²⁶Consider Paul's similar comparison: "(14) But thanks be to God, who always leads us in triumphal procession in Christ and through us spreads everywhere the fragrance of the knowledge of him. (15) For we are to God the aroma of Christ among those who are being saved and those who are perishing. (16) To the one we are the smell of death; to the other, the fragrance of life. And who is equal to such a task?" (2 Cor 2:14-16). The fragrance is that of Christ (vs. 14), but it is represented to the world through the apostle's ministry (vs. 15) and provokes widely different responses among those who hear (vs. 16).

²⁷The "'oil of joy'" in Heb 1:9, quoting Ps 45:7, is the Holy Spirit. And yet Christ does not say, "'The Holy Spirit is the light of the world'" (John 9:5). Christ is the light of the world and yet the Holy Spirit is the oil. There is no conflict here. It is the Holy Spirit who, as the vicar of Christ on earth, makes the Savior present among us. If He did not, there would be no fulfillment of Christ's promise in Matt 28:20 ("And surely I will be with you always, to the very end of the age"). And by the same reasoning it is Christ who is made present through the Holy Spirit's agency. Physically of course He is at the right hand of the Father and not on earth (Heb 1:3, 13), but by His Spirit He is here. If Christ and His Father are one (John 10:30), Christ and His Spirit are also one. We are not tritheists.

²⁸The dispensationalist question of whether the Christian church was foreseen in the Old Testament should be raised in the present context.

²⁹Damsteegt speaks of "mission" rather than "outreach" and deals with the process by which Seventh-day Adventists developed their sense of mission. He provides a history of mission. My own interest is in a theology of mission (or outreach, or witness). Damsteegt traces the course that our concept of mission has actually taken. What I wish to establish is a scriptural framework in which to understand the above concept.

³⁰This fact has been blown out of proportion. Andross merely points out in chap. 4 of his book that Moses dedicated every part of the sanctuary before Aaron and his sons could minister in any part of it (see Exod 40:9-16). He then draws the analogy with what Christ does in the antitype. "Following the work of consecration performed by Moses, the high priest, 'who served

unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,' began his yearly round of service in the first apartment of the sanctuary. in like manner, following the consecration of the heavenly sanctuary, our great High Priest began His work in the first apartment. . . . Likewise, the entrance of Christ 'within the veil,' and the sprinkling of the blood of the everlasting covenant, constituted a pledge that He would surely complete the great work of atonement in the holy of holies in the investigative judgment, to begin at the end of the twenty-three hundred years of Dan. 8:14, or in 1844" (*A More Excellent Ministry* [Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1912], p. 53). Andross' point is simply that Christ serves in both apartments of the heavenly sanctuary and that He dedicates the sanctuary before doing so. His book deserves to be reprinted and read even if it does not answer all our questions.

³¹"Therefore it was necessary for Moses to pass 'within the veil' to sprinkle the sacred ark"; "He [Christ] first of all entered 'within the veil' to anoint the ark of the testimony"; "By the study of the record of the dedication of the earthly sanctuary, it is very apparent that Moses passed 'within the veil' and poured the holy anointing oil upon the ark of the testament, and also sprinkled the blood of consecration upon it before the regular service in the sanctuary began. In like manner, Christ, after making His offering on Calvary, passed 'within the veil' of the heavenly sanctuary and anointed the ark of the testament, and with His own blood performed the service of consecration"; "Likewise, the entrance of Christ 'within the veil,' and the sprinkling of the blood of the everlasting covenant, constituted a pledge that He would surely complete the great work of atonement in the holy of holies in the investigative judgment, to begin at the end of the twenty-three hundred years of Dan. 8:14, or in 1844"; "[The sinner] looked forward to the time when the high priest would pass 'within the veil,' with the blood of the Lord's goat, and cleanse the sanctuary"; "His [the sinner's] hope was anchored to that 'within the veil'" (ibid., pp. 51-54, passim).

³²Andreasen wrote two books dealing with the sanctuary, *The Sanctuary Service* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1937, revised 1947) and *The Book of Hebrews* (Review and Herald, 1948). In his first book he does not so much as mention the last verses of Heb 6. (He does cite vs. 2 on p. 147.) In his second book he deals with the figures of an "anchor" in vs. 19 and of a "forerunner" in vs. 20. Then in an Additional Note he states that, "Some have been much exercised over the question of which veil is here meant, the first or the second. The text does not tell us, which it doubtless would have if this question had been important. It simply says 'the veil,' not further defining it. It is not the veil that is emphasized, but that which is 'within the veil,' which in the next verse is said to be our forerunner, even Jesus. It is Christ who is at the other end of the line; it is He who holds the anchor. If He is in the first apartment, that is where our hope and anchor are. If He is in the second apartment, that is where the are. That may be why 'veil' is not further defined. Wherever Christ is, there is our anchor and hope" (*The Book of Hebrews*, p. 242). In this way he sets the issues aside. "If the assumption is correct that Andreasen did feel the force of Ballenger's exposition of Heb 6:19, 20, and therefore found himself at a loss to defend the traditional Adventist view while, however, still clinging to it, then his treatment of the problem in *Hebrews* was a study in 'theological diplomacy'. Evidently, he regarded it as the better part of valor simply to avoid engaging the issue rather than attempting to defend an untenable position. In following Andross' lead, however, it is questionable whether he opted for a very convincing theological alternative" (Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine*, p. 222).

³³Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," in Holbrook, *Issues in Hebrews*, pp. 182-83.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵In the Editorial to *Historicism* No. 25/Jan 91 I spoke of three categories instead of two and used the term "metaphorical" in a way that could be misunderstood: "Here [in Heb 10:20] the author is not speaking of the heavenly sanctuary in a metaphorical way which compromises its reality. Instead he is speaking something altogether different. The terms are borrowed from the sanctuary, but the contrast is between heaven and earth (see Heb 7:26b). In Hebrews this is

a third major category of usage." If I were writing that editorial again I would change the wording but the thought is still the same. The author is speaking metaphorically in Heb 10:20, but this does not challenge the reality of the sanctuary in heaven because he is not talking about the sanctuary. He is talking about heaven. His language is drawn from the sanctuary but he uses it to describe something else. That is one point. When I call this "a third category of usage," the first two are the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary. In the present paper I say it is a second category of usage, where the first includes both the literal sanctuary on earth and the literal sanctuary in heaven. Count them as you will, there is more than one. When the author of Hebrews speaks of Christ going "within the veil" (Heb 6:19, KJV) or speaks of His flesh as "a new and living way" into heaven (Heb 10:20), that is different from what the high priest did on earth by ministering inside the second apartment on the day of atonement and it is also different from what Christ started doing within the second apartment of the antitypical sanctuary in 1844. Such use of sanctuary language is in a different category, whether there are two others or one.