

# Allusions to the Sanctuary in Heb 13

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

## Introduction

Over the past year there have been papers in *Historicism* on Heb 1-2, 6, and 8-9.<sup>1</sup> These chapters all refer in some way to the sanctuary. Below I discuss three passages from Heb 13 which use sanctuary symbolism as well (vss. 9-10, 11-14, and 15-16). They are the last in the book to do so. What gives them such significance here is that the symbolism they use differs substantively from that in chaps. 8-9, just as the symbolism of chaps. 8-9 differs from that in chap. 6. The author of Hebrews speaks of the sanctuary "at many times and in various ways" (Heb 1:1). This point is clearest in chap. 13 and most significant in chap. 6.

In the past Seventh-day Adventists have assumed without further investigation that Heb 6 and 8-9 both coequally refer to the antitypical sanctuary--the literal structure in heaven corresponding to the earthly types. And because they knew from other passages that Christ did not begin His second apartment ministry until late in earth's history, they were careful to omit the second apartment from their interpretations of Heb 6:19-20. Reasoning that second apartment imagery would be inappropriate if applied prior to the beginning of the judgment, they avoided seeing it there. Doing otherwise seemed to compromise their belief in God's leading and to cancel their mandate for preaching a judgment hour message just before Christ's return.

Unfortunately the two verses in question would not stay explained under such assumptions. When we read, "It [i.e., your faith] enters the inner sanctuary behind the curtain, where Jesus, who went before us, has entered on our behalf" (vss. 19-20), it is one thing to explain how clearly Dan 8:14 places Jesus' work in the second apartment at the end of the 2300 days in 1844 and quite another to explain how the word "inner" in Heb 6:20 really means "outer."<sup>2</sup> And yet stating the problem in this way implies too much. Early Adventists were right in what they were trying to get at in Heb 6 and wrong only in the way they went about doing it. A correction was needed, not a revision. My point in this journal has been that Heb 6:19-20 can only be used to put the beginning of the judgment in the first century A.D. (as our opponents assert) if it is describing the literal sanctuary in heaven. That is not what the passage has in view. But many on both sides of the debate have shared the opposite opinion, taking that as their starting point.

Some have left the church over this issue,<sup>3</sup> never once pausing to question the assumption that lies beyond it (which turns out to be completely erroneous), i.e., that Heb 6 must be interpreted in the same literal or antitypical manner as Heb 8-9.<sup>4</sup> The contexts of the two passages are widely different. In fact they are more than different; they are not even directly comparable. Below I point out that in chap. 13 there is a third category of usage as well. What this means is simply that the author states himself in a variety of ways. Thus, the problem of Heb 6:19-20 and of chaps. 8-9, which have caused the church so much grief, must be reevaluated. It is possible to do this in a straightforward way. By making one very reasonable

change in our starting assumptions we no longer need to revise either the Holy Spirit's intent within the text or the historical foundations of Adventism.<sup>5</sup>

The epistle before us either exhibits a degree of harmless internal variety or it is all one and positively at variance with what other biblical writers say--most notably Daniel. If the author disagrees with Daniel, then we as a church will have to reevaluate our concept of inspiration. If he uses sanctuary symbolism variously within his own epistle, that merely shows that he enjoys using it and tends to see a wide range of facts about the gospel through the lens of the sanctuary.

What we find in chap. 13 provides conclusive evidence supporting the latter position. In order to compare the high priest's sin offering, which was burned outside the camp, with Christ, who suffered on the cross outside the city of Jerusalem, certain assumptions must be made. One of them is that Jerusalem is analogous to the camp; another is that the temple inside Jerusalem is analogous to or represents or reflects the ancient sanctuary inside the camp. For the temple to derive historically from the sanctuary is one thing, but whether the sanctuary looks forward in time to a later counterpart on earth is open to question. Its counterpart is in heaven. So making the lesser earthly sanctuary typify a greater but still earthly one in Jerusalem, as in Heb 13, is a surprising application--or at least it is not the same application that we find elsewhere within the same book.

As an exercise, anyone doubting this assertion should go through chaps. 8-9 applying each statement about the antitypical sanctuary in the manner of chap. 13--i.e., to the earthly temple in Jerusalem. Is the temple of Solomon (or Zerubbabel, or Herod) the "greater and more perfect tabernacle" referred to in 9:11? If it is, what was Christ saying in Matt 23:38 ("Look, your house is left to you desolate")? If it is not, then the symbolism of Heb 13 is different from that of Heb 8-9. Again, in chap. 6 Christ ascends from Jerusalem rather than to it. From these facts I conclude that the allusions to the sanctuary in Heb 13 are wholly unique to that chapter.

This does not mean that the author is being random or haphazard in his use of sanctuary symbolism. He likes the sanctuary and alludes to it as often as possible, in as many ways as he finds appropriate. If there is a fact that he can illustrate from the sanctuary or in some other way, he uses the sanctuary. And why not? It is a rich source of spiritual insight. There is more than one thing to learn from it. But if the author speaks in three ways and we think he can only be speaking in one, we will surely misinterpret his intent. I believe we have done this in chap. 6. But the topic of the present paper is chap. 13. We now consider in greater detail the three passages from chap. 13 which contain allusions to the sanctuary.

## The Three Allusions

First, Christians have "an altar from which those who minister at the tabernacle have no right to eat" (vs. 10). Second, Christ "suffered outside the city gate to make the people holy through his own blood" (vs. 12). And third, Christians "continually offer to God a sacrifice of praise--the fruit of lips that confess his name" (vs. 15). The pattern is chiasmic. Each passage is now discussed in turn.

## "We have an altar"

(9) Do not be carried away by all kinds of strange teachings. It is good for our hearts to be strengthened by grace, not by ceremonial foods, which are of no value to those who eat them. (10) We have an altar from which those who minister at the tabernacle have no right to eat. (Heb 13:9-10)

The "strange teachings" alluded to in vs. 9a are defined for us in vs. 9b. They have to do with "ceremonial foods," i.e., with a return to Judaism, as we see elsewhere in Gal 1:6-10; 3:1-14. Central to the above teachings is the altar from which "those who minister at the tabernacle" eat, i.e., the altar at the temple in Jerusalem. The author is saying that in Christ we have something better than the portions of food received by the temple priests ministering the various animal sacrifices, whose only function was to point people forward to Christ.

Having contrasted his first readers' Jewish past with their Christian present, the "altar" in vs. 10 can mean only one thing and that is the cross. On one level we eat from an altar by sharing in the sacraments of bread and wine. On another level Christ nourishes the church by leading it to study His written Word and incorporate the principles of His life into their lives. This after all is what happens in the digestion of natural food. The elements of the food become incorporated into the person's body, giving it strength. It is the latter sense that Jesus has in mind when He says, (56) "Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. (55) For my flesh is real food and my blood is real drink. (56) Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me, and I in him" (John 6:54-56). It would be possible to participate in the outward ceremony of the eucharist without having any hint of spiritual life in Christ. That has happened countless times throughout history. But it is not possible to incorporate the principles of Christ's character into the practical affairs of everyday living and not have life in Christ.

This much has to do with being fed. But notice that anciently a priest was fed from the altar only as a byproduct of serving his people. And this is precisely the lesson to gain from the present passage. In serving others we ourselves are fed.

We now examine those passages in Leviticus which describe eating in relation to the sanctuary. In Lev 1-7 there are five types of sacrifices: burnt offerings (Lev 1:1-17; 6:8-13), grain offerings (2:1-16; 6:14-23), fellowship offerings (3:1-17; 7:11-21), sin offerings (4:1-5:13; 6:24-30), and guilt offerings (5:14-6:7; 7:1-10). Only one of these (the burnt offering) was entirely consumed by fire. All the other sacrifices were eaten under specified conditions, although that was not the only way to minister them. The sin offering, for example, could be ministered by eating it or, alternatively, by bringing its blood inside the sanctuary. The Lord did not require anyone to become a glutton in order to fulfill his duties as a priest. The priest could follow either course but he had to follow one of the two, and not both. In Lev 6:30 the blood of a sin offering is brought into the sanctuary and cannot be eaten ("But any sin offering whose blood is brought into the Tent of Meeting to make atonement in the Holy Place must not be eaten; it must be burned" [Lev 6:30]); in Lev 10:16-18 we have an offering that should have been eaten because its blood was not brought into the sanctuary.

(16) When Moses inquired about the goat of the sin offering and found that it had been burned up, he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's remaining sons, and asked, (17) "Why didn't you eat the sin offering in the sanctuary area? It is most holy; it was given to you to take away the guilt of the community by making atonement for them before the Lord. (18) Since its blood was not taken into the Holy Place, you should have eaten the goat in the sanctuary area, as I commanded." (Lev 10:16-18)

In some cases a sacrifice could be eaten only by the officiating priest (see Lev 6:26; 7:7, 14, 32-34), in other cases by any male in the priest's family (see Lev 6:16-18, 29; 7:6; 8:31).<sup>6</sup> The fellowship offering was eaten by the worshiper as well as the ministering priest (see Lev 7:19). And the Passover lamb was eaten by all Israel. So does the imagery of Christians eating from an altar imply that they occupy the role of a priest or that of a worshiper? Does the author see them primarily as ministering or as being ministered to in Heb 13:10?

Paul draws a parallel between the Jewish Passover and the spiritual life of Christians: "Get rid of the old yeast that you may be a new batch without yeast--as you really are. For Christ, our Passover lamb, has been sacrificed" (1 Cor 5:7). But Passover cannot be the focus of Heb 13:10 because the Passover lamb was slaughtered at home without benefit of an altar, whereas the altar is the central point of focus in what we are talking about here ("We have an altar from which those who minister at the tabernacle have no right to eat").

Christians minister to others and are ministered to by Christ, so in fact both types of meaning are appropriate. But here we must emphasize the church's own active ministry for others. The imagery of Heb 13:10 has in view primarily the role of priests rather than worshipers. The two groups being compared ("We" and "those who minister at the tabernacle") must be comparable for the comparison to have any force. The one group has its own spiritual needs supplied as it ministers Christ to others, while the other group receives literal food--sacrificial animals which point forward to Christ--offered on a literal altar. Those who eat from the altar are those who minister there and the ceremonial foods they eat are the sacrificial animals they minister on behalf of those who come to worship. Whereas worshipers shared in the fellowship offering, here we are talking about more offerings than just one. The focus is on all priestly ministry.

Saying such things places us in no danger of establishing a priestly caste within the church because no one is excluded or excused from such ministry. Not all can preach but every Christian has the priestly duty of ministering Christ to those who do not know Him (see Rom 15:16). Otherwise, we do not have that duty. The church has some other commission, some other reason for existence. What is it?

Elsewhere I point out that God renewed His acceptance of the Jews--despite their leaders' rejection of Him--by extending such acceptance to all mankind in Christ, thus allowing Him to accept back on that basis any of the Jews who would put their faith in Him (see Rom 11:22-23). The church is under solemn obligation to minister this acceptance--not to Jews only but to all mankind everywhere, without exception (see Rev 7:9-10; 14:6-7). The church exists for the sole purpose of serving. Here the author of Hebrews places Christian service in the context of the sanctuary, which is precisely where it belongs. Christians feast on Christ in His Word. Those won through such ministry inherit along with their new privileges in Christ the same obligation to serve that their teachers had. They also must share Christ with others.

If the church's concept of the sanctuary is not the same as its concept of missionary outreach, it has the wrong concept of the sanctuary.<sup>7</sup> It is more than a means of being served or being saved. To the extent that we do not bring these facts together in our thinking, we will never understand either of them fully or well. The sanctuary tells us not only what Jesus is doing for us at the present moment; it tells us, by analogy, what we must do for other people as well. This is the point made in Heb 13:9-10.

"Jesus also suffered outside  
the city gate"

(11) The high priest carries the blood of animals into the Most Holy Place as a sin offering, but the bodies are burned outside the camp. (12) And so Jesus also suffered outside the city gate to make the people holy through his own blood. (13) Let us, then, go to him outside the camp, bearing the disgrace he bore. (14) For here we do not have an enduring city, but we are looking for the city that is to come. (Heb 13:11-14)

There are four references in Leviticus to the remains of sacrificial animals being burned outside the camp (Lev 4:11-12, 21; 8:14-17).<sup>8</sup> The fat of the bull for a priest's sin offering was burned on the altar inside the court but "the hide of the bull and all its flesh, as well as the head and legs, the inner parts and offal--that is, all the rest of the bull--he must take outside the camp to a place ceremonially clean, where the ashes are thrown, and burn it in a wood fire on the ash pile" (Lev 4:11-12). When the whole community sins, a bull is to be offered in the same manner as that for a priest: "Then he shall take the bull outside the camp and burn it as he burned the first bull. This is the sin offering for the community" (Lev 4:21). The third example mentioned above is the sin offering that Aaron and his sons presented as an act of dedication at the beginning of their ministry. This was not a special sacrifice but an ordinary sacrifice offered on a special occasion.

(14) He then presented the bull for the sin offering, and Aaron and his sons laid their hands on its head. (15) Moses slaughtered the bull and took some of the blood, and with his finger he put it on all the horns of the altar to purify the altar. He poured out the rest of the blood at the base of the altar. So he consecrated it to make atonement for it. (16) Moses also took all the fat around the inner parts, the covering of the liver, and both kidneys and their fat, and burned it on the altar. (17) But the bull with its hide and its flesh and its offal he burned up outside the camp, as the Lord commanded Moses. (Lev 8:14-17)

In each of the above cases the blood of the sin offering was taken into the first apartment. But on the day of atonement the blood of the bull for the high priest's sin offering was sprinkled "on the front of the atonement cover" (vs. 14) inside the second apartment. The blood of the Lord's goat was ministered in the same way as that of the bull (see vs. 15). Both animals are called sin offerings. The appropriateness of this designation is confirmed by the fact that the goat's body, like that of the bull, was burned outside the camp.

The bull and the goat for the sin offerings, whose blood was brought into the Most Holy Place [baqqâ'ideÁ] to make atonement, must be taken outside the camp; their hides, flesh and offal are to be burned up. (Lev 8:27)

Heb 13:11 speaks of "the blood of animals" (plural), calls them "a sin offering," and states that "the bodies are burned outside the camp." Here the author can only be talking about the rituals performed on the day of atonement. The place where the blood of the high priest's bull and the Lord's goat was taken is "behind the curtain" in Lev 16:15, *ta hagia* in Heb 13:11. So what implications does this fact have for our understanding of Heb 8-9? Does *ta hagia* refer exclusively to the area "behind the curtain"? I examine this question in a separate paper entitled, "What Can 1 and 2 Chronicles Tell us About *ta hagia* in Heb 13:11?"<sup>9</sup> There is a reason why the term *ta hagia* is appropriate in Heb 13:11 and it may not be the reason we suppose. Facts and the conclusions we derive from facts should certainly correspond but they are not

identically the same. The one is something drawn from (and thereby made distinct from) the other.

One implication which does not follow from the above facts of usage is that the antitypical day of atonement began in the first century A.D. If Christ's death was the antitype of all sacrifices, it was the antitype of the daily sacrifices as well. So by the same logic we could argue that the cross marks the beginning of the antitypical daily service. Indeed, in this same way we could prove that the antitype of the daily service and that of the yearly service began simultaneously in A.D. 31. If Christ's death marks the start of any antitypical ministry, it marks the start of all antitypical ministry. (Never mind that the only High Priest capable of ministering in such a context was rendered unavailable by the event that made His work necessary. It is the ascension that marks the beginning of ministry.) The bare fact that Christ's death is the antitype of both daily and yearly sacrifices does not tell us when either phase of His high priestly work began. For chronological information of this sort we must turn to other passages.

To understand any of the ancient sacrifices we must bring them through the fulcrum of the cross. All typical ministry leads up to that one event and all antitypical ministry follows from it. Calvary is the focal point of the sanctuary's entire cultus. If this is so, Christ's antitypical sacrifice on the cross cannot be identified with one of the types excluding all others. Thus, from the fact that the day of atonement sacrifices find their antitype at the cross it does not follow that the ministry which immediately follows the cross in history is a day of atonement ministry. Nor does it follow from the fact that there were sacrifices of dedication that the significance of the cross is limited to them.

So what form does Christ's ministry take when it is finally time for it to begin? The circumstances surrounding His death do not tell us. But by reasoning from type to antitype we may assume that Christ's ministry in the antitypical first apartment comes first and that His ministry in the antitypical second apartment comes second. On what basis could we argue that one or the other function is excluded? So if anyone wishes to see second apartment symbolism in Heb 13:11-14, there is no harm in that--except as he or she claims that all other symbolism is displaced by it.

"Let us continually offer to  
God a sacrifice of praise"

(15) Through Jesus, therefore, let us continually [*dia pantos*] offer to God a sacrifice of praise--the fruit of lips that confess his name. (16) And do not forget to do good and to share with others, for with such sacrifices God is pleased. (Heb 13:15-16)

In the above passage the English word "continually" represents Greek *dia pantos* ("always") (see Matt 18:10).<sup>10</sup> The Hebrew word corresponding to *dia pantos* is *tāmîd*, which occurs six times in Leviticus. Moses is told that, "The fire must be kept burning on the altar continuously [*tāmîd*]; it must not go out" (Lev 6:13 [6]). The grain offering that Aaron brings for the first time on the day he is anointed is "a tenth of an ephah of fine flour as a regular [*tāmîd*] grain offering, half of it in the morning and half in the evening" (Lev 6:20 [13]). God commands Moses that, "The lamps on the pure gold lampstand before the Lord must be tended continually [*tāmîd*]" (Lev 24:4; see also vss. 2, 3). And the consecrated bread opposite the lampstand "is to be set out before the Lord regularly [*tāmîd*], Sabbath after Sabbath, on behalf of the Israelites,

as a lasting covenant" (Lev 24:8). In Lev 24:3 and 4 the LXX translates Hebrew *tāmîd* as *heōs (to) prōi* ("until the morning"). In each of the other five passages the Greek term is *dia pantos*. It would be reasonable to assume that our author wrote with these parallels in mind.

Offering a sacrifice always involved the joint activity of a worshiper (who supplies the animal) and a priest (to minister its blood). So there is an irreducible level of ambiguity in comparing the above activity with Christian worship. But notice that in Leviticus the context for *tāmîd* each time it occurs is a priestly one. If the emphasis in Heb 13:15-16 is on supplying the offering, the believer's role as worshiper is perhaps more prominent there. The Old Testament parallels, on the other hand, deal more with the priest's role. At issue is whether our praise to God benefits others and can therefore be considered an act of ministry. To the extent that it can be, the passage before us portrays believers in both roles--as priests serving others and as worshipers being served by Christ. The chiasmic link between Heb 13:15-16 and 9-10 is another factor that shifts our emphasis toward the priestly component in the Christian's experience.

### Discussion

The three passages from Heb 13 that are discussed above converge to form a very robust chiasm. There are many (see vss. 9-10), then One (see vss. 11-14), then many again (see vss. 15-16). Those mentioned occupy figurative, antitypical, and figurative roles dealing respectively with priests, Victim, and priests in a daily, then yearly, then daily setting.

The fact that Christ's followers occupy a priestly role, assisting their great High Priest in service to mankind, does not in any way imply that they no longer occupy the role of worshipers. They minister but are also ministered to. This dual role is not an innovation imposed artificially by the Christian church. It was already present in ancient times. The common priests served as their high priest's assistants and yet not one of them could complete the cycle of ministry, entering the second apartment on his own behalf. That task was for the high priest alone. Thus, common priests ministered but were also ministered to. In the same way Christians both minister to others as members of Christ's body on earth and are ministered to by their great High Priest in heaven. They occupy a dual role. We both have needs of our own and serve the needs of others. To remove either element of Christian experience would harm not only individual worshipers but the church as a whole.

## What Does Heb 13 Tell Us About the Rest of Hebrews?

Heb 6 deals metaphorically with Christ in heaven only, Heb 8-9 deals literally with the sanctuaries and covenants as they pertain to both heaven and earth, and Heb 13 presents both metaphors and literal realities but only on earth. At the beginning of chap. 1 Christ is in heaven surrounded by glory and at the end of chap. 13 we see His followers on earth hard pressed and struggling. In between these two points there is a more or less steady progression from the one orientation to the other: (1) Christ is already in glory, (2) Christ enters heaven, (3) the sanctuary in heaven where He ministers is similar to the one on earth, (4) Christ dies on earth, and (5) His servants struggle with hardships as they minister to others on Christ's behalf.

Thus, by the time the author finishes sketching the problem the solution is already in place. The help we need as we struggle against temptation and adversity here on earth comes from the sanctuary in heaven, i.e., from Christ in His capacity as High Priest. The structure of Hebrews is not inherently pessimistic. The more help we need, the more clearly we see the help that Christ makes available from the sanctuary. By the end of chap. 13 we should appreciate more fully the significance of chap. 1. Midway between these two points, Christ is our Forerunner, the One "who went before us" (Heb 6:20), implying that where He went we too will go (see John 14:3b)--when He comes to take us there (see John 14:3a). Our future destiny and Christ's present ministry as we wait amid hardships to receive what He has in store for us is the author's answer to his readers' discouragement.

### General remarks

One of the author's most significant and heavily emphasized points is that Christ, now in heaven, continues ministering to human need. He did not go there to retire. That is not the special significance of His ascension. On the contrary, only after returning to heaven could He begin ministering the benefits of His sacrifice as our great High Priest. On earth His task was to shed His blood, there His task is to minister it. He does this by presenting Himself. The blood shed on the cross still courses through His human body.

Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is not an empty exercise. It is something that needs to be done. Here is the context for Paul's statement, "And if Christ has not been raised, our preaching is useless and so is your faith" (1 Cor 15:14). Is this true? Was the atonement incomplete at the cross? Christ's death was a complete death but His death alone will not save us, so it is academic to ask whether it represents a complete atonement. Whether it does or not, without His resurrection we would be lost. Or at least Paul says we would be. Christ had to rise from the tomb in order to complete the process of saving us. Why? The explanation is given in the sanctuary. There the act of shedding blood was never an end in itself but was always a basis for ministry. Here is the reason why it was so essential for Christ to live again as well as die--because from the tomb He could not minister the benefits of His sacrifice. To do that He had to enter heaven. Being dead is not the same as being alive, nor is staying in the tomb the same as going to heaven. So these facts are significant for our understanding of the state of the dead as well as for our understanding of the sanctuary.

Another doctrine clarified by what we are studying is that of perseverance. As we wait for Jesus' return it would be possible to while away the time in ways that are aimless or harmful. It was possible for Israel to do this while they waited for Moses' return (see Exod 32:1-6). No one is bound to Christ in a way that makes leaving Him impossible, any more than Israel was rendered incapable of apostasy at the foot of Mount Sinai. But Christ's followers remain with Him because, by His Holy Spirit, He remains with them. It is not His physical presence that fulfills the promise of Matt 28:20 but His work in the sanctuary and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Christ, as the Son of man, has a human body (see Luke 24:37-39) and that body is in heaven, i.e., in the sanctuary which is located in heaven. Otherwise Jesus does not have a human body. What point was He trying to convey in Luke 24:37-39? Or He is not in heaven. Where is He? Seventh-day Adventists believe in a real sanctuary because they believe in a real Christ. He is not an illusion and neither is it. From the sanctuary Jesus is still involved in everything that concerns us. And so we must be involved in everything that concerns Him.



The change of physical location that Christ underwent at His ascension does not constitute leaving us in any useful sense of the term. He continues to minister to human need in a way that would not have been possible here (see Heb 8:4). And beholding His great faithfulness, the church comes to reflect it.<sup>11</sup> By what other means could we hope to do so? Here is the true biblical meaning of perseverance. The perseverance of the saints is that process by which the saints persevere. This is a Christ centered doctrine rooted and grounded in the sanctuary.

#### Implications for chaps. 6 and 8-9

The main contribution of Heb 13 is not confined to chap. 13, although there are certainly things we can learn from it without going any further. But instead the main value of Heb 13 lies in what that chapter tells us about other earlier ones. More specifically, from chap. 13 it is clear that in such a context we can see the differences more clearly between the sanctuary symbolism of Heb 6 and Heb 8-9. On the one hand the author uses the imagery of a second apartment to say that Christ has entered heaven, while on the other hand he uses the imagery of a second sanctuary, which is not the same thing at all. There is no question that Christ went to heaven. The question is how the author uses sanctuary symbolism to say so. If the author's intent is the same in both passages but his imagery is different, that is a significant fact.

Heb 9:8, 11, 12, 23, and 24 consistently portray Christ's entry into heaven as an entry into a "greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made" (vs. 11). The Greek word here is *skēnē* ("tent"). This "tabernacle" is not a second apartment but a second sanctuary.<sup>12</sup> Heb 6:19-20, on the other hand, does use second apartment symbolism,<sup>13</sup> but this fact is only inimical to historic Adventism if the symbolism is applied as though it were not symbolic. There is an antitypical sanctuary in heaven but the "veil" in Heb 6:20 is not a direct reference to it. It is a reference to the distance separating heaven and earth, as also in 10:19-20. Our problem with Heb 6:19-20 is solely a function of our insistence that the symbols in that passage be applied as something other than symbols.

Why should it be necessary to maintain a literal interpretation of Heb 6:19-20? More than this, how is it possible to defend such a position even if we wanted very much to do so (and here it is not to our advantage)? If we cannot, then let us acknowledge that not reading the passage literally is the long sought for solution to the problem of the veil in Heb 6. When the language becomes symbolic, we can at last lay to rest the challenge of Ballenger and maintain both the integrity of the relationship between Hebrews and Daniel, and with it the integrity of the relationship between what Hebrews says about the sanctuary and what we have always taught about the sanctuary.

How can we be sure a symbolic interpretation of the veil in Heb 6:19 is correct? We can be sure we have interpreted this one word correctly by simply considering the passage as a whole. The locus of interpretation is the passage and not individual words isolated from the passage. We should apply the middle word in the series the same way as those on either side of it. So how should we apply the word "anchor" in vs. 19 (a figure drawn from shipping) and "forerunner" in vs. 20 (which seems literal, but is actually a figure drawn from horse racing)? If these terms are metaphorical (not unreal, but metaphorical), then the veil is metaphorical. We must interpret consistently or we will interpret incorrectly.

In Heb 6:19-20 the difference between Christ being in heaven with God rather than here with us is stated as the difference between a Levitical high priest being in the second apartment of the sanctuary rather than the first. This is a useful metaphor. It is appropriate to the point the author is trying to make. Jesus is closer to God now, in one sense, than He was before going to heaven. But the fact that a metaphor is useful and appropriate does not make it into anything other than a metaphor. There is nothing in what the author says that would tell us the sanctuary in heaven has only one apartment or, having two, that Christ is excluded from the first. It does not tell us that His second apartment ministry began in A.D. 31. In short, it does not justify setting aside any part of what we might learn about the sanctuary from other passages. And the reason why it does not is that the language is metaphorical.

If we apply the veil literally in Heb 6:19-20 (and 10:19-20), the second apartment is heaven. And, if we accept that the second apartment was never the whole sanctuary (otherwise why would we use the term "second"?), we would have to conclude that the sanctuary itself is larger than heaven. It would have cosmic proportions. This is not what chaps. 8-9 say and it is not a literal use of terms under any definition. Heb 8-9 speaks of a real sanctuary on earth and a real sanctuary in heaven. So let us avoid superimposing the two passages (chaps. 6 and 8-9) over each other. But if we cannot and if the veil--in Heb 6:19--is literal after all, then so are the other two figures in the same passage. Christ's presence in heaven is tangible and real, but the language the author borrows from the sanctuary in order to say so is not literal.

In chap. 6 heaven is the second apartment and the first apartment is the earth. In chap. 9 the sanctuary is something entirely contained within heaven. That is a second way to use such language. And in chap. 13 the whole sanctuary is on earth and is confined to literal Jerusalem. The point in chap. 13 is that Christ died. He suffered "outside the city gate" (13:12). The point in earlier chapters was that He ministers in heaven. None of this is contradictory, but different figures are used.

The passage that speaks of Christ entering a second apartment in A.D. 31 does not have the antitypical sanctuary in view and the passage that does have that sanctuary in view does not speak of Him entering the second apartment in A.D. 31. So is the author of Hebrews telling us something different from Daniel, who places the cleansing of the sanctuary at the end of the 2300 days in 1844? Not at all. Hebrews and Daniel have different points of view but are consistent with each other when each writer's intent is correctly understood. Christ enters the sanctuary at the center of human history (just as Passover marked the center of the ceremonial year anciently).<sup>14</sup> He then enters the second apartment of the sanctuary toward the end of history (just as the day of atonement marked the end of the ceremonial year).

This much has to do with the bearing of chap. 13 on chap. 6. Its bearing on chaps. 8-9 derives from the way *ta hagia* is used in 13:11, as discussed in the following paper.

## Conclusion

In the present discussion two points must be given equal emphasis. The first is that sanctuary symbolism in Hebrews is used at least three different ways. The sanctuary assumes cosmic proportions in Heb 6:19-20 (and 10:19-20), it is a literal structure in heaven in chaps. 8-9, and it is a literal structure on earth in chap. 13. That is one point. The other is that

the author's three uses of sanctuary symbolism do not compete with each other. They do not compete because they do not compare.

A corollary to the above is that the author of Hebrews is not in competition with Daniel. The two men see things from different points of view, as might be expected, but they describe aspects of only one set of events. There is one plan of salvation, one antitypical Sacrifice, one means by which the benefits of that Sacrifice are made available to mankind, and one timetable for doing so. Human history only ends once. The prophets describe these events and the sanctuary teaches us about them as well. But even though our sources are diverse, when we understand what they are saying it is clear enough that they speak with one voice--as at Pentecost, when the disciples used different languages to proclaim one and only one message.

Scripture is not a Babel of confusion. It is a model for the loud cry. The cry is loud in the end time because there are so many voices. And it is one cry rather than many because those speaking agree. This fact ought to give us more confidence in Scripture's testimony than any other one factor. It is possible to achieve unity within diversity. What Scripture says about the sanctuary is evidence of this fact.

I emphasize that there is not a Hebrews sanctuary theology to be defended by one group within Adventism here and a Daniel sanctuary theology to be defended by another group there. Correctly understood, the entire body of Scripture is consistent with itself. The emphasis of different authors is frequently not the same,<sup>15</sup> nor is there any reason why it would need to be. There are enough things to say about the sanctuary that none of them would need to be said twice. According to Daniel the 2300 days (see Dan 8:13-14) end long after the seventy weeks (see Dan 9:24-27).<sup>16</sup> The two periods begin together but end separately.<sup>17</sup> The one ends just after the first coming of Christ and the other ends just before the second coming of Christ.<sup>18</sup> Daniel focuses on the longer period, Hebrews (without saying so) focuses on the shorter one--the point at which the "daily" begins (see Dan 8:11, 12, 13) rather than the point at which it ends (see Dan 8:14).

I submit that it is possible to see all the diversity that is rightfully present in the book of Hebrews and yet interpret it consistently with itself and with Daniel. Indeed, we will never be able to reconcile the most difficult passages of Hebrews with each other or with Daniel until we gain a clearer appreciation of its diversity. Doing so is a prerequisite for success in our efforts to understand the total witness of Scripture concerning the sanctuary. We must understand the New Testament against the backdrop of the Old. Thus, we must study Hebrews in the context of Daniel (and Daniel in the context of Leviticus). Why would we want not to? So if an alternative like this is available, let us pursue it. Let us start at the beginning and not stop until we can draw everything Scripture says on this topic into a single seamless model. Until we have done this we do not understand what God is saying and should study the matter further.

---

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.

<sup>1</sup>See Hardy, "The Christology of Heb 1," *Historicism* No. 25/ Jan 91, pp. 2-12; "The Case for Metaphor in Heb 6:19-20," *Historicism* No. 26/Apr 91, pp. 2-50; "Covenants and Sanctuaries in Heb 8-9," *Historicism* No. 27/Jul 91, pp. 2-60. In addition my paper entitled "Faith and Praise" (in this issue) might be thought of as dealing with Heb 11.

<sup>2</sup>The issues were of course stated in terms of KJV wording. There the problem is that if "within the veil" means within the first veil, it means outside the second veil--unless it means simply within the sanctuary. But clearly the thought is not that Christ has passed beyond all barriers but one, such that only the veil into the second apartment remains to separate Him from the Father. The thought is not that the two Parties are brought closer--even very much closer--but that they are brought together. Christ in going before us to heaven has transcended all barriers. So whatever arguments we might be able to bring from other passages, until we have let Christ pass beyond the second veil in Heb 6:20 we have flown in the face of what the author is trying to say. See Hardy, "The Case for Metaphor in Heb 6:19-20," *Historicism* No. 26/Apr 91, pp. 2-50, including the appendices. Conservative Seventh-day Adventists will argue that the Father was in the first apartment with the Son until thrones were "cast down" (Dan 7:9, KJV), i.e., set in place, in preparation for the judgment. One does not put a throne where it already is. The antitypical yearly service takes place in the second apartment. On this all agree. So the antitypical daily service takes place elsewhere--in the first apartment. What I have been saying does not contradict this. But it is not what Heb 6:19-20 is talking about. That passage is not providing a literal description of the antitypical sanctuary in heaven. It is not speaking literally of anything. It is speaking figuratively. And the figure it presents is one of the high priest entering the holiest of all.

<sup>3</sup>The church's sanctuary related apostasies are perhaps best documented in Desmond Ford's book entitled, *Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment* (Casselberry, FL: Euangelion Press, 1980), pp. 25-72 passim.

<sup>4</sup>Uriah Smith, Albion F. Ballenger, and M. L. Andreasen all assumed that Heb 6:19-20 describes the antitypical sanctuary in heaven (see Roy 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], pp. 180-85). Ford appears to share this assumption: "The same is true of the expression 'within the veil' or 'the inner shrine behind the curtain' of Hebrews 6:19-20 (RSV), which is equivalent to 'after the second veil. . . the Holiest of all' or 'behind the second curtain . . . the Holy of Holies' of Hebrews 9:2-3 (RSV) (57, 261)" (idem, "Daniel 8:14 and the Day of Atonement," *Spectrum* 11 [1980]: 33).

<sup>5</sup>The author is not referring to the sanctuary in Heb 6:19-20 but from it, if we could say it this way. He is using terms borrowed from the sanctuary. What he describes with them is the ascension--which did indeed occur in the first century A.D. But this is not the judgment. See also Heb 10:19-20.

<sup>6</sup>A priest's grain offering was not eaten but burned (see Lev 6:23). Also any sacrifice which came in contact with something impure had to be burned (see Lev 7:19). In any event the fat was always consumed. "The remaining portions of the sacrifice were eaten (*ṛākal*) in a sacrificial meal, either by the priests and worshippers together (peace-offering), or by the priests and their families, or by the priests alone. Priestly food was classified as either holy or most holy. The former included the peace-offerings (Lv. 10:14; 22:10ff.) and firstfruits and tithes (Nu. 18:13), and could be eaten by the priest's family in any clean place, but the latter included the sin-offerings (Lv. 6:26), guilt-offerings (Lv. 7:6), cereal-offerings (Lv. 6:16), and showbread (Lv. 24:9), and could be eaten only by the priests themselves, and within the Temple precincts. The people's sacrificial meal from the peace-offering was the popular accompaniment of local worship in early times (1 Sa. 1; 9), but with the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem (cf. Dt. 12) tended to recede before the formal aspects of worship. As late as Ezk. 46:21-24, however, provision continued to be made for it" (*New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. Sacrifice and Offering [p. 1049]).

<sup>7</sup>It is peculiarly appropriate that a people who have so much to say about the sanctuary should also have a highly developed sense of world mission and outreach. This state of affairs

already exists. So I am not saying we should. We do. But the sanctuary places these facts in a sound theoretical framework.

<sup>8</sup>Notably absent from this list is the scapegoat. The scapegoat was led outside the camp and presumably died there but it was never put to death as part of any sanctuary ceremony. This is a crucial omission.

<sup>9</sup>In this issue of *Historicism*, pp. 22-34 below.

<sup>10</sup>In 1 Thess 5:17 the Greek word is *adialeiptōs* "constantly, always."

<sup>11</sup>See Hardy, "On the Nature of Holiness," *Historicism* No. 27/Jul 91, pp. 85-89.

<sup>12</sup>See Hardy, "Covenants and Sanctuaries," pp. 18-33.

<sup>13</sup>See Hardy, "The Case for Metaphor," pp. 3-19.

<sup>14</sup>Here is a useful context in which to celebrate the Lord's Supper. The sanctuary enables us to understand the fullest significance of that event.

<sup>15</sup>It is possible for inspired writers to disagree on matters of emphasis and there is nothing wrong in this. See Hardy, "Paul and James," *Historicism* No. 27/Jul 91, pp. 75-76.

<sup>16</sup>See Hardy, "Daniel 8:9-12," *Historicism* Supplement/ Jul 85.

<sup>17</sup>See Hardy, "The End of the Seventy Weeks in Dan 9:24-27," *Historicism* No. 29/Apr 91, pp. 61-71.

<sup>18</sup>See Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983), p. 206; "Some Relationships Among Dan 8, 9, and 10-12," *Historicism* No. 7/Jul 86, p. 65 and related discussion.