

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 why this point is unclear, leading us to ask such a question, 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 gradually over the course of the entire book and at this point in his argument the distinction we have become accustomed to seeing between the first and second apartment is out of place.

The author's thought is set forth in a number of clearly defined stages. (a) The irreducible starting point for everything he says is that Christ is in heaven. (b) Having established this fact in chap. 1, the author next shows that, although He is there rather than here, He has not stopped ministering to human need. His work was not cut short by the ascension, but made possible by it. At the ascension He entered a new and necessary phase of His work for mankind. His death on the cross, being all-sufficient the first time, does not need to be repeated, but His blood, once shed, must be ministered. (c) Next the author asserts that Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven takes place in a sanctuary. (d) 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 (b) above. We are not yet at point (c). Using the term "veil" (KJV), or "curtain" (ESV, NET, NIV, NJB, NLT, NRS, RSV), places its verse in a cultic context, but nothing more. Thus, Heb 6:19-20 should not be required to answer questions that pertain to point (c) or (d). It is inappropriate to make Heb 6 tell us which apartment Christ went to first when He ascended to heaven. He has not even introduced the idea that there is a sanctuary in heaven. That will come in chap. 8. The point here is that He went. Later we will learn how He ministers.

Introduction

In this paper I argue that Heb 6:19-20 (and Heb 10:19-20) entering “within the veil,” or “behind the curtain,” is a metaphor. There are passages in Hebrews that do not use metaphors, but this one does. And it says something different from the 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 verse simply means Christ went to heaven.

The above proposal explains on one level how the author can use second apartment imagery without talking about the second apartment. It also explains how the passage can say what it obviously says and yet not contradict other passages which say something different. Nor does the present model weaken the historic Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the antitypical sanctuary in heaven. 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 Heb 6:19-20 and concluded that the Seventh-day Adventist theology of the sanctuary is fundamentally misconceived. Ballenger taught that Christ entered the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, not in 1844, but in AD 31. It is a powerful argument. The problem is not that he talked about the wrong veil, but that he interpreted a metaphorical passage literally, and subsequent Adventist scholars have followed him in understanding the passage literally. But once we accept Ballenger's premise, it is hard to resist his conclusion. It is a powerful argument that deserves to be taken seriously.

Expanding on various aspects of the discussion below is 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 topic in enough detail to show that he understands what the issues are has 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. If he was right, we need to admit it. If he was wrong, we need to know why. Tightening up a detail here or there will not suffice. We must take the discussion in an entirely different direction.

Which veil?

Ballenger amassed a considerable amount of textual data to support his theory that the "veil" (KJV) or "curtain" (NIV) in Heb 6:19 is the second one, that the reference to it is literal, and that the significance of Christ's going beyond this veil at His ascension is that His antitypical second apartment ministry did not begin in 1844. The question for Ballenger, and indeed for most of those who have challenged him, is: Which of two veils in the heavenly sanctuary is the author talking about--first or second, outer or inner? It is the wrong question. We should not be asking which veil; we should be asking which sanctuary. And before getting this far, we should ask whether the author is talking about a sanctuary in any sense of the word.

Below we discuss the work of a number of Seventh-day Adventist scholars. But here we start with two: Roy Adams and William Johnsson. 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 a physical feature of the antitypical sanctuary in heaven. Johnsson especially goes out of his way to make the point that the sanctuary in heaven is not metaphorical. In this he is right. The sanctuary in heaven is not metaphorical. But the reference to a "veil" in Heb 6:19-20 is metaphorical. We can maintain both positions because the reference to a "veil" in Heb 6:19-20 does not have the antitypical sanctuary in heaven in view.

Roy Adams. According to Roy Adams, Ballenger is right by a technicality but has overstated his case. He states:

[T]hese 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 Adams' 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 plausible, but a conclusion can only follow from its premise. If the premise is flawed, it does not matter how tight the logic is that follows from it. What Adams has done is to draw Ballenger's conclusion from Ballenger's premise, which accomplishes 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 is strong. And yet Adams' assessment cannot be right. Or if it is, Ellen White's assessment cannot be right. What she says is, "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 things that are positively 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 are right. And there is an answer to this question. It is not rhetorical.

William G. Johnsson. Ballenger claims that in twenty-five out of twenty-five cases where the second veil is referred to in the Old Testament, the Hebrew word *pārōket* is used to refer to it. He then reads Heb 6:19-20 in this context. Johnsson argues that only twenty-three of twenty-five cases unequivocally refer to the second veil.

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 attempts to correct Ballenger on two minor points. First, not every example of Hebrew *pārōket* 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 twenty-three 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., as *pārōket* without amplification. In some cases additional words are used along with *pārōket* (see Exod 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 40:21; Lev 4:6; 24:3; Num 4:5). However, correcting such minor points does nothing to reverse the course of Ballenger's argument, or to weaken its force.

Both Adams and Johnsson lead the reader to believe that the case Ballenger makes is overwhelmingly strong and that the only objections one can raise against it are mere quibbles. Instead of the Hebrew Old Testament using *pārōket* to refer to the second curtain every time without exception (100%), 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. Another way of saying the same thing is that Ballenger's case stands.

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. It is a bold claim that will be discussed further below.

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

Rice's last assertion is a flat contradiction of one of the key components in Ballenger's argument. Ballenger claimed that the first veil is always called a "door" (Hebrew *petah*, Greek *thura*) and that only the second veil is always 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 the argument is simply wrong. Ballenger did not do his homework. The facts of the case are other than he supposes.

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 *petah* "opening" (Greek *thura* "door") in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, fifty-six of which refer to the first or outer veil of the tabernacle. This body of additional references is a major component of Ballenger's argument. His point was that the first veil is always 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. Thus, however welcome Rice's efforts might be, he does not accomplish his objective and in fact contradicts Ellen White in the process. What she says is, "The words [Ballenger uses] are right but misapplied to vindicate error."¹¹ Rice sets out to show that the words are also wrong.

There is a solution to the problem that 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 The problem is not in the proofs but resides outside them in the matter of what Ballenger uses them to prove. So we should be willing to accept a certain amount of what Ballenger says. Any effort to resolve the problem by correcting the manner in which Ballenger counted his data is doomed from the outset and goes beyond the Spirit of Prophecy. Ballenger did do his homework and he did it more or less accurately. See appendix 1.

What I suggest in this paper is that the author of Hebrews departs from accepted usage, not by changing the meaning of the word "veil" or by counting up his data incorrectly, but by using the term in question to refer to the literal sanctuary in heaven. The author of Hebrews is not describing a sanctuary in Heb 6:19-20. He is using language borrowed from the sanctuary to talk about something else. There's a big difference here. Ellen White is not simply speaking out of loyalty when she says what she does; she is exactly correct. God did not lead her to give us detailed reasons for her position. He has left that task to us.

Discussion

In my view the question is not whether *katapetasma* in Heb 6:19 uses second apartment imagery. Clearly it does. But we should not ask which veil until we have established which sanctuary. According to Edward Heppenstall there are only two of these 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 is only one sanctuary. When the earthly sanctuary (and temples) were in operation,

the heavenly services had not yet begun. And once they did begin, the earthly services were rendered meaningless. This is the meaning of Matt 27:51 and Mark 15:38. See appendix 2.

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, we would have to side with the Pharisees and ask: Yes, how are you going to do that? There are only two sanctuaries and Jesus was obviously not talking about the one in heaven. This means He must be talking about the temple of Herod here on this earth – the one that took forty-six years to build. So, how are You going to raise that temple in three days? But of course Jesus wasn't talking about either of the two sanctuaries Heppenstall considers possible. He was talking about Himself. He was taking the discussion in an entirely different direction.

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 possible 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 language borrowed from the sanctuary, how dogmatic should we be in saying that the author of Hebrews can only be talking about one of two sanctuaries when he speaks of a "veil" in Heb 6:19? If figures of speech drawn from the sanctuary are used in other passages, why not here? See appendix 3.

I submit that Heb 6:19-20 and 10:19-20 are in exactly the same category as the passages cited above. In each case the language is metaphorical. It is drawn from the sanctuary, but does not refer to the sanctuary. The author's point, both in chap. 6 and in chap. 10, is that Christ has ascended to heaven. The context is cultic, but we should not get ahead of ourselves by placing this passage in a context that will not be developed until later. Some still living remembered seeing Him before He left this earth, and now they don't see Him. If He is gone, where is He? If Jesus is in heaven, what is He doing? These are the questions that require explanation in a mid-first century context. Even now, when we understand what Jesus has been doing for us ever since His ascension, that knowledge will have a stabilizing influence on our Christian experience. It will serve 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 after His ascension or when He started doing this task as opposed to that task in the sanctuary--which is the information Ballenger wants us to draw from it--is anachronistic. In chap. 6 the author has not gotten that far.

Context Argues Against Ballenger

One problem Ballenger does not mention is that there are two other figures of speech in Heb 6:19-20. One of these occurs before the reference to a "veil," the other afterward. Together these provide a context that we ignore at our peril.

Other verses in the same passage

There are three metaphors to consider in Heb 6:19-20: (a) "anchor," (b) "veil," (c) "forerunner." The first comes to us from shipping, the second from the sanctuary, and the third from horse racing. If the references to ships and to horses is metaphorical, the reference to a "veil" is also metaphorical.

The anchor. Consider the *agkuran* ("anchor") in vs. 19. First, it is "an anchor for the soul." Anchors would normally pertain to ships, not souls. But if we wish to be literal, how shall we visually this figure literally? Most anchors start from a ship and extend downward; this one starts from our souls and extends upward. This is not a literal anchor. Metaphorically, all difficulty vanishes. The first readers of Hebrews were buffeted by doubt within and persecution without and the author is saying that fixing our attention on Christ's ongoing high priestly ministry in heaven can bring peace and stability to our souls.

Jesus did not leave this earth to enter a state of inactivity. He is just as actively involved in the work of saving souls now as He was during His life on earth. 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 on our behalf serves the same function that an anchor does for a ship near harbor, i.e., it keeps the ship from drifting away from the shore or from being dashed in pieces by rocks until it can be safely brought to a harbor.

Correctly understood the anchor metaphor gives us yet another example of biblical rock symbolism.¹⁵ Christ is the solid Rock holding our anchor firm. He is as much more stable than us as rock is more stable than water. This is vertical imagery. On a horizontal level we could point out that Christ has entered the harbor before us. Thus, the fact that He has gone there first is a promise that we will safely follow Him later. It is a restatement of Christ's earlier 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, and it would be equally inappropriate to use this passage to prove that there is a tangible sanctuary in heaven. It's not what the author is talking about. There are other passages where he does (e.g., Heb 8:1-2), but here he is not seeking to demonstrate either position. The point is that Christ's presence in heaven brings spiritual stability to our lives.

The only thing that can keep us from being buffeted from one sin to another, as a ship without an anchor is buffeted from one rock to another, is the high priestly ministry of Jesus. In every generation He continues to live and to minister on our behalf (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 fact is perhaps understandable, but it is also a tragedy.

The Forerunner. The third metaphor in our passage is the word *prodromos* ("forerunner"). A forerunner by definition goes somewhere before others, but what does this actually mean? It is a figure drawn from horse racing. The *prodromos* is the lead horse – the one out in front. When Christ comes again we will not be locked in the sanctuary for eternity, but will walk with Jesus on the golden streets (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. This will be ours, because it is His. We will go where He has gone, because He has gone before us to prepare the way. In a literal context *prodromos* means nothing. We are not horses. Metaphorically, however, 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 a related passage, "let us run with perseverance the race marked out for us" (Heb 12:1):

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, does not imply that our Forerunner is unreal, nor does it mean that the heavenly sanctuary He serves in is unreal. Real things can be described in more than one way. They can be described literally, or poetically, and are just as real in either case. The nature of the language used does not determine the nature of the reality referred to. The figures of an "anchor" (where people are compared with ships) and of a racetrack (where people are compared with horses) are figures. Between these two figures is the word "veil" or "curtain," which must be interpreted in the context established by the words on either side of it. If the author uses the word "curtain" between references to anchors and race horses, how is that literal? And if it is not, how does his veil imagery correspond to the rest of the passage? If our presuppositions place us where we can see no relationship between the beginning and end of the passage, and the term at its middle, on what basis can we say we have correctly captured the author's intent? The solution is to interpret consistently, which in this case means interpreting metaphorically.

The curtain in Heb 6:19-20 is the distance separating earth (where we are) from heaven (where Christ is), and in Heb 10:19-20 the "new and living way" is a means of access between the two. "The Jews said to one another, 'Where does this man intend to go that we will not find him? Does he intend to go to the Dispersion among the Greeks and teach the Greeks?'" (John 7:35 ESV). The Jews were of course mocking Jesus when they said this, but it is true that wherever He might go – if it were on planet earth – we could hope to go where He is and find Him there. Only if He was going to heaven would it be true that no one could follow Him there. This is the point Jesus is making in John 7 and it is the point the author of Hebrews is making in Heb 6.

Other passages in the same book

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) and *eiselthēn* "entered" (6:20) on the one hand, and *eisodon* "entrance" (lit. "way into") (10:19) and *hodon* "way" (10:20) on the other. There is 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 two ways. The most obvious meaning in English 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 and, in my view, is correct in doing so.¹⁸ What he draws from this is that the text of Heb 10:20 does not reduce the curtain in the heavenly sanctuary to a figure of speech. It does not compromise the tangible reality of the sanctuary in heaven.

I agree with the larger point Johnson is trying to make, but submit that he goes about it the wrong way. The curtain is not Christ's body; instead His body is the way to heaven. How literal is that? A possible parallel would be with Jacob's ladder in Gen 28:10-17.¹⁹ 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 Heb 6:19-20. The two passages are closely parallel.

There is a point at which the distinction between the "curtain" and the "way" breaks down. Any curtain will keep some out and let others in. See appendix 1. The difference between barring and granting access does not have to do with the barrier, but 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 lets sheep in keeps robbers out (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," which brings us "through the curtain" into the presence of God (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 context of history

The question on the minds of first century Christians was not, "What part of the sanctuary is Jesus in now?" For people who had seen and heard Jesus personally, their question would not be, Where is He relative to a veil? but, Where is He relative to me? He is gone now. Where is He? And the answer is, not on earth, but in heaven.

If we say that our Forerunner passed from the first apartment to the second, how many feet and inches is that? By contrast, if we say that our Forerunner passed from earth to heaven, we are talking about distances that are truly vast. On the one hand the contrast is between one place we can't go and another place we can't go. On one level this contrast is not a contrast. On the other hand, it is between where we are and where He is. First century Christians would be much more interested in the second question than the first.

The context of earlier books

In Dan 8:9-14 the little horn takes something away from the Prince of the host--not an object of some sort but a function or ministry described as *tāmīd* ("daily" or "continual"). The timeframe for this ministry would have to be after Christ ascends to heaven, because on earth He was not a High Priest, but rather a Victim; living an unblemished life and dying on the cross. When His ministry as High Priest begins, it takes two forms. The function of the first apartment is to bring sin in; the function of the second apartment is to take sin out. Both functions must be performed for either of them to be meaningful. Without the first apartment, there is nothing to remove; without the second apartment, the function of the first apartment is meaningless. It takes both ministries to accomplish our salvation, and all of it must take place after the cross when Christ has something to offer (Heb 8:3). It would be reasonable to suggest that, if Christ

performs both ministries, He ministers in the first apartment first and in the second apartment second. This sequence explains why the little horn was trying, during the years after Christ's ascension, but before 1844, to take away the "daily" ministry – not the "yearly." The "daily" is what the little horn tried to take away, because that is what Christ was ministering at the time. Thus it is not the case that His heavenly ministry begins in the second apartment, omitting the first.

In the middle ages the little horn tried to achieve its goal by imitating on earth what Christ was doing in earth. Now it tries to accomplish the same purpose through arguments, like those of Ballenger, to the effect that Christ never ministered in the first apartment at all. In such a model there is only a "yearly" ministry, never a "daily" ministry. If we believe this, the little horn has succeeded in taking the "daily" away. If this is what we think, we must achieve a better understanding of the sanctuary. The "daily" service begins when Christ ascends to heaven. The "yearly" service begins at the end of the 2300 "days" or years in 1844 (Dan 8:14). This last is the antitypical or end time counterpart to the Day of Atonement (Lev 16). It is when the sanctuary was cleansed once a year. The cleansing of the sanctuary begins in 1844; the ministry of the first apartment precedes it during the years between the ascension in AD 31 and 1844.

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 is literal. We can see the spiritual meaning of John 10 and 14, 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 literal, all are literal. Similarly, it is not the case that if one passage is metaphorical, all are metaphorical. Each passage must be approached in its own context. If we interpret literal things as though they were metaphors, and metaphors as though they were literal, we will get some things wrong. That is what William Johnsson did.

William Johnsson

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 if we banish metaphor from the entire book, some things will be impossible to explain.²¹ There is a variety of usage in the book of Hebrews.²² We can see this with crystal clarity in Heb 13, but that will be for another paper. I merely point out here that the author of Hebrews, like the prophets he describes, has expressed himself "in various ways" (Heb 1:1).

To the extent that Johnsson succeeds in ruling out metaphor throughout the epistle, he establishes Ballenger's argument and defeats his own purpose, because in his model chaps. 6 and 10 must be interpreted as literally as chaps. 8 and 9. This cannot be. We must make a distinction. What Johnsson wants to establish is that the sanctuary in heaven is real, and I agree. It is real. But my point is that it can continue being real, even if chaps. 6 and 10 speak

metaphorically. What we need is a rigorous method for distinguishing between the two sets of passages, and the present model offers such a method. When it is implemented, we not only avoid conflicts within Hebrews, but gain insight into other passages of the New Testament that remain obscure in any other model.

Spiritual significance of the first apartment

In proposing a metaphorical interpretation I do not replicate William Miller's error. He thought the sanctuary was universal and that the earth was literally the second apartment.²³ What I suggest is that, in a metaphorical sense, there is much to be learned from associating the earth with the first apartment. First, the proposed model offers a sanctuary-based framework for understanding the everyday life of the church in study, prayer, and witness, and second, it provides the basis for a rigorous theology of mission, which is the primary reason why the church exists (see *Acts of the Apostles*, p. ***).

In the ancient tabernacle one of the functions of the first apartment was to convey some idea of what Jesus would eventually do in heaven. But another function is to portray the life of the church on earth during the time when Christ is doing these things.

Bread. On the south side of the first apartment (the right-hand side of the room), was a table with two stacks of consecrated bread (Exod 25:23-30; 37:10-16; 40:22-23).²⁴ We are familiar with Christ's words, "I am the bread of life" (John 6:35, 48). This is the main point of the symbol. But the bread also represents the fact that the church must feed on Christ to maintain its strength and well-being (John 6:52-62).²⁵ It feeds on Christ, not only in the eucharist (1 Cor 11:23-24), but by studying the words of Christ as these have been preserved for us 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). A healthy and growing Christian takes on spiritual nourishment at the beginning of each day by studying the Scriptures and in this way has strength to meet his or her daily spiritual needs (see Matt 6:11).

Incense. In front of the curtain leading to the second apartment was 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 to God.²⁶ But the incense also represents "the prayers of the saints" (Rev 8:4). Because God accepts what Christ has done, and because we approach God through Him, we are accepted and freely approach the Father through our prayers. The Christian studies, and also prays. But if we stop here our Christian experience will not be complete.

Light. Directly across the room from the table of consecrated bread, on the north side, was the golden lampstand (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? What happens after He leaves? "You are the light of the world. A city on a hill cannot be hidden" (Matt 5:14). Light is an appropriate way to describe Christian witness, aided by the Holy Spirit.²⁷

Christ never delegated His status as the bread of life, and we have no other basis for approaching the Father than through the merits of Christ (Acts 4:12), but every member of Christ's spiritual body also has a responsibility to serve as an ambassador for God to a world that does not know Him. Every Christian, therefore, studies (bread), prays (incense), and bears

witness to Christ (light). These are the three parts of a well-rounded program of health and well-being for the church. It is first and foremost a description of Christ, but also a description of His church in the world.²⁸ Because the symbols which describe these are all in the first apartment, there is a metaphorical sense in which the first apartment is the earth--the place where we live as Christians and minister to those about us on Christ's behalf.

I repeat that what I am saying takes nothing away from the fact that there is a literal sanctuary in heaven, as Seventh-day Adventists have taught all these years. Rather than detracting from a literal understanding of the sanctuary, the proposed model actively supports it by preventing Heb 6:19-20 and 10:19-20 from being used to destroy this understanding.

The priesthood of all believers

One implication of the above model is that those who believe in Christ serve a priestly function, because the figures of bread, incense, and light come together only in the first apartment, and the only ones who could enter the first apartment were priests.

Luther emphasized the priesthood of all believers during the time of the Reformation, but what he meant used that term was that all believers can approach God for themselves. They don't need human priests to help them. Without denying what Luther was saying, the point I wish to make is slightly different, i.e., that all believers can approach God on behalf of someone else. This is a good description of intercessory prayer. And there is a further meaning:

(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 goes beyond prayer (the golden altar) to include preaching (the golden lampstand). We must do more than feed ourselves; we must feed others.

"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 or she has experienced these things. Here is the context for Christ's words to the demoniac, "Go home to your friends and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you" (Mark 5:18-19 ESV). This was something the demoniac could share, and that no one else could share as convincingly. There is nothing here about forgiving other people's sins or creating a separate human priesthood in the Roman Catholic sense. The present model does not introduce any separation among believers, but draws all into ministry of some kind as we are led by the Holy Spirit. The goal of our ministry is to call people's attention to Christ's ministry, which is something every Christian can and must do. Such ministry does not compete with what Christ does for us in heaven, but brings it to greater prominence. Here we have the basis for a powerful theology of Christian witness and ministry.²⁹

Bear in mind that anciently commonly priests were merely the assistants of the high priest. They carried out his instructions and helped him in his ministry. In the same way, when

we bring Christ to people or people to Christ, we serve as His assistants on earth. When we do this, we carry out His will and strengthen His work.+

Some have supposed that, if we allow any passage to speak of the sanctuary in any but a literal way, that we would weaken the church's understanding of what happened in 1844, but this is not the case. On the contrary, by setting Heb 6:19-20 on the same course as Dan 8:13-14 and Heb 8:1-2 we pit these passages against each other. The problem is that none of them can ever lose, for they are the words of God, so their struggle against each other can never end – if we understand them incorrectly. This need not be. The Scriptures were not given to destroy each other or us. That is not their role. These same Scriptures must be the bread on which we feed. They must build us up, and not tear us down. To do this, we must understand them correctly, i.e., in a way that allows one passage to make its point without contradicting another. We cannot complete our work in the world if the church is split into warring camps of Hebrews Adventists here and Daniel Adventists there. We must all be Bible Adventists.

Further Discussion Within Adventism by Scholars After Ballenger

A number of Seventh-day Adventist scholars have tried to harmonize the crucial passage in Heb 6:19-20 with the rest of what we know about the sanctuary, and Christ's role in the sanctuary, and our own history. These include Uriah Smith, E.E. Andross, M.L. Andreasen, Norman Young, Richard Davidson, and Felix Cortez.

Uriah Smith taught that the veil of Heb 6:19 was the veil at the entrance to the first apartment, on the basis of the common Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the sanctuary, as shaped by the Millerite experience in 1844.³⁰

Albion F. Ballenger challenges this understanding, arguing that the veil in question is the one at the entrance to the second apartment and that Christ has been ministering there ever since His ascension – not since 1844. Ellen White saw this as a serious threat to the doctrinal foundation of Adventism, and she was right. It is truly a threat to Adventism.³¹

E.E. Andross concedes Ballenger's premise that the veil in Heb 6:19 leading to the second apartment, but suggests that when there only to inaugurate the second apartment, before returning to the first apartment where He served until 1844.³²

M.L. Andreasen takes no position on which veil is intended, neither asserting that it was the first nor denying that it was the second.³³ This, however, is a fragile position, because if we know that Jesus dedicated the second apartment at His ascension, we cannot at the same time claim that we don't know where He went or what He did there.

In 1987 George Rice wrote a paper on the topic, which attracted comment from Roy Gane, Norman Young, and Richard Davidson.³⁴ It will be convenient to discuss these papers together.

Rice's argument was that the Greek word *katapetasma* can refer equally well to the curtain into the first apartment or the second and that "beyond the veil" refers metaphorically to the sanctuary as a whole (not to heaven as a whole, as I suggest above). Gane accepts Rice's

argument in regard to *katapetasma*, but points out that the author would not speak as he does if Christ had entered anything other than the holiest of all. Young finds Gane's argument convincing, but supportively expands on what he wrote. Going beyond Gane he suggests (a) that *katapetasma* cannot, in fact, be used to refer to just any veil (it is only the second veil), (b) that *esōteron* cannot mean "within" just any apartment (it is only the second apartment), and (c) that Lev 16:2, 12, and 15 are not distant from Heb 6:19-20 in meaning. The passages stand in close parallel to each other. This takes us back toward the positions of Ballenger.

In the same issue of *AUSS* with Young's paper, Davidson published a reply, which takes us back toward the positions of Andross. Davidson articulately argues that the occasion the author has in view in Heb 6:19-20 is an inauguration rather than the Day of Atonement. To this, Young replies (a) that nothing in Exod 40; Lev 8; or Num 7 refers to Moses as a high priest; (b) that there is no reference in Exod 40; Lev 8; or Num 7 to anyone going "within the veil"; (c) that the differences between the Hebrew and Greek expressions for "within the veil" do not outweigh their similarities; and (d) that the inauguration ceremonies Davidson points to occurred only once. They were not repeated annually.

Young's fifth point (e) is that Heb 10:19-20 should not be considered a key to interpreting Heb 6:19-20. Instead, 6:19-20 is the key to interpreting 10:19-20. His sixth (f) is that, while *ta hagia* refers to the whole sanctuary, that does not prevent the passage from referring to the Day of Atonement. Seventh, (g) Young downplays the connection *tragōn* and *moschōn* ("goats and calves") in Heb 9:12 and Num 7, which would associate these animals with an inauguration ceremony, and emphasizes the connection between *tragōn* and *taurōn* ("goats and bulls") in Heb 9:13 and 10:4, which creates an association with the Day of Atonement. Young's final point (h) is that the aorist participle *genomenos* in Heb 6:20 does not refer to Christ becoming a High Priest in the heavenly realm, but that He had already become a High Priest before entering the heavenly realm.

To this, Davidson replies that he does not disagree with Young on the identity of the veil in Heb 6:19. He accepts for the sake of argument that it is the second veil, and so agrees with both Gane and Young on the major point of their respective arguments, but raises a deeper issue, i.e., that sitting "at the right hand" of God (Heb 1:3; also 1:13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2) refers primarily not to location, but to status. Thus the question of where Christ is at any given moment is not addressed in the passage under review. The Old Testament passage behind Heb 1, 8, 10, and 12 is Ps 110, where the Messiah sits at God's right hand in vs. 1, but in vss. 5 and 7 (while presumably still sitting at God's right hand) he is actively engaged in combat with His enemies. Thus the comparison being made sets off the entire Old Testament sanctuary on earth against the entire New Testament sanctuary in heaven. Davidson capably responds to the points Young sets forth, but to avoid being tedious I will not rehearse these here. The intellectual level of the above debate is quite high throughout. The papers of Rice, Gane, Young, and Davidson deserve close study.

In his doctoral thesis, Felix Cortez argues that Heb 6:19-20 should be read in the context of Heb 5:11-6:20.³⁵ He divides the extended passage into four parts (5:11-6:3; 6:4-8, 9-12, 13-20), applied as follows: (a) Early Christians have understood only the basic teachings about Christ (5:11-6:3); (b) whatever happens they must not fall away (6:4-8); (c) they can inherit the promises only if they remain faithful (6:9-12); (d) God's act of appointing Christ as High Priest (c) confirms His promise, (b) removes any reason they might have had to fall away, and (a) confirms the past teachings they have received. Thus a chiasmic structure is implicit in the author's reasoning. "The author of Hebrews provides Abraham as an example of faith and patience in vv. 13-15 and explains the ascension of Jesus as the assurance of their hope in vv.

16-20.”³⁶ After enduring patiently, Abraham receives, not just a confirmation of the promise God had made to him, but an actual fulfillment of what was promised (vs. 15).³⁷ This last point, however, might be challenged in view of Heb 11:39.

“What is, then, the function of Jesus’ ascension to heaven in 6:19-20?”³⁸ For Cortez, what enters “the inner place behind the veil” in vs. 20 (RSV) is not Christ, but our hope. Our hope is anchored in God’s throne and the honor of God’s throne is bound up with the fulfillment of what He promised. The inner veil is, therefore, the one leading to the innermost apartment of the heavenly sanctuary – the second apartment – but saying so does not negate our historical position on the sanctuary, because it is not Christ that enters, but our hope.³⁹

Is a contrast of this sort sustainable? In Heb 11:1 KJV translates, “Now faith is the substance [*hupostasis*] of things hoped for, the evidence [*elegchos*] of things not seen.” I suggest that Christ in His physical person is the “substance” of what we hope for, the tangible “evidence” of what we do not yet see. If so, Cortez may have proposed a false dichotomy. If our hope is what enters heaven itself, it does so in the person of Christ.

Discussion

For the reader’s convenience I summarize the main thrust of what these 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
Uriah Smith	Literal	First veil	Start of ministry
Albion F. Ballenger	Literal	Second veil	Start of ministry
A.A. Andross	Literal	Second veil	Dedication ceremony
M.L. Andreasen	Literal	Not specified	Start of ministry
Roy Gane	Literal	Second veil	Not specified
Norman Young	Literal	Second veil	Day of Atonement
George Rice	Literal	Not specified	Not specified
Richard Davidson	Literal	Second veil	Dedication ceremony
Felix Cortez	Literal	Second veil	Not specified
This paper	Metaphorical	Second veil	Ascension to heaven

Ellen White explicitly applies Heb 6:19 to the first veil, as does Smith, but applies it 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 (first veil, second veil, and a spiritual application without reference to which veil). See appendix 4.

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 Plac.”³⁴

Conclusion

The passages Ballenger assembles 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 doing this is incompatible with the assumptions made by Ballenger. The proposed result only follows when we acknowledge that there is more than one category 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), we should reconcile ourselves 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 any point of historic Adventist sanctuary theology. On the contrary, it prevents Heb 6:19-20 from doing so. It prevents a collision by putting things on different tracks.

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 the sanctuary in heaven is just as real as the High Priest who ministers in it. However, if we try to protect our position on the reality of the sanctuary by ruling out any use of metaphor in Hebrews, what we protect ourselves from is actually the only adequate defense of the position we wish to support.

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

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. This is 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 begun in the first. This 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 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 to the next, but the next generation's point of special emphasis might not be of interest to the one preceding it.

Applying the above principle, what the book of Hebrews says about Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven would have had less impact if it had been written before He ascended. Until the event occurred, present truth was that He is alive (or has risen from the dead)--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 had less impact in the first century than it did in their own day, because in the eighteenth century the events were unfolding before their eyes. The author of Hebrews does not set out to tell people what Christ would do two thousand years later. It is not a book of prophecy but deals with present realities. The sanctuary itself is another matter. In the sanctuary 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 something we have not yet finished assimilating?

Having said this, let me suggest that if there is anything more to learn from the sanctuary, as I'm sure there is, no one will be in a better position to learn it than Seventh-day Adventists. The disappointed hopes our spiritual ancestors experienced in 1844 are powerful teaching devices. We must sink deep roots in what God has already revealed, through Scripture and through practical experience. If there is more He wishes to show us, it will grow from this soil. Striking off in new directions, on the other hand, would be like pulling the plant up. Nothing will grow if we destroy the root. We have certainly not exhausted the present topic. The challenges that remain 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.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 382.

⁹*Ibid.*

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).

¹⁹What 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.

³⁰Uriah Smith, "The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days of Daniel 8:14" (Battle Creek, 1877), 224-25 (<file:///C:/Users/hardy/Downloads/Other/Smith%202300%20and%20Sanctuary.pdf>).

³¹Albion F. Ballenger, *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ* (1909). "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).

³²This 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; see pp. 42-54). 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.

³³Andreasen 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).

³⁴George Rice, "Hebrews 6:19: Analysis of Some Assumptions Concerning *Katapetasma*," *AUSS* 25/1 (1987), 65-71; and before this, "Within Which Veil?" *Ministry* (June 1987), 20-21; Roy Gane, "Re-opening *Katapetasma* ('Veil') in Hebrew 6:19," *AUSS* 38/1 (2000), 5-8; Norman Young, "Where Jesus Has Gone as a Forerunner on Our Behalf," *AUSS* 39/2 (2001), 165-73; and before this, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," *NTS* 27 (1981), 205, 209; Richard Davidson, "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19-20: The Old Testament Background," *AUSS* 39/2 (2001), 175-90; Norman Young, "The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Reconsidered," *AUSS* 40/1 (2002), 61-68; Richard Davidson, "Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's 'Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited'" *AUSS* 40/1 (2002), 69-88.

³⁵"The Anchor of the Soul that Enters Within the Veil": the Ascension of the 'Son' in the Letter to the Hebrews" (Andrews University, 2008).

³⁶Idem, p. 308.

³⁷Idem, p. 309.

³⁸Idem, p. 310.

³⁹Idem, pp. 311-12.