

Why Is the Book of Hebrews a Problem?

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

Introduction

The book of Hebrews is a problem for Seventh-day Adventists because it appears to state in chap. 6, and again in chap. 9, that Christ went directly to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary after His ascension, bypassing the first apartment, whereas Seventh-day Adventists have always taught that the second apartment ministry did not begin until 1844. It is a problem because men like Albion F. Ballenger and others have magnified the difficulties, pressing the point. And it is a problem because, through a lack of study, we have rendered ourselves unable to meet the challenges brought against us in this way. We should understand the book of Hebrews better than we do. This is perhaps the largest single factor. It is not enough to know what other people have thought the issues were. We must know the book for ourselves.

Preliminary Excursus: Learning from the Mistakes of Others

William Miller was wrong, long ago, in saying that the earth is the sanctuary, by which he meant that the part of the sanctuary cleansed on the day of atonement was the earth and that the cleansing of the sanctuary was therefore the second coming of Christ. He thought the second coming would occur at the end of the 2300 day prophecy of Dan 8:14 in 1844. So the Millerites were wrong on the point to which they gave the greatest emphasis. And yet there is much to learn from their experience. Let us consider it briefly.¹

The Millerites had the witness of the Holy Spirit that they being led by God both before and during 1844, and the disappointment the disciples experienced after Christ's death provides a firm biblical precedent for the Millerites' mistake. In this comparison, the years immediately prior to 1844 correspond to the years that the disciples spent with Jesus during His ministry and the great disappointment of 1844 corresponds to the great disappointment of A.D. 31 when the disciples, standing as close to the cross as they dared, saw all their hopes bleed and die. Both groups had been wrong. Or were they wrong?

The disciples were not given an explanation; they were given an experience, which they initially misinterpreted. Later, under the leading of the Holy Spirit, they formulated their accounts of what had happened and recorded their more mature understanding of those events. But the events themselves came first. Christ's earliest followers expected their Lord to sit on the throne of David and expel the Romans. That is not what happened. And so we find two of those followers saying (to Jesus), ""but we had hoped that he was the one who was going to redeem Israel"" (Luke 24:21). Unless we are prepared to discount what the disciples wrote (because until after Christ's death they had proceeded under a misunderstanding of His mission), we should not lightly set aside the insights of those who went through a similar experience involving comparable issues in 1844.

Revelation 3

In the letter to Philadelphia Christ says, "I will make those who are of the synagogue of Satan, who claim to be Jews though they are not, but are liars--I will make them come and fall down at your feet and acknowledge that I have loved you" (Rev 3:9). From this I draw that something happens during the time in question to make it seem (incorrectly) that God did not love His faithful remnant. Whatever this might be, it must have been disappointing, if it made the remnant seem wrong and their opponents seem right. In Rev 3:9 God promises to correct this misunderstanding.

Who are these people who put forward some apparently dreadful miscalculation just before the period of Laodicea begins, at the end of the seven churches? Is there any relationship between the mistake referred to in Rev 3:9, the sudden bitterness of the scroll in Rev 10:10, and the call for God's people to go everywhere preaching a judgment hour message in Rev 14:6-7 just prior to Christ's return? The remnant thought their preaching was over, and when they found that their work had only just begun, it was a severe disappointment to them. It is not that they no longer wanted to work for Christ; they wanted to be with Him, and found out that they could – at least for the present. These questions and these answers should give us a better idea of the prophetic credentials with which the Millerite experience comes down to us in the New Testament. The disciples had an identical experience when Christ died, and the disappointment suffered by the Millerites is described in Rev 3:9; 10:10; and 14:6-7.

Revelation 10

One reason why we can be very sure that the disciples' experience was not a mistake is that the events surrounding it were predicted in Scripture many long years before they occurred (see 2 Pet 1:19). The same is true for the Millerites. In Rev 10:5-11 John, personifying the remnant church of a later day, is given a scroll and told to eat it, which tastes sweet in his mouth but turns bitter in his stomach.

In 1844 Jesus was expected to come to the earth but He did not come. That is, He did not come to the earth. A parallel to Rev 10:6 is Mal 3:1 ("Then suddenly the Lord you are seeking will come to his temple; . . ."). Both passages were fulfilled exactly as stated. The Scriptures were true, the timing was right, but the people were looking in the wrong place (the earth) for a fulfillment that involved heavenly realities and so misunderstood the event.

The initial sweetness of the scroll is explained in vs. 6: "And he swore by him who lives for ever and ever, who created the heavens and all that is in them, the earth and all that is in it, and the sea and all that is in it, and said, 'There will be no more delay!'" The subsequent bitterness, on the other hand, is explained in vs. 11: "Then I was told, 'You must prophesy again about many peoples, nations, languages and kings.'" The people represented here had thought their work was over. In heaven there is no need to prophesy. But now they learn that there is still a work of proclamation to do.² Their books and papers were yet to be scattered everywhere "like the leaves of autumn."³ Their schools and hospitals were yet to encircle the globe. The experience described in Rev 10 is that of the Millerites, who looked for Christ's return in 1843 and again in 1844, and those who would carry forward what they had begun and perform the work of proclamation that many of the Millerites became too discouraged to do.

We have no reason to apologize for our association with the Millerites. Those who knowingly reject the message of 1844 might have some valid insights, but none that would justify rejecting it. If some interpret crucial passages of Scripture incorrectly, my question is, How can we get it right? How can we benefit from the legitimate insights of those we otherwise know to be wrong?

Revelation 14

The episode involving a scroll in Rev 10 is stated in language reminiscent of the three angels' messages of Rev 14. On the one hand the angel "swore by him who lives for ever and ever, who created the heavens and all that is in them, the earth and all that is in it, and the sea and all that is in it, and said, 'There will be no more delay!'" (Rev 10:6).⁴ And on the other hand the first angel's message says:

(6) Then I saw another angel flying in midair, and he had the eternal gospel to proclaim to those who live on the earth--to every nation, tribe, language and people. (7) He said in a loud voice, "Fear God and give him glory, because the hour of his judgment has come. Worship him who made the heavens, the earth, the sea and the springs of water." (Rev 14:6-7)

Both messages emphasize the creatorship of God by referring to the heaven, the earth, the sea, and then a fourth element ("and all that is in it" occurs three times in 10:6, "and the springs of water" occurs once in 14:7), both are given by an angel or angels,⁵ and in both cases the message is related to time (a delay, the hour of judgment). The parallel is not between isolated phrases in Rev 10:6 and Rev 14:7 but between that and also the contexts of both passages.

Albion F. Ballenger

(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)

One person who may serve as a test case in this regard is Albion F. Ballenger--himself at one time a Seventh-day Adventist minister. Around the turn of the century he started gathering an impressive array of evidence by which he sought to demonstrate that the Seventh-day Adventist understanding of 1844 and the sanctuary was fundamentally misconceived.⁶ Ellen White does not deny that Ballenger's proof texts say what they say, but comments that, "His proofs do not belong where he places them, and although he may lead minds to believe his theory in regard to the sanctuary, there is no evidence that his theory is true."⁷ "The words are right but misapplied to vindicate error. We must not give countenance to his reasoning."⁸ Ballenger's proofs do not demonstrate what he says they do. What then do they demonstrate? Not that 1844 was a mistake, but what? If the same evidence had fallen into other hands, what constructive use could have been made of it?

The church has been able to learn from the friendly error of the Millerites. How and in what way can it learn from Ballenger's more hostile errors? At the very least we should learn how to defend ourselves against them intelligently--a goal which so far has eluded us. There

have been defenses, to be sure, but none that answers Ballenger in such a way that he stays answered. We flail at him from time to time or ignore his assertions altogether, but when we finish, his arguments are still there. Ballenger deserves both more and less attention than he has gotten. In the end, one reason for our frustration with him might be that he has something to say. But which part is the bait and which part is the hook? Surely, knowing the difference will not put us in any greater danger than we are already in.

Approaching the problem at close range will take keen discernment and an open mind, but the result will repay the effort. In the process, conservative Seventh-day Adventists will have to learn how to deal with evidences they would rather ignore and liberal Adventists will have to accept conclusions they have so far tried to deny.

Based on the way the Greek words of Heb 6:19-20 are used in the Septuagint, Ballenger shows that "the inner sanctuary behind the curtain" (Heb 6:19) is a reference to the second apartment rather than the first. He then pits Heb 6 against Dan 8, arguing that if Christ's ministry in the second apartment began in A.D. 31, it cannot also have begun in 1844 as Seventh-day Adventists teach. This is a powerful argument. Not only so, but every Adventist writer after Ballenger who has written on the topic in enough depth to show that he understands what is involved has felt the force of Ballenger's criticisms.⁹

Right from the first--starting with E. E. Andross¹⁰ and coming on down to such later conservative scholars as A. L. Andreasen¹¹--what we have challenged (or avoided challenging) is Ballenger's assertion that the language of Heb 6:19-20 refers to the second apartment. The question we have always asked is, Which apartment was the author talking about? We then try to show that Heb 6:19 does not require a second apartment application. But at this point in the book we are not ready to ask about apartments.

There is a prior question to raise and until we have addressed it there is no basis for saying anything about apartments. That question is, Which sanctuary is the author talking about? In the earthly sanctuary the only way to get to the second apartment was by going through the first apartment. When did Christ minister in the first apartment if He entered the second one at His ascension? Or did He pass through the first apartment without pausing, completely ignoring all the symbolism of the services performed there? If that is so, Why did He instruct Moses to perform them?

The question will not go away. What do we do with the first apartment if Christ ministers only in the second? And what do we mean when we speak of the first apartment? Is it merely the system of earthly types, as B. F. Westcott supposes?¹² In this case the type of the first apartment is the antitype of the first apartment and the first apartment of the sanctuary in heaven is not in heaven. Personally I find such logic exhausting. But if it is not the case that the author of Hebrews is talking about a structure located in heaven, what structure is he talking about? Or is he talking about a structure at all? Just what is he trying to say?

He is saying that Christ entered heaven. He when there before us, which gives us a strong basis for confidence that we also will enter the same place after Him. Here the promise given in John 14:1-3 is stated in terms borrowed from the sanctuary. But that does not mean we must bring them back to the sanctuary for their application. Heb 6:19-20 makes no statement of any kind about the sanctuary in heaven. Pointing out that Christ went to heaven and claiming that, after going to heaven, He entered one specific part of a structure located in heaven are two different assertions. It is a separate question, not taken up in chap. 6, what Christ does in

heaven after He arrives there. This might help to explain Ellen White's exegesis of the passage in *Great Controversy*, pp. 420-21, which offended Ballenger so badly.¹³

Ballenger is not wrong in his reasoning but in the assumptions which underlie his reasoning. Thus, if we accept what he assumes, it will be very difficult to avoid what he concludes. Make no mistake: Ballenger is truly wrong. But we need to know with exact precision where he is wrong and where he is not, and why.

From the outset Ballenger takes for granted that if the author of Hebrews uses second apartment imagery in reference to anything other than the earthly sanctuary, he must be talking about the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. This simply does not follow. Paul uses temple imagery to describe both the church and the human body (see 1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:21). Heb 6:19-20 is on the same level, as is Heb 10:19. If we do not accept the possibility that there is a third way, we place the first two on a collision course with each other.

In my view, Christ could be outside the city enjoying the beautiful flowers and still be in "the inner sanctuary behind the curtain" in the sense of Heb 6:19. What Christ entered on our behalf, having "become a high priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek" (Heb 6:20), is just heaven--at this point in the discussion. Later we learn that there is a sanctuary in heaven (chap. 8) and are shown how many apartments it contains (chap. 9). But let each thing be taken in its proper order. The author's thought unfolds gradually.

Walter Martin

(11) When Christ came as high priest of the good things that are already here, he went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made, that is to say, not a part of this creation. (12) He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place [ta hagia (plural), "the holy places"] once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. (Heb 9:11-12)

An embarrassing failure

Before discussing the above passage let me share a very frustrating set of events relating to it, which occurred while the book, *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine*, was under preparation.¹⁴ The person speaking in what follows is Walter Martin, author of *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism*.¹⁵ In the following excerpt Martin has just been asked whether he considers *Questions on Doctrine* to be a clarification of positions Seventh-day Adventists always held or a theological shift on their part to other different positions.

Martin: "The people I dealt with maintained that it was a clarification, that their position could be defended from Adventist writings, and they vigorously maintained that they were not changing anything which they thought was basic to the Adventist message. I think they did, however, admit--(and I can recall the day it happened, when Dr. Murdoch and Dr. Heppenstall were present, and the question came up). They had brought them in because we were exegeting [interpreting the biblical passages] on the sanctuary doctrine, the holy place, the Most Holy Place, and so forth in the [book of] Hebrews. And George Cannon accompanied me on these [occasions]. He's professor of Greek at Bethel Seminary. He was then professor of Greek and Theology at Nyack Missionary College and has a

doctorate from Union Seminary in Greek, and is a brilliant scholar. And George, I remember, went head-to-head with Dr. Heppenstall and Dr. Murdoch with the Greek New Testament there, and they went line upon line through the text, and as they got to the crucial point there, everybody was listening carefully to what they said. Cannon looked at them and said, 'There is just no sense debating the issue any further. The text is clear. At His resurrection, Jesus Christ entered into the Second Apartment of the sanctuary, into the Holiest of all, with His own blood, having obtained eternal redemption for us. This could not, did not, take place in 1844.'

"And the gentlemen looked very long and hard, and Cannon said, 'The text says He went into the Second Apartment, didn't He?' And Dr. Heppenstall said, 'Yes, into the Second Apartment, into the Holiest of all, with His own blood at the resurrection. The text says so.'

"Murdoch said the same thing. Now, you can read Desmond Ford on this in great detail. He's probably one of your most articulate, and surely one of your most brilliant men I've met on Adventism and on general theology. I think you'll find that he's done a very commendable job of exegeting this as well, but that was admitted at that time [in the 1950s]. . . .

"Now if you read Questions on Doctrine on this, they went very clearly and in depth to explain what Jesus did from their perspective of clarification. Now, I don't really care whether you say, 'clarify' or 'reverse field,' the important thing is, you get back to what the text says. The ultimate point of contention is 'what does the text say?' Not what somebody says the text says. I had enough of that in Romanism. I had enough of it in my upbringing of the Church. I don't care what somebody says the text says. That's why I learned the language to find out what the text says. And I know what it says. And it says it didn't happen in 1844. . . . You can believe it if you want to, but it isn't there. Now that's clarification, or reversal, but it sure is truth."¹⁶

From this much it will be clear that as a church we have some growing to do. Peter says, "Always be ready to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have" (1 Pet 3:15). We need to get past the stage where our best and brightest scholars are unable to fulfill this requirement and progress to a stage where every person in the pew from Earliteens on up is able to do so.¹⁷

The Holy Spirit is not trying to deny in Hebrews what He asserts in Daniel. The two books have different points of view. No one would deny this. But we must know how to relate them to each other without needing to force them into the same mold. Both must be allowed to say what they say, and yet even when they emphasize different things, we must learn to hear them speak with one voice. The two sources do not contradict each other if both are inspired by the same Spirit. If we do not know how to bring the various passages together in a cohesive manner, we do not understand what they mean and should continue studying. It is that simple.

What went wrong?

The Seventh-day Adventist position that Christ has been in the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary since 1844 is not controversial, except insofar as most Christians do not believe there is a sanctuary in heaven or, if there is, that it only has one apartment. But assuming there is a sanctuary in heaven and that it has two apartments, Christ ministers in the second one. On this all agree. The problem is that, if He began ministering in the second apartment in 1844, He was somewhere else prior to 1844--i.e., in the first apartment. And if He began ministering in the second apartment in AD 31, His ministry in the first apartment was before AD 31. Before the cross. But Heb 8:3 says "it is necessary for this priest also to have something to offer," which only makes sense after the cross. Thus, the position we are at pains

to defend is that Christ performs a first apartment ministry. If He performs a first apartment ministry first and a second apartment ministry second, as would seem reasonable, there must be some difference between the two ministries. What He does before 1844 must be different in some way from He does after 1844. The two ministries serve different though complementary functions and contrast with each other in important ways.¹⁸

Discussion

It is the work of the little horn to take away the "daily," which I associate with the work of Christ in the first apartment (see Dan 8:11). Seventh-day Adventists refuse to accept any position which does this, but does the book of Hebrews succeed in doing what the little horn failed to do, by transferring every aspect of the heavenly ministry of Christ to the Most Holy Place? I answer no. If one's interpretation of Hebrews makes it appear that this is happening, it is the wrong interpretation. God does not send His Spirit to oppose His Spirit. He is not divided against Himself (see Luke 11:17-20). If we cannot see the inner unity, we need to pray for deeper insight.

Our theology of the sanctuary must leave room for the first apartment. Christ in heaven does something that the first apartment points forward to; otherwise, that apartment has no reason to be part of the system of ancient types. If the book of Hebrews appears to make only the second apartment ministry of Christ necessary, we're missing something. There is more to learn, and until we have learned it, we do not understand what Christ does for us as our great high priest in heaven.

Conclusion

The claim of this paper is that Heb 6:19-20 is simply telling us that Christ ascended to heaven, and of course we cannot go there at the present time. I challenge the assumption that Heb 6 is informing us about the heavenly sanctuary--a physical structure in heaven. Instead the heavenly sanctuary is informing the author as He talks about the ascension. What the words are drawn from is not necessarily the same as what they point to. Heb 6:19-20 is closely parallel to John 7:34, 36; 8:21-22; and 13:33, where Jesus tells both His enemies and His disciples, "Where I am going you cannot come."

The primary emphasis in the book of Hebrews is not on what would take place eighteen centuries later, but on what was happening at the time the book was written. What the Holy Spirit led the author of Hebrews to write is consistent with what He led Daniel to write. The two men had different points of view and expressed themselves differently. The agreement between they write is an underlying agreement that does not lie on the surface, but they do not contradict each other. We can say this confidently because the Holy Spirit does not contradict itself.

If nothing new needs to be added to our understanding of Heb 6, then I invite the person who thinks so to take his or her seat across the table from George Cannon along with Heppenstall and Murdoch and improve on their answer without going beyond their assumptions. It is not enough to repeat existing positions, stating them louder than before. That is not the same as learning something. We must grow in our understanding until we can bind together those strands of truth whose interrelationships have eluded us previously. This need not involve

either opening the door to novel interpretations or discarding proven points of doctrine. But it does mean allowing the Holy Spirit to illuminate our minds. To the extent that we do this we can advance in knowledge and yet remain on safe ground theologically.

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.

¹It would be a misuse of Scripture to say, on the basis of Isa 8:20, that because the Millerites were wrong in their interpretation of the sanctuary they were not speaking according to "the law and to the testimony" and that there was therefore "no light in them" (KJV). Every morning I come to the Scriptures expecting to learn something from them. If I am in darkness before learning whatever the Holy Spirit teaches me on a given morning, how can I account for the fact that He is the One who leads me to learn it? The word of the prophets is like "a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts" (2 Pet 1:19). "The path of the righteous is like the first gleam of dawn, shining ever brighter till the full light of day" (Prov 4:18). How can we account for these facts in view of Isa 8:20? The Millerites were wrong. In some degree we are all wrong, because at any given time we cannot know what the Holy Spirit will teach us tomorrow. But we should remain open to His leading. Some of the Millerites did this and they learned from their mistake. If we fault them, should it be for having the experience that they did or for learning from it--both under the leading of the Holy Spirit?

²Here is the context for our early misunderstanding of the closed door. It took time for Seventh-day Adventists to realize just what was involved in prophesying again. See P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 103-64. It took time for the apostles to realize what was involved in Christ's statement, "The field is the world, and the good seed stands for the sons of the kingdom." (Matthew 13:38). We have all had painful lessons to learn (see Heb 12:7-11). But this is not proof that those confronted with such lessons are illegitimate children and not true sons. The absence of disciple demonstrates that.

³"The message of truth is to go to all nations, tongues, and people; its publications, printed in many different languages, are to be scattered abroad like the leaves of autumn" (Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, 9 vols. [Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1948], p. 79).

⁴This passage must be taken together with Rev 12:12 ("He [the devil] is filled with fury, because he knows that his time is short"). It is short because "Now have come the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ" (vs. 10). In the context of proposing an alternative system of government for the universe and expecting that system to establish itself and last indefinitely, "short" means not lasting indefinitely. It means being limited as opposed to being unlimited. And indeed in terms of the starry universe it does not take long for our earth to go around its sun two thousand times. But in Rev 10:6 "no more delay" (*chronos ouketi estai*) does not mean that the church would have nothing more to do. Otherwise, how do we explain vs. 11 ("Then I was told, 'You must prophesy again about many peoples, nations, languages and kings'")? One explanation would be that no prophetic time period extends beyond this point in history. In either case, time is viewed here from a more than human perspective.

⁵The parallel does not break down because John is told that he (not the angel) must prophecy again. When Christ fed the five thousand He gave the food to His disciples and it was they who distributed it. In Rev 14 also the message is of heavenly origin but it is preached by ordinary people.

⁶See 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. 95-104.

⁷Quoted in William G. Johnsson, "The Significance of the Day of Atonement Allusions in the Epistle to the Hebrews," Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Lesher, eds., *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical and Theological Studies* (Washington, D.C.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1981), p. 392, n. 28.

⁸Ibid., p. 393.

⁹Andross meets the issues head on, Andreasen appears to avoid some of them. For the latter see Adams, *Sanctuary Doctrine*, pp. 180-85.

¹⁰Andross, *A More Excellent Ministry*. Let me say just a word about this book. It is a pity that it is so often brushed aside. Andross had a keen mind and a good understanding of his subject. Of course what he wrote does not silence Ballenger or answer all the questions we ourselves might wish to ask but his book is well worth reading. Anyone who does so will come away with a better understanding of the sanctuary than before and that is one way in which the author's success must be measured.

¹¹Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1947; originally published, 1937); *The Book of Hebrews* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1948).

¹²No less a commentator than B. F. Westcott misses this point. "The comprehensive sense which has been given to *ta hagia*, as including both the Holy and the Most Holy place, explains the use of *hÛ prÿtÛ skÛnÛ*. This phrase has been used just before (v. 6; comp. v. 2) of the Holy place as the vestibule, so to speak, of the Divine presence-chamber; and it is very difficult to suppose that it should be suddenly used in another sense for 'the first (the Mosaic) tabernacle' as opposed to 'the heavenly archetypal tabernacle' (v. 11). . . . Thus the outer sanctuary was the representative symbol of the whole Tabernacle as the place of service" (*The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, reprint ed. 1980], p. 252). The reason why he misses it is that his emphasis is on earlier verses (i.e., verses from an earlier section) rather than those later ones which fall within the same section as the verse he is dealing with.

¹³Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1950. This is not the only place where Ellen White uses Heb 6:19-20. She uses the term "anchor" fourteen times in this connection and "veil" (in earlier sources spelled "vail") seventeen times, with two additional references possible though not certain (*Early Writings*, p. 253; *SDA Bible Commentary* 7:930). Both of these terms occur in vs. 19. In reference to vs. 20 she uses the term "Melchizedek" in one place (*Review and Herald* 1:115). And there is one possible use of the term "holiest" in this same connection (*Review and Herald* 2:569). In *Great Controversy* pp. 420-21 she explicitly applies Heb 6:19-20 to the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Doing that offended Ballenger badly. And yet in *Early Writings* p. 72, speaking of the same passage, she states, "We must send up our petitions in faith within the second veil and let our faith take hold of the promised blessing and claim it as ours." Is she right in *Great Controversy* and wrong in *Early Writings*, right in *Early Writings* but wrong in *Great Controversy*, or is there some point that formulations like this lead us to miss? How are both applications possible? If the passage simply refers to Christ's being in heaven and does not declare on the nature of His work there at any given time, which is my position, there is no conflict. The antitypical first apartment is in heaven and so is the antitypical second apartment. Christ ministers in both of them. When He does, in either case, His work falls within the scope of what the author of Hebrews is saying in the vexed passage under review. I submit that this concept is reasonable as an interpretation of Heb 6:19-20 and is also reasonable as an interpretation of Ellen White's comments on the passage. These comments are discussed at greater length in a forthcoming paper.

¹⁴Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1957.

¹⁵Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1960.

¹⁶Quoted in Dave Fiedler, "Adventism and Walter Martin, Part Four: January-June, 1989," *Our Firm Foundation*, February 1990, pp. 21, 30. In Fiedler's article a comment on the last ellipsis was inserted in the text, but is omitted here.

¹⁷Having agreed with Martin and Cannon at "the crucial point" (Heb 9:8-12), one can only consider Heppenstall's extensive rebuttal of their position in *Ministry* magazine an exercise in theological diplomacy. We are not called to be Christ's diplomats, but His ambassadors. The prototypical example of this is John the Baptist. There was nothing remotely diplomatic about his message. He just told the truth.

¹⁸See Hardy, "The Problem of the First Apartment in Seventh-day Adventist Sanctuary Theology," *Historicism* No. 17/Jan 89, pp. 2-17.

¹⁹The two verses (9:11, 12) say identically the same thing. Christ "went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made" (vs. 11). In chap. 8 this structure is called "the true tabernacle set up by the Lord, not by man" (8:2). It serves as a "pattern" for the two-apartment "copy and shadow of what is heaven" (8:5) made by Moses and his assistants. In vs. 12 Christ "entered the Most Holy Place" (NIV), from *ta hagia*, lit., "the holies"--i.e., the two holies, consisting of a first and a second apartment, just as in the earthly type. This assertion goes beyond what we find in Heb 6:19-20. There He simply enters heaven. Here He enters a sanctuary in heaven. But we are still not talking about which part of that sanctuary He ministers in first. The book of Hebrews does not address that question. For such additional information we must consult the books of Daniel and Leviticus.

²⁰Verse 24 must be taken in the context of vs. 23. In vs. 23 we have not "heaven itself" but "heavenly things," i.e., things in heaven, things that one part of heaven but not the whole. If we make the heavenly sanctuary into something no more specific than heaven in general, we also make the earthly copy of that sanctuary into a copy of heaven in general. Thus, all heaven is portrayed in the sanctuary. Or, putting the same thing another way, there is nothing more in heaven than what we find portrayed in the sanctuary--on a grander scale, to be sure, but nothing more on that grander scale than what we find on a lesser scale in the sanctuary. No one would make such a claim. So let us avoid getting ourselves into exegetical corners. The type is a reflection of the antitype, but the reality it is a reflection of will be only one small part of what we find when we get to heaven. There is more in heaven than a temple. Indeed, by the time we get to heaven there will be no temple (see Rev 21:22).

²¹In a footnote to Heb 9:21 NIV gives Exod 24:8 as a reference. But what Moses sprinkled in Exod 24:8 was not the sanctuary or anything used in its ceremonies, much less everything used there. It was a stone altar erected at the base of Mount Sinai with "twelve stone pillars representing the twelve tribes of Israel" (Exod 24:4). That is not what the author of Hebrews was talking about. Similarly, Exod 29:16 and 20 deal only with the altar outside the sanctuary in the court. The sprinkling mentioned in Heb 9:21 brings to mind the events of Exod 40, where anointing oil was used rather than blood: "Take the anointing oil and anoint the tabernacle and everything in it; consecrate it and all its furnishings, and it will be holy" (Exod 40:9). In Exod 40 all the articles of the sanctuary are enumerated.

²²Ford, "Daniel 8:14 and the Day of Atonement," *Spectrum* 11:2 (November 1980), p. 33).

²³See Hardy, "The Problem of the First Apartment in Seventh-day Adventist Sanctuary Theology," *Historicism* No. 17/Jan 89, pp. 2-17; "A Context for the Sanctuary Terminology of Ezek 41," *Historicism* No. 20/Oct 89, pp. 49-50, 69-70.

²⁴This does not mean that there was a sanctuary on earth before there was one in heaven. Heb 8:5 will not allow such an interpretation. But the one on earth was to be superseded by the one in heaven.

²⁵See n. 13 above.

²⁶See Hardy, "*w'nišdaq* in Dan 8:14, Part 3: The Context of Atonement," *Historicism* No. 5/Jan 86, pp. 32-37.

²⁷See Hardy, "Jerusalem Symbolism," *Historicism* No. 24/Oct 90, pp. 34-36.