

WHY IS THE BOOK OF HEBREWS A PROBLEM FOR SDA'S?

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
We should learn from the mistakes of others-	1
Revelation 10	2
Revelation 14	2
Revelation 3	3
Albion F. Ballenger and Heb 6	3
Walter Martin and Heb 9	5
An embarrassing failure	5
So what went wrong?.....	6
Discussion	10
Discussion: Significance of the Issues	10
Conclusion	11
END NOTES:	12
APPENDIX A.....	15
Table 1 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:1-10.....	7
Table 2 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:11-28.....	8

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 His 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. 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.

We should learn 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/year 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 before and during 1844 and there is a sound biblical precedent for what they underwent in the disciples' disappointment after Christ's death. In this comparison the years immediately prior to 1844 correspond to the years that the disciples spent with Jesus 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 really 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 gross misunderstanding of His mission), we should not lightly set aside the insights of those who went through a similar experience involving identically the same issues in 1844.**

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 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 in question 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 actually perform the work of proclamation that many of the Millerites became too discouraged to do.

Revelation 14

Notice that 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 angels message says:

⁶ And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, ⁷ Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. (Rev 14:6-7)

Both messages emphasized the creatorship of God, both are given by an angel or angels, 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 the entire text of both passages, with similar emphases.

Revelation 3

Another passage that should be mentioned here is the letter to Philadelphia, in which 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) . Something happens during the time in question to make it seem (incorrectly) that God had not loved His faithful remnant. Whatever that might be it makes 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 (the last of the seven churches) begins? 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? When we finish answering these questions we will have a better idea of the prophetic credentials with which the Millerite experience in and around 1844 comes down to us in the New Testament.

From the foregoing discussion I conclude that whatever valid insights those might achieve who knowingly reject the message of 1844, there is none that would justify rejecting it. So if such persons do genuinely see something in crucial passages of Scripture and yet interpret it wrongly, my question is, How can we interpret it right? How can we benefit from the legitimate insights of those we otherwise know to be wrong?

Albion F. Ballenger and Heb 6

⁹ 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)

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 friendlier 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. Is it 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 he is still there when we finish. Ballenger deserves both more and less attention than this. 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 down to such later conservative scholars as A. L. Andreasen¹¹--what we have challenged (or avoided) 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 we are not ready at this point in the book 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 through the first apartment. When did Christ minister in that apartment if He entered the second apartment 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 supposes¹² Then the type of the first apartment is itself 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 other 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 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 He went to one specified 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 at Controversy, pp. 420-21, which offended Ballenger so badly.

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. 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 just 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 can be expected to contain (chap. 9). But let each thing be taken in its proper order. The authors thought unfolds gradually.

Walter Martin and Heb 9

(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) NIV

¹¹ But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

¹² Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*. KJV

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 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

At the outset we can be sure that the Holy Spirit is not trying to deny in Hebrews what He has asserted previously in Daniel. We must know how to relate the one book to the other without forcing them to have identically the same point of view. They do not. But both are the work of the same Spirit and as such they must be allowed to speak with one voice, even when they express themselves with differing emphases. The two sources do not contradict each other. That is the main point to draw from all of this. If we do not know how to bring the various passages together in a cohesive manner, we do not understand what they mean. It is that simple.

So what went wrong?

Our argument 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 has two apartments. But assuming there is a sanctuary in heaven and if it has two apartments, Christ ministers in its second one. This is not the problem. 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. Thus, the position we are at pains to defend is that Christ performs a first apartment ministry first and a second apartment ministry second. If this is so, then the two phases of His work for us in heaven before and after 1844 serve different though complementary functions and contrast with each other in important ways, with all that that implies.¹⁸

It is the work of the little horn to take the "daily" away (see Dan 8:11). Seventh-day Adventists refuse to accept any position which does this. Does the book of Hebrews give aid and comfort to the little horn in the above work? Seventh-day Adventists reject that premise as well. 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 fight His Spirit. He is not divided against Himself (see Luke 11:17-20).

What does the text say?. Chapter nine divides naturally into two parts, one of which describes, while the other explains, certain features of the sanctuary. Structurally the dividing line between the two sections comes at vs. 11. Thus, with exceptions as noted below, vss. 1-10 are the description and vss. 11-28 the explanation.

Below I argue that the author uses his terms differently in these two sections. They do not disagree but should be distinguished from each other nevertheless. Thus, to determine what the text of Heb 9 says it is imperative that we keep straight which part of the text says it.

The Greek word skene occurs in both parts of the chapter--in Heb 9:2, 3, 6, 8, 11, and 21. In vss. 2, 3, and 6 it obviously refers to the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary as contrasted with the second apartment. In vs. 8 the reference is no longer to the earthly sanctuary and so there is a question how skene is used there. The real issue, however, is how the word is used in vs. 11, which in turn will largely determine our understanding of vs. 12--the passage on which Murdoch and Heppenstall were challenged in the narrative quoted above.

Another term used in chap. 9 is hagion "holy [place]," also hagia (plural) "holy [places]." This is the word used in vs. 12. But it also occurs in vss. 1, 2, 3, 8, 24, and 25. In vs. 1 it is singular and refers to the entire earthly sanctuary. In vs. 2 the first apartment of that sanctuary is called Hagia. And in vs. 3 the second apartment is called, Hagia Hagion.

Thus, in vss. 1-7, where the reference is clearly to things on earth, forms of the same word hagion "holy" (= "sanctuary"), Hagia "Holies," or Hagia Hagion ("Holies of Holies") span the gamut semantically, referring in turn to the structure as a whole and to both of its parts. In the latter cases the word is used as a name so those two references might be considered unusual. Apart from their names, however, when either apartment is referred to individually the word used is skene "tent." There is a first "tent" (skene . . . he prcte, vs. 2) and a second "tent" (ten deuteron skenen], 9:7). These facts are summarized in table 1.

Table 1 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:1-10

Ref.	Term	Literally	Aramaic Peshitta
FIRST APARTMENT			
9:2	Skene.....he prote	The first tent	The first tabernacle
9:2	Hagia	Holies	The sanctuary
9:6	Ten proten skenen	The first tent	Outer tabernacle
SECOND APARTMENT			
9:3	Skene	Tent	Tabernacle
9:3	Hagia hagion	Holies of Holies	The Holy of Holies
9:7	Ten deuteran(skenen)	The second (tent)	Inner Tabernacle
OTHER SANCTUARIES			
9:1	Hagion kosmikon	Earthly sanctuary	Earthly Sanctuary
9:8	Ton hagion	Of the holies	To the Holy Things
9:8	Tes protes skenes	The first tent	First Tabernacle

The Aramaic Peshitta translation agrees with the position of this paper. It is taken from the actual language spoken by Jesus and the Apostles. See APPENDIX A for actual text.

NOTE: In citing Heb 9:7 I have supplied the word skenen "tent" from context.

As regards the two terms from Heb 9:8, I have separated them from the references to the earthly sanctuary as being on a different level, which they obviously are, and have put them together as being counterparts of each other without creating a fourth category. We return to vs. 8 below.

In vss. 11-28 at least this much is clear: One group of passages describes earthly things (whatever those things are) and another group describes heavenly things (again without saying what they are in advance). See table 2.

Table 2 SANCTUARY TERMINOLOGY IN HEB 9:11-28

Ref	Term	Literally	Aramaic Peshitta
Things on Earth			
9:21 9:24	ten skenen eis cheiropoieta antitupa	the tent into hand-made holies copy	The Tabernacle Sanctuary that was made by hands
Things in Heaven			
9:11 9:12 9:24	tes meizonos kai teleioterass skenes ou cheiropoiētou ta hagia ton alethinon [hagion]	of the greater and more perfect tent not hand-made the holies of the true [holies]	The great and perfect tabernacle not made by hands The Sanctuary of that True Sanctuary
Other: Apartments			
9:25	ta hagia	the holies	The Sanctuary

What does the text mean? In table 2, one of two references to things on earth uses skene "tent" (see vss. 8, 21) and two of three references to things in heaven use ta hagia "the holies" (see vss. 8, 12). But in vs. 24 the "man-made sanctuary" is called ta hagia and in vs. 11 the "greater and more perfect tabernacle" is called skene. **Thus, unless we give the "greater and more perfect tabernacle" an earthly application or the "manmade sanctuary" a heavenly application, we will have to conclude that the terms hagion and skene are being used interchangeably.**

In vss. 1-10 the distinction is primarily between apartments, whereas in vss. 11-28 it is between earthly things and heavenly things--whatever those might be. The terms are the same in both sections but they are used differently. Thus, in vs. 11 "the greater and more perfect tabernacle skene" is not the first apartment and vs. 12 "the Most Holy Place [ta hagia]"--despite all appearances to the contrary based on its mistranslation in NIV and some other versions--is not the second apartment.¹⁹ It is not a matter of choosing apartments. That is not the distinction.

NOTE: In citing Heb 9:24 I have supplied the word hagion "holies" from context.

In support of this conclusion, notice that the first group of references within vss. 11-28 corresponds to men hupodeigmata ton en tois ouranois ("the copies of heavenly things," vs. 23) and the second group corresponds to epourania ("the heavenly things themselves," vs. 23), also auton ton ouranon ("heaven itself," vs. 24).²⁰

None of us has seen the heavenly sanctuary but, as regards the corresponding earthly sanctuary, what we are talking about here is all of it.

First, with regard to vs. 21 ("In the same way, he sprinkled with the blood both the tabernacle [ten skenen] and everything used in its ceremonies"), the word is skene (accusative skenen) "tent." **Does skene refer only to the first apartment here? The sprinkling of blood was an act of consecration. Was only the first apartment consecrated for use?**

Second, with regard to vs. 24a ("a man-made sanctuary [cheiropoieta . . . hagia]"), **how much of the ancient sanctuary was man-made? Desmond Ford, addressing the point before us, writes, "I argue that the expression ta hagia, 'the holies,' of Hebrews 9:3, 8, 12, 24, 25, Hebrews 10:19, and Hebrews 13:11 is a plural with singular meaning; it refers exclusively to the Most Holy Place."²²**

This is one of the verses he cites. **Is it true that ta hagia refers "exclusively to the Most Holy Place" in Heb 9:24? Was only the second apartment man-made? How did the first apartment come into existence? And consider Heb 8:5, which says, "This is why Moses was warned when he was about to build the tabernacle: 'See to it that you make everything according to the pattern shown you on the mountain.'" If the assertion needs demonstrating, Heb 8:5 shows that Moses and the people with him were to "'make everything," i.e., every part of the structure about to be built. The reason why God was speaking to Moses at all in the above passage was to commission him to build it. The whole structure was man-made.**

But then what does that do to the rest of his argument? Or that of George Cannon? Or whomever? The issue is not one of personalities. **Why should we not interpret ta hagia as a plural with plural meaning? What grammatical facts would prevent us from doing that and what implications would follow as a result? Clearly the term does refer to both apartments of the earthly sanctuary in Heb 9:24. If this is so, by what logic can we argue that it does not also refer to both apartments of the heavenly sanctuary in Heb 9:12?**

And third, with regard to vs. 24b ("that was only a copy [antitupa] of the true one"), how much of the ancient sanctuary was a copy of the true one? According to Heb 8:3-6 we must bring the whole sanctuary into this comparison, omitting none of its major features. In my view the distinction between two apartments qualifies as a major feature.

³ For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. ⁴ For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: ⁵ Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, *that* thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.

⁶ But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant^b, which was established upon better promises. (Heb 8:3-6)

The contrast in much of Heb 9:1-10 is between two apartments. (This is not the case in vs. 8.) The contrast in Heb 9:11-28, on the other hand, is between two sanctuaries--the first on earth, the second in heaven. Human priests minister in the one, Christ ministers in the other. There is an old covenant governing the entire earthly cultus and a new covenant governing the entire heavenly cultus--the entire system of Christian worship. Why are these things so hard to understand? The contrast is simple and clear and as distinct as the difference between heaven and earth.

More on vss. 8. In this context the words tes protes skenes refer in vs. 6 to an apartment (the first apartment) but in vs. 8 to a sanctuary (the first or earthly sanctuary). The same words occur in both passages but they are used differently. Despite the fact that vs. 8 is structurally in the first part of the chapter, this conclusion is required by the words, "The Holy Spirit was showing by this . . ." (vs. 8). Whenever the author deals with heavenly things, as in vs. 8, he contrasts them with earthly things. What Christ enters ("the Most Holy Place" [NIV], lit. "holy places") is in heaven. By contrast, what He does not enter ("the first tabernacle") is on earth.

Verse 8 is an isolated example of the contrast between the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries in a section which deals mostly with the contrast between apartments in the earthly sanctuary. Similarly, vs. 25 ("the way the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood that is not his own") is an isolated example of the contrast between two apartments in a section which deals mostly with the

^b covenant: or, testament

contrast between sanctuaries. But the rule that these exceptions are exceptions to is that vss. 1-10 has in view a contrast between apartments while vss. 11-28 has in view a contrast between sanctuaries.

Discussion

In this context it can be seen that it was a fatal error on the part of Heppenstall and Murdoch to allow the discussion to stop at vss. 11-12. That is just where it should have begun in earnest. When the literary structure of the chapter is taken into account--and it is always unwise not to take it into account--the most appropriate context for the terms used in vss. 11-12 is not what precedes but what follows.²⁵ If the second part of the chapter had been given the same level of attention as the first, or had received any attention at all, the above encounter would have ended differently than it did.

Let me clarify that I do not wish to dissociate the sacrifices offered on the day of atonement from what happened on the cross. If all the sacrifices in the ancient sanctuary pointed forward to Jesus, then those offered on the day of atonement would certainly be included. But my point is that all the others must not be excluded. No blood offered in the sanctuary at any time throughout the ceremonial year can have any conceivable reference other than to Christ on the cross. There is only one sacrifice for sin. But many different types and symbols of it occupied the priests throughout the entire ceremonial year, not on one day only (see Heb 1:1). Let us not omit any of them. In this context it should be clear that when a biblical writer relates the day of atonement sacrifices to Jesus' death on the cross, that does not imply that the day when Jesus died on the cross was the antitypical day of atonement.

Discussion: Significance of the Issues

Seventh-day Adventists base their expectation that Christ will soon return on their understanding of His second apartment ministry just before His coming. If we were to extend the beginning of His second apartment ministry back two thousand years in time, we could just as easily extend the end of it forward two thousand years. In this way the nearness of the second coming loses all its meaning. If such an interpretation does not imply, "My master is staying away a long time" (Matt 24:48), what kind of interpretation would?

Nor does forcing a first apartment ministry into the second apartment make it a second apartment ministry. In their respective functions the two ministries are polls apart. They serve different, though complementary, functions. By transferring the function of the first apartment into the second apartment, we make the end time endless and remove any value that term might have had. More importantly we remove the immediacy of the second coming and defer it indefinitely. Doing this does not reflect a biblical perspective.

If Christ ministers not only for all time but for all eternity, He will never reach a point where He can stop ministering and return to the earth. But in this event we will never be with the Lord because the promise that we will be with Him corresponds to His promise that He will come again. So if we deny the nearness of the second coming, we must either give up our hope of being with Christ in heaven any time soon or find some other way of going there. The popular view is that we go to be with the Lord immediately at the moment of death. In this way Christ need never come--at least He would never need to come in order for His people to be with Him in heaven. Evangelicals assert that He will return, but it is an isolated assertion. There is nothing in their understanding of the sanctuary or the state of the dead which requires this.

The above theory appears to solve one problem but in fact it creates another. What do we do with the resurrection, having rendered unnecessary the second coming which makes it possible? That there will a resurrection is firmly biblical. But if we can be free from the prison house of flesh at the point of death, why should we look forward to being sent back into it at the resurrection of the body when Jesus comes? In such a model the second coming becomes positively distasteful--something not to look

forward to but to dread. There is nothing biblical about this perspective either. Paul looks forward with longing to what Jesus will do on "that day," i.e., on the day when He returns in glory:

⁸ Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.(2 Tim 4:8)

There is no second method for getting to heaven (see 1 Thess 4:17). We do not go there automatically when we die. And because there is not any other way, His return ought to be something we look forward to with eager anticipation, as Paul did. Let me add that understanding the theory behind it ought to be something we try to make work instead of trying to frustrate or evade.

The end of what we now have should be a welcome thing in view of the reward to which we look forward. I have believe that the church is the heir of all the promises and blessings given to Abraham. Just here is the proper context for this claim. Our reward is Christ-to be with Him and to enjoy all the blessings that He has inherited on our behalf. We should desire not His possessions but Him (see 2 Cor 12:14).

¹ After these things the word of the LORD came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I *am* thy shield, *and* thy exceeding great reward.(Gen 15:1)

The sanctuary--and especially those features of the sanctuary that some object to most strenuously, i.e., those which deal with bringing the ceremonial year to a final end---represents this same promise through types and shadows. The end of what we have now is the beginning of what we are soon to receive. And what we are to receive, above all else, is the unbroken privilege of companionship with Jesus. These are not teachings that any Christian should want to obscure or resist. On the contrary, they should be grasped and laid under heavy emphasis. If the sanctuary implies that an end will come, then let it remind us of that precious promise.

Conclusion

I believe the following.

First, Heb 6:19-20 has in view only the fact that Christ is in heaven, and not His relative location within the heavenly sanctuary once He arrives there. I challenge the assumption that Heb 6 is speaking of what we call the heavenly sanctuary--a physical structure in heaven. On biblical evidence there is a physical sanctuary structure in heaven, but here our author is not talking about it. Even if he were, the distinction between apartments is not systematically introduced until later, in chap. 9.

And second, Heb 9:11-12 tells us the sanctuary, not the apartment, where Christ ministers upon His ascension. That sanctuary is in heaven. The contrast throughout the second part of chap. 9 is between heaven and earth. The same thought carries over into chap. 11.

¹³ These all died in faith^c, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. ¹⁴ For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. ¹⁵ And truly, if they had been mindful of that *country* from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. ¹⁶ But now they desire a better *country*, that is, an heavenly:

^c in faith: Gr. according to faith

wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.(Heb 11:13-16)

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. From this it follows that Seventh-day Adventists should not try to use Hebrews to prove that the events of 1844 are biblical, nor should it be used by those critical of the Seventh-day Adventist position to prove that those same events are not biblical.

It is good to realize that there are two apartments (see Heb 9:1-7) but that is not the authors emphasis in vss. 11-28. It is enough here to show that what the Holy Spirit led the author of Hebrews to write is consistent with what He led Daniel to write. These two men had different points of view and expressed themselves differently. But they do not contradict each other.

Having said this, let me clarify that the agreement between the above books is an underlying agreement. It does not always lie on the surface. If nothing new needs to be added to our understanding of Heb 6 and 9 in order to articulate this view, 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 so far. 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 penetrate our minds. To the extent that we do this we can advance in knowledge and yet remain on safe ground theologically.

END NOTES:

1. It 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?

2. Here 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.

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).

4. This 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.

5. The 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.

6. See Roy Adams, The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1981), pp. 95-104.

7. Quoted in William G. Johnsson, "The Significance of the Day of Atonement Allusions in the Epistle to the Hebrews," Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner, eds., The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical and Theological Studies (Washington, D.C.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1981), p. 39, n. 28

8. *Ibid.*, p. 393.

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

10. Andross, 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 authors success must be measured.

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

12. No 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 he-prote skene. 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.

13. Mountain 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, then 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 Whites comments on the passage.

14. *Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1957.*

15. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1960.

16. Quoted 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 elipsis was inserted in the text, but is omitted here.

17. Having 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.

18. See Hardy, "The Problem of the First Apartment in Seventhday Adventist Sanctuary Theology," *Historicism* No. 17/Jan 89, pp. 217.

19. **The 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.**

20. **Verse 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 are in 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 in reality it is a reflection of 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).**

21. In 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 12 all the articles of the sanctuary are enumerated.

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

23. See Hardy, "The Problem of the First Apartment in Seventhday 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.

24. This 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 superceded by the one in heaven.

25. See n. 13 above.

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

APPENDIX A

The following are photo copies of the relevant verses from interlinear Aramaic Peshitta. It is a vertical interlinear translation with the normal view at the beginning of the text. These photo copies go along with Table 1 and Table 2 above.

Vertical Interlinear

HEBREWS		CHAPTER 6			
0716	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	so he bound it	0173	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	the veil
1060	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	with oaths	2718	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	.
VERSE 18		that by two things that are unchangeable in which God is not able to lie, we who have sought refuge in him may have great comfort and may hold fast to the hope that was promised to us.	VERSE 20		where Jesus previously entered for us and became a priest forever in the likeness of Melchisedec.
2709	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	that by two	1220	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	where
2078	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	things	2150	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	previously
1262	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	that are unchangeable	1796	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	entered
0811	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	.	0812	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	for us
1262	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	not	3257	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	Jesus
2510	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	is able	0603	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	and became
0093	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	God	1146	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	a priest
0485	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	to lie	1813	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	forever
0217	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	in which	0542	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	in the likeness
0263	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	comfort	3317	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	of Melchisedec
2271	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	great	CHAPTER 7		
0603	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	we may have	VERSE 1		Now this Melchisedec was king of Salem, a priest of the Most High God. And he met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him.
1261	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	.	0598	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	this
0384	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	who have sought refuge	0518	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	Now
0217	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	in him	3317	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	Melchisedec
0047	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	and may hold fast to	0069	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	was
1592	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	the hope	1383	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	king of
1381	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	that was promised	3517	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	Salem
1261	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	to us	1146	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	a priest
VERSE 19		which we have as an anchor that holds our soul, so that it is not shaken and it enters within the veil.	0093	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	of God
0593	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	which	2333	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	the Most High
0069	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	we have	0592	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	And <was>
1261	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	.	0197	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	he met
0060	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	as	3005	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	Abraham
0036	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	an anchor	1128	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	returning
1271	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	that holds	0616	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	.
1547	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	our soul	1388	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	from
1262	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	so that not	0893	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	the slaughter
0657	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	it is shaken	1383	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	of the kings
1796	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	and it enters	0335	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	and blessed him
0379	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	within			
1388	ܘܫܒܘܢܐ	.			

Vertical Interlinear

HEBREWS

CHAPTER 8

0323	לְחֵיב	HIS FELLOW-CITIZEN	CHAPTER	9	
0499	וְעַתָּה	*	VERSE	1	
0170	אוֹדֹם	OR EVEN		Now in the first [covenant] there were ordinances of service and an earthly sanctuary.	
0043	אֶחָיו	HIS BROTHER	2157	בְּהַבְרִית הַבְּרִיחָה	in the first [covenant]
0116	וְיֹאמֵר	AND SAY	0518	עַתָּה	Now
1023	יָדָעוּ	KNOW	0069	שָׁמָּה	there were
1426	יְהוָה	THE LORD	0603	וְעַתָּה	*
1347	כִּי	BECAUSE	0217	וְעַתָּה	<in it>
1168	כָּל	ALL	2008	הַמִּצְוֹת	ordinances
1023	יֵדְעוּ	WILL KNOW ME	2556	וְעַתָּה	of service
1388	מִ	FROM	0243	וְעַתָּה	and sanctuary
0686	הַיָּשָׁרִים	THE YOUNGEST OF THEM	2164	וְעַתָּה	*
1747	עַד	UP TO	1815	וְעַתָּה	an earthly
2263	הַבְּרִיחָה	THE OLDEST	VERSE	2	
VERSE	12	AND I WILL FREE THEM FROM THEIR WICKEDNESS AND I WILL NOT REMEMBER THEIR SINS AGAIN.		For the first tabernacle that was made had a candlestick and a table and show-bread, and it was called the sanctuary	
0851	וְעַתָּה	AND I WILL FREE	2512	וְעַתָּה	the tabernacle
0592	מֵהֶם	THEM	0403	כִּי	For
1388	מִ	FROM	2157	בְּהַבְרִית	first
1766	מִפְּשָׁעֵיהֶם	THEIR WICKEDNESS	1724	הַבְּרִיחָה	that was made
0771	וְעַתָּה	AND THEIR SINS	0069	שָׁמָּה	had
2650	עַד	AGAIN	0603	וְעַתָּה	*
1262	כִּי	NOT	0217	וְעַתָּה	*
0527	אֶזְכֹּר	I WILL REMEMBER	1402	וְעַתָּה	a candlestick
1261	לָהֶם	<to them>	2069	וְעַתָּה	and a table
VERSE	13	By that which he called new, he made the first old, and that which is outdated and old is near to corruption.	1293	וְעַתָּה	and show-bread
0593	בְּ	By that	0173	כִּי	*
0116	הַבְּרִיחָה	which he called	2239	וְעַתָּה	and it was called
0735	הַבְּרִיחָה	new	0603	וְעַתָּה	*
2157	בְּהַבְרִית הַבְּרִיחָה	the first	0243	וְעַתָּה	the sanctuary
1916	וְעַתָּה	he made old	2164	וְעַתָּה	*
0066	וְעַתָּה	and that	VERSE	3	
1916	הַבְּרִיחָה	which is outdated		And the inner tabernacle that was behind the second veil was called the holy of holies.	
1577	וְעַתָּה	and old	2512	וְעַתָּה	tabernacle
2248	עַד	is near	0518	וְעַתָּה	And
0592	וְעַתָּה	*	0377	וְעַתָּה	the inner
0703	לְפְשָׁעֵיהֶם	to corruption	0379	וְעַתָּה	that was behind
			1388	וְעַתָּה	*
			0173	וְעַתָּה	veil

2718	שֵׁנִי	*	VERSE 5	and on top of it, cherubim of glory that were overshadowing the mercy seat.	
2709	שֵׁנִי	the second		But there is not time to speak about each one of these [things] that were so arranged.	
2239	קָרוֹבִים	was called			
3603	קֹדֶשׁ	*	1803	וְעַל	and on top
2164	קֹדֶשׁ	the holy of	1388	עָלָיו	of it
2164	קֹדֶשׁ	holies	1224	כְּרוּבִים	cherubim
VERSE 4		And in it there was the censer of gold and the ark of the covenant that was completely overlaid with gold and it had a pot of gold that had the manna and the rod of Aaron that sprouted and the tablets of the covenant,	2431	וְעַל	of glory
2089	וְהָיָה	And there was	0970	וְעַל	that were overshadowing
3603	קֹדֶשׁ	*	1804	עָלָיו	*
217	בָּהּ	in it	0852	קִרְבַּן	the mercy seat
243	הַזֶּה	the censer	1262	לֹא	not
291	זָהָב	*	0603	וְהָיָה	<was>
489	זָהָב	of gold	0518	כִּי	But
133	וְהָאֲרוֹן	and the ark	0633	זְמַן	time
520	הַבְּרִית	of the covenant	0592	וְהָיָה	there is
254	הַזֶּה	that was overlaid	0116	לְדַבֵּר	to speak
168	כֻּלָּהּ	completely	1804	עָלָיו	about
489	זָהָב	with gold	0721	אֶחָד	each one
069	וְהָיָה	and it had	0721	מֵהֵם	*
217	בָּהּ	*	1388	וְהָיָה	of
225	קִי	a pot	0598	כֵּן	these [things]
489	זָהָב	of gold	0597	וְעַל	that so
593	וְהָיָה	that	2699	קָרוֹבִים	were arranged
069	הָיָה	had	0603	וְהָיָה	*
603	קֹדֶשׁ	*	VERSE 6	And into the outer tabernacle the priests were always entering and performing their service.	
217	בָּהּ	*	2512	וְעַל	And into the tabernacle
400	מַנָּה	the manna	0321	הַחוּצָה	outer
433	וְהָרֹד	and the rod	1170	כִּלְמַד	always
313	אֲרוֹן	of Aaron	1796	כִּלְמַד	were entering
593	וְהָיָה	that	0603	וְהָיָה	*
337	וְהָיָה	sprouted	1146	כֹּהֲנִים	the priests
283	וְהָיָה	and the tablets	2530	וְעַל	and performing
520	וְהָיָה	of the covenant	0603	וְהָיָה	*
			2556	וְעַל	their service

HEBREWS

CHAPTER 9

VERSE 7	But into the inner tabernacle once a year the high priest entered alone with the blood that he offered for himself and for the wrong-doing of the people.	0069	הָיָה	was
		0603	וְ	*
		2174	קָמַם	standing
2512	לְמִשְׁכָּן	2512	לְמִשְׁכָּן	the tabernacle
0518	כִּי	2157	בְּרִשְׁתּוֹ	first
0379	בְּפִנְיֹה	VERSE 9	This was a symbol for that time, in which offerings and sacrifices were offered that were not able to perfect the conscience of him who offered them,	
1388	וְ	0069	וְהָיָה	was
0721	בְּרִשְׁתּוֹ	0603	וְ	*
0592	וְהָיָה	1454	וְהָיָה	a symbol
2559	שָׁנָה	0598	זֶה	This
1041	בְּלִישְׁתּוֹ	0633	לְ	for time
1796	בָּרָא	0593	וְ	that
0603	וְ	0217	בְּ	in which
2278	הַכֹּהֵן	2246	וְהָיָה	offerings
0539	בְּדַמְּוֹ	0474	וְהָיָה	and sacrifices
0593	וְ	2244	וְהָיָה	were offered
2244	וְהָיָה	0603	וְ	*
0603	וְ	0066	וְ	<those>
0812	לְ	1262	וְ	that not
1547	לְעַצְמוֹ	2510	וְהָיָה	were able
0812	וְ	0603	וְ	*
1652	לְעוֹשֵׂי	0423	וְ	to perfect
1818	הָעָם	2629	וְהָיָה	the conscience
VERSE 8	Now by this, the Holy Spirit was making known that the way to the holy [things] was not yet revealed, as long as the first tabernacle was standing.	1389	וְ	of him
		2244	וְהָיָה	who offered
0598	בְּזֶה	1261	וְ	them
0518	כִּי	VERSE 10	but [were] only in food and drink and in washings of various kinds that are commandments of the flesh that were established until the time of a reformation.	
1023	וְהָיָה	0090	וְ	but [were]
0603	וְ	0080	וְ	in food
2323	רוּחַ	2622	וְ	and drink
2164	קֹדֶשׁ	1041	וְ	only
1262	וְ	1821	וְ	and in washings
0409	וְהָיָה	0678	וְ	of various kinds
1745	וְ	0678	וְ	*
0038	וְהָיָה			
2162	וְהָיָה			
1188	וְ			
0633	וְ			

HEBREWS

CHAPTER 9

0069 **כִּי** that are
 2008 **צִוִּיּוֹת** commandments
 0294 **בְּחֵלֶם** of the flesh
 1625 **אֲשֶׁר** that were established
 1747 **עַד** until
 0633 **לְזֶמַּן** the time
 2721 **מִתְּחִילָה** of a reformation
VERSE 11 Now Christ who has come [was] a high priest of the good [things] that he did. And he entered the great and perfect tabernacle that was not made by hands and was not of these created [things].

1446 **יֵשׁוּעַ** Christ
 0518 **עַתָּה** Now
 0208 **הַיֹּשֵׁב** who has come
 0603 **כִּי** *
 2278 **הַיֹּשֵׁב** [was] a high priest
 0938 **דֵּי** of the good [things]
 1684 **אֲשֶׁר** that he did
 1796 **וַיָּבֵא** And he entered
 2612 **לְהַקְדִּישׁ** the tabernacle
 2271 **הַגָּדוֹל** great
 2532 **וְהַתְּמִימִם** and perfect
 1262 **כִּי** that not
 1724 **עָשָׂה** was made
 0057 **בְּיָדַי** by hands
 1262 **וְכִי** and not
 0603 **הָיָה** was
 1388 **מֵאֵלֶּיךָ** of
 0598 **אֵלֶּיךָ** these
 0331 **אֲשֶׁר** created [things]

VERSE 12 And he did not enter with the blood of goats or of calves, but with his own blood, he entered the sanctuary one time and obtained redemption forever.
 1262 **כִּי** And not
 1796 **וַיָּבֵא** he did enter
 0539 **בְּחֵלֶם** with the blood
 2126 **בְּחֵלֶם** of goats
 1739 **וְעֵלֶם** or of calves
 0090 **כִּי** but

0539 **בְּחֵלֶם** with blood
 1547 **בְּחֵלֶם** his own
 1796 **וַיָּבֵא** he entered
 0721 **אֶחָד** one
 0633 **זְמַן** time
 0243 **לְהַקְדִּישׁ** the sanctuary
 2161 **כִּי** *
 2510 **וַיִּשְׁלַח** and obtained
 2043 **מִגְדָּלוֹת** redemption
 1813 **לְעֹלָם** forever

VERSE 13 For if the blood of goats and of calves and the ash of a heifer was sprinkled on those who were defiled and it made them holy to the cleansing of their flesh,
 0121 **כִּי** if
 0403 **לְכַלֵּי** For
 0539 **בְּחֵלֶם** the blood
 2126 **בְּחֵלֶם** of goats
 1739 **וְעֵלֶם** and of calves
 2182 **וְעֵלֶם** and the ash
 1740 **וְעֵלֶם** of a heifer
 2378 **מִגְדָּלוֹת** was sprinkled
 0603 **כִּי** *
 1804 **עַל** on
 0066 **אֵלֶּיךָ** those
 0984 **הַיֹּשֵׁב** who were defiled
 0603 **כִּי** *
 2160 **וַיִּשְׁלַח** and it made holy
 1261 **לְכַלֵּי** them
 0522 **בְּחֵלֶם** to the cleansing
 0294 **מִגְדָּלוֹת** of their flesh

VERSE 14 then how much more will the blood of Christ, who by the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, cleanse our conscience from dead works that we may serve the living God?
 1188 **כִּי** how much
 0596 **אֲזַי** then
 1101 **כִּי** more
 0539 **בְּחֵלֶם** the blood
 1446 **יֵשׁוּעַ** of Christ

HEBREWS

CHAPTER 9

0542	הַיְהוֹדוּת	that a type	VERSE 25	Neither [was it necessary] to offer	
0592	הֵם	are		himself many times, as the high priest	
2544	הַשָּׁמַיִם	of the heavenly [things]		did when he entered the sanctuary	
0598	אֵלֵיהֶם	with those [things]		every year with blood that [was] not his	
0521	יִטְהַרְרוּ	should be purified	0170	אֵלֵיהֶם	Neither [was it necessary]
0598	אֵלֵיהֶם	these	2244	אֵלָיו	to offer
0518	וְ	and	1547	לְעַצְמוֹ	himself
2544	הַשָּׁמַיִם	heavenly [things]	0633	רַבּוֹתַיִם	times
0474	בְּזִבְחֵי	by sacrifices	1596	רַבּוֹתַיִם	many
1104	הַשָּׁמַיִם	that are more excellent	0060	כַּאֲשֶׁר	as
1388	מֵאֵלֵיהֶם	than	1724	עָשָׂה	did
0598	אֵלֵיהֶם	those	0603	וְ	*
VERSE 24		For Christ did not enter the sanctuary	2271	זֶה	the high priest
		that was made by hands that was a type	1146	וְ	*
		of that true [one], but he entered into	1796	כִּי	when he entered
		heaven to appear before the presence	1168	בְּכָל	<in> every
		of God for us.	2559	שָׁנָה	year
1262	וְ	not	0243	לְבֵית	the sanctuary
0603	וְהָיָה	<was>	2161	וְ	*
0403	כִּי	For	0539	בְּדָמָיו	with blood
0243	לְבֵית	the sanctuary	1262	וְ	that [was] not
2161	וְהָיָה	*	0517	לְעַצְמוֹ	his own
1724	בְּיָדָיו	that was made	VERSE 26	Otherwise, it would be required that he	
0057	בְּיָדָיו	by hands		should suffer many times since the	
1796	כִּי	did enter		beginning of the age. But now in the end	
1446	יֵשׁוּעַ	Christ		of the age, he has offered himself one	
0069	וְ	that was		time by his sacrificing to abolish sin.	
0542	הַיְהוֹדוּת	a type	0121	אֲלֵכֶם	Otherwise
0593	הַזֶּה	of that	1262	וְ	*
2593	הַיָּשׁוּב	true [one]	0745	לֵב	it would be required
0090	וְ	but	0603	וְ	*
1261	כִּי	<it>	0633	רַבּוֹתַיִם	that times
2543	לְבֵית	into heaven	1596	רַבּוֹתַיִם	many
1796	כִּי	he entered	0911	לֵב	he should suffer
0758	יִפְגַּע	to appear	1388	וְ	since
2154	לְפָנָיו	before	2601	בְּרֵאשִׁית	the beginning
2041	לְפָנֵי	the presence	1813	הַיָּמִין	of the age
0093	הַאֱלֹהִים	of God	0602	וְ	now
0812	לְעֵלֵינוּ	for us	0518	וְ	But
			0054	בְּאַחֲרֵית	in the end
			1813	הַיָּמִין	of the age