

Andrews University

From the Selected Works of Denis Kaiser

2016

The Biblical Sanctuary Motif in Historical Perspective

Denis Kaiser



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/denis_kaiser/39/

The Biblical Sanctuary Motif in Historical Perspective

Denis Kaiser

Introduction

Christianity's source text is undeniably the writings of the Old and New Testaments. These writings contain numerous genres of literature, including legal, historical, wisdom, poetic, lyric, narrative, epistolary, prophetic, and apocalyptic literature. Surprisingly, the Bible fails to present us with a dogmatic or systematic theological section, even though much of Christian theology was pursued in a dogmatic way. Not only does it lack systematic explanations of foundational beliefs, but the Bible also fails to utilize philosophical terminology to communicate its presuppositions about being, metaphysics, ontology, and epistemology. Because of the lack of systematization, Christian thinkers began early on to try to fill the gap themselves, assuming the ontological and metaphysical presuppositions of Plato and Aristotle and then explaining, interpreting, and systematizing biblical teachings through the glasses of these philosophical presuppositions.¹ Of course, this influenced the formulation of Christian beliefs quite heavily. In particular, Fernando Canale, professor emeritus of theology and philosophy, suggests that these philosophical presuppositions "played a foundational hermeneutical role in the theological interpretation" of the biblical teaching of a spatio-temporal sanctuary in heaven, destroying it almost beyond recognition.² He argues in favor of a deconstruction and reconstruction of Christian beliefs to rid them of unbiblical presuppositions and to establish them on a truly biblical foundation.

Considering the enormous theological and practical significance of the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary for Seventh-day Adventists, it is the aim of the present chapter to summarize Canale's remarks on the philosophical conceptions concerning a heavenly sanctuary and outline the theological and exegetical ideas of Christian thinkers on the sanctuary motif throughout Christian history to determine whether Canale's observations correspond with the primary sources. These sections will be followed by a survey of studies of more recent Adventist scholars and conclude with some reflections on the potential universal and personal relevance of the sanctuary doctrine. In the end it will be possible to determine whether Canale's call for the development of a theological system circled around the biblical sanctuary motif is valid and worthwhile. While a comprehensive and

¹ Fernando L. Canale, "Evolution, Theology and Method, Part 3: Outline and Limits of Scientific Methodology," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 42, no. 1 (2004): 22, 23; Fernando L. Canale, "Deconstructing Evangelical Theology?," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 44, no. 1 (2006): 108, 109, 115.

² Fernando L. Canale, "Philosophical Foundations and the Biblical Sanctuary," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 36, no. 2 (1998): 187.

exhaustive study of these subtopics would be desirable, this chapter can only point at a number of future research topics.

Canale on the Biblical Sanctuary Motif

Canale has argued that throughout the history of Christianity the interpretation of the biblical sanctuary was generally conditioned by a Platonic-Aristotelian perception of reality. Classical, medieval, and modern theologies consistently interpreted biblical sanctuary passages as metaphors. These theologies are steeped in the philosophical notions of divine perfection as an absolute state of timelessness, immaterialness, and impassability, negating any divine involvement in time, history, and space. Although biblical passages such as Exod 25:8 describe the sanctuary as a place where God dwells among human beings, such a presence of God in time and space is incompatible with the presuppositional framework of theologians, especially as it pertains to the notion of God. Since these assumed presuppositions resulted in metaphorical interpretations of the biblical sanctuary, earthly and heavenly, Canale has called for a deconstruction of these philosophical presuppositions and a reconstruction of the sanctuary doctrine and Christian theology as a whole based on the biblical conception of God as being compatible “with our space, time, and history.”³

Yet the idea of a biblical ontology that stems from the sanctuary was not an idea that originated with Canale; rather it stems from early Sabbatarian Adventist theology. Canale has written a series of three articles in which he calls for the development of complementary theological methodologies based on the hermeneutical key of the sanctuary doctrine.⁴ He emphasizes that early Sabbatarian Adventists started from a hermeneutical premise that inherently carried a different philosophical perspective than that which influenced the development of Christian theology. Instead of the classical ontological view of God as a timeless, non-spatial

³ Ibid., 204, 205. To avoid an unconscious adoption of the above philosophical notions Canale suggested (1) to deconstruct “the classical and modern interpretations of the God principle” and (2) to select a new “starting point from which to think anew and formulate a reconstruction of the God principle in harmony with the biblical text.” He argued that Scripture should be that starting point for the Christian interpretation of the God principle. See Fernando L. Canale, *A Criticism of Theological Reason: Time and Timelessness as Primordial Presuppositions*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 10 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987), 285-287; Canale, “Philosophical Foundations and the Biblical Sanctuary,” 201, 202. For a discussion of how Canale articulates the biblical conception of time see the chapter “Divine Divine Passibility, Analogical Temporality, and Theo-Ontology: Implications of a Canonical Approach” by John C. Peckham in this volume.

⁴ Fernando Canale, “From Vision to System: Finishing the Task of Adventist Theology, Part I: Historical Review,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 15, no. 2 (2004): 5-39; Fernando Canale, “From Vision to System: Finishing the Task of Adventist Biblical and Systematic Theologies Part II,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 16, 1-2 (2005): 114-142; Fernando Canale, “From Vision to System: Finishing the Task of Adventist Theology, Part III: Sanctuary and Hermeneutics,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 17, no. 2 (2006): 36-80.

being, they adopted the view of a God who is analogically temporal, relates as such within history, and operates within a literal-spatial heavenly sanctuary. This ontological paradigm shift indicated that early Sabbatarian Adventists saw heaven as a temporal-spatial place. Quoting Seventh-day Adventist co-founder and prophetic voice Ellen G. White (née Harmon; 1827-1915),⁵ Canale states that this belief was a “key that unlocked the mystery of the disappointment” and “opened to view a complete system of truth.”⁶ This new hermeneutical vision gave the small group of Sabbatarian Adventists unity, identity, and a sense of mission.

While later generations of Seventh-day Adventists inherited this hermeneutical vision encapsulated in the sanctuary doctrine, it does not seem that it was ever fully developed, and soon the Lutheran notion of justification by faith became an increasingly competing hermeneutical view. Eventually the Lutheran view replaced the former view as Adventism’s new hermeneutical vision, and the sanctuary doctrine was relegated to being just another doctrine among others.⁷ A striking example of the adoption of the Lutheran soteriological view replacing the sanctuary as hermeneutical vision came with Desmond Ford in the late 1970s. Ford equated the Day of Atonement with Calvary because he felt that the sanctuary doctrine was incompatible with his view of justification by faith. Canale notes three different responses within Seventh-day Adventism to the challenges posed by Ford: (1) *Evangelical Adventists* either radically reinterpreted the sanctuary doctrine or entirely abandoned Adventism because, like Ford, they felt the sanctuary doctrine was incompatible with the Protestant soteriological view. (2) *Historical Adventists* affirmed the sanctuary doctrine but interpreted it through the ontological vision of Christ’s fallen human nature and the believer’s absolute sinless perfection before the second coming. (3) *Biblical Adventists* held fast to the sanctuary doctrine and pursued a number of exegetical studies on issues related to that doctrine, but they continued to neglect the macrohermeneutical role of the sanctuary doctrine in Seventh-day Adventist theology.⁸ Because the hermeneutical notion of the early

⁵ For biographies on Ellen G. White see, e.g., Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981-1986); Jerry Moon and Denis Kaiser, “For Jesus and Scripture: The Life of Ellen G. White,” in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, eds. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2013), 18-95; Terrie Dopp Aamodt, Gary Land, and Ronald L. Numbers, eds., *Ellen Harmon White: American Prophet* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

⁶ See Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan: The Conflict of the Ages in the Christian Dispensation* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1911), 423.

⁷ Canale, “From Vision to System: Finishing the Task of Adventist Theology, Part I,” 12-17; Fernando L. Canale, “The Eclipse of Scripture and the Protestantization of the Adventist Mind, Part 1: The Assumed Compatibility of Adventism with Evangelical Theology and Ministerial Practices,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 21, 1-2 (2010): 155-160.

⁸ Canale, “From Vision to System: Finishing the Task of Adventist Theology, Part I,” 17-37; Canale, “From Vision to System: Finishing the Task of Adventist Theology, Part III,” 58, 62, 79.

Seventh-day Adventists was never developed philosophically, and because the Ford crisis began due to the lack of exploration of the ontology of the sanctuary, Seventh-day Adventists have never reestablished the sanctuary doctrine as a hermeneutical vision which opens to view a complete system of theology.

Exposing the current lack of an integrated system of Adventist beliefs, Canale emphasizes the need to move beyond reaffirmations of the *sola Scriptura* principle, the sanctuary doctrine, and other Seventh-day Adventist pillars and progress instead to their application as a hermeneutical vision in order to discover a complete, harmonious, interconnected, and relevant system of theology and truth. Finding deficiencies with the current theological disciplines, he suggests new approaches to these disciplines to allow for a proper expression of the sanctuary doctrine as a hermeneutical vision of such a system. He suggests that by avoiding historical-critical presuppositions and through ongoing research, exegetical theology has been able to put the sanctuary doctrine on solid biblical ground, yet it has failed to provide room for a consistent application of the sanctuary doctrine as a hermeneutical vision for a complete system of theology. Canale argues that by implicitly assuming that the exegetical approach is the only valid way of studying Scripture, exegetical theology may have contributed to the forgetting and replacing of the sanctuary as Adventism's hermeneutical vision. Similarly, while biblical theology has processed, understood, and connected the biblical data of the sanctuary doctrine to the rest of the biblical material through passages about God, it may also have contributed to the forgetting-replacing process, because theology within Seventh-day Adventism developed primarily as biblical theology. Canale concludes that systematic theology would naturally be the discipline best suited for the development of an overall system of theology and truth, given that it aims to understand nature, reality, and life as they relate to God following the ontological evidences and connections present in Scripture. He observes, however, that Seventh-day Adventists are not known for having developed a systematic interconnected system of theological beliefs. Thus, he emphasizes the need for complementary disciplinary methodologies to join in the discovery of biblical truth in order to allow for a proper expression of the sanctuary doctrine as a hermeneutical vision of a complete system of theology.⁹

The Sanctuary in Christian History

In his 1998 article "Philosophical Foundations and the Biblical Sanctuary," Canale has surveyed how Platonic and/or Aristotelian philosophical presuppositions influenced Philo of Alexandria (20 B.C.–A.D. 50), Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), and John Calvin (1509-1564) in terms of how they "dealt with the biblical sanctuary motif."¹⁰ The present section will concentrate on how a number of early Christian, medieval, reformation, and post-reformation writers perceived both the earthly Israelite tabernacle and the heavenly sanctuary. Whereas the idea of a tangible

⁹ Canale, "From Vision to System: Finishing the Task of Adventist Biblical and Systematic Theologies Part II," 118, 120, 126-133, 137-142.

¹⁰ Canale, "Philosophical Foundations and the Biblical Sanctuary," 188-195.

sanctuary in a temporal-spatial heaven was almost absent throughout the Christian era, the biblical sanctuary motif was interpreted in a number of ways.

Ancient Christianity

Most early Christian writers discerned a correlation between the earthly tabernacle and the true tabernacle, yet they generally considered the church to be the true tabernacle. They still maintained the idea of Christ as the heavenly high priest but they generally focused on spiritual activities and localities on earth. Because they assumed that Plato's metaphysical conceptions were based on Moses, the prophets, and the ancient Hebrews, early Christian writers considered their adoption of Plato's ideas and presuppositions suitable.¹¹ And because the *ecclesia*, that is, the believers, were viewed as the sanctuary, the Church Fathers identified the soul of each believer as the Most Holy Place.

Origen (c. 185-254) was probably one of the most prolific and influential early Christian theologians. Strongly influenced by Platonic philosophy and the works of Philo and Clement of Alexandria (150-215), he aimed at getting beyond the literal or plain meaning of a given biblical passage to its hidden spiritual meaning by use of the allegorical method of interpretation. It was specifically through the commentaries of Jerome (347-420), "which relied heavily on Origen's commentaries," that the allegorical interpretation became the standard method of interpreting the Bible well into the Middle Ages. While Origen did not necessarily ignore the historical and literal nature of the text (as is evident from his attempts to interpret biblical passages verse by verse, to place the biblical books in their historical context, and to analyze their themes), he often employed the allegorical method by linking OT and NT passages "on the basis of christological and typological connections already established in the New Testament or already familiar from Christian tradition and early Christian writings."¹² His rather structured application of the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture is evident from his consistent interpretation of the "temple" as a symbol of the church as Christ's body.¹³

In his understanding of Scripture, Augustine (354-430) was influenced by Ambrose (337-397), who "utilized the techniques and interpretive traditions of Philo, Origen, and the Alexandrian school," and by Jerome, "whose commentaries

¹¹ See, e.g., Justin, *I Apol.* lix; Pseudo-Justin, *Graec. ver. rel.*, xiv, xxv, xxvi, xxxiii; Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* vi.68.1-71.1. Origen, e.g., argued that Plato borrowed his idea of heaven from the writings of the OT. See *Cels.* xix.

¹² Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson, "Introduction and Overview," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation: The Ancient Period*, eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 1:45, 46. See Frances Young, "Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation: The Ancient Period*, eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 1:335-338; Dennis Brown, "Jerome and the Vulgate," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation: The Ancient Period*, eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 1:365, 371.

¹³ Hauser and Watson, "Introduction and Overview," 1:46.

he read and who supplied him with Latin translations of Origen's commentaries."¹⁴ To refute the Manichean assertion of the dichotomy between the two testaments, Augustine stressed that Christ is the one main theme of Scripture and that the entire OT foreshadowed the NT. Distinguishing between the letter of the text (sign) and its spiritual or figurative meaning (reality), he tried to get to the expression of divine thoughts regarding morals and the truth of the church found throughout the words of Scripture. Being aware of the multiple interpretations Christian interpreters drew from the same biblical texts, he argued that there are many valid readings of Scripture.¹⁵ Given the influence of Augustine's views on later theologians, it should not surprise us that several different interpretations of the heavenly sanctuary appear next to each other in the writings of theologians after him. A number of such interpretations are described below.

Heavenly Realms/Mysteries: Some early Christian writers explicitly linked the sanctuary to the heavenly realms, yet it should be noted that most of these statements remain somewhat ambiguous and that the same writers often interpret the biblical sanctuary motif in different ways, as will be seen further below. McClay inferred from Athanasius' (296-373) quote from Heb 9:23 that he had a deep understanding of the significance of the heavenly sanctuary and its services,¹⁶ yet it should be noted that Athanasius does not provide any further explanation as to why he was quoting the passage. Although Athanasius saw a type-antitype correlation between the Levitical priesthood and Christ's high-priestly ministry, he remained ambiguous regarding the nature of the heavenly sanctuary when he stated that the "service performed in the Tabernacle was a type of the heavenly mysteries."¹⁷ Interestingly, he mentioned Christ's high-priestly ministry frequently in the context of his sacrifice at the cross.¹⁸ Ephrem the Syrian (c. 306-373) suggested on the other hand that the tabernacle and its services were "symbolic shadows of this heavenly ministry."¹⁹ That this was not his only interpretation of the sanctuary motif will be seen below. Gregory of Nazianzus (330-390) argued that

¹⁴ Ibid., 1:48, 49. See Richard A. Norris, Jr., "Augustine and the Close of the Ancient Period of Interpretation," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation: The Ancient Period*, eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 1:383, 384, 386.

¹⁵ Hauser and Watson, "Introduction and Overview," 1:49, 50; Norris, "Augustine and the Close of the Ancient Period of Interpretation," 1:389-399, 403-405.

¹⁶ Bruce Edward McClay, "The High Priesthood, Mediation, and Intercession of Christ, and the Heavenly Sanctuary in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Early Christian Church" (Term paper, Andrews University, 1971), 8.

¹⁷ Athanasius, *C. Ar.* ii.8. See McClay, "The High Priesthood, Mediation, and Intercession of Christ, and the Heavenly Sanctuary in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Early Christian Church," 6, 9.

¹⁸ Athanasius, *C. Ar.* ii.8; McClay, "The High Priesthood, Mediation, and Intercession of Christ, and the Heavenly Sanctuary in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Early Christian Church," 7.

¹⁹ Ephrem of Syria, *Comm. Heb.*; Erik M. Heen, Philip D. Krey, and Thomas C. Oden, *Hebrews*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament, vol. 10 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005), 132.

the earthly tabernacle symbolized the whole creation, things visible and invisible. That being the case, he called for believers to pass through the veil, in other words, to move beyond the realm of sense in order to see the holy place, which is the “intellectual and celestial creation.”²⁰ Similarly, Theodoret of Cyrus (393-457) defined the “tent” as heaven created by Jesus but also as the place where Jesus ministers as man, suggesting the possibility of a human being living in the heavenly realms.²¹ On the other hand, he also suggested that the tabernacle symbolizes the entire cosmos, with the Holy Place representing “the way of life on earth” and the Most Holy Place signifying the “life in heaven.” Accordingly, the veil which separated the Holy from the Most Holy Place was a symbol of the firmament.²²

The Church: A number of early Christian writers interpreted the earthly tabernacle as an imitation and representation of the coming *ecclesia*. Thus, although Ephrem the Syrian stressed the similarities between the earthly and the heavenly tabernacles, one should notice that he emphasized how the transient and temporal earthly tabernacle pointed to the church, “the perfect prototype which lasts forever.”²³ He suggested that “all those ancient religious institutions were shadows and symbols of this institution of the church, which is established in its spirituality and divinity before him,” implying that this was the pattern that Moses had been shown and ordered to build (Exod 25:9).²⁴ Whereas the previous statement suggests a clear conception of how the biblical passages on the sanctuary were to be understood, he acknowledged elsewhere that the meaning of the sanctuary symbolism was unclear, saying that “the sanctuary in the very tabernacle of truth” may be located either in the kingdom of heaven or in this world where Christ ministered to his disciples during his earthly life.²⁵

Spiritual Activities: Other writers extended the spiritual interpretation of biblical passages on the heavenly sanctuary to all kinds of religious and spiritual activities on earth. Thus, while Origen acknowledged that the tabernacle could be seen as representative of the whole world, he also suggested that every “individual can have an image of the world in [himself].” He argued that every person is able to “fulfill the form of the sanctuary in [himself]” and each soul can “act the part of

²⁰ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Theol.* 2.31; John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Van Dusen, Henry P., eds., *The Library of Christian Classics*, 26 vols. (London: SCM, 1953-1966), 3:158; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 132.

²¹ Theodoret of Cyrus, *Comm. Heb.* 8; Jacques Paul Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca*, 166 vols. (Paris: Migne, 1857-1886), 82:736; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 121.

²² Theodoret of Cyrus, *Comm. Heb.* 9; Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus*, 82:737-740; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 132.

²³ Ephrem of Syria, *Comm. Exod.* 25.1. See Roy J. Deferrari, ed., *Fathers of the Church: A New Translation* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947-2013), 91:261; Joseph T. Lienhard, Ronnie J. Rombs, and Thomas C. Oden, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, Old Testament, vol. 3 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 122.

²⁴ Ephrem of Syria, *Comm. Heb.*; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 123.

²⁵ Ephrem of Syria, *Comm. Heb.*; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 121.

[a] priest.”²⁶ Eusebius’ (263-339) understanding was similar to Origen’s view, for he suggested that the believers are the “greatest and truly holy sanctuary” and that the soul of a person is the “holy of holies.”²⁷ While he stated that Christ is “the great High Priest of the universe” who presents the incense and sacrifices of the believers before the Father in Heaven, he also suggested that the bishops were performing priestly functions here on earth.²⁸ John Chrysostom (c. 347-407) interpreted the “heavenly things” of Heb 8:5 as spiritual things performed on earth. Consequently baptisms, hymns, the altar, the sacrifice, the rites, and the church became heavenly things when believers employed their will and thinking to connect their soul with Heaven.²⁹ John Cassian (360-435) began by interpreting every item in the Most Holy Place in a spiritual manner. Thus the soul was to become the Ark of the Covenant in which the two tablets of stone were laid; these tablets he interpreted as the “perpetual strength of the two Testaments.” The golden urn, the “pure and unstained memory,” contained the manna which symbolized the “eternal, heavenly sweetness of spiritual meanings.” Aaron’s rod was “the saving standard of our exalted and true high priest, Jesus Christ.” Consequently, Cassian argued, the soul of a person not only becomes the Ark of the Covenant, it will also be “carried forward into a priestly realm.”³⁰

The Medieval Church

Medieval writers continued to assume the philosophical foundations of Platonism and to apply the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture. Some writers went to great lengths to interpret almost every minute detail of the ancient Jewish tabernacle and its rites, whereas others (such as Anselm of Canterbury) had nothing to say concerning the sanctuary or Christ’s high priestly ministry. It was especially in the writings of Thomas Aquinas that the heavenly sanctuary service was replaced by the sacraments and activities of human priests. Thus O’Collins and Jones suggest that it is in his writings that “Christ and his sacraments form a bridge between human activity and God. In particular, the Eucharist becomes the

²⁶ Origen, *Hom. Exod.* 9.4; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 132, 133; Origen, *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, transl. by Ronald E. Heine, *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, vol. 71 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 340-343.

²⁷ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History: Books 6-10*, Transl. by Roy J. Deferrari, 64 vols., *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, vol. 29 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1955), 251. See McClay, “The High Priesthood, Mediation, and Intercession of Christ, and the Heavenly Sanctuary in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Early Christian Church,” 4, 5.

²⁸ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, 266, 267. See McClay, “The High Priesthood, Mediation, and Intercession of Christ, and the Heavenly Sanctuary in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Early Christian Church,” 4, 5.

²⁹ John Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* 14.3; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Heb.* 16.7-10.

³⁰ John Cassian, *Coll. dec. quart.* 10; John Cassian, *Conferences*, transl. by Colm Luibheid, *Classics of Western Spirituality* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 164; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 133.

sacramental means of entry into the offering and fruits of Christ's priestly sacrifice."³¹ It was during this time that the sacraments received increasing significance as the means of grace.

Writing around the early 7th century, Oecumenius suggested that the mercy seat signified Christ. Assuming that the altar of incense actually stood in the Most Holy Place of the OT tabernacle (Heb 9:3, 4), he concluded that the high priest went into the Most Holy Place twice a day to burn incense (Exod 30:7, 8). This idea conflicted, of course, with the biblical statement that the high priest entered the Most Holy Place only once a year (Heb 9:7; Exod 30:10). In order to solve this conflict Oecumenius argued that the high priest went into the Most Holy Place only once a year with blood; at other times he entered it with the offering of incense.³²

Bede (672-735) interpreted all items in the Most Holy Place as symbolic of Christ. Thus he argued that the golden urn signified Christ's soul, the budding rod the invincible power of Christ's priesthood, and the tablets of the law "all knowledge of the Father's secrets and all power of judgment . . . in Christ."³³ At the same time, Bede followed John Cassian's line of thought by also applying these items to the personal spirituality of a believer. Thus the ark signified the holy church, with the incorruptible wood of the ark being a figure of holy souls. The different items were reminders of the continual meditation on God's law (tables of stone), the guarantee of Christ's incarnation (golden urn), and a sharing in his kingship and priesthood (Aaron's rod). As the cherubim were set over the mercy seat, so the city of God—that is, the holy church—was built upon a mountain which is Christ himself.³⁴ Suggesting that the author of Hebrews used the allegorical method in his explanations, Bede interpreted the veil between the two holy places of the tabernacle as heaven. As true priests of God and Christ, the saints may "ceaselessly atone for the daily errors of their frailty . . . through the daily sacrifices of good works and the daily libations of their own tears."³⁵ Likewise, about two hundred years later, Arethas of Caesarea (c. 850-944) stated that the heavens are "the tent," yet he added that Christ's body was "the true tent."³⁶

Commenting on Heb 9:2-3, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), best known for his *Summa Theologica*, suggested two interpretations for the distinction between the

³¹ Gerald O'Collins and Michael Keenan Jones, *Jesus Our Priest: A Christian Approach to the Priesthood of Christ* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 108.

³² Oecumenius, *Fr. Heb.* 9.5-7; Karl Staab, ed., *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 2nd ed. (Münster i.W.: Aschendorff, 1984), 15:465; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 135.

³³ Bede, *Tab.* 1.4.17; Bede, *Bede: On the Tabernacle*, ed. Arthur G. Holder, 1st ed., *Translated Texts for Historians*, vol. 18 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994), 16; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 134.

³⁴ Bede, *Tab.* 1.5.20-21; Bede, *Bede: On the Tabernacle*, 18:20, 21; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 134.

³⁵ Bede, *Tab.* 2.7.71; Bede, *Bede: On the Tabernacle*, 18:79; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 135.

³⁶ Arethas of Caesarea, *Fr. Heb.* 8.2; Heen, Krey and Oden, *Hebrews*, 121; Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, 15:661.

two compartments of the OT tabernacle. He argued that since the OT was a figure of the NT and the NT “a figure of the heavenly fatherland,” the OT was signified by the Holy Place and the NT by the Most Holy Place. Similarly, Aquinas suggested that the Holy Place referred to “the present church” and the Most Holy Place to the heavenly glory.³⁷ This last aspect seems to reflect the writings of a number of early Christian writers who suggested that the earthly sanctuary prefigured the church. Aquinas was especially concerned with the bridge that Christ’s priesthood and the sacraments formed between God and human activity.³⁸ In the same vein, Aquinas argued that the sacraments, particularly the Eucharist, not only signify grace but actually “cause grace.” Although God was still the principal cause of grace, it was the sacraments which were the “instrumental cause.”³⁹ Consequently, the sacraments, the channel of divine grace, could only be received through the church by the administration of the priests. It may be argued, therefore, that the church and the sacraments replaced the Holy Spirit in the medieval understanding as the true channel of divine grace.⁴⁰ A perusal of Anthony C. Thiselton’s extensive work on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Christian history seems to lend support to that conclusion since it leads to the astounding realization that, except for a few mystic works on the Holy Spirit, the salvific work of the Holy Spirit seems to be almost nonexistent in medieval writings.⁴¹ Thus the church on earth, with its priests, sacraments, and the Mass, superseded the heavenly sanctuary and its services in every possible way.

Reformation and Post-Reformation Times

Although the Reformation brought about a new understanding of the role and importance of Scripture, of justification by grace through faith, and of the function of the sacraments and Mass, it failed to remove the philosophical foundations and presuppositions of Platonism that had influenced Christian theology and practice for more than a millennium. It is nevertheless interesting to see the parallels and differences between the Protestant Reformers and later Protestant writers such as

³⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *Com. Heb.* 418 on Heb 9:1-5.

³⁸ O’Collins and Jones, *Jesus Our Priest*, 108.

³⁹ Paul J. Landa, “Medieval Perspectives on the Atonement: A Survey from Anselm of Canterbury to Thomas Aquinas,” in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Theological, and Historical Studies*, eds. Arnold V. Wallenkampf, W. Richard Leshner, and Frank B. Holbrook, abridged ed. (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 283. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* iii.62.1.

⁴⁰ Alan Strange, “Inerrancy, Charles Hodge and the Spirituality of the Church,” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Baltimore, Md., November 20, 2013.

⁴¹ See Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Holy Spirit: In Biblical Teaching, Through the Centuries, and Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 222-254. There are about 160 pages covering the biblical writings, sixty pages the period from 100 to 550 AD, and about 210 pages the period from 1520 to 2000 AD, yet there are only about thirty that deal with the time between 550 and 1520 AD.

the Puritans on one hand and early Christian and medieval writers on the other hand.

Martin Luther (1483-1546) was aware of three interpretations of the OT tabernacle. Since his primary statements on the biblical sanctuary stem from his lectures on the Epistles to the Hebrews given between April 1517 and March 1518,⁴² it is probably somewhat anachronistic to place them in the Reformation period. The first view Luther treated was reminiscent of the view advocated by Theodoret of Cyrus, suggesting that the tabernacle prefigured the entire universe, with the Most Holy Place representing the celestial and invisible world, the Holy Place symbolizing the visible world, and the veil referring to the starry sky. Yet, Luther disagreed with that view because he thought it was “somewhat forced” and did “violence to the text.” The second view understood the tabernacle “tropologically,” suggesting it referred to the world in “man himself.” Demonstrating some similarities to the views of several early Christian writers, this view proposed that the Most Holy Place pointed to the “higher part of reason [which] dwells among the things that are invisible and belong to God” (the intellect), whereas the Holy Place referred to “the lower reason which . . . is illumined by the light of natural reason” (reason). Luther failed to comment on this second view, yet since he quickly turned to the third view and continued to elaborate on the sanctuary based on that third approach, it may be assumed that he favored the last view. According to that final view, the apostolic writer of Hebrews was referring to “a kind of spiritual world” or “the holy church of God.” Moving through salvation history, Luther argued that the court of the temple referred to the synagogue; his reasoning was that the synagogue depended on the five books of Moses, which corresponded to the height of the court (five cubits). Holy Place was then pointing to the “church militant” and the Most Holy Place to the “church triumphant.” The different pieces of furniture in the tabernacle were equated with different aspects of the spiritual life of the church, the believer, and Christ’s nature and acts of salvation.⁴³ While it would seem that Luther later took a biblical approach, as seen in his opposition to invoking the saints and his emphasis on Christ as “High Priest, Advocate, Mediator, Reconciler, and Comforter” who “appeared in the presence of God in our behalf” to intercede for us,⁴⁴ it is clear that

⁴² Jaroslav Pelikan, “Introduction to Volume 29,” in *Lectures on Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews*, vol. 29, eds. Jaroslav Pelikan and Walter A. Hansen (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 1968), xii.

⁴³ Martin Luther, *Lectures on Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews*, eds. Jaroslav Pelikan and Walter A. Hansen, Luther's Works, vol. 29 (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 1968), 199, 200, cf. 200-211.

⁴⁴ V. Norskov Olsen, “The Atonement in Protestant Reformation Thought,” in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Theological, and Historical Studies*, eds. Arnold V. Wallenkampf, W. Richard Leshner, and Frank B. Holbrook, abridged ed. (Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 287-289; O’Collins and Jones, *Jesus Our Priest*, 128-148.

Luther nevertheless continued to assume a timeless interpretation of the divine realm.⁴⁵

John Calvin (1509-1564) argued that “the greater and more perfect tabernacle” in Heb 9:11 refers to “the body of Christ” because it was through the sacrifice of his own body that Christ was able to enter the glories of heaven. The Day of Atonement, which occurred once a year, prefigured the “unique sacrifice of Christ” on the cross. While the high priest was allowed to enter the Most Holy Place only one day a year, Christ’s entry into heaven is “for ever to the end of the world” because his sacrifice is valid for ever and needs no repetition.⁴⁶ Although Calvin sometimes stated that Christ “entered the heavenly sanctuary” to appear in the Father’s presence for us,⁴⁷ it does not seem that he envisioned a tangible physical sanctuary in heaven but rather merely employed biblical phraseology to convey the idea that Christ is interceding for us before the Father by virtue of his own sacrifice. Calvin emphasized that the high priestly ministry of Christ is “untransferable” because that ministry includes both his death, which “appeased”⁴⁸ God, and his continuing intercession before the Father. Thus his death and intercession are the two parts of Christ’s priesthood.⁴⁹ Consequently, Calvin rejected the “Roman Catholic understanding and practice of the ordained priesthood and its connection with Christ’s priesthood” as well as the practice of “ministerial priests taking it upon themselves to offer the daily sacrifice of the Mass.”⁵⁰

In his book *The English Connection: The Puritan Roots of Seventh-day Adventist Belief* (1981), Bryan W. Ball outlines the thoughts of several 17th-century Puritan writers on Christ’s high priestly ministry in heaven.⁵¹ While these writers emphasized his intercessory ministry, they rarely dwelt on the nature of the heavenly sanctuary and usually failed to recognize a corresponding typology between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries. Ball claims that some Puritan writers advocated the view of a two-apartment heavenly sanctuary, though closer examination shows that they might not have held such a view after all.

⁴⁵ Denis Kaiser, “‘He spake and it was done’: Luther’s Creation Theology in His 1535 Lectures on Gen 1:1-2:4,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 24, no. 2 (2013): 120, 121.

⁴⁶ John Calvin, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistle of St. Peter*, transl. by William B. Johnston, eds. David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance, Calvin’s Commentaries, vol. 12 (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1963), 105, 119, 120, 128, 129.

⁴⁷ Olsen, “The Atonement in Protestant Reformation Thought,” 291-293.

⁴⁸ The idea of Christ who, through his death, had to “appease the anger of God” appears in Calvin’s commentary on Hebrews. See Calvin, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistle of St. Peter*, 33, 59. This aspect is discussed by O’Collins and Jones, *Jesus Our Priest*, 152, 153.

⁴⁹ Olsen, “The Atonement in Protestant Reformation Thought,” 293, 294.

⁵⁰ O’Collins and Jones, *Jesus Our Priest*, 153-156, 162.

⁵¹ Bryan W. Ball, *The English Connection: The Puritan Roots of Seventh-day Adventist Belief* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1981), 102-119.

One of the writers Ball covers is William Perkins (1558-1602) who concluded that the OT sacrificial services clearly prefigured the substitutionary death of Christ.⁵² Speaking of Christ's high priestly ministry in heaven, he stated that Christ, as our priest, pleaded with the Father to accept his sacrifice after his ascension.⁵³ "The workes of Christs priesthood which follow his death, serve not to make any satisfaction to God's justice for sinne, but only to confirme or apply it," Perkins argued.⁵⁴ In his attempt to explain the significance of the high priestly breastplate of judgment (Exod 28:22-25; Songs 8:6) Perkins suggested that "Christ our high priest being now in his sanctuary in heaven, hath in memory all the Elect, and their very names are written as it were in tables of gold before his face; and he hath an especiall love unto them and care over them."⁵⁵ Whereas Ball understands this statement as a clear affirmation of the Puritan belief in a heavenly sanctuary⁵⁶, other remarks by Perkins sound a note of caution. For example, Perkins elsewhere stated that the rending of the inner veil in the earthly temple "figureth unto us that by the death of Christ" the way is open to heaven because "the holy of holies signified the third heaven, where God sheweth himself in glory and majesty unto his Saints." Here, Perkins suggested that the typology between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries is not a typology of correspondence but of antithesis (heaven is the Holy of Holies).⁵⁷ Considering the link between the OT priesthood and Christ's new covenant priesthood as it is described in Scripture, Perkins argued that the Roman Catholic liturgy, Mass, sacraments, priesthood, and papacy actually bereave Christ of his nature and offices. Thus these elements were "instruments of Satan" and "blasphemy" because they suggest that Christ's perfect and complete once-and-for-all sacrifice was imperfect and incomplete, and that self-appointed human priests were to sacrifice him repeatedly on a daily basis.⁵⁸ He stressed the scriptural teaching that "all Christians are priests," whose role is not to sacrifice Christ again, but "to offer up spiritual sacrifice[s]" in prayer (Mal. 1:11; 1 Tim. 2:8) and to dedicate "our bodie and soules, our hearts and affections, the workes of our lives, and the workes of our callings . . . to the service of God for his glorie and the good

⁵² William Perkins, *The Workes of that Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Universitie of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins*, vol. 1 (London: John Legatt, 1626), 206, 213, 218, 219.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 218. Perkins's interpretation was usually rather literal and his "typological exegesis was quite consistent with that employed by his Protestant contemporaries." Yet, sometimes he also resorted to allegorical interpretations. For a general description of his interpretations see Erwin R. Gane, "The Exegetical Methods of Some Sixteenth-Century Puritan Preachers: Hooper, Cartwright, and Perkins, Part II," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19, no. 2 (1981): 101-104, 107-111.

⁵⁶ Ball, *The English Connection*, 109.

⁵⁷ Perkins, *The Workes of that Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Universitie of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins*, 225.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 210, 218-220, 225.

of his Church.” However, he said, our sacrifices can only be acceptable to God if accompanied by the merits of Christ’s death.⁵⁹

Ball refers to the Puritan writer George Lawson (1598-1678) as another clear example of someone who advocated the two-apartment heavenly sanctuary idea.⁶⁰ However, the context of Lawson’s seemingly plain statements suggests once again that when Lawson talked about the “heavenly sanctuary” and the “better tabernacle,” he was employing biblical phraseology but interpreting the relevant passages in line with traditional conceptions of the nature of the heavenly sanctuary. Lawson objected to two views which saw the tabernacle as a symbol of either (1) “the Church both Militant and Triumphant, and especially the Triumphant, because of Christ’s bodily presence there,” or (2) “the Body of Christ, wherein the *Schekina*, or the divine Glory and Majesty, fixed it’s habitation.”⁶¹ In his view, the typical tabernacle on earth signified the antitypical sanctuary, yet it should be noted that Lawson considered the Holy Place of the earthly tabernacle as a figure of the body of believers (the church) here on earth, who serve God and pray to him after being converted, sanctified, and made priests. The Most Holy Place he regarded as “a type of heaven” where Jesus as the high priest entered once to perform a more excellent ministry.⁶² Thus it could be argued that Lawson interpreted the OT tabernacle as a type of the whole cosmos (earth-heaven), although he saw the Holy Place as only including the spiritual realm of the earth.

Interestingly, when Canale refers to Ball’s conclusions, he exercises caution by using a variety of conditional phrases, such as, “if Ball’s assessment of Puritan theology is correct,” or “his study seems to imply.”⁶³ Since Ball’s interpretation of the statements by the two clearest examples of Puritan advocates for a literal heavenly sanctuary building displays imprecision and misinterpretation, Canale has done well to be cautious. More in-depth analysis of the primary sources that Ball presents as Puritan precursors for the Adventist sanctuary doctrine are needed to determine what view the Puritans really held.

Early Seventh-day Adventists

Seventh-day Adventists esteem the doctrine of Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary as one of their official fundamental beliefs.⁶⁴ Since a number

⁵⁹ Ibid., 219, 221.

⁶⁰ Ball, *The English Connection*, 109, 110.

⁶¹ George Lawson, *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrewes Wherein the Text Is Cleared, Theopolitica Improved, the Socinian Comment Examined* (London: George Sawbridge, 1662), 135. Lawson mentioned the names of the two Reformed theologians Theodore Beza (1519-1605) and Franciscus Junius (1545-1602) as the principal exponents of the second view. See *ibid.*, 135, 136.

⁶² Ibid., 94, 95, 132-134, 136, 158, 162-164. He suggested that this view was held by most expositors.

⁶³ Canale, “Philosophical Foundations and the Biblical Sanctuary,” 199-200 fn. 63.

⁶⁴ H. E. Rogers, ed., *1931 Yearbook of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1931), 378, 379; *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook 2013* (Silver Spring, MD: Office of Archives, Statistics, and Research, General Conference

of scholars have already researched the historical development of the sanctuary doctrine in the 19th century,⁶⁵ the present section will summarize these developments only briefly.

The Millerites of the late 1830s and early 1840s placed much emphasis on the prophecies and the prophetic time periods of Daniel and Revelation, and the cleansing of the sanctuary at the end of the 2,300 evening-mornings (Dan 8:14) received particular attention in this context. Interpreting the “sanctuary” as both the church and the earth, they classified the cleansing as a two-dimensional horizontal process. Accordingly, they believed that the church was cleansed spiritually and the earth was cleansed by fire at the literal second coming of Christ.⁶⁶ Eventually they reached the conclusion that the 2,300 evening-mornings would conclude with Christ’s return on October 22, 1844. When the expected event did not materialize

of Seventh-day Adventists, 2013), 9.

⁶⁵ See, e.g., Robert Haddock, “A History of the Doctrine of the Sanctuary in the Advent Movement, 1800-1905” (B.Div. thesis, Andrews University, 1970); P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977); Robert W. Olson, *One Hundred and One Questions on the Sanctuary and on Ellen White* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981); Paul A. Gordon, *The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1983); Frank B. Holbrook, ed., *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 5 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989); P. Gerard Damsteegt, “The Sanctuary and Adventist Experience,” *Ministry*, October 1994, 34-38; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *Magnificent Disappointment: What Really Happened in 1844 . . . and Its Meaning for Today* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1994); Alberto Ronald Timm, *The Sanctuary and the Three Angels’ Messages: Integrating Factors in the Development of Seventh-day Adventist Doctrines*, Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series, vol. 5 (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1995); Denis Fortin, “Ellen G. White’s Understanding of the Sanctuary and Hermeneutics,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 9, no. 1 (1998): 160-166; Merlin D. Burt, “The Historical Background, Interconnected Development and Integration of the Doctrines of the Sanctuary, the Sabbath, and Ellen G. White’s Role in Sabbatarian Adventism from 1844 to 1849” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2002); Alberto R. Timm, “The Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary (1844-2007): A Brief Historical Overview,” in “*For You Have Strengthened Me*”: *Biblical and Theological Studies in Honor of Gerhard Pfandl in Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds. Martin T. Pröbstle, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Martin G. Klingbeil (St. Peter am Hart, Austria: Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2007), 331-345; Richard M. Davidson, “Sanctuary, Doctrine of the,” in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, eds. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2013), 1130-1133.

⁶⁶ William Miller, “Cleansing of the Sanctuary: A Letter from Wm. Miller,” *Signs of the Times*, 6 April 1842, 1; William Miller, *Letter to Joshua V. Himes, on the Cleansing of the Sanctuary* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 3-9. P. Gerard Damsteegt stated that this twofold interpretation was “the predominant view among the Millerites.” See Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, 34. Differing only very slightly from him, Alberto R. Timm pointed out that there were also some Millerite interpreters who perceived the sanctuary of Dan 8:14 as a symbol of the Promised Land. See Timm, “The Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary (1844-2007),” 332.

on that date, a number of different solutions were proposed to explain the disappointment. The majority of the Millerites maintained the basic horizontal interpretation of the sanctuary and the cleansing, yet they calculated new dates for the end of the 2,300 evening-mornings (Albany Adventists). The minority held fast to the calculation of that time period but reinterpreted the expected event in one form or another (Bridegroom Adventists). Most of these Bridegroom Adventists “spiritualized away”⁶⁷ the expected coming of Christ, claiming that he had already returned on that date, albeit spiritually (Spiritualizers). Yet, there was also a small group of Bridegroom Adventists which interpreted the sanctuary as a heavenly sanctuary, suggesting that at the end of the 2,300 evening-mornings Christ did not return to the earth but rather entered the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary for the first time to commence the Day of Atonement (Literalists). Thus, instead of viewing the cleansing of the sanctuary as a horizontal process, they interpreted the cleansing as a two-dimensional vertical process (heavenly sanctuary and church).⁶⁸

A small group of Literalists led by Franklin B. Hahn (1809-1866), Hiram Edson (1806-1882), and O. R. L. Crosier (1820-1912) had studied the questions surrounding the sanctuary in Dan 8. It was particularly Crosier’s article “The Law of Moses,” which was published in early February 1846⁶⁹, that caught the attention of other Literalists. Although they did not accept every point in the article, they agreed with much of it.⁷⁰ Crosier recognized that the OT sanctuary could be defiled in two ways. The first way was through God’s designated mode for transferring sin from the repentant sinner to the sanctuary (Num 5:6-8). A person confessed his sins over a sacrificial animal by placing his hands on the head of the animal and killing the animal. A priest would sprinkle some of the blood before the inner veil, put some of it on the horns of the altar of incense, and pour the rest at the bottom of the

⁶⁷ Sabbatarian Adventists frequently used the phrase “spiritualize away” to describe the spiritualizing interpretations of the Spiritualizers. See Joseph Bates, *The Opening Heavens: Or a Connected View of the Testimony of the Prophets and Apostles, Concerning the Opening Heavens, Compared with Astronomical Observations, and of the Present and Future Location of the New Jerusalem, the Paradise of God* (New Bedford, MA: Benjamin Lindsey, 1846), 28; James White, *Life Sketches: Ancestry, Early Life, Christian Experience, and Extensive Labors of Elder James White, and His Wife Mrs. Ellen G. White* (Battle Creek, MI: Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Pub. Assn., 1880), 230; Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts: My Christian Experience, Views, and Labors in Connection with the Rise and Progress of the Third Angel’s Message*, vol. 2 (Battle Creek, MI: James White, 1860), 73. Cf. White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*, 674, 675.

⁶⁸ Burt, “The Historical Background, Interconnected Development and Integration of the Doctrines of the Sanctuary, the Sabbath, and Ellen G. White’s Role in Sabbatarian Adventism from 1844 to 1849,” 60-272; Gordon, *The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers*, 12; Damsteegt, “The Sanctuary and Adventist Experience,” 35-41.

⁶⁹ O. R. L. Crosier, “The Law of Moses,” *Day-Star*, Extra, 7 February 1846, 37-44.

⁷⁰ Sabbatarian Adventists disagreed with his interpretation of the *tāmīd* in Dan 8:11-13 and his “Age to Come” views. See Denis Kaiser, “Ellen White and the ‘Daily’ Conflict,” *Ellen White and Current Issues Symposium* 6 (2010): 11-13; Denis Kaiser, “Guilt by Association: Why Sabbatarian Adventists Rejected O. R. L. Crosier’s Interpretation of the *Tāmīd* in Dan 8,” *Journal of Asia Adventist Studies* 16, no. 1 (2013): 33-49.

altar of burnt offering. The second way in which the sanctuary was defiled was through apostate transgression. Crosier suggested that the heavenly sanctuary was defiled in like manner as the earthly. Specifically, confession of sin and acceptance of the substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus on the cross transferred human sin to the heavenly sanctuary, which was one avenue of defilement, but apostasy also defiled the heavenly sanctuary. Citing Dan 8:11-14, 11:30-31, and other passages, Crosier suggested that the heavenly sanctuary had been polluted through Rome and apostate Christianity when they ascribed divine titles and names to the pope, established a counterfeit temple on earth, and claimed to forgive sins. According to Crosier, Heb 9:11-12, 23-24 indicates that the “heavenly things” (heavenly sanctuary) had to be purified like the “patterns” (earthly sanctuary), as typified in the cleansing on the Day of Atonement. Thus, while it was through the agency of Christ that the sanctuary was defiled by the sins of the people, so it will also be cleansed by the “same agency” on the Day of Atonement. Meanwhile, the unrepentant and apostates have to bear their own sins and their names are blotted out of the book of life.⁷¹

This small group of Literalists discovered several other biblical teachings, such as the seventh-day Sabbath and the end-time gift of prophecy, and they later became known as Sabbatarian Adventists. In the spring of 1847, these Sabbatarian Adventists began linking the seventh-day Sabbath to the heavenly sanctuary.⁷² They observed that Rev 11:19 provides a look at the Ark of the Covenant in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly temple, something that is usually only seen by the high priest on the Day of Atonement. They further noted that following this introduction to the eschatological part of the Book of Revelation were descriptions of a people “who keep the commandments of God” (Rev 12:17; 14:12). They concluded that it was the looking into the inner *sanctum* of the heavenly temple that gave a new emphasis to God’s law. In fact, the discovery of the continued significance of the rather neglected fourth commandment, the seventh-day Sabbath, came after the antitypical Day of Atonement commenced. Thus, not only did the sanctuary message give more weight to the seventh-day Sabbath, but the connection between

⁷¹ P. Gerard Damsteegt, “Among Sabbatarian Adventists (1845-1850),” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 5, *Doctrine of the Sanctuary: A Historical Survey*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989) 38-41. See Crosier, “The Law of Moses,” 38-43; Hiram Edson, “An Appeal to the Laodicean Church,” *Advent Review*, Extra, September 1850, 3.

⁷² Joseph Bates, *Second Advent Way Marks and High Heaps: Or a Connected View of the Fulfillment of Prophecy, by God’s Peculiar People, From the Year 1840 to 1847* (New Bedford, MA: Benjamin Lindsey, 1847); Ellen G. White, *A Word to the Little Flock* (Gorham, ME: James White, 1847), 18; Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Mrs. White: Experiences and Views, and Spiritual Gifts, Volume One* (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1882), 32-35.

these two doctrinal elements made the Sabbatarian Adventists realize that they were a prophetically foretold movement (Rev 12:17).⁷³

It was through the study of the Bible that Sabbatarian Adventists came to believe that the heavenly sanctuary was a literal, objective reality located in the heavenly Jerusalem. This discovery was confirmed by the visions of Ellen G. White.⁷⁴ While they therefore opposed all attempts to spiritualize the physical reality of Jesus, the Father, heaven, and the sanctuary, they also emphasized that “the sanctuary of the new covenant is not on earth, but in heaven.”⁷⁵ That discovery constituted a hermeneutical and philosophical shift that set them apart from other Millerite groups and religious denominations and had even more ramifications for other theological beliefs. This simple understanding would inevitably break with the conception of reality as timeless that had reigned in Christian theology for centuries. Although Sabbatarian Adventists believed in the necessity of a truly spiritual experience and the importance of spiritual gifts, from a philosophical perspective they were avowed materialists and opposed to any form of spiritualization.⁷⁶ They viewed heaven as a tangible spatial place where the saints will live in their resurrected material bodies. Thus they were not only opposed to spiritualizing interpretations of Scripture but also to the spiritualistic (i.e. demonic) manifestations that emerged in the early 1850s.⁷⁷

⁷³ Uriah Smith, “The Relation Which the Sabbath Sustains to Other Points of Present Truth,” *Review and Herald*, 25 July 1854, 196; R. F. Cottrell, “The Sanctuary,” *Review and Herald*, 15 December 1863, 21. Cf. John N. Andrews, “The Opening of the Temple in Heaven,” *Review and Herald*, 6 April 1869, 114.

⁷⁴ Ellen G. Harmon, “Letter from Sister Harmon,” *Day-Star*, 14 March 1846, 7, 8; Ellen G. White to Leonard W. Hastings and Elvira Hastings, Milton, MA, 21 April 1849, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD (Lt 5, 1849); White, *Early Writings of Mrs. White*, 32-35, 42, 43, 54-66, 252, 253.

⁷⁵ Crosier, “The Law of Moses,” 38; Damsteegt, “Among Sabbatarian Adventists (1845-1850),” 43, 44. See, e.g., Bates, *The Opening Heavens*; James White, “The Parable, Matthew XXV, 1-12,” *Review and Herald*, 9 June 1851, 101; James White, “Who May Hear the Truth?,” *Review and Herald*, 17 February 1852, 94.

⁷⁶ Thomas McElwain, *Adventism and Ellen White: A Phenomenon of Religious Materialism*, Studies on Inter-Religious Relations, vol. 48 (Uppsala, Sweden: Swedish Science Press, 2010), 25-53. While I appreciate McElwain’s contribution to the view that early Seventh-day Adventists were materialists, there are a number of other aspects of his study I disagree with. See Denis Kaiser, “[Book Review of] *Adventism and Ellen White: A Phenomenon of Religious Materialism*, by Thomas McElwain,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 51, no. 1 (2013): 132-136.

⁷⁷ Before mid-1853, Sabbatarian Adventists used the term “spiritualism” and its derivatives only in the sense of interpretations of biblical prophecies that “spiritualized away” their literal meaning, such as the reality and existence of a literal Jesus in a literal heaven with a literal heavenly sanctuary, the literal second coming of Christ, etc. In mid-1853, however, the term began to be used also in reference to the new reports of “spirit manifestations.” Both forms of spiritualism deny materialism in the sense of the material reality of things. See Denis Kaiser, “The Origin of a Leading Doctrine: Conditionalism among Sabbatarian Adventists (1845-1860),” unpublished manuscript, Berrien Springs, MI,

Adventist historians Alberto R. Timm and Merlin D. Burt have described the important role that the sanctuary doctrine played in the integration of several theological beliefs held by Sabbatarian Adventists.⁷⁸ The sanctuary allowed the integration of the seventh-day Sabbath, the third angel's message, and the sealing into a coherent theological system.⁷⁹ Increasingly, Sabbatarian Adventists recognized that the sanctuary doctrine did not only unlock "the mystery of the disappointment" but also "opened to view a complete system of truth."⁸⁰ They frequently depicted it as the great central doctrine that connected all their beliefs into a coherent and harmonious system of truth.⁸¹ Sabbatarian Adventists saw that

2014, 13, 14. Interestingly, Dudley M. Canright (1840-1919), a Seventh-day Adventist pastor who in the late 1880s turned into one of the most severe critics of Seventh-day Adventists, argued that the judgment which takes place in the heavenly sanctuary suggested the futility of a belief in the immortality of the soul. It would not make any sense to send the righteous already to heaven and the wicked to hell at death, and then after hundreds of years call them back to heaven for a judgment. Were some taken accidentally to heaven and others falsely sent to hell? Did God make a mistake? The Bible, Canright suggested, taught that God will not give the reward until the heavenly judgment comes to a close. Thus he connected the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary with the belief in conditional immortality. See Dudley M. Canright, "The Two Absurdities," *Review and Herald*, 19 January 1869, 27.

⁷⁸ Timm, "The Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary (1844-2007)," 335-337; Burt, "The Historical Background, Interconnected Development and Integration of the Doctrines of the Sanctuary, the Sabbath, and Ellen G. White's Role in Sabbatarian Adventism from 1844 to 1849," 273-389.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 402-404, 406-409.

⁸⁰ Ellen G. White, *The Spirit of Prophecy: The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan from the Destruction of Jerusalem to the End of the Controversy*, vol. 4 (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Pub. Assn., 1884), 268; Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan During the Christian Dispensation* (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1888), 423; White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*, 423. See also "The Twenty-three Hundred Days," *Review and Herald*, 18 April 1854, 101; R. F. Cottrell, "The Original Advent Faith," *Review and Herald*, 18 September 1855, 44; "The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, 1 December 1863, 5; "A Friendly Word with the Voice of the West," *Review and Herald*, 9 August 1864, 84; James White, *Life Incidents, in Connection With the Great Advent Movement, as Illustrated by the Three Angels of Revelation XIV* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press, Seventh-day Adventist Pub. Assn., 1868), 309, 308.

⁸¹ Cottrell, "The Sanctuary," 21; John N. Andrews, "The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, 19 April 1864, 164; reprinted in John N. Andrews, "The Sanctuary," *Review and Herald*, 18 June 1867, 12; White, *Life Incidents, in Connection With the Great Advent Movement, as Illustrated by the Three Angels of Revelation XIV*, 309, 308; Uriah Smith, *The Sanctuary and the Twenty-three Hundred Days of Daniel 8:14* (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Pub. Assn., 1877), 10, 11; also slightly adapted in Uriah Smith, *Looking Unto Jesus: Or Christ in Type and Antitype* (Chicago, Ill.: Review and Herald, 1898), 57; White, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, 268; White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan During the Christian Dispensation*, 423; White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*, 423; Ellen G. White, "The Two Dispensations," *Review and Herald*, 2 March 1886, 129; Ellen G. White, "The Two Dispensations," *Present Truth*, 1 April 1886, 51.

the sanctuary doctrine and this broader system of truth explained their past experience and gave them an identity, a message, and a worldwide mission. The reference to a “complete system of truth” could be interpreted as a call for a detailed, fixed, and unchangeable systematized dogmatic theology. However, they also had an understanding of “present truth” as a growing set of important theological truths that need to be proclaimed in this time of the end, and they continued to oppose an unalterable creed. This suggests that any interpretation of the “complete system of truth” as fixed and unchanging would go far beyond early Adventists’ sentiments and actually contradict their intentions.

The connections that Seventh-day Adventists saw between the sanctuary doctrine and other beliefs may be seen in two examples. One of these is the way that the heavenly sanctuary and Christ’s ministration formed a prominent part in Ellen G. White’s description of her famous vision of the great controversy between Christ and Satan, suggesting a fundamental link between the heavenly sanctuary and the great controversy.⁸² The second is Uriah Smith’s succinct summary, first in 1881 and again in 1887, of the ramifications that a belief in the sanctuary doctrine has for other teachings. In 1881, his list of teachings showed ten points whereas six years later it contained thirteen teachings; altogether there were seventeen distinct points of teaching mentioned in these two lists. In the lists, he argued that this “great central subject of that system of truth” suggests (1) a pre-Advent judgment; (2) Christ’s work of intercession and denial; (3) a blotting out of sins or of names from the book of life; (4) avoidance of new time setting; (5) distinction between the atoning sacrifice and the high priestly work of atonement for sin; (6) “the immutability of the law and the perpetuity of the Sabbath”; (7) “the soon coming of Christ”; (8) “the unconscious state of the dead”; (9) clearer, more “definite, and beautiful views of Christ’s position and work” than any other subject does; (10) the recognition that the present message bears the “seal of divine truth and of divine providence”; (11) “an understanding of many of the prophecies”; (12) an explanation of “the great Advent movement of the past”; (13) the avoidance of the errors of universalism and predestination; (14) a clear manifestation of tangibility and reality of Christ’s personhood and work of redemption; (15) an understanding of the parable of Matt 22:1-14; (16) an understanding of the parable of Matt 25:1-13; and (17) the basis of the “third angel’s message of Rev 14.”⁸³ The fact that Uriah Smith expanded that list of teachings in 1887 suggests that this basic system was open and quasi flexible.

⁸² White, *Early Writings of Mrs. White.*, 250-253; cf. White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan During the Christian Dispensation*, 409-450.

⁸³ Uriah Smith, “The Great Central Subject,” *Review and Herald*, 22 November 1881, 328; Uriah Smith, “The Sanctuary,” *Review and Herald*, 27 September 1887, 616. See Timm, “The Seventh-day Adventist Doctrine of the Sanctuary (1844-2007),” 336, 337.

Recent Adventist Studies on the Sanctuary

The sanctuary doctrine has been challenged by a number of people throughout the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, most of them suggesting that the Day of Atonement began long before 1844 with Christ's ascension in 31 A.D.⁸⁴ Probably the most influential detractor was Desmond Ford (1929-), who argued that the Day of Atonement occurred at the Cross. His views on prophetic interpretation, the heavenly sanctuary, the Day of Atonement, the investigative judgment, and salvation have challenged traditional Adventist beliefs. As mentioned before, Canale has observed that numerous studies have emerged within the last thirty some years in response to Ford's interpretations and assumptions.⁸⁵ Attempting a more precise definition of the biblical sanctuary doctrine, these studies have dealt with the OT sanctuary service and its rites, their relationship to the heavenly sanctuary, cultic and juridical motifs in various biblical books, eschatological passages in Daniel and Revelation, and cultic language in Hebrews. The present section briefly summarizes the findings and conclusions of these studies, focusing first on those that deal with biblical typology, terms, concepts, and passages in the OT writings and NT writings, then concluding with some survey works.

⁸⁴ See, e.g., Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921), William Warde Fletcher (1879-1947), Ludwig Richard Conradi (1856-1939). See Gary Land, "Ballenger, Albion Fox (1861-1921)," in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, eds. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2013), 302, 303; "Fletcher, William Warde (1879-1947)," in *Commentary Reference Series*, vol. 10, *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia*, rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1976), 464; Gilbert M. Valentine, *W. W. Prescott: Forgotten Giant of Adventism's Second Generation*, rev. ed., Adventist Pioneer Series (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2005), 320, 321; Daniel Heinz, "Conradi, Louis (Ludwig) Richard (1856-1939)," in *The Ellen G. White Encyclopedia*, eds. Denis Fortin and Jerry Moon (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2013), 348. An interesting comparison between the views on the sanctuary in the writings of Uriah Smith (1832-1903), A. F. Ballenger, and M. L. Andreasen (1876-1962), whose ideas on the last generation and atonement will be discussed further below, is made in Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981).

⁸⁵ Several more general publications also appeared in that context or in response to more recent challenges. See Richard M. Davidson, "In Confirmation of the Sanctuary Message," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 2, no. 2 (1991): 93-114; Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary: Understanding the Heart of Adventist Theology* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1993); Jack J. Blanco, "The Sanctuary and the Mission of the Church," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 9, no. 1 (1998): 245-261; Roberto Ouro, "The Apotelesmatic Principle: Origin and Application," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 9, no. 1 (1998): 328-344; Clifford Goldstein, *Graffiti in the Holy of Holies: An Impassioned Response to Recent Attacks on the Sanctuary and Ellen White* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2003).

Biblical Typology

Richard M. Davidson sheds more light on the biblical usage of several terms associated with typology and Dan 8. In his study of biblical passages that use the terms *tabnît*, *paradeigma*, and *typos* (type, example, pattern, construction) and *hypodeigma* (antitype, copy, image), Davidson discovered five typological structures (historical, eschatological, christological-soteriological, ecclesiastical, prophetic) in Scripture. These always exhibit a correspondence between two realities in the linear sequence of history; one reality is the absolute augmentation of the other reality. There is not always a direct correspondence of all the details, but those having a soteriological significance generally correspond with each other. Thus Scripture presents a corresponding typology rather than an antithetical typology, Davidson concluded.⁸⁶ Similarly, William G. Johnsson's work critiques metaphorical/figurative interpretations of the heavenly sanctuary and discusses a realistic/literal interpretation.⁸⁷

Cultic Terms and Themes in the Pentateuch

The word *kipper* (atone) is central to Lev 16 (Day of Atonement) and has therefore been a focus of study for those wanting to understand how the Israelite tabernacle was contaminated and purified. Whereas Treiyer has studied the principles of the contamination and purification of the sanctuary in its biblical context,⁸⁸ Rodríguez focuses on the transfer of sin in Leviticus.⁸⁹ Winandy has examined the meaning, use, and function of the word *kipper* (atone) in the context

⁸⁶ Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Typos Structures*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981); Richard M. Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 121-186. See also Alberto R. Treiyer, "Antithetical or Correspondence Typology?," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 187-198.

⁸⁷ William G. Johnsson, "The Heavenly Sanctuary—Figurative or Real?," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 4.35-51.

⁸⁸ Alberto R. Treiyer, "The Day of Atonement as Related to the Contamination and Purification of the Sanctuary," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 3, *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 3.198-256.

⁸⁹ Angel M. Rodríguez, "Transfer of Sin in Leviticus," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 3, *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 3.169-197.

of Dan 9:24.⁹⁰ Gane's work expands on the meaning and system of purification offerings, the phases of *kipper* (atone), and the connections between cult and theodicy. He argues that God's sanctuary where God as Israel's king and judge "is enthroned stands for his character, reputation, and authority." As the condition of any nation affects the reputation and "throne" of their king, so God's reputation receives the impact of the imperfections and faults of his subjects. For him to continue dwelling among them, "his reputation must be cleared periodically so that it will not become too seriously compromised." Gane concludes that "this clearing takes place on the Day of Atonement," when God's honor and reputation are

absolved of any perceived taint (1) with regard to the physical imperfections . . . of the Israelites because they are purified, (2) with regard to the wanton/defiant sins . . . of the disloyal because they are condemned, and (3) with regard to the forgiven sins . . . of the loyal because they have accepted the sacrificial remedies that he has provided and demonstrated their ongoing loyalty and penitence by obediently practicing self-denial and resting from work on the Day of Atonement. While it would be pointless to demand absolute perfection from a people unable to give it, he can require loyalty that includes acceptance of his remedies for imperfection.

Elucidating the reasons for the Day of Atonement, Gane states that God incurs judicial responsibility when he forgives guilty people, resulting in an "imbalance between justice and kindness that affects his reputation as ruler (cf. 2 Sam 14:9)." The Day of Atonement restores this equilibrium "through the ritual purification of the sanctuary" and thus vindicates God's administrative justice.⁹¹

Cultic Terms and Themes in Daniel

By examining the cultic motif in the book of Daniel as it relates to time and space, Vogel has convincingly demonstrated that the idea of a conflict between two opposing systems of cult and worship plays a dominant role. He also points out the relation of the cultic motif with the main themes of Daniel such as judgment, eschatology, kingdom, and worship.⁹²

In the context of cultic studies in the book of Daniel, chapters 7-9 have received the most attention. Thus, for instance, Arthur J. Ferch and Loron Wade

⁹⁰ Pierre Winandy, "The Meaning of Kipper in Daniel 9:24," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 3, *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 3. 119-127.

⁹¹ Roy Gane, *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 379; Roy Gane, "Temple and Sacrifice," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 10, no. 1 (1999): 357-380.

⁹² Winfried Vogel, "Cultic Motif and Space and Time in the Book of Daniel" (Th.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1999); Winfried Vogel, *The Cultic Motif in the Book of Daniel* (New York: Peter Lang, 2010).

have referred to the possibility that the judgment scene of Dan 7, which describes one like a “son of man” coming to the Ancient of Days, contains allusions to the Day of Atonement event in the heavenly sanctuary.⁹³

Further, based on the OT usage of the term *sdq* (be just/righteous) Davidson suggests that its Niphal form *nišdaq* in Dan 8:14 may have three extended meanings: (1) the meaning “to correct” in the sense of “to restore” or “to put something back to its rightful place,” which is often found in a relational context; (2) the meaning “to cleanse,” “to purge,” or “to purify,” which is often used in poetic synthetic parallelisms and occurs particularly in cultic contexts; and (3) the meaning “to justify,” “to vindicate,” or “to judge,” which is used in legal contexts. It seems that all three contexts are present in Dan 8:9-14. While the author could have used other words to express each single meaning, he employed the word *nišdaq* to indicate the solution to all three problems caused by the little horn power. Thus the *tāmīd* (regular, continual, daily) service of the heavenly sanctuary that was taken away is restored to its rightful place (restoration). Also, the cleansing of the sanctuary removes the *péšaʿ* (rebellion) that causes horror in the sanctuary and illegally contaminates it (cleansing). Whereas the trampling down of the sanctuary and the host defamed God, his character, and his plan of salvation, the *nišdaq* process vindicates him, his character, and his way of salvation (vindication).⁹⁴

In his massive 871-page dissertation, Pröbstle employs linguistic, literary, and intertextual approaches to investigate Dan 8:9-14. His study, probably one of the most significant studies on the passage and the subject, supports previous studies on the terminology and concepts used in the text. He discovered that the Day of Atonement motif serves as the macrotheme of the passage and “typifies the divine reaction to the cosmic challenge created by the cultic war of the horn.”⁹⁵ Several

⁹³ Arthur J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel 7*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 6 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983); Loron Wade, “‘Son of Man’ Comes to the Judgment in Daniel 7:13,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 11, no. 1 (2000): 277-281.

⁹⁴ Richard M. Davidson, “The Meaning of Nisdaq in Daniel 8:14,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 7, no. 1 (1996): 107-119. Cf. Niels-Erik Andreassen, “Translation of Nisdaq/Katharisthesetai in Daniel 8:14,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 2, *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 475-496; Angel M. Rodríguez, “Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 2, *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 537-549.

⁹⁵ Martin Pröbstle, “Truth and Terror: A Text-oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9-14” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2005), abstract; cf. Martin Pröbstle, “A Linguistic Analysis of Daniel 8:11, 12,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 7, no. 1 (1996): 81-106. For previous brief studies of the passage and its language see, e.g., Gerhard F. Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 2, *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 378-461;

scholars have discussed the historical evidence of the beginning date for the seventy weeks of Dan 9 in order to support the dating of the 2300-year prophecy of Dan 8.⁹⁶

The Heavenly Sanctuary and Ministration of Christ in Hebrews

A number of other scholars have discussed *ta hagia* (the holy [place], the sanctuary) in the context of Hebrews.⁹⁷ Since most of these studies are in one way or another connected to the question of whether Hebrews suggests a beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement in the first century A.D., some have investigated the specific allusions to the Day of Atonement.⁹⁸ For example, Kiesler has

Siegfried J. Schwantes, "Ereb Boqer of Daniel 8:14 Re-examined," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 2, *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 462-474; William H. Shea, "Spatial Dimensions in the Vision of Daniel 8," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 2, *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 497-526; Rodríguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," 527-549; Clifford Goldstein, *1844 Made Simple* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1988).

⁹⁶ Arthur J. Ferch, "Commencement Date for the Seventy Weeks Prophecy," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 3, *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 3.64-74; William H. Shea, "When Did the Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24 Begin?," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 2, no. 1 (1991): 115-138; William H. Shea, "When Did the Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24 Begin?," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vols. 6-7, *Symposium on Revelation*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1992), 6.375-394; Brempong Owusu-Antwi, *The Chronology of Dan 9:24-27*, Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1995); William H. Shea, "Supplementary Evidence in Support of 457 B.C. as the Starting Date for the 2300 Day-Years of Daniel 8:14," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 12, no. 1 (2001): 89-96; William H. Shea, "A Review of the Biblical Evidence for the Use of the Fall-to-Fall Calendar," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 12, no. 2 (2001): 152-163. Cf. Siegfried H. Horn and Lynn H. Wood, *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, 2nd rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1970). See Gerhard F. Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 3, *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1986), 3-63, for a survey and discussion of amillennial, dispensational, historical-critical, and historicist interpretations of the seventy-weeks chronology.

⁹⁷ Alwyn P. Salom, "Ta Hagia in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 4.219-227.

⁹⁸ William G. Johnsson, "Day of Atonement Allusions," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 4.105-120.

examined six particular passages in Hebrews that are often central to the question of whether Hebrews denies a two-phase ministry (regular/daily service and Day of Atonement) in the heavenly sanctuary. He concludes that the book has a different purpose; it intends “to emphasize the superiority of Christ’s blood over animal blood” and that sin no longer presents “a barrier between God and man.”⁹⁹ Salom briefly outlines various aspects of Hebrews’ sanctuary theology, including the sanctuary itself, Christ’s heavenly ministration, the “right hand of God” theme, the “free access” theme, the Day of Atonement allusions, and the two-phase ministry.¹⁰⁰

In the late 1980s, George E. Rice analyzed prevalent presuppositions concerning the term *katapetasma* (curtain, veil) and concluded that in Heb 6:19, 20 the term is used in a context that is quite different from its use in the LXX, suggesting that Heb 6:19, 20 does not specify what veil is meant.¹⁰¹ Gane has demonstrated that Rice was correct in stating that *katapetasma* may refer to any of the three veils, yet Gane argues that Rice overlooked the fact that the word belongs to the phrase *esōteron tou katapetasmatos* (into the inside of the veil), which appears four times in the LXX (Exod 26:33; Lev 16:2, 12, 15) and has the same meaning in each case: within the inner veil. Thus Gane concludes that the phrase seems to be a technical expression to refer to the inner veil of the sanctuary.¹⁰² Norman H. Young and Richard M. Davidson have each responded to and built on Gane’s work in the form of an exchange of articles between the two of them. While Young agrees with Gane in his identification of the veil based on the usage in the LXX, he argues that Heb 6:19, 20 has its background in the Day of Atonement and is in its nature parallel to Heb 10:19-21, suggesting that both passages picture the same veil, namely the inner veil.¹⁰³ Like Gane and Young, Davidson emphasizes the need to recognize Hebrews’ dependence on the LXX. He nevertheless stresses that he finds a different answer to the question, “What OT event provides the background for this passage?” Davidson suggests that Heb 6:19, 20 actually has three parallel sanctuary “entering” passages in the book of Hebrews (9:12, [18], 24; 10:19, 20) which seem to refer to the same veil. Interestingly, all three parallel

⁹⁹ Herbert Kiesler, “An Exegesis of Selected Passages,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 4.53-77.

¹⁰⁰ Alwyn P. Salom, “Sanctuary Theology,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 4.199-218.

¹⁰¹ George E. Rice, “Within Which Veil?,” *Ministry*, June 1987, 20, 21; George E. Rice, “Hebrews 6:19—Analysis of Some Assumptions Concerning Katapetasma,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1989), 229-234.

¹⁰² Roy E. Gane, “Re-Opening *Katapetasma* (‘Veil’) in Hebrews 6:19,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38, no. 1 (2000): 5-8.

¹⁰³ Norman H. Young, “Where Jesus Has Gone as a Forerunner on Our Behalf (Hebrews 6:20),” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39, no. 2 (2001): 165-173.

passages employ the three terms *tragos* (goat), *moschos* (calf), and the *enkainizō* word group (renew, inaugurate, dedicate), which appear together in the LXX only in Num 7, a chapter that deals with the inauguration of the tabernacle. Considering the context of Heb 6:19, 20 (“describing a point in time of Christ ‘having become’ [genomenos] high priest;” cf. Exod 40:9-15), Davidson concludes that “inauguration should also be seen as the most probable OT background for Heb 6:19, 20 as for the other sanctuary ‘entering’ passages.” He suggests that “neither inauguration nor the Day of Atonement take center stage” in the central cultic section of Hebrews. Instead, there is “a complex of motifs” that reveal the “superiority of Christ (and the gospel realities brought about by him) over the shadows of the OT cultus.” The sanctuary “entering” passages show the inauguration of the sanctuary, the initiation of Christ’s heavenly mediatorial work as high priest, and the provision of an ongoing access of the believers to the benefits of Christ’s mediation and God’s presence.¹⁰⁴ Young contends that Hebrews’ use of Philo’s writings concerning the word *tragos* and the idea of a high priest entering the Most Holy Place are strong arguments for the Day of Atonement. He further dismisses the connection between the word *enkainizō* and the inauguration of the sanctuary since the word itself does not appear in Exod 40, Lev 8, and Num 7. While he concedes that Heb 9:18-23 and perhaps 10:19, 20 may contain allusions to dedicatory ideas, Young remains “convinced that the Day of Atonement is the OT background for Heb 6:19-20 and 9:11-12.” He apparently favors an antithetical sanctuary typology in Hebrews, interpreting the sanctuary primarily in metaphorical terms.¹⁰⁵ Reminding Young that it was not so much the word itself but the word group *enkainizō* that appeared in Num 7 (four times), Davidson adds that it is repeatedly and exclusively used in inauguration contexts, yet not once in the context of the Day of Atonement. He further states that in the cultic parts of the LXX Torah, *tragos* appears only in Num 7 and that *tragos* and *moschos* together appear only in inauguration contexts. The three paralleling sanctuary “entering” passages mentioned above are always located in the context of “the transition between the two covenants with their respective sanctuaries and the official starting up of the heavenly sanctuary ministry.” Yet, in the OT, the Day of Atonement never occurred with the inauguration. Davidson contends that the context of the parallel passages does not require *ta hagia* to be limited to the Most Holy Place but allows the possibility that the reference is to the entire heavenly sanctuary, which, in turn, would be in harmony with the usage of the term in the LXX and the fact that in the OT it was always the entire sanctuary that was inaugurated and not merely the Most Holy Place. He observes a key difference between himself and Young concerning the view of typology in Hebrews. Davidson suggests a “fundamental continuity

¹⁰⁴ Richard M. Davidson, “Christ’s Entry ‘Within the Veil’ in Hebrews 6:19-20: The Old Testament Background,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39, no. 2 (2001): 175-190.

¹⁰⁵ Norman H. Young, “The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40, no. 1 (2002): 61-68.

between the *basic contours* of type and antitype” except where the OT itself announces discontinuity (as in Ps 40:6-8 and 110:4), whereas Young seems to assume a “radical discontinuity between type and antitype.” While Davidson believes in the “existence of Christ’s ongoing priestly ministry in a real, spatiotemporal heavenly sanctuary, he keeps away from overly literalistic applications of all the minute details of the OT tabernacle to the heavenly sanctuary. He notes that these basic contours of the OT sanctuary typology that the book of Hebrews revealed as being fulfilled in Christ were (1) “his sacrifice, coalescing the many daily and yearly sacrifices into his once-for-all death in light of Ps 40:6-8;” (2) “his inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary to officially start up its services and provide access into the presence of God;” (3) “his ongoing high priestly mediatorial ministry in the heavenly sanctuary;” and (4) “his future (from the author’s perspective) Day of Atonement work of investigative and executive judgment for the professed people of God.”¹⁰⁶

Studying passages on the ascension of Jesus to heaven (Heb 1:6; 4:14-16; 6:19, 20; 9:11-14; 10:19-22), Felix Cortez has discovered that the writer of Hebrews associated the ascension with “Jesus’ enthronement,” “his appointment as high priest,” and the “inauguration of the new covenant,” forming “part of Jesus’ exaltation at the right hand of God” and “contributing to his identity as ‘Son’.” He further notes that the epistle argues that Jesus, as the “Son,” fulfilled the expectations of a future Davidic king (2 Sam 7:12-15; Heb 1:5). Cortez considers the imagery of the inauguration of the covenant a more important background to the exposition of Jesus’ ascension in the Epistle to the Hebrews than the often assumed imagery of the Day of Atonement.¹⁰⁷

Johnsson emphasizes the necessity for biblical interpreters to consider “the full theological perspective” of a book when interpreting a specific passage in that book. Interpreters of Heb 9:23 should therefore consider that the book of Hebrews wants to show the one true solution to the sin problem, the one “sacrifice that is able to purify decisively.” Discussing the purification theme in Heb 9:23, he concludes that the text does not refer to the time of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary but only shows the need of the heavenly sanctuary “to be purified by the better sacrifice of Christ.” It also does not suggest that Christ’s death on Calvary was the antitype of the *Day of Atonement* but rather presents his sacrificial death as the antitype of *all OT sacrifices*. Johnsson concludes therefore that the passage does not equate Calvary with the Day of Atonement but refers its readers to the specific point in time when God gave the “single, all-sufficient Answer to sin.”¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ Richard M. Davidson, “Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young’s ‘Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited,’” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40, no. 1 (2002): 69-88.

¹⁰⁷ Felix Cortez, “The Anchor of the Soul that Enters Within the Veil: The Ascension of the ‘Son’ in the Letter to the Hebrews” (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2008), abstract, 30, 31.

¹⁰⁸ William G. Johnsson, “Defilement / Purification in Hebrews 9:23,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 4, *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day

At this point I want to make a brief excursion to note two recent studies of non-Adventist scholars which are of interest to the discussion in this chapter. Using Canale's "dissertation on the prescriptive analysis of Exodus . . . as a paradigmatic model"¹⁰⁹ for his own work, King L. She has done a descriptive text-oriented analysis of Exodus to find significant ontological and hermeneutical markers of the doctrinal system of the author of Hebrews in order to determine which theological positions on Heb 9:22-23 are ontologically consistent or inconsistent with the system of the author. Discovering that Exod 3:14 and 25:40 serve as such markers, She utilizes these passages to demonstrate that the hermeneutics of the author was a Christocentric-typological biblical pedagogy with Exod 32-34 serving as the controlling revelation of the author's hermeneutic. He further states that it was foundational for the estimation of the significance of Christ's high-priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary to consider that the author's audience must be connected to the Exodus generation via the book of Exodus. In his discussion of the validity and consistency of three theological positions on Heb 9:22-23, She concludes that both the classical pedagogy (heavenly sanctuary as heaven itself; metaphorical immaterial sanctuary) and the modern pedagogy (heavenly sanctuary idea is incomprehensible) build on ontological presuppositions that are foreign to Scripture. However, he finds a truly biblical pedagogy reflected in the position of Alberto Treiyer and Kevin Conner, who interpret Heb 9:22-23 ontologically as referring to a bipartite spatiotemporal heavenly sanctuary.¹¹⁰

David M. Moffitt, senior lecturer at University of St. Andrews, has challenged the view generally accepted among Protestants that Hebrews should be interpreted metaphorically against the background of Philo's dualistic cosmology. Based on his study of Jewish apocalyptic writings and the Old Testament he has come to the conclusion that the author of Hebrews assumed a literal-spatial sanctuary within heaven. Although the documentary evidence attests to the "influence of philosophical ideas permeating Jewish religious thought," Moffitt nevertheless holds that there are marked differences between Jewish apocalyptic and Middle Platonist assessments concerning the perception of reality, the relationship between the earthly and the divine realm, the future existence, and the moral status of the material nature.¹¹¹ A number of features of Hebrews suggest that Jewish apocalypticism forms the most likely context of the book, including the references to God's throne in heaven, the veil of the temple, God's glory, participation in angelic worship, the future world, the present time as the last days, the final embodied resurrection and the final judgment, "the peshar adjacent hermeneutic,"

Adventists, 1989), 79, 80.

¹⁰⁹ King L. She, *The Use of Exodus in Hebrews*, Studies in Biblical Literature, vol. 142 (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 7.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 7, 9, 169, 171-174.

¹¹¹ David M. Moffitt, "Serving in Heaven's Temple: Sacred Space, Yom Kippur, and Jesus' Superior Offering in Hebrews," Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature (Chicago, IL, 2012), 3; David M. Moffitt, *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 141 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013).

and the assumption of the bodily “ascension of a human being through the heavens.” The contrast is therefore not so much between the material and the spiritual realm, but between “the realm of sin, corruption, and impurity and the realm of life, purity, and God’s presence.”¹¹² Referring to Jonathan Klawans, Moffitt suggests that ancient Judaism knew at least two models for relating the earthly temple to the heavenly realms. One model viewed the earthly temple as a metaphorical representation of the entire cosmos, i.e. earth and heaven. The court represented the earth and the sanctuary symbolized heaven. The second view saw the earthly temple as a model of a real temple in heaven, suggesting an analogy. This second view always correlates with the views that God’s presence dwells fully in that heavenly space and that angels serve as priests in that heavenly temple. The primary sources usually advocate one view or the other, not both together. Moffitt concludes that Hebrews clearly fits into that second category of writings, envisioning a temple *in* heaven, but not a temple *as* heaven. This conception of heaven having spatial dimensions is compatible with the idea previously mentioned of embodied human beings in the heavenly realm, suggesting that “heaven need not be an immaterial place.”¹¹³ Commenting on various aspects of Jesus’ life, death, resurrection, and ministry in this context, he concludes,

With this kind of approach, the author is able to correlate elements of the basic story of Jesus with the sacrificial ritual of Yom Kippur in a way that does not devolve into a reduction of the heavenly Yom Kippur ritual into the one historical act of Jesus’ crucifixion. By way of analogy the author is able to identify Jesus’ death as the initial act or trigger that puts into motion a series of ritual events. In this way Jesus’ death is a sacrificial element. The narrative of Jesus’ resurrection, ascension, and session can be further correlated with the ritual process by linking Jesus’ resurrection with his qualification to serve as high priest, his ascension as his entering into the holy precincts in heaven and ultimately into the true tabernacle in heaven. There he presents his offering—which is nothing less than himself (cf. 7:28) before God. Having made a purification for sins (1:3), he is then invited by God to be the first human to be elevated above the angels and sit down on the heavenly throne. In this way the story of Jesus is correlated with the ritual actions of Yom Kippur such that Jesus’ life, death, resurrection, ascension and session can also be shown to be the events that enact the true atoning Yom Kippur ritual in the one true tabernacle that, by analogy, the earthly one is modeled upon.¹¹⁴

¹¹² Moffitt, “Serving in Heaven’s Temple,” 4, 5.

¹¹³ Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 111-144; Moffitt, “Serving in Heaven’s Temple,” 10-13.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 15, 16.

Although Seventh-day Adventists would generally disagree with him in his suggestion that the antitypical Day of Atonement began with Christ's ascension, Moffitt has unearthed much evidence that supports the Adventist view of the heavenly sanctuary and Canale's suggestions regarding the philosophical foundations of the biblical sanctuary motif.

The Heavenly Temple in Revelation

In their discussion of the literary patterns of the Book of Revelation, Richard M. Davidson, Jon Paulien, and later on Ranko Stefanovic have all suggested a sevenfold structure of successive major sections (chaps. 2-3; 6:1-8:1; 8:6-11:18; 12:1-15:4; chaps. 16-18; 19:11-21:1; 21:9-22:5), which are always introduced by a generally brief heavenly sanctuary scene (1:9-20; chaps. 4-5; 8:2-5; 11:19; 15:5-8; 19:1-10; 21:2-8), and framed by a prologue and epilogue (1:1-8; 22:6-11). Following the previous studies of Davidson and Paulien, Stefanovic suggests that these introductory sanctuary scenes indicate "two definite lines of progression: first, there is a complete circle moving from earth [1:12-20] to heaven and then back to earth again [21:1-22:5]. Then, there is a definite progression from the inauguration [chaps. 4-5] of the heavenly sanctuary to intercession [8:3-5], to judgment [11:19], then to the cessation [15:5-8] of the sanctuary function, and finally to its absence [19:1-10]." The heavenly sanctuary seems to be "the center of all divine activities," and "the entire Revelation-vision," as Stefanovic suggests, "is apparently perceived from the vantage point of the heavenly temple."¹¹⁵ Interestingly, while the first part of the book follows the order of the *tāmīd* (regular, continual, daily) service, the second part, starting in Rev 11:19, frequently alludes to the Day of Atonement.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Richard M. Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vols. 6-7, *Symposium on Revelation*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1992), 6:112-115; Jon Paulien, "Seals and Trumpets: Some Current Discussions," in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vols. 6-7, *Symposium on Revelation*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1992), 6:187, 188; Jon Paulien, "The Role of the Hebrew Cultus, Sanctuary, and Temple in the Plot and Structure of the Book of Revelation," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 33, no. 2 (1995): 247-255; Ranko Stefanović, "Finding Meaning in the Literary Patterns of Revelation," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 13, no. 1 (2002): 32, 33. They differ from Kenneth A. Strand who suggested a structure of eight basic sections. See Kenneth A. Strand, *Interpreting the Book of Revelation: Hermeneutical Guidelines, with Brief Introduction to Literary Analysis*, 2nd ed. (Naples, FL: Ann Arbor Pub., 1979), 51, 52; Kenneth A. Strand, "The Eight Basic Visions in the Book of Revelation," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25, no. 1 (1987): 107-121; Kenneth A. Strand, "The 'Victorious-Introduction Scenes' in the Visions in the Book of Revelation," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25, no. 3 (1987): 267-288.

¹¹⁶ Paulien, "The Role of the Hebrew Cultus, Sanctuary, and Temple in the Plot and Structure of the Book of Revelation," 225-257; Stefanović, "Finding Meaning in the Literary Patterns of Revelation," 33-35; William H. Shea, "The Cultic Calendar for the Introductory Sanctuary Scenes of Revelation," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 11, no. 1 (2000): 120-147.

In the same vein, Revelation seems to follow the sequence of the spring and fall festivals.¹¹⁷ The structure of the book, Stefanovic concludes, suggests therefore that Rev 1-11 describes the entire Christian age whereas Rev 12-22 focuses on the final events of the history of this world. The same point is proven by the chiasmic structure of the entire book. The central segment (11:19–13:18) deals with the great controversy between Christ and Satan which seems to be “the central theological theme of the book.”¹¹⁸

Several other studies deal with specific issues and topics in the book of Revelation. For example, Paulien surveys the relation between the sanctuary and the judgment in Revelation.¹¹⁹ In his master’s thesis, Stefanović focuses specifically on the reality and meaning of the heavenly sanctuary and its services in the Book of Revelation.¹²⁰ There have also been a few discussions revolving around the question of whether the scenes presented in Rev 4-5 show the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary or the judgment scenes of the Day of Atonement.¹²¹

Survey Works on the Sanctuary Doctrine

Alberto R. Treiyer has shown the cultic, theological, typological, and eschatological aspects of the Day of Atonement and the heavenly judgment, especially as seen in Leviticus, the OT prophets, Hebrews, and Revelation. He points out the correlation between the heavenly sanctuary and its earthly counterpart and describes the principles of contamination and purification of the sanctuary.¹²² Elias Brasil de Souza has investigated the function of the heavenly sanctuary and its relationship to the earthly counterparts, as reflected in forty-three OT passages. These passages depicted the heavenly sanctuary as a location where God “supervises the cosmos, performs acts of judgment . . . , hears the prayers of the needy, and bestows atonement and forgiveness upon sinners.” It is also presented

¹¹⁷ Paulien, “Seals and Trumpets,” 6.190-192; Paulien, “The Role of the Hebrew Cultus, Sanctuary, and Temple in the Plot and Structure of the Book of Revelation,” 257-261; Davidson, “Sanctuary Typology,” 119-126, 130; Stefanović, “Finding Meaning in the Literary Patterns of Revelation,” 35-37.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 35, 38.

¹¹⁹ Jon Paulien, “Sanctuary and Judgment,” in *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vols. 6-7, *Symposium on Revelation*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1992), 7.275-294.

¹²⁰ Ranko Stefanović, “The Heavenly Sanctuary and Its Services in the Book of Revelation: Its Reality and Meaning” (M.A. thesis, Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, 1990).

¹²¹ Alberto R. Treiyer, *The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Judgment: From the Pentateuch to Revelation* (Siloam Springs, AR: Creation Enterprises International, 1992), 474-494; Norman R. Gulley, “Revelation 4 and 5: Judgment or Inauguration?,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 8, no. 1 (1997): 59-81; Ranko Stefanović, “Revelation 4 and 5: Inauguration or Day of Atonement?,” Paper presented at the “Current Issues in Eschatology” Symposium co-sponsored by the Adventist Theological Society and the Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University on March 1-3, 2007, Berrien Springs, MI, 2007.

¹²² Treiyer, *The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Judgment*.

as “a place of worship, a meeting place for the heavenly council, and an object of attack by anti-YHWH forces, thus playing a pivotal role in the cosmic battle between good and evil.” Further, de Souza points out that these passages reveal structural and functional correlation between the heavenly and the earthly sanctuaries, suggesting that “the activities of one could affect the other.”¹²³

Several writers have highlighted Christ’s function, ministry, and work as sacrifice, high priest, intercessor, and king.¹²⁴ In the same vein a number of publications have elaborated on the salvation and atonement aspects illustrated in the biblical sanctuary motif.¹²⁵ Judgment proceeding from the sanctuary is another subject that has been examined by a number of scholars. Noting that the judgment encompasses several phases, they have emphasized that divine judgment is an event of both salvation and damnation. One phase of the judgment takes place during the antitypical Day of Atonement before the second coming of Christ. It vindicates God in his act of saving some and condemning others, answering Satan’s accusations that God cannot be just and merciful at the same time.¹²⁶

¹²³ Elias Brasil de Souza, *The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple Motif in the Hebrew Bible: Function and Relationship to the Earthly Counterparts*, Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series, vol. 7 (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 2005), abstract.

¹²⁴ Frank B. Holbrook, “Christ’s Inauguration as King-Priest,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 5, no. 2 (1994): 136-152; Frank B. Holbrook, *The Atoning Priesthood of Jesus Christ* (Berrien Springs MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1996); Alberto R. Treiyer, “The Priest-King Role of the Messiah,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 7, no. 1 (1996): 64-80. Cf. Erwin R. Gane, *Heaven’s Open Door: The Seven Seals of Revelation and Christ Our Heavenly High Priest* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1989).

¹²⁵ Hans K. LaRondelle, “Salvation and the Atonement,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 3, no. 1 (1992): 22-51; George W. Reid, “Salvation and the Sanctuary,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 3, no. 1 (1992): 97-104; Roy Gane, *Altar Call* (Berrien Springs, MI: Diadem, 1999); Angel M. Rodríguez, *Spanning the Abyss: How the Atonement Brings God and Humanity Together* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2008).

¹²⁶ Richard M. Davidson, “The Good News of Yom Kippur,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 2, no. 2 (1991): 4-27; Roy Gane, “Judgment as Covenant Review,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 8, no. 1 (1997): 181-194; Jiri Moskala, “Toward a Biblical Theology of God’s Judgment: A Celebration of the Cross in Seven Phases of Divine Universal Judgment (An Over-view of a Theocentric-Christocentric Approach),” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 15, no. 1 (2004): 138-165; Roy Gane, *Who’s Afraid of the Judgment?: The Good News About Christ’s Work in the Heavenly Sanctuary* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2006); Martin Pröbstle, *Himmel auf Erden: Gott begegnet uns im Heiligtum*, 2nd enl. ed. (Vienna, Austria: Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2013).

**The Significance of the Antitypical Day of Atonement
and the Heavenly Sanctuary**

In my experience, pastoral students and church members generally believe in the sanctuary doctrine, but when asked to explain why the antitypical Day of Atonement is necessary, they are unable to give an answer that goes beyond the mere idea of the heavenly sanctuary being cleansed from our sins. Many students affirm the importance of the doctrine, but when asked regarding its practical significance, they fail to specify its universal and personal dimensions.¹²⁷ This observation corresponds with Canale's estimation that many Adventist leaders (pastors, administrators, teachers, etc.) look at the sanctuary doctrine through the lens of an Evangelical understanding of justification by faith, and they tend to borrow the hermeneutical principles on which Roman Catholic and Protestant theology was built. Thus they have difficulties seeing the relevance and significance of the sanctuary doctrine.¹²⁸ While the sequence of actions on the Day of Atonement can be easily comprehended on the literal level, many people find it difficult to fathom the actual universal and personal meaning of these actions. Since sin is generally conceived as an action or a condition—in other words, as an abstract thing—many wonder how it can be kept in the sanctuary over an extended period of time as if sin were a physical object. It is hard for us to grasp why there may be a need to “keep” our sins “stored” in the sanctuary until the Day of Atonement. Therefore one may ask whether that need arises from the behavior of the believers or from reasons that go beyond them. While older generations considered doctrines important because they were firmly grounded in Scripture, younger generations tend to estimate the significance of a belief based on its practical value and significance. The *what* of a doctrine (content level) takes second place to the *why* of that doctrine (level of meaning and importance). Should Adventist scholars fail to provide adequate answers to the question of the significance of the sanctuary doctrine, they will convince younger people of its unimportance. That is why I want to draw attention to a few aspects that should receive more attention in the context of the sanctuary doctrine.

The biblical sanctuary, its services, and the Day of Atonement seems to provide an answer to the question of whether God's justice and mercy can be harmonized. This provision may come in response to Satan's accusations that God

¹²⁷ A recent survey among undergraduate students at Andrews University seems to substantiate this personal impression. See Leane M. Sigvartsen, Jan A. Sigvartsen, and Paul B. Petersen, *Beyond Beliefs 1: What Millennial Young Adults Really Think of the 28 Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, Department of Religion and Biblical Languages, 2014), 41, 44, 45, 375-386. The authors noted that the results may not represent the overall picture of Adventist young adults in North America due to the particular demographics of those who choose to study at Andrews University and decided to take the class in which that survey was done.

¹²⁸ Of course, without a proper large-scale survey it is difficult to determine whether these reasons are the common underlying causes of the perceived practical insignificance of the sanctuary doctrine. Personal observations may nevertheless suggest that the reasons mentioned above are among several issues that create problems for many.

is either too strict (requiring every creature to keep a law that is impossible to keep), or he is too lenient (remitting everyone's failures and sins). The basic question is, how is God both just and merciful in saving some and condemning others? This question judges God at the core of his character of love and holiness.

It has been mentioned earlier in this paper that the sins and transgressions of God's professing people defile the sanctuary in two ways. Some repent of their sins and follow the divinely appointed way of removing sin from the transgressor. Others commit sins of rebellion and follow their own alternative plan of salvation, yet their sins are associated with God and his sanctuary because as members of his community they represent him. The first group trusts in God's means of forgiveness and salvation; the second group pursues their own way of salvation, thereby replacing the true sanctuary service. While the first course of action transfers sins legally to the sanctuary and defiles it, the other one illegally contaminates the sanctuary through the air. Since both groups are professed members of God's people, their behavior and actions either represent or misrepresent his character and plan of salvation. That is why a final assessment is required which comes in the form of the Day of Atonement. The high priest (Jesus Christ) who functions as the people's representative and substitute entered the Most Holy Place in place of all those who during the daily service trusted in God's means of forgiveness and salvation. Thus God is vindicated in his act of saving them. Other members of God's people who take alternative ways contaminate the true sanctuary illegally. On the Day of Atonement their sins fall back on them and they are blotted out from among the people. God is vindicated in his act of judging them. This assessment allows God to be just and merciful at the same time. Therefore the sanctuary can be cleansed from the transgressions and sins of the people, and ultimately from Satan's charges against God. These incidents describe both the salvific and the condemnatory aspects of the Day of Atonement. It is both a day of salvation and a day of judgment. There is no creative leeway for humanity in regard to salvation. God shows very clearly how salvation can be brought about and how he will eventually solve the sin problem and the issue it poses to the wellbeing and destiny of the universe. A deviation from his plan distorts the illustration of how salvation comes about and how ultimate reconciliation will take place. The Day of Atonement shows that God is both just and merciful. Before the entire universe God is vindicated in his character against Satan's charges.

Beyond the universal dimensions of the Day of Atonement, there are also practical earthly dimensions of that event. In 1844, the knowledge of God's true heavenly sanctuary and its services began to be restored. The proclamation of the sanctuary message through the Sabbatarian Adventist movement pointed people to that true sanctuary in heaven and Jesus' high-priestly ministry. The proclamation of this message called attention to the true worship, the true way of salvation, and the true intercessory ministry. While in that sense the heavenly sanctuary ministry was restored, it also clarified that religious denominations that reproduced a sanctuary, priesthood, sacrifices, etc. on earth and restricted the attention of the believers to these earthly services actually erected a counterfeit sanctuary service and salvation plan. Thus God's true heavenly sanctuary with its services (his true

plan of salvation) and his character of love and holiness began to be vindicated before humanity. Seventh-day Adventists have engaged in this work of cleansing, restoring, and vindicating God, his character, his plan of salvation, Christ's ministrations, and his way of dealing with the sin problem. That is why this movement was called into life. Hence it is the work of each believer to personally participate in that work.

Possible ramifications of a slightly limited view of Satan's claims, the nature of sin, salvation, the work of the Holy Spirit, the vindication of God, and atonement may be seen in the teaching of the "Last Generation Theology" as it was developed by M. L. Andreasen (1876-1962), an influential Adventist educator and theologian in the 1930s and 1940s. Since his view of the antitypical Day of Atonement results from his assumptions and presuppositions, these will be explained before his view of atonement is mentioned. The section will conclude with a comparison of Andreasen's view to Ellen G. White's writings, which are often seen as the source for Andreasen's view.¹²⁹ Concentrating on only one of the two charges, namely that God asked obedience to a law that could not be kept, Andreasen concluded that it was necessary to prove only that man can keep the law. He argued that Jesus' perfect life provided humans with an example of how they can keep the law, but it was still not sufficient to disprove Satan's charge. While he viewed Job as the prime example of perfect human obedience, Andreasen argued that it was nevertheless only an imperfect example because it did not occur under common circumstances. In order to vindicate God there has to be at least one person or one generation that will demonstrate beyond a doubt that humans can keep the law without divine aid and intervention. Thus it will be the struggle of the last generation of believers on this earth to live a perfect sinless life. Andreasen concluded that this generation will conquer Satan and disprove his charge. It is only when believers stop sinning, he argued, that sin can be removed from the heavenly sanctuary. Consequently, complete atonement depends on human performance.¹³⁰ Whereas many people assume that Andreasen's concept corresponds with Ellen G. White's view of last-day events, it should be noted that Andreasen went beyond the basic elements common to both him and White, integrating them systematically into a special end-time scenario and assigning to the last generation's victory a significance that is foreign to her writings. Ellen G. White mentioned that Satan accused God of two things: God is too strict, for he requires humans to keep a law that is impossible to keep, and God is too lenient, because he just forgives them. Depending on the circumstances, Satan employs either the first or the second

¹²⁹ This paragraph depends on the comparison found in Paul M. Evans, "A Historical-Contextual Analysis of the Final-Generation Theology of M. L. Andreasen" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2010); Woodrow W. Whidden, *Ellen White on Salvation: A Chronological Study* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1995), 132-142; Woodrow W. Whidden, *The Judgment and Assurance: The Dynamics of Personal Salvation* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2012), 146-152.

¹³⁰ M. L. Andreasen, *The Sanctuary Service*, 2nd rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1947), 302, 303, 309-321.

charge.¹³¹ Ultimately, he claims that God cannot be just and merciful at the same time, an accusation that cuts at the root of God's character of holy love. While both White and Andreasen affirmed that Jesus' life on earth demonstrated that it is possible for man to keep God's law, White places another emphasis which is absent in Andreasen's writings, namely that Jesus' obedience did, in fact, vindicate God's character and his dealings with the rebellion of Satan.¹³² Talking about the last and complete demonstration to be given in the time of trouble, White suggested that it was to be a demonstration of evil so that once and for all the true character of Satan and the terrible consequences of sin become visible. This will uproot even the last sympathy and affection for him and his temptations in a way that nothing else could.¹³³ In the context of the last-day events, White did not connect the last generation's overcoming of sin with the vindication of God. It is rather in the context of the pouring out of the last plagues or the postmillennial execution judgment that she talks about God's vindication.¹³⁴ Similarly, the struggle of the believers in the last generation is not primarily to maintain perfect obedience but to persevere in their faith and trust in Jesus, the power of his forgiveness, and the divine promises.¹³⁵ Although the restraining influence of the Holy Spirit is removed from the wicked, he will not leave the believers alone when the powers of darkness break loose. Realizing the depth of their own weakness, helplessness, and the inherent sinful tendencies, they will hold fast to their Redeemer in faith, trust the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and be comforted and protected by angels.¹³⁶ Interestingly, White referred to Joshua the high priest, Jacob, and Enoch (rather than Job) as examples for the last generation to emulate during the time of trouble, emphasizing the endurance of their faith.¹³⁷ While she mentioned the victory of the saints over temptations and trials, she emphasized that it was Christ who ultimately

¹³¹ Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages* (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1898), 761; Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets: or, The Great Conflict Between Good and Evil as Illustrated in the Lives of Holy Men of Old* (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1890), 69.

¹³² Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, 9 vols. (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1948), 8:207, 208; Ellen G. White, "Christ and the Law: Or the Relations of the Jew and Gentile to the Law," *Signs of the Times*, 25 August 1887, 513; White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 68, 69.

¹³³ Ellen G. White, "Unity and Love," *Review and Herald*, 12 August 1884, 513.

¹³⁴ Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan: The Conflict of the Ages in the Christian Dispensation* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1911), 504, 627, 628.

¹³⁵ Ellen G. White, *Spirit of Prophecy*, vol. 1 (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Pub. Assn., 1870), 125; Ellen G. White, "Our Advocate and Our Adversary," *Review and Herald*, 22 September 1896, 598.

¹³⁶ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 201; Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts: Testimony for the Church, Number One – Ten* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Pub. Assn., 1864), 44; White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*, 620, 623, 631.

¹³⁷ Ellen G. White, *The Captivity and Restoration of Israel: The Conflict of the Ages Illustrated in the Lives of Prophets and Kings* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1917), 588, 589; White, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*, 619, 620.

gained the victory over Satan.¹³⁸ Another striking difference appears regarding the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. White emphasized that believers should confess their failures and sins as long as Jesus is still ministering in the heavenly sanctuary so that these sins may be blotted out. Then God will place his seal on them to protect them through the time of trouble.¹³⁹ Thus atonement and the cleansing of the sanctuary are based on what God has done rather than on human performance. The two different views have an impact on the practical Christian life. While M. L. Andreasen urged believers to obey the law because the last generation has to live victoriously without divine help through the time of trouble to rebuff Satan's charge (behavior-oriented), Ellen G. White urged believers to confess their sins and put their faith in Jesus because the last generation will be lost without trust in Jesus and complete dependence on him.

Not being aware of the hermeneutical principles on which Roman Catholic and Protestant theology were built, we tend to adopt views, trends, and practices from other religious denominations. Thus it may not be surprising for us when some Adventists refer to the church building or the worship room as the sanctuary, temple, or tabernacle. Accordingly, chairs, benches, pulpits, and the room itself are regarded as possessing sacred qualities, and it is suggested to avoid common use of these pieces of furniture and locations. Others attribute sacred qualities to the emblems of the Lord's Supper. Still others surmise that the act of ministerial ordination transmits special virtues, qualifications, and powers.¹⁴⁰ While I believe that we should stand and kneel in awe and reverence before God, I also believe that all these common sacerdotal and sacramental understandings have their origin in other traditions and are incompatible with the biblical motif of the true heavenly sanctuary. In fact, they may unconsciously turn people away from the true heavenly ministry to an earthly sanctuary and earthly services. It is therefore necessary to study the similarities and dissimilarities of the ancient sanctuary service and the sanctuary service of the new covenant. Since both clergy and laity are a royal priesthood who aid their heavenly high priest Jesus in his ministry, one may ask what it means to serve as a priest here on earth. Clearly, the one true sacrifice was

¹³⁸ White, *The Desire of Ages*, 758; Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 3 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1958, 1980), 1:255, 349.

¹³⁹ White, *Early Writings of Mrs. White*, 48, 43.

¹⁴⁰ See Denis Kaiser, "Setting Apart for the Ministry: Theory and Practice in Seventh-day Adventism (1850-1920)," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 51, no. 2 (2013): 198, 199. Interestingly, some early Seventh-day Adventist writers connected specific views and practices of ordination with apostate Christianity. Thus, talking about Christianity in the second century, E. J. Waggoner stated that the church introduced "mysterious forms of ordination," connected them "with the Old Testament priesthood," and attached to them "external tokens of peculiar sanctity." See E. J. Waggoner, "The Church—True and False," *Present Truth*, 14 December 1893, 582.

already offered two thousand years ago and does not need to be repeated. Yet, we are to bring sacrifices of love, praise, thanksgiving, obedience, and consecration.¹⁴¹

Summary and Conclusion

Although the theme of Jesus Christ as our heavenly high priest has not been absent from the writings of theologians in the history of Christianity, the documentary evidence seems to suggest that theological reflection about the biblical sanctuary motif was heavily influenced by the philosophical presuppositions of such influential philosophical and theological thinkers as Plato, Philo, Origen, and Augustine. The philosophical foundations of a timeless and non-spatial view of the nature of God and the heavenly realm precluded the idea of a spatio-temporal building in heaven. The allegorical interpretation of Scripture drove the typological understanding of particular passages to extremes. Thus most early interpreters concluded that the OT tabernacle prefigured the Christian church as the body of Christ who is the true tent of God. It seems that in the medieval period interpreters applied more and more details of the biblical sanctuary to the structure, liturgy, and practices of the Roman Catholic Church. It could be argued that the knowledge of a literal spatial heavenly sanctuary disappeared, being replaced by spatio-temporal temples on earth where, during Mass, priests repeatedly offered Christ afresh as a sacrifice on an altar. The Protestant Reformers took issue with this sacrificial understanding, but they were unable to divest themselves of the philosophical foundations of Greek philosophy and pierce through that wall to an understanding of a literal sanctuary in heaven. It seems that it was not until the mid-19th century, when Sabbatarian Adventism discovered the biblical sanctuary doctrine, that a hermeneutical shift took place in this regard. These considerations are in harmony with Fernando Canale's views.

Reflecting on the discoveries of the early Sabbatarian Adventists and the recent scholarly contributions of Seventh-day Adventist scholars, I agree with Canale that future generations of Adventist theologians, philosophers, and historians should engage in summarizing, systematizing, and consolidating these discoveries and contributions into a coherent doctrine of the sanctuary which is firmly founded in Scripture and easily comprehensible. Beyond the mere systematizing of that doctrine, there is a need to seriously study the relationships between the biblical sanctuary motif and other beliefs such as the nature of man in death, the second coming of Christ, the Great Controversy, last-day events, the phases of judgment, justification and sanctification, the Sabbath, atonement, divine-human relationships, the vindication of God, Christian priesthood, worship, prayer, intercession, etc. This task is in accordance with Canale's as well as the early Sabbatarian Adventists' call for a development of a complete and harmonious system of truth. Furthermore, beyond the mere affirmation of traditional beliefs, this study process should give

¹⁴¹ See Rom 12:1; Eph 5:2; Phil 4:18; Heb 13:16; 1 Pet 2:5. Cf. Michael Allen, "The Theo-Logic of Exaltation in the Epistle to the Hebrews: A Reply to David Moffitt," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Baltimore, MD, November 20, 2013.

special attention to considerations about the practical significance of these beliefs as younger generations of believers estimate the importance of a particular belief based on its manifest practical relevance. If scholars fail to take these considerations into account and fail to communicate them in intelligible language to the church, they have to expect that an increasing number of people will thrust aside the sanctuary doctrine and other pivotal beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Fernando Canale may be commended for his efforts to call attention to developments regarding the role and place of the sanctuary doctrine within the set of Adventist beliefs. While he probably wished to see the materialization of a complete and harmonious system of truth centering around the sanctuary doctrine during his academic years, there may possibly be no greater honor than for him to see how former colleagues and students work towards the materialization of such a system that is still open for future improvements.

Denis Kaiser, a native of Germany, studied in his home country, Austria, and the United States, and earned degrees in tax law, theology, and church history. He is currently completing a Ph.D. in Adventist Studies and Historical Theology at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, and is teaching Adventist history at the same institution as well as serving as assistant annotator of Ellen G. White's letters and manuscripts for the Ellen G. White Estate. His research interests include the life and ministry of Ellen G. White and the development of beliefs and hermeneutics in Adventist history. He is happily married to Angelika. Email: denis@andrews.edu.