

Editorial

Con la edición del presente número, completamos la publicación correspondiente al año 2024. En esta entrega, damos espacio a voces provenientes de Rumania, Grecia y la India.

Laurențiu F. Moț analiza desde varias perspectivas la expresión ὁ ἐρχόμενος en Apocalipsis 1,4.8 y 4,8. Identifica diversos factores cotextuales y contextuales que permiten determinar el referente y ofrecer una lectura escatológica que advierte en el desenlace último de la realidad tal y como la conocemos un acto soberano del Dios triunfo.

Kim Papaioannou aporta un estudio teológico que se adentra en el ámbito de las manifestaciones sobrenaturales y su impacto en la experiencia cristiana. La escatología bíblica, en general, y neotestamentaria, en particular, proveen el marco teórico de una reflexión que exhorta a mantener una actitud juiciosa y bíblicamente informada.

Lalnuntluanga Ralte presenta la segunda y última parte de su estudio sobre la compatibilidad entre la ascensión de Cristo en la Epístola a los Hebreos y la teología del juicio preadvenimiento. Se centra, en esta ocasión, en Hebreos 6,19 y 9,12 a fin de determinar en qué departamento del santuario celestial ingresó Jesús en su ascensión y el significado teológico de tal suceso.

Leandro J. Velardo
Editor de *DavarLogos*

Autoridades UAP

Rector

Mag. Horacio Rizzo

Vicerrector académico

Mag. Carlos Mari

Vicerrector económico

CP Marcelo Sapia

**Vicerrector de investigación
y desarrollo**

Dr. Rafael Paredes

Secretaría general

Mag. Nilde Mayer de Luz

Secretaría de Extensión

Mag. Patricia Müller

**Decano de la Facultad
de Ciencias de la Salud**

Dr. Daniel Heissemberg

**Decano de la Facultad
de Ciencias Económicas
y de la Administración**

Dr. Ricardo Costa Caggi

**Decano de la Facultad
de Humanidades, Educación
y Ciencias Sociales**

Dra. Vanina Lavooy

**Decano de la Facultad
de Teología**

Dr. Sergio Becerra

**Director de la Escuela
de Graduados**

Dr. Fernando Aranda Fraga

Contenidos

Editorial i

Artículos

1. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος: A trinitarian approach to “the One coming”,
por Laurențiu F. Moș 1

2. Signs and wonders in the Apocalyptic framework,
por Kim Papaioannou 17

3. The compatibility of Christ’s ascension in the Epistle to the Hebrews
and the theology of pre-advent judgement: Part 2,
por Lalnuntluanga Ralte 31

Recensiones bibliográficas

Bediako, Daniel K. y Ekkehardt Mueller, eds. *The Sabbath in the Old Testament
and the intertestamental period: Implications for Christians
in the twenty-first century*. Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2021,
por Eloá Moura Galvão 71

John Anthony McGuckin. *Origen of Alexandria. Master Theologian of the Early
Church*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2022,
por Christian Varela 76

ARTÍCULOS



1. 'Ο ἐρχόμενος: A trinitarian approach to "the One coming"

'Ο ἐρχόμενος: un enfoque trinitario a "El que viene"

Laurentiu F. Mot

Adventus University
Cernica, Romania
laurentiu.mot@uadventus.ro

Recibido: 7 de octubre de 2024
Aceptado: 11 de noviembre de 2024

Abstract

The main question of this research is what the meaning of the title *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (Rev 1,4.8; 4,8) is, when applied to the One sitting on the throne (Rev 4,3). The pattern of an immovable God makes His portrayal as coming to earth seem unnatural. The pattern of an ubiquitous Spirit makes His coming to earth seem unnecessary. However, there are certain directions of interpretation on which account the study suggests that the eschaton is not only the second advent of Jesus, but also the coming of the God the Father and of the Spirit. The research is based on textual critical, exegetical, and inter-textual elements, as it argues that the formula "who is, who was, and who is to come" must be interpreted against the Greek picturing of various gods as continuously being in time (past, present, and future). The coming of God in Revelation is ultimately a conveyance of a portable throne, an image which falls in tune with the Jewish representation of the divine throne, as a movable object. Likewise, the Spirit is revealed to be the cause of the grand resurrection (Romans), as well as making eschatological promises in the first-person singular, some being related to the moment of the Parousia (Revelation). This has implications for the understanding of the eschaton as the conclusion of history brought about by the presence and direct involvement of the triune God.

Keywords

Eschaton — Revelation — 'Ο ἐρχόμενος — Trinity

Resumen

El interrogante principal de esta investigación es cuál es el significado del título *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (Ap 1,4.8; 4,8), cuando se aplica a Aquel que está sentado en el trono (Ap 4,3). El modelo de un Dios inamovible hace que su representación como Uno que viene a la tierra parezca



antinatural. El modelo de un Espíritu omnipresente hace que su venida a la tierra parezca innecesaria. Sin embargo, hay ciertas corrientes de interpretación en cuya cuenta el estudio sugiere que el *eschaton* no es solo el segundo advenimiento de Jesús, sino también la venida del Dios Padre y del Espíritu. La investigación se basa en elementos críticos textuales, exegéticos e intertextuales, y sostiene que la fórmula “el que es y que era y que ha de venir” debe interpretarse a la luz de la imagen griega de varios dioses que están continuamente en el tiempo (pasado, presente y futuro). La venida de Dios en el Apocalipsis es, en última instancia, el traslado de un trono portátil, imagen que sintoniza con la representación judía del trono divino, como objeto móvil. Asimismo, se revela que el Espíritu es la causa de la gran resurrección (Romanos) y que hace promesas escatológicas en primera persona del singular, algunas relacionadas con el momento de la Parusía (Apocalipsis). Esto tiene implicaciones para la comprensión del *eschaton* como la conclusión de la historia provocada por la presencia y la participación directa del Dios triuno.

Palabras claves

Eschaton — Apocalipsis — Ὁ ἐρχόμενος — Trinidad

Introduction

When the Parousia is referred to by the expression “the second coming” it is inferred that the One coming had come to earth before. With the immeasurable number of texts which express the coming of Jesus Christ at the end of earth’s history, there is no wonder why the Parousia came to be associated almost exclusively with Christ. The coming is Christ’s coming. The aim of this study is to look at the Parousia from a Trinitarian perspective. Therefore, the question is the following: is there evidence in the Bible that the Father and the Holy Spirit are also going to be present at the consummation of all things?

To know the answer to this question is important because of its implications for theology (it contributes to the image of God and the Holy Spirit, especially as related to their involvement in the last things) and practice (it may count for faith whether God is simply waiting in heaven for the saved to be brought or comes to meet them). The first step of this endeavor is defining God’s immutability from the perspective of systematic theology. The second step requires finding a hypothesis regarding the question of this study which springs from the other major works in the salvation history. The third step presupposes the analysis of

biblical evidence (mainly in the Book of Revelation), which seems to confirm the hypothesis.

For the sake of clarity, in this paper, the term trinity/trinitarian is used, with Thomas Aquinas, in reference to “the number of persons of one essence” and to “the Persons numbered in the unity of nature”.¹ The oneness in nature or essence is called the ontological Trinity. The oneness in purpose, when the three entities (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) work together as a team, is called the economical Trinity.² Although some have denied this distinction, there is no serious reason to do so.³ Therefore, the trinitarian hypothesis in the title of this study refers to the coming of all three entities or persons of the Trinity at the consummation of all things.

The hypothesis of a trinitarian *Parousia*

Virtually all systematic theology works⁴ explain the doctrine of the last things in terms of Christ’s return, whether it be literal at the end of time, dispensational, or already realized. A good number of systematicians view God’s coming as God’s acting in and through Christ’s *Parousia*.

¹ Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, trans. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2009), s. v. I q.31 a.1 ad 1.

² Robert A. Morey, *The Trinity: Evidence and issues* (Iowa Falls, IA: World Bible Publishers, 1996), 438–439.

³ John M. Frame, *The doctrine of God* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2002), 706-707.

⁴ Millard J. Erickson, *Christian theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998), 1191-1200; Louis Berkhof, *The history of Christian doctrines* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949), 270-272; Roy E. Gingrich, *Introduction to theology*, 2 vols. (Memphis, TN: Riverside, 2001), 2:35; Robert L. Reymond, *A new systematic theology of the Christian faith* (Nashville, TN: T. Nelson, 1998), 988-1047; Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic theology* (Bellingham, WA: Logos, 2004), 1003-1014; Morton H. Smith, *Systematic theology*, vol. 1: *Prolegomena, theology, anthropology, Christology* (Greenville SC: Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary Press, 1996), 765-789; Rousas John Rushdoony, *Systematic theology*, 2 vols (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1994), 2:877-881; Robert Duncan Culver, *Systematic theology: Biblical and historical* (Ross-shire, UK: Mentor, 2005), 1111-1119; Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic theology*, vol. 4: *Church, last things* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 2005), 552-553; Charles Hodge, *Systematic theology*, 3 vols (Oak Harbor, WA: Logos, 1997), 3:790-836; Edward Wilhelm August Koehler, *A summary of Christian doctrine: A popular presentation of the teachings of the Bible* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1999), 296-298; James Petigru Boyce, *Abstract of systematic theology* (Bellingham, WA: Logos, 2010), 451-453.

It is not clear whether this overlap comes from an exaggerated divine transcendence that paints a God similar to the unmoved Mover of Greek philosophy.⁵ Some theologians perceive that divine immutability means not only or not so much covenantal permanence, but rather “complete unresponsiveness”.⁶ In passing, we can easily sympathize with Norman Geisler in affirming: “While God is the unmoved mover, He is not the unmoving mover. He is immovable but not immobile”.⁷ But this may not be the only or the main reason why the *Parousia* is not associated with the Father. This may very well have been caused by the scarcity of evidence about the Father’s eschatological coming in the New Testament, despite the Old Testament generous evidence about the Day of the Lord⁸ and God’s coming.⁹

The hypothesis that God the Father should be involved in the last things, in the *Parousia* to be more specific, comes in two layers. First, from the perspective of protology, since creation was a Trinitarian work,¹⁰

⁵ C. Fred Smith, “Does classical Theism deny God’s immanence?,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160 (2003): 23-33, esp. 26.

⁶ Thomas C. Oden, *The living God: Systematic theology* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992), 1:29.

⁷ Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic theology*, vol. 2: *God, creation* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 2003), 257.

⁸ Isa 13,6,9; Ezek 13,5; 30,3; Joel 1,15; 2,1.11.31; 3,14; Amos 5,18.20; Obad 1,15; Zeph 1,7; Zech 14,1; Mal 4,5. Cf. Acts 2,20; 1 Cor 3,13; 1 Cor 5,5; 2 Cor 1,14; 1 Thess 5,2; 2 Thess 2,2; 2 Pet 3,10; Rev 1,10.

⁹ Psa 50,3; Isa 19,1; 40,10; 62,11; 66,15; Jer 47,4; Ezek 7; Hab 3,3; Mal 4,1.

¹⁰ A footnote would definitely be insufficient to articulate this hypothesis. However, and in brief, the idea is that the creation act is associated in Scripture not only with God the Father, but also with the Spirit and Jesus. The Spirit can lay behind the expression רִיחַ אֱלֹהִים (Gen 1,2), though contemporary scholarship recognizes that this is not without doubts. E.g., Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis— Chapters 1-17*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 111-114; Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, WBC (Dallas, TX: Word, 2002), 16-17. Cf. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis: Introduction, translation, and notes*, AYB (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 5. If the expression means “the Spirit of God” as elsewhere in the Old Testament (e.g., Gen 41,38; Ex 31,3; 35,31; Num 24,2; 1 Sam 10,10; 11,6; 2 Chr 15,1; etc.) this may affirm the presence of the Spirit at the act of creation. That Christ is presented in the NT as a Creator is a fact present in multiple texts. The most evident are John 1,3; Col 1,15-16; and Heb 1,2.10. For more details, see Ekkehardt Mueller, “Creation in the New Testament,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 15, no 1 (Spring 2004): 47-62, esp. 57-59.

one may see eschatology in the same terms. Second, as far as soteriology is concerned, the problem of sin was and is being solved by the interplay between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit.¹¹ Christian soteriological experience comprises—from a Trinitarian standpoint— atonement (Heb 9,14; 10,29-31), knowing God (Acts 2,38-39), salvation (Rom 5,5-6; 8,9.11; Eph 2,18.21-22; 1 Pet 1,2), and assurance of salvation (Rom 8,14-17; Gal 3,3-6; 4,6), all blended around the triune Godhead.¹² Since the final victory is to be completely won at the consummation of all things, it is expected that the Trinity be involved in it. We are now turning to the New Testament (i.e. Revelation) evidence about the Father’s and the Spirit’s involvement in the *Parousia*, which are meant to test this hypothesis.

A trinitarian *Parousia* *The Parousia of the Father*

In the Book of Revelation, one of the divine titles of the Father is “the One who is, who was, and who is coming” (Rev 1,4.8; 4,1).¹³ Instead of ending the temporal formula with ὁ ἐσόμενος (“who will be”), as one might expect, John prefers ὁ ἐρχόμενος (“who is coming”). Phonetically,

¹¹ It is probably an oversimplification but the idea can be supported that God provided the means of salvation, which is Christ’s sacrifice, and that the Spirit is the one securing this sacrifice for individual benefit of the repentant and believing sinner. In other words, salvation is a work that involves all three persons of the Trinity. The illustration of Kevin Vanhoozer, *The drama of doctrine: A canonical-linguistic approach to Christian theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2005), 448, is well fit here:

The Father is the playwright and producer of the action; the Son is the climax and summation of the action. The Spirit, as the one who unites us to Christ, is the dresser who clothes us with Christ’s righteousness, the prompter who helps us remember our biblical lines, and prop master who gives gifts (accessories) to each church member, equipping us to play our parts.

¹² Larry L. Lichtenwalter, “The person and work of the Holy Spirit in the general Epistles and the Book of Revelation”, *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 23, no 2 (2012): 72-111, esp. 75-76. See also J. Todd Billings, *The Word of God for the people of God: An entryway to the theological interpretation of Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 197-206.

¹³ In 1,8 one may conjecture that the subject is Christ, since He is the one described in v. 7 as the One coming. However, the title “the One who is and was and is coming” is a title exclusively applied to the Father as other titles which are descriptive of the Father (e.g., Alpha and Omega, the Almighty, etc.) are used in conjunction with this. See also Woodrow W. Whidden, “Trinitarian evidences in the Apocalypse”, *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 11, nos 1-2 (Spr-Aut, 2000): 248-260, esp. 249-250.

it is not a huge distance, but theologically it definitely is. God is not only One whose present existence prolongs into the future, but He is the One who holds the future and who comes.

Mounce says: “In the Greek world, similar titles for the gods are found. In the song of the doves at Dodona we read of ‘Zeus who was, Zeus who is, and Zeus who will be’”.¹⁴ It is also true of the Jewish thinking about the temporal infinity of YHWH.¹⁵ Many scholars do not perceive any difference in meaning between Zeus who was, is, and will be, and God who was, is, and is coming.¹⁶ The title in Revelation 1,4 seems to them to denote eternal existence only.¹⁷

But John seems to be using *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* in order to express something more than just the future aspect of divine existence. For R. H. Charles, this is because of Christ’s return, so much present in the book, in whom God Himself will come: “As for *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, where our author returns to the participial construction, it is clear that he uses *ἐρχόμενος*, instead

¹⁴ Robert H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 46. Mounce refers to Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 10: Ζεὺς ἦν, Ζεὺς ἔστιν, Ζεὺς ἔσσεται; Mounce also mentions that the “shrine of Minerva at Sais provides the inscription, ‘I am all that hath been and is and shall be’ (Plutarch, *De Isid.* 9)”. Other references include Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris* 9; Plato, *Timaeus* 37E (λέγομεν γὰρ δὴ ὡς ἦν ἔστιν τε καὶ ἔσται).

¹⁵ Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 5.6.34.6.1, explains the meaning of the tetragrammaton (YHWH) as *ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐσόμενος*. See also the Jerusalem Targum to Deut 32,39: “I am he who is and who was and I am he who will be ...”. J. Massyngberde Ford, *Revelation: Introduction, translation, and commentary* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 377.

¹⁶ According to Pierre Prigent, the meaning really is that God will be. Pierre Prigent, *L’Apocalypse de Jean*, Commentaire Du Nouveau Testament XIV (Lausanne, CH: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1981), 16. Prigent would translate *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* as *ὁ ἐσόμενος*, although he recognizes that the would-be formula has been altered in order to describe God in Christological terms, as the idea of coming is usually conveying the return of the Son.

¹⁷ So Simon J. Kistemaker and William Hendriksen, *New Testament commentary: Exposition of the Book of Revelation*, NT 20 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1953-2001), 81. They affirm: “This greeting is unique and reveals God’s infinity with respect to present, past, and future. God is timeless from eternity to eternity”. Richard Lehmann argues that the coming of God conveys two things: God is not atemporal or timeless (He comes into our history) and He is in “constant proximity” (based on the present participle).

God is present but also on the way to his followers. Cf: Richard Lehmann, *L’Apocalypse de Jean: Commentaire biblique* (Norderstedt, DE: BoD, 2018), 26-27.

of ἐσόμενος, with a definite reference to the contents of the book and especially to the coming of Christ, 1,7; 2,5.16; 3,2; 22,7.12, etc., *in whose coming God Himself comes also*.¹⁸ Eugene Boring contends that unlike the Greek formulas, “John speaks not only of God’s being but of his acts: ‘he comes’”.¹⁹

From the above lines, one distinguishes three explanations for the use of the participle ἐρχόμενος: (a) it signifies that God is eternal, (b) it tells that God comes in Christ, and (c) it is a straightforward information about God that He will come at the end of time. The first two views find support in the biblical intertextuality. God is eternal, without a beginning and an end.²⁰ It is also correct to say that, to some extent, God was in Christ in the work of redemption and in the manifestation of Christ as a human being.²¹ But are these definitive reasons to believe that the application of the phrase ὁ ἐρχόμενος to the Father does not imply that the Father actually comes?

It is the purpose of this study to provide neglected evidence which support the last view. First, to a certain extent, the expression speaks for itself. The Greek language has all the necessary means to express the future of “to be”, either in the indicative or in the participle. The fact that John does not opt for any of these but chooses an alternative is meaningful.²² It appears that he wanted to say something other than what he would have been able to declare by the future of the verb “to be”. Second,

¹⁸ R. H. Charles, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Revelation of St John*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark International, 1920), 10 (italics mine).

¹⁹ M. Eugene Boring, *Revelation, interpretation, a Bible commentary for teaching and preaching* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1989) 75.

²⁰ E.g., Isa 40,28 (παῖν ἡπύξ), Rom 16,26 (ὁ αἰώνιος θεός). See also Heb 9,14 which speaks about the eternal Spirit and the living God: πόσω μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ, καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι.

²¹ E.g., 2 Cor 5,19 (θεός ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ); John 14,9-10 (λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοσοῦτω χρόνῳ μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με, Φίλιππε; ὁ ἑωρακώς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα πῶς σὺ λέγεις δεῖξόν ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα; οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐστιν).

²² Steven E. Runge, *A Discourse grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Bellingham, WA: Logos, 2010), 16, gives a generic example:

the same expression appears truncated elsewhere in the book, the key phrase, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, being left out. Indeed, God is called in Revelation 11,17 and 16,5 by the idiom ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν. Minuscules between the 10th and the 15th centuries (051, 35, 1006, 1773, 1957) try to harmonize the divine name adding the missing ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Revelation 11,17. These late manuscripts, nonetheless, cannot compete with the agreement between early manuscripts (P47, Ⲙ, A, C).²³ Based on this omission, like many others,²⁴ Ekkehardt Mueller inferred that “God will have come at

If I choose to do X when Y and Z are also available options, this means that I have at the same time chosen *not* to do Y or Z. Most of these decisions are made without conscious thought. As speakers of the language, we just do what fits best in the context based on what we want to communicate. Although we may not think consciously about these decisions, we are nonetheless making them.

- ²³ The best manuscript agreement is not the only reason why ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν should be accepted in Rev 11,17. The most effective text-critical methodology especially applicable in Revelation is the following. J. K. Elliott, in “A short textual commentary on the Book of Revelation and the ‘New’ Nestle”, *Novum Testamentum* 56 (2014): 68-100, esp. 71:

I tend to accept as “original” a reading that conforms to the language, style, vocabulary (and, indeed, the theology) of the earliest recoverable text. One can plot and establish each Biblical author’s style and usage from the many ‘safe’ places where all extant manuscripts are in agreement, there being no reported variant. Having established the usage from the secure places, variants that concern a feature agreeing with the authors’ practice elsewhere are likely to represent the earlier text. Obviously, it may transpire that some hitherto firm readings may be challenged by subsequent collations, but, in general, it often works out that one is able to establish an author’s preferences and then one can see which variants conform to and which readings disagree with that usage.

In our case, the original formula appears to have been the complete one (1,4,8; 4,1) while the scribe tries to harmonize 11,17 with this earlier formula, nonetheless, leaving the short formula in 16,5 as it is.

- ²⁴ “Dieu et le Christ n’ont plus a ‘venir’, la Parousie a eu lieu”. Ernest Bernard Allo, *Saint Jean L’Apocalypse*, 2nd ed. (Paris, FR: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1921), 150. “On ne dit pas, cette fois: ‘qui vient’ (cf. i,8; iv,8), parce que précisément, Dieu arrive” (“It does not say this time ‘who is coming’ (cf. I,8; iv,8) because precisely, God is coming”). Alfred Loisy, *L’Apocalypse de Jean* (Paris, FR: Émile Nourry, 1923), 219. So also Gerhard Maier, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes Teil 1: Kapitel 1-11*, HTA (Witten, DE: SCM, 2014) 497; Ranko Stefanović, *Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2002) 360; George Eldon Ladd, *A Commentary on the Revelation of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 162. “Its absence (except in some inferior authorities) in 11:17 illustrates the meaning, for there a visitation of God is spoken of as having already come to pass”. F. J. A. Hort, *The Apocalypse of St. John 1-3: The Greek text with introduction, commentary, and additional notes* (London, UK: Macmillan, 1908), 11.

that time. God the Father is also coming”.²⁵ Moreover, even the late manuscripts which alter Revelation 11,17 leave Revelation 16,5 untouched and this text again has ὁ ἐρχόμενος removed from the divine title.

There is no reason to omit ἐρχόμενος if it simply carries the same denotation as ἐσόμενος. If one does that, it is like depriving God of his future eternity. However, if ὁ ἐρχόμενος reflects God’s movement towards earth at the great consummation,²⁶ it makes sense to drop it in two sections of the book where indeed the great consummation is in view.

According to Ranko Stefanović,²⁷ the seventh trumpet, which 11,17 is part of, is blown at the end of earth’s history (cf. 11,15.17-19). The idea that God is “the One who is and who was” means that by the time of the seventh trumpet God will have come (cf. 10,7). A general overview of the structure of the book indicates that “the visions prior to the break at the end of chapter 14 deal primarily with the Christian Era. The visions after that break are focused on the era of eschatological judgment”.²⁸ Revelation 1-14 presents the various Christian eras from different angles, in a recapitulative form. In other words, all major sections present phenomena that deal with the church or with the world between the two advents of Christ. For this reason, the seventh trumpet must be the end of the earth, which culminates with the *Parousia*.

²⁵ Ekkehardt Mueller, “Jesus and His Second Coming in the Apocalypse”, *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 11, nos 1-2 (Spr-Aut, 2000): 205-215, esp. 206-207.

²⁶ John does not only describe the future God ontologically, but in terms of His works: He comes to save and judge. The NT writer most probably envision those plentiful OT prophetic instances where God is depicted as coming to do these very things: to save and judge (e.g. Psa 96,13; 98,9; Isa 40,10; 66,15; Zech 14,5). Early Christians understood this Jewish background in reference to God’s coming to complete the final purpose of the world and identified the event as the Parousia of Jesus Christ. Richard Bauckham, in *The theology of the Book of Revelation*, NTT (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 29-30, says:

Thus John interprets the divine name as indicating not God’s eternity in himself apart from the world, but his eternity in relation to the world. This is the biblical God who chooses, as his own future, his coming to his creation, and whose creation will find its own future in him (cf 21:3).

²⁷ Ranko Stefanović, *Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2002), 357, 359-360.

²⁸ Kenneth A. Strand, “The eight basic visions”, in *Symposium on Revelation-Book I*, ed. by Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 29.

At the same time, Revelation 16,5 falls in the section of the seven last plagues. This is an eschatological vision of the divine wrath ready to unleash in a time without any mediatory intervention (Rev 15,1,8; cf. 14,10). This also culminates with the coming of Christ. To call God in those two moments of history as “the One who is and who was” suggests that for John, by the time of the last trumpet and the seven bowls, God will have come.²⁹

The third argument that ὁ ἐρχόμενος conveys a God who literally comes is intertextual and based primarily on data from the vision of the seven seals. The sixth seal represents a picture of the final consummation. The whole category of the lost express their desperation in vivid and meaningful words: καὶ λέγουσιν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ταῖς πέτραις πέσετε ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ κρύψατε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ καθήμενου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν, καὶ τίς δύναται σταθῆναι:

And they said to the mountains and the rocks: “Fall on us and hide us from the face of the One sitting on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb, because the great day of their wrath has come and who is able to stand?” (Rev 6,16-17).

Two details are paramount in this text. The wicked are afraid to face the One sitting on the throne and the wrath of the Lamb. These are not two images for the same entity. Two distinct characters are presented here. The One sitting on the throne is single-handedly an expression of God in Revelation (cf. Rev 4-5, 21). When Christ alludes to His sitting on the throne He means the Father’s throne that He shares (Rev 3,21). In light of 3,21, Jesus comes as enthroned with the Father, so the latter

²⁹ “Dieu n’est pas appelle ici ὁ ἐρχόμενος, parce qu’il est la deja, en pleine activite de juge” (Allo, *L’Apocalypse*, 234). So also, Loisy, *L’Apocalypse de Jean*, 287; Traugott Holtz, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes: Neubearbeitung* (Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 22.

comes too.³⁰ Therefore, the Lamb is “joined with God in the approaching visitation”.³¹

What also follows is that Revelation 6,16 is not a picture of God’s wrath manifested in Christ. That God is present at the time of the wicked’s lamentation derives from three lines of evidence. First is the expression “the face of”. This is a metonymy, “an anthropomorphic image evoking His presence”.³² Second, if the Lamb’s presence is taken literally, the one of the Father shares naturally the same status. Third, the expression “the day of *their* great wrath” proves that the wicked do not only fear the Lamb-Christ, but also God the Father who sits on the throne under their very eyes. That is indeed a time when “sinners dread [...] having to stand before a holy and righteous God”.³³

In this context, another intertextual argument that God the Father also comes at the *Parousia* springs from the last seal. Revelation 8,1 speaks of a silence in heaven of about half an hour. If by this silence heaven is seen as the home of a *Deus solus/solitarius* we most probably miss the point.³⁴

³⁰ Theodor Zahn, in *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, DE: Erlangen, 1926), 365, says:

Das Himmelsgewölbe selbst, an welchem ein Licht nach dem andern erloschen ist, gleicht einer Schriftrolle, welche bis dahin entrollt gewesen war und, in welcher, wie wir hinzudenken dürfen, Astronomen und Astrologen seit Jahrtausenden forschend gelesen haben, reißt sich nun vom Horizont ab und wird nun wieder von unsichtbarer Hand zusammengerollt, weil der Menschensohn, der jetzt noch mit dem Weltschöpfer über allen Himmeln thront, auf den Wolken des Himmels zur Erde kommen soll.

³¹ Isbon T. Beckwith, *The Apocalypse of John: Studies in introduction with a critica land exegetical commentary* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1919), 529-530. See also Paige Patterson, *Revelation*, NAC 39, ed. by E. Ray Clendenen (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2012), 188; Leon Morris, *Revelation: An introduction and commentary*, TNTC 20 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1987), 111.

³² Stephen S. Smalley, *The Revelation to John* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005), 170.

³³ Robert L. Thomas, *Revelation 1-7: An exegetical commentary* (Chicago, IL: Moody, 1992) 456. Pointing to Gen 3,8 as a background, Henry Barclay Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 2nd ed., CCGNT (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1906), 92-93, remarks: “The Apocalypticist foresees the same shrinking from the sight of God in the last generation of mankind which Genesis attributes to the parents of the race”.

³⁴ David Aune reveals five possible meanings of the silence in Rev 8,1, of which I mention only three here: primordial silence, a prelude to divine visitation, and silence in worship. Aune embraces the last option. David E. Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, WBC (Dallas, TX: Word, 2002), 507. However, the context of the seals seems to rather confirm the second option.

At the time of the seventh seal, it is silence in heaven not because God is alone, while the whole heaven is emptied. If it is true that Christ will descend with all the angels (πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι, Matt 25,31) it is hard to conceive that God who is the Alpha and Omega will passively wait alone in heaven for the angelic and human host to reach heaven upon return. It would be more natural to admit that this may be another indicator that God the Father is present at the consummation. This, in turn, may clarify the statement of Jesus that He will return “in the glory of His Father” (Matt 16,27; Mark 8,38) or “in His glory and of the Father” (Luke 9,26). God’s glory involves God’s real presence at the event.

The Parousia of the Spirit

There is no language in the Bible that presents the Holy Spirit as coming. This is not to say that the Spirit disassociates Himself from the event of the *Parousia*. Wolfgang Pannenberg states:

In primitive Christian testimonies the importance of the Holy Spirit in the event of final consummation is not so plain as the function of the gift of the Spirit as an anticipation of eschatological salvation. Yet it would be a mistake to conclude that the Spirit will have no decisive function any longer at the eschatological consummation itself. Instead, the gift of the Spirit can have for the believer’s present the significance of an anticipation and pledge of future salvation only because the Spirit is also the power of God effecting future salvation itself.³⁵

The presence of the Spirit at the time of the consummation is discernible from His association with the preparation of the church, precursory to the final events of earth’s history, His involvement in the resurrection of the faithful, and His contribution to the eschatological promises of Revelation 2-3 and 22,17.

Joel 2,28-29 presents the spirit of God coming to Israel, through whom God is “communicating himself to his creatures”.³⁶ The special endowment with the Spirit on the day of Pentecost following Jesus’ ascension is taken by Peter as a direct fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy (*cf.* Acts.

³⁵ Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991-1998), 3:622.

³⁶ Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiab, Jonah, and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 98.

2,17-21). According to Joel, this precedes the Day of the Lord, but before that moment, the presence of the Spirit is a time of salvation. Later, Peter addresses a strong call to repentance so that the times of refreshing can come and Jesus be sent (*cf.* Acts 3,19-20). The Spirit has the role to prepare for the return of Christ.³⁷ “For the Spirit brings to the churches the powerful word of Christ, rebuking, encouraging, promising and threatening, touching and drawing the hearts, minds and consciences of its hearers, directing the lives and the prayers of the Christian communities towards the coming of Christ”.³⁸

This argument tells us that the Spirit is in the world, at work, prior to the *Parousia*. If this does not mean that the Spirit comes proper, some biblical theologians perceive the event of the resurrection as similar to the *Parousia* of the Spirit and the basis hope of the faithful (*cf.* Rom 8,11).³⁹ Though the resurrection is not a coming *per se*, it “can be regarded as in a real sense the climax of the bodily outworking of the Spirit’s life in the here and now”.⁴⁰ The spirit worked out the resurrection of Christ and is the “vivifying principle”⁴¹ which will effect the resurrection of the faithful.

In the section of the seven churches in Revelation (chaps. 2-3), there is an interesting interplay between Jesus who begins each of the seven

³⁷ In ancient Christianity, to be “in the Spirit” reclaimed the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, a manifestation of the last days (Joel 2,28). Having this gift effectively working within it, it is equivalent to say that the church lives in the eschatological times. Before that actually happens, the Spirit directs the life of the church towards the Parousia. The visions received and related by John were meant to provide an eschatological meaning to the historical circumstances of the seven churches of Asia during the reign of Domitian. “They were to show the meaning in those circumstances of living towards the coming of Christ”. Richard Bauckham, *The climax of prophecy* (Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1993), 159.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 161.

³⁹ “Here the Spirit of God that resurrected Jesus is not only the very Spirit animating the churches in Rome but also the basis of their future hope”. Robert Jewett, *Romans: A commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2006), 492.

⁴⁰ James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, WBC (Dallas, TX: Word, 2002), 445. See also Pannenberg, *Systematic theology* 3:622.

⁴¹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A new translation with introduction and commentary*, AYB (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 491.

epistles (“Thus says He who”) and the Spirit, who ends each message (“This is what the Spirit says to the churches”). For some scholars this means that Christ works in the church through the Spirit.⁴² For others, it simply means that the Spirit speaks to the churches alongside Christ.⁴³ However, it may be much more. As Lenski suggested long ago: “Here the Spirit is named because it is his especial work to operate through the means of grace and to effect faith by hearing (Rom 10,17) and all its fruits, love, endurance, etc.”⁴⁴ The first three promises pertain to the Spirit,⁴⁵ whereas the last four are given by Jesus. What is interesting is that all are given in the first person. The Spirit promises access to the tree of life, protection from the second death, and hidden manna and a white stone. Whatever these symbols refer to, they are to be seen as promises to be fulfilled by the Spirit at the time of the *Parousia*.

The Book of Revelation presents the Spirit from an eschatological perspective. Not only that the Spirit prepares a community of faith pertaining to the age to come. Not only that He predicts the events of the end. But He is specifically present at the consummation of all things as Revelation 22,17 depicts: “The Spirit and the Bride say ‘come!’”. Richard Bauckham interprets this eschatologically. Summed up, his arguments comprise the fact that the Bride is descriptive of the church at the *Parousia* (19,7-8; cf. 21,2), that the exclamatory entreaty “come!” reflects Christ’s promise to come, three times mentioned in the epilogue of the book (22,7.12.20), and that the invitation to come and drink living water can only point to the river of life, which is part of the new creation (21,6;

⁴² “The formula also shows that Christ’s words are none other than the words of the Spirit and that Christ dwells among the churches through the Spirit” G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A commentary on the Greek text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 234.

⁴³ “The Holy Spirit is also speaking directly through these letters, and that is the more likely emphasis here”. Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 122.

⁴⁴ R. C. H. Lenski, *The interpretation of St. John’s Revelation* (Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern, 1935), 92.

⁴⁵ Τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev 2,7), Ὁ νικῶν οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῆι ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ δευτέρου (Rev 2,11), Τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ ψῆφον λευκὴν (Rev 2,17).

22,1-2).⁴⁶ Klaus Berger rightly observes that Revelation 22,17 echoes John 4,10-15 and 7,38.⁴⁷ The free water reflects Jesus’s offer at Jacob’s well that seems to relate to the abundance of the Holy Spirit at the end of times.

Conclusions

This paper raised the hypothesis that all three persons of the Trinity are involved in eschatology in general and in the event of the *Parousia* in particular. The hypothesis is evincible on several grounds.

First, in Revelation, God the Father is named ὁ ἐρχόμενος, which means more than the future aspect of divine existence. Second, God appears to be present at the *Parousia* in at least three passages when He is either described as present at *Parousia* or defined by an abbreviated form of the formula “the One who is, who was and who is coming”, wherein the last element is left out (e.g., Rev 6,16; 8,1; 11,17; 16,5). Third, in the Epistle to the Romans, the Spirit is revealed to be the one effective cause behind the resurrection of the dead. Fourth, in Revelation the Spirit makes eschatological promises in the first-person singular, some being related to the moment of the *Parousia*.

There is no wonder then, that sometimes the final consummation is simply called in the New Testament “the Day of God” (2 Pet 3,12). Therefore, depending on the context, the Greek phrase ὁ ἐρχόμενος can refer to both the Father (e.g., Rev 1,4.8; 4,1) and the Son (Heb 10,37; cf. Matt 11,3; 21,9; Luke 13,35; John 6,14). It never applies to the Spirit, but the Spirit is present at the end of all things. Accordingly, the *Parousia* denotes the presence of all three persons of the Trinity, at the very end of history.

⁴⁶ Bauckham, *Climax of prophecy*, 166-168. For similar thoughts, see Smalley, *Revelation to John*, 577; Craig R. Koester, *Revelation: A new translation with introduction and commentary*, AYB (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 844.

⁴⁷ Klaus Berger, *Die Apokalypse des Johannes: Kommentar* (Freiburg, DE: Herder, 2017) 1516.



2. Signs and wonders in the Apocalyptic framework

Señales y prodigios en el marco apocalíptico

Kim Papaioannou

Nicosia, Cyprus

kpapaioannou@adventist.org.cy

Recibido: 3 de octubre de 2024

Aceptado: 14 de noviembre de 2024

Abstract

Contemporary Christianity is fascinated with claimed supernatural manifestations. The Bible speaks about signs and wonders. How does the biblical evidence inform the contemporary fascination? The appearance of signs and wonders in the Bible centers around three pivotal periods, the exodus, the time of Jesus and the apostles, and the eschaton. While in the first they are the result of divine intervention, in the eschaton they are associated with the activities of antigod powers. Similarly, Revelation speaks of end time signs that will be performed by the false prophet. The purpose of such is to deceive if possible God's people. This sobering picture calls for spiritual vigilance towards any claims of supernatural manifestations.

Keywords

Signs and wonders — Miracles — Eschaton — Revelation

Resumen

El cristianismo contemporáneo está fascinado por las supuestas manifestaciones sobrenaturales. La Biblia habla de señales y prodigios. ¿De qué manera la evidencia bíblica influye en la fascinación contemporánea? La aparición de señales y prodigios en la Biblia se centra en tres periodos fundamentales: el éxodo, la época de Jesús y los apóstoles, y el eschaton. Mientras que en el primero son el resultado de la intervención divina, en el eschaton se asocian a las actividades de poderes antidioses. Del mismo modo, el Apocalipsis habla de señales del fin de los tiempos que serán realizadas por el falso profeta. Su propósito es engañar, si es posible, al pueblo de Dios. Este cuadro aleccionador exige vigilancia espiritual ante cualquier pretensión de manifestaciones sobrenaturales.

Palabras claves

Señales y prodigios — Milagros — Eschaton — Apocalipsis



A key characteristic of contemporary Christianity is a fascination with powerful demonstrations of the supernatural. Claims of miracles in the form of healings abound. But expectations go far beyond these. A key term to describe such expectations is the phrase “signs and wonders”. While any supernatural manifestation can be regarded as a miracle, the expression signs and wonders usually anticipates something grander. The *Holman Bible dictionary* defines signs and wonders as “events which unmistakably involve an immediate and powerful action of God designed to reveal His character or purposes”.¹ This definition is not accurate, because we will see that signs and wonders are performed not only by God. But it is accurate in highlighting the supernatural, immediate, and powerful actions entailed.

The contemporary fascination with supernatural manifestations is evident in bibliography. A simple search on Amazon reveals more than thirty books published in the last few decades that contain the words “signs and wonders” or related terms, either in the title or in subtitle.² Such fascination has no doubt been fueled by the rapid growth of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements but is not limited to them. Mainstream Protestants have also been affected,³ as have the Orthodox⁴ and Catholic faithfuls⁵ who have long believed in miracles performed by saints.

Considering such an outlook, this study will explore signs and wonders signs and wonders in biblical writings with an emphasis in the

¹ *Holman Bible dictionary*, s. v. “miracles, signs, wonders”, accessed on July 20, 2021, <https://www.studylight.org/dictionaries/eng/hbd/m/miracles-signs-wonders.html>.

² Amazon, “Signs and wonders”, accessed on November 22, 2024, https://www.amazon.com/s?k=%22signs+and+wonders%22&crd=2HDHQQFUE0EG5D&qid=1732262043&sprefix=signs+and+wonders+%2Caps%2C425&ref=sr_pg_1.

³ E.g., John A. Algera, *Signs and wonders: A reformed look at the Spirit's ongoing work* (Grand Rapids, MI: Faith Alive Christian Resources, 2015); John Wimber and Kevin Springer, *Power evangelism* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 2009), especially pages 205-260.

⁴ E.g., Μαρία Σκλειδα, “Άγιοι θεραπευτές των ψυχών και των σωμάτων. Θαυμαστές δυνάμεις, σημεία, τέρατα και θαυμάσια”, accessed on November 22, 2024, <https://www.pemptousia.gr/2020/04/agii-therapeftes-ton-psichon-ke-ton-somaton-thavmastes-dinamis-simia-terata-ke-thavmasia>.

⁵ E.g., Joseph Pronechen, *The fruits of Fatima: A century of signs and wonders* (Manchester, N.H.: Sophia Institute Press, 2019).

apocalyptic timeframe. It will be divided in two parts. In the first part, the expression “signs and wonders” will be explored.

The study is descriptive and introductory. It will broach the topic and describe an outlook in the hope that it will elicit further and more detailed research.

Signs and wonders in the biblical text: An introduction

“Signs and wonders” appear together thirty-four times in the biblical text.⁶ They can be neatly divided into three categories:

1. In Israel’s history, especially the exodus
2. In the ministry of Jesus and the apostles
3. In the eschaton

We will look at representative texts from each, with more emphasis on the third category.

Texts relating to Israel’s history

Most Old Testament “signs and wonders” texts refer to God’s miraculous intervention in history. The key event with which “signs and wonders” are associated is the exodus from Egypt. A few examples will suffice:

1. “But I will harden Pharaoh’s heart, and though I multiply my signs and wonders in the land of Egypt Pharaoh will not listen to you” (Exod 7,3-4).
2. “And the LORD showed signs and wonders, great and grievous, against Egypt and against Pharaoh and all his household, before our eyes” (Deut 6,22).

⁶ English Standard Version (ESV) throughout unless otherwise noted. Exod 7,3; Deut 4,34; 6,22; 7,19; 13,1,2; 26,8; 28,46; 29,3; 34,11; Neh 9,10; Ps 135,9; Jer 32,20.21; Dan 4,2,3; 6,27; Matt 24,24; Mark 13,22; John 4,48; Acts 2,19.22.43; 4,30; 5,12; 6,8; 7,3; 14,3; 15,12; Rom 15,19; 2 Cor 12,12; 2 Thess 2,9; Heb 2,4. Numbers vary slightly depending on the translation used, but this does not change the overall picture.

3. “And you saw the affliction of our fathers in Egypt and heard their cry at the Red Sea, and performed signs and wonders against Pharaoh and all his servants and all the people of his land” (Neh 9,9-10).

One of the New Testament references also looks back to the exodus: “This man led them out, performing wonders and signs in Egypt and at the Red Sea and in the wilderness for forty years” (Acts 7,36).

Three times “signs and wonders” appear in Daniel, twice on the lips of Nebuchadnezzar (4,2.3), and once on the lips of Darius (6,27). In the case of Nebuchadnezzar the “signs and wonders” appear in the context of his account of his pride, downfall, and restoration. The “signs and wonders” probably include the dream of the mighty tree that was cut, as well as his restoration to the kingdom after seven years of insanity. Most likely, however, they also include previous divine interventions in his life, namely the dream of the statue in Daniel 2 and the incident of the golden image, the three faithful young men, and the fiery furnace. In Daniel 6,27, in a letter to his subjects, Darius praises God after Daniel’s divine deliverance in the lion’s den.

Though in the Old Testament “signs and wonders” are performed by God, the possibility of “signs and wonders” of a non-divine origin is raised though not developed. Deuteronomy 13,1-3 contains the following strong warning:

If a prophet or a dreamer of dreams arises among you and gives you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder that he tells you comes to pass, and if he says, “Let us go after other gods,” which you have not known, “and let us serve them,” you shall not listen to the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams. For the LORD your God is testing you, to know whether you love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul.

“Signs and wonders” therefore could be used by false prophets to lead Israel to the worship of other gods.⁷

⁷ Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, WBC, rev. ed. (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 271, the sign or wonder in question “should be viewed with scepticism”.

*Texts relating to the ministry of Jesus
and the apostles*

The main use of “signs and wonders” in the New Testament is connected to the ministry of Jesus and the apostles. When an official invites Jesus to heal his ailing son Jesus replies to him: “Unless you see signs and wonders you will not believe” (John 4,48). Jesus here appears to castigate a dependence on “signs and wonders” (*cf.* Matt 12,39; 16,4).⁸

In Acts 2,22 in his Pentecost sermon Peter describes Jesus in the following words: “Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs that God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know”.⁹ “Signs and wonders” here refer to the miracles Jesus did publicly, healings, feeding the five thousand, casting out demons, raising the dead.

More frequently, “signs and wonders” refer to miracles done through the apostles. For example, shortly after Peter mentions the “signs and wonders” performed by Jesus, we read: “And awe came upon every soul, and many wonders and signs were being done through the apostles” (Acts 2,43). Similarly: “Now many signs and wonders were regularly done among the people by the hands of the apostles” (Acts 5,12).

Such miraculous “signs and wonders” are not the work of the apostles, but of Christ working through them:

And now, Lord, look upon their threats and grant to your servants to continue to speak your word with all boldness, while you stretch out your hand to heal, and signs and wonders are performed through the name of your holy servant Jesus” (Acts 4,29-30).

⁸ Jesus “desired a belief characterized by dedication rather than amazement, and the second half of the episode shows that his aim was to inculcate a genuine commitment rather than merely to perform a cure”. Merrill C. Tenney, “John”, *The expositor’s Bible commentary*, 12 vols., ed. by Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1976-1992), 9:60.

⁹ Kenneth O. Gangel, *Holman New Testament Commentary: Acts*, ed. by Max Anders (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1998), 28.

Eschatological texts

More important for the focus of this study are the three “signs and wonders” texts that appear in an eschatological context. Their number is small but their significance great.

Then if anyone says to you, “Look, here is the Christ!” or “There he is!” do not believe it. For false christs and false prophets will arise and perform great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. See, I have told you beforehand (Matt 24,23-25).¹⁰

And then if anyone says to you, “Look, here is the Christ!” or “Look, there he is!” do not believe it. False christs and false prophets will arise and perform signs and wonders, to lead astray, if possible, the elect. But be on guard; I have told you all things beforehand (Mark 13,21-23).

Matthew follows Mark almost *verbatim* (or vice versa depending on one’s view on Synoptic relations). They both are an echo of the warning of Deuteronomy 13,1-3 whereby “signs and wonders” could be used to lead believers astray.¹¹ While the Deuteronomy warning appears as a hypothetical scenario, the warning of Jesus is clothed in the language of prophecy and certainty. And while the warning of Deuteronomy is against the worship of other gods, the warning of Jesus is about leading believers astray—πλανάω.

The third eschatological “signs and wonders” texts comes from Paul’s brief apocalypse in 2 Thessalonians 2,1-12. In verses 8-10 we read:

And then the lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will kill with the breath of his mouth and bring to nothing by the appearance of his coming. The coming of the lawless one is by the activity of Satan with all power and false signs and wonders, and with all wicked deception for those who are perishing, because they refused to love the truth and so be saved (2 Thess 2,8-10).¹²

¹⁰ Carson, “Matthew”, in *The expositor’s Bible commentary*, 503, notes that believers must not be deceived by “spectacular signs and miracles”.

¹¹ Michael J. Wilkins, *The NIV Application Commentary: Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004), 781, notes that while false messiahs and false prophets would characterize “the entire age until the Parousia”, just before the coming of Jesus “there will be an unprecedented rise of miracle-working false messiahs and prophets”.

¹² David J. Williams, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 129, notes that signs and wonders together with “power” (δύναμις) also appear in Acts 2,22 of the work of Jesus.

Here the “signs and wonders” are false. This could mean either of two things. First, it might be that there is an appearance of “signs and wonders” but there is no actual supernatural manifestation, just an appearance of it. They are counterfeit.¹³ Perhaps this harkens back to Pharaoh’s time when Egypt’s magicians tried to replicate some of the miracles done through Aaron and Moses, and appeared to succeed initially, but lacked the power of the divine “signs and wonders”. Nonetheless, there will be power in these manifestations and an aim and ability to deceive. Second, it might be that the false “signs and wonders” do indeed involve supernatural manifestation, but their purpose is to deceive, and therefore they are termed “false.”

*Observations on the “signs
and wonders” texts*

There are several important points that can be drawn from this perusal of “signs and wonders” texts. First, they can refer to different supernatural manifestations. In the “signs and wonders” texts referring to the exodus, “signs and wonders” refer primarily to divine intervention in nature: blood, darkness, insects and animals, the opening of the Red Sea, a pillar of fire and a pillar of cloud. By contrast, in the ministry of Jesus and the apostles, “signs and wonders” refer primarily to healing miracles and the casting out of demons.

Second, with few exceptions, the “signs and wonders” texts refer to one of three brief timeframes in the history of humanity: the exodus, the time of Jesus and the apostles, the eschaton. All three are pivotal in salvation history. The exodus formally launches Israel as the people chosen to convey the message of God to the world and provide a descent for the coming of the Messiah; the time of Jesus and the apostles marks the moment when the plan of salvation reaches a climax on the cross, and the Christian church that is to carry the good news to all the earth is established; the eschaton marks the time just before the consummation

The implication is probably that we see here is an expectation of a power that wants to impermate or replicate the works of Jesus.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 129.

of human history as we know it. It seems then that pivotal points in salvation history are marked by strong supernatural manifestations.

Third, in the first two timeframes, “signs and wonders” are the sole prerogative of God. When Pharaoh’s magicians try to replicate some of the miracles of Moses, they are defeated. They are also utterly powerless to stop the acts of God that bring devastation in Egypt and deliverance to God’s people. Similarly, the working of miracles by Jesus and the apostles is unmatched by anything anyone else can master. Thus, both the sons of Sceva and the woman with a python spirit who try to emulate or stop the apostles are defeated. Immediately after the incident with the sons of Sceva, those who practiced magic arts in Ephesus burn their books, their value being a staggering 50,000 pieces of silver (Acts 19,17-20). While Deuteronomy 13,1-3 allows the possibility of “signs and wonders” by false prophets, it remains only a possibility for most of history, only to be realized at the eschaton.

Fourth, this picture is completely reversed at the eschaton. In the three relevant texts it is the false christs and false prophets who perform “signs and wonders”, in fulfilment perhaps of the warning of Deuteronomy 13,1-3. Indeed, as far as the biblical evidence goes, only the false christs and prophets perform “signs and wonders”. The “signs and wonders” of the false messiahs and prophets can involve direct supernatural manifestation (Matt 24,23-25; Mark 13:21-23), or possible the appearance of it (2 Thess 2,1-12).

That is not to say that God removes Himself from the miracle business. The Bible does speak of the latter rain that will be given to prepare God’s people for the Second Coming. It also speaks of the gifts given to the early church. Though operating at different intensity through the ages, depending on the needs of God’s people, they will be operative throughout history including the eschaton. However, it seems that “signs and wonders” are *not* one of the identifying marks of God’s end-time people.

Fifth, the false “signs and wonders” aim to deceive and lead astray, to lawlessness. The false christs and prophets endeavor to convince that they are the real thing. The fact that the deception will almost deceive even

the elect indicates that the imitation will be hard to distinguish from the original. The lawless one will similarly manifest powerful “signs and wonders”, but he will deceive only those who have “refused to love the truth” (2 Thess 2,10). Both the synoptics and Paul then agree that despite deceptive appearances, the elect will not be deceived.

Sixth, we can draw some implications on the nature of the “signs and wonders”. The mention of false christs indicates an attempt to imitate Christ, which in turn suggests “signs and wonders” like the ones Jesus performed: healings, casting out of demons, feeding the needy.

The mention of false prophets is harder to pinpoint. Is it a reference to fake apostles? Possible, even though the apostles were called apostles rather than prophets. More likely, it could be a reference to the prophets of the Old Testament through whom “signs and wonders” were performed, mainly Moses. If so, and since the “signs and wonders” associated with the ministry of Moses and the exodus involved nature, perhaps the false prophets will perform them in nature. It seems then that what God has forbidden Satan to perform in the past, He allows him to do at the eschaton.

Signs in Revelation

Neither the expression “signs and wonders” nor the word “wonder(s)” appear in Revelation. Nonetheless, Revelation takes an interest in signs, and they play a prominent role. A discussion of signs in Revelation is included in this study, because it corroborates the outlook gained about through the “signs and wonders” texts. The word appears three times in the singular and four in the plural. They will be discussed in this manner because the plural uses entail a different outlook from the singular uses.

“Sign” in the singular

Of the three singular uses the first two have no direct bearing on the study. They do not describe supernatural manifestations but

unexpected sights—a woman clothed in white with the moon under her feet (Rev 12,1), and a red dragon, symbol of Satan (Rev 12,3).¹⁴

The third is the sight of seven angels (Rev 15,1) who are about to pour out the seven last plagues on earth, which represent the completion of “the wrath of God”. There are linguistic/thematic parallels between the seven last plagues and the ten plagues of Egypt.¹⁵

We noted earlier that the exodus, inclusive of the plagues, is the event most alluded to by the expression “signs and wonders”. As such, John might want to point to the seven last plagues as an example of “signs and wonders”, a reflection of what happened in Egypt. However, while the parallel between the two sets of plagues is likely, John avoids the expression “signs and wonders”. He does use *σημείον* in the singular, “sign,” but the “sign” in question is the appearance of the angels who carry the bowls with the plagues, rather than the plagues themselves. If the word *σημείον* is in any way reflective of the exodus “signs and wonders”, the reflection is faint.

¹⁴ David E. Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, WBC (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998), 679, suggests that the three singular uses are interconnected because 12,3 and 15,1 are introduced with the words “another sign”. This is correct as far as the flow of the prophetic timeframe is concerned; however, the first two singulars do not involve a direct miraculous divine intervention – indeed in 12,3 the great sign is a red dragon, a symbol of Satan (12,9). Leon Morris, in *Revelation: An introduction and commentary*, TNT vol. 20 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1987), 152, notes that though in John *σημείον* is used in the gospel of John of Jesus’ miracles, “here [12,1] it seems to refer to a significant person rather than a significant happening” and compares with the use 12,3 and 15,1).

¹⁵ In Exodus 7,14-25 (plague 1) the Nile turns to blood and this causes thirst; in Revelation 16,4-9 (plagues 2 and 3) the ocean and rivers turn to blood which causes thirst. In Exodus 8,1-15 (plague 2) frogs appear; in Revelation 16,12-16 unclean spirits resembling frogs deceive the kings of the earth. In Exod 8,16-19 (plague 3) gnats appear leading Pharaoh’s magicians to acknowledge that God is at work; in Revelation 16,9.11.21 the wicked acknowledge that God is at work. In Exodus 9,8-12 boils appear (plague 6); in Revelation 16,2 the wicked receive painful sores. In Exodus 9,23-25 hail and fire descend upon Egypt (plague 7); in Revelation 16,17-21 great hail falls on the earth (plague 7). In Exodus 10,21-29 a heavy darkness fell upon Egypt (plague 9); in Revelation 16,10-11 a great darkness that causes pain falls on the wicked (plague 5).

Cf. Jack Hillard, *Understanding Revelation* (Longwood, FL: Xulon, 2008), 139: “... in some respects the seven last plagues were similar to the ten plagues God brought on Egypt (Exodus 5:1-12:30)”. Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, 869-70, sees a connection to the “plagues” of the seven seals and seven trumpets prophecies though admits that the word “plague” is not used in either.

"Signs" in the plural

More relevant for our purposes is the plural *σημεῖα* used four times in Revelation. Aune points out that in all four plural instances Revelation uses the expression *ποιεῖν σημεῖα*, "performs signs", "which is a favorite expression in the fourth Gospel, occurring thirteen times (John 2,23; 3,2; 4,54; 6,2.14.30; 7,31; 9,16; 10,41; 11,47; 12,18.37; 20,30)".¹⁶ If we assume the same author for both works, then this would be an intentional construction to suggest that the antigod powers involved in these end-time signs endeavor to imitate the works of Jesus. Morris adds that in all four instances it "denotes miracles worked by evil powers".¹⁷

The first two plural "signs" (Rev 13,13.14) describe the signs the land beast performs in front of the people of the earth. There is a gamut of signs involved as evidenced by the use of the plural *σημεῖα*. Two are mentioned, the land beast giving "breath" to the image of the sea beast;¹⁸ and the land beast bringing fire down from heaven, a sign elsewhere performed by God.¹⁹ Stefanovic draws a parallel between the heavenly Trinity, Father, Son, Holy Spirit, and the satanic or counterfeit trinity, dragon, sea beast, land beast respectively.²⁰ He draws a parallel between the tongues of fire

¹⁶ Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, 758-59.

¹⁷ Morris, *Revelation*, 166.

¹⁸ Ian Paul, *Revelation: An introduction and commentary*, TNTC 20 (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018), 237, explains that talking images with the following words: "... the development of automata and the use of ventriloquism in the ancient world as part of pagan religion and in particular as part of the imperial cult". Obviously, much more is at stake in this end-time image, that go beyond mere deceptive tricks.

¹⁹ Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, 759, points to the ministry of Elijah, namely the fire that came down from heaven (1 Kgs 18,38) and the fire that consumed the soldiers who came to arrest him (2 Kgs 1,10) which he compares with the request of James and John for fire to come down on the Samaritans (Luke 9,54). Other instances can also be invoked (e.g., Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, 760), especially the fire that consumed David's sacrifice (1 Chr 21,26), the sacrifices at the inauguration of the temple (2 Chr 8,1), and the fires that devoured Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10,1-2), and Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19,24). Perhaps even the first that fell upon Egypt together with hailstone (Exod 9,23). In Job 1,16 the fire that destroyed Job's sheep is described as "the fire of God" though reading the statement in the context of the two heavenly councils (Job 1,6-12; Job 2,1-7) it seems that Satan is the active agent in the catastrophes that fall upon Job.

²⁰ Ranko Stefanovic, *Revelation of Jesus Christ*, 2nd ed. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2002), 369-371.

that came down on Pentecost (Acts 2,3) and the land beast that brings down fire from heaven (Rev 13,13),²¹ a counterfeit Pentecost.

While it is the land beast that performs the signs, it does so through power given to it, ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ, possibly by the dragon,²² or by God, in which case the ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ would be a divine passive and should be translated, “he was permitted”.²³ The aim of the signs is to impress and coerce those who dwell on the earth to worship the image of the sea beast. It manages to deceive the earth dwellers, usually a reference to the unsaved. By contrast, those who receive the seal of God, are protected from the deceptions of the land beast (Rev 14,9-11).

The third occurrence (Rev 16,14) appears after the plagues have begun to fall and shortly before the second coming. Demonic spirits, unclean like frogs,²⁴ proceed to perform signs. The mission of the spirits is to assemble the kings of the earth for battle in preparation for the day of God.

The fourth and final occurrence, on the day of God, the false prophet is arrested to be thrown into the lake of fire. He is the one who performed signs and led to world to worship the image of the sea beast. As such, he is identified with the land beast of Revelation 13.²⁵

Observation on the “signs” texts of Revelation and conclusion

John’s “signs” parallel closely the apocalyptic “signs and wonders” texts of the synoptic and Pauline apocalypses. They all envision a great

²¹ *Ibid.*, 371.

²² See e.g., Morris, *Revelation*, 166.

²³ Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, 760.

²⁴ ESV/KJV/NKJ/YLT, “three unclean spirits like frogs;” RSV/NRS “three foul spirits like frogs;” NIV, “three evil spirits that looked like frogs”. The English translations, even the YLT, miss the force of the original. The Greek πνεύματα τρία ἀκάθαρτα ὡς βάραχοι should more accurately be translated as “three spirits unclean like frogs”. The Greek can mean either that the unclean spirits look like frogs (if we assume a comma after “unclean”), or that they are as unclean as frogs are (if we assume a comma before “unclean”). The second nuance is more likely since unclean spirits do not appear in the Bible in the shape of animals, but they are compared to unclean animals (e.g., Rev 18,2) in their uncleanliness. It is possible that both nuances are in view.

²⁵ Morris, *Revelation*, 236; Stefanovic, *Revelation of Jesus Christ*, 371; Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, 760.

movement of eschatological deception. In the two synoptic apocalypses, it is false christs and false prophets who lead out; in Paul it is the man of lawlessness; in Revelation it is the land beast/false prophet.

They all agree that “signs and wonders” aim to deceive. But it is only the unsaved that are deceived, the earth dwellers in Revelation, those who did not love the truth, in Paul, all but the elect in the synoptic apocalypses.

The picture is sobering. The language is intense—false christs, false prophets, man of lawlessness, land beast. The deception unprecedented—for the first time Satan is allowed to replicate supernatural manifestations that throughout history were the prerogative of God. The stakes are highest—salvation or damnation.

As Carson put it, “empty-headed credulity is as great an enemy of true faith as chronic skepticism. Christian faith involves the sober responsibility of neither believing lies nor trusting imposters”.²⁶

²⁶ Carson, “Matthew”, in *The expositor’s Bible commentary*, 503.



3. The compatibility of Christ's ascension in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the theology of pre-advent judgement: Part 2

La compatibilidad de la ascensión de Cristo en la epístola a los Hebreos
y la teología del juicio preadvenimiento (2da parte)

Lalnuntluanga Ralte

Gate Adventist Theology College

Falakata, India

gateatc@gmail.com

Recibido: 22 de mayo de 2024

Aceptado: 9 de julio de 2024

Abstract

This article examines the theological significance of Christ's ascension and His role as High Priest, particularly in relation to the heavenly sanctuary motif found in both the Old and New Testaments. It highlights the evidence for a heavenly sanctuary in the Old Testament and analyzes key passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews, specifically Hebrews 6,19 and 9,12, to determine whether Jesus entered the Most Holy Place or the Holy Place at His ascension. The study addresses historical context, literary structure, and themes within Hebrews, while exploring the implications of divine investigative judgment. By reconciling differing interpretations regarding Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, this article aims to clarify His intercessory role for humanity and enhance understanding of His ascension within the broader narrative of salvation history.

Keywords

Ascension — Heavenly sanctuary — Within the veil — Investigative judgment

Resumen

Este artículo examina el significado teológico de la ascensión de Cristo y su papel como Sumo Sacerdote, especialmente en relación con el motivo del Santuario celestial, que se encuentra tanto en el Antiguo como en el Nuevo Testamento. Destaca la evidencia de un santuario celestial en el Antiguo Testamento y analiza pasajes clave de la Epístola a los Hebreos, concretamente Hebreos 6,19 y 9,12, para determinar si Jesús entró en el Lugar



Santísimo o en el Lugar Santo en su ascensión. El estudio aborda el contexto histórico, la estructura literaria y las temáticas de Hebreos, mientras explora las implicaciones del juicio investigador divino. Al conciliar las distintas interpretaciones sobre el ministerio de Cristo en el Santuario celestial, este artículo pretende aclarar su función intercesora por la humanidad y mejorar la comprensión de su ascensión en el contexto más amplio de la narrativa de la historia de la salvación.

Palabras claves

Ascension — Santuario celestial — Dentro del velo — Juicio investigador

Introduction

In the light of Elias Brasil de Souza’s work about the heavenly sanctuary motif in the Old Testament, one can find strong evidence of the presence of heavenly sanctuary in that part of the Bible.¹ Subsequently, Leonardo N. Dunes had recently done a thorough study on the heavenly sanctuary motif in the New Testament as well.² Biblical pieces of evidence of divine investigation are quite recognizable from these studies.³ Thus, in light of the foregoing sophisticated studies done by Souza and Dunes, I would not go into detail about the biblical teaching of divine investigative judgment from the Old Testament and the New Testament. In addition to these, Jiří Moskala and Frank B. Holbrook have written an insightful study regarding the functions of Christ’s ascension and His heavenly ministries which explains the meaning of Christ’s intercessory ministry—sitting at the right hand of God” (Eph 1,20; 2,6; Col 2,12; 3,1; Heb 1,1-4; 8,1; 10,12; 12,2),” and his king-priest position (1 John 1,2; Heb 2,17-18) in the heavenly sanctuary.⁴

¹ Elias Brasil de Souza, “The heavenly sanctuary/temple motif in the Hebrew Bible: Function and relationship to the earthly counterparts” (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2005). For a few examples on the biblical evidences of the sanctuary in th OT, see Mic 1,2; Hab 2,20; 18,7; Exod 25,8-9.

² Leonardo N. Dunes, “Function and nature of the heavenly sanctuary/temple and its earthly counterparts in the New Testament Gospels, Acts, and the Epistles: A motif study of major passages” (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2020).

³ Gen 3,9-13.14-19; Ps 139,1-4; 147,5; 1 John 3,20; Isa 46,9-10; Dan 7,4-7.22.25; Matt 22,11; 1 Cor 4,5; Rom 2,5.7-8; 2 Thess 1,8-9; 1 Cor 4,9; Rev 14,6-12.

⁴ See Frank B Holbrook, “Christ’s inauguration as King Priest”, *Journal of Adventist Theological Society* 5, no 2 (1994): 136-152; and Jiří Moskala, “The meaning of the intercessory ministry of

From the aforementioned studies, one may easily agree that at His ascension, Jesus went to heaven and became a High priest on behalf of humanity. This truth is based on the Epistle to the Hebrews which claims that Jesus became a high priest for us as an advocate in the heavenly sanctuary.⁵ However, the problem remains as to which compartment of the heavenly sanctuary Jesus entered at His ascension. Did He enter the second compartment known as the Most Holy Place or the first compartment known as the Holy Place? Or, is the author of the Epistle referring to the whole sanctuary without making any specific mention of the compartments of the heavenly sanctuary?

Hebrews 6,19 seems to show that Jesus as a High priest entered within the veil, in which, the nuance concerning the veil occurs. The question arises: Does the expression “within the veil” refer to the Most Holy Place or the Holy Place? In Hebrew 9,12, τὰ ἅγια⁶ has been translated variously.⁷ Consequently, one will ask, whether τὰ ἅγια is the Most Holy Place or the Holy place. Or can there be another interpretation of τὰ ἅγια? Despite all the questions being asked, Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is understood by many to have commenced in the Most Holy Place in the year 1844 to begin the investigative judgment or the pre-advent judgment (Dan 7,9-13; 8,14; 9,25-27). Such an interpretation of the Book of Daniel seems to conflict with the idea presented by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews that Jesus went into the Most Holy Place

Jesus Christ on our behalf in the heavenly sanctuary”, *Journal of Adventist Theological Society* 28, no 1 (2017): 2-25.

⁵ Hebrews 3,1; 4,14; 7,25; 8,2; 9,24; 9,12; 10,12.

⁶ Τὰ ἅγια is the phrase used for sanctuary, Holy Place, Holy of Holies, Most Holy Place, etc., based on the version of the Bible. See Barbara Friberg, Timothy Friberg, and Kurt Aland, in *Analytical Greek New Testament: Greek text analysis* (Cedar Hill, TX: Silver Mountain Software, 2001), s. v. “Hebrews 9:12”.

⁷ *American King James Version, Emphasized Bible, King James 2000 version, New Heart English Bible: Aramaic Names New Testament Edition and World English Bible* translated the word as ‘the holy place; Darby Bible, Modern Literal Version, *Voice in the Wilderness 2008 Bible*, translated the word as ‘the holy of holies’; *English Majority Text version 2011 Edition, the Logos Bible, Modern King James Version, and Smith's Literal Translation* translated the word as the ‘Holies’; *New English Translation, Unlocked Literal Bible, New International Version and New King James Version* translated the word as ‘the Most Holy Place’; *Open English Bible* translated the word as ‘sanctuary’; and *Young Literal version* translated the word as ‘the holy places’.

soon after His ascension.⁸ However, if one accepts the unity and harmony of the Scriptures, both Old and New, then it may be profitable to examine the seemingly conflicting verses more to see if there is a harmony that has been overlooked.

This article attempts to find the true meaning of what the text says in Hebrews 6,19 and Hebrews 9,12, which deal with the entrance of Christ in the inner veil and into the *τὰ ἄγια* with His blood. It begins with an investigation of the context of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which covers the historical background, literary genre, and theme of the Hebrews' epistle. The analysis of Hebrews 6,19 will follow, with a focus on the meaning of the "veil", and conclude with the theological meaning of Revelation 6,19. The next sections follow the analysis of Revelation 9,12, in which the context of Revelation 8-10 is summarily studied. This is followed by an introduction dealing with inauguration theology, which in turn will analyze whether Christ's entrance into the sanctuary in Revelation 9 points to His inauguration in heaven or the antitypical Day of Atonement. The word *σικηνή* is used as a medium of interpretation, followed by inter-textual studies on the words, *τράγων* and *μόσχων* in Revelation 9,12.13, which concludes the meaning of the texts analyzed.

Contexts of the Epistle to the Hebrews

The main focus of the study is solely on the two texts mentioned above, knowing the intent of the author and the condition of the recipients is important, which is a help for the analysis of the chapters. Thus, the section provides the background for the exegesis of the texts. The section is divided into three parts: historical setting, literary structure, and theme of the epistle of Hebrews.

⁸ According to the interpretation of Daniel 8,14, Jesus entered the Most Holy Place only by 1844 and not in His ascension. See William Shea, "Supplementary evidence in support of 457 B.C. as a starting date for 2300 day-years of Daniel 8:14", *Journal of Adventist Theological Society* 12, no 1 (Spring, 2001): 89-96.

Historical setting of the Epistle to the Hebrews

Since most of the existing manuscripts of this epistle bear the name Προς Εβραιους, “to the Hebrews”, Paul Ellingworth argues that the title most likely alludes to a Jewish audience.⁹ However, Matthew Black suggested that the local synagogue in ancient Rome and Corinth was known as the “Hebrews”. He adds that early church publications referred to first-century Jewish Christians as “Hebrews”.¹⁰ On the other hand, Gareth L. Cockerill points out that the epistle is entirely devoid of any sort of ethnic differentiation. He recognized that interpreters quickly cause misunderstanding when they use the word “Jewish Christian” in an ethnic context. Thus, according to Cockerill, the term “Jewish Christian” refers to all Christians, regardless of race, who have become accustomed to and remain drawn to Jewish religious rituals.¹¹ Thus, one could agree that the hearers of the epistle could possibly be both Jews and Gentiles who felt the need for various Jewish associations or practices. Henceforth, I will use the term “Jewish Christian” as referring to both Jewish and Gentiles alike.

The external evidence implies that Jewish Christians were confused about whether they would be detached from the rituals of the temple or not because they practiced this cultic act their whole lives. It seems that they did not recognize the fulfillment of the antitype concerning the sanctuary when Christ died and became a high priest for them in heaven (Matt 27,50-51). Although the council of Jerusalem in AD 49 clearly stated that there is no Jew nor Gentile regarding salvation (Acts 15,7-11), the council made a policy for the gentiles Christian and did not make a requirement for the practice of worship in the temple (Acts 15,13-21.28.29). However, the Jewish Christians were not

⁹ Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A commentary on the Greek text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 21-22.

¹⁰ Matthew Black, *The scrolls and Christian origins: Studies in the Jewish background of the New Testament* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1961), 78.

¹¹ Gareth L. Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 66.

given any instruction concerning their ritualistic worship in the temple (Rom 14,5-6).¹² The internal evidence also shows that the Jewish Christians were weary in their faith, and as a result, they had less confidence in the return of their Lord. Thus, there was a danger of them turning back to Judaism.¹³ Apparently, in this condition, the author attempts to explain that there is hope, and concerning the sanctuary, the antitype has come.

Structure of the Epistle

According to Johnson, there are at least four points that can be drawn out concerning the structure of the Epistle. First, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the High Priestly Christology is dominant. One may find only a few hints regarding Jesus as a high priest in the New Testament (for example, Rom 8,34, 1 John 2,2, and Rev 1, 4, and 5), but the entire argument of the Epistle centered on the priesthood of Christ.¹⁴ Second, the Epistle is comprised of terminology such as “tabernacles, sacrifices, priests, blood, and ablutions”.¹⁵ Thus, the theological argument of the Epistle is largely based on this cultic terminology. Third, Johnson points out that the author of Hebrews is systematic in preparing the Epistle, which means the author wrote it with a wise intent of changing a system. Fourth, in reading the Epistle, the climax of the argument is fully expressed in the central section of Hebrews 7,1-10,18.

For instance, the Levitical priesthood is completely fulfilled in Christ and He has become a better priest. Chapter 8 points out that the author has come to the main point of the argument, that Christ is a better high priest in the better sanctuary in heaven, with a better covenant. Another significant aspect of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the author’s dependence on the LXX version to quote the Old Testament. Thus, the author

¹² “Daniel and Revelation committee report”, in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, DARCOM, 7 vols. (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1989), 4:1.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 22.

seems to read the Old Testament in Greek.¹⁶ William Lane stated on this matter: “A virtual consensus has been reached that the writer read his Bible in Greek”.¹⁷ Thus, one must borrow the eye of the author when reading the text in the epistle to the Hebrews.

Homiletical nature of the Epistle

Analyzing the structure of the Epistle, Steve Stanley suggested that the literary genre is that of a homily.¹⁸ On the other hand, Manson argues that the Epistle is not a sermon due to its epistolary ending.¹⁹ Davis also concluded that the Epistle is best considered as a letter because it meets the needs of the recipients.²⁰ However, the majority of scholars find that it is homiletic in nature.²¹ The evidence for the argument of the homiletical nature is the phrase in 13,22, where the author considered his epistle “the word of exhortation” (τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως).

There is only one usage of the same phrase in the New Testament, which is Acts 13,15, where the passage explicitly portrays the speech or sermon in the synagogue.²² Hartwig Thyen also suggested that the Epistle of Hebrews is written in a genre of Jewish-Hellenistic homily. The homiletical pattern he discovered is the frequent change of “we”

¹⁶ Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 37, comment on the subject, saying: “There is very general agreement that the author drew his quotations, not directly from a Hebrew text, but from the LXX [...]. There is no compelling evidence that the author had access to any Hebrew text”.

¹⁷ William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, WBC (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1991), cxviii.

¹⁸ Steve Stanley, “The structure of Hebrews from three perspectives,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 45, no 2 (1994): 247.

¹⁹ W. Manson, *The Epistle of Hebrews: An historical and theological reconsideration* (London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), 3.

²⁰ J. H. Davies, *A Letter to Hebrews* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 2.

²¹ For Instance, R. Mc. L. Wilson, *Hebrews*, NCBC (Basingstoke, UK: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1987), 16-17; H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1989), 13; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 25-26.

²² J. Swetnam, “On the literary genre of the ‘Epistle’ to the Hebrews,” *Novum Testamentum*, no 11 (1969): 261. See also David Allan Black, “The problem of literary structure of Hebrews: An evaluation and a proposal,” *Grace Theological Journal* 7, no 2 (1986): 167.

to “you” and to “I”, and he added that the style of introducing the Old Testament witnesses as the evidence is homiletical.²³ David Aune also observed that Hebrews 11,32 is evidence for its homily, which says, “And what more shall I say, for time will fail me if I tell of... (NASB)”²⁴ Thus, it seems reasonable to consider that the Epistle to the Hebrews is written in the form of a homily, which is written to be read out loud before the congregation.²⁵

The theme of the Epistle

Another concern for the Epistle to the Hebrews is its theological theme. Merland Ray Miller supplied seven theological themes that are in the epistle: faith, perfection, promise, endurance, superiority, witness, and inheritance. He also pointed out that Hebrews 11,1-12,2 contains the themes of the Epistle in a compact form.²⁶ However, Johnsson provided a theme which is throughout the Epistle. He pointed out that the key word is “better”, under which he provided the following examples: “better name (1,4), better hope (7,19), better covenant (7,22), better promises (8,6), better sacrifices (9,23), a better country (11,16), a better resurrection (11,35), and a better blood (12,24)”²⁷

Thus, as one reads the Epistle to the Hebrews, one can know the intent of the author who attempts to provide “better” things for the Jewish Christians rather than the rituals and cultic practices which is the type that has met the antitype in Jesus. With these contexts in view, we will proceed to our study.

²³ Hartwig Thyen, *Der Stil Der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*, FRLANT 47 (Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955), 10-23; 43-50; 62-72, quoted in Stanley, “Structure of Hebrews,” 249-250.

²⁴ David Aune, *The New Testament in its literary environment* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1987), 212-214.

²⁵ J. L Bailey and L.D. Vander Broek, *Literary forms in the New Testament* (London, UK: SPCK, 1992), 193.

²⁶ Merland Ray Miller, “Seven theological themes in Hebrews”, *Grace Theological Journal* 8, no 1 (1987): 131.

²⁷ William G. Johnson, “Hebrews: An overview”, in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 28.

Καταπέτασμα in Hebrews 6,19

The NASB version of Hebrews 6,19-20 reads:

This hope we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast and one which enters within the veil [εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος], where Jesus has entered as a forerunner for us, having become a high priest forever according to the priest of Melchizedek.

In 1987, George Rice in his article concluded that the LXX word *καταπέτασμα* in Hebrews 6,19 could be referring to any of the three veils of the Israelite's sanctuary, either the inner veil that separated the Holy and the Most Holy Place (Exod 26,31.33-35), outer veil at the entrance of the Holy Place (Exod 26,37; 37,5), or the screen of the court (Exod 37,16).²⁸ After supplying the variety of meanings, Rice asserted that one should not rely on the general views of scholars, especially in their conclusions and assumptions on Hebrews 6,19 as the second veil.²⁹ Accordingly, he interprets the passages as a metaphor for Jesus entering into the

²⁸ George Rice, "Hebrews 6:19: Analysis of some assumptions concerning *Katapetasma*", *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25 (1987): 65-71. The idea of *καταπέτασμα* as possibility to refer to inner and outer veil is well known. For example, see Attridge, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 184; Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 199; M. Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews", in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. by W. R. Nicoll, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1956), 305. C. Schneider, "Καταπέτασμα", in *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ed. by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 3:629. Early Adventist scholars agreed the same; see William G. Johnsson, "Day of Atonement Allusion," in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 105-120; P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Among Sabbatarian Adventists, 1845-1850", in *Doctrine of the sanctuary: A historical survey*, DARCOM, 7 vols. (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1989), 5:17-54.

²⁹ For the scholars who concluded that the inner veil in Hebrews 6,19 is the Most Holy Place, see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 184; Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 155, 250-251; B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek text with notes and essays*, 2nd ed. (London, UK: Macmillan, 1892), 163; G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews: Translation, comment and conclusions*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972), 116; Otto Michel, *Der Brief an Die Hebraer*, 12th ed. (Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 253-54; H. Braun, *An Die Hebraer*, Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament 14 (Tübingen, DE: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984); P. Gordon and W. Horbury, "Better promises: Two passages in Hebrews against the background of the Old Testament cultus", in *Templum amicitiae: Essays on the temple presented to Ernst Bammel*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 48 (Sheffield, UK: JSOT, 1991); Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 347; Simon J. Kistemaker, *New Testament commentary: Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1984), 176; Donald Alfred Hagner, *Hebrews*, NIBC (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990), 98-99; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, WBC 47a, 154; Thomas G Long, *Hebrews* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 78-80; Beverly Roberts Gaventa

heavenly sanctuary as a whole.³⁰ However, in 2000, Roy Gane re-studied the passage and brought a new conclusion in the light of exegetical analysis,³¹ which, Norman Young expanded in 2001, to affirm that *καταπέτασμα* refers only to the inner veil.³² With these comments as background, we will provide an exegetical analysis of the phrase “within the veil”.

*Summary of Gane’s exegetical note
on “within the veil” in Hebrews 6,19*

The phrase *ἑσώτερον τοῦ καταπέτασματος*, “within the veil”, occurs four times (Exod 26,33; Lev 16,2.12.15) in the LXX, and for each occurrence, the meaning is the same.³³ Gane observes that each occurrence of the Greek phrase *ἑσώτερον τοῦ καταπέτασματος* renders the Hebrew phrase *לְפָרֶכֶת מִבֵּית לְפָרֶכֶת* which refers to the inner veil of the sanctuary. He sees that the LXX word *καταπέτασμα* can point to various veils, however, the rendered Hebrew word *פָּרֶכֶת* clearly refers to the inner veil.³⁴ One exception that Gane observes was the usage of the Hebrew *מָסָךְ* translated as a screen or veil at the entrance of the tabernacle (Exod 26,37-38; 38,18),³⁵ however, the word *פָּרֶכֶת* in relation to the word *מָסָךְ* specifically served as the screen that separates the Most Holy Place and the Holy Place. For example, the Masoretic Text provided that the phrase

and David L. Petersen, eds., *The New Interpreter’s Bible* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2010), 12:81-82.

³⁰ Rice, “Hebrews 6:19”, 70-71; George E. Rice, “Within which veil?,” *Ministry*, June 1987, 20-21. For the scholars who have the same idea about the metaphorical notion of the inner veil in Heb 6,19 as a figurative for heavens as a whole, see Marvin Richardson Vincent, *Word studies in the New Testament* (Charleston, SC: Nabu Press, 2010), 453; Long, *Hebrews*, 78-79; Kistemaker, *New Testament commentary*, 176; Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, Felix W. Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker, *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 2000), 416.

³¹ Roy E. Gane, “Re-opening *Katapetasma* ‘(veil)’ in Hebrews 6:19”, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38 (2000): 5-8.

³² Norman H. Young, “‘Where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf’ (Hebrews 6:19)”, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39, no 2 (2001): 165-173.

³³ Gane, “*Katapetasma*,” 6; Ballenger, *Cast out*, 28.

³⁴ Gane, “*Katapetasma*,” 6.

³⁵ Ballenger and Bruce notice these differences in terminology; see Ballenger, *Cast out*, 20-27; and Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 199.

הַמָּסָךְ הַפְּרֻכֶּת refers to the inner veil (Exod 35,12; 39,34; 40,21; Num 4,5), thus, according to Gane, פְּרֻכֶּת almost always refers to the inner veil within the category of מָסָךְ which is in accordance with the etymology of the Sumerian word *bara*, that is a loan-word from Akkadian word *paraku*, which means “cultic base/ pedestal, high seat; shrine/ apartment (of deity)”.³⁶

Gane also pointed out that there are various spatial terminologies concerning the veil, in which one can recognize the differences between the terms. For example, for the location of the ark of the covenant, the Hebrew phrase uses מִבֵּית לְפָרְכֶת “within the veil,” which in the LXX is translated as ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (Exod 26,33), whereas, for the location of the lampstand and the table, the Masoretic Text rendered מִחוּץ לְפָרְכֶת which means “outside the veil”, and the LXX translated as ἔξωθεν τοῦ καταπετάσματος (Exod 26,35; 27,21). Another usage of a spatial term is לְפָנֵי הַפְּרֻכֶּת which means “before the veil,” and the LXX translates as ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος (Exod 30,6).³⁷ Thus, Gane concluded that the phrase בֵּית לְפָרְכֶת (LXX, ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος) is reserved only for the inner veil in contrast to the other spatial term such as “outside the veil” and “before the veil”.³⁸

Grammatical significance of τὸ ἐσώτερον

Rice, in his article “Hebrews 6:19: Analysis of some assumptions concerning *Katapetasma*”, asserted that ἐσώτερον is merely a positive adjectival degree, which means that it must be simply translated as “within”

³⁶ Roy E. Gane and J. Milgrom, “פְּרֻכֶּת”, in *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, trans. by Douglas W. Stott, vol. 12 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 95-97. *The Sumerian dictionary of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania*, ed. by Sjoberg (Philadelphia, PA: Babylonian Section of the University Museum, 1984), 2:134-143.

³⁷ Gane and Milgrom, TDOT, 96.

³⁸ Gane, “*Katapetasma*”, 8. Young, “Where Jesus has gone”, 167, also affirmed that the word פְּרֻכֶּת rendered for the phrase “inner veil” in MT for twenty-five times (Exod 26,31.33.35; 27,21; 30,6; 35,12; 36,35; 38,27; 39,34; 40,3.21.22.26; Lev 4,6.17; 16,2.12.15; 21,33; Num 4,5; 18,7; 2 Chr 3,14), in which, twenty two of these passages rendered καταπετάσμα in LXX.

and indicates the outer veil of the sanctuary implicitly. However, Young argued with this conclusion by asserting that ἐσώτερον is a comparative adjective, and if it were to be translated as a positive adjective, the word ἐσώ would be used.³⁹ Thus, comparing the usage of ἐσώτερον in the other texts, it is impossible to restrict the translation of ἐσώτερον to a positive adjectival degree.⁴⁰ The NRSV seems to translate Acts 16,24 in the right manner: “Following these instructions, he put them in *the innermost cell* and fastened their feet in the stocks”, rendering τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακὴν. Young also pointed out that Hellenistic Greek would usually consider the comparative adjective with an article as a superlative degree, as in the case of Hebrews 6,19.⁴¹ One must also note that the phrase ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος occurs only five times in the Greek Bible, one in the New Testament (Heb 6,19) and four in the LXX (Exod 26,33; Lev 16,2.12.15). All four occurrences in the LXX refer to the Most Holy Place. Therefore, the meaning of “within the veil” in Hebrews 6,19 unequivocally denotes the veil separating the Most Holy Place and the Holy Place.

In light of this conclusion, Young strongly suggested that the context of Hebrews 6,19 is the Day of Atonement setting. He pointed out that there is only one place in the Old Testament that described the high priest going into the veil (Lev 16), and it is all related to the Day of Atonement. He disregards Exodus 26,33 because it dealt with the command of God to Moses to set up the tabernacle, which, according to him, is not a “cultic service”.⁴² Another argument he brought out for the case of supplying

³⁹ Young, “Where Jesus has gone”, 168. Cf. George E. Rice, “Hebrews 6:19: Analysis of some assumptions concerning *Katapetasma*”, in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 232-233.

⁴⁰ For Example, in 1 Samuel 24,4, David and his men sit in the innermost part of the cave (ἐσώτερον τοῦ σπηλαίου), 2 Chr 4,22 uses the word as to describe the inner door of the Most Holy Place (ἡ θύρα τοῦ οἴκου ἢ ἐσωτέρα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη τῶν ἁγίων), likewise the word ἐσώτερον is almost always employed as the inner part of the court (Esth 4,11; Ezek 44,27; 45,19; 46,1; 1 Macc 9,54; 2 Chr 23,20). See Horn, *SABD*, s. v. “temple”, 1098.

⁴¹ Young, “Where Jesus has gone”, 169. For the grammar, see Archibald T Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research* (London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), 667-668; Friedrich W. Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 32-33.

⁴² Young, “Where Jesus has gone”, 171.

the evidence for the Day of Atonement setting in Hebrews 6,19 is the aorist tense employed in the passage. For example, “having become a high priest” (ἀρχιερέως γενόμενος) has an aorist tense which denotes something that happened only once in the past. It is similar in the case of the phrase, “Jesus entered” (εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς), thus, Young argues that the event of Jesus in his entering within the veil is not repetitive.⁴³

In 1981, Rice wrote a scholarly article presenting the chiasmic parallel of Hebrews 6,19-20 and 10,19-20, showing that the veil referred to in Hebrews 6,19 must be similar to the veil in Hebrews 10,20.⁴⁴ Thus, he concluded that the veil could also refer to outer veil as the language preference in Hebrews 10,20 implies. However, Young rejected this conclusion by pointing to the context of Hebrews 10,20, asserting that the background is the Day of Atonement setting which is solely relative to the Aaronic priesthood and the entrance to the inner veil. In addition, he asserted that any first-century Jew would support his argument concerning the usage of Day of Atonement as the background of Hebrews 6,19.⁴⁵ Due to Young's conclusion on Hebrews 6,19 as the accomplishment of Day of Atonement, Richard M. Davidson proposed an alternate interpretation regarding this subject.

Hebrews 6,19 in the context of Old Testament typology

Davidson pointed out that Hebrews 6,19 uses the Old Testament references, as in the case of “the coming priest after the order of Melchizedek (Ps 110,4) and not after the order of Aaronic priesthood.”⁴⁶ Moreover,

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Young, “Where Jesus has gone”, 172. For the reference to chiasmic parallel of Hebrews 6,19 and 10,20, see George E. Rice, “The chiasmic structure of the central section of the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19, no 3 (1981): 243-246.

⁴⁵ For the articles by Young on attempting to provide evidence that the Day of Atonement as the background of Hebrews 6,19, see Norman H. Young, “ΤΟΥΤ' ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΣΑΡΚΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ”, Heb X. 20: Apposition, dependent and explicative?, *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 100-104; Norman H. Young, “The Gospel according to Hebrews 9”, *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 198-210.

⁴⁶ 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 (Autumn 2001): 176.

he found that Numbers 18,7 has a similar usage of the phrase “within the veil” with Hebrews 6,19.20, subsequently, he disclosed that Numbers 18,7 may not merely refer to the second veil, because the passage seems to connect both Aaron and his sons to the work of the priesthood “within the veil”. As a result, the phrase “within the veil” in Numbers 18,7 could possibly indicate both the veils at the first entrance and the second. Thus, the question regarding the meaning of the phrase “within the veil” remains somewhat ambiguous to Davidson, although he acknowledges that a good case can be made for it referring only to the inner veil.⁴⁷

The order of Melchizedek as the background of Hebrews 6,19

Davidson points out that Melchizedek is a king-priest who can encompass both Old Testament characters, Moses the ruler, and Aaron the priest. Accordingly, Jesus as the antitypical priest according to the order of Melchizedek required fulfilling the roles of Moses and Aaron together. Accordingly, the author of Hebrews draws a parallel between the faithfulness of Moses and Jesus in the house of God (Heb 3,1-6), which is expounded again in Hebrews 10,20 where the “High priest over the house of God” is the subject dealt with. Hebrews 9 also had the same motif where Moses was compared to Jesus in terms of priesthood (Heb 9,16-24). Thus, as Jesus is the priest “according to the order of Melchizedek” in Hebrews 6,19, one cannot merely apply to the Aaronic priest.⁴⁸ Consequently, the Day of Atonement with its Aaronic priesthood may not be the most favorable background of Hebrews 6,19.

Davidson supplied another possible background apart from the Day of Atonement motif in Leviticus 16 which Young had strongly introduced.⁴⁹ Davidson exposed the only occurrence in the Old Testament where one enters the Most Holy Place apart from the Day of Atonement, which is when Moses inaugurated the sanctuary. Moses did the priestly

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 175.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 177.

⁴⁹ Young, “Where Jesus has gone”, 171-172.

work of anointing before Aaron was a priest (Exod 40,1-9; Lev 8,10-12; Num 7,1). Hence, one can conclude that Moses did the king-priest ministry at this time of inauguration which is analogous to the dedication of the sanctuary during the reign of Solomon (2 Chro 6,12-43; 7,5). Exodus 26,33 also points to the event when the ark was brought to the Most Holy Place “within the veil,” at the time when the inauguration of the sanctuary was carried out (Exod 40,3.9). In explaining the aorist participle of Hebrews 6,19, Davidson plainly stated that the aorist participle would indicate that Jesus inaugurated the sanctuary once in the past and at that time became a high priest.⁵⁰

The chiasmic parallels as medium of interpretation

The presence of chiasmic parallels in Hebrews 6,19-20 and Hebrews 10,19-20 was early identified by Albert Vanhoye.⁵¹ William Shea also identified these parallels in the epistle and produced a more detailed chiasmic structure.⁵² Subsequently, Davidson expanded the work of William Shea with a minor change in the chiasm as illustrated below:

Chiasmic structure of Hebrews 6, 19-20 to 10, 19-20

- A. The veil – 6,19-20
- B. The priesthood – 7,1-25
- C. The sacrifice – 7,26-28
- D. The sanctuary – 8,1-5
- E. The covenant – 8,6-13
- F. The sanctuary – 9,1-10

⁵⁰ Davidson, “Christ’s entry ‘within the veil’”, 177.

⁵¹ Albert Vanhoye, *Structure and message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Subsidia Biblica 12 (Rome, IT: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989), 40a-40-b. See also Albert Vanhoye, *La Structure Littéraire de l’Épître Aux Hébreux*, 2nd ed. (Bruges, BE: De Brouwer, 1976), 228/29.

⁵² William Shea, “Literary and architectural structures in the sanctuary section of Hebrews (6:19-20 to 10:19-20)”, (unpublished paper), n. d., 2.

F'. The sanctuary – 9,11-14

E'. The covenant – 9,15-22

D'. The sanctuary – 9,23-28

C'. The sacrifice – 10,1-10

B'. The priesthood – 10,11-18

A'. The veil – 10,19-20⁵³

Concerning members A and A' above, one may notice that they constitute the two parallels regarding the “veil” (6,19-20 and 10,19-20). Davidson affirmed the conclusion of Vanhoye in analyzing these passages regarding “the veil” because Vanhoye suggested that A' is the reiteration of the same point into more explicit exposition.⁵⁴

Utilizing the argument of Vanhoye, Davidson disclosed that the parallels are not merely applied to “the veil” but also to the overall background of the event. Thus, just as the LXX is significant for the interpretation of Hebrews 6,19, he maintained that the same equity concerning the usage of LXX as a background must also be applied to Hebrews 10,19-20.⁵⁵ Accordingly, he asserted that although Hebrews 6,19 in itself does not provide a clear understanding of the meaning of the passage, Hebrews 10,19-20 is the key to interpreting Hebrews 6,19-20.⁵⁶

Grammatical significance of ἐνεκαίνισεν in Hebrews 10,20

The NASB version reads “by a new and living way which He inaugurated for us through the veil, that is, His flesh (Heb 10,20). The term “inaugurated” in the passage is ἐνεκαίνισεν as the LXX rendered, which means “to bring about the beginning of something, with the implication

⁵³ Davidson, “Christ’s entry ‘within the veil’”, 178.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* Vanhoye, *La structure*, 228-229. See also George Guthrie, *The structure of Hebrews: A text linguistic analysis*, NovTSup 73 (Leiden, NL: E. J. Brill, 1994), 99-100.

⁵⁵ Davidson, “Christ’s entry ‘within the veil’”, 179.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

that it is newly established, to ratify, inaugurate, dedicate”.⁵⁷ The LXX mostly used nominal derivatives as a cultic term for the inauguration of the temple.⁵⁸ In the Pentateucal passages of the LXX, there are only four occurrences of the root word which deals with the sanctuary cultus, all these words are from Numbers 7, and all of them are in the context of the inauguration of the sanctuary.

The noun *ἐγκαίνισμός* is found in Numbers 7,10.11.84, and the other noun *ἐγκαίνωσις* occurs in Numbers 7,88. Davidson points out that all this inauguration is done in the context of Numbers 7,1, which describes Moses as the one who inaugurates the sanctuary.⁵⁹ Some scholars have recognized this conclusion but have not drawn out the implications.⁶⁰ Thus, Davidson suggested that the author intentionally used the cultic term inauguration instead of using the common Greek term “open”. In addition, the translation of *ἐνεκαίνισεν* as “inaugurated” is compatible with the only other occurrence of the word that is found in Hebrews 9,18, which unequivocally denotes the cultic meaning of “inauguration/dedication”.⁶¹

Concerning the entering motif in Hebrews 6,19.20 and 10,19.20, the literary parallels can be illustrated in table 1:

⁵⁷ Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker, *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*, s. v. “ἐγκαίνιζω”.

⁵⁸ For example, 1 Kgs 8,63 and 2 Chr 7,5 described about the dedication of Solomon's temple, in which the verb *ἐνεκαίνισεν* is employed, 2 Chr 15,8 also dealt with the rededication of the temple after they had defiled. This passage uses the same verb. In Ezra 6,16.17, the noun form *ἐγκαίνια* is employed when there was a rededication of the temple in the postexilic period.

⁵⁹ Davidson, “Christ's entry ‘within the veil’”, 179.

⁶⁰ For Example, Erich Grasser, *An Die Hebraer*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997), 14-15; and Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 518; N. A Dahl, “A new and living way: The approach to God according to Hebrews 10:19-25”, *Int* (1951): 401-92.

⁶¹ Davidson, “Christ's entry ‘within the veil’”, 180. See also, Dahl, “A new and living way”, 405.

Table 1. Literary parallels in Hebrews 6,19-20 and 10,19-20

6,19-20	10,19-20
<p>This hope we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast and one which <i>enters</i> within the veil, where Jesus has <i>entered</i> as a forerunner for us, having become a high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.</p> <p>V. 19, εἰσερχομένην (go in, enter), present participle of εἰσέρχομαι</p> <p>V. 20, εἰσῆλθεν (go in, enter), an aorist form of εἰσέρχομαι</p>	<p>Since therefore, brethren, we have the confidence to <i>enter</i> the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which He <i>inaugurated</i> for us through the veil, that is, His flesh.</p> <p>V. 19, εἴσοδον (entrance, access), non-temporal noun of εἴσοδος</p> <p>V. 20, ἐνεκαίνισεν (to inaugurate) aorist form of ἐγκαίνιζω</p>

In the table above, Hebrews 6,19 uses the common root word for “entering,” *εἰσέρχομαι*,⁶² and Hebrews 10,19 employs *εἴσοδος* which is more of the nature of entrance, it means, “acceptance, entrance, access”.⁶³ Both verses in Hebrews 6,19 and 10,19 describe the access that is bestowed upon humanity. Subsequently, Hebrews 6,20 employed the aorist form of *εἰσέρχομαι*, which is a common usage word of “enter” again, however, the aorist tense indicates its completeness and unrepentive nature. Hebrews 10,20 deals with the nature of entrance again, using the aorist form of *ἐγκαίνιζω*, which means “to bring about the beginning of something, with an implication that it is newly established, *ratify, inaugurate*”.⁶⁴ Both verses in Hebrews 6,20 and 10,20 elaborate on the nature of Christ’s entrance to the heavenly sanctuary for the inauguration, at a specific point in time (as an aorist form of the word would indicate). Therefore, the various parallels inform that believers have ongoing access to the heavenly sanctuary because Christ had entered and opened/inaugurated access for humanity.

⁶² Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker, *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*, s. v. “εἰσέρχομαι”.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, s. v. “εἴσοδος”.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, s. v. “ἐγκαίνιζω”.

Theological implications of Hebrews 6,19.20

Since Hebrews 6,19.20 is not adequate in itself to give the background event of the passage, the cultic parallel in Hebrews 10,19.20 can help elaborate the theology of the author. The context of Hebrews 10,19.20 primarily points to the inauguration of the new covenant. For instance, Hebrews 10,1-10 describes the establishment of the new system through the sacrificial body of Christ and the abolishment of the earthly sacrificial system (vv. 9, 10), the passage continued with Jesus as being sitting at the right hand of God (the author is quoting Ps 110) in verse 12, and verse 16 describe the establishment of the new covenant (*cf.* Jer 31,33.34), followed by his dedication of the new covenant, “new living way”, in the sanctuary in verse 20 (*cf.* Heb 9,18). Davidson observes the background and points out the chronological terminology, namely “sacrificial system, covenant, high priesthood, and sanctuary”.⁶⁵

According to the context, the focus of the chapter is more on the inauguration of the sanctuary. Thus, in the light of Hebrews 10,19-20 as a context, Hebrews 6,19-20 implies that Jesus entered within the veil to inaugurate the sanctuary and open access for the believers. Jesus as the high priest became the forerunner⁶⁶ for humanity, thus inviting the believers to boldly enter the heavenly sanctuary through the merit of Christ.

Tὰ ἅγια in Hebrews 9,12

The NASB reads “and not through the blood of goats and calves, but through His blood, He entered the Holy Place (τὰ ἅγια) once for all, having obtained eternal redemption (Heb 9,12). The word τὰ ἅγια in regard to Christ’s ascension plays an important role in defining the geographical location and the nature of Christ entry to heaven and the sanctuary in particular. Thus it calls for a careful study of the inter-textual usage of

⁶⁵ Davidson, “Christ’s entry ‘within the veil’”, 181.

⁶⁶ Felix Cortez rightly points out that the word “forerunner” has the same function to the word ἀρχηγὸν in Heb 2,10, meaning “pioneer”, and ἀπόστολος in Heb 3,1, meaning “one who is sent”. Thus, according to him, Jesus is the forerunner as a pioneer from humanity who leads “many children to glory”. See Cortez, “Letter to the Hebrews,” 301, n. 1.

the term in the LXX and the New Testament. A study of the context of the chapter also provides the theological implication of the text. This section will attempt to assess the proper meaning of τὰ ἅγια in Hebrews, particularly in 9,12.

*Translation variants of τὰ ἅγια
in Hebrews 9,12*

The word ἅγιος denotes something *dedicated to God, holy, sacred* in a cultic sense.⁶⁷ The opposite word is κοινός, which means *not consecrated, common*.⁶⁸ The phrase τὰ ἅγια and its variants occur only ten times in the New Testament and all of them are in the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁶⁹ Moreover, table 2 reveals the variety in translation:

Table 2. Various translation of τὰ ἅγια in the Epistle to the Hebrews

Τὰ ἅγια	Different kinds of Bible versions		
Holy Place	KJV	ASV	ERV
Holy Places	YLT	–	–
Sanctuary	JUBT	Goodspeed	NEB
Holy of Holies	DBY	Wuest's expanded translation of New Testament	PNT
Most Holy Place	NIV	NLT	ISV

⁶⁷ Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker, *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*, s.v. “ἅγιος”. ἅγιος occurs 230 times and distributed all over the NT except from Galatians, James and 2,3 John. It occurs 20 times in Luke, 53 times in Acts, 20 times in Romans, 18 in Hebrews. See Robert H. Balz, “ἅγιος”, in *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 3 vols., ed. by Robert H. Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990-1993), 1:16.

⁶⁸ Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, *Analytical lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2000), 32.

⁶⁹ Hebrews 8,2; 9,1.2.3.8.12.24.25; 10,19; 13,11. A. P. Salom in his article clearly portraits that different sort of translations had been done by different scholars. See A. P. Salom, “Ta Hagia in the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 5, no 1 (1967): 59-70.

The table identifies that there is a vast array of variants in the translation of the word τὰ ἅγια into English. For instance, while Jubilee, Goodspeed, and New English Bible translate as “sanctuary”, Darby, Wuest, and Phillips New Testament translate as “Holy of Holies”. The common usage of translation for today could be NIV, NLT, and ISV which rendered the phrase, “Most Holy Place” .

Τὰ ἅγια in LXX and its usage

The survey on the usage of τὰ ἅγια and their meanings in the LXX is a crucial step to understanding the concept of τὰ ἅγια because the author of Hebrews seems to rely heavily on the LXX as a primary source.⁷⁰ Salom, in his survey on the usage of τὰ ἅγια and its variants across the LXX, found that 170 uses of the phrase and its variants are related to the “tabernacle or temple”, out of which 142 refers to the sanctuary in general. He noticed that τὰ ἅγια usually occurs randomly in a form of plural or singular, in which the plural is about twice more frequent than the singular. He also recognized that the singular form of the phrase is merely employed for specifying the outer and inner parts of the sanctuary as spatial terms. He added that there are only four exceptions without a singular, and these exceptions are with the article.⁷¹ Among the 98 expressions that denote sanctuary as a general in the LXX, Salom pointed out that 36 of them had the same Hebrew expression שְׂדֵקָה which has the expression of sanctuary in general. The remaining 62 are translated from

⁷⁰ For scholars who concluded that the author of Hebrews rely on the LXX as a primary source, see Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 469-480; R. A. Steward, “The Old Testament usage in Philo, rabbinic writings, and Hebrews” (M. Litt. Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1947); F. C. Syngé, *Hebrews, and the Scriptures* (London, UK: SPCK, 1959); Kenneth J. Thomas, “The Old Testament citations in Hebrews”, *New Testament Studies* 11 (1965): 303-325; Kenneth J. Thomas, *Use of the Septuagint in the EH* (Manchester, UK: University of Manchester, 1959); Susan E. Docherty, *The use of the Old Testament in Hebrews: A case study in Early Jewish Bible interpretation* (Tubingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); Markus Barth, “The Old Testament in Hebrews”, in *Current Issues in NT Interpretation*, ed. by W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1962), 53; George Howard, “Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations”, *Novum Testamentum* 10 (1968): 208-216; Gert J. Stein, *A quest for the assumed LXX Vorlage of the explicit quotations in Hebrews* (Göttingen, DE: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

⁷¹ Salom, “Ta Hagia in the Epistle to the Hebrews”, 60; For discussion on the plural form of τὰ ἅγια, see Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, *A Greek grammar of the New Testament*, 78.

שֹׁהַבֵּית which is similar to ἅγιος.⁷² Thus, most of the usage suggested that the phrase and its variants are employed to define the sanctuary as a whole. Salom organize a table that may be easier to understand (see table 3).

Table 3. The use of τὰ ἅγια in the LXX⁷³

	Sanctuary	Outer compartment	Inner compartment
Total number of uses	142	19	9
Singular	45	13	8
Plural	97	6	1
Articular	138	19	9
Anarthrous	4	-	-

According to the table above, the expression of τὰ ἅγια as a sanctuary, in general, is 142 which outnumbered the other expressions such as 19 for the outer compartment and 9 for the inner compartment. Thus, τὰ ἅγια is regularly an expression referring to the whole sanctuary in LXX. Salom also argued that τὰ ἅγια in Hebrews, chapter 9 in particular, must be connected with the seven uses of the phrase in Leviticus 16, because in his view, Hebrews 9 has an allusion to the Day of Atonement setting. However, in relating this, he acknowledged that Leviticus 16 uses the singular form for the inner sanctuary, while the Hebrews expression uses the plural form with one exception. Thus, he argued that if the author borrows the words from Leviticus 16, the author must surely employ the singular form. He concluded that the author is influenced by “the general tendency of the LXX”, which relates τὰ ἅγια predominantly to the sanctuary as a whole bipartite structure.⁷⁴

⁷² Salom, “Ta Hagia in the Epistle to the Hebrews”, 62.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 59-70.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* Salom clearly supplied that there are specific terms used for the inner compartment of the sanctuary in the LXX, for example, the phrase τῶ ἁγίῳ τῶν ἁγίων in Exodus 26,34 is used only for the inner sanctuary, out of which four of them are (plural/plural) and the remaining seven

Usage of ἅγιος and its variants outside the Bible

Surveying the usage of ἅγιος outside the Bible is another crucial step for understanding the meaning of τὰ ἅγια since τὰ ἅγια is the plural articular form of ἅγιος. Carl P. Cosaert published an article on this subject, built on his MA thesis; supplying evidence that τὰ ἅγια in the Jewish contemporary world refers to the sanctuary as a whole.⁷⁵ Based on Cosaert's work, a survey on the usage of τὰ ἅγια in the Old Testament pseudepigrapha, the works of Philo and Josephus will be done.

Usage of ἅγιος in the Old Testament pseudepigrapha

The survey on the usage of ἅγιος in the Old Testament pseudepigrapha is significant since it is the Jewish literature in the contemporary time of the LXX translation and covers between 200 BCE to 200 CE.⁷⁶ Thus, it defines the perspective of the Jews during this duration of time. There are four books among the Old Testament pseudepigrapha where ἅγιος occur 11 times in relation to the sanctuary.⁷⁷ A brief survey concerning the occurrence of ἅγιος and the variants will be done on these books such as *Sibylline oracles*, *Testament of Levi* and *Testament of Asher*, and *Psalms of Solomon*.

ἅγιος and its variants in *Sibylline oracles*

In the book *Sibylline oracles*, there is only one reference to ἅγιος which refers to the sanctuary in heaven. The story narrates that Babylon will

are (singular/plural). For the biblical references see, 1 Kgs 6,16; 7,36; 8,6; 1 Chr 6,49; 2 Chr 3,8.10; 4,22; 5,7; Ezek 41,4; Dan 9,24; Lev 16,33; Num 18,10. This clearly shows that LXX uses different terms for inner sanctuary.

⁷⁵ Carl P. Cosaert, "The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary in the Old Testament pseudepigrapha, Philo and Josephus", *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 42, no 1 (2004): 91-103. See also, Carl P. Cosaert, "A study of *Ta Hagia* in the LXX, pseudepigrapha, Philo, and Josephus, and its implications in Hebrews" (M.A. thesis, Nazarene Theological Seminary, 2000).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁷⁷ *Sibylline oracles* 3,308; *Testament of Asher* 7,2; *Testament of Levi* 8,17; 9,9.11; 18,2b.18.19.53; *Psalms of Solomon* 1,8; 2,13; 8,11.

receive judgment from heaven.⁷⁸ J. J. Collins translated this as “the holy ones”,⁷⁹ but Cosaert argues that the context is more likely implying the heavenly sanctuary because the judgment normally comes from the heavenly sanctuary.⁸⁰

Ἅγιος and its variants in the Testament of Levi and Asher

Another book in relation to the usage of ἅγιος in the Old Testament pseudepigraphy is *The testaments of the twelve patriarchs*. This book seems to be closer to the Jewish community than LXX itself during the time it was composed.⁸¹ Among the twelve patriarchs, *The testament of Levi* and *The Testament of Asher* contain the variants of ἅγιος. It occurs four times with a plural form (*T. Levi* 18,2b.18.19.53), once with a singular form in *Levi* (*T. Levi* 8,17) and occurs once in *Asher* (*T. Ash* 7,2).

The one occurrence in the singular in *Testament of Levi* describes the vision given to Levi concerning their responsibilities for Hebrew cultus. It reads: “From among them will be high priests, judges, and scribes, and by their word, the (τὸ ἅγιον) sanctuary will be administered” (*T. Levi* 8,17). Baruch Levine commented on this the passage saying that it is an allusion to Numbers 3,38 (LXX) in which Moses and Aaron were given the responsibility of the sanctuary (which is expressed as a sanctuary in general).⁸² The plural form expression is found in *T. Levi* 9,9 and 11 where Isaac warned Levi to beware of fornication which will defile the sanctuary (τὰ ἅγια) in the future. Isaac told Levi to marry a virgin and

⁷⁸ *Sibylline oracles* 3,308.

⁷⁹ J. J. Collins, “Sibylline oracles: A new translation and introductions”, in *Old Testament pseudepigrapha*, ed. by J. H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 1:369.

⁸⁰ Cosaert, “The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary”, 93. For the concept of judgment that comes from heavenly sanctuary, he supplies reference such as Isa 26,21, Jer 25,30.32; and Ps 20,2; 19,3; which are taken from the LXX version.

⁸¹ H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the twelve patriarchs: A new translation and introduction”, in *Old Testament pseudepigrapha*, 777-78.

⁸² Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 1-20: A new translation with introduction and commentary*, AB 4 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1993), 161.

bathe before entering the τὰ ἅγια. Thus, the plural form refers to the sanctuary in general.

Ἅγιος and its variants in *The psalms of Solomon*

The last book for this section that contains a variant of ἅγιος is *The psalms of Solomon*, the collection of 18 psalms that the Jews composed in their response to the Romans when Pompey captured Jerusalem in 63 BCE.⁸³ The plural form of ἅγιος is employed three times regarding the sanctuary in this book (*Pss. Sol* 1,8; 2,3; 8,11). *Pss. Sol* 1,8 refers to the wickedness of Romans in profaning the τὰ ἅγια. *Pss. Sol* 2,3 also refers to God's judgment of the "sons of Jerusalem" through the actions of the Romans and Pompey in particular, because the people of God had desecrated the τὰ ἅγια.

With the examples of references being given, τὰ ἅγια is most likely referred to as the sanctuary in general. Additionally, in *T. Levi* 3,4, the author employed the phrase ἀγίω ἀγίων which is used for the inner part of the sanctuary in the LXX (Exod 26,34), which implies that the author uses this phrase to describe the inner sanctuary.⁸⁴

Usage of ἅγιος in the works of Philo

Cosaert pointed out that Philo employed several terms for sanctuary such as ναὸς, ἱερὸν, σκηνὴ, ἁγίασμα,⁸⁵ however, the survey will merely cover the usage of ἅγιος in a plural and singular form. The singular form of ἅγιος has only two occurrences in *Legum Allegorice*.⁸⁶ Although Philo quotes "the Holy Place" from Exodus 28,30, he used the verse to clarify his allegorical explanation. Thus, it is not helpful for the evidence of the usage of

⁸³ R. B Wright, "Psalms of Solomon: A new translation and introduction", in *Old Testament pseudepigrapha*, 639.

⁸⁴ For more discussion on the inner sanctuary in *T. Levi*, see Kee, "Twelves patriarchs", 789.

⁸⁵ Cosaert, "The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary", 96.

⁸⁶ *Leg.*, 3: 119, 125.

the ἄγιος. On the other hand, plural usage has twelve occurrences.⁸⁷ One of them is *Post* 173, where Whitaker and Colson translated this way: “He (Moses), the seventh from Abraham, do not, like those before him, haunt the outer court of the Holy Place (τῶν ἁγίων) as one seeking initiation, but as a sacred Guide has his abode in the sanctuary (ἐν τοῖς ἁδυστοῖς)”.

Philo expounded on the seventh seed of Abraham, Moses, who did not need to relate to God from the outer sanctuary but can talk to God in the inner sanctuary. Cosaert recognized that Whitaker and Colson failed to make a difference between τῶν ἁγίων and τοῖς ἁδυστοῖς. He asserted that Philo used the two terms to refer to the outer sanctuary and the holy of holies respectively.⁸⁸ Hence, τοῖς ἁδυστοῖς is a unique usage to refer to the Holy of Holies.

Cosaert points out the remaining 11 occurrences speak of the sanctuary in general with one exception in *Her.* 226, where Philo employed τοῖς ἁγίοις to the sanctuary containing “the candlestick, table and the alter of incense”, which can imply the outer part of the sanctuary. However, the works of Josephus supply another possibility that refers to the entire sanctuary.⁸⁹ Concerning the Holy of Holies, the noteworthy point is that Philo used specific terms such as ἁδυστοῖς⁹⁰ and τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων,⁹¹ in which the latter in particular, to refer to the Holy of Holies in Leviticus 16,17

⁸⁷ *Post.* 173; *Her.* 226; *Somm.* 1,207.216; *Migr.* 104; *Fug.* 93; *Mos.* 2,87.114, 155; *Spec.* 1,115.296.

⁸⁸ Similar differentiation occurs in *Mos.* 2:87. Cosaert, “The Use of ἄγιος for the sanctuary”, 97, n. 29.

⁸⁹ Another possibility that Cosaert draws out was the work of Josephus which narrates that when Pompey had taken the city of Jerusalem, Pompey reported that “the lampstand and the lamps, the table, the libation cups and censers [...] and a great heaps of spices and the sacred money” was all he saw in the sanctuary. Cosaert suggested that Josephus’ later description of the Holy of Holies can be related to the report of Pompey. Josephus states: “Nothing at all was kept in it; it was unapproachable, inviolable, and invisible to all, and was called the Holy of Holies”. Thus, according to Josephus, the only ritualistic material that had been there may be “the candlestick, the table, and the alter of incense”. See *ibid.* For the quote of Josephus and Pompey, see Flavius Josephus, *The works of Josephus: Complete and unabridged*, trans. by William Whiston (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008); *J. W.* 1.152; 5. 219. Note that all the translation of Josephus are taken from the translation of William Whiston. See also Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War*, trans. by G. A. Williamson, rev. ed. (Random House Tower, NY: Penguin, 1981), 491.

⁹⁰ *Legat.* 306 and *Somm.* 1,216.

⁹¹ *Leg.* 2,56; *Her.* 84; *Mut.* 192; and *Somm.* 2,189.231.

LXX, where LXX in Leviticus 16,17 renders τῷ ἁγίῳ as to refer to the Most Holy Place. This shows that Philo uses different terms for referring to the Most Holy Place.⁹² Thus, the work of Philo indicates that the plural form of ἅγιος most likely speaks of the sanctuary as a whole bipartite structure of the building.

Usage of ἅγιος in the works of Josephus

Josephus is a crucial figure for identifying the usage of ἅγιος and its variants because he is the contemporary of the author of Hebrews and could contribute to an understanding of the prevailing terminology which the Jewish nation at that time as a community would use for describing the sanctuary, the Holy place, or the Most Holy Place. Cosaert points out that the first work of Josephus, namely *The Jewish war*, employed different variants of ἅγιος forty times in the book which dealt with the sanctuary. However, the second work, *The antiquities of the Jews*, contain merely two occurrences, and the final works, such as *The life* and *Against Apion* surprisingly cease to use ἅγιος, but employed other terms for a sanctuary such as ναὸς and ἱερὸν.⁹³

Josephus uses a singular form of ἅγιος thirteen times⁹⁴ in *The Jewish war*. Cosaert asserted that though Josephus ἅγιος refers to the sanctuary in general, he also uses the term for describing the Most Holy Place. As a result, Cosaert concluded that the singular form is not likely employed for the Holy place.⁹⁵ However, when Josephus describes the temple of Jerusalem, he makes a distinction between the court of the Gentiles and the inner court which Gentiles are not allowed to enter. In his narration, he states: “For the second court of the temple (ἱερὸν) was called the sanctuary (ἅγιόν).⁹⁶

⁹² Cosaert, “The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary”, 98.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁹⁴ *J. W.* 1,26.152; 4,150.151.159; 5,194.195.385.394; 6,73.95.99.260.

⁹⁵ Cosaert, “The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary”, 99.

⁹⁶ *Bellum Judaicum* 5. 184-247. See also, E. Mary Smallwood, “Introduction, notes, and appendixes to Josephus,” in *The Jewish war*, trans. by G. A. Williamson (Random House Tower, NY:

Thus, Josephus used ἅγιόν to refer to the inner court, in which one can assume that he may refer to the whole sanctuary precinct as compared to the Gentile's court outside, or it is possible that he referred to the inner court only. Another reference is found in *B.J* 1,152, where Josephus portrays Pompey's entrance to the Jewish sanctuary, saying:

But there was nothing that affected the nation so much, in the calamities they were then under, as that their holy place [τὸ ἅγιόν], which had been hitherto seen by none, should be laid open to strangers." Here, the usage of τὸ ἅγιόν may seem to be only the Most Holy Place, but the later description narrates that what Pompey saw was "the candlestick, with its lamp and the table.

Thus, while the singular form is also used for the Most Holy Place (Lev 16 LXX), the description of Josephus suggested that it can refer to the whole sanctuary.⁹⁷

Apparently, Josephus seems to use another terminology to differentiate the innermost part of the sanctuary. In *B.J* 1,25-26, in his plan to explore the sanctuary for his work, he makes an outline for "the defense of the city and the plan of the sanctuary (τοῦ ἱερῶν) and the Temple (τοῦ ναοῦ); and the exact measurement of these and the altar [...] and a description of the Holy of Holies (τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ ἅγιόν)".⁹⁸ Translators like Whiston, Williamson, and Thackeray translated τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ ἅγιόν as the Holy of Holies.⁹⁹ Smallwood translated these words to make it simple. For instance, she suggested that ναὸς is best translated as "central shrine" of the sanctuary and ἱερὸν as the "enclosure and everything within".¹⁰⁰ Thus, one can assume the τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ ἅγιόν refers to the Holy of Holies since Josephus employed unique words together.¹⁰¹

Penguin, 1981), 48.

⁹⁷ For more reference on the usage of the singular form which refers to the entire sanctuary, see *B.J* 5,194-195; *A.J.* 3,125; 12,413.

⁹⁸ *B.J* 1,25-26.

⁹⁹ Whiston, *The work of Josephus*, 545; Williamson, *The Jewish war*, 30; and Josephus, *B. J* 1,26 (Thackeray, LCL).

¹⁰⁰ Smallwood, "Appendixes to Josephus", 409-410.

¹⁰¹ Cosaert, "The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary", 101.

ἅγιος in its plural form occurs twenty-three times in the book *The Jewish wars*, and all the passages refer to the sanctuary in general.¹⁰² For example, the Roman leader Cestius sent Neopolitanus to assess the attitude of the Jews in Jerusalem. The story provided that Neopolitanus was impressed by the positive spirit of the Jews, thus, “after paying his devotions to the sanctuary (τὰ ἅγια) of God from the permit area, he returned to Cestius”.¹⁰³ The “permitted area” here refers to the court of the Gentiles.¹⁰⁴ Another interesting unique term that Josephus employed for describing the Holy of Holies is ἁγίου δὲ ἁγίον, which is the only place in Old Testament pseudepigraphy, LXX, and even in the works of Philo where δὲ (conjunction) between the word ἅγιος.¹⁰⁵

Summary

According to the brief survey on the usage of ἅγιος in the Old Testament pseudepigraphy, the works of Philo and Josephus, it is apparent that the plural form of ἅγιος is never employed to refer to the Holy of Holies alone. The plural form of ἅγιος almost always points to the sanctuary in general. Besides, the terminology for denoting the Most Holy Place seems to be different in most of the cases. For instance, Philo employed ἄδυτοῖς and τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων to refer to the Holy of Holies and Josephus used the phrase such as τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ ἁγίον which is unique compared to the typical variants of ἅγιος. Therefore, it is evident that the plural form of ἅγιος and specifically the phrase τὰ ἅγια is understood as the sanctuary as a whole during the first century. Cosaert provided a table for the usage of ἅγιος in the Old Testament pseudepigrapha.

¹⁰² *J.W.* 2,341.401.539; 4,162.171 (2).173.182.183.191.201.242.323.397; 5,406.412; 6,104.120.124.128. 165.267.346. See Cosaert, “The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary”, 101, n. 44.

¹⁰³ *J. W.* 2,341.

¹⁰⁴ Smallwood, “Appendixes to Josephus,” 432-433.

¹⁰⁵ *B. J.* 5,219; see Cosaert, “The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary”, 102.

Table 4. The usage of ἅγιος by itself for the sanctuary in the Old Testament pseudepigrapha, Philo, and Josephus¹⁰⁶

	Sanctuary in general	Holy Place	Most Holy Place
Singular	14	2	2
Plural	44	0	0
Total number of uses	58	2	2

The above table portrayed that the plural and singular usage of ἅγιος is understood most likely as the whole sanctuary. Thus, one can assume that the Jewish understanding of τὰ ἅγια in the Epistle to the Hebrews and Hebrews 9,12 in particular, must be the entire sanctuary.

The word Σκηνή as a medium of interpretation

To understand the meaning of τὰ ἅγια in Hebrews 9,12, it is essential to study the usage of the word σκηνή in the context of chapter 9. This section explores the appropriate understanding of τὰ ἅγια according to the study on the usage of σκηνή in relation to τὰ ἅγια in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Thus, the word σκηνή occurs in the New Testament 20 times and 10 times in the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹⁰⁷ In the LXX, it translates the word for “shelter”. For example, from the cultural-historical perspective, Abraham’s faith was manifested by his dwelling in tents (Heb 11,9). Σκηνή is also the sacrificial tent of the Levites and the gentiles (Heb 13,10; Acts 7,43). The Book of Revelation also described σκηνή as the heavenly tabernacle (Rev 15,5).¹⁰⁸ Thus, one can define σκηνή generally as tent or tabernacle. Consequently, to understand the meaning of τὰ ἅγια

¹⁰⁶ Cosaert, “The use of ἅγιος for the sanctuary”, 103.

¹⁰⁷ Σκηνή occurs 4 times in the Gospel (Matt 17,4; Mark 9,5; Luke 9,33; 16,9), 6 times in Acts of Apostles and Revelation (Acts 7,43.44; 15,16; Rev 13,6; 15,5; 21,3), and 10 times in Hebrews (Heb 8,2.5; 11,9; 13,10), in which most of its occurrences is in Hebrews 9 (Heb 9,2.3.6.8.11.21).

¹⁰⁸ J. A. Bühner, “σκηνή”, in Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament, 3:251.

in Hebrews 9,12, one requires to understand the elaboration of σκηνή from the immediate context.

Firstly, it is clear that the author employed σκηνή as a whole part of the earthly sanctuary and described the articles inside the bipartite sanctuary (Heb 9,2).¹⁰⁹ Moreover, for the second compartment after the second veil δεύτερον καταπέτασμα, the author terms it as a part of the tent (Heb 9,3). Thus, it does not indicate that the second compartment is the other tent (σκηνή). The author implied that the second apartment is a part of the general σκηνή (Heb 9,2-3).¹¹⁰ After these, it seems that the author is not focusing on the detail of the sanctuary. The author “ends abruptly with a declaration, ‘we cannot speak in detail now about these things’”.¹¹¹

Secondly, the author employed the word “now”, which “marks the minor step of the argument”,¹¹² elaborating the function of the cultus in the earthly sanctuary, where two services namely, daily, and yearly ministration of the priest and high priest are mentioned respectively (Heb 9,6.7). The author continues to use the term σκηνή in verse 6, but adds the word πρώτην, meaning “first, outer, anterior”,¹¹³ which referred to the outer part of the sanctuary. Accordingly, the passage in verse 7 begins with the word δέ, a conjunction, which indicates that the verse “completes and develops the contrast (δέ) with verse 6”.¹¹⁴ In verse 7, the author did not employ σκηνή. The usage of δευτέραν implicitly connotes the second tent. Thus, he separates the priestly functions of the first and the second part of the tent by using terms such as the first tent and the second.

¹⁰⁹ The author explained that the tabernacle (σκηνή) has two compartments, and the first section contains the candlestick, the table and the shewbread, and the author called the first section as ἅγια, meaning the holy place as NASB rendered (Heb 9,2), and the author identified the second compartment located after the second veil, which he termed as ἅγια ἁγίων, meaning the Holy of Holiest as NASB rendered (Heb 9,3).

¹¹⁰ Here the author introduced a σκηνή as a whole in Hebrews 9,2.

¹¹¹ Lane, Hebrews 9-13, 220.

¹¹² Paul Ellingworth and Eugene Albert Nida, *A handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews* (New York, NY: United Bible Society, 1994), 183.

¹¹³ Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker, *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*, s. v. “πρῶτος”.

¹¹⁴ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 434.

Thirdly, in proceeding to elaborate the argument of Hebrews 9,6-7, the author explained that the Holy Spirit indicates (as in a form of constituting a special insight which is not “previously available to readers of the OT”)¹¹⁵ that the way into τοῦ ἁγίου (“the holy place”, NASB) was not revealed yet while the first tent is standing (Heb 9,8).

The concern here is about the first tent, which in the earlier explanation the author defined in spatial terms and refers to the outer compartment (Heb 9,2,6). However, here the author uses the first tent as a metaphor for the “cultic ordinances” in the Israelite’s sanctuary, signifying that access to the heavenly true tent is possible only after the first tent is set aside (Heb 8,2; 9,11).¹¹⁶ The author clarifies in verse 9 that the description of the first tent in the earlier verse is a *symbol* or *parable* for them in their time. Thus, the outer compartment metaphorically “represents the sanctuary as a sphere of cultic activity, which constitutes a barrier to the presence of God”.¹¹⁷

Subsequently, Hebrews 9,11 has now introduced Christ as the High Priest who came with a more perfect σκηνή, reiterating the argument in Hebrews 8,2, which described the true σκηνή in heaven. Thus, comparing verses 8 and 11, there are two σκηνή, namely, the metaphorical “first tent” that is the barrier into the Holy Place, and the true perfect tent where Jesus ministers. In the light of the immediate contexts, the author comes to the climax that Jesus with his blood entered into the τὰ ἅγια (Heb 9,12). It is clear that the author points to the true and more perfect tent than the first tent which has a limitation in its cultic activity. Thus, that true tent is τὰ ἅγια where Jesus ministers as our High Priest (Heb 8,2). Another mediate context that confirms the nature of Jesus’ entrance to the true tent is Hebrews 9,21, where Moses inaugurates the sanctuary with the blood of animals. The author was paralleling the old covenant

¹¹⁵ Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 223.

¹¹⁶ Hebrews 9,8 explained that the author employed a temporal particle ἔτι, meaning “while”, which renders a temporal significance to the passage. Thus, the author uses the first tent as a metaphor to represent the early sanctuary and its services. The first tent “showed the limitation of the Levitical system”. See Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, 4:478.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

inaugurated by Moses and Jesus in his inauguration of the new covenant in the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 9,19-20). Hence, Jesus went into the τὰ ἅγια to inaugurate the new covenant with his blood.

*Inter-textual studies on τράγων
and μόσχων*

The NASB reads “and not through the blood of goats (τράγων) and calves (μόσχων), but through His blood, He entered (εἰσῆλθεν) the Holy Place (τὰ ἅγια) once for all, having obtained eternal redemption (Heb 9,12)”. Commentators have usually argued that the sacrificial animals mentioned in Hebrews 9,12 such as “goats and calves” are an allusion to the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16 because these similar animals are used for sacrifices on that day.¹¹⁸ However, though it seems that Hebrews 9,12 have only the allusion to Leviticus 16, another background for Hebrews 9,12 concerning “goats and calves” is also possible. Thus, through inter-textual analysis, this study will seek the best possible context of Hebrews 9,12 in the LXX.

The word μόσχος is employed commonly for the Day of Atonement and the Inauguration Day in relation to the cultic services.¹¹⁹ On the other hand, the word τράγος occurs 13 times in the Pentateuch, and all of them are in Numbers 7, which solely describes the inauguration of the sanctuary and not the Day of Atonement.¹²⁰ The term “goat” used in Leviticus

¹¹⁸ For discussion on Hebrews 9,12 as a Day of Atonement allusion, see “goats [...] calves” [Heb 9,12], Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown, *A commentary, critical and explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments* (Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 1997); Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 238; J. J. Moffatt, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 120; Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 260; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 452; Aelred Cody, *Heavenly sanctuary and the liturgy in the EH* (St. Meinrad, IN: Grail, 1960), 170-172; The SDA commentary also give a cross reference to Lev 16 suggesting the Day of Atonement allusion. See “Blood of goats and calves” [Heb 9,12], *SDABC*, 7:453.

¹¹⁹ For references on the word μόσχος usage in the inauguration services, see Numbers 7 and 8 (7,3.15.21.27.33.39.45.51.57.63.69.75.81.87; 8,8.8.12) which occurs 17 times in LXX, and for the Day of Atonement, see Leviticus 16 (16,3.6.11.14.15.18.27), which appears 7 times.

¹²⁰ For reference of the word τράγος usage in Pentateuch, see Numbers 7 (7,17.23.29.35.41.47.53.59.65.71.77.83.88). There are other occurrences of τράγος outside the Pentateuch such as Jacob's animals (Gen 30,35; 31,10.12; 31,15), the promises of God expressed in the song of Moses (Deut 32,14). Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 452, rightly comment on this subject saying, “The only

16 (in the context of the Day of Atonement) is *χιμάρους*, which occurs thirteen times,¹²¹ and the Hebrew word rendered for *χιμάρους* is *עִזִּים* which is a different noun. The word *χιμάρους* does not appear at all in the New Testament despite its known usage as “goat” in the first century including in the works of Josephus and Philo,¹²² and *τράγος* only appear in the Hebrews in the New Testament, which implies that the author of Hebrews intended to use the term in the context of the inauguration of the sanctuary in the LXX.

Moreover, the only chapter where *τράγος* and *μόσχος* appear together with a background of cultic service in the LXX Old Testament is Numbers 7, which is the chapter on the inauguration. Davidson rightly comments on this matter saying that “the author of Hebrews inter-textually links with the OT inauguration service and not the Day of Atonement”.¹²³

Hebrews 9,19, the passage which clearly describes Moses’ inauguration services, unambiguously suggest the best possible background for Hebrews 9,12. The mediate context of Hebrews 9,12 also support the context of inauguration as well as the implication found in the passage.¹²⁴ Therefore, one can conclude that the reference to the blood of goats and

reference in the Pentateuch to the sacrifice of goats is in Nu. 7:17-88, of peace offerings (*θυσται σωτηρίου*) at the dedication of the altar”.

¹²¹ Lev 16,5,7,8,9,10,15,18,20,21,22 (2),26,27.

¹²² Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker, *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*, s. v. “*χιμάρους*”. The other term for “goat” is rendered in the Gospel (Matt 25,32,33; Luke 15,29) which is *ἔριφος*, however, this word can be translated as “kid” or “goat” alternatively according to the context and did not have any cultic background. See Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker, *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*, s. v. “*ἔριφος*”.

¹²³ Davidson, “Christ’s entry ‘within the veil’”, 185.

¹²⁴ Hebrews 9,13 and 10,14 also supported that Hebrews 9,12 have a context of inauguration service in the OT LXX. These two passages employed the phrase *τράγων και ταύρων* instead of using *τράγων και μόσχων* as in Hebrews 9,12. Here, there is a change in the term for bulls, that is, *μόσχων* is not employed anymore in Hebrews 9,13, instead, the author used *ταύρων*. Now, the phrase *τράγων και ταύρων* occurs only in four places in the OT and NT. Obviously, two occurs in the EH (Hebrews 9,13; 10,24), one in Deuteronomy which is not related to cultic activity, and the last one occurs in Isaiah, which says: “And I take no pleasure in the blood of bulls, lambs, or goats” (Isa 1,11,12). In this passage, God used the blood of bulls and goats for describing the whole sacrificial services. Thus imply that the usage of this phrase *τράγων και ταύρων* implicitly indicate the whole sanctuary sacrificial system and not the Day of Atonement.

calves points back to the inauguration service also and not only the Day of Atonement.

*Theological implications
of Hebrews 9,12*

The transition of the old covenant into the new covenant in the immediate context has been elaborated through the word study on *σκηνή* (Heb 9,1-11). Commentators also have supported this idea of transition.¹²⁵ Therefore, in light of the context, the theological implication in Hebrews 9,12 is the efficacy of the blood of Christ compared to the blood of animals, where Jesus entered into the perfect tent (Heb 9,11) in heaven (Heb 8,2). MacArthur suggested three significant points on Hebrews 9,12.

First, Christ went into the heavenly sanctuary with his blood, thus, “the Sacrificer is the sacrifice”. Second, His sacrifice is only once, which is sufficient for the whole generation of humanity. Third, Christ’s redemption is permanent, and eternal, unlike the old cultic service of Atonement.¹²⁶ In addition, Hebrews 9,13 mention “the ashes of the heifer,” which has the Old Testament background in Numbers 19. The ashes of the heifer were used for ceremonial cleansing, especially for people who came in contact with the corpse so that they will continue in the “tabernacle or temple worship”. With this mediate context, the author of Hebrews expounded on the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus which can clean the internal conscience contrary to the ceremonial or external cleansing.¹²⁷ This again added the significance of Christ’s entrance to the heavenly sanctuary once with His blood to cleanse us completely. The author uses an argument “from the lesser to the greater”. The lesser is the blood of bulls, goats, and ashes of

¹²⁵ For discussion on the transition of old covenant to new covenant, see Richard M. Davidson, “Typology in the Book of Hebrews”, in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, 179-183; Cody, *Heavenly sanctuary*, 147-148; Dahl, “Living way”, 405; Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 194-195; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 438; Jean Hering, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, UK: Epworth, 1970), 70-75.

¹²⁶ John MacArthur, *Hebrews* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1996), 229.

¹²⁷ Jon Courson, *Jon Courson's application commentary* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2003), 1486.

the heifer, which is offered by the high priest in the earthly sanctuary, the greater is “blood shed by Christ”.¹²⁸

Conclusion

The problem of this study focused on Hebrews 6,19-20 and Hebrews 9,12 which seems to bring out puzzling questions on which compartment in the heavenly sanctuary Christ entered. The findings of the study suggest the best possible biblical resolution. Regarding Hebrews 6,19-20, the contextual study of the text demands that Jesus must have indeed gone inside the inner veil, that is, the Most Holy Place. However, the results clearly show that the context is more likely not to be the Day of Atonement, but the day of inauguration.

This conclusion is achieved through surveying the possible contexts of Hebrews 6,19-20, including the Old Testament typology, the immediate context of the text, the chiasmic parallels, and thorough inter-textual study. According to all these lines of evidence, one may conclude that Jesus entered within the veil in the order of Melchizedek and not in the order of Aaron’s priesthood. These differences are significant because Aaron is only a High priest, contrasted with Melchizedek who is a king-priest. The only possible Old Testament typology that relates to cultic activity is the day of the inauguration of the sanctuary in Numbers 7, where Moses as a ruler and a priest dedicated the sanctuary. The notable point here is that Moses entered within the veil to inaugurate the sanctuary and it is before the Levitical priesthood was established. Thus, Hebrews 6,19-20 concluded Jesus in His ascension entered within the veil for the inauguration of the sanctuary.

In addition to this, Hebrews 9,12 had the same conclusion as Hebrews 6,19, reached through surveys on the word $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\alpha$, along with contextual and inter-textual studies of the text. According to the survey on the usage of the phrase $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\alpha$ through the LXX, Old Testament pseudepigrapha, Philo and Josephus, the term dominantly refers to the sanctuary as a whole and not the Most Holy Place. Moreover, the contextual study

¹²⁸ Luder G. Whitlock et al., *The reformation study Bible: Bringing the light of reformation to Scriptures* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1995), s. v. “Hebrews 9:13”.

supports this conclusion too; the word study on *σκηνή* explicitly indicates that the author intended to employ *τὰ ἅγια* as the general term for the heavenly sanctuary. Furthermore, the inter-textual studies on *τράγων* and *μόσχων* support an inauguration motif in Hebrews 9,12. Therefore, Hebrews 9,12 concluded that Jesus went into the perfect tabernacle, the heavenly sanctuary as a whole.

Now, one may ask the question of compatibility with the pre-advent judgment. The basic measuring rule that the researcher constantly employs is the inspiration of the Scripture (2 Tim 3,16) and that there is only one Spirit who moved the biblical writers as they produced the Holy writ (2 Pet 1,21). Thus, the same Author of the Scripture should not contradict Himself. In these contexts, the inauguration motif of Hebrews 6,19-20 and Hebrews 9,12 is compatible with the prophecy of the Messiah in the Book of Daniel where it was predicted that Jesus will anoint the Most Holy (Dan 9,24). In history, Jesus died on the cross and ascended to heaven (Acts 1,9), and the prophecy was fulfilled. This prophecy is a part of the longer time prophecy, that is the 2300 day-year prophecy (Dan 8,14). Subsequently, one understands that 70 weeks is cut off from the larger prophecy, and it ends at 34 A. D, which further indicates that the end of 2300 day-year prophecy is 1844, to be precise on October 22.

Therefore, when Jesus ascended to heaven, He anointed/inaugurated the heavenly sanctuary, and became an intercessor for humanity. Furthermore, Jesus began the antitype of the Day of Atonement in 1844, which is called the pre-advent judgment. In this way, Christ's ascension is compatible with the pre-advent judgment because the Epistle to the Hebrews explained Christ's early ministry from His ascension, and the pre-advent judgment is the second phase of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

However, the nature of the ministry is still the same in regard to the mediatory ministry, but the only difference is the change in the Old Testament typology, that is from the Holy Place ministry to the Most Holy Place ministry, the daily to the yearly, inauguration day to the Day of Atonement. Therefore, the pre-advent judgment is not in contradiction with the ascension of Christ in the Epistle of Hebrews.

RECENSIONES BIBLIOGRÁFICAS



Bediako, Daniel K. y Ekkehardt Mueller, eds. *The Sabbath in the Old Testament and the intertestamental period: Implications for Christians in the twenty-first century*. Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2021. Pp. 417. ISBN: 978-0-9256-7533-0

La publicación del libro *The Sabbath in the Old Testament and the intertestamental period* es parte de una serie de dos volúmenes que ofrecen un singular aporte a las discusiones teológicas, particularmente aquellas relacionadas con la teología del sábado. Este primer volumen reúne catorce capítulos escritos por académicos adventistas con amplia experiencia en investigación bíblica, cuyo principal objetivo es comprender la relevancia del sábado hoy analizándolo desde sus aspectos bíblicos, históricos, teológicos y prácticos.

El libro se divide en tres secciones principales: (a) estudios exegéticos de pasajes centrales sobre el sábado en el Antiguo Testamento, (b) perspectivas temáticas sobre el sábado y, finalmente, (c) el sábado en la literatura intertestamentaria. Al abrir la primera sección, Mathilde Frey analizó los principales textos del Pentateuco sobre el sábado (Gn 1-2; Ex 16,1-36, 20,8-11, 23,12, 31,12-17; Nm 15,32-36; Lev 19,3, 30, 23,3, 24,1-9; Dt 6,12-15) y concluyó que el sábado es un elemento integral presente en esta sección bíblica, que resalta la presencia constante de Dios en el mundo, su deseo de relacionarse con los seres humanos y restaurar en ellos su imagen.

En el siguiente artículo, Gerald A. Klingbeil investiga la presencia del sábado en el decálogo basándose en los textos de Éxodo 20,8-11 y Deuteronomio 5,12-15. Según el autor, la presentación del sábado en estos textos, así como su lenguaje que evoca la creación, resalta la relación divino-humana sin barreras sociales y el señorío de Dios sobre el tiempo recordándonos regular nuestro ritmo de vida con el suyo. El tercer artículo de esta sección fue escrito por Roy Gane, quien analiza el significado del “pan de la presencia” en Levítico 24,5-9, su relación con todo este libro y en el pasaje paralelo de Éxodo 31,12-17. El autor concluye que en ambos textos bíblicos el “pan de la presencia” representa el deseo constante de



Dios de estar con los israelitas, a quienes desea santificar especialmente mediante la observancia del sábado.

En el cuarto artículo de esta primera sección, Daniel K. Bediako investiga la narración de Números 15,32-36 donde se describe que un hombre fue castigado con la muerte cuando recogía leña en sábado. El cuidadoso análisis exegético del autor demostró que la actitud del hombre mencionado era de rebelión intencional a las ordenanzas divinas, lo que conlleva la pena de muerte. Además, la actitud desafiante ocurrió dentro de la comunidad de alianza, por lo tanto, se trata abiertamente y requiere la participación de la congregación. Este relato destaca el sábado como una señal decisiva en la relación de pacto entre Dios y su pueblo.

En el siguiente artículo, Richard M. Davidson investiga las menciones del sábado en los salmos y en los libros sapienciales. El autor destaca que el sábado no se menciona o evoca con frecuencia en estos escritos, aunque los casos existentes contribuyen significativamente a una teología bíblica del sábado. La mención principal se encuentra en el salmo 92, que parece haber sido reservado para la liturgia del sábado y se destaca a través de su construcción quiástica de siete partes. Este salmo enfatiza el carácter de Dios, las obras creativas y recreativas de Dios y las obras divinas en el pasado y el futuro. Además de este texto central, el sábado también parece estar presente en Salmos 104, en Job 38-42 y en Proverbios 8-9.

La primera sección de la obra finaliza con las investigaciones de Laurențiu G. Ionescu y Gerhard Pfandl, quienes analizaron las menciones del sábado en los escritos proféticos. Los autores dividen tales acontecimientos en cinco temas teológicos principales: (a) el sábado como señal de que Dios santifica a su pueblo (Ez 20,12); (b) el sábado no debe ser profanado, es decir, debe ser un día sagrado y especial (Ez 20,13); (c) el sábado como día de deleite y reforma espiritual, en el que no se hacen negocios ni nos acordamos de ellos (Is 58); (d) el sábado como elemento de inclusividad y universalidad (Is 56,4-7); y (e) el sábado en la consumación final de la historia como fiesta escatológica semanal (Is 66,3).

Abriendo la segunda sección del libro, Martin Pröbstle analiza la terminología del sábado en la Biblia hebrea, presenta las principales teorías

académicas sobre el origen del sábado (origen babilónico, cananeo, árabe, origen social y socioeconómico en Israel y origen hebreo) y, finalmente, lleva a cabo su propio análisis sobre el origen del sábado (“séptimo día”). En resumen, el origen del sábado en la creación (Gn 2,1-3) “justifica la universalidad del sábado para toda la humanidad” (p. 212). En el siguiente artículo, Lael O. Caesar trata del carácter y el significado del sábado en la creación. Para él, el relato de Génesis 1-2,1-3 está diseñado con el objetivo de culminar en el séptimo día, resaltando este día bendito y santificado por Dios y diferenciándolo de todos los demás días de la semana.

El tercer artículo de esta sección fue escrito por Roy Gane, quien busca investigar el sábado dentro del contexto del nuevo pacto. El autor busca valorar si el sábado tiene un alcance universal o está restringido a la comunidad de Israel, si era un significado literal o simplemente un tipo que perdió su significado con la llegada del antitipo y, finalmente, si hubiera algún significado teológico para el sábado dentro del contexto del nuevo pacto. El autor concluye que el sábado fue dado a la humanidad mucho antes de la existencia de la comunidad de Israel, que tiene un alcance universal y que no se restringe al servicio de adoración israelita. El “nuevo pacto” en el cristianismo restaura el significado del sábado y es un signo de la santificación de Dios para su pueblo.

A continuación, Elias Brasil de Souza intenta evaluar a la luz de las Escrituras si el sábado es solo un día de descanso o también un día de adoración. Revisando el sábado en la creación, el sábado como parte del tiempo santificado, el sábado y el Sinaí, el sábado y la construcción del santuario (santa convocación, rituales del tabernáculo, adoración en el templo), Souza llega a la conclusión de que el Antiguo Testamento no apoya una dicotomía entre descanso y adoración. Así, el sábado, siguiendo el ejemplo del Creador, era un día de descanso, pero también incluía adoración como ocurría en la santa convocación del pueblo de Israel.

El quinto artículo de esta segunda sección fue escrito por Michael Sokuva y presenta un interesante estudio sobre cómo se relacionaba el sábado con las festividades anuales de la comunidad israelí. Para ello, propone verificar la finalidad, el significado tipológico y teológico de las fiestas, su relación con el sábado en el calendario bíblico y la relevancia de este

día para los cristianos. El autor concluye que “a diferencia de las fiestas, el séptimo día o sábado fue establecido y santificado por Dios en la creación y sirve para recordar a la humanidad —de ahí su celebración— la obra creativa de Dios [...]. La muerte de Cristo no invalida el sábado” (p. 323), a diferencia de las fiestas y los sacrificios religiosos israelitas que ya no es necesario realizar.

Cerrando la segunda sección, Richard M. Davidson aborda de manera profunda, práctica y a través de experiencias reales las siete dimensiones del descanso sabático resaltadas mediante el uso de expresiones específicas de este día en el Pentateuco. Tales dimensiones son las siguientes: (a) descanso físico (Gn 2,2, *shavath*); (b) descanso mental (Ex 20,11, *nuakh*); (c) descanso emocional/restaurativo (Ex 31,17, *nafash*); (d) descanso creativo/celebratorio (Gn 2,3, *asah*); (e) descanso evangélico lleno de gracia (Gn 2,2, *kalah*); (f) descanso bendito y fortalecedor (Gn 2,3, *barakh*); y (g) descanso íntimo o santo (Gn 2,3, *qadhash*).

Finalmente, la última sección del libro presenta dos artículos sobre el sábado en la literatura intertestamentaria. El primero fue escrito por Teresa Reeve y Roy Gane, quienes analizaron las referencias al sábado en los escritos de Qumrán y la comprensión que esta comunidad parece haber tenido sobre ese día. En resumen, los rollos del mar Muerto presentan la observancia del sábado como una señal de adoración a Dios instituida en la creación. Entre varios aspectos destacados en el artículo, la comunidad de Qumrán pareció entender que la violación del sábado era un motivo determinante para el exilio, por lo que buscaron establecer reglas para evitar que este día fuera profanado nuevamente.

El segundo artículo fue escrito por Daegyeuk Nam y trata de un análisis del sábado en la literatura apócrifa y pseudoepigrafiada. El autor concluye que el sábado fue observado durante todo el período del Antiguo Testamento y considerado como una señal entre Dios y su pueblo. La información obtenida en esta literatura demostró que tal observancia no fue rechazada ante la persecución y que muchos perdieron la vida ante la posibilidad de violar la observancia del sábado. Además, hay evidencia de que después del Nuevo Testamento algunos cristianos intentaron cambiar la observancia del sábado al primer día de la semana.

El libro engloba investigaciones realizadas con seriedad, rigor académico y profundidad, lo que lo convierte en una obra de referencia obligatoria para todo aquel que desee obtener una comprensión más completa y precisa de la teología del sábado.

Eloá Moura Galvão
Facultad de Teología
Universidad Adventista del Plata
eloa.mgalvao@gmail.com



John Anthony McGuckin. *Origen of Alexandria. Master Theologian of the Early Church*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2022. Pp. xi + 184. ISBN: 978-1-9787-0843-3

McGuckin es clérigo de la Iglesia ortodoxa del patriarcado de la arquidiócesis de Rumania. Es rector en St. Gregory's Chapel en St. Anne's on Sea, Reino Unido. Desde allí enseña en la Facultad de Teología de la Universidad de Oxford. También es profesor emérito de patrística e historia de la iglesia bizantina en Union Theological Seminary, New York. Es editor principal y asociado de obras dedicadas a los estudios de teología histórica e historia del cristianismo temprano y bizantino. Ha escrito varios libros, reseñas, artículos y capítulos especializados en sus áreas de investigación.¹ Su amplia experiencia lo ha convertido en un referente de los estudios sobre Orígenes de Alejandría. Fue editor del reconocido *The Westminster Handbook to Origenes* (Westminster John Knox Press, 2004).

Antes de iniciar un recorrido histórico y teológico de más de mil setecientos años guiados por McGuckin, es importante considerar la portada del libro. Ella fue diseñada por su esposa, Eileen McGuckin (Icon Studio, St. Anne's on Sea, UK). El moderno ícono fue titulado *Origen teaching the saints*. A manera de introducción, la obra inicia explicando su significado. Esta ilustra a Orígenes en un podio frente a una iglesia bizantina. Él viste ropas sacerdotales y sostiene un rollo que dice "attend above all else to the reading of the Scripture". Reconocidos maestros del cristianismo oriental y occidental se encuentran alrededor de él. Gregorio Nacianceno, Gregorio Taumaturgo, Melania de Roma, Gregorio de Nisa y Máximo el Confesor están cerca. Otros están más alejados. McGuckin concluye la simbología del retrato afirmando lo que será la argumentación central de todo el libro: "Origen's importance in the history of doctrine and celebrates his stature as master theologian of the early church" (p. viii).

¹ Para una lista de las publicaciones de McGuckin, véase <https://myunion.utsnyc.edu/document.doc?id=1081>



La obra se divide en dos partes. La primera, presenta una breve introducción a la vida y al pensamiento del alejandrino. La segunda, con el aporte más valioso del libro, evidencia su legado y recepción a través del tiempo. Esta parte explora la influencia de Orígenes en su tiempo, en la de sus discípulos, durante la Edad Media, en la época de la Reforma y en los tiempos modernos. La monografía también posee dos apéndices, una bibliografía selecta, un índice de los autores mencionados y una breve biografía del autor.

El primer capítulo de la obra plantea una tesis contundente. Él expresa:

He was the first truly international philosopher the Christian church had ever produced. His combination of profound spiritual energy, mental acuity, biblical sophistication, and reverence for intellectual culture made him a figure of such significance in the classical architecture of the ancient Christian religion that he is arguably the most important Christian in the history of the church after the evangelists and St. Paul; he was intellectually far more impressive and influential than the great Augustine... (p. 3).

Sin embargo, por diversas causas, McGuckin indica que Orígenes ha sido rechazado y desconocido a través de los siglos por diversas causas. Él describe que recién a finales del siglo XX diversos académicos accedieron a sus enseñanzas con nuevos enfoques libres de prejuicios.

Ante el renovado interés origeniano, McGuckin destaca que su obra “tries, in an introductory and synoptic way, to give an account of that sea change in the scholarly (and theological) approach to Origen, and also to give a relatively simple account of why he still matters” (p. 5). Este capítulo, luego de exponer algunas ideas generales sobre el libro, desarrolla una biografía general del Adamancio. El autor muestra al alejandrino como maestro, predicador, escritor y mártir frente a los adversos contextos políticos y religiosos que enfrentó.

McGuckin, en su segundo capítulo, presenta de manera breve cuatro temas importantes que marcaron la teología del alejandrino: el concepto de Trinidad, la revelación bíblica, la teología espiritual (ascetismo) y la teología dogmática de la iglesia. Con este capítulo, termina la primera parte del libro.

La segunda parte estudia el legado de Orígenes. “In this second part of the book I would like to discuss some of that contested legacy in greater detail: how it was that Origen ‘mapped out the tradition’ for later generations of the church”, afirma McGuckin (p. 44). Esta sección abarcará los siguientes cuatro capítulos.

El tercer capítulo describe los problemas que enfrentaron sus discípulos en Alejandría y Cesarea. Entre aquellos que sostuvieron sus ideas se encontraron Dionisio, Teognosto, Pierios, Dídimo el ciego y los capadocios, entre otros. Ellos mantuvieron el legado en medio de severas controversias eclesiásticas contra el Adamancio.

El cuarto capítulo aborda otras antiguas crisis origenistas. McGuckin comienza con las polémicas de Epifanio de Salamina (m. 403). Continúa describiendo la polémica de Teófilo de Alejandría con los origenistas “hermanos Altos egipcios”. Luego, expone el gran conflicto del siglo VI. Este determina la condenación de la “herejía origenista” durante el Segundo Concilio de Constantinopla (553 d. C.). El autor cree que esta controversia debería “really to be called the Evagrian crisis, for it has more to do with the fight against aspects of Evagrius of Pontus’s theological version of Origen’s school than Origen himself” (p. 86). Luego presenta la recepción negativa y positiva del maestro griego en pensadores como Ambrosio, Jerónimo, Agustín de Hipona y Casiodoro.

El quinto capítulo describe la recepción de las ideas origenistas de finales de la Edad Media y los tiempos de la Reforma. McGuckin presenta varios pensadores, entre ellos, Pascasio Radberto, Ratramno de Corbie, Juan Scoto Eriugena, Pedro Aberlardo, Bernardo de Clairvaux, Pico della Mirandola, Erasmo de Rotterdam, Ulrico Zwinglio, Martín Lutero, Teodoro de Beza y Giordano Bruno. También destaca la labor de uno de los eruditos origenianos modernos, Pierre Deniel Huet (1630-1721), quien publicó en 1668 una importante edición que duró hasta las monumentales ediciones Abbé Jacques Paul Migne (*Cursus completus patrologiae latinae et Graecae*) en el siglo XIX. Además, sostiene y expone que la disponibilidad de las obras completas del alejandrino

condujo a un renovado interés entre eruditos católicos, protestantes y anglicanos (ej. John Jewel y Richard Hooker).

En el anteúltimo capítulo, McGuckin realiza una reevaluación del legado del alejandrino, principalmente en la actualidad. Él afirma:

... after the sixth century, it is *probably* not until the twentieth century that Origen began to be read once more holistically in terms of his overall output (instead of small and tendentiously selected gobbets) and with a clearer eye to the context of the school techniques of Late Antique philosophical circles (in other words, the original context in which Origen set out his teachings) (p. 136).

En el moderno redescubrimiento de Orígenes y su importancia en la tradición cristiana destaca la labor de ocho jesuitas en recuperar el pensamiento origeniano. Estos son Hans Urs von Balthasar, Henri de Lubac, Jean Daniélou, Frédéric Bertrand, Henri Crouzel, Lothar Lies, Robert Daly y Brian Daley.

McGuckin también destaca el impacto favorable que realizó la publicación de la serie francesa *Sources Chrétiennes*. A esta se suman las continuas conferencias internacionales que reúnen eruditos en estudios origenianos desde 1973. Luego sus investigaciones son publicadas bajo el título de las reconocidas obras *Origeniana*. Estos son impresos bajo el sello académico de Peeters.

McGuckin, aparte de los renombrados jesuitas mencionados, destaca las investigaciones realizadas por eruditos anglicanos (R. P. C. Hanson, C. Bammell, M. Wiles), franceses (Pierre Nautin, Marguerite Harl, Gilles Dorival), italianos (Lorenzo Perrone, A. Monaci Castagno) y norteamericanos (Ronald Heine, Joseph Trigg, Karen Torjesen). Menciona que recientes investigaciones, como las de Elizabeth Dively Lauro y Peter Martens, ayudan a la comprensión filosófica, metodológica, exegética.

El último capítulo es un breve epílogo en el cual muestra su deseo de una restitución de la persona y el pensamiento de Orígenes. Expresa que fue un ícono teológico importante para muchos grandes pensadores a través de la historia cristiana. Además, argumenta que sus ideas siguen vigentes para la teología y la praxis actual.

Los dos apéndices presentan importantes datos para un investigador que inicia en los estudios del alejandrino. En el primero, registra los volúmenes de las traducciones francesas *Sources Chrétiennes*. Estas ediciones críticas realizadas por especialistas son importantes para los estudios en el Adamancio. Presentan el texto en griego o latín, junto a su traducción en francés. El segundo apéndice describe los doce volúmenes de la Serie Origeniana con sus respectivos temas.

Al finalizar, registra una bibliografía selecta. Esta es actual y pertinente para los temas tratados en la obra. Es una valiosa fuente de información que ayudará al lector en futuras investigaciones o profundización de los argumentos presentados.

La obra de McGuckin es accesible al lector que se inicia en el pensamiento del alejandrino. Sin embargo, presenta nuevos e importantes temas de investigaciones con bibliografías clásicas y recientes que informan y actualizan al experimentado en las ideas del Adamancio.

El investigador aborda temas controvertidos desde nuevos horizontes históricos, tratando de aclarar los conceptos desde la misma cosmovisión del Adamancio. Controversias como la preexistencia de las almas, el origen del Logos, la *apokatastasis* y otros son tratados de una manera objetiva a la luz del pensamiento original. Creo que hubiese sido útil, como autoridad en el Adamancio, que amplié otros asuntos como la influencia del (neo)platonismo en Orígenes y sus intérpretes. Su visión habría marcado un aporte interesante ante las discusiones pasadas y actuales. Tal vez por cuestiones de espacio y objetivos, tampoco describe los significativos descubrimientos textuales de la Biblia que realizó el alejandrino al elaborar la *Hexapla*, por ejemplo.

Es importante destacar que McGuckin cumple con el propósito de la serie. Crea un mapa claro del pensamiento, de las controversias origenistas y la recepción de su legado a través de la historia del cristianismo. Además, argumenta de manera concisa y definida que Orígenes no fue considerado un sinónimo de hereje para muchos pensadores cristianos de gran reputación como los capadocios, Atanasio y Ambrosio, Bernardo de Claravaux, Abelardo y Erasmo. Al contrario, fue una figura intelectual inigualable y respetada. Piensa que debe ser entendido en

su propio contexto religioso, intelectual y literario, ya que su influencia se refleja hasta hoy en las teologías sistemática y práctica. Esta obra debería ser leída por aquellos que deseen tener un panorama general de la influencia de Orígenes a través la historia cristiana.

Christian Varela
Asociación Argentina del Sur de la IASD
Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina
christian.varela@adventistas.org.ar

