

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Art Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

8-1-2003

The Old Testament Source of Rev 21:3c

Helen Cadogan

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis, ir_cadoganh@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.csl.edu/ma_th



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cadogan, Helen, "The Old Testament Source of Rev 21:3c" (2003). *Master of Art Theology Thesis*. 95. https://scholar.csl.edu/ma_th/95

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Art Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Master's Thesis:

The Old Testament Source of Rev 21:3c

*“As the last book of the Bible and the completion of God's revelation to his church,
[Revelation] is the lens through which the entire Scripture is to be viewed.”*
(Louis A. Brighton, *Revelation*)

Helen Cadogan

Summer 2003

Thesis Advisor: Pr. Louis A. Brighton

Readers: Dr. David Adams; Dr. R. Weise

CONTENTS

Chapter 1: “What’s past is prologue.”	3
Definition of Terms	10
Review of Literature	12
Methodology	22
Thesis	24
Scope.....	24
Chapter 2: Summing the Parts in John.....	26
Chapter 3: The σκην- Context in John.....	32
Chapter 4: The Fathers on σκηνώω	41
Chapter 5: Peering Through the Lens at the MT	56
Chapter 6: Peering Through the Lens at the LXX.....	62
Chapter 7: The OT Context and Themes	69
Chapter 8: Rev 21:3c and the OT—A Comparison.....	77
Chapter 9: Textual Variance Anyone?.....	90
Chapter 10: Painting Ex 25:8b into Rev 21:3c.....	96
Chapter 11: “What shall we say, then?”	100
Selected Bibliography.....	102

Chapter 1

“What’s past is prologue.”

As had Paul, who was sometimes unable to present his missives personally to the churches, either because of imprisonment or because the Holy Spirit would not permit him to travel to a particular locale, John, exiled on Patmos, sent his letter as substitute for his living presence in the churches¹. That the letter was received as “authoritative and canonical”² and disseminated by the churches signified that they knew the writer and accepted his “apostolic presence, teaching, and authority.”³ That John painted a landscape rich with Old Testament text and symbols⁴ onto the letter’s canvas⁵ indicates that the OT was his theological and literary palette.⁶ That the palette was familiar to the letter’s audience denotes the extent to which its Scripture and theology were embedded in the new Christian faith and were received as its foundation. Therefore, familiarity with the “language ... and [the] intentions”⁷ of the OT is requisite for apprehending Revelation’s message; for, John is thought to compress and point

¹ Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 3.

² Louis A. Brighton, *Revelation* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2000), 22.

³ Richard N. Longenecker, “On the Form, Function, and Authority of the New Testament Letters,” in *Scripture and Truth* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983), 104.

⁴ Brighton, *Revelation*, 24-25.

⁵ Thomas E. McComiskey, “Alteration of OT Imagery in the Book of Revelation: Its Hermeneutical and Theological Significance,” *JETS* 36:3 (1993): 307-316. McComiskey observes that Revelation makes us of OT material in a number of ways, including “interweaving of OT phraseology into the tapestry of events it depicts.”

⁶ Brighton, *Revelation*; Ferrell Jenkins, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Marion, IN: Cogdill Foundation, 1972); H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951); G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), amongst others. Revelation scholars generally regard John’s usage of the OT as unparalleled amongst NT and apostolic writers.

⁷ Hans Hübner, “The New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. Magno Saebø; 2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996-2000), 335-372.

toward larger OT passages⁸ even though he does not precede any of his usages of the OT with any quotation formula⁹ and does not include lengthy texts. Rather, John colors in single words, short phrases and clauses, or sentences of nine words or less;¹⁰ moreover, the OT text version from which he does this is open to question.¹¹

Though commentators generally agree that the Book of Revelation makes prodigious use of the OT, the calculation of the number of references and the categorization of the same have been very fluid.¹² Perhaps the discrepancies in calculation are a consequence of the

⁸ Moisés Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority" in *Scripture and Truth* (ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge; Leicester: InterVarsity, 1983), 160.

⁹ Hübner, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," 367. These include "καθώς γέγραπται, γέγραπται γάρ, καθώς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον, λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή," none of which are there instances of in Revelation. The first, second, and fourth do not occur in the Johannine literature at all, and the third occurs twice only in John 6:31, 12:14.

¹⁰ Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996), 12. Menken is discussing "seventeen passages [in John's Gospel] which qualify as OT quotations," and he remarks that, generally, the quotations are "relatively short: on average nine words." That prompted this writer's examination of the OT (LXX) references in the margin of NA27, which [examination] led to the discovery that Menken's statement, though made in relation to set texts in John's Gospel, is also applicable to Rev 21:1-8, which is the wider context of 21:3c. This abbreviated usage of OT is a stylistic similarity that, though identified in a very limited sphere, may contribute to the argument that the writer of the Gospel and Revelation are both one and the same; Brighton, *Revelation*, 15-16. Also, Steve Moyise, "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," *JSNT* 76 (1999): 97-113, asserts parenthetically that "the longest [allusion] is seven words." C. H. Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963), 8, notes that the OT references in the NT are "usually quite short, more often than not confined to the limits of a single sentence, or even a single phrase."

¹¹ John may have referred to texts from either the MT alone or the LXX alone, or from both the MT and the LXX, or may have made his own translation from the MT, or may have edited the LXX, or may have used some variant of the LXX. The permutations and combinations on the textual source of the OT texts in Revelations are numerous. What is certain is John's prodigious use of the OT for his literary palette.

¹² G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 77, chronicles some of the variation; his footnoted list is here repeated in full: "UBS³, 901-11 = 394; NA²⁶, 739-74 = 635; H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, ed. G. D. Kilpatrick (British and Foreign Bible society, 1958²), 734-87 = 493; Hühn, *Alttestamentliche Citate und Reminiscenzen*, 269ff. = 455; Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentus in Novo*, 263-79 = 195; Swete, *Apocalypse*, xcl = 278; Charles, *Revelation*, lxxv-lxxxii = 226; van der Waal, *Openbaring*, 174-241 = 1000 (approximately)."

A brief survey reveals that Westcott-Hort lists approximately 565 "quotations" from the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation; of these, there are 42 alone in Rev 21, and 3 in Rev 21:3. The margins of NA 27, on the other hand, include approximately 700⁺ references to OT, approximately 65 in Rev 21, and 8 in Rev 21:3. The UBS, however, lacks an approximate total number of OT texts referenced, but a quick count of the margin notes yields 49 in Rev 21, and 4 in Rev 21:3c (these numbers are original).

Jan Fekkes, *Isaiah and the Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 61-62, writes that "[t]he need for systematic methodological guidelines in delimiting John's use of specific OT texts is evident simply from the multitude of disparate enumerations of OT allusions in Revelation. Charles 250; Swete 278; Tenney 348; Marty 453; Gelin 518; *UBSGNT* 634; Staehelin 700. A differential of 50 or perhaps even 100 suggested

overabundance of categories as well as a corresponding mutability in scholars' perceptions of the mode of John's inclusion of OT in Revelation, which in turn impacts their categorization.

Tenney indicates 348 'allusions' to the Hebrew OT discernible by verbal similarity and by contextual correlation¹³. Hübner notes that OT in NT occurs via quotations distinguishable for their "*formulae quotationis*,"¹⁴ of which there are no instances in Revelation. Prigent declares that John does not quote the OT expressly and ascribes that to him being a prophet.¹⁵

Van Ruiten, though citing Brooke F. Westcott's and Fenton J. A. Hort's numbers, differs from them in asserting that John's liberal usage of OT *never*¹⁶ includes quotations.¹⁷ Also differing from the others, Steve Moyise discovers 579 allusions and quotations from OT in

allusions between scholars is not unreasonable to expect in a book such as Revelation, but one of 450 (250 versus 700) is unacceptable."

Jon Paulien, "Elusive Allusions: The Problematic Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," *BR* 33 (1988): xx, also provides an example of the varying lists of allusions in a particular segment of Revelation (8:7-9:21 and 11:15-18). One reason for the varying statistics is that some of these lists include parallels together with allusions and citations.

Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort. *The New Testament: in the Original Greek* (New York: Macmillan, 1943), 601, note that "[m]any of the quotations are composite, being formed from two or more definite passages, or from one passage modified by the introduction of a phrase found in one or more other definite passages. Sometimes also it is difficult to tell from which of several similar passages a phrase was taken, if indeed it was taken from one more than another," and these are "passages and phrases which are marked by uncial type in the text as taken from the Old Testament." Jenkins, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 23-25, totals Westcott and Hort more loosely, noting "over 400 quotations from the Old Testament in the Apocalypse." He cites Tenney that there are 348 allusions to the Hebrew OT "traceable both by verbal resemblance and by contextual connection", but since this number includes 95 repetitions, the actual number of allusions are approximately 250, roughly "more than ten for each chapter" of the Apocalypse. Jenkins includes Tenney's charts of the distribution of OT quotations and allusions in Revelation, according to which there are 95 OT references in Chs. 17:1-21:8 (24). Jenkins notes that Tenney's chart "reveals that all major sections of the OT are included in Revelation, with quotations or allusions from 24 books." The major prophets constitute a preponderance of these allusions with 197, and that "other significant books" cited are "Genesis, Exodus, Psalms and Zechariah." In order of magnitude of "allusions", the top five are Isaiah (79), Daniel (53), Ezekiel (43), Psalms (43), and Exodus (27), says Jenkins. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cxi, counts Westcott-Hort at 404 and says that of this number found in Revelation, 278 refer to the OT.

¹³ Jenkins, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 23, citing Tenney who adds that since this number includes 95 repetitions, the actual number of allusions are approximately 250, roughly "more than ten for each chapter" of the Apocalypse.

¹⁴ Hübner, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," 335.

¹⁵ P. Prigent, *Apocalypse et Liturgie* (Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1964), 10.

¹⁶ Original emphasis.

¹⁷ Jacques Van Ruiten, "The Intertextual Relationship Between Isaiah 65, 17-20 and Revelation 21, 1-5b," *EB* 51 (1993): 473-510, cites Westcott-Hort, Swete, and Tenney as found in Jenkins.

Revelation.¹⁸ He further argues that previous studies on John's use of the OT attempt to circumnavigate the whole issue of allusions—rather than quotations—by “distinguishing between allusions and echoes”;¹⁹ Moyise attributes this to the desire to avoid subjectivity by treating “a smaller group of allusions ... as quotations.”²⁰ This remark may be a response to Beale²¹—who argues for both allusions and echoes, and who distinguishes between “‘clear’, ‘probable’ and ‘possible’ allusions,”²²—and perhaps also to Jon Paulien who identifies five categories of allusions, included in which are “certain”, “non-allusion”, and “echo.”²³

Fekkes indicates that the discussion must begin with a definition of “the special nature of OT allusions in Revelation and the criteria used for isolating these texts.”²⁴ He opines that “citing parallels”²⁵ is not the way to grasp John's touches of the OT. Rather, he advocates an intense

¹⁸ Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (JSNTSup., 115; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 14. Moyise's numbers are based on the UBS's GNT. Of this 579, the prophets—major and minor—number 400, Psalms are 97, and the Pentateuch 82. Moyise nowhere breaks down the Pentateuch into individual units. Moyise notes that “deciding what constitutes an allusion is itself a very subjective affair.”

¹⁹ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 16.

²⁰ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 17.

²¹ There is, in fact, an ongoing debate between Beale and Moyise about the OT and NT interpreting each other. Moyise's side of the debate may be found in his monograph, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, followed by his further response, “The Old Testament in the New: A Reply to Greg Beale,” *IBS* 21 (1999): 54-58.

²² G. K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*, (JSNTSup., 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), speaks of echoes. So does Thomas E. McComiskey, “Alteration of OT Imagery in the Book of Revelation: Its Hermeneutical and Theological Significance,” *JETS* 36:3 (1993): 307-316, who writes, “[w]e find allusions to the OT in almost every page. While many of them are merely faint echoes, we nevertheless gain the overwhelming impression that the whole of the OT, not only its symbols and predictions, receives life and meaning from the events surrounding the Revelation of Jesus Christ.”

Robert K. MacKenzie, *The Author of the Apocalypse: A Review of the Prevailing Hypothesis of Jewish-Christian Authorship* (Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1997), 62, comments on these three categories of Beale's noting that for Beale, they “provided a framework for his attempts to identify which version of the Greek Old Testament John had used for certain of his biblical references.”

²³ Jon Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12* (Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, 21; Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987), cited in Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*, 19.

²⁴ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 61.

²⁵ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 62. For such a list of parallels, see Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cxi-cliii.

scrutiny of "language, context, tradition history"²⁶ to decipher the function of each "allusion" in the work. Therefore, taking into consideration that John's text "has its own special grammar,"²⁷ Fekkes argues for a special set of criteria—different from that used for the rest of the canon—to evaluate Revelation's use of OT. Furthermore, he articulates the distinctions between formal and informal quotations and allusions,²⁸ and argues that "perceived authorial motive,"²⁹ gleaned from examining the text in its context, must be the primary determinant of the distinction between "an informal quotation and an allusion."³⁰

Jon Paulien assesses the analytical difficulties of the use of the OT in Revelation; he also raises some issues, such as the doubt concerning the "language and text tradition of the OT" which John employs;³¹ the irregular grammar and syntax of John's text;³²

²⁶ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 63.

²⁷ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 63, argues, "[f]or example, it may be that some texts which have usually been considered as allusions should in the wider background of John's method and purpose be regarded as quotations. Or, in passages where allusive clusters form a particular OT source are present, further previously undiscovered or doubtful parallels may rise to become clear allusions." Such is the muddiness not in nomenclature but in the actual taxonomy of examples of John's use of the OT.

²⁸ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 63-64. In Fekkes's lexicon, a "formal quotation [is] any portion of OT text accompanied by any additional word or phrase which the author uses to introduce that text"; "informal quotations ... are simply OT citations without introductory formulae." Fekkes is stymied when he attempts to distinguish between "informal quotation" and "allusion"; he is forced to conclude that "the term *allusion* itself can only be accepted as a broad definition, for it conveys little information about an author's use of Scripture, except to indicate that it is not a quotation."

²⁹ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 64.

³⁰ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 64.

³¹ Jon Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," in *Studies in the Book of Revelation* (ed. Steve Moyise; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 113-129. Paulien began by evaluating the contribution of scholars to the debate on the language and text tradition of the OT John references in Revelation. He addressed John's Palestinian heritage and argued for the Hebrew and Aramaic influence of Revelation's "thought-patterns." Paulien indicated that R. H. Charles has influenced others to think that John's allusions came from the MT version of the OT; nevertheless, scholarly opinion on the matter has been diverse and divided. Torrey and Trudinger are proponents of an "Aramaic antecedent" to the text; Swete and others assert that the LXX is John's source material; Montgomery, Vos, Smith, and Moyise support a "multiplex background" or an unfamiliar Greek text extant in John's time; Trudinger and Vanhoye argue for a Semitic background generally, but confess that the information is inconclusive with regard to the text tradition of allusions.

³² Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," 114-115. Paulien's thought is similar to Charles's; he opines that it may be Greek was John's second language. Thus he accounts for the Semitic syntax of John's language being stronger than his Greek grammar. However, Paulien, unlike Charles, hypothesizes that John's strange grammar might be intentional and might be a clue to the MT background of his allusions.

"word...phrase...concept" allusions in place of direct quotations;³³ and, the criteria for selecting allusions.³⁴ Paulien posits that divergent scholarly opinion on allusions is due to the inability to distinguish between John's "intentional allusions"³⁵ and his inadvertent ones which just "echo[es]"³⁶ the OT.

In Maarten Menken's view, the abundance of Revelation's references to the OT may be regarded as an expression of its accordance with the OT.³⁷ He dispenses with the excess of categories advocated by Beale and Fekkes and precisely defines the parameters for the NT's use of the OT. He declares that a quotation is "a clause (or series of clauses) from Israel's Scripture that is (or are) rendered verbatim (or anyhow recognizably) in the NT and that is (or are) marked as such by an introducing or concluding formula."³⁸ Other OT texts that fall short of this criterion Menken regards as allusions.³⁹

Trudinger, opines that only 120 inclusions of OT in Revelation were strongly linked to a particular OT text or version, and that "of these, 53 *could be held to be*⁴⁰ 'quotations', and the

³³ Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," 115-116. For these allusions, Paulien indicates that there is a need for "careful controls focusing on method and criteria" in order to provide a listing of OT allusions.

³⁴ Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," 116-117. In addressing this issue, Pauline assesses Trudinger's methodology for "isolating allusions" and Beale's criteria for distinguishing "clear, probable, possible" allusions. He notes that Beale indicates that these would require similarities of theme, content, specific syntax, structure, and establishment of a persuasive basis for the author's motive and that Beale regards authorial intent as critical to interpreting allusions.

³⁵ Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," 119, defines an "echo" as the utilization of "OT language and themes [without an] intentional reference to [a] particular text."

³⁶ Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," 119.

³⁷ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 11; his actual statement is, "[a]s the most explicit way to express the accordance with the Scriptures is to quote from the Scriptures, it is not astonishing that we find many OT quotations in the writings of the NT." Since the whole is equal to the sum of its parts, what is said of the NT may be said of any of the texts which comprise it.

³⁸ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 11.

³⁹ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 11.

⁴⁰ Original emphasis.

remainder are allusions."⁴¹ Moreover, Trudinger argues that since John doesn't use "proper" quotations, it's rather difficult to decide what OT text source is being utilized.⁴²

Thus, it may be seen that, as scholars have sought to characterize John's OT brush-work in Revelation, the vocabulary has expanded from quotations to allusions⁴³ and even to echoes; concomitant with this looseness of language, the debate seems to have veered into subjectivity.⁴⁴ This debate is not just about nomenclature, especially since Revelation appears to contain none of the markers that other NT writers employ to signal a quotation.⁴⁵ It also concerns taxonomy and methodology for determining the textual version of the OT in Revelation.⁴⁶

Given these issues as well as the uniqueness of Revelation's text and John's identity as NT prophet,⁴⁷ and given the increased subjectivity of scholarly language concerning the matter

⁴¹ Leonhard P. Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," *JTS* 17 (1966): 82-88. Trudinger regards "proper" quotations as those preceded by an "introductory formula." In his view, the introductory formula is not necessarily the "sound[est] criterion for determining [a] quotation"; he thinks that if other criteria can be developed beyond that, then Revelation has many 'quotations' that are long enough to determine "their textual source.." Trudinger argues that even with allusions, "elements of linguistic structure and of vocabulary are often present which provide a high degree of conclusive evidence as to their text source."

⁴² Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 86. He makes a second point that a "substantial number ... [of these] O. T. quotations and allusions ... [have] their closest affinity with the text of the Aramaic Targumim.... [These followed the] *Palestinian* Targumim ... against both the Masoretic text and the LXX" . Trudinger cannot verify this beyond the shadow of a doubt. Caird, who was Trudinger's reader, disagreed because the "Targumim are in fact later than Revelation." However, Trudinger responds with the possibility that John "knew the traditional Aramaic version of the Hebrew and/or the exegesis of the Hebrew which finally gave rise to the Targumim," and based this thought on Zunz and on Böhl, respectively, who argued for the "existence of fixed, written Targum texts as early as the third century B.C." and extended Zunz's thesis, and Kahle who "supported the findings of Zunz concerning the existence of early Targumim of the Prophets."

⁴³ Hübner, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," 335, remarks that the distinction between quotation and allusion is fuzzy and only the type of the writer's argumentation can determine which the text is. This is reflective of Moyise's views regarding the subjectivity of an allusion, *vide infra*.

⁴⁴ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 14, states "deciding what constitutes an allusion is itself a very subjective affair."

⁴⁵ Hübner, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," 335.

⁴⁶ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation* , 63; Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," 115-116; and, Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 82-88.

⁴⁷ John, as are the Old Testament prophets before him, is commissioned to the prophetic office (Rev. 1:11; 10:8-11), his prophetic task the announcement of the fulfillment of all prophecy and history in the light of a Christological and eschatological realization of both. Therefore, when John commences his text "Ἀποκάλυψις" (Rev. 1:1) and identifies himself "Ἰωάννης" (Rev. 1:4,9), it is an indicator of the re-emergence of open prophecy,

of John's use of OT and the underlying interest in taxonomy and methodology reflected in scholarly debate, it would be apropos to establish criteria for classifying the various possibilities of usage of OT in Revelation according to "citation,"⁴⁸ "quotation,"⁴⁹ and "reference."⁵⁰

Furthermore, absent clear markers such as quotation formulae, non-subjective measures may serve to establish correspondence between the OT reference in Revelation and the OT textual source. Such a correspondence may be established by means of four linguistic markers—lexical, syntactic, semantic, and thematic—the presence of a majority of which would indicate a relationship between the OT and Revelation that may signify the OT textual source.

Definition of terms

Of the three terms—"citation," "quotation," and "reference"—only "citation" has a forensic component to its meaning, which is "a reference to a previous decision by a court or legal authority, specifying precisely where it is documented."⁵¹ It is here suggested that some

for, according to R. H. Charles, *Lectures on The Apocalypse* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923), 68, "with the advent of Christianity, the grounds for pseudonymity[that bred apocalyptic, had] disappeared."

⁴⁸ *Encarta® World English Dictionary on CD-ROM*. Microsoft® Word X for Mac® Service Release 1, 1999, "citation," n.p. A 'citation' is, amongst other things, "a quotation from an authoritative source, used, for example, to support an idea or argument; a reference to a previous decision by a court or legal authority, specifying precisely where it is documented; the legal practice or process of referring to precedent."

⁴⁹ *Encarta® World English Dictionary* n.p. A 'quotation' indicates "a piece of speech or writing quoted somewhere, for example, in a book or magazine; the quoting of what somebody else has said or written;... the use in an artistic work, especially music, of material taken from or alluding to somebody else's work."

⁵⁰ *Encarta® World English Dictionary* n.p. The noun 'reference' signifies, in part, "a spoken or written comment that either specifically mentions or calls attention to somebody or something, or is intended to bring somebody or something to mind; the process of mentioning or alluding to somebody or something; applicability or relevance to, or connection with, a particular subject or person; a note directing a reader's attention to a particular section of a work or to another source of information.... [and the verb] to use or refer to somebody or something as a source in the writing of something." These variant meanings are here regarded as encompassing the range of John's usage of the OT, inasmuch as there is scholarly consensus that John's text does not include citations.

⁵¹ *Encarta® World English Dictionary* n.p.

variant of this forensic meaning may be used to help refine the description of John's use of OT in Revelation.⁵² For the purposes of this paper, then:

A *citation* is a mention of a text of any length accompanied by precise documentation of its specific source, such as the name of the source cited.

A *quotation* is an unattributed text of any length which is reproduced verbatim or with some variation of syntax and/or diction, and is preceded by or concluded with *formulae quotationis*.

A *reference* is an unattributed text of any length, unmarked by *formulae quotationis*, and which may or may not be verbatim, but which specifically mentions, paraphrases, alludes to, or directs the reader's attention to an undocumented text of OT, or which evokes a text, theme, symbol, or image used in the OT.

Taking then into consideration the uniqueness of John's incorporation of OT texts, it may be accurately said that Revelation contains neither citations nor quotations of OT; for, John neither identifies his sources by name nor introduces their ideas with any *formulae*. However, the term *reference*, because of the fluidity of its definition and the corresponding flexibility and range of John's usage of the OT, is a more accurate descriptor of the OT in Revelation. Utilizing *reference* to convey John's range of use eliminates the hair-splitting proliferation of nomenclature, the variance and subjectivity that has attended the debate, and opens the way to introduce four non-subjective and linguistic elements⁵³—lexical, syntactic, semantic, and

⁵² Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," 127, suggests that scholars "move toward consistent terminology" in order to avoid confusion amongst readers and attach some certainty to "potential" references.

⁵³ Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 86. These criteria would make it possible to establish the textual form of the OT reference; for, as Trudinger argues, John does not include "proper" quotes from the OT makes textual source identification difficult.

thematic. These four may help to identify the textual form of any OT reference found in Revelation⁵⁴ when formulated into the following three criteria:

- 1) if a possible OT source is discovered to have one or no linguistic elements in common with the reference in its Johannine context, then there is not likely to be any correspondence between the reference and that possible OT textual source,⁵⁵
- 2) if a possible OT source has at least two of the elements in common with the reference in its Johannine context, then it is open to question whether there is a correspondence between the reference and the OT textual source;
- 3) if a possible OT reference source has three or four of the elements in common with the reference in its new context, then the reference definitely corresponds to that OT textual source.

Review of Literature

The inconsistency that has plagued the calculation and classification of the OT in Revelation extends to thinking on the text-form of OT⁵⁶ which John brushes in; meanwhile, very little of quality has been written on the methodology for identifying that text-form. It is probable that John referenced all the extant versions of OT throughout Revelation because he is who he

⁵⁴ As stated earlier, just as Fekkes, *vide supra*, argued for a special set of criteria to evaluate Revelation's use of OT, this paper argues that there is an equal or greater need for a set of criteria, not special, to identify the *textual form* of instances of Revelation's use of OT. This set of criteria may be applicable in any exegetical situation in which correspondence is sought between OT and NT texts.

⁵⁵ Is a theme, symbol, or image in Revelation and derived from the OT sufficient to identify a particular version of OT as the textual source? This paper would argue not—because theme, symbol, and image, if present in one version of OT, may well be present in the other. The only exception to this would be that created by the translators of the LXX if they either compressed or omitted to translate an OT text, as was the case with 1Ki 6:13. In such a case, then, one may construe that the textual source would be MT or some other variant of the OT that is non-LXX. True textual form parallel may then be achievable with no less than two linguistic elements.

⁵⁶ It is not here proposed that the textual form of OT in Revelation is monolithic. Rather, this paper holds that it is not possible to know the textual source of any reference in Revelation unless that reference is examined according to the established criteria. This is true for even those references that seem to be obvious derivatives of a particular version of OT. Revelation is too multiplex for such facile correspondence conclusions.

is—prophet⁵⁷—and the work is what it is—prophecy.⁵⁸ Thus, perhaps divine inspiration is the imperative guiding not only the text selection but also the constant changes in text-form throughout Revelation, more so than the theological, literary, and aesthetic inclinations of its author. It is also probable that John could have judiciously selected an OT text-form for the hermeneutical associations and implications of its micro- and macro-context. Thus, the degree of text-form variation in Revelation may be deliberate because, for each OT reference, John may have been consciously constructing a hermeneutical matrix consisting of the MT, the LXX,⁵⁹ and his own text purposed to interpret the OT texts. Thus, to interpret Revelation's phrases, clauses, and sentences is to look at the OT.⁶⁰ In that sense, then, Revelation may be thought to function as

⁵⁷ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 66, declares, quite properly, "John is foremost a προφήτης, not an ἀπόστολος or διδάσκαλος. His commission gives birth to a new prophecy—a fresh revelation—which is authorized simultaneously by God, the risen Christ, and the divine Spirit." Like Brighton, Fekkes attributes John's free-form references to the OT to his "prophetic consciousness."

P. Prigent, *Apocalypse et Liturgie* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1964), 10-11, opined that "c'est qui'il est lui-même prophète. Or, si l'un des office du prophète Chrétien consiste effectivement à annoncer l'avenir, le plus souvent son message n'est pas autre chose qu'une interpretation nouvelle et chrétienne de l'Ancien Testament, généralement donnée dans un cadre culturel. On peu meme aller un peu plus loin dans cette direction: l'Ancien Testament joue, dans l'Apocalypse, un role essentiel."

⁵⁸ Bauckham, *Theology of Revelation*, 3, 7, notes that biblical prophecy, as a genre, is primarily oral and addresses "a concrete historical situation that of Christians in the Roman province of Asia towards the end of the first century A. D." Bauckham also writes that Revelation differs from the prophetic norm in that it is a scribal message employing symbols—meant to be delivered during the course of the church's service (precedent for this is found in 1 Cor. 14:29-32)—the content of which is simultaneously visionary revelation interspersed with prophetic oracles. Charles, *Lectures on The Apocalypse*, 65-66, notes that prophecy is simultaneously foretelling and forth-telling concerning events in the *zeitgeschichte* and consequent "future events." These events entail either prophetic oracles or visionary revelation delivered orally and through symbolic acts. In prophetic literature, the prophecy itself is focal, and its contents are "true for all time and for all like crises in human affairs." Finally, he notes that the prophetic office is the revelation of the mind of YHWH to its auditors. Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 36, points out that the focus of the text is "the source of the revelation," YHWH, rather than the prophetic message. Brighton, *Revelation*, 6, asserts that Revelation is similar to the rest of Biblical prophecy in terms of the prophetic office. Moreover, it shares with Biblical prophecy a message whose truth is enduring, and the illocutionary force of which is to bring sinners "to repentance and faith, and to worship—to the blessedness of faithful service in the confidence of God's love and care."

⁵⁹ Or perhaps some other unknown Greek text of the OT may be part of the matrix.

⁶⁰ Bauckham, *Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 18, to his observations on the magnitude of OT references in Revelation adds that "[t]hese are not incidental but essential to the way meaning is conveyed.... John's very precise and subtle use of Old Testament allusions creates a reservoir of meaning which can be progressively tapped. The Old Testament allusions frequently presuppose their Old Testament context and a range of connexions between Old Testament texts which are not made explicit but lie beneath the surface of the text of Revelation."

a prism, as "the lens through which the entire Scripture is to be viewed."⁶¹ Therefore, the primary hermeneutical issue would revolve around not so much the mode of John's use of the OT,⁶² but the text of OT which stands behind a particular phrase, clause, or sentence, as well as the meaning to be derived from that phrase, clause, or sentence possessing or consisting of John's deliberately blended in OT text-forms. Is the meaning the same, new, or an extension of that of the original source?

So, which version of the OT did John employ in writing Revelation? The question is still being hotly debated, and proponents can be found on either side and in the middle of the MT-LXX divide. On the one hand, R. H. Charles contends that John was such a poor Greek scholar⁶³ that his grammatical solecisms were involuntary.⁶⁴ Charles attributes the 'poverty' of Revelation's Greek to John's having "adopted Greek as a vehicle of thought in his old age, and that, while he wrote in Greek, he thought in Hebrew."⁶⁵ Elsewhere, Charles apparently contradicts himself when he declared that John, apart from thinking in Hebrew, "also translates already existing Hebrew documents into Greek."⁶⁶ Charles's contention that Revelation's text source is essentially Hebraic is grounded in the Hebraic "order and structure ... [and]

⁶¹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 1.

⁶² See Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 86-99, for a discussion of categories of John's mode of use of the OT; also, cited in Beale, Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 70-103.

⁶³ R. H. Charles, *Lectures on The Apocalypse*, 21, in reconstructing the last three chapters of Revelation, concluded that John had an editor who, though "lacking in intelligence, ... was apparently a better Greek scholar than his master." Charles thinks that John's use of the LXX would have been more precise had he known it.

⁶⁴ Charles, *Lectures on The Apocalypse*, 72; Dionysus the Great, "Extant Fragments," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol. 6 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 84. Charles's thoughts on John's Greek are in accord with Dionysus's who wrote, "I perceive that his dialect and language are not of the exact Greek type, and that he employs barbarous idioms, and in some places also solecisms."

⁶⁵ Charles, *Lectures on The Apocalypse*, 72.

⁶⁶ R. H. Charles, *Studies in The Apocalypse* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1915), 96. This thought of Charles may well serve as the basis for the opinion that John may have prepared his own translation from the MT, hence the lexical divergence of Rev 21:3c from the LXX.

parallelism"⁶⁷ of John's language and style; consequently, Charles concludes that the MT was the text that John "consciously" made use of when he referenced the OT.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, Charles does admit to the LXX having an influence on John's "renderings,"⁶⁹ but he leaves its nature and scope undetermined.

Contrary to Charles, Stanley Porter, in his study, concludes that the Greek of Revelation is no different from that in use in the First century A. D.⁷⁰

P. E.-B. Allo, at the end of his study on the grammar of Revelation, determines that the work is the hand of one author⁷¹ and wonders whether its "irrégularités" might be explained by John's Semitic identity.⁷² He concludes by concurring with Charles, Swete, and others that the language of Revelation is more Hebraic than Septuagintal because Greek idioms do not abound in Revelation. Moreover, like Charles, Allo believes that John was an Aramaic speaker who thought in that language and wrote in Greek.⁷³

L. P. Trudinger, too, remarks on the dearth of LXX phraseology in Revelation. He identifies only thirty-nine quotations and allusions which are derived from some extant version of the LXX.⁷⁴ Furthermore, Trudinger notes the paucity of inclusions which are indubitably from the LXX⁷⁵ and believes that those belong to wider passages reliant on some Semitic text.⁷⁶ These findings underlie Trudinger's conclusion that John was familiar with terminology from the Greek

⁶⁷ Charles, *Studies in The Apocalypse*, 88.

⁶⁸ Charles, *Lectures on The Apocalypse*, 72.

⁶⁹ Charles, *Lectures on The Apocalypse*, 72.

⁷⁰ Stanley Porter, "The Language of the Apocalypse in Recent Discussion," *NTS* 35 (1989): 582-603.

⁷¹ P. E.-B. Allo, *Saint Jean L'Apocalypse* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1933), clxiv.

⁷² Allo, *Saint Jean L'Apocalypse*, clxiv.

⁷³ Allo, *Saint Jean L'Apocalypse*, clxv.

⁷⁴ Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 85.

⁷⁵ Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 85 cites Rev 1:1 (Dan. 2:28); Rev 1:4 (Ex. 3:14), amongst others.

⁷⁶ Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 85 e.g. Rev 1:4 (Exod. 3:14) and Rev 4:8 (Isa. 6:2, 3).

text of OT.⁷⁷ Trudinger then asserts that this terminology was derived from catchphrases in " 'testimony' books" current in John's day.⁷⁸

Though Fekkes, too, like the others, opines that "John is working from a knowledge of the Hebrew text",⁷⁹ he nevertheless concedes that John may have referenced some version of the Greek text.⁸⁰

On the other side, Henry B. Swete provides a lengthy two-column list of Revelation passages and their sources.⁸¹ Moreover, in opposition to Charles, he argues for the Johannine use of either the LXX or some other version of the OT, either independent of LXX or based upon it; thus Swete accounts for any divergence from LXX phraseology.⁸² Swete discounts any notion of a "direct use" of the MT, indicating only two forms that implied a Johannine "acquaintance ... with Hebrew or Aramaic."⁸³ According to Swete, Revelation's references to OT are of two kinds, that which consists of unattributed OT "words and phrases" uninformative regarding their specific contexts⁸⁴ and quasi-quotations which appear to relate to specific texts, but in which John eschews use of any quotation formula.⁸⁵ Swete views John's brushing in of OT texts as "artless and natural"⁸⁶ rather than designedly deliberate; for Swete, it is vision-evoked OT memory work which self-arranges "in [John's] visions like the changing patterns of a

⁷⁷ Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 85.

⁷⁸ Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation," 85.

⁷⁹ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 17.

⁸⁰ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 17.

⁸¹ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cxl-cliii.

⁸² Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, clv.

⁸³ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, clvi; these two forms are Ἀβαδδὼν (Rev 9:11) and Ἀρ Μαγεδὼν (Rev 16:16).

⁸⁴ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cliii.

⁸⁵ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cliii-cliv.

⁸⁶ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cliv.

kaleidoscope."⁸⁷ Swete's implied argument for Revelation as a work produced under divine inspiration without input from the author is almost Platonic and antithetical to the Judaeo-Christian perspective, according to which the recipient of the vision is the shaping force behind the language and form in which the vision is communicated to men.

Prigent indicates that the Semiticisms in Revelation encourage query concerning whether John knew Hebrew.⁸⁸ In a very brief discussion of the topic of the sources of Revelation, Prigent references both Charles and Lohmeyer, but concurs with the latter that John employs "septuagintismes" and that his style reflects the LXX.⁸⁹

Brighton, in his discussion of the language of Revelation, points to the frequency of coloration from the LXX in Revelation's text;⁹⁰ however, he leaves open the possibility of Hebraic or non-LXX material being used as a source.⁹¹ Brighton then straddles the middle line when he advances the hypothesis that the Semiticisms of Revelation might be attributable to the rapidity and urgency with which the work was done and perhaps to John's not making the transition from his "native Semitic way of thinking into standard Greek idiom."⁹²

Finally, somewhat in the middle are G. K. Beale, Steve Moyise, Moisés Silva, and Robert MacKenzie. Beale ascribes the ambiguity of the text-form debate to "[t]he complex relationship of the Hebrew text to early Greek versions, the history of which is largely unknown to us, [and

⁸⁷ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cliv.

⁸⁸ Prigent, *Apocalypse et Liturgie*, 10.

⁸⁹ Prigent, *Apocalypse et Liturgie*, 10, however notes that "[d]ans tous les cas il s'agit d'un auteur très proche de l'Ancien Testament, quoi-qu'il ne le cite presque jamais expressément."

⁹⁰ Brighton, *Revelation*, 16, indicates "abundant Greek renditions of OT passages, often by way of the LXX translation."

⁹¹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 16, writes, parenthetically and in relation to Revelation not being a translation, that John's word "contains abundant Greek renditions of OT passages, *often by way of the LXX translation*" (this writer's emphasis).

⁹² Brighton, *Revelation*, 17.

which] makes it difficult to know whether John depends on the Hebrew or the Greek."⁹³ Beale notes that scholars tended to follow Charles rather than Swete based on the divergence between John's text references and the LXX's text. While Beale recognizes that a similar disparity exists between John's material and the MT, he still concludes that "John draws from both Semitic and Greek biblical sources and often modifies both"⁹⁴; however, he does not attempt to explain John's textual eclecticism.

Moyise and, to a lesser extent, MacKenzie come to the same conclusion based on the mode of John's use of the OT. Moyise asks and answers his own question:

Is it possible to distinguish between the use of a Hebrew text that, in Charles's words, is "hardly ever literal," and the use of a Greek text that is merely an "influence" or has a "slogan-like" quality? I would suggest that the nature of John's use of the Old Testament makes it highly unlikely, for the allusions seldom continue for more than a few words (the longest is seven words) before being conformed to the narrative or fused with other texts.⁹⁵

Moyise's evaluation of the work of Charles, Vanhoye, Trudinger, and Ozanne leads him to conclude that "John knew and used both Greek and Semitic sources."⁹⁶ Elsewhere, though, Moyise queries whether the agreement of some texts with the MT, others with the LXX, and yet others that are different could be ascribed to John's "lapse of memory" or to the extant text

⁹³ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 77.

⁹⁴ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 78.

⁹⁵ Moyise, "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," 109.

⁹⁶ Moyise, "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," 113.

traditions of John's time.⁹⁷ However, he remarks that any Johannine divergence from the LXX is a factor of John's general use of Scripture rather than his reliance on the MT.⁹⁸

MacKenzie merely observes that John's "allusive style"⁹⁹ precludes any attempt to determine "the question of his familiarity with Semitic tongues."¹⁰⁰

Moises Silva in his essay discusses how variation in OT references in the NT affect biblical authority,¹⁰¹ and he examines the complexities involved in "determining the transmission of one text *within* the transmission of another."¹⁰² Silva would regard NT texts, such as Revelation, as "transmission-within-transmission-within-transmission" because the Greek-writing NT authors either translated from the Hebrew or used an extant Greek version of the OT,¹⁰³ thus "bridging" both texts.¹⁰⁴ He argues that "apostolic hermeneutics,"¹⁰⁵ according to which the NT writers did not "quote the OT verbatim," was responsible for creating "formal changes" to the OT text referenced in the NT.¹⁰⁶ If, as Beale posits, John paraphrased texts from both the MT and the LXX, then it was with certain hermeneutical principles in mind, according to Silva.

Exegetes generally agree that the NT writers had a variety of reasons and ways of using the OT. Not all of these pertained to establishing doctrine or justifying a theological argument,¹⁰⁷ however, all be thought to be founded in the NT writers' knowledge of the OT, the prism

⁹⁷ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 11.

⁹⁸ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 17.

⁹⁹ MacKenzie, *The Author of the Apocalypse*, 63.

¹⁰⁰ MacKenzie, *The Author of the Apocalypse*, 63.

¹⁰¹ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority", 147-165.

¹⁰² Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 148.

¹⁰³ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 148.

¹⁰⁴ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 148.

¹⁰⁵ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 149.

¹⁰⁶ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 149, argues that the NT writers paraphrased OT texts out of their "concern for interpretation and application" of the same.

¹⁰⁷ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 156.

through which they may have viewed and responded to life-events. Thus, in the manner of people very familiar with a text, a writer might have made a passing reference to the OT for some serious, non-doctrinal purpose.¹⁰⁸ The corollary to this is that when the writer is confronted with a particular situation, theme, or symbol, he immediately thinks of OT Scripture that reflects the situation at hand.¹⁰⁹ This degree of familiarity with the Scripture may also be mirrored when the writer utilizes a brief reference as a flag for a much larger OT text which he may have had in mind.¹¹⁰ Additionally, the OT provided the proof-texts for Christ-related events.¹¹¹ Just as proof-texting aided the edification of the disciples and the establishment of the church, the didactic use of the OT offered guidance to the emerging church.¹¹²

Significantly, scholars contend that John's purposes for referring to the OT differed from that of other NT writers. Swete writes that through his abundant use of the OT in Revelation, John presents a new text that is firmly limited to his purpose.¹¹³ Additionally, according to Beale, the OT is thought to provide the prototype¹¹⁴ according to which John intentionally models his

¹⁰⁸ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 157, argues that references of this type would not be indicative of the writer's "exegetical method" or "doctrine of inspiration." Silva cites Paul's 2 Co. 13:1 reference to Deut 19:15 which might be an example of such usage, bearing in mind that the NT texts are not casual.

¹⁰⁹ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 158-59.

¹¹⁰ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 160; Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New*, 8. These usages may be regarded, to some measure, as informal uses of OT in the NT in the sense that they may not necessarily be attended either by authorial attribution or by *formulae quotationis*.

¹¹¹ MacKenzie, *The Author of the Apocalypse*, 28. See also Claus Westerman, *The Old Testament and Jesus Christ*, (trans. O. Kaste; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1968), 14. Westerman indicates that such authentication "by citing an Old Testament passage [was] introduced by the formula, 'This came to pass in order to fulfill that which was written....' See, for example, Luke 24:27, in which Jesus relates how all Scripture, from Moses onward, spoke of Him so that his audience knew that that which was promised was fulfilled.

¹¹² See 1 Cor 9:8 which references Deut 25:4 which, in turn, pertains to the payment of pastors and other church workers.

¹¹³ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, cliv.

¹¹⁴ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 88. This prototype is regarded as a "form[s]" to understand and predict "future eschatological fulfillment," and as a "lens[es]" through which to comprehend "past and present eschatological fulfillment."

text.¹¹⁵ Beyond this, Beale, Fekkes, Bauckham and others present an array of other ways John uses the OT.¹¹⁶ MacKenzie concurs somewhat with Beale when he remarks that, in Revelation, John sought to evoke "the spirit and tone of certain Old Testament passages"¹¹⁷; for, from them he acquired "an appropriate idiom for his prophecies."¹¹⁸

Thus, it may be said that John apparently had a far different purpose in mind than the presentation of doctrine;¹¹⁹ for, some of his references to the OT may have functioned as a signal to a much larger OT text which he may have had in mind.¹²⁰ In furtherance of his multiplex

¹¹⁵ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 86-87; Moyise 74-83.

¹¹⁶ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 86-99, presents a brief compilation of scholarly opinion on the categories which he describes as thematic, analogical, universalizing, inverted, and stylistic. He also states that John expands on OT themes such as salvation and judgment in the eschaton, and holy war. Citing Vos regarding the analogical category, Beale notes that "the key idea in the OT context is usually carried over as the main characteristic or principle to be applied in the NT situation." Additionally, he offers a sampling of these analogies pertaining to "judgment ... tribulation and persecution of God's people ... seductive, idolatrous teaching ... divine protection ... the victorious battle of God's people over the enemy ... apostasy ... [and] the divine Spirit as the power for God's people." An example of this analogical use is the "harlot [apostasy] of Ezek 16:15, etc/Revelation 17)." Beale references Vanhoye whom he indicates is the only scholar regarding universalization as "a formal category of OT usage"; he describes universalization as John's global application of what the OT relates only to Israel or others. An example of this is the "plague imagery from the land of Egypt to the whole 'earth' in Rev. 8:6-12 and 16:1-14." According to Beale, Vanhoye argues for the congruity between OT "sense" and universalization, for the latter is the principle according to which "the church comes to be viewed as the true Israel." Beale writes that inverted category of allusions is, superficially, "distinctly contradictory to their OT contextual meanings"; moreover, they are reflective of John's "consistent ironic understanding of some of the major themes" of Scripture. Beale further notes that John's "inverted or ironic" use of these OT themes arise out of a "contextual awareness of the OT." As example of this, Beale cites "Dan. 7:14 in Rev. 5:9" and explains "[w]hereas in Daniel the phrase refers to the nations subjugated to Israel's rule, now these very nations rule together with the Messiah." Beale relates the stylistic to John's use of language. Beale ponders, as other scholars have, whether John's grammatical solecisms are "intentional ... or an unconscious by-product of his Semitic mind." He argues that John's failure to keep the rules are indicative of the "solecisms being intentional." Beale explains that John may have done this in order to "create a 'biblical' effect in the hearer and thus to demonstrate the solidarity of his work with that of the divinely inspired OT Scriptures." Whether John needed to utilize grammatical solecism with the view of solidarity in mind is a dubious proposition; for, as Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 11, notes, "the most explicit way to express the accordance with the Scriptures is to quote from the Scriptures." Beale's second reason is more convincing; he indicates that John may have had the "polemical purpose ... [of] expressing the idea that OT truth via the church as the new Israel was uncompromisingly penetrating the Gentile world and would continue to do so until the parousia."

Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 70ff, labels one category the "thematic." Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 210ff.

¹¹⁷ MacKenzie, *The Author of the Apocalypse*, 27.

¹¹⁸ MacKenzie, *The Author of the Apocalypse*, 27.

¹¹⁹ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 157-159.

¹²⁰ Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," 160; Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New*, 20. MacKenzie, *The Author of the Apocalypse*, 28, disagrees that some of the Johannine

goals, John inserts, amongst other things, words, phrases, clauses, images, symbols, and themes from the OT, and the genre of his text may provide clues to his purpose.¹²¹ Given the prophetic intention of Revelation, it is likely that John referenced the OT to the extent to which he did, neither to proof-text, nor to establish doctrine, nor for some other similar reason but to "identify himself with the writers of the Old Testament Scriptures, and to impress on his readers the character of his vision as the last of the prophetic books."¹²² Moreover, John was charged with producing a work; this he did with the tools at hand, in the language of his time,¹²³ and including OT idioms that would resonate with his message's recipients.

Methodology

allusions are purposed to "evoke direct recollection of specific Old Testament contexts." He limits John's use to an aesthetic re-creation of "the spirit and tone of certain Old Testament passages [and a] stylistic and literary purpose, providing him with an appropriate idiom for his prophecies." Instead, he conceives of John as using the OT as an idiomatic source book for his prophetic message.

¹²¹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 4, 6; Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 38; Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 2; Paul J. Achtemeier, Joel B. Green, and Marianne M. Thompson, eds., *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 556. Revelation is thought to belong to three genres: to the apocalyptic (Rev. 1:1), to prophecy (Rev. 1:3), and, to the epistolary (Rev. 1:4-6). Scholarly opinion on Revelation's form is diverse. Brighton characterizes Revelation as apocalyptic with prophetic "intention"; Beale regards Revelation's form as epistolary; Bauckham describes the text as "an apocalyptic prophecy in the form of a circular letter"; and, Ramsay Michaels, *Interpreting Revelation*, 30, 31-32, cited in Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, comments that "[i]f a letter, [Revelation] is like no other early Christian letter we possess. If an apocalypse, it is like no other apocalypse. If a prophecy, it is unique among prophecies"; for, according to Achtemeier et al, Revelation has "characteristics" of the three genres.

Brighton *Revelation* 5, 6. As a response to the *kirchegeschichte*, which is an original term coined to mean the 'political, social, and economic history contemporary to a church', Revelation's form is determined by its writer's purpose, which is to communicate, from his place of exile on Patmos, a precautionary and praemonitory message; to issue a call to repentance, faith, and worship; and, to reveal YHWH who desires salvation for all. Thus, Revelation is considered to be in its own new genre, the apocalyptic-prophetic epistle. This means that Revelation's content is apocalyptic, the illocutionary force of which serves to drive its audience to hear the prophetic message; its intention prophetic, a "call [to the auditors in the seven churches] to repentance and faith, and to worship—to the blessedness of faithful service in the confidence of YHWH's love and care"; and, its form is epistolary, to assert "the apostolic presence, teaching, and authority" of the writer.

¹²² C. G. Ozanne, "The Language of the Apocalypse," *THB* 16 (1965): 3-9. Ozanne indicates that the Hebraic grammar of Revelation is best understood in this context. He cites Hort that John's style of writing "helps us to understand that we are listening to the last of the Hebrew prophets."

¹²³ Porter, "The Language of the Apocalypse in Recent Discussion," 603.

Criteria critical to the determination of the textual form of an OT reference in Revelation have already been established. They attempt to take into consideration that there are difficulties arising out of the requisite comparison of texts in languages which are linguistically different and between which exist translation ambiguities¹²⁴. In spite of inter-linguistic issues, the textual form identification of an OT reference is essential to creating an interpretive matrix within which the text in and along with its contexts may be better understood. The best methodology, therefore, must be that which dispenses with pre-existing assumptions concerning the textual source of a reference and concentrates instead on applying the criteria to the reference. Regrettably, only two studies appear to contain a methodology that would permit such;¹²⁵ one is Maarten J. J. Menken's *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, and the other is Bruce G. Schuchard's Ph.D. dissertation, *Scripture Within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, which is dependent on Menken's methodology.

Menken's methodology,¹²⁶ to which are added the aforementioned three criteria, ought to produce results that are similar to Menken's, when applied to Rev 21:3c. The methodology followed herein involves:

- (1) a comparison of 21:3c with possible OT text sources to educe lexical and syntactic correspondences between the reference and the OT versions, and a comparison with other NT texts with similar linguistic elements;

¹²⁴ Moyise, "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," 110.

¹²⁵ Moyise, "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," 110, recognized the importance of this critical issue and indicated that he is "unaware of any significant methodological discussion concerning the evaluation of sources that are in the author's own language and sources in a different language"; this in spite of Menken's *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* having been published three years before Moyise's "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse."

¹²⁶ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 48-49, compares an NT text with the relevant OT passages in order to determine the most likely source of the reference; discusses the reference's meaning in its context; and, addresses whether the reference's interpretation is applicable to its "supposed source." By this means, Menken establishes the textual form and version of an OT text in the NT.

- (2) an elicitation of semantic and thematic parallels between 21:3c and possible OT sources, between 21:3c and other NT texts possessing similar linguistic elements, and an explanation of any possible alterations in the text form of the reference; and,
- (3) an assessment of whether the interpretation of 21:3c is consonant with that of its OT source.

Thesis

καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν (Rev 21:3c) may be a reference to a covenantal promise consistently expressed from Exodus to Zechariah in the MT as $\text{מְדִינָה יְהִי־בָשִׁיל}$ and rendered diversely in the Greek versions of OT in Ex. 25:8, 29:45; 1Ki 6:13; Ezek 43:9; Zech 2:14, 15, 8:3. This study proposes to determine if the textual form of Rev 21:3c may be thought to parallel a particular clause or similar clauses in one of these OT texts by exploring the key vocabulary (σκηνώω, ἰσθ , ὄραω, κατασκηνώω, ἐπικαλέω), syntax, meaning, and themes in the context of each clause. As such, while it is probable that the text source of 21:3c may be either the MT or the LXX,¹²⁷ it is equally probable that *both* the MT and the LXX may be the textual source. The identity of the version of OT that is the textual source of Rev 21:3c may be determined by the preponderance of linguistic elements held in common between Rev 21:3c and the OT version examined.

Scope

This paper intends an assessment of the textual form of Rev 21:3c as an OT reference; as such it may have something to contribute to the discussion commenced by Menken and continued by Schuchard on deciphering the form of the OT in the NT. Even though other aspects

¹²⁷ Or some variant of either.

of Revelation study may be vital, the limitations of this research preclude more than the most cursory excursion, if any at all, into the ongoing dialogue on the use of the OT in the NT, language, style, authorship, unity, symbolism, the historical context of Revelation, or whether the author of the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse are one and the same¹²⁸. Moreover, regrettably, textual references do not include the literature of either the Qumran community or the Pseudepigrapha but are limited to the MT, LXX, and other non-LXX texts of the Greek OT.

¹²⁸ The assumption of this paper, based on the writings of the Early Church Fathers, is that they are.

CHAPTER 2

Summing the Parts in John

The textual form of Rev 21:3c, Jo 1:14b, and Rev 7:15d exhibits similarities which are derived from the use and meaning of the lexeme σκηνώ; its subject, YHWH; and the clausal syntax.

In the NT, σκηνώ occurs five times in no other texts but the Johannine, in Jo 1:14b; Rev 7:15d; 13:6; 12:12; and, 21:3c. However, only in three of these five texts—Jo 1:14b; Rev 21:3c; and 7:15d—is YHWH the subject of the verb.¹ Though σκηνώ generally denotes “to pitch one’s tent”² and “to live, settle, take up residence,”³ in Jo 1:14b, Rev 21:3c, and 7:15d the verb’s theological connotations have more weight than its denotations.⁴

In these three texts, Jo 1:14b, Rev 21:3c, and 7:15d, σκηνώ is non-literal and indicative of both the temporary (Jo 1:14) and permanent, eternal life of the redeemed in YHWH’s sensate presence⁵ (Rev 21:3; 7:15). Moreover, where Jo 1:14b pertains to YHWH’s Divine Presence on earth in the mask of the Incarnate Son, Rev 21:3c and 7:15d “speak of his dwelling place in

¹ In Rev 12:12 and 13:6 the saints and angels before the presence of YHWH are the subjects of the verb. On this head, see Brighton, *Revelation*, 179.

² J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, “σκηνώ,” n.p., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002. Print ed.: J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of The Septuagint on Accordance*, 2 vols. Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 1992-1996.

³ Frederick W. Danker, ed., “σκηνώ,” n.p., *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1. Print ed.: Frederick W. Danker, ed. *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

⁴ Gerhard Kittel, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (10 vols.; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-), 385.

⁵ Pierre Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*, (trans. Wendy Pradels; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 595.

heaven.”⁶ Thus, the language of the tent points to a “stable durable residence”⁷ having theological connections to the Feast of Tabernacles, whose temporary tents served an eschatological purpose in that they “foreshadow[ed] the future in which YHWH will set up camp permanently with his own.”⁸ Nevertheless, John’s use of the σκην- root verb does not signify that in the eschaton YHWH will dwell in either tent, tabernacle, or temple;⁹ indeed, Rev 21:22 clearly asserts otherwise. It is more likely that, in John, the meaning of the σκην- root embraces and transcends the rabbinical notion of “the miraculous protection which God bestowed on his people”¹⁰ to depict more accurately the eschatological reality of YHWH’s sensate presence as His final, existential gift to man.

As stated earlier, the common subject of these clauses is YHWH, who is diversely referred to as ὁ λόγος (Jo 1:14b), ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου (Rev 7:15d), and ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev 21:3c), which latter is synonymous to the other two clauses because σκηνή is a non-literal describing YHWH’s “abiding and gracious presence.”¹¹ Each clause is joined to its predecessor by the copulative conjunction καί, and is syntactically similar in that each consists of conjunction + monolectic¹² verb + preposition + pronoun.¹³

⁶ Brighton, *Revelation*, 179.

⁷ Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*, 595.

⁸ Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*, 595.

⁹ Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*, 595.

¹⁰ Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*, 595.

¹¹ Horst Balz, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982-83), 386.

¹² Porter *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 293; this means that the form conveys information about the action and subject of the verb “even though it does not explicitly specify or express that subject.”

¹³ Alternatively, this may be rendered conjunction + monolectic verb + prepositional phrase.

The verb of 21:3c is σκηνώσει, future indicative active third singular; Nestlé-Aland notes an aorist active indicative third singular variant, ἐσκήνωσεν.¹⁴ The clause's preposition is μετά and the object of the preposition¹⁵ is the masculine genitive plural αὐτῶν having τῶν ἀνθρώπων as referent. Similar to Rev 21:3c, the verb form of Rev 7:15d is also σκηνώσει, future indicative active third singular; its preposition is ἐπὶ, and the object of the preposition is masculine accusative plural αὐτούς because its referent is οἱ περιβεβλημένοι τὰς στολὰς τὰς λευκὰς (7:13). In both 21:3c and 7:15d, John's use of the future may not be merely predictive¹⁶ but may be actually a categorical imperative or a volitive future.¹⁷ As such, the verb may express YHWH's will and purpose on the matter; thus, certainty is attached to its inherent promise in both 21:3c and 7:15d.

¹⁴ This variant is supported by the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus (4th C), 12th C minuscules 1611 and 2050, a few other mss which differ from the Majority text, Vulgate mss with independent readings, and the Syriac Harklensis. Apart from this, there are no major critical issues in relation to Rev 21:3c.

H. C. Hoskier, ed., *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1928), 233, reads ἐσκήνωσε in Oecumenius.

¹⁵ Stanley Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), 1992, 291.

¹⁶ Daniel B. Wallace, n.p., *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002. Print. ed.: Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996. For example, Jonah 3:4 נִשְׁמַע וְיִתְנֶה נִחְמָה יִם אֲרָבָעִים יוֹם עַד is predictive future; however, the destruction of Nineveh is certain only if Nineveh does not repent, which repentance is the purpose of the warning. Nineveh does repent, and is not destroyed. It is worth noting that הִפְךָ signifies not only "overthrow" but also "change of heart". Thus, the prediction includes a *double entendre*, either half of which may come to pass if the people of Nineveh act with or without fear of YHWH. If Nineveh repents it is because YHWH has changed their hearts; if Nineveh refuses to repent, then YHWH has hardened their hearts and will overthrow them.

¹⁷ Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, 94, §280.

A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 874. Robertson indicates that the difference between the predictive future and the "volitive future" is that where a prediction implies "resistless power or cold indifference, compulsion or concession" (citing Gildersleeve, Synt. 116) the volitive future is purposeful. Robertson notes that this purposefulness is rare in the third person; however, in the context of Rev 21:3c, what must be borne in mind is that the clause is part of a discourse emanating from the throne of YHWH and that the divine will is clearly expressed in the utterance of 21:3c. Robertson cites several third person examples, Mt 10:13; 20:26; Mk 9:35; Lk 10:6, in each of which Christ Jesus is the speaker.

Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 44. Porter notes that "[t]his use is common in quotations from the OT." The issue of whether John is quoting from the OT and from which version of the OT has yet to be decided. One might argue for the use of the future here as being "timeless" as in Mt. 6:33; however, the timeless future appears to be more durative, while in this specific case, the verb's aspect is punctiliar, being ordained to occur at one specific point in the future—the eschaton.

Unlike both of these clauses, the verb form of Jo 1:14 is ἐσκηνώσε, aorist indicative active third singular, the preposition ἐν, the object of the preposition is masculine dative plural ἡμῖν with τῶν ἀνθρώπων as antecedent (1:3).¹⁸ Where the aorist of Jo 1:14b is thought to underscore the singularity of the Incarnation, in Rev 14:7d, “[t]he future tense of the verb emphasizes the ‘not yet’ aspect of [God’s] promise”¹⁹ to dwell with man sensately, consistent with the meaning of Jo 1:14.²⁰ Rev 21:3c is here thought to be included in this assessment, and, indeed, to realize it.

With specific regard to the structure of Rev 21:3c, καὶ σκηνώσει μετ’ αὐτῶν is an independent clause, in a compound sentence, and is but one clause in a string of seven coordinate clauses (Rev 21:3-4) polysyndetically connected²¹ and spanning two verses. In these two verses, καὶ is logically continuative,²² for all that occurs in the other six clauses is a consequence

¹⁸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων may be the antecedent rather than ὄσοι (Jo 1:12) because if it were the latter that would be to state that the Word dwelt only amongst those who received Him. Whilst this is true of the in-dwelling of Christ, it is not so of the sensate presence of the Incarnate Christ.

¹⁹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 201.

²⁰ Brighton, *Revelation*, 202.

²¹ Καί appearing 1107x in Revelation, is present here six times. The abundance of the usage of this conjunction may well be a consequence of John’s “Hebraic” prose style as evidenced in the use of καί as part of his “transition formulae”; it is very definitely an instance of polysyndeton. For a full discussion, see Nigel Turner, “The Style of the Book of Revelation,” in *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James H. Moulton (vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James H. Moulton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976), 147, 150.

The pericope commences with καὶ, which John uses anaphorically, perhaps for emphasis rather than rhetorical effect, and sometimes adversatively in vv. 1-6. It is noteworthy that when the sentence begins with καὶ each of the accompanying verbs is sensory: in 21:1, καὶ εἶδον; in 21:2, καὶ ... εἶδον; in 21:3c, καὶ ἤηουσα; in 21:4, καὶ ἐξαλείψει; in 21:5, καὶ εἶπεν; and, in 21:6, καὶ εἶπεν; John may be attempting to convince his auditors that that which he is conveying in these eight verses is not the shadow of things but its substance. The eschaton will be as he describes with YHWH sensate.

Furthermore, καὶ in 21:1 functions similarly to the Hebrew ׀ for it expresses the continuation of the action from the previous narrative and even signals a dramatic turning point in the present one; thus, it is translated “and then.” Indeed, after καὶ there are no more scenes of destruction; the eschaton is realized. Moreover, by means of καὶ, John piles promise fulfillment statement upon promise fulfillment statement, each of which contributes to the reason why the churches must remain faithful until the end. The summary of the pericope, vv. 7-8, restates its theme anew, the new creation is now and YHWH is approachable, and asserts that the promises of vv. 1-6 belong to the justified and not to those condemned for unbelief.

²² Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, n.p.

of 21:3a. The object of the verb in 21:3c is the prepositional phrase μετ' αὐτῶν²³ which is either local or participative, indicating “community of action”. Alternatively, and more apropos to John’s meaning, in this prepositional phrase, μετό may denote God *with, among, in company with [man]*, which conveys both “placement”²⁴ and “association.”²⁵ In that sense, μετό is more akin to σύν in that it is expressive of the eschatological “intimate personal union”²⁶ of God, the sensateness of which is indicated by σκηνώω. Thus, the phrase would have the force of an adverbial genitive²⁷ related to the verb σκηνώσει; for, it raises the existential question of how God will dwell with man, with the subtext of how God will be experienced by man.

Freshly out of Egypt and semi-pagan, Israel had to be purified and prepared for the heavenly and invisible things of YHWH via the tabernacle with its untouchable radiant glory and a system of worship through sacrifice. Mirroring this, and for the purpose of the preparation of the people of God, the literal tent, which is the tabernacle and temple, yields to the divine and sensate, masked presence of God in the unmasked flesh of the Son²⁸ (Jo 1:14), and, in the end,

²³ What is curious is that John does use not ἐν μέσῳ which is the literal Greek for ἵνα; why? Also, is there an appreciable difference between ἐν μέσῳ and μετό? Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, n.p., explains concerning ἐν μέσῳ, “[o]f close personal relationship ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν among you = in communion with you Lk 22:27; 1 Th 2:7”; and, of μετό with the genitive: “with, 1. marker of placement, with, among, in company with someone...in the midst of....”

John means more than ‘in communion’, for that phrase does not indicate the corporeality implied by ‘together with’. It may be that John uses the word that best conveys that YHWH is immanent, visible, and can be touched. Thus, μετό may be thought to transcend ἐν μέσῳ in that respect. YHWH is not an abstract philosophical construct, neither is His dwelling with man to be so construed, and the language conveying these ideas is precise. Therefore, although John does not use the phraseology of the LXX, between ἐν μέσῳ, he adequately conveys the same idea as does the OT texts.

²⁴ Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, n.p.

²⁵ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, n.p.

²⁶ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, n.p.

²⁷ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, n.p.. Wallace actually writes, “this use of the genitive has the force of a prepositional phrase (which, of course, is similar in force to an adverb). Thus the genitive will normally be related to a verb or adjective rather than a noun.”

²⁸ It may be argued that because of the Incarnation, YHWH dwells with man sensately in Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

permanent and unmasked as the redeemed abide in eternal and sensate relationship with YHWH (Rev 21:3; 7:15). So, 21:3c is translated, “and He will dwell together with them”.

It appears, then, that the lexical and syntactical constancy of the textual form of Rev 21:3c; 7:15; and Jo 1:14b extends to the semantic and is unaffected by minor variations in verbal morphology and other linguistic components of the clauses. Therefore, all three texts may be seen as reflective of the same theological idea of the relationship between man and God in the now and the not yet. Whether this is actually so may be borne out by an examination of the contextual situation of, and the Early Church’s literature on, the σκην- root verb to discover its deeper meaning and themes.

CHAPTER 3

The σκην- Context in John

In the Johannine literature, the contexts of σκηνώ differ in that, as has been previously stated, where Jo 1:14b pertains to YHWH's Divine Presence on earth in the mask of the Son, Rev 21:3c and 7:15d "speak of his dwelling place in heaven".¹

Jo 1:14b occurs in the introduction to the Gospel of John which addresses the identity and divinity of Christ, and the nature and purpose of His ministry. Significant to John's statement of 1:14b is 1:14c-18; there, John reveals the mystery of the Incarnation—that while man has beheld the glory of YHWH,² only the Son, Christ, has seen Him. Thus, YHWH, the Father, the Hidden One revealed in the Incarnation, is still hidden, not by veils shielding man lest he gaze upon the One who decreed a tabernacle of pure gold, but by a veil of flesh that is the tabernacle of the Incarnation. This same tabernacle imagery, because it is repeated in the Incarnation, may well signify that the wilderness tabernacle was more than worship structure, that it may also have been an eschatological promise that eternal life in sensate relationship with YHWH awaits the faithful. If it does, then the context of 1:14b may well exceed the Gospel and embrace Exodus 25-40 in which YHWH reveals His Shekinah,³ His "manifest and hidden Presence."⁴ This theophany recurs in the Incarnation, and, as with the Exodus text, it has to do not with place but

¹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 179.

² Man continues to behold the glory of YHWH in Baptism, in Absolution, and in the Lord's Supper. This is the corollary to the doctrine of the Real Presence.

³ H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, eds. *Midrash Rabbah* (trans. S. M. Lehrman; vol. 3; London: Soncino, 1961), 424, The rabbis understood Ex 25:8b as referring to the Shekinah. Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, (trans. Israel Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975), 41, quotes Moore who notes that the concept of the Shekinah is a "verbal smoke to conceal the difficulty presented by the anthropomorphic language" pertaining to YHWH. The irony is that language becomes reality when, in the Incarnation, YHWH becomes man.

⁴ Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 40.

with people and is expressive of YHWH's nearness and the intimacy of His interaction with man.⁵ Moreover, just as the tabernacle signified God's election⁶—for He chose to take to Himself a people and to give them a visible sign of His immanence—so does the Incarnation. Thus, it should come as no surprise that John's diction and imagery echo the OT, even though no quotation formula is apparent. For, it is possible that John intended to direct his reader's mind to that OT text, as integral to apprehending the Divine Presence in the Incarnation, as a way of understanding the extent of Divine condescension at the third and final stage of the descent from the mountain (Ex. 19), as well as again affording man a concrete depiction of the eschaton so that he is prepared for what awaits. Therefore, Jo 1:14b may be seen as the fulfillment in the 'now' of the seven-times expressed promise "I will dwell in the midst of them,"⁷ which is first heard in Ex 25:8b.

In Rev 7:14d, John repeats the tabernacle imagery and accompanies it with a vivid depiction of what awaits the faithful in the 'not yet'. Brighton describes Rev 7:1-17 as an "interlude," that is, "a vision of comfort"⁸ consisting of two scenes, the sealing of the 144,000 and the saints before the divine throne.⁹ He writes:

What John sees in this interlude *comforts* him. After the horrifying scenes introduced by the first six seals,... he is now lifted up by what he sees next. These two scenes, of the church militant and the church triumphant, would at any time

⁵ Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 43, indicates that only after the destruction of the temple is the Shekhinah designated a theophany of place. However, one may argue that based on the Ex 25:8 text, YHWH always intended for it to be a theophany of *people*. Ex 25:8b, when translated, is "and I will dwell in the midst of *them*," not *it*. Where the people were in His righteousness, that is where YHWH dwelt; thus, the tabernacle was not the dwelling place of YHWH but a visible sign of His Presence in the midst of His people. Also, and quite interestingly, Urbach writes that "[a]t times God speaks of the Shekhinah as though it were separate from Himself"; the significance of this may be seen in the writings of Tertullian.

⁶ Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 52-53.

⁷ See Ex 25:8b; 29:45d; 1Ki 6:13; Ezek 43:9; Zech 2:14-15; and 8:3.

⁸ Brighton, *Revelation*, 180.

⁹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 180.

and place appear beautiful, instilling peace and hope in the Christian heart. But here in this setting, in sharp contrast to the horrors of suffering and despair and darkness and death depicted by the first six seals, these scenes appear even more beautiful to John.¹⁰

Part of this “comfort” may be the fulfillment and reiteration of the promise of eternal life with YHWH, which magnificently echoes Christ’s words in Jo 14:2-3. Additionally, Rev 7:15d has to be seen against the backdrops of Jo 1:14b and Jo 19¹¹; for, its narrative situation is only possible because of the Incarnation and the Cross.

As with Jo 1:14b, Rev 7:15d also seems to embrace several OT texts. John’s depiction of the sealing of the 144,000 is reminiscent of Num 1:20-44 in which YHWH orders the numbering of Israel for a military purpose;¹² in both cases, the purpose is clearly protective. Also, this narrative of the victorious bearing palms is evocative of Lev 23:39-43 and Neh 8:13-18, both of which relate the Feast of Tabernacles as reminding Israel of the temporary dwellings in which they were sheltered before YHWH brought them to the promised land.¹³ Rev 7:15d itself is evocative of Ps 91; in the eschaton, man will have no fear or want of anything for he will be under the shadow of the Almighty, which is the tent which YHWH will spread over him. So, in fulfillment of His promise and as reward for their endurance, faithfulness, and obedience, YHWH and the Lamb will dwell with them “in a manner that can be experienced also with the human senses.”¹⁴

¹⁰ Brighton, *Revelation*, 180.

¹¹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 15-22.

¹² Brighton, *Revelation*, 191.

¹³ It also evokes Jo 12:12-13 in which Christ is greeted with palms upon His entry into Jerusalem.

¹⁴ Brighton, *Revelation*, 201.

The promise heretofore twice expressed in the Johannine literature, that God will dwell with man (Rev 21:3c; 14:7; Jo 1:14), is once more announced in Rev 21:3c. The divine pronouncement occurs after a series of cataclysmic events culminating in the second resurrection and the destruction of the devil, sin, sinners, and “hell and death” (Rev 20:8-15), and is followed by Rev 21 with its vision of a new heaven and earth and the eternal death of those who have rejected YHWH. Revelation 21:1-8, the immediate context of 21:3c, is the climax of Revelation, and it contains the thrust of John’s message to the churches; for, it is the fulfillment of the seven promises which Christ made to the seven churches (Rev 2:7; 2:11; 2:17; 2:26; 3:5; 3:12, and 3:21) based on their situation and condition. The sum of the promises is eternal life with God as His sons.

In Rev 21:1-2, John restates the same idea of a new creation in three different ways;¹⁵ this repetition reinforces the idea of the magnitude of the change. The new creation is successively “new heaven and earth” (21:1), “absence of the sea” (21:1), and the “new Jerusalem” (21:2), and John seems to imply a contrast between the old and new heaven and earth.¹⁶

The human and sinful aspect of the old heaven and earth may be indicated by the sea,¹⁷ which, Brighton states, “seems to represent the chaos caused by sin and the fearful gulf that

¹⁵ The phrase οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινὴν is hendiadys expressing the more complex idea of the new creation.

¹⁶ F. Blass, and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. Robert W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 34, §62. The adjective πρῶτος is superlative with the comparative meaning (first of the two) of πρότερος. Blass, DeBrunner, and Funk cite Diodorus Siculus (1.42.1) as having employed a similar construction, ἡ πρώτη, to describe the first half of a two-part work. Thus, πρῶτος for πρότερος may be taken to indicate the first of a series, which, if its beginning or end is referenced, is done so without regard for the quantity of items in that series. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 105, writes that in number, πρῶτος signifies the first of more than two.

¹⁷ Given that the absence of the sea is one of the three ways in which John articulates the new creation, this is quite possible.

separated God and humanity resulting from human sin and rebellion against God.”¹⁸

Hengstenberg argues that because “[t]he sea is the sea of the peoples, the wicked restless world,”¹⁹ when the wicked are destroyed the sea comes to an end²⁰ which, in turn, signifies the end of the “Cainite spirit of brotherly hatred”²¹ whose result is murder of one’s fellow man. Thus, for Hengstenberg and Brighton, the sea is more than Swete’s “ideas [in John’s mind] which are at variance with the character of the New Creation,”²² and Caird’s, “cosmic sea out of which that heaven and earth were made, the primaeval ocean or abyss which is an alias for the dragon Leviathan, a home for the monster, and a throne for the whore....”²³ According to Brighton and Hengstenberg, the sea which vanishes is not the perfection of the creation, but that of the post-Fall order when “the corruption [which] began with persons,... passed over to the other parts of creation.”²⁴ Thus, its absence denotes that man is no more separated from his Creator.²⁵

Therefore, in the new heaven and earth, John, through his diction, may be informing that creation is a two-part work—pre-Fall and eschatological, as ἡ πρώτη γῆ might suggest.

Whatever it may be, it is indubitable that the first creation was ruined by the Fall, which made

¹⁸ Brighton, *Revelation*, 593, discusses the sea as a non-literal, perhaps in order to avoid the perception that “in the new creation there will be no bodies of water, such as oceans and lakes” which may be construed from the text’s reading, καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι. It is quite likely that Brighton is correct; when one considers the narrative of Genesis 1 it may be argued that there are four main aspects to creation: the heavens and its creatures; the earth and its creatures; the sea and its creatures; and man. In the redemption of all creation, it is unlikely that YHWH would destroy fully one fourth of His creation because of the sin of another, man (see Ro 8:22).

¹⁹ E. W. Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John: Expounded for Those Who Search the Scriptures* (trans. Patrick Fairbairn; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1952), 318.

²⁰ Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John*, 318.

²¹ Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John*, 318.

²² Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 275.

²³ G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (London: A. C. Black, 1984), 262, contrary to both Brighton and Hengstenberg, ascribes a different significance to John’s statement of the sea’s passing away.

²⁴ Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John*, 317.

²⁵ Brighton, *Revelation*, 595.

necessary the Incarnation, which is a type of the fulfillment of the promise expressed in Ex 25:8; 29:45; 1Ki 6:13; Ezek 43:9; and Zech 2:14; 2:15; 8:3.

Down into the new creation comes the New Jerusalem, described as a “bride who has been adorned for the benefit of her husband” (21:2),²⁶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ and ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. She is separated from YHWH, who is her source as He is of the new creation and of the Church itself. This descent of the heavenly city signals that YHWH has not only prepared Himself a people, but also a place that where He is they may be also (Jo 14:2-3); for, none but the redeemed are inhabitants of the new creation which is devoid of the sin that inhered in the old. This is contrary to Irenaeus’s view that the New Jerusalem is “the tabernacle of God, in which God will dwell with men.”²⁷ Though God and man are face to face in the eschaton, a distinction must be made between God and man; this Irenaeus does not seem to do here when he argues for a one-to-one correspondence between New Jerusalem and the “tabernacle of God”. There is nothing in the Johannine literature to support this exegesis; indeed, for John, the tabernacle is the Incarnate Christ (1:14). Thus, when John mentions the tabernacle of God in Rev 21:3c, he evokes Christ and not Jerusalem.

In the Gospel, Jerusalem is corrupt and worldly. In Revelation, she is the Bride with whom and within whom YHWH will dwell with His people. Jerusalem is people²⁸ and the tabernacle speaks to Divine Presence. In that sense, the sum of the eschaton is the reunion of Jerusalem with the tabernacle of God. Jerusalem is also place in that while YHWH is builder and maker of the new creation and the new city (Heb 11:10), place is not just physical structure or

²⁶ H. E. Dana, and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 84; also, Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 144. Both indicate τῷ ἀνδρὶ must be considered a dative of advantage.

²⁷ Irenaeus, “Against Heresies,” in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol. 1; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 566.

²⁸ Brighton, *Revelation*, 596, notes, “[t]he city represents God’s faithful people, who are identified as the bride of Yahweh.” Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 132-143, regards the New Jerusalem as place, people, and the Presence of God.

geographical location, it is the locus of the Divine Presence which is unbound by place. If the Shekhinah designates a theophany of place, it is in an eschatological context, for place is where YHWH is, in the midst of His people. Place is “God’s rest” into which the faithful enter (Heb 4:1-11). Moreover, place is the end of YHWH’s preparation of man, which is to say that place is being in the Divine Presence since place speaks of His immanence. The OT parallel is that of Israel and the promised land (Exodus-Joshua), the preparation for and entry into which prefigures the eschaton.²⁹ Revelation and the Pentateuch complement each other on this point and are united around the concept of man being in the Divine Presence.

John’s distinguishing between the orthography of the lexemes Ἱερουσαλήμ (3:12; 21:2; 21:10) and Ἱεροσόλυμα (Jo 4:21; 10:22, and elsewhere) may also be indicative of the concept of New Jerusalem as place for which YHWH has prepared and in which He is in the midst of His people. This orthographic distinction delineates the chasm between the corrupt and earthly Jerusalem which kills her prophets (Mt 23:27) and the new, holy, and heavenly Jerusalem which comes from YHWH and in which those faithful prophets see Him face to face. In the OT, Jerusalem is the place where the ark of the covenant is set in the temple (1Ki 3:15); she is also His chosen city, where He has elected to put his name (1Ki 11:32, 36) and from whom the remnant goes forth (2Ki. 19:31). However, this is the city which John spells Ἱεροσόλυμα and which is associated with corruption—for she has killed her prophets (Mt 23:27)—and is the locus of a legalistic religion whose leaders used the Law as a tool to entrap (Jo 8:3-9) rather than as a school-master to bring man to Christ (Ga 3:24). In contrast, Ἱερουσαλήμ, “[t]his ‘new Jerusalem’ is not the old historic city of the present earth restored. Rather it comes ‘from God,’ for God is its ‘architect and builder’ (Heb 11:10), and it is the city where God dwells with his

²⁹ The corollary to this argument may be that YHWH is the promised land for His people; He Himself is the rest into which they will enter.

people (Heb 12:22), and it will remain forever (Heb 13:14).³⁰ Thus, through his orthography, John may be distinguishing between the earthly and the heavenly, the corrupt and the incorruptible, and the temporal and the eternal. In the world of Rev 21:1-8, time becomes a non-event, and holiness becomes normative. It is into this environment, God-created, new, and holy, that the voice from the throne comes.³¹

John sets the stage for the pronouncement of Rev 21:3c with his use of ἀκούω, which means “to receive news or information about something, *learn about* something.”³² In spite of how the genitive after a verb of sensation affects the meaning of the text,³³ the focus of this verse is less on John’s understanding what he heard, and more—emphatically so—on the information he receives: “ἡ σκηνη τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων....” Probative is the interjection ἰδοῦ, which delineates the significance of the information,³⁴ because it is preceded by the genitive absolute.³⁵ The climax of Revelation, all Scripture, and history is seen as occurring when the voice continues, “καὶ σκηνώσει μετ’ αὐτῶν.”

Though the Early Church’s commentary on Rev 21:3c is somewhat meager, its discourse on Jo 1:14b might further elucidate the meaning of σκηνώω. Therefore, from its writings on that

³⁰ Brighton, *Revelation*, 595.

³¹ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 277, would have it that the “voice is that of one of the Angels of the Presence...not of God Himself, Who speaks for the first time in v. 5.” This, though, is debatable and is the subject of further exploration, *vide infra*.

³² Danker, “ἀκούω,” *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, n.p.

³³ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 133. A verb of sensation such as ἀκούω followed by a genitive indicates not just hearing, but understanding.

³⁴ Brighton, *Revelation*, 600; Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of Revelation*, 25. Since, apart from Rev. 1:8, this is the only other instance in Revelation in which God speaks, when He does, His words must be attended.

³⁵ Danker, “ἰδοῦ,” *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, n.p. In the Greek, ἰδοῦ follows “after a genitive absolute, in order to introduce something new, which calls for special attention in the situation generally described by the genitive absolute.”

text, it may be possible to extrapolate to Revelation 21:3c³⁶ in order to determine what the verb means in the eschatological situation depicted in Rev 21:1-8.³⁷

³⁶ Origen, *Commentary on John: Books I, II, IV, V, VI, X* (trans. Ronald E. Heine; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 105. Origen stated that the writer of the Gospel and the writer of the Apocalypse were one and the same person, and this point of view was ubiquitous in the Early Church. Brighton, *Revelation*, 18-23, walks after the Early Church with respect to the identity of the author of the Gospel and the Revelation, citing the Gospel of John and Athanasius to reinforce thought on the matter. Moreover, based on the absence of significant events in the Gospel and their presence in Revelation—he indicates that one such is the ascension of Christ in Rev 5—Brighton envisions a scenario in which “first John experienced and wrote Revelation and then, after meditating on it, he undertook to write a gospel *as an introduction for Revelation*.” Therefore, in the absence of any convincing proof to the contrary, this writer regards the position of the Early Church as authoritative.

³⁷ Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John*, 323, says that Jo 1:14b is “the sure foundation” of Rev 21:3c.

CHAPTER 4

The Fathers on σκηνώω

Cyril, he who was Archbishop of Alexandria, argued that the Incarnation was for man's sake, and its purpose reconciliation with YHWH.¹ Cyril regarded σκηνώω as consisting of two things, "the Dweller and that wherein is the dwelling."² Inasmuch as Christ is the implied subject of ἔσκηνώσε, He is the Dweller; inasmuch as the Word was made flesh, then the dwelling is of corporeal substance.

As Dweller, Christ is YHWH in a tabernacle of flesh, having two natures forever united and laying down His life *pro nobis*. Moreover, He is the hidden but revealed God who causes Himself to be seen for the purpose of reconciling all creation to Himself.

As YHWH incarnate and having two natures, Christ is not "transformed into flesh"³ but assumes it. He is no longer just God but is now the God-man, truly God and truly man,⁴ being made flesh in the womb, and forever having in Himself the divine and the human natures of both God and man "united with each other"⁵—this the Church historical has confessed and taught.⁶

¹ Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John* (8 vols., Oxford: James Parker, 1974), 110.

² Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 110.

³ Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 110.

⁴ Tertullian, "On the Flesh of Christ," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 537, writes, "[f]orasmuch, therefore, as He is of the Spirit He is God the Spirit, and is born of God; just as He is also born of the flesh of man, being generated in the flesh as man."

⁵ Martin Chemnitz, *The Two Natures in Christ*, (trans. J. A. O. Preus; St. Louis: CPH, 1971), 41; Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert, eds. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (trans. Charles Arand, Eric Gritsch, Robert Kolb, William Russell, James Schaaf, Jane Strohl, Timothy J. Wengert; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), FoC VIII, 11:618.

Delineating this teaching, “Christ Himself clearly establishes that He consists of both a human and a divine nature and that He has existed and subsisted as a person before He was conceived and born of Mary according to the human nature, for He says in John 8:58: ‘Before Abraham was, I am’.”⁷

Christ as Dweller is the God who is simultaneously revealed and hidden, “Visible and ... Invisible.”⁸ Revealed, man sees the fullness of the Godhead bodily and experiences the glory sensately because, as with the tabernacle in the wilderness, YHWH comes in the Incarnation that He “can be seen by us,”⁹ in the Person and form of the Son. However, the same human form that reveals YHWH also hides Him, and the flesh may be thought of as the hand shielding Moses from gazing upon God, lest Moses die. For he, like all men until the eschaton, is permitted to see only the back-side of YHWH.¹⁰ Thus, the Incarnate One presents a paradox;¹¹ He is

⁶ Chemnitz *TNIC*, 41, writes: “For the entire church with one voice affirms that in the incarnate Christ the two natures, the divine and the human, have been united, and that the person of Christ consists of two natures, the divine and the human, which are united with each other.”

Kolb-Wengert, *The Book of Concord*, FoC VIII, 617:8, 10. The Church historical has also taught that these two natures remain forever unmixed with each retaining its essential characteristics such that the divine is divine, and the human, human. Though the two natures are unmixed with each other, there exists a communication of attributes between them such that whatever is said about the divine and the human natures, respectively, is said about the person of Christ. Termed the *communicatio idiomatum* in *The Book of Concord*, FoC VIII, 31, 37:621-623, this is the first of the three types of sharing of characteristics of the two natures in Christ. Finally, both natures operate simultaneously in every single action; and, the divine nature, by virtue of the Incarnation, shares certain characteristics of the human nature. According to *The Book of Concord*, FoC VIII, 55:626, this is essentially the *genus maiestaticum* and indicates that, paradoxically, though an attribute of the divine nature is omniscience, yet, because of the human nature, Christ experienced growth in knowledge, in addition to size and age. Nevertheless, YHWH Himself does not change and nothing was added to or taken away from the divinity by the human nature. The corollary is the humiliation of Christ, during which He chose not to use all of His power all the time. The corollary to these three is that though it cannot be said that YHWH died, it is possible to say that YHWH, in the Person of Christ, died in the flesh *pro nobis*.

⁷ Chemnitz, *TNIC*, 39.

⁸ Tertullian, “Against Praxeas,” in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 610.

⁹ Origen, *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus* (trans. Ronald E. Heine; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1981), 338.

¹⁰ David P. Scaer, *Christology* (Fort Wayne: IFLCR, 1989), 41.

¹¹ Tertullian, “Against Praxeas,” 610-611. The paradox of God Visible and Invisible is explained in a Trinitarian framework which elucidates the mystery of the God-head, and according to which “it is evident that He

simultaneously and actively *deus revelatus* and *deus absconditus*. His “active absence,”¹² as experienced by Moses, was also that experienced by all of Christ’s contemporaries, including His disciples. They, no different from Moses, beheld the back-side of the One God in that they were enabled to behold and touch the Son, but not the Father. Hence the notion that the Incarnation is the mask of YHWH. Thus, in the Incarnation, the Father and the Son are one. Whoever sees the Son also sees the Father who yet is in the Son where YHWH actively reveals and hides Himself; consequently, the salvific work itself is one. Therefore, the Visible and Invisible God of whom Tertullian speaks is but the One who reveals Himself in the Son purposely, and has ever done so, and also hides Himself¹³ that, through the Son, man can stand before Him in whose presence no man can live. Hence Christ’s words, “I and the Father are one” (Jo 10:30), and “He who sees Me sees also My Father. I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me” (Jo 14:9-10).

was always seen from the beginning, who became visible in the end; and that He, (on the contrary,) was not seen in the end who had never been visible from the beginning; and that accordingly there are two—the Visible and the Invisible. It was the Son, therefore, who was always seen, and the Son who conversed with men, and the Son who has always worked by the authority and will of the Father; because ‘the Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do’—‘do’ that is, in His mind and thought. For the Father acts by mind and thought; whilst the Son, who is in the Father’s mind and thought, gives effect and form to what He sees. Thus all things were made by the Son, and without Him was not anything made.”

Tertullian here speaks to what Martin Chemnitz, *Loci Theologici* (vol 1; trans. J. A. O. Preus, St. Louis, CPH, 1989), 43, 74-76, calls the *ad extra* works of YHWH whilst touching somewhat on the *ad intra*. Tertullian may regard the *ad intra* as indicating the different characteristics of the Persons of the Trinity. Thus, one may argue that there is some basis for thinking that other prime characteristics of the Son may be His Visibility and His laying down His life. Neither may be attributed to either the Father or the Holy Spirit (though the Holy Spirit does manifest Himself in the form of a dove (Mt 3:15; Mk 1:10; Lk 3:22; Jo 1:32)), though They may do one. Chemnitz writes that “[t]he works which YHWH does outside of all created things, within Himself, are not common to the three persons, but are peculiar to only one person, so that it is characteristic of the Father to beget, of the Son to be begotten, and of the Holy Spirit to proceed from both.” Similarly, it is characteristic of Him that the Son is both Visible and lays down His life for that which is created through Him.

Chemnitz, *Loci Theologici*, 74, citing Gregory of Nazianzus, *Theol. 5, Oratio* 31.14, MPG 36.149, concerning the *ad extra*, Gregory of Nazianzus says that “the external works (*opera ad extra*) are held in common” for “[t]hat which acts is the one essence common to the three Persons”; therefore, Chemnitz concludes that “just as the essence is one and undivided, so the One who acts and does is one, and the work itself is one and undivided.”

¹² Gerhard Forde, *Theology Is for Proclamation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 16.

¹³ Tertullian, “Against Praxeas,” 610-611.

In sum, YHWH Himself, in that He dwelt amongst men as man, through the Son, allowed to be seen the fullness of His glory.¹⁴ Yet, the seeing of the hidden God as He *is* is possible only by the redeemed who endure to the end (Rev 7:9-15). Therefore, man before the incarnate Christ, either while He walked among men or as He continues to walk further masked in Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord's Supper, has but a foretaste of the full revelation which is to come in the eschaton (1 Cor 13:12) realized in Rev 21:1-8.

The second thing of which σκηνώ consists is the “dwelling”, concerning which it may be properly said that it is the very flesh of Christ, His own body which He received in the womb of Mary—which same flesh masks YHWH. It is the means whereby the Divine Presence is sensate, and His glory is discernible in His deeds. Moreover, the enfleshed Christ is thought to be, also, a real expression of what YHWH is like.

Though the Incarnation did not alter Christ's divine nature in any way—it united the human nature to it for all eternity—it impacted, however, the form in which He dwelt. The Incarnation¹⁵ enfleshes YHWH¹⁶ in “His own Body.”¹⁷ He did not take possession of¹⁸ or descend upon¹⁹ an existing one,²⁰ or inhabit a spiritual body,²¹ or borrow a physical body,²² or

¹⁴ In the flesh, the same glory that no man could behold in the wilderness, the same glory that Ezekiel beheld departing the temple in Jerusalem, this same glory man beheld in the Incarnate Son.

¹⁵ John, in his first epistle, indicates that the confession of the Incarnation is requisite for distinguishing between the Spirit that comes from YHWH and the demonic spirits (1Jo 4:1,2).

¹⁶ Irenaeus, “Against Heresies,” 546-547, “For the Creator of the world is truly the Word of YHWH: and this is our Lord, who in the last times was made man, existing in this world, and who in an invisible manner contains all things created, and is inherent in the entire creation, since the Word of YHWH governs and arranges all things; and therefore He came to His own in a visible manner, and was made flesh, and hung upon the tree, that He might sum up all things in Himself.”

¹⁷ Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 110.

¹⁸ Chemnitz, *TNIC*, 49-65; Richard A. Norris, Jr., ed., *The Christological Controversy* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 88.

¹⁹ Irenaeus, “Against Heresies,” 440. This is the position of the Valentinians who “maintain that the dispensational Jesus was the same who passed through Mary, upon whom the Savior from the more exalted [region] descended.”

have one conferred upon Him only at a later stage in life. Instead, Christ dwelt in flesh “using His own Body”²³ received in the womb of Mary.²⁴ The result is that the dwelling was not “a phantasm or an apparition,”²⁵ but a body of flesh and blood which, “because of its conception by the Holy Spirit, was purified and sanctified.”²⁶ In contrast to the brief divine visitations in the form of flesh, such as found in Ge 18, the Incarnation presented YHWH²⁷ as truly man from babyhood to adulthood, from birth through to deeds, suffering, and death. In human form, Christ was man in all things²⁸ but without sin;²⁹ subject to the flesh but able not to sin.³⁰ That He was truly of human flesh is evident from “the blood which Christ shed for us.”³¹

²⁰ Rupert of Deutz, *Commentary on Saint John* (trans. and eds. George E. McCracken and Allen Cabaniss; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957), 265.

²¹ Tertullian, “On the Flesh of Christ,” in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 534, writes that Valentinus taught that Christ had “a spiritual” rather than human flesh. More importantly, Tertullian cites Scripture from Isa 53:9; Jo 8:40; Matt 12:8; Isa 43:3; Jer 17:9; Dan 7:13; 1 Tim 2:5; and Acts 2:22 as proof that Christ did not assume an angelic nature but “had human flesh derived from man, and not spiritual, and that His flesh was not composed of soul, nor of stellar substance, and that it was not an imaginary flesh....”

²² Norris, *The Christological Controversy*, 88.

²³ Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 110.

²⁴ Tertullian, “On the Flesh of Christ,” 538, views “made” as confirmation of Jo 1:14a and an assertion of “the reality of the flesh which was made of a virgin.” Furthermore, Tertullian argues that the Holy Spirit’s descent into Mary’s womb was not necessary for a spiritual flesh; for, if the flesh is spiritual, it can be provided extra-uterus. That the conception occurred within the womb of Mary, therefore, argues for a human flesh and against Christ having a spiritual one.

²⁵ Chemnitz, *TNIC*, 50.

²⁶ Chemnitz, *TNIC*, 52.

²⁷ Irenaeus, “Against Heresies,” 440, writes that Matthew says not the birth of Jesus but “the birth of Christ was on this wise” because the Holy Spirit foresaw the heresies that would erupt. Irenaeus says that “He is Emmanuel, lest perchance we might consider Him as a mere man: for ‘not by the will of the flesh, nor by the will of man, but by the will of YHWH, was the Word made flesh;’ and that we should not imagine that Jesus was one, and Christ another, but should know them to be one and the same.”

²⁸ Norris, *The Christological Controversy*, 89.

²⁹ Tertullian, “On the Flesh of Christ,” 535-536. Tertullian writes that “[w]e maintain, moreover, that what has been abolished in Christ is not *carnem peccati*, ‘sinful flesh,’ but *peccatum carnis*, ‘sin in the flesh,’—not the material thing, but its condition; not the substance, but its flaw; and (this we aver) on the authority of the apostle, who says, ‘He abolished sin in the flesh.’”

³⁰ Tertullian, “On the Flesh of Christ,” 535-536, affirms that “there was in Christ the same flesh as that whose nature in man is sinful. In the flesh, therefore, *we say* that sin has been abolished, because in Christ that same flesh is maintained without sin, which in man was not maintained without sin. Now, it would not contribute to the purpose of Christ’s abolishing sin in the flesh, if He did not abolish it in that flesh in which was the nature of sin, nor

Christ is the Word, literally made flesh to purify the flesh that “the whole man” might be saved.³² Because of this divine purpose, the Word had to be a “complete man of flesh and rational soul.”³³ Furthermore, it is the same purpose that necessitated that Christ be made under the law, subordinate to [His parents] circumcised and purified with sacrifice according to the law like any other sinner, enduring hunger and undergoing the artifices of the tempter, suffering also persecution at the hands of men, saddened unto death, fleeing from place to place, and at the very least made obedient even to death³⁴

because YHWH willed³⁵ it, and it came to be as He willed it³⁶ (Ga 4:4-5). Thus, when John writes in 1:14a that “the Word became flesh”, it may be understood that not only was the dwelling voluntary, but it was also purposeful. For, Christ assumed flesh in Mary’s womb for two reasons:

(would it conduce) to His glory. For surely it would have been no strange thing if He had removed the stain of sin in some better flesh, and one which should possess a different, even a sinless, nature! Then, you say, if He took our flesh, Christ’s was a sinful one. Do not, however, fetter with mystery a sense which is quite intelligible. For in putting on our flesh, He made it His own; in making it His own, He made it sinless.”

³¹ Chemnitz, *TNIC*, 52.

³² Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 110; Origen, “Origen Against Celsius,” in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol. 4 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 604. He asks “[a]nd who else is able to save and conduct the soul of man to the God of all things save God the Word, who, ‘being in the beginning with God,’ became flesh for the sake of those who had cleaved to the flesh, and had become as flesh, that He might be received by those who could not behold Him, inasmuch as He was the Word, and was with God, and was God?”

³³ Rupert of Deutz, *Commentary on Saint John*, 265.

³⁴ Rupert of Deutz, *Commentary on Saint John*, 267.

³⁵ Tertullian, “On the Flesh of Christ,” 537-538, amplifies Irenaeus’s remark (*vide infra*) when he says of Christ, “[a]s flesh, however, He is not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of man, because it was by the will of YHWH that the Word was made flesh.” He argues that the grammar was tampered with to make it seem that it referred generally to man rather than particularly to Christ.

³⁶ Irenaeus, “Against Heresies,” 441, cites Jo 1:13 in support; however, it is here thought that the grammar does not support this text being a reference to Christ but rather to those who are baptized into His death and risen in His resurrection.

(1) that He might redeem and free it from the wrath of YHWH, from condemnation, and from eternal death; and (2) that, corrupted and depraved by sin as it is, He might refashion and restore it first in Himself, and that then from Himself as the Head there might come to us who are His members cleansing, sanctification, and renewal.³⁷

Consequently, just as the assumption of the dwelling is voluntary, the blood of Christ shed from it *pro nobis* is not reluctant blood-shed. Indeed, the words of Mk 14:35-36, 39 are the groanings of the two natures knowing the agony and the forsaking by the Father which are yet to come. For, Christ's life was not *taken* from Him, but He loved His creation so much that He *laid down* His life *pro nobis* (Jo 10:15, 17; 1Jo 3:16).

For sinful man, Christ is both "the wound and the medicine,"³⁸ the Savior and salvation in the flesh,³⁹ the second Adam who paid the price for the sin of the first and who "arrang[ed] after a new manner the advent in the flesh, that He might win back to God that human nature (*hominem*) which had departed from God; and therefore men were taught to worship God after a new fashion."⁴⁰ In Him, man is at once shown death and life;⁴¹ for, He is death to unbelief and unbelievers, death to sin in the flesh, death to the law of sin and death and new life to those that believe and the new law of Spirit and life (Gal 2:19). He who "promised by the law and the prophets that He would make His salvation visible to all flesh; so that He would become the Son of man for this purpose, that man also might become the son of God"⁴² lived, said, did, suffered, and laid down His life *pro nobis* with the result that, through and because of Him, man is

³⁷ Chemnitz, *TNIC*, 60.

³⁸ Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 110.

³⁹ Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," 424.

⁴⁰ Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," 424.

⁴¹ Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 110.

⁴² Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," 424.

redeemed, justified, sanctified, and has sonship with God (cf. Gal 4:5-7). Concomitant with sonship, YHWH gave man of His glory⁴³ and of His righteousness; in this way, He facilitated the possibility of a sensate relationship with Him for Christ's work on man's behalf made the redeemed able to stand before the presence of YHWH and see His face without penalty of death.⁴⁴

Clement of Alexandria states that the Incarnation was that YHWH's Divine Presence might be seen amongst men,⁴⁵ and Tertullian asserts that the visibility of the Divine Presence is characteristic of the Son rather than the Father. Nevertheless, visibility "is the common work of the whole Trinity."⁴⁶ While Christ walked with men, His glory was manifested in signs and wonders⁴⁷ (Jo 2:11) of wholeness and reconciliation of God with man; what man saw was the proper work of God. That this glory is the glory of YHWH is unquestionable, for to see Christ is to see God (Jo 14:9-10) since Christ, as Dweller, is "God by Nature in flesh and with flesh,"⁴⁸ and "the whole fullness of the deity dwells bodily in [Him]."⁴⁹ This means not only that YHWH

⁴³ Chrysostom, "Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, (ed. Philip Schaff; vol. 14 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 38-40. Chrysostom declares that in the Incarnation, He who was the very Son of God "became Son of man ... in order that He might make the sons of men to be children of YHWH [in so doing, Christ] in nothing diminished His own Nature by this condescension, but raised us, who had always sat in disgrace and darkness, to glory unspeakable [and] 'was made Flesh,' not by changing His Essence to flesh, but by taking flesh to Himself, His Essence remained untouched.... For that Essence is superior to all change.... [Moreover, Christ's tabernacling amongst men pertained to the] dwelling [of His Nature's] and its inhabiting." The Incarnation also enabled man to experience sensately the glory of YHWH which "we could not have beheld, had it not been shown to us, by means of a body like to our own." Therefore, Christ's dwelling amongst men enabled man "with much fearlessness to approach Him, speak to, and converse with Him."

⁴⁴ Chrysostom, "Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews," 40, Homily 12.

⁴⁵ Clement of Alexandria, "The Stromata, or Miscellanies," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Second Century* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol. 2 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Second Century*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 448. Clement argues that in the Incarnation, the Word "generated himself."

⁴⁶ Chemnitz, *Loci Theologici*, 74.

⁴⁷ Frank J. Matera, *New Testament Christology* (Louisville: John Knox, 1999), 218. Scaer, *Christology*, 42, cites FoC Ep VIII 16 (equivalent to Kolb-Wengert FoC Ep VIII 16:511).

⁴⁸ Cyril, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*, 109.

⁴⁹ Chemnitz, *TNIC*, 41, adds that "the fullness of deity is whatever the deity is and possesses in itself."

is man and man is YHWH, but also that YHWH God, the Second Person of the Trinity, has assumed humanity into Himself such that He ate and drank with man, and He even let Himself be seen “as He ascended in glory to heaven.”⁵⁰ Therefore, since the deity is man and has a human nature, then the deity is the God-man who suffers no diminution of glory but shares His glory with His humanity. Consequently, the glory has a human face and form and is visible when Christ not only walked on water, but made τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (Lk 7:22). Herein are not only signs and wonders, but YHWH’s glory manifested through God-assumed means—flesh, and God-given absolution of sins, which is also reconciliation.

It may then be said that the dwelling, “the Incarnation is ... a real expression of what God is like”⁵¹ because it “is not foreign to God, as if He were doing something unnatural.”⁵² Indeed, Ge 18, for one, recounts Abraham’s experience of YHWH’s transitory enfleshment in which He washes His feet, rests, eats, drinks, and talks (18:4-21) with Abraham before going down to see Sodom. That YHWH partakes of that which men do speaks to the type of body in which He appears. It is not an ephemeral or angelic body, but a human one, for Abraham sees three men (18:2), and those men refresh themselves with food. Moreover, the dialogues of 18:14, 21-32 demonstrate that Abraham knows that he is in the presence of YHWH.

How to account for this human activity of His? What does it mean that YHWH not only comes down to man, but socializes with him, explains His imminent action to Him, and hears man’s concerns regarding that action? There surely must be a discrepancy between the Genesis

⁵⁰ Rupert of Deutz, *Commentary on Saint John*, 267.

⁵¹ Scaer, *Christology*, 27.

⁵² Scaer, *Christology*, 27.

text and that of Ex 33:20 in which YHWH tells Moses *לֹא תִרְאֶנּוּ אֶת-פְּנֵי יְהוָה כִּי לֹא יִרְאֶנּוּ אֶת-פְּנֵי יְהוָה וְהָיָה מֵת*? Actually, not; for the divine paradox containing both concepts is present in the Shekhinah (Ex 25:8) and, logically, in the Incarnation (Jo 1:14b)—YHWH Visible and Invisible; YHWH revealed and YHWH hidden; YHWH sensate, whom man beholds and touches, and YHWH unapproachable, whom man may not see or touch lest he die (19:12, 21); YHWH immanent, and YHWH transcendent.

According to John, the God whom man beheld and touched is the Second Person of the Trinity (1 Jo 1:1), who, writes Luther, when He dwelt with man in His own womb-received flesh, “[i]nto His thirty-fourth year ... ate and drank with us, He was angry and sad, He prayed and He wept.”⁵³ Furthermore, He was more than we are, for “He executed His Father’s mission, suffered persecution and death in the end at the hands of His own people.... [A]nd we saw His blood oozing forth and flowing to the ground.”⁵⁴ Moreover, John also indicates that not only will the children of God be like God, but they will see Him as He is in the eschaton.

John’s ἀγαπητοί, νῦν τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὕτω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα (1 Jo 3:2) is somewhat puzzling. What does John mean by ‘beloved, now we are children of God and it is not yet known what we shall be’? This may be a reference to the now and the not yet. In the now, “we are children of God”; in the not yet, the same. Alternatively, this text may mean that though man may be described as “children of God” now, it is questionable whether that state of affairs may continue unto death, since once saved is not always saved. Or, the text may be subtly raising the question of the form of YHWH and man in the not yet.

⁵³ Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works: Sermons on the Gospel of John, 1-4 on CD-ROM*. Libronix Digital Library System Version 1.0, 2002. Print ed.: Martin Luther. *Luther’s Works: Sermons on the Gospel of John* (vol. 22 of *Luther’s Works*; ed. Jaroslav Pelikan; St. Louis: CPH, 1957) n. p.

⁵⁴ Luther, *Sermons on the Gospel of John*, n.p.

John continues, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῆ, ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστὶν (1 Jo 3:2). This clause makes it likely that the first assessment may be the accurate one, since it may indicate the similarity of man and YHWH in the eschaton; therefore, these texts, in conjunction with הַלֵּב הַחַיִּים יִשְׁבְּבוּ אֶת־הַבְּרִיָּה עִרְוָה (Job 19:26), prompt questions dealing with the nature of man's *ontos* in the eschaton. יִשְׁבְּבוּ cannot be the same flesh as man had before, for that sinful flesh is destroyed by worms in the grave, and sin in the flesh is abolished by Christ.⁵⁵ What kind of flesh, then, will man have in the eschaton? Paul, addressing the resurrection of the dead, queries, ποῖόν δὲ σῶματι ἔρχονται;. His answer: σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν (1 Co 15:44), and καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου (15:49), and εἰ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν (15:53).

Thus, the eschatological form of man will be a heavenly one; though of flesh,⁵⁶ it will be spiritual, immortal, incorruptible, and in the image of YHWH; for, to reiterate, *we shall be like Him*. As YHWH is in the eschaton, so man will be, and man will know it ὅτι ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστὶν (1 Jo 3:2). YHWH makes Himself like us⁵⁷ that we may become like Him, for He

⁵⁵ Tertullian, "On the Flesh of Christ," 535-536.

⁵⁶ Tertullian, "On the Resurrection of the Flesh," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 551-552, 572-573, queries, "[s]hall that very flesh, which the Divine Creator formed with His own hands in the image of God; which He animated with His own *afflatus*, after the likeness of His own vital vigour; which He set over all the works of His hand, to dwell amongst, to enjoy, and to rule them; which He clothed with His sacraments and His instructions; whose purity He loves, whose mortifications He approves; whose suffering for Himself He deems precious;—(shall that flesh, I say), so often brought near to God, not rise again?" His answer, "God forbid, God forbid, (I repeat), that He should abandon to everlasting destruction the labour of His own hands...." Tertullian also asserts that Christ's resurrection of the dead is a testament to the resurrection of the flesh.

⁵⁷ It cannot ever be forgotten that Christ forever remains both human and divine. The two natures are inseparable and will continue on like this into all eternity. The message of Scripture is thus not only YHWH becomes man, but man becomes like YHWH. God brings about man's apotheosis through justification and sanctification (Rev 7:13-16).

is the servant who acts *pro nobis*.⁵⁸ Concerning this, Origen writes that “after tabernacling and dwelling *within* us, He did not continue in the form in which He first presented Himself, but caused us to ascend to the lofty mountain of His word, and showed us His own glorious form, and the splendour of His garments.”⁵⁹ The sum of the texts is that in the eschaton, YHWH is Visible, and there is no more YHWH Invisible because sin, which had incurred the penalty of death for gazing upon Him,⁶⁰ is no more, for the new Creation has replaced the old (Rev 21:1-8). Consequently, it may be said that the entire Trinity will share in that visibility which is primarily characteristic of the Second Person, God the Son,⁶¹ and which may become its existential mode. This glory will no longer be seen mediately through signs and wonders, through Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord’s Supper; instead, the glory will be visible immediately for the tabernacle of God dwells sensately with man without any further need of the old masks of tabernacle, temple, or flesh.

Based on this, extrapolating from Jo 1:14 to Rev 21:3c underscores that John’s utilization of σκηνόω in Rev 21:3c is equally multiplex. The language of Rev 21:3c would indicate that inasmuch as God is amongst us and together in company with us, then we are able to see Him as we would any man in our company. The Divine Presence, the text implies, will not be masked, nor will it be such that man can see Him only upon pain of death. Instead, the Divine Presence will be physically visible to man, will be physically in association with, and will be physically accessible to him. The previous may provide the basis for the anthropomorphizing of YHWH in verse 4, accomplished through the very physical action explicit in the verb of καὶ ἐξαλείψει

⁵⁸ Scaer, *Christology*, 42, citing FoC, Ep VIII 16. Scaer writes that YHWH does set this mien aside “to manifest His majesty.”

⁵⁹ Origen, “Origen Against Celsius,” 604.

⁶⁰ This does not mean that there is any alteration in the *opera ad intra* but in the *ad extra*.

⁶¹ Chemnitz, *Loci Theologici*, 74, like Tertullian, considers visibility “the common work of the whole Trinity.”

πάν δάκρυον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν, and emphasizing the face to face and personal relationship man will have with God in the eschaton.

If σκηνώ of Jo 1:14 reveals the Incarnation as the final stage in YHWH's descent from the mountain toward man (Ex 19) in such a form that man could look upon Him and live, and with the ultimate purpose that man become like his Creator, then Rev 21:3c may be the perfect realization of that goal. For, σκηνώ demonstrates the nature of the relationship between the Creator and the created being in the eschaton. Because of the totality of the divine victory and the changed situation and circumstance of man for whom YHWH has done all, σκηνώ may be indicative of man's theosis achieved in, by, and through Christ. God becomes man that man may become like God. Man is not God, nor in God, nor God in man; instead, man stands before God as His seed, the heir of His heavenly things (Gal. 4:1-4). Man literally stands before the throne of YHWH, in His sensate Presence, robed in white, in His service, fed by the Lamb, and comforted by Him (Rev 7:9-17). Therefore, ultimately, in Rev 21:3c, σκηνώ may transcend Jo 1:14 by signifying the end of all Scripture, Gospel proclamation, and worship as it is in the now. For, YHWH has done that which He promised in the wilderness in the form of the tabernacle, which is evoked in 21:3c and "*signifies* [His] actual presence ... with his people."⁶²

In a sense, Jo 1:14b and Rev 21:3c may be regarded as bookends. The first is the introduction to the narrative of the glory of YHWH as seen in the Incarnate Son, and the latter—occurring in the conclusion of the prophetic message whose "heart and center"⁶³ is the crucified and exalted Christ—introduces the God in whom transcendence and immanence may be irrevocably merged, who effects the end of the separation between Himself and His creation,

⁶² Brighton, *Revelation*, 597.

⁶³ Brighton, *Revelation*, 1.

and whose omnipotence is fully manifested because He makes all things new.⁶⁴ In between is the interlude of comfort in which the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant are shown to be inheritors of the promises of God in Christ (the context of Rev 14:7).

What is apparent from these three texts is that, in the Johannine corpus, the constancy of textual form is replicated on several levels, the lexical, syntactical, and contextual, and the semantic. That there is such textual form correspondence in these three texts from the Johannine literature suggests authorial intent rather than randomness. It may be that this intent is entirely intra-Johannine; however, given the ubiquity of the OT in Revelation, it is more likely that John is referring to some OT text(s) which may parallel Rev 21:3c. Discovering whether this is so requires an assessment of the OT lexemes יְבֹרָא in the MT and κατασκηνόω, ὀράω, and ἐπικαλέω in the LXX.

⁶⁴ Jan A. Du Rand, "The Transcendent God-View: Depicting Structure in the Theological Message of the Apocalypse of John," *Neotestamentica* 28:2 (1994): 557-573, writes, "His transcendence should, however, not be understood in terms of being totally apart from this world but in relation to the world. In other words, this designation is not meant ontologically, describing God's self-existence, but functionally, to demonstrate his commitment as transcendent God who is also designated as 'the Lord God Almighty' ... indicating his omnipotence and control over the course of historical events." In contrast, the above view that is divine transcendence and the below view of divine immanence appear to be merged because not only is there no more distance between man and God, but there is no more need of a mediatorial figure standing between. Worship is thus immediate rather than mediate. This transcendence is thus not just functional, as DuRand would have it, but, blended with the immanence, remains ontological, not in the old way, but in a new. Perhaps it is one of the things that YHWH makes new.

CHAPTER 5

Peering through the Lens at the MT

Though there are one hundred and thirty occurrences of יָשָׁב in the MT, the Qal Pf w/c 1cs¹ of יָשָׁב occurs in the MT only in Ex 25:8; 29:45; 1Ki 6:13; Ezek 43:9; Zech 2:14; 2:15; and Zech 8:3.² In each of these texts, the subject is YHWH and He Himself is the speaker, and the verb is translated “dwell” in the KJV³ and ASV⁴ and by lexicographers.⁵ יָשָׁב may also denote “to settle, to abide, to stay,”⁶ having the basic idea of remaining in a place or residing at some location in a “temporary rather than a permanent way.”⁷ “Dwell,” however, is the secondary definition of the verb; the primary denotation is “to settle down,” and the tertiary is “to abide.”⁸ This secondary and connotatively locative idea of the verb is thought to underlie the frequent usage of יָשָׁב in the MT—YHWH dwelling in the midst of his people.⁹

¹ Ernst Jenni and Claus Westerman, *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (3 vols.; trans. Mark Biddle; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), 1327. Inasmuch as the morphology of יָשָׁב , in the relevant MT texts, is Qal Pf w/c 1cs, then the discussion will be limited only to occurrences of the verb having that aspect and form.

² Solomon Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae Atque Chaldaicae* (Tel Aviv: Schocken, 1969), 1170.

³ *The Holy Bible*, King James Version on CD-ROM. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002.

⁴ *The Holy Bible*, American Standard Version on CD-ROM. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002.

⁵ For instance, see George V. Wigram, *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972), 1260-1261. See also Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, n.p., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of The Old Testament* on CD-ROM. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002. Print ed.: Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of The Old Testament* (trans. and eds., M.E.J. Richardson, G.J. Jongeling-Vos, L. J. De Regt; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

⁶ Gregory A. Lint, ed., *The Old Testament Hebrew-English Dictionary* (7 vols.; Springfield: World Library, 1995-2000), 228.

⁷ Lint, *The Old Testament Hebrew-English Dictionary*, 229.

⁸ Ernest Klein, *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English* (NY: MacMillan), 1987.

⁹ Lint, *The Old Testament Hebrew-English Dictionary*, 230.

שכן has both a secular and a theological component. In its secular usage שכן is synonymous with ישב; however, theologically, it may be argued that ישב and שכן are antonymous.¹⁰ The theological use of שכן describes YHWH's existential relationship with His people—personal to the extent that He dwells in the midst of them, whether in relation to place (Mt. Zion of Zech 8:3 and Jerusalem of Zech 2:14) or people¹¹ (Ex 25:8; 29:45; 1Ki 6:13; Ezek 43:9). This relationship, though, has a transitory subtext that cannot be ignored.

The fundamental sense of שכן may be “live, dwell,”¹² the connotation of which appears to be more transient than ישב and more enduring than גור. Pertaining to YHWH, שכן signifies that His Divine Presence in the midst of His people is voluntary, is transcendent, and is immanent (as in Ezek 43:1-9).¹³ Cognates of שכן (שכנה and משכן) have theological weight, referring respectively to YHWH's “earthly presence [and His] transcendence.”¹⁴ Frank M. Cross argues that the term משכן

¹⁰ Jenni-Westerman, *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 1327. Jenni-Westerman consider ישב to be “relatively insignificant” theologically; however, such a conclusion is debatable. The major theological difference between ישב and שכן may be the different God-views represented by the two lexemes—as may be discerned in Is 45:18 and Ex 29:45, for example. On the one hand, ישב is seen as depicting YHWH as distant, transcendent, and not sensate; for, through ישב, YHWH is invariably described as dwelling not with people but in a place congruent with His representation of Himself—either sitting on His throne (1Ki 22:19, Is 6:1) or in darkness (1 Ki 8:12-13); in Zion (Ps 9:11; 132:13-14); in His holy hill (Ps 68:16); or, in the heavens (Ps 123:1). Furthermore, these texts contain no attached covenantal promise, as in Ex 29:45. Finally, inasmuch as these dwelling places have not to do with man but with the ontology of YHWH, then, in that sense, ישב seems to signify the permanence of YHWH's dwelling. On the other hand, through שכן, YHWH is presented as immanent and sensate; He is the God who is near. Furthermore, where ישב portrays Him as visible only to those whom He grants vision, as in Is 6:1, שכן reveals YHWH visible and whose dwelling place is with reference primarily to people and then place. Thus שכן and ישב may offer different insights into YHWH, into who He is in relation to man and creation in the now and the not yet. This difference may have to do with the *opera ad intra*, the inner workings of the Trinity. The God who ישב is not the God who comes down the mountain to be seen in the Incarnation; thus, there can be no logical progression from ישב to σαρκώω of Jo 1:14. Instead, the God who ישב is the Hidden One, the First Person of the Trinity, who, because of the nature of the Trinity, שכן in the Person of the Son in the Incarnation. As such, ישב may be thought to signify the permanence of YHWH's dwelling place in the now and the not yet, while שכן would indicate that such dwelling among His people is transitory in the now and permanent in the not yet.

¹¹ Jenni-Westerman, *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 1328.

¹² Van Gemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 109.

¹³ Van Gemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 110, makes a similar point.

¹⁴ Jenni-Westerman, *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 1328.

has been limited to “the one Tent, the Mosaic sanctuary,”¹⁵ which is the tabernacle that YHWH has designated His dwelling is on account of His *הסר*¹⁶. Similarly, *שכן*, connotes “temporary lodging in a tent”¹⁷ and is thus evocative of the temporary and nomadic lifestyle.¹⁸ Therefore, *שכן* and its cognates *משכן* and *שכנה* may specifically signify that “the earthly presence of Yahweh,”¹⁹ or, put another way, His immanence, His “Divine Presence in the camp of Israel”²⁰ is transitory until the eschaton. Thus, it may be said that in relation to His people, YHWH never *ישב* or *גור* but *שכן*.²¹

In Ex 25:8b (MT), *שכן* is a Qal Perfect *waw consecutive*.²² This clause is preceded by three volitives, an imperative *דבר* (Ex 25:2), and two jussives *ויקחו* and *ועשו* (Ex 25:2; 25:8, respectively). These combine to give the *w-qtל* *וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ* “a consequential force.”²³ As a result of the previous grammatical construction of “volitional form... + *wō-* + prefix conjugation”, Ex 25:8b

¹⁵ Frank M. Cross, “The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological and Historical Approach,” *The Biblical Archaeologist*, X:3 (1947): 45-68.

¹⁶ Deut 7:7-8; 9:1-6. See Van Gemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 109.

¹⁷ Nahum A. Sarna, ed., *The JPS Torah Commentary: Exodus* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1991), 158.

¹⁸ Cross, “The Tabernacle,” 67; Nahum A. Sarna, *Exodus*, 158.

¹⁹ Cross, “The Tabernacle,” 67.

²⁰ Sarna, *Exodus*, 158. YHWH’s presence in the midst of His people is/has been/will be on His terms, and He will only dwell with man on His conditions. Just as once saved is not always saved, YHWH will not dwell with man when the latter is in a degraded spiritual condition—see Ezekiel 10, in which the glory of YHWH departs the temple.

²¹ This line of argumentation recognizes that the same situation pertains with regard to those redeemed in Baptism. Though we behold the glory of YHWH in Baptism and in the Lord’s Supper, we still do not see Him as He is but as He has chosen to present Himself to us. Only in the eschaton will there be no more disparity between YHWH as He is and YHWH as He presents Himself. YHWH’s dwelling with man is transitory because the eschaton has not yet come, and because the sin that so easily besets man often serves as a *parokhet* separating man from Him.

Furthermore, YHWH’s permanent presence is an eschatological promise for the not yet, and it is for those who endure to the end. In a sense, *שכן* may be thought to encapsulate YHWH’s gradual movement to and relationship with His people—from the sound of Him walking in Eden (Ge 3:8), to the burning bush (Ex 3:2), to His descent upon the mount of Sinai (Ex 19:20), to the Incarnation (Jo 1:1-17), to the cross (Jo 19:16-34)—each of which are transitory prefigurations of His intention to dwell permanently with man in the eschaton.

²² E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley, eds., *Gesenius Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 333; this form is used “[t]o express *future* actions, &c., as the temporal or logical consequence of tenses, or their equivalents, which announce or require such future action or events.”

²³ Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 562-563 §33.4.

indicates “purpose or result (‘so that’).”²⁴ Consequently, 25:8a reading, in part, “and let them make me...” is followed up by the purpose clause of 25:8b, *וְיִשְׁכְּנֵנִי בְּתוֹכָם*, which is “so that I may dwell with them.” Similarly, Ex 29:45 (MT) requires one to refer to 29:1 to discover that the Qal Imperative second singular masculine *קִלְטָה*²⁵ which dominates the entire chapter is followed by a series of *w-qtls* in vv. 2-41. Thereafter, the text contains a series of purpose clauses, vv. 42b-46, of which 29:45a is one.

Unlike the previous two texts, 1Ki 6:13²⁶ (MT) is in a conditional relationship with its preceding verse 6:12, the grammatical constructions of which determine the form of 6:13. In 1Ki 6:12, a “real conditional,”²⁷ the protasis is introduced by *כִּי* with a Qal Perfect second singular masculine verb,²⁸ and 6:13 is the second of two apodoses²⁹ in which the *waw* of *וְיִשְׁכְּנֵנִי* “serves as an apodosis *waw*.”³⁰ Moreover, the *וְהָיָה* of 6:11 signals that 6:12 is the outcome of 6:1-11, and

²⁴ Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 650 §39.2.2; in 577 §34.6a, note that “[a]fter an imperative a verbal form not preceded by its subject or a negative particle is normally either a jussive ... or a cohortative.... The second volitional form signifies purpose or result.”

²⁵ The LXX translates this with the FIM2s *λήμψη*.

²⁶ There really is no LXX equivalent of this verb. The closest may be *τοῦ κατασκηνώσαι ἐν γνόφῳ* of 3 Ki 8:12 (LXX), which is 2 Chr 6:1 (MT). However, the verb there is a future articular infinitive which is in the genitive (of dwelling) and is the object of *εἶπεν* which limits its content (see Smyth 450 §2027; 451 §2032a). Moreover, the time indicated by the articular infinitive is future, which occurs after verbs of saying such as *εἶπεν*. Therefore, the translation is, “The Lord said that His dwelling will be/He will dwell in darkness.” Other than that, the Greek text of 3 Ki 8:12/2 Chr 6:1 bears the same relation to the rest of the passage as does that of the MT text.

²⁷ Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 636 §38.2c, state that a real condition is either “fulfilled in the past or still capable of being fulfilled.”

²⁸ Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 636 §38.2c, describe this verb as “non-perfective.”

²⁹ The first is *וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכְּנֵנִי בְּתוֹכָם וְיִשְׁכְּנֵנִי בְּתוֹכָם*

³⁰ Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 636 §38.2b; an apodosis *waw* introduces the consequential independent clause (the apodosis) after the conditional dependent clause (the protasis).”

Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (2 vols.; Rome: Pontificio, 1996), 647 §176, argue for the apodosis *waw* being rather a resumptive *waw*. However, the resumptive *waw* would require the resumption of the same verb (fn 2). Taking into consideration this section of Joüon-Muraoka, one would be required to translate the text “Then I will dwell...”; however, the “then” is not applicable to the verb of 1Ki 6:13, but to that in the apodosis in 6:12, *וְהָיָה*. Thereafter, what follows is a simple *waw* consecutive to be translated “and I shall....”

that 6:13ff., which follows the background information found in the early verses, is part of that 6:1-11 narrative.³¹

Somewhat akin to the וַיְהִי of 1Ki 6:11, the adverbial particle עַתָּה of Ezek 43:9 (MT) dominates the sentence as a result of its pre-verbal position in the sentence.³² It also modifies the clause in relation to the preceding vv. 43:5-8, in which context the *w-qtl* of 43:9b, which follows the jussive וַיִּרְחֹקוּ , is to be understood.

Also different, Zech 2:14b-15 (MT) are causal clauses which are the basis for 2:14a, introduced by the particle כִּי , which dominates Zech 2:15. The use of הִנְנִי in 2:14b signals the imminence of the Qal Participle masculine singular כָּא , which has future meaning.³³ In Zech 8:3 (MT), the prophetic formula,³⁴ כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה , is subordinate to the introduction in 8:1, $\text{וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה}$ in a chapter which consists of a series of oracles, and 8:3c is in the oracle of 8:3. כֹּה אָמַר is a discourse marker,³⁵ and the rest of the verse is the content of that discourse. As with 1Ki 6:13, the וַיְהִי of 8:1 predominates the discourse of Zech 8. In 8:3a, the perfective form of the fientive שָׁבַתִּי may convey the idea of the simple past, that which is recently completed, thus requiring the English auxiliary “to have” in translation.³⁶ Therefore, the text is rendered, “I have returned.”

The main verb of the next clause, 8:3b, is a Qal Perfect *waw consecutive*, and the verbs in both clauses are active and intransitive; both verbs, aspectually, signify ongoing action.³⁷ In each

³¹ Christo H. J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999, 332.

³² van der Merwe, et al., *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 338.

³³ Joüon-Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 401 §119n. The “participle with future meaning is usually continued by a *w-qatalti* also with future meaning. More often than not there is an idea of succession. The future expressed by the participle is usually a near future. The nuance of proximity is often emphasized by הִנְנִי . See also §119i and l, 398 and 399.

³⁴ This formula is used several times throughout Zech 8. See 8:2a, 3a, 4a, 6a, 7a, 8a, 14a, 19a, 20a, 23a.

³⁵ Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 666 §39.3.4e.

³⁶ Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 487 §30.5.1.

³⁷ Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 355-357.

instance, the Qal subject, YHWH, is the agent. The verb of 8:3b is *w-qatalti*, which is “mainly used for further action subsequent to another action,”³⁸ and though this predictor of the future normally commences with *yiqtol*, it can also occur “after a verb in the present or past.”³⁹ The *w-qatalti* also may indicate “a (logical) consecution”;⁴⁰ thus Zech 8:3b and 8:3c may read, “I have returned to Zion, and (therefore) I will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem.” Furthermore, Zech 8:3b may be thought of as a substantival clause—for example, “and I will dwell” becomes the equivalent of “and my dwelling,” and may function as the predicate object of the main clause’s verb. Thus, *וָשַׁבְתִּי* has dual objects, “Zion” and “my dwelling,”⁴¹ and the text might read, “I have returned to Zion and my dwelling in the midst of Jerusalem.”

³⁸ Joüon-Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 396 §119c.

³⁹ Joüon-Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 396 §119c.

⁴⁰ Joüon-Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 397 §119e.

⁴¹ Joüon-Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 589 §157a.

CHAPTER 6

Peering through the Lens at the LXX

In contrast to the MT, the LXX offers thirty variants to the Qal of קָשׁ ;¹ these, in the texts in question, constitute an interpretive, rather than literal,² rendition of קָשׁ using three different vocables. The first is the future indicative passive first singular of ὀράω ; the second, the future indicative passive first singular of ἐπικαλέω ;³ and, the third, the future indicative active third plural of κατασκηνώω . In Ex 25:8 and 29:45 the LXX translates קָשׁ with ὀράω and ἐπικαλέω ;⁴ in both these cases, the reading of the LXX differs from other translations which variously read either σκηνώσω or κατασκηνώσω .⁵ κατασκηνώω , occurring fifty-one times, is the rendition of קָשׁ , with YHWH as subject (only in Ezek 43:9; and Zech 2:14-15).

¹ This is a total of thirty-two when the other binyanim are included. Alfred Rahlfs, ed. *Septuaginta*, (Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 1935), 425, 489; it is worth noting that in the LXX version of the OT, σκηνώω occurs only five times—Ge 13:12; Judg 5:17 (twice); 8:11, the latter two of which have alternate readings. Edwin Hatch, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to The Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 1273; Judg 5:17A and 8:11A both read κατασκηνώω , while 5:17B and 8:11B are σκηνώω ; and 3 Ki 9:12 in Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT* 385. 3 Ki 8:12-13 are omitted from Rahlfs but appear in the critical notes. *LXX1* on CD-ROM. Accordance Version 5.6.1. Print ed.: Alfred Rahlfs, ed. *Septuaginta*. (Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 1935). *LXX1* includes 3 Ki 8:12 as 2 Chr 6:1.; four times in secular contexts, and once with YHWH as subject in Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 646; here, the text reads $\text{κύριος εἶπεν τοῦ σκηνώσαι ἐν γνώφῳ}$; *LXX1* at 2Chr 6:1 reads $\text{κύριος εἶπεν τοῦ κατασκηνώσαι ἐν γνώφῳ}$.

² Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 42, quotes the Tanna R. Judah that “He who translates a verse literally is a liar’.”

³ Takamitsu Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 150. Moreover, in the LXX version of the OT, the word σκηνώω appears only five times—Ge 13:12; Judg 5:17; 8:11; 3 Ki 8:12) as translation for לָחַק , בָּשׂ , and קָשׁ .

⁴ Hatch and Redpath, *A Concordance to The Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, 744, provide a list of five Hebrew vocables which serve as translations for κατασκηνώω : לָחַק , בָּשׂ , קָשׁ , רָבַר , and קָשׁ , while the last is most likely to be the translation for לָחַק and בָּשׂ .

⁵ Alan E. Brooke and Norman McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1906), 235. While the LXX text of Ex 25:8 reads οφθησομαι , the other translators (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) read σκηνώσω . Likewise in Ex 29:45 in which the variant is επισκηνώσω . Also, Friedericus Field, ed., *Origenis Hexaplorum* (2 vols., Hildesheim: Olms), 1964, 124, καὶ οφθησομαι is the reading of only the LXX at Ex 25:8, all the others read καὶ σκηνώσω there and at Ex 29:45. See also John W. Wevers, ed., *Septuaginta: Exodus* (Göttinger: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1991), 282; Wevers’s text indicates two variant readings apart from

Of the 1136 times that ὁράω occurs in the LXX, only six times does it render יָרָא as the future indicative passive of ὁράω;⁶ however, only twice (Ex 25:8 and Lev 16:2) is YHWH the subject of the verb. Moreover, only in Ex 25:8 is the future indicative passive of ὁράω a translation for a “dwelling” rather than “seeing” verb. ὁράω possesses a multi-variety of meanings amongst which are “see, look, perceive, witness, experience”. In its passive form, ὁράω refers to “letting oneself be seen”;⁷ as intransitive passive, the verb is causative, “to cause oneself to be seen,” and is thought to connote more a spiritual than a physical seeing.⁸ Elsewhere in the LXX, as in Nu. 23:21, ὀφθῆναι transcends seeing and means “to be present.”⁹

that in the LXX at Ex 25:8, και κατασκηνωσω εν μεσω αυτων and και σκηνωσω εν μεσω αυτων, these are corrections in a cursive hand. The rest of the translators also read σκηνωσω. Ex 29:45 in this version also has σκηνωσω εν μεσω as variant corrected in cursive.

⁶ This is at Ex 10:29; 25:8; Lev 16:2; 1Ki 18:15; Psa 16:15; 41:3.

K. Dahn, “See, Vision, Eye,” *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1. Print ed.: Colin Brown, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-1985. Interestingly, the Hebrew equivalents of ὁράω are “הָרָא and הִרָא, which have a rather wider meaning than ὁράω...” In fact, there are 212 instances of הָרָא in the HMT. Lev 9:4 is the one discoverable instance in which the niphal perfect הִרָא, is rendered ὀφθῆσεται in the LXX, with YHWH as third person subject.

⁷ Lust et al, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, n.p.; Liddell-Scott, *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon*, n.p.; Dahn, *NIDNTT*, n.p.

⁸ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 324-325.

⁹ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, (Cf. Michaelis, 151, n. 147) 325.

Thus, it seems that the response of the LXX translators of Exodus to the existential issue of the God-man relationship is not the same as that of the scribes of the MT. Where the latter includes the anthropomorphic יָרָא, the former eliminates that same quality by electing to employ ὁράω instead of either σκηνώω or κατασκηνώω. Whereas the MT depicts YHWH as immanent and accessible to man, for He will dwell in the midst of the camp, the LXX spiritualizes Him, and YHWH is the transcendent God who will cause Himself to be seen or will be present. It is unlikely that the God who condescends to undergo the humiliation of the Incarnation is the God depicted in the LXX. For, this version of OT presents YHWH as a philosophical ideal who remains outside the senses of His people, which characterization is divorced from the way He presents Himself in human terms. If the first is anthropomorphic, the second is more philosophical, which is consistent with the Hellenic sensibilities of the LXX translators.

God as depicted in the Johannine literature is more akin to YHWH of the MT, for He is enfleshed, made man, and dwelling amongst us. However, it may be argued that inasmuch as to dwell in a community means to be seen, to be present, or to have a presence there, when YHWH says ὀφθῆσομαι, He is committing Himself to dwelling in the middle of His people, Israel. Unfortunately, ὀφθῆσομαι is not the obverse of יָרָא; that YHWH will be present does not mean that YHWH will dwell. Visibility or presence does not infer residence, and by the diction of the MT YHWH promises residence. Nevertheless, inasmuch as YHWH committing Himself to dwell in the middle of His people means He will be seen by them, then one may contend that the LXX effects a minimalist rendering of the essential meaning of יָרָא.

Additionally, although ἐπικαλέω occurs 155 times in the OT, only once (Ex 29:45) is YHWH the verb's subject. In the active voice, ἐπικαλέω signifies to “summon a God to a sacrifice or as witness to an oath”;¹⁰ in the middle, the verb is understood as “call in as helper or ally”;¹¹ and, in the passive, “to be called by surname ... to be nicknamed.”¹² Danker offers an alternative denotation, “to address or characterize someone by a special term” and “appeal” in the sense of “a request put to a higher judicial authority for review of a decision in a lower court.”¹³ Though this translation of the MT at Ex 29:45 is even more puzzling than that at Ex 25:8,¹⁴ in this context of divine promise, it is possible that ἐπικαλέω, though passive in form, might be used in the active sense of calling upon or invoking¹⁵ YHWH, or YHWH witnessing an oath or watching over Israel—because He has made the oath Himself in his promise so to do. It is possible that ἐπικαλέω may connote the NT concept of “call upon in confession”;¹⁶ in that case, then, ἐπικαλέω of Ex 29:45 may well mean something like “my personal name will be confessed by the children of Israel”. If that is so, it may be argued that the LXX translators added a new interpretive dimension to the MT's יְהוָה—to the concept of YHWH's Divine Presence in the midst of His people—that of “confession,”¹⁷ on the basis of which He is to be called “their God” (Ex 29:45). One might posit that the keeping of the Decalogue and civil legislation is an

¹⁰ *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon: Founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon on CD-ROM*, Accordance Version 5.6.1. Print ed.: *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon: Founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 635.

¹¹ Liddell-Scott, *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon*, n.p.

¹² Liddell-Scott, *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon*, n.p.

¹³ Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, n.p.

¹⁴ In Ex 29:45, the FIP1s of ἐπικαλέω is used in the same sense in which it is in Ge 12:8; 13:4; 21:33, and other texts in which the MT reads קָרָא. In Ex 29:46, the APInf of the verb is the LXX reading of the Qal Inf Cs of קָרָא, in precisely the same context as 29:45.

¹⁵ Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, n.p.

¹⁶ Balz and Schneider, *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, .

¹⁷ This is the same sense in which ἐπικαλέω is used in Heb 11:16 where the verb form is in the present passive infinitive.

implicit confession of YHWH as God alone. The man whom He enables to keep the Law becomes a sanctuary in which He can and does dwell and who may abide in His presence; for YHWH will dwell amongst only those who confess His name, and if His personal name is known, it is because He has revealed Himself (Ex 3:14). In this way, there may be a connection between the use of ἐπικαλέω in Ex 29:45 and ὀράω in Ex 25:8. In this way, too, the dwelling of יָשַׁב of the MT may be synonymous with confession, or, at the most elementary level, to calling upon YHWH.

Kittel notes the rarity of σκηνόω in the LXX. He states that, with the exception of Ge 13:12, σκηνόω “corresponds to יָשַׁב”;¹⁸ furthermore, he argues that since σκηνόω appears ten times in Aquila it may be an indication of the “affinity” which he perceived between “יָשַׁב and σκην-.”¹⁹ The LXX’s translators might have had in view this same correlation when rendering יָשַׁב as κατασκηνόω.²⁰ However, this argument is undercut because of the translators’ interpretive variation²¹ of the vocabulary denoting this narrow theological sense of יָשַׁב.

That יָשַׁב is usually translated with κατασκηνόω—meaning variously “to pitch one’s tent,”²² “live, settle, cause to settle, dwell”²³—is to some attributable to “the clear correspondence”²⁴ between these two verbs, in spite of just 55 of the 140 occurrences of יָשַׁב being read as κατασκηνόω.²⁵ Furthermore, the translation of יָשַׁב with κατασκηνόω (Ezek

¹⁸ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 385.

¹⁹ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 385.

²⁰ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 386.

²¹ Not only is κατασκηνόω (1Ki 6:13; Ezek 43:9; Zech 2:14-15; 8:3) used, but ὀράω (Ex 25:8) and ἐπικαλέω (Ex 45:9) also are.

²² Liddell-Scott, *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon*, n.p.

²³ Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, n.p.; Lust et al, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, n.p.

²⁴ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 387.

²⁵ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 387. It is noteworthy that of the seven relevant texts, κατασκηνόω is substituted for other vocables twice.

43:9; Zech 2:14-15; 8:3) may point to a “longer or more permanent residence”²⁶ for YHWH amidst His people. Dahn argues that this sense of duration, of permanence is derived from the verb’s prepositional prefix, *κατῶ*, which emphasizes the “idea of a longer stay.”²⁷ Liddell-Scott likewise note that *κατα* “strengthen[s] the notion of a simple word,”²⁸ thus raising questions concerning how this affects the meaning of *κατασκηνώω*.

If *κατασκηνώω*, because of the prepositional prefix, signifies a “longer or more permanent residence” than does *σκηνώω*, then that would bring *κατασκηνώω* closer in meaning to *נשׁו* rather than *ינשׁו*, but only with regard to duration. It is worth repeating here that the basic idea of *ינשׁו* is temporary residence and that, in the MT, YHWH never *נשׁו* or *ינשׁו* but always *ינשׁו*. Thus, the diction of the MT signifies that YHWH’s dwelling with man in the now is transitory. In the not yet, the impermanent nature of the relationship will change. Therefore, when the LXX renders *ינשׁו* and all that it thereby connotes with *κατασκηνώω* instead of *σκηνώω*, it ignores the subtle semantic differences in diction, seems to interpret the text non-eschatologically, and, therefore, alters its meaning.²⁹

Ex 25:8 (LXX) is a compound sentence linked by the copulative conjunction *καί*, which may be rhetorical parataxis—inasmuch as 25:8b is logically subordinate to 25:8a. As such, then,

²⁶ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 387-388.

²⁷ Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 387-388. Willem A. Van Gemeren, ed., *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (4 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), disagrees with the TDNT regarding its view that, in the OT, *ינשׁו* reflects a permanent stay..

²⁸ Liddell-Scott, *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon*, n.p.

²⁹ One might posit that, for the scribes of the LXX, there is no not yet; there is only a now. How YHWH is perceived to dwell with man is shaped by that perspective. If this is so, then the variable diction of the LXX might signal a non-eschatological escalation from YHWH revealing Himself (Ex 25:8), to His name being confessed (Ex 29:45), to His dwelling with His people (Ezek 43:9; Zech 2:14-15; 8:3), all of which are rooted in the now. This lexical and semantic distinction between the LXX and MT versions of OT hovers in the background of the discussion of the contextual situation of the OT texts; for, where the MT is here perceived to look toward some eschatological future, the LXX, with its different God-view and God-man relationship, is not.

25:8b is regarded as “independent for the sake of emphasis”³⁰ and may be the climax, not just of 25:8a, but of the action which begins in Ex 19 when, in the post-Fall world, YHWH commences His movement towards man by coming down upon the mountain to meet Moses. Thus, καί in 25:8b would also signify the result of YHWH’s action.³¹

Ex 29:45 (LXX) is as 25:8 in its use of καί, which, in these two texts, may have an adverbial function since it may be intended to stress the importance of the idea inherent to the subsequent word³² (ὀφθήσομαι and ἐπικαλέω, respectively). In both cases, the verbs (intransitive and future indicative passive first singular) are followed by the dative in its locative use, meaning “among” (25:8b) and “on” (29:45a). Finally, the common syntax of these clauses is conjunction-predicate-dative indirect object. Also, at Ezek 43:9 (LXX), the use of καὶ may be climactic, especially after vv. 43:5-9a.

Zech 2:14b-15 (LXX) contains the Pres Imv 2sm in τέρπου and εὐφραίνου. Where the MT uses the “presentative adverb”³³ וְהִנֵּה, which purposes to attract attention, the LXX employs ἰδοῦ. διότι signifies that Zech 2:14b and 2:14c are causal—one may infer that διότι is also implied after the καί of 2:14c, and διότι ἰδοῦ may be thought to dominate the text from 2:14-17 for the phrase draws the attention to each of the things over which the daughter of Zion should sing and rejoice. Where the Hebrew text’s use of וְהִנֵּה plus the participle may signal the future, the LXX employs verbs in the indicative, ἔρχομαι³⁴ and κατασκηνώσω, which occur after the present imperative in the primary tenses, thus establishing that the causal clause begun with

³⁰ Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980, 486.

³¹ See Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 650 §2870; 651 §2874.

³² See Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 652 §2881.

³³ See Waltke-O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 351 §105d.

³⁴ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 422 §1879, ἔρχομαι is in the anticipative present in which “the present is used instead of the future in statements of what is immediate, likely, certain, or threatening.” Moreover, ἔρχομαι, like πορεύομαι and νέομαι (poet.) may be used in a future sense.” Since the context here is prophecy, then ἔρχομαι is in the prophetic or “oracular present [in which] a future event may be regarded as present.”

διότι is factual.³⁵ Finally, the ἐν μέσῳ of Zech 2:14b and 2:15c is a locative dative prepositional phrase. Zech 8:3b (LXX), has ἐπὶ with the genitive, meaning not “to” but “on” or “upon.”³⁶ Syntactically, Zech 8:3b is one of a series of utterances, and the use of καί as a copulative makes the clause independent and, as with Ezek 43:9a, the climax of the text.

³⁵ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 504 §2241.

³⁶ Smyth *Greek Grammar*, 371 §1676; 378 §1689.

CHAPTER 7

The OT Context and Themes

YHWH's descent upon the mount of Sinai (Ex 19) is the backdrop against which Ex 25:8b plays out. For, after the voice in the Garden (Ge 3) and the burning bush (Ex 3), it is the third stage of His movement towards man in the post-Fall world, and it is here that He defines what it means for Him to dwell with man (19:5-6).

YHWH's condescension is immediately followed by the giving of the Law (19:20) and the civil legislation (19:21-24). The Decalogue expresses "man's duties to God [and] ... to his fellow man";¹ it taught the Israelites, newly out of Egypt, of the sovereignty of YHWH and the threats and promises through which He would make for Himself a people. The civil legislation, on the other hand, prescribes how YHWH is to be worshipped, and in conjunction with the Decalogue, reveals His divine will.

Ex 32 relates the Golden Calf narrative in which Israel, tainted by centuries in Egypt, attempts to depict the Hidden One as they think He might be, even while He is giving Moses the Law; thus, it is not coincidental that their imagery is Egyptian. What follows is the outpouring of the righteous judgment of YHWH against Israel, their repentance and restoration to right relationship, and the erection of the tabernacle wherein YHWH will dwell with His people.

The themes arising out of this context are the sovereignty and righteousness of YHWH; His holiness and Divine Presence; the holiness that YHWH requires of those who serve Him; and, the mediate character of divine worship. Also, for the first time, the grand theme is YHWH

¹ J. H. Hertz, *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs* (London: Soncino, 1970), 295.

as the Hidden God who will dwell with His people and reveal Himself in a glorious but distant form,² simultaneously immanent and transcendent. It may be in the context of this revelation of the divine will, concerning “every phase of human and national life—civil as well as religious, physical as well as spiritual,”³ that the text of Ex 25:8b is best received. Having given the Law and the civil legislation, YHWH then sets out their intended purpose, which may be a paradigm for immediate worship. His purpose might be that His people are to be prepared, spiritually and physically, to dwell in His presence, masked in the now and unmasked in the not yet; this eschatological point of view may be absent from the LXX.

In conjunction with Ex 25:8, 29:45 presents the themes holiness and worship as well as preparation for Divine Presence. The vocable ἐπικαλέω comes at the end of a section describing what Moses must do to prepare Aaron and his sons for their priestly service to YHWH (Ex 29:1-42). The sin offering (29:14, 36), the whole burnt offering (29:18), the wave and heave offerings (29:27), and the drink offering (29:40) are the rites of preparation for YHWH’s sanctification of worship structures and priests (29:44). At the end of the preparations (29:42), YHWH utters four promises: to meet with Moses at the door of the tabernacle (29:42); to meet with Israel and to consecrate by His glory (29:43); to sanctify the tent of meeting, the altar and the sons of Aaron (29:44); and, to dwell amongst the children of Israel and be their God (29:45). These are intended to impress upon man the holiness of YHWH and the concomitant holiness required for service in His priesthood.

If Ex 25:8 tells who YHWH is, then 29:45 relates how He expects man to be—holy; the means by which man may so become; what He requires of man—worship, and that right worship

² Distant because even though YHWH is in the midst of the camp, He may only be approached by worship through sacrifice, and, even then, upon pain of death to the man, including Moses, who draws nigh unsanctified.

³ Hertz, *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*, 306.

necessitates confession of Him as the only God. YHWH can only be served by a people who is holy because He Himself is holy. Also, only an obedient and sanctified people can stand in YHWH's presence to worship Him because He can abide no sin. However, the LXX's selection of ἐπικαλέω as translation of the MT indicates that the end-result of the sacrificial rituals is man's action (confession) rather than divine action (sanctification) which makes possible YHWH's dwelling amongst men. Moreover, if man is in the Divine Presence, then it is because man has earned that Presence through confession.⁴ Human effort seems to result in man having a God (29:45) who delivered him from bondage for the purpose of man confessing Him (29:46). Just as confession is not an eschatological event—it is firmly limited to the here and now though it may pertain to endurance as requisite to faith—neither is it, by itself, a recreative event which will restore all creation to right relationship with the Creator. As such, the LXX translation of 29:45 may be seen as a limiting of the Divine design for all creation and a further insertion of distance between man and his Creator. The God who would dwell is the God who, in the Incarnation, would be sensate; yet, in the LXX, He is presented as the transcendent God who would be distantly seen and spoken about in confession.

Beyond these ideas, 1Ki 6:13 represents an escalation and restatement of the Exodus themes; though the tabernacle is replaced by the temple, yet YHWH does not change. He insists upon a type of holiness code for His people, which code is a requirement for His dwelling with them. In 1Ki 6:12, YHWH visits Solomon and invokes the Davidic promise (2Sam 7:9-16) which is contingent, in part, upon Solomon's fidelity. In exchange, v. 13, YHWH reiterates His promise to dwell among the sons of Israel and not forsake them. Thus, having asserted the means

⁴ Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, 52, writes that in the rabbinic view, the Shekinah's dwelling amongst men is because of "human merit" earned by acceptance of the Torah. That Moses and his sons perform all the rituals that YHWH ordained signifies their acceptance; thus, it is only fitting that the language of the LXX is that of confession rather than dwelling, for the former term is indicative of acceptance and merit.

by which the people are to be prepared for His holy and Divine Presence, and having established His requirement for dwelling with man, YHWH must consecrate and set man apart for His service. Then, given the disaffections and faithlessness of Israel in the intervening time, He reiterates His promise in relation to Solomon's desire to build a house for Him (6:12). Though there is no record in the text of Solomon's assent, such is implicit in 6:14, and the construction of the temple is connected with obedience to divine command, as it is with the tabernacle. More significant than the building in the sight of YHWH is obedience to His Word and Law, which requires that they be established and adhered to so that YHWH may dwell amongst them and not forsake His people. Predominant, thematically, are the covenant keeping nature of YHWH; His righteousness; and, obedience to YHWH as right worship.

The precursor to Ezek 43:9 addresses familiar situations and themes escalated beyond the previous levels. Ezekiel addresses YHWH's condemnation of Judah and Jerusalem in chapters 1-24 and their restoration in 25-48. In 5:11, YHWH promises to withdraw from the sanctuary and the people because of their idolatry; this is followed by Judah and Jerusalem's disdain for YHWH (8:3, 5, 10-11, 16-17). Inasmuch as they would not repent, YHWH gives a vision of His judgment in which commences the departure of His glory from the temple;⁵ the sealing of the faithful and destruction is followed by the vision of the new temple (9:2-11). Ezek 40-47 amplifies this vision of the eschatological temple which is measured in 40-42, and, in Ezek 43, the glory of YHWH returns to the temple from the east (43:2; cf. 1:22-23) in a vision the purpose of which is to shame Israel for their iniquities that they may repent.

The Law of the house is repentance and faithfulness in this context, and the pattern of the temple is perhaps not for a building at all, but for the holiness required to be in the presence of

⁵ In Ezekiel, the departure of the glory of YHWH is accomplished in three stages: from the cherub over the ark to the temple's threshold (10:4); from the threshold to the four cherubim and the east entrance (10:18-19); and from the four cherubim to the mountain east of Jerusalem (11:22-23).

YHWH, as is emphasized in 43:12. Where Ex 29 narrates the establishment of the priesthood via sanctification, Ezek 43:18-19 offers a new Zadokite priesthood to serve at the altar, which needs to be purified and cleansed (vv. 20-27). The closing chapters of Ezekiel informs of YHWH's shutting of the east gate of the sanctuary because He Himself has entered (44:1-2); once more Ezekiel sees the glory of YHWH (44:4-5), and the divine charge concerning the sanctuary is the same as it is in the earlier texts discussed: obedience (44:8), which is better than sacrifice and the fat of lambs, and the setting apart of the sanctified (44:7-8). To this end, the Zadokite Levites are assigned to minister and to wear the linen that is a mark of purity and holiness in Revelation (44:15-31), while the other Levites are to be punished (44:11-13). In the end, a river of water flows from under the threshold of the temple to the east, from the right side of the house, from the south side of the altar (47:1-2), and the depth of that water gradually increases from a trickle (47:2) to a river that cannot be forded (47:5) and which has trees on both sides (47:7-12; cf Rev 21).

Within this narrative, 43:9 asserts that YHWH will dwell with man when man turns from sin, and 48:35, the last words in the book of Ezekiel, proclaims "the promise of Yahweh's presence"⁶ with the words *וְשָׁם-הָעִיר קִיּוּם יְהוָה שָׁמָּה*. YHWH's righteous judgment on unfaithful Israel is exercised in Ezekiel, and Israel must repent; for, only amongst the repentant and faithful Israel, newly rededicated to obedience, can YHWH dwell with His people forever. Thus is emphasized the holiness and righteousness of YHWH, who will kill to save and who will preserve only a remnant that His covenant be fulfilled.

⁶ William J. Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21-22 and the Old Testament* (Australia: Lancer, 1985), 24.

If the MT's use of *יָשׁוּב* here signifies that Ezekiel's temple is some transitory future time or eschatological structure,⁷ *לְעוֹלָם* of 43:9 does seem to suggest that YHWH's dwelling with His people would be permanent, which would appear to contradict the transitory sense of *יָשׁוּב* and incline toward the permanence of the LXX's *κατασκηνώω* and its possible reference to some non-eschatological or future time when a new temple will be constructed on this earth. The ambiguity created by the diction of the MT might be resolved by addressing the verse's overall context with its themes of judgment, restoration, and the promise of YHWH's presence. These three may clearly indicate that the time frame of both *יָשׁוּב* and *κατασκηνώω* is the not yet.

If Ezekiel 40-47 recounts the measuring of the temple, the contextual situation of Zech 2:14-15 addresses the measuring of Jerusalem as though that city were a temple without walls (2:8) and in which YHWH promises that He will be her protector and glory (2:9). According to Zechariah's prophecy, YHWH promises vengeance against those who have plundered His people (2:12). Vv. 14-15 are the climax of Zechariah's eschatological vision, for in them, YHWH, having restored and preserved His people to Himself, renews His promise to dwell with them. Then, where Exodus, Kings, and Ezekiel are parochial, Zechariah (by looking beyond Israel as a nation to the whole people of God of Rev 21:3d) is distinguished from those three texts in that his application of Israel is global rather than local. Similarly, in Zech 8:3, YHWH promises to dwell with the people of God in a Jerusalem in which peace exists, and He says, *אָהֶם וְשָׁכְנוּ בְּהוֹרֵךְ* (8:8). Zechariah's eschatological vision looks past the tent, temple, and city structures of all the previous texts, and he depicts the people of YHWH as a blessed people to whom all nations flock and who will live in His light,

⁷ Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985), 112-115. Yadin writes that though the author of the temple scroll believed in both "the heavenly Temple, ... [and] the future Temple", he deals with the "earthly Temple of the present, the only one of the three that was to be man-made."

blessedness, peace, and love. Unlike the other texts, Zechariah 2:14-15 and 8:3 have a stronger thematic focus on the eschatological dwelling of YHWH with all peoples who believe.

Nevertheless, the sense of the MT does not completely survive translation, especially in 2:15 with its different verbal morphology, because of the LXX's insistence on κατασκηνόω rather than σκηνόω as meet translation of יָשָׁב.

From Exodus 25:8 to Zechariah 8:3, the contexts reveal a thematic and graphic escalation in which YHWH establishes not only His own identity and nature—He is the holy and righteous One who makes and keeps covenants. He also establishes how He wants His people to be (holy, faithful, righteous, and covenant-keeping as He is) as a condition for His dwelling with them. YHWH's holiness and righteousness negate any possibility of Him dwelling amidst an unrighteous people; so, YHWH will kill and will preserve to Himself a remnant, as in Ezekiel, amongst whom He will dwell in the now and in the eschaton.

When these texts are viewed through the prism of Rev 21:3c, the eschatological message of the OT appears in richly vibrant colors. God dwells with man because He comes down to man and raises man up to Himself. Put another way, through the Cross, which signifies the continuation and culmination of YHWH's descending movement to man and His reversal to man's ascent which is accomplished through Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord's Supper, God confers upon man the gift of theosis. That man is given theosis does not mean that man shares in the divine attributes; rather, theosis is a testament to the perfect restoration of the divine image and likeness of God in man. Thus, man is once more like his Creator, because YHWH Himself has acted, and this act is further underscored by γέγοναυ (21:6a); hence, theosis is eschatological gift. Nevertheless, it is not an end in itself; rather, it serves the divine purpose of reconciliation of all creation. Only a man who is like God, perfect and without sin, can return to

the Father and behold the Holy One-God. Only YHWH Himself can make man holy and perfect as He is. Thus, theosis is also God's re-creative act via the Cross and reiterated through the Word, Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord's Supper. It is God's cycle to perfection. For the MT, the end of this movement occurs in the eschaton; for the LXX, the end is in the now.

CHAPTER 8

Rev 21:3c and the OT: A Comparison

Table 1: Rev 21:3c and the Probable OT Sources

Johannine literature	LXX	MT
Rev 21:3 καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν And He will dwell together with them	Ex 25:8 καὶ ὀφθήσομαι ἐν ὑμῖν And I will cause myself to be seen amongst you/And I shall be present amongst you	Ex 25:8 אֶשְׁכְּנֵה בְּתוֹכָם And I shall dwell in the midst of them.
Rev 7:15 καὶ ... σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς And He will abide over them	Ex 29:45 καὶ ἐπικληθήσομαι ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ And I shall be confessed by the sons of Israel	Ex 29:45 אֶשְׁכְּנֵה בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל And I shall dwell in the midst of the sons of Israel.
Jo 1:14 καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν And He dwelt amongst us		1Ki 6:13 אֶשְׁכְּנֵה בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל And I shall dwell in the midst of the sons of Israel.
	Ezek 43:9 καὶ κατασκηνώσω ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν And I shall dwell in the middle of you	Ezek 43:9 אֶשְׁכְּנֵה בְּתוֹכָם And I shall dwell in the middle of them.
	Zech 2:14 καὶ κατασκηνώσω ἐν μέσῳ σου And I shall dwell in the middle of you.	Zech 2:14 אֶשְׁכְּנֵה בְּתוֹכְךָ And I shall dwell in the midst of you.
	Zech 2:15 καὶ κατασκηνώσουσιν ἐν μέσῳ σου And they will dwell in the middle of you.	Zech 2:15 אֶשְׁכְּנֵה בְּתוֹכְךָ And I shall dwell in the midst of you.
	Zech 8:3 καὶ κατασκηνώσω ἐν μέσῳ Ἱερουσαλημ And I shall dwell in the middle of Jerusalem.	Zech 8:3 אֶשְׁכְּנֵה בְּתוֹךְ יְרוּשָׁלַם And I shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem.

One of the factors uniting the Johannine literature with the MT version of the OT is the consistency of both with regard to the key vocabulary signifying the Divine Presence of YHWH with man, both in the now and the not yet. In each of the seven OT texts, the MT utilizes יָצַח as descriptive of that relationship. That the MT limits its vocabulary to this one vocable is highly significant for two reasons, one having to do with the connotations of יָצַח , and the other having to do with its cognate יָצַחַן . Just as the MT does not vary in its diction, neither does John; where the MT addresses the eschatological and sensate relationship between YHWH and man with יָצַח , John does the same not in the language of $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ or $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ (LXX) but of $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$. Moreover, neither $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ nor $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ appear in the Johannine corpus, and John assigns to $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ three modes of seeing;¹ what the common man saw every day (1 Jo 1:1); seeing of a spiritual nature (1 Jo 1:2); and, that which Christ beheld in relation to His Father (Jo 1:18). It is the second sense of John's use of $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ which is parallel to the LXX's $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ in Ex 25:8. Yet, though John uses $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ seven times in Revelation (Rev 1:7; 11:19; 12:1; 12:3; 19:10; 22:4; 22:9) and twice in relation to Christ (Rev 1:7 and 22:4), such use is either of the first or second sense, and in both Rev 1:7 and 22:4 is limited to the first mode. Nowhere does John employ $\delta\rho\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ to signify the Divine Presence. For that, John reserves $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$. Why?

In the focus on the Divine Presence—either in the tabernacling in which YHWH is enfleshed (Jo 1:14b), or in His settling down over His people (Rev 7:15d), or in His dwelling together with His people (Rev 21:3c)—there appears to be thematic parallels between $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ and יָצַח . It is possible that John may be seeking to replicate, encapsulate, and intensify the theological content and weight of יָצַח when he uses $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ to signify the existential God-man relationship using a term that evokes tent imagery. For, that YHWH will cause Himself to be

¹ Dahn, *NIDNTT* n.p.

seen or will be present (LXX) is not necessarily the same as YHWH will dwell (MT); however, that YHWH will dwell (MT) implies both that YHWH will be present and, consequently, will cause Himself to be seen (LXX), for YHWH's visibility is confirmation of His promise.

It may be that in choosing σκηνώω to reflect the non-literal dwelling of YHWH with man in the now (the Incarnation) and the not yet (the eschaton), John sought to remain close to the diction, sound, and sense of the MT. If his intention was to evoke the language and rhythm of the OT to his hearers and readers, to inform subtly that he is a prophet in the tradition of the OT Hebrew prophets, then John would have selected σκηνώω for יָשַׁב. This lexical choice may have been made not because of any etymological relationship between the two vocables, but most likely because the words share a common tri-literal root, s-k-n, and a similar sound,² and he wanted to convey the similarity of theological ideas.

It is possible that to achieve this closeness to the MT, John may have either redacted the LXX himself, perhaps for the sake of a better fit with the MT's יָשַׁב. Alternatively, he may not have had access to the LXX at all but to some redacted version of it, such as might appear in a testimony book. Then again, John may have simply translated the MT for himself and rendered its text with a word that he thought most directly reflected the concepts of divine transcendence and divine immanence, since he may have seen parallels between יָשַׁב and σκηνη, and between יָשַׁב and σκηνώω. Too, John may have taken advantage of the vocables' sonic similarity. While John's text might have some affinity to another non-LXX renditions of the MT, akin to Aquila's, Theodotion's, or Symmachus's, it is improbable that John had access to these three because it is unlikely that he was contemporaneous with any of them.³

² Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 387.

³ Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica* (trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1979), 53, 54, 64, notes that Aquila produced his text circa A.D. 130;

Rev 21:3c tends to be in syntactical accord with the textual form of all the MT texts. For example, in Ex 25:8 a *w-qtל* follows a volitive;⁴ 1Ki 6:13 is the second of two apodoses of a real conditional and in which is the consecutive *waw*⁵ וַיִּבְנֶה; Ezek 43:9, is similar to Ex 25:8 in that a volitive precedes a *w-qtל*; Zech 2:14-15 has the future implicit in the participle אֵף which is continued by וַיִּבְנֶה a Qal Perfect *waw consecutive*; and, the *w-qatalti* of Zech 8:3b indicates the future also. In each of these texts, the verb form of וַיִּבְנֶה is comparable to the future indicative active of the Greek, for the MT's verbal form, Qal Perfect *waw consecutive*, is equivalent to σκηνώσει of Rev 21:3c. As with the Greek regarding syntax, conjunction + monolectic verb + object/prepositional phrase, even so with the Hebrew. A verbatim comparison yields the

Symmachus, circa A. D. 170; Theodotion, about the close of the 2nd C A. D. Also, D.A. Carson, Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), A. D.; or during Trajan's, 98-117 A. D. Brighton, *Revelation*, 13, cites Irenaeus that Revelation was written "near the end of the reign of the Roman emperor Domitian" and that "John was in Ephesus until the time of Trajan." Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; vol. 1 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 1:559, asserts that Revelation was most likely written during the reign of Domitian, for as he wrote, concerning the name of the anti-Christ, "if it were necessary that his name should be distinctly revealed in the present time, it would have been announced by him who beheld the apocalyptic vision. For that [the apocalyptic vision] was seen no very long time since, but almost in our day, towards the end of Domitian's reign." Say for argument's sake that Irenaeus is right, then John would, at that time, have been either 81 or 96 years old, assuming that he was 17 by A. D. 33. If Aquila produced his text circa A. D. 130, then one would assume that Aquila himself was more than 30 because of the Jews' custom that a man could achieve nothing worthwhile until he was 30. Therefore, Aquila may well have been 49 or 34 or thereabouts. What does that mean? Given John's much revered position in the Church, it was more likely that John influenced Aquila, rather than the other way around, especially since Aquila was reputed to have converted to Judaism out of disgruntlement with the Church (See M. Abrahams, *Aquila's Greek Version of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919), 6, 7.). Additionally, given the later dates of Symmachus's and Theodotion's texts, it is impossible for John to have had access to work of their producing. It is possible that, just as there had been free renditions of the Hebrew text until the canon was formed, that there were Greek translations that were more pleasing than the LXX, especially to those who wanted a more "precise scholarly translation," which the LXX most definitely is not.

⁴ Joüon-Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 399 § 1191, explains "*w-qatalti* continuing an imperative is ... very common ... [with a] full sense of succession.... If the second action does not belong to the present moment, but to a more or less distant time, it is logical since the imprv. is properly used for an immediate action...., that is should be expressed by the future with the nuance of succession, *w-qatalti*." Thus, the most appropriate rendition from the Hebrew to the Greek would be the FIA1s.

⁵ Joüon-Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 647 § 176, argue for the apodosis *waw* being rather a resumptive *waw*. However, the resumptive *waw* would require the resumption of the same verb (fn 2). Taking into consideration this section of Joüon-Muraoka, one would be required to translate the text: "Then I will dwell..."; however, the "then" is not applicable to the verb of 1Ki 6:13, but to that in the apodosis in 6:12, וַיִּבְנֶה. Thereafter, what follows is a simple *waw consecutive* to be translated "and I shall...."

following: καὶ = ך; σκηνώσει = יתקנשׁ;⁶ and, μετ' αὐτῶν = עִתָּוָם⁷ (or any of its variants).

Furthermore, Ex 25:8b and Ezek 43:9b have in common with Rev 21:3c that the prepositional phrase (the object of the verb) consists of a third person plural pronoun (which is itself the object of the preposition whose meaning is equivalent to that in Rev 21:3c) whereas that of the LXX is second person plural. This change of form may be attributed to the differing perspectives of the MT and LXX.⁸

Finally, both Rev 21:3c and the MT texts share a similar clausal structure: copulative conjunction + verb + prepositional phrasal object of the verb. Moreover, they require the preceding clause for their full meaning to be comprehended with regard to subject, YHWH and Christ, and means of dwelling.⁹ It is this same preceding clause which demonstrates the correspondence of the textual form of Ex 25:8b and Rev 21:3c which is expressed via their thematic statement. Thus, though there are obvious linguistic differences between the Greek of Rev 21:3c and the Hebrew of the MT, in this case, syntactically, there appears to be much in common.

The difference between Rev 21:3c, the MT, and the LXX at Ex 29:45 pertains to all four linguistic categories;¹⁰ for, when the LXX reads καὶ ἐπικληθήσομαι ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραηλ

⁶ This does not imply any etymological relationship between the two words, but merely that where one is used the other is understood.

⁷ Waltke-O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, classifies the preposition ך as spatial with reference to domain and cites Ps 57:10 as exemplar.

⁸ From the standpoint of the MT, Moses is YHWH's mouthpiece through whom the message is communicated to Israel, and he is also the agent of its implementation. Though he is one of the sons of Israel, this particular message with its promise of YHWH's presence is to reassure semi-pagan Israel concerning the YHWH who delivered them from Egypt. He is present and He will reveal Himself so that they have that assurance, which Moses—who has been through the burning bush, the plague, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the meeting on the mount of Sinai—perhaps does not need. The LXX, however, does not make this distinction between Moses and the children of Israel, and represents both with υἱῶν.

⁹ This last is true of Ex 25:8 and Rev 21:3c only.

¹⁰ Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 64, notes, referring to the semantic, that the LXX as a whole is more an interpretation of the MT than a literal translation, and it was not intended to be "a precise scholarly

its key vocabulary is at variance with **לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי בְּחֹרֶךְ יִשְׁכְּנֵהוּ** (MT), and with **καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν** (Rev 21:3c). The sole disagreement between Rev 21:3c and the MT version of Ex 29:45 is that the object of the verb in Revelation is a prepositional phrase, the object of the preposition of which is a pronoun rather than a noun phrase (MT, LXX). This verbal object, curiously enough, is also the sole point of agreement between the OT texts. Lexically, semantically, and thematically it is not clear how the LXX arrived at its translation of the MT, and this murkiness divides the OT texts from each other and the LXX from Rev 21:3c. However, if the LXX's reading does mean that Israel's confession of YHWH signifies that He will be their God, then it may be semantically consonant with not only the MT but also Rev 21:3c, which would then be a concise reiteration of Rev 7:14-17 and Ex 29:45 (MT, LXX). Those with whom the Lamb dwells are those who have confessed Him, have remained faithful to the end, and have endured great tribulation for His name's sake. The reward for confession, if such endures, is eternal life with the sensate Divine Presence in the eschaton.¹¹

Thematically, that YHWH dwells with His people (MT) means that He will prepare them for His presence, and that, to them, He is accessible and sensate in the now (Ex 25:8b; 29:45, et al, MT) and in the not yet (Rev 21:3c). Both Rev 21:3c and Ex 29:45 convey that only the redeemed—the sanctified—will experience and worship YHWH mediately in the now and immediately in the eschaton, where the transcendent and immanent God will present Himself sensately as He is. The sacrificial system of the OT, in this respect, is a type of the preparation which YHWH has made that His people may have eternal life. The sin and other offerings of Ex

translation." Moreover, the LXX scribes' interpretation of the Masoretic text was most likely guided by their Hellenized sensibilities which made them disapprove of anthropomorphisms, resulting in a more abstract and philosophic view of YHWH than had the Hebrews and Masorettes (66).

¹¹ Saying this is not to speak either of an *a priori* (confessing Christ leads to dwelling with Him in the eschaton) or an *a posteriori* (dwelling with Christ in the eschaton is a result of confessing Christ) relationship between confession and dwelling; for, once saved is not always saved, and that would be to imply that man's actions can lead to His eternal salvation.

29 yield to the sacrifice of the God who is enfleshed (Jo 1:14b) to die for man (Mt 20:28; Mk 10:45; Jo 10:10; 10:11; 10:15; 10:17) who is readied for the Divine Presence with the gifts of the Word, Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord's Supper. Whereas there were gradations of sacrifice and preparation in the OT, there is but one sacrifice in the NT, that is Christ, and one means of preparation and sustenance for the end, that is His sacramental gifts.

With respect to the multiplex view of YHWH as transcendent and immanent, the diction of the LXX limits YHWH to the transcendent; He is the God who is accessible only through worship as sacrifice and confession (Ex 25:8b; 29:45). Though the MT presents the same God-view, its language of the tent includes the other dimension of immanence; by it, YHWH is the hidden God whose back-side is visible in a cloud so that man may see Him and live in proximity to the One who condescends to dwell with man. The absence from the language of the LXX of YHWH as immanent is a thematic rift between the two versions of OT and also between the LXX and Rev 21:3c, and may be a factor of the lack of eschatological subtext in the LXX with regard to the seven OT texts in question. Nevertheless, it must needs be stressed that the MT does not imply that YHWH can be touched by man; indeed, man can approach Him only through the means He has ordained, and, even then, upon pain of death (Ex 19:10-13). What the anthropomorphic diction of the MT, in addition to the tabernacle of Exodus, asserts is that YHWH is perceptible to man through all his senses, and not just through sight alone (Ex 25:8b, LXX). The corollary is the Incarnation of the Johannine literature in which YHWH is sensate; such a claim may not be made in relation to the LXX and its avoidance of divine anthropomorphism.

Unlike the previous Exodus texts, there are slight syntactic and semantic differences between Rev 21:3c and the MT at 1Ki 6:13 (absent from the LXX); a single instance of syntactic

variance between Rev 21:3c and the MT, but lexical, syntactic, and thematic distinctions between the MT and LXX at Zech 2:14; 8:3. When Rev 21:3c is compared to 1Ki 6:13, the difference is that in 1Ki 6:13, as with Ex 29:45, and Zech 8:3, the object of the preposition is respectively the noun phrase בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and the noun יְרֵדוּשָׁלַם, whereas Rev 21:3c has the plural genitive pronoun αὐτῶν. Another point of variation is that in 1Ki 6:13, the promise of the Divine Presence is localized to Israel rather than globalized to encompass all humanity (Rev 21:3b). Otherwise, Rev 21:3c is in accord with 1Ki 6:13, partially syntactically because of the verbal morphology. In this text, the sense and themes mirror that of Ex 29:45 with the inclusion of the subtle reminder that the sovereign God expects obedience from His people (1Ki 6:12). The God who is faithful demands a corresponding fidelity; the God who makes and keeps covenants requires also that man will keep them. All of these expectations are met in the Incarnate Son who, in turn, desires them of His sheep. The reward, as He has promised in Jo 14:2-3, is eternal life in His presence, which is also the promise of 1Ki 6:13; for the Israel of which YHWH speaks to Solomon is also the Israel of faith, according to Paul in Gal 3:29 and Rom 9:6b-8. What may be construed from the absence of this text in the LXX? At the least, a defective Hebrew text; at the most, scribal error, perhaps prompted by insurmountable interpretive difficulties resulting from the blatant anthropomorphism of the missing text, 1Ki 6:11-14.¹²

Somewhat similar to 1Ki 6:13, the MT of Zech 2:14-15 differs from Rev 21:3c only partially with regard to the syntactic element in that the object of the prepositional phrase is a second singular pronoun, which refers back to the vocative הָאֱלֹהִים (Zech 2:14), as opposed to a

¹² Emmanuel Tov, ed., *The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible on CD-ROM*, Accordance Version 5.6.1., n.p., confirms the absence of the Greek counterpart of the MT's 1Ki 6:11-14.

third plural, with a genitive referent τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Rev 21:3b).¹³ The significance of this variation is delineated by the synonymity of בני ישראל (Ex 29:45), בְּתַח-צִיּוֹן (Zech 2:14), and יְרוּשָׁלַם (Zech 8:3), being made so, at the most elementary level, by them all being the object of the verb, consistently הִקְנִיָהוּ. The shared commonality of these differences is that they are all restrictively local, in contrast with the μετ' αὐτῶν in Rev 21:3c which is universal and becomes, in the context of Rev 21:1-8, a symbol of the whole Church on earth. Therefore, what was applicable only to historical Israel in the OT (2 Sam 7:12-16) is now true of all those peoples who constitute the Body of Christ, who believe in Him, and who confess His name.¹⁴ He will dwell with them in the eschaton.

When Rev 21:3c is compared to the text of the LXX, one finds that John's text is lexically, syntactically, and thematically distinct from the LXX version of Zech 2:14. For instance, John's text differs from the LXX's with respect to the number of the key verb as well as the case and category of the prepositional phrase; that the LXX's verb is first singular is a feature in common with the MT, one not shared by the third singular verb of Rev 21:3c. Moreover, while the LXX's text contains a locative dative prepositional phrase, the corresponding phrase in Rev 21:3c is a communal genitive which may be a literal translation of the MT at Ex 25:8b. The final difference between the two texts is that shared by the other texts in the study; amongst other things, diction informs theme. Thus, while an eschatological future time may be construed from the key vocabulary of the MT at Zech 2:14, such a reading may not be

¹³ This is in addition to the verb number which is the variation that is common to all the MTs under discussion.

¹⁴ G. K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*, 18, "Old Testament texts pertaining to ethnic Israel's redemption and restoration are applied in Revelation to the world's redemption on the basis of defining the true people of YHWH according to their faith in Christ and according to their corporate representation by Christ, the one who sums up true Israel in himself. And, since Christ is also the last Adam, all humanity finds its hope summed up in him."

possible from the LXX because of the alteration of the levels of meaning¹⁵ wrought by the prefixing of *κατα* to *σκηνώω*, hence the variation between the LXX and the MT, and the LXX and Rev 21:3c. Thus, semantically and thematically, the LXX would differ from both the MT and John's text with regard to the eschatological viewpoint of the latter.

At Zech 2:15 in particular, the LXX's reading is at total variance with the MT, *וְהָיָה יְהוָה בְּיָמֵינוּ* which, being translated, is, "and many nations will join¹⁶ themselves to YHWH in that day, and they will be my people, and I will dwell in the midst of them, and they will know that YHWH of hosts has sent me to you." The one redeeming feature of the LXX's translation is that the verb's form is FIA. The text of the LXX could be the result of a defective Hebrew text, a scribal error, or an interpretive alteration: *καὶ καταφεύξονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἔσονται αὐτῷ εἰς λαὸν καὶ κατασκηνώσουσιν ἐν μέσῳ σου καὶ ἐπιγνώσῃ ὅτι κύριος παντοκράτωρ ἔξαπέσταλκέν με πρὸς σέ,* which is to say "and many nations will flee to the Lord in that day, and they will be his people, and they will dwell in the middle of you, and you will know that the Lord Almighty has sent me to you."

From the MT to the LXX, there are at least seven noticeable emendations; a single one could have been considered a scribal error. So large a number of them and at such significant points is likely to be a result either of a defective Hebrew text or of deliberate redaction. For example, where the MT reads "join." the LXX has "flee." Twice the Tetragrammaton is replaced

¹⁵ James W. Voelz, *What Does This Mean?: Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Post-Modern World* (St. Louis: CPH, 1997), 156-167, speaks of three levels of meaning, only two of which are entertained here. The level one meaning "constitutes what a text is saying", in other words, its "sense." The level two meaning pertains to the significance of the words of the text, and the level three meaning addresses the "implications", relative to the author and his environment, which may be gleaned from the words of the text.

¹⁶ Koehler-Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of The Old Testament*, n.p.; the niph'al perfect of *לָוַי* is "usually taken as future."

by the more acceptable Kyrios.¹⁷ Where the Hebrew pronoun is the first person “my,” the LXX substitutes the third person “his.” Critically, the MT’s first person singular subject of the verb “dwell,” “I” (meaning YHWH)—in the LXX becomes the third person plural “they”. Finally, the subject of the verb “know” is “they” in the MT, but “you” in the LXX. The most significant grammatical emendation is the substitution of “they will dwell” for “I will dwell.” Its importance rests in the deletion of the eschatological intention of the prophetic message and the restriction of the text’s meaning only to the now. Furthermore, that modification effects an alteration in the text’s perspective so that the voice of YHWH becomes muddled with the voice of the prophet.

The OT depicts the prophet as a mouthpiece through and from whose mouth YHWH’s words to His people are heard and received as though He Himself delivered them. Thus, the prophet in the act of prophesying is as YHWH Himself. The MT, perhaps making allowance for this, smoothly transitions between the words of YHWH and the prophet’s statement of his prophetic mission with וְדַבַּרְתָּ כִּי־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֶיךָ. This view of the prophet as YHWH’s mouthpiece, as standing in His stead before the people, is lost in the LXX translation because that textual version converts the first person pronouns to third, possibly to preserve the translator’s abstractly neo-Platonic view of YHWH.¹⁸

That the number of κατασκηνώω is third plural, and that that change in number has affected the meaning and thematic statement of the text is the primary factor which divides the LXX’s version of Zech 2:15 from Rev 21:3c. That Rev 21:3c, apart from the syntactic difference, has almost every other linguistic element in common with Zech 2:15 (MT) further delineates the distinction between these two and the LXX.

¹⁷ Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 66, writes that Kyrios represents a new idea of YHWH that is more universal instead of parochial as the Septuagint scribes sacrificed image to meaning.

¹⁸ Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 66.

Thus, it would appear that the text of Rev 21:3c has more in common with the MT's textual form than with the LXX's, and the similarity occurs in all four linguistic areas: lexical, syntactic, semantic, and thematic. Rev 21:3c is in lexical agreement with all seven MT texts in that both texts consistently utilize the same key vocabulary, but there is no such concord with the LXX which varies its diction. While there are syntactic parallels between Rev 21:3c and the MT text, even with morphological differences at Ex 25:8b, Ezek 43:9, Zech 2:14-15, and 8:3, such is not the case with the LXX which has some slight morphological relationship with Rev 21:3c only at Zech 2:14-15, 8:3. Semantically, Rev 21:3c accords more with the MT than the LXX, both denotatively and connotatively, even taking the issue of textual localization into consideration, with regard to the existential relationship between the key subject YHWH and man. There is limited concord between the MT and the LXX at Ezek 43:9, Zech 2:14-15, 8:3 concerning the covenant-keeping nature of YHWH. Finally, though a slight syntactic and thematic difference exists between Rev 21:3c and the MT at Ex 25:8b, there is little accord between John's text and the LXX at that same point. Moreover, the most textual form variance between Rev 21:3c and the LXX, and the LXX and the MT arises at Ex 25:8b, 29:45, and Zech 2:15, and the least occurs between Rev 21:3c and Ex 25:8b (MT).

The greatest margin of textual form similarity at the lexical and syntactical levels, then, exists between Rev 21:3c and the MT at Ex 25:8b and Ezek 43:9. However, when the preceding clause—the one which provides immediate context to the salient “dwelling” clause—is factored in, then the textual form of Rev 21:3c appears to be closest to that of Ex 25:8b because then it is found that, in spite of minor syntactical differences, Rev 21:3c and Ex 25:8b are also in accord semantically and thematically. Therefore, it is most likely that the textual source of Rev 21:3c is Ex 25:8b (MT) since, it appears quite unlikely that John's text could have been derived from the

LXX's reading at any of the previously discussed texts as they stand. So saying does not preclude the possibility of a Johannine rewriting of the LXX or his employment of some other source unknown; however, the evidence in support of either hypothesis is weak, tending more towards a Johannine redaction of the MT. Absent sufficient evidence to the contrary, however, it is safe to say that John's most likely source may have been the MT at Ex 25:8b. Nevertheless, though Rev 21:3c may not have been derived from the LXX either lexically or syntactically, inasmuch as σκηνώ signifies that the God who dwells with man is the God who is seen, the God who is confessed, and who has gone to prepare a place for those who confess Him, then it is likely that the Johannine literature embraces some of the semantic and thematic ideas of the LXX's variants to the MT's diction.

CHAPTER 9

Textual Variance, Anyone?

Table 2: Rev 21:3c and the Most Likely MT sources

Rev 21:3c, καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν	Rev 21:3c, ἴδου ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν
Ex 25:8b, ׀תִּבְנֶה אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן	Ex 25:8, וְשָׂא לִי מִקִּדְשֵׁי הַתְּבָרָה
Ezek 43:9b, ׀תִּבְנֶה אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן	Ezek 43:9, עֲתָה יִדְבַקוּ אֶת־זִנְוֹתָם וּפְגָרֵי מַלְאֲכֵיהֶם לְעוֹלָם מִפְּנֵי הַתְּבָרָה לְעוֹלָם

If Ex 25:8b is the most likely text source of Rev 21:3c, then syntactical variance caused by the third person singular ending of σκηνώ in Rev 21:3c must be accounted for. Who is this voice from the throne?¹ Why the third person ending to the verb? The verbal suffix of Ex 25:8b, ׀תִּבְנֶה אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן, is indicative of first person speech; the context, the discourse between YHWH and Moses in which Moses is given the pattern for the tabernacle, reveals that YHWH Himself is the speaker. In contrast, the speech from the voice from the throne, καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν,

¹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 596-597, writes, “[a]s often elsewhere in Revelation, the actual living source of the voice is not identified. Sometimes an object is named as the source or direction from which the voice comes: one of the corners of the heavenly incense altar (9:13); heaven itself (10:4; 12:10; 14:13; 18:4); the temple or sanctuary of YHWH in heaven (16:1, 17); or YHWH's heavenly throne (16:17; 19:5; 21:3). In 16:17 both the temple and the throne together are mentioned.

“Whatever source might be named, the voice expresses the majesty and holiness and glory of the ultimate living source, YHWH himself. Because at times an angel speaks for YHWH (5:2; 6:6-7; 7:2; 14:6-7; 18:1-2), it may well be that it is also an angel who actually speaks when only a voice is mentioned. When some object is named, such as the furnishings in the heavenly temple, that may emphasize that the source is not only YHWH, *but the YHWH who has bound himself to his people in an Incarnational and sacramental way*—in Christ, who is the new temple, and in divine worship, when YHWH comes to his people through his Word and Sacraments. Thus, naming the altar as the source of the voice would suggest that the one who provided atonement for sin and who hears and receives the prayers of his saints is the living source of the voice. Naming heaven as the source of the voice might suggest that the one who is adored by the heavenly hosts is the source, while naming the temple could suggest that the one who dwells among his people through his covenant of grace in Christ is the source. And naming the throne might suggest that the one who rules his people as their only King and Lord is the source. Here in 21:3c (as elsewhere) it may be an angel who is speaking, even though only “the throne” of YHWH is mentioned. Even if it is an angel who is speaking, he is doing so for YHWH and under YHWH's authority, that is, by and under the authority of the royal Lord, who alone is the object of the worship of all creation in the new heaven and earth (see 19:4; cf. 19:10; 22:8-9).”

contains the third person singular form of the verb. Why does σκηνόω not have the same first person ending as Ex 25:8, with its clear assurance of the identity of the speaker?

Critical opinion on this issue is varied. E. W. Hengstenberg argues that “[t]he voice from the throne could only be the voice of YHWH”;² however, Hengstenberg provides no adequate rationale for his statement. Swete and Prigent counter Hengstenberg when they declare, respectively, that “[t]he voice is that of one of the Angels of the Presence, as in xvi. 17, xix. 5 ..., not of God Himself”³ and that YHWH is not the speaker since He is spoken of “in the 3rd person.”⁴ According to Hailey, the “voice from the throne is not identified; it may belong to the unknown speaker of 16:17 or 19:5, or it may be that of Christ or God”;⁵ beyond this statement, Hailey is silent. Glasgow writes that the “voice out of the throne is, as in ch. xix. 5, the voice of the four *zoa*, including that of the man Jesus Himself”;⁶ however, the basis of his and the other claims is uncertain since none of these scholars, unfortunately, provide any basis for their assertions regarding the identity of the speaker. Lenski perhaps comes closest when he summarizes the issue thus, “[a]ll we can say is that the great voice speaks about God and is thus not God’s own voice but one that God employs although we admit that God may speak of himself in the third person as well as in the first.”⁷

Rev 14:13 is illustrative of this problem of the identity of the speaker.⁸ For instance, how is one to account for ναί, λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα in the midst of the speech in 14:13? There are a

² Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John*, 323.

³ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 277.

⁴ Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*, 595.

⁵ Homer Hailey, *Revelation: An Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 406.

⁶ James Glasgow, *The Apocalypse* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1872), 529.

⁷ Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John’s Revelation*, 619.

⁸ Perhaps the answer may be found in John’s use of the clause, καὶ ἤκουσα, which occurs seventeen times in Revelation. In Rev 1:10, the first instance of καὶ ἤκουσα, the voice which John hears is Christ’s, and He identifies Himself in 1:17 and continues speaking at length until 3:22. He does not speak in the first person again

number of possibilities, including that the speaker is an angel or another, such as Brighton indicates;⁹ that the speaker is one of the Persons of the Trinity whose message pertains to another not Himself, hence the third person; that 14:13 is a dialogue between two Persons of the Trinity, the first unidentified and the second the Holy Spirit; and, that the clause is John's interjection which identifies the speaker as being the Holy Spirit.

If the first is true, then 14:13 is from an angel who gives utterance to that which he has been commissioned and, in the act of so doing, quotes the Holy Spirit. If the second is true, then 14:13 is one continuous text from the same speaker in which He quotes another like unto Himself. If the third is true, then 14:13 is a dialogue with two speakers, the first of whom says to John, γράψον μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἀπ' ἄρτι, and the second, ναί, λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν, τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν. If the fourth is true, then 14:13 is uttered by the Holy Spirit. The answer may be any one of these. Moreover, the questions raised with regard to this text are also applicable to other texts, with some modifications.

For instance, only the first two of the aforementioned possibilities are applicable to Rev 18:4-5 and 19:6,¹⁰ and to 21:3c as well. The language of 18:4-5 and 19:6 strongly suggests that the voice in these two texts, and possibly in 21:3c, belongs to one of the Persons of the Trinity. The phrase ὁ λαός μου in Rev 18:4-5 may reveal the identity of the speaker, for it is thus that

until 21:5-8. In 5:11, 6:1, 8:13, 16:5, 16:7 the voices are identifiable as the elders, one of the four beasts, the eagle flying, the angel of the waters (he speaks directly to YHWH saying, "δίκαιος εἶ, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν, ὁ ὅσιος, ὅτι ταῦτα ἔκρινας..." (16:5-6)), and the voice from the altar (which also speaks directly to YHWH, "ναὶ κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ἀληθινὰ καὶ δίκαια αἱ κρίσεις σου" (16:7)). In 6:6, 9:13, 10:4, the identity of the speaker is questionable (for a different point of view, Brighton, *vide supra*, fn 48); but in 12:10-12; 14:2; 16:1; 18:4; 19:6. and 21:3c though the voice is unidentified, the message and the loci from which they emit point to one of the Trinity.

⁹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 601.

¹⁰ John's description suggests that the speaker is one of the Trinity, "Καὶ ἤκουσα ὡς φωνὴν ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴν βροντῶν ἰσχυρῶν," and His remarks pertain to another, most likely the First Person, "ἀλληλουϊά, ὅτι ἐβασίλευσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς [ἡμῶν] ὁ παντοκράτωρ," or to the Three in One.

YHWH refers to Israel and the redeemed throughout the OT and NT. Moreover, the speaker refers to YHWH in the third person, ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ἀδικήματα αὐτῆς; thus, one may infer from both that the speaker may be either the Second or Third Person of the Trinity, and the one spoken of is God the Father, Himself. In 19:6, again, John's description of the voice suggests that the speaker is one of the Trinity, φωνὴν ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴν βροντῶν ἰσχυρῶν (Ezek 43:2; Ps 29:3; Rev 1:15; 14:2; 17:1), and His remarks pertain to another, most likely the First Person, ἀλληλουϊά, ὅτι ἐβασίλευσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς [ἡμῶν] ὁ παντοκράτωρ, or to the Three in One.

If the speaker of 21:3c is an angel, then he certainly has heavenly authority. For, his words proclaim the most significant promise of all salvation history: YHWH will dwell with man in the eschaton. As such, since his words are not his own; his ἰδοὺ is the equivalent of "Thus saith the Lord," and the third person singular is the only point of view he may present.

Alternatively, if the speaker is one of the Persons of the Trinity, then His conversation would pertain to one of His peers. That the voice in Rev 21:3c is ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου suggests that the speaker is YHWH,¹¹ especially when 4:5¹² and 22:1¹³ are taken into consideration.¹⁴ In these two texts, the images associated with the phrase are indicative of the Almighty Himself; therefore, it is unlikely that the speaker in 21:3c may be an angel, as Brighton partly estimates.¹⁵

If that is so, then Rev 18:4-5, 19:6, and 21:3c may be affording another view of the *opera ad intra*, the inner workings of the Trinity, not so much how it communicates within itself, but

¹¹ Hengstenberg, *The Revelation of St. John*, 323. E. W. Hengstenberg argues that "[t]he voice from the throne could only be the voice of YHWH"; however, Hengstenberg does not provide an adequate rationale for his statement.

¹² ἐκπορεύονται ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταί. Ex 19:16.

¹³ ποταμὸν ὕδατος ζωῆς λαμπρὸν ὡς κρύσταλλον, ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. Ezek 47.1-9.

¹⁴ These are the only three verses in the Johannine corpus in which the phrase ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου occurs.

¹⁵ Brighton, *Revelation*, 596-597.

how it communicates about itself. It appears that the Persons in the Trinity when communicating about another other than self may use either the second or third person singular with regard to that Person who is spoken of (Mt 7:5; Mk 1:11; Heb 1:5; 5:5). Thus, it is possible that Rev 21:3c may be an example of third person intra-Trinitarian communication concerning Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity, and most likely uttered by the First Person.¹⁶ However, if the Book of Acts¹⁷ is any indicator, it would not be a stretch to conjecture that in 21:3c the speaker may be the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit.

Rev 21:3c as spoken by one of the Trinity is strongly connected to Jo 1:14b, 32-34.¹⁸ For, Christ is the Sent One, and His mission the redemption of mankind, the reconciliation of man and all creation with the Father, which fact is indeed expressed in Rev 21:1-8. Brighton states it more comprehensively:

Jesus Christ is the Incarnation of the glory of Yahweh, in and through whom God dwells among his people. He is the new tabernacle, the new temple, the means of atonement and the place of forgiveness of sins, the one who reconciles the holy God with sinful human beings.... And this will be manifestly evident and realized in the new heaven and earth.¹⁹

Therefore, it is most likely that the third person singular form of the verb in Rev 21:3c is a slight change from the first person singular form of Ex 25:8b, and the adjustment may have been made not to accommodate the speech of an unknown speaking from the throne of YHWH,

¹⁶ The Book of Acts, which may be subtitled "The Book of the Works of the Holy Spirit," delineates why it is more likely that the speaker in 21:3c is the First Person of the Trinity, YHWH the Father, Himself, rather than YHWH, the Holy Spirit. Apart from that, the Holy Spirit was the One who animated the prophets, and moved and spoke the words of the Father through them.

¹⁷ See the Book of Acts, for example.

¹⁸ An expansion of the Johannine text is expressed in the Synoptics in Mt 3:17; 17:5; Mk 1:11; 9:7; and Lk 3:22.

¹⁹ Brighton, *Revelation*, 598.

but that of either the First or Third Person of the Trinity speaking of the Second. Thus, though the verb form is changed, the sense of the text is still consistent with that of Exodus 25:8b; moreover, in spite of the change, YHWH Himself may be the speaker in Rev 21:3c as He is in Ex 25:8b.

CHAPTER 10

Painting Ex 25:8b into Rev 21:3c

Ex 25:8a is the divine commission of the *שִׁבְעָה* which will house the tent, the *σκήνη*, and Rev 21:3b announces the presence of the *σκήνη* amongst men. Where the Exodus text combines the literal and non-literal in the one word, the Rev 21:3c text, by way of John 1:14 and Rev 7:15d, refers entirely to the non-literal, to Christ. Thus, both texts progress from the physical tent as type of the Divine Presence (Ex 25:8), to the Incarnate Christ as the non-literal tent who is the presence of YHWH in the now (Jo 1:14), and to the tent who is the sensate presence of YHWH in the eschaton (Rev 21:3b). Thus, YHWH moves the narrative from a type that, in the wilderness, foreshadows the eschatological reality forward to the reality itself. This tabernacle as type may be a primitive view of what awaits in the eschaton. Thus, it may have been matched to the sensibilities of a people newly delivered from a pagan land wherein religious ideas found expression in earthly realities. Thus, in the wilderness, YHWH may have met His people on their level and showed them what awaited those who would endure to the end. In the Incarnation, which may be an escalation of the wilderness tabernacle, YHWH's intention may have been to demonstrate, in an even more sensate way, how His glory would be experienced by man in the end. Furthermore, the eschaton may itself be the third level of escalation after the Incarnation event, and, in it, indicates John, man enjoys a fully sensate relationship with YHWH.

The contrast between the Incarnation, the eschaton, and the wilderness experience is that whereas in the wilderness no man could look upon YHWH and live—hence the ephemeral mask of the cloud—John could and did write concerning the Incarnation, *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*

καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός (Jo 1:14), and ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὁ ἐώρακαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐθεασάμεθα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν (1Jo 1:1). The ephemeral is solidly substantial, though still masked. Regarding the eschaton, John wrote, ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν (Rev 21:3c) and καὶ ἐξαλείψει πᾶν δάκρυον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν (Rev 21:4a). In the eschaton, the fullness of the divine glory is man's to experience because there are no more masks. It is noteworthy that what is said of the eschaton is the intensified converse of the Incarnation. Whereas man touches God masked in the Incarnation, in the eschaton, as in the sacramental gifts, He touches man as He is.¹

What, then, does it mean when both Ex 25:8b (MT) and Rev 21:3c promise that YHWH will dwell with man? Both texts anticipate events but from different perspectives. On the one hand, while Ex 25:8b, firmly rooted in the now, looks forward to the not yet (through the Law and the prophets, the Incarnation, and on through to the new heaven and earth wherein that of which the tabernacle is a type comes to pass), Rev 21:3c, on the other hand, as the final prophetic utterance of the same promise, encompasses all that precedes it, from Ex 25:8b forward, and squarely faces its realization. YHWH has kept and will keep the promises He made and reiterated through His prophets.²

Furthermore, the significance of the MT's diction, יָצַח, cannot be underestimated. In spite of the holiness restrictions and that man may not look upon God and live, YHWH is "accessible"³ in the midst of the camp by worship through sacrifice. He is the God who is there

¹ Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation*, 311.

² Friedrich Dürstedeck, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Revelation of John* (Trans. and ed. Henry E. Jacobs; New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1887), 477.

³ James Moffatt, "Revelation of St. John the Divine," in *The Expositor's Greek New Testament* (ed. W. Robertson Nicoll; vol. 5 of *The Expositor's Greek New Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll; New York: Doran, n.d.), 480.

and who will continue to abide as long as man remains faithful. This same message is conveyed and intensified in Rev 21:3c by way of the Incarnation and its exchange of the transitory for the permanent.

Because of the Incarnation and the sacrifice of the Son, YHWH meets man face to face. That which was masked in the cloud is hidden no more. YHWH is seen as He is and man knows that he is like Him. In addition to this, YHWH is the source of man's "eternal comfort"⁴ for in His presence ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι οὔτε πένθος οὔτε κραυγή οὔτε πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι (Rev 21:4b); instead, is realized the life of fellowship,⁵ hinted at through יְהוָה אִמָּנוּ, which is synonymous with 'God with us'. Those same words point to the promise of the name by which Jesus would be called—according to the prophet Isaiah who bore witness and said, לַאֲנָשִׁים וְלַבְּרִיָּהּ (Is 7:14),⁶ which is to say God with us—and which promise is realized "not only in grace but also in glory"⁷ by "God's actual and personal presence among his people"⁸; for, YHWH literally *is* with man in the eschaton. This "union and communion of God with us,"⁹ hinted at in the wilderness tabernacle, comes with the advent of the new heaven and new earth when YHWH joins Himself eternally¹⁰ in perfected communion with His saints.¹¹

⁴ Moffatt, "Revelation of St. John the Divine," 480.

⁵ Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 278.

⁶ R. C. H. Lenski, *Commentary on the New Testament: The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1998), 619.

⁷ Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation*, 619; R. H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 383.

⁸ Brighton, *Revelation*, 597.

⁹ Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation*, 620; G. R. Beasley-Murray, ed., *The Book of Revelation* (Greenwood: Attic Press, 1974), 311.

¹⁰ Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation*, 620; Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, 383; R. H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 372.

¹¹ Herman Hoeksema, *Behold, He Cometh!: An Exposition of the Book of Revelation* (Grandville: Reformed, 1986), 674; Düsterdeck, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Revelation of John*, 477.

As with Ex 25:8b so with Rev 21:3c, for therein YHWH makes Himself visible *to man*.¹²

¹² Siegbert W. Becker, *Revelation: Distant Triumph Song* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1985), 330; Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation*, 311.

CHAPTER 11

“What shall we say, then?”

The evaluation of the seven OT texts employing set linguistic criteria has led to the conclusion that the most likely textual source of Rev 21:3c is Ex 25:8b (MT). That this may be so ultimately says nothing about the rest of John’s text; for, the study contends that the prophetic genre of John’s work determines the seemingly random utilization of material from both the MT and the LXX.

If scholars opine that John’s text was Hebraic or Septuagintal or some admixture of the two, then it is likely that such a conclusion might have been drawn because of John perhaps delving into the levels of meaning of his source texts and extracting what he required to convey his message. Thus, it is not possible to extrapolate from the findings of any one text or set of texts to Revelation as a whole.

As a consequence of doing a textual source study on Rev 21:3c, the most that may be said is that John’s primary OT text source may have been the MT or it may not. As well, his source may have been the LXX or it may not. Like the cat in the box of Schrödinger’s experiment,¹ until one examines a particular textual reference and discovers, from the interpretive matrix formed by all the related texts, that a particular thing is occurring with a particular text, neither a study of style or the language alone will be persuasively informative; for, conclusions drawn from the part may be applicable only to the part rather than to the whole.

¹ John Gribbin, *In Search of Schrödinger’s Cat: Quantum Physics and Reality* (New York: Bantam, 1984), 1-4, 203-208, 237-238.

Further study arising out this research would needs focus on the meaning of καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ, ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ ἄρνιον (Rev 21:22) in light of this understanding of Rev 21:3c.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, M. *Aquila's Greek Version of the Hebrew Bible*. London: Spottiswoode and Ballantyne, 1919.
- Achtemeier, Paul J., Joel B. Green, and Marianne M. Thompson, eds. *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Adams, D. L. *Deus Praesens: The Present God in the Patriarchal Narratives*. Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Aland, Barbara and Kurt, eds. *Biblia Sacra Utriusque Testamenti Editio Hebraica et Graeca*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Allo, E. B. *Saint Jean L'Apocalypse*. Paris: Lecoffre, 1933.
- An Intermediate Greek Lexicon: Founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1. Print ed.: *An Intermediate Greek Lexicon: Founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- Balz, Horst, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982-83.
- Bauckham, Richard. *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Beale, G. K. *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*. JSNTSup., 166. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

- . *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R., ed. *The Book of Revelation*. Greenwood: Attic Press, 1974.
- Becker, Siegbert W. *Revelation: Distant Triumph Song*. Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1985.
- Blass, F., and A. DeBrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Brighton, Louis A. *Revelation*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2000.
- Brooke, Alan E., and Norman McLean. *The Old Testament in Greek*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1906.
- Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1. Print ed.: Colin Brown, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-1985.
- Buchanan, George W., ed. *The Book of Revelation: Its Introduction and Prophecy*. Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1993.
- Caird, George B. *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Carson, D.A., Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Charles, Robert H. *Lectures on The Apocalypse*. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.
- . *Studies in The Apocalypse*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1915.

- Chemnitz, Martin. *Loci Theologici*. Vol. 1 of *Loci Theologici*. Translated by J. A. O. Preus. St. Louis: CPH, 1989.
- . *The Two Natures in Christ*. Translated by J. A. O. Preus. St. Louis: CPH, 1971.
- Chrysostom. "Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 1-334 in *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. 14 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989.
- Clement of Alexandria. "The Stromata, or Miscellanies." Pages 299-402 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Second Century*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 2 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Second Century*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Cross, Frank M. "The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological and Historical Approach." *The Biblical Archaeologist* X:3 (1947): 45-68.
- Cyril. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John*. 8 vols. Oxford: James Parker, 1974.
- Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. *A Manual of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- Danker, Frederick W., ed. *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002. Print ed.: Frederick W. Danker, ed. *Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

- Dionysius the Great. "Extant Fragments." Pages 81-120 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 6 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Old Testament in the New*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963.
- Dumbrell, William J. *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21-22 and the Old Testament*. Australia: Lancer, 1985.
- Du Rand, Jan A. "The Transcendent God-View: Depicting Structure in the Theological Message of the Apocalypse of John." *Neotestamentica* 28:2 (1994): 557-573.
- Düsterdeck, Friedrich. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Revelation of John*. Translated and edited by Henry E. Jacobs. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1887.
- Encarta® World English Dictionary* in Microsoft® Word X for Mac® Service Release 1, Microsoft Corporation 1999.
- Fekkes, Jan. *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
- Field, Friedericus, ed., *Origenis Hexaplorum*. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964.
- Forde, Gerhard. *Theology Is for Proclamation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Freedman H., and Maurice Simon, eds. *Midrash Rabbah*. Translated by S. M. Lehrman. 3 vols. London: Soncino, 1961.
- Glasgow, James. *The Apocalypse*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1872.

- Hailey, Homer. *Revelation: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to The Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.
- Hengstenberg, E. W. *The Revelation of St. John: Expounded for Those Who Search the Scriptures*. Translated by Patrick Fairbairn. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1952.
- Hertz, J. H. *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*. 2nd ed. London: Soncino, 1970.
- Hoeksema, Herman. *Behold, He Cometh!: An Exposition of the Book of Revelation*. Grandville: Reformed, 1986.
- Hoskier, H. C., ed. *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1928.
- Hübner, Hans. "The New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament." Pages 335-372 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by Magno Saebo. Vol. 1 of *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996.
- Irenaeus. "Against Heresies." Pages 315-567 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson. Vol. 1 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westerman, *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Mark Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jenkins, Ferrell. *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1972.
- Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 vols. Rome: Pontificio, 1996.

Kautzsch, E., and A. E. Cowley, eds. *Gesenius Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.

Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-.

Klein, Ernest. *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English*. NY: MacMillan, 1987.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of The Old*

Testament on CD-ROM. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002. Print ed.: Ludwig Koehler and

Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of The Old Testament*.

Translated and edited by M. E. J. Richardson, G. J. Jongeling-Vos, L. J. De Regt. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Kolb, Robert, and Timothy J. Wengert, eds. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the*

Evangelical Lutheran Church. Translated by Charles Arand, Eric Gritsch, Robert Kolb,

William Russell, James Schaaf, Jane Strohl, and Timothy J. Wengert. Minneapolis:

Fortress, 2000.

Lenski, R. C. H. *Commentary on the New Testament: The Interpretation of St. John's Revelation*.

Peabody: Hendrickson, 1998.

Lint, Gregory A., ed. *The Old Testament Hebrew-English Dictionary*. 7 vols. Springfield: World

Library, 1995-2000.

Longenecker, Richard N. "On the Form, Function, and Authority of the New Testament Letters."

Pages 101-113 in *Scripture and Truth*. Edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge.

Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983.

- Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. "σκηνώ." *A Greek-English Lexicon of The Septuagint on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1, 2002. Print ed.: J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of The Septuagint on Accordance*. Leuven: , 1992.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works: Sermons on the Gospel of John, 1-4 on CD-ROM*. Libronix Digital Library System Version 1.0, 2002. Print ed.: Martin Luther. *Luther's Works: Sermons on the Gospel of John*. Vol. 22 of *Luther's Works*. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: CPH, 1957.
- LXXI on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1. Print ed.: Alfred Rahlfs, ed. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.
- MacKenzie, Robert K. *The Author of the Apocalypse: A Review of the Prevailing Hypothesis of Jewish-Christian Authorship*. Lewiston: Mellen Biblical Press, 1997.
- Mandelkern, Solomon. *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae Atque Chaldaicae*. Tel Aviv: Schocken, 1969.
- Matera, Frank J. *New Testament Christology*. Louisville: John Knox, 1999.
- McComiskey, Thomas E. "Alteration of OT Imagery in the Book of Revelation: Its Hermeneutical and Theological Significance." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36:3 (1993): 307-316.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Moffatt, James. "Revelation of St. John the Divine." Pages 279-494 in *The Expositor's Greek New Testament*. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 5 of *The Expositor's Greek New Testament*. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. New York: Doran, n.d.

- Mounce, R. H. *The Book of Revelation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Moyise, Steve. "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 76 (1999): 97-113.
- . *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. JSNTSup., 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- . "The Old Testament in the New: A Reply to Greg Beale." *Irish Biblical Studies* 21 (1999): 54-58.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *Hebrew-Aramaic Index to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Norris, Richard A., Jr., ed. *The Christological Controversy*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Origen. *Commentary on John: Books I, II, IV, V, VI, X*. Translated by Ronald E. Heine. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- Origen. *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*. Translated by Ronald E. Heine. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1981.
- . "Origen Against Celsius." Pages 395-669 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 4 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Fathers of the Third Century*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Ozanne, C. G. "The Language of the Apocalypse." *Tyndale House Bulletin* 16 (1965): 3-9.
- Paulien, Jon. "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation." Pages 113-129 in *Studies in the Book of Revelation*. Edited by Steve Moyise. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001.

———. "Elusive Allusions: The Problematic Use of the Old Testament in Revelation."

Biblical Review 33 (1988): xx.

Porter, Stanley. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

———. "The Language of the Apocalypse in Recent Discussion." *NTS* 35 (1989): 582-603.

Prigent, Pierre. *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*. Translated by Wendy Pradels.

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

———. *Apocalypse et Liturgie*. Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1964.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of Historical Research*.

Nashville: Broadman, 1934.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Rupert of Deutz. *Commentary on Saint John*. Translated and edited by George E. McCracken

and Allen Cabaniss. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957.

Sarna, Nahum A., ed. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Exodus*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1991.

Scaer, David P. *Christology*. Fort Wayne: IFLCR, 1989.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture Within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in*

the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992.

Silva, Moises. "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority." Pages

147-165 in *Scripture and Truth*. Edited by D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge. Leicester:

InterVarsity, 1983.

Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Stephenson, J. R. *Eschatology*. Fort Wayne: The Luther Academy, 1993.

Swete, H. B. *The Apocalypse of St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.

Tertullian. "Against Praxeas." Pages 597-627 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

———. "On the Flesh of Christ." Pages 520-542 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

———. "On the Resurrection of the Flesh." Pages 545-594 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of Tertullian*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

Tov, Emmanuel, ed. *The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1.

Trudinger, Leonhard P. "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the OT in the Book of Revelation." *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1966): 82-88.

Turner, Nigel. "The Style of the Book of Revelation." Pages 145-159 in *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James H. Moulton. Vol. 4 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James H. Moulton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976.

Urbach, Ephraim E. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975.

- van der Merwe, Christo H. J. Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999.
- Van Gemeren, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Van Ruiten, Jacques. "The Intertextual Relationship Between Isaiah 65, 17-20 and Revelation 21, 1-5b." *Estudios Biblicos* 51 (1993): 473-510.
- Voelz, James W. *What Does This Mean?: Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Post-Modern World*. St. Louis: CPH, 1997.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics on CD-ROM*. Accordance Version 5.6.1. 2002. Print. ed.: Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wevers, John W. ed. *Septuaginta: Exodus*. Göttinger: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1991.
- Westcott, Brooke F., and Fenton J. A. Hort. *The New Testament: in the Original Greek*. New York: Macmillan, 1943.
- Westerman, Claus. *The Old Testament and Jesus Christ*. Translated by O. Kaste. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1968.
- Wigram, George V. *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972.

Wurthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*.

Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985.

Zerwick, Maximilian. *Biblical Greek*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1994.

- BA *Biblical Archaeologist*
- BR *Biblical Review*
- EB *Estudios Bíblicos*
- IBS *Irish Biblical Studies*
- JETS *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
- JSNT *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
- JTS *Journal of Theological Studies*
- NTS *New Testament Studies*
- THB *Tyndale House Bulletin*