

Anthropology of the Dead Who Wait at Judgment in Hebrews 9:27–28

William W. Henry Jr.¹

Key Words: anthropology; immediate resurrection; afterlife of the dead; immediate judgment; holy place bodily spirits; tabernacle of the heavens; Hebrews 9:27–28; resurrection opinions of Jesus, the author of Hebrews, Essenes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Josephus, Justin, and Irenaeus.

Abstract

This paper probes anthropological questions surrounding Jesus appearing to the dead waiting for him in Hebrews 9:27–28. It searches for correspondence with the possibility of immediate resurrection in Matthew 27:52–53; 1 Corinthians 15:12–58; 2 Corinthians 4–5, and Philippians 1:21–24; 3:17–21. Modern readers usually overlook the overarching discourse context of Hebrews 9:27–28 and presume a traditional proof text for only Jesus’s earthly second coming. Neither second coming features nor speculation for future earthly resuscitation-resurrection of the flesh of believers ever emerge in Hebrews, which should be puzzling.

Examination of this functional unit conclusion of text that governs the discourse lines of Hebrews searches for a cohesive message that Jesus, now, promptly at death leads bodily into heaven those who believe in his offering for their sin—just as God both promptly raised him, as a bodily, complete, eternal-place spirit, at the instant of death on the cross, to inaugurate the promised, new covenant benefits as Christ, and confirmed his spirit, eternal-place redemption to those on earth by the sign of his fleshly resurrection.

The paper compares the anthropological foundation behind the common traditional views toward the dead in Hebrews 9:27–28. Most opinions perceive either an inferior bodiless soul or some level of delayed consciousness until resuscitation-resurrection of the flesh. The paper looks for possible cohesion with the less common anthropological expectation both before and since the first century for immediate transformation from flesh to spiritual bodies into an open heavenly access by Jesus’s present shepherd ministry.

Introduction

My recent work in Hebrews suggests the probability that Hebrews 9:27–28 functions as a macro conclusion summary [MCS] of the Pastor’s previous discourse unit conclusion-summaries

¹ Paper for presentation at the Evangelical Theological Society, San Antonio, TX, Nov 16, 2023. Independent Physician and Scholar serving Jesus as Lord and Christ, M.D. (1993) University of Arkansas Medical Sciences, M.A.Th. (2015) and Ph.D. N.T./Biblical Theology (2023), Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. This paper builds on my larger project, William W. Henry Jr., “Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in Hebrews 9:27–28: Jesus’ Ministry to Lead Believers for Salvation into Heaven A Very Little While after Individual Death and Judgment” (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2023). Contact information: wm@wmhenryjr.com. Website: <http://www.wmhenryjr.com>. Paper also available at <http://www.academia.com>.

[DUC] from his rhetoric.² As the peak claim of six previous assertions developed in a chiasmic form, these two clauses form his main rhetorical point against continued practice of the now obsolete first covenant ministry. Utilizing multiple cognates, he tracks four main subtopics from the discourse introduction [DI] in Hebrews 1:1–4, which are death, judgment, salvation, and Jesus’s enthronement for present, priestly intercession of people into heaven. This paper, in continuance of that work, explores the language the Letter to the Hebrews for cohesion with the first-century, anthropological view of afterlife as a prompt, bodily resurrection at death in transformation to a spirit body with rising into God’s presence in heaven. The thesis counters other developed traditional concepts which embrace salvation as an eschatological delay until resuscitation of a flesh-body on earth that is temporally restricted to the second coming.

Recent Background Discussion

In a long tradition for the academy, the sermon finds its greatest value for proof texts concerning philosophical and theological suppositions mostly limited to an earth-centric only background containing closed heavens for *complete* people, at least to the end of this age. Cynthia Westfall highlights a paradoxical observation, regarding the statements of George Guthrie and David Black, that with Hebrews considered as a literary masterpiece in clear train of thought, then why have scholars, according to Black, reduced it to a collection of memory verses and proof texts, and lack clear hearing of this “symphony in form,” so-called by Guthrie?³ This haziness, especially concerns the background anthropology that governs the interpretation of the

² Henry, “Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in Hebrews 9:27–28.” See also, provided with this paper concerning the Letter to the Hebrews, appendix 1 for a conceptual handout for the proposed “tabernacle of the heavens” *aiōn*-field [apocalyptic] background and appendix 2 for the chiasmic formation of the rhetoric.

³ Cynthia Long Westfall, *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning*. LNTS 297 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), xi.

fate concerning those waiting for Christ to appear at judgment after death, which pertains to Hebrews 9:27–28. Two main antithetical opinions, either a bodiless, incorporeal immortality of the soul or a bodily resurrection of the flesh of the dead, dominate the modern discussion. However, contemporary conversation often overlooks evidence that other first-century views concerning the Messianic afterlife for people embrace a different anthropological perspective than the prevailing dominate opinions.

First-Century History of Anthropological Afterlife Discussion

Not a new question among the living in the visible cosmos since before the time of Jesus, the issue remains unsettled without conclusive resolution.⁴ For example, Second Temple Literature [STL], in the books of Enoch several centuries before Jesus’s ministry, speculates about Enoch’s transformation recorded by Moses in Genesis 5:22–24.⁵ The Pastor in the Letter to the Hebrews proffers an interpretation that, “By this kind of faith, Enoch was changed/transferred [μετετέθη] for the purpose to not see death, and he was not found because God changed/transferred [μετέθηκεν] him. For before the change/transformation [μεταθέσεως], it

⁴ The background for this exploration views Hebrews as sermon of early date 66–70 CE likely from Rome after early victories in the Jewish War (66–70 CE), to Jewish Christians in a synagogue. The recipients were pressured by growth of Jewish nationalism and further messianic expectation to fall away from Christian confession, congregational assembly, and teaching, in return to former Jewish cultural norms. Cf. David L. Allen, *Hebrews*, NAC (Nashville: B&H, 2010), 23–93.

⁵ The present extant forms of Enoch are pseudonymous and likely develop as an assembly of several circulated writings in available languages from the fourth to second century BCE as a polemic against the spiritual state of others in a separate orthodoxy. As other STL which was preserved in later centuries by the state-church, the early Enochian imagination influenced later Christian redactions of Enochian books in line with subsequent developed theology and practice. Cf. John C. Reeves & Anette Yoshiko Reed, “Enoch’s Escape from Death,” in *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Volume I: Sources from Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 211–44. Reeves and Reed evaluate passages where Enoch is taken alive either to Gan Eden or the ends of the earth, heaven/paradise, or the fourth, sixth, or seventh heaven. Cf. Philip F. Esler, *God’s Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Re-interpreting Heaven in Enoch 1–36* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017). For the relationship of pseudonymity to the NT, see Terry Wilder, *Pseudonymity, the New Testament, and Deception: An Inquiry into Intention and Reception* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004).

had been attested he had the result to please God” (Heb 11:5).⁶ The aorist and perfect tense support weight for a past historical event where God utilizes Enoch’s transformation as revelation of his desired final destiny for humanities place after life on earth. There is no hint that Enoch’s pleasing God at judgment merits any kind of inferior, bodiless form or place, when transformed to God’s heavenly presence. Such a lessened sense would diminish the purpose of Enoch’s illustration supporting the hope of faith as *now* better than his listeners consider.

The Pastor later summarizes his list of elders, which includes Enoch, as “...since now they desire a better *place* [κρείττονος], that is a heavenly *one* [ἐπουρανίου]. Therefore, God does not himself shame them [at judgment]; the result God purposes to call to them. For them he prepared a city” (Heb 11:16). Specifically for rhetorical punch in his message, the Pastor considers Abraham (Heb 6:15), David (Heb 10:5), and other deceased brethren (Heb 2:10; 12:22–24) are already with God in heaven at the time of his writing by the present priestly ministry of Jesus. He speaks of no eschatological delay of the promise of a complete life at death.⁷

About thirty-five years before the writing of Hebrews, Jesus’s ministry cuts across the debate of ancient afterlife “opinions” [*haireisis*] between the Greeks and the Pharisees and

⁶ I use the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament*, 28th Edition for Greek NT text. Other ancient texts supply the source. All English translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

⁷ Roy A. Stewart, “Creation and Matter in the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *NTS* 12, no. 3 (1966) 284–93. There is a higher probability that the Pastor stands on common ground with Philo, Josephus, and language of Middle Platonism, than the chance that he stands alone against all of them in later, antithetical, contrastive views with a typology contrary to metaphor. Both typology and metaphor move in the realm of a mental association but with different relationships (287–89). Stewart finds that Plato, Philo, and the Pastor operate in dualistic thinking of two worlds but simply use different terminology that expresses similar meaning. The Pastor’s worlds of types/antitypes compare closely with Plato’s eternal forms/sensed images and Philo’s intelligible/sensed world conceptions. Philo does not easily fit in modern antithetical, philosophical ideas. He embraces elements of a complementary contrast for the opposite creations of the unsensed heavens and the visible sensed world. Philo conceptually held that people would enter heaven (*Praem.* 152, *Spec.* 2:45). His concept would assume some kind of perceivable form for people that is compatible with the spiritual substance-reality of eternal-places in space and time.

Scribes (the teaching class), the Sadducees (the educated ruling class), and the Essenes (religious monastic groups). Richard Horsley comments, "...that the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes all originated early in the Hasmonean times, perhaps in response to Jonathan's assumption of the high priesthood."⁸ The change from the Zadok to Hasmonean priesthood generated divided beliefs in Jewish "schools of thought, sects" [αἵρεσις, cf. Acts 5:27; 15:5; 24:5, 14; 26:5].⁹

A decade or more after the time of the Letter to the Hebrews, the first-century historian Josephus regarding these sects describes a common trait of the Essene philosophy with that of the Greeks, stating "on the one hand those who are subsequently surviving an eternal-*place* soul" [μὲν αἰδίους ὑφιστάμενοι τὰς ψυχὰς WFJ:GTM] before highlighting differences between Jewish and Hellenistic afterlife destinations and speculated experiences.¹⁰ His point is that like the Greeks, the Essenes had faith for continued living after death. He further comments how Greek philosophy offers that the good virtuous life free from vice is made better in one's lifetime by the hope of reward after death.¹¹ He compares the monistic Essene afterlife philosophy as like the Greek eternal survival and reward of the soul.¹²

Josephus also describes the Pharisaical school, stating, "And, then again, every soul is immortal, some, the one good only, the result to transfer/change into another body, the one morally base the result to penalize an eternal-*place* of punishment" [ψυχὴν τε πᾶσαν μὲν

⁸ Richard A. Horsley, *The Pharisees and the Temple-State of Judea* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2022), 88. Cf. Jean Le Moyne, *Les Sadducéens*, (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1972).

⁹ Alain Le Boulluec, *The Notion of Heresy in Greek Literature in the Second and Third Centuries*, eds. David Lincicum and Nicholas Moore, trans. A.K.M. Adam et al. (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2022).

¹⁰ Josephus, *J.W.* 2.154. [WFJ:GTM] Greek text from, Flavius Josephus and Benedikt Niese, "Flavii Iosephi Opera Recognovit Benedictvs Niese ..." (Berolini: apvd Weidmannos, 1888-).

¹¹ Ibid. 2.156.

¹² Ibid.

ἄφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὰς δὲ τῶν φαύλων αἰδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι WFJ:GTM].¹³ He further contrasts the Sadducean school with the Greeks, Pharisees, and Essenes, saying, “and that continuance of the soul, that according to eternal punishment and honor, they continually condemn *them*” [...ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ’ ἕδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσιν WFJ:GTM].¹⁴ Of these groups, Josephus claims that only the Sadducees rejected prompt bodily life after death.

Early twentieth-century scholars translated the commentary of Josephus in line with the common philosophical view of their day as “the doctrine of immortality of the soul,” which differently apprehended people’s afterlife form as inferior, incorporeal, and awaiting perfection in fleshly resurrection.¹⁵ John Collins writes, “One of the major topics of apocalyptic revelation was judgment after death and the contrasting fates of the righteous and wicked in the hereafter. Belief in life after death was not confined to apocalyptic literature; the immortality of the soul was widely accepted in Greek-speaking Judaism, and the Pharisees, who may have subscribed to apocalyptic ideas to various degrees, believed in resurrection. But belief in the judgment of the dead and a differentiated afterlife is first attested in Judaism in the books of Enoch and Daniel, and it is the primary factor that distinguishes apocalyptic eschatology from that of the prophets.”¹⁶ Collins recognition of immediate afterlife concepts as a common option in apocalyptic literature, so-called, opens opportunities for discussion of the ignored option for

¹³ Ibid., 2.163.

¹⁴ Ibid., 2.164.

¹⁵ E.g., Josephus, *The Jewish War: Books 1–7*, eds. Jeffrey Henderson, T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H. D. Rouse, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, vol. 203, 487, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; William Heinemann Ltd; G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1927–1928), 2:156.

¹⁶ John J. Collins, “Early Judaism in Modern Scholarship,” ed. Daniel C. Harlow, *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2010), 12.

prompt and complete afterlife fulfillment.

STL apocalyptic revelation and Josephus's description of the Pharisees as believing that the soul after death changes bodily in perpetual living, against the total opposition of the Sadducees, supports a different take on the first-century, often volatile deliberation between Jewish schools of thought [cf. Acts 23:6–10]. In Josephus's recollection, the issue focused more on resurrection of the dead as spirits or spiritual bodies than our later anachronistic concepts of incorporeal souls awaiting fleshly resuscitation after the pattern of Jesus's fleshly sign of his accomplished atonement.¹⁷ Jesus's teaching cuts across Sadducean views (cf. Mark 12:24–27) and adopts first-century Greek and Jewish afterlife language in his teaching (cf. Luke 16:19–31) with individuals at death rising to God for judgment and continuing bodily in an eternal form and place. It is interesting that the much later opinion that demands fleshly resurrection of humanity, other than that of the Jesus's fleshly sign of atonement (John 2:18–22) by return from the holy of holies after the priestly pattern of *Yom Kippur*, does not directly appear anywhere in the OT or first-century completed NT.

Later Church Discussion

After the obliteration of the Pharisees, Scribes, and Essenes in the Jewish Wars surrounding the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE, the Sadducean ruling class outlook for a postmortem closed-heaven emerges uncontested in the revised and rebuilt rabbinical tradition.¹⁸ When combined with surviving future hope for a fleshly Jewish kingdom,

¹⁷ Josephus, *J.W.* 2.163. Josephus's counter views of immediate resurrection and transformation bodily to modern traditional concepts since the late second century are often challenged by modern scholarship to align with modern controlling ecclesiastical traditions. E.g., Moyne, *Les Sadducéens*, 27–62.

¹⁸ Cf. *J.W.* 2.150–55. Josephus comments on the admirable deaths of the Essenes in his account of the Jewish Wars. Richard A. Horsley, writes, "THE PHARISEES FIRST EMERGE as an identifiable group in Judea under the Hasmonean high priests in mid-second century BCE. They evidently disappear from history after the Roman destruction of Jerusalem temple following the great revolt against Roman rule in 66–70 CE." Horsley, "The

in early catholic church by end of the second-century, Justin and Irenaeus drift toward persecution of those who look for bodily transformation at death in a heavenly hope to God's presence. Alain Le Boulluec documents concerning later first-century use of the term *haireisis*, "A position that was simply a rejection of novel aspects in the development of ancient revelation is, in the hands of Christian authors after Josephus, fossilized into an absolute negation."¹⁹

Le Boulluec, demonstrates that by the time of Justin, about 160 CE, there exists a polemically oriented, catechetical tradition held by the ruling class of the educated elders that evaluates *αἵρεσις* pejoratively.²⁰ For example, Justin, concerning the thousand-year reign of Christ with his church, states, "If you have ever encountered any nominal Christians who do not admit this doctrine, but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob by asserting that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that their souls are taken up to heaven at the very moment of death, do not consider them to be Christians."²¹

The Pharisees and Essenes before and Josephus's and Justin's later comments, together provide bookends around the Letter to the Hebrews for the existence of people who consider the anthropological end of fleshly life as a rising to God bodily into heaven at the moment of death. Paradoxically, Justin and others, while holding afterlife understandings against other forementioned first-century concepts of the Greeks, Pharisees, Essenes, Philo, and Josephus, by the middle of the second century consider the faith for immediate transformation bodily into

Pharisees and the Temple-State of Judea," 85 (caps emphasis Horsley). However, scholars commonly recognize that the Sadducees survived in hundreds of thousands. E.g., Moyne, *Les Sadducéens*, 19. It appears as the religious educated and moderates, the Sadducees did not fully engage in the war with Rome to the degree of death as the much more conservative Essenes and Pharisees, and thereby survive in great numbers.

¹⁹ Ibid., 68.

²⁰ Le Boulluec, *The Notion of Heresy*, 66.

²¹ Ibid., 66–67. Dial. 80.3–4. Translation Le Boulluec.

God's presence as demonic and a rejection of the proper succession concerning the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, even as the Sadducees themselves.²² By the middle second-century, the first-century Sadducean, afterlife philosophy turns on its head, as Christian. Justin's disciple, Irenaeus, takes Justin's pejorative view and assimilates the belief in a prompt heavenly entrance with other pagan teachings.²³ Irenaeus claims, "For whatsoever all the heretics may have advanced with the utmost solemnity, they come to this at last, that they blaspheme the Creator, and disallow the salvation of God's workmanship, which the flesh truly is."²⁴

Notably, the Nicene Creed versions of 325 and 381 by the fourth century CE omit any heavenly expectation apart from the resuscitation of the flesh.²⁵ By the fifth century, a revival of ideology toward spiritual life after death appears in the Apostles Creed, where believers are rescued from the Roman ideology of Hades, as they wait as inferior souls for later fleshly completion on earth.²⁶ However, Justin's reinvention of heresy continued to be used for persecution of those who rejected the so-called proper faith for later fleshly resuscitation in an earthly kingdom through the authority and ministry of the state-church.²⁷

Later tensions with biblical descriptions related to the afterlife and God's judgment led to gap-filling in doctrines of purgatory, last rites, and indulgences, in order to lessen a conjectured

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., 123.

²⁴ *Haer.* 4. Pref. 4.

²⁵ Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes: The Greek and Latin Creeds, with Translations*, vol. 2 (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890), 57–60.

²⁶ Ibid., 45.

²⁷ E.g., Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* II-II, q. 11. a. 3. Aquinas advocated that heretics should be put to death for crimes that murder the soul in the same way a murder commits crimes against the body.

necessary penitence for sin before fleshly resurrection. Many of the reformers, when testing these ideas by statements of Scripture, rejected them as non-biblical solutions. Many of the educated church elders since, in the inherited traditions and ecclesiastical control since Justin, still deny bodily postmortem opportunities in open heavens, while others surmise either some inferior quality of soul or unconscious sleep until Jesus returns at his second coming. A very small minority, mostly in independent ecclesiastic congregations, consider biblically viable the option for immediate transformation in a complete spirit body to a place in heaven with God.²⁸ Recent religious freedom from over a millennium of persecution, by educated elders who view themselves doing God's service (cf. Matt 24:9–12; John 16:2; Rev 16:6; 17:5–6), now opens opportunity in a movement away from common, controlled assumptions for dialog on this unsettled issue in consideration of suppressed first-century views.²⁹

²⁸ Joachim Jeremias, "Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern: Descensus und Ascensus in der Karfreitagstheologie des Neuen Testaments." *ZNW* 42 (1949): 194–201; Otfried Hofius, "Das 'erste' und das 'zweite' Zelt: Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung von Hebrews 9:1–10," *ZNW* 61 (1970): 271–77; idem, "Inkarnation und Opfertod Jesu nach Hebr 10,19f," in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern*, ed. Eduard Lohse (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 132–41; Thomas Knöppler, *Sühne im Neuen Testament: Studien zum urchristlichen Verständnis der Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesu*, WMANT 88 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener, 2001), 188–219.

²⁹ Stephen Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection: A Critical Response to Recent Catholic Debate Concerning the Intermediate State* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017). Yates defends the traditional Catholic dogma of an inferior intermediate state of *animae separata* of the soul until resurrection at the second coming against growing Catholic scholarly views that the NT teaches immediate resurrection. His critical response admits that texts in 2 Cor and Phil confirm this concept through the work of scholars such as Dermot Lane, R. H. Charles, Marray Harris, Anton Van der Walle, and F. F. Bruce. However, Yates after his confirming critical evaluation, still follows the Catholic position of tradition over text. My project proposes to add to the evidence of 2 Cor and Phil, the NT text of Hebrews as support for an immediate resurrection after death that includes the full benefits of a spiritual body, without an inferior state, when eternal-place living. The flipped and delayed presuppositions for the traditions of an earthly kingdom pressure against acceptance of an immediate heavenly hope, and more toward a closure of heaven for people after death. Other presuppositional obstacles follow in footnote discussion of my larger work.

Cf. Larry. J. Kreitzer, "Intermediate State." *DPL* 438–41. Kreitzer documents the tensions concerning scholarly attempts to explain a development in Paul's thought between 1 Cor and 2 Cor from anticipated resurrection at the second coming to earth and Pauline inferences for an immediate resurrection at death. His brief mention of proposed solutions concerning heavenly hope for the dead is unconvincing. However, a review of apocalyptic [*aiōn*-field background] concepts in the first century reveals immediate rising to God at death is the normalized eschatology. The NT concept of later resurrection at the second coming for the living has since become imbalanced in limited future eschatology lenses.

Cf. Anthony C. Thiselton, *Life After Death: A New Approach to the Last Things* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 68–88. Thiselton, with presuppositions of soul sleep and general judgment, argues for both immediate rising

Internal Evidence in Hebrews For Waiting A Very Little While for Jesus in the Eternal-Place of Heaven

In his probable MCS, the dat. pres. pass. ptc. ἀπεκδεχομένοις (“to those presently waiting”), highlights that people are *presently* waiting in a place after death and judgment *at* the appearance of Christ, for “salvation” by him.³⁰ The Pastor, in his developed *aiōn*-field [apocalyptic] revelation of the heavens and earth with movement characterized by inseparable elements of space and time, summarizes the consummation of his parenthesis as “salvation” in the hope that “Christ...will appear” (Heb 9:28).³¹ An anthropological question centers on whether

to Christ and an intermediate state. His approach keeps logic and calculation separate, where believers are immediately with Christ and wait until the second coming to wake up together at a general judgment. His logical separation solves the paradox by the former as an observer with the latter as a participant, with either position having a unique perspective. However, 1 Thess 4:13–18 speaks of two groups as a class—the dead and the those who remain living. As a class, the dead do not all die at the same time. Also, they all do not die together but die over time until the class of the living are added to them by Jesus bringing together the two groups of the dead and living. He brings the dead with him (1 Thess 4:14). The dead rise first as a class (1 Thess 4:16). While the dead are brought with Jesus at the same time, the dead do not die at the same time, and do not have to all rise to Jesus at the same time. They only have to be with Jesus when he comes for those who are living to be together with them. The context does not rule out the possibility of immediate rising to Jesus at death in the first-century apocalyptic view. My dissertation footnote discussion briefly provides other NT texts with probable prompt rising to God after death.

³⁰ Consider another angle on the assertion, namely that a reading of Hebrews in modern cultural language can miss many important clues that signal there is more for deceased believers than becoming only a memory or simply sleeping while waiting to live again on a transformed earth. If people are only memories of God “in Christ,” without literal conscious existence, or if they are only sleeping in Jesus, until a later fleshly body resurrection on earth, how are people presently aware of God’s judgment after death, any waiting for salvation after death, and at that judgment experience their salvation? Both views that concern either non-existence “in Christ” or soul-sleeping create great tension with the Pastor’s present reality concerning salvation events involving death, judgment, and the present ministry of Jesus as high Priest from the throne of God to those in need of his service.

³¹ For discussion of the terms *aiōn*-field in relation to a cosmic-field, see, Henry, “Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in Hebrews 9:27–28.” A visual aid illustration is provided with this paper. The term *cosmic-field* maps visible, material, spatial-temporal reality and *aiōn*-field includes unseen substance-reality of any *heavenly* invisible movement in space and time narrative. The *cosmic-field* is a subset of the spatial-temporal reality of the Pastor’s *aiōn*-field background [apocalyptic] language.

Locative, temporal, and instrumental properties in narrative are naturally complementary, and only adversative when negativized either by a negative particle or a referent/verbal meaning with inherent contrastive properties. The genre of historical narrative mainly emphasizes horizontal eschatology in the OT, but hints reveal a vertical eschatology in heavenly interaction with both God and his created beings, as always present in the background. Also, the study of modern Greek syntax, in teaching separate category choices for time and space, subtly implies to the minds of translators that time and space are divisible. Scholars often argue over enlarged concepts based on one to the exclusion of the other, as seen in examples to follow.

the Pastor envisions salvation as either a short wait for Jesus by the people who presently approach after death for judgment similar to the Greeks, Essenes, Pharisees, Philo, and Josephus, or, do all people still wait for a resuscitation of the flesh in denial of prompt bodily rising to God similar to a hope of Sadducees and late second-century motifs? Scholars argue for both options. For example, David Moffitt uses Heb 9:28 for argument that, “For Hebrews, the Yom Kippur analogy (and so Jesus’s atoning ministry) ends when, like the earthly high priest, Jesus leaves the heavenly holy of holies to return to and be present with his people (Heb 9:28). Only then will his followers receive the salvation for which they are waiting.”³² Contra, Martin Karrer contends the believer “strides to God in heaven” and finds a plural of believers in the symbolism of the cloud of witnesses in Hebrews 12:1.³³

Concerning the waiting people, the original audience would understand the anthropological interrogatives of this MCS from the narrative of his *previous* context. As a summary unit conclusion [UC], Hebrews 9:27–28 cannot function as a stand-alone proof text for any option, unless the meaning for that option is contained in the previous discourse.³⁴ The Pastor provides answers about people waiting for salvation after death to audience interrogative

³² David M. Moffitt, “Jesus as Interceding High Priest and Sacrifice in Hebrews: A Response to Nicholas Moore,” *JSNT* 42, no. 4 (2020): 542.

³³ Contra Martin Karrer, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 2:170, 2:300. Cf. Nikolaus Walter, “Hellenistische Eschatologie’ im Frühjudentum—ein Beitrag zur ‘Biblischen Theologie,’” *TLZ* 110 (1985): 335. Nikolaus Walter also asserts that Jewish Hellenistic literature emphasizes, “...the consummation of salvation is in heaven.”

³⁴ Daniel J. Treier, “Proof Text,” *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, eds. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, Craig G. Bartholomew, Daniel J. Treier, and N. T. Wright (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 622–24. If treated as an isolated warrant, with no influence from the rest of his message, then the pres. ptc. “those presently waiting,” has a force of contemporary time with the future time of the main fut. verb “will appear.” People wait at the same time that Jesus, as the Christ in present priestly ministry, appears. However, the summary text alone does not provide information for the space or time of the verb “appear.” The summary text also does not provide the function of the ordinal idiom “from a second...” that has adverbial and adjectival properties in modification of both “Christ” and “will appear.” The original listeners, as well as those considering this summary text later, must determine available narrative options from the context of the previous message. Options must remain inside the text of Hebrews for an accurate sense of the Pastor’s meaning, or are a proof text.

categories in the previous narrative concerning this event. Intertextual canonical answers in other messages or church traditions should not be included as choices here.

The modern debate primarily hinges around the spatial-temporal aspects of possible narrative questions. The Pastor, in the spatial *where* exposition about the people, has rhetorically provided directional verbal movement for both Jesus and his people. He provides temporal *when* options for movement to open heavens for access *now* to God (1) by the person of Jesus in an endless life, and (2) for his people who follow him, (a) in earthly life by testimonial worship, and (b) in reality of an endless eternal-place life, in death and judgment. The sermon provides *no* mention of the future earthly ministry of Jesus's return to earth for the living and remaining that is supported in other canonical narrative.³⁵ Clearly, the possibility of a hope to return to earth is not logically supported in Hebrews for narrative summary options by the Pastor. Crucially regarding DUC, other canonical or noncanonical options should only be considered if the Pastor's meaning remains unclear from his previous context.

Answers to the temporal *when* of these options now develop under the label “eschatology,” another late philosophical term probably unknown by the Pastor. Among scholars, it carries freight different from the Pastor's rhetorical issues developed from his opening phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων (“upon these last days,” Heb 1:2). Gabriella Gelardini provides a history of the term and mentions the debate, as to whether it should follow

³⁵ Cf. 1 Thess 4:13–18. Paul speaks of two groups as a class—the dead and the those who remain living. As a class, the dead do not all die at the same time. Also, they all do not die together but die over time until the class of the living are added to them by Jesus bringing together the two groups of the dead and living who remain. He brings the dead [now living] with him (1 Thess 4:14). The dead rise first as a class as they individually die (1 Thess 4:16). While the dead [now living] are brought with Jesus at the same time, the dead do not die at the same time, and do not have to all rise to Jesus at the same time. They only have to be with Jesus when he comes for those who are living and remaining to be together with them. Further, the term ἀρπαγησόμεθα (“will be caught up”) only applies to the class of those who are alive and remain. The context does not rule out the possibility of immediate rising to Jesus at death in the first-century, *aiōn*-field [apocalyptic] view.

the LXX use τὰ ἔσχατά σου (“your last things,” Sir 7:36 LXX) in reference “to death,” or the NT cognate ἔσχατος (“last”), used 4 times in 1 Corinthians 15.³⁶

Past scholarship’s proposals regarding the spatial-temporal message in Hebrews contemplated “now and not yet” solutions, whose speculation was initially based upon now acknowledged missteps about cultural divides of Jewish-Hellenistic (Alexandrian) and Jewish apocalyptic (Palestinian) thinking. These missteps forced, in options for the temporal *when* fulfillment of the future “will appear” concerning Christ, an adversative solution as either within a future eschatology of horizontal time on earth (apocalyptic) or a present eschatology of vertical-space in heaven (Alexandrian).³⁷ The antithesis of the two lenses spawned other

³⁶ Gabriella Gelardini, “The Unshakeable Kingdom in Heaven: Notes on Eschatology in Hebrews,” in *Deciphering the Worlds of Hebrews: Collected Essays*, NovTSup 184, ed. Gabriella Gelardini (Boston: Brill, 2021), 308. Cf. John W. Bowman, “Eschatology in the OT” *IDB* 2:135–40. Bowman asserts the term as a nineteenth-century development. He distinguishes, in the OT, individual (at death) or general eschatology (national future of the chosen people or the whole world). Cf. Robert Henry Charles, *Eschatology: The Doctrine of the Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity, A Critical History* (New York: Schocken Books, 1963). Charles in his work attempted “to deal with Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian eschatology, or the teaching of the Old Testament, of Judaism, and the New Testament on the final condition of man and of the world” (1). He claimed, “From the period of Moses, the religious and political founder of Israel, to the time of Christ, we can with some degree of certainty determine the religious views of that nation on the after-world” (2). However, he admits at the beginning, concerning his after-world conjectures, “But the facts are so isolated, the sources so often defective and reset in later environments that, if we confine our attention to ideas of the after-life alone, it is possible to give only a disjointed statement of beliefs and expectations with large lacunae and unintelligible changes, and lacking that coherence and orderly development without which the mind cannot be satisfied” (*ibid.*). Charles then proceeded to provide, on this weak foundation of large lacunae, his speculation for the development of afterlife by the rise of the doctrine of immortality. Cf. Erwin Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*, 2 vols., trans. W. B. Hillis (New York: Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1925; repr., Eastford, CT: Martino, 2019). The problem of “immortality” is another rhetorical strawman conceived by scholars who focus on resurrection as an earthly hope and kingdom like the first-century leadership that was holding to an earthly messianic hope. A “now” option for rising at death and entering to God and a kingdom in heaven is unheard. Those who did, as C. H. Dodd, have Cartesian presuppositions of a timeless heaven. All along, the common believer often expressed that they are going to heaven at death.

³⁷ E.g., Nikolaus Walter, “‘Hellenistische Eschatologie’ im Frühjudentum—ein Beitrag zur ‘Biblischen Theologie,’” *TLZ* 110 (1985): 330. Walter introduced his categories of Jewish Hellenistic eschatology and Jewish Apocalyptic eschatology as containing a great many variations. Since built on “hints,” his strong categorical division between the cultural concepts is doubtful. Wisely, he cautions against the rejection of the concepts of individual salvation at death due to a preconceived negation for a collective salvation, especially over negation of the term “individual,” because both concepts still involve an individual salvation at the end of judgment. Cf. Gert J. Steyn, “The Eschatology of Hebrews: As Understood within a Cultic Setting,” in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*, WUNT 2, vol. 315, ed. Jan G. Van der Watt (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 429–50. Steyn states, “For many years Scholarship on Hebrews has been divided about whether its eschatology is either vertical-spatial or horizontal-temporal” (431). Steyn contends, in a doubtful solution to the spatial-temporal tension,

hypothetical tensions over the language in Hebrews.³⁸ For example, a supposition of early church debate over delay of the Parousia was conjectured under the pressures of an absolute horizontal eschatology of “history” considered under a timeless, transcendent heaven of God’s dwelling in “eternity.”³⁹ The scientific Cartesian timeless solution also was applied to people from death to resurrection in seeking answers to explain the “already and not yet” weight in the adverbial *vũv* (“now”) used 16 times in Hebrews, along with the Pastor’s frequent pres. tense constructions in vertical narrative.⁴⁰ Further deliberation developed over whether the people waiting represent a continuous entrance of individuals at respective experiences of death or a collective assembly of all the dead for one general judgment.⁴¹ For future, delayed eschatology

for a dual spatial and temporal eschatology in Hebrews that flattens together at the second coming of Christ to earth. Cf. Bertold Klappert, *Die Eschatologie des Hebräerbriefs*, Theologische Existenz Heute 156 (Munich: Kaiser, 1969). Klappert traces representatives of the main views of eschatology in Hebrews and presents an attempt to derive a consolidation from them as, “...rather the testimony of a more radical version of the futuristic-apocalyptic horizontal by means of the vertical Alexandrian.” Cf. idem., “Begründete Hoffnung und bekräftigte Verheißung: Exegetisch-systematische Erwägungen zur Eschatologie des Hebräerbriefes,” in *Alles in allem: Eschatologische Anstöße*, eds. Ruth Heß and Martin Leiner (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener, 2005), 447–74. Wilfried Eisele contends by Hebrews’ use of Middle Platonic language that the temporal aspects of eschatology are inherently present but deprived of their all-importance. Wilfried Eisele, “Bürger zweier Welten: Zur Eschatologie des Hebräerbriefs,” *ZNT* 29 (2012): 35. His reason for unimportance is that he perceived no time from death to resurrection for the believer, like Earle Ellis, in order to resolve spatial-temporal tensions.

³⁸ Ibid., Eisele identifies the same observed tension between the language in Hebrews and an assumed second coming to earth motif option in Hebrews 9:28. It is likely both inherent elements of rising at death and subsequent bodily resurrection are inseparable, complementary truth concerning both ends of the process of salvation, without any theoretical Jewish Hellenistic/apocalyptic divide. People who believe and follow Jesus, initially at death, are first assisted in spirit bodies by angelic ministry (Heb 1:13–14), then rise to God by Jesus’ shepherding in death at judgment, with later earthly, collective assembly by adding those still living (Heb 11:39–40), in spiritual bodily return for ministerial service in the remaining time of the temporary cosmos (Heb 12:25–29; see Henry, *Atonement and Logic*, appendix 1 fig. 2 or present visual handout).

³⁹ Gelardini, “The Unshakeable Kingdom in Heaven: Notes on Eschatology in Hebrews,” in *Deciphering the Worlds of Hebrews: Collected Essays*, 312. Gelardini reviews past scholarly concern over the location of salvation that led to the classical topics of either imminent expectation or the contrary, delay of the parousia. Cf. Eric Grässer, *Aufbruch and Verheißung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Hebräerbrief*, BZNW 65 (New York: de Gruyter, 1992), 86–90.

⁴⁰ Eisele, “Bürger zweier Welten,” 35–44. Eisele offers heavenly timelessness as a solution that was asserted by Earle Ellis. E.g., Ellis, *Christ and the Future in New Testament History* (Boston: Brill, 2001), 120–128; idem, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1997), 16–17, ref. 45.

⁴¹ Karrer, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 2:170–71. Karrer presents both as a possibility for options but leans

purists, no one dead, except Jesus, has been able to ἐγείρω (“rise”) or experience ἔγερσις (“rise, resurrection”) from the grave after death to see Jesus.⁴² Such rational conclusions, collapse as a house of cards when the evidence of God’s salvation has no future delay after death. Such evidence would include Moses and Elija living at Jesus’s transfiguration (Matt 17:1–8; Mark 9:2–8; Luke 9:28–36) or those seen coming from their graves at the time of Jesus’s death (Matt 27:52–53). Gap ideology also collapses under the full weight voiced by the Pharisee who we know as the Apostle Paul (1 Cor 15:12–58; 2 Cor 4–5, and Phil 1:21–24; 3:17–21).

Internal Evidence in Hebrews for Spiritual Body Transformation At Death As Complete People into Heaven Just Like Jesus Did

In the Pastor’s narrative, the question concerning the bodily form in *how* people wait for salvation, now solves according to views of “anthropology.” Based on decades of Jewish-Hellenistic and Jewish apocalyptic cultural partitions, scholars devised two strawmen about people in contrastive terms, either as “wholistic,” “monistic,” and “human” against possibilities for either a “dichotomy,” “trichotomy,” or “dualism” of the Lord’s people with an incomplete eternal-place spirit/soul.⁴³ Space does not allow a literature evaluation of the issues surrounding

toward a traditional option for a collective judgment and resurrection. Eisele supports individual judgment at death in his timeless heaven solution to immediate resurrection. Eisele, “Bürger zweier Welten,” 35–44; idem, *Ein Unerschütterliches Reich: Die Mittelplatonische Umformung Des Parusiegedankens Im Hebräerbrief*, BZNW 116 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 85. Cf. Henrich Zimmerman, *Das Bekenntnis der Hoffnung: Tradition und Redaktion im Hebräerbrief*, Bonner biblische Beiträge 47 (Köln: Hanstein, 1977), 201; Gabriella Gelardini, “Faith in Hebrews and Its Relationship to Soteriology: An Interpretation in the Context of the Concept of Fides in Roman Culture,” in *Deciphering the Worlds of Hebrews: Collected Essays*, 269.

⁴² There is intertextual insight that believers have already experienced ἐγείρω (“rising”) to God, as the initial step in the process of “completion” in salvation. E.g., according to Matthew, believers have arisen just like Jesus. If so, *where* are they today and *how* did it happen, before the expected eschaton of Jesus’ return to earth? (Matt 27:51–53; cf. 1 Cor 15:35–58). Cf. David M. Allen, *According to the Scriptures: The Death of Christ in the Old Testament and the New* (London, SCM, 2018), 65–66.

⁴³ Post-Bultmann, there was scant debate in NT scholarship concerning first-century views of anthropology, which were dominated by Pauline studies with little consideration for Hebrews. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament [Theologie des Neuen Testaments]*, 2 vols. (New York: Scribner, 1951), 1:190–352. The modern understanding of anthropology arose primarily with Rudolf Bultmann drawing from his former teacher Johannes

the debate that remains despite crumbling assumptions about the first-century Jewish culture.⁴⁴

Neither common strawman fits the Pastor's anthropology about people.

The evidence either not considered, or rejected by some scholars, is the Pastor's *comfort* in implementation of a highly descriptive language, without clarification or polemic, that supports *present* spirit bodily access by people rising to God after death and judgment, who are featured as better, complete beings (cf. 2 Cor 5:17). People, in salvation by God's ability and will, participate with Jesus in the substance-reality of the spiritual realm.⁴⁵ For example, in Hebrews 2:4, by addition of *place* for a spatial weight to ἅγιος ("holy *place*"), the Pastor may be referencing the testimonies of God and others, who received gifts in heaven, in correspondence with his later summary of Hebrews 9:28 (cf. Heb 11:13–16). He rhetorically asks, "How shall we

Weiss. Bultmann's work, and that of John Robinson, had significant impact. John A. T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*, SBT 5 (London, SCM, 1952). These works, after World War II, had profound effect on current understanding of anthropology. Their domination is seen in current literature. Scholars often accept this new orthodoxy as warrant with no need for argumentative justification. James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 51–127. A slow advance, in a slightly dissenting option regarding Bultmann's foundations, arose in the work of James Dunn. Both Dunn and Bultmann make claims for OT Jewish against Hellenistic views of holistic vs. partitive views of man. This claim is made without clear evidence in their work. The assumption seems to stem from an anti-Gnostic strawman reaction against independence of man's created parts. Cf. Joel B. Green, *Body, Soul, and Human Life: The Nature of Humanity in the Bible* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008).

⁴⁴ Robert H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (Grand Rapids: Academic, 1987); John W. Cooper, *Body, Soul and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989). Cf. David E. Aune, "Anthropological Duality in the Eschatology of 2 Cor 4:16–5:10," in *Paul Beyond the Judaism and Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 215–239.

⁴⁵ Robert E. Bailey, "Life after Death: A New Testament Study in the Relation of Body and Soul" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, Great Britain, 1962). Bailey concludes, "The fundamental faith of the NT for a life after death is that it is a life of unending fellowship in and with Christ (resp. God). This is the Christian's life: (1) we live now in Christ; (2) we will, in some way, be with Him after death; (3) we will be with him in full fellowship at the Parousia-Resurrection, 'when our now hidden lives will be revealed (Col. 3:1–4)'" (Abstract). He states, "The dead have some physical substance just as they have some conscious existence" (214). He concludes, "While our curiosity regarding the Interim State is not fully satisfied in the New Testament, there is one result that is significant. We may not know with assurance how we shall survive during the Interim, nor know much regarding those 'who have never heard', but the one thing needful' is known. This one thing is that death cannot separate us from God in Christ. We will be with Him and this communion is the vital and essential element of faith and hope. This community with God and those who are His as the goal of life here and hereafter is another result of importance and abiding worth" (494–95, underline Bailey's). Cf. 1 John 3:2.

escape after neglecting so great salvation, which after first received through the Lord upon the ones having heard, to us it was confirmed, he of God [the Son] testifying at the same time with both signs and wonders and many abilities, even with distributions of a spirit of a holy *place* [πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς] according to his will?” (Heb 2:3–4; cf. Heb 4:12; 6:4; John 3:6).⁴⁶

The lexeme “salvation” can locate the subtopic salvation event of Jesus with the first-century distribution of his “spirit of a holy place” (cf. Heb 9:14; cf. 1 Cor 15:44–58) at death and judgment, which believers follow in a bodily, spiritual birth (cf. Heb 5:5–7; cf. Luke 23:46; John 3:5–7).⁴⁷

⁴⁶ See Henry, *Atonement and Logic of Resurrection in Hebrews 9:27–28*, appendix 2 table 9 for ἅγιος as the unseen holy place(s) of the heaven(s) of all creation. The glosses *place(s)* or *tent/tabernacle* are added to ἅγιος, as “holy places/tent” to force consideration of the eternal-place spatial implications in the context of Hebrews. An exception is when it is used in reference to people, who are “holy ones” (Heb 6:10; 13:24) or places God abides within by his Spirit (cf. Rom 8:16). However, the holiness of people has a spatial weight that is lost in the Latin transliterations of *sanctifico* in the now used transliterated English words “sanctify” for ἁγιαζῶ (Heb 2:11; 9:13; 10:10, 14, 29; 13:12), “sanctification” for ἁγιασμός (Heb 12:14), and “saint(s)” for ἅγιος (Heb 6:10; 13:24). Sanctification, or holy place dwelling, allows a person into the presence of God’s dwelling, both relationally in this life, and literally, by access to the eternal-place with Jesus (Heb 2:11). This *place* emphasis intensifies when paired in contextual interplay with the place of the “dominion-rule” (Heb 2:5, 11) and *aiōn*-field background theme of “eternal-place(s)” (Heb 1:2) in Hebrews.

⁴⁷ Scholars translate πνεύματος ἁγίου as “the Holy Spirit” with the topic of *spiritual gifts* for ministry in mind, with some light consideration for other options connected with the overarching theme in Hebrews of death and judgment, to which the signs, wonders, and abilities may refer. See Allen, *Hebrews*, 188–201. Concerning μερισμοῖς (“divisions, distributions”), Allen writes, “It is possible that the author had in mind ‘a kind of preliminary apportionment of future inheritance’ such as in Eph 1:14” (196). Cf. Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* AYBC 36 (New York: Doubleday), 207. Koester found in P. Oxy. 493.8 and P. Ryl. 65.5, the term “was used for various things, including inheritance.” Cf. John W. Kleinig, *Hebrews*, Concordia Commentary (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 2017), 106 n. 46. Kleinig describes the only two uses for the term in the LXX (Josh 11:23; Ezra 6:18). This included allocation of the land to Israel and the assigned divisions of the Levites with their responsibilities. This would identify with the context of Jesus’ inheritance in heaven as well as that of the listeners, who are about to inherit salvation in heaven (Heb 1:2, 4, 14) by the seal of the Holy Spirit as a bodily spirit after death. In the NT era, the ambiguous term πνεύματος ἁγίου (“spirit of a holy place,” Heb 9:14), in the different form from the definitive τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου (“the Holy Spirit,” Heb 9:8), may be designed as an idiom to describe the union of the Holy Spirit with the spirit substance of people, that together testifies one is now holy and a child of God at judgment (Heb 2:4; 6:4; cf. Rom 8:16; 1 John 4:13). The form πνεύματος ἁγίου is used 23 times as unique to the NT. It usually refers to either a filling, faith, renewal, or joy from the Holy Spirit, who is occupying the place of a person as one with the substance of their spirit (Matt 1:18; Luke 1:5, 41, 67; Luke 4:1; Acts 1:2; 2:4; 4:8; 4:25; 6:5; 7:55; 9:17; 11:24; 13:9, 52; Rom 5:5; 15:13; 1 Thess 1:6; 2 Tim 2:14; Titus 3:5; Hebrews 2:4; 6:4; 2 Pet 1:21).

He closes another, prior UC to Hebrews 9:27–28, with a warning concerning the example of Jesus’s and God’s faithful judgment, as historically typified in relation to the antitype of the people of Israel (Heb 3:1–4:13). For the Pastor, the typological events of Israel’s deliverance, judgment, and the inheritance of rest in the Promised Land (cf. Josh 11:21–23 LXX) symbolize the reality of heavenly entrance available “today” (Heb 4:6–10). This includes a μερισμός (“division”) of people by the Son, as the Word of God, for judgment after death into “both soul and spirit, and bones and marrow, even an able judge of intentions and thoughts of the heart” (Heb 4:12). At judgment, when people approach to God in heaven, Jesus can judge the reflections and thoughts of people’s hearts, without having to scientifically explain the *how* concerning the people or *where* of the place. The Pastor, like David, accepts by faith the typology of the heavenly access “today” that is symbolized by Israel’s inheritance of promised rest in the land, “of heavenly places.”

His selection for verbal nouns and verbal activity describes directional movement of people, who are regarded as μέτοχοι (“partners,” Heb 3:1, 14) in a heavenly calling of Jesus’s house.⁴⁸ He comments that his listeners qualify in this partnership with Jesus, by a condition of following a common unseen spatial reality to God’s calling in heaven. His condition for partnership states, “if indeed, we should adhere steadfast the beginning of the substance-reality until completion” (Heb 3:14). The context assumes the necessity of a commonly experienced journey of life that begins before death and completes in heaven.⁴⁹ His narrative perceives that

⁴⁸ BDAG, “ὑπόστασις, 1040–41. Bauer observes, “...the author of Hb 3:14 uses ὑπ. in a way that invites an addressee to draw on the semantic component of obligation familiar in commercial usage of the term...an association that is invited by use of μέτοχος, a standard term for a business partner.” This language links strongly with the first-century CE patron system and heavenly οἰκουμένη (“dominion rule”).

⁴⁹ The condition inferred is that if the audience does not travel the entire path Jesus traveled, beginning to end, they will not partner with Christ in their heavenly calling as part of his house. The time range that the audience should hold fast has both individual beginnings and endings, as possibly inferred by μέχρι τέλους (“until ends”), a probable idiom that functions as a marker of continuance in time up to a point. BDAG, “μέχρι,” 644. The gen. sg.

those hearing are in a journey already beginning, with an expected upward rising in death to the eternal-places (Heb 6:2, 4), toward the unseen ὑπόστασις (“substance-reality,” cf. Heb 1:3, 11:1) of faith, with completion at eternal judgment, by Jesus appearing for salvation.⁵⁰ People either dwell with God or are ἀφίστημι (“turned away”) from God (Heb 3:12; 4:1; cf. Heb 6:5), based upon faith in God’s promise of forgiveness and atonement in Christ.⁵¹ The Pastor, based on the

τέλους, could infer either a collective, as “common endings at the same time,” or individual, as “common endings at different times” determined by context. Both are probable options since people individually finish in heaven at death and collectively τελειόω (“to complete, finish”) the process of rising to God, all at the same time, when the living people are later added to those deceased, who already live with Jesus (Heb 2:11–13; cf. 1 Thess 4:13–17). Similarly, the verbal activity of προσέρχομαι (“approach”) begins in life, realizes at death, and ends in heaven, where all believers εισέρχομαι (“enter,” Heb 3:11; 3:19; 4:1, 3, 5; 4:10, 11; 6:19–20; 9:24–25; 10:5).

⁵⁰ Ernest Käsemann called this heavenward motion of the soul, “the wandering people of God” to heaven, after the typology of the journey leaving the exodus into the promised land. Ernest Käsemann, *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville and Irving L. Sandberg (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002). Cf. William G. Johnsson, “The Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews,” *JBL* 97, no. 2 (1978): 239–51. Johnsson asserts this pilgrimage in Hebrews is not realized on earth but “The ‘real’ city which is ‘to come’ (13:14) already is, because it belongs to the realm of the invisible, not made with hands, whose builder and maker is God (11:10; 8:1–5; 9:11)” (247–48). Otfreid Hofius, *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*, WUNT 2, vol. 11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1970), 116–51. Hofius, critiqued the idea of “wandering,” and pronounced those believers in faith were better described as “waiting.”

Jon Laansma, ‘*I Will Give You Rest*,’ WUNT 2, vol. 98 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 311. Laansma appropriately remarks, “Both of these interpretations - - as argued by Hofius and Käsemann - - have a direct connection to the respective religious historical hypotheses, for just as the idea of ‘waiting’ is fitting for the apocalyptically conceived future revelation of the world which is now ‘hidden,’ so the idea of ‘travelling’ is suited to the dualistically conceived movement from the created realm to the uncreated.”

⁵¹ The idea of descent initially was only for those who did not rise up to God at judgment. Cf. Jan N. Bremmer, “Descents to Hell and Ascents to Heaven in Apocalyptic Literature,” in Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 340–57. Bremmer does not find, in the available first-century Jewish and Christian apocalypses, the descents to hell with typical features that are mentioned in available Greek literature. The experience of Enoch in 1 Enoch describes a great land of darkness when traveling to the Northwest (1 En. 17–19). However, later writings from the late first- to second century of the Latin *Vision of Ezra* and Greek *Apocalypse of Peter* reveal descents into hell. These later descents, for *all* people, are probable missteps based upon a change of emphasis by conflation of heavenward hope with elevated antitypes about future available earthly kingdom matters promised to Israel. Earlier Jewish and Christian works, either before or contemporary with the Pastor have close connections with Hebrews in being often composed in the first-person, have angel interpreters, and include the concept of layered heavens. Later Hellenistic Greek explanation turned to downward, earth limited contemplation, whereas it tentatively appears that most Jewish and Christian emphasis in the first century was envisioned as a personal ascent heavenward for the righteous with angelic guidance (Heb 1:14; cf. Luke 16:19–31; 23:43).

The first-century literary direction of the *ascent* to heaven for the righteous is universally recognized by scholarship. Cf. Richard Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998), 49–96. Bauckham asserts, in apocalypses that deal with the fate of the dead, that judgment after death was an overlapping later development during the first century CE but this probably pushes the limited amount of his evidence too far. Cf. Adela Yarbro Collins, “Traveling Up and Away: Journeys to the Upper and Outer Regions of the World,” in *Greco-Roman Culture and the New Testament: Studies*

symbolism of Israel's typology, warns that unbelievers are "turned away" (Heb 3:12; cf. Matt 7:21–23; Luke 13:22–35).

He also explains in his UC of Hebrews 6:11–20, an ontological "better" heavenly access, "as an anchor...for the soul" of people, in following Jesus as πρόδρομος ("the forerunner," Heb 6:20). God speaks, he is able, he is faithful, he cannot lie, he provides the heavenly hope promised access, which "presently is entering" beyond the veil—for people as living "souls" after death with a transformed body to eternal-place spirits just like Jesus did (Heb 9:14; 10:5, 39; 12:22–24; cf. 1 Cor 15:50–58; 1 John 3:2).

The Pastor utilizes fifteen different words to describe features of people in the overarching theme about the priestly intercession of Jesus in death and judgment on approach to God. He especially emphasizes invisible features of people. These include a "spirit" (Heb 2:4; 4:12; 6:4; 9:14; 10:29; 12:9, 23), "heart" (Heb 3:8, 10, 12, 15; 4:7, 12; 8:10; 10:16, 22; 12:3; 13:9), "soul" (Heb 4:12; 6:19; 10:38–39; 13:17), and "conscience" (Heb 9:9, 13; 10:2; 13:18) of both Jesus and people, in connection to the unseen heavenly decisions in judgment about heavenly access.⁵² The Pastor's lexical emphasis in language that includes terms to explain the

Commemorating the Centennial of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, eds. David E. Aune and Frederick Brenk (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 135–166. Collins provides a brief history of scholarship and recommends general division of the theme of ascents and journeys as a theme of the Bible, post-biblical Jewish and Christian texts, as well as in Greek and Roman works. Cf. idem, "Ascents to Heaven in Antiquity: Towards a Typology," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in honor of James C. VanderKam*, ed. Eric F. Mason et al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 2:553–72; Alan f. Segal, "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and Their Environment," in Haase, ANRW 2.23.2, 1333–94; idem, *Life After Death: A History of the Afterlife in Western Religion* (New York: Doubleday, 2004); Martha Himmelfarb, "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean World," in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, eds. John C. Collins and Michael Fishbane (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 123–37; D. Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Himmelsreise Der Seele* (Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971); James M. Scott, "Heavenly Ascents in Jewish and Pagan Traditions," *DNTB* 447–52.

⁵² Ernest De Witt Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh: πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and σὰρξ in Greek Writings and Translated Works from the Earliest Period to 225 AD; and of their Equivalent rûah, nepesh and basar in the Hebrew Old Testament*, Historical and Linguistic Studies, 2nd ser., vol. 3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918), 141–72. Burton finds no special distinction of the Pastor's use of the terms from other Greek literature of the time (203). In the philosophical and medical writers, πνεῦμα denoted "world-stuff, soul-stuff" (168) with

dualism of bodily unseen elements of people in the heavenly places after death is hard to ignore. People after death are still bodily people transformed into another form (Heb 10:5; cf. 2 Cor 5:16–17).

The Pastor further shares in Hebrews 6:4, that Christ and people share the same spiritual experience in association with death and judgment, which concerns his illustration of the last two basic requirements of Christ, “both of rising of the dead people and of eternal-place judgment” (Heb 6:2). He reasons, “For it is impossible for the ones having once been enlightened, those having tasted of the heavenly gift, those having become a partaker of a spirit of a holy place [πνεύματος ἁγίου], and those having tasted a conversation of God’s abilities of the coming eternal-places” (Heb 6:4–5). This statement links as normative the experience of “a spirit of a holy place” in “the abilities of the presently coming eternal-places” in his rhetorical illustration of the prerequisites of Hebrews 6:2. He explains “eternal-place judgment” in the pattern of the Christ that people follow in “both of rising of the dead and of eternal-place judgment.” The use of the pres. ptc. μέλλοντος (“presently/subsequently coming”), provides force for an available spirit body of substance-reality for the Pastor’s *present* expectation of entrance to God.

With words having a dualistic *complementary* contrast, the Pastor’s frequent terms of “blood,” “body,” and “flesh” reference objects in the sensed, visible realm, either the person of Jesus as the Christ, people with sin living in the cosmos, or the symbolic sacrificial offerings portraying the Christ in the OT. This understanding is generally accepted. However, when the seen and unseen language merge in narrative, his message is hard to hear. Many listeners miss how these terms enjoyed a comfortable home in most first-century CE dualistic venues

implications of a created element of a human being. The concept enabled the task of denoting the unembodied or disembodied spirit or shade.

concerning the fate of people waiting after death and already bodily as spirit rising to God from the dead.⁵³

The Pastor, in Hebrews 9:27–28, predicts that Jesus will appear for salvation to those awaiting τοῖς αὐτὸν (“for him”). The location concerning the acc. direct object αὐτὸν (“him”) for the audience of his probable MCS, in his theme about the priestly Christ, has several choices of spatial location for the event(s) where Jesus initially shepherds his sheep together: (1) the place of throne of the holy of holies beyond the veil, (2) the less holy place outside, or (3) the earth of the visible cosmos. In later exhortation, the Pastor shares people bodily enter to a ἐπουρανίου...πόλιν (“heavenly place...city,” Heb 11:16) with other brethren, an ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς (“an assembly of firstborn having been enrolled in the heavens,” Heb 12:23), and πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων (“spirits of the righteous having been completed,” Heb 12:23).

A Response to Contra Claims Against Prompt Resurrection

The Pastor’s imagery of people waiting in a place for the appearing of Christ and salvation has bearing on whether God’s tabernacle is either a substance-reality “about” the plural heavens with movement of people in spirit bodies by the priesthood of Jesus from the visible realm to God, or only a temple “in heaven,” a so-called “heavenly tabernacle,” where *only* the resurrected human person of Jesus enters for offering, atonement, enthronement, and ascension movement. As evaluated in Henry, *Atonement and Logic of Resurrection in Hebrews 9:27–28*

⁵³ Jan N. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983). Bremmer states, “It is now generally recognized that the use of modern Western terminology to describe non-Western beliefs influences analysis since it assumes the existence among other peoples of the same semantic fields for modern words, and thus often implies a nonextant similarity” (4). This Western influence colors OT, ANE, and Hellenistic concepts of the afterlife for people by a tradition for only a fleshly bodily rising from the dead in earthly kingdom preconceptions.

concerning the concept of open heavens for sinful people, David Moffitt rejects the proposal that tabernacle symbolism embraces *all* the heavens of both God's seen and unseen creation. Moffitt's spatial and anthropological views are critiqued therein. This paper lightly highlights the responses surrounding anthropological questions about the people waiting.

In Moffitt's monograph, *Atonement and Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, he dialogs with Jeremias and Hofius mentioned earlier, who both place emphasis on the approach by Jesus as spirit into heaven for enthronement, after death on the cross, before being rejoined to his fleshly body three days later. Moffitt finds those who follow this first-century optional approach as problematic with four main issues: (1) He postulates that the full heavens approach pushes the interpretation of Hebrews 13:20, as exaltation instead of fleshly resurrection, too far, with no internal evidence in Hebrews to support it.⁵⁴ (2) The texts of Hebrews 1:3 and 8:1–2 may provide for readers "the strong impression that the atoning offering of Jesus and his heavenly 'session' cannot be parsed out as neatly as Jeremias's and Hofius's solutions demand."⁵⁵ (3) The view concerning Jesus's approach as spirit holds less significant Jesus's human body, than does the argument of Hebrews by the author.⁵⁶ And (4), in Hebrews 13:20, it must be admitted that if the traditional language of resurrection does not occur, then the author may steer clear of thinking of resurrection at all.⁵⁷

Regarding Moffitt's first issue, the apocalyptic language employed by the Pastor on his *aiōn*-field easily supports Hebrews 13:20 as an emphasis about Jesus' salvation when being led

⁵⁴ Moffitt, *Atonement*, 25.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 26.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

by God after judgment at the death of the cross for enthronement and subsequent ministry as the great Shepherd of the sheep. Further evidence is that Hebrews 13:20 serves the Pastor as a UC that connects narrowly in stride with his other DUC along the same theme from the DI. Discourse analysis easily demonstrates that the overarching theme, as summarized in Hebrews 9:27–28, concerns the ministry of Jesus, from the place of the heavenly throne to those recently deceased at the place of judgment for salvation. In Moffitt’s assumption for only fleshly resurrection, Hebrews 13:20 then becomes a tangential proof text about flesh resurrection away from the thematic line. He admits in his logic of flesh resurrection that no one has been saved till Jesus leaves the throne for the second coming to earth. This position suggests that Jesus is a shepherd, who in personal, near relationships with his people has not shepherded anyone, perhaps at most leaving this work to the Holy Spirit till he can get off his throne. One could ask if Jesus came for Stephen at death when standing at the throne or does Stephen still wait for the Jesus he saw on that day for his promised salvation in continuous living? (Acts 7:55–56).

The second issue has also been addressed. When the words of these texts and others are stripped of Latin transliterations with sense foreign to the Pastor and are allowed consideration of their spatial weight in context of a first-century *aiōn*-field, the specific language of the Pastor more than adequately describes a coherent first-century CE dualism where Hebrews 1:3; 2:4; 4:12; 6:4–5, 13–20; 9:14; 12:22–24; and Hebrews 13:20 are the same thematic event of death and judgment as a complete, bodily, holy *place* spirit described herein, rather than Jesus’s later σημεῖον (“sign”) of fleshly resurrection (cf. John 2:18–22; 13:31–32).

Moffitt’s third issue arises concerning the approach of Jesus in spirit at death for judgment. He views, as opposing rather than complementary contrasts, (1) Jesus’s human offering in the pattern of the basic requirements for the OT sacrificial Christ, judgment, rising to God, and his enthronement, and (2) Jesus’s human fleshly resurrection. However, both are

human and within God's ability for Jesus as human. There is no textual evidence in Hebrews that the change from a fleshly body of Adam to a spirit body of Christ disqualifies a person from the category of being human, no less than losing a limb or an organ makes one less a person (cf. 1 Cor 15:35–57).

Moffitt's rightly detects logic about the flesh resurrection of Jesus and that the human factor of Jesus's flesh resurrection carries great emphasis for the Pastor's argument to his audience. However, for the Pastor, the earth and cosmos have no lasting appeal since they are temporary and wearing out in decay (Heb 1:10–12; 12:25–29). Also, the Pastor does not mention in his sermon the direct prophetic fulfillment on earth of OT promises for earthly ministry in a later fleshly resurrection on earth. However, the endpoint of the Pastor's exposition and exhortation easily locates heavenly with God, where the presence of the human Jesus in heaven now testifies, in greater emphasis (cf. John 2:18–22), for the same present ability of Jesus to bring his believers into the substance-reality of heaven at judgment (Heb 2:4; 6:5). Jesus's current ministry anticipates a corporate collection of the living people being added with the dead now living in heaven (Heb 11:39–40). Even then, his message points upward in movement to dwelling with Jesus in the substance-reality of the living God once the temporary heavens and earth are shaken (Heb 12:25–29). In the OT and NT, bodily resurrection is not about the dead joining the living on earth; it is about the living on earth joining the living who died and experience better, complete, and perpetual living with Jesus (cf. 1 Thess 4:17).

In Hebrews 11:40, by adding the *living* of his audience to the *dead* already in heaven at a corporate τελειωθῶσιν (“completion, finishing”), the Pastor logically supports a rising to God for all believers (cf. Rev 7:9–17) like that of Jesus. His rhetoric does not depend on Hebrews 13:20 as the events of the flesh resurrection/ascension concerning the later movement of Jesus to God but as his rising to God *at death* and return to earthly fleshly life as proof of completed

atonement. Jesus's earthly sign of God's acceptance of his atonement at his death is his fleshly return from the holy of holies in an indestructible life—not his second coming for the living on earth.

The Pastor's use of the *αγω*- word group (Heb 1:6; 2:10; 8:9; 13:20), as in Hebrews 13:20, and *φερω* word group (Heb 1:3; 9:14, 28; 10:5; 10:18), mainly describe Jesus's ministry in offering, bringing and leading people to God at judgment, and even now shepherding people after the pattern where God brought up Jesus into heaven at his judgment. There is even stronger logical evidence in the *τελ*-word group (Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:19, 28; 10:14; 11:40; 12:23) for the process of rising/resurrection *from* the dead into heaven. The Pastor uses the *τελ*- word group in Hebrews 11:39–40 to contrast “those, they,” [the *dead* in faith], with “us,” [the *living* audience], to assure them, “that they [the dead in faith] do not finish without us [the living audience]” (Heb 11:40, brackets sense mine).⁵⁸ No believer is left outside of heaven, including those living.

⁵⁸ The Pastor assures his audience, as living, that they will not be left out of the process of finishing their salvation that includes a collective of the living with the dead, who are already judged and now with Jesus (cf. 1 Thess 4:13–18). This is the inverse of the question, What about the dead? that Paul answered to the Thessalonians. From the possible observation that all his testimonials of faith did not receive the promises while *living*, but in *death* (Heb 11:13–16), the Pastor anticipates a question, What about us, the living? The syntax of the aorist prohibitive subjunctive “without us they should not be complete” (Heb 11:40) in context is better considered as a general or customary concept rather than the possible inceptive sense for a statement that implies a completion has not begun for either the dead or living.

A review of the Pastor's use of the *τελ*- word group supports an application range that includes Jesus' *πάθημα* (“sufferings”) of his experience of death (Heb 2:10) to his current ministry in the flesh based on his *τελειωθείς* (“having been finished,” Heb 5:9) with the process. Jesus fulfills the Word of the Law about, “a Son, who having been perfected in the eternal-place” (Heb 7:28), which reveals that his finish, completion, or perfection locates in the eternal-place and not on earth. Concerning people, the Law “perfected” nothing (cf. Heb 9:9; 10:1), but the better hope allowed that “we draw near to God” (Heb 7:19), which implies in context the reality of closeness to the holiness (Heb 10:14) of the living God in heaven as “spirits of the righteous ones having been perfected” (Heb 12:23). By the Pastor's range application of the term, an inceptive sense of the aorist prohibitive subjunctive would also imply that no one has yet begun to suffer death “with us.” For similar findings of the meaning as congruent with the Pastor's contextual use of “entrance” to the holy of holies in the direct and unmediated presence of God, see John M. Scholer, *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, JSNTSup 49 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 20–30, 185–200. Scholer probably missteps by only finding application of the *τελ*- word group to believers in this life or a future eschatological gathering, by concluding, “The deceased—the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, the spirits of just men made perfect—who are currently gathered around the throne (Heb 12.22–24) have ‘entered’ into the heavenly holy of holies, i.e., into God's very presence (e.g., Christ: 2:10; 5:9; 7:28; others: 11.40; 12.23)” (201). The Pastor applies the term to people as spirits around the throne with the living God in heaven now, which Scholer forces into a limited future eschatology. *Pace* Jon Laansma, *I Will Give You Rest*, 302–

Conclusion

Afterlife concepts surrounding the Pastor in the first century were far from monolithic.⁵⁹ On approach in judgment, the righteous rise up from the dead in ascent to God, whereas the wicked descend outside of heaven to remain with the dead, in space labeled by other authors as Sheol, Hades, and the Abyss.⁶⁰ For the Lord's partners in his house, the Pastor does not thematically follow Greek or later Jewish Christian cultural options that refer to the movement of

03. For a survey of scholarly positions, see David Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, SNTSMS (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1–20.

⁵⁹ Klaus Bieberstein, “Jenseits der Todesschwelle: Die Entstehung der Auferweckungshoffnungen in der alttestamentlich-frühjüdischen Literaturen,” in Berlejung and Janowski, *Tod und Jenseits im alten Israel und in seiner Umwelt*, 423–46. Bieberstein explores a variety of concepts available concerning the hope of rising after death. He proposes a development of four steps toward a successive formulation of the concept of resurrection of all the dead under the theological force of God's righteousness in the face of innocent sufferers. These flow from Ps 88 to 1 Cor 15. He observes that the conceptions of hope in resurrection do not provide every detail, and reason no systematically, thoroughly declined conceptions of the fate of body and soul after death. The idea of development of first-century afterlife views, fails to recognize the genre differences between the history of Israel that has less background of dualism in after death experience and the more apocalyptic perspective-laced genre that includes more heavenly detail. Cf. Rachel S. Hallote, *Death, Burial, and Afterlife in the Biblical World: How the Israelites and Their Neighbors Treated the Dead* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2001); Dina Katz, *The Image of the Netherworld in the Sumerian Sources* (Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2018); John Coleman Darnell and Colleen Manassa Darnell, *The Ancient Egyptian Netherworld Books* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2018); Franz Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, Silliman Memorial Lectures, 1921 (New York: Dover Publications, 1959); idem, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York: Palatine Press, 2015); Robert Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); Ulrich Fischer, *Eschatologie Und Jenseitserwartung Im Hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (New York: de Gruyter, 1978); Matthew J. Suriano, *A History of Death in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018). Suriano observes in the ritual of secondary burial with one's collective ancestry and treatment of the dead, that transcended generations, could serve the same purpose to offer hope and security in the afterlife (53–54).

⁶⁰ Cf. Richard Bauckham, “Life, Death, and the Afterlife in Second Temple Judaism,” in *In Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message of the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker, McNTS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 80–95. Bauckham conceives an OT ideology that *all* the dead *remained* in Sheol until a future bodily resurrection and a general judgment. He does not seriously consider the biblical option concerning the righteous expectation for an immediate judgment and rising upward from Sheol to God into heaven of his temple (92; cf. Ps 16:10; 30:3; 31:17; 49:15; 86:13; 139:8, 23–24). Bauckham's preconceptions follow the adversarial rhetorical strawman divide toward either Jewish wholistic or Platonic Hellenistic afterlife possibilities, which has recently been heavily critiqued. Cf. Peter G. Bolt, “Life, Death, and the Afterlife in the Greco-Roman World,” in Longenecker, *Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message of the New Testament*, 51–79; Edwin M. Yamauchi, “Life, Death, and the Afterlife in the Ancient Near East,” in Longenecker, *Life in the Face of Death*, 21–50. Bauckham, Bolt, and Yamauchi provide a balanced evaluation demonstrating a variety of Jewish, ANE, and Greco-Roman beliefs, in concepts that contain similar, spatial, dualistic topography and human afterlife abilities, by which the Pastor claims for the availability of access and entrance into heaven at judgment could be understood.

the believer in death as descent in going downward to Hades, nor remaining as a wandering spirit in the cosmos in the region of the grave, nor as either asleep or non-existent to await Jesus in later-resumed earthly living.⁶¹ The Pastor does not describe the waiting as for resurrection of the flesh.⁶² Neither does his afterlife hope embrace concepts of an “intermediate-state” or the modern strawman of “immortality of the soul.”⁶³ His verbal nouns and activity portray people

⁶¹ Evidence suggests that the Pastor’s emphasis centers more on rising heavenward to God after death for continued life in God’s dwelling, than other concepts of bodily return in resurrection for temporary earthly living and ministry with Jesus. Cf. Casey D. Elledge, *Life after Death in Early Judaism*, WUNT 2, vol. 208 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). Elledge provides comprehensive analysis concerning the afterlife in the writings of Flavius Josephus in comparison to other controls of STL. He recognized that Josephus makes no direct mention of the concept of a flesh bodily resurrection of the dead, instead opting in his Hellenistic rhetoric for immortality of the soul. As I have mentioned, Josephus’s concept differs from modern partitive or inferior states but possesses complete, bodily features compatible with spirit life. Cf. Joshua R. Farris, *An Introduction to Theological Anthropology: Humans, Both Creaturely and Divine* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020), 161–86; Cf. Jaime Clark-Soles, *Death and Afterlife in the New Testament* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006). Jamie Clark-Soles senses wide variety in NT concepts of the afterlife but pushes in a flattened, future eschatology for NT Christianity, teaching mainly a future, flesh resurrection of believers in a relationship with Jesus in heaven (61, 102–03).

⁶² Cf. Richard Elliot Friedeman and Shawna Dolansky Overton, “Death and Afterlife: The Biblical Silence,” in Avery-Peck and Neusner, *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, 35–57. Friedmann and Overton explore the scant references of resurrection in the text of the OT in connection with the much greater evidence in Israel’s worldview of the existence of an afterlife found in mortuary rites, the netherworld, veneration of deceased ancestors, necromancy, and rising from the dead. They conclude that the history of thought rarely moves in a linear progression toward bodily fleshly resurrection. The evidence supports a focus on what happens to people after death in heaven, with relative silence on fleshly resurrection. Interestingly, Friedmann and Overton find that the priests are less likely to mention life-after-death and speculate multiple possible reasons. Matters have not really changed; those educated in religion still resist contemplating the afterlife worldview that is held by most of the religious world outside of their small tight circle. Cf. Jürgen Zangenberg, “Trochene Knochen, himmlische Seligkeit: Todes- und Jenseitsvorstellungen im Judentum der hellenistisch-frührömischen Zeit,” in *Tod und Jenseits im alten Israel und in seiner Umwelt*, eds. Angelika Berlejung and Bernd Janowski, FAT 64 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 655–89. Zangenberg generally observes that in ancient Jewish funeral practices and in activities surrounding death, from the those on the verge of death, to burial practices, to concepts beyond death and new life, all reflect a perceived understanding of life-after-death in common with other surrounding people. He chooses not to address the distinct differences. He also notices that, in these practices surrounding death, the NT concept of “resurrection” regarding the flesh was innovative and not found in ancient Judaism.

⁶³ Cf. Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?*, 48–57. Cullmann’s view on immortality of the soul and the waiting of the dead are probably an unnecessary contemplation, especially if believers bodily rise complete to God ‘now’ by Jesus’ ministry in death, without an intermediate state. Cf. George Wesley Buchanan, “Introduction,” in *Eschatology: The Doctrine of the Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity, A Critical History* (New York: Schocken Books, 1963), xiv. Buchanan summarizes the modern imbalance of the assumed warrant that drives the concept of the intermediate state and immortality considerations when he says, “The primary event for the Christian faith, then, is not the end which is still to come, but the resurrection which has already occurred and has determined the outcome of future events. Judaism was eschatologically oriented, but in primitive Christianity eschatology was dethroned and the resurrection was given central place.”

with hope in Jesus as rising in death to dwell with God as complete.⁶⁴

The Pastor seems uninhibited to speak about humanity either in dualistic, partitive bodily features or wholistic bodily concepts. He fully embraces the necessary language to describe a person's relationship to the invisible/eternal and visible/temporary creation both in and after visible life. He does not embrace the anachronistic either/or extremes of syncretism vs. disunion, wholistic vs. dichotomy/trichotomy, or dualism vs. monism. His message contains no parenetic correction or polemic reaction to limit his language about people that commonly appears in modern strawmen concerning Hellenistic and Jewish philosophy, to regulate the same probable optional understandings of his audience.

The Pastor freely deploys this language without embracing or mentioning any of the collective theological polemic assembled by the speculation of modern theological inquiry. The language of his text in common with STL does not bear the modern weight for either syncretic influence or complete disunion with the then existing language of first-century philosophical conclusions or applications. Rather, the Pastor simply uses common Jewish methods and normative language in a first-century priestly view that would be understood by his audience for immediate bodily transformation into God's heavenly presence as completion.

⁶⁴ The Pastor's concerns are more toward the rising to God of both Jesus and people in death and at judgment, after the pattern of Jesus' death-to-resurrection experience, than the promised spiritual bodily return to earth. If a person is not with Christ by rising to God after death, then later return in eternal-place life for future ministry is not an option. Modern thought so focuses on a fleshly resurrection on earth, it diminishes entrance into heaven and afterlife of a present heavenly transformation as nonexistent or perhaps unknowable in God's revelation. The modern concept of later spiritual bodily return to earth is only a final part of the whole first-century understanding of rising and resurrection.

Appendix 2

