# From Son to High Priest: The Christological Rhetoric of Hebrews

David H. Thiele

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy at

The University of Queensland in October 2008

The School of History, Philosophy, Religion and Classics

**Declaration by author**

This thesis is composed of my original work, and contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I have clearly stated the contribution by others to jointly-authored works that I have included in my thesis.

I have clearly stated the contribution of others to my thesis as a whole, including statistical assistance, survey design, data analysis, significant technical procedures, professional editorial advice, and any other original research work used or reported in my thesis. The content of my thesis is the result of work I have carried out since the commencement of my research higher degree candidature and does not include a substantial part of work that has been submitted to qualify for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. I have clearly stated which parts of my thesis, if any, have been submitted to qualify for another award.

I acknowledge that an electronic copy of my thesis must be lodged with the University Library and, subject to the General Award Rules of The University of Queensland, immediately made available for research and study in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968.

I acknowledge that copyright of all material contained in my thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of that material.

**Statement of Contributions to Jointly Authored Works Contained in the Thesis**

No jointly-authored works.

## Statement of Contributions by Others to the Thesis as a Whole

No contributions by others.

## Statement of Parts of the Thesis Submitted to Qualify for the Award of Another Degree

None.

## Published Works by the Author Incorporated into the Thesis

None.

## Additional Published Works by the Author Relevant to the Thesis but not Forming Part of it

None.

**Acknowledgements**

My interest in the book of Hebrews can be traced back at least at far as the patient spiritual care afforded me by Maurice Woods a biblical literate church pastor of my home town church when I was a high school student. That interest was nurtured in the classes taught by Norman Young at Avondale College (Australia) in the late 1970s as part of my B.A. degree and later again in my M.A. studies. Since that time my own reading of both the Bible and scholarly literature has drawn me back to Hebrews again and again. I count it a great privilege to have been able to have studied this book at depth for my doctorate.

So many people have contributed in so many ways to my doctoral programme that it is difficult to offer adequate thanks. First of all, my thanks go to the administration of the South Pacific Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church who have sponsored and supported my study. Dr Laurie Evans, recently retired President of the South Pacific Division, in particularly, has been unfailingly supportive and encouraging. Second, my thanks go to Drs Nemani Tausare and Branimir Schubert, successive Vice-Chancellors of Pacific Adventist University who with their administrations have provided me with relief from my teaching responsibilities. Likewise, Dr David Tasker, until recently Dean of the School of Theology at Pacific Adventist University was very pro-active in getting me into a doctoral programme and was ever ready with encouragement and practical advice.

I did significant amounts of research at the Library of the Claremont Graduate School in California and found the staff there to be *absolutely wonderful*. Similarly, I would like to particularly thank Kim Robinson and his team at the Moore Theological College Library (Sydney, Australia); Jo Lloyd and her team at the Avondale College

Library and Laurie Bradey of the Presbyterian Theological Centre Library Sydney. The interlibrary loan department at UQ have also been extremely helpful.

My initial contact at the University of Queensland, Dr Ed Conrad, was very helpful and my supervisor Dr Rick Strelan has been tremendous. Working at a distance is can be challenging but Rick was always prompt in replying to my e-mails and his comments were always deserving of careful consideration.

In Papua New Guinea I have been helped greatly by the Rev. Dr. Valerian Fernandes SVD, a Lukan scholar working at Catholic Theological Institute (Port Moresby). Valaran volunteered to proof-read my entire document, chapter by chapter. He did, I have to say, an incredibly thorough job of this most tedious of tasks. Nothing I can say could express the gratitude I have for his work.

Amongst many others I must make mention of Mrs Veronika Chester, a lecturer at Pacific Adventist University, who was every ready to help me with my German reading. Similarly, thanks to Dr Ross Cole of Avondale College who provide linguistic support as well as helping me with locating specific resources.

Lasting I wish to thank my family. My wife, Jillian, has endured living with a doctoral student for the last five years–and still loves me! Without her love and support, I surely would not have seen this project to its completion. Similarly my children have sacrificed time with Dad as he wrestled with what must have seemed to them, the most esoteric of subjects.

Dedicated to

my first *Neutestamentler* (Avondale College, Australia, 1977),

pioneering rhetorical critic

Dr Desmond Ford

διδασκάλος

ποιμήν

μάρτυς

φίλος

**Abstract**

This thesis deals with the Christology of the book of Hebrews, specifically the relationship between the Christological categories of "Son" and "high priest". It is argued here that the rationale for the introduction of a priestly Christology has been insufficiently considered in previous scholarly work on Hebrews Furthermore, in previous studies insufficient consideration has been given to the way in which the interrelationship of the categories of sonship and priesthood functions in the rhetorical structure of Hebrews. This thesis argues that a form of "second Adam" Christology lies behind the Christological thought of Hebrews. It consequently endeavours to establish the rationale for the introduction of priestly Christology by exploring those "second Adam" ideas.

Until the 1970s historical-critical methodologies dominated in the study of Hebrews. This is one of the reasons for the lack of scholarly consideration of the interrelationship of the priestly and filial Christological categories in the rhetoric of Hebrews. This thesis underscores the deficiencies of the historical-critical approaches to Hebrews as highlighted by the paucity of results such approaches have produced. It is argued that rhetorical criticism is an appropriate methodology for supplementing more historical-oriented methodologies. A survey of previous rhetorical-critical work on Hebrews is undertaken with a view to showing the potential of rhetorical-critical study of the book.

It is argued that the rhetorical purposes of Hebrews is the bolstering of the community's confidence in their confession of faith. Acceptance of such an understanding of purpose leads naturally to the further question of the content of that confession, and specifically to the issue of whether or not it contained a statement of

the priesthood of Christ. It is argued that the confession of the Hebrews did not refer to the priesthood of Christ, but can rather be summarized as "Jesus is the Son of God".

The core of this thesis is found in a careful exegesis of Heb 2 which is crucial for understanding the relationship of the sonship and priesthood of Jesus in Hebrews. This chapter is introduced by explicit references to Jesus as Son (in Hebrews 1:5-14) and ends with the first explicit application of the word "priest" to him (2:17). It is argued that the underlying Adamic and Edenic themes in the chapter provide the key to understanding the relationship. The significance of such Adamic/Eden themes lies at the heart of this thesis.

The rest of Hebrews is then examined with a view to ascertaining if such Adamic/Edenic themes are utilized elsewhere in the work. The rhetorical significance of the Adamic/Edenic allusions found throughout Hebrews is also explored. It is argued that the pattern of usage strongly suggests that Adamic/Edenic themes constitute "common ground" between *Auctor* and his recipients, which is presupposed in the overall argument of Hebrews rather than being argued in detail.

The thesis concludes with a summary of the work as a whole, a statement of conclusions arrived at and an outline various implications arising from it.

**Keywords**
Christology, sonship, priesthood, Adam, Adamic, rhetoric, rhetorical, eschatology, eschatological, Hebrews

**Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classifications (ANZSRC)**

220401 100%

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AB . . . . . Anchor Bible
ABD . . . . . Anchor Bible Dictionary
ABR . . . . . Australian Biblical Review
ACR . . . . . Australian Catholic Record
AG . . . . . Analecta Gregoriana
AJBA . . . . . Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology
AJT . . . . . American Journal of Theology
AKG . . . . . Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte
ALGHJ . . . . . Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib . . . . . Analecta Biblica
ANRW . . . . . Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.
Aratus, *Phaen.* . . . . . Aratus, "Phaenomena."
[Arist.] *Rh. Al.* . . . . . [Aristotle.] *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*
Arist. *Rh.* . . . . . Aristotle. *Art of Rhetoric*
*As. Mos.* . . . . . "Testament [Assumption] of Moses."
AsiaJT . . . . . Asia Journal of Theology
ATR . . . . . Anglican Theological Review
August. *Conf.* . . . . . Augustine, "Confessions of St. Augustine"
AUS . . . . . American University Studies
AUSDDS . . . . . Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series
AUSS . . . . . Andrews University Seminary Studies
BA . . . . . Biblical Archaeology
BAP . . . . . Bibelauslegung für die Praxis
BBB . . . . . Bonner Biblische Beiträge
Bib . . . . . Biblica
BibLeb . . . . . Bibel und Leben
BibSac . . . . . Bibliotheca Sacra
Bij . . . . . Bijdragon
BIS . . . . . Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL . . . . . Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
BNTC . . . . . Black's New Testament Commentaries [= HNTC]
BTB . . . . . Biblical Theology Bulletin
BU . . . . . Biblische Untersuchungen
BZ . . . . . Biblische Zeitschrift
BZET . . . . . Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BZNW . . . . . Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
CBC . . . . . Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBET . . . . . Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBNTS . . . . . Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series
CBQ . . . . . Catholic Biblical Quarterly

CBQMS . . . . . Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CBSC . . . . . Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CD . . . . . Damascus Document
CGTSC . . . . . Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges
Cic. *De or.* . . . . . Cicero, *On the Orator*
Cic. *Top.* . . . . . Cicero, *Topics*
CJT . . . . . Canadian Journal of Theology
CNT . . . . . Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
CR: BS . . . . . Currents in Research: Biblical Studies
CTL . . . . . Crown Theological Library
DBSJ . . . . . Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal
Deut. Rab. . . . . "Deuteronomy," in *Midrash Rabbah*
EKK . . . . . Evangelische-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EKKv . . Evangelische-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament Vorarbeiten
Enc. Jud. . . . . Encyclopaedia Judaica
Epictetus, *Diss.* . . . . . Epictetus, *Discourses*
ER: ASCF . . . Evangelical Resourcement: Ancient Sources for the Church's Future
ESEC . . . . . Emory Studies in Early Christianity
ET . . . . . Expository Times
EQ . . . . . Evangelical Quarterly
EUS . . . . . European University Studies
Exp . . . . . The Expositor
Ex. Rab. . . . . "Exodus," in *Midrash Rabbah*
FM . . . . . Faith and Mission
FOTL . . . . . Forms of Old Testament Literature
FV . . . . . Foi et Vie
Gen. Rab. . . . . "Genesis," in *Midrash Rabbah*
GNS . . . . . Good News Studies
GOTR . . . . . Greek Orthodox Theological Review
GPM . . . . . Göttingen Predigt-Meditationen
GTJ . . . . . Grace Theological Journal
HeyJ . . . . . Heythrop Journal
HNT . . . . . Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC . . . . . Harper New Testament Commentaries [= BNTC]
HTR . . . . . Harvard Theological Review
HUCA . . . . . Hebrew Union College Annual
HUT . . . . . Hermenteutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
IB . . . . . Interpreter's Bible
ICC . . . . . International Critical Commentary
IDBS . . . . . Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume
JBL . . . . . Journal of Biblical Literature
JETS . . . . . Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
JMT . . . . . Journal of Ministry and Theology
Jos., *Ant.* . . . . . Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*
Jos., *Ap.* . . . . . Josephus, *Contra Apionem*
Jos. *Vita* . . . . . Josephus, *The Life of Josephus*
JPS . . . . . Jewish Publication Society

JRR . . . . . Journal from the Radical Reformation
JSNTS . . . . . Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOTSS . . . . . Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSS . . . . . Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JTS . . . . . Journal of Theological Studies
KD . . . . . Kerygma und Dogma
LD . . . . . Lectio Divina
Lev. Rab. . . . . "Leviticus," in *Midrash Rabbah*
LXX . . . . . Septuagint
MelTheol . . . . . Melita Theologica
*Mem. Mar.* . . . . . *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah*
MKEK . . . . . Meyer Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
MLBS . . . . . Mercer Library of Biblical Studies
MNTC . . . . . Moffatt New Testament Commentary
MT . . . . . Masoretic Text
NABPRDS National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion Dissertation Series
NCB . . . . . New Century Bible
NIB . . . . . New Interpreter's Bible
NICNT . . . . . New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC . . . . . New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovTest . . . . . Novum Testamentum
NPNF/1 . . . . . Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series
NPNF/2 . . . . . Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series
n.s. . . . . new series
NTD . . . . . Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTS . . . . . New Testament Studies
Num. Rab. . . . . "Numbers," in *Midrash Rabbah*
OTL . . . . . Old Testament Library
OTP . . . . . Old Testament Pseudepigrapha
POS . . . . . Pretoria Oriental Series
Philo, *Abr.* . . . . . Philo, *On Abraham*
Philo, *Cher.* . . . . . Philo, *On the Cherubim, the Flaming Sword and Cain*
Philo *Conf.* . . . . . Philo, *On the Confusion of Tongues*
Philo, *Congr.* . . . . . Philo, *On Mating with the Preliminary Studies*
Philo. *Gig.* . . . . . Philo, *On the Giants*
Philo, *Leg. 1-III* . . . . . Philo, *Allegorical Interpretations of Genesis II and III*
Philo, *Mos.* . . . . . Philo, *Moses*
Philo, *Mut. Nom.* . . . . . Philo, *On the Change of Names*
Philo, *Op. Mundi* . . . . Philo, *On the Account of the World's Creation given by Moses*
Philo, *Plant* . . . . . Philo, *Concerning Noah's Work as a Planter*
Philo, *Post.* . . . . . Philo, *On the Posterity of Cain and his Exile*
Philo, *Praem* . . . . . Philo. *On Rewards and Punishments*
Philo, *Rer. Div. Her.* . . . . . Philo, *Who is the Heir of Divine Things*
Philo, *Sac.* . . . . . Philo, *On Abel and the Sacrifices Offered by Him and Cain*
Philo, *Somn.* . . . . . Philo, *On Dreams that they are God-Sent*
Philo, *Spec. Leg.* . . . . . Philo, *On the Special Laws*
Philo, *Virt.* . . . . . Philo, *On the Virtues*

PR . . . . . Philosophy and Rhetoric
Ps. Philo, *LAB* . . . . . Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities*
PTMS . . . . . Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
PTR . . . . . Princeton Theological Review
QJS . . . . . Quarterly Journal of Speech
Quint. *Inst.* . . . . . Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*
1QS . . . . . *1QRule of Community*
4Q174 . . . . . *4Q Florilegium*
4Q175 . . . . . *4QTestimonia*
*Rhet. Her.* . . . . . [Cicero], *Rhetorica ad Herennium*
RevExp . . . . . Review and Expositor
*RGG* . . . . . Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RQ . . . . . Revue de Qumran
RSR . . . . . Recherches de science religieuse
RTK . . . . . Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne
RTP . . . . . Revue de Théologique et de Philosophie
RTR . . . . . Reformed Theological Review
SB . . . . . Subsidia Biblica
SBLDS . . . . . Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS . . . . . Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBS . . . . . Sources for Biblical Study
SBT . . . . . Studies in Biblical Theology
SE . . . . . Studia Evangelica
Sen. *Ben.* . . . . . Seneca, *De Beneficiis*
Sen. *Ep.* . . . . . Seneca, *Moral Letters*
SJLA . . . . . Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJT . . . . . Scottish Journal of Theology
SJTOP . . . . . Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers
SMTS . . . . . Saint Marys Theological Studies
SNT . . . . . Supplements to Novum Testamentum
SNTSMS . . . . . Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPAW. PH . . . . . Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
SR . . . . . Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses
SSEJC . . . . . Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
ST . . . . . Studia Theologica
StBL . . . . . Studies in Biblical Literature
StNT . . . . . Studien zum Neuen Testament
StudBibTh . . . . . Studia Biblica et Theologica
SUNT . . . . . Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SupNum . . . . . Supplement to *Numen*
SWJT . . . . . Southwestern Journal of Theology
TBT . . . . . The Bible Today
TDNT . . . . . Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT . . . . . Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
Th . . . . . Theology

TJ . . . . . Trinity Journal
TLOT . . . . . Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament
TLZ . . . . . Theologische Literaturzietung
TNTC . . . . . Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TRu . . . . . Theologische Rundschau
TSK . . . . . Theologische Studien und Kritiken
TU . . . . . Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
TynBul . . . . . Tyndale Bulletin
TZ . . . . . Theologische Zeitschrift
VD . . . . . Verbum Domini
VoxEv . . . . . Vox Evangelica
WBC . . . . . Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT . . . . . Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WSPL . . . . . Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature
WTJ . . . . . Westminster Theological Journal
WUNT . . . . . Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WW . . . . . Word and World
WZKM . . . . . Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZAW . . . . . Zeitschrift für die Altestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW . . . . . Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK . . . . . Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

## Note on Sources

The following editions and translations of primary sources have been used unless otherwise stated.

For classical Greek and Latin writers, Philo, and Josephus: Loeb Classical Library.

For early church fathers: *Ante-Nicene Fathers* edited by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson; *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, series 1 edited by P. Schaff and *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* Series 2 edited by P. Schaff and H. Wace.

For the Dead Sea Scrolls, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, edited by F. C. Martinez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar.

For the Memar Marqah, *Memar Marquah: The Teaching of Marqah*, edited by J. MacDonald.

For the Midrash Rabbath, *Midrash Rabbah*, edited by J. Rabbinowitz.

For the pseudepigrapha, the *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth.

The orthography of the name of the German scholar Erich Grässer presents a particular problem. His surname is sometimes given in the form of Grässer and at other times in the form of Gräßer. This variation is found both in references to Grässer by other scholars and in the ascriptions of authorship in his own works. In an endeavour to provide consistency in the text of this dissertation the name is standardized to Grässer. However, in the footnotes the form found in the original source is retained.

## CHAPTER 1

## THE CHRISTOLOGY OF HEBREWS: SONSHIP AND PRIESTHOOD

The Christological categories of sonship and priesthood lie at the heart of the theological presentation of the book of Hebrews. *Auctor ad Hebraeos* uses the the word υἱός (son) 23 times, ἱερεύς (priest) 14 times, and ἀρχιερεύς (high priest) 17 times, mainly in explicitly Christological contexts.[1] In addition the work is filled with a variety of priestly images relating to the sanctuary and especially to the Day of Atonement. Other imagery further emphasizes the filial relationship between Jesus and God, not least of which is the designation of God as "Father".

The fact that Hebrews sees the Christological concepts of sonship and priesthood as intimately intertwined is universally acknowledged. David Dunbar declares the connection between these two Christological categories in Hebrews to be "clear to any careful reader of the Epistle."[2] The importance of the relationship for *Auctor* is obvious. His first mention of the Son attributes a priestly function to him

---

[1]Following the lead of Hurst and Buck, the author of Hebrews is referred to in this work as *Auctor (ad Hebraeos).* This has the particular advantage of being equally applicable if Hebrews is regarded primarily as a literary or an oral work. See L. D. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought,* SNTSMS 65 (Cambridge: Cambridge Universicty Press, 1990), 4; D. E. Buck, "The Rhetorical Arrangement and Function of OT citations in the Book of Hebrews: Uncovering their Role in the Paraenetic Discourse of Access" (PhD diss. Dallas Theological Seminary, 2002), 1-2.

[2]D. G. Dunbar, "The Relationship of Christ's Sonship and Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (master's thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1974), 2.

(1:2-3). The exhortation of 4:16 is grounded in the fact that the believer's heavenly priest is the Son of God (4:14-15). The juxtaposing of Ps 2:7 and Ps 109:4 (LXX) in 5:5-6 explicitly emphasizes the nexus between the two concepts. The two testimonies share a pronoun–σύ–in common. By providing both with a common referent, *Auctor* effectively identifies the υἱός of the first testimony with the ἱερεύς of the second.[3] Similarly, the model priesthood of Melchizedek is brought into direct relationship with Sonship (7:3). Finally, when *Auctor* declares his "main point" to concern the activity of the heavenly priest (8:1-2), his priesthood is again connected to his Sonship (7:28).[4] The nature of the relationship between the two concepts has attracted attention from the beginning of modern scholarship on Hebrews.

## Son and Priest in Previous Hebrews Scholarship

The period of early critical study of Hebrews, during which it was understood to be primarily a theological tractate, scholars such as George Milligan, saw the Christology of the book dominated by a number of closely related themes. First, the inter-relationship of the Sonship and priesthood of Christ was generally understood in terms of an escalation of the contrast of Christ with Judaism. Jesus is first shown to be superior to the angels (1:1-13) who gave the law (2:2); to Moses (3:1-6) and then to Aaron (4:14-5:10; 7:1-25).[5] This particular comparison was seen as being of crucial

---

[3]A. J. McNicol, "The Relationship of the Image of the Highest Angel to the High Priest Concept in Hebrews" (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1974), 183.

[4]Dunbar, "Relationship," 2-3.

[5]G. Milligan, *The Theology of Hebrews* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000; original published, 1899), 101. Such views are still present among conservative scholars at a much later date (for example, Dunbar, "Relationship," 15).

importance: it entailed superiority of the new covenant over the old and the heavenly sanctuary over the earthly.

The second suggested relationship of the two themes was that in Hebrews the priesthood of Christ is rooted in his Sonship.[6] The exact nature of this grounding in Sonship was sometimes left unspecified, although some suggested the link could be found specifically in the incarnation or the exultation of Christ. William Bishop suggests that "Son" refers especially to the pre-existent Christ, whereas "priest" refers to his role after his exaltation.[7] The link between the two states is necessarily the incarnation.[8]

The entire emphasis of Bishop and like-minded scholars is challenged by George Caird who rightly points out that the emphasis of Hebrews–and not least of all in regard to the title "Son"–does not fall on the period of pre-existence, but rather on the earthly existence of Jesus and his exalted state in the heavenly world.[9] As David

---

[6]W. S. Bishop, "The High Priesthood of Christ as Set Forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Exp* Vol 8, No. 84 (1917): 406. See also J. Ungeheuer, *Der große Priester über dem Hause Gottes: Die Christologie des Hebräerbriefes* (Würzburg, Stürtz, 1939), 88. Similar views are also found at a later date. See, for example, M. Henderson, "The Priestly Ministry of Jesus in the Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Hebrews" (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1965), 43; J. Tetley, "The Priesthood of Christ in Hebrews," *Anvil* 5 (1988): 202.

[7]Bishop,"High Priesthood," 417-18; see also, O. Michel, *Der Brief an Die Hebräer*. MKEK13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 164; H. L. MacNeill, *The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914), 86.

[8]Ungeheuer, *Der große Priester*, 88; H. H. Meeter, *The Heavenly Priesthood of Christ: An Exegetico-Dogmatic Study* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans-Sevensma, 1916), 65.

[9]G. B. Caird, "Son by Appointment," in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*, 2 vols., ed. W. C. Weinrich (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984), 1: 73-82.

Hurst and James Dunn do explicitly, Caird implicitly understands "pre-existence" in Heb 1:1-4 in terms of Jewish wisdom speculation.[10]

Dunbar suggests an alternative view, seeing the priesthood of Christ as rooted in his resurrection.[11] His argument hinges on the meaning of the word σήμερον in 5:5, where it forms part of the citation of Ps 2:7. On the basis of the parallel citation of the testimony in Acts 13:33, Dunbar suggests that the "day" in question is the day of the resurrection. Thus the resurrection (begetting) of the Son is seen as being the equivalent to his being "declared to be the Son of God with power" (Rom 1:4), which coincides with his installation as intercessory priest in the heavenly sanctuary. The fatal flaw of this reconstruction is that Hebrews does not put the degree of emphasis on the resurrection of Jesus needed to sustain the argument.

Another variant of the understanding that priesthood is rooted in Sonship emphasizes that the divine eternity of the Son gives "eternal validity to what He, as High Priest, does."[12] Commenting on the repetition of Ps 2:7 in 5:5 and its close connection with Ps 110:4 in 5:6, Milligan notes,

> And the recurrence of the words in this connection is an interesting corroboration of how closely in the writer's minds Sonship and Priesthood are connected. It is as the Son that Christ has all the qualifications fitting Him to be High-priest. In His Divine and human natures, He combines all that is essential to perfect mediation between

---

[10]L. D. Hurst, "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2," in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*, ed. L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 155; J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM, 1980), 206-09.

[11]Dunbar, "Relationship," 91.

[12]Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 65; C. P. Sherman, "'A Great High Priest' (Hebrews iv.14)" *ET* 34 (1922-23): 235-36.

> God and man. His relation of Sonship makes His appointment to the priesthood natural and possible.[13]

There is obviously some validity to these observations. Commentators have generally been struck by the fact that Melchizedek appears to *Auctor* to be a suitable model for the priesthood of Christ, because "he resembles the Son of God" rather than the Son resembling him, as might have been expected.[14] However, this approach to the relationship is also flawed by a lack of logical rigour. If the priesthood of Jesus demonstrates his superiority, it is difficult to see how the superiority of his priesthood could be rooted in his Sonship, and yet this seems to have been regularly affirmed.[15] William Loader's observation that the usefulness of such early studies is compromised by their dogmatic interest is justified.[16]

---

[13]Milligan, *Theology*, 106.

[14]Dunbar, "Relationship," 23-34.

[15]Milligan, *Theology*, 72. See also T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*. SJTOP 3 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1955), 14.

[16]W. R. G. Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*, WMANT 53 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1981), 2. Such dogmatic concerns were not always as evident as in Bishop's work ("High Priesthood," 403-04): "Our Lord is presented under two aspects–as the Divine Son and as the human Jesus. It is the Divine aspect of His Person and priestly work that is first presented; and after that, and in connexion with it, the human aspect is brought forward. In order to develop the fulness of this teaching, not one, but two Old Testament priestly types are required–Melchizedek and Aaron: Melchizedek pointing to Him who is the Divine "Son" and Aaron to Him who is the human Mediator . . . . In this double typology of Melchizedek and of Aaron we see the indication not only of our Lord's two "natures"–the Divine and the human–but also of what are termed by theologians His two "states" namely, the earthly and the heavenly–the past and the present–the 'status exaninitionis' and the 'status exaltationis'." Writing much later, Dunbar ("Relationship," 6-10) still felt it necessary to preface his study of the priesthood and Sonship in Hebrews with an investigation of the various aspects of "Sonship." Ultimately, he concludes that there are two such aspects: the ontological and the mediatorial. "Ontological" Sonship appears to presume a fully developed trinitarianism which must certainly be read back into the New Testament. The importation of such dogmatic considerations vitiates the

According to Allan McNicol, one nineteenth century scholar, Wilhelm Lueken, accounted for the linkage in another way. He saw the crucial issue being the comparison of the Son with the angels in 1:4-14. Since, in Lueken's view, angels were understood to have the role of heavenly priests in the Judaism of the first century C.E., any comparison of the Son with the angels necessarily raised the issue of the Son's priestly role.[17] Lueken correctly notes that in Hebrews the superiority of Christ over the angels is directly linked to his incarnation (2:9),[18] which means Lueken's different approach to the interrelationship of Sonship and priesthood might, in fact, not be as novel as it first appears. Other aspects of Lueken's reconstruction are more arbitrary. He suggests that the archangel Michael is "a compassionate and interceding figure in Judaism" and that this contributes to the presentation of Christ as high priest in Hebrews.[19] However, apart from 2:17, mercy is not mentioned in Hebrews in connection with Christ's priesthood at all. McNicol's survey of the ancient Jewish sources demonstrates that, in some circles at least, angels were thought to have some liturgical function.[20] Certainly, the emphasis of Hebrews on the uniqueness and superiority of Christ's heavenly priesthood contains an implicit rejection of any other

---

value of Dunbar's work for a study of the New Testament itself.

[17]Lueken's views are well summarized and evaluated in McNicol, "Relationship," 3-13. Lueken published his major study on angel-Christology in 1898. See, A. Lueken, *Michael: Eine Darstellung und Vergleichung der jüdischen und der morgenländisch-christlichen Tradition vom Erzengel Michael* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1898).

[18]McNicol, "Relationship," 9

[19]Ibid., 42.

[20]Ibid., 121-43.

proposed system of mediation, including any proposed for the angels.[21] However, their priestly role does not necessarily correspond with the priestly role assigned to Jesus in Hebrews. For example, the angel-priests in Judaism are sometimes presented as offering actual sacrifice in the heavenly sanctuary.[22] By contrast, Christ's sacrifice is made on the cross, that is, on earth, not in heaven as it is according to Hebrews (7:27).

Adolphine Bakker, like Lueken, sees an angel-Christology as providing the matrix for the understanding of Hebrews, although unlike Leuken he makes no mention of the supposed priesthood of the angels in outlining his position.[23] For both Bakker and Lueken, the key issue is the incarnation. An angel could not be a man and the superiority of Christ over the angels resided precisely in the fact that he could and did become a man.[24] On the basis of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Yigael Yadin revisits the grounds for suggesting that the Son-priest link in Hebrews could be found in a priestly angelology.[25] McNicol himself endeavors to find parallels between the priestly activities of Jesus in Hebrews and the angelic priests of Jewish sources.[26] The entire enterprise appears to rest on an extremely weak foundation. The texts cited

---

[21]Ibid., 168.

[22]See, for example, T. Lev 3:5-7.

[23]A. Bakker, "Was Christ an Angel? A Study in Early Christian Docetism," *ZNW* 32 (1933): 255-65.

[24]Ibid., 260.

[25]Y. Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews", *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1958): 36-55.

[26]McNicol, "Relationship," 194-203. See also Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 215-38.

by Lueken to show an angelic priesthood have dating, text-critical and interpretative problems.

Larry Hurtado, Margaret Barker, Peter Carrell, and, Clinton Arnold have in different ways shown that by the time Hebrews was written various manifestations of Judaism had incorporated angelic figures into their beliefs and written documents.[27] However, Hurtado points out that although Jewish religious belief was able "to accommodate powerful 'divine agent' figures within commitment to the one God . . . this accommodation did not characteristically involve the incorporation of angels as objects of cultic reverence in devout Jewish groups."[28] There is similar difficulty in demonstrating that an inflated angelology was as pressing a problem in the early church as the studies of Bakker and Yadin suggest. Such a problem *may* have existed in the early church. Col 2:18 would seem to suggest it was. However, even this text is open to alternative interpretations. Fred Francis argues that the danger referred to in Colossians is not the worship of angelic beings but the joining in the heavenly worship with the angels (presumably in some sort of visionary state).[29] The possibility

---

[27]L. W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* 2d ed. (London: Continuum, 1998; 1st ed.: Minneapolis, MN: Augsberg Fortress, 1988); M. Barker, *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992); P. R. Carroll, *Jesus and the Angels: Angelology and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, SNTSMS 95 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); C. E. Arnold, *The Colossian Syncretism: The Interface between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996; reprint of WUNT 2/7, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).

[28]Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, xiii.

[29]F. O. Francis, "The Christological Argument of Colossians," in *God's Christ and His People*, ed. J. Jevell and W. A. Meeks (Oslo: University of Oslo Press, 1977), 192-208. See also *idem*, "Humility and Angelic Worship in Col 2:18," in *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies*, ed. F. O. Francis and W. A. Meeks. Rev. ed. SBS 4 (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975), 163-96.

of alternative interpretation of Col 2:18 is very significant. McNicol declares it to be the *only* Christian or Jewish text from the time of the penning of New Testament documents "suggesting the existence of a group in Judaism in danger of venerating angels at the expense of the superiority of the deity."[30] He further claims that the first Christian writer to allude unambiguously to angel worship is Justin Martyr, although his specific reference to Justin, *Apol.* 1:6 appears to be incorrect.[31]

Regardless of the exegetical conclusions made in regard to the situations reflected in Colossians, it is difficult to show that Hebrews' main purpose is to combat such an angelology. Lueken, Bakker, and Yadin tend to focus attention of chapters 1 and 2 in this regard but fail to detail how the situation they envisage accounts for the rest of the motifs of the book.[32] McNicol acknowledges this fault with previous studies and strives to overcome it. However, he fails to provide an adequate reason for *Auctor*'s selection of a relatively insignificant motif in Jewish sources for his primary description of Jesus and his heavenly work On one level, the thrust of McNicol's argument is almost trite. If various factions within Judaism shared a belief in a heavenly sanctuary with *Auctor*, his comments about Christ's ministry there would have inevitably appeared to have a relationship with the corresponding Jewish pictures, regardless of whether or not this was the intention of *Auctor*. Despite McNicol's endeavours to the contrary, the argument of Hebrews does

---

[30]McNicol, "Relationship," 26-27.

[31]Ibid., 29. The correct reference appears to be 1:65

[32]Ibid., 20-21.

not appear to be concerned in any more than an incidental way with any alternative views of a heavenly priesthood.[33]

Another early explanation of the Son/priest relationship in Hebrews attributes it to the "combination of the messianic and the sacerdotal functions which is reflected in the hundred and tenth psalm."[34] Deborah Rooke suggests that this Psalm reflects a wider "priestly" understanding of kingship in Israel, according to which the king who is regarded as being the "Son" of God in some sense is consequently also regarded as a priest of God.[35] Unfortunately the nature of the ancient Israelite monarchy is too unstable a foundation for building any substantial conclusions. The reality and nature

---

[33]On the function of 1:5-14 in the argument of Hebrews, see below, pp. 179-80, 251-62.

[34]J. Moffatt, "The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" *ET* 28 (1916-17): 507. See also *idem.*, "The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" *ET* 29 (1917-18): 29. The same position is accepted by later scholars as well. See, for example, A. J. B. Higgins, 'The Priestly Messiah', *NTS* 13 (1966/67): 235-36; W. G. McCown, "Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ: The Nature and Function of the Hortatory Sections of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (PhD diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1970, 172;
P. Ellingworth, "Reading through Hebrews 1-7," *Epworth Review*, 12 (1985): 84;
H. Anderson, "The Jewish Antecedents of the Christology of Hebrews," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992), 527-28; S. Nomoto, "Herkunft und Structur der hohenpriestvorstellung im Hebräerbrief," *NovTest* 10 (1968): 13. Loader reverses the logic of those who find the Son-priest combination in Ps 110:4. Rather he suggests that *Auctor* was aware of a tradition which linked the messiah to priestly service and this knowledge led him to regard Psalm 110:4 as a valuable testimony. See, W. R. G. Loader, "Christ at the Right Hand–Ps CX.1 in the New Testament" *NTS* 24 (1978): 205-08.

[35]D.W. Rooke, "Kingship as Priesthood: the Relationship between the High Priest and the Monarchy," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar,* JSOTSS 270, ed. J. Day (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 193-94. Rooke explicitly uses her conclusions in this article for reflections on Hebrews in a later article. See D.W. Rooke, "Jesus as Royal Priest: Reflections on the Interpretation of the Melchizedek Tradition in Heb 7," *Bib* 81 (2000): 81-94.

of the royal priesthood in ancient Israel is subject to considerable scholarly debate, and is inevitably tied to the interpretation of Ps 110:4 in particular. The results are tenuous at best.[36]

Regardless of the correctness of Rooke's position on the priestly nature of the ancient Israelite monarchy, 8:4 suggests that it is unlikely to have been a factor in the conscious thinking of *Auctor*. Her position is "unlikely" given the complexity of the Christology of Hebrews.[37] The fact that Hebrews' preferred title for Christ is ἀρχιερεὺς rather than ἱερεὺς (as in Ps 110) also counts against this suggestion.[38] This suggested explanation also leaves crucial questions unanswered. It assumes that there was a common messianic understanding in ancient Judaism; that there is a messianic referent in Ps 110:4, and that "Son of God" was a recognized messianic title in pre-Christian Judaism. Each of these assumptions is questionable. James Charlesworth outlines the diversity in messianic expectation in ancient Judaism.[39] The Gospels' use of Ps 110 (Matt. 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42-43) presupposes a

---

[36]See, for example, H. H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)," in *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet*, ed. W. Baumgartner, O. Eissfeldt, K. Elliger and L. Rost (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1950), 461-472; G. J. Wenham, "Were David's Sons Priests?" *ZAW* 87 (1975): 79-82; M. J. Paul, "The Order of Melchizedek (Psalms 110:4 and Hebrews 7:3)," *WTJ* 49 (1987): 195-211; H. W. Bateman, IV, review of *The Priest-King of Psalm 110 in Hebrews*, by D. R. Anderson, *JETS* 45 (2002): 530.

[37]Anderson, "Jewish Antecedents," 527.

[38]D. L. Powell, "Christ as High Priest in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Studia Evangelica. Vol 7: Papers Presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies held at Oxford, 1973*, TU 126, ed. E. A. Livingston (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982), 387. Powell points out that, apart from Hebrews, Melchizedek is never called "high priest" in any extant source.

[39]J. H. Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992), 13-31.

Jewish messianic understanding of Ps 110, but it is not actually attested in non-Christian Jewish sources.[40] Similarly, the evidence for a Jewish messianic understanding of "son of God" is ambiguous.[41]

Beyond these preliminary difficulties, even more serious questions remain: Why did *Auctor* pick up on this relatively ancient blending of concepts when none of the other New Testament writers did? What role does the interrelationship of the two concepts play in the argument of Hebrews? Providing an explanation for the origin of a blending of concepts is not necessarily the same as explaining the use made of them.[42] James Moffatt hints at, but does not develop, other associations of ideas when he declares that "the category of high priesthood was not adequate to the writer's full thought."[43] It tends to recede from the foreground when either eschatology or ethics are being discussed.

Similar weaknesses exist in those views which attempt to root the connection in later Jewish speculations rather than in Ps 110 directly. Geerhardus Vos points to Philo's λόγος speculation and various statements in the Talmud and Pseudepigrapha.[44] However, Vos appears to give no consideration to the complications raised by the dating of the Talmud or the textual history of documents

---

[40]J. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, WBC 35C (Dallas, TX: Word, 1993), 973

[41]J. Fossum, "Son of God," *ABD*, 6: 129-30.

[42]Moffatt, "Christology," 505.

[43]Ibid., 29.

[44]G. Vos, *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1956; reprinted Eugene OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001), 91-92. See also G. H. Gilbert, "The Greek Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *AJT* 14 (1910): 526 and the much later comments of R. A. Stewart, "The Sinless High Priest," *NTS* 14 (1967-68): 126-35.

such as the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,* but rather appears to assume the early dating of all the traditions he points to in such sources.

Charles Kingsley Barrett suggests a variation on this view. He sees two primary points of departure of the development of the high priest Christology in Hebrews: The first is a "son of man" Christology reflected in the quotation of Ps 8 in Heb 2. The second is found in Ps 110:4. He notes that the Danielic son of man is a representative figure, as is the high priest, and finds it significant that the title of priest is first used in Hebrews at the conclusion of the discussion introduced by the citation of Ps 8 in Heb 2. Noting the Adamic focus of Ps 8 Barrett argues that "second Adam" Christology is a variation on "son of man" Christology. Specifically, he suggests that Paul substitutes the awkward phrase "son of man" with the more acceptable "second Adam".[45]

Barrett's position represents a significant advance in that it draws attention to the role and significance of Adam in Heb 2. The key weakness in his reconstruction is his insistence on seeing a reference to the Danielic "son of man" in the citation from Ps 8.

Daniel Plooij points to a different combination–that of testimonies in the Testimony book–to explain the interrelatedness of Sonship and priesthood in Hebrews.[46] He masterfully summarizes the links between the Christological use of testimonies in Hebrews and its use in later Christian writers. However, it is now

---

[45]C. K. Barrett, "The Christology of Hebrews," in *Who do Men Say that I am? Essays on Christology in Honor of Jack Dean Kingsbury*, ed. M.A. Powell and D. R. Bauer (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 119-20.

[46]D. Plooij, "The Apostle and Faithful High Priest, Jesus," in *Studies in the Testimony Book* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche, 1932), 31-48.

generally felt that the relationship between Hebrews (and the New Testament generally) and the "testimony book" is different from that assumed by Plooij. Following the lead of Rendel Harris, he assumes that the Christian writers, even in the apostolic period, used a testimony book.[47] The existence of a Christian "testimony book" is not explicitly attested until the third century C. E.[48] It is now generally thought that the New Testament writers, if they had any direct connection with a testimony book, were more engaged in the selection of texts to go into it, rather than using a collection already formulated. This is the reverse of the situation assumed by Plooij. Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258 C. E.) does not testify to the type of testimony book extant in the time of the apostles, but rather shows the end-product of a Christian exploration of the Jewish Scriptures which was only in its infancy in the time of the apostles.

If Plooij's assumptions were accepted, the association of Sonship and priesthood would belong to the earliest strata of Christian traditions. It has already been noted that this conclusion is bereft of substantive support. Furthermore, a crucial question would still require answering: Why does Hebrews alone of the New

---

[47]J. R. Harris, *Testimonies*, 2 volumes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920-21). Acceptance of the testimony book hypothesis does not necessarily preclude belief that the concept of Christ's heavenly priesthood was part of the confession of the community. See D. K. Burns,"The Epistle to the Hebrews," *ET* 47 (1935-36): 184-89.

[48]Cyprian of Carthage *Treatise XII: Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews.* Although similarly collections of texts have been found among the Dead Sea Scrolls (especially, 4Q174 and 4Q175), Cyprian's work remains the only extant collection of *Christian* testimonies. See R. E. Heine, *Reading the Old Testament with the Ancient Church: Exploring the Formation of Early Christian Thought*, ER: ASCF (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007), 98.

Testament writings make the interrelationship explicit? Plooij's views, at best, would give an explanation of the process, but provide no reason for its occurrence.

The same type of difficulty appears with the related suggestion of Dunbar, that the co-joining of the Christology categories of Sonship and priesthood results first from the fact that they occurred in acknowledged messianic psalms (Ps 2:7; 109:4 [LXX], see also Heb 5:5-6). Dunbar is not suggesting the existence of a testimony book; he merely suggests a generally agreed source for testimonies about the messiah.[49] However, he goes no further than Plooij in explaining why *Auctor* actually made the link.

Rafael Gyllenberg sees Sonship and priesthood as very closely related. He writes: "die Sohnschaft eine höhere Potenz des Mittlertums bezeichnet."[50] Gyllenberg distinguishes between Jesus work of atoning for sin and his work of gaining victory over death. Consequently, he puts considerable weight on 2:14-18, but as Loader points out, it is impossible to justify seeing this section as anything but a facet of *Auctor*'s atonement theology.[51]

In some ways Gyllenberg anticipates the contribution of Ernst Käsemann who also sees Sonship and priesthood as being in the closest of relationships. On the basis of 5:5-6, he argues that Jesus' "installation to the office of high priest clearly corresponds to bestowal of the title 'Son'."[52] References to Jesus as "Son" prior to his

---

[49]Dunbar, "Relationship," 34.

[50]R. Gyllenberg, "Die Christologie des Hebräerbriefes" *ZST* 11 (1933/34): 679.

[51]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 3.

[52]E. Käsemann, *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*, trans. R. A. Harrisville and I. L. Sandberg (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1984; translation of *Das wandernde Gottesvolk: Eine Untersuchung zum*

exaltation (for example, 1:2; 5:7) are "proleptic."[53] However, the use of καίπερ in 5:8 makes the suggestion of a "proleptic" use of υἱός difficult in this verse.[54]

It is important to recognize that Käsemann is not advocating some form of adoptionist Christology. Käsemann argues that the Christological understanding of Sonship in Hebrews is "oriented to the same Christological scheme" as the "Christ-hymn" of Phil 2:5-11.[55] He notes that "what previously existed within the Godhead as capacity or essence undergoes eschatological disclosure in the heavenly act of enthronement, and only from that point can be trajected back into the earthly history by the believing community."[56] In this regard he foreshadows something of the approach of Dunn, who explains texts such as 1:2 in terms of wisdom speculation.[57]

Käsemann sees this entire Christological schema as derived ultimately from the Gnostic *Anthropos* or *Urmensch* myth. Consequently, Käsemann emphasizes that Christ is Son principally in relation to the believing community which receives the designation υἱοί (sons).[58] He stresses the relationship between υἱός and

---

*Hebräerbrief* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939]), 98. See also, D. R. Anderson, *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews* , StBL 21 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 204; MacNeill, *Christology*, 86.

[53]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 99.

[54]Ungeheur, *Der große Priester*, 16; see also W. L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, WBC 47A (Dallas, TX: Word, 1991), 120-21.

[55]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 101. The parallels between the Philippian Christ-hymn and the Christology of Hebrews are widely recognized. See, for example, M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (London: SCM, 1976), 88.

[56]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 99.

[57]Dunn, *Christology*, 206-09.

[58]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 117-19.

πρωτότοκος, and emphasizes the Son's role as forerunner, precursor of others who also attain to the promised "rest". It is unsurprising that he regards the designation υἱοί for the faithful as being proleptic in exactly the same way that the earthly Jesus could be designated υἱός in a proleptic way.

For Käsemann Christ's high priesthood, as much as his Sonship, is a development of the *Urmensch* myth.[59] He sees a variant development of the theme in Philo's λόγος speculation and in various areas of Jewish apocalyptic and messianic speculation.[60] He refers specifically to the book of Revelation and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, as well as more generally to Jewish messianic speculation about Adam, Phineas, Elijah, Melchizedek and Metatron. He asserts that the "figures change but the scheme remains."[61] Thus, according to Käsemann the titles "Son" and "priest" cannot be separated. The conferring of the first title implies the second. This position is defended on both exegetical (with reference to 5:5-6) and religious-historical grounds–specifically the fact that the Urmensch, "the *Anthropos* furnished in Hebrews with the title of Son, is as such the bearer of the heavenly office of High Priest."[62]

Käsemann's position is defended by more recent scholars such as Erich Grässer.[63] However, a number of problems are widely recognized with Käsemann's

---

[59]Ibid., 201.

[60]Ibid., 196-200.

[61]Ibid., 203.

[62]Ibid., 218.

[63]See for example, E. Gräßer, "Mose und Jesus: Zur Auslegung von Hebr 3 1-6," *ZNW* 75 (1984): 1-23.

position. Later research has certainly not vindicated his confidence in the existence of a widely spread pre-Christian gnostic myth of a "redeemed redeemer", which is foundational to his entire schema. Indeed, Reginald Fuller declares this theory to have been "conclusively demolished by Carsten Colpe in 1961."[64]

Mary Clarkson does not directly address the interrelationship of Christology categories of Sonship and priesthood. However, she suggests that the idea of the priesthood of Christ arises as a result of the influx of priests–associated with Stephen and the Hellenists–into Jewish-Christian congregations (Acts 6:7).[65] In this she is an important precursor of the views of William Manson and Oscar Cullmann.[66] Priests who joined the fledgling Christian movement must have accepted the Christological affirmations made by the church at the time (presumably including the idea that Jesus is God's "Son"). However, Clarkson posits that they experienced a cognitive dissidence revolving around the fact that the "hierarchy they belonged to, divinely appointed as their Scriptures taught, had, by the condemnation of God's Chosen One, been guilty of defying the Divine purpose."[67]

---

[64]R. H. Fuller, "Pre-Existence Christology: Can We Dispense with it?" *WW* 2 (1982), 30. Fuller reference is to Colpe's work *Die Religiongeschichte Schule* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961). See also, C. Colpe, "New Testament and Gnostic Christology," *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, SupNum 14, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 227-23.

[65]M. E. Clarkson, "The Antecedents of the High-Priestly Theme in Hebrews," *ATR* 29 (1947): 91.

[66]W. Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsideration* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951), 25-46 and O. Cullmann, "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," *ET* 71, (1959-60): 8-12.

[67]Clarkson, "Antecedents" 92.

Clarkson admits her proposal is a "path of conjecture."[68] Her views are certainly possible, but fall well short of being compelling. Given that Clarkson's focus is not primarily on the book of Hebrews it is not surprising that she does not attempt to explain why the interrelationship of Sonship and priesthood came to the fore in that work. Any endeavours to do so using her conclusions would inevitably involve highly hypothetical reconstructions regarding the locale and ethnicity of the recipients.

Like Clarkson, Cullmann was not primarily focused on the book of Hebrews. He saw the Christological concepts of Sonship and priesthood as being linked at their point of Christian origin, the teaching and self-understanding of Jesus himself.[69] He sees the priestly Christology as a variation on the theme of the "suffering servant."[70] He asserts the concept of "Son of God" also has a close connection with the "suffering servant."[71] The weaknesses of this reconstruction are readily apparent. If the concept of priesthood goes back to Jesus surely it would be more evident in the New Testament writings. Its absence in the New Testament outside of Hebrews has already been noted. Cullmann's view assumes that the "servant" is fundamental to the earliest Christology reflection but it is difficult to find support for this assumption. Indeed, Morna Hooker concludes that "there is little evidence that the Servant-Christology had

---

[68]Ibid., 93.

[69]O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, trans. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall (London: SCM, 1959; trans of *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* [Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Tübingen, 1957]), 87-89; 276-85.

[70]Ibid., 83. See also J. Gnilka, "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im neuen Testament," *RQ* 2 (1959-60): 420.

[71]Ibid., 283.

*any* important place in Christian thought in the New Testament period."[72] Even if this were not true, in general, it is far from self-evident that the priestly Christology derives primarily from the servant concept. James Schaefer declares "it is clear that servant Christology provides but one, and that not the most influential, of several converging elements that bring the author [of Hebrews] to see Jesus' death as a priestly act."[73]

Yadin considers the expectation of a priestly messiah alongside a royal messiah at Qumran to provide the background of the combination of priestly and royal christologies in Hebrews.[74] However, Simon Kistemaker rightly objects that the differences between the Christology of Hebrews and the messianic expectation at Qumran mean that Qumranic influence on Hebrews at this point is, at best, indirect.[75] McNicol specifically objects that while the heavenly nature of Christ's high priesthood is stressed in Hebrews, the various apocalyptic pictures of the eschatological High Priest in Judaism rarely speak of him in otherworldly terms.[76]

A further proposed source of the combination of priesthood and Sonship is the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The most significant passages for this topic in the *Testaments* are *T Reub* 6:7-8; 10-12; *T Sim* 7:1-2; 2:9-10; *T Levi* 5:1-2; 8:1-17;

---

[72]M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* (London: SPCK, 1959), 128; emphasis added.

[73]J. R. Schaefer,"The Relationship between Priestly and Servant Messianism in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *CBQ* 30 (1968): 382; see also L. Sabourin, *Priesthood: A Comparative Study* SupNum 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 208

[74]Yadin, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 48-53.

[75]S. J. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: van Soest, 1961), 86-87.

[76]McNicol, "Relationship," 172.

18:2-15; *T Judah* 21:2; *T Naph* 5;1-4; 8:2; *T Gad* 8:1; *T Jos* 19:11-12; *T Ben* 11:2.[77] The messianism of the *Testaments* is closely related to that of the Qumran community.[78] However, almost everything about the theme is open to debate. Some see the *Testaments* as essentially pre-Christian Jewish documents which have been given a later Christian redaction.[79] On this reading, the combination of royal and priestly messianic motifs reflects the Hasmonean royal ideology prevalent at the time of composition. The pre-Christian origin is sometimes supported by apparent affinities between the *Testaments* and the Qumran literature.[80] This is also open to challenge. George Beasley-Murray argues that the *Testaments* do not combine royal and priestly messianism in one figure but rather look for two eschatological figures.[81] Marinus de Jonge goes further and denies a pre-Christian origin for the *Testaments*.[82]

Even more significant than the insurmountable difficulties involved in dating the Jewish sources with certainty are the radical differences between Hebrews' conception of priesthood and that found in Jewish sources dealing with the coming

---

[77]For example, see, D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, SBLMS 18, (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1973), 135.

[78]K. G. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York: Crossroad, 1992; originally New York: Harper, 1957), 57-58.

[79]R. H. Charles, *Religious Development Between the Old and New Testament* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1914), 227-29.

[80]Kuhn,"Two Messiahs," 54-58.

[81]G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JTS* n.s. 48 (1947): 1-12.

[82]M. de Jonge, "Christian Influence on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *NovTest* 4 (1960): 182-235; *idem*, "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *NTS* 26 (1980): 508-24

eschatological priest: Jesus is not simply portrayed as perfect due to scrupulous ritual observance but through the overcoming of painful temptation (5:7-8); he is not the one who purifies and restores the Levitical cult but rather replaces it; he is not a Levitical figure alongside a Davidic messiah but combines both priestly and royal features in one non-Levitical figure; he does not bring the sacrifices stipulated by Moses but offers himself.[83]

Aelred Cody's study of the heavenly sanctuary inevitably deals in some detail with the priesthood of Christ.[84] He understands the priesthood of Christ to begin at the incarnation–a view he declares to be unanimous among Catholic scholarship.[85] Nevertheless, his priesthood is "heavenly" in that "Hebrews sees the whole earthly life of Jesus, including His priesthood during the time of His sojourn in this world, in view of a celestial existence, as directed toward that celestial plane."[86] The "perfecting" of Jesus is seen in a related way. His priesthood is perfected because "it has *become* heavenly, because the process of development and historical movement through life, death and ascension has reached its term and its final completion on the other side of the veil–in heaven."[87] Cody views the Sonship of Christ in the same

---

[83]See, B. Vawter, "Levitical Messianism and the New Testament," in *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*, ed. J. L. McKenzie, SMTS 1 (New York: Herder & Herder, 1962), 98; Schaefer, "Relationship," 369-70; Gnilka, "Erwartung des Messianischen Hohenpriesters," 421

[84]A. Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspective* (St. Meinrad, Ind.: Grail, 1960), 86-103.

[85]Ibid., 92-93.

[86]Ibid., 99.

[87]Ibid., 101.

terms. Christ is the eternal Son who nevertheless becomes Son "perfectly" at his ascension. His incarnation is essential to his becoming "perfectly superior to the angels."[88] Thus Cody sees "Sonship" and "priesthood" as being parallel to one another. Even though he correctly insists on the humanity of Jesus as a prerequisite for priesthood, he leaves undeveloped the way in which "Sonship" as such, intersects with "priesthood".[89]

Building on the earlier work of Francis Synge, Kistemaker draws attention to the importance of Joshua the son of Jehozadak (Zech 3, 6) for the picture of the priesthood of Jesus in Hebrews.[90] Although this particular figure from Israel's past is never mentioned by name in Hebrews, Zech 3:1-7 is "the only passage in the Old Testament which seems to combine the role of angel and priest in a heavenly context."[91] Joshua is regarded as a typological foreshadowing of Jesus in the early church.[92] Although Joshua is explicitly called a priest in Zech 3:8; 6:1 a number of parallels noted by Kistemaker refer to aspects of Christ's Sonship in Hebrews: his position at the "right hand", his glory, and the fact that he sits on a throne. (Zech 6:12-13 [LXX]; see also Heb 1:3, 8; 2:9).

---

[88]Ibid., 102.

[89]Ibid., 97.

[90]Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 143; Synge, *Hebrews*, 21. See also Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 54; M. R. D'Angelo, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*, SBLDS 42 (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1979), 81-83.

[91]McNicol, "Relationship," 116.

[92]Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew," 115-116; Tertullian, *Against Macion* 3:7:6. For a fuller discussion see, Sabourin, *Priesthood*, 219-21.

The relationship of Sonship to priesthood in Hebrews is incidental to Kistemaker's concerns and he does not draw any conclusions about this relationship from his observations about *Auctor*'s possible use of Zechariah. Nevertheless, he opens the possibility that *Auctor* combines Sonship and priesthood as a result of the overlap of key characteristics of these concepts in the Jewish Scriptures which he uses. Schaefer evaluates such parallels between Zechariah and Hebrews as "interesting . . . but hardly conclusive of dependency."[93] In any case, it does not explain *why Auctor* has this distinctive Christology. At best it may give an indication of what suggested it to him.

Hugh Montefiore suggests (and ultimately rejects) that the Son/priest combination may go back to Jesus himself. He points to Jesus' self-understanding of his mission as sacrifice. He further notes a variety of traditions found in the gospels may have helped *Auctor* develop his view of the priesthood of Jesus. Important among these are those traditions which speak of Jesus building a new temple (Mark 14:58; 15:29; Matt. 26:61; John 2:19) and those underlying his high-priestly prayer (John 17).[94] If the Son/priest linkage does indeed go back to Jesus, it is difficult to explain the lack to intermediate traces of the Son/priest combination between the time of Jesus and Hebrews. Hebrews does not base the priesthood of Christ on his sacrifice but rather the reverse (8:3).[95]

---

[93]Schaefer, "Relationship," 369.

[94]H. W. Montefiore, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, BNTC (London: Black, 1964), 95-96.

[95]Powell, "High Priest," 387.

In contrast to most of the scholars surveyed thus far, David Aune does not look to Jewish sources to elucidate the Christology of Hebrews. Rather he considers the ancient legend of Heracles which was pervasive throughout the Mediterranean world of the first century. [96] He concludes that

> . . . the similarities between Heracles imagery and the Christology of Hebrews that have been explored above suggest that many of the important and vital functions attributed to Heracles as a Hellenistic savior figure were understood by some early Christians as applicable to Jesus to an even greater extent than they were to Heracles.[97]

However, he does not go so far as to suggest that the origin of the Son / priest Christology can be found in Heracles mythology even if it is coloured by it.

The most recent attempts to explore the relationship of priesthood and Sonship in Hebrews have attempted to utilize sociological and anthropological methodologies. Thus Patrick Gray stresses that both Sonship and priesthood reflect "vertical" relationships, namely Father/Son and God/man. In Hebrews, the "brotherhood"–a "horizontal" relationship–of Jesus with humanity is also stressed. Gray endeavours to demonstrate that in Greco-Roman society, filial devotion was *demonstrated* by brotherly love, and he notes the way in which the brotherly love of Jesus for his fellow men is stressed in Hebrews as an essential pre-requisite and expression of his

---

[96]D. E. Aune, "Heracles and Christ: Heracles Imagery in the Christology of Early Christianity," in *Greeks, Romans and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson and W. A. Meeks (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990), 3-19. See also H. W. Attridge, "Liberating Death's Captives: Reconsideration of an Early Christian Myth," in *Gnosticism and the Early Christian World*, ed. J. E. Goerhing, C. W. Hedrick, J. T. Sanders and H. D. Betz (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1990), 103-15; and, McCruden, "Perfection of Divine Intimacy," 120-35.

[97]Aune, "Heracles," 19.

priesthood.[98] Gray has essentially "triangulated" the issue relating Sonship to priesthood by relating both of them to another concept, namely, brotherly love. However, he provides no inkling of why *Auctor* chooses to bring the two concepts together.

Another recent investigation is that of Pamela Eisenbaum.[99] Drawing heavily on Nancy Jay's investigation of sacrifice–although not endorsing her comprehensive theories regarding sacrifice–Eisenbaum suggests that Sonship and priesthood are related fundamentally rather than incidentally in Hebrews.[100] The unique emphasis on the priesthood of Christ in Hebrews is commonly noted, but Eisenbaum points out that his divine Sonship is emphasized more strongly in Hebrews than in any other New Testament work, except perhaps in the Johannine corpus.[101] She points out that Hebrews opens with the concept of Sonship but quickly moves to that of inheritance, in keeping with the norms of Roman patrilineal society. Eisenbaum argues that, contrary to modern assumptions, a legitimate boy in the classical world would not automatically have been considered part of the patriline, but would have to be incorporated into it through ritual process. In effect, all heirs had to be "adopted."

---

[98]P. Gray, "Brotherly Love and the High Priest Christology of Hebrews," *JBL* 122 (2003): 335-51.

[99]P. Eisenbaum, "Father and Son: The Christology of Hebrews in Patrilineal Perspective," in *A Feminist Companion to the Catholic Epistles and Hebrews*, ed. A-J. Levine (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim, 2004), 127-46.

[100]Ibid., 130-34. See also N. Jay, *Throughout your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion and Paternity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

[101]Eisenbaum, "Father and Son," 135.

The patriline itself was regarded as an "eternal structuring of the social order."[102] The emphasis on Jesus' "brotherhood" with humanity serves to highlight the possibility of the reader becoming part of the divine patriline.[103] In the Roman world the priesthood (*pontifices*) "regulated family law, including adoptions, wills and the distribution of inheritance."[104] In an analogous way, the priesthood of Jesus has a vital role in the realization of the possibility of incorporation into the divine patriline. The importance of the pratrilinity of the priesthood was greater in Judaism than in Greco-Roman cults generally. However, regardless of the degree to which the priesthood was rooted in ancestry, "becoming a priest and assuming priestly duties [in the classical world] is remarkably similar to becoming a son and assuming the rights of inheritance."[105] In any case, in Hebrews the priesthood of Jesus is rooted in a patriline–he is the "Son" of God. In keeping with the motif of "better", it may be said that he had a "better" patriline than the levitical priests. Eisenbaum correctly notes the significance of the fact that the discussion of the Melchizedek priesthood of Christ ends with an affirmation of his Sonship.[106]

Eisenbaum's article is stimulating and insightful. Her use of sociological and anthropological categories provides a useful window into how Hebrews can be understood as having an underlying unity despite its use of disparate and sometimes

---

[102]Ibid., 137. The discussion in Hebrews 7 about the relative standing of the Levi and Melchizedek illustrates the point Eisenbaum is making.

[103]Ibid., 138.

[104]Ibid., 139.

[105]Ibid., 141.

[106]Ibid., 142.

seemingly incompatible Christological categories. However, Eisenbaum does not explore the ways in which the contribution of different Christological categories in Hebrews are related in the rhetorical argument of the work.

## Conclusions

Although the interrelationship of priestly and filial categories in Hebrews has attracted considerable attention, significant questions remain. The rationale for the introduction of a priestly Christology has been insufficiently considered. The research in this thesis endeavours to find answers to these questions by exploring the significance of the "second Adam" ideas which, it is suggested lie behind the argument of Hebrews.

Furthermore, in previous studies insufficient consideration has been given to the way in which the interrelationship of the categories of sonship and priesthood function in the rhetorical structure of Hebrews. One of the reasons for this second lacunae in particular is the dominance of historical-critical methodologies in the modern study of Hebrews until the 1970s. It is only natural that rhetorical questions were not examined in depth prior to the rise of rhetorical criticism.

The following chapters of this work will deal with a number of interrelated issues. Chapter 2 will attempt to highlight the deficiencies of the historical-critical approaches to Hebrews by means of a survey of the results garnered by the use of such methodologies. Secondly, it will be argued that rhetorical criticism is an appropriate methodology for supplementing more historical-oriented methodologies. A survey of previous rhetorical-critical work on Hebrews will be undertaken with a view to showing the potential of rhetorical-critical study of the book.

In chapter 3 it will be argued that the rhetorical purposes of Hebrews is the bolstering of the community's confidence in their confession of faith. Acceptance of such an understanding of purpose leads naturally to the further question of the content of that confession, and specifically to the issue of whether or not it contained a statement of the priesthood of Christ. It will be argued that the confession of the Hebrews did not refer to the priesthood of Christ, but can rather be summarized as "Jesus is the Son of God".

Chapter 4 will argue that a correct understanding of Heb 2 is crucial for understanding the relationship of the sonship and priesthood of Jesus in Heberws. This chapter is introduced by explicit references to Jesus as Son (in Hebrews 1:5-14) and ends with the first explicit application of the word "priest" to him (2:17). It will be further argued that the underlying Adamic and Edenic themes in the chapter provide the key to understanding the relationship. The significance of such Adamic/Eden themes lights at the heart of this thesis.

Chapter 5 will examine the rest of Hebrews with a view to ascertaining if such Adamic/Edenic themes are utilized elsewhere in the work. This chapter will also explore the rhetorical significance of the Adamic/Edenic allusions found throughout Hebrews. It will be argued that the pattern of usage strongly suggests that Adamic/Edenic themes constitute "common ground" between *Auctor* and his recipients, which is presupposed in the overall argument of Hebrews rather than being argued in detail.

Chapter 6 will then summarized the work as a whole, present the conclusions arrived at and outline various implications arising from it.

## CHAPTER 2

## METHODOLOGY: RHETORICAL CRITICISM

In this chapter the appropriateness of rhetorical criticism as a method for studying the Christology of Hebrews will be explored. Rhetorical criticism will first be defined and delimited. Secondly, a brief survey will be made of previous rhetorical critical studies of Hebrews. Lastly, the validity of the methodology will be explored and responses provided to objections that have been raised against the use of the method.

There is no such thing as the "rhetorical-critical method".[1] The term "rhetorical criticism" actual encompasses a collection of disparate methodological approaches. Three broad approaches are discernable, although considerable variety exists even within each of these approaches.

One method of rhetorical criticism is concerned with the rhetoric *of* scripture rather than the rhetoric *in* scripture.[2] This approach is concerned primarily with the rhetorical power the text has on contemporary readers. The philosophical undergirdings are postmodern and this type of approach is illustrative of a rebellion

---

[1]C. C. Black, "Rhetorical Criticism," in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. J. B. Green (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 273-74.

[2]J. D. H. Amador, "The Word Made Flesh: Epistemology, Ontology and Postmodern Rhetoric," in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht; JSNTSS 146 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 53.

against the dominance of history in biblical studies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Representatives of this approach in New Testament Studies include David Amador and, increasingly towards the end of his life, Wilhelm Wuellner.[3]

A second method of rhetorical criticism endeavours to understand the relevant biblical material in terms of the strictures of ancient rhetoric. In New Testament studies this approach is particularly associated with the work of George Kennedy and scholars influenced by him.[4] The work of Hans Dieter Betz forms another sub-set of this approach to rhetorical criticism.[5] Both of these scholars endeavour in different ways to measure New Testament documents against a template derived from analysis of ancient rhetorical handbooks. Thus Betz finds in Galatians an example of an ancient apologetic letter.

The third form of rhetorical criticism involves utilization of traditional historical critical methods but incorporates an emphasis on the rhetorical features of the work being studied. In this approach rhetorical criticism is not set in opposition to

---

[3]J. D. H. Amador, *Academic Constraints in Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction to a Rhetoric of Power,* JSNTSS 174 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999); W. Wuellner, "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" *CBQ* 49 (1987): 448-63; *idem*, "Biblical Exegesis in the Light of the History and Historicity of Rhetoric and the Nature of the Rhetoric of Religion," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S.E. Porter and T.H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 492-513

[4]G. A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); see also D.F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*; SBLDDS 104 (Atlanta GA: Scholars, 1988).

[5]H. D. Betz, *Galatians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979).

historical critical methodologies but is rather seen as complementary to them. An example of this type of approach may be seen in the work of Scott Mackie.[6]

These three approaches are all valid and are all likely to produce fruitful insights into the New Testament. The third approach is adopted in this thesis. It takes seriously the maxim "I can see further than others because I stand on the shoulders of giants." In this regard at least, this approach coheres with the programmatic vision of James Muilenburg for a rhetorical criticism of the Jewish Scriptures. He saw such rhetorical criticism as "going beyond" form criticism–a completion rather than a replacement.[7] In exactly this manner the present thesis seeks to build on the research of the past rather than to discard it.

Certainly, historical approaches to the study of Hebrews have produced only meagre results with the majority of issues addressed spawning an array of competing hypotheses.[8] Apart from a general consensus that Paul did not write Hebrews, there is a striking lack of unanimity among Hebrews scholars regarding introductory issues

---

[6]S. D. Mackie, *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, WUNT 2/223 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007). Mackie opens his treatment with a discussion of the situation of the recipients (*Eschatology*, 9-17) without suggesting in any way that such an investigation is futile or invalid. This is immediately followed with a discussion of the rhetoric of the author's response (*Eschatology*, 19-26).

[7]J. Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88 (1969): 1-2.

[8]The extent of the diversity can be readily seen in surveys of Hebrews research such as E. Burggaller, "Neue Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief," *TRu* 13 (1910): 369-417; and, E. Gräßer, "Der Hebräerbrief 1938-1963," *TRu* 30 (1964-65): 138-236. Bruce, Buchanan and Johnnson have also provided useful surveys, but on a smaller scale, both in terms of scope and the time period surveyed. See, F. F. Bruce, "Recent Contributions to the Understanding of Hebrews," *ET* 80 (1969): 260-64; G. W. Buchanan, "The Present State of Scholarship on Hebrews," in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, 4 vols., ed. J. Neusner, SJLA 12 (Leiden, Brill, 1975; reprinted, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004), 1: 299-330; and, W. G. Johnsson, "Issues in the Interpretation of Hebrews," *AUSS*, 15 (1977): 169-88.

such as authorship, date, occasion, provenance, or recipients. However, such a failure to achieve results does not mean that historical study should be abandoned, as the first type of rhetorical criticism does. It suggests rather that it should be done better.[9] Kenneth Kuntz declares, with reference to the study of the Jewish Scriptures,"We understand that in the rhetorical criticism and form criticism of biblical texts we have scholarly pursuits which are supplementary in character."[10] This statement is no less valid with regard to the New Testament. Martin Warner's observation is correct for any historically oriented rhetorical criticism: "[T]he contrast [between redaction criticism and rhetorical criticism] should not be over-drawn; no responsible rhetorical criticism can altogether dispense with issues of redaction."[11] Analysis of the way an author or speaker uses and modifies traditional material to state a case is the task of redaction of redaction criticism. When analysis turns to the ways in which traditional material is used as persuasive proof rhetorical criticism is used.[12] In both cases, it is essential to distinguish between traditional and redactional material.

---

[9]W. A. Meeks, "Why Study the New Testament?" *NTS* 51 (2005): 164-65.

[10]J. K. Kuntz, 'The Canonical Wisdom Psalms of Ancient Israel: Their Rhetorical, Thematic and Formal Dimensions," in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. J. J. Jackson and M. Kessler, PTMS 1 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 1974), 215.

[11]M. Warner, "The Fourth Gospel's Art of Rational Persuasion," in *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*, WSPL, ed. M. Warner (London: Routledge, 1990), 156.

[12]See, for example, C. D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Clark, 2004).

**The Structure of Hebrews: A Case Study in Rhetorical Criticism**

One area where the insights derived from rhetorical analysis of Hebrews has proved to be of value is in regard to the work's structure. Hebrews is today generally regarded as a "homily"–an essentially oral work. Indeed, Judith Wray declares with confidence that "'To the Hebrews' is the only New Testament document that, as a book, qualifies as a sermon."[13] The document is certainly marked by signs of orality

---

[13]J. H. Wray, "An Exhortation to Faithfulness: Hebrews," in *Chalice Introduction to the New Testament*, ed. D.E. Smith. (St Louis, MO: Chalice, 2004), 285. Other twentieth century scholars who accept the generic designation of "sermon" for Hebrews include: R. Perdelwitz, "Das literarische Problem des Hebräerbriefs," *ZNW* 11 (1910): 50-78; C.C. Torrey, "The Authorship and Character of the So-called 'Epistle to the Hebrews'," *JBL* 30 (1911): 145-56; L.O. Bristol, "Primitive Christian Preaching and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL* 68 (1949): 89-97; C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: in Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 363; F. B. Craddock, *The Pre-existence of Christ in the New Testament* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1968), 130; F. Bovon, "Le Christ, la foi et la sagesse dans l'Épître aux Hébreux," RTP 18 (1968): 131; J. Swetnam, "On the Literary genre of the 'Epistle' to the Hebrews," *NovTest* 11 (1969): 261-69; T. G. Stylianopoulos, "Shadow and reality: Reflections on Hebrews 10:1-18," *GOTR* 17 (1972): 215; A. Vanhoye, *Our Priest is Christ* (Rome, Pontifical Institute, 1977), 3-8; M. D. Hutaff, "The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Early Christian Sermon," *BTB* 99 (1978): 1816-24; W. L. Lane, "Hebrews: A Sermon in Search of a Setting," *SWJT* 28 (1985): 13-18; H. W. Attridge, "New Covenant Christology in an Early Christian Homily", *Quarterly Revue* 8 (1988): 89-108; M. E. Isaacs, *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, JSNTSS 73 (Sheffield: JSNT Press, 1992), 18; M. Hengel, "Christological Titles in Early Christianity," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992), 435; D. J. Pursiful, *The Cultic Motif in the Spirituality of the Book of Hebrews* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1993), 33-35; L. T. Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999), 458; C. R. Koester, *Hebrews*, AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 81; and, P. Walker, "A Place for Hebrews? Contexts for a First-Century Sermon," in *The New Testament in its First Century Setting*, ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 231-249. For an even more recent defence of the homiletic nature of Hebrews see G. Gelardini, "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha be-Av*: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation," in *Hebrew: Contemporary Methods–New Insights*, ed. G. Gelardini, BIS 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 107-27.

rather than literariness. In this regard William Lane points to the lack of γράφειν-introductory formulas for scriptural citations; the general use of verbs indicting speaking rather than reading when referring to communication (2:5; 6:9; 8:1; 9:5; 11:32), and exhortation to attentive listening (5:11).[14] Such a conceptualization of Hebrews as a primarily oral work has significant implications for the understanding of the work's structure, calling into question structural analyses which was more fitting to a written work.[15]

Even when historical-criticism held almost universal sway in biblical studies attempts to outline the book's structure were common.[16] Nevertheless, some commentators made no attempt to analyze the structure of Hebrews.[17] A variety of outlines have been proposed by those who have attempted to sketch the structure of the book. As Harold Attridge observes, the difficulties in establishing a generally accepted structural outline of Hebrews is "due not to the lack of structural indices, but to their overabundance."[18]

When Pauline authorship was still regarded as a viable option, some suggested that Hebrews divided neatly into doctrinal and hortatory sections, as is the case with

---

[14]Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, lxxiv-lxxv.

[15]Note the criticism of Vanhoye's work below, pp. 53-55

[16]A comprehensive survey of the history of attempts to discern the structure of Hebrews may be found in G. H. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998; reprint of SNT 73; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3-41.

[17]See for example, J. Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1924), xxiii-xxiv.

[18]H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadephia, PA: Fortress, 1989), 16.

the Pauline epistles.[19] Earlier attempts at providing an outline of the book's structure generally focused on the content of the book. Thus structural outlines based around the theme of "Christ is better than . . ." were not uncommon.[20] Another suggested leitmotif for the structure of the book is "the finality of Christianity".[21] Some scholars simply listed the sections according to topics appearing in them without trying to present an overarching unity.[22] The fatal flaw of this approach is that it concentrates on the doctrinal sections of the book virtually to the complete neglect of the exhortatory sections. Indeed, until Friedrich Büchsel (1928), no real significance was given to the alternation of genre throughout the book.[23] Today it is more widely recognized that the paraenetic sections of the book are primary. The comment of Heinrich Zimmermann is increasingly typical: "Seine Theologie steht im Dienst der

---

[19]J. H. Thayer, "Authorship and Canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *BiSac* 24 (1867): 687; W. Leonard, *Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews: Critical Problems and the Use of the Old Testament* (Rome: Vatican Polyglot, 1939.), 23.

[20]See, for example P. E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977), ix-x. Kendrick, adopts a Pauline-style bipartate structure (theology and exhortation) for the book but analyses the theological section (1:1-10:15) using the "Christ is better" template. See A. C. Kendrick, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, American Commentary on the New Testament (Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1889), 13-15.

[21]B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays*, 3rd ed. (London: MacMillan: 1909 [1st ed.: 1890]), xlviii-l.

[22]A. Nairne, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, CGTSC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), xi-xii; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), xix-xxii. That a degree of subjectivity is involved in this process is self-evident.

[23]F. Büchsel, "Hebräerbrief," *RGG*, (2nd ed., 1928) 2:1669–73. Guthrie (*Structure*, 9) notes that the alternation between the two genres had been noticed before but Büchsel was the first to make it the basis of a structural analysis of the book.

Paränese, wie ja das ganze Schreiben als λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως verstanden sein will ([Hebr.] 13,22)."[24]

In more recent times, analysis of the book's structure has become more sophisticated. Proposals have been made which are based on structural features of the book and not simply on its content. An essay by Léon Vaganay marks an important turning point.[25] The work provides a foundation on which Albert Vanhoye has been able to base his structural analysis, which has been especially influential.[26] Vanhoye suggests the following structural features of Hebrews provided a map to the structure of the book:

---

[24]See, H. Zimmermann, *Das Bekenntnis der Hoffnung: Tradition und Redaktion im Hebräerbrief*, BBB 47 (Cologne: Peter Hanstein, 1977), 3. See also, W. G. Übelacker, *Der Hebräerbrief als Appell: I. Untersuchungen zu exordium, narratio und postscriptum* CBNTS 21 (Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1989), 34-35.

[25]L. Vaganay, "Le Plan de l'Épître aux Hébreux,," in *Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris: Gabalda, 1940), 269–77.

[26]A. Vanhoye, "De structura litteraria Epistulae ad Hebraeos," *VD* 40 (1962) 73–80; *idem*, "Discussion sur la structure de l'Épître aux Hébreux," *Bib* 55 (1974) 349–80; *idem*, "Les indices de la structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux," in *SE* 2 (1964) 493–509; *idem*, "La structure centrale de l'Épître aux Hébreux (Heb. 8/1–9/28)," *RSR* 47 (1959): 44–60; *idem*, "Structure littéraire et thèmes théologique de l'Épître aux Hébreux," in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*, 2:175–81, AnBib 17–18 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963). The best English summary of Vanhoye's work is found in A. Vanhoye, *Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, SB 12 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989).

Among those "who generally follow Vanhoye," Koester (*Hebrews*, 83) includes the commentaries by Attridge, Ellingworth, and Lane, as well as the following articles: D. A. Black, "The Problem of the Literary Structure of Hebrews: An Evaluation and a Proposal," *GTJ* 7 (1986): 163–77; F. F. Bruce, "'To the Hebrews': A Document of Roman Christianity?" in *ANRW*, 25.4: 3496-3521; and, D. J. MacLeod, "The Literary Structure of the Book of Hebrews," *BibSac* 146 (1989): 185-97. Further sources include: Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 31 and N. R. Lightfoot, *Jesus Christ Today: A Commentary on the Book of Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1976), 42-52. Of course, many of these scholars make modifications to Vanhoye's proposal, even if they remain faithful to its essential direction.

A. Announcement of the subjects to be discussed;
B. Inclusions which indicate the boundaries of the development;
C. Variation of literary genre: Exposition or paraenesis;
D. Words which characterize a development;
E. Transition by immediate repetition of an expression or of a "hook" word;
F. Symmetric arrangement.[27]

David Black correctly observes with regard to Vanhoye's structural studies: "It is difficult to give a coherent picture of the structural components in Vanhoye's analysis because of the enormous amount of detail which characterizes it."[28] In its simplest terms, Vanhoye's analysis reveals a complex chiastic structure in the book of Hebrews.[29]

As impressive as Vanhoye's work is, it is certainly possible to wonder if he has been perhaps *too* clever. Werner Kümmel evaluates Vanhoye's analysis as "contrived."[30] Some scholars deny the existence of "macro-chiasms" such as Vanhoye claims to find in Hebrews.[31] On the micro-level, chiasms are a well known

---

[27]Vanhoye, *Structure and Message*, 20.

[28]Black, "Literary Structure" 171. Black goes on to describe Vanhoye's results as "relatively coherent and self-authenticating."

[29]His analysis is diagrammed succinctly in Vanhoye, *Structure and Message*, 33.

[30]W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. H. C. Kee (London: SCM, 1975; translation of *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* 17th rev. ed.; Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973), 390.

[31]Chiasm (or chiasmus) may be defined as "a form of antithesis, a reversal in the order of words so that the second half of a statement balances the first half in inverted word order." See H. Shaw, *Dictionary of Literary Terms* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), s.v. "Chiasmus"; see also K. Beckson and A. Ganz, *A Reader's Guide to Literary Terms: A Dictionary* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1960), s.v. "Chiasmus." M. Dahood ("Chiasmus," in *IDBS*, 145) distinguishes between micro-chiasms, which encompass a single sentence or verse, and macro chiasms, which structure much larger units, including entire books.

feature of speech, both polished and unaffected. However, χιασμός is not a technical term in classical rhetoric. This is not necessarily because classical rhetors failed to utilize chiasm, but because the concept was largely subsumed under other headings: *inclusio, anaphora, antithesis, palistrophes, commutatio*.[32] Simply chiasms are easy to envisage even in spontaneous speech. However, book length macro-chiasms seem improbable in the setting of speech and would seem to be more the product of literary craftsmanship. Their very complexity has led some scholars to doubt that "[macro-] chiasm is anything more than a construct of modern scholarly imagination."[33]

Surely, if Hebrews is conceptualized as a homily rather than a letter, the deliberate use of a macro-chiastic structure is less plausible. It is precisely here that the value of viewing Hebrews from a rhetorical perspective can be illustrated. Craig Koester criticizes Vanhoye's structural schema from the point of view of ancient rhetorical practice. He points out that although Vanhoye sees the climax of the argument in 5:11-10:39, ancient rhetorical practice would suggest a linear, rather than a concentric structure.[34] Barnabas Lindars notes further that Vanhoye's proposed

---

[32]See A-S. Di Marco, "Rhetoric and Hermenetucis–on a Rhetorical Pattern: Chiasmus and Circularity," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 480.

[33]S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed, "Philippians as a Macro-Chiasm and its Exegetical Significance," *NTS* 44 (1998): 213-331. See also B. W. Longenecker, *Rhetoric at the Boundaries: The Art and Theology of New Testament Chain-Link Transitions* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005), 47. For a discussion of the various issues concerning the usefulness of chiasm in New Testament study see, D. E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003), s.v. "Chiasmus."

[34]Koester, *Hebrews*, 83; see also B. Lindars, "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews", *NTS*, 35 (1989): 384. It is interesting to note that a similar sort of scholarly debate exists in regard to the Paul's farewell speech at Ephesus (Acts 20:17-38) with Exum and Talbert finding an elaborate chiastic structure to the speech and Watson

chiasm derives mainly from two features: inclusio and the careful proportioning of the book so that sections of the argument appear balanced. Lindars argues that *Auctor* includes these features for their rhetorical effect.[35]

Koester proposes an alternative to Vanhoye's structure:

I. EXORDIUM (1:1-2-4)
II. PROPOSITION (2:5-9)
III. ARGUMENTS (2:10-12:27)
  A. First Series (2:10-6:20)
    1. Argument: Jesus receives glory through faithful suffering–a way others are called to follow (2:10-5:10)
    2. Transitional Digression: Warning and Encouragement (5:11-6:20)
  B. Second Series (7:1-10:39)
    1. Argument: Jesus' suffering is the sacrifice that enables others to approach God (7:1-10:25)
    2. Transitional Digression: Warning and Encouragement (10:26-39)
  C. Third List (11:1-12:27)
    1. Argument: God's people persevere through suffering to glory by faith (11:1-12:24)
    2. Transitional Digression: Warning and Encouragement (12:25-27)
IV. PERORATION (12:28-13:21)
V. EPISTOLARY POSTSCRIPT (13:22-25)[36]

Koester understands Hebrews to be an example of epideictic rhetoric–a classification which is open to significant objection.[37] A significant weakness of his outline in these terms is the lack of mention of the theme of the priesthood of Jesus.

---

finding it to be structured according to the principles of classical rhetoric. See C. Exum and C. Talbert, "The Structure of Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts 20,18-35)," *CBQ* 29 (1976): 233-36; D. F. Watson, "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts 20:17-38): Epideictic Rhetoric of Farewell," in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. D. F. Watson, JSNTSS 50 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 184-208.

[35]Lindars, "Rhetorical Structure," 384.

[36]Koester, *Hebrews*, 83-84.

[37]See below, pp. 70.

This is of such great importance to *Auctor*, its absence in Koester's outline of the book is striking.[38]

The approach of Walter Übelacker overcomes this problem and is consequently preferable. He understands Hebrews to be an example of deliberative rather than epideictic rhetoric.[39] In his analysis, he posits 1:1-4 as the exordium; 1:5-2:18 as the *narratio* which includes the *propositio* in 2:17-18, and 13:22-25 as the *postscriptum*. Unfortunately, his analysis is limited to these three sections of the book. One support for Übelacker's conclusions over those of Koester is found in the essentially parallel nature of Hebrews 1 and 2. Both go over and amplify the assertions of the exordium.[40] This strongly suggests that it is better to view Heb 2 *in toto* in close relationship to Heb 1, rather than to posit a change of relationship in the middle of Heb 2.

The relocation of the propositio from 2:5-8 in Koester's analysis to 2:17-18 is of particular significance, since the content of 2:17-18 is repeated twice more in Hebrews, namely in 4:14-16 and 7:26-28. The overlap of the content of these three passages is readily demonstrable as the first chart overleaf shows. This repetition suggests that at the end of first two major blocks of argument, *Auctor* returns to the *propositio*. Thus using Übelacker's work as a starting point, a coherent structural analysis of the book of Hebrews can be made as follows in the second chart below.[41]

---

[38]A. Vanhoye, review of *Hebrews* by C. R. Koester, *Bib* 84 (2003): 293.

[39]For a more through discussion of this point, see below, p. 70.

[40]For a detailed treatment of this literary feature of Hebrews see below, pp. 231-34.

[41]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 214-29. For further discussion of these repetitions see below, pp. 175-77.

| Repetition of Heb 2:17-18 in Hebrews | |
|---|---|
| Heb 2:17-18<br>Heb 4:14-16<br>Heb 7:26-28 | Had to become like his brothers and sisters in every<br>One who in every respect has been tested as we are<br>— |
| Heb 2:17-18<br>Heb 4:14-16<br>Heb 7:26-28 | Merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God<br>A great high priest<br>A high priest, holy blameless, undefiled, separated form sinners |
| Heb 2:17-18<br>Heb 4:14-16<br>Heb 7:26-28 | To make a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the people<br>—<br>This he did once for all when he offered himself |
| Heb 2:17-18<br>Heb 4:14-16<br>Heb 7:26-28 | Tested by what he suffered<br>Tested as we are<br>A son made perfect forever |
| Heb 2:17-18<br>Heb 4:14-16<br>Heb 7:26-28 | Able to help those who are being tested<br>So we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need<br>who ever lives to make intercession (7:25) |

Structural Analysis of Hebrews

1. Exordium (1:1-4)
2. Narratio with embedded propositio: the Son is our High Priest (1:5-2:17)
   - embedded exhortation: “pay attention” (2:1-4)
3. Argumentatio
   - As a pilgrim people’s need of the Son-High Priest (3:1-4:16)
     - embedded exhortation: “do no harden your hearts” (3:8)
   - The Son-High Priest surpassing qualifications (5:1-7:28)
     - embedded exhortation regarding falling away (6:4-11)
   - The High Priestly achievements of the Son
     - a new covenant (Heb 8)
     - entrance to God and cleansing from sin (9:1-10:39)
       - embedded exhortation: hold fast (10:19-39)
   - Possibility of believing in the Son-Priest in hard times (11:1-12:29)
     - embedded exhortation: “do not refuse him” (12:14-25)
4. Peroration: Privileges and lifestyle of the people of the Son-Priest (13:1-21)
5. Postscriptio (13:22-23)

Of course the validity of any such structure which assumes Hebrews represents a form of ancient rhetoric is dependent on the viability of rhetorical criticism as a method for studying the book of Hebrews, and it is to that topic to which we must now turn.

**Previous Rhetorical Criticism of Hebrews**

A number of attempts have been made to elucidate Hebrews using rhetorical criticism.[42] A pioneer effort in this area was that of Christopher Evans. The starting point of his analysis is the extensive use of the rhetorical technique of *synkrisis* or *comparatio* in Hebrews.[43] This is certainly not a novel insight. The importance of the word κρείτων (better) in Hebrews has long been noted. However, Evans points out that *synkrisis* is a "recurrent and dominant" literary feature of Hebrews.[44] He is particularly struck by the fact that the opening sentence of Hebrews–composed with extraordinary care and skill–ends with a comparison.[45] Evans uses his observations regarding the importance of *synkrisis* in Hebrews as the basis for drawing three conclusions: a) those suggesting that Hebrews is combating a Christology heresy or some form of Gnosticism have not taken sufficient note of the rhetoric of the letter, especially *synkrisis*; b) that Hebrews should not be regarded as a "midrash" on an Old Testament text or texts, but rather the use of the Old Testament in the book serves *Auctor*'s rhetorical aims; and c) the Christology of Hebrews rests less on Platonic dualism than eschatology.[46]

---

[42]It must be noted that long before the rise of modern rhetorical criticism, close attention was paid to various stylistic features of Hebrews. See, for example, F. Blass, "Die Rythmische Komposition des Hebräerbriefes," *TSK* 3 (1902): 420-61. In the classical world style was considered to be part of the rhetorical domain.

[43]C. F. Evans, *The Theology of Rhetoric: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Dr. Williams's Trust, 1988), 5.

[44]Ibid., 8. There are twenty-seven usages of comparative adjectives or comparative adverbs in the book.

[45]Ibid., 9.

[46]Ibid., 11-17.

Another important early article on the rhetoric of Hebrews is that of Lindars in 1989.[47] This study has a broader scope than some others, looking at the rhetorical implications found in the structure of the document. Lindars notes that, in keeping with good rhetorical practice, *Auctor* begins with areas of commonality between himself and his readers. New material is introduced later in the document. In a parallel way the exhortations of the document become increasingly strident. According to Lindars the situation of the readers presupposed by *Auctor* is one of pressure to join or rejoin the synagogue. The essence of the problem, as conceptualized by Lindars, is post-baptismal sin. The readers understand that the death of Jesus provides atonement for past sins, but are troubled by how post-baptismal sins are to be cleansed. The argument is not that Christ was a sacrifice for sin, but rather that the effects of his death are permanent.[48]

Lindars' study is subject to a number of telling criticisms. Duane Watson sees a "puzzling inconsistency" in Lindars' work. He points out that Lindars sees *Auctor* of Hebrews as someone who had training in rhetoric and who had a command of rhetorical art. Nevertheless, Lindars rejects attempts to find rhetorical structure in the work and insists that it is not a product of "conscious artistry."[49] Others have been unconvinced by Lindars' defence of the generic designation "letter" for Hebrews or

---

[47]Lindars, "Rhetorical Structure," 382-406.

[48]Ibid., 390-402.

[49]D. F. Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism of Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles Since 1978," *CR: BS* 5 (1997): 181.

have found his reconstruction of the setting of letter in the needs of the congregation overly speculative.[50]

Thomas Olbricht, an important figure in the modern revival of rhetorical criticism, has also written a rhetorical study on Hebrews.[51] He endeavours to demonstrate that *synkrisis* in Hebrews is used for the amplification the status of Jesus in comparison with others (angels, Moses, Joshua, the Old Testament cultus, etc). Amplification is a "rhetorical devise used to expand a simple statement."[52] This may be achieved using such techniques as comparison, division, accumulation, intimation, and progression. Of these, Hebrews uses comparison predominantly. Olbricht draws attention to the parallels between the amplification in Hebrews and that typical of Greco-Roman funeral orations (epideictic rhetoric). On this basis he suggests that the comparison of Jesus with the angels (1:5-14) reflects a *topos* used to establish divine descent.[53]

---

[50]For example, Eisenbaum, finds Lindars' reconstruction of the situation overly speculative and Ellingworth rejects the generic designation of "letter". See P. M. Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, SBLDS 156 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1997), 7-9; and, P. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews,* NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 56-63.

[51]T. H. Olbricht, "Hebrews as Amplification," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S.E. Porter and T.H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 375-87.

[52]R. A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms: A Guide for Students of English Literature* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), 6. For a treatment of amplificiation in the classical handbooks see Arist. *Rh.* 1.9.38-39.

[53]Olbricht, "Amplification," 381.

A recent helpful study is that of Hermut Löhr.[54] Taking his lead from an earlier article by Carl Classen, which explored the use of the technical language of classical rhetoric in the Pauline corpus, Löhr seeks to do the same thing with regard to Hebrews.[55] He points to four specific terms in Hebrews which have a set meaning in ancient rhetorical handbooks: κεφάλαιον (8:1), ἀναγκαῖος (8:3), πρέπειν (2:10, 7:26), and, ἀδύνατος (6:18, 10:4; 11:6).[56] However, he does not see the use of the phrase λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως (13:22) as providing *any* evidence of rhetorical language.[57]

Undoubtedly, the writer who has contributed most voluminously to the rhetorical study of Hebrews is David deSilva, beginning with his published doctoral dissertation.[58] DeSilva examines the important role played by honour and shame in

---

[54]H. Löhr, "Reflections on Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods–New Insights*, ed. G. Gelardini, BIS 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 199-210.

[55]C. J. Classen, "Paul and the Terminology of Ancient Greek Rhetoric," in *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*, (Leiden: Brill Academic, 2002; reprint from Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 29-44. Löhr ("Reflections," 201) openly acknowledges his debt to Classen.

[56]Löhr, "Reflections," 202-08. With regard to πρέπειν Löhr draws support from an earlier article by A. C.Mitchell, "The Use of πρέπειν and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10,," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 681-701.

[57]Löhr, "Reflections," 208-09. The emphasis is present in Löhr's article. Many have expressed the contrary opinion, of course.

[58]D. A. deSilva, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews,* SBLDS 152 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1995). DeSilva also published a more popular digest of the dissertation and further distilled the essence of his research in journal articles. See, D. A. deSilva, *Bearing Christ's Reproach: The Challenge of Hebrews in an Honor Culture* (North Richmond Hills, TX: Bibal, 1999); *idem*, "Despising Shame: A Cultural-Anthropological Investigation of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL* 113 (1994): 439-61; and, *idem*, "Exchanging Favor for Wrath: Apostasy in Hebrews and Patron-Client Relationships," *JBL* 115 (1996): 91-116. He has also applied his methodology to an

the ancient Mediterranean world. He notes that honour was only valued if it was given by a person (or group) whose opinion *mattered.* The situation presupposed in Hebrews is of (Gentile) Christians who have been isolated from their surrounding society and have suffered loss of honour and shame as a direct consequence of their faith. *Auctor* points them to a higher court of opinion: God himself, illustrating from the Old Testament and the example of Christ, that dishonour in the eyes of society does not preclude honour and vindication in the eyes of God.

Some rhetorical studies have focused on a limited section of Hebrews rather than on the entire document. One passage which has been given particular attention by rhetorical critics is chapter 11.[59] Michael Cosby has carefully noted the rhetorical features of the chapter and examined its relationship to other ancient *exampla* lists–both Jewish and pagan.[60] He would certainly agree with Burton Mack's evaluation that the chapter is "a fine example of polished rhetorical composition."[61] Cosby gives some attention to the rhetorical function of the chapter. He suggests that

---

exploration of a notoriously difficult passage in Hebrews as well as providing a full scale rhetorically-oriented commentary on the book. See, D. A. deSilva, "Hebrews 6:4-8: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation," *TynBul* 50 (1999): 33-57; 225-35; and, *idem, Perseverence in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000).

[59]When Mack seeks an example of New Testament rhetoric in the book of Hebrews it is to 11:1-12:3 that he turns. See B. L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship, New Testament Series (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990), 73-76.

[60]M. R. Cosby, *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11 in Light of Example Lists in Antiquity* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988). This work is summarized in M. R. Cosby, "The Rhetorical Composition of Hebrews 11," *JBL* 107 (1988): 257-73.

[61]Mack, *Rhetoric*, 76. Cosby, himself (*Rhetorical Composition*, 3), comments "In a highly efficient manner the author implements this series of rhetorical techniques in Hebrews 11 to persuade his audience to stand firm in there Christian commitment."

it serves as a means for making the paraenesis of the book *sound* persuasive.[62] The figures in the example list endure hardship with unwavering faith. Hebrews is encouraging the community to emulate that example.[63]

Eisenbaum gives much more attention to the rhetorical function of Heb 11 than Cosby does.[64] She dissents from the majority view that the key to understanding the chapter is πίστις. Rather she finds the subversive retelling of Israel's history more significant. The values undergirding a Jewish understanding of these biblical characters are undermined. The "heroes of faith" are de-nationalized.[65] Each character developed is either marginal in the biblical narrative or made to appear marginal in Hebrews by a failure to emphasize–or in many cases, even mention–their most notable exploits.[66] Hebrews 11 also emphasizes that each person has experienced "death" or some symbolic equivalent, despite their ability to see the future. Indeed, Eisenbaum suggests that this is the meaning of the heroes' "faith": They correctly discern God's future rewards and act accordingly. The heroes provide examples of alteration of status–Abraham leaves Ur, Moses rejects Egypt and identifies himself with the Hebrews. In this way the Jewish heroes of faith are appropriated for Christian exhortation.

---

[62]Cosby, *Rhetorical Composition*, 90; emphasis original.

[63]Ibid., 88-89.

[64]Eisenbaum, *Jewish Heroes*; *idem*, "Heroes and History in Hebrews 11," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, JSNTSS 148/SSEJC 5 (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic, 1997), 380-96.

[65]Eisenbaum, *Jewish Heroes*, 187-88.

[66]Thiessen is critical of this aspect of Eisenbaum's proposal. See M. Thiessen, "Hebrews and the End of the Exodus," *NovTest* 49 (2007): 360-69.

Burton Mack and Clayton Croy have also given attention to rhetorical features of Heb 12.[67] Mack focuses on two specific issues: a) the way the positioning of this passage after the example list of chapter 11 modifies the form of the rhetorical template being employed; and b) the way proverbial wisdom is employed in the chapter. The use of proverbial wisdom is also important to Croy, who notes particularly the way in which the context in Hebrews modifies the meaning of the quotation from Proverbs.[68]

It is evident that also issues of the style and structure of Hebrews attract the attention of scholar in the early- and mid-twentieth century the book has been view increasingly as an example of ancient rhetoric since the late 1980s. Rhetorical criticism of Hebrews has been provided an array of insights into the work and opened new avenues for investigation. These studies demonstrate, at a minimum that rhetorical criticism is a *useful* tool for use in the study of Hebrews. Use of rhetorical criticism in the study of Hebrews is in its infancy, and this fact suggests that it may yet be productive of many further insights.

**The Appropriateness of Rhetorical Criticism**

From at least the time of Socrates and Plato rhetoric has been defined as the art of persuasion.[69] Since all the New Testament documents are "to a degree persuasive

---

[67]Mack (*Rhetoric*, 77-78) examines 12:5-17 in a cursory way. Croy explores 12:1-13 in considerably more detail, although his interest is broader than just the rhetorical aspects of the passage. See, N. C. Croy, *Endurance in Suffering: Hebrews 12.1-13 in its Rhetorical, Religious and Philosophical Context*, SNTSMS 98 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[68]Croy, *Endurance in Suffering*, 129-33.

[69]In the earliest extent discussion of rhetoric Socrates challenges Gorgias to explain what rhetoric is and what it deals with. Gorgias responds, Τὸ πείθειν ἔγωγ'

texts" rhetorical analysis would seem to be a legitimate tool to use in elucidating their meaning.[70] Unquestionably, Hebrews–containing, as it does, passages of urgent exhortations coupled with dire threats–is more explicitly a "persuasive text" than some other New Testament books, for example, Acts or Mark. Such works are doubtlessly attempts at persuasion, but given their narrative format they generally contain implicit rather than explicit persuasive arguments.

*Hebrews as Ancient Rhetoric*

Few would dissent from John Reumann's description of Hebrews as the "most rhetorically elegant of all New Testament writings."[71] Adolf Deissmann's comment that Hebrews is "the earliest example of Christian artistic literature" may be something of an overstatement but it expresses an important insight nonetheless.[72] The rhetorical elements in Hebrews are strikingly obvious. This is true to the extent

---

οἷόν τ' εἶναι τοῖς λόγοις. ("I call it the ability to persuade with speeches . . ."). See, Plato *Gorgias* 452E. In a similar vein Aristotle wrote: Ἔστω δὴ ῥητορικὴ περὶ ἕκαστον τοῦ θεωρῆσαι τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον πιθανόν (Rhetoric then may be defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever), (Arist. *Rh.* 1.2.1). It is true that historically rhetorical has often been conceptualized in terms of style and ornamentation rather than argumentation. Amador (*Academic Contraints*, 133) notes that this phenomenon "arose during the Second Sophistic out of the impact upon civic institutions by the rise of imperial Rome."

[70]J. Lambrecht, "Rhetorical Criticism and the New Testament," *Bij* 50 (1989): 239.

[71]J. Reumann, *Variety and Unity in New Testament Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 163; see also E. J. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament*. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1937), 257.

[72]A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 2nd ed., trans. L. R. M. Strachan (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911), 237.

that some have suggested that *Auctor* was formally trained in rhetoric.[73] However, this suggestion goes beyond the evidence. In the ancient Greco-Roman world rhetoric was regarded as the pinnacle of education.[74] Rhetorical handbooks were among the most commonly published literary items of the day–"quite possibly the single best-attested genre of writing from the ancient world.."[75] One did not have to be a trained rhetor to have a working knowledge of rhetoric. Reading the handbooks or even hearing speeches and orations, in their various forms, would give something of a rhetorical education. In short, rhetoric was "in the air" (as it were).[76] *Not* being influenced by it would seem less likely than being influenced by it. A useful analogy may be provided by the pervasiveness of computing and Internet-related jargon today. One does not have to be a formally trained computer programmer/technician/operator to use terms like "software", "flowchart", or "hard drive" which derive directly from the world of computing. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a modern westerner with even basic education being unfamiliar with such terms.

---

[73]Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, l-li; Wray, "Exhortation," 282.

[74]This fact is attested in all treatments of education in the Greco-Roman world, For example, H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. G. Lamb (New York: Mentor, 1964; translation of *Historie de l'education dans l'antiquité*; Paris: Seuil, 1948).

[75]T. Habinek, *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory,* Blackwell Introductions to the Classical World (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 44. Habinek (*Ancient Rhetoric*, 45-46) goes on to draw an apt parallel with the ubiquity of self-help and business manuals today.

[76]Kennedy, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 10-11.

*Rhetorical Elements in Hebrews*

Many scholars have noted the many rhetorical elements in Hebrews. For example, the introduction (1:1-4) is composed with extraordinary rhetorical skill–a fact which modern commentators have been quick to note.[77] Attridge lists rhetorical techniques used in Hebrews including alliteration (for example, 1:1-3; 2:1-4; 4:16; 10:11, 34; 11:17; 12:21), assonance (for example, 1:1-3; 6:20; 10:26; 12:9), asyndeton (for example, 7:3, 26; 11:32-34, 37; 12:25), brachylogy (for example, 1:4; 12:24), chiasm (for example, 2:8-9, 18; 4:16; 7:3; 23-24; 10:38-39; 12:19, 22;13:14), ellipse (for example, 7:19; 12:25), hendiadys (for example, 2:2; 5:2; 6:10; 8:5; 11:36; 12:18), hyperbaton (for example, 2:9, 14; 4:8; 9:15; 12:3, 24), isocolon (for example, 1:3; 7:3, 26), litotes (for example, 4:15; 6:10; 7:20; 9:7,18) and paronomasia (2:10; 3:11; 5:8; 7:9, 23-24; 9:16-17; 10:38-39; 11:11; 12:2).[78] To this list can be added

---

[77]See, for example, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 36-37; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 5-7; deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 84-85; and, Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 89-90.

[78]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 20-21; see also 36-37. These rhetorical techniques are discussed as some length in the rhetorical handbooks of antiquity.

For discussion of alliteration (which is called as *paroemion* in classical sources) see, for example, Arist. *Rh.* 3.9.9; *Rhet. Her.* 4.12.18 (which counsels against overusing this technique), and Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.75-76.

For assonance see, Arist. *Rh*. 3.8.1,3.

For discussion of asyndeton see Arist. *Rh.* 3.6.6-7.

For discussion of brachylogy see Arist. *Rh.* 3.6.5-6; Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.40-51.

For discussion of chiasm (or chiasmus) see, Arist. *Rh.* 3.9.7, 10.10.5; Cic. *De or.* 15.21, 28.39. As pointed out above (pp. 53-54) *chiasm* was not a technical term in classical Greco-Roman rhetoric. The concept was rather subsumed under such terms as *inclusio, anaphora, antithesis, palistrophes, commutatio*.

For discussion of ellipse see, Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.40, 8.6.21. Note also Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.50 where Quintialian warns against use of ellipses that result in obscurity.

Hendiadys is not a technical term of ancient rhetoric though the word itself derives from the Greek expression ἕν διὰ δυοῖν ("one by means of two").

For discussion of hyperbaton see *Rhet. Her.* 4.32.44; Quint. *Inst.*1.5.40.

For discussion of *Isocolon* see Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.80 Arist. *Rh*. 3.8.2-7 (on rhythm, more generally).

For discussion of litotes see, *Rhet. Her.* 38.

antithesis (10:19; 11:3, 9-10, 24-26), hyperbole (11:12), and circumlocution (11:7-9, 11, 17).[79] The use of metaphors and enthymematic arguments are also unsurprising in a highly rhetorical work.[80] Hebrews also contains one of the most striking and extended usages of anophora in the entire surviving literary corpus from antiquity.[81] However, more prominent than any of these techniques in Hebrews is *synkrisis*.[82]

---

With regard to Paronomasia Crosby (*Rhetorical Composition*, 81) suggests that the co-joining of the words Σάρρα στεῖρα in this verse has a similar effect as the cojoining of "sterile Cheryl" would have in English.

[79]On antithesis in Hebrews see Crosby, *Rhetorical Composition*, 75-81. For a discussion of antithesis in the classical handbooks see Arist. *Rh*. 3.9.7,10; 3.10.5; Quint. *Inst.* 7.4.7-12; *Rhet. Her.* 15.21.

On Hyperbole in Hebrews see Crosby, *Rhetorical Composition*, 81. Hyperbole is the use of exaggerated or extravagant terms for emphasis and not intended to be understood literally (Lanham, *Handlist*, 56). In classical handbooks, Quintilian speaks of an "appropriate exaggeration of the truth" (Quint. *Inst*. 8.6.67.) Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.68-76 is devoted to developing this suggestion.

On circumlocution in Hebrews see Crosby, *Rhetorical Composition*, 82-84. In the classical handbooks see *Rhet. Her*. 4.33; Quint. *Inst*. 8.6.59-61

[80]Croy (*Endurance in Suffering*, 37-76) points to the metaphor of the ἀγών, or athletic contest (12:1). In the classical handbooks see Arist. *Rh.* 3.2.8-13; *Rhet. Her.* 34.45; Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.71; 8.6.4-18. Croy (*Enduring in Suffering*, 71-73) likewise, observes that Hebrews follows the lead of Aristotle in placing enthemenic proofs before proofs based on example. See Arist. *Rh*. 2.20.9; see also [Arist.] *Rh. Al.* 32.9-40; *Rhet. Her.* 4.3.5. Enthymemes are the rhetorical equivalent of syllogisms in logic. They often appear in abbreviated or incomplete form (Lanham, *Handlist*, 41). Bitzer argues that the distinguishing mark of an Enthymeme is that the major premise is assumed to be accepted by all the parties in the discussion. See, L. F. Bitzler, "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited," in *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric*, ed. K.V. Erickson, 141-155 (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1974). They are at the core of Aristotle's conceptualization of rhetoric.

[81]Cosby (*Rhetorical Composition*, 41) declares that "no responsible commentator fails to mention ... the anaphoric use of πίστει in [Heb] 11:3-31." He further notes this as the "dominant rhetorical technique in Hebrews 11." The structure and usefulness of the technique of anophora is outlined in *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19; and Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.30.

[82]For discussion of *synkrisis* in the classical sources see, Quin. *Inst*. 9.2.100.

*The Genre of Rhetoric Exampled in Hebrews*

Going back at least as far as Aristotle, ancient rhetoric was customarily divided into three genres: forensic, epideictic and deliberative.[83] Modern students of ancient rhetoric–including those who see Aristotle's work as generally quite idiosyncratic–recognize that this three-fold classification is fundamental to ancient rhetorical theory and practice.[84] If Hebrews represents a sample of ancient rhetoric, which genre is represented?

In the early twentieth century attempts were made to identify Hebrews as judicial rhetoric.[85] Hebrews contains a number of terms which probably derive ultimately from the legal sphere (for example, πρᾶγμα, ἀντιλογία, βεβαίωσις, ὅρκος).[86] Further it possible to detect a resemblance between the work as a whole and "a systematic putting of a case, or a 'counsel's opinion'."[87] However, despite the presence of elements possibly derived from judicial rhetoric it is generally recognized

---

[83]G. A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 72. See, Arist. *Rh.*, 1.3.3.

[84]See, R. D. Anderson, Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (CBET 18; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 39-40. Not all ancient rhetorical theorists accepted this division. For example, Quintilian (*Inst.* 3.4.1-16) mentions several other proposed classifications but defends the traditional three-fold grouping He points out that other more complex systems of classification can be collapsed into Aristotle's three basic categories in any case.

[85]See, for example, T. Haering, "Gedankengang und Grundgedanken des Hebräerbriefs," *ZNW* 18 (1917-18): 153-63, and H. Windisch, *Der Hebräerbrief*, HNT 14. (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1931), 8. According to Lane (*Hebrews 1-8*, lxxvii), Haering and Windisch were following the older work of H. von Soden, as represented in his *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1899), 8-11.

[86]R. O. P. Taylor, "A Neglected Clue in Hebrews xi.1," *ET* 52 (1941): 256-59.

[87]Ibid., 258

today that Hebrews is not forensic rhetoric, which deals with guilt and innocence in the context of the law court.[88] "No-one today would follow von Sodon in identifying Hebrews with forensic rhetoric."[89]

The choice between epideictic and deliberative is much more difficult to make.[90] Epideictic rhetoric assigns praise and blame with the implied intention of encouraging or discouraging certain behaviour. A case can be made for seeing Hebrews as a whole in this light and without question parts of Hebrews, at least, appear to function in exactly this way.[91] Good examples are found in chapters 3-4, which cast blame on the wilderness generation, and chapter 11 which extols the virtues of past "heroes of faith." However, deliberative rhetoric deals with promoting or discouraging future action and Hebrews is clearly concerned with the possible actions of the congregation being addressed, whether they be understood as full scale apostasy or simply a slide into spiritual lethargy. This is the certain implication of its frequent exhortations (2:1-4; 3:1, 7-14; 4:1, 11, 14-16; 6:1-3; 10:19-39; 12:1-13:19).

In analyzing the genre of Hebrews, the balance of probability favours seeing it as deliberative rhetoric.[92] This position can be defended on the basis of four strands of

---

[88]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 110.

[89]Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, lxxvii; c.f., Koester, *Hebrews*, 82.

[90]Olbricht ("Amplification," 378) notes "Hebrews best conforms to the epideictic genre in its superstructure even though the body of the argument may be conceived as deliberative."

[91]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 14; McCruden, "Perfection of Divine Intimacy," 226; Reumann, *Variety and Unity*, 168.

[92]So also, Lindars, "Rhetorical Structure," 382-406; Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 214-19; deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 28; and Mitchell, "Rhetorical Propriety," 689; T. E. Schmidt, "Moral Lethargy and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *WTJ* 54 (1992): 169.

evidence. First, Aristotle distinguishes epideictic and deliberative rhetoric, in part, on the basis of the audience being addressed. Epideictic rhetoric addresses spectators; deliberative rhetoric addresses participants.[93] The frequent blocks of paraenesis in Hebrews indicate that the original recipients of the document were participants being asked directly to make a decision regarding their own future actions.

Second, epideictic rhetoric is "superficially, at least, . . . typically ceremonial."[94] Deliberative rhetoric, on the other hand, being concerned with the future involves an element of prediction and consequently argues for conclusions which "are in principle testable."[95] Again, it is clear that Hebrews resorts to predictions of future consequences on several occasions. If these predictions are not empirically testable it is because *Auctor* has, in effect, resorted to a form of "eschatological verification."[96]

Third, when the ancient rhetorical handbooks deal with religious discussion it is in the context of deliberative rhetoric. For example, *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* declares

---

[93]Arist. *Rh.* I.iii.2.

[94]A. O. Rorty, "Structuring Rhetoric" in *Essays on Aristotle's* <u>*Rhetoric*</u>*,* ed. A. O. Rorty (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1996), 3.

[95]Ibid., 6.

[96]This term derives from John Hick who argues that from a philosophical point of view, the existence of God is verifiable–but only after death: if the soul of the deceased arrived in heaven, the existence of God would thereby be verified for that person. See, J. Hick "Theology and Verification" in *The Existence of God: A Reader*, ed. J. Hick (New York: MacMillan, 1964), 253-74; reprinted from *Theology Today*, 17 (1960): 12-31. In an analogous way, Hebrews predicts eschatological consequences for the actions of the congregation being addressed: either entry into the heavenly city or loss of the rewards of salvation.

> [T]he subjects about which we shall make public speeches in council are seven in number: our deliberations and speeches in council and in parliament must necessarily deal with either *religious ritual*, or legislation, or the form of the constitution, or alliances and treaties with other states, or war, or peace, or finance. . . . In speaking about rites of religion, three lines can be taken: either we shall say that we ought to maintain the established ritual as it is, or that we ought to alter it to a more splendid form, or alter it to a more modest form.[97]

Finally, rhetors are expressly said to be able to make use of a given rhetoric genre in composing or giving a speech which is predominantly in a different rhetorical genre. Thus Aristotle writes,

> The end of the deliberative speaker is the expedient or harmful; for he who exhorts recommends a course of action as better, and he who dissuades advises against it as worse; *all other considerations, such as justice and injustice, honour and disgrace are included as accessory in reference to this*.[98]

In a similar way the *Rhetoricia ad Alexandrium* declares,

> All the species of oratory have now been distinguished they are to be employed both separately, when suitable, and jointly, with a combination of their qualities–for though they have very considerable differences, yet *in their practical application they overlap*.[99]

Thus the presence of epideictic features in Hebrews in no way precludes seeing the work as deliberative rhetoric.[100] Modern researchers, such as Lauri Thurén, consequently argue that the entire question of whether Hebrews is an example of

---

[97][Arist.] *Rh. Al.* 2. 22-34, emphasis added. See also Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.15, 29. On the basis of such comments in classical writers Zweck provides a study of one New Testament speech as an example of deliberative rhetoric. See D. Zweck, "The *Exoridum* of the Areopagus Speech, Acts 17:22,23," *NTS* 35 (1989): 94-103.

[98]Arist. *Rh*, 1.3.5

[99][Arist.] *Rh. Al.*, 5.30-36. See also [Arist.] *Rh. Al.*, 3.18-19; *Rhet. Her.*, 3.8.15.

[100]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 110.

deliberative or epideictic rhetoric may be misguided. They suggest that the work may be epideictic on one level and deliberative on another.[101]

**Objections to the Use of Rhetorical Criticism**

A number of objections have been raised to the use of classical rhetorical criticism as a heuristic device for exploring the meaning of the New Testament.

One such objection insists that New Testament documents did not, in fact, arise in any of the settings stipulated for the original rhetorical genres. Dean Anderson, for example, declares that it is "pretty pointless" to assign a work to a specific genre without coupling this to "an investigation of the argumentative techniques specific to each genre," because "it all came down to certain kinds of τόποι (*loci*) which were specific to the various genres"[102] This is undoubtedly correct, as far as it goes. Essentially the same objection has been made against the earlier methodology of form criticism.[103] Indeed, Jack Lundbom argues in favour of rhetorical criticism in preference to form criticism at precisely this point.[104] However,

---

[101]L. Thurén, "The General New Testament Writings," in *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. S. E. Porter, (Leiden: Brill Academic, 2001), 588. See also, Buck, "Rhetorical Arrangement," 83; see also deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 35; Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 187.

[102]Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory*, 83.

[103]Walton notes that "rhetorical criticism is a parallel, but not identical, discipline to form criticism." See S. Walton, "Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction," *Themelios* 21 (1996): 4-9. It should be noted that by "rhetorical criticism" Walton means classical rhetorical criticism. His observation is not correct for those forms of rhetorical criticism which are more strongly informed by postmodernism.

[104]J. Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*, SBLDS 18 (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975), 9-13. Lundbom is obviously not concerned with New Testament form criticism but the methodological concerns he raises as readily transferable to the study of the New Testament.

in both cases, the objection fails because the application of both form criticism and rhetorical criticism recognizes that genres or forms originating in one context can be applied in situations which are in some sense *analogous*. No-one seriously contends that a prophetic "covenant law-suit" entailed a literal proceeding in a court room. Rather the prophets employed a legal "form" in an analogous way. Failure to recognize this leads to "hermeneutic 'transubstantiation' or substantializing of metaphor into reality".[105] Similarly, it can be easily recognized that Christian preaching and exhortation involved attempts at persuasion leading to actions. The analogy with the activities in a parliamentary context during a time of crisis is very obvious. The weakness of the objection becomes particularly clear when it is realized that even rhetorical theorists of the classical period saw Aristotle's three-fold division of rhetoric inclusively. Quintilian wrote: "Aristotle, with his three divisions of rhetoric–Forensic, Deliberative and Epideictic–also brought virtually everything within the orator's sphere; *for there is nothing that does not come under these heads*."[106] Not only so, but classical handbooks actually specify religious ritual as an appropriate topic for rhetorical disputation.[107]

A closely related objection declares that classical rhetoric deals with spoken communication whereas the New Testament consists of written documentation. Some scholars, including Stanley Porter, Jeffery Reed and Carl Classen, draw a fairly sharp line between the two systems of communication, pointing out that most ancient

---

[105]B. Gemser, "The *Rib*- or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley*, VTS 3, ed. M. Noth and D. W. Thomas, (Leiden: Brill, 1960), 128.

[106]Quint. *Inst.* 2:23, emphasis added.

[107]See above, p. 72..

rhetorical handbooks make no reference to writing (except perhaps in regard to style). This situation changes to any significant degree only in the later Roman period.[108]

This objection has a certain force but it is not difficult to extend it beyond its legitimate bounds.[109] In the ancient world reading–even in private–was usually done out loud, not least of all because *scripta continua* was more easily read with individual syllables being sounded out.[110] Indeed, Aristotle recommends that Ὅλως δὲ δεῖ εὐανάγνωστον εἶναι τὸ γεγραμμένον καὶ εὔγραστον· ἔστι δε τὸ αὐτό (Generally speaking, that which is written should be easy to read or easy to utter, *which is the same thing*).[111] Hundreds of years later, St. Augustine expressed surprise at seeing his mentor, Ambrose of Milan, reading *silently*.[112] Thus, normally, even a

---

[108]S. E. Porter, "The Theoretical Justification for Application of Rhetorical Categories to Pauline Epistolary Literature," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 100-22. See also, J. T. Reed, "Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 292-324 ; C. J. Classen, "St Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 265-92.

[109]For a warning against overdrawing the distinctions between oral and written communication in the ancient world see, Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 106-07.

[110]F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Tyndale, 1951), 191. For more recent discussion of the same issue see, P. J. Achtemeier, "*Omne Verbum Sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity," *JBL* 109 (1990): 3-27; H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 203-04. A significantly different viewpoint is expressed by F. D. Gilliard, "More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non Omne Verbum Sonabat*," *JBL* 112 (1993): 698-96.

[111]Arist. *Rh* 3.5.6; emphasis added.

[112] August. *Conf.* 6.3. This should not necessarily be taken to indicate that Ambrose was the first person in antiquity to read silently. See M. Slusser, "Reading

written document had some features of orality inherent in it. This is especially the case if the document was intended to be read to a group for purposes of persuasion, as the New Testament letters were.[113] Not only so, but Aristotle makes it clear that even in his time there was a recognized overlap between writing and at least some forms of rhetoric. He declares, Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπιδεικτική λέξις γραφικωτάτη· Τὸ γὰρ ἔργον αὐτῆς ἀνάγνωσις· δευτέρα δὲ ἡ δικανική. ("The epideictic style is especially suited to written compositions, for its function is reading; and next to it comes the forensic style"). [114]

There were in classical times, as there are now, a variety of *types* of letters. Numerous typologies attempted at varying degrees of length and depth have come down from the classical world.[115] Reed notes:

> Therefore, it is not surprising that some of the epistolary types parallel the three sub-genres of rhetoric. Such functional parallels do not necessarily indicate, however, that an author patterned his or her letter after the rhetorical handbooks. Rather, the similarities may simply be due to culturally-shared means of argumentation. In other words, argumentation is universal as well as particular. Groups within the society (for example, rhetors and philosophers) may have developed and classified ways of "persuading others" to serve their own needs. Thus *functions* of judicial, deliberative , and epideictic "species" of rhetoric would likely have been used in various literary contexts such

---

Silently in Antiquity," *JBL* 111 (1992): 499.

[113]On the significance of orality for the interpretation of the Pauline epistles see, P. J. J. Botha, "The Verbal Act of the Pauline Letters: Rhetoric, Performance and Presence," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 409-28.

[114] Arist. *Rh* 3.12.6. See also Arist. *Rh* 3.1.7.

[115]Reed refers to the typologies of Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Apollonius of Tyana, Demetrius of Phalerum, Libanius, and others. See, J. T. Reed, "The Epistle," in *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. S. E. Porter (Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997), 172-74.

as the letter. This functional overlap between the rhetorical species and epistolary types is demonstrated in the epistolary theorists.[116]

The use of rhetorical technique in philosophical writings provides a useful parallel. From the time of Plato onwards philosophy and rhetoric had an antagonistic relationship, coming to reconciliation only in the writings of Cicero and beyond.[117] Notwithstanding this antagonism philosophical writings often manifest rhetorical features. Speaking specifically of the philosophical genre of protreptic, Dirk Schenkeveld notes "The very aim of protreptic, to win over someone to study philosophy, *a priori* makes the view probable that this kind of text uses persuasive techniques found in rhetoric."[118] Exactly the same sort of situation exists with regard to the exhortatory writings of the New Testament.

Further, letters were generally regarded as substitutes for conversation.[119] However, it is surely more correct to regard the New Testament epistles as being substitutes for sermons rather than substitutes for conversations. Certainly Hebrews, along with many of the Pauline Epistles, was substantially longer than the typical "conversational" letters known from antiquity. [120]

Porter objects that the use of classical rhetorical methodology gives the impression that these methods of rhetorical construction were actually used in the

---

[116]Ibid., 174.

[117]D. M. Schenkeveld, "Philosophical Prose," in *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. S. E. Porter (Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997), 197-202.

[118]Ibid., 205.

[119]See for example, Sen., *Ep.* 75:1-2.

[120]Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory*, 93-109.

composition of the New Testament–an impression, which he claims, finds no support in the New Testament itself.[121] This may be true in general, although the pervasiveness of the rhetoric in the classical world makes it unlikely that anyone in the Greco-Roman world of the apostles trying to gain a hearing in Gentile (and diaspora Jewish) world would not have used such rhetorical techniques. Their use in Hebrews is especially likely, if Hebrews was originally composed not simply as a letter to be read to the church, but as an actual homily in written form.[122]

Amador further objects that the classical model of rhetorical criticism entails an uncritical acceptance of Lloyd Bitzer's situational understanding of Rhetoric.[123] Bitzer developed a model which understands rhetoric as a response to the situation–the "rhetorical situation"–just as an answer comes as a response to a question.[124] Bitzer's critics find this view far too deterministic.[125] However, Bitzer

---

[121]Porter, "Theoretical Justification," 109-110.

[122]A. Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1-2*, LD 58 (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1969), 24-26. This is not to suggest that there are not significant differences between a sermon and an example of classical oratory. Ford provides a substantial list such differences. See, D. Ford, "A Rhetorical Study of Certain Pauline Addresses" (PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1960), 522-30.

[123]Amador, *Academic Constraints*, 27-31.

[124]L. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," in *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*, ed. W. A. Covino and D. A. Jolliffe (Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), 300-10, reprinted from *PR* 1 (1968): 1-14.

[125]R. E. Vatz, "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation,' in *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*, ed. W. A. Covino and D. A. Jolliffe (Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), 461-67, reprinted from *PR* 6 (1973): 154-61. For a somewhat more nuanced statement of this objection see D. L. Stamps, "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: The Entextualization of the Situation in New Testament Epistles," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 193-210.

has been misunderstood and/or misrepresented at this point, as John Patton points out.[126] He is certainly not saying that rhetoric follows from a rhetorical situation as effect follows from cause. Rather he is saying that the rhetorical situation provides that opportunity for a rhetorical explanation and response to be given. The nature of that response, the elements of the situation highlighted by the response and the course of action recommended are in the hands of the rhetor and not the rhetorical situation.

A further objection is that classical rhetorical criticism has not broken away from an historical interest.[127] The rhetoric of scripture is now studied for not its own sake, but for the sake of making historical judgement. Amador dismisses such an approach, somewhat contemptuously as "neo-form criticism."[128]

It is quite correct to see classical rhetorical criticism as a fundamentally historical endeavour. This is readily acknowledged by practitioners of the art.[129] What is open to challenge is the implication that this state of affairs is somehow a negative thing. It is true that post-modernism has destroyed the paradigm of "objective" history and has brought the role of the observer into clear focus in any act

---

[126]J. H. Patton, "Causation and Creativity in Rhetorical Situations: Distinctions and Implications," *QJS* 65 (1979): 39-44.

[127]S. E. Porter, "Ancient Rhetorical Analysis and Discourse Analysis of the Pauline Corpus," in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 146 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 259.

[128]Amador, *Academic Constraints*, 23. K. Berger also uses the term "neo-form criticism" but in a much more positive way than Amador. See, K. Berger, "Rhetorical Criticism, New Form Criticism and New Testament Hermeneutics" in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht, JSNTSS 90 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 390-96.

[129]See, for example, M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians,* HUT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1991), 7; and Kennedy, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 4

of observation. However, this does not make it impossible or illegitimate to engage in historical study. Rhetorical criticism does not necessarily mean the abandonment of all previous historical-critical research and the making of a completely fresh start. Rather, rhetorical criticism can be seen as a means of complementing prior historical-critical research and building upon the results of that research. [130]

## Conclusion

Hebrews has been an object of study since its production. Issues, such as authorship, which perplexed some of the greatest minds of the early church remain unsolved today. Indeed, the growing consensus is that they are, in fact, insoluble. More than a century of rigorous historical investigation has produced very meagre results indeed. Nothing resembling a positive consensus has emerged regarding authorship, destination, date, provenance, the ethnicity of the recipients, or, the purpose of *Auctor*.

The time is ripe for different approaches. In the past thirty years numerous studies have been made of Hebrews which have been less oriented to historical concerns. It should not be thought that such approaches, for most part, are necessarily mutually exclusive to historical concerns, but can rather be seen as complementary to historical research.

One approach which seems promising in light of the recognized emphasis on orality in Hebrews, is rhetorical criticism. Many of the criticisms brought against rhetorical criticism of the bible in general have less validity in the case of Hebrews than most other biblical documents. This is because of both the origins of this work

---

[130]See above, pp. 47-48.

in an oral context–preaching–rather than a literary one–letter writing–and because of the evident rhetoric skill of the man who produced the work originally. His skills, conceivably reflecting formal education in rhetoric, are on constant display in the work. Richard Spencer rightly observes that "The craftsmanship of the author of Hebrews is more than decoration, however. Each of the rhetorical features used by the writer is purposeful and effective."[131]

If the originator put such effort into producing a rhetorical work, then rhetorical criticism is a legitimate heuristic tool to use in exploring that work. Such usage has considerable promise for clarifying some of the problems of the book. The following chapter is concerned with elucidating precisely one of those problems.

---

[131]R. A. Spencer, review of *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11: In Light of Example Lists in Antiquity*, by Michael R. Cosby, *FM* 7 (1989): 94.

## CHAPTER 3

## THE ARGUMENTATIVE PURPOSE OF HEBREWS

A crucial–perhaps the most crucial–characteristic of classical rhetoric is its deliberately persuasive nature. Since Hebrews is a carefully produced example of ancient rhetoric, the question of its purpose is clearly an important one.[1] Of what are the readers intended to be persuaded? The question is even more appropriate once the generic designation of "sermon" is accepted for the work. Not only were early Christian sermons examples of the rhetorical art, but they also functioned as the means of persuasion with the purpose of leading to specific actions.[2] The book of Acts, when depicting sermons, always incorporates a call for action.[3] It follows that

---

[1]The question can be restated in other ways. For example, Johnson (*Writings*, 463) declares Hebrews to contain "the longest sustained argument in the NT." What is the goal of that argument?

[2]L. Wills, "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity," *HTR* 77 (1984): 277-299; C. C. Black, II, "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills," *HTR*, 81 (1988): 1-18.

[3]This point is valid, regardless of the historicity of the sermons in Acts, or the date of their composition or that of the book as a whole. For a variety of perspectives on the speeches of Act (including the sermons), see E. Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1966), 208-16; M. Wilcox, "A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts," in *Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults*, ed. J. Neusner, SJLA 12 (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004 [Reprint: Leiden: Brill, 1975]), 1: 206-25; H. J. Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts," in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5 vols.,
ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1979 [Reprint: London: Macmillian, 1922-1932]), 5: 402-26 ; F. F. Bruce, "The Speeches of Acts–Thirty Years After," in *Reconciliation and Hope*, ed. R. Banks (Grand Rapids,

the paraenetic sections of Hebrews are crucial for understanding the purpose of the work as a whole.[4] In them *Auctor* urges his readership to *action*.

The first of the hortatory passages (2:1-4) is particularly significant in that it lays the foundation for all that follows in subsequent exhortations. The pericope opens with the specific exhortation: Διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν, μήποτε παραρυῶμεν (2:1). The opening adverbial phrase shows that this exhortation provides the purpose for the exposition found in chapter 1.[5] The focus of concern is that the recipients of the message not "drift away" (παραρρέω) from "what we had heard" (τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν). Jeffery Lickliter's remark that the "purpose for the writing of this sermonic epistle was to encourage and exhort the audience not to forsake the faith" would seem to be quite apt.[6] The cause of this drifting and the eventual destination of those who might drift is disputed in modern scholarship.[7] However, the fact that *Auctor* saw the recipients as being in

---

MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 53-68; and, M. Dibelius, *Studies in the Book of Acts* (London: SCM, 1956) [Tranlation of *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951)].

[4]McCown (*ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ*, 1) lists the following seven passages of Hebrews under the heading of hortatory: 2:1-4; 3-4; 5:11-6:20; 10:19-39; 11; 12; 13. Manson (*Hebrews*, 47) correctly notes that the exhortatory passages, "are of very great interest as showing how the author envisaged the religious situation of the particular society to which he was writing."

[5]Übelacker (*Hebräerbrief*, 153) observes that here διὰ τοῦτο could equally refer back to 1:14, 1:5-14 or all of Heb 1.

[6]J. N. Lickliter, "The Superiority of the Son in Hebrews 1:5-14: Introductory Formulas and Contextual Understanding of the Old Testament in the Book of Hebrews," (master's thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004), 10.

[7]Mackie (*Eschatology*, 11-17), after noting that *Auctor* expresses the threats to the community in three ways (passive dangers; active dangers; and, external threats), presents a summary of the five main scholarly reconstructions of the systemic forces creating difficulties for the community: persecution; relapse to Judaism; waning

significant spiritual peril due to their "drifting" is indisputable. The lengthy exposition of the failures of the wilderness generation in Heb 3-4 contains three further exhortations not to respond with hardness of heart when the voice of God is "heard" (2:7, 15; 4:7). "Drifting away" entails a refusal to "hear." The later emphatic declaration of the impossibility of repentance for those who had abandoned the Christian faith further highlights that the main goal of the document was "to exhort the community to faithfulness and to encourage communal solidarity. Throughout the epistle the doctrinal exposition is integrated with parenesis in service of this objective."[8]

What was it that the recipients of the document were in danger of drifting from? In 2:3 ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν is more closely defined as τηλικαύτης . . . σωτηρίας which was both "spoken" (λαλεῖν) and heard (ἀκούειν). This message is rooted in the life and ministry of Jesus, attested by ear-witnesses, and divinely confirmed by the manifestation of spiritual gifts among the believers. Quite clearly, what had been heard was considered by *Auctor* to be the essence of Christian belief.[9] He is, in fact, referring to the basic Christian confession.[10] Käsemann suggests that

---

commitment; loss of social status; and, realized eschatology.

[8]S. Haber, "From Priestly Torah to Christ Cultus: The Re-Vision of Covenant and Cult in Hebrews," *JSNT* 28 (2005): 123; see also DeSilva, "Hebrews 6:4-8," 39.

[9]MacNeill, *Christology*, 45.

[10]The use of a masculine participle in 11:32 indicates *Auctor* is a man. Of course the possibility exists that the original text has a feminine participle which has been altered in the process of transmission, or that a female author was intentionally misleading as to her gender at this point. Such conjectures have allowed scholars to attempt to identify *Auctor* with both Priscilla and the Virgin Mary. Authorship by Priscilla was first proposed by A. von Harnack, "Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs," *ZNW* 1 (1900): 16-41 and was supported by J. R. Harris, "Sidelights on the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Sidelights on New*

ὁμολογία in Hebrews refers specifically to Christian liturgical formulations.[11] This is possible, although unprovable. Core aspects of the confession were doubtless incorporated into the early church's liturgy. Regardless of the precise source of the "confession", it is foundational to the argument of Hebrews.[12]

Hebrews uses the word "confession" (ὁμολογία) three times (2:1; 4:14; 10:23). *Auctor*'s use of this word in these later passages casts light on his meaning in 2:1.[13] In 2:1 the exhortation κατανοήσατε parallels the phrase δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ἡμᾶς in 2:1 However, in 2:1 κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν is also brought into immediate connection with κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, with the result that partaking of the heavenly calling is virtually synonymous with "our confession." If the former expression indicates the essence of entrance into membership of the Christian community, so too does the

---

*Testament Research: Seven Lectures Delivered in 1908 at Regent's Park College, London* (London: Clarke, 1908), 148-76. It has more recently been strongly defended by R. Hoppin, *Priscilla's Letter: Finding the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Fort Bragg, CA: Lost Coast, 1997). Marian authorship has been argued by J. M. Ford, "The Mother of Jesus and the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *TBT* 82 (1976): 683-94. In the present dissertation the text is taken at face value and *Auctor* is consistently identified by masculine pronouns.

[11]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 171.

[12]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 13

[13]Torrance's suggestion that the primary reference in these passages is to the confession made by Christ, as "High Priest as he enters within the veil" seems unsupported by the context. See T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, SJTOP 3 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1955), 12. Stine makes the same evaluation of Torrance' position. See D. M. Stine, "The Finality of the Christian Faith: A Study of the Unfolding Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews Chapters 1-7" (PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1964), 167.

latter.[14] Lane's summary seems to be accurate: "The term ὁμολογία, "confession" denotes a binding expression of obligation and commitment, the response of faith to the action of God."[15] Paul Ellingworth notes the implications of this and declares that *Auctor* is referring "specifically to the content of the Christian faith, perhaps to a fixed confessional formula or creed."[16]

In 4:14, once again the Christian confession is the object of exhortation: κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. The same is true in 10:23: κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογία. In Hebrews the avoidance of "drifting" away from what had been heard, means exactly the same as "paying attention" to the confession or "holding fast" to it.

---

[14]Numerous attempts have been made to demonstrate that the recipients of Hebrews were not "genuine" Christians, especially in the light of the "warning" passages in the book. See, for example, R. Nicole, "Some Comments on Hebrews 6:4-6 and the Doctrine of the Perseverance of God with the Saints," in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by his Former Students*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 355-64; W. Grudem, "Perseverance of the Saints: A case Study from Hebrews 6:4-6 and Other Warning Passages in Hebrews," in *The Grace of God, the Bondage of the Will*, 2 vols., ed. T.R. Schreiner and B.A. Ware (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1995), 1: 133-82; R. B. Compton, "Persevering and Falling Away: A Reexamination of Hebrews 6:4-6," *DBSJ* 1 (1996): 135-167. However, such endeavours do not necessarily entail a denial that the recipients were members of the church. Furthermore, such endeavours have been motivated by theological concerns, specifically the need to harmonise the reformed doctrine of "perseverence of the saints"–derived largely from the Pauline writings–with the data of Hebrews. DeSilva ("Hebrews 6:4-8," 43) correctly observes that it is invalid to give priority to Pauline expressions of faith over non-Pauline ones, such as are found in Hebrews.

[15]Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 75. At this point Lane is making a close paraphrase of O. Michel "ὁμολογέω, ἐξομολογέω, ἀνθομολογέομαι, ὁμολογία, ὁμολογουμένως" *TDNT*, 5: 216. In a similar way, Moffatt (*Hebrews*, 41) suggests that ὁμολογία is almost the equivalent of "our religion."

[16]Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 199.

## The Content of the Confession of the Hebrews

It is generally agreed that the confession of the community affirmed Jesus was the Son of God. Less consensus exists on the question of whether or not the confession included reference to belief in the High Priesthood of Jesus. The evidence relating to the content of the confession is canvassed here and the thesis that the confession included belief in the sonship, but not the priesthood of Jesus is defended.

### Jesus is the Son of God

If the confession was at the heart of *Auctor*'s concern, what was its content? Consideration of some of the structural features of the book is helpful in answering this question. Διὰ τοῦτο in 2:1 indicates that *Auctor* is drawing a conclusion from the argument in 1:5-14.[17] However, more can be said here. 2:1-4 is in many ways parallel to 1:1-4. Both passages refer to the "speaking" of God through the Son (ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, 1:1; λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, 2:3), to "us"; both contrast this divine speaking with prior speaking of God (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν, 1:1; ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγῶς, 2:2) and both sound the note of eschatological fulfilment (ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, 1:2; the distribution of spiritual gifts, 2:4).[18]

---

[17]See above, pp. 83-85.

[18]Admittedly Hebrews does not use the terminology of spiritual gifts, but it is generally recognized that this is the referent. See, for example, Westcott, *Hebrews*, 40; Hughes, *Hebrews,* 81; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 67; Koester, *Hebrews*, 207; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 142-43; D. B. Wallace, "Hebrews 2:3-4 and the Sign Gifts," http://www.bible.org/docs/soapbox/heb2-3-2.htm (accessed February 28, 2008). The coming of the Holy Spirit was an eschatological event in ancient Judaism. See, for example, Is 44:3; Ez 11:19; 26:26; Jl 2:28; Ps. Sol. 17:37; 18:7; 1 En 62:2; Test.. Levi 18:7, 11; Test. Jud. 24:2-3.

The bracketing of the 1:5-14 by passages dealing with the "message" suggests strongly that what those addressed had "heard" is outlined in 1:5-14. As Asahel Kendrick noted long ago, "the things which we have heard" (2:1) are "*the things which were heard* when God spoke to us through his Son."[19] This passage reviews the content of their creed. What is the focus of 1:5-14? This is not a difficult question to answer. Heb 1:5 contains the first use in this section of the word υἱός (which had been preceded by it two occurrences in the exordium) and the rest of chapter 1 is focused on this topic. The "closing bracket" for this section--2:1-4–does not use υἱός, but substitutes κύριος (2:3). However, the two words appear to be regarded as virtually synonymous by *Auctor*. Both the exordium and opening paraenesis are closed linked to the catena by adverbial prepositions–γάρ (1:5) and διὰ τοῦτο (2:1).[20] The Son is exalted, enthroned and high above the angels of heaven. The confession of the Hebrews concerns the Son. Indeed it could be summarized as "Jesus is the Son of God".[21] This very confession is alluded to elsewhere in the New Testament writings (Acts 9:20; 2 Cor 1:19; Gal 2:20; 1 John 4:15; 5:5, 10, 12-13; cf. Rom 1:4, as

---

[19]Kendrick, *Hebrews*, 28. See also Buck, "Rhetorical Arrangement," 134; B. Weiss, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, MKEK 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897), 63.

[20]D. R. Anderson, *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews*, StBL 21 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 145.

[21]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 45-47; see also R. Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ALGHJ 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 457; G. Bornkamm, "Das Bekenntnis im Hebräerbrief," in *Studien zu Antike und Urchristientum*, BZET 28 (Munich: C. Kaisar, 1959), 190; K. T. Schäfer. "KPATEIN ΤΗΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ (Hbr 4,14)," in *Die Kirche im Wandel der Zeit*, ed. F. Groner (Colonge: Bachem, 1971), 64; V. C. Pfitzner, *Chi Rho Commentary on Hebrews* (Adelaide, Lutheran Publishing House, 1979), 71.

well as Acts 8:37 which is textually suspect.[22] In fact the title "Son of God" can rightly be described as "einem der wichtigsten Begriffe in der urchristlichen Bekenntnistradition." [23] Furthermore, as Cullmann reminds us, it continued to have currency in the post-apostolic period (for example, Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, 61; *Dialogue with Tyrpho*, 30:3; Irenaeus, *Adversus Hereseas*, 1.10.1).[24]

The hints found in Heb 1 and 2 that the "confession" was that Jesus is the "Son of God" find strong confirmation elsewhere in the book. Mackie points out that it is "misconceptions and 'mis-confessions' of the Son of God [that] are diagnosed in the two key warning passages, 6:4-8 and 10:26-31 as the *non plus ultra* of apostacy."[25] In 13:15 the congregation is admonished to continue to offer sacrifices of praise to God, that is, "the fruit of the lips that confess his name" (καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ). This verse provides the "sole unequivocal designation and description of that confession."[26] The antecedent of the personal

---

[22]Acts 8:37 is unlikely to be part of the original text of Acts. However, as Zimmermann (*Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 45-46) points out it contains a very old confession none-the-less.

[23]Nomoto, "Herkunft und Structur," 12.

[24]O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* trans., J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutterworth, 1949; translation of *Les Premières Confessions de Foi Chrétiennes* [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1943]), 18-42. Cullmann (*Confessions*, 48-64) suggests that the basic form of the early church's confession, from which all others developed, is "Jesus is Lord." However, this goes beyond the available evidence. It is more likely that the church had a variety of complementary, perhaps even equivalent, confessions from earliest times. See, R. N. Longenecker, *New Wine into Fresh Wineskins: Contextualizing the Early Christian Confessions* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 6-47.

[25]Mackie, *Eschatology*, 226.

[26]S. D. Mackie, "Confession of the Son of God in Hebrews" *NTS* 53 (2007): 125.

pronoun αὐτός here is not Θεός. Rather the personal pronoun is but one of a series of pronouns that all refer back to Ἰησοῦς (13:12): "Jesus . . . by his own blood . . . . Let us . . . . bear the abuse he suffered . . . through him . . . . Through him . . . confess his name." The echo of the more excellent name inherited by the exalted Son (1:4) is unmistakable–and the two testimonies in 1:5-6 clear show that "name" is "Son".[27]

The significance of this confession in Hebrews is readily seen. The word υἱός is used directly of Jesus eleven or twelve times in the document (1:2, 5, 8; 2:6; 3:6; 4:14; 5:5, 8; 6:6; 7:3, 28; 10:29).[28] Some have suggested that "Sonship" is the "fundamental idea of the whole epistle."[29] Certainly the title "Son" connotes the superiority of Christ in Hebrews.[30] Alexander Balmain Bruce points out that in four major contrasts of Hebrews the superiority of Christ is grounded in his Sonship: the

---

[27]Both testimonies contain the word υἱός. The identification of the name as "Son" is generally recognized. See, for example, Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 17; Koester, *Hebrews*, 182; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 51; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 39. Some scholars have argued for different positions. For example, Ulrichsen argues that the name is "Lord" and Ellingworth suggests it is "high priest". See J. H. Ulrichsen, "Διαφορώτερον ὄνομα in Hebr 1:4: Christus als Trager des Gottesnamens," *ST* 38 (1984): 65-75; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 106. However, Ulrichsen's arguments depends more on texts outside of Hebrews, such as Phil 2:6-11 and Ellingworth's position is lacking in immediate contextual support.

[28]The uncertain here derives from the disputed exegetic question of whether of note υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου (2:6) applies directly to Jesus. Four of these uses of υἱός occur in scriptural citations (1:5; 8; 2:6; 5:5).

[29]A. B. Davidson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1882), 79.

[30]M. C. Parsons, "Son and High Priest: A Study in the Christology of Hebrews," *EQ* 60 (1988): 205. The title is introduced in the context of an extensive treatment of Jesus' superiority over the angels (1:4-13) and later serves to highlight his superiority of Moses (3:1-5). A. B. Bruce points out that in four major contrasts of Hebrews the superiority of Christ is grounded in his Sonship: the contrast between the old and new revelation (1:1-2); between Christ and the angels (1:4-5); between Christ and Moses (3:5-6); and between Christ's priesthood and the Levitical priesthood (7:27-28). See A. B. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The First Apology for Christianity* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1899), 34.

contrast between the old and new revelation (1:1-2); between Christ and the angels (1:4-5); between Christ and Moses (3:5-6); and between Christ's priesthood and the Levitical priesthood (7:27-28).[31] Daniel Harrington suggests that Hebrews explores in depth "the theological significance of the early Christian confession of faith that "Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scripture (1 Cor 15:3)."[32] This is basically correct although Christological affirmations appear more central to the argument of Hebrews than soteriological ones.

## The High Priesthood of Jesus and the Confession

The question of whether or not *Auctor* derived his priestly conception of Jesus from previously existing confessional materials has drawn radically different answers from different scholars. Georg Strecker, for example, declares that such statements "all derive from the author of Hebrews."[33] Others have argued that *Auctor* regards sonship and priesthood as identical categories.[34] Certainly, *Auctor* expresses the meaning of Sonship in priestly terms from the very beginning.[35] Moreover the theme

---

[31]A. B. Bruce, *Apology*, 34.

[32]D. J. Harrington, *What are they Saying about The Letter to the Hebrews* (New York: Paulist, 2005), 1.

[33]G. Strecker, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. E. Boring (New York: de Gruyter, 2000; translation of *Theologie des Neues Testaments*; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996), 610. See also Clarkson, "Antecedents," 89; and, Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 144.

[34]H-F. Weiss, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, MKEK 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 293, F. Laub, *Bekenntnis und Auslegung: Die Paränetische Funktion der Christologie im Hebräerbrief.* BU 15. (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1980), 14-15; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 53.

[35]Sabourin (*Priesthood*, 206) points out that a priestly work–the purification of sins–is attributed to the Son at the his first mention in Hebrews (1:2-3). See also Ellingworth, "Reading," 81.

of the heavenly high priesthood of Jesus continues to be interwoven with that of Sonship (for example., 5:5-6; 7:28-8:1).[36] However, Mackie correctly argues against this conclusion that "the Son of God Christology is in every way antecedent to the high priestly Christology."[37] He points to the "sonship emphasis within the 'decisive control centres' (3.14-16; 10.19-25)" and the importance of "misconceptions and 'mis-confessions' of the Son of God [which] are disagnosed in the two key warning passages, 6.4-8 and 10.26-31, as the *non plus ultra* of apostacy."[38] Still others have argued that sonship and priesthood, although distinct concepts, were both derived from tradition. This is supported by the fact that the priestly designation is introduced it is given no immediate clarification (2:17)–as though it was already well understood in the community.[39] Attridge writes, with specific reference to 3:1, "That such confessional formulas included explicit references to Christ as 'apostle' and 'high priest' is certainly possible", adding in a footnote that it was actually a "probability."[40] Similarly, Gerhard Friedrich notes that the priestly understanding of Jesus "nicht ein Speziellehre vom Verfasser der Hebräerbriefs ist, sondern daß sie tief in Glauben und

---

[36]Ungeheuer, *Der große Priester*, 88.

[37]Mackie, "Confession" 126. See also the earlier arguments of Pfitzner (*Hebrews*, 71-72).

[38]Mackie, "Confession" 126.

[39]A. Stadelmann, "Zum Christologie des Hebräerbreifes in der neueren Diskussion," in *Theologische Berichte 2*, ed. J. Pfammatter and F. Furger (Zürich: Zwingli, 1973), 165. See also Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 27.

[40]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 108. See also, J. W. Thompson, "Hebrews 5:11-14 and Greek *Paideia*" in *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, CBQMS 13 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 31; Powell, "High Priest," 388; J-C. Margot, "La christologie de l'épître aux Hébreux" *FV* 62 (1963): 307; Burns, "Hebrews," 184-89; MacNeill, *Christology*, 40; Manson, *Hebrews*, 54; Stine, "Finality" 167.

Kultus der Urgemeinde verwurzelt ist."[41] Detailed studies by Loader and Zimmermann have concluded that elements of Hebrews which emphasize the *earthly* priestly activities of Jesus are derived from tradition, whereas those elements which emphasize the heavenly priestly ministry of Jesus are derived from *Auctor*.[42] Jürgen Roloff concludes to the contrary, that "Dieser Prädikat [that is, Hohepriester] gehörte in der Tradition sicherlich nicht dem Irdischen, sonder dem Erhöhten."[43] 3:1 provides most important support for seeing the attribution of a priestly role to Jesus in earlier traditions utilized by *Auctor*: κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν. If Jesus is the "High Priest of our confession" does that mean the confession affirms that he is high priest? Manson concluded that it does: "Christianity as known to the writer [of Hebrews] is the confession of Jesus Christ as our High-Priest, and this for him is as momentous as the confession 'Jesus is Lord' is for St. Paul." [44]

Certainly such an interpretation of these words, taken in isolation, is possible. However, it is not the only possibility and it is open to challenge on a number of

---

[41]G. Friedrich, "Das Leid vom Hohenpriester im Zusammenhang von Hebr. 4,14-5–5,10," *TZ* 18 (1962): 111; see also B. Heininger, "Sündenreinigung (Hebr 1,3): christologische Anmerkungen zum Exordium des Hebräerbriefs" *BZ* 41 n.s. (1997): 67.

[42]This conclusion is reflected throughout in Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester* and Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*.

[43]J. Roloff, "Der mitleiden Hohepriester: Zur Frage nach der Bedeutung des irdischen Jesus für die Christologie des Hebräerbriefes" in *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentlich Festchrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. G. Strecker (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1975), 163.

[44]Manson, *Hebrews*, 58. See also H. Zimmermann, *Die Hohepriester-Christologie des Hebräerbriefes* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1964), 10; Nomoto, "Herkunft und Structur," 11; Vos, *Teaching,*, 91.

grounds: The meaning of ὁμολογία, contextual factors, *Auctor*'s use of traditional materials, the lack of evidence for early "high priest" confessions, and the rhetorical structure of the book.[45]

**The Meaning of ὁμολογία**

It has already been suggested that ὁμολογία refers to the *content* of a confession of faith, rather than to the *act* of confessing.[46] It follows that 3:1 does not have to mean that the Christians addressed by *Auctor* were confessing Jesus as "apostle and high priest.[47] Any statement of faith has implications beyond its actual content. "The main element of Roman worship was the sacrifice."[48] The earliest Christians must have puzzled anyone who considered them. They were religious but had no priest, no sacrificial cultus, and no visible holy place![49] It is certainly conceivable that *Auctor* means that Jesus is the apostle and high priest *implied* by the confession "Jesus is the Son of God." Karl Schäfer notes in this regard that the

---

[45]As long ago as 1955, Schille argued on redactional grounds that traditional material used in Hebrews did not contain any reference to Christ's heavenly high-priesthood (although he admits it did contain references to priestly activities by the earthly Jesus). See G. Schille, "Erwägungen zur Hohepriesterlehre Hebräerbriefes," *ZNW* 46 (1955): 101.

[46]See above, pp. 85-86.

[47]The rendering of 3:1 in the New International Version is particularly misleading: "Therefore, holy brothers, who share in the heavenly calling, fix your thoughts on *Jesus, the apostle and high priest whom we confess*." Similarly, Powell's comment ("High Priest," 388) that 3:1 refers to "he whom we name as high priest in our common and basic profession of faith" has a quite inaccurate emphasis.

[48]B. Gadigow, "Roman Religion," in *ABD* 5: 812.

[49]G. A. Barton, "The Date of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL*, 57 (1938): 198. See also C. F. D. Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *JTS* n.s., 1 (1950): 29-41.

ascension of Jesus into heaven and his being seated at the right hand of God is a feature of many early Christian confessions. Ps 109:2 (LXX) was important for establishing this point in the early church. The same Psalm is used by Hebrews in relation to the priesthood of Christ. The entrance into heaven is expressed as the entrance into the true most holy place (9:24-26).[50]

Zimmermann objects to this conclusion, arguing that the similarity of 3:1 and 4:14 suggest that both ἀπόστολος and ἀρχιερεύς belonged to the confession of the community addressed in Hebrews.[51] The two verses each combine a Christological title, the name Ἰησους, the word ὁμολογία, and the phrase υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, thus:

- κατανοή
- Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν . . . Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. (4:14).

Zimmermann's arguments fail to convince on a number of grounds. First, it should be noted that the elements pointed to by Zimmermann are related to each other differently in the two verses. In 4:14 the word ὁμολογία is not related to the title ἀρχιερεύς by means of a genitive as it is in 3:1. Actually, nothing in 4:14 suggests that ἀρχιερεύς is part of the confession. It is difficult to see how it can thereby lend support to the suggestion that ἀρχιερεύς is part of the confession mentioned in 3:1.

Second, the absence of ἀπόστολος in 4:14 means that this verse can lend absolutely no support to this term being considered part of the confession in 3:1, and may even suggest the contrary. However, the two words are so closely connected in

---

[50]Schäfer, "ΚΡΑΤΕΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ," 67.

[51]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffung*, 48-49.

3:1 that any weakness in the case of seeing ἀπόστολος as part of the confession transfers inevitably to ἀρχιερεύς also.

The use of ὁμολογία in 10:23 provides a more useful comparison with 3:1 : κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ. It is certainly not necessary to conclude from this verse that *Auctor* and the recipients of Hebrews included some explicit eschatological statement in their confession of faith. This clearly seems not to be the case. A statement along the lines of "We have this hope . . . ." is absent from the earliest known creedal statements. An eschatological emphasis is absent from most of the early creedal statements discussed by John Leith. His list of traditional credos quoted in the New Testament include one with some explicit eschatological focus: Phil 2:6-11, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth." This note is thereafter absent in the creeds until the "Profession of the Presbyters of Smyrna" (180 C.E.).[52] However, the confessions of the early church had eschatological implications. Hope was implicit in it rather than affirmed by it.

The issue of the content of the "confession" of the community *Auctor* is addressing is crucial for this thesis. His purpose is to bolster the community's commitment to the confession. If the priesthood of Jesus is part of that confession, *Auctor*'s strong emphasis on priesthood is readily understood within that purpose. If the priesthood of Jesus was not part of the confession, *Auctor's* emphasis needs further explanation. However, the use of the word ὁμολογία does not necessarily indicate that the priesthood (or apostleship) of Jesus were part of the community's

---

[52]*Creeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*, ed. J. H. Leith (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1963), 14-18.

confession. Context could suggest that it was part of the confession, but the immediate context of 3:1 strongly suggests that it was not.

**Contextual Factors**

Heb 3:1 introduces a comparison of Jesus and Moses.[53] A most unusual feature of the verse is the fact that it ascribes two particularly rare Christological titles to Jesus–Apostle and High Priest. Hebrews strikingly develops one of these titles (high priest) at length while saying nothing further on the other.[54] The use of "apostle" as a Christological title is unique to this verse in the entire New Testament.[55] The application to Jesus in this verse is unexpected and demands explanation. The fact that Jesus' apostleship is not developed further in Hebrews indicates that it is tangential to *Auctor*'s purpose. If this is so, why are these designations introduced here?

Käsemann's suggestion that the title here derives from its usage in the gnostic *Urmensch* myth illustrates the methodological weakness of his entire reconstruction: his reliance on late Mandaean sources to demonstrate the nature of "pre-Christian gnosticism."[56] The suggestion of Karl Rengstorf that the title derives from its use in

---

[53]Quintilian discusses the use of example and comparison in argument (Quin. *Inst.* 5.11.1-36). Some of his comments are particularly apt for 3:1-4: "but while Examples [*sic*.] are sometimes complete parallels (like the last one), they are sometimes taken "from greater to lesser" or "from lesser to greater" . . . Unequal parallels are particularly useful for exhortations" (Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.9-10). He later refers to "dissimilitudes in similars" (Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.30).

[54]Ellingworth, "Reading," 80.

[55]Among the early church fathers Justin Martyr uses ἀπόστολος Christologically in *Apol.* 12:9 and 63:10.

[56]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 153-54.

Jewish traditions for priests is more likely.[57] Nevertheless, if this were correct, it would be difficult to account for the failure of *Auctor* to further develop the title "apostle", given that priesthood remains one of his major foci. The solution proposed by Donald Stine is superficially attractive: ῾Ο ἀπόστολος emphasizes that God has *acted* in Jesus and ἀρχιερεύς stresses that continuing action."[58] However, in Hebrews the past work of Christ is regularly described in priestly, rather than apostolic terms (for example, 1:3; 2:17; 5:7). The most likely solution to this puzzle is that the designations were applied to Christ as an integral part of the comparison with Moses *because they had already been applied to Moses*.[59] In dealing with rhetorical proofs, Quintilian discusses examples and declares "all arguments of this kind must be either Similars or Dissimilars or Contraries."[60] It is easy to see how the suggested transfer of titles from Moses to Jesus in 3:1 enhances an argument of similarity.

---

[57]K. H. Rengstorf, "ἀποστέλλω (πέμπω), ἐξαποστγέλλω, ἀπόστολος, ψευδαπόστολος, ἀποστολή," in *TDNT* 1: 423. McNicol ("Relationship," 178) suggests that the idea of "representation", binds the concept of high priest and apostle together.

[58]Stine, "Finality" 169, emphasis his.

[59]J. Lierman, *The New Testament Moses: Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion*; WUNT 2/173 (Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2004), 65-78. See also Edwards, "Hebrews," 53; P. C. B. Andriessen, "La teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de He I 6 et II 14-III 2," *NovTest* 18 (1976): 312-13; E. L. Jones, "Jesus and Moses in the New Testament," *ET* 67 (1955/56): 105; M. R. D'Angelo, *Moses*, 65-94. As early as 1890, Bruce (*Apology*, 131) had taken the same position.

[60]Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.6.

*Moses as Apostle*

In the Jewish Scriptures Moses is said to have been "sent" from God (for example, Ex 3:10).[61] In later non-biblical Jewish literature Moses' "sentness" is also mentioned, although in the pre-Christian period a noun designating that role is generally absent. Both Josephus and the *Assumption of Moses* point to the fact of God having sent Moses.[62] In Samaritan literature Moses is commonly designated as one sent from God. Similarly, *Memar Marqah* refers to God who sent Moses. However, it goes further and explicitly attributes "apostleship" to Moses: "they believed in the True One and knew that the apostleship of Moses (שליחותה משה) was true."[63] Similarly, the later Jewish writings refer to Moses as the "apostle of the Creator of the Beginning" and the "apostle of the King of Glory."[64]

*Moses as Priest*

The Jewish Scriptures explicitly affirm Moses' descent from Levi (Ex 2:1) and Ps 99:6 ascribes the title "priest" both to him and to his brother Aaron. Furthermore,

---

[61]It is significant for the understanding of the comparison in 3:1-4 that Jesus is also described as having been sent by/from God, especially in the Johannine traditions (for example, John 3:34; 4:34; 5:23-24, 30; 36-38; 6:29, 38-39, 44, 57; 7:16-18, 28, 33; 8:16-18, 26, 29, 42; 9:4; 10:26; 11:42; 12:44-49; 13:20; 14:24; 15:21; 16:5; 17:3, 8, 18-26; 20:21 ). Of course, the Johannine traditions also contain highly developed comparisons of Jesus and Moses. See T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, SBT 40 (London: SCM, 1963).

[62]Jos. *Ant.* 2.274; *As. Mos.* 11:17

[63]*Mem. Mar.*, 2.9. The traditions included in this work are older than the written document but dating them with any precision is impossible. In any case, there does appear to be some connection between the Jewish concept of שלה and the concept of "apostle" in the early church (Rengstorf, "ἀποστέλλω," 400-03; 413-20). See also C. K. Barrett, *The Signs of an Apostle* (London: Epworth, 1970), 11-15.

[64]Lierman (*Moses*, 72) attributes these two designations of manuscript fragments found in the Cairo Genizah.

the Exodus narratives frequently describe Moses in essentially priestly roles. It was he who entered the presence of God to receive instruction for the people in the sanctuary itself (Ex 25:22), just as the high priest was to enter the inner sanctuary on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:12-15).

John Lierman points out that the description of Moses as a priest "crops up repeatedly" in a variety of pagan writers from around the time of the New Testament.[65] More important for our purposes is the widespread Jewish ascription of the designation "priest" to Moses in the same period, especially by Philo.[66] Beyond the designation of "priest", Moses is portrayed by Jewish writers of the same period as engaging in various priestly activities: sacrifice, oversight of tabernacle (especially in regard to its construction and consecration) and oversight of other priests, and taking responsibility for sanctifying the people.[67] The designation continues to be found in the later Rabbinic writings and in the Samaritan writings.[68] The Samaritan *Memar Marqah* declares:

> Where is the like of Moses and who can compare with Moses the servant of God, the faithful one of his House, who dwelt among the angels in the Sanctuary of the Unseen? They all honoured him when he abode with them. He was supplied from their provisions, satisfied from them. He was brought right in among them. He was a holy priest

---

[65]Ibid., 67. In such cases the reference is generally to his supposed *Egyptian* priesthood. See also J. G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, SBLMS 16 (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1972), 114-123.

[66]Philo, *Sac*. 130; *Spec. Leg*. 4.192; *Mos.* 1.334; 2.2-7, 16, 76, 187, 292; *Praem*. 53, 56. See also Ps. Philo, *LAB* 99.6

[67]On sacrifice, see, Jos. *Ant.* 2.269, 275, 349; 3.60; 4.101; on oversight of the sanctuary see, Philo, *Mos.* 2.71, 75; on oversight of the priesthood see, Philo, *Mos.* 2.71, 143-152; Jos. *Ant.* 3:197, 204-206; Ps. Philo, *LAB* 11.3; on sanctifying the people see Ps. Philo *LAB* 11.15; 12:8-10; 19:13.

[68]For details of the rabbinic comments see, Lierman, *Moses*, 70.

> in two sanctuaries. Because of him they assembled and the world trembled before him when he made proclamation, when it heard the voice of his Lord and the voice of the great prophet Moses too.[69]

It seems evident from the extensive extra-biblical evidence that 3:1 does not necessitate that either the apostleship or the priesthood of Jesus be understood as part of the pre-existing Christian confession. Zimmermann dissents from both this conclusion and from the background proposed here for the titles "apostle" and "high-priest."[70] He argues that Ps 109 (LXX), widely used in Hebrews, provides the source of title high priest (Ps 109:4 [LXX]). On the basis of the frequency with which the first and fourth verses of this Psalm are quoted in Hebrews, he argues that the whole Psalm was understood in a messianic sense. He therefore points to Ps 109:2 (LXX): ῥάβδον δυνάμεώς σου <u>ἐξαποστελεῖ</u> κύριος ἐκ Σιών, and suggests that this is the likely origin of the Christological title ἀπόστολος in 3:1. This argument is not convincing. Ps 109:2 (LXX) does not contain the noun ἀπόστολος but a verb. This verb does not refer to the "sending" of the royal figure, but the sending to him of a ῥάβδον δυνάμεώς σου. In other words it is a matter of the king's empowering rather than his being sent–an interpretation particularly appropriate for the apparent coronation setting of the Psalm.[71] The link to 3:1 is consequently more tenuous than Zimmermann's argument seems to presuppose.

---

[69]*Mem. Mar.* 4.6. The similarity with 3:1-4 is unmistakable.

[70]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 50-51.

[71]A. Weiser, *The Psalms,* trans. H. Hartwell, OTL (London: SCM, 1959), 693; H-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60-150*, trans. H. C. Oswald, Continental Commentaries (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1989; translation of *Psalmen 60-150*, 5th ed., Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978), 347; A. A. Anderson, *Psalms (73-150)*, NCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 767.

Thus it is evident that the context of 3:1, just like the word ὁμολογία itself, does not indicate that the priesthood of Jesus was part of the community's confession. Such a negative finding effectively supports the thesis that the priesthood of Jesus was *not* part of the confession, but was rather an interpretation of it. An examination of the use of traditional material in Hebrews supports this further.

**Hebrews' Use of Traditional Material**

An obvious place to look for the content of Hebrews' confession is in the traditional material utilized by *Auctor*. He himself points in this direction by emphasizing the chain of tradition stretching from Jesus through the apostles to both him and to the congregation he is addressing in 2:3-4. Does such traditional material lend any support to the suggestion that the priesthood of Christ formed part of that confession? There are obvious methodological difficulties in dealing with this question. Exactly which parts of Hebrews reflect "traditional material"? *Auctor* does not tell us, and any attempt to isolate such material is bound to be somewhat subjective. The cautions of Geoffrey Lampe are as valid today as they were when he first made them:

> We must therefore be on our guard and ask, in every case whether there appears to be a direct allusion to the cultus, whether a "credal" statement necessarily reflects the language of a formal or public profession of faith or whether it is simply an original expression of Christian belief on the part of the writer, and to what extent formal catechesis can be distinguished from the exhortation and advice which must naturally form part of the subject-matter of ordinary homilies. Is every rhythmic and lyrical utterance by an apostolic writer to be regarded as a citation from a liturgical hymn? What is the definition of catechesis and how is catechetical material to be recognized? Such

questions need to be asked, and it is not easy to find satisfactory answers.[72]

It is best to proceed cautiously, initially casting the net widely. It has been suggested, with varying degrees of plausibility, that several passages in Hebrews incorporate traditional material. These must now be examined with a view of determining a) the likelihood that they do, in fact, incorporate traditional material; and b) the degree to which they tend either to support or to disconfirm the proposal that the priesthood of Jesus was part of the creed of the Hebrews.

*Hebrews 1:3*

This verse is widely regarded as incorporating traditional material.[73] Günther Bornkamm argues that it actually continues a fragment of a baptismal confession.[74] David Hay agrees this is "most probable."[75] However, this would seem to be overly

---

[72]G. W. H. Lampe, "The Evidence in the New Testament for Early Creeds, Catechisms and Liturgy," *ET* 71 (1959/60): 360.

[73]See, for example G. Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics: The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament Example of Biblical Interpretation*, SNTSMS 36 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 6; R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*, SUNT 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 137-40; J. T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*, SNTSMS 15 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971); 92-94; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), 220; R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1983; reprinted from Cambridge University Press, 1967), 19; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 41; Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 43.

[74]Bornkamm, "Bekenntnis," 188-203. See also Friedrich, "Lied vom Hohenpriester," 102; E. Käsemann, "Hebräer 4,14-16," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960, reprinted from *GPM*, 3, 1948, 63-67), 1:307.

[75] Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 41.

precise, not least of all because, despite the once-for-all nature of baptism in early Christian thinking, the baptismal confession was open to re-use in the liturgical life of the church community.[76] Since the earliest creeds were used and reused in a variety of circumstances any attempt to isolate the specific occasion for any New Testament creedal statement is misguided.[77] Nevertheless, there is considerable support for seeing the verse as containing some sort of traditional formulation utilized by *Auctor*.

The verse contains the first direct allusion to Ps 109 (LXX), which is foundational for the whole treatment of the Son in the 1:3-4. This treatment lays the foundation for the detailed comparison of the Son with the angels in 1:5-13. The suggestion that 1:3 contains traditional material is therefore not intrinsically improbable. Bornkamm suggests the following reasons for seeing a confessional fragment in 1:3:

1. the fact that the subject abruptly changes from Θεός in vv. 1-2 to υιός in v. 3;
2. the use of ὅς to introduce a series of relative phrases;
3. the fact that the participial predications employ substantive participles without articles;
4. the fact that the vocabulary of the verse (especially in the first line) is atypical of Hebrews;
5. the rhythmic style of the verse;
6. the fact that the verse appears to be structured in terms of formal parallelism;

---

[76]Schäfer, "ΚΡΑΤΕΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ," 63

[77]Cullmann, *Confessions*, 18.

7. and, the fact that the Son of God is presented in language which is exalted and creedal in character (as confirmed by comparison with other proposed confessional and hymnic fragments found in the New Testament such as, Phil 2:6–11; Col 1:15–20; 1 Tim 3:16; 1 Pet 3:18–22).[78]

Lane adds another argument: the subtle differences between the allusion to Ps 109:1 (LXX) here as compared with such allusions elsewhere in Hebrews. In 1:3 the allusion to the Psalm is in the dative case (ἐν δεξιᾷ), and not in the genitive (ἐκ δεξιῶν) as elsewhere in Hebrews (following the LXX). This suggests that *Auctor* may be citing someone else's formulation in this verse.[79]

It is, of course, impossible to *prove* that 1:3 is a fragment of an earlier confession.[80] If it is a liturgical or confessional fragment it has certainly been carefully incorporated into its present setting.[81] Vanhoye points out that the key expression καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος is not traditional but reflects

---

[78]Bornkamm, "Bekenntnis," 188-203.

[79]Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 7. See also, Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 35, 41.

[80]So J. Frankowski, "Early Christian Hymns Recorded in the New Testament: A Reconsideration of the Question in the Light of Heb 1:3," *BZ* 27 (1983): 183-94. See also Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 7-8; H. Langkammer, "Problemy literackie i genetyczne w Hbr 1,1-4," *RTK* 16 (1969): 77-112; D. W. B. Robinson, "The Literary Structure of Hebrews 1:1-4," *AJBA* 2 (1972-73): 178-86; Schäfer, "ΚΡΑΤΕΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ," 68.

[81]E. Gräßer, "Hebräer 1,1-4: Ein exegetischer Versuch," in *EKKv* 3, 55-92; Republished in *Text und Situation: Gesammelte Aufs*ätze *zum Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1973), 182-230; J. P. Meier, "Structure and Theology in 1,1-14," *Bib* 66 (1985): 168-89. If one were to accept the validity of the statistical analysis of the syllables in 1:1-4 (and further of the entirety of Heb 1 and 2) presented by Übelacker (*Hebräerbrief*, 81-96), any incorporation of previous material would be rendered highly improbable. However, Übelacker's suggestion is surely not likely.

the language of Hebrews.[82] Nevertheless, it is probable that *Auctor* has incorporated a fragment of tradition at this point. DeSilva points out that regardless of whether or not a confessional fragment is incorporated, it is clear that *Auctor* is here articulating a common understanding of the faith, rather than attempting to teach new doctrine.[83] What light does this fragment cast on the question of the content of the confession of Hebrews?

In 1:3 *Auctor* introduces the theme of the priesthood of Jesus.[84] What is startling is that it is conceptualized here in a way different to its major development in the document as a whole. In this verse, the priestly work of the Son is alluded to with the words καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος, a phrase which "is more troublesome than it first appears."[85] *Auctor* used two participles in the present tense in 1:3a,b (ὢν, φέρων) to indicate a continuing state of affairs. The use of an aorist (ποιησάμενος) seems to indicate that the purification of sins has been completed.[86]

The timing of this event is made clear by the reference to what happened next: ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς. These words clearly depict the ascension and heavenly enthronement of the Son as having happened subsequent to the purification for sins.[87] The priestly work of Christ is here focussed on the cross,

---

[82]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 80.

[83]deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 86.

[84]Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 8; deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 89-90; Meier, "Structure," 183.

[85]L. T. Johnson, *Hebrews* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 71.

[86]Westcott, *Hebrews*, 14; R. Jewett, *Letter to Pilgrims: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (New York: Pilgrim, 1981), 23.

[87]Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 143; Anderson, *King-Priest*, 142.

clearly understood as a sacrifice for sins.[88] When this priestly work was completed the priest "sat down". J. C. Campbell seeks to qualify this position by insisting that *Auctor* includes both incarnation and atonement in the phrase καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος.[89] John Meier dissents from this view, declaring that, "for the author [of Hebrews] Christ's sacrifice is constituted not only by the bloody death on the cross but also by the entrance into the heavenly sanctuary."[90] However, it seems more correct to associate the heavenly entrance with the allusion to Ps 109:1 (LXX)–as elsewhere in the New Testament–and thus with Jesus "sitting down at the right hand of majesty" (1:3) than with his making purification for sins which was accomplished prior to that act of sitting.[91] This fact can be demonstrated from several other passages in Hebrews.

First, in 2:8 Jesus is "crowned" (ἐστεφανωμένον) because the prerequisite "suffering of death" (διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου) has been completed. If "crowned" is synonymous with "seated" in 1:3, then "suffering of death" parallels "made purification for sins." The progression of thought in 5:8-10 is also parallel in important ways to that in 1:3. In 5:8-9, the perfection of Jesus through suffering is

---

[88]H. Langkammer, "'Den er zum Erben von allem eingesetzt hat' (Hebr 1,2)," *BZ* 10 (1966): 280; Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary*, 175; R. Williamson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Epworth, 1964), 6; H. Nakagawa, "Christology in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1955), 77; P. E. Hughes, "The Christology of Hebrews," *SWJT* 28 (1987): 21; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 7; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 45-46; Koester, *Hebrews*, 188; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 102; Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 99.

[89]J. C. Campbell, "In a Son," *Int* 10 (1956): 26.

[90]Meier, "Structure," 183

[91]J. W. Thompson, "The Structure and purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5-13," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 353, reprinted in, J. W. Thompson, *The Beginning of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, CBQMS 13 (Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 129.

the precondition of his becoming a source of salvation for other (paralleling the purification for sins in 1:3). Being the source of salvation for others is the essence of Jesus' priestly role (paralleling his being seated in heaven in 1:3). Similarly, in 9:24-28, the entrance of the levitical high priest into the sanctuary (v. 24) is paralleled by the "suffering" of Jesus, which is explicitly identified with his sacrifice (v. 25). In the following two verses "death" and the "offering" of Christ are explicitly paralleled.[92] Again, in 10:10-12 the offering of the "body of Christ" which sanctifies us precedes Christ's being seated at the right hand. [93] Meier points to the fact that both the offering for sins and the entrance into heaven are described in Hebrews as unrepeatable, once-for-all events.[94] However, this simply does not mean that both events are to be identified–even if they are closely related. In either case, as Meier himself acknowledges, "the sacrifice does not continue in heaven after Jesus' entrance with his blood."[95]

Gerd Theißen suggests that the phrase καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος is an addition to the hymn made by *Auctor*.[96] Given that its focus is somewhat different from the book as a whole, that would seem unlikely. It is typical

---

[92]N. H. Young, "Αἱματεκχυσία: A Comment," *ET* 90 (1978-79): 180.

[93]Dunbar, "Relationship," 54.

[94]Meier, "Structure," 183.

[95]Meier, "Structure," 184; contrast S. C. Gayford, "The Aorist Participles in Heb i.3, vii.27, x.12," *Th* 7 (1923): 282.

[96]G, Theißen *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief,* StNT 2 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969), 50.

of such hymn fragments in the New Testament to include reference to the incarnation, humiliation and exaltation of Christ.[97]

Heb 1:3, which alludes directly to the Day of Atonement, highlights the significance of the death of Jesus in cultic terms.[98] To the extent that this verse reflects earlier traditions, it suggests that such traditions applied priestly categories to the death of Jesus rather than to a heavenly ministry. The book of Hebrews as a whole certainly understands the sacrifice of Christ on the cross to be of crucial significance but tends to locate the focus of his priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. The evidence of derived from *Auctor's* use of traditional material in 1:3 thus points away from the conclusion that the priesthood of Jesus was confessional in the community addressed.

*Hebrews 3:7-4:11*

There is no question that the exodus and the wilderness wanderings were important foci for early Christian contemplation of the Jewish Scriptures.[99] The placement of a major block of material on this topic immediately after the exhortation to focus on the "apostle and high priest of our confession" may be significant for uncovering the content of that confession. However, such does not actually appear to be the case. This entire section of Hebrews is almost entirely bereft of explicit, unmistakable Christian content. It consists rather of scriptural exegesis, typical of Jewish interpreters of the time, and exhortation, which generally would not have been

---

[97]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 30; Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 25; Gräßer, "Hebräer 1,1-4," 65.

[98]Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 37.

[99]F. L. Fisher,. "The New and Greater Exodus: the Exodus Pattern in the New Testament," *SWJT* 20 (1977): 69-79.

out of place in a Jewish synagogue. Indeed, the primary exhortation of the passage–"Do not harden your hearts"–is taken directly from Ps 94:8 (LXX). The name Jesus is absent–despite having been used twice in the introductory paragraph (3:1, 3).[100] The title "Christ" is mentioned once (3:14), but no Christological development of thought follows. If this block of material represents earlier tradition, it seems likely that *Auctor* has borrowed and slightly reworked a Jewish synagogue homily rather than a piece of Christian exhortation. However the position of Otfried Hofius may be even more likely: "die in der Hebräerbrief-Auslegung mehrfach vorgetragen Ansicht als unhaltbar erwiesen, daß diese Perikope ein ursprünglich selbständiger Midrasch zu Ps 95,7b-11 zu beurteilen sei."[101]

In regard to the question of the priesthood of Jesus: not only is this topic missing from 3:7-4:11, there is no development of cultic themes in this passage at all. Despite the fact that *Auctor* makes reference to "God's house" in the introduction, there is no explicit mention of the sanctuary in the entire passage. Thus, far from use of traditional material suggesting *Auctor* derived his high-priestly Christology from traditional material, some of the material with greatest claim to be regarded as traditional has the least contact with such christological views.

*Hebrews 4:12-13*

Grässer refers to this passage as a "Logos-Hymnus" at the end of the first major section of Hebrews which corresponds to the "Christus-Hymnus" at the

---

[100]In fact, the name *is* used in 4:8, but the reference is to the Old Testament figure of Joshua, as modern translations make clear.

[101]O. Hofius, *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*, WUNT 1/11 (Tübingen: Mohr / Paul Siebeck, 1970), 54.

beginning (1:3).[102] The proposed opening hymn fragment contains cultic language and allusions to priestly work, but the locale of that work is on earth rather than in heaven.[103] However the proposed closing "Logos-Hymnus" contains no cultic language at all. Even it if does contain traditional material it is silent on the topic of the priesthood of Jesus. As such it lends no support to the suggestion that *Auctor* took the idea of the heavenly high priesthood of Christ from tradition. The absence of this theme in two counterbalancing fragments as Grässer sees here strongly suggests that *Auctor* did not take his priestly christology from tradition.

*Hebrews 5:7-10*

The conclusion drawn by most scholars is that Heb 5:7 alludes to the Gethsemane traditions.[104] Jean Héring declares that various features of the verse "situe sans erreur possible cette épreuve à un moment précis de la vie terrestre . . . du

---

[102]Gräßer, "Hebräer 1,1-4," 203.

[103]See above, pp. 107-10 for a fuller discussion.

[104]A. E. Garvie, "The Pioneer of Faith and of Salvation," *ET* 26 (1914-15): 549; T. Hewitt, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Tyndale, 1960), 97; W. Hillmann, "Der Hohepriester der künftigen Güter," *BibLeb* 1 (1960): 161; R. C. H. Lenski, *The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1961 [Reprinted from Colombus OH: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938]), 161; R. Milligan, *Hebrews* (Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate, 1989 [Original: 1875]), 193; F. D. V. Narborough, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Clarendon Bible (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939), 99; R. E. Omark, "The Saving of the Savior: Exegesis and Christology in Hebrews 5:7-10," *Int* 12 (1958): 40; T. H. Robinson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, MNTC (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1933), 63-64; H. S. Songer, "A Superior Priesthood: Hebrews 4:14-7:28," RevExp 82 (1985): 348; A. Strobel, "Die Psalmengrundlage der Gethsemane-Parallele Hebr 5:7ff," *ZNW* 45 (1954): 252-66; R. McL. Wilson, *Hebrews*, NCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 98-99; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 98; Henderson, "Priestly Ministry," 49-50; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 182; Jewett, *Letter to Pilgrims*, 87; Kendrick, *Hebrews*, 68; Leonard, *Authorship*, 29; MacNeill, *Christology*, 22; Michel, *Hebräer,* 220; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 66; Nairne, *Hebrews*, 62; Stadelmann, "Christologie," 191; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 128; Williamson, *Hebrews*, 48.

Sauveur, à savoir à Gethsémané.[105] This position is actually beset by a number of difficulties.

First, the Gethsemane traditions themselves are complex. The various accounts of the time Jesus spent in the Garden of Gethsemane reflect considerable development.[106] The exact relationship of the Gethsemane accounts to the passion narrative proper is also uncertain. Is the narrative of Jesus struggle in Gethsemane to be regarded with Rudolf Bultmann as "originally an individual story of a thorough-going legendary character", or with Vincent Taylor as "certainly historical and beyond the reach of invention"?[107] The relationship between the Gethsemane accounts in the synoptics and the extended passion prologue of the Fourth Gospel (which does not record the garden scenes) is a further issue.[108]

If Heb 5:7-10 does allude to the Gethsemane narratives differences from the Gospel accounts have to be accounted for as well as the similarities. Alexander

---

[105]J. Héring, *L'Épitre aux Hébreux*, 2 vols., CNT 12 (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1954), 53.

[106]See the discussion in R. S. Barbour, "Gethsemane in the Tradition of the Passion," *NTS* 16 (1969-70): 231-51; A. W. Holleran, *The Synoptic Gethsemane: A Critical Study,* AG 191, Series Facultatis Theologicae Secto B n. 61 (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1973).

[107]R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Traditions*, trans. J. Marsh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963; translation of *Die Geschichted der synoptischen Tradition*; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1931), 267;
V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indexes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1981; Originally, London: Macmillian, 1966], 551.

[108]Brown argues that, in some regards, the Johannine account is more historical than that found in the synoptics. See, R. E. Brown, "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Comparison," in *New Testament Essays* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), 246-253 [Originally, "Incidents that are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John's Gospel," *CBQ*, 23 (1961): 143-148].

Nairne correctly cautions that *Auctor* "hardly [alludes] to the [Gethsemane] narrative as it stands in any of our Gospels."[109] Various common features of the synoptic developments are missing from Hebrews–not least significant being the geographical marker "garden of Gethsemane" and an explicit temporal marker indicating the night of Jesus' arrest. Hebrews locates Jesus' prayers only generally ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. Similarly, the sleep of the disciples and the bloody sweat of Jesus are passed over. Conversely, Hebrews mentions various details absent from all the narratives of the Gospels. None of the Gospel writers mentions "loud cries and tears" (κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων). Indeed, the passion narratives with their picture of the slumbering disciples would seem to present a more subdued picture of Jesus' prayer. Similarly the designation κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων deviates from the Gospel accounts, as does the circumlocution for God: τὸν δυνάμενον σῴζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου. All of which indicates–even if events in the Gethsemane are being alluded to in Hebrews– the extreme difficulty of determining with any degree of certainly which parts of a passage in Hebrews reflect tradition and which parts reflect the unique contribution of *Auctor*.

The clearest difficulty is that Hebrews says that Jesus prayed to "the one who was able to save him from death" and was "heard" (5:7). If the reference is to Gethsemane, what was the nature of this "hearing"? Clearly his petition that the cup of suffering to pass from him was not granted, and he was not saved from death.[110]

---

[109]Nairne, *Hebrews*, 62

[110]E. Brandenburger, "Text und Vorlagen von Hebr V 7-10: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefs," *NovTest* 11 (1969): 190.

Numerous attempts have been made to harmonize this verse with the Gethsemane narratives but they appear uniformly artificial and unconvincing. Adolf Harnack's suggestion that the verse originally read οὐκ εἰσακουσθείς cuts the Gordian knot but is singularly lacking in textual support.[111] Montefiore takes εὐλάβεια to mean "fear" rather than "godly fear" suggesting that Jesus was actually delivered from the fear of death.[112] It is true that εὐλάβεια can mean "fear" but its use elsewhere in Hebrews (11:7; 12:28) is inconsistent with that meaning in 5:7. Such an understanding requires a "rather harsh ellipse" in the text.[113] Nor is it self-evident from the passion narratives that Jesus was rescued from the fear of death in Gethsemane–particularly in the light of the cry of dereliction on the cross (compare, Mk 15:34; Matt. 27:46). Others have suggested that ἐκ θανάτου be translated "out of death", making it a reference to the resurrection.[114] Joseph Ungeheuer extends this thought: seeing as *Auctor* regards the prayer as a priestly activity, he portrays Jesus as praying not only for his own deliverance from the realm of death but also for the deliverance of those he leads into salvation.[115] However, this is an unjustified over-

---

[111]A. von Harnack, "Zwei alte dogmatische Korrekturen im Hebräerbrief," in *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testament und der alten Kirche. I: Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik*; AKG 19 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931), 249-52. This article was originally published in SPAW. PH, 1929, 62-73.

[112]Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 98.

[113]Attridge, "'Heard'," 90.

[114]J. Jeremias, "Hbr 5.7-10," *ZNW* 44 (1952-53): 107-11; Friedrich, "Lied vom Hohenpriester," 105; Schille, "Erwägungen," 100; Hillmann, "Hohepriester," 161. Friedrich argues that the thought of the verse is so foreign to that of *Auctor* generally as to provide evidence that a traditional fragment is being cited here.

[115]Ungeheuer, *Der große Priester*, 129; L. Cerfaux, "Le sacre du grand prêtre," *BVC* 21 (1958): 56.

theologizing of the text. While the translation "out of death" is possible, there is no indication that Jesus prayed for resurrection in Gethsemane.[116] Similarly, the suggestion that Jesus' declaration of fidelity, "Not my will but yours be done," was heard is true but trite. Is there any suggestion that *this* declaration was marked by loud cries and tears? Marie Isaacs' suggestion that the reference is not to Gethsemane but to the cry of Jesus on the cross, is certainly not an obvious reading of the text.[117] There is no clear link between the cry on the cross and the thought of praying for deliverance from death.[118] Ungeheuer suggests *Auctor* is alluding to both the prayers in the garden of Gethsemene and those from the cross.[119] In doing so he seems to admit the inadequacy of either locale for the allusion in Heb 5.[120]

The link between 5:7-10 and the Gethsemane tradition is thus not actually as self-evident as often appears to be assumed.[121] An alternative view is that *Auctor* is not referring to the Gethsemane traditions but is rather constructing a picture of the prayers of a righteous man using traditional and conventional material.[122] The virtue

---

[116]G. Braumann, "Hebr 5,7-10," *ZNW* 51 (1960): 278-80. Omark ("Saving," 43) notes that it might be conceded that the resurrection might provide the content of Jesus "having been heard" even if not for the content of his actual petition.

[117]Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 107.

[118]Friedrich, "Lied vom Hohenpriester," 110.

[119]Ungeheuer, *Der große Priester*, 128; see also Cerfaux, "Le sacre du grand prêtre," 55.

[120]There is no logical reason why the broadening of reference begun by Ungeheuer should be limited to the time of the passion. See below, pp. 120-21.

[121]H. W. Attridge, "'Heard because of His Reverence' (Heb 5:7)," *JBL* 98 (1979): 91.

[122]See the discussion in M. Dibelius, "Der himmlische Kultus nach dem Hebräerbrief," in *Botschaft und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 2 vols. (Tübingen:

of this view is that it accounts for some of the very details in the pericope which the Gethsemane view finds most troubling. These details include "loud cries and tears." The Gethsemane traditions are silent about both of these but there are Jewish traditions about the prayers of the righteous in trying circumstances which make mention of both details.[123] If *Auctor* is utilizing such material his comments are determined much more by the situation of his recipients than by the "historical Jesus."[124] Attridge draws attention to Philo's treatment of Abraham's interaction with God (Gen 15:2-18).[125] Philo lays stress on boldness (παρρησία) as a virtue in acceptable prayer.[126] Of course, the Christian's παρρησία is an important sub-theme in Hebrews (3:6; 4:16; 10:19, 35).[127] Philo declares that bold prayers are characterized by "loudness" and "true emotion."[128]

---

Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1956), 2: 171-72; see also Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 104-06. Loader argues for a composite view: *Auctor* is referring to Gethsemane but his description has been coloured by psalmonic language.

[123]2 Macc. 11:6; 3 Macc 1:16; 5:7, 25. For further discussion, see deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 190-91.

[124]R. P. Gordon, *Hebrews* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 68.

[125]Philo, *Quis Heres,* 1-29. See also Attridge, "'Heard'," 92-93.

[126]Philo, *Quis Heres*, 5.

[127]S. B. Marrow, "*Parrhesia* and the New Testament," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 431-46.

[128]Philo, *Quis Heres*, 14, 19.

Another alternative view suggests that Hebrews was citing a confessional formulation or hymn fragment.[129] Support for this position derives from a number of sources:

1. the pericope opens with a relative pronoun, as is common when hymn fragments are quoted;
2. the passage contains a significant number of words not found elsewhere in Hebrews (for example, δέησι, ἱκετηρία, κραυγή, and εἰσακουσθείς) as well as a number of words used in a different sense elsewhere in Hebrews (for example, σῴζειν, θάνατο, εὐλάβεια (assuming it means "fear" rather than "reverence" here, and τελειωθεί);
3. the stylistic peculiarities of the passage (for example, the unusual use of doublets, such as δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας and κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων);
4. the rhythmic character of the material, which readily lends itself to strophic structuring;
5. and, a perceived difference in the theology of priesthood in this passage compared with the rest of Hebrews.[130]

---

[129]M. Rissi, "Die Menschlichkeit Jesu nach Hebr. 5,7-8," *TZ* 11 (1955): 28-45; G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews*, AB 36 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972), 97-99; T. Lescow, "Jesus in Gethsemane bei Lukas und im Hebräerbrief," *ZNW* 58 (1967): 223-39; Brandenburger, "Text und Vorlagen," 190-224; Schille, "Erwägungen," 97-104.

[130]Friedrich, "Lied vom Hohenpriester," 99-100; Schille, "Erwärgungen," 84-109. Schille highlights the last point, suggesting that 5:5-10 sees the priesthood of Jesus beginning only after the passion, whereas the book as a whole sees his death as a priestly sacrifice. An obvious difficulty with this argument is that it begins the proposed range of the borrowed material in v 5, negating some of the other arguments (such as the use of the initial relative pronoun, noted in point 1, above).

None of the arguments for the confessional or hymnic nature of this passage is without difficulties.[131] Obviously not every relative phrase or clause represents a fragment of a hymn. It is also possible that the vocabulary in this passage differs from elsewhere in the book because the specific focus of the passage is different. Stylistic features may be explained in terms of rhetorical strategy.[132] Classical rhetoric insisted on the engagement of the emotions, not merely the stimulation of the intellect. The use of doublets at key points can be part of this process. Similarly, classical handbooks discuss the degree of rhythm an oration should have.[133] There is no question of *Auctor*'s own rhetorical skill. The distinctive and effective rhetoric of this passage may be his own creation.[134] Not only so, but the proposed reconstructions of the original form of the hymn adopted and adapted by *Auctor* of Hebrews diverge greatly. Egon Brandenburgers suggest, in fact, that this pericope contains fragments of two confessions: the first found in v. 7 and the second in vv. 8-10.[135] George Wesley Buchanan modifies this, seeing the second confession as being found in vv. 7-

---

[131]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 107-10.

[132]See for example Arist. *Rh*.3.8.4. For detailed discussions of this topic, see G. O. Rowe, "Style," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. S. E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 121-58 and H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, trans. M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, and D. E. Orton, ed. D.E. Orton and R.D. Anderson (Leiden: Brill, 1998; translation of *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturewissenschaft*, Ismaning bei München: Hueber, 1973), 215-477.

[133]See, for example Arist. *Rh*.3.8.

[134]Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 112; C. Maurer, "'Erhört wegen der Gottesfurcht' Heb 5.7," in *Neues Testament und Geschichte: historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament. Oscar Cullmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke, (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 278.

[135]Brandenburger, "Text und Vorlagen," 195-224.

9 and understanding v. 10 as an editorial comment by *Auctor*.[136] Theodor Lescow suggests a single original confession which has been heavily reworked by *Auctor*:

> Der Christus verherrlichte sich nicht selbst;
> (sondern) lernte an dem, was er litt, den Gehorsam
> und wurde allen, die ihm sind gehorsam,
> Ursache ewigen Heils.[137]

It may well be that positing an underlying confessional formulation is unnecessary on other grounds as well. Heb 5:7 is the most troublesome verse in the passage and it has significant parallels with Ps 114 and 115 (LXX).[138] Given that this was a Psalm sung at Passover, it is likely to be well-known to both *Auctor* and the recipients of Hebrews. That background alone may explain those features of the passage which might otherwise be attributed to a confessional statement.

What conclusions can be drawn from this plethora of suggestions? The likelihood is that *Auctor* is focussing on the humanity of Jesus, illustrated by the fact of his prayer-life.[139] His is not concerned with a specific moment in the life of Jesus but with the "days of his flesh" in general.[140] He presents the entire life of Jesus as characterized by faithfulness, righteousness, prayer and steadfastness (as he hopes his recipients' lives will be also). Kendrick's objection that the aorist participles προσενέγκας and εἰσακουσθεὶς "denote single, not habitual acts and clearly point

---

[136]Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 97-99.

[137]Lescow, "Gethsemane," 230.

[138]Strobel, "Psalmengrundlage," 256.

[139]R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Tyndale, 1950), 33.

[140]J. M. Scholar, *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, JSNTSS 49 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 86-87.

to single scene" reflects a misunderstanding of the meaning of the aorist and of the significance of tense in Greek participles generally.[141] These aorist participles appear to be aorists of attendant circumstances, suggesting that the action takes place contemporaneously with that of the main verb ἔμαθεν.[142] If Jesus learns obedience throughout his life, this whole process is marked by prayer and supplication.

In presenting Jesus as a faithful and righteous man who is steadfast in prayer, *Auctor* doubtlessly draws on various Jewish traditions of the prayers of the righteous, including Psalm 116. He may also have been aware of specific traditions about Jesus which inform his description. It is certainly feasible that he was aware of the Gethsemane tradition, which would have served as a good illustration of his purpose. The core traditions about Jesus seem to have included that he was a man of prayer and that his prayer life grew in intensity as the time of his death drew closer.[143] The synoptic Gospels portray Jesus as being concerned about prayer from the beginning of his ministry (Matt. 5:44, 6:5-9; Luke 5:33), praying during his ministry (Matt. 14:23; Mark 6:46; Luke 5:16; 6:12; 9:28) and concluding his ministry before his arrest (Matt. 26:36-41; Mark 14:32-38; Luke 22:40-46). John also shows Jesus as a man of prayer, especially as his narrative moves towards the climax of the passion (John 11:41-42;

---

[141]Kendrick, *Hebrews*, 68.

[142]F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 175.

[143]T. H. Olbricht, "The Faith (Faithfulness) of Jesus in Hebrews," in *Renewing Traditions: Studies in Texts and Contexts in Honor of James W. Thompson*, PTMS 65, ed. M. H. Hamilton, T. H. Olbricht, and J. Peterson (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2007), 128.

12:27-28; 17:1-26). The tradition of Jesus as a man of prayer was developed by the early church in a number of subtly different ways.

Important questions arise with regard to any supposed underlying confessional fragment in 5:7-10. Redaction criticism correctly raises the question of the extent to which it has been reworked and embellished to convey the precise point the author might wish to make.[144] What is the extent of the fragment? For our purposes the most important issue is this: does the designation of Jesus as high priest (5:10) belong to *Auctor*'s source–be that Gethsemane traditions, a confessional formulation, or Ps 116–or does it reflect his own theological reflection?

The latter position is far more likely than the former.[145] The relevant passage in Heb 5 is bracketed by an *inclusio* dealing with Melchizedek (5:6, 10). Gottfried Schille argues that the actual quotation of Ps 109 (LXX) in 5:6 is a contribution by *Auctor* which is dependent on the allusion to that Psalm in 5:10 which is derived from tradition. He argues further that even the traditional material in 5:7-10 has been reworked by *Auctor*, evidenced not least of all by the use of ἀρχιερεύς rather than of ἱερεύς as a title for Melchizedek in 5:10.[146] Ultimately, Schille appears to say no more than that Ps 109 (LXX) was a traditional source of testimonies. Consequently the presence of an allusion to this Psalm in traditional material is unsurprising.

---

[144]Brandenburger, "Text und Vorlagen", 213; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 109-10.

[145]Of course, it is possible with Manson (*Hebrews*, 54), Zimmermann (*Hohepriester-Christologie*, 10), Nomoto ("Herkunft und Structur," 11) and others to assume that the priesthood of Christ was part of common Christian heritage in the first century. See pp. 93-94, above. However, without supporting evidence that assumption establishes nothing.

[146]Schille, "Erwägungen," 97-98.

The effect of inclusion (5:5, 10) is that the entire discussion of the prayers and the perfecting of Jesus could be deleted without disrupting the flow to *Auctor*'s argument. In 5:6 *Auctor* quotes Ps 110:4: σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ. Verse 10 returns to a closely paraphrased allusion to the same text: προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ. Christological application of the Melchizedek passages of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament writings is unique to the book of Hebrews. This suggests that such an application is the creation of *Auctor* rather than part of a received tradition. The mention of priesthood in this context depends on the reference to Melchizedek, suggesting that it too derives from *Auctor*. Indeed, v 10, taken in entirety, can be understood as a distinctive commentary by *Auctor* on the common Christian tradition of Jesus as "the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him" (5:9).

This basic conclusion can be supported by an examination of the various sources proposed for 5:7-9. First, there is no suggestion in the Synoptic accounts of Gethsemane–supposedly alluded to in 5:5-7–that Jesus is acting in the role of a priest or even preparing for that role. Furthermore, the priestly themes within the passage itself are muted. In fact, the only explicitly priestly touch to the presentation of Jesus at prayer is the word προσφέρω. This word has undeniable cultic overtones. In the LXX it is used predominantly for "the bringing of the offering to the priest, temple or altar by the one who is making the sacrifice, or the actual sacrifice which is usually done by the priest."[147] Admittedly, the word seems to have a broader range of meaning

---

[147]K. Weiss, "φέρω, ἀναφέρω, διεφέρω, τὰ διαφέροντα, διάφορος, (ἀδιάφορον), εἰσφέρω, προσφέρω, προσφοφά, συμφέρω, σύμφορος, φορέω, φορτίον, φορτίζω," in *TDNT*, 9: 65.

in the New Testament, where is used of bringing people to Jesus (Mark 2:10; 10:13; Luke 18:15); meeting someone (Matt. 18:24; 19:13), and of treating someone in a specified way (12:17). Nevertheless, even in the New Testament the primary sense of the word is cultic.[148]

Similarly, there is nothing in the material relating to the prayers of the righteous that is specifically priestly. Ps 116 is not particularly linked to priesthood. Artur Weiser describes this Psalm as a song of thanksgiving which "the poet recites in public worship in the presence of the congregation."[149] This admittedly indicates a cultic setting for the Psalm but the "I" of the Psalm is not a specifically priestly figure. Steven Croft argues that this is actually a royal Psalm where the king prays as an individual rather than as a representative of the people.[150] However, this view may well be overly precise in its identification. Sigmund Mowinckel refers to the action which the Psalm accompanied as a "private offering."[151] The presence of Aramaisms

---

[148]W. Schenk, "προσφέρω" in *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 3 vols., ed. H. Balz and G. Schneider, trans. V.P. Howard, J. W. Thompson, J. W. Medendorp & D. W. Stott (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993; translation of *Exegetische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*; Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1983), 3: 177-78.

[149]Weiser, *Psalms,* 719; see also Kraus, *Psalms 60-150*, 386.

[150]S. J. L. Croft, *The Identity of the Individual in the Psalms*, JSOTSS 44 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 64-65, 129-30.

[151]S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2 vols., trans., D. R. Ap-Thomas (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962; translation of *Offersang og sangoffer. Salmediktningen i Bibelen*; Oslo: Aschehoug [Nygaard], 1951); reprinted in one volume (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 1:10.

in the Psalm may, in fact, suggest a composition date after the exile, when the monarchy was a thing of the past.[152]

Later Jewish sources similarly fail to provide a specifically priestly locale for the prayers of the righteous. 2 Macc 11:6 declares that Maccabeus, who was a priest, was praying with "lamentations and tears" but note that both "his men" and "all the people" were similarly engaged in prayer. 3 Macc 1:16 mentions not only the priests but the fact that the prayers and crying "filled the temple." However, this is directly paralleled in v 18 by an explicitly non-priestly reference: "Young women who had been secluded in their chambers rushed out with their mothers, sprinkled their hair with dust, and filled the streets with groans and lamentations." Neither 3 Macc 5:7 nor 5:27 makes any specifically priestly references but attribute the prayers to all the Jews. In the same way, Philo gives no indication that he is thinking specifically of the priesthood in his comments in *Quis Heres* 1-29. Rather, his comments are applicable to the "wise" in general.

It seems highly likely that *Auctor* has used traditional material in composing 5:7-10–although the exact nature and identity of that material remains opaque. Regardless of the sources(s) *Auctor* is thought to have used, it appears that the use of that source material to undergird the priesthood of Jesus is *Auctor*'s contribution, rather than his inheritance from common tradition.

---

[152]L. C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150*, WBC 21 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1983), 114; Anderson, *Psalms* (73-150), 790; Kraus, *Psalms 60-150*, 386.

*Hebrews 7:1-3*

A number of proposals have been made which discern a hymn fragment in the carefully constructed opening sentence of Heb 7. Otto Michel saw in 7:3 "ein rhythmisches Gebilde aus vier Zeilen."[153] The threefold use of "without" in English, rendering three alpha-privatives, certainly gives the verse a rhythmic feel.[154] Ellingworth endeavors to reconstruct the original hymn but admits that the evidence of its very existence "falls short of proof."[155] Zimmermann argues that an original hymn fragment can be reconstructed from 7:1-3, 26, but acknowledges that such a distribution of a hymn to different parts of a secondary text is unattested elsewhere in the New Testament.[156]

The primary difficulty in seeing it as a hymn fragment is that the focus is on Melchizedek. Ellingworth suggests that perhaps an originally non-Christian hymn-fragment was worked over by *Auctor* based on his own study of scripture and his knowledge of extra-biblical speculation about Melchizedek.[157] The suggestion by Schille that the hymn (7:1a, 2b; 3a-c) originally honoured Christ and was transferred to Melchizedek is unrealistic.[158] Can we really conceive of *Auctor* transferring the focus of a hymn from Christ to Melchizedek in order to be able to direct attention back to

---

[153]Michel, *Hebräer*, 259; see also B. A. Demarest, "Hebrews 7:3: A *Crux Interpretum* Historically Considered," *EQ* 49 (1977): 142

[154]Theißen, *Untersuchungen*, 21.

[155]P. Ellingworth, "'Like the Son of God:' Form and Content in Hebrews 7,1-10," *Bib* 63 (1983): 260.

[156]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 93-94.

[157]Ellingworth, "Form," 260-61; see also Nakagawa, "Christology," 190.

[158]Schille, "Erwägungen," 85-87.

Christ? Even if that were feasible, the unexpected declaration ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ clearly seems to be the work of *Auctor*.[159] No hymn honouring Melchizedek would contain such a line.[160] Zimmermann understands the clause to be an interpretative addition made by *Auctor* but correctly observes that the addition itself implies *Auctor* understood the hymn to be directed to Christ rather than Melchizedek.[161] The final phrase of the verse, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές is a clear allusion to Ps 110:4 and as such has good claim to being seen as *Auctor*'s contribution.[162] Loader points out that the elements most likely to have derived from a hymn correspond exactly to the very points which Hebrews emphasizes about the priesthood of Jesus. He declares this correspondence to be "auffällig."[163]

It follows that the "hymn fragment" view of 7:3 suffers from several unsolvable difficulties. The "poetic" rhythm of the verse is easily explained by the stylistic concerns of a skilled rhetor.[164] Loader notes further that the supposed hymn fragments in Heb 7 provide no evidence for the use of the titles "high priest" or "priest".[165] Other scholars go further and deny the presence of any hymn fragment at all in these verses.

---

[159]Theißen, *Untersuchungen*, 23.

[160]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 211.

[161]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 96.

[162]For a discussion of the role of Ps 109:4 (LXX) in *Auctor's* traditions, see below pp. 136-39.

[163]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 210-11.

[164]For a discussion in the classical handbooks of the role of rhythm in rhetoric see, Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.80 and Arist. *Rh.* 3.8.2-7.

[165]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 211.

Reinhard Deichgräber declares: "Danach dürfte der Versuch, hinter 7,1-3 einen Hymnus aufzuzeigen, zurückzuweisen sein."[166]

*Hebrews 7:26-28*

A number of scholars have suggested that a hymn fragment has been incorporated at this point by *Auctor*. Michel points to the resumption of the "'wir'-Stil" (v. 26) as evidence that a source is being utilized at this point.[167] He correctly observes a change from third person in v 25 (ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν) to first person in v 26 (τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν). In the Greek text these words are adjacent to one-another, highlighting the change. Hans Windisch suggests that the entire pericope (7:26-28) consists of "ein kleiner Hymnus."[168] However, the most "poetic" aspects of v 26 are not actually represented in the next two verses and it preferable to limits the hymn to v 26 and vv 27-28 as *Auctor*'s exegesis and application of it.[169]

However, even v 26 opens with formulations quite characteristic of *Auctor*. In the New Testament writings only *Auctor* uses the word πρέπω with reference to the actions of God (7:26; 2:10). Its use does not appear to be traditional and its presence in a hymn, or any other fragment of tradition, would be unexpected. Theißen notes further that v 26 uses the word οὐρανός (as opposed to ἐπουράνια) which he argues belongs to the specialist vocabulary of *Auctor*. Theißen actually takes ἀρχιερεύς as

---

[166]Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus*, 178.

[167]Michel, *Hebräer*, 278.

[168]Windisch, *Hebräerbrief*, 67; see also Nakagawa, "Christology" 209..

[169]Michel, *Hebräer*, 278.

evidence of *Auctor*'s own creative work.[170] He points out that whenever *Auctor* actually cites Ps 109:4 (LXX), Jesus is given the title ἱερεύς, but when he is only alluding to the verse, the title is just as likely to be ἀρχιερεύς as ἱερεύς. His conclusion is supported by the fact that vv 27-28 elaborate precisely this aspect of v 26.

If there is a hymn fragment in 7:26, it consists of no more than the affirmation that Jesus was "holy, blameless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and exalted above the heavens." There is no support here for seeing the priesthood of Christ as part of *Auctor*'s inherited tradition.

*Hebrews 10:10*

Michel suggests that there is in this verse a "Bekenntnis im Wir-Stil." There is admittedly a change from first person singular to first person plural between 10:9 and 10.[171] However, the key topic of the verses–the will of God–remains the same.[172] This fact has led other scholars to view the suggestion that the verse contains a confessional fragment with some skepticism.[173] In any case, although the verse picks up cultic metaphors it focuses on the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and contains not even a hint of a heavenly priestly ministry. If it does contain a traditional fragment, for the purposes of this study, the lack of reference to the heavenly priesthood of Christ is more significant than its use of cultic language.

---

[170]Theißen, *Untersuchungen*, 22-23.

[171]Michel, *Hebräer*, 338. See also, Schille, "Erwägungen," 92; Theißen, *Untersuchungen*, 73.

[172]Windisch, *Hebräerbrief*, 89.

[173]For example, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 276.

*Hebrews 11:4-40*

It has sometimes been suggested that this highly stylized eulogy to the heroes of faith reflects an earlier, even pre-Christian source.[174] Various arguments have been put forth to suggest that Hebrews 11 was a pre-existing Jewish document, reworked by *Auctor* for inclusion in his work. Among the more significant arguments are

- that Christ is mentioned only once in the entire 40 verses (11:26);
- that there is a contradiction between the statement in 11:13, 39 that the heroes did not receive the promises and that in 11:33 indicating that they did;
- and that the heroes are poor examples of faith suggesting that the anaphoric form had been artificially grafted onto an existing list.[175]

Eisenbaum dismisses these arguments as "extremely weak."[176] The absence of the mention of Jesus is a function of the fact that *Auctor* is expounding an Old Testament text at this point. The same phenomenon is seen in the treatment of the exodus generation in 3:7-4:11. The "contradiction" between 11:13, 39 and 11:33 can be resolved by positing that vv 13 and 39 refer to the *fulfilment* of the promises, whereas v 33 refers to the act of *promise-making*. This suggestion is consistent with

---

[174]For example, Käsemann, *Wandering*, 184-86; McCown, *ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ*, 85; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, SNTSM 21 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 250. More recently Niederwimmer has suggested that the chapter not only contains a pre-existing document but that the interpretative comments stemming from *Auctor* can be identified. See, K. Niederwimmer, "Vom Glauben der Pilger," in *Quaestiones theologicae: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, BZNW 90, ed. W. Pratscher and M. Öhler (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998), 209.

[175]Michel, *Hebräer*, 244. See also Windisch, *Hebräerbrief*, 98-99; Bovon, "Christ," 137-38; G. Schille, "Katechese und Taufliturgie: Erwägungen zu Heb 11," *ZNW* 51 (1966): 112-131.

[176]Eisenbaum, *Jewish Heroes*, 85.

the fact that *Auctor* uses the word λαμβάνω for the "receiving" of the promises in v 13 and κομίζω in 39, but in v 33 he uses ἐπιτυγχάνω. The last objection, of the mismatch between the anaphoric structure and the actual heroes, loses potency when Heb 11 is compared with other ancient hero/example lists, which reveal that "there can be varying degrees of similarity between the *illustrans* and the *illustrandum*."[177]

Finally, after making a comprehensive survey of both Jewish and Gentile "example lists" from antiquity, Eisenbaum concludes that such example lists are invariably the original work of the author in whose work they are found. Each author has a specific and unique context in which an example list is thought to be relevant. It follows that the best person to select the examples to highlight and the specific aspects of their lives to emphasize is the author. No advantage adheres to using an already existing list.[178]

It is therefore unlikely that Hebrews 11 represents an earlier tradition which had been reworked and incorporated by *Auctor*. Even if it did, it lends no support for the suggestion that the Christology of priesthood formed any part of that tradition.

*Hebrews 12:5-11*

Wayne McCown, noting the parallels in this passage in various sources, suggests that "most probably EH [Epistle to the Hebrews] has borrowed this piece from its hellenistic Jewish environment; furthermore, it would seem to have been incorporated *immutatus*."[179] This is certainly possible, but unprovable. It is equally

---

[177]Ibid., 85.

[178]Ibid., 84-85.

[179]McCown, *ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ*, 102.

likely that the passage contains *Auctor*'s own reflections on and application of Prov 3:11-12.[180] In any case the passage is utterly lacking in any priestly reference, despite the fact that Hebrews elsewhere implies a link between the suffering of Christians and the priesthood of Christ (2:17-18; 4:14-16; 5:7-10; 10:19-23; 12:3-4 see also 3:1). It is because of his priesthood that they should endure suffering faithfully.

*Hebrews 12:(18a-19), 22-24*

Käsemann suggests that this passage reflects a "relatively fixed tradition."[181] He considers this tradition to be also reflected in *Odes of Solomon* 33 and Revelation 14.[182] Schille concurs and adds 12:18a-19 to his proposed reconstruction of traditional material.[183] The use of traditions made by *Auctor* here are of a very general nature, the appropriation of widespread imagery which was frequently employed in eschatological and apocalyptic speculation.[184] Examples of this include an eschatological application of Sinai and Zion (Jerusalem) and the use of Abel as a prototypical martyr. Jon Paulien refers to such usage as "echoes"–the appropriation of a commonplace symbol of which a precise source is impossible (and unnecessary) to determine.[185] It is not surprising

---

[180]W. L. Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, WBC 47B (Dallas, TX: Word, 1991), 406.

[181]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 49.

[182]Ibid., 54-56.

[183]Schille, "Katechese," 130.

[184]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 374; O. Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament," *RQ* 6 (1967-69): 89-107.

[185]J. Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12*, AUSDDS 11 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987), 175-77.

that the dominant thought in this passage is eschatological. However, the specific use made of the imagery is not determined by the tradition.

Verse 24 does allude to the priesthood of Christ. He is called μεσίτης, a word which is able to bear priestly connotations. However, it is primarily a legal and not a cultic term.[186] Its direct association with διαθήκης νέας rather than the priestly activities in the heavenly sanctuary indicates that legal rather than liturgical connotations predominate here. The phrase αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ has clear cultic significance. However, this can scarcely be said to reflect any tradition beyond Scripture itself. It is a clear allusion to the levitical rituals–especially those of the Day of Atonement.[187] The placement of this brief allusion after the detailed arguments of Heb 9 and 10 is significant. The meaning of the allusion in this context depends on those detailed arguments, which are clearly *Auctor*'s creation.[188] All of this suggests that the reference to αἵματι ῥαντισμου comes from *Auctor*, even if 12:22-24 is basically taken over from traditional sources. This verse consequently provides no information suggesting the concept of the priesthood of Christ was itself traditional.

---

[186]See the further discussion below, p. 151.

[187]S. C. Gayford, *Sacrifice and Priesthood: Jewish and Christian* 2d ed. (London: Methuen, 1953), 72; N. H. Young, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," *NTS* 27 (1981): 205-06. Gayford argues that references to the "sprinkling of blood" allude exclusively to the Day of Atonement. Young suggests that while the Day of Atonement is the primary source of such allusions, other ideas derived from the original sanctuary consecration service and /or the ritual of the red heifer are also present.

[188]Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 681-82.

*Hebrews 13:1-25*

McCown correctly observes that there are numerous points of contact between the concluding chapter of Hebrews and "a broad stream of paraenetic tradition."[189] It is, however, extremely difficult to isolate specific sources for any of the material in the chapter. It is most likely that *Auctor* has incorporated Christian commonplaces which were circulating freely in the early Church community. Cultic language is used in two sections of the chapter–both of which show evidence of the incorporation of traditional material. A third passage is striking by its lack of cultic language.

McCown says of 13:(9)10-16: "This paragraph proffers the strongest proof of the tradition-tied character of the surrounding context."[190] Cultic language abounds: θυσιαστήριον, λατεύω (13:10), εἰσφέρω, αἷμα, τὰ ἅγια, ἀρχιερέως (13:11), ἁγιάζω (13:12), and θυσία (13:15). Much controversy surrounds some of this cultic language, especially in regard to the identity of the altar mentioned in v 10.[191] However, such controversy is not germane to the present investigation. It must be noted that most of cultic language in the paragraph refers to the priests of the levitical cultus or to ordinary Christians. Remarkably little of the language applies directly to

---

[189]McCown, *ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ*, 122.

[190]Ibid., 127.

[191]See for example, E. L. Randall, "The Altar of Hebrews 13:10," *ACR* 46 (1969): 197-208; S. Ruager, "'Wir haben einen Altar' (Heb 13:10): Einige Überlegungen zum Thema: Gottesdienst/Abendmahl im Hebräerbrief," *KD* 36 (1990): 72-77; A. Snell, "'We Have an Altar'", *RTR* 23 (1964): 16-23; J. M. Creed, "Great Texts Reconsidered: Heb 13:10", *ET* 50 (1938-39): 13-15; B. P. Haensler, "Zu Hebr 13:10," *BZ* 11 (1913): 403-09; H.-J. Klauck, "Θυσιασθριον in Hebr 13:10 und bei Ignatius von Antiochien", *Studia Hierosolymitana* 3 (1982): 147-58; J. E. L. Oulton, "Great Texts Reconsidered: Hebrews 13:10," *ET* 55 (1943-44): 303-05; W. H. Spencer, "Hebrews 13:10," *ET* 50 (1938-39): 484; J. P. Wilson, "The Interpretation of Hebrews 13:10," *ET* 50 (1938-39): 380-81;
N. H. Young, "'Bearing His Reproach' (Heb 13.9-14)," *NTS* 48 (2002): 243-61.

Christ, and when such language is applied to him it does not refer to his heavenly priesthood. *Auctor* refers to the entrance of the levitical priests into the sanctuary with sacrificial blood (13:12). Astonishingly, in light of the extended argument of Heb 9 and 10, the comparison is not then made to the entrance of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary but to his death "outside the camp" (13:12). If the passage is deeply imbued with traditional thought and expression, it provides no evidence that the heavenly priesthood of Christ formed part of that tradition.

Similarly the reference in v 18 to "good conscience" (καλὴν συνείδησιν) is reminiscent of the statement in 9:13-14 that the cultic ministry of Christ was able to purify the conscience and not simply the body (καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν). However, in Heb 13 it is not surrounded by any cultic imagery at all.

Lastly, another reference to the "blood of the eternal covenant" (αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου) is found in the closing benediction (13:20). Michel draws attention to the highly structured character of this benediction, which may reflect its use in liturgy.[192] Once again, this cultic allusion is not developed in terms of the heavenly high-priesthood of Christ. Rather, Jesus is referred to the Christological title κύριος, which is common in early Christian literature but relatively infrequent in Hebrews. Jesus is given the further Christological title τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν γέγαν which is neither characteristic of early Christian literature nor especially priestly. Again, although these verses do seem to be deeply indebted to early Christian traditions, they lend no support to the view that the heavenly high priesthood of Christ was included in such traditions.

---

[192]Michel, *Hebräer*, 535. See also McCown, *ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ*, 130.

*Evaluation.* A survey of passages throughout Hebrews which have been identified by various scholars (with varying degrees of plausibility) as containing traditional material which has been utilized by *Auctor* has returned remarkably uniform results. Such passages do not provide evidence that *Auctor's* high-priestly Christology was found in tradition. Such a result points to the conclusion that such Christology was not part of the confession shared by *Auctor* and the community addressed, but was rather a creation of *Auctor*, himself. This, in turn, leads to the question of why it features so prominently in a work intended to bolster faith in the confession.

Of course there are ways of checking these findings. One of the most obvious is to compare them with the results of an analysis of use of scriptural "testimonies" in Hebrews. If the results reached in the previous section are valid, similar results would be expected from a survey of *Auctor's* use of testimonies.

*The "Testimonies"*

There is no doubt that *Auctor* received some of his "scriptural proofs" from common early Christian tradition. Charles Harold Dodd's standard, namely, passages from the Jewish Scriptures which are "cited by two or more writers of the New Testament in *prima facie* independence of one another" is, in general sufficient for isolating testimonies which were part of the stock of Christian tradition.[193]

Ps 109:1 (LXX) is the clearest case of an appropriated testimony in the Book of Hebrews. This verse is one of the more widely used testimonies in the New Testament, being "cited independently in Mark, Acts, Paul, Hebrews and 1 Peter."[194] It

---

[193]C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 28-29.

[194]Ibid., 35.

is used in a variety of contexts and for a variety of purposes. Hebrews uses it as "an affirmation of Christ's post-resurrection state of heavenly exaltation."[195] It has been argued by some that this verse was incorporated into confessional or hymnic material prior to its appropriation by New Testament authors.[196] Hebrews certainly regards the verse as well known and makes use of it without resorting to special introduction or complex exegesis. The fact that his first use of the verse is by way of allusion rather than direct quotation (1:3) indicates its familiarity to his readers. Acceptance of the theory that 1:3 contains a hymn fragment strengthens the likelihood that Ps 109:1 (LXX) had a pre-New Testament role in Christian hymns or confessions.[197]

Ps 109:1 (LXX), taken by itself, contributes nothing to a priestly Christology. It is generally recognized that in its original setting this is a royal psalm.[198] The referent is a royal figure, rather than a priestly one. The designation "my lord" indicates a position of power and authority over the speaker. "Sitting at the right hand" was an

---

[195]Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 180.

[196]See for example, Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand 39-43*; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 19.

[197]On the presence of a hymn fragment in 1:3, see above, pp. 104-10.

[198]B. W. Anderson, *Out of the Depths: The Psalms Speak for Us Today*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1983), 189-92; H. W. Bateman, IV, "Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament," *BibSac* 149 (1992): 438; J. W. Bowker, "Psalm CX," *VT* 17 (1967): 37; K. R. Crim, *The Royal Psalms* (Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1962), 113-14; M. Dahood, *Psalms III: 101-150*, AB 17A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), 112-13; J. H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, SBT/2 (London: SCM, 1976), 1; J. Gammie, "A New Setting for Psalm 110," *ATR* 51 (1969): 4; H. Gunkel, *The Psalms*, FBBS 19, trans. T. M. Horner (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1967; translation of "Psalmen," in *RGG*. 2nd ed. 2: 1669-73), 23-24; C. Westermann, *Praise and Lament in the Psalms*, trans. K. R. Crim and R. N. Soulen (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1981; translation of *Lob und Klagen in den Psalmen*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 245; Allen, *Psalm 101-150*, 83; Anderson, *Psalms (73-150)*, 767; Croft, *Identity*, 36; Kraus, *Psalms 60-150*, 346-47; ; Mowinckel, *Psalms*, 1: 47 (1967): 37; Weiser, *Psalms*, 693.

indication of special privilege and prestige. The temporal element, "until I make your enemies your footstool," evokes the world of (international) politics rather than that of the sacrificial cultus. In Ps 109:6 (LXX), the enemies are identified as the nations.

Dodd has argued persuasively that the "testimonies" used by New Testament writers were understood as pointers to their context, rather than being adopted in isolation.[199] However, it cannot be argued that the New Testament writers always had all the details of the context in mind whenever a text was cited. Albert Sundberg, Jr. draws attention to the profoundly different uses texts were put to when cited by different writers.[200] This is quite correct, but scarcely overthrows Dodd's position. Dodd, himself, repeatedly points to the different uses of the "testimonies" cited by more than one author as evidence that the later New Testament author did not simply copy the citation from the early New Testament writer.[201] Essentially, as Howard Marshall points out, Dodd argues that the use of a "testimony" by a New Testament writer led others to expect that the original context of the "testimony" may provide further "testimonies."[202] This being the case, the question of whether or not a

---

[199]Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 126.

[200]Sundberg, "On Testimonies," *NovTest* 3 (1959): 268-81, reprinted as "Response Against C. H. Dodd's View: On Testimonies," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994), 182-94. .

[201]Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 28-60.

[202]I. H. Marshall, "An Assessment of Recent Developments," in *Scripture Citing Scripture*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 5-7; reprinted in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994), 202.

Christological interpretation of Ps 109:4 (LXX) was part of the tradition inherited by *Auctor* becomes crucial.

Of course, Ps 109:4 (LXX) is foundational to the high priestly Christology of Hebrews. Manson advances the view that the phrase, "you are a priest forever," which *Auctor* uses is actually part of a primitive Christian confession.[203] Ronald Williamson's conclusion is the precise opposite:

> It was only to be expected that when Ps. 110 [Ps 109 (LXX)] came to be applied to Jesus that someone in the Early Church would also apply to Him and regard as being fulfilled in Him the words of Ps. 110.4 about one who would be "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." It is not impossible, though we have no proof of it, that in fact the Writer of Hebrews was the first to extend the application of Ps. 110 to Jesus beyond its first verse (and to link this with the relevant Genesis Melchizedek passage (Gen. 14.17ff).[204]

The fact that no other New Testament writer alludes to the verse suggests Williamson position is more likely than that of Manson. Evidence within Hebrews itself points away from Manson's conclusion. Ps 109:4 (LXX) is cited four times in Hebrews (5:6; 7:3, 17, 21) and, according to Hay, is alluded to a further six times (5:10; 7:8, 11, 21, 24-25, 28).[205] The context of the initial citation suggests that a new concept is being introduced to the recipients of the message.[206] The citation in 5:6 forms the opening inclusio balanced by a reference to "having been designated by God a high priest according to the order of Melchizedek." in 5:10. The next words are significant: Περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν (5:11). The relative pronoun

---

[203]Manson, *Hebrews*, 54.

[204]Williamson, *Philo*, 432.

[205]Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 165-66.

[206]Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 180.

οὗ has as its antecedent the priesthood of the order of Melchizedek.[207] However, the word δυσερμήνευτος is hardly an appropriate description of a long held traditional belief. Philo's one use of this word, in *Somn* 188, is illuminating. In this section of *de Somniis* Philo draws a contrast between knowledge of the intelligible world and that of "the world whose substance is discernable only by intellect." Knowledge of that latter world is described as δυσερμήνευτος. Elsewhere Philo makes it clear that such knowledge is attainable only through strenuous mental effort, in contrast to knowledge of the physical world which is readily available through the senses.[208] Thus Philo uses the word to indicate precisely those things which were not generally known but were rather acquired only by advanced learners.

The impression that *Auctor* is likewise not using the word to indicate something well known is further confirmed when he suggests that such "hard to understand" teaching is the "solid food" suitable only for the spiritually mature (5:14). When he then proceeds to give a catalogue of elemental teachings (6:1-2) he does not include priesthood.[209] He urges the readers to "go on" (ἀφίημι) from such basic teachings as

---

[207]It is obviously possible that the antecedent should be understood more generally (for example, as Christ, alone) or more specifically (for example, as Christ being appointed as priest after the order of Melchizedek). However, none of the alternate suggestions make any difference to the fundamental point. If the antecedent is seen as "Christ" it is still clear that the aspect of Christ's significance which *Auctor* develops is his Melchizedek priesthood.

[208]Philo. *Congr.* 35.

[209]Exactly what the *Auctor* means by this catalogue is uncertain. Some (for example, Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 104; C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* [Paris: J. Gabalda, 1952], 147) have suggested that he is referring to basic Christian teachings; others (for example, Nairne, *Hebrews*, 15; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 139) that he is referring to the Jewish matrix of beliefs from which Christian theology grew. The suggestion of Adams that he is referring to the teaching of the historical Jesus is unlikely. See J. C. Adams, "Exegesis of Hebrews 6:1f," *NTS* 13 (1967): 378-85.

he catalogues and after an intervening exhortation (6:3-12) he turns to God's promise to Abraham (6:13-20) which morphes seamlessly into a discussion of Abraham's encounter with Melchizedek and the Melchizedekian priesthood (7:1-28). This procession would seem to clearly place the teaching of the Melchizedekian priesthood of Christ is the category of "solid food" in contrast to the basic teaching of the gospel which formed the foundation of the community's beliefs.[210] Thus the conclusion of McCown seems more probable than that of Manson: "The especial contribution of our author [*Auctor*] appears to be this: he links with Ps. 110:1 [109:1 (LXX)] the oracle of Ps 110:4 [109:4 (LXX)]."[211]

If there were independent evidence to suggest that *Auctor* inherited a "priestly" understanding of Ps 109:1 (LXX), Manson's suggestion would gain support. That this is not the case is shown by the way *Auctor* uses this particular testimony. The initial allusion to Ps 109:1 (LXX) in 1:3, as we have already noted, appears to suggest that the promise of this testimony is realized only after priestly activity is concluded. Being seated "at the right hand of majesty" is presented as being directly equivalent to being superior to the angels and receiving a better name than they (1:4). This point is immediately developed with the use of two further testimonies (Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14) in 1:5. Both of these testimony texts, deal with monarchical issues rather than priestly

---

[210]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 85; A. T. Lincoln, "Hebrews and Biblical Theology," in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation*, SHS 5; ed. C. Bartholomew, M. Healy, K. Möller and R. Parry (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2004), 320-21. Schmithals, appears to speak in a similar way but actually regards the "elemental teachings" as instructions given to god-fearers seeking affiliation with hellenistic synagogues. See W. Schmithals "Über Empfänger und Anaß des Hebräerbriefes," in *Eschatologie und Schöpfung: Festschrift für Erich Gräßer*, ed. M. Evang, H. Merklein and M. Wolter, BZNW 89 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 333.

[211]McCown, *ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ,* 171.

ones in their original contexts. Ps 2 is an enthronement Psalm of the divine covenant of kingship with David, and there is not a hint that *Auctor* saw either testimony in any sort of "priestly" terms. Ps 2:7 is especially important in Hebrews being used in the crucial transition from "son" imagery to "priestly" imagery in 5:4-6. However, this testimony is used at that transition point to illustrate *son* imagery. This strongly suggests a similar meaning in 1:5. Kistemaker draws attention to the similarities between the use of Ps 2:7 in Hebrews and the use of the pre-Pauline fragment found in Rom 1:2-4a.[212] Similarly 2 Sam 7:14 is cited in 4QFlor which indicates its perceived interpretative value, not only in the early church, but in some sections (at least) of pre-Christian Judaism.[213] However, in neither Rom 1 nor 4QFlor are priestly themes emphasized.

Similarly, the first actual citation of Ps 109:1 (LXX) in 1:13 is the culmination of a point involving another two testimonies (Ps 44:7-8 [LXX]; Ps 101:26-28 [LXX]) in 1:8-12. The first of these has a clearly "royal" referent. The mention of "throne", "sceptre", and "kingdom", make this unmistakable. The reference to "anointing" could be understood in terms of the appointing of a high priest, except for the fact that according to the Jewish Scriptures kings were also anointed.[214]

---

[212]Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations,* 75.

[213]H. W. Bateman, IV, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5-13: the Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage* AUS, Ser. VII: Theology and Religion 193 (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 56-75.

[214]See, for example, 2 Sam 2:4-7; 5:4; 19:11; 1 Ki 1:34, 45; 5:1 [MT: 1 Ki 5:15]; 2 Ki 11:12; 23:30.

The second testimony (Ps 101:26-28 [LXX]) refers to YHWH in its original context.[215] Once again there is no "priestly" overtone to the citation. In Ps 101 (LXX), God's eternity is contrasted with human mortality. Not only is the psalmist in apparent physical distress (Ps 102:2-11), the city of Jerusalem is also broken down (Ps 102:13-16). In contrast to this the psalmist declares, "You, O LORD, are enthroned forever" (Ps 102:12). The focus is broadly on God's eternal kingship. He is sitting (enthroned) in the height of his קדש (Ps 102:19). This can be taken concretely as "his sanctuary" or abstractly as "his holiness."[216] The more abstract understanding is more probable here.[217] The difference in meaning between these two alternate understandings is, in practice, not great. Weiser points out that the "name" and "holiness" of God was manifest to the people of Israel in their worship at his "sanctuary", especially in the great annual feasts.[218] Even if the word is taken concretely there is still no priestly reference present. YHWH is understood as the master of the sanctuary and not its servant.

What conclusions can then be drawn concerning the understanding of Ps 109:1 (LXX) in Hebrews? Far from manifesting any overt priestly understanding, *Auctor* appears to have understood this testimony in strictly royal terms. If the concerns undergirding the catena of testimonies in Heb 1 were some sort of understanding of a

---

[215]Note the use of the word יהוה in vv 1, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22 of the Psalm. Hebrews adds the word κύριε to the opening of the citation from the LXX. This was necessary only because he cites a fragment of the Psalm rather than the whole.

[216]For קדש taken concretely here, see the New International Version. For a more abstract understanding see the New Revised Standard Version.

[217]Anderson, *Psalms (73-150)*, 710.

[218]Weiser, *Psalms*, 655.

priesthood of angels which *Auctor* perceived as threatening the unique status of Jesus, as some have suggested, no explicit reference is made to this.[219] "In Hebrews [1:5-13], Scripture and first-century concepts are interwoven to present the Son as Divine Wisdom and Davidic King who presently reigns even though future aspects of that reign are yet to come."[220] The contrasts undergirding this catena of texts deal with the relative status of the Son and the angels. Significantly, when an explicit contrast is drawn between their respective roles, it is in terms of rulership (over the coming world), rather than in terms of priesthood (2:5, 8). Thus it appears that *Auctor* inherited a royal messianic understanding of Ps 109:1 (LXX) from Christian tradition, and just as Dodd postulated in taking the context of the testimony seriously, found another useful testimony in Ps 109:4 (LXX).

Another testimony used in Hebrews is Ps 8:4-6, cited in 2:6-8.[221] A fragment of the testimony is cited in 1 Cor 15:27. Paul uses the testimony here in close connection with a citation of Ps 110:1. This dual citation suggests that the interpretation of each of these two testimonies in terms of the other was also part of the early church's common traditions.[222] Dodd detects further allusions to Ps 8:4-6 in Eph 1:22, Phil 3:21, 1 Pet 3:22, and less certainly in Lk 24:26 and Rev 5:12.[223] There is, therefore, no good

---

[219]See, for example, J. D. Charles, "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews", *JETS* 33 (1990): 171-78; M. Goulder, "Hebrews and the Ebionites," *NTS*, 49 (2003): 394-96.

[220]H. W. Bateman IV, "Two First-Century Messianic uses of the OT: Heb 1:5-13 and 4QFlor 11.1-19," *JETS* (1995): 26.

[221]This testimony will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 4, below.

[222]W. B. Wallis,"The Use of Psalms 8 and 110 in I Corinthians 15:25-27 and in Hebrews 1 and 2", *JETS* 15 (1972): 25-29.

[223]Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 32-34.

reason for excluding this testimony from the stock of tradition inherited from the community by *Auctor*. This testimony is fundamental for the development of the argument of Hebrews and Ps 8 is closely related to the *priestly* creation narrative of Gen 1:1-2:4. However, the psalm is lacking in explicitly priestly content. In its original context the Psalm praises God as creator, directing attention especially to humanity as God's handiwork. The dominant imagery is royal rather than priestly. Humankind was "crowned" and given "dominion" with all things "put under [their feet]." No comparable priestly images are present. More significant is the fact that neither Paul nor *Auctor* use the testimony to develop priestly imagery. Indeed, the *Auctor*'s use of the testimony is only indirectly messianic.[224]

In the context of Heb 2, the emphasis of the testimony continues to be royal rather than priestly. The point drawn by *Auctor* is that the promised Lordship of humankind is "not yet" seen but the accomplishment of Christ is seen already. He is already *crowned* with glory on the basis of his death "for everyone" (2:8). Any explicit indication of a priestly ministry for Jesus in the present time is absent.

*Evaluation. Auctor* certainly made use of Christian traditions known to him. Although a number of attempts have been made to demonstrate that his high-priestly Christology was present in those traditions, these attempts have not been successful. It is much more plausible to argue that this distinctive Christology was the creation of *Auctor*, who used the traditions available to him in creative ways to meet the needs of the audience being addressed, and to give it further instruction.[225]

---

[224]See below, pp. 185-86.

[225]Note the similar conclusions reached by F. Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 104.

**High-Priest Christology in other Early Christian Sources**

Given that *Auctor* claims an unbroken line of transmission of his teaching from Jesus, through the apostles, to the church he is addressing (2:3-4), it is not unreasonable to expect `that the key features of his teaching would be found in other early Christian sources if it derived from common traditions. Is this, in fact, the case with his high-priestly Christology?

It is widely acknowledged that such a Christology is only found in its developed form in Hebrews.[226] However, a number of scholars have argued that this teaching is implicit in other sections of the New Testament, to one degree or another.[227] The validity of such claims must now be briefly considered.

A basic methodological consideration makes this whole issue extremely difficult: just how does one determine when one proposition implies another? This is hardly an exact science. For example, as Maurice Wiles points out, Roman Catholics find the institution of the papacy implied–present in seminal form–in the New

---

[226]See, for example, B. Leeming, "Christ the Priest," *The Way* 5 (1965): 3; F. B. Craddock, "The Letter to the Hebrews," in *NIB*, 12: 41; A. C. Purdy, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," in *IB*, 11: 586-87; S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, BST 1 (Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1965), 119; Fuller, *Foundations*, 259; Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 98; Vanhoye, *Priest*, 23.

[227]See, for example, G. Friedrich, "Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohenpriestererwartung in den Synoptikern," *ZTK* 53 (1956): 265-311; O. Moe, "Das Priestertum Christi im NT ausserhalb des Hebräerbriefs," *TLZ* 72 (1947): 335-38; C. Spicq, "L'origine johannique de la conception du Christ-pretre dans L'Épître aux Hébreux," in *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chretienne: Melanges offerts a M. Maurice Goguel* (Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950), 258-69; Cullmann, *Christology*, 89-107; Higgins, "Priestly Messiah," 234; and J. R. Schaefer, "Relationship," 370-73.

Testament. Protestants, by contrast, do not see such an implication at all.[228] What sort of evidence can validly be used to make a determination that something is implied? John Baigent speaks of this as "methodologically, the basic problem" in this entire enterprise.[229] Does the fact that Paul speaks of the "Jerusalem above" (Gal 4:26), imply belief in a heavenly temple with a heavenly priesthood? In some way, it probably does, but how much weight should be put on that sort of implication?

Another limitation is also important: In his typology *Auctor* focuses on specifically cultic activities of the priests, especially those of the Day of Atonement rituals. Obviously the work of priests in the Second Temple period entailed much more than this. However, it is particularly such cultic aspects of priesthood which are important in determining the relationship of *Auctor's* Christology to that implicit in the rest of New Testament.

Various New Testament facts have been adduced as evidence for the implicit teaching of the priesthood of Jesus:

- The use made of Ps 110:1 (109:1, LXX) which is thought to imply similar Christological application of Ps 110:4 (109:4, LXX);[230]
- The presentation of Jesus as opposed to the temple, claiming authority to cleanse it, predicting its destruction and replacement (Matt. 12:6; 21:12-17; Mk 11:15-19; 14:58; Jn 2:19);[231]

---

[228]M. Wiles, "A Survey of the Issues in the Myth Debate," in *Incarnation and Myth: The Debate Continues*, ed. M. Goulder (London: SCM, 1979), 9. Wiles attributes the Roman Catholic position referred to here to Cardinal Hume.

[229]J. W. Baigent, "Jesus as Priest: An Examination of the Claim that the Concept of Jesus as Priest may be found in the New Testament outside the Epistle to the Hebrews," *VoxEv* 12 (1981): 34.

[230]G. Vos, "The Priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *PTR* 5 (1907): 423; Cullmann, *Christology*, 87-89.

[231]R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1971; reprinted, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1982), 99-100.

- The designation "son of man" derived from Dan 7 where his role is understood in priestly terms;[232]
- The designation of Jesus as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Mk 1:24; Lk 4:34);[233]
- the fact that Jesus prayed for his disciples (Lk 22:32; John 17:20);[234]
- The "priestly" blessing given by Jesus at the close of the third gospel (Lk 24:50-51);[235]
- The seamless tunic of Jesus (Jn 19:23), seen as symbolic of the high priest's vestments;[236]
- The "high priestly prayer" of Jesus (Jn 17);[237]
- The extensive sanctuary symbolism of the fourth gospel;[238]
- High Priestly imagery and Day of Atonement symbolism in the passion narratives of the Gospels;[239]
- The use of σκηνόω (to tabenacle) for the incarnation of the λόγος (Jn 1:14);[240]
- The use of the word παράκλητος to designate the heavenly Jesus (1 John 2:1);[241]

---

[232]Bruce, *Hebrews*, lviii.

[233]Friedrich, "Beobachtungen," 275-78.

[234]Bruce, *Hebrews*, lviii; Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 130.

[235]J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, AB 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1590; cf. Sabourin, *Priesthood*, 218.

[236]M. L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 2001), 204; Sabourin, *Priesthood*, 218-19.

[237]Cullmann, *Christology*, 105-06; Henderson, "Priestly Ministry," 146-65; Sabourin, *Priesthood*, 216-18; Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 130.

[238]Milligan, *Theology*, 101; Spicq, "L'origine johannique," 258-69; Henderson, "Priestly Ministry," 107-67; Sabourin, *Priesthood*, 216-18. For a detailed study of the temple symbolism in John see Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*.

[239]J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970; reprinted Eugine, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005), 410-11.

[240]Spicq, "L'origine johannique," 258-60; Henderson, "Priestly Ministry," 109-11.

[241]Vos, "Priesthood," 424; Moe, "Priestertum Christi," 338; Cullmann, *Christology*, 106; Higgins, "Priestly Messiah," 234; and, Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 30; Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 130.

- The fact that Jesus is presented as a priest in Revelation (for example, Rev 1:13);[242]
- The description of the death of Jesus in sacrificial terms (for example, 1 Pet 1:2, 19; 2:24; 3:18);[243]
- The description of Christians in priestly terms (for example, 1 Pet 2:5-9);[244]
- The designation of Jesus as ποιμήν, ἐπίσκοπος, ἀρχιποιάμην, ἀρχηγός and μεσίτης (1 Peter 2:25; 5:4; Acts 3:15; 5:31; 1 Tim 2:5)[245]
- The fact that the heavenly Christ opens the way of access to God (Rom 5:2;
  Eph 2:18; 1 Pet 3:18);[246]
- The intercessory role of the heavenly Christ (Rom 8:34);[247]
- The description of Jesus as ἱλαστήριον (Rom 3:25);[248]
- The "fact," that the church inherited a common Jewish understanding of a priestly messiah;[249]
- The use of the title ἀχιερεύς for Jesus in 1 Clement.[250]

---

[242]Vos, "Priesthood," 424; Cullmann, *Christology*, 104-05; Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 30-31.

[243]Moe, "Priestertum Christi," 337; Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 30; Sabourin, *Priesthood*, 212-16.

[244]Moe, "Priestertum Christi," 337.

[245]Vos, "Priesthood," 424; Friedrich, "Beobachtungen," 267; Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 30.

[246]J. Baehr, "Priest, High Priest," in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, 4 vols., rev. ed., ed. C. Brown (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1986), 3: 40; Moe, "Priestertum Christi," 337; Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 30.

[247]F. F. Bruce, "Kerygma of Hebrews," *Int* 23 (1969): 8; E. Käsemann, *Jesus Means Freedom*, trans., F. Clarke (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969; translation of *Der Ruf der Freiheit,* 3rd ed. Mohr [Siebeck], 1968), 108; J. Baehr, "Priest," 40; Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 30; Higgins, "Priestly Messiah," 234; Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 131-32. Hay correctly notes that the closest New Testament parallel to Rom 8:34 is found in Heb 7:25.

[248]Moe, "Priestertum Christi," 338; see also Heininger, "Sündenreinigung," 67.

[249]Friedrich, "Beobachtungen," 265-311.

[250]M Mees, "Die Hohepriester-Theologie der Hebräerbriefes im Vergleich mit dem Ersten Clemensbrief," *BZ* 22 (1978): 115-24; Käsemann, *Wandering*, 169-70; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 238; Nomoto, "Herkunft und Struktur," 12 Theißen,

Although this list may appear impressive, closer examination shows that none of this data demonstrates that Jesus was widely understood in priestly terms in the early church. It has already been noted that it is not valid to assume that a Christological application of Ps 109:4 (LXX) is implied by every Christological application of Ps 109:1 (LXX). As Baigent points out the best that Jesus' application of Ps 110:1 to himself achieves is the "possibility" that Jesus applied Ps 110:4 to himself (if the sayings are authentic).[251]

The "son of man" designation–surely one of the knottiest problems in New Testament study–is the weakest of reeds to use to support a widespread acceptance of Jesus' priesthood. The derivation of the designation from Daniel 7 is widely accepted, although not without challenge.[252] However, although it is possible to see the son of man of Daniel in priestly terms he is much more clearly modeled on a royal figure.[253] He receives the kingdom and is instrumental in the destruction of his enemies (Dan

---

*Untersuchungen*, 33-37.

[251]Baigent, "Jesus as Priest," 35.

[252]Among the scholars who understand this designation to be derived from Dan 7, see, C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 11-22; V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (London: Macmillan, 1962), 25-35; Dunn, *Christology*, 65-97; R. N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (Vancouver: Regent College, 1970), 82-92. For arguments against a derivation of the title from Dan 7 see L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 297; C. L. J. Proudman, "Remarks on the 'Son of Man'," *CJT* 12 (1966): 130.

[253]For Daniel's "son of man" understood in priestly terms see C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible," in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 36 (1997): 161-93. For a treatment of the figure which emphasizes his royal attributes see A. J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel 7,* AUSDDS 6 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983).

7:13-14). He is a representative figure but that is equally indicative of a kingly figure as a priestly one.

Much of the proffered support for a widespread priestly understanding of Jesus *allows* for such a reading but do not *demand* it. Jesus certainly exhibits a negative attitude to the Temple and its priesthood in the Gospels, but this does not necessarily entail belief that he was a priest of a superior order.

Jesus prays for his disciples but prayer is scarcely an exclusively priestly prerogative, except in strict liturgical contexts. In a similar way, it goes well beyond the evidence to suggest that use of Temple imagery–even extensive use–necessarily suggests that Jesus was understood in priestly terms. Some explicit indication would need to be present to justify such a conclusion and it is singularly absent from the New Testament, except in Hebrews. There is little doubt that Jesus was thought in some circles to be the new temple (for example, Matt. 12:6; John 1:14; 2:19), his death was (at times) understood in sacrificial terms, and there is cultic imagery in the passion narratives, but these facts do not demonstrate that he was understood to be a priest.

None of the designations pointed to as evidence of an implicit priestly Christology (ποιμήν, ἐπίσκοπος, ἀρχιποιάμην, ἀρχηγός, and μεσίτης) is exclusively–or even, especially–priestly. Ποιμήν is used in the LXX as a royal designation (eg, Isa 44:28; Jer 6:3; Ez 37:24). ᾽Αρχηγός is used with priestly connotations in Hebrews but it is the context of that book which provides these connotations, rather than them being inherent in the word. Παράκλητος is used in 1 John 2:1 in a way parallel to the use of ἀρχιερεύς in 2:17 but, once again, it is the

parallel with Hebrews which gives the word any priestly connotation.[254] Παράκλητος along with μεσίτης is derived from the legal rather than the cultic sphere. Ceslas Spicq captures well the direction of the flow of thought with regard to μεσίτης when he declares "in 8:8; 9:15; 12:24 where Christ is portrayed as great high priest, mediation becomes a new chapter in NT Christology."[255] Similarly, holiness is certainly a mandated attribute of the priesthood, but is scarcely limited to it in the Jewish Scriptures (compare, Jer 1:5).[256] In the case of Jesus, the designation may have much more to do with his endowment with the Holy Spirit (Mk 1:10; Lk 3:22).[257]

The prayer of Jesus in John 17 is often described as "high priestly".[258] However, given that the scope of the prayer extends, in principle, to the end of the age, it may not imply the sort of heavenly priesthood developed in Hebrews. The key issue here is the referent of "those who will believe in me through their word" in Jn 17:20. The purpose of the Gospel is to lead others to belief (Jn 20:30), or perhaps to strengthen the faith of those who already believe. It is, therefore, possible to regard the referent as being all Christians of later generations.

---

[254]J. Behm, "παράκλητος," in *TDNT* 5: 812.

[255]See C. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*, 3 vols., trans. J. D. Ernst (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1994), s.v., "μεσίτης."

[256]Gnilka, "Erwartung des Messianischen Hohenpriesters," 410.

[257]O. Procksch and K. G. Kuhn, "ἅγιος, ἁγιάζω, ἁγιασμός, ἁγιότης, ἁγιωσσύνη," in *TDNT*, 1:101.

[258]See, for example, S. Agourides, "The 'High Priestly Prayer' of Jesus" in *Studia Evangelica, Vol 4: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965. Part 1: The New Testament Scriptures*, ed. F.L. Cross (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968), 137-45; and, E. Haenchen, *John*, 2 vols., Hermeneia, trans. R. W. Funk (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984; translation of *Das Johannesevangelium. Ein Kommentar*; Tübingen. Mohr [Siebeck], 1980), 147-59; Henderson, "Priestly Ministry," 135-65.

> John has already referred to the mission of the disciples εἰς τὸν κόσμον (v. 18). As their faith is itself the result of Jesus' mission to the world, so their mission will evoke faith. John now deliberately turns to view this process, the history of the church.[259]

It is certainly not clear that John saw the prayer in particularly priestly terms. Sacrificial language, for example, is lacking. There is no sign of an original cultic *Sitz im Leben* for the prayer.[260]

It is possible that the Third Gospel presents the final benediction of Jesus (Luke 24:50) in such a way as to remind the reader of the priestly blessing of the Second Temple period. However, the parallels are very subtle, consisting largely of the act of the raising of the hands. The evidence for seeing a priestly allusion here is less than compelling.

The same is true of the "seamless tunic" of the Fourth Gospel. Similarly, Paul provides data which *may* serve as pointers towards a priestly Christology. But there is nothing that implies that Paul himself thought of Jesus in priestly terms. Shinya Nomoto correctly notes of Rom 3:24-25 that even if these verses reflect a typological understanding of the Jewish sacrificial cultus applied to the death of Jesus, "wenngleich diese Tradition noch nicht auf ein Handeln des Hohenpriesters reflektiert."[261]

---

[259]C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St John*, 2d ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), 511.

[260]H-F. Weiss, *Hebräer*, 230.

[261]Nomoto, "Herkunft und Structur," 11.

The presentation of Jesus in Revelation *may* be in priestly terms, but this claim is disputed.[262] Priests did wear long white robes but so did kings, princes (1 Sam 18:4; 24:5, 11; Ez 26:15), prophets (Zech 3:4) and heavenly messengers (Ez 9:2, 3, 11; Dan 10:5).[263] Three strong lines of evidence can be brought against the proposition that Jesus is presented as a priest in Rev 1:13. First, the primary allusion of the verse is to the son of man of Daniel 7 who is not necessarily a priestly figure. Second, although the reference to lampstands immediately reminds the reader of the candelabra in the Temple, that is not the intended referent here. John refers not to a single lamp stand but to a group of lamp stands–presumably a total of seven, one for each of the churches about to be addressed–among which Jesus is walking. Lastly, in the absence of a definite Temple allusion in this verse and the presence of a certain allusion to the book of Daniel, it is most likely that the image of the long white robe is derived from the dress of the heavenly messenger of Dan 10:5. Given the intensely symbolic nature of the book of Revelation, it would be difficult to demonstrate that Jesus was regarded as a heavenly priest, even if this book did so picture him. Nor is it methodologically

---

[262]A priestly interpretation is supported by Milligan, Caird, Best, and (with qualifications) Mounce. It is rejected by Charles, Morris, Beasley-Murray, Ladd, Aune.and Mazzaferri. See, W. Milligan, *The Ascension of Christ* (Minneapolis, MN: Klock & Klock, 1980; [originally, London: MacMillan, 1891], 63; G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* HNTC (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 25; E. Best, "Spiritual Sacrifice," *Int* 14 (1960): 292; R. H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977), 77-78; R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John* ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1920), 1: 28; L. Morris, *The Revelation of St. John*, TNTC (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1969), 53; G. E. Ladd, *A Commentary on the Revelation of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 32-33; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation*, NCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 66-67; F. D. Mazzaferri, *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective*, BZNW 54 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 303, 320; D. E. Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, WBC 52 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1997), 93-94.

[263]On white priestly robes see Jos. *Ant.* 3.7.2-4.

sound to assume that the New Testament writers simply adopted the commonplace Jewish "priestly-messiah" ideal.[264] Jewish messianism is now recognized as having been far more diversified than was once thought.[265] Furthermore, the entire understanding of "priestly messianism" at Qumran is problematic.[266]

The final argument from the use of ἀρχιερεύς in 1 Clement suggests that a comparison of the use of testimonies common to Heb 1 and 1 Clem 36 reveal the later usage to be independent of Hebrews and, indeed, more primitive in form.[267] However, Gareth Cockerill has subjected this suggestion to severe scrutiny and concluded that the differences between Hebrews and 1 Clement at this point are best accounted for by postulating that Clement borrowed from Hebrews and modified the material he used.[268] Loader concludes similarly "daß 1Klem deutlich vom Hb abhängig ist."[269]

Thus, the evidence that a priestly Christology is implicit in the New Testament outside of Hebrews is weak. The data which is pointed to for support is interpreted in the light of the Christology of Hebrews, rather than providing genuine independent

---

[264]Friedrich, "Beobachtungen," 268-75.

[265]Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology,"13-31.

[266]See discussion in chapter 1, above.

[267]Nairne, *Hebrews*, xxxix.

[268]G. L. Cockerill, "Heb 1:1-14, 1 Clem 36:1-6 and the High Priest Title," *JBL* 97 (1978): 437-40. The idiosyncratic view of Powell ("High Priest," 389) that 1 Clement is antecedent to Hebrews and provides the source for the latter's treatment of the high priest theme is ignored by Cockerill. However, if Cockerill's analysis of the relative dating of the traditions of the two books is accepted, Powell's conclusions are nullified.

[269]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 65; see also D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*, SNT 34 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 182-84; 193-94.

support for such a Christology. However, *Auctor* does not create his priestly Christology *ex nihilo* but rather uses the building blocks provided in some measure in early Christian tradition.[270] Such building blocks included priestly and Temple imagery, a sacrificial understanding of the atonement, and, Christological designations which were easily reapplied in priestly terms. Schaefer's conclusion is correct that although the New Testament (apart from Hebrews) does not "explicitly" express a priestly messianism, it does so "rudimentarily".[271] This state of affairs is not as surprising as is sometimes supposed. The high priesthood of Christ in Hebrews is intimately associated with the utilization of Day of Atonement imagery in that book. The situation with regard to the high priestly Christology is precisely analogous to that with regard to the Day of Atonement in the New Testament. Jesus' death is elsewhere presented in sacrificial terms (for example, Rom 8:3; Eph 5:2). Kevin McCruden correctly notes that the "sacrificial appraisal of Christ's person is a highly traditional one and constitutes a fairly widespread and treasured conceptualization of Christ's work and significance in the context of the early Christian movement."[272] Use of Day of Atonement imagery is much more limited than use of sacrificial imagery generally. The significance of the death of Jesus is explained in terms of the Day of Atonement almost exclusively in Hebrews.[273]

---

[270]H-F. Weiss, *Hebräer*, 229-32.

[271]Schaefer, "Relationship," 370. See also Lincoln, "Hebrews," 320-21.

[272]McCruden, "Perfection of Divine Intimacy," 105.

[273]M. E. Isaacs, "Priesthood and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *HeyJ* 38 (1997): 55. Another possible example is found in Rom 3:25. See N. H. Young, "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the Thought of the New Testament" (PhD diss., University of Manchester: 1973), 274-339.

The confession of the community clearly included the affirmation that Jesus was the Son of God. The evidence adduced thus far suggests that it did not include an affirmation of the heavenly priesthood of Jesus. Yet some a affirmation is made repeatedly in Hebrews, despite that books proclaimed intention to bolster faith in the confession. This suggests that the priesthood and sonship of Christ may be related to one another at a deeper level in *Auctor's* thinking. Evidence drawn from a rhetorical-critical reading of Hebrews can be adduced to indicate that this understanding is valid.

**The Rhetorical Structure and Strategy of Hebrews**

It has already been noted that Übelacker classifies 1:(4)5-2:18(3:1) as "*narratio* mit *propositio* in 2,17f."[274] Not until 4:14 is the priestly ministry of Jesus in heaven directly alluded to. Significantly, 4:12-13 has been identified by some scholars as the second element in the *inclusio* which brackets the first major thematic section of Hebrews (see also 1:1-4).[275] Jesus is designated as (high) priest first in the first section of arguments (2:17).

The significance of these structural observations is that the *exordium* of a well-structured deliberative speech consists exclusively of material which both the orator and his audience agree upon.[276] Attempts are made to bring (or keep) the judge and/or audience "on side". Divisive arguments are avoided. One of the fundamental purposes

---

[274]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 185. For further discussion see above, pp. 56-57.

[275]See, for example, G. W. MacRae, "'A Kingdom that Cannot be Shaken': the Heavenly Jerusalem in the Letter to the Hebrews," in *Studies in the New Testament and Gnosticism*, GNS 26 (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1987; reprinted from *Tantar Yearbook* [1979-80]: 27-40), 100.

[276]It was acceptable for a deliberative speech to lack an *exordium* if the issues were considered urgent enough and a decision had to be reached with alacrity (Arist. *Rh.* 3.14.12; Quin, *Inst.* 3.8.10).

of the *exordium* is the building of "the audience's sympathy with the topic of the speech (on the side of the speaker's party) and with the speaker himself."[277] This involves, in part, the development of ethical proofs.[278]

Significantly, before *Auctor* begins his first major block of arguments, he goes to pains to remind his recipients of the impeccable lineage of the confession he wishes to defend and reinforce (2:3-4). The message is traced back through an unbroken line of witnesses to the Lord, himself. It has been endorsed by God in miraculous and charismatic ways. The purpose of all of this is to reinforce *Auctor's* authority as the mediator of this "confession" and by derivation to facilitate acceptance of the arguments he is about to make and the conclusions he is going to draw from them. His personal credibility is enhanced by his being part of this unbroken chain of tradition.

Thus it may be surmised that if *Auctor* conformed to the rhetorical conventions of his day, it would appear likely that the heavenly priesthood of Christ was not part of the traditions or confessions of the church he addressed. Milligan lends support to this observation:

> Thus, though in his opening summary Christ's work as Priest is clearly pointed to in the words, 'when he had made purification of sins' (c. i.3), the word itself is not used. And though it is abruptly introduced in c. ii.17 'a merciful and faithful High-priest in things pertaining to God,' and again in c. iii.1, 'the Apostle and High-priest of our confession, *even* Jesus,' it is *not dwelt upon until, by means of more familiar comparisons*, the writer has raised the Hebrews' mind to a proper sense of the greatness of their Christian privileges.[279]

---

[277]Lausberg, *Handbook*, 114. See also Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 74. In the classical handbooks note Quint. *Inst*. 4.3.

[278]Arist. *Rh.* 2.2.4.

[279]Milligan, *Theology*, 102-03; emphasis added.

Is there any concrete evidence supporting this conclusion? Two aspects of the development of thought in the paranaetic sections of the book actually provide precisely this sort of confirmatory evidence: the degree of identification *Auctor* makes with the recipients and the nature of the exhortations themselves.

George MacRae suggests that sixteen paraenetic sections can be detected on formal grounds in Hebrews.[280] He concedes that this analysis is not universally accepted. Given both the brevity of some of MacRae's proposed paraenetic sections and their close proximity to each other (in many cases), it is probably better to group the parenesis more broadly into five major blocks: 2:1-4; 3:7-4:16; 5:11-6:12; 10:19-39; 12:1-39.[281]

*"We" Language and "You" Language*

Identification has been called "a basic means of persuasion."[282] The evaluation of the degree of identification made by *Auctor* with his recipients in the language of the exhortatory passages of Hebrews is thus of obvious significance in discerning *Auctor*'s rhetorical strategy. A significant pointer in making such an evaluation is the use of first and second person statements in the parenasis of the book. No doubt, some of the

---

[280]MacRae, "Kingdom that Cannot be Shaken," 102-03. The sixteen passages identified by MacRae are 2:1-4; 3:1-2, 12-14; 4:1, 11, 14, 16; 6:1-3, 11-12; 10:19-25, 32-33, 35; 12:1-3, 12-16, 25a, 28.

[281]This grouping is reflected, for example, in T. K. Oberholtzer's five-part analysis of the warning passages in Hebrews. See, T. K. Oberholtzer, "The Eschatological Salvation of Hebrews 1:5-2:5," *BibSac* 145 (1988): 83-97; *idem*, "The Kingdom Rest in Hebrews 3:1-4:13," *BibSac* 145 (1988): 185-96; *idem*, "The Thorn Infested Ground in Hebrews 6:4-12," *BibSac* 145 (1988): 319-28; *idem*, "The Danger of Willful Sin in Hebrews 10:26-39," *BibSac* 145 (1988): 410-19; *idem*, "The Failure to Heed his Speaking in Hebrews 12:25-29," *BibSac* 146 (1989): 67-75.

[282]L. Thurén, "Romans 7 Derhetorized" in *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*, ed. S. E. Porter and D. L. Stamps, JSNTSS 195 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 431.

first person plurals are a matter of authorial style and may not necessarily point to identification with the recipients, as such (for example, 2:5). Others are somewhat ambiguous, either representing a feature of *Auctor*'s style or a deliberate attempt at identification with the recipients (eg, 2:8-9). However, other uses of the first or second person appear to be more significant. In general the admonitions phrased in the first-person "clearly indicate that what he [*Auctor*] appeals to the recipients to do, he himself is doing or is prepared to do."[283]

In the opening paraenetic block of Hebrews *Auctor* first explicitly identifies himself with the congregation and its experience. These verses abound with first person plural verbs and pronouns: ἡμᾶς (2:1, 3), παραρυῶμεν (2:1), ἡμεῖς (2:3), ἐκφευξόμεθα (2:3). *Auctor* includes himself in the exhortation, identifying himself fully with the recipients. As the work progresses, *Auctor* increasingly stands apart from the congregation to rebuke them.

The second parenesis opens with a statement of identification: Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· οὗ οἶκος **ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς** ἐάνπερ τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος **κατάσχωμεν** (3:6). Once again, *Auctor* identifies himself with the community he is addressing. However, there is an immediate change to second person verbs: σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ <u>ἀκούσητε</u> (3:7). This change is arguably not *Auctor*'s choice but is forced on him by the fact that he is quoting Ps 95:8. However, not all the "you" language of this hortatory section is directly dependent on the Psalm citation (for example, 3:12-13). Further "we"

---

[283]W. Übelacker, "Hebrews and the Implied Author's Rhetorical Ethics," in *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion in Biblical Discourse*, ed. T. H. Olbricht and A. Eriksson, ESEC 11 (New York: Continuum, 2003), 332.

language is found throughout this exhortatory section (3:14, 19; 4:13) and especially in its conclusion: Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, **κρατῶμεν** τῆς ὁμολογίας. οὐ γὰρ **ἔχομεν** ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις **ἡμῶν**, πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. **προσερχώμεθα** οὖν μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος ἵνα **λάβωμεν** ἔλεος καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν (4:14-16). "We" language and "you" language is intermingled in this exhortation, sometimes in startlingly dramatic ways: Βλέπετε, ἀδελφοί, μήποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας- μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ **γεγόναμεν**, ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν **κατάσχωμεν**- ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι· σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ. (3:12-15; see also 4:1-3). The transition from first-person plurals to third person plurals, between vv 13 and 14, suggests that if the recipients heed the exhortation the identification with *Auctor* will be preserved–but responsibility for the continuation of this identification is *theirs*, not *his*. Repetition of the Psalm citation subtly suggests that the use of "you" language here is not *Auctor*'s preference.

The first person plural form which introduced the third paraenetic block is clearly stylistic. Rather than emphasizing an identification of *Auctor* and the recipients, its placement with a barrage of second person plurals serves to highlight the separation between them: Περὶ οὗ πολὺς **ἡμῖν** ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον, πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ τὰ

στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος [καὶ] οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς (5:11-12). Although "we" language is found in the exhortation (for example, 6:1, 3), the predominant note is sounded by the "you" language The first person plurals in 6:9, 11 (πεπείσμεθα; λαλοῦμεν; ἐπιθυμοῦμεν) are solely stylistic rather than attempts to indicate solidarity. The exhortation concludes with a barrage of second person plurals, similar to its opening (6:11-12).

The fourth exhortation shows a mixing of first and second person plurals. However, it is clear that even when *Auctor* says "we" he really means "you". A comparison between 10:22 and 35 is illuminating in this regard. In the early verse, near the beginning of this block of parenesis, *Auctor* declares **προσερχώμεθα** μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως. The language is inclusive. *Auctor* includes himself in the exhortation. The second verse, much closer to the conclusion of this exhortation, declares Μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν. *Auctor* here doubly separates himself from the recipients. Significantly he is referring to their παρρησία–the very word he has previously used with regard to entrance into the heavenly sanctuary (4:16), which is referred to in 10:22 with first person plurals.

The final hortatory block (12:1-29) is introduced with a concentration of "we" language unseen in Hebrews since the first exhortation (2:1-4): Τοιγαροῦν καὶ **ἡμεῖς** τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον **ἡμῖν** νέφος μαρτύρων, ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, δι' ὑπομονῆς **τρέχωμεν** τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα (12:1). Although much of the exhortation is then expressed in "you" language (12:3-5, 25), the metaphor of family discipline allows *Auctor* to express his solidarity with the recipients: εἶτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς **ἡμῶν** πατέρας **εἴχομεν** παιδευτὰς καὶ **ἐνετρεπόμεθα**· οὐ πολὺ [δὲ] μᾶλλον

**ὑποταγησόμεθα** τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ **ζήσομεν**; (12:9). The first person plurals of this verse are not merely stylistic. *Auctor* is declaring that he, along with his recipients had experienced and (now) appreciated parental discipline, analogous to the discipline God metes out to his children. The exhortation closes with a final burst of "we" language: Βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα· εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα, πολὺ μᾶλλον **ἡμεῖς** οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἀποστρεφόμενοι . . . . Διὸ βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες **ἔχωμεν** χάριν, δι' ἧς **λατρεύωμεν** εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους (12:25, 28). The change from the second person plural βλέπετε to the following first person plurals in v 25 serves to emphasize that even in his use of "you" language in this exhortation, the identification of *Auctor* with his recipients remains intact.

How should this data be evaluated? In classical rhetoric, as we have already noted, the function of the *exordium* and *narratio* is to gain the sympathy of the audience. *Auctor* has done this in 2:1-4 in part by identifying himself strongly with the recipients through the use of "we" language. In the argumentative section of classical oration, a rhetor might have to introduce arguments of a more divisive nature having endeavored to bring the audience over to his side in the *exordium*. This strategy is obviously fraught with risk. The audience may not be sufficiently "on-side" and may consequently be alienated by the presentation of the arguments. For this reason, classical handbooks recommend a final endeavor to bring the audience on to the rhetor's side before the conclusion of the oration–if this is considered necessary.[284]

---

[284]Arist., *Rh*.3.19.1-6.

This is precisely the type of rhetorical strategy revealed by the use of “we” language and “you” language in the hortatory sections of Hebrews.

The careful selection of “we” statements and “you” statements in hortatory sections of the work suggest that *Auctor* moves from common ground between himself and the community he is addressing to topics that are more novel. When the pattern of “we” statements and “you” statements is compared with the expositional and theological content of the book it becomes evident that the heavenly priesthood of Christ is not part of the common ground *Auctor* shares with the community. It is not part of the confession.

This same pattern can be seen–and for the same reasons–from an analysis of the hortatory passages themselves. there is a significant change in tone in the exhortations from the first to the last.[285] The changes are evident in the actual exhortation given; the danger warned of, the penalty threatened, and the examples used to reinforce the exhortation.

*Content of the Hortatory Passages*

The tone of the opening parenesis is mild. The readers are exhorted to "pay closer attention" (δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν) to what they have heard. The danger is that they will "drift away" (παραρυῶμεν) and "neglect" (ἀμελήσαντες). ’Αμελέω carries connotations of carelessness.[286] No hint of deliberate rebelliousness or even failure of the will is hinted at. The penalty for failing to heed the exhortation is

---

[285]Lindars, “Rhetorical Structure,” 390-402.

[286]W. Bauer, W.F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3th ed. rev. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v., ἀμελέω; Spicq, *Lexicon*, s.v, ἀμελέω, ἐπιμελέομαι.

that they will not "escape" (ἐκφευξόμεθα) their due punishment. The nature of this punishment is not specified. Actually, punishment is not directly threatened. Rather a rhetorical question is posed and the readers are asked to consider for themselves if any escape will be feasible. The exhortation is given force by the use of an example: Those who disobeyed the law of Moses were punished. Again, the nature of both their disobedience and punishment is left unspecified. The use of the word παρακοή–"refusal to listen and so be disobedient, unwillingness to hear"–suggests that the failings of ancient Israel are here cast far more in terms of moral responsibility than those threatening the church.[287] This is the word Paul uses to describe Adam's sin in contrast to the ὑποκοή of Christ (Rom 5:19). Gerhard Kittel notes:

> Παρακοή in the NT alway [*sic*.] means 'bad hearing' in consequence of unwillingness to hear (c.), and therefore in the guilty sense of disobedience which does not and will not proceed to the action by which hearing becomes genuine hearing.[288]

The second exhortation manifests a rhetorical escalation in all four areas. The exhortation is no longer to "pay closer attention" but rather not to harden hearts (μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, 3:8, 15; 4:7). This more serious exhortation is given the full weight of scriptural authority, being part of the citation from Ps 95:8. The fact that this particular fragment of Ps 95 is cited three times in this hortatory section makes the exhortation "do not harden your hearts" the touchstone of the entire section. The danger faced by the recipients is upgraded from "drifting away" and "neglect" to having "an evil, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God."

---

[287]Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich and Danker, *Lexicon*, s.v., παρακοή, ῆς, ἡ.

[288]G. Kittel, ἀκούω, ἀκοή, εἰς-, ἐπ-, παρακούω, παρακοή, ὑπακούω, ὑπακοή, ὑπήκοος, in *TDNT*, 1: 223.

(μήποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, 3:12), "so none of you my be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin" (ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, 3:13), and not holding firm to the end (μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, 3:14).[289] If not holding firm suggests no more than weariness, the two explicit exhortations indicate that danger is much more than that: hardening of the heart has a clear connotation of rebellion and deliberate rejection of God and καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος unmistakably indicates the same. Spicq notes that although σκληρύνω ("harden") is rare in Philo and secular Greek sources, it is "common in the LXX, here most of the occurrences have a moral and religious meaning."[290] This "moral and religious meaning" is further elaborated by Ulrich Becker: "Hardening, according to the OT understanding, results from the fact that men persist in shutting themselves to God's call and command."[291] The overtones of carelessness which pervade the first hortatory section are replaced by those of rebelliousness. The wilderness generation is typified as being rebellious from beginning to end.[292] The grumbling at Massah and Meribah (Ex 17:1-7) are conflated with the open rebellion at Kadesh Barnea (Num 14:1-44). Heb 3:9-10 suggests (inaccurately, when measured by the account in

---

[289]The negative is implied here. *Auctor*, in saying his recipients will be partners with Christ if they hold fast, suggests that they are in danger of forfeiting that right by not holding fast.

[290]Spicq, *Lexicon*, s.v., "σκηροκαρδία, σκληρός, σκληρότης, σκληροτράχηλος, σκληρύνω."

[291]See, U. Becker, "Hard, Hardened," in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, 4 vols., rev. ed., ed. C. Brown (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1986), 2: 154; see also K. L. and M. A. Schmidt, "σκληρύνω," in *TDNT*, 5: 1030-31.

[292]Note ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ, again taken from the biblical citation of Ps 95:10 (3:10).

Numbers) that the rebellion at Kadesh Barnea happened at the end of the forty year wilderness wandering instead of near its beginning. The addition of διό to the citation after τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη (3:10) had precisely this effect in mind.[293] The penalty for the Exodus generation's disobedience is also specified: complete rejection by God and utter failure to enter his "rest" (3:18; 4:3).[294] Consequently, the penalty for the recipients' failure to heed *Auctor*'s exhortation is that they too may fail to enter God's rest. (4:1).[295] Note also that the references to lack of faith (4:1) and disobedience (4:6) are both to the wilderness generation but with the clear implication that the recipients face the same dangers.

The third exhortation features further escalation of rhetoric. The recipients are exhorted to "go on to perfection" (ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα, 6:1). The danger of rebelliousness is again stressed (παραπεσόντα, 6:6), but here it is further defined with a graphic image: crucifying Jesus again (ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, 6:6). It is difficult to imagine what would be more distressing to first-

---

[293]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 115.

[294]Except for Caleb and Joshua according to Numbers but this detail does not feature in Hebrews.

[295]"Rest" in the case of the wilderness generation is clearly a metaphor for the land of Caanan (see particularly, 3:17). The precise nature of the "rest" which the recipients are in danger of not entering is considerably more debated. See, for example,
H. W. Attridge, "'Let us Strive to Enter that Rest': The Logic of Hebrews 4:1-11," *HTR* 73 (1980): 279-88; J. Laansma, *"I Will Give You Rest": The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4*, WUNT 2/98 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 252-358; ; J. H. Wray, *Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth Early Christian Homiletics of Rest*, SBLDS 166 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1998), 52-95 K-K. Yeo, "The Meaning and Usage of the Theology of 'Rest' (καταπαυσις and σαββατισμοσς) in Hebrews 3:7-4:13," *AsiaJT* 5 (1991): 2-33; Hofius, *Katapausis*; 51-58; Oberholtzer, "Kingdom Rest," 185-96.

century Christians than this. The personal examples of the previous two exhortations are abandoned in favour of an impersonal one: thorn-infested farm land. The fate of such land is to be "cursed" (κατάρας ἐγγύς) and to be "burned over" (τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν, 6:8). Both elements are reminiscent of the fate of those who reject salvation. The danger for the recipients, if they do not heed the exhortation, is that it will be impossible to "restore [them] . . . again to repentance" (Ἀδύνατον . . . ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, 6:4, 6). The grim sternness of this exhortation is relieved only by one qualifier: "we are confident of better things in your case" (Πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, 6:9).

The fourth hortatory passage builds on its predecessors. Concern for the confession, implicit in the first exhortation (τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν, 2:1) is now made explicit (κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος, 10:23). The recipients are further exhorted not to abandon their confidence (παρρησίαν, 10:19).[296] The admonition to go on to perfection in the third exhortation is also further defined: ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶ, (10:22). The example used echoes that of the first exhortation: those who broke the Mosaic law and were punished (10:28 see also 2:2). However, here the punishment, not specified in the first exhortation, is detailed: χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν . . . ἀποθνῄσκει, 10:22). The danger facing the recipients is that they might choose to wilfully persist in sin (ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν, 10:26), that is, they might spurn "the Son of God, [profane] the

[296]The word παρρησία occurs only here in the hortatory sections of Hebrews. However, the immediate context of the second and third exhortation also features the word (3:6; 4:16). The third exhortation uses the word πληροφορία, (6:11; see also 10:22) which, although not a synonym for παρρησία, may have a similar import here. See G. Delling, "πλήρης, πληρόω, πλήρωμα, ἀναπληρόω, ἐκπληρόω, ἐκπλήρωσις, συμπλῳρόω, πλῳροφορέω, πληροφορία," in *TDNT*, 6: 311.

blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified, and outrage the Spirit of grace" (ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσα, 10:29).[297] The penalty for failure to heed the exhortation is outlined with grim sternness: οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία, φοβερὰ δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους (10:26-27).[298] Like the first exhortation, the penalty is put as a rhetorical question. However, where the first exhortation has a very general question (how shall we escape?), this question is very specific: how much worse will the punishment be than the execution without mercy, inflicted on transgressors of the Mosaic law? God is presented as the one who lays exclusive claim to vengeance. As in the third exhortation, the otherwise unrelenting harshness of this hortatory section is lightened by a qualifier: ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς (10:39).

The final block of exhortation returns in large message to the tone of the first. The harder edge of the intervening exhortations is still evident, especially in the illustrative use made of the story of Esau (12:16-17), who is unable to find repentance despite seeking it with tears. However, this illustration is surrounded by much gentler imagery: God as the loving Father who disciplines just as earthly fathers do (12:5-13); and the present reality of the recipients' arrival at the mountain of God (12:21-24). The first admonition in this block is quite general: ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ

---

[297]This formulation deliberately echoes the danger of "recrucifying the Son of God" which lies at the heart of the third exhortation.

[298]The mention of "fire" here develops the illustration of the fate of an unproductive field in the previous hortatory block (6:9), although the vocabulary used is different.

τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα (12:1). Others of similar ilk follow: Διὸ τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε, καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιεῖτε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν . . . Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον, ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ (12:12-15). The danger faced by the recipients is that they might "grow weary or lose heart" (ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι, 12:3). The penalty for disregarding *Auctor*'s exhortation echoes that of the first hortatory block (2:1-4). Again it is a rhetorical question: "how shall we escape . . . ?" (ἐκφεύγω, 12:25). The exhortation closes with a reminder καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον (12:29), which picks up the reference to burning in the third and fourth hortatory sections.

The pattern with the exhortations is exactly parallel to that seen in the degree of identification evinced between *Auctor* and the recipients.[299] The first exhortation is gentle and inoffensive. Exhortations two, three and four bear witness to a progressive escalation of rhetoric. Finally the fifth exhortation returns in large measure to the tone of the first exhortation although retaining and reinforcing some of the themes from the other blocks as well. This is precisely what would be expected if *Auctor* were following the classical rhetorical models as he, indeed, appears to be. This lends significant weight to the suggestion that he also follows those models in the presentation of his argumentative proofs: beginning with what is known and accepted and only adding that which is new and divisive at a later stage. This suggests that the

[299]See the discussion above, pp. 159-64.

heavenly (high) priesthood of Jesus is not part of the common tradition being utilized by *Auctor*.

**Results: Is the Priesthood of Jesus Included in the "Confession"?**

The results from surveying the potential evidence for concluding that the priesthood of Jesus as a part of the confession of the recipients have been uniformly negative. Such a supposition is not supported by the rhetorical structure of the document, the use of traditional material in it, or by the witness of the rest of the New Testament. The strongest support for seeing priesthood as a part of the confession is found in 3:1: ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν. However, contextual factors and an understanding of the meaning of ὁμολογία lessen the likelihood that this phraseology actually indicates that priesthood was part of the confession. The comments by Ernest Scott remain as valid now as they were when they were written:

> Attempts have often been made to construe the Epistle as the manifesto of some school or party which rested its Christianity on a belief in the priesthood of Christ. It is true that suggestions of this belief can be discovered elsewhere, but there is no indication that it as widely current, much less that any definite type of doctrine had grown out of it.[300]

If this is so, how does priesthood contribute to the furtherance of the exhortation to hold fast to the confession?

**Conclusion**

The importance of the reinforcing commitment to the confession as a motive for the writing of Hebrews is widely recognized. Significantly less unanimity exists with regard to the content of the confession. The specific question of whether or not

---

[300]E. F. Scott, "The Epistle to the Hebrews and Roman Christianity," *HTR* 13 (1920): 210.

the priesthood of Christ was part of the confession receives diametrically opposite answers from scholars. Some have argued that the importance of the priesthood of Christ in Hebrews *necessarily* implies its inclusion in the confession of that community. However, I have argued on a number of grounds that this position is unlikely. How then does *Auctor*'s emphasis on Christ's priesthood contribute to his intended goal of strengthening the reader's commitment to their confession? It is to this question that I now turn.

# CHAPTER 4

## STARTING AT THE BEGINNING: HEBREWS 2:5-18

In this chapter the focus of attention will be on Heb 2. There are a number of facets to this focus. First, the decision to accept Heb 2 as the most valid entry point for a discussion of the relationship of priesthood and Sonship in Hebrews needs to be justified. Second, the rhetorical and structural position of Heb 2 within the entire book needs to be established. Third, exegesis on the chapter must be done in some detail to ascertain the nature of the argument developed therein.

### A Starting Point for the Investigation

The Christological argument of Hebrews can broadly be divided into two sections: Heb 1-7, which deals with the person of the heavenly priest; and Heb 8-13, which deals with the work of the heavenly priest. This is obviously an extremely broad division. It is recognized that there is much beside these topics in the two sections delineated–not least of all considerable amounts of paraenesis. It should also be noted that the dividing point between the two sections does not form an impenetrable barrier, so that no reference to the person of the priest is found in Heb 8-13, or any to his work in Heb 1-7. Despite these qualifications, it is widely recognized that Heb 8 serves as a

major turning point in the argument of Hebrews.[1] The question of the relationship between Sonship and priesthood will therefore be explored primarily in the first seven chapters of the book. There are three places in Hebrews–2:5-18; 5:5-6; and 7:28-8:1–where the Christological terminology of Sonship and priesthood are brought into particularly close connection, and the key to relationships ought logically to be sought in them. The two latter passages indicate the close relationship between the Sonship and priesthood by explicitly juxtaposing the two concepts in the text. In 2:5-18 the nature of the relationship is developed in a more sustained way.

**Hebrews 2:5-18**

The selection of this passage as the crucial starting point of any investigation of the relationship of priesthood and Sonship in Hebrews can be justified on several grounds. The chapter is widely recognized as being very important to the development of the argument of Hebrews, even by scholars not concerned particularly with the issues explored here. For example, Bruce describes these verses as a "supremely important section" of Hebrews, while Montefiore describes it as "Sum[ming] up the whole of the consequent argument of Hebrews." [2]

The *rhetorical* significance of this section of Hebrews has been highlighted in different ways by various scholars, including Koester, Übelacker and Franz Laub. According to Koester's outline of the book in terms of ancient rhetoric, 2:5-9 forms the *propositio*, which is a logical place for the key issues of the discussion to be

---

[1]See, for example, L. Dussaut, *Synopse Structurelle de l'Épître aux Hébreux: Approach d'Analyse Structurelle (*Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1981), 66; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 400; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 132; Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 87.

[2]Bruce, *Apology*, 65; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 101.

delineated.[3] Übelacker agrees with Koester in ascribing considerable significance to Heb 2. However, unlike Koester, he locates the *propositio* in 2:17-18.[4] In this he is supported by Vanhoye.[5] Laub describes 2:5-18 as a "Grundlegung der Theologie des Hebr."[6] Roloff is even more specific. Referring to 2:5-18 he declares "Sein unmittelbarer Zweck scheint die Begründung der Bezeichnung Jesu als Hoherpriester zu sein."[7]

Heb 2:5-18 begins with a focus on Jesus as Son but climaxes with a focus on Jesus as priest (2:15-16; 3:1). Spicq suggests the transition actually takes place in 2:9[8] Admittedly, Jesus is not explicitly named as Son in Heb 2, but the emphasis on his rule and dominion correlates with the concept of Sonship given expression in chapter 1. The significance of the progression from Sonship to priesthood in Heb 2 should not be overlooked. Heb 2:17-18 is the first explicit mention of Christ as high priest. This topic is not taken up in detail until 4:14 which introduces a lengthy exposition on priesthood and the priestly work lasting until 10:18.[9] Heb 4:14 repeats all the themes of 2:17-18. The topic of priesthood is *re-introduced* in the same terms as it is initially

---

[3]Koester, *Hebrews*, 83-86.

[4]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 185-96.

[5]Vanhoye, review of *Hebrews*, 291-94.

[6]Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 95.

[7]Roloff, "Der mitleidende Hohepriester," 148.

[8]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2: 35-36.

[9]It is broken by only a single passage of exhortatory material (6:1-8). The treatment of the new covenant in Heb 8 is an integral part of the argument about priesthood (Moffatt, 'Christology', 564).

introduced. The themes of the introduction are then developed in greater detail in the subsequent exposition.

Within the unit 4:14-10:18 a distinct turning point, as already noted above, comes in 8:1. Graham Hughes points out that there is no further discussion of "Sonship" after this point. [10] At this point, a transition is made from discussions primarily about the priesthood itself, to discussions of the work of priesthood and its locale. At the very point where the discussion focussed particularly on the priesthood itself is concluded (7:26-28), the motifs found in 2:17-18 and 4:14-16 are repeated yet again.[11] Heb 2:17-18 thus introduces the themes of the inclusio surrounding the main discussion of priesthood in Hebrews. It can therefore not be thought of as a trivial passage with regard to this theme.[12] Rather, it represents the foundation of the entire teaching of Hebrews on the topic. It suggests that 3:1-4:13 forms a virtual excursus, after which *Auctor* returns to his previous point–the priesthood of Jesus. The word "excursus" used here is deliberately chosen. 3:7-4:14 cannot be called a "detour." Exhortation, rather than exposition, is at the core of the document. Hughes notices the same structural points noted here, but draws the opposite conclusion. For him, it is

---

[10]Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*, 23.

[11]Ibid., 13. Kurianal points out that 7:26-28 is an important argumentative conclusion in Hebrews, assuming and presupposing the entire presentation from 5:1 to 7:25. However, he appears to overlook the significant parallels between 2:17,19; 4:14; and, 7:26-28. See J. Kurianal, *Jesus Our High Priest: Ps 110,4 as the Substructure of Heb 5,1-7,28*, EUS Ser. XXIII: Theology: Vol. 693 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 129.

[12]Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 101.

2:5-18 which represents "something of an interruption to the development of his argument, which is taken up again in 3:1ff."[13]

It is also significant that in the transition-summary (3:1-6), the order of progression is reversed: the summary starts with Christ as priest (3:1) and finishes with Christ as Son (3:6). If Sonship implies priesthood to *Auctor*, the reverse seems also to be true.

Furthermore, 2:5-18 forms a distinct unit of discourse climaxing with an explicitly priestly picture of Jesus (2:17-18). This unit is both preceded and succeeded by exhortatory material (2:1-4; 3:1-4:12).[14] Heb 3:1-6 forms both a conclusion and a summary of this argument, as well as providing a transition to an exhortatory section which deals with the Exodus generation.

The logic of looking for the key to the relationship between the christological categories of Sonship and priesthood in Hebrews in 2:5-17 is thus strong. The importance of the section in the work as a whole is widely recognized. The passage opens with an emphasis of Sonship and concludes with explicit mention of priesthood. Careful exegesis of the passage will reveal the logical which binds these two Christological categories together. In such exegesis, a theology which is strongly

---

[13]Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*, 9.

[14]The assertion that 2:5-18 forms a "distinct unit of discourse" does not mean that it can be completely isolated from its context. In order for it to function within the entire document, it must have points of contact and continuity both with what precedes it and what follows it. Such points of continuity will be explored in greater depth below. However, a turning point in the thought of the document is widely recognized in 3:1. Übelacker (*Hebräerbrief*, 46) surveys various structural analyses of the document and includes 3:1 in his list of "mehr oder weniger deutliche Einschnitte."

imprinted with Adamic themes becomes evident, as will be shown in the rest of this chapter,

## The Place of Hebrews 2:5-18 in the Argument of Hebrews

In this section it will be argued that the underlying logical of *Auctor's* argument lies in a form of "second Adam" Christology. Both the category of "Son" and that of "priest" related to the fulfilment of the destiny of the original man, Adam. Heb 2:15-18 is dominated by an introductory citation of Ps 8:4-6 and the exposition of it (2:5b-9). The remaining verses (2:10-18) presuppose *Auctor's* exegesis of this psalm pericope. It is clear from a reading of the Hebrew text of Ps 8 that it has numerous points of contact with the Creation narrative (Gen 1). The creation reference is modified in the LXX translation and a greater degree of ambiguity is introduced in places. However, the fundamental "creation theology" of the Psalm is still readily evident. *Auctor* further modifies the focus placing emphasis more on the end of the Eden story (Gen 3) than on the initial creation narrative. Nevertheless, a relationship to the Adam story is still clear. In the light of this strong Adamic/Eden imagery, *Auctor* presents Jesus as the one who fulfills the original intended destiny of Adam and makes such a destiny available to believers again.

### The Argumentative Structure of Hebrews 2:5-18

The fact that 2:5-18 opens with Οὐ γὰρ raises the inevitable question, "To what does the γάρ refer?" Numerous suggestions have been made.[15] It seems to be a

---

[15]For example, Delitzsch suggests that 2:5 takes up the general thought of the preceding material. See F. Delitzsch *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 2 vols., trans. T.L. Kingsbury (Edinburgh: Clark, 1871-72 ; translation of *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*; Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1857), 1:101-02. Kendrick

poor logical fit with what has gone immediately before, the exhortation of 2:1-4. Arthur Peake's attempt to tie the two sections together by suggesting that ultimate attention is not to be paid to the angel-mediated revelation because angels do not have authority over the world to come, is certainly not reflected in the text.[16] Übelacker's suggestion that συνεπιμαρτυρέω (2:4) and διαμαρτύρομαι (2:6) serve as hook words binding the two sections together, establishes a linguistic link but not a thematic one.[17] Much more attractive is the suggestion which sees the γάρ leaping back over the exhortation to the conclusion of the argument in Heb 1.[18] The flow of thought between 1:13-14 and 2:5 is easy to see: πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἴρηκεν ποτε· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου; οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν; . . . Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν.[19] The connection is of crucial importance, although it should not be taken to mean that the intervening paraenesis is a

---

(*Hebrews*, 30) argues that it reinforces the exhortation just given. Peake suggests that *Auctor* is providing the grounds for the exhortation just given. See, A. S. Peake, *Hebrews*, Century Bible (London: Thomas Nelson, 1902), 96. Westcott (*Hebrews*, 41) refers the γὰρ "directly to the signs of divine power among believers which were a prelude to the complete sovereignty." Milligan (*Hebrews*, 98) suggests that γὰρ actually indicates the opening of a new line of thought concurrent with that found in 1 and reaching the same general conclusions as those found in 2:1-4.

[16]Peake, *Hebrews*, 96.

[17]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 167.

[18]Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 145; see also Craddock, "Hebrews," 33; Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 54; Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 155.

[19]Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 65; Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2: 30; J. H. Davies, *A Letter to Hebrews,* CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 27; G. H. Guthrie, *Hebrews*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998), 97.

completely isolated island of thought, unrelated to either what precedes it or what follows it. Caird suggests that the citation of Ps 8:4-6 which is introduced by 2:5 actually controls the argument of 1:5-14.[20]

Does the denial that the coming world is subject to the angels imply that the present world is subject to them? Bruce, and Nairne deny this implication.[21] However, Moffatt, Fredrick Farrar, Fredrick Narborough, and Brooke Foss Westcott (with qualifications) accept it, generally with a reference to Deut 32:8-9.[22] Certainly the acceptance of the implication makes the transition to the quotation from Ps 8 smoother. One of the key functions of the argument in Heb 2 is to demonstrate the victory of the Son over the angelic rulers of this age, specifically the devil (2:14). The general statements of Heb 1 on the superiority of the Son over the angels serve to prepare the way for that demonstration. 2:5, which nominally introduces a statement of the angels' superiority to humanity, is actually the transition from a discussion of angels in general to a focus on the angelic rulers of the world.

Bruce objects that the topic of 2:5-8 is not the angels and their inferiority to the Son.[23] Bruce is quite correct in his observation but not in the conclusions he draws from it. "The truth is, rather, that the angels are in the author's mind to the end of the

---

[20]G. B. Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews", *CJT* 5 (1959): 47.

[21]Bruce, *Apology*, 69; Nairne, *Hebrews*, 41.

[22]F. W. Farrar, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, CBSC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), 70; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 24; Narborough, *Hebrews*, 86. Westcott, *Hebrews*, 41.

[23]Bruce, *Apology*, 67-69. See also B. Weiss, *Hebräer*, 62.

second chapter."[24] A comparison of the argumentative structures of the two chapters is informative. Development in an argument–its turning points–are marked linguistically and syntactically by the use of such words as ἀλλά, γάρ, οὖν, ὅτι, ἆρα, and ὥστε. In ancient rhetoric such words often introduce enthymenes.[25] Use of words like καί and πάλιν suggest the elaboration of an argumentative point, rather than a transition to a new point.

Heb 1:1-4 concludes with a simple statement of the superiority of the Son over the angels: τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα. This serves as both the conclusion of the proem and the introduction of the argumentative block which follows in 1:5-14.

*Structural Analysis of Hebrews 1:5-14*

The topic of the following argument is consequently announced as being a contrast in relative status between the Son and the angels. The argument begins in 1:5 with the use of γὰρ. This conjunction is not used again in the rest of the chapter. Analysis of the chapter in these terms is somewhat complicated by the degree to which it consists of scriptural citations. The use of conjunctions within a citation may tell us more of the original author's argumentative structure than that of *Auctor*. The structure of 1:5-14 can be outlined in this way:

---

[24]Peake, *Hebrews*, 92.

[25]A. Eriksson, *Tradition as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians*, CBNTS 29 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998), 43; *idem*, "Enthymemes in Pauline Argumentation: Reading between the Lines in 1 Corinthians" in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*, ESEC 8, ed. A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht and W. Übelacker (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 247; J. L. Sumney, "The Argument of Colossians" in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*, ESEC 8, ed. A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht and W. Übelacker (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 348-349.

- [**Thesis**: The Son is superior to the angels, as reflected in the superior name he has inherited (1:4)];
  - **Introduction** of supporting argument, by use of γὰρ / for (1:5a);
    Supporting argument derived from citation of Ps 2:7 (1:5b);
  - **Elaboration** of argument, introduced by use of πάλιν / again (1:5c);
    - Further support argument from citation of 2 Sam 7:14 (1:5d);
  - **Elaboration** of argument introduced by use of πάλιν / again (1:6a);[26]
    - Further support from citation of Deut 32:43 (1:6b);[27]
  - **Elaboration** of argument introduced by καὶ / and (1:7a);
    - Further support from citation of Ps 104:4 (1:7);
  - **Elaboration** of argument introduced by δέ / but (1:8a);[28]
    - Further support from citation of Ps 45:6-7 (1:8-9);
  - **Elaboration** of argument introduced by καὶ / and (1:10a);
    - Further support from citation of Ps 102:25-27 (1:10-12);

    **Elaboration** of argument introduced by δέ / but (1:13a);
    - Further support from citation of Pa 110:1 (1:13) and *Auctor*'s own summary comment (1:14);

  [**Conclusion** drawn from the argument: We should pay greater attention to what we have heard (2:1-4)].

The argument of 1:5-14 thus consists of a single proposition supported and elaborated by a variety of citations supplemented by *Auctor*'s minimal original contribution. This single proposition and its elaboration serve as the basis for the exhortation of 2:1-4.

---

[26]The meaning of πάλιν in this verse is ambiguous. It may qualify λέγω or may instead qualifiy εἰσάγω. The point being made here about the structure of Heb 1 and 2 remains fundamentally unaffected either way.

[27]The source of this citation is not certain. Bruce (*Hebrews*, 56) points out that the citation "bears a general resemblance to Ps. 97:7 (LXX 96:7) . . . . But it bears an even closer resemblance to the words from the Longer Septuagint form of Deut. 32:43."

[28]The use of a disjunctive here may seem to indicate a turning point in the argument, but it must be remembered that the thesis itself centres on a *contrast*. In this verse δε indicate merely a shift in focus from one side of the contrast to the other, not a shift in the basic thrust of the argument. Such a shift in argumentative thrust would more likely have been indicated by ἀλλά than by δέ. Similar use of δέ is seen in v 13.

*Structural Analysis of Hebrews 2:1-4*

The argumentative structure of this pericope is fundamentally different to that found in 1:1-15. The chapter begins with an exhortation (2:1-4) which is clearly based on the argument of the preceding chapter.[29] The structure of the exhortation is simple:

- **Thesis:** Jesus is superior to the angels (Heb 1:4[-14]);
- **Introduction to concluding exhortation:** διὰ τοῦτο / therefore (2:1a);
    - **Exhortation:** pay attention to what has been heard (2:1b);
    - **Introduction to supporting elaboration**: γάρ / for (2:2a);
        - **Supporting elatoration** (2:2b-4).

*Structural Analysis of Hebrews 2:5-18*

Neither the singularity of focus of 1:5-14 nor the simplicity of the structure of 2:1-4 is evident in the rest of Heb 2. The dominant conjunctives suggest changes of focus rather than amplification of a single point. The opening γάρ of 2:5 has already been noted. Other uses of γάρ follow in 2:8, 10, 11, 16, and 18. To the list of transitional words must be added a single example of οὖν (2:14). The word καί occurs twelve times in 2:5-18, three of which are found inside scriptural citations (2:7, 9, 13c); four more join separate nouns (or noun phrases) to form single noun phrases (2:10, 11, 14a, 17); and another is used adverbally rather than as a conjunction (2:14b).[30] As such, none of these instances is significant for the argumentative structure of the passage. The two examples of καὶ πάλιν (2:13a,b) are used to join citations and thus

---

[29]The relationship of this exhortation to the argument of Heb 1 has already been discussed above, pp. 87-89.

[30]The relevant noun phrases joined by καὶ are δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα / through whom and for whom all things [exist] (2:10); ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι / the Sanctifier and the sanctified (2:11); αἵματος καὶ σαρκός / blood and flesh (2:14); and, ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς / merciful and faithful.

reflect the elaboration of a single argument. The final use of καί (2:15) also indicates the elaboration of an argument at that point.

This data suggests that rather than a single sustained focus 2:5-18 contains a number of foci.

- **Foundational Premise**: The Son is superior to the angels;
  - **Turning Point:** signaled by γὰρ / for (2:5);
  - **First Topic:** Overlordship of the coming world (2:5-9);
    - **Conclusion**: Introduced by γὰρ / for (2:8-9);
  - **Turning Point:** signaled by γὰρ / for (2:10);
  - **Second Topic:** The unity of the Son with humanity (2:10-14a);[31]
    - **Supporting argument**: Introduced by γὰρ / for (2:11a);
    - **Implication:** Introduced by δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν;
    - **Elaboration**: Introduced by καὶ πάλιν / and again (2:13a,b);
    - **Conclusion:** Introduced by οὖν / therefore (2:14a);
  - **Turning Point:** signalled by ἵνα/ in order that (2:14b);[32]
  - **Third Topic:** The Son's present achievement and role (2:14b-18);
    - **Elaboration**: Introduced by γὰρ / for (2:16-17);[33]
  - **Conclusion**: Introduced by γὰρ / for (2:18).[34]

---

[31]In analyzing 2:10-14, Klein discerns two subsections: "V. 10-13 handeln von dem, was der Sohn für die Söhne *ist*, V. 14-18 von dem, was er für sie *tat*." See G. Klein, "Hebräer 2,10-18," *GPM* (1963/64): 137; see also Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 155. Übelacker (*Hebräerbrief*, 167) sees three sections and agrees with the analysis presented here regarding the starting point of the first two. However, he sees the third section starting at v 16.

[32]The ἵνα-clause in Heb 2:14b serves as both the conclusion of the previous argument on the identity of the Son with humanity and the introduction to his present achievement and role. This overlap is possible because his present achievement and role are rooted directly in his complete identification with humanity.

[33]Strathmann links 2:16-18 directly to 2:10, treating the intervening verses as a virtual parenthesis. See H. Strathmann, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (with J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*), NTD 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968 [reprint of 1936 edition]), 88.

[34]Swetnam's structural outline of Heb 2 is similar to the one given here. He makes the intriguing suggestion that the Christological titles "apostle and high priest" (3:1) relate back to the content of Heb 2. He sees the "high priest" title as echoing 2:13-16 (roughly our argument 3) and "apostle" echoing 2:10-12 (roughly our argument 2). See J. Swetnam, "The Structure of Hebrews 1,1 -3,6," *MelTheol* 43 (1992): 62.

In each of the three arguments found in 2:5-18 there is at least an implicit contrast made with the angels. In the first argument the coming world is not subjected to them (2:5), but to humanity.[35] In the second argument the Son shares the experience of humanity, and thus, by implication, the angels do not. In the third argument the Son "takes hold of" or "helps" humanity, not angels (2:16).[36] However, the angels are not the focus of this sequence of changes of argument. That focus is rather on the humanity and the fulfilment of the destiny God originally intended for it. Westcott brings out this focus well, despite collapsing the second and third topics into one, when he declares

> Two main thoughts are brought out in this section. (1) The promise of sovereignty to man was fulfilled in Jesus (the "Son of man"): 5-9. (2) The fulfilment of man's destiny owing to the intrusion of sin, could only be brought about through suffering, made possible for Christ and effective for man through the incarnation (10-18).[37]

**First Argument: Lordship over the "Coming World" (Hebrews 2:5-9)**

The relationship of this section to the argument in Heb 1 is highlighted by the use of the "hook word" ἄγγελος.[38] Its use in 2:8 picks up on the usage of the same word in 1:13 (and a further implied reference in 1:14). The first block of exhortatory material (2:1-4) is therefore surrounded by references to "angels." As in 1:5-14 the argument in 2:5-9 is dominated by citations from the Jewish Scriptures. The citation

---

[35]See below, pp. 186-88 for discussion of who is given dominion over the coming world.

[36]The meaning of ἐπιλαμβάνειν is discussed below, p. 227.

[37]Westcott, *Hebrews*, 41.

[38]The significance of the use of hook words in Hebrews is emphasized by Vanhoye, *Structure and Message*, 19-23.

here is taken from Ps 8:4-6 (LXX) and its meaning in Hebrews is of crucial significance.

However, the differences from the argument of 1:5-14 should be noted as well as the similarities. Primary among these differences is the greater eschatological emphasis. The phrase τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν has clear eschatological reference, being derived unquestionably from Jewish speculation regarding the "two ages".[39] Indeed, Vanhoye argues for a specifically eschatological referent for the word οἰκουμένη.[40] It refers, quite unambiguously, to the future period of messianic rule over the earth.[41] In common with New Testament eschatology generally *Auctor* sees the future new age as having already become a reality in the salvation achieved by Christ.

*Auctor*'s use of the phrase περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν is somewhat puzzling. Hughes asserts that Hebrews has previously not been discussing the "coming world" but only the heavenly world.[42] However, this misses the point. In the eschatological perspective of *Auctor*, the coming age has already arrived and Christ has entered into it at his exaltation as forerunner.[43] There were eschatological references in Heb 1 but they were considerably more muted. Thus *Auctor* speaks of the Son as "heir of all things" (1:2) but immediately moves on to speak of his role in creation (1:3).

---

[39]Nakagawa, "Christology," 86-87; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 26. One does not have to agree with Buchanan that 2:6-8 contains a "Son of man" Christology to acknowledge the correctness of his understanding of 2:5.

[40]A. Vanhoye, "L'οἰκουμένη dans l'épître aux Hébreux," *Bib* 45 (1964): 248-53.

[41]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 70.

[42]Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics,* 81.

[43]Barrett, "Christology," 117. See also McCruden, "Perfection of Divine Intimacy," 114; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 59.

Similarly, he contrasts the transience of the cosmos with the permanence of God (1:11), but without developing it in terms of an explicit eschatological hope. There is the suggestion, derived from Ps 109:2 (LXX), that the enemies are yet to be subdued (1:13), but it is not until that final verse of the chapter that this is explicitly expressed in terms of human hope.

The Psalm testimony is introduced in Hebrews by the most general of formulae: διεμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων (2:6). Marcus Dods plausibly suggests that this is a deliberate rhetorical strategy by *Auctor*, suggesting to the readers that they are so familiar with this passage that they do not need further details.[44]

The introduction to this argument appears truncated. The denial that the "coming world" is not subjected to angels logically demands an apodosis, "but to . . . .." The absence of the expected apodosis may be, as Übelacker surmises, a deliberate rhetorical strategy intended to refocus the readers' attention on the argument.[45]

What is the apodosis implied by the argument? Exegetes are divided into those who argue that *Auctor* means that the coming world will be subject to the Son and those who argue that he means it will be subject to humanity. Ellingworth observes that broadly speaking German scholarship favours the former alternative, while English-speaking scholarship favours the latter.[46] Geoffrey Grogan asks a closely related question of the use of the citation itself: Does *Auctor* use it as directly

---

[44]M. Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 5 vols., ed. W. R. Nicoll (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980; reprinted from London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910), 4: 262.

[45]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 191.

[46]Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 143.

messianic or indirectly messianic?[47] The preponderance of evidence suggests that the Psalm citation is only indirectly messianic and the argument presupposes that the coming world is to be subjected to humanity.

The flow of thought from 1:5-14 leads the reader to expect a resumption of presentation of the argument of the Son's superiority over the angels in 2:5, namely, it is not to angels that the coming world has been subjected, but to the Son. If this were the correct reading of *Auctor*'s argument, Ps 8 has been cited in a directly messianic way. Indeed, this is precisely how Laub interprets the passage, referring to the declaration of 1:2, that the Son was appointed heir of all things for further support.[48] However, this is not the major focus of the presentation of 2:5-18. Rather, the focus is on the Son's abasement below the angels and on his identification with humanity. This may, of course, be seen as the basis of the Son's superiority over the angels, but the argument of Hebrews does not develop along these lines. It must also be noted that *Auctor* has not only referred to the Son as being heir of all things (1:3), but has also referred to believers as "those who are to inherit salvation" (1:14). It is consequently more likely that *Auctor* "accepts the words of this passage as prophetic of the true destiny of man".[49] This is confirmed by the direct linking of the abasement of the Son under the angels (2:8), and specifically his death, with the salvation of ὑπὲρ παντὸς (2:9).[50] Hideyasu Nakagawa correctly concludes, "there is no hiatus between the

---

[47]G. W. Grogan, "Christ and His People: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5-18," *VoxEv* 6 (1969): 56.

[48]Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 63.

[49]Tasker, *Gospel*, 28. See also Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 276.

[50]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 293.

foregoing "anthropology" (vv. 5-8a) and the following "Christology" (vv. 8b-9), in so far as in Christ the glory promised to man has found its fulfilment."[51]

The setting of the Psalm citation in the context of Hebrews creates an ambiguity as to whom *Auctor* is referring: man in general or Jesus specifically.[52] Koester suggests that this ambiguity is a deliberate rhetorical strategy designed to focus the reader's attention.[53]

When Ps 8 is cited elsewhere in the New Testament (1 Cor 15:27; Eph 1:20-23; and possibly, 1 Pet 3:22) it is generally associated with Ps 110 (as it is in Hebrews).[54] This association may suggest a direct messianic understanding of the Psalm in Heb 2. However, in its original context there is no hint of the Psalm having any sort of messianic reference. Rather it serves as a hymn of praise to the creator for his creation.[55]

---

[51]Nakagawa, "Christology," 88. See also F. Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005), 592; Pfitzner, *Hebrews*, 38; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 35.

[52]Crucial to any discussion of the use of this Psalm fragment in Hebrews is the ambiguity inherent in its use of the word ἄνθρωπος, which can have either a collective or individual referent. It is difficult to capture the same ambiguity in gender neutral translations such as "humanity" or "humankind", which generally necessitate the use of plural pronouns. For this reason the discussion of this passage in this thesis retains the traditional translation of ἄνθρωπος by "man".

[53]Koester, *Hebrews*, 220.

[54]Matt. 21:16 contains a quotation from Ps 8:8 without a corresponding reference to Ps 110 (109, LXX). The use of the designation "son of David" (Matt. 21:15) explicitly indicates a messianic context for the citation, nonetheless. See M. J. J. Menken, "The Psalms in Matthew's Gospel," in *The Psalms in the New Testament*, ed. S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken (London: Clark, 2004), 70-72.

[55]A. A. Anderson, *Psalms (1-72)*, NCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 100; G. W. Anderson, "The Psalms," in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley (Sunbury-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1962), 414; P. C. Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, WBC, 19 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1983), 106; Anderson, *King-*

It is often suggested that Ps 8 is being cited in a directly messianic way and *Auctor* is drawn to this Psalm by the presence of the phrase "son of man".[56] Hurst correctly observes that the evidence for this is "non-existent."[57] Loader dissents from this judgement arguing that it is significant that despite Ps 8 being cited or alluded to elsewhere in the New Testament, this is the only place where the phrase "Son of man" is included.[58] This argument would have more force if the phrase were then developed in any Christological way in Hebrews. However, *Auctor* makes no explicit use of it.

The form of the expression "son of man" in Psalm 8 (and therefore in Hebrews) is different from its form in the Synoptic Gospels. The phrase in Hebrews is anarthrous whereas its Christological use in the Synoptics is consistently articular in form. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the key elements of the pattern found here–humiliation and suffering followed by exaltation to glory–are expressed in the Gospels by Jesus in "Son of man" terms (for example, Mk 8:31; Lk 9:22; Matt. 26:64). Montefiore's comments on this issue are very balanced:

> The parallelism of Hebrew poetry shows that the Son of man is no more here than a periphrasis for man. Our author probably knew of Jesus' self-designation as the Son of Man, and this may have influenced his choice of this *testimonium*. Jesus took the phrase Son of Man from his bible, and the same pattern of man's exaltation after previous degradation is seen here as in the Son of Man passage in Dan. vii (cf.

---

*Priest*, 170; Buck, "Rhetorical Arangement," 136; Weiser, *Psalms*, 140; Westermann, *Praise and Lament*, 139.

[56]P. Giles, "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews" *ET* 86 (1974-75): 328-32; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 35; Barrett, "Christology" 116-19.

[57]Hurst, "Christology", 153; see also Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 66; Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 63. A minority of earlier scholars (for example, Westcott, *Hebrews*, 43-45; Vos, "Priesthood", 444) also rejected a Christological understanding of "son of man" in this verse.

[58]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 35.

> Psalm lxxx. 17). However this may be, our writer does not here apply "the Son of Man" in Psalm viii to Jesus at all.[59]

In the Psalm the words "man" and "son of man" are synonymous, in accordance with the principles of poetic parallelism central to Hebrew poetry.[60] Loader argues that the reference must be to Jesus because "the coming world" in Hebrews is equivalent to the "heavenly world."[61] Robert Hamerton-Kelly's comments more adequately capture the nuance of Hebrews: "Jesus is the first manifestation of that triumph [promised in 2:8], that mankind and Jesus cannot be separated."[62] This point is illustrated by the flow of thought in 1:13-14. The lordship of the Son is proclaimed and immediately contrasted to the servile position of the angels. However, they are not portrayed as serving the Son, as could certainly be expected, but as serving those who are to inherit salvation. The elevation of the Son implies the elevation of those who are faithful to him.

The original setting of the Psalm unmistakably draws the reader's attention to the creation narratives (Gen 1-2). *Auctor* of the Psalm looked first at the world of nature (Ps 8:3 [Heb 8:4]) and then directs his attention to the status of man (Ps 8:4

---

[59]Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 57. See also Héring, *Hébreux*, 32; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 85.

[60]Barrett ("Christology," 117) objects that parallelism was not discerned in Hebrew poetry until Robert Lowth discovered it in the eighteenth century, and therefore it cannot be assumed that *Auctor* would have been aware of it. To some extent this is disingenious. Lowth would surely claim to be *rediscovering* what had been there all along. More important is that fact that Hebrews does not develop his argument in such a way as to indicate that he understood "son of man" to refer to a figure distinct from man.

[61]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 30-31.

[62]Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence*, 248. See also K. Frör, "Hebräer 11,1-2. 6. 8-10 (17-19)," *GPM* (1963-64): 109; E. Gräßer, "Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn in Hebr 2,6," in *Jesus und der Menschensohn für Anton Vögtle*, ed. R. Pesch and Schnackenburg (Freiburg: Herder, 1975), 411-13.

[Heb 8:5]) as the pinnacle of creation. When the psalmist declares מָה־אֱנוֹשׁ (What is man ...?) his primary referent is to Adam, the biblical father of the human race, rather than to the king–as an expression of royal ideology–or to humanity in general.[63] As legitimate as it may be to see overtones of all the royal ideology or a picture of humanity in general in Ps 8, they appear to be derived from an even more fundamental referent: Adam. This position can be defended on a number of grounds. First, as Henry Ellison puts it "The real prototype of the king was Adam, God's viceregent, with his dominion over the world."[64] In other words, seeing the primary referent as the king reverses the correct order of emphasis. The view which sees the primary referent as being humanity suffers from a similar weakness. The psalmist presents a "high anthropology" in Ps 8:4-6 [Heb: 8:5-7]–one that completely ignores the fall narrative

---

[63]Among those who see Adam as the referent are, D. F. Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A study of the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms*, NABPRDS 10 (Lewiston, New York, Edwin Mellen, 1994), 119; M. Isaacs, *Reading Hebrews and James: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 40; H. L. Ellison, *The Centrality of the Messianic Idea for the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1953), 14.

Among those who consider the king to be the primary referent is, H. Ringgren, *The Messiah in the Old Testament,* SBT 18 (London, SCM, 1956), 20.

The most common view among scholars is that the primary referent is humanity in general. For example, D. J. A. Clines, "The Image of God in Man," *Tyn.Bul* 19 (1968): 84; E. S. Gerstenberger, *Psalms, Part 1 with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry,* FOTL 14 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 69 J. L. Mays, "'What is Man ...?' Reflections on Psalm 8," in *From Faith to Faith: Essays in Honor of Donald G. Miller on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. D.Y. Hadidian, PTMS 31 (Pittsburg, PA: Pickwick, 1979), 207; J. P. Oberholzer, "What is Man ...?" in *De Frucur Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus van Selms*, ed. I. H. Eybers, F.C. Fensham, C. J. Labuschagne, W.C. van Wyk and A. H. van Zyl, POS, 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 147; Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 108.

[64]Ellison, *Centrality of the Messianic Idea*, 14; see also Mowinkel, *Psalms*, 1: 143.

of Gen 3 and the often sordid and squalid reality of human existence in his day.[65] There is only one discordant note in the entire Psalm: a reference to enemies in Ps 8:2 [Heb, 8:3], where three terms are used: צָרַר, (foes), אֹיֵב (enemies) and נָקָם (adversary). If the enemies are to be understood as being present in the world of the psalmist, he clearly recognizes that he is not living in some Edenic paradise. Nevertheless, as he develops his anthropological statements they have a distinctly Edenic feel about them. Arnold Anderson suggests that these enemies may refer to the forces of chaos overcome in the creation. This view takes "the fortress" God builds as a metaphor for creation.[66] The only place where this "high anthropology" is represented *textually* in the Old Testament is in the creation narratives of Gen 1-2. In the Genesis account (as in Ps 8) "man in his pristine state is . . . honoured as royalty with the very attributes of God: glory and honour (majesty)."[67] It is true that Adam is a representative figure in Genesis and is portrayed as the primeval ancestor of all humanity.[68] The ideal situation of Adam in Gen 1-2 is certainly presented as representing God's ideal for all

---

[65]The term "high anthropology", undoubtedly coined in conscious imitation of the older "high Christology", goes back to B. C. Lategan, "Some Implications of Hebrews 2:5-18 for a Contextual Anthropology," in *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament. Essays in Honor of Hendrikus W. Boers*, ed. T. W. Jennings, Jr. (Homage Series; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990), 155. According to Lategan, such a "high anthropology" can be traced from Gen 1:25 to its Old Testament high point in Ps 8. Others have noted the idealistic nature of the picture in Ps 8 without using Lategan's vocabulary. See, for example, W. A. VanGemeren, "Psalms," in *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, 12 vol., ed. F. E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991), 5:114; and, B. S. Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," *Int* 23 (1969): 22.

[66]Anderson, *Psalms (1-72)*, 102.

[67]Stine, "Finality," 153.

[68]H. N. Wallace, "Adam (Person)," in *ABD*, 1: 62-63.

humanity–an ideal thwarted by the fall recorded in Gen 3. By focusing exclusively on a "high anthropology", the psalmist draws attention directly to Adam and only `secondarily to humanity as a whole.

Admittedly, the psalmist uses the word אֱנוֹשׁ rather than the more obvious אָדָם, which could simultaneously indicate "man[kind]" and the individual Adam.[69] However, אֱנוֹשׁ is "usually synonymous with it [that is, אָדָם]."[70] The fact that the psalmist uses בֶּן־אָדָם (Son of man) in the parallel phrase in the next line emphasizes the synonymous nature of the two words. The initial choice of אֱנוֹשׁ in Ps 8 may be related to the fact that this word is especially common in Hebrew poetry. Fritz Maass identifies only one (Isa 8:1) of its forty-two usages in the Hebrew Scriptures as being in prose. He further suggests that the reading of אֱנוֹשׁ in this verse represents a textual corruption.[71] אָדָם, on the other hand, is used 562 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is much less clearly a "poetic" word being used in both prose and poetic writings.[72]

The affirmation that "man" was made "a little lower than אֱלֹהִים" immediately reminds the reader of the priestly creation account which declares אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה (Gen 1:26)–a fact well recognized in scholarly studies of the Jewish

---

[69]F. Maass, "אָדָם 'ādhām," in *TDOT*, 1: 79.

[70]F. Maass, "אֱנוֹשׁ 'ᵉnôsh," in *TDOT*, 1: 347.

[71]Ibid., 346.

[72]Maass, אָדָם, 79-83.

Scriptures.[73] Certainly, the terms צֶלֶם and דְּמוּת may suggest the inferiority of the copy in comparison with the original.

Although צֶלֶם has a basic meaning of the word is "plastic [that is, formative], *sic.* replica" and thus does not usually have the connotation of inferiority so much as exact replication, it is twice used in the Psalms (39:7; 73:20) "in a comparison of human life with a fleeting dream apparition" or a "shadow".[74] The inferiority of the "image" in Gen 1:26 can also be inferred contextually. While discussing צֶלֶם in the context of Gen 1:26; 5:3, Franz Stendebach approvingly cites Jürgen Ebach: "The relationship between God and human beings is continued in the relationship between father and son." [75] Similarly דְּמוּת "in and of itself refers to total comparability and not to a perceptibly lesser degree of mere similarity but . . . the need to refer to comparability exists only if similarity is not self-evident."[76] Horst Preuss suggests that

---

[73]See, for example, H-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary,* trans., H. C. Oswald, Continental Commentary (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1988; translation of *Psalmen 1-59*, 5th ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978), 183; D. R. Glenn, "Psalm 8 and Hebrews 2: A Case Study in Biblical Hermeneutics and Biblical Theology," in *Walvoord: A Tribute*, ed. D. K. Campbell (Chicago, IL: Moody, 1982), 43; Anderson, *Out of the Depths*, 153; Childs, "Psalm 8," 21-22; Weiser, *Psalms*, 144. The connection is also noted by Hebrews' scholars dealing with the citation of Ps 8 in Heb 2. See, for example, Bruce, *Hebrews*, 34 and Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 87.

[74]F. J. Stendebach, "צֶלֶם selem," in *TDOT*, 12:395; H. Wildberger "צֶלֶם *selem* image," in *TLOT*, 3:1081.

[75]J. Ebach, "Die Erschaffung des Menschen als Bild Gottes," *Pastoraltheologie: Wissenschaft und Praxis* 66 (1977): 210; cited in Stendebach, "צֶלֶם selem," 12: 395.

[76]E. Jenni, "דמה *dmh* to be like"in *TLOT*, 1:340; see also C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, trans., J. J. Scullion, Continental Commentary (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994; translation of *Genesis. 1. Teilband: Genesis 1-11*; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), 146.

the combination of the two words serves to emphasize the distance between the original and the copy in Gen 1:26:

> Thus *kidhmuthenu, 'after our likeness,'* in Gen 1:26, no matter how it may be elucidated by the otherwise predominant and characteristic use of *demuth*, can only correct a too direct understanding of *tselem*, which has a strongly concrete and plastic reference. This in turn paves the way in P (cf. Ezk.!) for the recognition that in respect of an analogy no identity of God and man can or should be asserted, but only a similarity ('something similar to us').[77]

But what exactly is the original, from which the copy is made? It has been suggested that the priestly author has incorporated a "sanitized" remnant of an originally pagan creation myth. In such a myth the אֱלֹהִים would have been the gods who are transformed into angelic beings in the demythologized version found in Genesis and alluded to in Psalms.[78] This suggestion has proven longevity and popularity. According to Gordon Wenham it is first attested in the writings of Philo of Alexandria.[79] However, its essential weakness was highlighted by Samuel Driver, over a hundred years ago: "The words of the text seem however clearly to imply that those who are included in the 1st pers. pl. are invited to take part in the creation of man,

---

[77]H. D. Preuss, "דָּמָה *damah*, דְּמוּת *d^e^muth*"*TDOT*, 3: 259.

[78]Wildberger, צֶלֶם, 3:1082; C. A. Simpson, "The Book of Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis," *IB*, 1:482-83; N. M. Sarna, *Genesis,* JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 12; T. E. Fretheim, "The Book of Genesis: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections," in *NIB*, 1:345; and, with qualification, G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15,* WBC 1 (Dallas TX: Word, 1987), 28. See also, among Psalms scholars, Anderson, *Psalms (1-72)*, 103; M. Dahood, *Psalms I: 1-50*, AB16 (New York: Doubleday, 1965), 51; Kraus, *Psalms 1-59*, 183; Anderson, *Out of the Depths*, 153-154. A variant of this view is that P simply incorporated a fragment of pagan literature without seeing or rectifying its essentially polytheistic nature. See, H. Gunkel, *Genesis*, trans., M. E. Biddle, MLBS (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997; translation of *Genesis*, 3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupricht, 1910), 112.

[79]Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 27; see also Philo *Conf.* 168-75.

which, if they are angels, is not probable."[80] If such is indeed the case, the process of demythologization has been very thorough.[81] The question remains as to the likely understanding of this verse in the context of Genesis and later Jewish tradition.

The plural אֱלֹהִים in Ps 8 is matched by a plural qal imperfect verb, נַעֲשֶׂה" (let us make) in Gen 1. If the reference is not to the council of the gods/angels, what is it to? Seeing a direct reference to the trinity in this verse is highly anachronistic.[82] Others have argued that the "we" is a plural of majesty.[83] Such an idiom does exist in Hebrew, but is unattested with verbs.[84] Still others have seen a plural of deliberation, but this idiom has only weak support in the Old Testament.[85] Others see a reference to "plurality" within God, understood in terms of the "spirit" mentioned in Gen 1:2.[86] Of

---

[80]S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, Westminster Commentaries (London: Methuen and Co., 1904), 14. For more recent criticism along the same line see Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 144-45; Clines, "Image" 66-67.

[81]See. G. von Rad, *Genesis*, OTL (London: SCM, 1961), 63, 67.

[82]Such a view was widely held by Christians prior to the rise of historical scholarship. See, to take examples coming from a variety of perspectives and time periods, Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho," 62; Augustine of Hippo, "Sermons on New Testament Lessons," 18, *NPNF/1*, 6: 264; Athanasius, "de Synodis," 26, *NPNF/2*, 4: 463; J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1: 134 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981).

[83]See, for example, Driver, *Genesis*, 14.

[84]Clines, "Image," 66.

[85]This position is attested among the rabbinic writings (for example, Gen. Rab. 8.3) Among modern scholars supporting this view is U. Cassuto, *From Adam to Noah: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Part 1* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1978), 55. For a critical evaluation of this suggestion see, Clines, "Image," 68.

[86]Clines, "Image," 68-69; G.F. Hasel, "The Meaning of 'Let Us' in Gn 1:26," *AUSS*, 13 (1975): 58-66. P. D. Miller, Jr. draws attention to the fact that Hasel's article "is taken over almost as is" from a section of Clines' article. See, P. D. Miller, Jr., *Genesis 1-11: Studies in Structure and Theme*, JSOTSS 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978), 44.

course the likelihood of this view is considerably reduced if וְרוּחַ is understood as meaning "wind" rather than "spirit".[87] Clearly, all of the proposals for understanding the plural here are problematical. However, the likelihood is that it probably does reflect plurality within God, as David Clines has suggested.[88] It may well be that the understanding of the plural form in Gen 1:26 in terms of Yahweh's address to the angelic hosts in ancient Jewish sources reflects the increasing emphasis on the utter unity of God in the Judaism of the period.[89] Such an understanding of Gen 1:26 may well date back to the first century C.E., although this is difficult to establish for certain.

There are further links between Ps 8 and Gen 1 beyond the fact that man was made "a little lower than אֱלֹהִים." Man is further described as being "crowned with glory and honour" which is further defined in terms of his being given "dominion over the works of your [that is, God's] hand" and the putting of "all things under their feet" (Ps 8:6).[90] The "all things" are then further defined as sheep, oxen, beasts of the field, birds, fish and other sea creatures. All of this is strongly reminiscent of the blessing of God on Adam in Gen 1:28-30: "God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the

---

[87]Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 28; E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, AB 1 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982), 5; A. Richardson, *Genesis 1-11*, Torch Bible Commentaries (London: SCM, 1953), 48; B. Vawter, *On Genesis A New Reading* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), 40-41.

[88]Clines, "Image," 68-69.

[89]A useful summary of the role of intermediaries in the Hellenistic Judaism is found in Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 17-50.

[90]Spicq (*Hébreux*, 2:32) points out that these are "priviléges royaux." On the synonymous nature of the two phrases "crowned with glory and honour" and "dominion over the works of your hand", see Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 22.

sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth."[91] One may also draw attention to the earlier reference to God as creator of the stars, and of the moon (Ps 8:3) which are also referred to in the priestly creation account (Gen 1:16). The psalmist makes no direct reference to the command to be fruitful, but, given his indebtedness to the creation account, there may be an oblique allusion to it in his comment regarding the mouths of babes and infants (Ps 8:2 [Heb 8:3]): מִפִּי עוֹלְלִים וְיֹנְקִים יִסַּדְתָּ עֹז. This suggestion is beyond all possibility of proof. However, a number of commentators have observed that the thought of the first half of verse 2 [Heb, 3] is unique in the Old Testament, which suggests that no more plausible allusion can be proposed for the verse.[92]

*Auctor* was not drawn to this Psalm by a "Son of man" Christology, but rather both he and his original readers appear to have been familiar with the notion of Christ as the "second Adam."[93] Archibald Henderson notes that "though he does not use the phraseology of a first and second Adam he presents precisely the same idea by quoting the description of the first Adam given in Ps. viii and then applying it to Jesus."[94]

Of course, *Auctor* accesses this Psalm (as all his scriptural citations) via Greek translation rather than using the original Hebrew. In fact *Auctor* shows no evidence of

---

[91]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:32.

[92]Anderson, *Psalms (1-72)*, 101-02; Kraus, *Psalms 1-59*, 181; Childs, "Psalm 8," 23.

[93]J. H. Kurtz, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Mitau: Neumann, 1869), 91; Pfitzner, *Hebrews*, 37.

[94]A. Henderson, "Hebrews ii.9" *ET* 7 (1895-96): 333.

being familiar with Hebrew at all.[95] In the LXX two particular translations have been made which are particularly fortuitous for the argument of Hebrews.

First, אֱלֹהִים is translated by ἀγγέλους in the LXX, although Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotian more literally translated it Θεός.[96] Scholarly evaluation of this variant translation depends largely on the interpretation given to "let us" in Gen 1:26. Those who affirm that the reference in the priestly narrative is to the heavenly council tend to regard ἄγγελος as the more correct translation. However, Peter Craigie is probably correct in seeing Θεός as the preferable translation.[97]

Second, where the MT has וְתְחַסְּרֵהוּ (Yet you have made them a little lower) the LXX has βραχύ τι. The Heb word חָסֵר indicates inferiority of degree. Βραχύ τι has a greater degree of ambiguity, possibly indicating either inferiority of duration (that is, "shorterness of time") or inferiority of degree. The context of the word within the Psalm shows the meaning is not temporal but one of degree. There is "no hint of eschatological progress."[98]

The LXX preserves the MT focus on the creation narrative. Man's crowning glory, his dominion over nature remains. Certainly, he is not portrayed as being made

---

[95]Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 37; R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Carlisle, Paternoster, 1985; reprinted from Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 169-70.

[96]Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 108. In this translation the LXX, the Targumim, and the later Vulgate and Peshitta translations are all in agreement.

[97]Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 150. See also, R. Gheorghita, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews*, WUNT, 2/160 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 45.

[98]J. W. Pryor, "Hebrews and Incarnational Christology," *RTR* 40 (1979): 44.

in "God's image"–if that is the correct understanding of Gen 1:26.[99] However, the central focus of the comments in Gen 1 and the Hebrew text of Ps 8–man's fundamental separateness from the natural world and kinship with heaven–remains unaffected.[100] Craigie plausibly suggests that the LXX translation was prompted by an understandable sense of modesty.[101]

The use of Ps 8 in the argument of Hebrews shows further development. First, the reading of ἀγγέλους is crucial to *Auctor*'s purpose. This provides an absolutely essential link back to the foundational arguments of Heb 1 and the sixfold use of ἄγγελος in 1:1-13. The ambiguity inherent in the Hebrew word אֱלֹהִים would be fatal to his purpose.

Second, the ambiguity in the Greek phrase βραχύ τι is clearly resolved in favour of a temporal meaning. A small number of scholars dissent from this generally accepted view, insisting that βραχύ τι should be understood in the psalmist's original sense of inferiority of degree in both 2:7 and 2:9.[102] Although it is possible to make sense of the passage assuming Westcott's reading, the presence of temporal markers in 2:8 (Νῦν δὲ οὔπω) make it more likely that the phrase was intended to be understood temporally. Lenksi argues that the temporal element is found in the use of the perfect passive participle ἠλαττωμένον.[103] Thus he effectively argues for a translation of

---

[99]See discussion above, pp. 196-98.

[100]Clines, "Image," 98-99.

[101]Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 150.

[102]Westcott, *Hebrews*, 44; Dods, "Hebrews," 262; Lenski, *Hebrews*, 77; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 68.

[103]Lenski, *Hebrews*, 77.

"make a little bit lower for a period," which incorporates both the idea of duration and quality. However, Hebrews puts no emphasis at all on the degree to which the Son was made lower than the angels. Rather, the emphasis is on the short duration of his abasement.[104]

Lastly, in the LXX the poetic parallelism of the original Psalm is broken up. There is no evidence of such a disregard of Hebrew parallelism in the case of man/Son of man (2:6).[105] However, *Auctor* clearly sees a temporal progression between the two clauses of 2:7, whereas the psalmist saw the same two clauses as synonymous. The temporal sequence of the two clauses is clearly marked in *Auctor*'s interpretative comments on the Psalm citation in 2:8-9: "As it is, we do not yet see everything in subjection to them, but we do see Jesus, who for a little while was made lower than the angels, now crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death." In the Psalm setting being "crowned with glory and honour" was synonymous with "being made a little lower than the angels." Hebrews presents them as sequential stages. This has the effect of introducing an eschatological reference to the Psalm which *Auctor* underscores by carefully not citing anything from the Psalm "que évoquait trop vivement la création présente."[106]

Robert McLachlan Wilson raises–but does little to resolve–the question of the feasiblity of taking βραχύ τι in a qualitative sense in 2:7, but in a temporal sense in

---

[104]D. A. Hagner, *Encountering the Book of Hebrews: An Exposition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002), 56.

[105]The objections to this conclusion by Barrett ("Christology," 110-27), noted above, pp. 191 notwithstanding.

[106]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 280.

2:9.[107] The difficulty is, of course, resolved if the phrase is understood temporally in both verses. Isaacs correctly notes that 2:7a refers to "man's temporary subordination."[108] The assertion that "you have crowned them with glory and honour" (2:7b) is echoed first in 2:9 with reference to Jesus–"Jesus . . . now crowned with glory and honour"–and then in 2:10 with reference to the redeemed–"in bringing many children to glory." This pattern suggests that *Auctor* understood the Psalm citation, even at this point, to have a primary application to humanity in general.[109] The divine intention, although apparently frustrated by the fall, will ultimately be realized, and indeed, has already begun to be realized in Jesus.[110]

This understanding of 2:7 equates being made a little while lower than the angels with the transgression (Gen 3) and particularly with the subjection of Adam and Eve to the power of the cherubim who barred their way to the tree of life (Gen 3:24). The fact of being made lower than the angels implies a time when he was their equal, if not superior. The prelapsarian Adam in this scenario was not lower than the angels.[111]

Is such a reconstruction of the argument of 2:7-10 feasible? A number of factors suggest that it is. First, the word ἐλαττόω used in 2:7, 9 does not have an intrinsic association with creation. Rather it can have the meaning "lack, be deprived

---

[107]Wilson, *Hebrews*, 50. See also Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 33-36.

[108]Isaacs, *Reading Hebrews and James*, 39.

[109]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 281.

[110]Stine, "Finality," 64-65.

[111]Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 107. Kistemaker's comments are admittedly focused on Heb 2 rather than directly on Ps 8. However, his discussion at this point is whether the exegesis of the Psalm seen in Hebrews would have seemed "strange" in the first century context. In answering this question, Kistemaker, of necessity deals with the LXX text as well as exegetical commonplaces of the first century.

of, decrease."[112] Thus the word is used for the relative sidelining of John the Baptist in comparison with Jesus (Jn 3:30); for the waning of the sun during an eclipse, or for becoming impoverished. Josephus typically uses the word for reduced in rank, depletion of troops in battle, and the political inferiority of one nation compared to another.[113] Philo likewise uses it for an army taking casualties in battle.[114] In all such cases the word signifies a change of status from higher to lower (or from more complete to less complete). Such a meaning fits the context of humanity's transition from perfection to imperfection very well.

Second, *Auctor* uses the Psalm to highlight the disjunction between humanity's originally intended position of rulership over the world and the actual status of humanity in an often hostile world. This disjunction is first (and most clearly) represented in the fall narrative of Gen 3.[115] Further, a number of Jewish sources relate Ps 8, and especially the question "What is man . . .?" to the sinfulness of the world, if not directly to the fall. Thus in 2 Esd 6:53-59 it is declared, with unmistakable allusions to Ps 8, that God made Adam to rule over all the works of God's hand. The descendants of Adam are as "nothing" and as "spittle". This is immediately followed by a description of the evil of the nations, specifically their oppression of Israel. Similarly in 1QS 3:17-19 the declaration that "He created man to rule the world," is immediately followed by the declaration that there are two spirits (of

---

[112]Spicq, ἔλαττον (ἐλάσσων), ἐλαττονέω, ἐλαττόω, *Lexicon*, 1:469.

[113]Jos. *Ant.* 7:31; 3:53; Jos. *Vita* 17.

[114]Philo, *Gig*. 27.

[115]McCruden, "Perfection of Divine Intimacy," 43-44.

truth and deceit) which dominate respective sections of humanity.[116] Significantly, when this document deals with the eschatological consummation it notes that "the upright ones" will be cleansed "from all the abhorrences of deceit and (from) the defilement of the unclean spirit" because "God has chosen [them] for an everlasting covenant and to them shall belong *all the glory of Adam*."[117] There is no likelihood that *Auctor* was dependent on such sources but they do illustrate one trend of interpretation of Ps 8 in and around the time Hebrews was written.

Recognizing the importance of the fall in this section of Hebrews helps to resolve a difficult exegetical puzzle in this section of the book. The structure of the sentence found in 2:9 has suggested to some that the crowning of Jesus takes place prior to his death rather than as a consequence of it.[118] However, despite its apparent grammatical support thisreading is highly improbable within the theological construct of Hebrews. This puzzle is solved when the verse is recognized as forming a chiasm:

(A) τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν

(B) διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου

(B[1]) δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον,

(A[1]) ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου.[119]

---

[116]For discussion of this material see G. H. Guthrie and R. D. Quinn, "A Discourse Analysis of the Use of Psalm 8:4-6 in Hebrews 2:5-9," *JETS* 49 (2006): 236-38. See also A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM, 1966), 147-48.

[117]1QS 4:21-23; see also CD 3:20.

[118]A. Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood: Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913), 70; Bruce, *Apology*, 79-83.

[119]The textual variant χωρὶς θεοῦ ("without God") is preferred by some scholars in the place of χάριτι θεοῦ. See, for example, J. K. Elliot, "'When Jesus

*Auctor*'s use of *hyperbation* accounts for the difficult structure of the sentence. It is thus seen as a rhetorical strategy designed to highlight the main focus of the sentence, found in lines B and $B^1$–the present enthronement of Jesus consequent on his suffering of death.[120] The causal use of διά in line B shows that lines B and $B^1$ are not completely synonymous but are related to one another in terms of action and consequence.[121] However, this type of explanation only functions if lines A and $A^1$ are also seen as being basically synonymous. This means that Jesus' temporary subservience to the angels is the equivalent of his suffering death.[122] It is a matter of Jesus' identification "not only with man in his pristine state but also with man as he is."[123] When one works back from this application to the original Adamic pattern, it becomes clear that Adam's subordination to the angels is parallel to his separation from the tree of life.

---

was Apart from God:' An Examination of Hebrews 2:9," *ET*, 83 (1972): 339-41; P. Garnet, "Hebrews 2:9: ΧΑΠΙΤΙ or ΧΩΠΙΣ?" *Studia Patristica XVIII*, 4 vols., ed. E.A. Livingstone (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1985), 1: 321-25; and J. C. O'Neill, "Hebrews 2:9," *JTS* (n.s.), 17 (1966): 79-82. However, the textual evidence for this alternative reading is weak. Vanhoye (*Situation du Christ*, 300) defends the usual reading and highlights the way in which *Auctor* effectively constructs a contrast with Adam through such a statement.

[120]Bruce, *Hebrews*, 75.

[121]See D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 369.

[122]Thomas Aquinas notes this in his medieval lectures, although he leaves open the possibility that the reference in the Psalm citation is not to Jesus alone but includes humanity in general, in which case a different interpretation is offered. See T. Aquinas, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, trans. C. Baer (South Bend, Ind.: St. Augustine, 2006), 56-57.

[123]Stine, "Finality," 154.

Third, although the original meaning of the cherubim is obscure, there is little doubt that by the first century C. E. they were understood as angelic beings.[124] The initial explicit mention of the cherubim in Genesis shows them as having authority over the fallen Adam and Eve–specifically authority to deprive them of access to the tree of life (Gen 3:24). The cherubim are associated with humanity's lack of access to God elsewhere in the Jewish Scriptures, not least of all in the symbolism found in the sanctuary.[125] The most significant example of this is the fact that representation of cherubim were to be woven into the veil separating the first and second apartments of the Hebrew tabernacle (Ex 26:1, 31; 36:8,35; 2 Chron 3:14).[126] God was declared to be

---

[124]E. Lohse describes the cherubim as being mentioned in the Old Testament as "mythical angelic beings" and goes on to show how their angelic status is made more explicit in the pseudepigrapha (for example, 1 Enoch 20:7; 61:10; 71:1) and rabbinic writing (bChag., 13b). See E. Lohse, "Χερουβίν," in *TDNT*, ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 9: 438 Lohse's designation of the cherubim as angels should not mislead the reader to think of them as "the round-face infant cherubim known in Western art." See, C. Meyers, "Cherubim," *ABD*, 1: 890. They were rather winged hybrid creatures. See further, W. F. Albright, "What were the Cherubim?" *Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, ed. G. E. Wright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961), 1: 95-97 [Reprinted from *BA* 1 (1938): 1-3]; and, D. N. Freedman and M. P. O'Connor, "כְּרוּב kᵉrûb **cherub**," in *TDOT*, 7: 307-19.

[125]On the symbolic relationship of the Hebrew sanctuary and the Garden of Eden, see T. E. Fretheim, *Exodus*, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1991), 268-72; G. J. Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," *PWCJS* 9 (1986): 19-25; J. Kearney, "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40," *ZAW* 89 (1987): 375-87; J. Blenkinsopp, "The Structure of P," *CBQ* 28 (1976): 280-83; H. R. Cole, "The Sacred Times Prescribed in the Pentateuch: Old Testament Indicators of the Extent of the Applicability" (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1996), 73-76.

[126]Although the cherubim embroidered on the veil are mentioned by the chronicler they are missing from the temple description in 1 Kings. Freedman and O'Connor ("כְּרוּב kᵉrûb **cherub**," 7: 314) attribute this absence to probable textual corruption in 1 Kings.

enthroned in the second apartment; the cherubim symbolically barred access to all to his presence with the exception of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement.

The issue of access to God is central in Hebrews. Christ has gone within the veil (6:19), where believers may follow and receive timely help (2:17-18). [127] The power of the cherubim to block access is broken. Given this context in the book of Hebrews as a whole, an initial reference to the cherubim in the context of the fall is entirely plausible. The association of Adamic imagery with the sanctuary was certainly made in antiquity. For example, CD 4:20 declares: "Those who remained steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam is for them." This is immediately followed (CD 4:21) by a reference to the priests, levites and sons of Zadok offering sacrifices, with Ez 44:15 being cited.

Fourth, there is an emphasis on the Fall in the context of Heb 2.[128] The clearest example is found in v 14 where the association of the devil and death clearly presupposes the transgression narrative of Gen 3. There is no mention of the devil in the actual narrative, where the tempter is designated simply as a serpent. However, there is ample evidence that by the first century C.E., the association of that serpent with both the devil and the angel of death was well established.[129]

---

[127]Day of Atonement allusions are clearly present in these passages. See N. H. Young, "'Where Jesus has Gone as a Forerunner on our Behalf' (Hebrews 6:20)", *AUSS* 39 (2001): 165-173; and, *idem*, "The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited", *AUSS* 40 (2002): 61-68.

[128]Detailed discussion of this point is found below, pp. 224-30.

[129]Wis 2:24; Jn 8:44-47; Rev 12:9.

Fifth, if the Psalm citation is understood in terms of the fall rather than creation, the theology of the Heb 2 is seen to reflect commonplace theological understandings of the early Christian movement. One of the earliest Christological statements extant is the pre-Pauline "Christ hymn" of Phil 2:5-11.[130] In that hymn the achievement of Christ is described in contrast to the fall of Adam.[131] Paul develops such thoughts into an explicit "second Adam" Christology in Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15. Such a second Adam Christology may also lie behind such texts as Rom 8:3, where the salvation is said to have been achieved by the entrance of Christ into the very sphere where sin and death exercised their power and authority: ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας.[132]

As already noticed *Auctor* uses the rhetorical strategy of moving from the known to the unknown. The heavenly priesthood of Christ is the crucial unknown in his presentation. It is scarcely surprising that he uses the well-established traditions of Christ as a second Adam as a staging point for leading his audience to the new understandings of the priesthood of the Son. The allusive nature of the argument in

---

[130]Bruce, *Hebrews*, 73.

[131]The presence and significance of the contrast with Adam in this hymn fragment has been widely discuss. See, for example, Dunn, *Christology*, 98-128; Sanders, *Christological Hymns*, 64-66; Cullmann, *Christology,* 174-181; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Christological Anthropology in Phil., II, 6-11," *RB* 83 (1976): 25-50; C. H. Talbert, "The Problem of Pre-existence in Philippians 2 6-11," *JBL* 86 (1967): 141-53. Although an anthropological approach to the hymn is not universally accepted, scholars who favour a more traditional incarnational understanding of the hymn still recognize the presence of Adamic imagery in it. See, for example, L. D. Hurst, "Re-enter the Pre-existent Christ in Philippians 2.5-11?" *NTS* 32 (1986): 453-54.

[132]M. M. Bourke, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990), 926.

this section reflects the degree of familiarity of the topics of Adam, the fall, and a second Adam Christology to both *Auctor* and his audience.

The conclusion of this argumentative section (2:8-9) returns to the introduction: God was not subjecting the future world to angels but to humanity (2:5). Indeed, that was God's original intention for the present world, but the fall has seen humanity placed under the authority of angels. Such is the present situation of humanity (2:8a), but Jesus has already achieved the position God intended for humanity. Commenting on 2:8-9, Campbell concludes "The earthly life of Jesus is no transient, unsubstantial episode but *the reality of man in the image of God*."[133]

The fact that Hebrews uses the personal name Ἰησοῦς for the first time in this context is significant. This personal name points to the life of Jesus on earth.[134] This is emphasized by the placing of the name at the end of the clause: τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν. Jesus is seen here as a representative figure, on the one hand fulfilling the destiny intended for Adam; on the other opening the door for the realization of this destiny for others.[135] The way is thus prepared for *Auctor*'s explicit designation of Jesus as ἀρχηγός (2:10) and πρόδρομος (6:20)–two terms which are virtually synonymous in Hebrews.[136]

---

[133]Campbell, 'In a Son', 28 (emphasis added).

[134]B. L. Melbourne, "An Examination of the Historical-Jesus Motif in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *AUSS* 26 (1988): 281-97; F. V. Filson, *"Yesterday": A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13*, SBT 2/4 (London: SCM, 1967), 36-38.

[135]Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 141.

[136]Michel, *Hebräer*, 144.

Gyllenberg argues that Jesus is not only fulfilling the role originally assigned to Adam but is actually his heavenly archetype.[137] He concludes from an analysis of the phrase, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, "daß Christus den Gläubigen eben dadurch Urheber des Heils geworden ist, daß er ist selbst erlangt hat."[138] However, there is nothing in the context of Heb 2 which requires such a thesis. The allusions to the human ideal here are all explicable in terms of the biblical account of creation and fall.[139]

The first argumentative section of Heb 2 thus brings into sharp focus the eschatological achievement of Jesus–"we see Jesus . . . crowned with glory and honour" (2:9; note also "the coming world" 2:5). It also highlights an "eschatological reservation" the fact that the eschatological hope is not yet fully realized–"we do not yet see" (2:8). Héring notes that in this regard the presentation of Heb 2 is "comme dans l'eschatologie paulinienne (1 Cor. 15.23-28)."[140] Significantly, Paul also makes use of a "second Adam" Christology in 1 Cor 15. Indeed, there are significant parallels between Heb 2 and 1 Corinthians more generally as well: for example, the mention of spiritual gifts (2:4 and 1 Cor 12-14) and the concept of the death of Jesus as a victory over the devil (2:14 and 1 Cor 2:6; 5:5; 10:10). Wilber Wallis points out that there are structural similarities in the development of thought related to the use of Ps 8 and 110 in 1 Cor 15 and Heb 1-2.[141] Another theme developed in this section of Heb 2 is the

---

[137]Gyllenberg "Christologie," 668; see also Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 103.

[138]Gyllenberg, "Christologie", 671.

[139]Michel, *Hebräer*, 159.

[140]Héring, Hébreux, 31.

[141]Wallis, "Use of Psalm 8 and 110," 27-28.

universal scope of the achievement of Jesus. He is the second Adam, who has tasted death for everyone (2:10). These themes are crucial to the development of thought in the rest of Heb 2.

**Second Argument: Unity of the Son with Humanity (Hebrews 2:10-14a)**

Like the first argumentative section, the second begins with γάρ. However, the relationship with what precedes is somewhat clearer in this second instance. The argument in 2:5-9 is concerned with Jesus as the second Adam. The argument in the second section builds on that by focussing on the Son's unity with humanity. Numerous points of contact exist between the conclusion of the first argumentative section (2:9) and the introduction to the second (2:10).

The arguments are connected by the hook word δόξα. In the first argument Jesus is already crowned with glory and honour (2:9); in the second "many sons" are to be led to glory (2:10). Michel observes that 2:10-12 give expression to a relationship between the one and the many. He notes "Diese Zusammenfassung ist zunächst nicht anders zu verstehen als bei Paulus in Röm $5_{15}$ 1Kor $15_{21}$."[142] Michel has, of course drawn attention to the two chapters where Paul explicitly develops his "second Adam" Christology. The direct relationship between the eschatological achievement of Jesus and the yet-to-be-realized eschatological hope for humanity, implicit in the Adam-Christ relationship of the first argument, is now made explicit by the use of the word ἀρχηγός (2:10). Similarly, the "suffering of death" in v 9 is echoed in the "made perfect through suffering" in v 10 (see also 5:8). If the suffering in v 9 is for everyone,

[142]Michel, *Hebräer*, 134.

the suffering in v 10 impacts on "many sons".[143] If the suffering in v 9 took place "by the grace of God" the suffering in v 10 was "fitting" for the one for whom and through whom everything was made, that is, God. Indeed the one element of v 9 which is not developed in v 10 is τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον, which is of crucial concern in the first argumentative section. However, the word ἔπρεπεν (fitting) may refer obliquely to it. This word, derived from the vocabulary of ancient rhetoric, alludes to the reliability of God's word: despite all appearances to the contrary, God's ideal of humanity is not ultimately frustrated. Thus it is appropriate that he should demonstrate this by citing Ps 8.[144]

The Adam-Christ parallel continues to be important in this section. First, God is not directly named but identified as the creator in 2:10. The circumlocution, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα serves a rhetorical function of emphasizing the power of God, despite the apparent frustration of his plans for humanity by the reality of sin in the world. The fact that this designation for God is juxtaposed with πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα highlights the correspondence of protology and eschatology here.[145] The divine intention for Adam (see also 2:7) will still be realized, because of the salvific achievement of the Son.

---

[143]The Semitic idiom reflected here should not be understood in an exclusionary sense ("many" as opposed to "all"). Rather it reflects an inclusive reckoning ("many" as compared with "one"). See Delitzsch, *Hebrews* 1:117.

[144]Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 55.

[145]E. Grässer, "Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesus in Hebräer 2,14-18," in *Theologia Crucis–Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag* ed. C. Andresen and G. Klein (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1979), 166.

More importantly, the use of the word ἀρχηγός (2:10) highlights the Adam-Christ parallel. This word has a wide semantic range. Attridge lists "'founder' of a city, family, school, colony or nation; the 'leader' or 'scout' of an army; an 'instigator' of trouble; [and,] the source or 'author' of good things'."[146] Of special significance in the context of Hebrews 2 is Kendrick's statement that Philo calls Adam the ἀρχηγός, "the *head* and *file leader* of the race conducting them on to a common goal with himself."[147] Unfortunately, he does not provide an actual Philonic reference to support this assertion. However, Spicq refers to Philo, *Op. Mundi*, 142: Τὸν δ᾽ ἀρχηγέτην ἐκεῖνον οὐ μόνον κοσμοπολίτην λέγοντες ἀψευδέστατα ἐποῦμεν.[148] Philo's comment about Noah–a "second Adam" in his own right in the Genesis account–is also illuminating here: ἑτέραν δὲ τὸ πάλιν ἀρχηγέτην αὐτὸν ὑπάρξαι νέας ἀνθρώπων σπορᾶς.[149] In a similar tone, Josephus refers to Noah as ὁ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγός and the Chaldaeans generally as τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγοί.[150] In Hebrews the picture of the believers in association with the leader of salvation, first introduced in 2:10, is found in several places thereafter throughout the epistle (4:14; 6:20; 9:12, 24; 10:19-22; 12:1-2; 13:20).

---

[146]Attridge, *Hebrews*, 87. See also Peake, *Hebrews*, 104. There is also an echo of the affirmations of 1:2-3.

[147]Kendrick, *Hebrews*, 37.

[148]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:38-39. E. Grässer also draws attention in this regard to Philo, *Op. Mundi*, 79, 136; *Mut. Nom.*, 64. See E. Grässer, *An die Hebräer*, EKK (Zurich: Benziger, 1990-1997) 1: 132.

[149]Philo, *Abr.* 46.1. Philo (*Abr* 9) applies similar language to Enoch. For a modern treatment of Noah as a second Adam see W. A. Gage, *The Gospel in Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Carpenter, 1984), 7-15.

[150]Jos. *Ap.* 130, 71.

The first reference to the "perfection" of the Son in this section should also be noted. The perfection of Christ in 2:10 refers not specifically to his priesthood but to his role as leader and pioneer of salvation.[151] It suggests that he successfully completed the human journey and reached the goal God intended for humanity.[152] In light of the underlying Adam imagery in Heb 2, parallels with Phil 2:5-11 to this concept of the perfecting of the Son are unmistakable.[153]

The most significant emphasis of this entire argumentative section is that of the unity of the Son with humanity. This unity is implied previously, particularly in connection with affirmations of his death. but *Auctor* gives it explicit expression for the first time in 2:11: ὅ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες. The phrase ἐξ ἑνός is syntactically and semantically ambiguous. Is ἑνὸς to be taken as a neuter or a masculine? What is its referent?

If ἑνός is understood as a neuter form the referent would be to "one [human] nature", "one common humanity" (or some such similar rendering), the position

---

[151]Of course "leader of salvation" and "high priest" are roles which are held closely together in Hebrews.

[152]Peake, *Hebrews*, 105; Michel, *Hebräer*, 144.

[153]Regardless of whether one understands the "Christ-hymn" (Phil 2:5-11) in primarily Christological or anthropological terms (see pp. 209, above) a certain contrast between Christ and Adam (or in stricter narrative terms, Eve) can be seen in the hymn. Christ is presented as one who although in the form of God did not regard equality with God as something to grasped firmly (or grasped after). Adam and Eve, by contrast, although made in the image of God did regard equality with God as something to be grasped for (Gen 3:5, 6). Christ willingly acted in a way that lead him knowingly to death; Adam and Eve only acted as they did when assured that it would not lead to death (Gen 3:4). The voluntary humiliation of Christ contrasts with the deliberate self-aggrandizement of Adam and Eve.

adopted by John Calvin.[154] Modern adherent of this view include Vanhoye, Williamson, Ellingworth, Philip Hughes, William Johnsson, and Victor Pfitzner.[155] Three different referents have been proposed on the presupposition that the noun is masculine, viz., Adam, Abraham, and God.[156]

All of these various alternatives have long traditions in interpretative history. According to the survey of Jean-Claude Dhôtel, St. Ephraim (ca. 306 - 373 C.E.) understood ἑνός as a neuter, whereas Pseudo-Athanasius (between the fifth and ninth centuries) understood it as a masculine referring to Adam and St. John of Damascus

---

[154]J. Calvin, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistles of St Peter*, trans. W. B. Johnston, Calvin's New Testament Commentaries 12 (Grand Rapids, MI: 1963), 26.

[155]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 334; Williamson, *Hebrews*, 14; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 105; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 20; W. G. Johnsson, *Hebrews*, Knox Preaching Guides (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1980), 20; Pfitzner, *Hebrews*, 44.

[156]Among those seeing Adam as the referent are Héring, *Hébreux*, 34; Peake, *Hebrews*, 106; Procksch and Kuhn, "ἅγιος," 112; L. L. Morris, "Hebrews," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*,12 vols., ed. F. E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1979-81), 12: 27; Stine, "Finality," 151; and, Bourke, "Hebrews," 925.

Among those seeing Abraham as the referent are Weiss, *Hebräer*, 86; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 32; and, J. Swetnam, "Hebrews 1,1 -3,6," 60.

Among those seeing God as the referent are Westcott, *Hebrews*, 50; Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, 1: 121; Kendrick, *Hebrews*, 37; Dods, "Hebrews," 266; Vos, "Priesthood," 435; Meeter, *Heavenly High Priesthood*, 43; Strathmann, *Hebräer*, 86-87; Garvie, "Pioneer," 504; Purdy, "Hebrews," 615; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 71. Käsemann, *Wandering*, 145; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 62; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 58; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 81; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 58: Craddock, "Hebrews," 40; Nakagawa, "Christology," 114; Isaacs, *Reading Hebrews and James*, 43; Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2: 41; Michel, *Hebräer*, 150; deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 114; Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 175; Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 133; Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 162; Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 77; Farrar, *Hebrews*, 76; and, D. Guthrie, *The Letter to the Hebrews*, TNTC (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1983), 90.

(ca. 676 - 749) thought it referred to Abraham.[157] Thomas Weinandy, on the other hand, points out that Thomas Aquinas saw that the referent of ἑνός was God.[158]

The three proposed referents, if the noun is masculine, can each muster contextual support. The unity is said to be between Sanctifier and sanctified (2:11) and since sanctification is ultimately the work of God, that may point to God as referent of ἑνός. Grässer appears to regard the referent of ἑνός to be God–although not in terms of his activity as creator–when he interprets this verse in terms of the common heavenly origin of the Son and the redeemed–"einer präexistenten συγγένεια."[159] This scarcely seems to be the most obvious reading of the text.

On the other hand, Abraham is named in the near context (2:16)–the first human apart from Jesus to have been explicitly identified in Hebrews. The use of the phrase σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ (2:16) might suggest the one common ancestor was Abraham rather than Adam. However, it is unlikely that *Auctor* wishes to restrict the work of Son to ethnic Jews alone. There are at least five plausible reasons for the mention of Abraham here: (1) The letter is addressed to Jewish Christians, which would make σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ the function equivalent here of ὑμῶν; (2) Abraham is mentioned as the father of the faithful, which suggests *Auctor* understood the church

---

[157]J-C. Dhôtel, "La 'sanctification' du Christ d'après Hébreux, II, 11," *RSR* 47 (1959): 517; see also Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 333.

[158]T. G. Weinandy, "The Supremacy of Christ: Aquinas' *Commentary on Hebrews,*" in *Aquinas in Scripture: An Introduction to his Biblical Commentaries*, ed. T. G. Weinandy, D. A. Keating and J. P. Yocum (London: Clark, 2005), 232; see also Aquinas, *Hebrews,* 64.

[159]Grässer, "Heilsbedeutung," 167. This interpretation finds its interpretative key in a supposed underlying gnostic myth.

to be "spiritual Israel";[160] (3) the name Abraham, instead of the expected Adam, may signal a shift in focus akin to that signalled by the Son/High Priest shift–from universal rule to a focus on a specific group, namely the faithful;[161] (4) Abraham is mentioned because of his association with the theme of "promise" which provides an important structure for the argument of Hebrews; or, (5) "the seed of Abraham" is intended as a subtle allusion to the Levitical priesthood–a major interest in Hebrew.[162] However, Adam has even stronger contextual claim to be seen as the common ancestor of 2:11.

Westcott declares that seeing a reference to Adam or Abraham here is "partly inadequate and partly inappropriate."[163] Similarly, Käsemann insists that it is "quite misleading" to see here a reference to Adam."[164] However, the same phrase clearly refers to Adam in Acts 17:26.[165] More significantly such a referent in the context of Heb 2 is perfectly natural. The reference is preceded as already noted by a Psalm citation (2: 5-8) which deals with the creation and the original Adamic ideal. It is further surrounded by the references to the human fate of death (2:9, 14-15). The declaration of common origin (2:11) is immediately preceded by a direct references to the suffering of Jesus (2:10). This verse provides the first use the word πάθημα in Hebrews. The meaning of this word in Hebrews is clearly expressed here: πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, The suffering of Jesus is consistently mentioned in connection with his

---

[160]Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 36-37; MacNeill, *Christology*, 51.

[161]For further elaboration of this point see below, pp. 233-35.

[162]Michel, *Hebräer*, 162.

[163]Westcott, *Hebrews*, 50; see also Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 175.

[164]Käsemann, *Wandering*, 145.

[165]Bruce, *Hebrews*, 81.

death in Hebrews (2:9-10; 2:18, see also 2:14; 5:7-8; 9:26; 13:12). In speaking of the "suffering of death" rather than simply of "death" *Auctor* highlights the fact that Son and the believers form a community of suffering. Although his readers had certainly "suffered" they had by not yet died (12:4). The word πάθημα thus had greater power to evoke a sense of community between the readers and Christ than the word θάνατος had.[166]

The immediate context of ἐξ ἑνός (2:10-11, 14) deals with the Son's close kinship with humanity in other ways as well. Alfred Garvie correctly observes that the unity of the Sanctifier and the sanctified (2:11) "implies more than, although it must include, common *blood and flesh*." [167] Vanhoye rightly notes the importance of this solidarity of the Son with humanity in this context and concludes "Le 'moi' dont il s'agit n'est donc pas un moi isolé; non pas 'moi seul', mais 'moi et les enfants'. *Le Christ glorifié se présente comme le chef de la famille humaine.*"[168] Donald Miller notes similarly, "He [namely, Jesus] was the 'new Adam' the fountainhead of a new order of humanity, offering himself for those whom he called 'brethren'."[169] This passage ends (2:17-18) with the first explicit ascription of the title "high priest" to Jesus. *Auctor* elsewhere stresses the necessity of priests being taken from among men

---

[166]N. H. Young, "Suffering: A Key to the Epistle to the Hebrews," *ABR* 51 (2003): 50-55.

[167]Garvie, "Pioneer," 503. One must question if this is a *necessary* implication if one takes ἐξ ἑνὸς to refer to God, as Garvie does.

[168]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 345, emphasis added.

[169]D. G. Miller, "Why God Became Man: From Text to Sermon on Hebrews 2:5-18," *Int* 23 (1969): 415.

(5:1). Consequently, reference to the common parentage of the redeemer and the redeemed by Adam is certainly not out of place here. Moffatt notes,

> what is in the writer's mind, as he develops the argument of the second chapter, is the notion, which was perhaps connected with a veneration for angels among his readers, that it was degrading for the Son of God to assume human nature. It is argued that Christ had far more in common with men than with angels. Men were 'sons of God,' to be conducted to glory, and Christ as God's Son, therefore became man.[170]

On the other hand, one must wonder why *Auctor* might imagine that Jesus could be understood as being ashamed to call them "brothers" if the reference is to common descent from God. Nor is it easy to see how a brotherhood of the Son and the angels is to be excluded if the referent is God.[171]

The use of the word ἐπαισχύομαι in this context is rhetorically significant. In the theological context of the New Testament documents to "not be ashamed" is identical with "to confess" (Rom 1:16-17; 2 Tim 1:12) and "to be ashamed" is identical with "to deny" (Mark 8:37; Luke 9:26). *Auctor* is here using the language of "confession", but strikingly he applies it here to Jesus rather than to the believer.[172] The rhetorical purpose is to reinforce a willingness on the part of the believers likewise not to be ashamed of (that is, to confess) Jesus as Son of God (2:1). The language of confession intrinsically points to relationships between God and humanity.

Of particular significance are the three testimonies in 2:12-13, which form the bulk of this argumentative section. Michel points out that the terms ἁγιαζόμενοι (2:11) ἀδελφοί (2:13) and παιδία (2:14) are used in a strictly synonymous way in this

---

[170]J. Moffatt, "Not Ashamed," *Exp* 8.5 (1913): 285-86.

[171]Lenski, *Hebrews*, 84; Hébreux, 34; Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 332.

[172]Michel, *Hebräer*, 150.

chapter. As such, these key words also bind this argumentative section to the next: the ἀδελφός of 2:13 reappears in 2:17; the παιδία of 2:13 is immediately picked up in 2:14. Although ἁγιαζόμενοι itself does not re-occur, Michel points to a thematic link with τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι in 2:18.[173]

Hughes correctly notes that "at first sight these three quotations from the Old Testament may appear to afford tenuous and scarcely adequate support for the argument our author is intent on sustaining."[174] However, the pattern of usage of scriptural citation in Hebrews helps to clarify their function in this context. *Auctor* tends to make broad statements and clarify them in the scriptural citations which follow. For example, the assertion of 1:4–"having become as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs"–is further explained and clarified in the catena of scriptural citations in 1:5-14. Similarly the assertion of 2:5–Now God did not subject the coming world, about which we are speaking, to angels–is clarified in the following citation (2:6b-8a). This pattern suggests that attempting to determine the referent of ἑνός on the basis of the preceding comments regarding "sanctification" is misguided. Rather the meaning should be explicated from the Scriptural citations which follow. The testimonies cited in 2:12-13 do not emphasize the common descent of the Son and humanity from God–which was a Stoic commonplace.[175] Rather they emphasize the Son's common humanity. The initial

---

[173]Michel *Hebräer*, 158.

[174]Hughes, *Hebrews*, 107.

[175]Sen. *Ben.* 3.28.1-2; Epictetus, *Diss.* 1.9.1-6. See discussion in deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 114. The Lukan Paul quotes the Stoic poet Aratus (*Phaen.* 5): τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν (Acts 17:28). See, Bruce, *Acts*, 338; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles*, ICC 2 Vols. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1998), 2: 847-48.

testimony (2:12) is taken from Ps 22 which is used elsewhere in the New Testament to emphasize Jesus' separation from the Father, rather than his connection with him.[176] Similarly, the words cited from Isa 8:17--ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ–seems to suggest "that the Son also shared with men an attitude of trust."[177] The "children" mentioned in the third citation (2:13 citing Isa 8:18) are "given by God." In the context of Hebrews they are those who rely on God in faith. *Auctor* relates them to Abraham (2:16), who exemplifies that faith (11:8-12).[178]

A number of qualifications must be made in rejecting the dominant interpretation of ἑνός as referring to God, and preferring instead the interpretation which sees Adam as the referent. First, there is not *necessarily* a great difference in meaning between these two alternatives. Much depends on what common origin in God is taken to signify. Dhôtel observes: "mais encore faut-il préciser si Dieu est ici considéré en tant que Créateur dont dépendent tous les hommes et l'humanité du Christ, ou en tant que Père commun du Monogène et des fils adoptés."[179] Robert Jewett's comments are illustrative of Dhôtel's first possibility: "Since the 'leader' and the 'sanctified' are all from God, *sharing the common created status*, he is 'not

---

[176]See Matt. 27:46; Mk 15:34.

[177]Purdy, "Hebrews," 615. See also Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 63 and Davies, *Hebrews,* 30.

[178]J. W. Swetnam, "A Merciful and Trustworthy High Priest," *PJT* 2/21 (1999): 9.

[179]Dhôtel, "Sanctification," 517.

ashamed to call them brethren'."[180] Laub similarly links the commonality to "des universal Schöpfertums Gottes."[181]

Second, the fact that the Lukan Paul can attribute common human origin to Adam and to God in the space of three verses (Acts 17:26-28) suggests that in the Greco-Roman world such alternatives were not as sharply differentiated as moderns may be inclined to think.

Third, those who understand the referent of ἑνός as being God are correct in declaring that the specific focus of the unity in 2:11-13 is not humanity in general, but those who have accepted the salvation proffered by the gospel. This is certainly indicated by the double use of ἁγιάζω in 2:11.[182] It is also inherent in the three citations. The word ἐκκλησία may not be used in the technical sense of "church" in 2:12, but it is highly likely that a Christian congregation, even in the first century, would have made some such association. Similarly in the second citation, mention of trust in God suggests the attitude of the believer rather than humanity in general. In the same way the children mentioned in the third citation are specifically said to have been given by God.

The second argument concludes with a forthright statement of the unity of the Son with humanity. He, like they, κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός. It is often

---

[180]Jewett, *Letter to Pilgrims*, 45. See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 88-89.

[181]Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 78.

[182]In Hebrews, as in biblical usage generally, ἁγιάζειν does not refer primarily to moral or ethical categories, but rather to dedication or consecration to God. Thus, although it does not correspond to the theological term "sanctification", it still denotes a category which is not specific to believers, rather than to humanity at large.

suggested that the unusual order "blood and flesh" instead of "flesh and blood" is due to the importance which "blood" holds for *Auctor*'s overall argument.[183] However, it may also be that the inversion is motivated by euphonic concerns, "éviter un '*kai-hai*' peu harmonieux."[184] In this case it also serves to draw attention to the phrase as a whole and thus to underscore the importance of the humanity of Jesus for the argument.[185] Such a rhetorical strategy is clearly recognized as legitimate in the classical rhetorical handbooks.[186]

The theme of the second argumentative section is the unity of the Son with humanity. This unity is a prerequisite for his work of salvation which is effective for some, but not all of humanity. The achievement of the Son is the focus of the third argumentative section. It is thus not surprising that there is a beginning of a narrowing of the focus–from humanity to the community of the believers. Speaking specifically of the scriptural citations of 2:12-13, Michel notes, "Der Offenbarer präsentiert sich als Vorbeter in der Gemeinde und erklärt seine Solidarität mit ihr."[187]

In the first argumentative section (2:5-10) the fact that the Son fulfills humanity original destiny is argued. He is already crowned with "glory" and will also lead "many sons" to glory. As such he is presented as, although not yet called the

---

[183]Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 64; Michel, *Hebräer*, 159-60.

[184]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 348.

[185]Hughes (*Hebrews*, 110) denies that the reversal in order has *any* exegetical significance, suggesting to the contrary that word order of phrase was simply reversible in Greek. However, the fact that "flesh and blood" is the order in every occurrence of the phrase in the New Testament except for 2:14 and Eph 6:12 speaks against such reversibility.

[186]*Rhet. Her.* 4.32.44; Quint. *Inst.*1.5.40.

[187]Michel, *Hebräer*, 134.

"forerunner" (πρόδρομος). That *Auctor* understands this term in a priestly way is evident from the context in which he actually uses it. (Heb 6:19-20). In the second argumentative (2:11-14a) section the stress falls on the pre-requisite for the Son's achieving his goal, namely his genuine identity with humanity. The identification with the children of Adam is a crucial step towards realizing the original destiny of Adam.

**Third Argument: The Achievement of the Son (Hebrews 2:14b-18)**

The third argumentative section begins with ἵνα indicting the purpose of the Son's identification with humanity.[188] The focus has moved from the person of the Son (as a "second Adam") to his accomplishments in that role.

Echoes of the creation and fall narratives are also unmistakable in 2:14-16, especially in the light of the quotation from Ps 8, which introduces this whole section.[189] The author(s) of Gen 2-3 repeatedly state that death was the penalty for eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. [190] The serpent is integral to the

---

[188]"The most fequent use of ἵνα clauses is to express purpose" (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 472).

[189]J. Dunnill, *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*, SNTSMS 75 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 220-221; Kendrick, *Hebrews*, 40; Héring, *Hébreux*, 35; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 61.

[190] Gen 2:17; 3:3, 19, 22 [by implication]. Application of historical critical methodologies has assigned both of these chapters of Genesis to the J source. For example, Speiser, *Genesis*, 14, 21; von Rad, *Genesis*, 73; G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1968), 147. This sort of analysis is out of vogue with newer more literary approaches to the text. See, for example, D. J. A. Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch*, JSOTSS 10 (Sheffield; JSOT Press, 1978), *passim*; J. B. Doukhan, *The Genesis Creation Story: Its Literary Structure* (AUSDDS 5; Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978), *passim*; and, L. A. Turner, *Genesis* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), *passim*. The validity or otherwise of the documentary hypothesis of the Pentateuch is irrelevant to the purposes of this dissertation. The book of Genesis was, on any hypothesis, known only as a unified work at the time Hebrews was written, as the numerous references in the New

fall narrative as the agent of temptation (Gen 3:1-2, 4, 13-15). By the time of the New Testament the identification of this serpent with the devil is well established (see Wis 2:23-24; 2 Enoch 31:4; Life of Adam and Eve 16; Rev 12:9).[191] One of the immediate results of the fall is "fear" at the approach of God (Gen 3:8-10). The "fear" is explicitly associated with "nakedness", a direct result of eating the fruit of the tree (Gen 3:6-7). However, in the context of the repeatedly affirmed death penalty, it is probable that the real source of fear was that their nakedness revealed that they had eaten from the forbidden fruit. Hebrews describes the devil as "the one having the power of death." Richard Lenski notes, "There is no need to explain to these Jewish Christians how the devil got the might of death and its killing power into his hands; they know Gen. 3."[192] William Robertson Smith points out that according to the Jewish Scriptures, the responsibilities of the priesthood included averting death from the people, "the fear of death [was] especially connected with the approach of an impure worshipper before God."[193]

---

Testament to Moses as the author of the Pentateuch clearly show (for example, Matt. 8:4; 19:8; 22:24; Luke 24:44; John 8:5; Rom 10:5).

[191]The dating of 2 Enoch is impossible to establish with any degree of certainty. However, F. I. Anderson favours a date around the beginning of the Common Era. See, F. I. Anderson, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction," in *OTP*, 1: 96. If this suggestion is correct, 2 Enoch may be used as a source for ideas current at the time Hebrews is written.

[192]Lenski, *Hebrews*, 90. Lenski's point is well taken, even though he shows no awareness of the competing Jewish interpretative traditions which related the introduction of sin into the world much more to the story of the watchers in Gen 6 than to the narrative of Gen 3.

[193]W. R. Smith, "Christ and the Angels: Hebrews ii. 11-17," *Exp* 2.3 (1882): 77.

Heb 2:14 finds a parallel in Wis 2:23-24: “for God created us for incorruption and made us in the image of his own eternity but, through the devil’s envy death entered the world, and those who belong to his company experience it.”[194] In both passages the devil is named and associated with death, which is the common human experience. Interestingly the editors of the NRSV give this section of *Wisdom of Solomon* (2:21-24) the heading “error of the wicked” and refer to Gen 1:26-27 for comparative purposes. However, the author of Wisdom is here more focused on the fall of man (Gen 3) than on his original creation in the image of God (Gen 1:26-27).

The direct correlate of the “fear of death” (φόβῳ θανάτου) in 2:15 is δουλεία (slavery). This image is also evocative of the fall of Adam. Slavery is not specifically mentioned in the Genesis account, but later Jewish reflection indicates such an association was known. For example, Sir 40:1-2 declares: "Hard work was created for everyone, and a heavy yoke is laid on the children of Adam, from the day they come forth from their mother’s womb until the day they return to the mother of all the living."[195] Here the use of the personal name “Adam” recalls the creation / fall narratives of Gen 1-3; the reference to both “hard work” and “return” [to the dust of the earth] alludes to the punishment given to Adam (Gen 3:17-19). The word yoke (ζυγός) correlates to the concept of “slavery” (see also ζυγῷ δουλείας, Gal 5:1).

In 2:14-15 the death of Christ is described as a victory over the devil. However, the devil’s work is carefully delineated. He is not described as the “tempter”

---

[194]T. E. Schmidt, “The Letter *Tau* as the Cross: Ornament and Content in Hebrews 2,14,” *Bib* 76 (1995): 80.

[195]Andriessen (“Teneur,” 307) declares that “sans doute” *Auctor* had Sir 40:1-2 in mind when composing 2:15.

or "accuser of our comrades" (cf. Rev 12:10). Rather, he is described as "the one who has the power of death" (2:14). The human problem here is not described as "sin" or even "impurity"–despite the importance of this topic in Hebrews–but the fear of death (2:15).[196] John Dunnill draws attention to the parallels between 2:14-16 and later passages in Hebrews. If *Auctor* here characterizes humanity as bound by the fear of death (2:15) he later refers to the reality that some of those have actually been imprisoned (τοῖς δεσμίοις: literally, "the bound" 10:34). This refers ostensibly to events of the past, but it is clearly a potentiality then current which is also in view: ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν (10:36). The Son died (2:14) in his victory over the devil, but the community addressed in their battle with sin has not yet resisted to the point of death (12:4).[197] Gyllenberg notes, "Der Tod Jesu ist in diesem Zusammenhang nicht als Sühnopfer gewertet, sondern als eine bahnbrechende Leistung."[198] Within the immediate context of this explicit mention of the "destruction" of the devil (2:14) there are found explicit references to his on-going work of temptation (2:18).[199]

Another possible echo of the fall narrative is found in the use of the word ἐπιλαμβάνομαι in 2:16. This word is usually translated as "to help", but actually has

---

[196]There is a contrast here even with the Pauline "second Adam" Christology where the "enemy" considered is "death" (Anderson, *King-Priest*, 172).

[197]Dunnill, *Covenant and Sacrifice*, 214.

[198]Gyllenberg, "Christologie", 678. For a similar comment see Käsemann, *Wandering*, 160.

[199]The devil is admittedly not mentioned in 2:18. However, the mention of the temptation of the Son in the same verse is evocative of the temptation narratives of Matt. 4:1-11 and Lk 4:1-13, where the devil is named as the tempter.

the sense "to take hold of", especially "to take hold of someone running away."[200] An allusion to the postlapsarian Adam is easy to see. Albert Bonus points out that the word is used elsewhere in both the Christian Scriptures and ancient Jewish religious documents, but that it does not have, in and of itself, the sense of "to help". He suggests that the text should be understood in terms of the fear of death, rather than of the Son, taking hold of humanity. If such a meaning is accepted, the allusion to the fall narrative is still evident. [201]

In Hebrews this affirmation of Jesus' defeat of Satan is followed immediately by the first direct reference to Jesus as high priest (2:17), which is developed in considerable depth in Hebrews 5-10.[202] Why does the development take the form it does? If fear of death is the issue, why is the resurrection of Christ not stressed? It has only a single explicit mention in the entire book of Hebrews (13:20).[203] The answer may be suggested in the Genesis fall narrative again. This narrative does not, in fact, end with Adam and Eve's *death*, but with their *exile* from the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:21-24). Their access back to tree of life is barred by cherubim holding a flaming sword (Gen 3:24). In consequence Adam and Eve begin a life of toil and hardship

---

[200]K-G. Dolfe, "Hebrews 2,16 under the Magnifying Glass" *ZNW* 84 (1993): 289-94.

[201]A. Bonus, "Heb. ii. 16 in the Peshitta Syriac Version," *ET* 33 (1921-22): 234-36.

[202]Dunnill (*Covenant and Sacrifice*, 216) draws attention to the fact that 5:7-10 also directly associates the *death* of Jesus with his priesthood.

[203]If Heb 13 is not part of the original document, as a minority of scholars have argued, *Auctor* does not explicitly mention the resurrection at all. Jones uses the reference to the resurrection in 13:20 as support for his thesis that the entire chapter is a accidentally misplaced fragment of a Pauline letter to the Corinthians. See E. D. Jones, "The Authorship of Hebrews xiii," *ET* 46 (1934-35): 562-567.

(Gen 3:17b-19). In the narrative they not only "fear" [death], but suffer exile and lack of access to the tree of life. In Hebrews Jesus overcomes the devil and delivers the faithful from the fear of death (2:14-15), he is with the exiles who seek the "rest" (Heb 3-4) and he provides access to God "behind the curtain" (6:19). The reference to the curtain here is clearly to the veil between the holy place and the most holy place of the sanctuary.[204] This formed a barrier between worshippers and the presence of God. The way was symbolically barred by cherubim woven into the fabric of the curtain (Ex 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35; 2 Chron 3:14).

The similarities to and differences from Paul's explicit 'second Adam' Christology to the argument in Heb 2 should be noted. Like *Auctor*, Paul refers to Ps 8 in his argument

(1 Cor 15:25). For both the ultimate realization of that Psalm's promise is to happen in the eschatological future. Paul and Hebrews alike link Adam's failure with the presence of death in the world (Rom 5:12; 1 Cor 15:22). However, the differences between them come to sharp focus at precisely this point. For Paul the consequence of Adam's sin is "death", but for Hebrews it is the "fear of death." In Romans, Paul's

---

[204]This generally accepted identification of the curtain with the inner veil of the sanctuary is vigorously defended by R. E. Gane, "Re-opening *katapetasma* ("veil") in Hebrews 6:19," *AUSS* 38 (2000): 5-8; N. H. Young, "Where Jesus has Gone," 165-73; *idem*, "Old Testament Background," 61-68; D. M. Gurtner, "Καταππέτασμα: Lexicographical and Etymological Considerations on the Biblical 'Veil'", *AUSS* 40 (2002): 105-111; *idem*, "LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil," *NovTest* 47 (2005): 344-53; and *idem,* "The Veil of the Temple in History and Legend," *JETS* 49 (2006): 97-114. The identification has been challenged, albeit unsuccessfully by G. E. Rice, "Hebrews 6:19–Analysis of Some Assumptions Concerning *Katapetasma*," *AUSS* 25 (1987): 65-71 and R. M. Davidson, "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19-20: The Old Testament Background", *AUSS* 39 (2001): 175-90 and *idem*, "Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's 'Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited'" *AUSS* 40-1 (2002): 69-88.

focus is on the underlying sin/righteousness contrast (Rom 5:12, 16); in 1 Corinthians it is explicitly on the death/life contrast (1 Cor 15:22). The emphasis in Hebrews is different again: fear of death/confidence to enter in. Although Heb 2 uses neither the verb "to enter" nor the noun "confidence", both are key words in Hebrews as a whole, and are especially related to Christ's high priestly work in the heavenly sanctuary, introduced as the climax of the argument in Heb 2. Hebrews asserts that Christ has the authority and status of "king" but in this age functions as interceding high priest, his kingly role being reserved for the future time of eschatological realization.[205]

Mackie has summed up the thought of 2:5-18 well:

> Thus, the last Adam is "crowned with glory and honor" (2:9), the pioneer has been made perfect (2:10), and the victor has conquered the devil and freed captive humanity (2:14-15). A final act of vindication might be seen in the Son's appointment to high priest [*Sic.*] (2:17). With Christ as the examplar of the life of faith, the author firmly establishes a hortatory pattern of "suffering/vindication" that [*Sic.*] what will become an enduring rhetorical strategy. That this same Son is said to be Lord of the imminently "coming world" lends further credibility and urgent impetus to the author's implied promise of the glorious heavenly vindication that awaits those who patiently and faithfully endure the various sufferings that attend discipleship to the Son.[206]

## Conclusion

Heb 2 is crucial to the argument of the work as a whole. The citation of Ps 8 is the means by which *Auctor* starts to bring the main themes of his epistle to the fore.[207] The chapter as a whole caps off the introductory themes found in Heb 1 and explicitly

---

[205]M. Saucy, 'Exaltation Christology in Hebrews: What Kind of Reign?', *TJ*, n.s. 14 (1993): 58.

[206]Mackie, *Eschatology*, 48. See also Thielman, *Theology*, 593.

[207]Strathmann (*Hebräer*, 84) notes correctly, with reference to the citation, "Damit leitet es zum Hauptthema des Briefes hin."

introduces a number of key motifs for the rest of the book, including that of the heavenly priesthood of Christ and the perfecting of the Son

The story of Adam is echoed in every argumentative section of the chapter. This suggests that the evaluation of Isaacs– that we should not find a second Adam Christology in Hebrews–is inadequate.[208] Rather, the evaluation of Peter Leithart–that the focus of the "opening chapters [chapters 1-4] is the restoration in Christ of Adamic domination over creation"–seems more correct.[209]

How does this analysis of Heb 2 clarify the relationship between Sonship and priesthood in Hebrews? Two patterns are evident. The first is that of eschatological fulfilment and reservation. The Son is presented initially in terms of eschatological achievement. He is above the angels (1:5-14). He has fulfilled the Adamic ideal and is now crowned with glory and honour (2:9). He has been made perfect subsequent to an experience of suffering (2:11).[210] He has "destroyed" the devil (2:14). Bauer, Arndt, Gringich and Danker list the following meanings for καταργέω:

1. "to cause someth. to be unproductive, *use up, exhaust, waste*;"
2. "to cause someth. to lose its power or effectiveness, *invalidate, make powerless;"*

---

[208]Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 168.

[209]P. J. Leithart, "Womb of the World: Baptism and the Priesthood of the New Covenant in Hebrews 10:19-22," *JSNT* 78 (2000): 58. Significantly when *Auctor* refers to the "coming world" in 2:5, he does not use αἰών (age), as in many other eschatological passages in the New Testament, but οἰκουμένη, which generally refers to the inhabited world.

[210]On "perfection" as an eschatological concept, see P. J. du Plessis, *ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ: The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959), 240-44. See also D. Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews,* SNTSMS 47 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 66-73. In 2:11, at very least, "perfect" is contrasted to "suffering".

3. "To cause someth. to come to an end or to be no longer in existence *abolish, wipe out, set aside*."[211]

The destruction of Satan is part of the eschatological hope of both the early church and early Judaism.[212] This hope is clearly echoed by *Auctor*, although he is certainly using the word καταργέω here with a sense of disempowerment rather than actual destruction

Despite these declarations of eschatological achievement, Heb 2 also makes it clear that eschatological hopes have not been fully realized. The Son's priesthood is explicitly placed in the context of the continuation of sin's dominion over the world: δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι (2:18). The devil may be "destroyed" but temptation continues. The epithet ἐλεήμων . . . καὶ πιστὸς used of Christ's high priesthood points in the same direction. The faithfulness of this priest stands in contrast to the potential faithlessness of the community. "Mercy" is not needed as a priestly attribute, except when there is failure on the part of the community.

The second pattern is that of a narrowing of focus from the universal to the particular. Adam is the biblical father of all humanity, the Adamic ideal is thus universal in scope and its frustration universal in consequence. Spicq notes that there is a strong universal note in Heb 2. Christ has tasted death "for everyone" (ὑπὲρ παντός), not only for the faithful. In a similar way the phrases δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα (2:10) and ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες (2:11) as evidence of a strongly

---

[211]Bauer Arndt, Gringrich and Danker, *Lexicon*, s.v. καταργέω.

[212]Rev 20:10. For parallel concepts in early Judaism note, for example, the eschatological defeat of Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls, specifically QM and 11QMelch. For further discussion, see A. Steudel, "God and Belial," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after their Discovery 1947-1997*, ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 332-40.

universal focus in this section of Hebrews. [213] Michel, noting the same universal focus in Heb 2, concludes "Der Erlöser schafft eine neue Menschheit."[214] Of course, if the emphasis in Heb 2 is on Christ's reversal of the fall of Adam, precisely such a universal focus would be expected.

In a variety of subtle ways the focus of the chapter gradually narrows from humanity as a whole to the community of faithful Christians in particular. The substitution of the name "Abraham" for the expected "Adam" in 2:16 is a vivid example. *Auctor* certainly does not intend to signify that the Son's achievement was only valid for Jews, to the exclusion of Gentiles. By the choice of this name he does signal a narrowing of focus *of some sort.*

In a similar way it may be that there is a deliberate narrowing of focus from the Son's superiority over the angels in general (1:5-14) to his victory over the "angel of death"–the devil–in particular (2:14).[215] The fact that the sole naming of the devil in Hebrews (2:16) is immediately followed by the last mention of angels until 12:22 points in this direction. The word ἄγγελος here points back both to the angels to whom the Son is superior in 1:5-14 and to those which 2:5-8 imply rule the present

---

[213]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2: 35.

[214]Michel, *Hebräer*, 144. Buchanan (*Hebrews*, 38) notes that the universal emphasis is also evident in Heb 1–most obviously seen in the frequent use of πᾶς (1:2, 3, 11, 14; 2:8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 17). However, other words clearly indicate a universal focus in the context of the two chapters: υἱός–which is a term of royal dominion over the earth (1:2, 5, 8; 2:6, 10); κληρονόμος–which indicates a universal eschatological hope; ἄγγελος–indicating in Jewish tradition the rulers of all the nations of the world. Of course, references to the universal human experience of sin (1:3; 2:17) and death (2: 9, 14, 17) further highlight the universal focus of this section of Hebrews.

[215]Vanhoye (*Situation du Christ*, 352) hints at this meaning but does not develop the thought. See also Grogan, "Christ and His People," 62.

world.[216] Loader raises the possibility of a connection between 2:14 and the statements of the superiority of the Son over the angels in Heb 1. However, he rejects the suggestion on the grounds that the superiority of the Son in Heb 1 is associated with his exaltation and not with his death as the defeat of the devil is in Heb 2.[217] Such reasoning is scarcely compelling in Hebrews, where the death and exaltation of Jesus are presented in the closest of relationships–to the virtual exclusion of any mention of his resurrection, explicitly referred to only once, in 13:20.

More broadly, it should be noted that even though there is little explicit priestly language in Heb 1-2, *Auctor* finds numerous subtle ways to prepare the way for the introduction of the title "high priest" in 2:17.

1. The "crown" of 2:9 may suggest a priestly role, since priests and not only kings wore crowns (Ex 28:36-38; Lev 8:9).
2. The Melchizedekian high-priest holds both royal and sacerdotal offices.
3. The fact that Jesus "brings many sons to glory" (2:10), elsewhere equated with entering the most holy place (8:1-2; 9:11, 25; 10:19).
4. The fact that Jesus is "perfected" (2:10), which *may* be a technical term for priestly ordination.[218]
5. The fact that the Sanctifier and the sanctified share a common origin (ἐξ ἑνός), implies the forming of a holy fraternity akin to the Aaronic community of saints

---

[216]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 27; Hurst, "Christology," 154.

[217]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 114.

[218]This understanding of the "perfecting" of Jesus is certainly not universally accepted. See, for example, Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection*, 26-30, 70-73.

(2:11; 3:1; see also Ex 29:1).[219] The community of the Sanctifer and sanctified is a community of suffering and temptation.

If the Adam story is used by *Auctor* to facilitate the transition from Sonship to priesthood, it must be asked if and how this link is manifest elsewhere in the epistle. It is to the investigation of this question that the next chapter is devoted.

---

[219]Leithart, "Womb," 58-59.

# CHAPTER 5

## OUTWORKING OF THE THEME: SON TO PRIEST

In the previous chapter, it has been argued that *Auctor* connects the Sonship and the priesthood of Christ through reflection on the story of Adam and by an implicit presentation of Christ as the second Adam. In the present chapter these conclusions will be examined in light of the rest of Hebrews (particularly chapters 1-7, where the theme of the person of the heavenly high priest is primarily developed).[1] It should be noted that the topic of Adam is not overtly discussed in Hebrews. However, it will be argued that a common early Christian understanding of the Adam/Second Adam topic is presupposed in the discussion. A number of concepts will be examined which may reflect the creation and fall narratives of Genesis to some degree, including confidence (παρρησία), entrance, house, forerunner, pioneer, rest, Melchizedek, sanctuary, and the Day of Atonement. An attempt will be made to explore these concepts in the order they occur in Hebrews as much as possible.

---

[1]See above, pp. 173-74.

**The Exordium: Hebrews 1:1-4**

Heb 1:1-4 serves as a theological introduction to the entire work.[2] Übelacker notes "die ersten vier Verse, die oft als Exordium oder als Proömium bezeichnet werden, den Auftakt bilden, der irgendwie die Hauptgedanken des Briefes anvisiere."[3] If the exegesis of Heb 2 given in the previous chapter is valid, one may logically expect to find anticipations of it in the exordium. Is this in fact the case? The status of "Son" is explicitly affirmed (1:2) and there are allusions to his priestly office (1:3). But is there any–even implicit–Adamic link between them? Many treatments of the exordium lack any reference to Adam. A notable exception is that by Karrer, who concludes "Ein Moment von Adam-Christologie geht in unseren Text ein, aber ohne dass wir es überbewerten dürfen."[4]

Perhaps more general links between Heb 1 and 2 should be noted before this question is explored in detail. Meier has argued that the exordium sets the pattern for the content of the rest of Heb 1. In other words the scriptural citations in the catena of 1:5-14 reflect and support the Christological affirmations of the exordium.[5] Meier recognizes that the parallels between the catena and the Christological statements of

---

[2]Lickliter, "Superiority of the Son," 118; Gräßer, "Hebräer 1,1-4," 187.

[3]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 69.

[4]M. Karrer, *Der Brief an die Hebräer Kapital 1,1-5,10*, Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 20/1 (Gütersloher Verlagshaus: Gütersloh, 2002) 121.

[5]J. P. Meier, "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1,5-14," *Bib* 66 (1985): 504-533. This article is effectively a "second part" of his article, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1,1-14," *Bib* 66 (1985): 168-189. Meier's basic idea is not new. W. Manson (*Hebrews*, 91-92) similarly linked the catena and Christological statements of the prologue. However, Manson only enumerated four such statements.

the exordium fall short of being of a precise "one-to-one" basis, but are rather general in nature.[6]

Heb 2 does not fall into the range of material in Meier's purview. Thus he does not note that the concepts found in the exordium recur to a considerable extent in the same order in Heb 2. This is demonstrated in the chart below.

| Chart 1: Points of Contact between the Exordium and Hebrews 2 | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Exordium | Hebrews 2 |
| 1 | God has spoken | what we have heard (2:1) |
| 2 | by the prophets | through angels (2:2) |
| 3 | by a Son | declared at first through the Lord (2:3) |
| 4 | appointed heir of all things | God did not subject the coming world to angels (2:5a) |
| 5 | through whom he created the world | Creation psalm cited (2:5b-8) |
| 6 | reflection of God's glory | crowned with glory and honour (2:9) |
| 7 | sustains all things | everything subject (2:8b) |
| 8 | made purification for sins | might taste death for everyone . . . the one who sanctifies . . . might destroy the one who has the power of death (2:9b, 11, 14-15) |
| 9 | sat down at the right hand of majesty | he might be a merciful and faithful high priest (2:17) |
| 10 | having become as superior to the angels as the name he inherited | he is able to help those who are being tested (2:18) |

In this chart each item from Heb 2 comes in the same order as in the exordium except for the inversion of items 6 and 7. However, these items occur in such close proximity in Heb 2 that this inversion is easily understood in purely stylistic terms. It

[6]Meier, "Symmetry," 523.

must also be acknowledged that there are variations in the strength of the parallels adduced here. Some of the parallels are so direct as to be self-evident (for example, 1-3, 5). Others demonstrate a development of thought, with evident linguistic affinities. Thus the parallel in item 6 hinges on the word δόξα, although the reference in the exordium is to the pre-existent Son while the reference in Heb 2 is to the exalted Son.

Items 8, 9 and 10 superficially might appear not to involve any parallel. However, as Loader correctly points out, victory over death in 2:14-15 does not reflect the intrusion of a new Christological or soteriological schema, but simply expresses the idea of making purification for sins in a different way.[7] Heb 2: 17 explains the meaning and implication of the Son's "sitting" at the right hand of God. It does not entail inaction but priestly mediation. Meier describes the final Christological affirmation of the exordium (item 10 here) in terms of "the results of the exaltation." In the exordium those results are expressed with a focus on the Son: his superiority over the angels and possession of a better name. In Heb 2 the focus is more anthropocentric: the availability of help for the tempted.

The weakest parallel is found in item 7. However, in Heb 2 as in the exordium this item deals with the continuance of the "world." In 2:8b πάντα alludes back to οἰκουμένεν τὴν μέλλουσαν (2:5), just as τὰ πάντα (1:3) alludes back to τοὺς αἰῶνας in 1:2. More importantly, φέρω (1:3) may have here the sense of "govern" rather than of "sustain".[8] Such an understanding strengthens the parallel with 2:8, where ὑποστάσσω certainly connotes rulership.

---

[7]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 111-13.

[8]Héring, *Hébreux*, 22-23. See discussion on the problems with this interpretation of φέρω, below pp. 242-43.

The emphasis of Heb 2 can be clearly seen in this analysis. Most items from Heb 1 are dealt with briefly in Heb 2. There are two exceptions. Victory over death is the topic of discussion in 2:9-15. The other topic developed in more than passing detail is that of creation (2:5b-8). This development is achieved by the citation of a relatively long fragment of a creation psalm.

The first half of the exordium makes clear the apocalyptic presuppositions of *Auctor*. The phrase ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων (1:2) is derived from Jewish eschatological expectation and sounds a clear note of eschatological fulfilment.[9] This provides the first hint of the development of the theme already noted in Heb 2, where a tension between eschatological realization and eschatological reservation is evident.[10]

The exordium begins with a statement lasting until the end of 1:2a, which declares that God has spoken. The reference is to the prophetic (in the broadest sense) revelation found in the Jewish Scriptures. There may also be an allusion here to the"speaking" of God in the creation story with which the Jewish Scriptures begin.[11] The LXX translation of the P creation story of Gen 1:1-2:4a contains a total of seventeen verbs denoting divine speech–λέγω (nine times); καλέω (five times); and, εὐλογέω (twice). It is true that εὐλογέω may not intrinsically indicate speaking. However, it clearly does in its first usage in this creation account, where it is immediately qualified by λέγω: καὶ ηὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς λέγων . . . . (Gen 1:28). The second occurrence (Gen 2:3) is not so clearly marked, although given the

---

[9]D. Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 63.

[10]See above, pp. 232-33.

[11]J. Girdwood and P. Verkruyse, *Hebrews* (Joplin, MO: College Press, 1997), 37.

prominence of speaking in the account as a whole it is not unlikely that speaking is also signified here.

Hebrews begins quite intentionally with reference to the speech of God. There are other ways in which *Auctor* could refer to God's progressive revelation rather than "speaking".[12] If *Auctor* intends any allusion to the creation account, the way of proceeding is extremely subtle. However, there is some support for such a suggestion. Luke Timothy Johnson suggests that in Hebrews "creation itself, then, is conceived as intrinsically verbal, as articulate, and as revelatory of the God who speaks it into being."[13] Thomas Hewitt suggests that the "speaking" alluded to by Hebrews may be exemplified, if not in the "speaking" narrated of the act of creation itself, then at least in the warning that eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (that is, sin) would lead to death (Gen 2:16-17).[14] This suggestion certainly harmonizes well with the strong paraenetic emphasis elsewhere in Hebrews.

The fact that the Son is described as φέρων τε τὰ πάντα <u>τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ</u> (1:3) may point in this direction. *Auctor* uses the directly parallel expression ῥήματι Θεοῦ to describe the original creation (11:3), in a reference which clearly alludes to Gen 1. Spicq observes that "ῥῆμα étant dans *Hébr*. la parole de la création (cf. XI, 3) et λόγος celle de la révélation (II, 2; IV, 12)."[15] Moffatt argues further that the word φέρω in 1:3 may refer to the creation rather than the maintenance

---

[12]For example, "God manifested his glory" or "God revealed himself."

[13]Johnson, *Hebrews*, 66.

[14]Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 49.

[15]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:10.

of the universe, as sometimes in Philo.[16] This suggestion is not likely. It would mean the phrase φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ would be redundant, adding nothing to the thought of the earlier δι᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας.[17] If φέρω is taken in the more likely sense with reference to the on-going government of the universe, rather than its creation, it entails a development of the thought of the preceding clause: ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων. The fall of man in no way frustrates the ultimate intention of God or precludes the Son from becoming heir of all things, for the Son continues to govern the universe, the sinfulness of humanity notwithstanding.[18] Such a development in thought would certainly not be out of place in the context of the Christological categories of "second Adam" and "new creation". Furthermore, if *Auctor* uses the word διά–in the expression δι᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας–in a causal instrumental sense, an allusion to creation by the utterance of God is likely.[19] It is certain that when *Auctor* declares that the one who has been the medium of God's speech in "these last days" is also the one "through whom he made the worlds." he is linking protology and eschatology tightly together.[20] This is indicated unmistakably by the use of καί in the phrase δι᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν

---

[16]Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 7. Moffatt cites for support Philo, *Rer. Div. Her.* 7 and Philo, *Mut. Nom.* 44.

[17]Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 35.

[18]Hughes, *Hebrews*, 45.

[19]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:6.

[20]Michel, *Hebräer*, 95; Stadelmann, "Christologie," 173.

τοὺς αἰῶνας.[21] The Son's work in creating and sustaining the universe is thus integral to the development of the exordium.

In 1:2, the first work ascribed to the Son is the creation τοὺς αἰῶνας. The word αἰών primarily means "age" rather than "world".[22] John Cunningham has suggested that the reference is actually to the inauguration of the eschatological messianic age rather than to creation.[23] However, the parallel with 1:10, where the object of creation is designated as οἱ οὐρανοί (the heavens), renders this view unlikely.[24] In any event, in the exordium itself, αἰών is directly parallel to τὰ πάντα in 1:3.[25] Since τὰ πάντα certainly refers to the universe, it is clear αἰών must also refer to the universe.[26] Of course, it remains possible that the word αἰών, rather than κόσμος, was used by *Auctor* because he also wished to allude to the eschatological age, which in Heb 2 is presented as a restoration of God's original intention for humanity.[27]

---

[21]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:6.

[22]Nakagawa ("Christology," 48-54) discusses the range of meanings which αἰών has in classical and koine Greek.

[23]J. Cunningham, "The Humanity of Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JRR* 6 (1997): 6-7. Cunningham's argument, it should be noted, serves an explicitly anti-Trinitarian doctrinal agenda. B. Weiss (*Hebräer*, 42) reached similar conclusions to Cunningham a century earlier, without having a similar dogmatic agenda. See also Cody, *Heavenly Sanctuary*, 132.

[24]C. D. Redmond, "Jesus: God's Agent of Creation," *AUSS* 42 (2004): 296-97.

[25]Spicq, *Hébreux,* 2:6.

[26]Nakagawa, "Christology," 53; Spicq, *Hébreux,* 2:6.

[27]Meier, "Structure," 178; Karrer, *Hebräer,* 117-18.

It is in this context that the Son is described as the “reflection of God’s glory and the exact imprint of God’s very being" (1:3). This language contains an unmistakable echo of Jewish wisdom speculations.[28] Indeed the earliest extant use of the word ἀπαύγασμα is found in Wis 7:26 as part of an extended description of divine Wisdom.

However, in the context of the creation theme, the language of 1:3 also brings Adam to mind. David Steenburg points to an important Pauline parallel to these juxtaposed phrases. Paul refers to man (that is male humanity) as the "image and glory of God" (1 Cor 11:7), in a passage replete with unmistakable allusions to the Genesis creation accounts.[29] In Jewish tradition, Adam was clothed with the glory of God before the fall. Significantly, *Wisdom of Solomon* applies the language of the divine image both to Adam/humanity and to divine wisdom itself (see Wis 2:23; 7:25-26). Philo declares man to be a "ray (ἀπαύγασμα) of the divine."[30] On the basis of this use Bruce concedes the possibility–which he ultimately does not accept–that 1:3 may mean that although Jesus appeared to be merely a man he was, in fact, the Son of God.[31] Janusz Frankowski points out that although ἀπαύγασμα is found alike in *Wisdom of Solomon* and Philo, the same is not true of the other key words of 1:3, namely, χαρακτήρ and ὑπότασις. The fact that these are found in Philo but not in *Wisdom of Solomon* suggests that the Philonic use may provide more insight into their use in

---

[28]Redmond, “Agent of Creation,” 301.

[29]D. Steenburg, “The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God,” *JSNT* 39 (1990): 99.

[30]Philo, *Op. Mundi.* 51.

[31]Bruce, *Apology*, 37.

Hebrews.[32] In the Dead Sea Scrolls it is said of Adam that God "fashioned [him] in the image of your glory" ([כה]יצרתה בדמות כבוד).[33] Moreover, Benjamin Murmelstein adduces evidence for similar references to Adam as the radiance of God in later Jewish rabbinic sources.[34] Not only so, but Adam was the "image of God" (Gen 2:26-28) and the terminology in Hebrews can "hardly be distinguished from that of image."[35] The words εἰκών and χαρακτὴρ are used in very close relationship in Philo. In his discussion of Bezalel, who was given wisdom by God for the building of the tabernacle, Philo notes,

> We must say, then, that here too we have a form which God has stamped on the soul as on the tested coin. What, then, the image (χαρακτὴρ) impressed on it is we shall know if we first ascertain accurately the meaning of the name [ie, of Bezalel].[36]

As part of his explanation he cites Gen 1:27 in the next paragraph: "And God made man after the Image (εἰκόνα) of God."[37]

The parallel nature of the words εἰκών and χαρακτήρ can also be seen when *Wisdom of Solomon* and Hebrews are compared:

---

[32]Frankowski, "Early Christian Hymns," 185-87.

[33]4Q504, recto 8.1.4.

[34]B. Murmelstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *WZKM* 35 (1928): 255. The evidence adduced is not dependent on acceptance of Murmelstein's central thesis–that of the Urmensch-Redeemer–which is no longer generally accepted.

[35]Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 35; see also Gräßer, "Hebräer 1,1-4," 218-19; H-F. Weiss, *Hebräer*, 145; Karrer, *Hebräer*, 121.

[36]Philo, *Leg. III*, 95; see also Philo, *Plant*, 18-19.

[37]Philo, *Leg. III*, 96. I have retained the capitalized form "Image of God" used by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker in their Loeb Classical Library translation.

ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστιν φωτὸς αἰδίου ... καὶ εἰκὼν ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ (Wis 7:26); and,

ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ (1:3).

It is similarly instructive to note that the author of Colossians uses the word εἰκών in making the same theological point as *Auctor* makes by his use of ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ: ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ (1:3); and,

ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου (Col 1:15).

In this instance Hebrews is more expansive but it is difficult to see ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτὴρ as encompassing anything other than that which εἰκὼν does in Colossians–just as δόξα and ὑπόστασις appear to directly correlate with τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου.[38] Zimmermann in noting the parallels between ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης and χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως and elements in other New Testament hymn fragments declares: "Besonders nahe steht Hebr 1,3 der Aussage Kol 1,15. Was hier εἰκών heißt, wird dort mit der Doppelbezeichnung ἀπαύγασμα und χαρακτήρ zum Ausdruck gebracht."[39]

Note that *Auctor* uses this vocabulary in his delineation of the attributes and activity of the Son, thus co-opting Jewish wisdom teaching. This is significant because in early Jewish and Christian sources not only is Adam is referred to as the Son of

---

[38]S. V. McCasland, "'The Image of God' According to Paul," *JBL* 69 (1950): 93-94.

[39]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 57. See also, W. R. G. Loader, "Hebräerbrief," in *Glaube in der Bewährung: Hebräer- und Jakobusbrief*, BAP 25, by W. R. G. Loader and R. Hoppe, (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), 13.

God; in some Jewish traditions Adam and wisdom are closely connected concepts.[40] Hamerton-Kelly notes that Sir 24:28 seems to deny polemically such a relationship, but this, in itself suggests that *Auctor* knew such a relationship was affirmed by others. Hamerton-Kelly also draws attention to Sir 17:1-4; Job 15:8; Prov 8:24-26; and, 1 En 42:1-2 as more positive evidence for the relationship.[41]

It may seem that there is an intolerable tension involved in suggesting that *Auctor* presents the Son in the likeness of both the creative Wisdom and the object of that creative power, Adam. This tension is not relieved by denying any Adamic allusion in Heb 1. It is clear that the Son is portrayed in terms of Wisdom in Heb 1, but it is equally clear that he is portrayed in Adamic terms in Heb 2. Indeed, one of the characteristic marks of the Christology of Hebrews is that it holds together numerous Christological images which do not logically perfectly fit together. The Son is both priest and sacrifice; he is the priest of the order of Melchizedeck and yet serves in the archetype of the levitical sanctuary. The typology of Hebrews is demonstrably able to hold together a vertical dimension and a horizontal dimension. For example, the Mosaic sanctuary is presented as a copy of the true heavenly sanctuary (8:5) but is also presented as a symbol of the development of salvation history (9:8-9). Likewise, Adam can be the image of Wisdom and a model of Jesus. Lampe suggests that a similar dual focus is a feature of New Testament Christological thought generally:

> He [that is, Christ] is the new Adam; but, more than this, he is the pattern for the original Adam. For Christ, as being the originator of the

---

[40]For Adam as "son of God" see, for example, Luke 3:38; Philo *Virt* 204; see also Jos. *Ant.* 4. 262.

[41]Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence*, 28; see also Steenburg, "Adam and Christ," 99.

> new creation which his resurrection inaugurates (*arche, prototokos ek ton nekron*), is the originator also of the original creation of which this is the fulfillment.[42]

An important link also exists between the treatment of the (second) Adam in Heb 2 and the Son in 1:2. The phrase ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων in 1:2 stands in a clear relationship to ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν (2:5). The reference in Heb 2 is to the fulfilment of God's intention for Adam.[43] This suggests that the Adamic ideal was a factor for *Auctor* from the beginning of his presentation. Westcott notes,

> The word *heir* marks the original purpose of Creation. The dominion originally promised to Adam (Gen. i.28; compare Ps. viii. 6, c. ii. 7) was gained in Christ. And so, in regard to the divine economy, the promise made to Abraham (compare Rom. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 29) and renewed to the divine King (Ps. ii. 8), which was symbolised by the 'inheritance' of Canaan (Ex. xxiii. 30), became absolutely fulfilled in Christ.[44]

Harris MacNeill suggests that the appointment of the Son as heir is not timeless but has to be located within time. The event he associates it with is the crucifixion.[45] If this association is valid, a further link with Heb 2 is suggested: the Son being appointed "heir of all things" is equivalent to his destroying the devil by means of his own death (2:14).[46] Theodore Robinson points out that the emphasis on the word κληρονόμος

---

[42]G. W. H. Lampe, "The New Testament Doctrine of *Ktisis*," *SJT* 17 (1964): 459.

[43]See above, pp. 187-90.

[44]Westcott, *Hebrews*, 8; see also Dods, "Hebrews," 249.

[45]MacNiell, *Christology*, 56.

[46]Parallels exist here with the Gospel imagery of binding the strong man and plundering his house (Matt. 12:29; Luke 11:21-22).

falls not on the death of a previous owner, as is the case in the English word "heir", but simply on the possession by a new master.[47]

There is no overt connection in Jewish sources between the figure of Adam and the thought of inheritance. The Genesis narratives present Adam more as the one who lost possession of the Garden of Eden rather than an heir of any sort. Nevertheless, there may be subtle connections between Adam and inheritance. In the Jewish Scriptures "inheritance" frequently has reference to the land of Canaan. Particularly in the Pentateuch, where "inheritance" bears the marks of promise, a number of points of contact are found between the inheritance and the creation/fall narratives of Gen 1-3. Some of these touch on themes which are developed in Hebrews.[48]

First, the promise of the inheritance of the land is linked to both the promise of an increase in population/descendants and a command to multiply and fill the land (Gen 15:3-5; 22:17; 47:27; Deut 11:8; 30:5, 16). This emphasis on an increasing population is directly reminiscent of the original statement of God's purpose for Adam: "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it" (Gen 1:28).[49]

Second, the inheritance of the land is directly associated with the theme of rest (Deut 5:33; 25:19-26:1; Josh 1:15). This is a theme which is developed at some length in Heb 3-4. *Auctor* himself draws attention to the echo of Gen 2:1-4a found here. In this priestly passage God is said to have "rested" on the seventh day, blessed that day

---

[47]Robinson, *Hebrews*, 5.

[48]D. R. Tasker, "The People of God in the Prophetic Literature," in *"For You Have Strengthened Me": Biblical and Theological Studies in Honor of Gerhard Pfandl in Celebration of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. Pröbstle, G. A Klingbeil and M. G. Klingbeil (St Peter am Hart: Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2007), 75-81

[49]Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism," 22.

and sanctified it. Wenham points out that the association of the theme of rest with the land is not the only association that theme has in the Jewish Scriptures. "The parallels in phraseology between the conclusion of the creation account in [Gen] 1:1-2:3 and the tabernacle building account in Exodus 25-40 have long been noted." [50] The association of God's dwelling and "rest" is found elsewhere in the Jewish Scriptures (for example, Ps 132:7-8 [MT: Ps 131:8:9]) and in Hebrews.

Third, the very description of the land of promised inheritance as a land flowing with milk and honey may be intended to remind the reader/hearer of the account of the riches of Eden which was able to provide Adam and Eve with a bounteous supply of food–"every plant yielding seed . . . and every tree with seed in its fruit you shall have for food" (Gen 1:29). The garden was likewise more than adequately provided with fresh water providing the source of four of the world's great rivers (Gen 2:10-14).[51]

When these hints and allusions are put side by side with later Jewish traditions of the Israelites as the only true sons of Adam, the only genuine humanity, it becomes highly plausible that the designation of the Son as "heir of all things" is an oblique way of saying that he is the one who fulfills the original destiny of Adam.[52]

Michel draws attention to the parallels of thought between 1:1-3 and 2:11-14, suggesting that both passages (along with 12:1-3) reflect the same sort of

---

[50]Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism," 23.

[51]Gage, *Gospel in Genesis*, 49-58.

[52]Sir 17:2-4; 11-14; 4 Ezra 6:53-59; 7:10-11. See the discussion in M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), 49-60.

Christological kerygma as found in Phil 2:11.[53] It should be noted that 2:11-14 contain some of the clearest allusions to the Adam story in all of Heb 2.

Heb 1:3-4 presents the details of honour of the Son in a chiastic form, beginning with him as agent of creation and ending with him as Lord over all creation.[54] The conclusion of Bernhard Heininger is significant: "[F]ührt das zur Verankerung der Soteriologie in der Protologie, was zugleich bedeutet, daß Sündenreinigung am kreativen Potential aller Schöpfung partizipiert."[55] Martin Karrer makes a similar point in noting the unusual construction in 1:3: καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος. The primary allusion Karrer sees here is to Ex 30:10. However, Hebrews does not use the verb employed by the LXX in that verse (ἐξιλάσκεσθαι). Instead it uses the verb ποιέω, which Karrer takes in the light of the context, as an allusion to the creation narrative. Atonement is thus regarded as "Schöpfungsakt."[56]

The significance of such ideas as a "new creation" and a "second Adam" is more often noted in regard to Pauline theology than in regard to Hebrews. However, "the positive correlation of 'eschatology' and 'protology' held a very firm position with the ancient church."[57] In the light of Nils Alstrup Dahl's observation that in Judaism

---

[53]Michel, *Hebräer*, 148.

[54]Barrett, "Christology," 114.

[55]Heininger, "Sündenreinigung," 68; see also Westcott, *Hebrews*, 7; Nakagawa, "Christology," 39; Stadelmann, "Christologie," 176.

[56]Karrer, *Hebräer*, 119.

[57]N. A. Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church" in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 423.

the relationship of "protology" and "eschatology" is highlighted especially in the cultus, it is scarcely be surprising if such a relationship is important in Hebrews, a work which expresses its theology largely in terms of the Jewish sacrificial cultus.[58] Actually the words of Larry Helyer with regard to Paul are equally applicable *mutatis mutandis* to Hebrews:

> [H.] Ridderbos views the first-born of all creation of Col. 1:15 as the keystone of Paul's Christology which was implicit in the resurrection of Christ. What we have then is the application of the same "Adamic" categories (Image, First-born) with which Paul describes Christ's significance in "eschatology" to his place in "protology" as well. "In other words, from Christ's significance as second Adam all the categories are derived which further define his significance as the Firstborn of every creature. This analogy, which is discernable not only in the whole of Paul's preaching of Christ as the second Adam, makes it improbable indeed that in Colossians 1:15 we have to do with a passage that may be said to have had an entirely different origin, or that two 'Christological schemata', have been combined here which in essence do not belong together."[59]

One might go even further: the purification for sins is directly related to the original divine intention for humanity reflected in the Genesis creation accounts. A number of scholars have drawn attention to the way the Pentateuch outlines the sanctuary and the garden of Eden in fundamentally similar ways.[60] Not least of all the entrance of the priest through the veil into the most holy place on the Day of Atonement has been pointed to as the literary reversal of the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden of Eden. The placing of the cherubim to the east of Eden (Gen

---

[58]Dahl, "Christ," 431.

[59]L. R. Helyer, "The Prōtotokos Title in Hebrews," *StudBibTh* 6 no. 2 (1976): 19. Helyer is quoting H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of his Theology*, trans. J. R. de Witt (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 84.

[60]See above, p. 207.

3:24) is of crucial significance here. The entrance to Eden–apparently the only entrance–is to the east, just as the sanctuary opens to the east (Ex 27:13).[61] The fall narrative describes humanity's banishment from the immediate presence of God; the Day of Atonement ritual symbolically portrays its restitution.

Heb 1:4 is the staging point for the presentation of the catena which follows in 1:5-13. More than that it is, as Smith points out, "the starting point of chapter ii."[62] Übelacker notes that the theme of God's eschatological speech in the Son (1:2) is immediately developed not in terms of a *logos*-conception, but in terms of the Davidic messiah (1:5).[63] Consequently, a further development in Heb 2 in terms of an Adamic figure is certainly possible.

This survey of the exordium has produced the finding which one might expect if the conclusions from the preceding exegesis of Hebrews 2 are valid. It has been argued in this dissertation that the filial and priestly elements of the Christology of Hebrews are bound together by an implicit "second Adam" Christology which gives Hebrews 2 its coherence and unity of thought. Close study of the exordium shows that

---

[61]Some Jewish sources regard Adam as a priest after the fall. See below, pp. 282, for further discussion. A number of modern scholars have highlighted priestly attributed of Adam prior to the fall. See, for example, J. H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), 100; Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 67; D. E. Callender, Jr., "The Primal Man in Ezekiel and the Image of God," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers*, SBLSP 37 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1998), 2; 624-25; R. R. Wilson, "The Death of the King of Tyre: The Editorial History of Ezekiel 28," in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*, ed. J. H. Marks and R. M. Good (Guilford, Conn.: Four Quarters, 1987), 214-15.

[62]W. R. Smith, "Christ and the Angels: Hebrews 1," *Exp*, Ser. 2, vol. 1 (1881): 29.

[63]Übelacker, *Hebräerbrief*, 143.

it prepares for the Adam thought of Hebrews 2 in a number of ways. An Adamic background can be seen for a number of key elements in the exordium. While "sonship" is overtly mentioned in the exordium the priesthood of Christ is presented only implicitly. Yet the way is prepared for the further development of this theme precisely by the subtle use of Adamic imagery and language.

**The Catena**

The purpose of the catena of Heb 1 is to support the assertions made in 1:1-4.[64] However, since the *qal wahomer* of 2:1-4 is introduced by διὰ τοῦτο, the catena must also be seen as laying the foundation for the presentation in 2:5-18.[65] Indeed, the key to understanding the catena of Heb 1 is correctly understood by some to be the citation of Ps 8 in Heb 2.[66] The catena opens with two citations explicitly dealing with the title "Son" (1:5) and closes with the epistle's first direct citation of Ps 110, from whence so much of the inspiration for its high-priestly Christology is drawn (1:13).[67]

---

[64]Lickliter, "Superiority of the Son," 56.

[65]The term *qal wahomer* reflects ancient Jewish exegetical practice. However, the argument from 'lesser to greater' is scarcely an exclusively Jewish insight. It is a rhetorical strategy discussed in the classical rhetorical sources. See, for example, Cic., *Top.* 4.23; *Rhet. Her.* 2.13.18 and the discussion in D. Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," *HUCA* 22 (1949): 251-52.

[66] L. Schenck, "A Celebration of the Enthroned Son: The Catena of Hebrews 1," *JBL* 120 (2001): 471. See also Caird, "Son by Appointment," 77; Hurst, "Christology," 154.

[67]Admittedly this last citation does not draw on the priestly reference in the Psalm, but in the light of the development of thought in the rest of the epistle the citation of the Psalm at this point can be considered, at least, allusive of the high-priestly Christology to follow.

Significantly the three remaining citations in the catena draw the reader's attention to one degree or another to the theme of creation.

*Hebrews 1:6*

This verse, which presents the third "testimony" in the catena with its introductory formula, is replete with difficulties. Does πάλιν qualify εἰσάγω or λέγω? What is meant by ἡ οἰκουμένη–the present world, the heavenly world, or the future eschatological world? When does the "entering in" occur? From where has the testimony itself been derived?

Vanhoye has argued persuasively that ἡ οἰκουμένη here refers to the eschatological world which exists already at this time in heaven. Consequently, he argues that the entrance of the firstborn has temporal reference to the time of the exaltation.[68] This certainly harmonizes with one of the dominant concerns of Hebrews: the entrance of the Son into the heavenly most holy place (6:19-20; 9:12, 24-25). This entrance corresponds to his sitting in the position of majesty at the right hand of God (1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2). Furthermore, since the sanctuary in Hebrews plays the role usually played by "paradise" in apocalyptic literature, the entrance of the Son into the sanctuary in Hebrews represents the victorious return to paradise lost to humanity in the fall of Adam.[69]

---

[68]Vanhoye, "L'οἰκουμένη," 248-53. See also, W. Eisele, *Ein unerschütterliches Reich: Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief*, BZNW 116 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 52-60; Andriessen, "Teneur," 293.

[69]O. Hofius, "Inkarnation und Opfertod der Jesu nach Hebr 10,19f." in *Der Ruf Jesus und die Antwort der Gemeinde*, ed. E. Lohse, C. Burchard and B. Schaller (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 140.

> F. Rendall gives this insightful comment on the meaning of the verse: The words *bring in* have here a legal significance; they denote the introduction of an heir into his inheritance, and are used by the LXX with reference to putting Israel in possession of his own and both in the time of Joshua and at the restoration.[70]

The word πρωτότοκος (firstborn) is used here as a Christological designation for the Son. The word πρωτότοκος, understood passively as "firstborn" is "rare outside the Bible and does not occur at all prior to the LXX."[71] In the New Testament, it is used with reference to Christ and without further qualification only in 1:6. Elsewhere it is related to specific events–creation (Col 1:15); birth of Jesus (Luke 2:7); or the resurrection (Col 1:18; Rev 1:5). In Hebrews the ascension takes the place occupied by the resurrection in many other New Testament writings. This conceptual association supports Vanhoye's suggestion that the reference in 1:6 is to the ascension rather than to the incarnation or second coming of the Son. However, the question remains as to why πρωτότοκος is used absolutely here. This question can certainly not be answered definitely, but the absolute use hints at the role of the Son as the inaugurator of the new age. Explicit Jewish evidence for Adam being referred to as the first-born is admittedly late.[72] However, Philo's reference to Adam as πρώτου καὶ γηγεοῦς suggests that such a designation would have been readily understood at an

---

[70]F. Rendall, quoted in Dods, "Hebrews," 254. The quote presumably comes from Rendall's commentary on Hebrews, although Dods gives no indication of his source beyond the author's name.

[71]W. Michaelis, "πρῶτος, πρῶτον, πρωτοκαθεδρία, πρωτοκλισία, πρωτότοκος, πρωτοτοκεῖα, πρωτεύω" in *TDNT*, 6: 871

[72]Num. Rab. 4:7-8. This reference to Adam as the world's firstborn is found in the context of a discussion of his priestly role.

earlier period.[73] Josephus also refers to the "birth" of Adam.[74] Thus the possibility should not be dismissed that Hebrews speaks of Jesus as the firstborn, absolutely, in allusion to his status as the one who fulfills Adam's role and destiny.

A further consideration also points in this direction. The most significant New Testament parallel to the use of πρωτότοκος in 1:6 is found in Rom 8:29 which speaks of the Son being the πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.[75] There are numerous linguistic and thematic parallels between the larger units in which these verses are found (Rom 8:18-30 and Heb 1-2), as can be seen in the following chart. More general points of contact between the two passages include the motif of intercession (Rom 8:27), echoed in the introduction of the motif of the priesthood of the Son (2:16-18). Similarly, a strong tenor of eschatological hope characterizes both passages.

The significance of this link between 1:6 and Rom 8:29 is underscored by the fact that the πρωτότοκος teaching of Rom 8 echoes the "second Adam" teaching of Rom 5.[76] The comments of Dunn are particularly perceptive. With reference to the

---

[73]Philo, *Virt.* 202.

[74]Jos. *Ant.* 10 148: ἐξ οὗ δ' ἐγεννήθη Ἄδαμος. . . .

[75]Narborough, *Hebrews*, 84; J. Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 5 volumes, ed. W. R. Nichol (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980; reprinted from London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910), 2: 652. A. M. Stibbs also links Heb 1 to Rom 8:29, but in connection with his discussion of 1:5 rather than 1:6. See A. M. Stibbs, "Hebrews," in *The New Bible Commentary Revised*, ed. D. Guthrie and J. A. Motyer (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1970), 1196.

[76]The connection was noted by M. Luther in his lectures on Romans of 1515-1516. See M. Luther, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, trans. J. T. Mueller (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1967), 133. For similar but more recent observations see F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* TNTC (Leicester, Inter-Varsity: 1963), 176-77; T. W. Manson, "Romans," in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, rev. ed., ed.

phrase τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, he declares "The Adam Christology involved is clear: Christ is the image of God which Adam was intended to be, the Son as the

| Linguistic and Thematic Contacts between Rom 8:18-30 and Heb 1-2 | |
|---|---|
| Romans 8:18-30 | Hebrews 1-2 |
| παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ (8:18) | πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου (2:9) |
| υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ (8:19) | υἱοὺς (2:10)<br>ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς (2:11)<br>τὰ παιδία (2;13) |
| κτίσεως (8:19); compare, κτίσις (8:22) | ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας (1:2) |
| τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς (8:21) | φόβῳ θανάτου ... ἦσαν δουλείας (2:15) |
| ἐλευθερίαν (8:21) | ἀπαλλάξῃ (2:15) |
| ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν (8:26) | αἵματος καὶ σαρκός (2:14; see also 2:17) |
| εἰκόνος (8:29) | χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως (1:3) |
| πρωτῶτοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (8:29) | πρωτῶτοκον (1:6; see also 2:10) |

pattern of God's finished product." [77] With reference to the following clause (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς) he continues:

> And here even more clearly the thought is of the accomplished goal of God's creative action. Hence the more immediate parallels are Col 1:18 and Rev 1:5 (πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν), and again the thought is of the resurrected Christ as the pattern of the new humanity of the last age, the firstborn (of the dead) of a new race of eschatological people in whom God's design from the beginning of creation is at last fulfilled. The closest parallel indeed is Heb 2:6–10, where Jesus completes the original purpose for Adam (to be crowned with glory) through the suffering of death, in order that he might bring many sons (likewise through suffering and death) to that glory, being thus perfected through

---

M. Black and H. H. Rowley (Sunbury-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1962), 947 and B. Byrne, *"Sons of God" – "Seed of Abraham"*, AnBib 83 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979), 115-19.

[77]J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, WBC 38A (Dallas, Tex: Word, 1988), 483.

> suffering . . . . Since a corporate dimension is in view (Christ as eldest of many brothers) Paul was also probably mindful of the fact that Israel was also called God's "firstborn" (Exod 4:22; Sir 31:9; *Pss. Sol.* 18.4; other references, including the Torah and the Messiah [cited by Str-B 3:257–58] do not come to clear expression till after Paul's time). The point being, by way of contrast, that in the new epoch, outside the bounds marked by the law, Christ's sonship is the norm and it is shared by all who have received and are led by the Spirit (vv 14–17). Here again it is the Adam motif which predominates (beginning a new family of humankind) rather than the thought of Christ's continuity and identity with the divine (as in Wisdom).[78]

John Levison's comments on 4 Ezra are illuminating here. He points out that 4 Ezra 6:55-59 draws Isa 40 and Gen 1 close together in order to juxtapose the motifs of creation and election. It is in this context that Ezra refers to Israel as God's first-born. In summarizing this passage Levison states "Ezra views Israel as the sole legitimate heir of Adam's prerogative to rule."[79] Thus in a Jewish work roughly contemporaneous with Hebrews the motifs of Adam, inheritance, and "firstborn" are drawn together, just as we suggest they are in Hebrews.

Paul Andriessen argues that 1:6a reflects a Jewish scriptural background implicitly just as 1:6b does explicitly. He suggests that passages such as Deut 6:10 and 11:29, which speak of the YHWH bringing Israel into the land of Canaan, provide the background to 1:6a.[80] If Andriessen's basic thesis is accepted, the entrance of Israel into the promised land is a type of the entrance of the Son in the heavenly world at the time of the ascension–as well as being the "fulfilment" of God's intention for Adam.

---

[78]Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 407.

[79]J. R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, JSPSS 1 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 120.

[80]Andriessen, "Teneur," 298-304.

"L'entrée dans le repos cananéen n'a pas été l'entrée le repos de Dieu, mais une simple préfiguration."[81]

Part of the evidence of the Son's superiority over the angels is the fact that the angels worship him (1:6). The Jewish legends of the fall of Satan suggest that Satan led a rebellion against God when commanded to worship Adam.[82] Isaacs denies that *Auctor* necessarily knows this legend and cautions against reading the Pauline notion of Christ as the second Adam into Hebrews.[83] However, the sitting at the right hand of God is the equivalent of "being crowned with glory and honour" (2:9), that is, it is a restoration of the Adamic privileges and prerogatives. Adam was made a little lower than the angels (2:7) and the angels are servants of those being redeemed (1:14).

*Hebrews 1:7*

Ps 104, cited in 1:7, contains obvious Edenic allusions.[84] It is described by Mitchell Dahood as a "hymn to God the Creator" and by Hughes as "an encomium of the wonders of God's creation."[85] This psalm is closely related to the Genesis creation narratives. Indeed, Jacques Doukhan argues that "Ps 104 reveals common motifs with the Genesis creation pericope which are distributed and clearly separated according to

---

[81]Ibid.., 300. The theme of "rest" is dealt with more fully below, pp. 271-77.

[82]M. D. Johnson, "The Life of Adam and Eve," in *OTP*, 2:249-295.

[83]Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 168.

[84]According to Werner, Ps 104 was traditionally recited as part of the Sabbath liturgy of the synagogue. However he sees this as part of the background for the development of the church's liturgy. However, the antiquity of such a practice is uncertain. See E. Werner, *The Sacred Bridge: Liturgical Parallels in Synagogue and Early Church* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959; reprinted Schocken, 1970), 150.

[85]Dahood, *Psalms III*, 33; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 61.

the same order and number."[86] The Psalm actually goes beyond the Genesis narrative in some details. Weiser describes the relationship of Ps 104 to the Genesis creation accounts as being "that of a coloured picture to the clear lines of a woodcut."[87] Among the details added to the Genesis outline is that of the "createdness" of the angels (Ps 104:4), which is directly associated with the creation of the earth (Ps 104:5). The citation of this Psalm by *Auctor* highlights again the importance of the creations theme as he lays the foundation of his argument in 1:5-13.

*Hebrews 1:8-12*

This section consists of two citations (Ps 44:6-7 [LXX] and Ps 101:25-27 [LXX]) linked together by the conjunction καί. Together these citations provide a contrast to the previous citation, to which they are linked by an introductory formula of contrast–πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν.

Although the citation from Ps 44 (LXX) does not contain explicit Edenic allusions, the same is not true of the citation from Ps 101:25-27 (LXX). This citation opens with an explicit return to the creation "in the beginning." It provides scriptural evidence for the affirmation of the statement of the exordium that the Son was the one through whom God made the worlds (1:3). It would certainly not have been difficult here for an early Christian reader of the Psalm to apply κύριος to the Son. However, as Vanhoye makes compellingly clear, the actual topic of these verses is not the creation, but rather the end of the world.[88] The verses echo 1:3 but do not merely repeat it,

---

[86]Doukhan, *Genesis Creation Story*, 83.

[87]Weiser, *Psalms*, 666.

[88]Vanhoye *Situation du Christ*, 206-07.

much less "prove" it. Rather, with 1:3 pointing unambiguously to the creation and 1:10-12 pointing to the final destiny (judgment) of the world, the relationship of the two passages is one of development. The Son is the crucial figure in God's dealing with the world, from beginning to end. If ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων (1:2) points to eschatological fulfilment, the citation from Ps 102 highlights an eschatological reservation. The Son is appointed "heir of all things" (1:2) but at present he has only inherited his superior name (1:4).

It is easy to put the citation of Ps 101 (LXX) into the context of the apocalyptic hope of "a new heaven and a new earth" (2 Pet 3:13).[89] Such a placement is readily justifiable on the basis of the apocalyptic schema used in 1:1-2.[90] Such a schema suggests the abolition of the present heaven and earth (1:11-12) is only the precursor of a recreation of the world in which the original Edenic ideal would be realized.

What conclusions can be drawn from this analysis of the catena of testimonies in 1:5-14? This block of material serves as a literary and rhetorical transition between the exordium and the first exhortation and further between the exordium and the major arguments of the epistle. It supports the assertions of the exordium scripturally and prepares for their later development. The topic discussed is the relative positions of the Son and the angels. Indeed, Michel sees the scriptural citations of 2:12-13, which are used to emphasize the closeness of the Son to humanity, as balancing the citations of Heb 1 which serve to emphasize his closeness to God.[91] Yet between the opening and

---

[89]See for example, 1 En 91:16; Syb. Or. 5:211-212; Bib. Ant. 3:10.

[90]See above, p. 241.

[91]Michel, *Hebräer*, 151.

closing testimony every block of testimony alludes to the topic of creation to a greater or lesser degree. Thus the initial theological section of Hebrews, while focusing on the Son, clearly and consistently draws attention to Edenic/Adamic themes. This lays the foundation of the same sort of allusions which have already been noted in Heb 2 where the focus is gradually moved from the Sonship of Christ to his priesthood. The strong Eden allusions in Heb 1 thus support the thesis being argued here that the Christology of Hebrews is rooted in an implicit Second Adam Christology.

It is difficult to see any narrowing of the focus from universal to specific in the catena, but there is certainly a presentation of an eschatological reservation. In the opening testimonies (1:5) the Son is introduced as enthroned (eschatological fulfilment). The testimonies as a whole "are not suggestive of the activity of ruling but intimate more the legitimacy and authority to rule."[92] The overall impression given by Heb 1 is that "of glory and honor, but inactivity [nevertheless]."[93] However, in the final testimony (1:13) the Son is presented as awaiting the final subjugation of his enemies (eschatological reservation). The bridge between the already achieved eschatological realities and their future expression is the priestly ministry of the Son–a topic *Auctor* is yet to introduce explicitly.

In 1:10-12, *Auctor* cites Ps 101:25-27 (LXX). The citation opens with a reference to creation paralelling the earlier reference in 1:2c.[94] The Psalm in its original context points to the symbolic "new creation" entailed in the return of Israel

---

[92]Saucy, "Exaltation Christology," 47.

[93]Ibid., 48.

[94]Lickliter, "Superiority of the Son," 99.

from captivity. In Hebrews the words of this citation, although referring to creation, are not to be viewed in isolation from the soteriology of the book:

> The God who 'mended' the worlds by his word (11:2) also mends his people through the word of salvation he spoke through his Son (1:2; 2:3). This salvific word is no less creative than the one 'through which' God made the worlds (1:2).[95]

In 1:13, *Auctor* cites Ps 110:1. The Son is invited to "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet." Isaacs states that these enemies are unidentified.[96] However, the direct reference to the "fear of death" in Heb 2 makes it clear that the enemies here are the same supernatural adversaries as encountered in the Pauline tradition.[97]

"Newness" is a dominant motif in Hebrews, suggestive of an eschatological arrival.[98] Further important motifs include those of the eschaton and perfection, as well as, superiority illustrated by the repeated use of "better".[99] Barrett correctly observes that

> . . . the common pattern of N.T. eschatology is in Hebrews made uncommonly clear. God has begun to fulfil his ancient promises; the dawn of the new age has broken, though the full day has not yet come. The Church lives in the last days but before the last day.[100]

---

[95]Schenck, "Celebration," 477.

[96]Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 182.

[97]A point specifically denied by Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 182-83.

[98]Stine, "Finality," 29-32.

[99]Ibid., 39-44; 95-102.

[100]Barrett, "Eschatology," 391.

**Hebrews 3:1-6**

This transitional paragraph opens with a unique designation for Christians: ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι (3:1). The designation prepares the way for the personal form of address in the admonition of the next section (3:7-4:11).[101] Grässer points out that the designation ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι is certainly not traditional and may, in fact, be *Auctor*'s creation. As such it harks back to the brotherhood of the Son with the redeemed emphasized in 2:11-14, 17.[102] Grässer argues that the word μέτοχοι likewise highlights the solidarity between Saviour and saved.:

> Was Paulus in apokalyptischer Terminologie eine καινὴ κτίσις nennt (2 Kor 5 17 Gal 6 15), das nennt unser Verfasser in hellenistischer Terminologie einen μέτοχος Χριστοῦ (3 14) bzw. einen κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχος (3 1) wobei der Akzent auf der Partizipation am Geschick Christi liegt.[103]

A similar point is made by Cynthia Westfall when she notes that this designation of the believers as κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι is the counterpart of the participation of the Son in humanity (2:14).[104] His participation in the old humanity is the avenue of the believers' participation in the new humanity.

---

[101]P. Enns, "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1-4:13," *WTJ* 55 (1993): 270.

[102]Gräßer, "Mose und Jesus," 5

[103]Ibid., 7.

[104]C. L. Westfall, "Moses and Hebrews 3.1-6: Approach or Avoidance?" in *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*, ed. S. E. Porter and B.W. R. Pearson JSNTSS 192 / Roehampton Papers 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 193.

The contrast between Christ and Moses may be taking up an implied comparison between Christ and Adam. There are ancient Jewish and Samaritan traditions which indicate that the glory of God which Adam lost in the fall was reclaimed by Moses on Sinai.[105]

Jesus is faithful to God who is designated obliquely as τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν (Heb 3:2). This can scarcely be taken to indicate that the Son was a created being; it indicates his installation to his priestly office. The word ποιέω has already been used of the work of creation (1:2) and *Auctor* may be suggesting the installation to priesthood is a parallel work to the creation.[106] If this suggestion is correct there is a concealed echo of the first man, Adam, who was also "made" (Gen 2:7) but did not remain faithful to the one who made him. Gen 2:7 (LXX) uses the word πλάσσω rather then ποιέω as in this verse of Hebrews. However, both words have a substantial overlap in meaning.

Creation is explicitly referred to in 3:4b.[107] This reference is easily seen as a disruption of the argument.[108] Héring goes so far as to call it a gloss added to the text

---

[105]See, for example, 4Q504, 6.2.11-12; *Deut. Rab* 11:3; *Mem. Mar*.5:4. For a discussion of this material see, A. A. Orlov, "Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies," Xristianskij Vostok: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912-1980) 4 (2002): 740-55.

[106]P. Auffret, "Essai sur la structure littéraire et l'interprétation d'Hébreux 3, 1-6," *NTS* 26 (1980): 393-94. Vanhoye, (*Situation du Christ*, 242) acknowledges the uncertain possibility that *Auctor* is here comparing the beginning of salvation with a new creation.

[107]Calvin (*Hebrews*, 36) argues for a restriction of the meaning here to the creation of the church, but this is unlikely.

[108]Purdy, "Hebrews," 621; Jewett, *Letter to Pilgrims*, 51.

by a later reader.[109] The intrusive nature of the comment is easily seen when the structure of the paragraph is examined.[110] *Auctor*'s argument is presented as a developing series of contrasts which simultaneously form a neat chiasm which may be outlined thus:

A. Ὅθεν, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι (3:1a)

B. ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν (3:1b)

C. πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν (3:2a)

D. ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν [ὅλῳ] τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ (3:2b)

E. πλείονος γὰρ οὗτος δόξης παρὰ Μωϋσῆν ἠξίωται (3:3a)

E[1] καθ' ὅσον πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτόν (3:3b)

D[1] καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων (3:5)

C[1] [Χριστὸς δὲ πιστὸς]

B[1] Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς (3:6a)

A[1] οὗ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐάνπερ τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος κατάσχωμεν (3:6b)

There is a dual link between the opening and closing lines: "brothers" and "partners" is echoed by the first person plural pronouns "we" and "our", just as the "heavenly calling" is echoed by maintaining "confidence . . . that belongs to hope." In line B the Christological designations "apostle and high priest" are echoed by "Son" in B[1]. If line C speaks of the faithfulness of Moses, C[1] speaks of the faithfulness of

---

[109]Héring, *Hébreux*, 39.

[110]Auffret, "Essai," 380-96.

Christ. This line is not actually expressed in the Greek text but is clearly implied by the nature of the contrast being drawn between Moses and Christ in 3:5. D and $D^1$ both locate the place of Moses' service as ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκω. The lines E and $E^1$ contain a double comparison Christ / Moses and Builder / house. 3:4 does not fit into this chiastic pattern and forms instead a footnote to the central set of contrasts (lines E and $E^1$).

In the entire paragraph *Auctor* is developing a contrast between Moses and Jesus. What function does the statement that "the builder of all things is God" have here? Loader suggests that Jesus compares to Moses as God compares to the creation.[111] However, in the light of the underlying sub-text regarding Adam, more can be said. Westcott suggests that πάντα is effectively the Jewish dispensation and cultus with which Moses was so closely identified.[112] Although, this interpretation fits well with the context, it seems reductionist in light of Hebrews otherwise careful use of language.

In Judaism the world was sometimes identified as God's house. This is evident in the writings of Philo.[113] Rabbinic writings also contain the same idea.[114] The word

---

[111]Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester*, 77.

[112]Westcott, *Hebrews*, 77. See also, Nairne, *Hebrews*, 48.

[113]Philo, *Somn.* I 185; *Post.* 5; *Plant.* 50; *Leg.* III 98-99; see also *Cher.* 127. For further discussion of these passages see Sowers, *Hermeneutics*, 116-18.

[114]See, for example, Ex. Rab. 30.9. This material in Ex. Rab. is in the form of a discussion between Rabban Gamaliel II, R. Joshua, R. Eleazar b. Azaariah and R. Aqiba in Rome (c. 95 C. E.). The earlier section of Ex. Rab.–the so called Ex. Rab. II (sections 15-52)–dates from the nineth century. See, M. D. Herr, "Exodus Rabbah," in *Enc. Jud.* 6: 1076-79. However, it certainly contains earlier traditions. See S. M. Lehrman, "Introduction: Exodus," in *Midrash Rabbah*. 10 vols. (London: Socino, 1983), 3: viii. Some scholars take the setting of Ex. Rab. 30.9 at face value. Lindars

κατασκευάζω in some Jewish contexts can refer to God's creative activity.[115] If humanity, in general, as part of the creation, is part of God's house, the implication of calling faithful Christians "God's house" is clear: believers are conceived as a new creation. Peter Enns provides support for this suggestion by showing the way redemption in the Jewish Scriptures is often described in terms of "creation" or "re-creation".[116] This is true not least of all for Ps 95, which is cited and applied at length in the following section of Hebrews (3:7-4:11). Turning to Hebrews 3, Enns notes the parallel of thought between vv 3 and 4: "[B]oth Jesus in v. 3 and God in v. 4 are engaged in creation activity: God creates everything, and Jesus, the new Moses, "creates" his people. Creation language is again used to express deliverance."[117]

Christians are the true members of the household created by God. Such a cosmic feature of the church is given extra significance by Westfall's assertion that οἶκος is the key indication of the topic of 3:1-6. Her argument at this point is strong.

---

declares without qualification that it (that is Ex. Rab. 30.9) "can be dated to c. A.D. 95." See B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John* NCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 218. (Lindars actually references the material as Ex. Rab. 30.6, but this appears to be a misprint, as the material is found in Ex. Rab 30.9). If Lindars is correct in his dating of Ex. Rab. 30.9, it is readily conceivable that the idea contained in this material were known at the time Hebrews was produced.

[115]Wis 9:2; 13:2; see also Isa 30:28; 43:7: 45:7, 9. For further discussion see, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 110. See also P. Enns, "The Interpretation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3:1-4:13," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, JSNTSS 148 / SSEJC 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 361.

[116]Enns, "Creation and Re-Creation," 258-61. Enns cites as examples Hos 8:13-14; Ex 15:16; Isa 43:14-17; 48:20-21.

[117]Ibid., 280.

She points out that the word occurs six times in five verses and is directly linked to all the participants in the discussion: Moses, Jesus, God, and believers.[118]

Christians are described as *already* being God's house–but only if they hold firm until the end (3:6). The present tense of the third clause of the verse is important: οὗ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς. If the eschatological reference were purely future a future tense would be expected. The same point is made in slightly different language in 3:14: "For we have become partners of Christ, if only we hold our first confidence firm to the end." Again, the tense of the opening verb is important. Γεγόναμεν is a perfect tense form, indicating a past action with continuing consequences in the present.[119] In both verses future realities are affirmed but are conditioned on present performances. In this way eschatological accomplishment and reservation are both brought to expression.

The concluding verse of this transitional paragraph introduces the first of four uses of the word παρρησία in Hebrews (Heb 3:6; 4:16; 10:19, 35). The word is usually translated as "confidence". In secular sources, it refers to the right of a citizen to speak in the city-state assembly, but in Hebrews each usage "seems to be associated with the right to enter the Holy of Holies."[120] As such it serves as a counterbalance to the motif of φόβος or "fear" introduced in 2:15. In that verse φόβος forms part of an allusion to the fall narrative in Gen 3. Now παρρησία reflects the undoing of that

---

[118]Westfall, "Moses and Hebrews," 189.

[119]Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Greek Grammar*, 175; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 573.

[120]J. Swetnam, "Christology and Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Bib* 70 (1989): 86. See also W. C. van Unnik, "The Christian Freedom of Speech in the New Testament," *BJRL* 44 (1961-62), 466-88.

event, just as the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Eden is counterbalanced by the entrance of the heavenly high-priest into the sanctuary as a representative and forerunner of all believers.

**Hebrews 3:7-4:11**

The argument in 3:7-4:11 is both crucial and distinctive in the overall presentation of Hebrews. On the one hand, neither the priesthood nor the Sonship of Jesus is explicitly mentioned anywhere in this section. Indeed, there is only a single reference to Jesus by any designation or title in the entire section (3:14–μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν). On the other hand, the co-joined motifs of "pilgrimage" and "rest" which are crucial to the argument of Hebrews, are introduced here. In 3:7-4:11 eschatological reservation gives rise to a presentation of the Christian life as a pilgrimage and its destination of rest.[121] There can be no legitimate "resting place" for the Christian within historical existence, but only in the eschatological city, despite the fact that Christians already participate in the promised eschatological realities. There is an essential continuity between the believers under the Old Covenant and Christians living under the New Covenant. The goal of both groups ultimately is the same city (11:10, 13-16; 13:14). "There is no material distinction between the call to the wilderness community to occupy Canaan and the call to Christians to press forward to the eschatological Rest (3:7-4:13)."[122]

---

[121]W. G. Johnsson, "The Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews," *JBL* 97 (1978): 239-51.

[122]Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*, 43.

Although the priesthood of Christ is not mentioned in 3:7-4:11, this detailed presentation of the Christian life in terms of pilgrimage (and uncertain outcome) is bracketed by references to Jesus as priest in the heavenly sanctuary (2:18; 4:14).[123] Thus the priesthood of Christ is directly linked to the fact that the people of God on earth have not yet fully reached their eschatological goal, even though they partake to some extent in the eschatological realities. The same point is made of the use of πρόδρομος at the conclusion of the next hortatory section (6:19).[124] Jesus, as forerunner, has entered into the most holy place; the believers do so now only by faith (and faithfulness). The sacrifice of Christ has been accomplished but the recipients of its benefits find themselves still in a hostile world.[125]

With regard to 4:3b-4: Ungeheuer notes,

> Wie sie im Glauben die künftigen Größen der bleibenden Stadt und des unerschütterlichen Reiches als gegenwärtige Wirklichkeit erfassen, so werden sie selbst umgekehrt von dieser Wirklichkeit erfaßt und bilden mit ihr das himmlische Jerusalem und das wahre Zelt. Mit Recht sieht Michel in diesen Größen eine umfassende Einheit: „Mehrere Bilder vereinigen sich zur Charakterisierung einer einzigen Sache. Zion und Jerusalem sind also geglaubte und erhoffte Symbole christlicher Verheißung; sie sind identische mit dem himmlischen Heiligtum und dem Vorbild der Stiftshüte‘‘.[126]

---

[123]Stine, “Finality,” 108-09.

[124]Ibid., 109.

[125]Ibid., 113.

[126]Ungeheuer, *Der große Priester*, 120. Ungeheuer is quoting from Michael, *Hebräer* (1936 ed.), 209; see also Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 138; Hofius, *Katapausis*, 54; Young, “Day of Atonement,” 158-59.

Michel could have gone further: Zion, Jerusalem, the true tent, the archetypal tabernacle are to be further identified with the 'rest' of God, the Edenic ideal of unimpeded fellowship with God restored.

Randolph Tasker correctly observes that "the institution of the Sabbath plays, in our writer's [that is, *Auctor*'s] view, an important place in the working out of God's purpose."[127] The rhetorical force of the presentation of the material relating to the rest is striking. *Auctor* begins with the exodus generation and declares that they did not enter the rest (3:11, 17-18; 4:3) which consequently existed for them only as promise (4:1). The reason for this failure is variously stated: "rebellion" (3:8), "going astray in their hearts" (3:9), "hav[ing] an evil unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God" (3:12), "be[ing] hardened by the deceitfulness of sin" (Heb 13), "unbelief" (3:19), "not [being] united by faith" (4:1). At the close of the section *Auctor* affirms explicitly that Joshua did not lead the next generation into rest either (4:8).

*Auctor* also refers to a different time frame: "today". The word σήμερον, admittedly occurs first in the citation from Ps 95 and occurs prior to the statement of the wilderness generation's failure. However, this reflects the rhetorical strategy of the psalmist rather than that of *Auctor*. The focus of the initial quote from Ps 95 is on the failure of the wilderness generation. This is the focus of 3:8-11. With 3:12 *Auctor*'s attention turns to the contemporary situation, as he exhorts his readers to "take care". With this exhortation comes a two-fold repetition of σήμερον (3:13, 15). He returns to this theme again as the section is drawn to a close. Once again Ps 95:7b-8 is quoted (4:7b) and σήμερον repeated a second time (4:7a). The Davidic authorship of the

---

[127]Tasker, *Gospel*, 19.

Psalm is explicitly affirmed (4:7), but it is clear that for *Auctor* σήμερον does not refer primarily to the time of David; it refers to his own time.[128] This σήμερον is certainly related to the σήμερον of the Son's begetting (1:5; 5:5), that is, the time of the ascension to heaven and the installation to the high-priesthood. The implication is clear, although the thought is not explicitly developed, that David no more led the people into the rest than Joshua had.

In the centre of this sustained treatment of the failure of past generations to enter the rest and the exhortation for the present generation to enter stands a simple positive affirmation about the rest:

| | |
|---|---|
| καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων. εἴρηκεν γάρ που περὶ τῆς ἑβδόμης οὕτως· καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ | . . . . though his works were finished at the foundation of the world. For in one place it speaks about the seventh day as follows, "And God rested on the seventh day from all his works" (4:3-4). |

The Christian hope of "rest" is thus directly associated with the "Sabbath rest" (4:9).[129] Indeed, "[t]ogether vv 3c and 4 serve to identify more precisely the origin and nature of

---

[128]Zimmermann, *Bekenntnis der Hoffnung*, 135.

[129]This assertion is logically independent from the question of whether or not the recipients of Hebrews were themselves Sabbath keeping Christians. G. F. Hasel argues strongly that they were. See G. F. Hasel, "Sabbath," in *ABD* 5: 855-56; see also S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), 65. Hasel's arguments have considerable force but the reservations expressed by J. Laansma ("*Rest,"* 316-17) show that his position is not unassailable. In any case it is possible for the Sabbath to serve as a powerful theological symbol without it actually being kept. This possibility must be considered especially open in a work like Hebrews where other arguments–especially those relating to the cultus–take place exclusively in the world of the Jewish scriptural text rather than in the world of contemporary practice. See also A. T. Lincoln, "Sabbath, Rest, and Eschatology in the New Testament," in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), 214.

'my rest' in 3b."[130] The Sabbath in Hebrews then becomes a potent symbol for the salvation. However, *Auctor* refers specifically not to the Sabbath of contemporary Judaism, or even the Sabbath of the decalogue and Mosaic law codes, but specifically to the Sabbath of Eden (Gen 2:2). Enns suggests that the "rest"-"Edenic Sabbath" connection is not original to Hebrews but is already implied in the original setting of Ps 95.[131]

Of course, the Edenic Sabbath was not completely distinct from the Sabbath of Judaism. Kistemaker avers that the Friday night liturgy outlined by the rabbis specified the reading of the relevant sections of both Ps 95 and Gen 2.[132] In any case, the immediate context of Gen 2:2 makes it clear that Adam is being presented as a Sabbath keeper. The fact that God "sanctified" (MT: קִדַּשׁ; LXX: ἁγιάζω) the seventh day (Gen 2:3) indicates that it was to be regarded as holy by Adam and Eve. Cuthbert Simpson notes:

> The fact that P thus connects the origin of the Sabbath not with some event in the life of one of the patriarchs–as he connected circumcision in ch. 17–or in the history of Israel, but with creation itself, is of some significance. For the implication of this passage is that observance of

---

[130]R. B. Gaffin, Jr., "A Sabbath Rest Still Awaits the People of God," in *Pressing Toward the Mark: Essays Commemorating Fifty Years of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*, ed. C. G. Dennison and R. C. Gamble (Philadelphia, PA: Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986), 39; see also Yeo, "Theology of 'Rest'," 11-12; Enns, "Creation and Re-Creation," 278. The importance of the Edenic Sabbath for defining the "rest" was already recognized in M. Luther, "Lectures on Hebrews," trans. W. A. Hansen, in *Luther's Works*, 55 vols., ed. J. Pelikan (St Louis, MO: Concordia 1955-71), 29: 160-61.

[131]Enns, "Creation and Re-Creation," 269.

[132]Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations*, 36.

> the day–actually a peculiarly Jewish institution–is really binding upon all mankind.[133]

It would hardly be a misrepresentation of Simpson's position to add "beginning with Adam" to the end this statement. The implication is clear. Adam prior to his fall into sin experienced the rest which existed as promise in the time of Israel and is experienced proleptically now by Christians and will be experienced in its fullness at the parousia–"if only we hold our confidence firm to the end."[134] The rest experienced by Adam is typologically the rest both experienced by and yearned for by Christians.[135] Once again protology and eschatology are aligned as parallels. Bruce insightfully highlights the way the theme of "rest" picks ups key concepts from Heb 2:

> We have seen that our author borrows three distinct conceptions for the great salvation from the primitive history of man. It is reasonable to suppose that they were all connected together in his mind, and formed one picture of the highest good. They suggest the idea of paradise restored: the Divine ideal for man and the world and their mutual relations realised in perpetuity; man made veritably lord of creation, delivered from the fear of death, nay, death itself for ever left behind, and no longer subject to servile tasks, but occupied only with work worthy of a king and a son of God, and compatible with perfect repose and undisturbed enjoyment.[136]

---

[133]Simpson, "Genesis," 489; see also Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 171-72; H. R. Cole, "The Sabbath and Genesis 2:1-3," *AUSS* 41 (2003): 5-12; N-E. Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation*, SBLDS 7 (Missoula, MT: Scholars 1972), 186.

[134]W. C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest," *BibSac* 130 (1973): 147; *idem*, "Experiencing the Old Testament 'Rest' of God," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985), 170. See also Oberholtzer, "Kingdom Rest," 191.

[135]Lincoln, "Sabbath, Rest, and Eschatology," 205-14. Gaffin ("Sabbath Rest," 39) argues, to the contrary, that for Christians the "rest" now exists only as "hope" and is not realized by them at all.

[136]Bruce, *Apology*, 162-63.

In 4:14 *Auctor* takes up his discussion of the person of the High Priest. It may well be significant that Jesus, as High Priest, is described as having been tempted and yet χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. If the first characterization serves to identify Jesus with the experience of fallen humanity, the second serves to identify him with the human Adamic ideal. The force of this identification is such that some suggest it compromises the genuineness of his very humanity.[137] It is scarcely surprising to find fewer references which help to explain the logical transition from Sonship to priesthood after this point, than before it.

**Hebrews 5:1-10**

Themes and vocabulary strongly evocative of the Adam story in Heb 2, recur in the Jesus / Aaron contrast developed in 5:1-10.[138] The words τιμή and δόξα / δοξάζω reappear (2:9 see also 5:4-5). In Heb 2 both words refer to the attainment by the Son of the originally intended position of humanity; in Heb 5 to the priestly vocation. *Auctor* is insistent that the Son did not presumptuously assume this vocation but that his appointment was completely an act of God–just as the death of the Son, which results in him being crowned with glory and honour, is χάριτι θεοῦ. There is also an evident parallel between what is said here of the Son's attitude to the priestly vocation and what is said in the Philippian "Christ-hymn" of his attitude to equality with God (Phil 2:5-11).[139]

---

[137]J. Knox, *The Humanity and Divinity of Christ: A Study of Pattern in Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 44; R. Williamson, "Hebrews 4[15] and the Sinlessness of Jesus," *ET* 86 (1974): 4-8.

[138]Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ*, 300.

[139]See above, p. 209.

The description of the Aaronic priestly work in 5:2 is reminiscent of the description of the Son's priestly work in 2:17. The Aaronic priest is said to be "able to deal gently with the ignorant and wayward, since he himself is subject to weakness" (5:2), even though there is no support in the Jewish sources to support the suggestion that such "dealing gently" was a requirement of the priestly office. This description appears to be dependent on the description of the Son's priesthood in 2:17: "Therefore he had to become like his brothers and sisters in every respect, so that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God."

Hebrews 5:1-10 forms a discrete unit, structured as a chiasm in an abccba form. The double use of ἀρχιερεύς serves as a delimiting inclusio for this unit.[140] This word suggests eschatological reservation. Those who follow the leader have not yet gone in.

**Hebrews 6:7-8**

These verses form an agricultural illustration attached to one of the most severe warnings in the entire book of Hebrews. The allusions of the Creation/Fall narrative in these verses are subtle but unmistakable in the lights of the Edenic/Adamic allusions elsewhere in Hebrews. Spicq correctly describes 6:7-8 as a "citations virtuelles" of Gen 3:17-18.[141] Their content is not Christological, but the very absence of Christological content serves to highlight the significance of their Edenic/Adamic allusions. The texts read:

---

[140]Tetley, "Priesthood," 202.

[141]Spicq, *Hébreux*, 1: 332. See also Héring, *Hébreux*, 61, Williamson, *Philo*, 234; Peake, *Hebrews*, 146.

| | |
|---|---|
| γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις ὑετὸν καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι᾽ οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους, ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς, ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν. | Ground that drinks up the rain falling on it repeatedly, and that produces a crop useful to those for whom it is cultivated, receives a blessing from God. But if it produces thorns and thistles, it is worthless and on the verge of being cursed; its end is to be burned over. |

The well-watered land which produces "a crop useful to those for whom it cultivated [and] receives a blessing from God" (6:7), is reminiscent of the Garden of Eden which "grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food" (Gen 2:9). This garden is specifically said to be planted by God (Gen 2:8) and is well watered–albeit not by rain but by "a stream . . . [which] . . . rose from the earth" (Gen 2:6). The account of the Garden of Eden is set in a literary context which speaks of God's blessing (Gen 2:3).[142] In the context of Hebrews the well watered and productive land symbolizes the believing community, "those who have once been enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and have shared in the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come" (6:5). The allusions to the Genesis story of the Garden of Eden suggest that in the view of *Auctor*, the community of believers are destined to experience the fulfilment of God's original intention for Adam. It has already been noted that in Hebrews this is also the destiny and one of the roles of the Son.[143] This is scarcely a contradiction as Hebrews

---

[142]As noted above, p. 225, the correctness or otherwise of the critical opinion which assign Gen 2:3 to a different source to that to which the account of the Garden of Eden is assigned is irrelevant to the point being made here. *Auctor* is certainly not away of such sources.

[143]See above, pp. 202-04.

links the Son and the "sons" together in the closest of ways–not least of all in contexts replete with Adamic imagery (for example, 2:10-11, 14, 17).

A further allusion to the Genesis account is found in the contrasting picture drawn by *Auctor*: land which produces "thorns and thistles" / ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους. This is "doubtless . . . a reference to Gen. iii. 18."[144] These are the very words used by the LXX translators in detailing the curse which fell on Adam as a result of his sin (Gen 3:18). Such land is fated to be "burnt over" (6:8). In the context of the warning of Hebrews this land symbolizes those who forsake their confession, "crucifying again the Son of God and . . . holding him up to contempt" (6:6). Here, *Auctor* suggests that forsaking the Christian confession is a sin comparable to the original sin of Adam. Such land is not blessed but put under a "curse" (κατάρας, 6:8), just as Adam was placed under a curse (ἐπικατάρατος), (Gen 3:17). The destiny of such land is to be "burnt over", reflecting the common early Christian expectation of fiery eschatological punishment for the wicked, which is found in Hebrews as well as elsewhere throughout the New Testament.[145]

Thomas Oberholtzer argues that allusions to the Genesis fall narrative are actually not found in 6:7-8. He suggests that in Gen 3:17-18 the thorns and thistles are part of the curse whereas in 6:7-8 they are causally related to the curse.[146] However, Oberholtzer attempts to make too much to this perceived "cause-and-effect inversion". It is true that the thorns and thistles are part of the curse in Genesis. However,

---

[144]Farrar, *Hebrews*, 108.

[145]10:27; see also Matt. 13:40-42; John 15:6; 2 Thess 1:8; 2 Pet 3:7-12; Rev 20:9-10, 14-15.

[146]Oberholtzer, "Thorn-Infested Ground," 325.

ultimately the curse in Genesis is that of death (Gen 3:19 see also 2:17). Thorns and thistles become preliminary harbingers of that doom. Exactly the same pattern can be seen in 6:7-8. The ultimate "curse" in this passage is the land being "burned over" (6:8) with the fires of eschatological punishment–and this fate is "on the verge" of being realized. The thorns and thistles represent a failure to respond to the gifts of God in an appropriate way.

The presence of these echoes of the creation and fall account in a paraenetic section of Hebrews is striking. *Auctor*'s use of such symbolism in theological/exegetical sections of Hebrews serve to indicate that Jesus fulfills Adam's original destiny. That destiny is ultimately not frustrated by the fall. *Auctor*'s use of similar creation/fall symbolism is his paraenesis suggests that believers–also is to realize that original Adamic destiny. The parallel use of symbolism for the Son and the sons highlights a parallel destiny for both.

**Hebrews 7:1-28**

Hebrews 7 provides the climax of the argument concerning Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchizedek.[147] The theme of the Sonship of the Melchizedekian priest is almost entirely overlooked in the discussion of 7:1-24.[148] (The only possible exception is the reference to Melchizedek "resembling the Son of God" in 7:3).

---

[147]W. G. Johnsson, "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews" (PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1973), 213.

[148]Kurianal, *Jesus Our High Priest*, 154.

However, 7:25 draws together the themes of Sonship and priesthood and in the same way 8:1 unites the themes of priesthood and the heavenly session of the Son.[149]

Haggadic traditions relate that God entrusted the priesthood to Adam, the "firstborn of the world", who consigned it to Seth and thence to Methuselah and then Shem, who is identified with Melchizedek.[150] In this way the priesthood of Melchizedek is directly associated with that of Adam. Käsemann notes that in various writings about Adam,

> Melchizedek, described as great high priest, officiates at the center of the earth and is buried there, as is true also of Adam, according to ancient speculation. In the Christian *Adam Book of the East*, this theme is taken up in such a way that Melchizedek does service at Adam's grave, bears Adam's body to Mount Calvary, and as bearer of Adam's body also takes over his high priestly functions and serves as connecting link between the high priest Adam and the third priest Christ. In the Armenian literature, Shem buries the corpse of Adam at Golgotha[151]

Such Haggadic sources, often reflected in early Christian comments on Melchizedek, post-date the writing of Hebrews. However, the fact that Melchizedekian priesthood was the object of early Christian speculation and yet such a tradition remains in late Jewish sources suggests it was too well established at an earlier period to be revised. Richard Longenecker plausibly argues that some of the extra-biblical traditions about Melchizedek go back to Hasmonean times.[152] Such Haggadic sources do not contrast

---

[149]Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 87.

[150]Murmelstein, "Adam," 272. On the priesthood of Adam see also Jub 3:27-31.

[151]Käsemann, *Wandering,* 202-03.

[152]R. Longenecker, "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews: A Study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression of New Testament Thought," in *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, ed. R. A. Guelich (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 166.

the Adamic/Mechizedekian priesthood with the Levitical. Rather they see the priesthood being transferred from Melchizedek to Abraham and thence to the Levitical priests.[153]

There are Jewish references which indicate that the Samaritans associated Melchizedek with worship at Mount Gerazim.[154] *Auctor* would not then be the first to suggest the Melchizedekian priesthood was superior to that of the priests at the temple in Jerusalem.[155]

**Summary**

The Christological focus in Heb 1-7 is primarily on the person of the heavenly priest rather than on his work. The thesis argued in this dissertation is that *Auctor's* understanding of Christ's heavenly priesthood is grounded in a form of "second Adam" Christology known both to *Auctor* and to those he addresses. The above survey shows Adamic/Edenic allusions in each of the first seven chapters of Hebrews. The concentration of allusions in this section of the work provides a strong indication of the importance of Adamic/Edenic categories in the construction of *Auctor's* picture of the

---

[153]Lev. Rab. 25.6; b. Nedarim 32b. For a detailed discussion of Jewish traditions regarding Melchizedek see G. Wuttke, *Melchisedech der Priestkönig von Salem: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese,* BZNW 5 (Gießen: Töpelman, 1927), 14-27; and
F. L. Horton, Jr., *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Criticial Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, SNTSMS 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 54-130.

[154](Pseudo-)Eupolemus, *Fragments One*, 5-6. See also Jub. 30:1. According to Doran, the (Pseudo-)Eupolemus fragment, which is preserved only in Eusebius' *Praepatio Evangelica* 9:17.2-9, is all but universally attributed to an otherwise unknown Samaritan writer. However, Doran dissents from this position, denying the need to posit a second Eupolemus, as all. See R. Doran, "Pseudo-Eupolemus: Introduction," in OTP 2: 874-76.

[155]Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 139.

person of the heavenly high priest. He explicitly identifies the heavenly priest as the "Son". His allusions to Adamic/Edenic themes suggests that a form of "second Adam" Christology serves to link these two categories.

The fact that Adamic/Edenic allusions can be introduced casually (as in 1:2) suggests that those addresses are familiar with the material and would have been expected to be aware of its significance. Similarly the fact that Adamic/Eden allusions can occur in contexts that appear extraneous–even intrusive–to the argument (as in 3:4) suggests that a second Adam Christological understanding was part of the common ground between *Auctor* and those he addressed.

The thesis argued here would suggest that Adamic/Edenic allusions may be less common in Heb 8-13 where *Auctor's* focus moves from the person of the heavenly high priest to the work of the priest. This expectation is confirmed by the survey below which finds Adamic/Edenic allusions in the second half of Hebrews but significantly fewer than are found in the first half.

**Hebrews 9:11**

The identity of the "greater and more perfect tabernacle" through which Christ has entered τὰ ἅγια has been discussed at length by scholars. Some have postulated the existence of a literal heavenly "holy place". Others have suggested the reference is to the earthly body of Christ, the literal heavens through which he ascended, the resurrected body of Christ, the church, or the mass.[156] However, the phrase οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, provides a interpretative clue which must not be overlooked.

---

[156]A good summary of the alternative views is provided in A. Vanhoye, "'Par la tente plus grande et plus parfaite . . . ' (He 9,11)," *Bib* 46 (1965): 1-28. See also J. Swetnam, "'The Greater and More Perfect Tent.' A Contribution to the Discussion of Hebrews 9,11," *Bib* 47 (1966): 92-96.

Hebrews shows no signs of a Gnostic-like ontological dualism between matter and spirit. However, *Auctor* does relate negatively to "this creation" *in its fallenness* and contrasts it to τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν (2:1) whence the Son as forerunner and high priest has already entered.

We have already noted that the entrance into the heavenly Most Holy Place equates in Hebrews to entrance into the Edenic Sabbath rest.[157] Such rest is not available to humanity in or through "this creation" but is found only in the world to come. This world already exists in the heavenly realm, where Jesus has already entered τὰ ἅγια as the believers' πρόδρομος (6:19), The Son has entered this "rest", this "most holy place", only by passing through the barrier of the eschatological realities now made present. He is the new Adam of a new world. Entrance to this reality has nothing to do with this creation but depends entirely on the mission of the heavenly "apostle" (3:1) sent to earth.[158] The entrance διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς" (9:11) is thus exactly parallel to entrance διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ (10:20). Vanhoye restricts the force of the verse unnecessarily when he limits the meaning of the "greater and more perfect tent" to the resurrected body of Christ.[159] Effectively, he has narrowed the focus to a single one of the eschatological realities ushered in by the passion of Christ, namely, the resurrection.

---

[157]See above, pp. 272-77.

[158]Young, "Gospel," 202-05.

[159]Vanhoye, "Par la tente plus grande," 21-28.

**Hebrews 11:1-3**

A final reference to creation appears at the beginning of the "faith chapter" (11:1-31). Once again it appears to fit poorly into the immediate context. Indeed, Schille sees here evidence that Hebrews 11 contains a traditional *Vorlage* which has been imperfectly reworked by *Auctor*.[160] In this chapter πίστει repeatedly introduces examples of faith, beginning with Abel (11:4). Before this sequence begins a single exception to the pattern occurs: Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι (11:3). The doctrine of creation expressed in Gen 1 is clearly presupposed.[161] How does a statement about the nature of God's activity in creation relate to an argument based on examples of human faith? The suggestion of A. G. Widdess that the reference is to God's faith which led to creation is creative but scarcely satisfying.[162] In fact, Widdess has merely exchanged one difficulty for another. In resolving the anomaly of the example of faith, he has created another concerning the exponent of faith involved. Eisenbaum has shown that the "heroes of faith" are all characterized by four attributes in Heb 11, namely, 1) death or a near-death experience; 2) the ability to see the future; 3) an alteration of status; and, 4) marginalization.[163] Only one of these attributes is applicable to God.

---

[160]Schille, "Katechese," 113-14. For more discussion of proposed traditional material incorporated into Heb 11 see above, pp. 129-31.

[161]P. E. Hughes, "The Doctrine of Creation in Hebrews 11:3," *BTB* 2 (1972): 64.

[162]A. G. Widdess, "A Note on Hebrews XI.3," *JTS* (n.s.) 10 (1959): 327-29.

[163]Eisenbaum, *Jewish Heroes*, 178-85; *idem*, "Heroes and History," 382-93.

In determining the significance of the allusion to creation in 11:1-3, it is important to note the literary relationships of the passage. Heb 11 opens with a clear reference to creation and closes with an explicit reference to eschatological perfection Indeed, the very last word of the chapter is τελειωθῶσιν. God's activity in salvation history reaches from Creation to eschaton. In the exordium this activity is described as a sequence of divine speeches; here it is explored from the viewpoint of the human response of faith.

Further literary relationships can be discerned. 11:3 introduces an anaphoric series of πίστει. This series ends with a concluding τοιγαροῦν statement (12:1-2). The introduction and conclusion form a bracket around the rest of the content of Heb 11.[164] There are numerous points of contact between the introductory paragraph, 11:1-3 and the exordium of the entire book (1:1-4)–and even more contact points when the introduction is read in conjunction with the conclusion and compared with the exordium. Thus the topic of the introductory paragraph (as in the first half of the exordium), is the action of God. If the exordium refers to God speaking (λαλέω), 11:3 refers to the ῥήματι θεοῦ (see also also 1:3). Both passages refer to the ancestors (τοῖς πατράσιν, 1:1; οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, 11:2). Both passages refer explicitly to the creation (ποιέω, 1:2; καταρτίζω, 1:3) of the "worlds" (τοὺς αἰῶνας in both cases). The rare biblical word ὑπόστασις occurs in both passages (1:3; 11:1).

The parallels to the introductory paragraph, 11:1-3, are heavily concentrated in the first half of the exordium. The parallels to the second half are found in the concluding paragraph, 12:1-2. If the exordium (1:3) refers to καθαρισμὸν τῶν

---

[164]McCown, *ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ*, 85.

ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος, 12:2 speaks of ὑπέμεινεν σταυρὸν. Both passages then conclude with a reference to the Son being seated at the right hand of God (1:4; 12:2). The themes encapsulated in the exordium have clearly been recast here to form the introduction and conclusion to this significant section. This recasting adds a further depth of significance to the reference to creation in 11:3.

McCown suggests that the purpose of the mention of God's creatorship here is to bolster faith in God's power and faithfulness in fulfilling his promises.[165] However, more may be said: *Auctor* draws attention once again to the present world as the result of the creative act of God–a fact which can only be apprehended by faith. This is particularly significant because *Auctor* and his recipients relate to the present world very much in terms of its fallenness and sinfulness. As noted above "this creation" is a code for "the present sinful world" (9:11).[166] The church he addresses has suffered the hostility of the contemporary world (10:32-36; 12:4) and looks in hope for the world to come (2:5). The creation of the world by God and his current Lordship over it require no less faith to discern than the reality of the coming world. Thus *Auctor* begins his treatment of the heroes of faith by referring to the faith required to apprehend correctly the present world before launching into a strongly eschatologically flavoured exhortation to faithfulness.

The eschatological tenor of the chapter is readily evident. Enoch "did not experience death" but, by implication, entered the world above, which is the same as the coming world (11:5). Abraham, along with Isaac and Jacob, looked for a city

---

[165]McCown, *ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ*, 94.

[166]See above, pp. 284-85.

"whose architect and builder is God" (11:10). They looked for a "better country, that is a heavenly one" (11:16) which would be their new homeland (11:15). Moses "was looking ahead to the reward" (11:26). Still others looked for "a better resurrection" (11:35). Finally, attention is turned to Jesus the τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν (12:2), that is, the one who has both gone before us as our forerunner (6:19) into the heavenly sanctuary/rest/city and guarantees the entrance of the faithful in due course.

The fact that the present creation is εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι (11:3) directly links creation and eschatology. In Hebrews the "unseen" does not correlate to the non-existent but to the heavenly, the eternal, the eschatological. Hughes develops this thought with particular reference to the relative value given to the visible earthly sanctuary and the unseen heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews.[167]

An eschatological reference to creation has a further point of contact in Hebrews. Eisenbaum points out that the example lists of the Jewish Scriptures which are most akin to Hebrews 11 prominently feature references to the inheritance of the land of promise.[168] As noted above, Jewish traditions often conceptually link the promised land to Eden and present the inheritance of the land as the undoing of the consequences of Adam's sin.[169] In 3:7-4:14, the themes of the Edenic Sabbath,

---

[167]Hughes, "Creation," 74. See also Frör, "Hebräer 11,1-2.6.8-10 (17-19)," 109.

[168]Eisenbaum, *Jewish Heroes*, 31-32.

[169]See above, pp. 250-51.

entrance into the land and the eschatological hope of Christians are closely associated. Mention of God as creator in 11:3 echoes the themes developed there.

**Rhetorical Significance of the Creation/Adam Material in Hebrew**

The distribution of the Adamic material in Hebrews is significant for an understanding of the work in rhetorical terms. The greatest concentration of explicit references to either Adam or the creation narratives outside chapter 2 is found in the first chapter. This is important for three reasons. First, the first chapter begins with the exordium which according to ancient rhetorical theory functioned to outline briefly the basic matters to be discussed and the arguments to be covered.[170] The presentation of Edenic/Adamic themes in the exordium is subtle and implicit rather than explicit. This is not surprising. It should be noted that the theme of the priesthood of Christ is only mentioned in passing in the exordium, yet its importance in the rest of Hebrews is indisputable. However, the absence of any Adamic/Edenic reference in the exordium could well have been fatal to any view of it playing a significant role in the rest of the work. If the thesis argued here–that *Auctor* used an understanding of "second Adam" Christology which he shared with the congregation addressed as a basis on which to present a novel high-priestly Christology–it is unlikely he would omit all Edenic/Adamic allusions from the exordium. This was the very place in which fundamental common ground between a rhetor and his audience was expressed in ancient rhetoric.[171]

---

[170]D. E. Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KN: Westminster John Knox, 2003), s.v. "Exordium".

[171]See above, pp. 157-58.

The second reason why the concentration of Edenic/Adamic references in Heb 1 is important is that it serves to reinforce the suggestion that the first major block of material in the book stretches from 1:5-2:18. This is generally accepted. However, the scope of the material is somewhat broader than often recognized. This block is not simply developing the theme of the superiority of Jesus over the angels. Rather it is also concerned to echo a second Adam Christology which appears to have been accepted by both *Auctor* and the recipients of Hebrews. Heb 2:5- 18 delineates the transition from Son to High Priest conceptions but 1:5-14 lays the groundwork for this change. This is strongly indicated by the structural parallels between the two chapters.

Third, the concentration of Adamic/Edenic allusions in Heb 1-2 suggests further that 1:5-2:18 is correctly seen (with Übelacker) as a *narratio* with an embedded *propositio*. The rhetorical function of the *narratio* is to lay the foundation of propositions accepted by the rhetor and his audience. It is clear that questions regarding an Adam Christology were not at the heart of the discussion in the community addressed by Hebrews. If they were central, one would expect to find greater explicit reference to the topic in the rest of the book, as one does with the priesthood of Jesus. What is found instead is a heavy concentration on the priesthood of Christ in the rest of the epistle with barely a cursory mention of this topic until the end of Heb 2. All of this strongly suggests that the Adamic Christology was a bridge firmly fixed on both sides (*Auctor* and community) by means of which *Auctor* can move discussion from that of sonship to that of priesthood. *Auctor* needs to move the discussion in this way because he was the one who develops the innovative priestly picture of Jesus.

In Heb 3 *Auctor* moves in his first cycle of arguments having laid a foundation of commonly held beliefs in the opening two chapters. The use of examples is common in deliberative rhetoric.[172] Heinrich Lausberg explains why this is so:

> The genuine period of time to which matters of this *genus* [that is, deliberative] refers is the future, but to help gain knowledge of the future matters from the past and present need to be dealt with . . . . Such "auxiliary topics from the past" are *exempla.*[173]

It is therefore not surprising that *Auctor* frames his first major argument–God's people wandering in a hostile world need a heavenly priest–in terms of the example of the wilderness generation. *Auctor*'s rhetorical strategy leads him to both introduce and conclude this argumentative section with a reference to the Adamic/Edenic ideal (3:4; 4:3-4). This highlights the distance of the wilderness generation from that ideal and serves as a counterpart to the other contrast of the wilderness generation to the ancients on the "honour roll" of faith (Heb 11).

The reference to the Adamic/Edenic ideal which opens this block of argument is admittedly allusive at best. This fact is scarcely surprising given that the theme has been developed at some length in Heb 1-2. However, the concluding reference (4:3-4), is more direct and explicit. The Genesis creation narrative is quoted and introduced with a temporal reference: καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων (and yet his works were finished at the foundation of the world). Not only is that argument bound together by these open and closing allusions to the Adamic/Edenic

---

[172]Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.6, 36.

[173]Lausberg, *Handbook*, 98.

ideal, but as the argument reaches its paraenetic climax[174] and the subsequent restatement of the *propositio*, attention is moved from the failures of the wilderness generation to God's original ideal still available for the faithful (4:11).

The possible references to Adamic Christology and the Edenic situation which follow in Heb 5, 7, 9, 10 are generally allusive at best and presented in a casual "in passing" way. As such they contribute little to the unfolding argument of Hebrews and serve to remind that this argument presupposes acceptance of traditional Christological views. The clearest reference back to the creation narratives in this section of Hebrews is found in 11:3. It is significant in rhetorical terms that *Auctor* should choose to return more explicitly to this theme in this section of his presentation. Heb 11 also serves as the climax of the paraenesis of Hebrews. The presentation of Hebrews has the fundamental purpose of encouraging the believers to hold firm to their commitment. The readers are encouraged to remain true by the fact that they have a high-priest who is willing and able to sustain them in their struggles. At the beginning of the final hortatory section they are reminded that this belief in the heavenly priesthood of Christ is rooted in traditional teachings and does not represent a deviation from them, but a development of them.[175]

---

[174]Heb 11 presents the climax of *Auctor's* paraenesis but it is not the final paraenesis in the work. Heb 13:12-14 contains a summarizing restatement of many of the themes found in 11:1-12:4. Among these should be noted that "Jesus also suffered outside the city gate" (13:12) which echos "Jesus . . . endured the cross"; and, "we are looking for a city that is to come" (13:14) which echos the city prepared by good for which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob looked (11:13-16). The exhortation "Let us then go to him" (13:13) echos "looking to Jesus" (12:2) thematically although not linguistically.

[175]On Hebrews' priestly Christology generally as a development of traditional themes, see Laub, *Bekenntnis*, 27-51.

The thematic parallels between the Heb 11 and 3:7-4:11 highlight another significant point. The exhortation based on the faithlessness of the wilderness generation reaches a climax with the affirmation that God's "rest" has been available since creation. Now the corresponding exhortation based on the faithfulness of men and women under the first covenant is introduced with a reminder that the one who provided such rest was the creator of all things. Such a restatement of an earlier argued theme is exactly what would be expected as a work of ancient rhetoric was coming to conclusion.

**Conclusion**

The book of Hebrews develops the faith of the early church in a highly distinctive way. However, it is evident that the development still presupposed the common traditions of the church. The analysis of Heb 2 which detects themes related to an Adamic Christology is amply confirmed in the rest of the book. Adam is not explicitly named in Hebrews, presumably because the specific question being raised by the community did not focus on the reality of Jesus' identification with a second Adam figure. However, they may still have been concerned with the implications of such an identification, and the analysis presented here suggests this is the case.

The Son is able to be priest only because he has assumed humanity–indeed, only because he stands in the place of Adam. Thus he is able to lead believers into the "rest" Adam should have experienced; take away their fear of death in the face of persecution; and minister in an eschatological sanctuary which is not of this creation but is part of the new creation. Indeed, when the two elements of traditional Christian eschatology and the genuineness of the Son's humanity are combined, the emergence of Adamic motifs is almost inevitable.

# CHAPTER 6

## Conclusions and Implications

In this chapter an endeavour will be made to summarize the research presented in the previous chapters, to present the results arising from this investigation, and to outline the significant implications which they entail. The issues covered will range from methodology and hermeneutics to exegesis and theology.

### Summary

A century of rigourous historical analysis of Hebrews yielded more disappointing results than those from almost any other New Testament writing. Positively, a near total consensus on the work's non-Pauline authorship has emerged. Negatively, despite numerous creative attempts, the likely identity of *Auctor* has not emerged. The date of authorship is scarcely narrower than the second half of the first century. Similarly, both the place of authorship and the location of the recipients cannot be specified beyond "somewhere in the Mediterranean world". The genre of the work remains uncertain, although the majority of scholars today see it as a homily. Despite the powerful attraction of the structural analyses informed by the work of Vanhoye, other structural analyses continue to vie for attention

In the last forty years a variety of new approaches have contributed much to the understanding of Hebrews. Anthropology, sociology, structuralism, and discourse analysis are among the various methodologies which have been utilized. Rhetorical

analysis has also been attempted. Although the legitimacy of rhetorical criticism as a tool for exploring the meaning of New Testament epistles is open to question, the situation with regard to Hebrews is less problematical. Regardless of whether it should be conceptualized as a letter or a homily, the rhetorical skill of *Auctor* is evident. It is also clear that the oral features of Hebrews are more evident than is the case with many of the self-proclaimed letters of the New Testament.

Rhetorical criticism is itself a diverse field. The expression can encompass anything from post-modern methodologies unconcerned with the "original meaning of the text" to a historically oriented classical rhetorical analysis in terms of the concepts Aristotle, Quintilian and others outlined in the rhetorical texts of antiquity. The approach adopted here is to use classical rhetoric as a supplement to historical study, rather than as a replacement for it.

A question that confronts any use of classic rhetoric as a methodology concerns the rhetorical genre of the document concerned. Since at least the time of Aristotle three genres of rhetoric were recognized–judicial, epideictic and deliberative. It is generally recognized that Hebrews does not fit into the judicial genre, but less consensus exists concerning the other two options. However, Hebrews is most adequately understood as an example of deliberative rhetoric. The work has undoubted epideictic and forensic features. However, taken as a whole it reflects the concerns of deliberative rhetoric in trying to dissuade the Hebrews from taking a course of action in the future–namely the abandonment of their Christian faith.

The conceptualization of Hebrews as deliberative rhetoric receives strong support from hitherto unexplored structural relationships between the exordium (1:1-4), the catena (1:5-14) and Heb 2. The nature of these relationships strongly supports the

structure of the initial section of Hebrews proposed by Übelacker in opposition to that proposed by Koester. Accepting Übelacker's structural outline also serves to highlight the importance of 2:17-18 as *propositio* in the development of the argument of the work as a whole. The detailed repetition of the themes found in these verses in two latter passages (4:14-16; 7:26-28) indicates major transition points in the argument.

A further issue is linked organically to generic classification of the document as deliberative rhetoric: Of what does *Auctor* wish to persuade the community? Here the paraenetic sections of the book are informative. They make clear that the focus of the argument is that the community hold fast to their "confession". However, this conclusion raises a further question: what is the content of this "confession"?

The importance of the Christological title "Son" in Hebrews indicates that a key part of the confession would have been "Jesus is the Son of God." This affirmation appears to be largely synonymous with the Pauline credo "Jesus is Lord" (Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 12:3). The confession of Jesus as Son of God is known from elsewhere in the New Testament and other early Christian literature. It is certainly possible that the confession referred to in Hebrews has a baptismal setting, although this is unprovable.

It is thought by many that the prominence of the priesthood of Jesus in Hebrews indicates that it was also part of the confession of the community. However, this appears to be unlikely. It is not demanded by texts, such as 3:1, often adduced as evidence for it. There is no evidence for such a confession existing outside Hebrews (despite the existence of various cultic metaphors). Nor does the traditional material in Hebrews refer to a heavenly priesthood of Jesus. To the extent that such material does refer to Jesus in priestly terms, it focuses on the cross as a sacrifice.

Viewing Hebrews as a carefully crafted rhetorical work suggests that the first chapters would be dedicated to material held in common by *Auctor* and the community. Only after such a foundation of commonly held understandings is laid would the rhetor be expected to move to novel, or even controversial views. The rhetorical structure of Hebrews suggests that the point where *Auctor* moves to more controverted topics is precisely the point where the topic of the priesthood of Christ is first explicitly introduced (2:17-18). An analysis of the rhetorical strategy of Hebrews lends further support to this conclusion. The developments in the tone and content of the exhortations as well as the alternative use of the first and second person address in the exhortations demonstrates a pattern of commonality leading to confrontation and challenge.

The conclusion that the heavenly high-priesthood of Christ does not constitute part of the community confession raises a crucial problem for the interpretation of Hebrews. Given that the self-proclaimed intention of the work is to bolster the community's grip on the confession, which does not include the priesthood of Christ, why is so much of Hebrews dedicated to the topic of the priesthood?

Heb 2 provides the key for answering this question, because it provides the transition from the discussion of Jesus' Sonship to that of his priesthood. Structural analysis reveals that the chapter consists of three discrete arguments. The first of these is based on a citation from Ps 8:4-6 (LXX). This Psalm is a hymn of praise to God as creator and has many points of contact with the priestly creation story of Genesis 1. In the context of Hebrews the citation retains a focus on Adam (possibly as a symbol for humanity as a whole). Despite frequent assertions to the contrary there is no evidence

that *Auctor* understands the words "son of man" in the Psalm citation as a Christological title. Rather "son of man" refers to Adam or humanity in general.

The fact that *Auctor* accesses the text of the Psalm only through a Greek translation facilitates its usefulness to him. Two translations in particular are significant for the argument of Hebrews. First, אֱלֹהִים is translated by ἀγγέλους, which provides the crucial hook-word needed to link the citation to the argument of 1:5-14, 2:5. Second humanity's subordination to the angels is best understood temporally rather than qualitatively in the Greek translation.

A much discussed issued in relation to the citation of Ps 8 is the point at which *Auctor* moves from a focus on Adam / humanity to a focus on Jesus. The conclusion of this study is that Hebrews applies the entire citation to Adam and only typologically to Jesus. Thus Adam, as much as Jesus, was "made for a little while lower than the angels". In the context of Hebrews this correlates with the fall of humanity narrated in Gen 3, where Adam and Eve are separated by a cherub from the tree of life. In 2:9 the Son's being made lower than the angels stands in chiastic parallel to his "tasting death for everyone".

The rest of Hebrews 2 is replete with Adamic references and allusions. The Son is crowned with "glory"–a traditional attribute of the prelapsarian Adam. Both the humanity of the Son and his faithfulness to God in his humanity are emphasized. Both he and those he "sanctifies" are ἐξ ἑνὸς. Although the referent of this expression is controverted, the conclusion of this study is that the "one" involved is Adam. The final section of Heb 2 echoes the fall narrative (Genesis 3) in many ways. The "fear of death" which humanity experiences, corresponds to the fear of Adam and Eve at the approach of God. Similarly the direct connection of the devil with death corresponds to

the connection made in Genesis between human death and Adam and Eve's succumbing to the temptation of the serpent.

The development of thought in Heb 2 leads from the concept of Jesus' Sonship to that of his High Priesthood. Two themes stand out in this development. First there is a refining of focus from universal to particular–from the Son's lordship over all creation to his priestly concern for the church. The second is closely related to the first: a change in focus from a realized eschatology to an unrealized eschatology, an eschatological reservation.

An understanding of Heb 2 in terms of an underlying "Adam Christology" finds confirmation throughout Hebrews. In exactly the way that would be expected in a piece of deliberative rhetoric the allusions to Adam and Eden are concentrated in the exordium of Hebrews (Heb 1-2), because this is the section of the work where *Auctor* established his common ground with the recipients. Both the proem and the catena of testimonies contain numerous allusions to Adam and God's Edenic ideal for humanity.

In the rest of Hebrews allusions to the creation ideal and its eschatological fulfilment are statistically rarer than in the exordium. However, such allusions are significant, not least of all because of the unexpectedness with which they appear. For example, the statement that God is the builder of everything (3:4) seems unrelated to the prevailing contrast between Moses and the Son in the immediate context (3:1-6). Similarly, the citation of Gen 2:3 appears somewhat intrusive in the discussion of Ps 95 found in 3:7-4:11. The same disjointedness is readily seen in the reference to creation which begins the "faith chapter" (Heb 11). Such isolated allusions serve to re-tether the novel arguments regarding priesthood to the commonalities shared between *Auctor* and audience.

**Conclusions**

A number of conclusions grow out of this close reading of the text of Hebrews. First, the validity of rhetorical analysis in the case of Hebrews is strongly affirmed. It is argued that the writing is essentially a piece of deliberative rhetoric. It is composed to persuade a Christian community to hold firm to their faith, at a time when it is under pressure and the community is in serious danger of departing from their "confession".

Second, the confession is seen as critical for the understanding of Hebrews. Despite common affirmations to the contrary, this study concludes that the (heavenly) high priesthood of Jesus is not part of the received confession of the community addressed. Rather this priestly Christology represents a transposition of the confession to meet the needs of the endangered community. The confession lies at the base of the theological statements of Hebrews. Simultaneously, the priestly re-interpretation of this confession is the goal of the document's theological concerns, as Bornkamm notes.[1] The purpose of both the recall of the confession and its re-interpretation is expressed in the hortatory sections of the work.[2]

Third, despite the fact that the name "Adam" is absent from Hebrews, some form of "second Adam" Christology undergirds the theology of Hebrews. It is presupposed in the theological argument of the book. Rather than being the subject of critical controversy between *Auctor* and the community this Christology provides a commonality between them. This commonality is the basis from which the high priestly Christology is developed. Analysis of literary structure, showing the close connection

---

[1]Bornkamm, "Bekenntnis," 189.

[2]McCown, "ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ," 250.

between Heb 1 and 2, supports such a conclusion. The high priesthood of Christ is not explicitly introduced until 2:17, suggesting that at this point *Auctor* moves from ground he shared with the community to more novel arguments.

This "second Adam" Christology comes in to particular focus in Heb 2 where the focus moves from Christological category of Son to that of High Priest. Such an understanding of Heb 2 entails a number of specific exegetical conclusions. Ps 8 is not cited in an attempt to exploit a "son of man" Christology, but rather to represent the Son as the second Adam. The entire citation is used in Hebrews with direct reference to Adam and only indirect, typological reference to the Son. This means the citation is applied more to the fall narrative of Gen 3 than to creation narrative of Gen 1. Again, the "one" to whom both sanctifier and sanctified are linked (2:11) is more probably Adam than God.

The paradoxical emphasis of Hebrews on the humanity of Jesus also reflects the word's "second Adam" presuppositions. Jesus is only able to serve as a priest if he is human, but he must simultaneously be sinless.[3] A model of such humanity could only be found in the picture of Adam in Gen 1-2.

Fourth, although the "second Adam" Christology of Hebrews is comparable with that expressed by Paul, there are differences between the two nevertheless. Paul associates the "second Adam" idea with his radical combining of sin and death. For Paul the last enemy to be overcome by the "second Adam" is death. In Hebrews the focus is more on suffering and the fear of death, rather than on death itself.

---

[3]Williamson ("Hebrews $4^{15}$," 4-8) regards this not so much as a paradox as an out-right contradiction.

Fifth, Hebrews utilizes the traditional Son Christology to emphasize the universality of the enthroned Son's reign and the present realization of eschatological hope. The high-priestly Christology serves to present different emphases: the concern of the high-priest for the believing community. The fact that this community is under threat and in danger highlights that the eschatological hopes are not yet fully realized.

Sixth, the "second Adam" Christology undergirding the theology of Hebrews casts light on a diverse array of topics covered in the document. The central imagery or the Day Atonement entrance in the Heavenly sanctuary which is paralleled by a subservient image of entrance into "rest" provides an example. On the one hand, the image of entrance into "rest" directly points to the realization of God's original intention for Adam, while on the other hand, "entrance" into the heavenly sanctuary points to the undoing of the fall of Adam which resulted in his expulsion from the Garden of Eden according to Gen 3.

**Implications**

The uncovering of the presuppositions which lie behind the theological argument of Hebrews has a number of implications for the broader field of the study of Christian origins. First, the conclusions of this research suggest that the book of Hebrews is not an isolated island in the world of the early church, but was rather integrally related to the developments in theology evidenced by the Pauline, deutero-Pauline and Johannine writings. On the one hand, the Christology of Hebrews is intimately related to that of such pre-Pauline fragments as those found in Phil 2:5-11 and Col 1:15-20. McCown observes that

> EH [Epistle to the Hebrews] would seem, in places, to presuppose specifically Christian exegetical traditions. Some of the Scripture

> passages cited are also found in Paul's writings [references give] . . . . Although EH's treatment of these texts manifests no dependence on the apostle, the two no doubt share a common exposition heritage.[4]

On the other hand, it mirrors the thought of the Pastoral Epistles. John Kelly's comments on 1 Tim 2:5 are as true of the Christological argument of Hebrews as they were of that of 1 Timothy.

> "The second member continues: 'and also one mediator between God and men, Christ Jesus, himself man.' . . . Christ can fulfil this unique role precisely because he is 'himself man.' We have here, in summary form, the conception of the second Adam, the inaugurator of a new redeemed humanity which Paul expounds in Rom. v. 12ff.; I Cor. xv. 21f.; 45 ff."[5]

Viewed from a different angle, this study suggests that Dunn's delimitation of the core kerygma of the early church to no more than the affirmation of the identity of the heavenly Lord and Christ with the human Jesus is too restrictive.[6] The fact that Christological concepts as disparate as Son and Priest are joined through the shared pre-supposition of a third concept–second Adam–certainly points in this direction.

Third, the conclusions of this study lend further support to the view that the conceptual background of Hebrews is found less in Platonic or Philonic thought than in that of Jewish apocalypticism. The apocalyptic eschatology which informed the New Testament generally, as Barrett concluded long ago, "is in Hebrews made uncommonly clear."[7]

---

[4]McCown, "ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ," 188.

[5]J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (London: Black, 1963), 63.

[6]J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Introduction into the Characters of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM, 1977), 203-26.

[7]Barrett, "Eschatology," 391.

Fourth, the implications of this study go beyond the concerns of purely academic scholarship. Hebrews is primarily a Christian document addressed to a Christian community. As such its study legitimately raises questions for contemporary Christian thinkers concerned with issues facing the contemporary Church. The use of rhetorical strategy in Hebrews raise issues concerning the legitimate role of persuasive techniques by contemporary church functionaries. Similarly, Hebrews' re-casting of the confession of the church in new terms must inevitably raise questions as to the permissible limits of re-contextualization of the Christian message in the present time.[8]

Fifth, the use of theology in the service of paranaesis raises challenges for the (post-) modern church which often appears to be in a "post-theological" phase, awash with feel-good pop psychology but bereft of any serious intellectual grappling with the "truths" inherited from the past or the role they might play in today's church. One of the lessons of Hebrews is that serious theological reflection can be a significant contributor to the spiritual health of the church.

---

[8]On this topic see K Haleblain, "The Problem of Contextualization," *Missiology* 11 (1981): 95-111; and, P. G. Hiebert, "Critical Contextualization", *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 11 (1987 ): 104-11.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Achtemeier, P. J. "*Omne Verbum Sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 3-27.

Adams, J. C. "Exegesis of Hebrews 6:1f," *New Testament Studies*, 13 (1967): 378-85.

Agourides, S. "The 'High Priestly Prayer' of Jesus." In *Studia Evangelica, Vol 4: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965. Part 1: The New Testament Scriptures*. Edited by F. L. Cross. 137-45. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968.

Albright, W. F. "What were the Cherubim?" In *Biblical Archaeologist Reader*. Edited by G. E. Wright & D. N. Freedman. 1: 95-97. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961. [Reprinted from *Biblical Archaeology* 1 (1938): 1-3].

Allen, L. C. *Psalms 101-150*. Word Biblical Commentary 21. Dallas, TX: Word, 1983.

Amador, J. D. H. *Academic Constraints in Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction to a Rhetoric of Power*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 174. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

____. "The Word Made Flesh: Epistemology, Ontology and Postmodern Rhetoric." In *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 53-65. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 146. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Anderson, A. A. *Psalms* (1-72). New Century Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

____, *Psalms* (73-150). New Century Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

Anderson, B. W. *Out of the Depths: The Psalms Speak for Us Today*. Revised and expanded edition. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster.

Anderson, D. R. *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews*. Studies in Biblical Literature 21. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

Anderson, G. W. "The Psalms." In *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Edited by M. Black & H.H. Rowley. 409-43. Sunbury-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1962.

Anderson, H. "The Jewish Antecedents of the Christology of Hebrews." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 512-535. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992

Anderson, R. D., Jr. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 18. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.

Andreasen, N-E. *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 7. Missoula, MT: Scholars 1972.

Andriessen, P. C. B. "La teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de He I 6 et II 14-III 2," *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976): 293-313.

Aquinas, T. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Translated by C. Baer. South Bend, IN: St. Augustine: 2006.

Aratus. "Phaenomena." In *Callimachus (Hymns and Epigrams): Lycophron, Aratus*. Translated by A. W. Mair & G. R. Mair. 185-299. Loeb Classical Library 129. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

Aristotle. *Art of Rbetoric*. Translated by J. H. Freese. Loeb Classical Library 193. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

____. *Problems Books 32-38 / Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Translated by W.S. Hett & H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 317. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Arnold, C. E. *The Colossian Syncretism: The Interface between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996. Reprint of Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.

Athanasius. "De Synodis." Translataed by A. Robinson. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Second Series. 14 volumes. Edited by P. Schaff & H. Wace. 4: 448-480. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978. Originally Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1890-99.

Attridge, H. W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia: Philadephia, PA: Fortress, 1989.

____. "'Heard because of His Reverence' (Heb 5:7)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 90-93.

____. "'Let us Strive to Enter that Rest': The Logic of Hebrews 4:1-11," *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 279-88.

____. "Liberating Death's Captives: Reconsideration of an Early Christian Myth." In *Gnosticism and the Early Christian World*. Edited by J. E. Goehring, C. W. Hedrick, J. T. Sanders & H. D. Betz. 103-115. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1990.

____. "New Covenant Christology in an Early Christian Homily," *Quarterly Revue* 8 (1988): 89-108.

Auffret, P. "Essai sur la structure littéraire et l'interprétation d'Hébreux 3, 1-6," *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980): 380-96.

Augustine of Hippo. "Confessions of St. Augustin." Translated by J.G. Pilkington. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* First Series. Edited by P. Schaff. 1: 27-208. Peabody, MO: Hendrickson, 1995. Originally, New York, Christian Literature Publishing, 1886.

____. "Sermons on New Testament Lessons." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. First Series. Edited by P. Schaff. 6:237-545. Peabody, MO: Hendrickson, 1995. Originally, Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1888.

Aune, D. E. "Heracles and Christ: Heracles Imagery in the Christology of Early Christianity." In *Greeks, Romans and Christian: Essays in Honor of Abrahm J. Malherbe*. Edited by D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson & W. A. Meeks. 3-19. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.

____. *Revelation 1-5*. Word Biblical Commentary 52. Dallas, TX: Word, 1997.

____. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament And Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

Bacchiocchi. S. *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity.* Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977.

Baehr, J. "Priest, High Priest." In *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 Volumes. Revised edition. Edited by C. Brown. 3: 32-44. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1986.

Baigent, J. W. "Jesus as Priest: An Examination of the Claim that the concept of Jesus as Priest may be found in the New Testament outside the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Vox Evangelica* 12 (1981): 34-44.

Bakker, A. "Was Christ an Angel? A Study in Early Christian Docetism," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1933): 255-65.

Barbour, R. S. "Gethsemane in the Tradition of the Passion," *New Testament Studies* 16 (1969-70): 231-51.

Barker, M. *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992.

Barrett, C. K. *The Acts of the Apostles*. International Critical Commentary. 2 Volumes. Edinburgh: Clark, 1994, 1998.

____. "The Christology of Hebrews." In *Who do Men Say that I am? Essays on Christology in Honor of Jack Dean Kingsbury*. Edited by M. A. Powell & D. R. Bauer. 110-27. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1999.

____. "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: in Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*. Edited by W.D. Davies & D. Daube. 363-93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

____. *The Gospel According to St John*, 2nd edition. London: SPCK, 1978.

____. *The Signs of an Apostle*. London: Epworth, 1970.

Barton, G. A. "The Date of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 57 (1938): 195-207.

Bateman, H. W., IV. *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5-13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage*. American University Studies, Series VII: Theology and Religion 193; New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

____. "Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (1992): 438-53.

____. Review of *The Priest-King of Psalm 110 in Hebrews*. By D. R. Anderson. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 45 (2002): 529-531.

____. "Two First-Century Messianic uses of the OT: Heb 1:5-13 and 4QFlor 11.1-19," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (1995): 11-27.

Bauer, W., W.F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich & F. W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd edition revised. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. *The Book of Revelation*. New Century Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.

_____. "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Journal of Theological Studies*. New series 48 (1947): 1-12.

Becker, U. "Hard, Hardened." In *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 volumes. Revised edition. Edited by C. Brown. 2: 153-56. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1986.

Beckson K. & A. Ganz. *A Reader's Guide to Literary Terms: A Dictionary*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1960.

Behm, J. "παράκλητος." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* 10 Volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 5: 800-14. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Berger, K. "Rhetorical Criticism, New Form Criticism and New Testament Hermeneutics." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 390-396. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Best, E. "Spiritual Sacrifice," *Interpretation* 14 (1960): 273-99.

Betz, H. D. *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Betz, O. "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament," *Revue de Qumran* 6 (1967-69): 89-107.

Bishop, W. S. "The High Priesthood of Christ as Set Forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Expositor,* 8.84 (1917): 401-23.

Bitzer, L. F. "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited." In *Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric*. Edited by K. V. Erickson. 141-155. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1974.

____. "The Rhetorical Situation." In *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*. Edited by W. A. Covino & D. A. Jolliffe. 300-310. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1995. Reprinted from *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1.1 (1968): 1-14.

Black, C. C., II. "Rhetorical Criticism." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by J. B. Green. 256-77. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

____. "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills," *Harvard Theological Review*, 81 (1988): 1-18.

Black, D. A. "The Problem of the Literary Structure of Hebrews: An Evaluation and a Proposal," *Grace Theological Journal* 7 (1986): 163–77.

Blass, F. "Die rythmische Komposition des Hebräerbriefes," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 3 (1902): 420-61.

____., A. Debrunner & R. W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blenkinsopp, J. "The Structure of P," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28 (1976): 275-92.

Bonus, A. "Heb. ii. 16 in the Peshitta Syriac Version," *Expository Times* 33 (1921-22): 234-36.

Bornkamm, G. "Das Bekenntnis im Hebräerbrief." In *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum*, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, 28. Munich: Kaisar, 1959, 188-203. Originally *Theologische Blätter* 21 (1942): 56-66.

Botha, P. J. J. "The Verbal Act of the Pauline Letters: Rhetoric, Performance and Presence." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 409-428. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Bourke, M. M. "The Epistle to the Hebrews." In *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, & R. E. Murphy. 920-41. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Bovon, F. "Le Christ, la foi et la sagesse dans l'Épître aux Hébreux," *Revue de Théologique et de Philosophie* 18 (1968): 129-44

Bowker, J. W. "Psalm CX," *Vetus Testamentum* 17 (1967): 31-41.

Brandenburger, E. "Text und Vorlagen von Hebr. V 7-10: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefs," *Novum Testamentum* 11 (1969): 190-224.

Braumann, G. "Hebr 5,7-10," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51 (1960): 278-80.

Bristol, L. O. "Primitive Christian Preaching and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 68 (1949): 89-97.

Brown, R. E. "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Comparison." In *New Testament Essays*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965, 246-253. Originally, "Incidents that are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John's Gospel," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 23 (1961): 143-61.

Bruce, A. B. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The First Apology for Christianity*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1899.

Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Tyndale, 1951.

____. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Revised Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.

____. "The Kerygma of Hebrews," *Interpretation* 23 (1969): 1-19.

____. "Recent Contributions to the Understanding of Hebrews," *Expository Times* 80 (1969): 260-64.

____. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester, Inter-Varsity: 1963.

____. "The Speeches of Acts–Thirty Years After." In *Reconciliation and Hope*. Edited by R. Banks. 53-68. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.

____. "'To the Hebrews': A Document of Roman Christianity?" In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Teil II: Principat*. Edited by W. Haase & H. Temporini. 25.4: 3496-3521. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987.

Buchanan, G.W. "The Present State of Scholarship on Hebrews." In *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. 4 volumes. Edited by J. Neusner. 1: 299-330. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975. Reprinted from Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

____. *To the Hebrews.* Anchor Bible 36. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972.

Büchsel, F. "Hebräerbrief." *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*. 2nd edition. 5 Volumes. Edited by H. Gunkel & L Zscharnack. 2: 1669-73. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1927-31.

Buck, D. E. "The Rhetorical Arrangement and Function of OT citations in the Book of Hebrews: Uncovering their Role in the Paraenetic Discourse of Access." PhD dissertation. Dallas Theological Seminary, 2002.

Bultmann, R. *History of the Synoptic Traditions*. Translated by J. Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963. Translation of *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1931.

Burggaller, E. "Neue Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief," *Theologische Rundschau* 13 (1910): 369-417.

Burns, D. K. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," *Expository Times* 47 (1935-36): 184-89.

Byrne, B. *"Sons of God" – "Seed of Abraham."* Analecta Biblica 83. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979.

Cadbury, H. J. "The Speeches in Acts." In *The Beginnings of Christianity*. 5 volumes. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson & K. Lake. 5: 402-426. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1979. Reprinted from London: Macmillan, 1922-1932.

Caird, G. B. "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 5 (1959): 44-51.

____. *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*. Harper New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

____. "Son by Appointment." In *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. 2 Volumes. Edited by W. C. Weinrich. 1: 73-82. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984.

Callender, D. E., Jr. "The Primal Man in Ezekiel and the Image of God." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers*. 2 Volumes. 2: 606-25. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 37. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1998.

Calvin, J. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistles of St Peter*. Translated by W. B. Johnston. Calvin's New Testament Commentaries 12. Grand Rapids, MI: 1963.

____. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. 2 Volumes. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981.

Campbell, J. C. "In a Son," *Interpretation* 10 (1956): 24-38.

Carroll, P. R. *Jesus and the Angels: Angelology and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Cerfaux, L. "Le sacre du grand prêtre," *Bible et Vie Chrétienne*. 21 (1958): 54-58.

Charles, J. D. "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 33 (1990): 171-78.

Charles, R. H. *Religious Development Between the Old and New Testament*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1914.

____. *The Revelation of St. John*. International Critical Commentary. 2 Volumes. Edinburgh: Clark, 1920.

Charlesworth, J. H. "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 3-35. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992.

Childs, B. S. "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," *Interpretation* 23 (1969): 20-31.

Cicero. *On the Orator*. 2 Volumes. Translated by E.W. Sutton & H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 348, 349. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942.

[____]. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by H. Caplan. Loeb Classical Library 403. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.

____. "Topics." In *On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics. A. Rhetorical Treatises*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. 377-460. Loeb Classical Library 386. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Clarkson, M. E. "The Antecedents of the High-Priestly Theme in Hebrews," *Anglican Theological Review* 29 (1947): 89-95.

Classen, C. J. "Paul and the Terminology of Ancient Greek Rhetoric." In *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*. 29-44. Leiden: Brill Academic, 2002. Reprinted from Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

____. "St Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 265-292. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Clines, D. J. A. "The Image of God in Man," *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968): 53-103.

____. *The Theme of the Pentateuch*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 10. Sheffield; JSOT Press, 1978.

Cockerill, G. L. "Heb 1:1-14, I Clem 36:1-6 and the High Priest Title," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 437-40.

Cody, A. *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspective*. St. Meinrad, Ind.: Grail, 1960.

Cole, H. R. "The Sabbath and Genesis 2:1-3," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41 (2003): 5-12.

____. "The Sacred Times Prescribed in the Pentateuch: Old Testament Indicators of the Extent of the Applicability." PhD dissertation. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1996.

Coloe, M. L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel.* Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 2001.

Colpe, C. "New Testament and Gnostic Christology." In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Supplement to *Numen* 14. Edited by J. Neusner. 227-43. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Compton, R. B. "Persevering and Falling Away: A Reexamination of Hebrews 6:4-6," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 1 (1996): 135-67.

Cosby, M. R. *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11 in Light of Example Lists in Antiquity*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.

____. "The Rhetorical Composition of Hebrews 11," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 107 (1988): 257-73.

Craddock, F. B. "The Letter to the Hebrews." In *The New Interpreter's Bible*. 12 volumes. Edited by L. E. Keck. 12: 1-173. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998.

____. *The Pre-existence of Christ in the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1968.

Craigie, P. C. *Psalms 1-50*. Word Biblical Commentary, 19. Dallas, TX: Word, 1983.

Creed, J. M. "Great Texts Reconsidered," *Expository Times* 50 (1938-39): 13-15.

*Creeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*. Edited by J. H. Leith. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1963.

Crim, K. R. *The Royal Psalms*. Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1962.

Croft S. J. L. *The Identity of the Individual in the Psalms*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 44. Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1987.

Croy, N. C. *Endurance in Suffering: Hebrews 12.1-13 in its Rhetorical, Religious and Philosophical Context*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Cullmann, O. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by S. C. Guthrie & C. A. M. Hall. London: SCM, 1959. Translation of *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*. Mohr (Siebeck): Tübingen, 1957.

____. *The Earliest Christian Confessions*. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth, 1949. Translation of *Les Premières Confessions de Foi Chrétiennes.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1943.

____. "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," *Expository Times* 71 (1959-60): 8-12, 39-43.

Cunningham, J. "The Humanity of Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Journal from the Radical Reformation* 6 (1997): 4-18.

Cyprian of Carthage. "Treatise XII: Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews." Translated by E. Wallis. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers.* 10 volumes. Edited by A. Roberts & J. Donaldson 5: 507-57. Peabody, MO: Henrickson, 1995. Originally: Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1886.

Dahood, M. "Chiasmus." In *Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1976

____. *Psalms*. 3 volumes. Anchor Bible 16-17A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965-1970.

Dahl, N. A. "Christ, Creation and the Church." In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*. Edited by W. D. Davies & D. Daube. 422-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

D'Angelo, M. R. *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 42. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1979.

Daube, D. "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 22 (1949): 239-64.

Davidson, A. B. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1882.

Davidson, R. M. "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19-20: The Old Testament Background," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 175-90.

____. "Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's 'Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited'" *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40 (2002): 69-88.

Davies, J. H. *A Letter to Hebrews*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

de Jonge, M. "Christian Influence on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 182-235.

____. "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *New Testament Studies*, 26.4 (1980): 508-24.

*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. 2 Volumes. Edited by F. C. Martínez & E. J. C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998.

Deichgräber, R. *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache un Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Deissmann, A. *Light from the Ancient East*. 2nd edition. Translated by L. R. M. Strachan. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911.

Delitzsch, F. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. 2 Volumes. Translated by T.L. Kingsbury. Edinburgh: Clark, 1871-72. Translation of *Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1857.

Delling, G. "πλήρης, πληρόω, πλήρωμα, ἀναπληρόω, ἐκπληρόω, ἐκπλήρωσις, συμπλψρόω, πλψροφορέω, πληροφορία." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* 10 Volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 6: 283-311. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Demarest, B. A. "Hebrews 7:3: A *Crux Interpretum* Historically Considered," *Evangelical Quarterly* 49 (1977): 141-62.

Denney, J. "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." In *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. 5 volumes. Edited by W. R. Nicholl. 2: 555-725. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980. Reprinted from London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.

Derrett, J. D. M. *Law in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman, Todd, 1970. Reprinted from Eugine, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005.

deSilva, D. A. *Bearing Christ's Reproach: The Challenge of Hebrews in an Honor Culture*. North Richmond Hills, TX: Bibal, 1999.

____. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 152. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1995.

____. "Despising Shame: A Cultural-Anthropological Investigation of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 439-61.

____. "Exchanging Favor for Wrath: Apostasy in Hebrews and Patron-Client Relationships," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 91-116.

____. "Hebrews 6:4-8: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation," *Tyndale Bulletin* 50 (1999): 33-57; 225-35.

____. *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

"Deuteronomy". Translated by J. Rabbinowitz. In *Midrash Rabbah*. 10 volumes. Edited by J. Rabbinowitz. London: Soncino, 1983.

Dhôtel, J-C. "La 'sanctification' du Christ d'après Hébreux, II, 11," *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses* 47 (1959): 515-43; 48 (1960): 420-52.

Di Marco, A-S. "Rhetoric and Hermeneutic–on a Rhetorical Pattern: Chiasmus and Circularity." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 479-91. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Dibelius, M. "Der himmlische Kultus nach dem Hebräerbrief." In *Botschaft und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze*. 2 volumes. 2: 160-76. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1956.

____. *Studies in the Book of Acts*. London: SCM, 1956. Translation of Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951.

Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Nisbet, 1952.

Dods, M. "The Epistle to the Hebrews." In *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. 5 Volumes. Edited by W. R. Nicoll. 4: 219-381. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980. Reprinted from London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.

Dolfe, K-G. "Hebrews 2,16 under the Magnifying Glass," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1993): 289-94.

Doukhan, J. B. *The Genesis Creation Story: Its Literary Structure*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 5. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978.

Driver, S. R. *The Book of Genesis*. Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen, 1904.

Dunbar, D. G. "The Relationship of Christ's Sonship and Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Master's Thesis. Westminster Theological Seminary, 1974.

Dunn, J. D. G. *Christology in the Making*. London: SCM, 1980.

____. *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 38A. Dallas, Tex: Word, 1988.

Dunnill, J. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

du Plessis, P. J. *ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ: The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament*. Kampen: Kok, 1959.

Dussaut, L. *Synopse Structurelle de l'Épître aux Hébreux: Approach d'Analyse Structurelle.* Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1981.

Eaton, J. H. *Kingship and the Psalms*. Studies in Biblical Theolgoy. Second Series. London: SCM, 1976.

Ebach, J. "Die Erschaffung des Menschen als Bild Gottes," *Pastoraltheologie: Wissenschaft und Praxis* 66 (1977): 198-214.

Edwards, T. C. "The Epistle to the Hebrews." In *The Expositor's Bible*. 25 volumes. Edited by W. R. Nicoll. New York: Armstrong, 1903.

Eisele, W. *Ein unerschütterliches Reich: Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief.* Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 116. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

Eisenbaum, P. M. "Father and Son: The Christology of Hebrews in Patrilineal Perspective." In *A Feminist Companion to the Catholic Epistles and Hebrews*. Edited by A-J. Levine. 127-46. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim, 2004.

____. "Heroes and History in Hebrews 11." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by C. A. Evans & J. A. Sanders. 380-396. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148/Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 5. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic, 1997.

____. *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 156. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1997.

Ellingworth, P. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.

____. "'Like the Son of God': Form and Content in Hebrews 7,1-10," *Biblica* 63 (1983): 255-62.

____. "Reading through Hebrews 1-7," *Epworth Review*, 12 (1985): 80-88.

Elliot, J. K. "When Jesus was apart from God:" An Examination of Hebrews 2:9," *Expository Times*, 83 (1972): 339-41.

Ellison, H. L. *The Centrality of the Messianic Idea for the Old Testament*. London: Tyndale, 1953.

Enns, P. "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1-4:13," *Westminster Theological Journal* 55 (1993): 255-80.

____. "The Interpretation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3:1-4:13." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by C. A. Evans & J. A. Sanders. 352-63. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148 / Studies in the Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Epictetus. *Discourses*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 131. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Eriksson, A. "Enthymemes in Pauline Argumentation: Reading between the Lines in 1 Corinthians." In *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 8. Edited by A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht & W. Übelacker. 243-59. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.

____. *Tradition as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argument is 1 Corinthians* Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 29. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998.

Evans, C. F. *The Theology of Rhetoric: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Dr Williams's Trust, 1988.

"Exodus." Translated by S. M. Lehrman. In *Midrash Rabbah*. 10 volumes. Edited by H. Freedman. London: Socino, 1983.

Exum C. & C. Talbert. "The Structure of Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts 20,18-35)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1976): 233-36.

Farrar, F. W. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.

Ferch, A. J. *The Son of Man in Daniel 7*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 6. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983.

Filson, F. V. *'Yesterday': A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 4. London: SCM, 1967.

Fisher, F.L. "The New and Greater Exodus: the Exodus Pattern in the New Testament," *South Western Journal of Theology* 20 (1977): 69-79

Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*. Anchor Bible 28A. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

Fletcher-Louis, C. H. T. "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 36 (1997): 161-93.

Fohrer, G. *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1968.

Ford, D. "A Rhetorical Study of Certain Pauline Addresses." PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1960.

Ford, J. M."The Mother of Jesus and the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *The Bible Today* 82 (1976): 683-94.

Fossum, J. "Son of God," In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6: 128-37. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

France, R. T. *Jesus and the Old Testament*. London: Tyndale, 1971. Reprinted from Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1982.

Francis, F. O. "The Christological Argument of Colossians." In *God's Christ and His People*. Edited by J. Jervell & W. A. Meeks. 192-208. Oslo: University of Oslo Press, 1977.

____. "Humility and Angelic Worship in Col 2:18." In *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies*. Edited by F. O. Francis & W. A. Meeks. 163-96. Revised. edition. Sources for Biblical Study 4. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975.

Frankowski, J. "Early Christian Hymns Recorded in the New Testament: A Reconsideration of the Question in the Light of Heb 1:3," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 27 (1983): 183-94.

Freedman D. N. & M. P. O'Connor. "כְּרוּב kᵉrûb **cherub**." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 volumes. Edited by J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H-J. Fabry. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromley, D. E. Green & D. W. Stott. 7: 307-19. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974-2006. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1970-95.

Fretheim, T. E. "The Book of Genesis: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections." In *New Interpreter's Bible*. 12 volumes. Edited by L.E. Keck. 1: 319-674. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994-98.

____. *Exodus*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1991.

Friedrich, G. "Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohenpriestererwartung in den Synoptikern," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 53 (1956): 265-311.

____. "Das Lied vom Hohenpriester im Zusammenhang von Hebr. 4,14-5–5,10," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 18 (1962): 95-115.

Frör, K. "Hebräer 11,1-2. 6. 8-10 (17-19)," *Göttinger Predigt-Meditationen* (1963-64): 107-12.

Fuller, R. H. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. New York: Scribners, 1965.

____. "Pre-Existence Christology: Can We Dispense with It?" *Word and World* 2 (1982): 29-33.

Gaffin, R. B., Jr. "A Sabbath Rest Still Awaits the People of God." In *Pressing Toward the Mark: Essays Commemorating Fifty Years of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*. Edited by C. G. Dennison & R C. Gamble. 33-51. Philadelphia, PA: Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1986.

Gage, W. A. *The Gospel in Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Carpenter, 1984.

Gager, J. G. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 16. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1972.

Gamble, H. Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.

Gammie, J. "A New Setting for Psalm 110," *Anglican Theological Review* 51 (1969): 4-17.

Gane, R. E. "Re-opening *katapetasma* ("Veil") in Hebrews 6:19," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38 (2000): 5-8.

Garnet, P. "Hebrews 2:9: ΧΑΠΙΤΙ or ΧΩΠΙΣ?" In *Studia Patristica XVIII*. 4 volumes. Edited by E.A. Livingstone. 1: 321-25. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1985.

Garvie, A. E. "The Pioneer of Faith and of Salvation," *Expository Times* 26 (1914-15): 502-04; 546-50.

Gayford, S. C. "The Aorist Participles in Heb i.3, vii.27, x.12," *Theology* 7 (1923): 282

____. *Sacrifice and Priesthood: Jewish and Christian*. 2nd edition. London: Methuen, 1953.

Gelardini, G. "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha be-Av*: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation." In *Hebrew: Contemporary Methods–New Insights*. Edited by G. Gelardini. 107-27. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Gemser, B. "The *Rib*- or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality." In *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East: Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 3. Edited by M. Noth & D. W. Thomas. 120-37. Leiden: Brill, 1960.

"Genesis" Translated by H. Freedman. In *Midrash Rabbah.* 10 Volumes. Edited by H. Freedman. London: Soncino, 1983.

Gerstenberger, E. S. *Psalms, Part 1 with and Introduction to Cultic Poetry*. Forms of Old Testament Literature, 14. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.

Gheorghita, R. *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/160. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Gilbert, G. H. "The Greek Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *American Journal of Theology* 14 (1910): 521-32.

Giles, P. "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Expository Times* 86 (1974-75): 328-32.

Gilliard, F. D. "More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non Omne Verbum Sonabat*," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 698-96.

Girdwood J. & P. Verkruyse. *Hebrews.* Joplin: MO: College Press, 1997.

Gadigow, B. "Roman Religion." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 5: 809-16. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Glasson, T. F. *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*. Studies in Biblical Theology 40. London: SCM, 1963.

Glenn, D. R. "Psalm 8 and Hebrews 2: A Case Study in Biblical Hermeneutics and Biblical Theology." In *Walvoord: A Tribute*. Edited by D. K. Campbell. 39-52. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1982.

Gnilka, J. "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament," *Revue de Qumran* 2 (1959-60): 395-426.

Goodspeed, E. A. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Gordon, R.P. *Hebrews*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Goulder, M. "Hebrews and the Ebionites," *New Testament Studies*, 49 (2003): 393-406.

Grässer, E. *An die Hebräer*. Evangelische-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 17. 3 Volumes. Zurich: Benziger, 1990-1997.

____. "Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn in Hebr 2,6." In *Jesus und der Menschensohn für Anton Vögtle*. Edited by R. Pesch & R. Schnackenburg. 404-14. Freiburg: Herder, 1975.

____. "Der Hebräerbrief 1938-1963," *Theologische Rundschau* 30 (1964-65): 138-236.

____. "Hebräer 1,1-4: Ein exegetischer Versuch." In *Evanelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament Vorarbeiten*. 4 volumes. 3: 55-92. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971. Republished in *Text und Situation: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament.* Gütersloh: Mohn, 1973, 182-230.

____. "Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesus in Hebräer 2,14-18." In *Theologia Crucis–Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by C. Andresen & G. Klein. 165-84. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1979.

____. "Mose und Jesus: Zur Auslegung von Hebr 3 1-6," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75 (1984): 1-23.

Gray, P. "Brotherly Love and the High Priest Christology of Hebrews," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 335-51.

Grogan, G. W. "Christ and His People: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5-18," *Vox Evangelica* 6 (1969): 54-71.

Grudem, W. "Perseverance of the Saints: A Case Study from Hebrews 6:4-6 and Other Warning Passages in Hebrews." In *The Grace of God, the Bondage of the Will*. 2 Volumes. Edited by T.R. Schreiner & B.A. Ware. 1:133-82. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1995.

Gunkel, H. *Genesis*. Translated by M. E. Biddle. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997. Translation of *Genesis*. 3rd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupricht, 1910.

____. *The Psalms*. Facet Books. Biblical Series 19. Translated by T. M. Horner. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1967. Translation of "Psalmen," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*. 2nd edition. 5 Volumes. Edited by H. Gunkel & L Zscharnack. 2: 1669-73. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1927-31.

Gurtner, D. M. "Καταππέτασμα: Lexicographical and Etymological Considerations on the Biblical 'Veil'," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40 (2002): 105-11.

____. "LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil," *Novum Testamentum* 47 (2005): 344-53.

____. "The Veil of the Temple in History and Legend," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49 (2006): 97-114.

Guthrie, D. *The Letter to the Hebrews*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983.

____ *Hebrews*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998.

____. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998. Reprint of Supplements to Novum Testamentum 73. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

____ & R. D. Quinn, "A Discourse Analysis of the Use of Psalm 8:4-6 in Hebrews 2:5-9," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49 (2006): 235-46.

Gyllenberg, R. "Die Christologie des Hebräerbriefes," *Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 11 (1933/34): 662-90.

Haber, S. "From Priestly Torah to Christ Cultus: The Re-Vision of Covenant and Cult in Hebrews," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (2005): 105-24.

Habinek, T. *Ancient Rhetoric and Oratory*. Blackwell Introductions to the Classical World. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

Haenchen, E. *John* 2 volumes. Hermeneia. Translated by R. W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984. Translation of *Das Johannesevangelium. Ein Kommentar.* Tübingen. Mohr (Siebeck), 1980.

Haensler, B. P. "Zu Hebr 13:10," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 11 (1913): 403-09.

Haering, T. "Gedankengang und Grundgedanken des Hebräerbriefs," *Zeitschrift für die Neuenstamentliche Wissenschaft* 18 (1917-18): 145-64.

Hagner, D. A. *Encountering the Book of Hebrews: An Exposition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002.

____. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 34. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Haleblain, K. "The Problem of Contextualization," *Missiology* 11 (1981), 95-111.

Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man.* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Harrington, D. J. *What are they Saying about The Letter to the Hebrews*. New York: Paulist, 2005.

Harris, J. R. "Sidelights on the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Sidelights on New Testament Research: Seven Lectures Delivered in 1908 at Regent's Park College, London*. 148-76. London: Clarke, 1908.

____. *Testimonies*. 2 Volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920-21.

Hasel, G. F. "The Meaning of 'Let Us' in Gn 1:26." *Andrews University Seminary Studies*. 13 (1975): 58-66.

____. "Sabbath," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 5: 849-56. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Hay, D. M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 18. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1973.

Heine, R. E. *Reading the Old Testament with the Ancient Church: Exploring the Formation of Early Christian Thought*. Evangelical Resourcement: Ancient Sources for the Church's Future. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007.

Heininger, B. "Sündenreinigung (Hebr 1,3): christologische Anmerkungen zum Exordium des Hebräerbriefs," *Biblische Zeitschrift*. New series 41 (1997): 54-68.

Helyer, L. R. "The Prōtokos Title in Hebrews," *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 6 no. 2 (1976): 3-28.

Henderson, A. "Hebrews ii.9," *Expository Times,* 7 (1895-96): 332-34.

Henderson, M. W. "The Priestly Ministry of Jesus in the Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Hebrews." PhD dissertation. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1965.

Hengel, M. "Christological Titles in Early Christianity." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 425-48. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992.

____. *The Son of God.* London: SCM, 1976.

Héring, J. *L'Épître aux Hébreux.* Commentaire du Nouveau Testament XII; Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1954.

Herr M. D. "Exodus Rabbah." In *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 16 volumes. Edited by C. Roth & G. Wigoder. 6: 1076-79. Jerusalem: Ketter, 1972.

Hewitt, T. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. London: Tyndale, 1960.

Hick J. "Theology and Verification." In *The Existence of God: A Reader*. Edited by J. Hick. 253-74. New York: MacMillan, 1964. Reprinted from *Theology Today*, 17 (1960): 12-31.

Hiebert, P. G. "Critical Contextualization," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 11 (1987 ) , 104-11.

Higgins, A. J. B. "The Priestly Messiah," *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966/67): 211-39.

Hillmann, W. "Der Hohepriester der künftigen Güter," *Bibel und Leben* 1 (1960): 157-78.

Hofius, O. "Inkarnation und Opfertod der Jesu nach Hebr 10,19f." In *Der Ruf Jesus und die Antwort der Gemeinde*. Edited by E. Lohse, C. Burchard & B. Schaller. 132-41. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

____. *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum neuen Testament 1/11. Tübingen: Mohr / Siebeck, 1970.

Holleran, A. W. *The Synoptic Gethsemane: A Critical Study.* Analecta Gregoriana 191. Series Facultatis Theologicae Secto B n. 61. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1973.

Hooker, M. D. *Jesus and the Servant*. London: SPCK, 1959.

____. *The Son of Man in Mark*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.

Hoppin, R. *Priscilla's Letter: Finding the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Fort Bragg, CA: Lost Coast, 1997.

Horton, F. L., Jr. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hughes, G. *Hebrews and Hermeneutics: The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament Example of Biblical Interpretation*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 36; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Hughes, P. E. "The Christology of Hebrews," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 28 (1987): 19-27.

____. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977.

____. "The Doctrine of Creation in Hebrews 11:3," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 2 (1972): 64-77.

Hurst, L. D. "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2." In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament: Studies in Christology in Memory of George Bradford Caird*. Edited by L. D. Hurst & N. T. Wright. 151-64. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

____. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

____. "Re-enter the Pre-existent Christ in Philippians 2.5-11?" *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 449-57.

Hurtado, L. W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

____. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. London: Continuum 1998. First edition: Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1988.

Hutaff, M. D. "The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Early Christian Sermon," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 99 (1978): 1816-24.

Isaacs, M. "Priesthood and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Heythrop Journal* 38 (1997): 51-62.

____. *Reading Hebrews and James: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.

____. *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 73. Sheffield: JSNT Press, 1992.

Jay, N. *Throughout your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion and Paternity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Jenni, E. "דמה *dmh* to be like." In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 3 volumes. Edited by E. Jenni & C. Westermann. Translated by M. E. Biddle. 1:339-42. Peabody, MO: Hendrickson, 1997. Translation of *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1984.

Jeremias, J. "Hbr 5.7-10.," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentlich Wissenschaft* 44 (1952-53): 107-11.

Jewett, R. *Letter to Pilgrims: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. New York: Pilgrim, 1981.

Johnson, L. T. *Hebrews*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

____. *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999.

Johnsson, W. G. "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews." PhD dissertation. Vanderbilt University, 1973.

____. *Hebrews*. Knox Preaching Guides. Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1980.

____. "Issues in the Interpretation of Hebrews," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 15 (1977): 169-88.

____. "The Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 239-51.

Jones, E. D. "The Authorship of Hebrews xiii," *Expository Times* 46 (1934-35): 562-67.

Jones, E. L. "Jesus and Moses in the New Testament," *Expository Times* 67 (1955/56): 104-06.

Josephus. "Contra Apionem." In *The Life / Against Apion* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. 161-411. Loeb Classical Library 186. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

____. *Jewish Antiquities*. 9 Volumes. Translated by H. St. J. Thackery, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren & L. H. Feldman. Loeb Classical Library 242, 490, 281, 326, 365, 489, 410, 433, 456. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930-65.

____. "The Life of Josephus." In *The Life / Against Apion* Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. 1-159. Loeb Classical Library 186. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Justin Martyr. "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 volumes. Edited by A. Roberts & J. Donaldson. 1: 194-270. Peabody, MO: Henrickson, 1995. Originally: Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1885.

____. "First Apology." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 volumes. Edited by A. Roberts & J. Donaldson. 1:159-87. Peabody, MO: Henrickson, 1995. Originally: Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1885.

Kaiser, W. C., Jr. "Experiencing the Old Testament 'Rest' of God." In *The Use of the Old Testament in the New*. 153-175. Chicago: Moody, 1985.

____. "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 130 (1973): 135-50.

Karrer M. *Der Brief an die Hebräer Kapital 1,1-5,10*. Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 20/1. Gütersloher Verlagshaus: Gütersloh, 2002.

Käsemann, E. "Hebräer 4,14-16." In *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen.* 2 Volumes. 1: 303-07. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960. Reprinted from *Göttingen Predigt-Meditationen*, 3, (1948): 63-67.

____. *Jesus Means Freedom*. Translated by F. Clarke. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969. Translation of *Der Ruf der Freiheit.* 3rd edition. Mohr (Siebeck), 1968.

____. *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*. Translated by R. A. Harrisville & I. L. Sandberg. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1984. Translation of *Das wandernde Gottesvolk: Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.

Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. London: Black, 1963.

Kearney, J. "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40," *Zeitschrift für die Altestamentliche Wiesenschaft* 89 (1987): 375-87.

Kendrick, A. C. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. An American Commentary on the New Testament. Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1889.

Kennedy, G. A. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

____. *New Testament Criticism Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Kistemaker, S. J. *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: van Soest, 1961.

Kittel, G. "ἀκούω, ἀκοή, εἰς-, ἐπ-, παρακούω, παρακοή, ὑπακούω, ὑπακοή, ὑπήκοος." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 1: 216-25. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1976. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Klauck, H-J. "Θυσιασθριον in Hebr 13:10 und bei Ignatius von Antiochien," *Studia Hierosolymitana* 3 (1982): 147-58.

Klein, G. "Hebräer 2,10-18," *Göttingen Predigt-Meditationen* (1963/64): 137-43.

Knox, J. *The Humanity and Divinity of Christ: A Study of Pattern in Christology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Koester, C. R. *Hebrews.* Anchor Bible 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Kraus, H-J. *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary*. Translated by H. C. Oswald. Continental Commentary. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1988. Translation of *Psalmen 1-59*. 5th edition. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.

____. *Psalms 60-150*. Translated by H. C. Oswald, Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1989. Translation of *Psalmen 60-150*. 5th edition. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.

Kuhn, K. G. "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by K. Stendahl. 54-64. New York: Crossroad, 1992. Originally New York: Harper, 1957.

Kümmel, W. G. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by H. C. Kee. London: SCM, 1975. Translation of *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* 17th revised edition. Heidelberg:: Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973.

Kuntz, J. K. "The Canonical Wisdom Psalms of Ancient Israel: Their Rhetorical, Thematic and Formal Dimensions." In *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by J. J. Jackson & M. Kessler. 186- 222. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 1. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 1974.

Kurianal, J. *Jesus our High Priest: Ps 110,4 as the Substructure of Heb 5,1-7,28*. European University Studies. Series XXIII: Theology: Volume 693. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000.

Kurtz, J. H. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Mitau: Neumann, 1869.

Laansma, J. *"I Will Give You Rest": The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum neuen Testament 2/98. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Ladd, G. E. *A Commentary on the Revelation of John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

Lambrecht, J. "Rhetorical Criticism and the New Testament," *Bijdragon* 50 (1989): 239-53.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Evidence in the New Testament for Early Creeds, Catechisms and Liturgy," *Expository Times* 71 (1959/60): 359-63.

____. "The New Testament Doctrine of *Ktisis*," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 17 (1964): 449-62.

Lane, W. L. *Hebrews 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 47A. Dallas, TX: Word, 1991.

____. *Hebrews 9-13*. Word Biblical Commentary 47B. Dallas, TX: Word, 1991.

____. "Hebrews: A Sermon in Search of a Setting," *South Western Journal of Theology* 28 (1985): 13-18.

Lanham, R. A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms: A Guide for Students of English Literature.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969.

Langkammer, H. "'Den er zum Erben von allem eingesetzt hat' (Hebr 1,2)," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 10 (1966): 273-80.

____. "Problemy literackie i genetyczne w Hbr 1,1-4," *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 16 (1969): 77-112.

Lategan, B. C. "Some Implications of Hebrews 2:5-18 for a Contextual Anthropology." In *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament. Essays in Honor of Hendrikus W. Boers*. Edited by T. W. Jennings, Jr. 149-61. Homage Series. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990.

Laub, F. *Bekenntnis und Auslegung: Die Paränetische Funktion der Christologie im Hebräerbrief.* Biblische Untersuchungen 15. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet 1980.

Lausberg, H. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Translated by M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, & D. E. Orton. Edited by D.E. Orton & R.D. Anderson. Leiden: Brill, 1998. Translation of *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturewissenschaft*. Ismaning bei München: Hueber, 1973.

Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*. London: SCM, 1966.

Leeming, B. "Christ the Priest," *The Way*, 5 (1965): 3-10.

Lehrman S. M. "Introduction: Exodus." In *Midrash Rabbah*. 10 volumes. Edited by H. Freedman. 3: vii-viii. London: Socino, 1983.

Leithart, P. J. "Womb of the World: Baptism and the Priesthood of the New Covenant in Hebrews 10:19-22," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 78 (2000): 48-65.

Lenski, R. C. H. *The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1961. Reprint from Colombus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938.

Leonard, W. *Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews: Critical Problems and the Use of the Old Testament*. Rome: Vatican Polyglot, 1939.

Leschert, D. F. *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study of the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms*. National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion Dissertation Series, 10. Lewiston, NY, Edwin Mellen, 1994.

Lescow, T. "Jesus in Gethsemane bei Lukas und im Hebräerbrief," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 58 (1967): 215-39.

Levison, J. R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Lickliter, J. N. "The Superiority of the Son in Hebrews 1:5-14: Introductory Formulas and Contextual Understanding of the Old Testament in the Book of Hebrews." Master's thesis. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004.

Lierman, J. *The New Testament Moses: Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion*. Wissenschaftlich Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/173. Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2004.

"The Life of Adam and Eve: A New Translation and Introduction." Translated by M. D. Johnson. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volumes. Edited by J. L. Charlesworth. 2:249-295. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.

Lightfoot, N. R. *Jesus Christ Today: A Commentary on the Book of Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1976.

Lincoln, A. T. "Hebrews and Biblical Theology." In *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation*. Scripture and Hermeneutic Series 5. Edited by C. Bartholomew, M. Healy, K. Möller & R. Parry. 313-38. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2004.

____. "Sabbath, Rest and Eschatology in the New Testament." In *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical and Theological Investigation*. Edited by D. A. Carson. 197-220. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982.

Lindars B. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

____. "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews," *New Testament Studies*, 35 (1989): 382-406.

Loader, W. R. G. "Christ at the Right Hand–Ps 110:1 in the New Testament," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977-78): 199-217.

____. "Hebräerbrief." In *Glaube in der Bewährung: Hebräer- und Jakobusbrief*. Bibelauslegung für die Praxis 25. By W. R. G. Loader & R. Hoppe. 7-90. Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990.

____. *Sohn und Hoherpriester: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum alten und neuen Testament 53. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1981.

Löhr, H. "Reflections on Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods–New Insights*. Edited by G. Gelardini. 199-210. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Lohse, E. "Χερουβίν." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 9: 438-438. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-76. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Longenecker, B. W. *Rhetoric at the Boundaries: The Art and Theology of New Testament Chain-Link Transitions*. Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2005.

Longenecker, R. N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Carlisle, Paternoster, 1985. Originally Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.

____. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Vancouver, Regent College, 1970.

____. "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews: A Study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression of New Testament Thought." In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*. Edited by R. A. Guelich. 161-85. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.

____. *New Wine into Fresh Wineskins: Contextualizing the Early Christian Confessions*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.

Lundbom, J. *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 18. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975.

Luther, M. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by J. T. Mueller. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1967.

____. "Lectures on Hebrews." Translated by W. A. Hansen. In *Luther's Works*. 55 volumes. Edited by J. Pelikan. 29: 107-241. St Louis, MO: Concordia 1968.

Maass, F. "אָדָם 'ādhām." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 volumes. Edited by J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H-J. Fabry. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromley, D. E. Green & D. W. Stott. 1: 75-87. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974-2006. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1970-95.

____. "אֱנוֹשׁ 'ᵉnôsh." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 volumes. Edited by J.Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H-J. Fabry. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromley, D. E. Green & D. W. Stott. 1: 345-348. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974-2006. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1970-95.

Mack, B. L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. New Testament Series. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.

Mackie, S. D. "Confession of the Son of God in Hebrews," *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 114-29.

____. *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/223. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

MacLeod, D. J. "The Literary Structure of the Book of Hebrews," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 146 (1989): 185-97.

MacNeill, H. L. *The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914.

MacRae, G. W. "A Kingdom that Cannot be Shaken: The Heavenly Jerusalem in the Letter to the Hebrews." in *Studies in the New Testament and Gnosticism*. Good News Studies 26. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1987): 98-112. Reprinted from *Tantar Yearbook* (1979-80): 27-40.

Manson, T. W. "Romans." In *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Revised edition. Edited by M. Black & H. H. Rowley. 940-53. Sunbury-on-Thames: Nelson, 1962.

Manson, W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsideration*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951.

Margot, J-C. "La christologie de l'Épître aux Hébreux," *Foi et Vie* 62 (1963): 299-311.

Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by G. Lamb. New York: Mentor, 1964. Translated from *Histoire de l'*éducation dans l'antiquité. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1948.

Marrow, S. B. "*Parrhesia* and the New Testament," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 431-46.

Marshall, I. H. "An Assessment of Recent Developments." In *Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D. A. Carson & H. G. M. Williamson. 1-21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. Reprinted in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by G. K. Beale. 195-216. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994.

Martin, R. P. *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Revised edition. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1983. Reprinted from Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Maurer, C. "'Erhört wegen der Gottesfurcht' Heb 5.7." In *Neues Testament und Geschiche: historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament*. *Oscar Cullmann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. Baltensweiler & B. Reicke. 275-84. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

Mays, J. L. "'What is Man ...?' Reflections on Psalm 8." In *From Faith to Faith: Essays in Honor of Donald G. Miller on his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by D.Y. Hadidian, 203-18. Pittsburg Theological Monograph Series 31. Pittsburg, PA: Pickwick, 1979.

Mazzaferri, F. D. *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 54. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989.

McCasland, S. V. "'The Image of God' According to Paul," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 85-100.

McCown, W. G. "Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΕΩΣ: The Nature and Function of the Hortatory Sections of the Epistle to the Hebrews." PhD dissertation. Union Theological Seminary, 1970.

McCruden, K. B. "The Perfection of Divine Intimacy: A Christology of Divine *Philanthropia* in Relation to the Concept of Christ's Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews." PhD dissertation. Loyola University, 2002.

McNicol, A. J. "The Relationship of the Image of the Highest Angel to the High Priest Concept in Hebrews." PhD dissertation. Vanderbilt University, 1974.

Meeks, W. A. "Why Study the New Testament?" *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 155-70.

Mees, M. "Die Hohepriester-Theologie der Hebräerbriefes im Vergleich mit dem ersten Chemensbrief," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 22 (1978): 115-24.

Meeter, H. H. *The Heavenly Priesthood of Christ: An Exegetico-Dogmatic Study*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans-Sevensma, 1916.

Meier, J. P. "Structure and Theology in Heb 1,1-14," *Biblica* 66 (1985): 168-89.

____. "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1,5-14," *Biblica* 66 (1985): 504-33.

Melbourne, B. L. "An Examination of the Historical-Jesus Motif in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 26 (1988): 281-97.

*Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah. Text and Translation*. 2 volumes. Edited and Trasnlated by John MacDonald. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 84. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963.

Menken, M. J. J. "The Psalms in Matthew's Gospel." In *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by S. Moyise & M. J. J. Menken. 61-82. London: Clark, 2004.

Meyers, C. "Cherubim." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 1: 889-890. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Michaelis, W. "πρῶτος, πρῶτον, πρωτοκαθεδρία, πρωτοκλισία, πρωτότοκος, πρωτοτοκεῖα, πρωτεύω." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* 10 Volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 6: 865-82. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Michel, O. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Meyer Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

____. "ὁμολογέω, ἐξομολογέω, ἀνθομολογέομαι, ὁμολογία, ὁμολογουμένως." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 5: 199-220. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-76. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Milligan, G. *The Theology of Hebrews*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000. Reprinted from Edinburgh: Clark, 1899.

Milligan, R. *Hebrews*. Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate, 1989. Reprinted from Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate, 1875.

Milligan, W. *The Ascension of Christ*. Minneapolis, MN: Klock & Klock, 1980. Reprinted from London: MacMillan and Co., 1891

Miller, D. G. "Why God Became Man: From Text to Sermon on Hebrews 2:5-18," *Interpretation* 23 (1969): 408-24.

Miller, P. D., Jr. *Genesis 1-11: Studies in Structure and Theme*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978.

Mitchell, A. C. "The Use of πρέπειν and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992): 681-701.

Mitchell, M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians.* Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 28. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1991.

Moe, O. "Das Priestertum Christi im NT ausserhalb des Hebräerbriefs," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 72 (1947): 335-38.

Moffatt, J. "The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Expository Times* 28 (1916-17): 505-08, 563-66; 29 (1917-18): 26-30.

____. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: Clark, 1924.

____. "Not Ashamed," *Expositor* 8.5 (1913): 285-86.

Montefiore, H. W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Black, 1964.

Morris, L. "Hebrews." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. 12 volumes. Edited by F. E. Gaebelein. 12: 1-158. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1979-81.

____. *The Revelation of St. John*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1969.

Moule, C. F. D. *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

____. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *Journal of Theological Studies*. New series 1 (1950): 29-41.

Mounce, R. H. *The Book of Revelation*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977.

Mowinckel, S. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. 2 Volumes. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962. Translation of *Offersang og sangoffer. Salmediktningen i Bibelen*. Oslo: Aschehoug (Nygaard), 1951.

Muilenburg, J. "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 1-18.

Murmelstein, B. "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928): 242-75; 36 (1929): 51-86.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. "Christological Anthropology Phil., II, 6-11," *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 25-50.

Nakagawa, H. "Christology in the Epistle to the Hebrews." PhD dissertation. Yale University, 1955.

Nairne, A. *The Epistle of Priesthood: Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1913.

____. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Narborough, F. D. V. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Clarendon Bible; Oxford: Clarendon, 1939.

Nicole, R. "Some Comments on Hebrews 6:4-6 and the Doctrine of the Perseverance of God with the Saints." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by his Former Students*. Edited by G.F. Hawthorne. 355-64. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.

Niederwimmer, K. "Vom Glauben der Pilger." In *Quaestiones theologicae: Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 90. Edited by W. Pratscher & M. Öhler. 207-16. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998.

Nolland, J. *Luke 18:35-24:53*. Word Biblical Commentary 35C. Dallas, TX: Word, 1993.

Nomoto, S. "Herkunft und Structur der Hohenpriestvorstellung im Hebräerbrief," *Novum Testamentum* 10 (1968): 10-25.

"Numbers." Translated by H. Freedman. In *Midrash Rabbah.* 10 volumes.. Edited by H. Freedman. London: Soncino, 1983.

Oberholtzer, T. K. "The Danger of Willful Sin in Hebrews 10:26-39," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 410-19.

____. "The Eschatological Salvation of Hebrews 1:5-2:5," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 83-97.

____. "The Failure to Heed his Speaking in Hebrews 12:25-29," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 146 (1989): 67-75.

____. "The Kingdom Rest in Hebrews 3:1-4:13," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 185-196.

____. "The Thorn Infested Ground in Hebrews 6:4-12," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 319-28.

Oberholzer, J. P. "What is Man ...?." In *De Fructu Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus van Selms*. Edited by I. H. Eybers, F.C. Fensham, C. J. Labuschagne, W.C. van Wyk & A. H. van Zyl. 144-151. Pretoria Oriental Series, 9. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Olbricht, T. H. "The Faith (Faithfulness) of Jesus in Hebrews." In *Renewing Traditions: Studies in Texts and Contexts in Honor of James W. Thompson*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 65. Edited by M. H. Hamilton, T. H. Olbricht & J. Peterson. 116-32. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2007.

____. "Hebrews as Amplification." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S.E. Porter & T.H. Olbricht. 375-87. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Omark, R. E. "The Saving of the Savior: Exegesis and Christology in Hebrews 5:7-10," *Interpretation* 12 (1958): 39-51.

O'Neill, J. C. "Hebrews 2:9," *Journal of Theological Studies*. New series 17 (1966): 79-82.

Orlov, A. A. "Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies," *Xristianskij Vostok: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912-1980)* 4 (2002): 740-55.

Oulton, J. E. L. "Great Texts Reconsidered: Hebrews 13:10," *Expository Times* 55 (1943-44): 303-05.

Parsons, M. C. "Son and High Priest: A Study in the Christology of Hebrews," *Evangelical Quarterly* 60 (1988): 195-215.

Patton, J. H. "Causation and Creativity in Rhetorical Situations: Distinctions and Implications," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65 (1979): 36-55

Paul, M. J. "The Order of Melchizedek (Psalms 110:4 and Hebrews 7:3): *Westminster Theological Journal* 49 (1987): 195-211.

Paulien, J. *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 11. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987.

Peake, A. S. *Hebrews*. Century Bible. London: Thomas Nelson, 1902.

Perdelwitz, R. "Das literarische Problem des Hebräerbriefs," *Zeitschrift für die Neuetestamentliche Wissenschaft* 11 (1910): 59-78, 105-123.

Peterson, D. *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Pfitzner, V. C. *Hebrews*. Chi Rho Commentaries. Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing, 1979.

Philo of Alexandria. "Allegorical Interpretations of Genesis II and III." In *Philo*, I. Translated by F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker. 139-484. Loeb Classical Library 226. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

____. "Concerning Noah's Work as a Planter."*Philo, III*. Translated by F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker. 205-317. Loeb Classical Library 247. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.

____. "Moses." In *Philo, VI*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 274-595. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

____. "On Abel and the Sacrifices Offered by Him and Cain." In *Philo, II*. Translated by G. P. Good. 88-195. Loeb Classical Library 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

____. "On Abraham." In *Philo, VI*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 1-135. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

____. "On Dreams that they are God-Sent." In *Philo V*. Translated by F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker. 285-580. Loeb Classical Library 275. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.

____. "On Mating with the Preliminary Studies." In *Philo, IV*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 451-551. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

____. "On Rewards and Punishments." In *Philo, VIII*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 309-423. Loeb Classical Library 341. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

____. "On the Account of the World's Creation given by Moses." In *Philo, I*. Translated by F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker. 1-137. Loeb Classical Library 226. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

____. "On the Change of Names." In *Philo, V*. Translated by F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker. 128-283 Loeb Classical Library 275. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.

____. "On the Cherubim, the Flaming Sword and Cain." In *Philo, II*. Translated by G. P. Good. 1-85. Loeb Classical Library 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

____. "On the Confusion of Tongues." *Philo, IV*. Translated by F. C. Colson & G. H. Whitaker. 2-119. Loeb Classical Library 261. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

____. "On the Giants." In *Philo, II*. Translated by G. P. Good. 441-79. Loeb Classical Library 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

____. "On the Posterity of Cain and his Exile." In *Philo, II*. Translated by G. P. Good. 441-79. Loeb Classical Library 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

____. "On the Special Laws." In *Philo, VI*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 3-155. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

____. "On the Virtues." In *Philo, VIII*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 158-305. Loeb Classical Library 341. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

____. "Who is the Heir of Divine Things." In *Philo IV*. Translated by F. H. Colson. 270-447. Loeb Classical Library 261. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Plato. "Gorgias." In *Plato, III*. Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. 247-533. Loeb Classical Library 166. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Plooij, D. "The Apostle and Faithful High Priest, Jesus." In *Studies in the Testimony Book*. 31-48. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche, 1932.

Porter, S. E. "Ancient Rhetorical Analysis and Discourse Analysis of the Pauline Corpus." In *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 249-74. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 146. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

____."The Theoretical Justification for Application of Rhetorical Categories to Pauline Epistolary Literature." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the*

*1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 100-22. Journal of the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

____ & J. T. Reed. "Philippians as a Macro-Chiasm and its Exegetical Significance," *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 213-31.

Powell, D. L. "Christ as High Priest in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Studia Evangelica. Vol 7: Papers Presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies held at Oxford, 1973*. Texte und Untersuchunge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 126. Edited by E. A. Livingston. 387-99. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982.

Preuss, H.D. "דָּמָה *damah*, דְּמוּת *dᵉmuth*." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 volumes. Edited by J.Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H-J. Fabry. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromley, D. E. Green & D. W. Stott. 3: 250-60. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974-2006. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1970-95.

Procksch O. & K. G. Kuhn, "ἅγιος, ἁγιάζω, ἁγιασμός, ἁγιότης, ἁγισύνη." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 Volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 1: 88-115. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-76. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Proudman, C. L. J. "Remarks on the 'Son of Man'," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 12 (1966): 128-31.

Pryor, J. W. "Hebrews and Incarnational Christology," *Reformed Theological Review* 40 (1979): 44-50.

"Pseudo-Eupolemus: A New Translation and Introduction." Translated by R. Doran. In *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 volumes. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2: 871-82. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.

"Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." Translated by D. J. Harrington. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volumes. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2: 297-377. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

Purdy, A. C. "The Epistle to the Hebrews: Introduction and Exegesis." In *The Interpreter's Bible*. 12 volumes. Edited by G. A. Buttrick 11: 575-763. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1952-57.

Pursiful, D. J. *The Cultic Motif in the Spirituality of the Book of Hebrews*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1993.

Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. 5 Volumes. Translated by D. A. Russell. Loeb Classical Library 124-127, 494. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Randall, E. L. "The Altar of Hebrews 13:10," *Australian Catholic Record* 46 (1969): 197-208.

Redmond, C. D. "Jesus: God's Agent of Creation," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 42 (2004): 287-303.

Reed, J. T. "The Epistle." In *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C. A.D. 400*. Edited by S. E. Porter. 171-193. Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997.

____. "Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 292-324. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Rengstorf, K. H. "ἀποστέλλω (πέμπω)· ἐξαποστγέλλω, ἀποστολος, ψευδαπόστολος, ἀποστολή." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 1: 398-447. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-76. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Reumann, J. *Variety and Unity in New Testament Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Rice, G. E. "Hebrews 6;19–Analysis of Some Assumptions Concerning *Katapetasma*," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25 (1987): 65-71.

Richardson, A. *Genesis 1-11*. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM, 1953.

Ringgren, H. *The Messiah in the Old Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology 18. London, SCM, 1956.

Rissi, M. "Die Menschlichkeit Jesu nach Hebr. 5,7-8," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 11 (1955): 28-45.

Robinson, D. W. B. "The Literary Structure of Hebrews 1:1-4," *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 2 (1972-73): 178-86.

Robinson, T. H. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1933.

Roloff, J. "Der mitleidende Hohepriester." In *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by G. Strecker. 143-66. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1975.

Rooke, D. W. "Jesus as Royal Priest: Reflections on the Interpretation of the Melchizedek Tradition in Heb 7," *Biblica* 81 (2000): 81-94.

____. "Kingship as Priesthood: the Relationship between the High Priest and the Monarchy." In *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar.* Edited by J. Day. 187-208. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

Rorty, A.O. "Structuring Rhetoric." In *Essays on Aristotle's* Rhetoric. Edited by A. O. Rorty. 1-33. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1996.

Rowe, G. O. "Style." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*. Edited by S. E. Porter. 121-58. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Rowley, H. H. "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)." In *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet*. Edited by W. Baumgartner, O. Eissfeldt, K. Elliger & L. Rost. 461-72. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1950.

Ruager, S. "'Wir haben einen Altar' (Heb 13:10): Einige Überlegungen zum Thema: Gottesdienst/Abendmahl im Hebräerbrief," *Kerygma und Dogma* 36 (1990): 72-77.

Sabourin, L. *Priesthood: A Comparative Study*. Supplement to Numem 25. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Sailhamer, J. H. *The Pentateuch as Narrative.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.

Sanders, J. T. *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Sarna, N. M. *Genesis*. Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

Saucy, M. "Exaltation Christology in Hebrews: What Kind of Reign?" *Trinity Journal*. New series 14 (1993): 41-62.

Schaefer, J. R. "The Relationship between Priestly and Servant Messianism in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968): 359-85.

Schäfer, K. T. "ΚΡΑΤΕΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ (Hbr 4,14)." In *Die Kirche im Wandel der Zeit: Festgabe für Joseph Kardinal Höffner*. Edited by F. Groner. 59-70. Cologne: J. P. Bachem, 1971.

Schenck, K. L. "A Celebration of the Enthroned Son: The Catena of Hebrews 1," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001): 469-85.

Schenk, W. "προσφέρω." In *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 Volumes. Edited by H. Balz & G. Schneider. Translated by V.P. Howard, J. W. Thompson, J. W. Medendorp & D. W. Stott. 3: 177-78. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993. Translation of *Exegetische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1983.

Schenkeveld D. M. "Philosophical Prose." In *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C. A.D. 400*. Edited by S. E. Porter. 195-264. Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997.

Schille, G. "Erwägungen zur Hohepriesterlehre des Hebräerbriefes," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46 (1955): 81-109.

____. "Katechese und Taufliturgie: Erwägungen zu Heb 11," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51 (1966): 112-31.

Schmidt, K. L. & M. A. "σκληρύνω." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 Volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 5: 1030-31. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1976. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Schmidt, T. E. "The Letter *Tau* as the Cross; Ornament and Content in Hebrews 2,14," *Biblica* 76 (1995): 75-84.

____. "Moral Lethargy and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Westminster Theological Journal* 54 (1992): 167-73.

Schmithals, W. "Über Empfänger und Anlaß des Hebräerbriefes." In *Eschatologie und Schöpfung: Festschrift für Erich Gräßer*. Edited by M. Evang, H. Merklein & M. Wolter. 321-42. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 89. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.

Scholar, J. M. *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 49. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Schweizer, E. "Concerning the Speeches of Acts." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by L. E. Keck & J. L. Martyn. 208-16. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1966.

Scott, E. F. "The Epistle to the Hebrews and Roman Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review* 13 (1920): 205-19.

"2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." Translated by
F. I. Anderson. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volumes. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2: 91-221. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

Seneca. *Moral Essays*, *Volume III / De Beneficiis*. Translated by J. W. Basore. Loeb Classical Library 310. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

____. *Epistulae Morales II: Letters LXVI-XCII / Moral Letters, Epistles 66-92*. Translated by R. M. Gummere. Loeb Classical Library 76. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

*Septuaginta*. Edited by A. Rahlfs. 2 Volumes in 1. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935.

Shaw, H. *Dictionary of Literary Terms*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Sherman, C. P. "'A Great High Priest' (Hebrews iv.14)," *Expository Times* 34 (1922-23): 235-36.

Simpson, C. A. "The Book of Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis." In *Interpreter's Bible*. 12 volumes. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 1: 437-829. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1952-57.

Slusser, M. "Reading Silently in Antiquity," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 499.

Smith, W. R. "Christ and the Angels: Hebrews 1," *Expositor*. 2.1 (1881): 25-33.

____. "Christ and the Angels: Hebrews ii. 11-17," *Expositor*. 2.3 (1882): 63-79.

Snell, A. "'We Have and Altar'," *Reformed Theological Review* 23 (1964): 16-23.

Songer, H. S. "A Superior Priesthood: Hebrews 4:14-7:28," *Review and Expositor* 82 (1985): 345-59.

Sowers, S. G. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Basil Studies in Theology 1. Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1965.

Speiser, E. A. *Genesis*. Anchor Bible 1. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982.

Spencer, R. A. Review of *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11: In Light of Example Lists in Antiquity* by Michael R. Cosby. *Faith and Mission* 7 (1989): 94-65.

Spencer, W. H. "Hebrews 13:10," *Expository Times* 50 (1938-39): 484.

Spicq, C. *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 2 Volumes. Paris: Gabalda, 1952.

____. "L'Origine johannique de la conception du Christ-prêtre dans l'Épître aux Hébreux." In *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne: Melanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*. 258-69. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950.

____. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. 3 Volumes. Translated by J. D. Ernst. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1994.

Stadelmann, A. "Zum Christologie des Hebräerbriefes in der neueren Diskussion." In *Theologische Berichte 2*. Edited by J. Pfammatter & F. Furger. 135-221. Zürich: Zwingli, 1973.

Stamps, D. L. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: The Entextualization of the Situation in New Testament Epistles." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter & T. H. Olbricht. 193-210. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Stanley, C. D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Clark, 2004.

Steenburg, D. "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39 (1990): 95-109.

Stendebach, F. J. "צֶלֶם selem." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 volumes. Edited by J.Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H-J. Fabry. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromley, D. E. Green & D. W. Stott. 12: 386-96. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974-2006. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1970-95.

Steudel, A. "God and Belial." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after their Discovery 1947-1997*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov & J. C. VanderKam. 332-40. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

Stewart, R. A. "The Sinless High Priest," *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967-68): 126-35.

Stibbs, A. M. "Hebrews." In *The New Bible Commentary Revised*. Edited by D. Guthrie & J. A. Motyer. 1191-1221. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1970.

Stine, D. M. "The Finality of the Christian Faith: A Study of the Unfolding Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Chapters 1-7." PhD dissertation. Princeton Theological Seminary, 1964.

Strathmann, H. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. With J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968. Reprint of 1936 edition.

Strecker, G. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by M. E. Boring. New York: de Gruyter, 2000. Translation of *Theologie des Neues Testaments*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.

Strobel, A. "Die Psalmengrundlage der Gethsemane-Parallele Hebr 5:7ff," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 45 (1954): 252-66.

Stylianopoulos, T. G. "Shadow and Reality: Reflections on Hebrews 10:1-18," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 17 (1972): 215-30.

Sumney, J. L. "The Argument of Colossians," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 8. Edited by A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht & W. Übelacker. 339-52. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.

Sundberg, A. C., Jr. "On Testimonies," *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959): 268-81. Reprinted as "Response Against C. H. Dodd's View: On Testimonies." In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Edited by G. K. Beale. 182-94. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994.

Swetnam, J. "Christology and Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Biblica* 70 (1989): 74-95.

____. "'The Greater and More Perfect Tent.' A Contribution to the Discussion of Hebrews 9,11," *Biblica* 47 (1966): 90-106.

____. "A Merciful and Trustworthy High Priest," *Pacific Journal of Theology*. 2/21 (1999): 6-25.

____. "On the Literary genre of the 'Epistle' to the Hebrews," *Novum Testamentum* 11 (1969): 261-69.

____. "The Structure of Hebrews 1,1 -3,6," *Melita Theologica* 43 (1992): 58-66.

Synge, F. C. *Hebrews and the Scriptures*. London: SPCK, 1959.

Talbert, C. H. "The Problem of Pre-existence in Philippians 2 6-11," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (1967): 141-53.

Tasker, D. R. "The People of God in the Prophetic Literature." In *"For You Have Strengthened Me": Biblical and Theological Studies in Honor of Gerhard Pfandl in Celebration of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by M. Pröbstle, G. A Klingbeil & M. G. Klingbeil. 75-84. St Peter am Hart: Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, 2007.

Tasker, R. V. G. *The Gospel in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Tyndale, 1950.

Taylor, R. O. P. "A Neglected Clue in Hebrews xi.1," *Expository Times* 52 (1941): 256-59.

Taylor, V. *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indexes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1981. Originally London: Macmillan, 1966.

____. *The Names of Jesus*. London: Macmillan, 1962.

Tertullian. "Against Marcion." Translated by E. C. Coxe. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 volumes. Edited by A. Roberts & J. Donaldson. 3: 269-47. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994. Reprinted from Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing, 1885.

"Testament [Assumption] of Moses: A New Translation and Introduction." Translated by J. Priest. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volumes. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 1: 919-34. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

Tetley, J. "The Priesthood of Christ in Hebrews," *Anvil* 5 (1988): 195-206.

Thayer, J. H. "Authorship and Canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 24 (1867): 681-722.

Theißen, G. *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief*. Studien zum Neuen Testament 2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969.

Thielman, F. *Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005.

Thiessen, M. "Hebrews and the End of the Exodus," *Novum Testamentum* 49 (2007): 353-69.

Thompson, J. W. "Hebrews 5:11-14 and Greek *Paideia*." In *The Beginning of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 13. 17-40. Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.

____. "The Structure and Purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5-13," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976): 352-63. Reprinted in *The Beginning of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly

Monograph Series 13. 128-40. Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.

Thurén, L. L. "Romans 7 Derhetorized." In *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. Edited by S. E. Porter & D. L. Stamps. 403-40. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 195. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.

____. "The General New Testament Writings." In *The Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*. Edited by S. E. Porter. 587-607. Leiden: Brill Academic, 2001.

Torrance, T. F. *Royal Priesthood*. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 3. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1955.

Torrey, C. C. "The Authorship and Character of the So-called 'Epistle to the Hebrews'," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 30 (1911): 145-56.

Turner, L. A. *Genesis* (Readings: A New Biblical Commenatary; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Übelacker, W. G. *Der Hebräerbrief als Appel: Untersuchungen zur Exordium, Narratio and Postscriptum (Hebr 1-2 und 13,22-25)*. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 21. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1989.

____. "Hebrews and the Implied Author's Rhetorical Ethics." In *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion in Biblical Discourse*. Edited by T. H. Olbricht & A. Eriksson. 316-33. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 11. New York: Continuum, 2003.

Ulrichsen, J. H. "Διαφορώτερον ὄνομα in Hebr 1:4: Christus als Trager des Gottesnamens," *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984): 65-75.

Ungeheuer, J. *Der große Priester über dem Hause Gottes: Die Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*. Würzburg: H. Stürtz, 1939.

Vaganay, L. "Le Plan de l'Épître aux Hébreux." In *Mémorial Lagrange*. Paris: Gabalda, 1940, 269–77.

van Unnik, W. C. "The Christian Freedom of Speech in the New Testament," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 44 (1961-62), 466-88.

VanGemeren, W. A. "Psalms." In *Expositor's Bible Commentary*. 12 volumes. Edited by F. E. Gaebelein. 5: 1-880. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1979-81.

Vanhoye, A. "De structura litteraria Epistulae ad Hebraeos," *Verbum Domini* 40 (1962): 73–80.

____. "Discussion sur la structure de l'Épître aux Hébreux," *Biblica* 55 (1974) 349–80.

____. "Les indices de la structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux." In *Studia Evangelica, Volume 2: Papers Presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1961*. 2 volumes. Edited by F. L. Cross. 493–509. Texte und Untersuchungen 87. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964.

____. "L'οἰκουμένη dans l'Épître aux Hébreux," *Biblica* 45 (1964): 248-53.

____. *Our Priest is Christ*. Rome, Pontifical Institute, 1977.

____. "Par la tente plus grande et plus parfaite . . . .' (He 9,11)," *Biblica* 46 (1965): 1-28.

____. Review of *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, by C. R. Koester. *Biblica* 84 (2003): 291-94.

____. *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1-2*. Lectio Divina 58. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1969.

____. *Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Subsidia Biblica 12. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989.

____. "La structure centrale de l'Épître aux Hébreux (Heb. 8/1–9/28)," *Recherches de science religieuse* 47 (1959): 44–60.

____. "Structure littéraire et thèmes théologique de l'Épître aux Hébreux." In *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. 2:175–81. Analecta Biblica 17–18. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

Vatz, R. E. "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." In *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*. Edited by W. A. Covino & D. A. Jolliffe. 461-467. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1995. Reprinted from *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6 (1973): 154-61.

Vawter, B. *On Genesis A New Reading*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977.

____. "Levitical Messianism and the New Testament." In *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*. Edited by J. L. McKenzie. 83-99. Saint Mary's Theological Studies 1. New York: Herder & Herder, 1962.

von Harnack, A. "Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs," *Zeitschrift für die Neuentestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1 (1900): 16-41.

____. "Zwei alte dogmatische Korrekturen im Hebräerbrief." In *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testament und der alten Kirche. I: Zur*

*neutestamentlichen Textkritik*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 19. 235-52. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931.

von Rad, G. *Genesis*. London: SCM, 1961.

von Soden, H. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Freiburg: Mohr, 1899.

Vos, G. "The Priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Princeton Theological Review* 5 (1907): 423-47; 579-604.

____. *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1956. Reprinted from Eugene OR: Wipf & Stock, 2001.

Walker, P. "A Place for Hebrews? Contexts for a First-Century Sermon." In *The New Testament in its First Century Setting*. Edited by P. J. Williams, A. D. Clarke, P. M. Head & D. Instone-Brewer. 231-49. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wallace, D. B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

____. "Hebrews 2:3-4 and the Sign Gifts." http://www.bible.org/docs/soapbox/heb2-3-2.htm. Accessed February 28, 2008.

Wallace, H. N. "Adam (Person)." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 1: 62-64. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Wallis, W.B. "The Use of Psalms 8 and 110 in I Corinthians 15:25-27 and in Hebrews 1 and 2," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 15 (1972): 25-29.

Walton, S. "Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction," *Themelios* 21 (1996): 4-9.

Warner, M. "The Fourth Gospel's Art of Rational Persuasion." In *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*. Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature. Edited by M. Warner. 153-77. London: Routledge, 1990.

Watson, D. F. *Invention, Arrangement and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*. Society for Biblical Literature Doctoral Dissertation Series 104. Atlanta GA: Scholars, 1988.

____. "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts 20:17-38): Epideictic Rhetoric of Farewell." In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Edited by D. F. Watson. 184-208. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 50; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

____. "Rhetorical Criticism of Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles since 1978," *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 5 (1997): 175-207.

Weinandy, T. G. "The Supremacy of Christ: Aquinas' *Commentary on Hebrews.*" In *Aquinas in Scripture: An Introduction to his Biblical Commentaries*. Edited by T. G. Weinandy, D. A. Keating & J. P. Yocum. 233-44. London: Clark, 2005.

Weiser, A. *The Psalms*. Translated by H. Hartwell. Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1962.

Weiss, B. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Meyer Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897.

Weiss, H.-F. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Meyer Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Weiss, K. "φέρω, ἀναφέρω, διεφέρω, τὰ διαφέροντα, διάφορος, (ἀδιάφορον)· εἰσφέρω, προσφέρω, προσφοφά, συμφέρω, σύμφορος, φορέω, φορτίον, φορτίζω." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 volumes. Edited by G. Kittel & G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 9: 56-87. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-76. Translation of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1933-79.

Wenham, G. J. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary 1. Dallas TX: Word, 1987.

____. "Were David's Sons Priests?" *Zeitschrift für die Altestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87 (1975): 79-82.

____. "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* 9 (1986): 19-25.

Werner, E. *The Sacred Bridge: Liturgical Parallels in Synagogue and Early Church*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. Reprinted from New York: Schocken, 1970.

Westcott, B. F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays*. 3rd edition. London: MacMillan: 1909 [1st ed.: 1890].

Westermann, C. *Genesis 1-11*. Translated by J. J. Scullion. Continental Commentary. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994. Translation of *Genesis. 1. Teilband: Genesis 1-11*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.

____. *Praise and Lament in the Psalms*. Translated by K. R. Crim & R. N. Soulen. Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1981. Translation of *Lob und Klagen in den Psalmen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Westfall, C. L. "Moses and Hebrews 3.1-6: Approach or Avoidance?" In *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Edited by S. E. Porter &

B.W. R. Pearson. 175-201. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 192 / Roehampton Papers 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

Widdess, A. G. "A Note on Hebrews XI.3," *Journal of Theological Studies.* New series 10 (1959): 327-29.

Wilcox, M. "A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts." In *Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults*. 4 volumes. Edited by J. Neusner. 1: 206-225. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004. Reprinted from Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Wildberger H. "צֶלֶם *selem* image." In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 3 volumes. Edited by E. Jenni & C. Westermann. 3:1080-85. Peabody, MO: Hendrickson, 1997. Translation of *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1984.

Wiles, M. "A Survey of the Issues in the Myth Debate." In *Incarnation and Myth: The Debate Continues*. Edited by M. Goulder 1-12. London: SCM, 1979.

Williamson, R. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Epworth, 1964.

____. "Hebrews $4^{15}$ and the Sinlessness of Jesus," *Expository Times* 86 (1974): 4-8.

____. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums 4. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Wills, L. "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review* 77 (1984), 277-99.

Wilson, J. P. "The Interpretation of Hebrews 13:10," *Expository Times* 50 (1938-39): 380-81.

Wilson, R. McL. *Hebrews.* New Century Bible. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans: 1987.

Wilson, R. R. "The Death of the King of Tyre: The Editorial History of Ezekiel 28." In *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*. Edited by J. H. Marks & R. M. Good. 211-28. Guilford, Conn.: Four Quarters, 1987.

Windisch, H. *Der Hebräerbrief.* Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1931.

Wray, J. H. "An Exhortation to Faithfulness: Hebrews." In *Chalice Introduction to the New Testament*. Edited by D.E. Smith. 281-306. St Louis, MO: Chalice, 2004.

____. *Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth Early Christian Homiletics of Rest*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 166. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1998.

Wuellner, W. "Biblical Exegesis in the Light of the History and Historicity of Rhetoric and the Nature of the Rhetoric of Religion." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S.E. Porter & T.H. Olbricht. 492-513. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

____. "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 448-63.

Wuttke, G. *Melchisedech der Priestkönig von Salem*: *Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese.* Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 5. Gießen: Töpelman, 1927.

Yadin, Y. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1958): 36-55.

Yeo, K-K. "The Meaning and Usage of the Theology of 'Rest' (καταπαυσις and σαββατισμοσς) in Hebrews 3:7-4:13," *Asia Journal of Theology* 5 (1991): 2-33.

Young, N. H. "Αἱματεκχυσία: A Comment," *Expository Times* 90 (1978-79): 180.

____. "'Bearing His Reproach' (Heb 13.9-14)," *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002): 243-61.

____. "The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40 (2002): 61-68

____. "The Gospel according to Hebrews 9," *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 198-210.

____. "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the Thought of the New Testament." PhD dissertation. University of Manchester: 1973.

____. "Suffering: A Key to the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Australian Biblical Review* 51 (2003): 47-59.

____. "'Where Jesus has gone as a Forerunner on our behalf' (Hebrews 6:20)," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 165-73.

Zimmermann, H. *Das Bekenntnis der Hoffnung: Tradition und Redaktion im Hebräerbrief.* Bonner Biblische Beiträge 47. Cologne: Peter Hanstein, 1977.

____. *Die Hohepriester-Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1964.

Zweck, D. "The *Exordium* of the Areopagus Speech, Acts 17:22,23," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 94-103.