Angela Costley

Creation and Christ

An Exploration of the Topic of
Creation in the Epistle to the Hebrews
Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in Theology at the
Pontifical University, St. Patrick's
College, Maynooth
2017-2018

Preface

This work is a revised version of my PhD thesis, completed at St. Patrick's College, the Pontifical University, Maynooth between 2013 and 2018, under the supervision of Rev. Dr. Jeremy Corley. It was inspired by a course undertaken at the same university, taught by Rev. Anthony O'Leary CP, in which I examined the theme of creation in Heb 1–2 as part of the assessment process. As part of the course on Hebrews at Maynooth, we naturally covered the more commonly discussed theme in the Epistle, the high priesthood of Christ. However, as I began to look at Hebrews more closely, I saw that the term high priest is not so common in the first four chapters of Hebrews, occurring only four times with a further reference to sacrifice in 1:3. Rather than emphasising the sacrificial activity of Christ, the opening section is replete with a number of references to creation: 1:2–3,10–12, 2:5–9, 10; 3:1–6; 4:3–4 and 4:9–10. This prompted me to ask why creation was being referenced so many times, and, indeed, in so many different ways. There was no one word that connected all the mentions of creation and Hebrews was not making references only to the Genesis account, but also to psalms, most notably 102, 8 and 95, in that order. This prompted an essay of around 2,000 words to begin with, but it only covered chapters 1–2, and it became clear that a much bigger investigation was needed. The result is this study, and a close analsysis of Hebrews' discourse in its opening four chapters that is contained herein.

The research proceeds by examining Hebrews' references to creation sequentially, hoping to gather insights into the purpose of the references to creation from the point of view of linearization. In the course of this investigation, I try to grapple with interpretational questions from a discourse analysis perspective, including intertextual analysis, and thus hope to contribute to a scholarly understanding of the discourse of Hebrews. I highlight important connections between the topic of creation and the Son's salvific activity and look at the impact of taking seriously the references to creation on some of the questions long posed of the text, such as the meaning of "rest" in Heb 3–4. It is hoped that this investigation will prompt further discourse analysis investigations into this topic in the later chapter of Hebrews and perhaps even into the theme of creation in other New Testament books.

I would like to express my gratitude to my PhD supervisor, Rev. Dr. Jeremy Corley. We first met, very briefly, many years ago at Ushaw College when I was

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review*
AJT	*American Journal of Theology*
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
AUS	American University Studies
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
BLS	Bible and Literature Series
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BSac	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Theology and Exegesis
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
CJT	*Canadian Journal of Theology*
ConBNT	Coniectanea Neotestamentica/Coniectanea Biblia: New Testament
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DCH	Clines, David J. A. *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1993–2014.
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JAL	Jewish Apocryphal Literature Series
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JGRChJ	*Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*

JSem	*Journal of Semitics*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer Kommentar)
L&N	Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
LCL	*Loeb Classical Library*
LD	Lectio Divina
LHBOTS	The Library of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LQ	*Lutheran Quarterly*
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTL	New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Message
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
NumenSup	Supplements to Numen: International Review for the History of Religions
OECS	Oxford Early Christian Studies
OTL	Old Testament Library
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCM	SCM Press
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SE	Studia Evangelica
SIL	Summer Institute of Linguistics
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World
SP	Sacra Pagina
SPhiloA	Studia Philonica Annual
StBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature

STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPatr	Studia Patristica
SubBi	Subsidia Biblica
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
ThTo	*Theology Today*
TJ	*Trinity Journal*
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Philo of Alexandria Texts:

Abr.	De Abrahamo
Aet.	De Aeternitate Mundi
Agr.	De Agricultura
Cher.	De Cherubim
Conf.	De Confusione Linguarum
Decal.	De decalogo
Deo	De Deo
Det.	Quod Deterius Potiori insidari soleat
Deus	Quod Deus sit immutabilis
Ebr.	De ebrietate
Fug.	De fuga et inventione
Her.	Quis rerum divinarum heres sit
Leg. 1, 2, 3	Legum allegoriae I, II, III
Migr.	De migratione Abrahami
Mos. 1, 2	De vita Mosis I, II
Mut.	De mutatione nominum
Opif.	De Opificio Mundi
Plant.	De Plantatione
Post.	De Posteritate Caini
QE 1, 2	Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum I, II
Sacr.	De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini
Somn 1, 2	De Somniis I, II
Spec. 1, 2, 3, 4	De specialibus legibus I, II, III, IV
Virt.	De virtutibus

Other Texts:

Gen. Rab.	Genesis Rabbah
Il	Homer, *The Iliad*
m. Yoma	Mishnah Yoma
Pirque Rab. El.	Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer
Tim.	Plato, *Timaeus*
Trach.	Sophocles, *Women of Trachis*

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Impetus For this Research

The Epistle to the Hebrews has been the subject of much investigation and controversy, and is renowned as one of the most eloquent texts in the New Testament. It seeks to communicate the importance of the definitive word of God spoken through the Son, who has offered the ultimate sacrifice for sin, and also to warn of the danger of falling away from faith in Christ (e. g., 1:1–4; 2:10–18; 3:12; 4:11; 9:12; 10:23). Though the historical identity of the author, once assumed to be Paul, remains unknown, the Epistle's place in the canons of East and West is secured for the theology and christology it contains. Most notably, Hebrews is usually associated with the theology of Christ's priesthood, especially his entering behind the veil (6:19 and 9:3), taking with him his own blood in atonement for sin. From the writings of Clement (*1 Clem.* 36:1–6) to modern scholarship, such as Vanhoye's "*A Different Priest*" or Mason's "*You are a Priest Forever*," this topic has been the focus of much interpretation and research.[1] However, it could be argued that this focus on the priestly Christ has led to other themes in Hebrews' being overlooked. Creation is one such topic.

The Epistle opens with a strong declaration that, whilst God has previously spoken through the prophets, he now speaks through his Son "through whom he also made (ἐποίησεν) the aeons (αἰῶνας)" (1:2), and the next four chapters are replete with references to the topic of creation more generally. From Ps 102:25–27 being applied to the Son as the one who "founded the earth" (1:10), to the status of humanity in the beginning (2:5–9), to exhortations on the importance of entering God's Sabbath rest (3–4), creation is clearly a subject central to Hebrews' argumentation. Hebrews 11:3 also reads "By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was made from things that are not visible" (NRSV). This statement brings the Epistle back to this very subject as it enters its final sections. Yet, although cre-

---

[1] Albert Vanhoye, *A Different Priest: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Series Rhetorica Semitica, trans. Leo Arnold (Miami: Convivium, 2011); trans. of *Prêtres Anciens, Prêtres Nouveau Selon le Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Seuil, 1980); and Eric Farrel Mason, *"You are a Priest Forever": Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, STDJ 74 (Leiden: Brill, 2008). In this thesis, I follow the convention of calling the text an epistle, even if below I propose that another genre is more apt.

ation is evidently a theme in Hebrews, I have been unable to locate any monograph written specifically about this topic. It is thus hoped that the present study will prove a useful contribution to scholarship and take its place among investigations into creation references in the New Testament.[2]

1.1.1 *The Focus of the Research*

There is a particular cluster of creation references in the first four chapters, at 1:2, 10–12; 2:5–9, 10; 3:1–6 and 4:3–4, 9–10, and thereafter the high priestly imagery takes precedence as the Epistle moves to discuss the supremacy of Christ's high priestly activity from ch. 5 onwards.[3] The term "high priest" only occurs four times in Heb 1–4, namely in 2:17; 3:1; 4:14, 15, with one other reference to his having made atoning sacrifice in 1:3.[4] However, "high priest" occurs three times in ch. 5 alone at 5:1, 5 and 10. There are further clusters of priestly vocabulary in chapters 7 ("priest" occurring 9 times), 8 (4 times) and 9 (3 times). There are a number of other references to offering sacrifice also found in the later sections, such as 9:14, 26–28; 10:1–5, 10–18, 11:4 and 13:16, with specifically priestly vocabulary found in 10:11, 21 and 13:11.[5] This would suggest that the discourse strand of creation is perhaps, however slightly, stronger in the opening chapters than the high priestly/sacrificial imagery, and that later on in the Epistle, the converse is true to a much greater extent. Indeed, creation imagery does occur later on in the Epistle, but seldomly, as at 9:11, 26 and 11:3.[6] The particular cluster of creation references suggests that the topic of creation is in some way in especial focus in Heb 1–4, and in view of this, these chapters are the main subject of my investigation. However, I do discuss the later creation references by means of sections when applicable and to demonstrate the links between the mentions of creation in Hebrews' discourse.

---

[2] There has been a recent interest in this topic, not least in the epistles, e.g., Moyer V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*, SNTSMS 119 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and T. Ryan Jackson, *New Creation in Paul's Letters*, WUNT 2/272 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

[3] As I understand 2:10 as introducing a new segment, I here mention it separately from 2:5–9.

[4] As the reference at 2:17 to making atoning sacrifice occurs in conjunction with a high priestly reference, I have not included it in my count as a separate item. The situation is similar for 5:3; 7:27; 8:1–4.

[5] Not all such references pertain to Christ's sacrifice or to the High Priestly offerings. We have the sacrifice of Abel in 11:4, and we have the "sacrifice of praise" offered to God through the Son in 13:15–16. Nevertheless, the use of sacrificial imagery is important in that it ties in with the greater discourse strand of "sacrifice", of which Christ's sacrifice and those of the high priests are a part, to indicate a certain emphasis on sacrifice in the later sections of the Epistle.

[6] We might also include 12:26–27 as a reference, in some way, to a renewal of creation, as I discuss later in this thesis.

At first, the creation references in Heb 1–4 appear to be very disparate, each referring to creation in diverse ways and using different vocabulary. Some have very definite references to a particular aspect of creation theology, as in the case of Christ the agent of creation (1:2), but others appear to be vaguer references to the Genesis account, such as the references to Sabbath rest in 4:3–5, 9–10. There is not even a key word which links all these passages, and the usual NT verb for "to create", κτίζω, is missing from them entirely.[7] One might therefore argue that the references are not, in fact, evidence of a theme, but are merely individual snippets intended to support whatever point is being made at the given stage in Hebrews' argumentation. However, it is important to consider that Hebrews itself employs a very rich vocabulary. In some cases, Hebrews does not refer to the Genesis account directly, but references other creation passages in the Old Testament. For instance, 1:2–3 might reference Wis 7:26 through the use of the NT and LXX *hapax legomenon* ἀπαύγασμα (radiance/reflection), and 2:6–9 refers to Ps 8 and its understanding of humanity's role given at creation. Spicq has even argued that the theology of Christ the agent of creation may be akin to Philo's Logos.[8] Rather than looking in Hebrews for shared vocabulary between our passages, or even between our passages and the Genesis account, it is, in fact, better to think more conceptually when analyzing the references to creation in the Epistle.

Returning to the fact that the number of creation references outnumber high priestly references in Heb 1–4, it may be significant that, nevertheless, we find discourse strands pertaining to Christ's salvific activity intertwining with the creation references, or at least very nearby. Hebrews 1:3 mentions the Son's sacrifice for sin, 2:3–4 holds out the warning not to neglect "so great a salvation" whilst 2:6–7 draws on Ps 8's idea of God visiting his people, something picked up in 2:9–18, which deals with the Son becoming human to lead the "sons" [children] to glory. Chapters 3–4 then centre on the warning to "listen to God's voice" in a christological exposition of Ps 95, so that one may enter God's "rest". This would suggest that the creation references are in some way linked to Hebrews' soteriology, and might be equally as important in understanding the opening chapters as the preponderance of high priestly images are to the Epistle's later passages.

1.1.2 Key Questions and Thesis Statement

My ultimate key question is, then, "how are these creation references strung together and to what end?" This can be broken down into a number of other questions:

---

[7] However, the cognate noun κτίσις (creature) is found in 4:13.
[8] Ceslas Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, vol. 1 (Paris: Lecoffre, 1952), 47–49.

- What connects the different references to creation?
- How are we to understand, in their co-text and context, some of the more puzzling lexemes employed by Hebrews in our creation references, such as the specific use of αἰών in 1:2 and 11:3, and the NT hapax legomena ἀπαύγασμα, and χαρακτήρ?
- How does the topic of creation relate to that of Christ's salvific role in Heb 1–4?
- Since the references to creation often take the form of allusions to/citations of the Old Testament, how are these texts used to shape and support Hebrews' discourse?

These questions help to direct the current research. This thesis proposes that the creation references in Heb 1–4 should be considered as integral to Hebrews' discourse in the first four chapters, and that the topic of creation is related to the topic of salvation through the Son in an important way. I will argue in this thesis that wherever we find a mention of creation in Heb 1–4, we find reference to his having become human and ascended back into heaven in order to bring about salvation, which I designate as a descent-ascent motif. I will argue that at 1:1–4 we have an implicit reference to the incarnation from a heavenly perspective which emphasizes the heavenly nature of the Son, which is repeated in reverse order in the catena of 1:5–14, when vv. 5–6 are understood as references to the exaltation on the basis of discourse analysis (DA) theory pertaining to intertextuality. I will demonstrate a change in perspective that focuses specifically on the Son's having become human in 2:5–9 before discussing how in 2:10–18 we see that this is to lead his "siblings", fellow humans, heavenward. This, I will suggest, is pulled together in 3:1–6 where we have the "apostle and high priest" who is, if we read 3:4 christologically, the creator. Finally, I shall argue that in 4:3–4 and 4:9–14, we see the ultimate connection between these two discourse strands as the primordial state of rest experienced by God at the end of creation becomes spatialized so that the Son and his followers may enter in.

1.2 Methodology

A number of methodologies would be possible for a study of creation in Hebrews. The literature review of this thesis discusses a selection of scholars and their various approaches to the Epistle, and how they touch on our theme. Some scholars, such as Kenneth Schenck, have employed insights from narrative criticism to the Epistle, taking into account plotline in particular.[9] Other

---

[9] Kenneth Schenck, "Keeping His Appointment: Creation and Enthronement in Hebrews," *JSNT* 66 (1997):91–117.

insights have come from more traditional literary and historical-critical meth-
ods. For instance, Craig Koester stresses the importance of the incarnation and
Christ's suffering, as outlined in his sections on Christology and eschatology
in the opening to his commentary, in which he covers the topic of creation.[10]
The approaches of the commentators have tended to be mostly historical-crit-
ical, and pick up on the theme of creation as part of wider investigations, such
as Spicq's examination of Hebrews' reliance on Philo, mentioned above, or
when discussing individual verses, as in the more recent commentaries by Wil-
liam Lane, Harold Attridge, and Paul Ellingworth. Other approaches include
ethical/ecological theological investigations such as Lamp's "*The Greening of
Hebrews?*"[11] This study, however, proceeds from the perspective of discourse
analysis as a way to draw out from the text the implications of the creation ref-
erences for the discourse of the Epistle. The aim is to put forward an exegesis of
Hebrews on creation by applying some of the tools of discourse analysis to the
selected passages.[12]

1.2.1 What do we Mean by "Discourse Analysis"?

Within mainstream biblical Studies, discourse analysis (DA) is a relatively new
discipline which primarily has its roots in linguistics. The term itself seems to
have been first used in 1952 by Zellig Harris, who sought to understand what
constitutes a text as more than just a jumble of sentences. In other words, he was
concerned with structure above the level of the sentence.[13] Discourse analysis
looks at speech acts and texts holistically and as an act of communication, rather
than being focussed on clauses as the largest unit of analysis, as is often the case
in other linguistic studies:

> The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot
> be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purpose or func-
> tions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs.[14]

Words are put into sentences, sentences framed in clauses and combined into
paragraphs and so on for a particular effect, and it is the whole text which con-
cerns the discourse analyst. Because it is concerned with not only the grammatical

---

[10] Craig Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 36
(Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2001), 97.
[11] Jeffrey S. Lamp, *The Greening of Hebrews?* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012).
[12] Because the methodology sets the direction for this thesis, it will be discussed before the
literature review, which contains sections on biblical scholars using discourse analysis.
[13] Zellig Harris, "Discourse Analysis," *Language* 28 (1952):1–30. For a good summary of DA,
see Brian Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*, Continuum Discourse Series (London:
Continuum, 2006), 2.
[14] Gillian Brown and George Yule, *Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press, 1983), 1.

features of language, but the use to which those features are put, DA further "considers the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used."[15] We may distinguish between the locutionary, or referential, meaning of utterances, i. e., the subject to which they pertain, and their illocutionary force, i. e. what the speaker "does" with the utterance; finally, we can consider that all utterances have a perlocutionary force, an impact on the audience. Such is the connection between an utterance and its usage, that John Langshaw Austin, who made these definitions, would even declare that "to perform a locutionary act is in general, we may say, also and *eo ipso* to perform an *illocutionary* act."[16] Language is utilized and manipulated to perform certain functions, such as to persuade or reprimand, to console or to command, and those functions are context dependent.

How, exactly, investigations into discourse should proceed, and where the emphasis should lie in investigations, however, has been the subject of much debate, and there are nearly as many approaches to DA as there are scholars. In fact, the very term "discourse" is employed differently by various discourse analysts. The term is often used of written and oral texts, and in particular of the way sentences come together to make sense.[17] For instance, for Brown and Yule, *text* is effectively the representation of *discourse*. *Text* is "the verbal record of a communicative act," a product. *Discourse*, however, is viewed more as a process as they consider "words, phrases and sentences which appear in the textual record of a discourse to be evidence of an attempt by a producer (speaker/writer) to communicate his message to a recipient (hearer/reader)."[18] German and Central European discourse analysts, though, tend to draw the distinction more sharply between *discourse* and *text*, as in the work of Gisela Brünner and Gabriele Graefen. In their view, discourse is seen as units and forms of speech as interaction, which, although seen as part of daily usage, can also have an "institutional dimension", and the term *discourse* can also be used to denote the totality of interactions between members of specific social groups (e. g., doctor/patient, among academics).[19] Not all discourse is oral, though it often is, and

---

[15] Paltridge, *Discourse*, 3.

[16] John Langshaw Austin, *How to do Things with Words*, 2nd ed., ed. James Opie Urmson and Marina Sbisà (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962), 98. See also, 100–08. I here retain the distinction made between sentences and utterances, the former being a feature of written discourse and the latter of spoken discourse, as per Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 19. It should be noted that the intended perlocutionary force may differ from that which actually results.

[17] For a simple explanation of this view, see James Paul Gee, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*, 4th ed. (London: Routledge, 2014), 17–18. On oral and written texts as representations of discourse, see also Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 6–19.

[18] Ibid., 190 and 24 respectively.

[19] Unless otherwise stated in this thesis, translations are my own. Gisela Brünner and Gabriele Graefen, "Einleitung: Zur Konzeption der Funktionalen Pragmatik," in *Texte und Diskurse: Methoden und Forschungsergebnisse der Funktionalen Pragmatik*, ed. Gisela Brünner and Gabriele Graefen (Opladen: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 1994), 7–24, esp. 7–8. In this the-

discourse "systematically relies on the shared presence of a speaker and a hearer, whether in person or at a distance (e. g., on the telephone)."[20] In the context of a theory of linguistic interaction, they consider it an "essential specification of the word 'text'" that it records a linguistic interaction, but "text" also "presupposes the receptive action of the reader," since "through the text linguistic action gains the quality of knowledge, which can be retained for later use."[21] The speech situation is thus extended. It should also be noted that oral cultures also have "text" in this sense, just not in a written format.[22]

Yet other scholars see *discourse* more broadly as structured forms of knowledge or the exercise of power. This latter definition is associated with "Critical Discourse Analysis".[23] The concept of discourse as power-force is somewhat captured in the words of Fairclough and Wodak, who are concerned with how discourse is socially constitutive as well as conditioned, and aim to uncover the strength language can exert over addressee:

It [discourse] is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people.[24]

These scholars, and others like Teun van Dijk, take a particular, socio-cognitive, approach to discourse analysis.[25] The socio-cognitive approach to DA aims in particular "to produce and convey critical knowledge that enables human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection."[26] Their focus is on power struggles, and how to rid a society of the oppression

---

sis, I attempt to strike a balance between a product-orientated view of texts, and the discourse-as-process view of scholars like Brown and Yule, bearing in mind the ancient nature of my texts and the inaccessibility of the original audience for research purposes.

[20] Ibid., 8.

[21] Ibid., 7–8. Quotation from 7.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, "Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed., ed. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (London: Sage, 2001), 1–33, here, 6.

[24] Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak, "Critical Discourse Analysis," in *Discourse as Social Interaction*, vol. 2 of *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, ed. Teun A. Van Dijk (London: Sage, 1997), 258–64, here, 258.

[25] For instance, see Teun van Dijk, "Discourse, Power and Access," in *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (London: Routledge, 1996), 84–104. He here describes what exactly he understands power and dominance to be, and gives good examples of how this relates to discourse analysis in his thought.

[26] Wodak and Meyer, "Critical," 7.

which results when a particular ideology is imposed upon it, and their thought should be understood in the context of Western Marxism.[27] They are indebted to the ideas of thinkers like Max Weber, for whom power consists in the opportunity that an individual has in a society to achieve their own will, often against the majority.[28] It is a problem-orientated approach where discourse analysis is not a goal in its own right, but rather a means to an end: emancipation.[29]

Related to the socio-cognitive approach to DA is the Discourse-Historical approach, favoured by scholars like Reisigl, which critiques historical records, such as propaganda or political speeches. Rather than trying to reconstruct what "really happened", since all historical records are essentially recordings of how people perceived their circumstances, this school is concerned with examining the ideology inherent in historical documents, and uncovering their manipulative purpose.[30] There is also another form of socio-cognitive DA, common to the Frankfurt school, that is somewhat counter-Marxist, the most famous proponent being Michel Foucault.[31]

These forms of DA are considered part of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) "family" which grew up especially in the 1990s. Whilst methodologies vary, critical discourse analysts are primarily concerned with "de-mystifying ideologies and power" by investigating semiotic data.[32] Critical Discourse Analysis covers a whole range of investigative techniques and methods, united by the way its adherents are interested in DA as a platform for social action.

1.2.2 DA In Biblical Studies

It is necessary to understand this background before we can begin discussing how DA has so far been employed in biblical studies. Stanley Porter, in particular, has discussed how CDA, with its emphasis on evaluation and the reasons

---

[27] Fairclough and Wodak, "Critical," 260.

[28] See Wodak and Meyer, "Critical," 8–10 for a summary. See also Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, Grundriss der Sozialökonomik* 3, 5th ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980), 28, to whom they refer.

[29] A good summary of this discipline is Teun A. van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach," in *Discourse as Social Interaction*, vol. 2 of *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, ed. Teun A. Van Dijk (London: Sage, 1997), 62–85.

[30] See Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak, "The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)," in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed., ed. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (London: Sage, 2001), 87–121. For an example of DHA in action, see Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak, *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and AntiSemitism* (London: Routledge, 2001).

[31] E. g., Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la Prison* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), which looks at how surveillance and punishment have been used historically to control society.

[32] Wodak and Meyer, "Critical," 3. A critical summary of the CDA situation appears in Stanley Porter, "Is Critical Discourse Analysis Critical? An Evaluation using Philemon as a Test Case," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley Porter and Jeffrey Reed, JSNTSup 170 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 47–70.

for certain discourse practices, may be useful when actualizing biblical texts. It is concerned not only with interpretation, that is, placing the text within its context, such as power structures, but also explanation, and "reflecting upon why the text is construed the way it is," and what it means for a text to be interpreted in a given way.[33] Porter gives the example of passages concerning the role of women, or certain spiritual practices, for instance, where he says the unmasking of power structures in some biblical texts may give cause to change certain church attitudes towards them. However, he also notes that, whilst it is true to some extent that the link between power and discourse may be helpful in understanding some of the dynamics of biblical texts, problems arise when this hermeneutic is applied across the board. Let us take, for example, the Pauline letters. On the one hand, Paul is trying to "utilize his linguistic capacity to effect certain changes upon his letter recipients. From this standpoint, he might well be seen as the one exercising power and authority, by means of language."[34] A proponent of CDA with its strong focus on the oppressor/oppressed might want to resist Paul's words in some way, almost automatically. However, Porter points out that in some cases Paul is himself in prison and is in this regard the "oppressed", who has no practical power.[35]

The question of hermeneutics in biblical studies will be discussed in detail below, under *Hermeneutical Considerations*. Here, we may observe that whilst the exegetical principles of CDA might be helpful, since they go "beyond the description of linguistic practice … to engage in linguistic explanation and evaluation," the socio-cognitive hermeneutic is perhaps less appropriate for biblical studies, especially when considering the texts denoted as "epistles" as in this thesis.[36] For example, we may note a similarity between the situation with Paul's letters given above with Hebrews, where the author sides with his persecuted addressees in 10:32–39. Certainly, all discourse is historical in the sense it is produced under a given set of circumstances, and CDA's emphases on the role of context as well as linguistic conventions and rules combine in a way applicable to traditional language and literary based forms of exegesis, not least redaction criticism. We can say with Porter that CDA also has enhanced our understanding and conception of intertextuality in particular, since, in their investigations into power struggles, scholars like Fairclough and Wodak have demonstrated how discourses are linked to other discourses, which are produced either earlier than or at about the same time as the text under analysis, and not just through direct quotations.[37] Texts can be connected more implicitly to those that came

---

[33] Porter, "Critical?" 66–67.
[34] Ibid., 65.
[35] Specifically, he gives the example of Philemon. Ibid., 65.
[36] Ibid., 68. The difficulty in establishing a historical situational context for Hebrews' audience creates some difficulties for a full use of socio-cognitive approaches.
[37] Ibid., 63.

before, or alongside, themselves by virtue of the social context in which they were constructed, perhaps by allusions or echos, but even, simply, by similar/related strands of thought. It is thus important to heed some of the lessons from this school of DA, and not to limit oneself to citations only when considering possible intertextual allusions in Hebrews. However, Porter suggests that we should restrict CDA to its "exegetical rather than its hermeneutical potential" given its marked, perhaps over-, emphasis on social oppression.[38]

Furthermore, whilst many scholars focus on the socio-cognitive approach of CDA, it is important to realize that not all proponents of discourse analysis share their emphasis on social action, and some of these other schools need to be considered before a decision is made over which type of DA to employ here. Porter identifies four main schools of DA that have already yielded fruit for biblical studies in particular, each of which pay attention to both the historical context and the internal features in a text without always having such a dramatic social emphasis.[39] Firstly, there is the North American model, which is used by the Summer Institute of Linguistics. This school has focussed primarily on Bible translation, adopting Pike's Tagmemics and Lamb's stratificational grammar.[40] This school has been especially helpful in uncovering the details of Greek syntax, and thereby its implication for semantics, producing works such as Callow's *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God.* [41] There is also the Continental European Model, which tends to focus on the macrostructure of a text, combining such diverse methodologies as those of van Dijk, already mentioned here, and Perelman, a modern rhetorical theorist.[42] This has resulted in inter-disciplinary works like Johnson's *To all the Brethren*.[43] The South African School also maintains an eye to rhetoric, such as colon analysis, which breaks

---

[38] Ibid., 68.

[39] I summarize here, very briefly, Stanley Porter, "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Donald Arthur Carson and Stanley Porter, JSNTSup 113 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 14–37.

[40] Tagmemics is a specialized form of linguistics which looks at how smaller units combine into the whole to examine the relationship between the hierarchical levels of a discourse. See Kenneth Lee Pike, *Linguistic Concepts: An Introduction to Tagmemics* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1982). According to Lamb, language is to be understood in terms of mental processes. In each person's brain, they have a partial understanding of the overall system of language, and this linguistic system he structures into strata to describe how meaning, expression, content and sound are interlinked. This is explained well in John White, "Stratificational Grammar: A New Theory of Language," *College Composition and Communication* 20:3 (Oct. 1969):191–97. See also Sydney M. Lamb and Leonard E. Newell, *Outline of Stratificational Grammar* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1966).

[41] Kathleen Callow, *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974).

[42] E. g., Chaim Perelman, *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities: Essays on Rhetoric and its Applications* (Boston: Reidel, 1979).

[43] Bruce C. Johnson, *To All the Brethren: A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to 1 Thessalonians*, ConBNT 16 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1987).

down a text into its constituent cola, a unit formed around a nominative and predicate structure, and diagrams their interconnections so as to demonstrate the semantic relations among them as increasingly larger semantic units are formed.[44] It thus strikes a good balance between analyzing syntax and semantics, which can then be interpreted in situational contexts. Finally, there is the systemic-functional approach, often associated with the English School. It is this latter approach that I have adopted in this thesis, though I also draw on some work from authors aligned to SIL.[45]

1.3 The Systemic-Functional Approach to DA

The systemic-functional model is largely concerned with linguistic cohesiveness and cohesion, and I focus much on these elements in this thesis. The term "cohesiveness" "refers to the means by which an immediate linguistic context meaningfully relates to a preceding context and/or a context of situation."[46] Systemic-functional DA is largely a descriptive approach and is primarily concerned with how grammar and structure create sense, or "meaning" in a given situation/co-text. "Meaning" is not understood here as a theological term, but as the communicated aspect of a discourse act. Two main proponents of a functional approach to linguistics are M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan.

Hasan and Halliday identify three major functional-semantic components in language. Firstly, there is the *ideational*, the part of the linguistic system, concerned with the expression of 'content' – "language is about something".[47] This can be sub-divided into two parts, the *experiential* and the *logical*. The experiential is concerned with the "context of culture" and involves representing an experience; the *logical* is more abstract, and expresses "the abstract logical relations which derive only indirectly from experience."[48] We then have the *interpersonal* component. The latter is "concerned with the social, expressive and conative

---

[44] Porter, "Discourse," 33.

[45] I do so because SIL has a concern for the manipulation of grammatical structures for effect, as in Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*: *A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas, TX: SIL International, 2000), which looks at constituent order and other features of Koine Greek. See also Porter, "Discourse," 22–23, which notes at least some emphasis on cohesion, though I heed his comments that there is an emphasis on sentence grammar in SIL thought.

[46] Jeffrey T. Reed, "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria for Analyzing New Testament Discourse" in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley Porter and Jeffrey Reed, JSNTSup 170 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 28–46, here 29.

[47] Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (London: Longman, 1976), 26.

[48] Ibid.

functions of language, with expressing the speaker's [or writer's] 'angle': his [or her] attitudes and judgements, his encoding of the role relationships in the situation, and his motive in saying anything at all."[49] The final component is the textual. This "comprises the resources that language has for creating text … for being operationally relevant, and cohering within itself and with the context of situation."[50] It is in respect of these functions that language is to be understood, and within this framework that language usage is to be analyzed. Words, sentences, even ideas are organized in discourse in respect of the above componential elements of the linguistic system, and grammar is itself functional:

… each **element** in a language is explained by reference to its function in the total linguistic system. In this … sense, therefore, a functional grammar is one that construes all the units of a language – its clauses, phrases and so on – as organic configurations of functions. In other words, each part is interpreted as functional with respect to the whole.[51]

Halliday recognizes two main goals of DA, to which this acknowledgement of the importance of functional grammar can contribute:

In any piece of discourse analysis, there are always two possible levels of achievement to aim at. One is a contribution to the **understanding** of the text: the linguistic analysis enables one to show how, and why, the text means what it does. In the process, there are likely to be revealed multiple meanings, alternatives, ambiguities, metaphors and so on … The higher level of achievement is a contribution to the **evaluation** of the text: the linguistic analysis may enable one to say why the text is, or is not, an effective text for its own purposes – in what respects it succeeds and in what respects it fails, or is less successful … It assumes an interpretation not only of the environment of the text, its 'context of situation' and 'context of culture', but also of how the linguistic features of a text relate systematically to the features of its environment, including the intentions of those involved in its production … whatever the ultimate goal that is envisaged, the actual analysis of a text in grammatical terms is only the first step. The grammatical analysis will presumably be followed up by some further commentary or exegesis.[52]

It is Halliday's last comment that is particularly relevant for this study. In identifying creation as a theme running through Hebrews, we are interested in understanding how it fits into the greater scheme of the Epistle. Why is creation referenced so many times? What do these references contribute to our understanding of its discourse? The goal is thus exegetical, and it is hoped that in this thesis, discourse analysis will contribute to an exegetical investigation into our topic.[53]

---

49 Ibid., 26–27.
50 Ibid., 27.
51 Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (London: Edward Arnold, 1985), xiv.
52 Ibid., xv–xvi.
53 The focus in this thesis is primarily on the exegesis, and DA is seen as a tool to aid it. I will, where pertinent, discuss debates in traditional exegesis over certain passages and propose solutions or new insights DA can bring. In this, I am somewhat indebted to Wilhelm Egger, *How to*

1.3.1 Key Concepts

Before we begin our own investigation, it is first necessary to outline briefly some basic concepts in systemic-functional DA.[54] In this section, I not only cover DA theory specifically pertinent to this investigation, but try to give a brief introduction to the method as a whole, in order to aid my reader to gain a broader picture of the discipline and its goals. Firstly, it is imperative to realize that terms we employ in biblical studies are sometimes also used in DA, but with a slightly different meaning, such as *structure*. When we think of the *structure* of a text in biblical studies, we tend to think of its overall composition. We look for units within the text, and then try to build a picture of what a given book or epistle "looks like", its *macrostructure*. In linguistics, however, the term *structure* has a more technical meaning: "the relation which links the parts of a sentence or clause."[55] The focus is on *constituency*, that is to say, "the layered part-whole relationship which occurs among the units of a written text," and that concerns *microstructure* as much as macrostructure.[56]

There may be many types of *structure* in a text. *Thematic structure*, for instance relates to how the rest of a clause, the *rheme*, is organized around a given topic.[57] *Grammatical Structure* would refer to the relation of the grammatical elements in a sentence. *Discourse structure* is actually defined by Halliday and Hasan as "the structure of some postulated unit higher than the sentence, for example, the paragraph, or some larger entity such as episode or topic unit."[58] However, *structure* is also to be understood more in terms of *how* a text is put together, as opposed to just *what* it looks like in terms of its overall organization as an end product, and so individual components come together to create a whole.[59]

Read the New Testament: An Introduction to Linguistic and Historical-Critical Methodology, ed. Hendrikus Boers (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996). Egger combines syntactic and semantic analysis with more traditional methods (e. g., historical-critical, form-critical) to produce a comprehensive methodology. He distinguishes between exposition and actualization. Exposition is the ascertaining of the meaning which the text had in its original environment, and actualization is presenting "the meaning which the text has as a text of the past and as the Word of God in today's concrete social, ecclesiastical, and personal setting." Ibid., 200. I am concerned here with the former. Ibid., 22–29.

[54] Although the majority of books mentioned here were originally written for the study of English, I have selected terms which are also applicable to NT Greek. Cynthia Long Westfall, *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship Between Form and Meaning*, LNTS 297 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 22–87 does similarly, and also offers a comprehensive introduction to discourse analysis theory key topics.

[55] Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion*, 6.

[56] Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 1st ed., 2. As many "structures" in biblical studies are centred around what the critic sees to be the main points of argumentation in a text, we might further describe that type of macrostructure as a semantic macrostructure.

[57] Ibid., 38.

[58] Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion*, 10.

[59] Westfall, *Discourse*, 28. Westfall here follows Michael Hoey, *Patterns of Lexis*, Describing English Language Series (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 29.

Another way of thinking of *structure* is to consider it in terms of patterns in the text. These patterns in a text reflect or realize linguistic features of the context such as genre, register and dialect, as personal idiolect and style," and structure "is also the result of the writer's conscious effort to package the text so that the reader(s) can process the intended message."[60] It is thus from looking at how a text is structured, be that thematically, grammatically or otherwise, that we can begin to think in terms of the ideational, interpersonal and textual linguistic components described above. A *text*, in systemic-functional DA terms, is a record of an act of communication, and systemic-functional DA attempts to unravel that record to give us a deeper understanding of that act, or at least how it might have been intended, whilst still accepting the possibility of multiple interpretations.[61] This is especially relevant in the case of Hebrews, which is very much a communicative act, being a "word of exhortation" (13:22).

Related to this communicative focus in systemic-functional DA investigations is the concept of *prominence*. Whatever the language in which the text is written, authors organize their material into units for a given effect and to emphasize certain things. *Prominence* relates to how they draw attention to certain facts or opinions in particular, and lend them emphasis for a desired effect on the addressee(s).[62] In our case, we are looking at the *prominence* given to the topic of creation in Heb 1–4. There are many markers of *prominence*. Some are grammatical, such as the use of adverbial participles, and language dependent. In NT Greek, for instance, primary clauses, those from which the author is arguing, are usually marked by the use of a finite verb, whereas secondary clauses, by contrast, are usually marked by the use of the infinitive, or finite verbs when they are used with such particles as ὅτι or ὡς.[63] This will form part of our investigation of the exordium, and how it is structured in a way to reveal God's speaking through the Son, specifically the Son through whom he made the aeons, as the most reportable event. In this investigation, we will also consider the use of alliteration and repetition, which work on the phonetic level to draw attention to a particular part of a clause or sentence, sometimes introducing a key point. For instance, we will focus attention on the repetition of "house" in 3:1–6, where I propose the author is playing on multiple referents for this term.

---

[60] Westfall, *Discourse*, 29. Westfall draws attention to the fact that even written texts are interactive in that "The writer attempts to gear the message toward the recipient, whether or not s/he knows the recipient personally." (29 n. 35).

[61] Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 6.

[62] Westfall, *Discourse*, 28–29.

[63] See Reed, "Cohesiveness," 33. Sometimes, the secondary clause effectively "shifts rank down into the slot of the complement; in this way, the idea is a way of 'completing' the process of the primary clause." Ibid. This is also a form of *projection*, where the secondary clause is 'projected through the primary clause.'

Prominence at the level of the sentence is sometimes called *focus*, which denotes the more "informationally relevant" part of the sentence, which presents "new" information.[64] Sentences can either have a narrow focus, where the new information is "explicit and well defined", and fills in a gap in the context; a contrastive focus, whereby the addressor makes one claim and the contradicts or replaces it with a different claim; or a conditional focus.[65] In a sentence with a conditional focus, a secondary clause contains information which is dependent on the content of the first clause and the information is given incrementally.[66] Essentially, we are dealing with a *theme* and a *rheme*. This is the typical thematic structure of any clause, according to Halliday. In a clause, an addressor attempts to communicate something to an addressee. Halliday says that the "Theme is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; the part in which the Theme is developed, is called … the Rheme."[67] Themes, or points of departure, might be temporal or spatial, or be referential and pointing to that which will be discussed. They can consist of anything from a noun phrase to an interrogative word, or even a verb form, such as an imperative.[68]

In a systemic functional approach, it is sometimes thought that the focus is generally placed on the theme, and identification of it can help us gain insights into the importance of a given topic within the discourse. Although the concept is perhaps most evident in sentences with topic-comment articulation, the same holds true in sentences with focus-presupposition articulation, where something is already held to be known to the audience and the focus is on how the event happened, or presentational articulation, where a new participant is introduced to the story.[69] However, the value of the *theme* and *rheme* distinction for establishing prominence has been called into question in linguistics circles, especially those pertaining to NT studies.

It is important to consider that the terms *theme* and *rheme* are used differently amongst scholars. Notably, in the Prague School, the term *theme* corresponds to the 'established' information in the clause, what is already known to

---

[64] This is backed up by findings from cognitive approaches to linguistics. See Carsten Gunther, Claudia Maienborn and Andrea Schopp, "Processing of Information Structure," in *Focus: Linguistics, Cognitive & Computational Perspectives, Studies in Natural Language Processing*, ed. Peter Bosch and Rob van der Sandt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 18–42. They point out that information is processed mentally as it is received sequentially, and investigate the "dimension of information structure that divides a proposition into an informationally more relevant (new) part, that is, the *focus*, and a less relevant part that is mutually known by the speaker and the hearer, that is the *background*." Ibid., 19.

[65] Westfall, *Discourse*, 32.

[66] On the types of focus Westfall, *Discourse*, 32–33. See also Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 177.

[67] Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 1st ed., 38. Note that "message" does not here carry any theological connotation. It refers simply to the key point that the addressor is trying to make. Capitalization his.

[68] Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 127. Theme is not to be confused with grammatical subject.

[69] See Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 7–11.

the audience, whereas the *rheme* corresponds to the newly asserted or focal information.[70] Halliday, by contrast, separates the given/new status of information from *theme* and *rheme* and distinguishes from them "information units":

> An information unit does not correspond exactly to any other unit in the grammar. The nearest grammatical unit is in fact the clause; and we can regard this as the unmarked or default condition: other things being equal, one information unit will be co-extensive with one clause. But other things are often not equal … Thus a single clause may be mapped into two or more information units; or a single information unit into two or more clauses …[71]

According to Halliday, then, the given/new distinction is the property of the information unit, whereas *theme* and *rheme* belong more properly to the constituents of the clause, that is, the central grammatical unit.[72] We must therefore distinguish between the grammatical focus, *theme*, and the information focus, which "reflects the speaker's decision as to where the main burden of the message lies."[73] Effectively, information focus is:

> [a] kind of emphasis, whereby the speaker marks out a part (which may be the whole) of a message block as that which he wishes to be interpreted as informative. What is focal is 'new information'; not in the sense that it cannot have previously been mentioned … but in the sense that the speaker presents it as not being recoverable from the preceding discourse.[74]

Moreover, information focus is inextricably linked to the spoken word in Halliday's thought, since it is realized in the phonological unit of tone group. The unmarked position for tonic prominence for new information in information units is the final position in the information unit, but it is also true that intonation in speech can mark a variation from this pattern.[75] However, Halliday does note that:

> The Theme of a clause is frequently marked off in speech by intonation, being spoken on a separate tone group … One tone group expresses one unit of information … and if a clause is organized into two information units, the boundary between the two is overwhelmingly likely to coincide with the junction of Theme and Rheme.[76]

---

[70] See Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*, Lexham Bible Reference Series (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 200–204.

[71] Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed., rev. and enl. Christian Matthiessen (New York: Routledge, 2014), 115. Previously, I have cited the earlier version of this book, since the revised edition is significantly different in several respects, and I wished to preserve the integrity of Halliday's original thoughts in those instances.

[72] Christopher S. Butler, "Focusing on Focus: A Comparison of Functional Grammar, Role and Reference Grammar and Systemic Functional Grammar," *Language Sciences* 27 (2005):515–618, here 592.

[73] Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, Part 2," *Journal of Linguistics* 3 (1967):199–224, here 204.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Butler, "Focusing," 592–93.

[76] Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 4th ed., 92. Capitalization his.

Since Halliday's model is so closely linked to intonation in spoken language, we need to exercise caution in using his approach for understanding information structure in texts which are not only written, but also written in an ancient form of language which is no longer spoken. Whilst Halliday's approach has the benefit of ascribing *theme* and information focus to the textual functional component of the grammar, making it internal to language and thereby theoretically enabling analysis because it ascribes to the speaker the ability to construct a coherent text with regard to its situational context, it falls short of what is necessary for NT studies given the antiquity of the texts under investigation and their written nature.[77] The use of Hallidaian concepts of "focus" in NT studies has come under fire from Steven Runge because of its origins in intonation and vocal stress.[78] Indeed, there are many factors that one must take into account when establishing prominence. At clause level, we may note that the disruption of usual word order may mark out a certain constituent for emphasis, and so emphasis on the *theme* qua point of departure is not necessarily a given. Whilst, for clarity, in this thesis, *theme* refers to the point of departure in a clause, these limitations of the concept for establishing prominence/focus are duly noted.[79]

Linked to *prominence* is another important concept, *linearization*, and the related concept, *reportability*. Normally, we expect information to flow from what is already known to the new information of which the author wants us to take especial note.[80] Nevertheless, Grimes observed that the speaker presents what they want to say from a specific perspective, and thus in a particular order:

It is as though the speaker has a strategy of presenting what he wants to say from a particular perspective. I find it convenient to think in terms of how various units are staged for the hearer's benefit. This staging is at least partially independent of both content structure and cohesive structure. It operates at many levels of text organization.[81]

---

[77] See Ibid., 594.

[78] Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 202–203.

[79] Ibid., 189–204. Runge is somewhat critical of word order as a principle in NT exegesis, given the relative flexibility of Koine Greek in this regard. See also BDF § 472. It is widely accepted that it is possible to establish emphasis on a given constituent when it is placed in a marked position, and I make such arguments based upon the observations of Levinsohn in that regard elsewhere in this thesis. Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 3–68.

[80] Ibid., 189–90.

[81] Joseph Evans Grimes, *The Thread of Discourse* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 323. At the level of the sentence, the work of Simon Dik in the related field of Functional Grammar DA is important. Dik ascribes information focus to the interpersonal level of DA; it is "that information which is relatively the most important or salient in the given communicative setting, and considered by S [speaker] to be most essential for A [audience] to integrate into his pragmatic information." Simon Dik, *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*, 2nd ed., Functional Grammar Series 20 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997), 326. He posits that normal information flow begins with established information and moves to new information. There are two preverbal positions for a topical element, positions 1 and 2, in the form (P1) (P2), Verb, Nonverbal Constituents. The 'known' elements of the clause are placed in what he calls po-

When we speak, we have to choose what to say first, since that governs what comes next and the presentation of facts or opinions in a certain order that has a particular impact on conveying what we wish to say. "Thus an initial main clause will, iconically, refer to an important event, while following clauses will supply subsidiary information."[82] It is thus necessary to consider each individual section of the text under investigation for its particular emphases and sequencing, since "each section, unit and sentence has its own point of departure in which the author is able to give the discourse a particular spin."[83] In a narrative, a specific event may also have to be stated, in order for the subsequent events to make sense, and so overall sequencing of events is also important: an event is deemed reportable if it is needed to make a given point, and a most reportable event is the one on which all others hinge. This is called *reportability*.[84]

Whilst we can issue a similar caveat to *theme* in that it may not always be the case that the first event mentioned is the most important, but simply the most *reportable*, at the level of discourse, however, *linearization*, also has the impact that every section/unit of text, no matter how big or small, must be interpreted in relation to what has come before, and what will come later, in the discourse. Very often, addressors will either build on what has come before anaphorically, or point forward to something that comes later in the text by means of cataphoric references in order to construct an argument. The interpretation of a preceding section will necessarily have an impact on how the later sections are read – *linearization* may impact on interpretation to restrict possible meanings for given lexemes, for instance. This theory underpins my examination of the use of σαββατισμός in Heb 4:9, which I will argue is constrained by the previous mention of God's rest at the end of creation (4:3–4).

Moreover, if we find similar importance given to the same subject at different points in a text, this indicates that the topic is of especial interest in terms of the discourse structure. Grimes' idea of staging, mentioned in the quotation on the previous page, has been applied to units and sections within a given discourse, not just at sentence level. Moreover, "staging is a dimension of prose structure which identifies the relative prominence given to various segments of prose discourse."[85] When certain entities or ideas recur as referents, we may even speak of *thematization*. *Thematization* is the process by which a certain topic, or

---

sition 1 (P1), and establish a new frame of reference for the clause that follows. New information will usually be placed close to the end of the clause, and placing it in position 2 (P2) lends it extra emphasis. Ibid., 19. See also Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 189–91 for a good summary.

[82] Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 134.

[83] Grimes, *Thread*, 323.

[84] Laura Alba Juez, *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice* (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009), 163–65.

[85] Pamela Clements, "The Effects of Staging on Recall from Prose," in *New Directions in Discourse Processing*, Advances in Discourse Processes 2, ed. Roy O. Freedle (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1979), 287–330, here, 287.

character, is given *prominence*, or *foregrounded*, throughout a discourse.[86] This is slightly different from "theme" as understood by Halliday, since it refers to *theme* qua the grammatical subject of a *series* of sentences, or a *discourse topic*.[87] This could be phrased thus: "by thematization we mean the discourse process by which a referent comes to be developed as the central subject of the discourse."[88] In this study, we are looking at the thematization of creation and I will argue that it is a major topic which recurs a number of times in the first four chapters in Hebrews to set the salvific action of the Son within the context of his descending to earth, becoming human, and ascending back to heaven.

We have begun to touch here on perhaps the most central topic in systemic-functional DA: *cohesiveness*, or *cohesion*. To quote Labov, "the fundamental problem of discourse analysis is to show how one utterance follows another in a rational, rule-governed manner – in other words, how we understand coherent discourse."[89] Halliday and Hasan posit that the main way to tell if a set of sentences do or do not make up a text depends on how those sentence come together, their *coherence*:

… a text has texture and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact it functions as a unity in respect of its environment … the texture is provided by cohesive RELATION.[90]

Cohesion occurs when interpretation of one part of the discourse is dependent on another part of the same discourse, and "the one PRESUPPOSES the other in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it."[91] *Cohesiveness* refers to how well the text "holds together." Halliday summarizes the need for cohesion thus:

---

[86] Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 134.

[87] Ibid., 135.

[88] Charles Perfetti and Susan Goldman, "Thematization and Sentence Retrieval," *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13 (1979):70–79, here 71. This is sometimes taken to mean that theme denotes a main character, but it can also refer to an object or possibly an idea, and thus we might still characterize creation in Hebrews as a theme. A theme can be referenced in a number of ways, and does not even have to be named explicitly after its first mention. It can be referenced by the use of pronouns, for instance, or by the repetition of particular lexemes. See Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 134–37. Nevertheless, to avoid confusion, I designate such 'themes' as topics from this point on.

[89] William Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), 252.

[90] Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion*, 2. Capitalization theirs. See also Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 191–204. However, it should be noted that Brown and Yule dispute the fact that formal features of cohesion are necessary for a text to be coherent, given, for instance, that we readily co-interpret phrases which follow each other. Nevertheless, in this thesis, the formal cohesion markers are taken to be evidence of the intended act of communication between author and audience, since Brown and Yule's observation in this regard does nothing to alter the fact that they play a key role in linearization.

[91] Ibid., 4. Capitalization theirs.

Theme and information together constitute the internal resources for structuring the clause as message – for giving it a particular status in relation to the surrounding discourse. But in order that a sequence of clauses, or clause complexes, should constitute a text, it is necessary to do more than give an appropriate internal structure to each. It is necessary also to make explicit the external relationship between one clause or clause complex and another, and to do so in a way which is not dependent on grammatical structure.[92]

In a sense, some areas of biblical studies already deal with cohesion – redaction and source criticism, for example, because they look at how different sources have been woven together to make new material, that itself "makes sense".[93] Rather than seek the supposed original sources, however, DA looks at a text mostly synchronically and holistically. In this thesis, we will look at how the sections containing creation references relate to one another within the Epistle itself. The reason cohesion was not to be dependent on grammatical structure alone is because a discourse is to be understood in terms of overall semantics, and not merely the construction of clauses and sentences. The concern in the examination of cohesion is centred on the "functional relationships" between the linguistic elements in a discourse and how they come together to create meaning, and not all lexical cohesion is grammar based.[94]

Cohesion is a more general notion, and one that is above considerations of structure. Moreover, only certain kinds of cohesive relation are governed by such rules [of structure]; mainly those involving identity of reference, which under certain conditions must be signaled by a reference item … [for instance] Cohesion that is expressed through substitution and ellipsis … is unaffected by the sentence structure; and so is lexical cohesion … In the case of conjunction … there are special forms to express the various conjunctive relations where these are associated with grammatical structure.[95]

To some extent, cohesion even depends on the extratextual world. The reader has to link what is in the text to "an understanding of a concept in the culture of that linguistic form's language. In this sense, the interpreter is creating a cohesive reading by linking the intratextual world to the extratextual world."[97] It is also worth taking an insight from the Discourse-Historical approach in this regard, for communicative acts take place in a local context and also a global one. The local context is the immediate situation in which the communicative act is taking place, while the global is "defined by the social, political, cultural

---

[92] Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 1st ed., 287. See also Reed, "Cohesiveness," 30.
[93] Reed, "Cohesiveness," 28.
[94] Ibid., 30.
[95] Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion*, 9.
[96] I use the term "extratext" to refer to the background situation of context, circulating ideas and other influences external to the text with which the text sometimes interacts and to which it in some way responds, or from which is subject to influence.
[97] Reed, "Cohesiveness," 30–31. Quotation from 31.

and historical structures in which a communicative act takes place."[98] To some
extent, especially in the discussion of intertextual and interdiscursive relation-
ship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses, within DA, an historical
discussion will necessarily ensue in order for the reference of the text to be fully
understood. This is especially true of lexemes, given the evolution of language
over time. To avoid confusion over the term *context*, we might distinguish in
the analysis proper between the immediate language used in the text in ques-
tion and its background by designating the former the *co-text*; *context* can then
denote extratextual situations, "contexts of situation".

To return to the inner workings of a text, however, it is helpful to have some
vocabulary with which to work. Firstly, we may speak of what makes a text
"cohesive" as "cohesive ties". Halliday and Hasan distinguish between two main
groups. Firstly, we have organic ties, which primarily concern the conjunctive
system of a language. Particles, conjunctions, prepositions and grammatical
structure are all inherent parts of the language and serve in texts as "markers of
transition".[99] From an understanding of these, we may speak of *taxis* (arrange-
ment). The latter defines the inter-dependency between clauses. Firstly, we may
think in terms of *hypotaxis* (subordination) and *parataxis* (co-equality). *Hypo-
taxis* is "the logico-semantic relation between a dependent element and the ele-
ment on which it is dependent (dominant element)."[100] Although the order of
the elements may vary, basically, one element is reliant on the other, and a sec-
ondary clause is dependent on a primary one.[101] *Parataxis*, is "the logico-se-
mantic relation between two linguistic elements of equal status and, thus, either
could stand independently of the other."[102] Parataxis is dependent, according to
Reed, "on the order of linguistic elements," as "the first clause initiates and the
second continues."[103] The primary clause comes first.[104] The secondary clause
can be either *projected* through the primary clause, by means of a *locution* or an
idea, or it can expand that primary clause. If it is projected by means of *locution*,
then we find verbs of saying or hearing. In the case of *idea*, the secondary clause
presents an idea or meaning.[105] *Expansion* refers to a case where the secondary
clause elaborates on the first clause, or extends or enhances it:

In the case of expansion, the secondary clause 'expands' the primary clause in one of
three ways: (1) *elaboration*, (2) *extension* or (3) *enhancement*. In *elaboration*, the second-
ary clause (or phrase) expands upon the primary [clause] by 'elaborating' on it or some

---

[98]   Wodak, "Discourse-Historical," 67.
[99]   Reed, "Cohesiveness," 32. See also Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 4th ed., 608.
[100] Reed, "Cohesiveness," 33.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid.
[104] Ibid.
[105] Ibid., see also Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 4th ed., 487.

portion of it, that is restating, specifying, commentating or exemplifying. In *extension*, the secondary clause 'expands' the primary clause by moving beyond it, that is, adding to it, giving an exception or offering an alternative. In *enhancement*, the secondary clause 'expands' the primary clause by qualifying it with a circumstantial feature of time, place, cause or condition.[106]

Secondly, we have *componential ties*. These refer more to the "meaningful relationships between *individual linguistic components* in the discourse (e.g., repetition of words). This generally amounts to the semantic relationships between words or phrases."[107] They are generally of co-reference, co-classification, or co-extension. The recognition of these cohesive ties is particularly important because through them we can begin to see semantic chains emerge: "a chain is formed by a set of discourse lexemes each of which is related to the others by the semantic relation of co-reference, co-classification and/or co-extension."[108] Co-referential ties create identity chains, and co-classificational and co-extensional ties create similarity chains. When these are examined, they can help us see the "thread" of the discourse emerge, and serve as further markers of prominence. Moreover, if two chains interact in more than one part of the text, then we can deduce that an author is concerned with a given topic.[109] In this thesis, we will be looking in particular at how the different references to the creation weave with references to salvation through Christ.

Cohesion is also linked to the idea of *semantic domain theory*. It was remarked above that Hebrews references creation in many ways, and that there is little shared vocabulary between the creation references. It is not uncommon for an author to refer to a topic in a variety of ways, and, indeed, referring to a topic in a number of ways also adds to a text's cohesiveness, creating threads that weave it together. Whereas traditional exegesis focuses on shared words between passages, DA helps us to look at a wider range of vocabulary as the basis for links between passages, since it emphasizes the connections between words which are related to each other more by concept than by precise "meaning". This comes under *semantic domain theory*, which is the idea that words belong to spheres of meaning, and so can be connected to each other. Acknowledging that vocabulary can be connected because it belongs to the same semantic domain (also called semantic field), or may do in a certain co-text, allows passages to be connected to each other when they might not otherwise have been. Indeed, metaphor is also included in semantic domain theory, and so we might link the idea of "building" or "construction" in 3:1–6, or the metaphor of laying the foundations of the world in 1:10–12 and 4:3–4, to the general domain of "creation", even though

---

[106] Reed, "Discourse Analysis," 206.
[107] Reed, "Cohesiveness," 36.
[108] Ibid., 43.
[109] Ibid., 44.

the verb "to create" is missing. This is due to the co-text in which that vocabulary is used. In 3:4, for instance, we have mention of the "builder/constructor" of "everything", and we know that πάντα (everything) has been used of what is created by God in 1:3 and 2:8–10. Similarly, in 1:10–12, the metaphor of "laying foundations" is clearly set in the co-text of the creation of heaven and earth.[110]

One scholar examining this concept in relation to Hebrews is Bryan Dyer.[111] Dyer makes an important point: "semantics breaks down the common assumptions that the word is the fundamental unit containing meaning and that the sentence (or phrase) is the sum of the values of their components."[112] He summarizes the other main point of semantic domain theory thus:

> While words do often have an established core of meaning attached to them, it is the linguistic co-text that determines how that word is being used. Most words have a variety of potential meaning that may be pulled from any given discourse.[113]

Indeed, different vocabulary choices can be used in the same discourse to express, broadly speaking, the same referent or topic because they want to nuance what they are writing, or perhaps to avoid repetition.[114]

Some scholars have even come to the conclusion that words *only* gather meaning in co-text and context. This idea is known as *polysemy*. As Porter explains, the basic idea is that "words are not univocal independent entities, but items that convey a variety of meanings according to the way that conceptual spheres are lexicalized by users of a language."[115] However, whilst one could argue that words garner their precise meaning from co-text and context, we should avoid the excesses of an extreme approach to polysemy which sees words as only deriving meaning from their co-text. Such a position might be expressed in the words

---

[110] Indeed, whilst the NT employs the verb κτίζω in the sense "create" (e. g., Col 1:16; Rev 4:11), its original meaning was to found a city, as in Homer, *Od.*, 11.263.

[111] Bryan R. Dyer, *Suffering in the Face of Death: The Social Context of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, LNTS 568 (London: Bloomsbury, 2017).

[112] Ibid., 48.

[113] Ibid. Dyer also draws attention to the importance of context, particularly situational context, in lending meaning to vocabulary. He picks up here on the work of Louw and Nida, L&N, vol. 1, xvi–xvii.

[114] Dyer, *Suffering*, 49. Dyer also draws attention to L&N, vol. 1, xvi which states that there are "no synonyms" because the various terms always convey a certain nuance. Indeed, where we find different terms used to refer to the same thing, then there is often a reason for that, some nuance that is intended in the different descriptions. However, sometimes the variation is simply to avoid repetition and so I do not take so strong a position as Louw and Nida in this respect. I rather follow Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 4th ed., 645: "once we depart from straightforward repetition, and take account of cohesion between related items, it is useful to distinguish whether the reference is identical or not …". This can be done by judging from co-text, as in my discussion of "rest" in Heb 4 and the connection between κατάπαυσις and σαββατισμός.

[115] Stanley E. Porter, "The Concept of Covenant in Paul," in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269–85, here, 275. Dyer also cites Porter on this matter.

of Nida: "Without a context, lexical units have only a potentiality to occur in various contexts, but in combination with contexts, words have meaning."[116] Nida takes a psychological approach related to language acquisition and states that the meanings of words are learned primarily in syntagmatic[117] contexts, but the practical contexts of usage also contribute to meaning and states that "95 % of the meanings of words in one's mother tongue are learned by means of syntagmatic and practical contexts."[118] As such, "meaning" is "not to be found in dictionaries but in people's hands, as a series of synapses in the networks of the brain that can be quickly activated. Lexicons do little more than record types of contexts in which such meanings are likely to occur."[119] Whilst Nida's approach wisely counsels against assuming that a given word must always and everywhere carry with it in co-text the exact same meaning, it is also true that language is constructed over centuries so that in any given era a term does usually have a base meaning, or at least base meanings – otherwise, we would be unable to communicate at all.[120] Whilst over the centuries base meanings may change, the potential meanings a word may have in a given context/co-text are at least to some extent socially constructed, to the extent that words essentially have only a limited range of meanings, which are employed to suit given co-texts and contexts.[121] This idea of a "base meaning" is particularly true of nouns, which serve to describe objects/animals/people, which have particular attributes. If I were describing a car, for instance, it would be clear I were not talking about a horse. It is also true that over time usages fall in and out of fashion, and might even vanish.

As such, whilst in analysis we might gather the precise meaning/nuance of a word from context and co-text, it is also important to heed that in themselves they have a basic sense or senses. Hence Anthony Thiselton and Moisés Silva, refer to a word's "stable core of meaning" and "stable semantic core" respectively.[122] The topic has been taken up in biblical studies recently by Gregory P. Fewster, who states succinctly: "the description of some sort of semantic core reveals an admission that lexemes must have a point of reference from which

---

[116] Eugene A. Nida, "The Role of Context in the Understanding of Discourse," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, JSNTSup 170 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 20–27 here, 20.

[117] That is, pertaining to how words relate to each other in a sequence.

[118] Ibid., 21.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Gregory P. Fewster, *Creation Language in Romans 8: A Study in Monosemy*, Linguistic Biblical Studies 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 43 discusses the social side of language in relation to Halliday's metafunctions of language.

[121] Admittedly, usage evolves over time, but within a given time period, words tend to have attached to them by society base meanings.

[122] Anthony C. Thiselton, "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation," in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, ed. Ian Howard Marshall (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1977), 75–104, here, 85 and Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 103.

alternate senses might extend."[123] Louw admits to "common semantic components among alternative senses of a single word."[124] At the other end of the scale to polysemy, we indeed have proponents of *monosemy*, such as Charles Ruhl, who argues that most words ultimately have "only one single general meaning," and that dictionaries are too quick to assume that a different meaning in co-text must mean a different base meaning.[125] He proposes that, generally, "a word has a single meaning", but that "if a word has more than one meaning, its meanings are related by general rules."[126] He argues for modularity, whereby "an abstract and core sense of a lexeme is constrained by contextual features."[127]

The question now arises of how to balance these two positions, that words garner meaning in co-text and that, at least to some extent, of necessity words must have relatively stable meanings. Various systemic-functional discourse analysts have argued for either polysemy or monosemy. In biblical studies, we see Dyer as a proponent of the former, whereas Fewster favours the latter. Like Fewster, however, I consider that in systemic functional linguistics, because we are concerned with language as systemic and functional, language is a social semiotic.[128] This results in "a give and take relationship between a social context and the language used in that context. Context informs language use, while language in turn forms and re-forms the social context."[129] In short, language use involves choices made on the part of those who are communicating, but these choices are made within a given linguistic system, which includes vocabulary. Naturally, as time moves on, the vocabulary of a language is adapted to meet new situations, and might therefore be argued to evolve, but we may recall the importance of the lessons from Halliday's descriptions above of the ideational and interpersonal metafunctions of language: language exists to communicate.[130] As such, "the interface between context [and, I add, co-text] and content is a fundamental concern as the language user makes sense of his or her experience and carries out interactions with others."[131]

Whilst analysts, particularly those who look at ancient texts, can only gather how a particular lexeme is being used in a given instance from the co-text in our

---

[123] Fewster, *Creation*, 34.

[124] Ibid., 34, see Johannes P. Louw *Semantics of New Testament Greek*, SBL Semeia Series (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982), 40.

[125] Charles Ruhl, *On Monosemy: A Study in Linguistic Semantics*¸ SUNY Series in Linguistics (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989), 1.

[126] Ibid., 4.

[127] Fewster, *Creation*, 37–38, quotation from 37, offers a brief summary of his position, but on modularity, see Ruhl, *Monosemy*, 1–24.

[128] See also Fewster, *Creation*, 39. By "social semiotic", it is meant language is effectively a signifying practice used in specific cultures and situational contexts.

[129] Ibid., 39.

[130] See also Ibid., 42–43.

[131] Ibid., 40–41. Fewster offers a helpful diagram as to the relationship between phonology, lexicogrammar, semantics and context.

assessment of a text, that is not the same thing as saying that a word only "gets" its meaning from a co-text. Instead of seeing words as having only one essential meaning, it seems more reasonable, when we take into account the purpose of language, to suggest that words have inherent base meanings and that they are employed in co-texts to this or that effect. Rather, the co-text specifies the particular usage from the point of view of the analyst as they uncover its use in situ – its "instantiation". The author will also have employed terms in accordance with their usage at a given time.[132] For that reason, it is necessary to investigate the historical usage of words, how that changes over time and how particular lexemes were being used at the proposed time of Hebrews' being written. In this investigation, we assess the contemporary use of specific terms whilst combining these observations with insights from DA as to cohesion to elucidate the particular sense being employed in the given section of Hebrews. With Fewster, I ask "what semantic choices does this particular instantiation realize?"[133]

1.3.2 Conclusion

I have tried above to give a very brief summary of some of the key terms and concepts in systemic-functional discourse analysis. It is, essentially, an examination of a text as a communicative act, taking into account linguistic choices, structure and the cohesion of a text to uncover the discourse in and behind it. Any such list of concepts can never be exhaustive, since space does not permit very detailed examination of Systemic-Functional DA terminology. Where the detail of the theory pertains to particular elements of my own analysis, I will discuss it below.

---

[132] Another response has been "relevance theory." Fewster summarizes the main concepts of this school of thought thus: "For relevance theorists, lexical meaning is a conceptual phenomenon with three important elements. The 'logical entry' is the essential meaning that is consistently associated with the lexeme irrespective of temporal and spatial constraints … The 'encyclopedic entry' consists of the information regarding various contextual extensions that can be made; this can involve specific cultural assumptions and idiosyncratic knowledge. Finally, the 'lexical entry' itself is the graphical (or phonological) sign that corresponds with the conceptual information stored in the speaker or hearer's mind … Relevance Theory emphasizes, therefore, the interaction between an essential (abstracted) semantic component and the encyclopedic information surrounding it with particular contexts of utterance." Fewster, *Creation*, 35. Although much of what I say here corresponds to relevance theory, I dispute that the logical entry is not time-bound. As an example of a relevance theorist working in biblical studies, Fewster points to Gene Green, "Relevance Theory and Biblical Interpretation," in *The Linguist and Pedagogue: Trends in Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, NTM 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009), 217–40.

[133] Fewster, *Creation*, 45. I also pay attention to lexicogrammar, rather than simply lexemes, placing an emphasis on the use of certain cases. Rather than viewing lexical and grammatical semantics as apart from each other, lexicogrammatical semantics describes lexis and grammar as "elements on a continuum". This is important given the highly inflected nature of Koine Greek, where cases can lend nuances to meaning. Ibid., 44.

1.4 Hermeneutical Considerations

The reason for choosing the systemic-functional form of DA in this thesis has much to do with an understanding of hermeneutics that is the product of analyzing the debate between historical-critical and literary/narrative approaches to biblical studies. Below are detailed some key hermeneutical issues as a guide to understanding why this methodology was chosen.

1.4.1 Recognizing the Value and Limits of Historical Criticism

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, historical-critical methodology held considerable sway. Since the nineteenth century, studies of ancient literature had focussed increasingly on the historical development and background of texts, and this idea made its way into biblical studies.[134] Recognition of the distance between the original context of the writing and the modern day reader had led to the idea of trying to read the text on its own terms. Schleiermacher famously observed that differences in language between the time of composition and the time of reading can alter how a text is perceived, and the need is, therefore, to try to understand words as the original author intended them, and many adopted his philosophy in this regard.[135] In biblical studies, there also arose a sense that people tended to read the Bible as a whole, and might therefore conflate different biblical accounts of the same event, even though they might have been written at different times and with different emphases. The main idea of historical criticism is that an individual text can be dissected to find evidence of its historical origins by comparing sections of it to what else is known of the surrounding milieu at the possible times for composition. These observations can then be used to understand the text "objectively". In turn, the findings from biblical research also contribute to our understanding of the ancient world. The emphasis is on the *world behind the text*.[136]

The incorporation of a systemic-functional discourse analysis into this exegetical study is partly a reaction to an over-historicizing tendency in some

---

[134] Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller, *The Implied Author: Concept and Controversy* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 18.

[135] Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutics: The Handwritten Manuscripts*, ed. Heinz Kimmerle, trans. James Duke and Jack Forstman (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 111–12, 145, 155. This is a translation of the drafts of Schleiermacher's works on hermeneutics – Schleiermacher (1768–1834) did not publish widely in his lifetime, and this volume seeks to collect and translate the original manuscripts anew.

[136] Sandra Schneiders, *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture*, 2nd ed. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 113. Schneiders' work is to be approached with caution, especially with regards to Catholic tradition, which she often casts aside disparagingly. However, she does offer a helpful summary of the "world of the text" and an introduction to this topic.

scholarship. Sometimes, the focus on the world behind the text can detract from a particular text's argumentation in favour of answering historical questions of "what really happened" or who actually composed the text. Discourse Analysis does acknowledge that each text is constructed in a given historical situation. In fact, certain modes of DA are constructed on that basis, as in the discourse-historical approach and CDA.[137] However, by looking at how the information is structured in the text, we can gain insight into the concerns of the addressor towards and for his/her addressees, and begin to discern what he/she wanted to convey. This is important for exegesis in terms of *explanation*, since any attempt to read a text, especially a sacred text, relies on fidelity to its literal sense. At the same time, systemic-functional DA does not neglect to recognize that these are ancient texts when looking at them as acts of communication, and that when reading them we are distanced by time and space. Indeed, since "every text – that is, everything that is said or written – unfolds in some context of use," historical investigations are valid and vital, especially in helping to establish external, or "exophoric" references.[138] However, the historical element becomes integrated into the analysis in that knowledge of the historical situation of composition can help us discern that act of communication further. Thus, DA balances synchronic and diachronic readings to get a fuller picture of the text than might be granted by taking only one such approach.[139]

Systemic-functional DA also responds to the concerns of another movement – New Criticism.[140] New Criticism was initially a strong reaction against the historicizing tendency, whereby historical criticism sometimes made textual interpretation equivalent to historical investigation. It arose in the mid-twentieth century, seeking to look at literary texts in and of themselves, without paying attention to any "redactor". Whilst itself a development in literature studies more generally, it would impact on NT Criticism and force scholars to reconsider where the emphasis should lie in biblical interpretation. The New Critics' focus was solely on *the world of the text*. The world of the text is the inner construction of a "reality" present in the text, including its story/discourse, plot, characters and their points of view, and the internal argument the text makes.[141] The New Critics focussed almost exclusively on such features, and their interpretations were detailed analyses of the narrative and syntactical features of the source. Some scholars began to divorce the texts almost completely from their histor-

---

[137] See Reisigl and Wodak, "Discourse-Historical," 87–121.

[138] Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 1st ed., xiii.

[139] On the need to balance synchronic and diachronic readings of the text in order to get a rounded interpretation, and the role of text-linguistics in this, see Egger, *How*, 202–4.

[140] Key texts include John Crowe Ransom, *The New Criticism* (Norfolk, CT: New Directions, 1941) and Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, *Understanding Poetry*, 4th ed. (New York : Heinle & Heinle, 1988).

[141] See Schneiders, *Revelatory Text*, 132–56.

ical background, developing definitions of a number of "fallacies" and "heresies," especially that of authorial intent.[142] Such scholars decided that we had no hope whatsoever of discerning the mind of a text's original author, and hence we should not speak of the original intended "meaning" for the text. The pendulum had swung completely in the opposite direction, from a methodology which put the emphasis on the historical construction of the text to one which largely rejected it.

As a response to some New Critics' extremely anti-historical readings, there has risen amongst other literary critics a desire to reintroduce an historical element to the interpretation of texts. In the case of New Testament studies, it has been recognised that the biblical writers were in some way reflecting history, and to divorce the historical dimension completely from literary studies did a disservice to texts. They are intrinsically historical in that they are artefacts produced by particular people in remote, yet specific, times, circustances and places, according to contemporary norms. To quote Malbon, a prominent NT literary critic:

Literary approaches to the New Testament developed just at the time that literary criticism was moving beyond the New Criticism and modernism. There has been a catch-up period during which the New Testament literary criticism has recapitulated not only the classical approaches of literary study but also New Criticism's move away from an earlier historical or biographical explanation of texts and its attempt to deal with the text in terms of the work itself as an autonomous object. Literary criticism of the New Testament is now moving beyond the exclusion of 'extrinsic' concerns to the inclusion of such concerns as the reader (or audience), history, biography, sociology, theology and so on as part of literature.[143]

Systemic-functional discourse analysis can be seen as in some way part of this movement to incorporate both synchronic and diachronic approaches. Closely analyzing syntax, cohesion and structure as the key to semantics, it addresses the concerns of New Criticism to take the text on its own terms; however, it acknowledges that the text, indeed, any text, has its origins within a specific historical situation. The latter gave rise to the author's desire to communicate, and thus is also a key aid to finding the literal sense. This is the benefit of bearing in mind Hasan and Halliday's model of the ideational, interpersonal and textual linguistic components: it allows for a more rounded approach to textual analysis as the basis for exegesis.

---

[142] Wolf Schmid, "Implied Author," in *Handbook of Narratology*, Narratologia/Contributions to Narrative Theory Series (New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 161–73, here, 164. Compare Sean Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Subjectivity in Criticism in Barthes, Derrida and Foucault* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 1998), 116–69.

[143] Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar McKnight, "Introduction," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar McKnight, JSNTSup 109 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 15–26 here, 18.

1.4.2 Discourse Analysis and the Concern For, and Over, Authorial Intention

When we read a text, we engage with it actively and allow our pre-understand-ing to be influenced by that experience with the text as we attempt the process of *explanation. Explanation* is the methodological process of investigating and test-ing our theories about the text.[144] Whenever scholars approach a text, they have their own concerns, their own agenda. It is a fallacy that a scholar can be truly "objective". To some extent, modern literary criticism is built upon the recogni-tion that once a text is composed, it in some way loses its own autonomy and becomes subject to the reader's own desires.[145] That readers interpret texts sub-jectively is undoubtedly true, perhaps even essential to some extent, especially in the case of a sacred text, where readers seek to apply the text to their own situation, perhaps as a guide as to how they should act. The immediate concern, however, would be that because we all approach texts with our own presupposi-tions, we might miss something the text has to say. It is equally possible to argue that a sacred text, precisely because it is sacred and therefore instructive for the believer, must be allowed to "speak" in its own right, and an approach which places the emphasis on an ill – informed or inattentive subjective interpretation might, in fact, silence the text in favour of the reader's own preferences.

There is an obvious difficulty, in such a hermeneutic, however: we simply cannot get inside the mind of the author to test our theories. This problem has long been recognised by proponents of DA. Indeed, major components of com-munication, such as intonation and gestures, are missing from written texts, and there is often, and certainly in the case of biblical studies, no way of asking for clarification from the original authors.[146] In recognition of this, the idea of an "implied author" has gained much ground among some biblical exegetes: "The concept of implied author refers to the author-image contained in a work and constituted by the stylistic, ideological, and aesthetic properties for which index-ical signs can be found in the text."[147] When a writer constructs a text, they pres-ent themselves in a certain way.[148] As Wayne Booth notes, "This implied author is always distinct from the 'real man' – whatever we may take him to be."[149] When a real reader looks at a text, what they perceive is therefore not the inter-action between the real, historical, author of the work and an actual audience, but the interaction of this "implied" author with an "implied reader," whom the

---

[144] Schneiders, *Revelatory Text*, 157–58.
[145] This idea was popularized in Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, ed. and trans. Garrett Barden and John Cumming (London: Sheed and Ward, 1975), xxix; trans. of *Hermeneu-tik 1: Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960).
[146] See Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 4–5.
[147] Schmid, "Implied Author," 161.
[148] Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 67–77.
[149] Ibid., 151

real author had in mind when they wrote. The implied author (and reader) is also, to some extent, a construct on the part of the real reader, as the one "whom" they perceive the author to be and what they perceive him/her to be doing when reading the text.[150]

Nevertheless, we cannot deny the involvement of a real author in the construction of the text. There was, historically, an original addressor, and an original addressee with real concerns or interests brought about by their historical situation.[151] Whilst we must be wary of presuming to know the intention of that original author, so as to ensure a text is to be interpreted on its own terms, and not purely to be subject to the ends of the exegete, the interpretation of a text must still pay careful attention to discerning those concerns. One must make proper allowances for the extratext, and well-informed exegesis will refer to the structure of the text itself and try to establish the key topics and points which that original author was trying to communicate. DA offers some concrete way of at least trying to attain these goals, even if the concrete can never be considered to truly set in the sense that DA is itself interpretive and thus texts may be re-visited and different conclusions drawn.

These key hermeneutical points make systemic-functional DA suitable for biblical exegesis in a unique way. It is the role of discourse analysis, in some respects, to try to establish the ideal meaning, even if scholars might reach different conclusions as to what it is.[152] This is especially important if a reader considers a text to be divinely inspired, for it is when one establishes its truth claims that one enters the world that the text projects forward, the **world before the text**. If the text is sacred, then it is this world before the text that one wishes to enter as a believer.[153] In order to enter the world which the text projects,

---

[150] Ibid., 71.

[151] In some ways, this is discourse analysis' answer, to the ideal vs. actual reader controversy. DA acknowledges that the person(s) to whom a writer/speaker addresses their discourse may not be the, or the only, person to receive it, and so it is wrong to speak simply of an "audience", as that would also include those for whom it was not originally intended. However, DA maintains that an act of communication was intended and is subject to investigation. DA places an emphasis on establishing situational context as a way of guiding the interpretation, since what is known about the addressee and addressor constrains what we might expect them to say/how they would react. However, DA also acknowledges that this is easier said than done, and much has to be inferred from the text itself. No single DA approach can, therefore, ever be said to be definitive. DA actually serves to raise the possibilities of what may have been the authorial intent, and to ensure that such interpretations remain grounded in the text. See Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 1st ed., xv–xvi, Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 38. A key proponent of this is Dell Hymes, "Towards Ethnographies of Communicative Events," in *Language and Social Context*, ed. Pier Paolo Gigoli (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), 21–44.

[152] Schneiders, *Revelatory Text*, 146–47. We saw this earlier in our discussion of socio-cognitive approaches to DA, such as the discourse-historical method.

[153] Ibid.

one must first understand the world of the text, and that is itself only properly understood with some knowledge of the world behind the text.[154]

1.4.3 Towards Establishing the Genre and the World Behind Hebrews

As part of this side of the methodology, any discourse analysis will try to establish the literary form with which it is dealing, and the historical context in which the text was written. The form one believes a text to take and the background from which it arose will necessarily impact upon one's understanding of how the internal features of the text are seen to function.

1.4.4 Establishing the Context: Dating

Part of the problem with investigations into Hebrews is that the Epistle is notoriously difficult to date with any precision. The following table shows the earliest manuscripts available to us.

Manuscript	Date
Papyrus 46 (whole of the Epistle)	c. 200
Papyrus 12 (Heb 1:1)	c. 250
Papyrus 13 (parts of Heb 2–5 & 10–12)	c. 250
Papyrus 114 (parts of Heb 1)	c. 250
P-17; P-89; P-126	Fourth Century
B, S, A	Fourth Century

We can see from the table that the early manuscripts we have are two or three centuries later than the origins of Christianity, and many of the early ones do not contain the whole of the Epistle. It is therefore necessary to look for internal markers, indications within Hebrews itself, to establish a rough date of composition. Yet even here there is much controversy. As Koester suggests, "Hebrews was probably written between about A.D. 60 and A.D. 90. A more precise date is difficult to determine."[155] If the Timothy of 13:23 is to be Paul's companion, then Hebrews was written sometime in the first century, since Acts 16:1–3 describes Timothy as traveling with Paul in about 49 CE and Paul mentions Timothy as his fellow worker in 1 Thess 3:2 and Rom 16:21. However, the mention in 13:7 of a generation of leaders who had apparently died before Hebrews was written

---

[154] Hence Egger proposes a combination of historical-critical, linguistic and literary-critical approach in his methodology. See Egger, *How*, 2–13.
[155] Koester, *Hebrews*, 50.

would suggest 60 C.E. as a probable earliest date.[156] Establishing a latest date is perhaps easier. Hebrews is likely to have been employed by Clement of Rome in *1 Clem. 36*, which would mean it was written before it. Yet, even here, there are problems, since it is unclear under which persecution Clement wrote, and it is sometimes thought to be that of Domitian, putting its date at around 96 C.E.[157]

Which date a given scholar chooses within the above time frame varies considerably, and some would even go beyond it into the second century. Gelardini and Eisenbaum take largely form-critical approaches and try to assess Hebrews against what is known of other literature in the ancient world. Eisenbaum remarks that 2:3 does not necessarily imply the audience is second generation, as the wording may not imply that they received the message directly from the apostles.[158] The presence of important details about Jesus's life in the Epistle and shared vocabulary with Mark (e.g. καταπετάσματος in Heb 6:19 [cf. Mk 15:38]) would suggest the possibility that the author knew this Gospel. Furthermore, she argues, the theological interpretation of Jesus' death in terms of entry into the inner sanctum would not likely have come about before the destruction of the Jerusalem temple.[159] Overall, she posits Hebrews has much in common with second century texts in terms of its form, and the author may have been influenced by other such Christian writings.[160] Gelardini takes Hebrews' self-identification as a "word of exhortation" (13:22) to be an indication that it was intended as a synagogue homily. Specifically, she considers it to be a homily for Tisha b'Av, which commemorates the fall of the First and Second Temples, for which the *sidrah* on the Sabbath was Exod 31:12–17 and the *haphtarah* was Jer 31:31–34, to which she finds reference in Heb 4:4 and 10:16–17 (see also 8:8–12). Tisha b'Av also commemorates the prohibition to enter the land [as may be present in

---

[156] However, not all scholars would agree in using the mention of Timothy to firmly posit a dating, even only a suggested *terminus ad quem*. Ellingworth argues that the reference to Timothy is not helpful since we do not know how old Timothy was, and so he is reluctant to use this "marker" to help him make his dating in any way. Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 30. See also Harold Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 6–8. Attridge also takes a different approach from Ellingworth and says the mention of Timothy in 13:23 helps establish his *terminus ad quem* since "it is difficult to imagine Timothy still alive, well, and ready to travel much beyond 100."

[157] A good summary of the debate is to be found in Koester, *Hebrews*, 49–53 and Attridge, *Hebrews*, 6–8.

[158] Pamela Eisenbaum, "Locating Hebrews Within The Literary Landscape of Christian Origins," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*, ed. Gabriella Gelardini, BibInt 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 213–37, here, 227–28.

[159] Ibid., 279.

[160] For example, ibid., 233–34. This article is a marked change from her earlier position. Previously, she had argued for a date no later than 100. She had argued for the earlier dating partly from the fact that Hebrews is cited in *1 Clement*, placing the *terminus ad quem* at around 100. Pamela Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*, SBLDS 156 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 6–7.

Heb 3–4], as well as the fall of the First and Second Temples, and later the con-
quering of the last Bar Kochba stronghold.[161]

The span of scholarly opinions (since 1950) as to Hebrews' date is encapsu-
lated in the following table.[162]

Author	Dating (CE)
Hugh Montefiore (1964)	52–54
George Wesley Buchanan (1972)	Pre-70
Craig Koester (2001)	60–90
Harold Attridge (1981)	60–100
William Lane (1991)	60–140
Ceslas Spicq (1952)	67
Albert Vanhoye (2015–latest)	No later than 95, but likely 66 or 67
Gareth Cockerill (2012)	Pre-70
Paul Ellingworth (1993)	Pre-70
Kenneth Schenck (2007)	Possibly 60s, but the best fit is post-70
Alan Mitchell (2007)	Early 70s
Martin Karrer (2002)	80s–100
Erich Grässer (1990)	80s–100
Gabriella Gelardini (2005)	Second century, following the Second Jewish War.
Pamela Eisenbaum (2005)	Second Century

Given all the various suggestions as to Hebrews' dating, the present author thinks
it is perhaps best to situate the Epistle generally, and thus follows Koester's sug-
gested time frame in this work. She considers that a second century dating is less
likely since much time would have elapsed since the destruction of the temple,
and this would have made sacrificial argumentation less forceful for a commu-
nity. Whilst accepting that much later texts, such as the final redaction of the
Mishnah, were also concerned with matters of sacrifice, the reliance of Hebrews
on this topic specifically for much of its exposition and exhortation would sug-
gest to me that the author saw it as a key point of contact between his argument
and the historical situation of his audience, that he saw it as something of real
meaning and importance to them. A similar argument, that the force of such ref-
erences indicated a pre-destruction Jerusalem audience, was made by Westcott,

---

[161] Gelardini, Gabriella. "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for Tisha be-Av: Its Func-
tion, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*,
ed. Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 107–27. For a critical review of this vol-
ume, see Patrick Gray, review of *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*, ed. Gabriella
Gelardini, *JBL* 125 (2006):608–10.

[162] For the publication details of the authors noted in the following table, see the bibliogra-
phy.

who posited a date of between 64 and 67.[163] The topic of sacrifice is perhaps too prominent to suspect the audience had no encounter with it themselves, even despite the fact it is the desert sanctuary that is referenced in ch. 9 and not the Jerusalem Temple, and thus would have been known by the community from the Torah. For an argument to have impact, it is reasonable to expect it to call upon things close to the heart of the reader. The lack of the mention of the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem, however, does mean we cannot conclude either way, as to a date pre- or post-70 CE. It may be that the thought of sacrifice is simply still fresh in the minds of author and audience, and so a date just after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, but within the same generation, cannot be ruled out.[164]

1.4.5 The Addressor

There are many suggestions as to Hebrews' authorship. Best known is the suggestion of Pauline authorship, made by many church fathers, some of whom assumed it as a matter of course or defended it against textual discrepancies with the Pauline Corpus. For instance, Athanasius listed Hebrews among the works of Paul (*Ep. Fest.* 39), and Clement of Alexandria (as recorded in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.2) believed Luke had translated the Epistle for Paul, which accounted for the linguistic differences from the other Pauline works. The first attestations of Pauline authorship come from Alexandria and the East, and the placement of the Epistle amongst the writings of Paul in the earliest attested form in P46 (Chester Beatty Papyrus), may indicate the judgment made as to the author in the ancient Eastern Church.[165] Augustine and Jerome are our earliest testimonies to Pauline authorship in the West (Augustine, *Civ.* 16.22; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 5.59). However, it is also true that since the time of Origen, who saw the author as a disciple of Paul not Paul himself (as recorded in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.12), this supposed authorship has been contested.[166]

---

[163] Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: Macmillan, 1889), xxxix, xlii. To be sure, some sections of the Mishnah (compiled around the year 200) deal extensively with sacrifice, such as tractate Zebahim.

[164] It is possible to argue that the declaration that the old covenant is becoming obsolete in 8:13 could relate to the fall of the temple in 70 CE. If the temple had just fallen, it might have been taken as a sign that this process was in action. However, scholars have often used it in argument to suggest that the temple was still functioning at the time Hebrews was written (e.g., Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 32). However, as Attridge and Lane both acknowledge, the author is arguing exegetically at this point from the desert sanctuary, and not historically about the Temple, and so this passage cannot be used to establish a dating either way. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 229 n. 49, William Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, WBC 47A (Dallas, TX: Word Publishers, 1991), lxiii.

[165] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 1. However, other scholars have suggested that it might have been placed with Romans on the grounds it is of a comparable length. For a discussion of the early manuscripts, see David Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*, (Bolivar, MO: Quiet Waters, 2001), 11–27

[166] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 1–2.

Views of Hebrews' authorship have fallen into several categories. Firstly, there have indeed been those which follow Pauline authorship for the sake of tradition. This was primarily the case as late as the nineteenth century.[167] The attribution of Pauline composition has possibly even been upheld to combat heresy at certain points in time – Pauline authorship was popularized in the West by those combatting the Arians. Ambrose (*Fid.* 5:13) cited Hebrews as Pauline in an apologetic context.[168] However, there have always been multiple suggestions as to Hebrews' authorship because of the distinctive quality of the Epistle's own features. Some such investigations have sought to attribute Hebrews to an author, or to discount a proposed author, based on a comparison between Hebrews and their known writings. There is perhaps evidence of this approach as early as Clement of Alexandria. He posited that Luke had translated it for Paul because he noted similarities between Hebrews' style and that of Acts (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.14, an argument repeated by Aquinas, *Preface to Hebrews*, 5). Calvin would also suggest Luke himself on similar grounds (Calvin, *On Heb.* 13:23). Origen also compared Hebrews and Paul's letters and concluded that the views were Paul's, but that the style was different. He thus suggested Hebrews was written by one of Paul's students (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl* 6.25.11–13).[169]

However, others have highlighted that the internal features of Hebrews suggest that it was not written by Paul. This approach has become more and more common since the time of the Reformation, and gathered momentum with the rise of historical critical approaches since the nineteenth century.[170] One key suggestion which has been looked at a number of times in this regard is Apollos (e.g. Luther, *WA* 45.389, Spicq and Montefiore).[171] This has usually been on the strength of Hebrews' elevated rhetoric and knowledge of the LXX. Historically, Apollos, who was Alexandrian, has been remembered for attempting to argue that Jesus was the Messiah using the OT, Acts 18:24, 28, and Hebrews also develops christological arguments from the OT Scriptures.[172] Barnabas has also been a suggestion (e.g. Tertullian, *Pud.* 20). Von Harnack, however, posited that the author might have been a woman, Priscilla. He believed that the recipients were at Rome, and had suffered under the Neronian persecution, and cites the hope that the author will be reunited with them as evidence the author had been

---

[167] Koester, *Hebrews*, 42.

[168] Ibid., 26.

[169] The way in which comparisons were made is discussed at length by Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 3–21.

[170] Koester, *Hebrews*, 42.

[171] Ceslas Spicq, "L'Épitre aux Hébreux, Apollos, Jean-Baptiste, les Hellénistes et Qumran," *RevQ* 1 (1959):365–90; Hugh Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, BNTC (London: Black, 1964), 3, 12.

[172] However, on the impossibility of reaching firm conclusions, see Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, xlix–xi; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 5–6 (though, Attridge does suggest he may have been part of the Pauline circle), and Koester, *Hebrews*, 44–45.

expelled, as had Priscilla and Aquila under Claudius (Acts 18:1).[173] However, the author refers to himself in 11:32 using a masculine form of the participle, making Priscilla an unlikely candidate for author.

Most major modern commentators do not seek to identify a particular person as Hebrews' author, and Paul is almost universally rejected.[174] As Attridge puts it, "there is not in the Pauline corpus, even in such a relatively reflective and carefully composed work as Romans, anything that matches the studied prose of Hebrews with its careful structure and rich rhetorical embellishment."[175] Even the self-identification of the respective authors differs – whereas Paul claimed his authority from knowledge of Christ by divine revelation (Gal 1:11–16), the author of Hebrews regards himself as among "secondhand" recipients, having heard the message preached by others (2:3).[176] As we have seen, a "Pauline date" is far from certain, and modern linguistic and syntactical analyses have demonstrated major differences between Hebrews and the Pauline letters.[177] What we can establish, however, is that this was an addressor who considered himself to have considerable authority over his addressees, and who sees himself as being their teacher. In modern terms, we might also say he sees himself as a spiritual leader who instructs them in what he believes to be the key points of Christian doctrine (5:12–13). The tone of Hebrews, with its forceful admonishments, especially those found in chs. 10–13, indicates a concern primarily for their spiritual welfare, and also suggests he is well acquainted with this community, even if now distant from it (13:24). He was possibly a leader in it as well as member of it, at some stage.[178]

The author's concerns seem to have been motivated by a particular eschatological viewpoint in which the present creation would be "shaken" and only certain things, and people, will endure eternally (1:10–12; 12:27–28). We can therefore expect the admonishments and arguments he makes to be governed in some way by that perspective. We also know that this was also a highly educated person, whose register and linguistic skill outstrips most of the other writings in the NT. The frequent citations of Scripture also demonstrate his familiarity with it, and since he most often cites the LXX, we can posit that he was an educated

---

[173] Adolf von Harnack, "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," trans. Luther D. Lazarus, *Lutheran Church Review* 19 (1900):448–71.

[174] Ellingworth concludes that Apollos is the least unlikely of the possible conjectures. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 21 see also Cockerill, *Epistle*,10.

[175] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 2.

[176] Ibid.

[177] For a good summary of the debate through the centuries, see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 126–27, Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, xlvii–li. Cf. Koester, *Hebrews*, 42–46.

[178] The leader's relationship with the audience has been taken up in some detail by Victor (Sung-Yul) Rhee, "The Author of Hebrews as a Leader of the Faith Community," *JETS* 55/2 (2012):365–75.

Jewish man from the diaspora, perhaps Alexandria.[179] Given the standard of his Greek we can expect him to have had a classical Greek education in rhetoric and poetics as was common at the time. By virtue of his education, the preserve usually of those with a certain social status, he would doubtlessly have known the philosophical works of the ancients like Plato and Aristotle, and probably also of his contemporaries and the likes of Philo. All these acknowledgments can help our interpretation of Hebrews' discourse, particularly with respect to intertextuality and the types of texts and traditions the addressor might have known and upon which be drawing (= the extratext).

1.4.6 *The Situational Context: Historical Setting*

When discussing Hebrews' author and audience, the issue has naturally often been tied to the historical situation surrounding the composition of the Epistle, in particular, the setting for the persecution envisaged in 10:32–34, and thereby the identity of the author and his intended audience, and, in particular, their geographical location.[180] In the light of my comment above regarding Alexandria as a possible background location, it is only fair to note that the question arises of whether the author could have been based in or even hailed from Rome, given the reference to Italy in 13:24, or Jerusalem, given Hebrews' priestly theology, or if he had moved from any one of these places to the other.[181]

The same questions may be asked of the audience, which might either have been displaced from Rome following persecution, or in Rome receiving the greetings from those no longer in Italy (13:24).[182] What is at stake, as Ellingworth notes, is how to interpret ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας in 13:24: Greet all your leaders and all the saints. Those from Italy send you greetings. (NRSV). It could mean either "those in Italy", "the Italians" or "those who come from Italy, implying they have left their place of origin."[183] He suggests that the second would give the more natural sense for the Greek use of ἀπό (cf. John 1:44; Acts 6:9; 10:23) and posits the community was based in Rome. He also points out that the fact Clement of Rome quotes Hebrews would support this theory. However, not all scholars have taken 13:24 the same way, and, even if they have, some would assert we cannot be sure if the Italians were still in Italy, or if the author himself had a directly Italian connection. For instance, Cockerill posits that this phrase

---

[179] See also Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 1, 209.

[180] Koester, *Hebrews*, 52.

[181] Martin Karrer, *Der Brief and die Hebräer Kapitel* 1,1–5,10 ÖTKNT 20/1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2003), 96 suggests Italy is the most likely place of origin for Hebrews, but cautions against making any interpretation dependent on location because of such complications.

[182] For a summary of the various positions, see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 1–13.

[183] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 28–29.

means "those from Italy" and confirms that both the author and the audience moved in a circle that included people living outside Palestine, but notes that no specific city is mentioned.[184] Montefiore, however, argued that Hebrews was sent to the community in Corinth by the Alexandrian Apollos, to whose Judaizing tendency Paul's 1 Corinthians also responded. They had, he claimed, been driven there following persecution under Claudius in around 49 CE, and were now under pressure to apostatize, hence Hebrews' constant comparison of the OT and NT.[185] Indeed, opinions vary greatly:

Author	Audience location
Ceslas Spicq (1952)	Priests from Jerusalem in Caesarea
Hugh Montefiore (1964)	Corinth
George Wesley Buchanan (1972)	Jerusalem
Harold Attridge (1981)	Rome
Erich Grässer	Uncertain
William Lane (1991)	Rome
Paul Ellingworth (1993)	Rome
Craig Koester (2001)	Rome
Martin Karrer (2002)	Rome is most probable, no certainty
Gabriella Gelardini (2005)	Christians in Roman Empire under Neronian persecution
Pamela Eisenbaum (2005)	Rome
Kenneth Schenck (2007)	Uncertain. Possibly Rome or Ephesus
Alan Mitchell (2007)	Rome
Gareth Cockerill (2012)	Rome
Albert Vanhoye (2015 – most recently)	Uncertain, likely the East (e. g. Asia Minor)

On the other hand, the references to the priesthood in 5:1–5, in particular the use of the present tense, could suggest that the Jerusalem priesthood was still in office and witnessed by the author of Hebrews.[186] Conversely, however, the author may himself not have been present in Jerusalem, but by his assuming that his writing would be understood by his audience, it may be inferred that the intended audience had access to the temple cult and was therefore Jewish-Christian and in Jerusalem.[187] The implication of the present tense in 5:1 is potentially to suggest that the intended audience were supposed to know the yearly event of the selection of a high-priest.[188] Whereas in earlier times the office was for

---

[184] Cockerill, *Epistle*, 16.
[185] Montefiore, *Commentary*, 3, 12.
[186] See Koester, *Hebrews*, 50–54 for the pros and cons of this argument.
[187] For a summary of the arguments, see Koester, *Hebrews*, 46–48.
[188] Philip Church, *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*, NovTSup 171 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 271–2 also argues that there is no word for

life, the Romans had made it an annual appointment, and the author, and also audience, may have been Jerusalem based.[189] The problem with this reading, however, is that Hebrews does not reference the temple itself, but rather the tabernacle of the Pentateuch in ch. 9, which might have been known to a diaspora community from the biblical account, as recorded in the LXX. For instance, Lane observes the connection between the reference to the sanctuary and the prior use of Exod 25:40 in 8:5 – the reference to the sanctuary links back to the gift of the Law on Sinai in the Epistle's argumentation, and is not necessarily indicative of the second Jerusalem temple. Lane thus suggests that the present tense should be read as "timeless".[190] Furthermore, a number of recent commentators, such as Attridge, Koester and Ellingworth have pointed out, the present tense was used of the Jerusalem temple rituals long after the temple was destroyed, as in Josephus *Ant.* 4.6.1–8; 4.9.1–7.[191] It has thus been suggested that perhaps the present tense was employed because the ordinance was considered to be an eternal one which still stood and would come into force if the temple were rebuilt, as in Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.6§77.[192]

With regards to the suggestion of Alexandria, the author knows the LXX, suggesting he is from the diaspora, and shares vocabulary with Philo, such as the use of χαρακτήρ (reflection/impress) (1:3 Cf. *De Opif.* 146), as we shall discuss in ch. 2.[193] Spicq is perhaps the most famous proponent of Hebrews' knowledge of Alexandrian texts, namely those of Philo.[194] In more recent times, however, this suggestion has been taken up by Ellingworth, who acknowledges that Hebrews shares much of the Alexandrian Jewish background of Philo, the author of Wisdom and the author of 4 Maccabees. For instance, the Epistle uses ἀπαύγασμα

"former" in 7:23. As such, this verse could be seen to apply to contemporary priests. He posits that the temple was still standing when Hebrews was written and that "first century readers, attracted to the temple and the priesthood, could be expected to think of their contemporaries." He also argues that the Jerusalem temple is in view in 8:3–4 and suggests that in the contrary to fact condition", the imperfect tense refers to the present.

[189] George Wesley Buchanan, *To the Hebrews*, AB 36 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972), 256–60, Westcott, *Epistle*, xxxix.

[190] Lane, *Hebrews*, lxiii.

[191] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 8 n. 58; Koester, *Hebrews*, 53.

[192] Though the idea of the old rite passing away in Hebrews would suggest that Hebrews did not envisage the temple cult reviving (e. g., 8:3). Attridge, *Hebrews*, 6–8; Koester, *Hebrews*, 53; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 31; Lane, *Hebrews*, lxiii. Even as late as the Mishnah, there may be evidence of similar patterns of thought through the use of participles to describe temple activities, rather than the perfect, e. g. *m. Yoma* 1:2.

[193] Interestingly, the Epistle is quoted by Clement of Alexandria (d. ca. 215 CE); see also Koester, *Hebrews*, 20. Against this possibility of Alexandria, Guthrie argues that the Alexandrian church was not suggested in antiquity as the destination for Hebrews, and also that it was in Alexandria that it was assumed to be by Paul and sent to "the Hebrews." Donald Guthrie, *Hebrews*, TNTC 15 (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1983; repr. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 2008), 29.

[194] E. g. Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 49. Ronald Williamson has argued against this position, as we shall later see.

(1:3) and this is hapax legomenon in the NT, and found only in the LXX in Wis 7:26 in a similar context of creation, and some of the thought in ch. 11 bears striking resemblance to passages like 4 Macc 3:5; 15:9 and 16:16–17.[195] However, he eventually concludes that Rome is a likely place of origin given that Hebrews is quoted by Clement of Rome.[196] Ellingworth also notes the difficulty in establishing exactly if Alexandria were the place to which Hebrews was written, citing in particular F. F. Bruce's observation that the early mistaken association of Hebrews with Paul would suggest this was not the case.[197]

From a DA perspective, we might argue that the author would have expected his intended audience to understand references to literature probably composed in Alexandria, such as to the Book of Wisdom, and an addressee with an Alexandrian connection cannot, therefore, be ruled out. Rhetorically speaking, it would be rather pointless to use an argument which one's intended addressees were unlikely to "get". We will also look later in more depth at the possible connections between Hebrews and Philo, and whilst we may not conclude a reliance on the latter, it does seem safe to affirm that he was aware of these writings (see also literature review on Spicq and Williamson), and also the Book of Wisdom. An Alexandrian milieu for Hebrews' authorship does seem the most likely in the opinion of this author. That he presumes his audience will understand such references, from a discourse analysis perspective, indicates some presupposed knowledge of these texts on their part, and thus they might have had Alexandrian origins themselves, even if they later moved to Rome.

1.4.7 Hebrews' Intended Audience and its Discourse

Aside from its geographical location, there is a diversity of suggestions as to the religious background of Hebrews' intended audience – from Ebionite Christians who thought Jesus was an archangel, to Essenes who had entered the Church.[198] It is widely recognised that the superscription "to the Hebrews" is a later addition to the text, because it is lacking in the earliest manuscript, and the question in the main revolves around whether the original audience had Jewish or Gentile heritage.[199]

---

[195] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 97, 624. On the Maccabean literature and Hebrews more generally, see Gert. J. Steyn, "The Maccabean Literature and Hebrews: Some Intertextual Observations," *JSem* 24 (2015): 271–91.

[196] Spicq, *L'Épître*, 28–29.

[197] Frederick Fyvie Bruce, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), xxxi.

[198] Michael Goulder, "Hebrews and the Ebionites," *NTS* 49 (2003):393–406 and Yigael Yadin "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, ScrHier 4 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958), 36–55. The background of thought employed in Hebrews' rhetoric is discussed at length throughout Hurst, *Epistle*.

[199] The title "to the Hebrews" is absent from P46 but is found in Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus.

Particularly in the first and early second half of the twentieth century, some previous scholars have viewed the Epistle as a polemic against "Judaizing Christians". The addressor employs *synkrisis*, as in 3:1–6, for instance, where he compares Jesus to Moses (see also 1:1–2; 4:8) and, elsewhere, to other OT figures, and his use of this technique was taken up by scholars and used to denigrate Judaism. It was argued that the priestly images of Christ, such as those in chs. 5 and 9, were intended to completely discount the sacrificial arrangement and invalidate the Levitical priesthood.[200] It was often argued that Hebrews was written to a Jewish Christian audience to persuade them not to fall back into "Jewish ways", and key proponents included Francis Charles Synge and B. P. W. Stather Hunt. They even went so far as to say that the title "to [πρός] the Hebrews" should be translated "against the Hebrews".[201] The Epistle was deemed a carefully woven piece of deliberative rhetoric.[202]

Nevertheless, in recent years, we have seen an acknowledgement in the scholarly community that emergent Christianity did not consider itself as something wholly distinct from Judaism.[203] Rather, "early Christians considered themselves to a large extent part of Judaism. For that reason, NT statements critical of Judaism have to be interpreted within the context of intramural conflicts among Jews in the first century."[204] Some scholars now maintain the idea that Hebrews was written primarily to Jewish Christians in danger of "reverting", but acknowledge that there was no intended anti-Semitism in the Epistle. Cockerill, for example, posits that there was a danger of the community returning to Jewish ways, but is keen to stress the positive attitude of the Epistle as a whole towards Judaism through the use of typology.[205]

It is, however, possible to argue against the view the Hebrews was written to Judaizing Christians. Indeed, other scholars, like Ellingworth have posited that there may be a mixed audience, and suggests that the lack of derogatory terms in relation to Israel may be to avoid reviving tensions now settled in the mixed community, happily comprised of both Jews and Gentiles.[206] Another group of

---

[200] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxvi–ii.

[201] Francis Charles Synge, *Hebrews and the Scriptures* (London: SPCK, 1959), 44. Bernard Patterson Wathan Stather Hunt, *Primitive Gospel Sources* (London: James Clarke, 1951), 292. For a modern example, see Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 35–39. Guthrie argues that Christians used to meet in houses and the author wanted to reassure them of the superiority of Christianity against the "loss of religious glories," such as temple worship. However, he accepts the primary concern is to prevent the audience from falling away from Christianity, rather than a return to Judaism.

[202] This debate has been taken up again more recently in Andrew J. Wilson, "Hebrews 3:6B and 3:14 Revisited," *TynBul* 62 (2011):247–68, who also discusses the possibility that there are people in the addressed community who appear to be true believers but whose conduct suggests they are not.

[203] E. g., Koester, *Hebrews*, 57; Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 35.

[204] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxvi–ii.

[205] Cockerill, *Epistle*, 22–23.

[206] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 25.

scholars have argued for a purely or majority Gentile audience, positing that the warnings regarding repentance from dead works (6:1) and concerning enlightenment (6:4; 10:32) were ways of talking about conversion from paganism, and that the strange teachings of 13:9 might refer not to the preaching of Judaizers but to Hellenistic syncretism.[207] Earlier proponents of the Gentile audience theory include Bruce, Moffatt and Von Soden, but this idea is now not very common.[208] As Attridge has pointed out:

… obvious features of the text, such as its appeal to Jewish cultic traditions or sophisticated exegetical arguments, do not necessarily indicate a Jewish-Christian audience. Other Jewish-Christian authors, such as Paul, write to what are exclusively or predominantly Gentile communities, such as Galatia or Corinth, and argue with Jewish techniques and themes.[209]

From a discourse analysis point of view, even if we might understand Attridge's point, we must consider the maxims of quality and quantity, that when writing, one bears in mind one's audience and tries to make what one says relevant to them in particular without concerning them with information they already know, or baffling them with arguments they would not understand.[210] This has been taken up in detail in relation to Hebrews by Westfall, who notes that because ch. 5–10 constitute a defence of Jesus' priesthood they supply information about the readers: "If the readers were not Jews then the extended discussion concerning priesthood and the sacrificial system would have had little relevance and would have been too much information."[211] This is because such a long section on a known topic "would constitute solving issues that were not problems and answering questions that would not have been raised," and, Westfall argues, "a predominantly Gentile church would have found it difficult to connect emotionally with the imagery for which they lacked an adequate frame of reference concerning the Aaronic priesthood."[212]

---

[207] Koester, *Hebrews*, 47.

[208] Alexander Balmain Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The First Apology for Christianity* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899), 23; James Moffatt, *Hebrews*, ICC (London: T&T Clark, 1924), xxiv–xxvi; Hermann von Soden, "Der Hebräerbrief," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 10 (1884):435–93, 627–56.

[209] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 12.

[210] This theory is usually attributed to Grice, who outlined the maxims of quantity (contributions are expected to be "neither more than less than is required"), quality (contributions are expected to be "genuine and not spurious"), relation (contributions are expected to be "appropriate to immediate needs at each stage of the transaction") and manner (partners in a conversation are expected to "make it clear what contribution [s/]he is making and to execute his[/her] performance with reasonable dispatch") as governing most discourses. See Grice, "Logic and Conversation," 47. See also Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 31–33.

[211] Westfall, *Discourse*, 108.

[212] Westfall acknowledges that a Gentile might have been familiar with the Aaronic priesthood from Scripture. However, a Jewish audience would still make more sense in that though

In addition, the keenness in Hebrews' *synkrisis* to avoid denigrating Judaism by continually expressing reverence for Jewish revelation and prophets (e. g. 1:1–2; 3:1–6; 11:4–33) would appear in some way to try to placate the audience, and to convince them of the author's sympathy for, and perhaps even his own love of, Jewish tradition. This is done so emphatically that a Gentile-Christian audience is unlikely, something supported by the expressed concern the author has for the hereditary Jews in 2:16, where he narrates Jesus' concern for Abraham's descendants: "for surely it is not with angels that he [Christ] is concerned but with the descendants of Abraham."[213] There is no mention here of spiritual descent as in Gal 3:29, leaving us to consider that it is physical descent at stake. As Cockerill has commented:

One might also argue that Gentile believers tempted to abandon Christ would not be moved by appeals to a Scripture they had accepted only when they identified with Christ. The author's concern that his hearers 'not fall away from the living God' (3:12) is no objection to their Jewish roots. The pastor [=author] is convinced that rejection of fulfilment in Christ is rejection of all that God has ever spoken and thus a rejection of God himself.[214]

Because of Hebrews' reliance on the LXX, the present author considers it probable that Hebrews was written to a Hellenistic Jewish audience. This is based on the way the author argues, and what this tells us of his expectations of his audience. Whilst there was no unified "Judaism" we can specifically label "Hellenistic Judaism", she concurs with Lane that "it is convenient to use this designation to connote the varieties of Jewish piety and praxis that emerged in urban centres throughout the Greek-speaking Roman world."[215]

1.5 Genre

Establishing the genre of a piece is very important from a DA perspective: "a fundamental communicative function of genres is that they allow the reader both to distinguish between complete and incomplete texts and to relate the text being read or heard to those from the reader's other textual experiences."[216] It is therefore key to understanding macrostructural cohesiveness, because genres tend to have shared structural formulae which enable the reader to recognize

---

priestly] imagery would have activated a strong mental and emotional frame of reference" and "the reconciliation of the priesthood of Jesus and the priesthood of the believer with the Aaronic system would have been a relevant issue." Ibid.

[213] See also Koester, *Hebrews*, 47.

[214] Cockerill, *Epistle*, 22.

[215] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxvi.

[216] Reed, "Modern," 39.

the type of genre being employed.[217] A major question posed by scholars of our Epistle, however, concerns what kind of literature Hebrews actually is. Traditionally, it has found its place with the writings of Paul, and was thus generally considered to be a letter. The problem here is that Hebrews does not open in the way one would normally expect of a letter – there is no formal greeting, as with the Pauline Epistles, either to a group or a single person.[218] However, the ending in 13:20–25 does contain what one would normally expect in the closing lines of such a letter, including a blessing, some personal comments and a farewell.[219] Various possibilities have been proposed, such as that the opening salutation or cover-note may have been lost, or that 13:20–25 is not original. Such possibilities are discussed by a number of scholars, such as Spicq and Vanhoye, who maintain Hebrews is a letter ("epistle").[220] Ellingworth also maintains the position that Hebrews was a letter, but does not focus on these possibilities to make his argument. He points out that there may have been special circumstances to Hebrews' composition, and therefore we cannot necessarily infer Hebrews is not a letter from the lack of a typical letter opening. From an examination of the features of Hebrews, he concludes that some are oral, like the alliteration of π- sounds in the exordium, and others are written, such as Hebrews' intricate structures, but he nevertheless concludes that Hebrews as we have it takes the form of a letter.[221]

To the argument over whether Hebrews retains its original opening, one might also add that the unity of the first chapter is demonstrable, given that the end of the exordium in 1:4 leads into the angelocentric argumentation of 1:5–14. We have no reason to assume that the exordium is a later addition, or was even used to replace an original letter-like beginning. Whatever form we might think Hebrews takes, as Lane asserts, the opening appears to be original "these opening lines are without doubt a real introduction, which would not tolerate any prescript preceding them."[222]

---

[217] Ibid. Admittedly, individual authors may manipulate, or even break with, some of these conventions in order to "guide" their addressees in a particular direction. This is especially true in cases of intertextuality, where previous discourses are employed to the current author's own ends. Ibid., 41–42. Nevertheless, genre is seen as being "a relatively stable set of conventions that is associated with, and partly enacts, a socially ratified type of activity." Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 126.

[218] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 13.

[219] This is discussed in more detail in Gert J. Steyn, "The Ending of Hebrews Reconsidered," *ZNW* 103 (2012):235–53, who proposes that the end of ch. 13 is an addition. See also Alexander J.M. Wedderburn, "The 'Letter' to the Hebrews and its Thirteenth Chapter," *NTS* 50 (2004):390–405.

[220] Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 21–25; Albert Vanhoye, *Le Christ est Notre Prêtre: la Doctrine de l'Épître aux Hébreux*, Vie Chrétienne 118 (Toulouse: Fournié, 1969), 14.

[221] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 59–62.

[222] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, lxx. See also Albert Vanhoye, *La situation du Christ: Hébreux 1–2*, (Paris: Cerf, 1969), 14–15. Floyd Filson, *"Yesterday": A Study of Hebrews in the light of Chapter 13*, SBT 4 (London: SCM, 1967), 13–26.

A key piece of evidence as to Hebrews' genre is the self-designation given in 13:22, where Hebrews describes itself as a "word of exhortation." There has been a recent attempt in scholarship to define this genre more specifically. As Koester states, "exhortation" is a common feature of early Christian letters. One might still therefore conclude that Hebrews is a letter. However, again as Koester notes, the general preference in scholarship is to interpret this term to refer to some kind of homily.[223] The Greek term used is λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως, which is also found in Acts 13:15. There, Paul is asked to speak in the synagogue, just after the reading from the Law and Prophets, to which he responds by offering a homily (Acts 13:16–41).[224] This term would appear, then, to refer to some kind of synagogue homily. This could also account for why the author refers to "speaking" rather than "writing" in a number of instances (2:5; 5:11; 6:9; 8:1; 9:5).[225]

Indeed, one of the classic arguments for Hebrews' being a homily is that it exhibits the features that one might ascribe to this genre. This was argued by Hartwig Thyen, who sought to prove that a number of Jewish and Christian writings in Greek were influenced by Jewish-Hellenistic homilies.[226] He based his studies on a number of works, including Philo's Allegorical Commentaries on Genesis, *1 Clement*, parts of 1, 3 and 4 Maccabees and Stephen's speech in Acts 7, but also included Hebrews in this category because it shares a number of features in common with such homilies. For instance, Hebrews uses the first and second person plural, not singular, and the address "brothers" to engage with his audience. Hebrews also contains paraenetic sections, including part of the conclusion, which are typical of homiletic works. Thyen also draws parallels between the use of the LXX in Hebrews and in other Jewish-Hellenistic homilies, in particular, referring extensively to the Pentateuch and Psalms, among other traits. Whilst we do not necessarily have to accept his conclusion that 13:22–25 is an appended postscript which was added when the homily was committed to writing to be sent out, his observations have struck a chord with a number of scholars, such as Grässer, and go a long way to establishing Hebrews as some kind of sermon.[227]

---

[223] Koester, *Hebrews*, 80.

[224] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, lxx. One might also compare the use of encouraging words in 2 Macc 7:24; 15:11. Dio Chrysostom also speaks of "words for the sake of encouragement", which may be a way of understanding "word of exhortation". *De regno* 1.

[225] Koester, *Hebrews*, 80–81.

[226] Hartwig Thyen, *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*, FRLANT 47, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955), 7–39, 58–59, 62–74, 85–110. Erich Grässer, "Der Hebräerbrief 1938–1963" *TRu* 30 (1964):138–226, 153, 160. Cf. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, lxxi, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 13–14.

[227] Thyen, *Der Stil*, 17, 106; Grässer, "Der Hebräerbrief 1938–1963," 153. See also Cockerill, *Epistle*, 11–16 and Lawrence Wills, "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity," *HTR* 77 (1984):277–99. For a good summary of the arguments for Hebrews' being a homily, see Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, lxx–lxxiv.

However, whilst viewing Hebrews as a homily assists modern readers to envisage Hebrews as being read aloud to a group, we really know rather little about the forms taken by Jewish or Christian preaching in the first century.[228] The conception of Hebrews as a homily is a better fit than seeing Hebrews as a letter, but a re-assessment would naturally need to be made if more evidence of such homilies were to become available. Hebrews' being this genre would certainly account for the alliterative use of π in the opening lines to the exordium (1:1–2), which are intended to catch the audience's attention, something best achieved when read aloud, it would account for the use of the first person plural, and the visible deliberative rhetoric evident in verses such as 3:6; 4:14 and 10:23.[229] However, accepting 13:22–25 as original, leaves some doubt that it was read aloud by the original author. An intermediary position, proposed by Lane, is that Hebrews was originally a homily sent from afar to be read aloud. This may explain why some features of Hebrews seem to be more akin to a letter, whilst others are more akin to a homily.[230] Andrew McGowan has also come to a similar conclusion, and suggests that Hebrews began life as a "desk homily" which was then sent to a community.[231]

The present author therefore wishes to focus on Hebrews' self-definition. Hebrews is a "word of exhortation" according to 13:22.[232] Whilst this may well be best understood as a type of homily, it is safe to say that it was sent to a community to encourage them in their faith in Christ. Hebrews was not read to them by the original author. Knowing that this would have been the case is significant, since when one writes knowing that someone else will mediate one's discourse, one is often more careful to ensure that the features of the text convey the point(s) one wishes. Indeed, within early Christianity, possibly partly because of illiteracy on the part of the audience, letters from preachers were read out at gatherings (e. g. Col 4:16; Acts 15:21), and so the difference between a letter sent to a community and a homily was potentially not very great. However, the term "Epistle" continues to be employed in this thesis as a title for Hebrews, simply as this is a traditional designation for the text.

---

[228] Koester, *Hebrews*, 81.

[229] On the types of rhetoric in Hebrews, Koester offers a helpful summary (*Hebrews*, 82).

[230] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, lxxv.

[231] Andrew B. McGowan, *Ancient Christian Worship: Church Practices in Social, Historical and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 76–77.

[232] Even if 13:22 were not written by the original author, the person who wrote it considered the previous chapters to be a word of exhortation, and so we can assume it was taken as such by some of the earliest readers.

Chapter 2

Literature Review and Status Quaestionis

2.1 Introduction

Although there is no widely known monograph on the exact topic of creation in Hebrews, scholars have considered this topic in other ways. A review of literature on Hebrews has revealed that our creation references are not neglected by scholars and sometimes form important parts of their examinations of the text. At the very least, the references to creation are often analyzed, even if creation is not treated as a topic in its own right or is considered to be a secondary/subsidiary topic. Approaches to creation include addressing it as one theological subject amongst others, for example, remarking upon this topic as it arises in various verses as part of commentaries and discussing it specifically as part of wider examinations in articles or in sections of studies. The aim of this section is to assess how the topic of creation is dealt with in existing literature. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss various approaches taken to Hebrews and how the topic of creation is both acknowledged and overlooked. I do this under topical headings rather than strictly chronologically, in order to make clearer the various ways with which our topic is dealt in existing literature, usually in relation to scholarly debates or as the result of methodological investigations.

2.1.1 Hebrews and Creation

Perhaps the most obvious way of approaching our topic in Hebrews would be from the point of view of ecology. There have been a number of volumes investigating creation in the New Testament. In part, this is more recently due to modern concerns over ecology, and some scholars have sought to interpret the NT so as to encourage environmental concerns. David G Horrell's volume, *Ecological Hermeneutics*, seeks to chart the appeals made to the Bible in environmental ethics, and offers a good introduction to this area of research.[1] The global concern over the environment and climate change means that some of these volumes have even made their way into mainstream reading. An example here would be Mark Bredin's *The Ecology of the New Testament: Creation, Re-creation*

---

[1] David G. Horrell, *Ecological Hermeneutics: Biblical, Historical and Theological Perspectives* (London: T&T Clark, 2010).

and the Environment.[2] Such a reading of Hebrews, specifically, is proposed by Jeffrey S. Lamp in his short volume *The Greening of Hebrews?*

In this book, Lamp offers an ideological reading of the text, employing ecological hermeneutics: "the goal is to hear a suppressed voice, the voice of Earth, in, through, or even against the text."[3] The work takes its impetus from the work of Norman C. Habel, who instituted the Earth Bible Project.[4] For Lamp, Hebrews is a "grey text". That is to say, in contrast to a "green text" that is positive in its affirmation of the value and care of creation, Hebrews shows how "human beings and/or God despoil or disregard Earth in favor of their own ends."[5] With regard to a passage covered in the present investigation, for instance, whilst Lamp sees Christology as taking precedence in the Epistle, he nevertheless believes that Earth's voice can be articulated through an examination of Heb 2:6–7. This passage, he notes, appeals to Ps 8:4–6, which although being a related commentary on Gen 1 and also subject to anthropocentric bias, "does make a strong affirmation of the fingerprint of God in the created order (8:3), an affirmation perhaps reinforced by the *inclusio* of vv. 1 and 9 that identifies Earth as the stage on which God's name is extolled."[6] According to Lamp, whilst Hebrews might play on the anthropocentric bias of the psalm, "to those who know the Psalm, however, the citation of vv. 4–6 elicits remembrance of v. 3, and thus provides opportunity for the voice of Earth to be injected into the argument of Hebrews at this point."[7] Lamp believes that the key to understanding the theological topic of creation within Hebrews is thus not by reading Hebrews alone, but looking at the texts cited in it and reading into it from the point of view of Earth, taking into account all intertextual references and even other biblical accounts that might elicit Earth's point of view.

A fair critique of Lamp would be to say that he sometimes sacrifices the plain meaning of the text in pursuit of his own ideological reading. Lamp's zeal to find Earth's voice sometimes results in his reversing, distorting or even ignoring the argumentation of Hebrews itself. This is, sadly, a common issue with much ecological exegesis, and whilst the intentions of such scholars may be, to some extent, laudable, the methodology runs contrary to mainstream exegesis which usually places an emphasis on historically locating a text in order

---

[2] Mark Bredin, *The Ecology of the New Testament: Creation, Re-creation and the Environment* (Colorado Springs, CO: Biblica, 2010).

[3] Jeffrey S. Lamp, *Greening*, 3.

[4] Lamp, *Greening*, 4–5, quotation from 6. Entries in the series include Norman C. Habel, *Readings from the Perspective of Earth*, Earth Bible 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Norman C. Habel and Shirley Wurst, eds., *The Earth Story in Genesis*, Earth Bible 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) and Norman C. Habel and Vicky Balabanski, eds., *The Earth Story in the New Testament*, Earth Bible 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2005).

[5] Ibid., 9.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid., 13.

to do it justice and prevent exegesis from becoming eisegesis. I therefore wish to make clear that the present study is not an ecological investigation akin to that of Lamp. Discourse analysis is very much concerned with the intended act of communication, as already discussed, and thus has very different exegetical goals from postmodernist works such as *The Greening of Hebrews?* It is not the purpose of this thesis to hear "the voice of the earth", but rather to hear the voice of the author. My impetus, however, does come from a volume dealing with OT citations in Hebrews, namely Susan Elaine Docherty's work *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews*.

2.1.2 Identifying the Topic of Creation as a Theme in the Epistle

Docherty aims to situate Hebrews within its first-century milieu, regarding it not as a solely *Christian* work, but as an example of first-century Jewish exegesis, the understanding of which can help elucidate its use of LXX.[8] One of the things she found in her examination of its citations was that Hebrews made frequent references to creation.

It was by building on the OT citations in Hebrews, and giving a thorough examination not only of which techniques are employed, but how those techniques are used, that Docherty identified creation as a significant topic in the Epistle. For instance, in her discussion of Ps 104 (103) in Heb 1:7 and further allusions to Ps 102:27 (101:27) in Heb 1:11, she saw that the topic of God's power over creation is present in both Psalms, something also reflected in Heb 1:2 and 4:4.[9] In fact, Docherty noted a number of references to the Genesis creation narrative in Hebrews, including to Gen 1-2 in Heb 1:2–3, the use of Gen 2:2 in Heb 4:4, the echoes of Gen 1:11 and 3:17–18 in Heb 6:7–8, as well as the reference in 11:3.[10] She therefore concluded that the creation topic in Hebrews is not to be underestimated. Docherty's findings in this regard have been reiterated and advanced as part of her chapter on "Genesis in Hebrews" in a recent compendium on the use of Genesis in the New Testament.[11]

Many of the observations made by Docherty are in themselves not unfamiliar to scholars of Hebrews. For instance, she acknowledges that the reference to creation in Heb 1:2–3 (see also 11:3) probably owes more to the Wisdom tradition

---

[8] Susan Elaine Docherty, *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews: A Case Study in Early Jewish Bible Interpretation*, WUNT 2/260, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 9–82 and 83–120 respectively.

[9] Ibid.,163.

[10] Ibid., 163, 189–90, 193–94.

[11] Susan Elaine Docherty, "Genesis in Hebrews," in *Genesis in the New Testament*, ed. Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, LNTS 446 (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 130–46. Karrer observes the sources of Hebrews' scriptural quotations: Pentateuch 13 times, Psalms 14 times, Prophets 5 times Major and 2 times Minor. Karrer, *Hebräer*, 62.

than to the Genesis account, and that there are possible links with Philo, something which is the subject of an important debate between Ronald Williamson and Ceslas Spicq, as we shall see.[12] However, in her detailed analysis of certain passages in the Epistle, she brings the topic of creation to the fore in an important way. Thanks to Docherty's work, a specific question now arises of what the significance is of the given creation reference at each stage of the Epistle's discourse.

2.2 Hebrews and Discourse Analysis

Although my impetus for the topic of this research came from Docherty's observations, the impetus for my methodology came from another source, namely the recent interest in Discourse Analysis being applied to the Epistle. In this section, I look at some of the most influential and substantial investigations into Hebrews using this methodology.

2.2.1 Linda Lloyd Neeley

Edited by Robert E. Longacre, a renowned discourse analyst, and one-time student of the Zellig Harris, Neeley's work, "A Discourse Analysis of Hebrews," focuses on four major systems of information organization in the Epistle's discourse:
– The combining of sentences into larger discourse units (paragraphs and embedded discourses).[13]
– The functions of discourse units and their constituent structure.
– The distinction between backbone and support information.
– Semantic organization.[14]

Neeley sees the above as the guiding principles by which someone organizes their information, in order to present it to their addressee, saying: "Failure to understand intuitively the underlying structure of a discourse may mean failure to distinguish these vital categories and, therefore, failure to understand the text."[15] What is more, she informs us, these principles are almost universally found across languages all over the globe. In many languages, authors tend to organize discourse around a "backbone of information". This "backbone" is then

---

[12] Ibid., 130–31.
[13] An embedded discourse is a smaller unit of discourse within the overall discourse. Guthrie, *Structure*, 46 n. 2.
[14] Ibid., 1. The functions of discourse units pertain to things like introduction, body and conclusion, whereas semantic organization pertains to the choice of words and theme development. See Westfall, *Discourse*, 16.
[15] Neeley, "Discourse," 2. Pages 3–4 discuss her categories in more detail.

supported with additional information, and in all languages, authors in some way organize their discourse to give meaning – they select particular words and develop particular topics in accordance with their aims.[16]

Neeley seeks to separate backbone from support material, in order to examine Hebrews' constituent structure and the internal structure of some of its major embedded discourses.[17] Her detailed work proceeds by establishing criteria for dividing Hebrews into its embedded discourses and paragraphs. She thus develops "partitioning criteria" by which to divide the text.[18] For instance, Neeley establishes "boundary features" such as changes in genre, and transitionary introductions or conclusions with their back-references and summaries, or reiterations, for embedded discourses. She also identifies certain phrases or particles like διὰ τοῦτο (because of this) and οὖν (therefore) as markers that the author is highlighting backbone information. Moreover, she seeks to identify how these markers are used by the author of Hebrews.[19]

Neeley is sometimes criticized for her lack of precision. For instance, she is said not to classify genres consistently, and her supposition that inferential particles are always markers of backbone material is criticized by Westfall.[20] However, by taking careful notice of the fact that "an author has definite linguistic ways, such as special connectives and grammatical subordination in which he indicates which of his material is backbone and which is support," and by acknowledging that those ways may be very individualistic, varying from author to author, she is clearly aware of such key issues of authorial intention and style.[21] Among her findings, she observes that Hebrews often employs a participle phrase as the last item in a discourse unit, and that it often states in some way information which foreshadows what is to come.[22] She also moves beyond the mere establishment of criteria to use them to establish "peaks" of prominence. For instance, in 10:5–14, she notes how there is a lexico-semantic climax, combining the repetition of earlier key lexical items, such as priesthood and sitting down at God's right hand.[23]

Neeley's detailed arguments as to Hebrews' structure are carefully interwoven with her establishment of criteria. Neeley offers a contribution to the use of discourse analysis in the study of Hebrews because she is among the first to

---

[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid., 5 gives a good summary of her chapters.
[18] Ibid., 6.
[19] Ibid., 6–21. On using particles for background information, see 18.
[20] See Westfall, *Discourse*, 17–18.
[21] Neeley, "Discourse," 4–5. See also Jeffrey T. Reed, "Modern Linguistics and Historical Criticism: Using the Former for Doing the Latter," in *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*, ed. Stanley Porter and D. A. Carson, JSNTSup 168, Studies in New Testament Greek 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 36–62, esp., 36, 39–54.
[22] Neeley, "Discourse," 29–31. This is called "participle foreshadowing".
[23] Ibid., 24.

look at Hebrews in the light of DA and to begin to establish on the basis of its own discourse how we might understand its structure. However, rather than her study having immediate value in exegetical terms, it may well be the fact that her analysis is so interwoven with her establishing criteria that the latter is the input she primarily brings to scholarship.[24]

2.2.2 Cynthia Long Westfall

Westfall's analysis is in some ways a response to Neeley's publication. In her book *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship Between Form and Meaning*, Westfall offers a comprehensive summary of many of the concepts in the systemic functional form of DA as part of her introduction, before going on to examine Hebrews for its inner cohesiveness and structure. She notes that there are multiple theories as to Hebrews' structure, but that many of them are contradictory, which seems paradoxical given that Hebrews, regarded amongst NT texts as a literary masterpiece, would surely have a "train of thought" and thus be relatively cohesive and coherent.[25] She argues that presuppositions about structure and composition have led scholars to largely miss the impact that Hebrews was intended to have on the original recipients as an act of communication.[26] Even those studies that do in some way see Hebrews as an act of communication sometimes impose top-down analysis which can then miss the patterns of repetition, of phrases and topics, in the Epistle.[27] Concerned partly that modern readers often misinterpret ancient texts because of the time-span between their original composition and our reading of them, and also that the subtleties of Hebrews' semantics are missed, she, too, sees systemic-functional DA as an appropriate methodology to investigate Hebrews' structure.

Westfall treats Hebrews as having a tri-partite structure in which the sections overlap: 1:1–4:16, 4:11–10:25 and 10:19–13:35.[28] She looks in detail at how the units in these sections are organized, with especial view to prominence features, and how they relate to the rest of the discourse. She takes account of the following:

… the detection of patterning of the performatives at the discourse level, the semantic relationship between the performatives and the indicative passages, the important role

---

[24] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, lxxxii–iii; Another scholar to deal mainly with cohesion in Hebrews, and who takes a text-linguistic approach, is George Guthrie in his volume, *The Structure of Hebrews*. However, his approach is very specific, and is primarily interested in "cohesion shifts," and also in *inclusios* and the lexical cohesion between different units in the discourse of the Epistle. See also, especially, Guthrie, *Structure*, 39–40.

[25] Westfall, *Discourse*, xi.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid., 6.

[28] Ibid., xii. Her observation that units overlap is also an important one, since it cautions us against dividing the text so sharply that we fail to see the progression of its discourse.

that conjunctions play in that determination, the topics detected and the role that prominence plays in detecting high-level clauses and passages in the discourse.[29]

Westfall's use of DA helps establish coherence where it might otherwise be hard to discern. For instance, the contrast between the angels and the Son is often taken to be the prominent topic in 1:1–14, something only flirted with in the exordium (1:4). However, in the first sentence in the first unit, the exordium, the focus is on God's having spoken through the Son, the finite verb, "spoken", contrasting with the participles that follow.[30] The phrase "in a Son" is then expanded through a series of clauses which refer to him anaphorically through the use of pronouns. Furthermore, the angels belong to the same semantic domain as the "prophets," being themselves messengers (2:5), and the contrast between God's having spoken in the past and now speaking through the Son is continued in the OT quotations of 1:5–14, in which catena the finite verb of the joining clauses is λέγω (to say/speak): the Son is more at stake.[31]

More generally, discourse analysis provides Westfall with a way of looking at the text which is respectful of its complexities to establish cohesion throughout. Indeed, she also discusses the ideational and interpersonal outworkings of the discourse features in some detail. However, a lacuna of Westfall's work is that in those interpersonal examinations she still focuses on the formal features of the text, and her thesis could perhaps be advanced further by considering their communicative implications as they pertain to the relationship between addressor and addressees. For instance, in her interpersonal analysis of prominence for the section on "rest", Westfall continues to examine the progression of the discourse and prominence patterns, rather than discuss the intended impact on the addressees.[32] Nevertheless, her investigation is an important contribution to the use of discourse analysis in Hebrews. Her clear explanation of DA terms and theory is especially useful for scholars getting to know this methodology.

2.2.3 Bryan Dyer

A recent DA approach to Hebrews is by one of Westfall's students, Bryan Dyer's *Suffering in the Face of Death*.[33] To some extent, his study represents a precedent for our own study in that it is an investigation into a given topic in the Epistle, using DA. Rather than focus on co-text and cohesion, however, Dyer's emphasis is on the social context of Hebrews. He notes the problems dating Hebrews and establishing its historical situation already discussed here, and observes that

---

[29] Ibid., 89.
[30] Ibid., 90.
[31] Ibid., 90–93.
[32] Ibid., 130.
[33] Dyer, *Suffering*.

scholars have been slow to take up the lessons of DA. He employs semantic domain theory and Halliday's theory pertaining to "context of situation" in his own investigation. Although the study is largely systemic-functional, his concern is more with context than co-text.[34]

As with this study into Hebrews, and the lack of identical vocabulary linking the creation references, Dyer remarks that a possible reason why the concepts of suffering and death have been relatively neglected in Hebrews scholarship is that the individual words do not occur frequently in the discourse, with πάσχω/πάθημα (to suffer/suffering) occurring only seven times, even though references to suffering appear throughout the Epistle using a variety of phrases. The same holds true for the terms θάνατος and νεκρός (death,dead), which are themselves infrequently used even though death is a key concept in the Epistle.[35] As in the present study, he attempts to move beyond wordcounts to take account of the ingenuity of Hebrews' author in constructing his discourse. Indeed, individual words, according to semantic domain theory, garner their precise meaning from their relationship to other words in the surrounding co-text, as we have discussed above, even if they themselves have more precise dictionary definitions. Hence, a speaker might choose a variety of expressions to relate a concept, depending upon the nuance they wish to convey. Groups of words may "do the job" of single words in this regard, and indeed one may employ metaphors and other literary devices to refer to a given topic.[36]

---

[34] Ibid., 47–76. He discusses the principles of semantic analysis in more detail on 50–52 as per Louw-Nida's definitions in L&N, vol. 1, xvi–xvii, which include the need to take into account co-text and situational context, the fact that words acquire meaning as a result of both, that a word may have figurative meanings, and that the variety of meanings for a single word or the related meanings of different words are difficult to organize and so one must pay close attention in individual instances to the discourse in question when establishing meaning.

[35] Dyer, *Suffering*, 48. See also Porter, "Concept," esp. 275.

[36] In this respect, his work is related to Jeffrey Reed's *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians*, and its concerns for ideational meanings. See, Dyer, *Suffering*, 52–53 and Jeffrey Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*, JSNTSup 136 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), see esp. 76–78. Reed explores how semantic chains in Philippians contribute to its cohesion and integrity. Westfall has also written an article on semantic domains in Hebrews: Cynthia Long Westfall, "Blessed Be the Ties that Bind: Semantic Domains and Cohesive Chains in Hebrews 1:1–2:4 and 12:5–8," *JGRChJ* 6 (2009):199–216. This article offers a good introduction to the link between cohesion and semantic domains, including the important topic of semantic repetition, where ideas are repeated using different words. This helps to build cohesion and the identification of this practice can help one establish a topic, ibid., 204, 206–9. Indeed, new entities may be introduced to a passage by anchoring them to other entities already in the discourse by exploiting semantic domains. The ability of a reader to make these semantic associations involves the concept of inferables, i. e., elements the author believes the audience can infer from a discourse entity already introduced. Ibid., 203. Stanley E. Porter and Matthew B. O'Donnell, "Semantics and Patterns of Argumentation in the Book of Romans: Definitions, Proposals, Data and Experiments," in *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, JSNTSup 193 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 154–204 also deals with the topic of semantics.

This is the realm of *semantic domains*. In this realm, differences in these meanings are garnered from the co-text and extratextual context in which words occur.[37] Dyer employs semantic domain theory as a "launching point" for his study of the overall language of suffering and death in Hebrews, even when the above key words are missing, and by doing so identifies the key passages in which the topics appear and the precise language used to refer to them.[38] He successfully combines these basic observations with Halliday's theory of functional grammar discussed above, as a "system of choices and meaning potential in which users convey meaning within a social context."[39] As such, he recognises that the linguistic choices in a text reflect the social context in which the text was constructed, given that the social context is, in fact, expressed through the interpersonal, ideational and textual metafunctions of language.[40] This has the effect that "one can make determinations regarding both the meaning of a text through knowledge of its context and of the context through the features of the text."[41]

Whilst not all aspects of a text's context of situation might be determined by an examination of grammatical features, and lexical structures, one can move, at least to some extent, from the elements of the text to possible aspects of the context of situation.[42] Dyer identifies five linguistic principles by which to move from text to context: pervasiveness ("if an author refers to a subject several times in a discourse, it is likely the topic is important for the author");[43] semantic variation ("two or more terms used relatively interchangeably to avoid repetition or to make an emphatic point … semantic variation contributes to repetition and, thus, markedness in a text");[44] types of utterance ("In Koine Greek, the type of utterance is mainly expressed through the mood system. The indicative and non-indicative moods communicate the author's perception of how an event

---

[37] Dyer, *Suffering*, 50. I employ some of the principles of Semantic Domains Analysis in my discussion of "rest" in ch. 3–4 of Hebrews, and the relationship of κατάπαυσις to σαββατισμός.

[38] Ibid., 55.

[39] Ibid., see my comments on Halliday above and the ideational function of language. Ibid., 55–57 offer a helpful summary of the development of ideas pertaining to contexts of situation in DA.

[40] Ibid., 59.

[41] Ibid., 60.

[42] Ibid. Using Halliday's principles, he hopes to improve upon previous attempts at establishing contexts of situation from a text, such as mirror-reading, i.e., looking at one side of a conversation to make determinations of the conversation as a whole. See Ibid., 62–66. In particular, he responds to the work of John M. G. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT 31* (1987):73–93 and Nijay Gupta, "Mirror-Reading Moral Issues in Paul's Letters," *JSNT* 34 (2012):361–81. In particular, he questions the methodology behind Barclay's spectrum of possibility, in which he attempts to define categories of likelihood for the other side of the conversation.

[43] Dyer, *Suffering*, 68.

[44] Ibid., 69–70.

relates to reality");[45] prominence ("A passage concerning a social issue that is given greater prominence is more likely to reflect a concern of the author");[46] and cohesion and coherence (he proposes we should ask of any theory about a text "Is this hypothesis coherent with the text itself?" and draws on Halliday's concepts of exophoric (external-referential/dependent) and endophoric (internal-referential/dependent) references to identify presuppositions in a text which help elucidate the situation of context).[47] Using these principles, he argues that Hebrews' author wrote in response to the active suffering and fear of death experienced by the (probable) audience.[48] His basic suggestion is that this context of situation is supported by the pervasiveness of the topics of suffering and death in Hebrews, when semantic variation of terms is duly considered.

Dyer makes good use of linguistics theory as it pertains to polysemy, even if he neglects to call it by this name, and the many ways in which meaning is constructed. Even though my own work is more concerned with the function of certain references within the discourse itself, Dyer's study does much to advance our understanding of how linguistic theory might be employed to try to answer some of the difficult questions pertaining to Hebrews' situational origins, even though one might then dispute the precise historical location of such origins. As a DA study of a given topic in the Epistle, his monograph sets a precedent for considering a topic in Hebrews even when it is not always marked by the repetition of particular vocabulary.

The work on discourse analysis approaches to Hebrews is not limited to these scholars, or indeed these works. For instance, George Guthrie, besides having written his own volume on the structure of Hebrews mentioned above in a footnote, has teamed up with Russell D. Quinn to perform a discourse analysis of the use of Ps 8:4–5 in Heb 2:5–9, and Andries Snyman has also penned a book chapter on Heb 6:4–6.[49] However, the above are good examples of how discourse analysis has been applied to the Epistle so far. David Alan Black has also conducted a colon analysis of the exordium, which, as I do here, he designates as Heb 1:1–4.[50] According to Black, the surface structure of 1:2 can be demonstrated to be "a typical colon consisting of a nominal element (*theos*) and a verbal element (*elalēsen*) which together convey a coherent piece of information."[51] The focus is very much

---

[45] Ibid., 70.
[46] Ibid., 71.
[47] Ibid., 74.
[48] Ibid., 130.
[49] George Guthrie and Russell Quinn, "A Discourse Analysis of the Use of Psalm 8:2–6 in Hebrews 2:5–9," *JETS* 49/2 (2006):235–46; Andries Snyman, "Hebrews 6:2–6: From a Semiotic Discourse Perspective," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, ed. Stanley Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed JSNTSup 170, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 355–67.
[50] Black, "Hebrews 1:1–4," 175–94.
[51] Ibid., 177.

on God's having spoken, and the event of speaking is extended three times in the text to highlight God's having spoken first in a preliminary revelation, and then definitively in the Son. Moreover, the three extensions of *lalēsas* (1:1)"render relations in terms of time, setting, and means of communication."[52] I will pick up on his work later in this thesis.

Each scholar brings a unique perspective to the Epistle, its discourse and its structure. What is interesting, though, is that, except for Dyer, none of these scholars has intentionally tried to address a given topic in the Epistle as a whole from the perspective of DA. Dyer's own thesis is also distinct in methodology from this study in that he is more concerned with establishing the historical context for the Epistle. In that respect, the present thesis builds on and develops the use of DA in biblical studies. The attempt here is to see how aspects of DA, specifically pertaining to cohesion, lexical choices and intertextuality might assist exegesis.

2.3 Related Methodologies: Narrative and Rhetorical Approaches

We saw in the introduction to this thesis that discourse analysis is a relatively new methodology to be employed in biblical studies. To avoid confusion over the goals of the present thesis, it is therefore essential to highlight some similarities and differences between DA approaches and modern literaray approaches to texts which may be more familiar to scholars of Hebrews and with which DA might be, at least to some extent, confused, especially the increasingly popular narrative and rhetorical criticism. With regards to the difference between DA and narrative approaches, DA works at the level of the discourse, not the story. It is concerned, as we saw in the methodology section, with how an act of communication is structured to have an effect on an addressee/audience at an historical point in time, not how the narrative world functions and the interrelationships of implied author to implied audience, or narrator to characters. That said, there is sometimes an overlap between the two methods. DA takes into account the genre, or mixed genres, within a text, because the conventions of those genres shape the formation of the discourse and recognises that there may be a narrative quality to a text or part of a text that is of another genre. A parallel might also be drawn between plot sequencing and linearization, since both concern the order in which information is presented. Similarly, there is some overlap with rhetorical criticism, which delves more deeply into the conventions for argumentation that might underpin the construction of the text. For

---

[52] Ibid. He later argues that, whilst some would regard ὅς as introducing a new colon, each one of the constituent elements of 1:1–4 can be linked either directly or indirectly to the verb ἐλάλησεν, ibid., 179.

this reason, it is important to take account of observations from narrative and rhetorical studies of Hebrews.

2.3.1 Brian C. Small

Brian C. Small's investigation is significant in that he attempts to view Hebrews as a both a literary and rhetorical work and shows an interest in the creative role of Christ in the Epistle. Small is specifically interested in applying modern narratological methods to the Epistle, which he calls a "book". He is concerned with the characterization of Jesus. Small's monograph comprises both an examination of the study of modern research into characterization and his own study of Hebrews. This review will focus primarily on what he has to say concerning the Epistle proper and how he deals with the references to Christ the agent of creation in particular.

Small defines "character" as "a construct of the totality of traits and attributes belonging to a particular human or non-human figure in a given story," and secondarily to this, he says that "character refers to the literary figure which is the focus of the totality of these traits and attributes", and so one can speak of either a figure in a given story as a character, or of the [personal] character of the same figure.[53] His work, to some extent, applies both definitions in the analysis. Central to characterizations are both the names given to a figure, and the nature that is described of them, and this is no less true of the figure of Jesus in Hebrews. The interchangeability of the name Christ and Jesus, with both being called high priest (e. g. 3:1; 4:34; 6:20 and 5:5; 9:31), signals to Small that the earthly Jesus is "coterminous with the exalted Jesus who now serves as high priest."[54] Unlike in Cicero's *De Inventione* 1.24–35, where mortal and godly characters are distinguished, Small identifies that Hebrews ascribes both divine and human aspects to Jesus' nature. Among these is the attribute of creator.[55]

---

[53] Small, *Characterization*, 36–7. On characterization in the Bible, see Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, BLS 17, trans. Dorothea Shefer-Vanson (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989), 47–48. See also David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, eds., *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, JSNTSup 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Another author to see narrative elements in Hebrews is Kenneth Schenck. He argues that the plotline moves from old covenant, valid yet unfulfilled, into an eschatological era in which Christ's sacrifice marks a turning point between the eras and the author appears to write in an intervening period in which the old covenant is obsolete because of Christ's sacrifice, but has not yet vanished (8:13). Schenck, *Cosmology*, 78–79.

[54] Small, *Characterization*, 160.

[55] Ibid., 161. Small discusses the various names and titles ascribed to Jesus throughout the Epistle, and together these form most of his investigation. Some of these, such as "effulgence", or "heir" of the Father in the exordium (1:2–3), are indeed pertinent to our thesis. Here, I attend to Small's comments on Christ's designation as agent of creation/creator. For a further examination of the titles applied to Christ in the exordium, see also James W. Thompson, *Hebrews*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 38–39.

Small details how the concept of Jesus' agency at creation, mentioned early in the Epistle, was not an uncommon thought in the NT, given that there are several other passages which state Jesus is the agent of creation, such as John 1:3 and 1 Cor 8:6, and so Hebrews is not unique in characterising Christ in this way.[56] However, it could be argued that there is a tension or even a contradiction between 1:2 and 1:10–12. Whereas Heb 1:2 says God made the aeons through the Son, Heb 1:10–12 places a quotation from Ps 102:26–28 (101:26–28) in the mouth of God speaking about his Son, and Jesus is said to have been present at the very beginning and to have himself laid the foundations of the earth. Thus, he is not just an agent, but to some extent the creator. Small takes a synchronic approach and looks at the text as we have it. Seeing Hebrews as a literary work in this way allows him to posit that there is no contradiction between these two statements. The latter, he says, can be seen as an extension of the description of Christ's agency, expanding upon it and specifying more accurately the role he played, something which contributes to the overall depiction of Christ as divine.[57]

For our purposes, what is significant is that, by seeing Hebrews as a narrative, Small offers the possibility of beginning to view our creation references together. Furthermore, Small does not restrict his comments on the characterization of Christ as the agent of creation to the references themselves, but tries to draw out their implication for the rhetoric of the Epistle. He believes that the larger point Hebrews might be making in relation to Christ the agent of creation is not merely that he is such, but rather to contrast the person of Jesus with the created order. Small suggests that Jesus' eternality is emphasized in 1:11, where he is contrasted to the finite earth and heavens:

Hence, Jesus' immutability is contrasted with the mutability of the created order. The fact that Hebrews goes on to describe Jesus as being involved in sustaining the earth is a further indication that Hebrews is drawing a distinction between Jesus and the creation itself, the dependence of the earth indicating Jesus' authority and power in his providential sustenance and governance of the world.[58]

---

[56] Small, *Characterization*, 206–7.

[57] Ibid. One could argue that there is a difference between 1:2 and 1:10–12 in that 1:2 suggests Jesus is an agent of creation while 1:10–12 suggests he is the creator. However, in Small's favour, it might be argued that, in fact, being an instrument can involve being an instrumental cause, and so the two phrases are not in fact two contradictory statements. The majority of scholars agree there is no contradiction. For example, see also Koester, *Hebrews*, 203, Thompson, *Hebrews*, 55.

[58] Small, *Characterization*, 209. See also Cockerill, *Epistle*, 111–12, Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30; Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 126 and Thompson, *Hebrews*, 55. Koester also sees a continuity, but argues the dependence is specifically linked to the word of God. Koester, *Hebrews*, 97, 203. This tension will be discussed in the main body of the thesis.

Perhaps surprisingly, Small does not go on to make much of the reference to creation in 2:5–9, save to state that the psalm was originally a psalm of creation (1:2) and make the somewhat usual comment that the psalm is interpreted Christologically, a claim I examine in this thesis.[59] However, his interest in the characterization of Christ in the Epistle means that he attends to the depiction of Christ as the agent of creation, and the subsequent description in 1:10–12, and this in turn causes one to ask the question of how the other references to creation might fit into Hebrews' discourse once it is considered as having a narrative quality.[60]

2.3.2 David deSilva

Similarly, rhetorical criticism is a discipline in its own right, with its own various branches that look at diverse aspects, from a text's relationship to ancient rhetorical forms to the text's socio-historical milieu. One of the few commentators to deal directly with the rhetoric of Hebrews is David deSilva, and on the topic of creation, his study is perhaps the most significant of the rhetorical investigations into Hebrews.[61] He is motivated by the recognition of the difference between our own socio-political situation and that of Hebrews' original audience. Today, religion is often seen in the West as being a private affair, not necessarily intertwined with politics, and persecutions are relatively rare, but politics, economics and religion were intertwined in the ancient world, and holding to the "wrong one" could have dire consequences.[62] DeSilva writes with a pastoral purpose in the belief that understanding Hebrews' encouragement of Christians to remain steadfast against the odds can be inspirational for modern-day pastors whose congregations face temptations to leave their religion to one side.[63] His commentary touches on creation as being of rhetorical import, albeit when making other observations.

From the very beginning of the Epistle, deSilva recognises that the eschatology of Hebrews has a key part to play in its socio-rhetorical schema:

---

[59] Small, *Characterization*, 210.

[60] Interestingly, the narrative quality of Hebrews is also picked up in Koester's commentary, in Koester, *Hebrews*, 97–104. He argues that at stake is essentially the role for which humanity is destined, as outlined in 2:5–9, and Koester encapsulates this within its particular cosmological and eschatological world-view concerning Christ, the word of God and his incarnation. The universe came into being through God's word, spoken through the Son (1:2), and continues to be maintained by this word.

[61] Another such scholar is Ben Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Hebrews, James and Jude* (Downers Grove, IL. Inter-Varsity, 2007)

[62] deSilva, *Perseverance*, 75–77. See also Koester, *Hebrews*, 97, Schenck, "Appointment," 112.

[63] deSilva, *Perseverance*, 77–79.

The first chapter begins and ends on distinctly eschatological notes – God's word 'in the Son' comes in 'these last days' (1:2), and the Son himself now waits for the forthcoming subjugation of all his enemies (1:13) even while others are identified as 'those who are about to inherit salvation' (1:14). This dimension is crucial to the author's strategy for confirming the addressees in their commitment to the Christian group, and especially to deterring the wavering from shrinking back in the face of their neighbors' ongoing disapproval. Ultimately, it is at the Son's judgment seat, and not in the opinion of unbelievers, that the decisive evaluation of one's worth takes place.[64]

DeSilva posits that the main point of the exordium is to amplify the Son's honour when the audience is not being as committed as it ought to be. He does this by looking at the author's lexical choices. By calling Jesus "the Son", the author is playing on the ancient view that one's honour derives from one's parentage.[65] The author's ultimate aim is to heighten the urgency of the exhortation to "pay attention to" this message spoken through the Son who has authority from God his Father:

… they need to be reminded to 'consider Jesus' (3:1), to recall the debt owed the Son for his role in creation, preservation and redemption, and to respond as grateful recipients not only of his past benefits but also of his promises for the future.[66]

The Son is himself not merely an heir of the nations of this world, but heir and master of the world to come (2:5–10), and those who remain partners with him will share in his own inheritance:

The honor and authority of the Son both in this age and the next are grounded in his role as agent of creation, for it was 'through him' that God 'made the ages.' He is thus owed a debt of gratitude and honor akin to the debt owed to God for the creation and preservation of all things, both in the shakeable and unshakeable realms, since he acted from the beginning as the mediator (broker) of God's benefactions, of which creation was the most universally recognised.[67]

The topic of Christ as the agent of creation, we see, is an important one for Hebrews' rhetoric, according to deSilva.[68] It is part of Hebrews' rhetorical strategy to convince the audience to invest in that which is eternal – all creation is of limited value in itself since it will not ultimately last (10:34; 11:13–16, 24–26; 12:16–17, 26–28; 13:13–14).[69] Viewed another way, commitment to the group will be based on the fact the visible world is of ultimately secondary importance to the invisible, he claims. Unlike the earth or heavens, the Son 'remains', having existed

---

[64] Ibid., 83.
[65] Ibid., 85.
[66] Ibid., 84.
[67] Ibid., 87.
[68] Ibid., 88.
[69] Ibid., 99–100. See also Scott D. Mackie, *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, WUNT 2/223, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 137 and Attridge, *Hebrews*, 36.

since before the foundations of creation were laid. The psalm citation in 1:10–12 uses this message to reinforce the audience's trust in Jesus. He is presented as trustworthy, unchanging, and this reinforces Hebrews' exhortation to stand firm in their confession of hope, which is itself grounded in the efficacy of Jesus as "broker", or mediator, (3:6,14; 6:19–20; 10:23).[70] Having warned the audience of the necessity to hold fast to the Son and his message, the author continues to "dwell on the significance of the Son, particularly for the 'coming world'" in 2:5–9.[71]

DeSilva pulls together the various streams of thought in Hebrews to examine its rhetoric. However, where he specialises is the interaction between the author and his intended audience within their sociological circumstances. Whilst he does not focus in detail on the topic of creation in its own right, he clearly thinks that the creation references have significance in this regard, and even though I differ in the details in my own work, it is necessary to note his contribution to acknowledging the importance of creation in the Epistle.

2.4 Thematic Studies

Narrative and Rhetorical critical studies into Hebrews tend to be more recent, following trends in scholarship. Furthermore, in the case of those taking a narrative or rhetorical approach to Hebrews, there is a tendency to look at how the ideas in Hebrews progress. However, some older studies focus more on establishing Hebrews' theology. Within this category, there are some books which, rather than having a straightforwardly exegetical approach, first seek to establish an overall topic for Hebrews. The rest of the Epistle is then read in that topic's light. This sometimes means that the passages on creation remain slightly overshadowed as to their individual significance for the Epistle's rhetoric, though they are seldom completely ignored. The most famous would be the priestly emphasis, as exemplified by the work of Albert Vanhoye.

2.4.1 Albert Vanhoye

Albert Vanhoye interprets Hebrews as focusing on the high priestly Christ. Although our own topic does not much occupy his thought, Vanhoye does not ignore our references altogether.

Vanhoye suggests that Hebrews is structured in a chiastic form which places the emphasis on those "high priestly" passages in the middle of the Epistle, which Vanhoye labels as the Third Part, 5:11–10:39.[72] The preceding parts build

---

70   deSilva, *Perseverance*, 100–1.
71   Ibid., 108.
72   Vanhoye, *La Structure*, 52–63.

up to this presentation of Jesus, explaining his relationship with God and with humanity; in the first part Christ is primarily designated as above the angels (1:5–2:18) and the second part begins by focusing on the faithful Jesus (section A being 3:1–4:14) and flows on to the conception of Jesus as merciful High Priest (section B being 4:15–5:10), which sets the scenes for the more developed high priestly images.[73] This idea that Hebrews has a high priestly focus sometimes means that Vanhoye passes quickly over the creation references. For instance, Vanhoye sees the emphasis in 2:5–9 as being on the glorification of Christ, rather than delving into the significance of a reference to humanity's original status at creation.[74] In terms of creation theology as such, he notes simply that Genesis 1 makes no connection between the original creation and the world to come, but that Hebrews links the two, as is common in various biblical texts [e. g., 2 Pet 3:4–7; Col 1:15, Rom 8:19].[75] It is a similar story with Vanhoye's interpretation of chs. 3–4, and the reference to Ps 95 (94). Rather than examining why the creation rest is specifically referenced, Vanhoye sees the text as promoting a participation in the rest of Christ himself, glorified and seated at the right hand of the Father.[76]

However, Vanhoye does sometimes recognise the importance of the creation references. For instance, he goes into considerable detail on the link between God's word and creative Wisdom, noting how Hebrews draws on and adapts OT traditions. God is said to have created "by his word" in Ps 33:6 and Wis 9:1, for instance, and has created "with Wisdom" (Ps 136:5; Wis 9:2), who is even personified in passages such as Prov 8:27 and Wis 9:9, present with God when he made the world. These traditions were clearly known, he claims. However, Hebrews' Son is not an "abstract personification," he is not "Wisdom or Word". He is placed in parallel to the prophets and is none other than the actual person, Jesus Christ.[77] The latter becomes particularly important when we consider that the Son is the one "through" whom creation takes place. It "indicates a true, personal association with the work of the Creator and implies a real pre-existence," and the role of the Son in the creation is taken up more directly in 1:10.[78]

---

[73] Ibid., 58, 86, 113.

[74] Vanhoye, *La situation*, 260. Other scholars have argued that Hebrews is referring to two successive ages. Compare Enns, "Creation," 169–70, or David deSilva, *Perseverance*, 89.

[75] Vanhoye, *La situation*, 275, 278, see also 280–81.

[76] Ibid., 99–100.

[77] Ibid., 67–69. This is in obvious contrast to the work of Lane (see Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxxix). One cannot help but think that Vanhoye has dismissed too easily the idea that Jesus and Wisdom are being linked intrinsically. Nevertheless, his point that the idea is one of Christ as a person active in history is not entirely incompatible with such other readings, since one could argue that it is an expansion of wisdom christology that sees Jesus as Wisdom incarnate.

[78] Vanhoye, *La situation*, 70. The issue of the eternality of the Son is taken up in much detail on 109–12. For more on the subject of pre-existence in relation to creation theology in Hebrews, see (Donald) Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 51.

The affirmation serves to build an overall picture of Christ: "he is … the Alpha and the Omega, the one through whom everything has begun and in whom everything is accomplished, the mediator of creation, and the inheritor of all the promises."[79]

Vanhoye offers a good example of how our topic is partially overlooked, but the significance of the references is not missed altogether when an overall topic is suggested for Hebrews. However, we shall see that the very chiasm, centring on 5:11–10:39, that Vanhoye puts forward has been called into question by Barnabas Lindars, and so we cannot be sure that the focus of Hebrews is entirely driven by the high priestly topic as he proposes.[80]

2.4.2 Barnabas Lindars

Not everyone is supportive of such thematic analyses of Hebrews, however. A monograph on Hebrews which has received much acclaim is Lindars' *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*, and for Lindars, "Hebrews is not an abstract theological treatise, but thoroughly practical in intention. It is a mistake to look for a leading idea as a key to the whole."[81] In particular, he contrasts his own analysis with that of Vanhoye:

The best-known composition analysis is that of Vanhoye, who found what he regarded as a perfect chiastic structure with its pivot in the centre at 8:1–9:28 on the sacrifice of Christ. This ought then to be the climax of the argument. But apart from the fact that the chiasmus is by no means perfect, because the correspondences are not exact on either side of this central section, the real climax from a rhetorical point of view comes at the conclusion of ch. 12 with its overwhelmingly impressive appeal to the readers. There have been previous climaxes like peaks on the path up the mountain, but the argument runs continuously through the whole letter … The solemn periodic sentence structure of ch. 1 is aimed at establishing a rapport with the readers before winding up to the main issue. The last chapter winds down gently so as to leave the rapport undamaged by the stern message in between.[82]

Lindars raises some important points. Firstly, he establishes Hebrews' theology as being rooted in practical, we might say interpersonal, purposes, rather than being an abstract treatise.[83] Secondly, he identifies that the author continually draws on concepts that are presumed to be familiar to the audience. Furthermore, Lindars' method is to read the text closely, taking into account what those

---

[79] Vanhoye, *La Situation*, 70. Harald Hegermann, *Der Brief and die Hebräer*, THKNT 16 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 1998), 32 observes a parallel to 1 Cor 8:6.

[80] Barnabas Lindars, *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*, New Testament Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 26–27.

[81] Lindars, *Theology*, 26.

[82] Ibid., 26–27. Amended to match SBL formatting.

[83] So also Koester, *Hebrews*, 82; DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 47.

presumed facts might be and thus to consider the intended impact of the original author. Here, Lindars' work sets a precedent for our own investigation to some extent, but he deals only briefly with our topic.

A key example of how Lindars addresses briefly the issue of creation in Hebrews comes when he comments on 1:1–4 under the thematic heading of "The Pre-existence of Jesus". The role of creation in the rhetoric is here overshadowed.[84] For instance, the designation of Christ as the agent of creation is seen in historical terms, rather than integral to the Epistle's argumentation: "It is a personification of God's creative ability and activity as a helper, like Wisdom (usually personified as a woman) in such passages as Prov 8:22–31 and Wis 7:22–8:1." [85] The approach taken by Lindars is an example of how the theological centrality of creation in certain passages has sometimes been overshadowed by historical-critical considerations.[86]

An example of where the topic of creation is almost completely subsumed by other considerations is in Lindars' discussion of Heb 2. Here, Lindars sees not a reference to creation, so much as a stress on the humanity of Jesus, and the contrast between the position of the angels and the destiny of the human race:[87]

Hebrews first shows how this [God's promise to humanity] had been fulfilled in Jesus himself. Made like all human beings, "lower than the angels", he had passed through death to the position of glory and honour …

The real humanity of Jesus is essential for the argument of Hebrews, because the whole argument turns on the saving efficacy of his death … For the solidarity of Jesus with humanity makes him a representative figure. He is the "pioneer" (2:10) of the way of salvation for the whole human race."[88]

Rather than focussing on this passage as a reference to creation, Lindars' view of the passage is governed by his consideration that Hebrews is written to persuade Jewish Christians not to lapse back into Jewish observances.[89] Perhaps the most attention paid to our topic by Lindars is in his treatment of chs. 3–4, and the use of Psalm 95:

---

[84] This contrasts with Guthrie's comments on this subject, since he looks at the two topics together, as we shall see later. Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 51.

[85] Lindars, *Theology*, 32.

[86] Ibid., 33. For instance, he links the exordium to passages such as Col 1:15–17 and the prologue of John 1 to establish an incarnational theology in Hebrews suitable for its time. Rather than seeing a full-blown incarnational theology in Hebrews, Lindars states that "because Wisdom/Son/Word is the personification of an attribute of God which refers to his activity, we are here dealing with a dynamic idea and it makes very little difference whether we think of it as expressed in Jesus or embodied (enfleshed) in him." Ibid., 42.

[87] Ibid., 38.

[88] Ibid., 40.

[89] Ibid., 40–1.

Taken literally as God's own rest, Hebrews equates it with the fact that 'God … rested (LXX *katepausen*) on the seventh day' of creation (Gen 2:2). This gives the clue to the nature of the new age: 'there remains a Sabbath rest (*sabbatismos*) for the people of God.' (4:9). This is a metaphor for something which cannot be described literally. But it is meant seriously in that in Psalm 95 God revealed his intention for the future, and according to the gospel message this has become available through Christ … the idea that the Sabbath rest is the 'image of the world to come' (Genesis Rabbah 17 (12a)) is known from rabbinic sources, and can be traced back into New Testament times in the use of *katapausis* to denote the eschatological future in the romance of *Joseph and Asenath* (8:9; 15:7; 22:13). It was thus available to provide one more designation of the coming "perfection", the coming direct access to God in the messianic era of the new covenant. But its use here is derived from the argument based on Psalm 95, and Hebrews does not take it up again.[90]

Lindars clearly sees here a reference to the creation, and does draw out its importance for understanding the concept of rest, but this is a rather isolated case of his considering our topic, and in his exposition, he does not much reflect on it in relation to the Epistle as a whole. This, almost passing, way of considering the creation references in Hebrews is the trend for how our topic has hitherto been treated in scholarship.

2.5 Historical-Critical Investigations

Having looked at, broadly speaking, synchronic approaches to Hebrews, in Lindars' study, we start to move to a more traditionally historical-critical approach. Indeed, as we go further back into the history of Hebrews research, we see an overwhelming emphasis on the possible historical sources behind Hebrews and how these, too, occasionally highlight the topic of creation.

2.5.1 Hebrews and Gnosticism

In the middle of the twentieth century, developments in the study of Gnosticism led some scholars to investigate possible parallels between gnostic world-views and cosmology and certain passages in the New Testament. For some time, given the polemic against Gnosticism in the writings of some ancient Christian writers, it was assumed that it was a Christian heresy.[91] Others, however, questioned this premise, and the texts found at Nag Hammadi later seemed to confirm their suspicions that gnostic world views existed prior to/at the same

---

[90] Ibid., 49–50.

[91] For example, Origen's *Contra Celsum*, 31, Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.1. Kurt Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, trans. and ed. Robert McLachlan Wilson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2008); trans. of *Die Gnosis: Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion* (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1977), 9–10.

time as early Christianity.[92] The texts found there did not only contain Christian gnostic works, but also non-Christian ones, and so whilst there was clearly a link between Christianity and Gnosticism in antiquity, the possibility that Gnosticism pre-dated Christianity became more likely.[93] The general consensus in scholarship shifted, and some scholars began to assess the NT texts for possible parallels with an earlier "Gnosticism/pre-Gnosticism".[94] References to Hebrews in relation to Gnosticism thus stretch from the earlier investigations of Ernest Scott in 1922, through to later works, such as those by Bultmann, and even Thompson.[95] However, we shall see that the parallels between gnostic thought and Hebrews are not clear cut.

The common core of Gnosticism was considered to be the "cosmic drama" whereby sparks of light had fallen to earth and become trapped. The drama would come to an end when they were released and able to travel back to their celestial home. Redemption would come from the heavenly world in the form of a person, *Urmensch*, sent by the highest God who would bring down the necessary *Gnosis* and wake up the sparks of light, reminding them of their heavenly origin. Disguised in human form, this "son" of the highest God would give them the passwords necessary to progress through the heavenly spheres (aeons) after death and so reach the highest heaven. He would go before them on the journey heavenward. This was termed the *Anthropos myth*.[96] As Bultmann put it:

In the Hellenistic world it was a historical necessity that the gospel should be translated into a terminology with which that world was familiar … Gnosticism and its myth offered a stock of terms that were intelligible to great numbers of people.[97]

Jesus was essentially a heavenly being made man, and was sent from God the Most High to lead people to heaven.

---

[92] For example, Ernest F. Scott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Doctrine and Significance* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 37–38 argued for a gnostic background to Hebrews.

[93] Ibid., 51. In recent attempts to understand Gnosticism on its own terms, some scholars have tried to view it apart from the Church Fathers, such as Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005). It could be argued that, since they are typically from the fourth century, such texts represent a development post-advent of Christianity. Some have researched its origins in relation to Neoplatonism. See also Richard T. Wallis and Jay Bregman eds., *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, vol. 6 of *Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern*, ed. R. Baine Harris (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1992).

[94] The very term has recently been called into question, given that many strains of thought have been clustered together under this heading, when, in fact, they differ greatly from each other in some respects. One monograph dealing with this issue is Michael Allen Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

[95] For example, Käsemann, *Wandering*, 97–121, Bultmann, *Theology*, vol. 1, 177 and Thompson, *Beginnings*, 88–91.

[96] Bultmann, *Theology*, vol. 1, 166–67. Käsemann gives the myth this title in Käsemann, *Wandering*, e. g., 108.

[97] Bultmann, *Theology*, vol. 1, 164

Käsemann was amongst the first to comment on the "obvious" parallels between Hebrews and Gnosticism in particular. Hebrews' view of Jesus was to be likened to that *Urmensch*, he argued: in the *Odes of Solomon*, 7:15–16, the Light "shone forth in the Son, so that it pervades the All for the sake of its redemption so that the Most High may be made known among His Holy ones," and this was parallel to Hebrews in that "the Son is also viewed at the Highest's effulgence and image for his holy ones [in 1:2–3]."[98] Hebrews carried through the *Anthropos myth* by "allowing Christ's exaltation to follow directly upon his humiliation, without regard for the resurrection."[99] Upon examining the Epistle, he decided that the "wandering people of God" was the foremost motif in the Epistle: Chapters 3–4 resembled the gnostic pilgrimage of souls, as did passages like 10:19 and parts of chapters 11–12 which spoke of coming to the "heavenly city".[100] For Käsemann, the κατάπαυσις of Hebrews 3–4 was the ἀνάπαυσις that was promised to the followers of the *Urmensch*, the total rest achieved only once one had left the world below and ascended through the *aeons* to the realm of the Most High God. This was evident through its association with the original Sabbath at the end of creation:

The enigmatic ideal of "rest" in Hebrews has found its historical origin in the notion of the aeons, according to which the highest aeon, the realm of the divine Spirit, the Sabbath, and the ἀνάπαυσις are identical … κατάπαυσις is construed spatially, thus as aeon-like, as a heavenly sphere, and is linked to Sabbath speculation. ἀνάπαυσις and κατάπαυσις alternate. This is clear *from gnostic sources*, when, for example, a reference is made to the τόπος τῆς ἀναπαύσεως [Acts of John 99]. Familiarity with the notion of the aeons is proved from a passage in the *Acts of Andrew* [18, where] … the rest appears as the goal of the gnostic wandering of redemption.[101]

Käsemann's argument did initially win some support. In his own commentary, taking up Käsemann almost verbatim, Grässer, for example, would argue that "Hebrews stands much nearer to the gnostic interpretation of rest and the seventh day, appearing in Philo, than to the apocalyptic interpretation [e.g., Barnabas 15]."[102] Grässer also argued that, whilst Jewish apocalyptic theology knew of the eschatological place of rest as the seventh aeon and a Sabbath which in the end time will appear on the renewed earth (e.g. Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer 18),

---

[98] Käsemann, *Wandering*, 102. Notably, Käsemann also sees links with Philo, but believes he, too, was drawing on the Hellenistic idea of εἰκών (image) and he argued that "The doctrine of the εἰκών and the predicates of aeon theology combine to describe the gnostic redeemer." He also argued εἰκών theology underpinned the description of Wisdom in Wis 7:25–26. Ibid., 104–6. Nevertheless, many scholars do not regard the *Odes of Solomon* as gnostic. See James H. Charlesworth, "The Odes of Solomon – Not Gnostic," *CBQ 31* (1969):357–69.

[99] Ibid., 108.

[100] Ibid., 36–37.

[101] Ibid., 75, italics original.

[102] Erich Grässer, *An die Hebräer*, vol. 1, EKK 17/1 (Zürich: Benziger and Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 210. He follows Käsemann, *Wandering*, 67–75.

Hebrews came closer to gnostic tradition.[103] However, it was not long before scholars began to rebut Käsemann's suggestions. Hofius would point out that the eschatological city-state of Heb 11–12 was reminiscent more of contemporary Jewish apocalyptic material and also identified its importance in relation to Ps 95, the very psalm Hebrews was citing.[104] Otto Michel would argue that in any case, Hebrews lacks; 1) the gnostic pre-existence of the human soul and 2) the gnostic opposition between body and material, both of which were decisive elements of the gnostic myth.[105]

Indeed, whilst the idea of a descending-ascending *Urmensch* is found in some gnostic myths, it is not common to all forms of Gnosticism, and is missing from Carpocrates' system where Jesus' soul remembered what it had seen in its circuit with the unbegotten God as told in Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 1.25.1–6. So also Origen's *Contra Celsum* 6.28 mentions an earthly being who fetches *gnosis* from heaven.[106] In addition, there were descending-ascending saviour figures in various Jewish traditions. For instance, there was a tradition of saviour archangels, as in the *Apocalypse of Moses*, where Michael takes Adam to Paradise in the third heaven to await the last day, while God's all-powerful Word is also seen to descend in passages like Wis 18:15.[107] Comparable Jewish conceptions themselves seem to underpin certain early Christian works, such as Justin Martyr's *First Apology* 46 or his *Dialogue with Trypho*. In the latter, ch. 56, he says Jesus can be called an angel because he delivers the messages of God.[108] Whilst it is unlikely Hebrews sees the Son as a kind of descending angel, especially given his exalted status in comparison with them in 1:5–14, Hebrews' perception of Christ might be underpinned by Wisdom tradition, as suggested by the use of the term ἀπαύγασμα, which is hapax legomenon in Heb 1:3 and Wis 7:26, something discussed at length later in this thesis. There is no need, then, to see the Son in Hebrews as necessarily connected to gnostic conceptions, and where underlying texts from the LXX can be demonstrated as the basis for Hebrews'

---

[103] Grässer, *Hebräer*, vol. 1, 210, see also Käsemann, *Wandering*, 67–75. It is unclear why they cite so late a text as Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer, sometimes dated to the middle of the first millennium.

[104] Otfried Hofius, *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*, WUNT 11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1970), 5–16, 53, 60, 102, 110. This has been followed by a number of scholars. See Jon Laansma, '*I Will Give You Rest': The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 1–4*, WUNT 2/98 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 10–13 and Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 102. However, it has also been contested, and the link between rest and the holy of holies called into question. See Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 125–27.

[105] Michel, *Hebräer*, 64–65. Koester, *Hebrews*, 60–61 states that subsequently Käsemann himself even chose to focus less on parallels with Gnosticism. He cites Ernst Käsemann, *Jesus Means Freedom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 101–19 as an example of this in his later work.

[106] Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John* (London: SPCK, 1992), 265.

[107] See ibid., 265–75.

[108] Ibid., 275. Compare also the Shepherd of Hermas, where Jesus is possibly equated to Michael. Ibid., 276. See also Tertullian, *On the Flesh of Christ*, 14.

argumentation, we would do better to look at how they are being employed, rather than to jump to Gnosticism for answers as to how to understand the Epistle.

2.5.2 Hebrews and Philo

Indeed, Gnosticism as a potential backdrop for Hebrews has become less popular. Rather, a large part of the discussion of creation in Hebrews centres around the possible connections between the Epistle and the work of Philo. Philo of Alexandria predates Hebrews, but only slightly, and his dates are estimated to be c. 10 BCE to 50 CE.[109] It is for this reason that many scholars have sought to place Hebrews' thought alongside his own, though it should be noted that Philo himself reinterpreted earlier works, such as Plato's *Timaeus*, and his work is often associated with Middle Platonism more generally, which will be a point of discussion in this thesis.[110]

The tracing of Hebrews to Philonic thought is much older than any attempt to connect it to gnostic speculation. Ever since the middle of the seventeenth century and the writings of Grotius, the idea that Philo of Alexandria's work had an influence on Hebrews has been proposed. This idea reached a general consensus by the middle of the twentieth century that Philonic influence was "one of the assured results of criticism."[111] The trend appeared to reach its climax in the work of Spicq in 1952, who concluded that Hebrews' author was a former follower of Philo now converted to Christianity. It is to Spicq's major work that we now turn as a primary example of how this topic can impact on readings of creation references in Hebrews, and this will be followed by looking at the other

---

[109] Sjoerd L. Bonting, *Creation and Double Chaos: Science and Theology in Discussion*, Theology and the Sciences (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 64.

[110] Thomas H. Tobin, "Interpretations of Creation in the World of Philo of Alexandria," in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*, ed. Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins, CBQMS 24 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992), 108–28 offers a good introduction to this. For an in depth look at Philo's *logos* theology, see David Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985). Comparisons have also been conducted between Philo and John, as in Masanobu Endo, *Creation and Christology*, WUNT 2/149 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 166–81, esp. 171–78, which deals with the *logos*. Others have been conducted between Philo and Paul, as in Jonathan D. Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo: The Beginning and Before*, WUNT 2/317 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), or Orrey McFarland, *God and Grace in Philo and Paul*, NovTSup 164 (Boston: Brill, 2016), esp. 67–81, which considers the *logos*.

[111] Hurst, *Epistle*, 7, based on James Burtness, "Plato, Philo and the Author of Hebrews," *LQ* 10 (1958), 54–64. See also Eugène Ménégoz, *La Théologie de L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris: Fischbacher, 1894), 197–219. However, Spicq himself cited the continuing controversy as his reason for completing his own commentary. See Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 39–40. For further discussions of this subject see Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1892), lxi.

side of the argument in the work of Ronald Williamson. The next few reviews will focus on scholars who fall on either side of the debate and who discuss Hebrews in relation to its cosmology and eschatology.

Making an interpretation of the Qumran scrolls, Spicq would later revisit his position and re-conclude that the author of Hebrews, whom he now identifies as Apollos, having come from Alexandria, had been writing to a group of Jewish priests who had been in contact with Qumran.[112] However, his 1952 commentary has been celebrated in Hebrews scholarship largely for his detailed comments on the relationship between Hebrews' view of creation and Philo's *logos*. This topic forms the basis for much of the modern debate over Philonic influence in Hebrews. All translations, including chapter headings, are my own.

2.5.2.1 Ceslas Spicq

Viewing previous accounts of Philo's influence on Hebrews to be too superficial, Spicq states that his intention in his own commentary is to look in detail at linguistic and conceptual similarities between the two authors:

… if Hebrews is dependent on Philo, it is surely not from the doctrinal point of view, since he expresses the most orthodox Christian faith, but his attachments [to Philo] can be revealed in the vocabulary and the semantics, the rhetorical figures, the style, the arguments, the tastes, above all the schemas and axes of thought.[113]

Whilst Spicq acknowledges that both the author of Hebrews and Philo came from two different world-viewpoints, he nevertheless argues that Hebrews adapted Philo's ideas to Christian purposes. Nowhere was this more important, or more controversial, than in his connection of Christ the agent of creation to Philo's *logos*.

For Philo, it is by humankind's spirit that humanity is likened to the divine *logos*, "an image and a brightness" of the divine nature (e.g. *Conf.* 147), but this comparison between the soul of a human being and the divine *logos* is itself only possible because the *logos* is himself a reflection and a brightness of the divine.[114] This has obvious resonances with Heb 1:3, which speaks of Jesus as

---

[112] Hurst, *Epistle*, 8. See also Ceslas Spicq, "Apollos," 365–69. The Qumranic interpretation has not won many supporters, as noted by Hurst, *Epistle*, 43–46. However, the Epistle's focus on the figure of Melchizedek (7:1–19) is often discussed in relation to the Qumran Melchizedek document (11 Q Melchizedek); see also Fred L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A. D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, SNTSMS 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša´*, CBQMS 10 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), James W. Thompson, *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, CBQMS 13 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 116–17 argues against this somewhat, suggesting Philo as a more likely source for the mention of Melchizedek.

[113] Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 40–41.

[114] Ibid., 49. See also Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 10.

"the radiance of his [God's] glory and the exact representation of his nature" [Spicq's rendering], Spicq therefore declares:

… if Heb 1:3 (ἀπαύγασμα, *hapax legomenon* in the NT) applies this property to the Son of God, it is without doubt because he is authorised [to do so] by Wis 7:26 ([where ἀπαύγασμα is] *hapax legomenon* in the LXX), but it is also because he has inherited from his Alexandrian education the taste for this metaphor (*Somn.* 1.85, 116, 23; *Spec.* 4.123).[115]

Whilst Philo describes the connection between what is eternal and what is created, Hebrews is focussed on one divine person, and does not go into other philosophical considerations. Nevertheless, Spicq believes that Philo's idea of the *logos* as the "solar brightness" of God seems to have inspired Hebrews' description.[116]

Against the idea that the role Wisdom plays in the creative activity (Wis 9:2) is the sole basis for Hebrews' description of Jesus in 1:2, Spicq therefore argues that Hebrews is also to be understood within the context of Philonic *logos* theology, to which the exordium clearly alludes in his opinion. This is doubly important when we consider that in *Cher.* 127 the *logos* is described as the agent of creation (cf. *Somn.* 1:149). Spicq also claims Hebrews is basically quoting *Cher.* 106 in Heb 3:3–6.[117] For Philo, the world is like a large house or village of which God is the efficient cause, but which has been constructed by the *logos*. Not only do we find the idea of an agent of creation in Heb 1:2, but the same idea of one who is the agent of creation and God as efficient cause is, in a metaphor involving a house and creation, also present in 3:3–6. In 4:12–13, we also see the *logos* described as "quick and powerful", omniscient as it is able even to pierce the human soul, characteristics also found in Philo, *Sacr.* A and C 65–66.[118] We might also add, in support of Spicq, that he is not alone in thinking there is a connection between Hebrews' depiction of the Son and Philo's depictions of the *logos*. Hegermann also recognises that an emphasis on the Word of God (*logos*) is a prominent feature of Philo's writing and draws a comparable parallel.[119]

2.5.2.2 Ronald Williamson

While acknowledging similarities of vocabulary, Ronald Williamson argued against Spicq that just because Hebrews shares vocabulary with Philo, that does not mean that he necessarily shared ideas with him:

A man may augment his vocabulary at the expense of another's without in any substantial way altering his beliefs or modifying his thoughts and views. He may extract words from one context and employ them in a totally different one, or use them with a force

---

[115] Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 49.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid., 47–49.
[118] Ibid., 51.
[119] Hegermann, *Hebräer*, 18–19.

and connotation significantly different from that given to them by his supplier … Before we can properly speak of the 'Philonism' of Hebrews (as Spicq does), it is necessary to demonstrate that the alleged influence extends beyond vocabulary into the realm of *Topics and Ideas*.[120]

Williamson outlined some immediately apparent discrepancies between Philo and Hebrews that called into question Spicq's conclusions. Philo, for instance, was a keen philosopher, believing that God had made humankind "partaker in kinship" with himself "in mind and reason" (*Opif.* 8).[121] However, Hebrews was not so much concerned with philosophy as with eschatology: the coming of Christ, and, eventually, the world to come, as demonstrated in his comments on the two covenants in 8:7–13.[122] Whereas "Philo, apart from one or two concessions to his Jewish background and attitudes, adopted a typically Platonic attitude to time and history which admitted no eschatology at all," the author of Hebrews was certainly concerned with "final things".[123] Williamson systematically goes through key topics in the Epistle to see how they "match up" to Philo's world-view.

With regards to Philo's *logos*, Williamson accepts that Jesus is at least described in terms similar to those of the Alexandrian *logos* in Heb 1:2. However, he says we cannot take it for granted that Hebrews is carrying over Philo's *logos* theology.[124] For instance, Spicq argues that the "hymn to the word" in 4:12–13, where God's word is described as quick and powerful, sharper than a two edged sword, is paralleled by the hymn to the glory of the creative Word in Philo's treatise on Cain and Abel (*Sacr.* A and C 65–66).[125] Here, Philo states that God's act of creation through his word is instantaneous, and that God is "even swifter than time." Whereas for Spicq there is a conceptual similarity between the two passages, Williamson points out that Philo is emphasizing the immense speed at which the divine Word operates creatively. He is not concerned with judgement, as is Hebrews. There is, in fact, a lack of verbal similarity between the two passages, and little resemblance in the thoughts expressed, either. Furthermore, some of Hebrews' key words, like διϊκνέομαι (pierce, 4:12), are missing entirely from Philo.[126]

In addition, the existence of two worlds, a seemingly shared feature is, in fact, not a similarity at all. The idea of two worlds is arguably shared between Hebrews and Philo, but whereas Philo would have seen the material world as a copy of the world of "Ideas" (in the Platonic sense), Heb 11:3 is to be understood as referencing the concept of the world's being created out of the forms them-

---

[120] Ronald Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ALGHJ 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 137.

[121] Ibid., 139.

[122] Ibid., 146.

[123] Ibid., 143.

[124] Ibid., 411.

[125] Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 51.

[126] Williamson, *Philo*, 389–91.

selves:[127] "the Writer … is affirming the traditional, orthodox Jewish-Christian view of the creation of the physical world *ex nihilo*."[128]

Williamson wishes to counter the assertion that Hebrews is reliant upon Philonic interpretations. He reminds us that exegesis is much more than the deduction of sources. Whilst we may examine the extratext for information which helps us understand Hebrews, we have first and foremost to look at the discourse before us.

2.5.3 Hebrews and Wisdom

More recently, however, another historical backdrop has been posed for the Epistle to the Hebrews. The LXX Book of Wisdom is relatively close in date to Hebrews, and may be an alternative background text to Philo. It is slightly earlier than both Hebrews and Philo, and seems to have been written after Alexandria's conquest by Rome in 30 BCE.[129] David Winston posits a date in the reign of Gaius Caligula (37–41 CE), a time of persecution and stripping of Jewish rights to citizenship and property, which he sees as underpinning passages like Wis 19:13–17, where Egypt is despised.[130]

As Winston argues, the Book of Wisdom is slightly bolder than Philo in depicting one that emanates from God, probably because of Philo's concerns for Jewish monotheism.[131] This holds true even if the figure of Wisdom is also described as the εἰκών (image, also in Wis 7:26) of God in a Platonic sense.[132] The Book of Wisdom also seems to share other ideas with Hebrews, as in its disdain for death, since Wis 1:14 says death is something that God did not envisage at the original creation (see also Heb 2:9). What is interesting is that in Wis 1:1–6:1, the author draws a parallel between the original creation of God

---

[127] See ibid., 382. Williamson also comments on the fact that to Philo the invisible world was perceptible by the intellect, not faith, another divergence between the two authors. E. g., *Conf.* 34.

[128] Ibid., 378. See excursus on 11:3. However, other scholars have questioned if *creatio ex nihilo* was a doctrine before 100 CE For example, see Gottfried Nebe, "Creation in Paul's Theology," in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Henning Graf Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, JSOTSup 319 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 2002), 111–37. The idea that Plato's idea of forms had made its way into Hebrews is not uncommon. Usually, it is thought to have come via the thought of Philo. Compare Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 39–40; Robert S. Eccles, "The Purpose of the Hellenistic Patterns in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Religions in Antiquity*, Festschrift *for E. Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner, Supplements to Numen 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 207–26, and Gilbert George Holley, "The Greek Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *AmJT* 14 (1910):521–32. Another scholar critical of Spicq's position is David Lincoln Hurst. Hurst in fact goes into a number of possible backgrounds for Hebrews, and his work is a thorough diachronic study of the possible texts behind the Epistle. See also Hurst, *Epistle*, 7–9.

[129] David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, AB 43 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 20–25.

[130] Ibid.

[131] Winston, *Wisdom*, 184–85.

[132] See Ibid., 187, where he notes that Philo speaks of the divine *logos* as God's image (*Fug.* 101).

where the cosmos is emphasized as being wholesome, and the ultimate judgement where God re-establishes justice by overcoming ethical chaos. Salvation in the Book of Wisdom, then, involves God's bringing humanity to the point of realizing the original intentions at creation; indeed, it is because the figure of Wisdom was present when the world was made that it knows the hidden plans of God (Wis 9:8–9). Wisdom's function in salvation is closely linked to its role in creation, and one might argue similarly for the Son in Hebrews' exordium, where the agent of creation offers sacrifice for sin (Heb 1:2–3).[133] I shall also argue for a similar train in Hebrews' thought in ch. 2, even though this time it makes direct reference not to the Book of Wisdom but to Ps 8.[134]

In this thesis, I also posit an important connection between Hebrews and the description of Wisdom in Prov 8:22–30. Here, the figure of Wisdom is described as having been present with God from the beginning, even before the depths were formed (a reference to Gen 1:2). Whereas Wisdom is perhaps described as being like a "master workman" (RSV) and thus involved in the creation in the Hebrew of Prov 8:30, in the LXX, Wisdom is here depicted as joined to God through the use of the word ἁρμόζουσα (being joined, as in marriage).[135] Interestingly, in Prov 8:31, we read that Wisdom also delights to be in the presence of people, and thus amid the heavenly description of Wisdom, we see Wisdom active on earth in a manner not dissimilar to the Son in Hebrews.[136] Moreover, in Prov 8:31, we also have the description of "children", which will come in Heb 2:10–18: "the image underscores the intimacy wise human beings have with God through Wisdom," and in Hebrews, they enjoy the same through the salvific actions of the Son.[137] This thesis will look closely at the of the creative Son in relation to salvation, and posit that this depiction is evident in a number of passages and connected to such Wisdom theology. Even though direct comparison with Wisdom in Proverbs is not the aim of this thesis, it is interesting to note these parallels here.

---

[133] Michael Kolarcik, "Creation and Salvation in the Book of Wisdom," in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*, ed. Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins, CBQMS 24 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992), 97–107, here 99, 101.

[134] It is also interesting that Hebrews links the exodus and creation. Again, using DA, I explore this in relation to its use of Ps 95 in Heb 4, but it has been argued that Wis 10 also connects the two, and even casts the exodus as a new creation. See Ibid., 103–04.

[135] It should be noted that the interpretation of Prov 8:30 is disputed in the Hebrew. This has been discussed at length by Stuart Weeks, "The Context and Meaning of Proverbs 8:30," *JBL* 125 (2006):433–42. The controversy surrounds the meaning of אָמוֹן, which can either be seen as "master craftsman" or "nursling, child". This does not seem to be the reading in the LXX, however, which has ἁρμόζω (to be joined), an image perhaps of marriage, not childhood.

[136] See also Mary Ann Beavis, "Hebrews and Wisdom," in *Mark, Manuscripts and Monotheism: Essays in Honour of Larry W. Hurtado*, ed. Chris Keith and Dieter T. Roth, LNTS 528 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 201–18, here, 212. See also Ben Witherington, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 48.

[137] Gale A. Yee, "The Theology of Creation in Proverbs 8:22–31," in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*, ed. Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins, CBQMS 24 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992), 85–96, here 95.

2.5.3.1 Paul Ellingworth

In my emphasis on Hebrews' link to Wisdom theology, I am partly indebted to the work of Paul Ellingworth and William Lane. The former, in particular, makes an important contribution in elucidating the references to creation in the Epistle, especially in terms of the language used. Ellingworth's observations on our topic are hidden within the overall textual analysis, as one would expect with a commentary.

In discussing the exordium, Ellingworth notes that the eternity of the Son is implicit in v. 2bc, and his activity at the beginning and end of time is expressed in vv. 2bc-3 and then in v. 10.[138] He claims that whilst the language of Hebrews is too distinct to show direct influence from other NT texts, Hebrews does contain a *logos* theology akin to John's gospel.[139] Although one could argue against Ellingworth that Hebrews uses ῥῆμα, and not λόγος in the exordium (1:3), and either for or against Philonic influence on the text, Ellingworth is an significant example of the way in which creation in Hebrews is treated as an indication of its historical milieu, which is in turn used to explicate the text. In the first place, Ellingworth observes that the question of intermediaries in the creation of the world, as per 1:2, was not an uncommon one. Indeed, the idea that God had an agent is found in various places, from Wisdom in Prov 8:22–30, to the Messiah in *Odes of Solomon* 41:15, and in various ways in Philo, in passages such as *Fug.* 95; *Mut.* 29, and Philo even describes a Son as this mediator in *Agr.* 5; *Conf.* 63.[140] However, he thinks that Hebrews expresses its *logos* theology in terms of the LXX, rather than Hellenism, and in particular argues for links with the book of Wisdom.[141]

In Wis 7, the figure of Wisdom is closely associated with God, and seems to proceed from him as an ἀπαύγασμα (radiance/effulgence) and is also characterized as God's agent of creation (7:22), making a closer conceptual and verbal link with this passage. In addition, we have in both Hebrews and Wisdom the

---

[138]   See also Small, *Characterization*, 206–7, or David deSilva, *Perseverance*, 100–101.

[139]   Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 90. Other scholars emphasize the differences between Heb 1:1–4 and John 1:1–18; compare Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxxix.

[140]   Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 96.

[141]   Ibid., 90, 99. Creation by the word is also picked up in Sir. 42:15; Wis 9:1, Philo *Sacr.* 8 and *Deus* 57.3. Ibid., 570. Interestingly, Ellingworth does not see 11:3 as referencing Christ as the agent of creation. One could argue that the similarities in vocabulary between 11:3 and 1:2 mean that the Epistle is coming full loop. This would not necessarily contradict Ellingworth's observations on the essential relationship between creation and faith, however, if we consider Hebrews to have an implied nascent Trinitarian theology, as would appear from 1:3's description of Jesus' relationship to the Father and the comment in 1:10, combined with the reference to the Holy Spirit in 9:14. For alternatives to Ellingworth's position, see Charles Kingsley Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. William David Davies and David Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1964), 363–93, here 382–83 and Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxxix.

close connection of ἀπαύγασμα to the "glory" of God in terms of surrounding co-text. Ellingworth posits that the Hebrews' description is, in fact, a combination of ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης (emanation of the glory of the Almighty) (Wis 7:25) and ἀπαύγασμα … φωτὸς ἀϊδίου (effulgence … of everlasting light) (Wis 7:26).[142] Indeed, the term ἀπαύγασμα is essentially part of a chain of descriptions that see the figure of Wisdom described as in some way proceeding from God himself, and it would appear that Hebrews is in some way drawing on this background in its exordium. I discuss this possibility at length in the main text.

2.5.3.2 William Lane

Lane also believes that, woven among the assertions regarding the Son, we can see phrases which equate Christ with Wisdom in Hebrews. In this regard, he comes very close to the thought of Ellingworth. However, his reading slightly contradicts Ellingworth's in that he thinks that there is an implied equation of Christ and Wisdom, and that it is not another form of typology.[143] This is emphasized by the change in subject from God in 1:2 to the Son in 1:3:

> The first of these statements (v. 2*c*, "through whom he made the world") is separated from those which follow by the change of subject in v. 3 … this arrangement serves to establish two striking equations: (1) the royal Son of Ps 2 is identified as divine Wisdom, the agent of creation (v. 2*b-c*); (2) divine Wisdom, the representative of God in the world and sustainer of creation, is identified as the royal Priest of Ps 110 (v. 3*a-b-c*). [144]

> The conception of the Son as the one through whom God created the universe and who now sustains everything by his powerful word (1:2*c*, 3*b*) is expressed with phrases elsewhere associated with a different construct, that of divine Wisdom … The writer does not say Jesus was divine Wisdom. He does not speak of the personal Word who was with God from the beginning as does John (John 1:1–3). He simply clothes the Son in the garb of Wisdom.[145]

Lane is correct in asserting that there is no contrast made between the figure of Wisdom and Jesus as we see between, say, Jesus and the prophets (1:1–2) or Moses and Jesus (3:1–6), and thus the Epistle does seem to be making a subtly different use of Wisdom theology from viewing it typologically. By seeing Jesus

---

[142] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 99. See also François Bovon, *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 36, trans. Jane Haapiseva-Hunter (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 1995), 129. Bovon also traces the gradual personification of divine Wisdom, and notes the links of this hypostasised Wisdom to the cosmos and to God, suggesting, as I do here, connections between Hebrews and Wis 7 in relation to the Son's and Wisdom's roles in creation.

[143] See Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 99.

[144] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 6. Lane also suggests that the change in subject might be due to the text originating in a liturgical setting. Ibid., 7.

[145] Ibid., cxxxix.

as clothed in the garb of Wisdom, Lane demonstrates a continuity in Hebrews' theology that builds on well-established Jewish tradition which befits the argumentation of the exordium in particular:

The framing statements … enunciate emphatically the topic of supreme revelation through the Son. The core of the exordium … described Jesus in an arresting way as the royal Son, Divine Wisdom, and the royal Priest.[146]

2.6 Why No Monograph on Creation in Hebrews? Edward Adams

Having surveyed the different approaches to Hebrews, we are forced to ask an important question: why is creation in Hebrews not generally dealt with as something in its own right? Why is there no monograph on our theme? Certainly, the topic has been noticed, as we have seen above. We might also mention the work of Martin Karrer, whose commentary includes a short discussion of the Son as "the agent of creation and the creator of purification," in which he discusses the use of the verb ποιέω for God's creation of the world and for the Son's making purification, suggesting that the two are to be understood together in the discourse.[147] Part of the reason creation in Hebrews does not receive much attention is that the major interest of Hebrews is not cosmology. This is something noticed by Edward Adams:

The epistle to the Hebrews is not a treatise on cosmology. The writer of the letter does not discuss the origin, structure and fate of the cosmos as matters of interest to him in their own right. Nevertheless, he does, within the context of his theological exposition and moral exhortation, make serious statements that relate to each of these questions.[148]

In short, Hebrews is not so much concerned with giving an account of creation as with appealing to it in its argumentation.[149] It is precisely this point of Adams that I wish to place at the heart of my thesis. Adams makes the valuable observation that Hebrews' use of creation references and its cosmology are not to be confused, the latter focusing on the Epistle's world view. Indeed, the emphasis of this thesis is on the Epistle's use of references to the creation of the world, not Hebrews' world view, even if the two topics are intricately connected.

It is, in fact, by looking at how the references to creation function together that Adams builds his understanding of the Epistle's cosmology. Let us take for an example Hebrews' understanding of how the world was created. The first creation reference occurs in the opening lines of the Epistle, introducing the Son

---

[146] Ibid., 7.
[147] Karrer, *Hebräer*, 117–20.
[148] Edward Adams, "The Cosmology of Hebrews," in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 122.
[149] Ibid., 132.

and his role in the exordium, where Christ is denoted as the one through whom God made the ages and who sustains and governs the universe. God, ὁ θεός, is the subject of the verb ἐποίησεν (to make) and so Christ is here denoted at the *agent* of creation.[150] Adams goes on to note that the next reference to the creation of the world comes only a few verses later, in 1:10–12, where Ps 102:25–27 is applied to Christ, as was observed above. The psalm "expresses God's sovereignty over the material universe; he made it and will outlive it," but Hebrews applies this verse to Christ as Lord: "the application makes the Son directly responsible for the establishment of the earth and the formation of the heavens."[151] We might here also mention the work of Hans-Friedrich Weiss, who observes that in 1:2, the creation reference follows immediately after the eschatological statement that the Son was made heir of all things, and therefore inherits what he created.[152] Then, in 2:10 we find another use of "prepositional metaphysics" when the Father is said to be "the one for whom and through whom everything exists," and whilst Christ was the agent of creation in 1:2, here God is presented as both the agent and cause δι᾽ οὗ (through whom) the world is created.[153] This is followed soon by 3:1–6, where he says we also have another reference to God [i. e. the Father] as creator.[154] Hebrews is intentionally signalling God's "creatorhood", and not as something distinct from that of Christ.

Furthermore, Adams explicitly says that Hebrews is concerned with the *createdness* of the world. In 9:11–12, he says, the word κτίσις is not being used to refer to the overall act of creation, but to its product. Another reference to this is found in 12:27, where the author refers to heaven and earth as "things made/created things".[155] Adams thus acknowledges that the author of Hebrews emphasizes that the visible heavens and earth had a created beginning. They will also be brought to a definitive end, as was possibly in his mind in the citation of Ps 102:25–27 in Heb 1:10–12, and this idea underpins the concept of the shakeability of earth and heaven in 12:25–29.[156] He concludes that:

Belief in God as creator and the world as his creation is crucial to the theology of Hebrews. To be sure, the creation of the world is not a subject which the writer develops for its own sake; it is mentioned in connection with other topics. But its status as a pri-

---

[150] Ibid., 125. Adams will later make the same point as Williamson, that the *Timaeus* envisages the visible cosmos being modelled on the invisible realm, not made out of it – see 128.

[151] Ibid.,126

[152] Hans-Friedrich Weiss, *Der Brief and die Hebräer*, KEK 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1991), 142.

[153] Ibid., 125. For more on prepositional metaphysics, see Gregory E. Sterling, "Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts," *SPhiloA* 9 (1997):219–38.

[154] Adams, "Cosmology," 126.

[155] Ibid., 129–30.

[156] Ibid., 135–6. See also Gerd Theissen, *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief*, SNT 2 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1969), 115.

mary theological conviction can hardly be doubted … the author positively affirms God's creatorhood, even when he is not required to do so by the argument in hand (Heb 2:10; 3:4). The very high degree with which Christ is involved in the creation of the world is clearly significant in terms of Christology.[157]

Adams' chapter is only around twenty pages long, but it represents a significant step forward in recognising the major role of the topic of creation in the Epistle to the Hebrews. He acknowledges its importance on the concrete level of quotable passages which demonstrate its significance in the Epistle, and on the abstract level of the world-view envisaged by Hebrews. This short article on Hebrews' cosmology opens the door to much deeper considerations of the topic of creation and its implications for Hebrews' exegesis, and it also explains why studies on Hebrews tend to overlook the references to creation, namely because of Hebrews' overall genre and the fact it is not overtly a treatise on cosmology.

2.7 Conclusion

To conclude, we can say that our topic is addressed in a number of ways and to a greater or lesser extent, which depends on the motivation of the exegete. It is true that in some works, the topic of creation is largely overlooked, or its significance missed, sometimes because an overall concern for Hebrews is perceived, for instance, on the High Priestly imagery. Such was the case with Vanhoye. However, it is also true that in some commentaries, the creation references play a vital role in elucidating Hebrews' eschatology or rhetoric (or both), as was especially the case with deSilva. In previous scholarship, when creation is addressed, it is also often in reference to Hebrews' cosmology, rather than its discourse, and the function of the references to the creation of the world at any given point in the discourse. Yet, perhaps ironically, it is Adams' article on the cosmology of Hebrews that highlights the importance of understanding the creation references are used in Hebrews. It is hoped that by examining our passages, this thesis will add to the developing recognition of the particular importance of the topic of, and references to, creation in the Epistle.

---

[157] Adams, "Cosmology," 129–30. He sees Hebrews as being akin to Jewish apocalyptic literature, where a new creation is envisaged. He thinks this even though there is no explicit mention of such a new creation in Hebrews, though one might argue for such a theology on the basis of 12:26–28 (I discuss this in the exegesis). In 2:5, the ideal state of things envisaged in Ps 8:4–6 is to be fulfilled when Christ reigns supreme, the phrase τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν (the world to come) reflecting an eschatological dualism of two ages which was often "conceptualized as two distinct spatial 'worlds,' this world and the world to come," but the use of οἰκουμένη here suggests that he has in mind a new physical world. Ibid., 136–37. However, not everyone would agree with Adams that creation will be destroyed. Ole Jakob Filtvedt's recent article offers one such challenge: Ole Jakob Filtvedt, "Creation and Salvation in Hebrews," *ZNW* 106 (2015):280–303.

Chapter 3

Christ the Agent of Creation in the Exordium

3.1 Introduction

Before we begin our investigation into the first reference to creation in Hebrews, it is necessary to establish the precise form of the text which we are analyzing, and to make an accurate translation of it into English. A fairly literal translation is provided of the section in question at the start of each chapter, so that the lexical chains and other semantic features become apparent in the English. The justification for my translation, as for each section under analysis, is included in Appendix A. An attempt has also been made to capture the sense of poetry inherent in the exordium. The manuscripts, as was customary at their time of composition, present the text as continuous prose. Whilst attention to layout did not occupy ancient copyists in the same way as modern scholars, it is helpful to set out the text in such a way that its flow might become more evident to the modern mind.[1]

Translation of Heb 1:1–4

In many parts and in many ways,[2]
of old, God, having spoken to the fathers through the prophets,
[2] In the last one of these days, has spoken to us through a son,[3]

---

[1] Layout was not completely unknown to ancient scribes, as in the Sinaiticus manuscripts of the Psalms, which arrange the colons so as to reflect their poetry. However, this was not the norm, and it is impossible to say how the original manuscripts of Hebrews would have laid out the text since we have only copies available to us which post-date the Epistle's latest possible date considerably.

[2] This phrasing is chosen to represent the Greek as literally as possible. The expression is one of diversity in the interactions of God with humanity, in terms of the number of interactions and the forms they took. It may also be suggestive of an overall sequence within these interactions, the "parts" being akin to "sections" that make up a whole. The term πολυμερῶς is sometimes used to denote the composite, as in Aristides 13:5 or Tatian 15:1 (see "πολυμερῶς," *BDAG*, 847). This may be a secondary sense in Hebrews, given the continuity between revelation in the prophets and in the Son, though the primary sense does seem to be one of contrast between the plurality of revelations through the prophets versus the ultimate revelation in the Son.

[3] As this is a general introduction, lacking the article in the Greek, I have not capitalised "son". It does not here seem yet to be being used as a title. Once it gains the article, I have capitalised "Son" for the converse reason. The tense used in the Greek is the aorist, however the translation

whom he has placed as an heir of everything, through whom he also made the aeons,[4]
[3] Who, being the radiance of his glory and impress of his substance,
and upholding[5] everything by his powerful word,
having made purification for sins,
sat down on the right of the majesty on high,
[4] having become as much superior to the angels as he has inherited a name more distinguished than theirs.

3.2 Exegesis

From a discourse perspective, the opening of the exordium is designed to immediately capture the audience's attention when read aloud. Whereas layout was lacking in such ancient texts, grammatical structures and phraseology often served the purpose of drawing one's attention to key points. The alliteration of the "p" sounds in πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (Heb 1:1) follows a standard literary convention which favoured the use of this plosive consonant at the opening to a speech or literary work.[6] Such sounds would emphasize the subject of the opening of the piece, which itself often consisted of periodic sentences such as the one in Heb 1:1–4, which would then go on to introduce the subjects to be covered later on in the discourse.[7] The result of the repetition of plosive sounds in

---

chosen better renders the definitive yet presently important sense of the verb in English. The aorist is the usual way of expressing the past tense in Greek narrative, and whilst there is clearly a contrast between the single revelation in the Son and that through the prophets in v. 1, it is not necessary to concern ourselves with its usual aspect to the point of rigid translation. The words "in the last one of these days" specifically indicate that the action of Christ is present to the intended audience, and thus the Greek ἐλάλησεν and ἔθηκεν is better conveyed in English by the perfect.

[4] The exact nuance of this term is discussed later in the thesis. I have tried to choose, here, the closest English equivalent to the Greek.

[5] Lit. "bearing". Translated here idiomatically to give the sense suggested in the Greek.

[6] The above alliterative technique can also be used to draw attention during a work, e. g. Heb 2:1. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 91. In 1 Cor 9:22–23; Paul says he has become weak to the weak to win them over and that he does this for the sake of the gospel: τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω πάντα δὲ ποιῶ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἵνα συγκοινωνὸς αὐτοῦ γένωμαι. The use of the "p" sounds lends emphasis to the latter part of his statement. In 1 Cor 13:2, the same usage is used to stress the importance of ἀγάπη (love), which shares a certain assonance, itself containing π in the final syllable.

[7] For example, the theme of God's speech in 1:1–2 will be developed in 4:12–13; 5:11; 12:24–25, the purification for sins in 1:3 will come again especially in 9:1–10:18, though it is also present in 2:9–11, and the subject of the angels in 1:4 will occupy the rest of chapter 1. This was a deliberate choice in terms of communication and discourse. "We shall have attentive hearers by promising to discuss something important, new and unusual matters, or such as appertain

quick succession is to almost startle one to attention as the first key point of the sentence is made.[8] Importantly for our purposes, the first reference to creation in Hebrews follows on directly from this dramatic start. This is marked by the insertion of the phrase δι᾽ οὗ (through whom), which serves to extend the statement just made and elaborate further by specifying the manner in which God has spoken. The author sets up a contrastive temporal and methodological frame, which focuses attention on the way in which God now speaks through the Son: "in the last one of these days, he has spoken to us through a son, whom he has placed as an heir of everything, through whom he also made the aeons" (1:2). What, then is the significance of the initial creation reference in its immediate co-text, and what impact does understanding it have on one's reading of the wider Epistle? This section will look at our reference in terms of presupposition and reportability in relation to the structure of the exordium.

3.2.1 Towards Revealing the Significance of a Neglected Description of the Son: Creation Through the Son and Authorial Expectation

Interactions often rely on a set of presuppositions. When we communicate, we do so on the basis that the one to whom we are communicating will understand what is being said. The converse is also true of the one to whom we are speaking or writing – they expect us to speak within their own frame of reference, or else explain what we mean in such detail that they may understand our speech. Otherwise, the communication is fraught with difficulty.[9] Because of such presuppositions, what is not said in the text can become as meaningful as that which is, and the omission of explanations pertaining to particular, yet clearly important, events or depictions might be significant for one's analysis.

---

to the commonwealth, or to the hearers themselves, or to the worship of the immortal gods; …
and by enumerating the points we are going to discuss." (Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.4.7
[Caplan, LCL]). Although printed under Cicero by Loeb Classical Library, some scholars doubt
this authorship as it is anonymous.

[8] We find the technique elsewhere in the NT for similar effect. For example, in Luke 1:1,
we have the alliterative sequence πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν
πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων. Here, the many other compilations regarding the events
surrounding Jesus' life are contrasted to those of the following account in Luke 1:2, stressing the
latter's superiority in much the same way as Heb 1:1 does God's speaking through the Son: "many
have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us"
(NRSV). We also see this technique in classical works such as Homer's *Odyssey* 1.1–4.

[9] Presupposition is "defined in terms of assumptions the speaker makes about what the
hearer is likely to accept without challenge." Talmy Givón, *On Understanding Grammar* (New
York: Academic Press, 1979), 50. Attempts have also been made to look at types of presupposition
between dependent phrases in a text, such as Keenan's logical presupposition. See also Edward
L. Keenan, "Two Kinds of Presupposition in Natural Language," in *Studies in Linguistic Seman-
tics*, ed. Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terence Langendoen (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
1971), 45–54, though his distinction between logical presupposition and pragmatic presupposi-
tion is rejected by many scholars. See, for instance, Brown and Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, 29.

In the exordium to Hebrews, it is striking that the author does not appear to think the notion of God speaking through "a son", specifically the Son and heir through whom he created, or the subsequent elaborations need explanation: it is thus to be considered that the intended audience already knew a tradition which saw Christ as the agent of creation, or was expected to know one.[10] This is, in part, supported by the fact that the name "Jesus" is later used in 2:9 without explicit equation to the Son that has come before: it is presupposed in Hebrews that the audience already know they are the same person. The presumed knowledge is important to recognize because it indicates that the audience would have identified Jesus from the description at the end of 1:2, and thus his status as the agent of creation is a defining characteristic of the Son not only for the author, but also his intended audience, and this is something on which the author plays for rhetorical effect.[11] It is significant that, rather than name the "son" in the exordium, the Epistle focuses on his characteristics to identify him.

Whilst we read first that God has spoken definitively through a son whom he has appointed heir, the lack of an article here denoting "son" in generic terms, immediately a qualification is given so that there can be no mistaking who this "son" is: the one through whom God made the αἰῶνας (aeons): *the* Son. The focus on characteristics is, in fact, a way of emphasizing who is in question. As Vanhoye puts it, "the omission keeps us waiting for clarifications. They are provided immediately and show that it is a matter of him who will later on be called 'the Son of God' (Heb 4:14; 6:6; 7:3) and who is 'God' with God (1:8–9)."[12]

---

[10] Neeley, "Discourse," 42 posits the development of the phrase "God has spoken to us in his son," at 1:5–6; 7–8, 13; 2:1–4, 3:1–4:13; 5:11–14; 6:11–20; 7:17–28; 8:8–13; 10:5–10, 15–18; 12:5–9; 12:18–29. She argues that God's speaking is emphasized in many ways through synonyms or ideas from the same semantic domain, such as promises, covenant, witness, speaking, voice, word or exhortation. Although the theme of creation does not interact so much with the later passages, the first four chapters have creation references either in these passages, or very close by as in 2:5–9. It would seem, then that there is a connection between creation and God's having spoken in the passages. I will, however, argue from a slightly different position that we find the topics of creation and salvation in collocation, partly on the grounds that one could argue that some of these are on the fringes of the semantic domain, such as covenant or promise. Interestingly, however, Neeley agrees that 1:1–4:13 can be seen to represent together a specific point in the discourse ibid., 43–45, which, she says, develops the topics of the exordium and unpacks the theme of God's having spoken, ending on the characterization of the word of God in 4:11–13. She calls this ED1 (Embedded Discourse 1). Although I break up the text into smaller units, her observation that λόγος in 4:12–13 leads us back to consideration of God's having spoken lends support to our consideration of the creation references in 1–4 together, since this can be seen as bringing us back to the opening sentence of the exordium. See ibid., 73–74 for Neeley's own division of this unit into subsections.

[11] To some extent, we are here dealing with the concept of "successful reference": "The traditional semantic view of reference is one in which the relationship of reference is taken to hold between expressions in a text and entities in the world", however, Brown and Yule point out that "successful reference depends on the hearer's identifying, for the purposes of understanding the current linguistic message, the speaker's intended referent, on the basis of the referring expression used." Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 204 and 205, respectively.

[12] Vanhoye, *Letter*, 54.

3.2.2 The Usual Scholarly Focus on the Structure of the Exordium

It is surprising, then, that our creation reference has gone relatively undiscussed in current literature. This lack of recognition is partly due to issues in establishing a structure for the exordium, and how the structure decided upon is perceived to influence one's readings of the descriptions of the Son. Sometimes, the appeal to a particular structure results in the exordium being seen to house a collection of separate designations for the Son as heir, agent of creation, radiance, impress, sustainer and exalted one at God's right hand. In such cases, our reference is seen in isolation. Other times, the descriptions are read as being interrelated, but the reference to creation is little considered, or considered to be a secondary one. Typically, decisions as to structure have been taken at the level of rhetorical features, such as chiasms. For instance, Heil has this structure:

A[1:1] Multifacetedly and multifariously much time ago God, having spoken to the fathers in the prophets, [2a] at the end of these days has spoken to us in a Son, whom he *placed* as *heir* of all things (Ps 2:8),

B[2b] through whom also he *made* the ages

C[3a] who, being radiance of the glory and representation of the reality of *him*,

C'[3b] and bearing up all things by the pronouncement of the power of *him* (Wis 7:25–26),

B'[3c] having *made* a cleansing for sins (Job 7:21),

A'[3d] *sat* at the right of the Majesty in the heights (Ps 109:1), [4] having become so far better than the angels to the degree that more excellent beyond them he has *inherited a name*.[13]

According to Heil, the chiasm moves from a "contrastive parallel progression to the alliterative expression of the continuity in God's speaking (1:1).[14] The issue is one of temporal progression from the past to the finality of the present, and a move from "them" [the fathers] to "us" [the audience and author] and the Son who had been made heir of all things. The Son in whom God has spoken, and again of whom he has made an heir, is then revealed as the one through whom he made the ages. This statement further attracts the reader to listen to God speaking in the Son through a reference to the world in both temporal and spatial dimensions, in which they are now living at "the end of these days" (1:2).[15] Heil then describes a progression where the emphasis switches onto the Son who has made a cleansing for sin, before finally focusing on how this one

---

[13] John Paul Heil, *Hebrews: Chiastic Structure and Audience Response*, CBQMS 46 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2010), 26. I have retained Heil's translation here, and the translations by Ellingworth and Lane in the next paragraphs, in order to preserve the integrity of their argument.

[14] Ibid., 28.

[15] Ibid., 28–29.

who was made heir of everything has inherited "a name" and taken seat at the "authoritative and powerful right side of God in heaven."[16]

On the other hand, it is possible simply to see a chiasm of concepts. Ellingworth, for instance, sees a rather loose chiastic structure and suggests the following:[17]

God has appointed Christ as heir	Enthronement
Through him he created the world	action in the universe
He reflects God's glory	relation to God
He bears God's stamp	relation to God
He upholds the Universe	action in the universe
(When he made purification,)	(reason for)
he sat downat God's right hand	Enthronement

Ellingworth ultimately believes that the chiasm corresponds to a shift in the temporal viewpoint in the exordium, from the act of creation in v. 2c to the eternality of the Son's relationship to God. The descriptions of Christ are treated as different concepts, rather than being intrinsically connected to what came before or comes after.[18] The exordium progresses from one description to another, coming full circle back to the concept of enthronement.

However, Lane, by contrast, proposes a different chiasm:[19]

A   God spoke to the fathers … through the prophets … he has spoken … by his Son

　　B   Whom he appointed heir of everything

　　　　C   and who yet is the one through whom he created the world

　　　　C   This Son, although the radiance … and exact representation

　　　　　　 … and although sustaining the universe

　　B'   yet made purification for sins and then sat down at the right hand

A'   having been exalted as far above the angels as the name which he has inherited is superior to theirs.

Lane argues that the literary structure of the exordium exhibits a "concentric symmetry" of the type A B C C' B' A', stating that "the conceptual correspondence of vv. 1 and 4 serves to frame the several statements concerning the Son in vv. 2 and 3 … The period begins and ends by asserting the ultimate significance of the revelation through the Son."[20] In addition, the "completion of the prophetic revelation with the word spoken through the Son and the superiority

---

[16]   Ibid., 28–34, here 34.
[17]   Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 95.
[18]   Ibid., 99.
[19]   Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 6–7, abbreviated.
[20]   Ibid., 6.

of his name to the rank and titles of the angels are parallel concepts."[21] The mention of the revelation through the prophets at the very beginning is balanced by the reference to the angels in v. 4 and "the central core of the paragraph is developed within this conceptual frame."[22] This core consists of various affirmations about the Son, and Lane observes that each declaration has its source in a coronation psalm celebrating the enthronement of a royal figure – in respect of Christ being made heir, see Ps 2:8 and with regards to his sitting down at God's right hand, see Ps 110:1.[23]

Each of these scholars takes the exordium to be structured in a slightly different way, and their readings that flow from these proposals lead to various conclusions as to the focus of the exordium. What is particularly interesting in this case is that everyone, to some extent, recognized a chiastic structure for the exordium. Indeed, whilst chiastic structures were used by many ancient writers and orators, within them the connections which link together the constituent parts can be considered in a number of ways, which can dramatically affect one's reading.[24] For instance, some might put the emphasis on the central concept, in the form A B C C' B' A' (Lane), or they may understand the chiasm as leading into a central point and then back out of in an almost *sed contra* fashion, A B C C' B' A' (Ellingworth). As a solution, I suggest we understand the exordium, and the place of our creation reference in it, in terms of reportability, linearization and cohesion.

---

[21] Ibid., 6–7.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] One study is Nils Wilhelm Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in Formgeschichte* (Madison, WI: University of North Carolina Press, 1942, Repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), or John Woodland Welch, *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981).

3.2.3 Reportability, Cohesion and Creation in Hebrews' Exordium

David Alan Black offers the following structure for the exordium, from a DA perspective:

1. ὁ θεὸς ἐλάλησεν
2. λαλήσας πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως
3. πάλαι
4. τοῖς πατράσιν
5. ἐν τοῖς προφήταις
6. ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων
7. ἡμῖν
8. ἐν υἱῷ
9. ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων
10. δι᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας·
11. ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς
12. ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ
13. φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ
14. καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος
15. τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων
16. ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ᾽ αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα

According to Black, the surface structure can be demonstrated to be "a typical colon consisting of a nominal element (*theos*) and a verbal element (*elalēsen*) which together convey a coherent piece of information."[25] The focus is very much on God's having spoken, and the event of speaking is extended three times in the text to highlight God's having spoken first in a preliminary revelation (items 2–5), and then definitively in the Son (items 6–8). Moreover, the three extensions of *lalēsas* "render relations in terms of time, setting, and means of communication."[26] God is said to have spoken earlier a) long ago, b) to the fathers) and c) by the prophets. Correspondingly, he is then said to have spoken a) in these last days, b) to us and c) by his Son. We thus see a progression in ideas moving from God to the Son (item 8 above) and the remainder of the sections (items 9–16) deal specifically with him, making the Son the focal point of the argument.[27]

The clauses beginning with *hon ethēken*, each of which includes a relative pronoun and a finite verb in the aorist tense, all increase considerably what might be regarded as the specificity of *huiō* and designates the natural consequences of sonship: God has appointed him to be heir. Items 10 and 11 may be regarded as the result of item 9, which

---

[25] Ibid., 177.
[26] Ibid. He later argues that whilst some would regard ὅς in item 11 as introducing a new colon, the fact that each one of the constituent elements of 1:1–4 can be linked either directly or indirectly to the predicate element ἐλάλησεν, ibid, 179.
[27] Ibid., 178–79.

conversely serves as the means of items 10 and 11. Since the Son is heir, he is also the rightful owner of all that he has created (item 10) and redeemed (item 11) … Four participle clauses extend and define the nature and background of the Son's session at the right hand of God. The durative form of the first two participles indicates that the sense involves enduring qualities or operations, while the aorist form of the final two participles implies the finished nature of the Son's incarnate activities.[28]

Black hereby recognizes that there is some kind of link between the heavenly descriptions of the Son as heir and agent of creation and his sacrificial activity on earth according to the exordium, as exhibited by the construction of the sentence. The statements which follow the exordium's opening clause are essentially one extended description of the Son, adding new bits of information about him: he is the radiance of his glory and impress of his substance, upholding everything by his powerful word, and having made purification for sins, has sat down at the right of God's majesty. I would like to take his initial idea a little further by examining further the discourse features of the exordium within the context of the exordium's genre.

3.2.4 The Exordium as Narrative and Reportability

Firstly, let us consider that Hebrews' exordium is basically telling a story, and as in all stories, the revelation of it is key. God used to speak through the prophets, but now has spoken through the Son through whom he created the aeons (1:1–3a). This same Son has offered a sacrifice for sin (1:3b) and been exalted above the angels to sit at the right of God's majesty (1:3c–4).[29] As Schenck identified, "a narrative world can underlie any discourse, not simply narrative discourses," and what we have in Hebrews is the "rhetorical use of a narrative world in a non-narrative text."[30] This outline is the basic *mythos* of the exordium: the events in a plot are organized in such a way, even contrary to the sequence of the overall story line, for dramatic effect.[31] We might wonder, for instance, how the agent of creation, radiance of God's glory and impress of the divine substance from 1:3a, could possibly have needed to be exalted since by his godly nature he is superior to them, a tension fully resolved in 2:5–9 where we read of his descent

---

[28] Ibid., 178–179.

[29] Philip Church, *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*, NovTSup 171 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 277, 284 observes that the very act of sitting is significant in stressing the Son's importance over the angels, who would stand as servants in God's presence according to traditions such as 11QMelch II, 10–11 and *Gen. Rab.* 65:21 (see n. 13).

[30] Schenck, *Eschatology*, 13.

[31] Ibid., 14. *Mythos* is actually an Aristotelian designation for the plotline of Athenian tragedy, but scholars like Schenck have seen fit to use it more widely. For Aristotle, the plot was the most important part of the construction of a play, characterization coming second. The order of events presented in a play told the story in a particular way so as to have an effect on the audience. Aristotle, *Poet.* 1451a.

"for a little while." There is also no direct mention of the resurrection at this point, despite the fact that 2:14 says that the Son shared human flesh and blood "so that through death he might nullify the one having power over death," but the Son has been enthroned in heaven where he is now seated "on high" (1:3).[32] Instead of telling the story in sequence, the author tells us it so as to draw attention to key points about the Son and his role.

In discourse analysis, a need to relate certain events to have a desired impact on an addressee is known as "reportability". When someone tells a story, they have a reason that compels them to do so, something so significant that it necessitates their becoming a narrator.[33] In order to understand the nuances of that which is being conveyed, it is thought necessary to consider what the author stresses to be the key points. It is an essential concept within the discourse analysis of narratives, even of short ones as in Hebrews' exordium, that telling a story requires shaping it in such a way as to carry enough interest for the audience so as to justify why it is being told. Thus, the events being related are drawn together so as to stress that which is considered to be important. Crucially, there is almost always a "most reportable event", which, although it might not be the key point in the narrative that is being stressed, is the "the semantic and structural crucial point around which the narrative is organized."[34]

One way to establish reportability is by examining the cohesion of the passage in question.[35] We can study the features of a text or speech act in terms of markers which are given the name "cohesive ties", which show us how the events are linked to each other and to other features of the text, such as descriptions and characterizations. These "ties" are the grammatical components and structures which form the necessary relations between the linguistic items at various levels of the discourse for it to function as a meaningful act of communication. These can include organic ties, the conjunctive systems of the language itself, or componential ties, such as the omission of details in dependent passages which indicate that such subsequent phrases, sentences or utterances are to be governed by the reference of the initial claim.[36] A sequential reading and consider-

---

[32] See Koester, *Hebrews*, 97. Explicit mention of the resurrection does come later in the Epistle, as in 13:20.

[33] Alba Juez, *Perspectives*, 164. Narrator, here, is not understood as a character in the narrative, as in narrative criticism, but is rather the role taken by an addressor in relating certain events.

[34] Ibid.

[35] To echo a phrase by Halliday and Hasan, a "text has texture", that is "what distinguishes it from something that is not a text," and "it derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment," and texture is itself established by the cohesive relation that exists between the text's constituent parts. Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion*, 2. For different types of texture, see ibid., 295–98.

[36] See Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 190–222. Reed, "Discourse Analysis", 205–12, offers a good introduction to this concept and includes some helpful tables.

ation of the syntactical features reveals God's speaking through the Son, specifically the heir through whom he made the aeons, to be the most reportable event in the exordium.[37]

Firstly, let us establish the importance of the depiction of the Son in question, as it qualifies God's act of speaking. The depiction of the Son as the "one through whom he [God] also made the aeons" stands out among the designations of the Son in the exordium since it is not connected to the depiction "Son" by a participle, as in those personal details given in vv. 3–4, which recall his nature, but rather by a prepositional phrase, δι᾽ οὗ. The phrase "through whom he made the aeons" modifies the description of the Son, but it does so specifically in respect of his relationship to God. The phrase "through whom he made the aeons" in fact extends the description of the one through whom God spoke, following on from the description of him as one "appointed heir," to qualify him more specifically, and thus emphasize and reiterate his close relationship to God still further. Here, we note the use of the word καί. In its present position, we should likely accept the adverbial meaning "also", which marks a continuation in the description from the preceding clause. In all likelihood, it is original, being omitted only in P[46] and some Coptic manuscripts. The καί could be seen to add stress to the description "through whom he made the aeons," signalling it out for especial emphasis given its delayed position in the clause. Together, these observations tell us that the one through whom God spoke is no ordinary heir, no ordinary son: he is, specifically, the Son through whom God created the αἰῶνας (aeons, ages, worlds) (1:2).[38]

Organic ties are significant for our passage since they help us to see that the reference to the Son as the one through whom God created the aeons further defines the "Son" and "heir". Furthermore, they help us see that it is from the descriptions in the opening clause that the subsequent descriptions of his nature and activities then flow (v. 3), and in the progression, the idea of Christ the agent of creation comes to the fore. Similarly to how the phrase "through whom" relates the Son to God as described above, the use of ὅς + present participle of the verb "to be" ὤν denotes a certain continuity between the reference to the Son being the one through whom God created and now speaks and the

---

[37] Whilst one could argue God's having spoken as generally the most reportable event, his having spoken through the prophets in the past is contrasted to the singularity of his having spoken through the Son and the former is, essentially, backgrounded as the exordium continues. Indeed, the contrast in the mode of speech is only possible because of the finality of God's having spoken through "a son", and I will argue it is his having spoken through the Son who is the agent of the creation that is the event governing the rest of the exordium.

[38] Spicq points out that the concept of being heir is connected to the idea of sonship, though, the initiative is on God's part. Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 2, 5. The connection of "heir" and υἱός (son) is fairly common in the NT (e. g. Gal 4:7), and it is also sometimes associated with τέκνον (child) (e. g., Rom 8:17). This is likely a reflection of Greek inheritance practices.

depiction of the Son as the radiance of God's glory and impress of his substance. Interestingly for our purposes, whilst some might argue that the description in v. 3a rightly belongs with the finite verb 'he sat down' in v. 3b, the direct impact of the creation reference itself stretches to the mention of the Son as upholding creation, and thus it appears that when the audience hears that the Son is the "radiance of God's glory and impress of his substance" who is "upholding everything by his powerful word", the author is expanding upon how the Son is the agent of creation, by indicating that he still sustains it. Verse 3, as much as it signals the background reasoning behind his being seated at the right of God's majesty, thus also further emphsizes the Son's role in creation. The argument for an inherent link between being the agent of creation and the one who sustains creation is supported when we compare 1:2–3 to 1:10–12, where both the Son's creative and governing action over creation are explicitly connected.

Furthermore, the idea of the Son sustaining creation is grammatically directly linked to the concept of the Son as the radiance of God's glory and the impress of his substance through the use of another participle, φέρων (sustaining/upholding/bearing).[39] The use of this participle suggests a continuity of description which denotes dependence of the clause upon the preceding one or ones, and thus it would even appear that because the Son is the agent of creation who is so intimately connected to the divine, he is able to be the sustainer of it. The likelihood of a connection between the Son's divine nature and his continued sustaining, 'bearing', activity is strengthened by the use of τε solitarium, which serves to add "distinct propositions that are characterized by *sameness*, in the sense that they refer to different aspects of the same event, the same occasion, or the same pragmatic unit."[40] This second mention of creation in relation to the Son also supports the suggestion that it may be significant that the author has linked this event's final act of speaking specifically to the description of the Son as the one "through whom he made the aeons": to some extent, it links his role in creation to the Son's very nature.

We can now recognize the descriptions "whom he appointed heir," but especially the "one through whom he made the aeons", as qualifying God's act of speech more specifically, to acknowledge God's speaking through the Son not only as the most reportable event, but the most reportable event that has been qualified in a particular way. Let us now consider the textual cohesion as the exordium continues to describe the Christ-event. We recall again Black's point that the event of God's speaking is itself greatly extended, in part through the

---

[39] I also suggest that what we see as an event, God speaking through the one through whom he created the aeons can also be seen to characterize the Son as the agent of creation. Thus, we get a series of descriptions which form a chain intended to give an overall impression of the Son as one closely linked to the divine and involved in his creative and sustaining activity.

[40] Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 106–7.

repetition of λαλέω between v. 1 and v. 2 and partly by relations of time, setting and means of communication. He has spoken 1) long ago, 2) to the fathers, 3) by the prophets; but now 1) in the last one of these days, 2) to us), 3) through the Son.[41] This extension marks a progression of ideas moving from God to his agent of creation, and this Son remains the agent until the end of the exordium.[42] Following the extended description of the Son in 1:3a, the passage then goes on to mention how the Son has made sacrifice for sin (1:3b). Here, we have an aorist participle, ποιησάμενος (having made), the use of which indicates the previous clause or phrase is being expanded upon, and thus this purificatory action is connected to the description of Christ's nature in 1:3, which we saw earlier was subordinate itself to the act of God's speech, as qualified above in relation to the specific descriptions of the Son. No sooner is the offering for sin mentioned than we return to the Son's heavenly activity and we learn he has sat down (ἐκάθισεν) at God's right hand "on high" (1:3), being greater than the angels because he has inherited (κεκληρονόμηκεν) a name greater than theirs. In terms of linearization, the act of God's having spoken provides the backdrop for the rest of the Christ event.

We should note that the participles in Heb 1:1–4 serve to highlight the finite verbs ἐλάλησεν (he spoke), ἔθηκεν (he placed [as heir]), ἐποίησεν (he made) and κεκληρονόμηκεν (he inherited), since Greek typically uses main verbs when prioritizing information, and participles when providing supporting information. However, both ἔθηκεν (he placed [as heir]) and ἐποίησεν (he made) are governed by God's act of speech, with ἐλάλησεν (he spoke) being the primary verb, that is to say, they help to further explicate the mode of speech in a relative clause, as indicated by the use of ὅν and δι' οὗ. Grammatically, ἐκάθισεν (he sat down) is then subordinated under the relative pronoun ὅς (who), and then so is the Son's having inherited (κεκληρονόμηκεν) the name in v. 4.[43] It is clear that the events that depict Christ's saving activity are subordinated to God's act of speech since they are in a further relative clause, and the descriptions of these events flow grammatically from that initial declaration God has spoken through a "son". Coupled with our above observations as to the qualification of God's act of speech, however, we now see that the most reportable event is God's act of speaking specifically through the Son who is the heir and, more importantly for our purposes, the agent of creation: the rest of the exordium explains how God has spoken through this very special Son.

---

[41] Black, "Hebrews 1:1–4," 178–79.
[42] Ibid., 177.
[43] This latter phrase, incidentally, brings us back to the topic of inheritance in 1:1, where description of the Son as "heir" was linked to that of his being the one through whom God created, and the description of the Son as being above the angels might be seen as another way of pointing to the Son's close association with God's creative work: angels belong to the created realm. On the created nature of angels, see excursus on 1:7–9.

3.3 The Incarnation and Hebrews' Exordium

That said, although the ἐκάθισεν (he sat down) is subordinated under the pronoun ὅς, there would appear to be some prioritization of the exaltation, the verb ἐκάθισεν being the next finite verb to occur. We may therefore consider a deep connection between the Son as the heir and agent of creation through whom God spoke and his exaltation in heaven, as is indeed indicated by the use of another aorist participle γενόμενος (having become) to connect this event to the topic of inheritance in v. 4. In recognizing that the sacrificial activity and the exaltation of the Son occur in relation to the initial depiction of God's having spoken specifically through the Son qua the heir and agent of creation, an implied descent/ascent motif emerges in the exordium when it is viewed as cataphoric to the descriptions of the Son's sacrificial activity that come later in the Epistle, especially in ch. 2.[44]

It is often thought that the sacrifice offered by the Son is a heavenly activity, as per 9:12, where Jesus is said to enter behind the heavenly veil. Indeed, sacrificial rites in Israel were not deemed complete with merely the immolation, but also encompassed a number of rituals according to which sacrifice was being offered. This could include the spilling/sprinkling of blood and burning of flesh on an altar, as in Lev 4 or 16, and in Hebrews that blood pouring takes place in the heavenly sanctuary. That said, the sacrifice of the Son is presented as unique in Hebrews in that he is said specifically to take his own blood behind the veil (9:12, compare 9:25). The immolation from which that offering could flow took place on earth, and so we cannot discount or overlook the earthly element to the offering of purification for sin in 1:3. The Son is not only the "high priest" in Hebrews, but also the victim who is slain, and according to the discourse of Hebrews, his having offered sacrifice of necessity requires that he became human and suffered death, before he could once again ascend, to which we have references in vv. 3b–4.[45] We find a clear link between the immolation part of the sac-

---

[44] Beavis, "Hebrews and Wisdom," 212. Unlike Eph 4:10, Hebrews never uses the verbs ἀναβαίνω (ascend) or καταβαίνω (descend), but the motif is nevertheless present.

[45] David Moffitt discusses in his monograph the significance of the resurrection for the Epistle in this respect. He argues that it is the resurrected Christ who is able to ascend, noting passages such as 7:16 and 13:20. See Moffitt, *Atonement*, 145–76. However, I consider it significant from a discourse perspective that Hebrews does not mention the resurrection directly in the early chapters of the Epistle under investigation here. Whilst I accept the logic of the resurrection may underpin his theology, even in 2:15, where it would seem obvious to mention it, the author chooses to focus on the death of the Son itself in the co-text of his leading people to glory, rather than reference his rising from the dead. I posit that this is to set up a descent-ascent motif for the Son which sees the heavenly Son descend to earth, become a human subject even unto death so that he be immolated and then ascend back to his place of origin. This motif is then unpacked in the later sections of the Epistle which describe his taking his blood behind the veil (9:3), to unpack in more detail what happens when he returns and how that impacts on the salvation of believers. The link between death and ascent of a sacrificial victim may be linked to Yom Kippur

rifice and the ascent of the Son within the context of the incarnation elsewhere in the Epistle, which lends credence to the idea that there is a shift in the spatial focus of the exordium, and suggests that rather than considering the reference to his having made a purification for sin in the exordium as purely a heavenly activity, at this point, we should consider that it also contains an implicit reference to his having become human. Once we have seen this, we can then view his sitting at the right of God's majesty and being exalted above the angels in vv. 3–4 as the closing section to a descent-ascent motif which returns the Son to his heavenly home and status, this time as a glorified human.[46] Indeed, the only one above the angels is God, and it may well be his name that the Son is here seen to inherit as he takes his seat (v. 4).

From the point of view of DA, the most significant of passages with this motif for the exegesis of the exordium would be the relatively nearby 2:10–18, where the Son is said to take flesh for the express purpose of offering that same sacrifice (compare 4:14–15, and 13:20). This is within the co-text of his leading his siblings "to glory", that is, heavenward (2:10), arguably a reference to ascent.[47] There is significant cohesion between the exordium, especially 1:2–3, and this passage. We have a hook word on τὰ πάντα in 1:3 and 2:10, this time in reference to God's creative activity.[48] We also find kinship language in the exordium and this passage, particularly expressing a relationship between parent and offspring in the term παιδία (2:13–14), from the same semantic field as υἱός, which itself occurs in 2:10. Perhaps most importantly, there is a hook word ἁμαρτία in 2:17

---

specifically if we consider the account given in Mishnah Yoma. On Yom Kippur, two goats were involved. One was sacrificed to God, the other sent out to Azazel. In Leviticus 16, the one for Azazel is sent out into the desert, but in the Mishnah, the goat for Azazel is pushed down a ravine (descent) and then the other's blood is taken inside the veil and the carcass is burnt (ascent). What is more, they are ordered to be similar in appearance, and value suggesting that perhaps they were understood in some way as representing one figure (*m. Yoma* 1–6). Interestingly, the one for the Lord has its blood sprinkled with that of a separate bull offering in bouts of seven, first inside the veil then on it and outside, which may suggest that there was a link to creation, and the restoration of the original state thereof, implicit in the Yom Kippur ritual and connected to the victim. In some way, the blood of the victim can be seen to unite humanity with God present in the Holy of Holies, bringing them back into contact arguably lost since the events of Gen 3. I shall argue later in this thesis that we see a restoration of the created order through the victim Son in Hebrews' interpretation of Ps 8 in Heb 2. Also significant in terms of Hebrews' discourse is that in Lev 16:17, the carcass of the goat for the Lord is ordered to be burned outside the camp. Hebrews connects the crucifixion to this in Heb 13:11–13 where followers of Jesus are asked to go with Christ "outside the camp" to suffer reproach with him because the bodies of the victims from whom the blood for the purification of the holy place is taken are burned outside the camp.

[46] On historical precedents for such a claim of human ascent, see Moffitt, *Atonement*, 147–80.

[47] I will later argue that the Son is depicted as a king in 1:8–9, and that this is a reference to the exaltation. As the Son is depicted as "crowned with glory and honour" in 2:9, it would seem that leading the children to sons in 2:10 is a reference to their joining him in heaven.

[48] I shall later argue, however, that the creative activity of the Son and God are equated somewhat in this verse, in that the phrase δι' οὗ is applied here to God in 2:10, but to the Son in 1:2.

and "making propitiation" (ἱλάσκομαι) is simply another way of saying he has "made purification" for these sins. There is also a further hook word in ἄγγελος, present in 1:4 and 2:16. These cohesive features could suggest that the exordium is to be understood as cataphoric to the description of the Christ event in this passage. In respect of the argument here that we should include an earthly element to our interpretation of 1:3, it is significant that only after describing the event of his death is Jesus depicted as "high priest" in 2:17: his sacrificial activity relies on his being a human who dies. This is not to detract from the fact the sacrifice is completed with the outpouring of blood described later in the epistle, but simply to state that one must consider that the incarnation and the Son's death is a key part of offering that sacrifice.[49]

It is also significant that this earthly side to the sacrifice is kept in view even towards the end of the Epistle, even following the descriptions of his having poured out his blood in the heavenly sanctuary. In 10:5–7 it is, in fact, the incarnation side of Christ's activity that is said to take precedence:

Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said, "Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired, but a body you have prepared for me; in burnt offerings and sin offerings you have taken no pleasure. Then I said, 'See, God, I have come to do your will, O God' (in the scroll of the book it is written of me)" (Heb 10:5–7 NRSV).[50]

In this passage, it is precisely the heavenly Son's becoming flesh that makes his sacrifice pleasing to God. Indeed, in 10:10–11, it is precisely the offering of his body that makes Christ's offering superior to those of the other priests, and in 10:12 we again move to his ascent in the statement that after he had offered this sacrifice he "sat down on the right of God", an anaphoric reference to 1:3.

It would appear that in the reference to his having made cleansing for sin in 1:3, we should understand not only a reference to his heavenly activity, as per the Yom Kippur imagery of 9:3, but also the Son's earthly life and death. I there-

---

[49] Dyer, *Suffering*, 86–89 discusses the emphasis on the Son's suffering in the wider co-text 2:9–18. He notes the "shift from the focus of the Son's exalted position in 1:5–2:4 to his humanity" and he also draws attention to 2:9, which "links Jesus's incarnation and exaltation to his suffering and death." Ibid., 86. He argues that the conditional statement in 2:14–15 "is prominent in both its protasis and apodosis. The protasis is marked by the use of οὖν [therefore] and the perfect κεκοινώνηκεν ("share") and emphasizes the shared humanity of Jesus and believers." Ibid., 119. He also points out the close connection between the Son's being a high priest according to the order of Melchizedek and the Son's suffering during the incarnation in 5:5–10. Ibid., 90–91, 119. For Dyer, the incarnation serves as a preparation for the high priestly activity of Christ in heaven, underpinning the exhortation in 3:1. However, I suggest that we understand the Son's death as an intrinsic part of the sacrifice, the immolation that precedes the blood offering. Indeed, it is his own blood that the Son offers in 9:12 and there is no forgiveness without the shedding of blood (9:22).

[50] Moreover, Heb 5:7 may recall Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane (Mark 14:36) that occurred "in the days of his flesh." In addition, Heb 13:12 reports that Jesus suffered outside the city gate [of Jerusalem] (John 19:17,20).

fore argue that in the exordium we thus have a reference to the incarnation, the embodiment of the Son, but it is, perhaps unusually, cast in heavenly light and the focus is less on the "having been made flesh" but more on the "having been the Divine Son who returns home". Firstly, the audience hears about Christ the agent of creation, Son and heir, the radiance and impress of the Almighty who still sustains the world; then, we have a fleeting reference to his having made sacrifice for sin, which in the discourse of Hebrews encompasses his earthly life, and after this, the audience are reminded that Christ now holds his heavenly position once again, and the description continues to say he is greater than the angels (1:3–4). The ratio might be set 5:1 in favour of heavenly depictions if we consider those of both of action and of person distinctly: we have the Son as heir and his role as the agent/sustainer of creation (1:2–3), and as radiance of God's glory and impress of his nature (1:3), and the fact he sits on God's right hand (1:3) and is above the angels (1:4), whereas the sacrificial reference contains within itself the only earthly descriptive element.[51]

3.3.1 A Closer Look At the Clauses: The Logic of the Creation and the Logic of the Incarnation

Can we be certain, though, that the focus is on the heavenly Son? Could it be that perhaps that the Son is in heaven primarily as a human, rather than a divine being? We saw earlier how an incarnational theology of the exordium in some way stresses his earthly nature. However, in addition to the observations on reportability above, in terms of narrative flow, it is also possible to view the events of the exordium in terms of logical subordination, and suggest that the offering of the Son is dependent on his original heavenly status.

If we accept a descent-ascent motif is implied in the exordium, it is arguably because the Son is the heavenly heir and agent of creation that he was able to return to heaven having been immolated, and indeed elsewhere it is once he has returned to heaven he completes the sacrifice with his blood (9:3). The emphasis on his heavenly status is indicated grammatically in the exordium by the

---

[51] I have here counted the description of the Son as the radiance of God's glory and impress of his substance as one heavenly description, though one might say they are two, in which case the ratio would become 6:1. However, Spicq describes how they are to be considered as two parts of the same description because they are joined together by the same present participle. Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 2, 8. The problem of how to count the christological designations is taken up by John P. Meier, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1–14," *Bib.* 66 (1985):168–89, here, 171–75. It would be possible to see the very mention of "through a Son" as implying an earthly reference, since the revelation through him presupposes knowledge of the incarnation and the descent mentioned later in 2:5–9. However, the title "son" is modified by a heavenly description in terms of his role in creation, as we saw earlier, and I have thus included it as a heavenly reference, though one could argue it is at once both earthly and heavenly, which would lend further emphasis to the incarnational undertones. Heir is included as a heavenly title, since the Sonship is divine.

change from the, specifically present, participle ὤν (being) (1:3), which denotes his heavenly status as an inherent part of his nature in the godly description of him as "radiance of his [God's] glory and impress of his substance", to an aorist participle ποιησάμενος (having made), which in contrast places a temporal condition on his offering sacrifice, as already stated, the only part of the Christ event to have an earthly connotation, and defines it in terms of a singular act (1:3). Finally, the aorist ἐκάθισεν (he sat down) reveals that the chain of events is finalized in the Son's being seated at the right of God's majesty, to which the participle ποιησάμενος is notably relative, even if this action remains secondary to God's having spoken, being found in a subordinate clause.[52] This returns us to a heavenly setting for the depictions of the Son, indicating that the emphasis is not merely on the human Christ, but on the *heavenly Son made man* who then returns to heaven to continue his rule.

As I said earlier, the Son returns as a glorified human, but we can now see that he does so on account of his divine nature and, I argue, his role governing creation. There is a certain implicit logicality about this order of events. In the being seated at the right of God's majesty, the Son returns to his original heavenly domain. One who is the radiance of God's glory and impress of his substance can reasonably be expected to return to heaven and in fact would presumably need to do so in order to continue in his activity in sustaining the world, which is denoted by the present participle φέρων, and therefore connotes

---

[52] See also Church, *Temple*, 278, which also argues that ἐκάθισεν (sat down) is a "significant verb" along with ἐλάλησεν because ἐλάλησεν has God as subject whereas ἐκάθισεν has the Son as subject, and argues that God has now spoken "through a Son who has sat down at God's right hand." Although I place greater emphasis on the Son as the heir through whom God created, I nevertheless agree there is a certain emphasis at this point on the Son who has sat down, as indicated by the use of another finite verb in the indicative mood. We saw in the introduction that primary clauses in ancient Greek generally have finite verbs, whereas secondary clauses are generally denoted by participles or finite verbs with a particle, yet here we have already had the finite verb in an earlier clause, the ἐλάλησεν (he spoke) of v. 2. In the second half of the exordium, the participle ὤν (being) is a secondary verb, grammatically dependent on the finite verb ἐκάθισεν (he sat). However, logically, it would appear that it is because of his nature that the Son is able to take his seat: it is due to his being the radiance of God's glory and impress of his substance that the Son sits down. In addition, whilst the action of his sitting is depicted as logically subordinate to God's having spoken, I argue that the use of a finite verb, ἐκάθισεν (he sat), is intended to link God's having spoken through the Son through whom he made the aeons to the session, and, by extending the discourse to return the Son's activities to a heavenly setting in a definite way, lending this action at least some prominence. Spicq has similarly argued that the reason for the exaltation is that the saviour-forerunner, the Son, is himself God incarnate. Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 2, 13. We here touch on the issue of credibility of a text, that in a successful narrative an author's claims should carry with them a sense of logicality. See Alba Juez, *Perspectives*, 164. One could also argue that the temporal elision with regards to the resurrection here lends emphasis to the Son's enthronement in heaven. A good summary of the use of participles in Greek is found in Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 243–68. Note also that Wis 9:4 signals the figure of Wisdom as "seated alongside your thrones," (τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρον), and so there may be another connection between the Son in Hebrews and the figure of Wisdom.

a present activity in which he is involved. What we have is arguably a case of logical presupposition: the implication is that the Son was always going to end up back in heaven because of his nature, and, importantly for our purposes, his role governing creation. It would be extremely difficult to complete the latter when a human on earth.[53]

One might now ask whether, logically, this means that the world was not being sustained by the Son when he was on earth. However, when we see this passage in relation to 2:5–9, we might also posit that there is a logical connection between the Son's upholding everything and his making purification, since his sacrifice is here envisaged in some way as restoring the order originally intended by God at creation: the audience is told in 2:5–9 how humanity was placed in control, but that things are not yet under its feet, yet they do see Jesus, who is crowned with honour and glory already, having tasted death, a key element in his sacrificial act. I discuss this in more detail in another chapter, but suffice it to say at this point that the sacrificial act might thus be seen as part of his sustaining activity in that it restores to creation an intended order that has been disrupted. The Son's incarnation, then, in the logic of the Epistle, is closely tied to his creative role.

To summarize what has been said so far, seeing the most reportable event in the exordium as God's having spoken through the Son he appointed heir and through whom he created the aeons thus reveals our creation reference as being key to understanding the incarnational undertones of the exordium, though 1:1–4 has a focus on the heavenly Son as opposed to his having been made flesh.[54] The most reportable event is the one on which a narrative hinges, and so from consideration of God's having spoken through the Son through whom he created, we have moved to understand more clearly the cohesion of the narrative as a whole. What is more, the sacrificial side of Christ's saving activity is

---

[53] This theory states that a sentence logically presupposes another sentence: "A sentence S logically presupposes a sentence S' just in case S logically implies S' and the negation of S, ~ S, also logically implies S'." Keenan, "Two Kinds," 45. The logic in Hebrews in this regard is implicit, however, rather than stated and is indicated by variation in the verbal forms rather than vocabulary, though the continuity in agent and pronouns adds further credence to this theory. Were it not for the Son's heavenly origins, he would not be able to make purification for sins.

[54] On the suitability of an incarnational theme for the exordium given historical theological considerations, see Lindars, *Theology*, 31–35, who argues that "Jesus can be represented as the one in whom God's Wisdom/Son/Word is definitively expressed. This almost amounts to the idea of the incarnation which had its one clear New Testament statement in the Prologue of John, with its assertion that the Word became flesh (John 1:14)." Ibid., 33. Whilst I will later argue that Hebrews' exordium owes more to Wisdom theology than *logos* theology as in John's gospel, I concur with Lindars that there is a link between the two, and given clear references to Christ's taking flesh relatively nearby in 2:9–18, I argue that the exordium makes implicit reference to the incarnation. By this term, I do not imply that the author of Hebrews necessarily knew John's gospel (especially given issues of dating), nor, somewhat obviously, that it is referring to the Nicene Creed itself; however, I do use the term to denote his "sharing flesh and blood" (2:14).

presented as only a minor part of this narrative, and in terms of soteriology, it is subordinated to this heavenly incarnation and, more importantly, an overall theology of the Son as the sustainer of creation.

3.3.2 The Sequencing of Events

What is so special about the depiction of the Son as the one through whom God made the world, however? Is it not equal with the description of his having been appointed heir? Here we turn to examine the linearization and causality within Hebrews' exordium. Causality is another key feature of narrative discourse, "where the sequence of events is explained by (a series of) explicit or implicit causal relations. In other words, there is a proposed chain of events that links the orientation to the most reportable event through a web of causal relations."[55] Notably, causality is not limited to "x happened, so y happened", rather, it can be implicit and preceding clauses might contain the reasons *how* subsequent events were able to happen, rather than *why*.[56] Linearization refers to the sequence in which events are placed:

One of the constraints on the speaker/writer is that they can only produce one word at a time ... they have to choose a beginning point. This point will influence the hearer/reader's interpretation of everything that follows in the discourse since it will constitute the initial textual context for everything that follows.[57]

A key issue for understanding a narrative in relation to its discourse is thus how the events are sequenced and joined together within the narrative's construction around the central point of the most reportable event. The latter, in our case, is the fact God has spoken definitively through the Son whom he appointed heir and through whom he made the aeons. From an examination of the sequence in which other events were depicted as they followed on from that declaration (linearization), we are able to deduce the concern of Hebrews' exordium with the incarnation since the understanding of the reference to the incarnation hinges on these original descriptions (causality). Specifically, understanding the grammatical sequencing allows us to deduce the collective significance of the other reportable events and key descriptions within the overall narrative structure. However, a closer look reveals the importance of the creation reference specifically.

---

[55] Alba Juez, *Perspectives*, 164.

[56] On reading causality "backwards" in this way, see Östen Dahl, "Causality in Discourse," in *Focus and Coherence in Discourse Processing*, Research in Text Theory, ed. Gert Rickheit and Christopher Habel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 251–61, here 252.

[57] Brown and Yule, *Discourse*, 125.

There have been many suggestions as to how to sequence the events in the exordium. Some, like Lane, take the participles in a concessive sense, to give:

… whom he appointed heir of everything/through whom he yet created the world/This Son, although the radiance … and exact representation … and although sustaining the universe/yet made purification for sins and then sat down at the right hand.[58]

Others have tried to show the time relationships suggested by the tenses employed, namely aorist and present, since aorist participles usually indicated actions performed prior to the main verb whilst present participles served to express something concurrent with the main action.[59] Koester therefore argues that "since 'radiance of his glory' is introduced with the present participle … glory is most directly related to the Son's exaltation," and is thus the central focus.[60] However, that the rest of the exordium flows from God's act of speech to give emphasis to the subsequent theme of the incarnation can also be supported when we look at the breakdown of the exordium into two main clauses.

In a slight variation from Black, rather than break after "Son," whilst I accept there is probably some subordination of the descriptions "whom he appointed heir" and "through whom he made the aeons," I propose that we break more cleanly after the designation "through whom he made the aeons." In the middle of the exordium, the subject changes from the God to the Son, and so we can see two units emerge: 1:1–2 and 1:3–4. This change in the subject is itself prepared for in v. 2b, where the Son is already a "central theme", and this is what has caused some scholars to posit a break after υἱός;[61] Hence, Meier suggests:

When one … notes the carefully ordered list of christological designations, another kind of caesura, christological as well as rhetorical, might be placed at the end of v. 2a, where 'Son' is first mentioned. Everything that follows is grammatically dependent (directly

---

[58] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 6–7. He uses the singular "world".
[59] Koester, *Hebrews*, 178.
[60] Ibid., 104–5, 178. He does not, however, deny Christ's pre-existence, but just places the emphasis on the Son's present situation.
[61] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 97. This is taken up in more detail by Meier, "Structure," 171. He discusses how the Son is not even mentioned in v. 1, appearing at the end of v. 2a. He is described in an instrumental sense here as the agent of revelation, is installed as heir and so the recipient of God's action in 2b (accusative case) and is the instrumental agent of creation in 2c. From 3a to the end of v. 4, however, he is grammatically the subject and chief agent. This is picked up by Black, "Hebrews 1:1–4," 78–79, even though he posits a break at "son". A good summary of the Greek terms used to mark elaboration, enhancement and extension can be found in Jeffrey T. Reed, "Discourse Analysis," in *Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, NTTS, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 188–218, esp. 200–204. For instance, ὡς (how, as, that) and ὅτε (when) may denote simultaneity in action, and thus indicate *enhancement*, whereas ὅτι (that, because, since) or ἵνα (in order that) suggest the author is clarifying matters, specifying things, and thus represent *elaboration*. By contrast, words like καί (when used to mean "and") or οὐδέ (and not, not even, neither) signal the author is going to move beyond what he has just said and represent extension.

or indirectly) on huiǭ and forms a chain of varied descriptions of the Son, referring to either his character (nature) or his action (creative and redemptive work).[62]

Grammatically, however, the latter unit (1:3–4) depends upon the former (1:1–2) because it begins with a relative clause which begins with "who being" (ὃς ὤν [ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως]).[63] We have already seen that ancient Greek participles were markers of cohesion, and the use of the participle of "to be" often served to indicate that what was coming next was an enhancement/extension of that which came before.[64] Notably, whilst one might argue that 1:3–4 conceptually has the dominant position, perhaps because it is the point on which the exordium meets its climax, the context set for the sacrifice is still one of the incarnation, and whilst it contains the reference to Christ as offering sacrifice, 1:3–4 still begins and ends with a heavenly depiction of the Son when considered as a unit in its own right.[65] This again lends support to the theory that a reference to the incarnation is intended.

However, in terms of textual features, there is also an inclusio on "heir" (1:2) and "inheritance" (1:4), which forms around the descriptions of the Son to include his agency in creation. In the first instance, 1:2 refers to his being appointed as heir, seemingly protologically given its juxtaposition to the description of the Son through whom God created the aeons, and in 1:4, the actual act of inheritance seems to take place after his return to heaven. This creates a tension between the protological aspect of his being appointed heir and his actually inheriting. However, what is interesting for our purposes is that he not only inherits the name, for we see that in 1:2 he is specifically said to be appointed heir of "everything" (πάντων).[66] That is, he inherits what he creates: as Attridge

---

[62] Meier, "Structure," 171. Although I differ slightly from Meier on the division of the text, I acknowledge this change in the subject, and it is in part that change that leads me to divide the text as I do.

[63] Interestingly, Sinaiticus has a break at the end of v. 2. Any such break might have been to add emphasis to the descriptions of the Son in relation to the Divine. However, the break does not negate the continuity of the exordium.

[64] Vanhoye, *La Structure*, 65–68. See also, Ibid., 54. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 9. Some scholars have preferred to see a number of smaller clauses, such as Attridge, *Hebrews*, 36. However, due to the subject change, it would appear Vanhoye's suggestion is likely. It is possible, however, to see subordinate clauses within these main clauses. Attridge himself identifies two main segments along the same lines, and so the two proposals are not necessarily in complete contradiction.

[65] Some scholars have proposed that the emphasis in the exordium is on the Son's exaltation, e. g. Koester, *Hebrews*, 178, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 155, others on the idea that God has spoken through his Word, e. g., Heil, *Hebrews*, 29, Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 7–8 or on Jesus as Son e. g., deSilva, *Perseverance*, 86. However, I here posit that the sacrifice and exaltation of Christ are encompassed within an incarnational description of the Son which sets the scene for the argumentation to come.

[66] Filtvedt, "Creation," 282, suggests that the Son's being heir of everything in 1:2 follows on logically from the fact he upholds everything. The question of when the Son becomes heir is debated. Thompson, *Hebrews*, 51–52, understands the Son to become truly heir only after his exaltation (ibid., 38–39), for instance. Nevertheless, one is always heir by virtue of being a son

remarks, "in the juxtaposition of the protological and eschatological perspectives a tension begins to emerge that will continue through the exordium and the following scriptural catena. Christ was made heir of that which he, as God's agent, created."[67] It would thus appear that all the separate elements in the exordium are being drawn together by virtue of this inclusio, belonging with the incarnation of the Son, the Son specifically as designated as the agent of creation.[68]

3.3.3 The Impact of this DA for The Exordium: Some Ideational and Interpersonal Comments

Before concluding this chapter, we may now look at the impact of the creation reference for the discourse of Hebrews as a whole. The recognition of the cohesion between the declaration that God has spoken through a Son through whom he created the aeons and the subsequent descriptions is significant for the cohesion of the remainder of Heb 1. In the light of the grammatical flow of 1:2–3, to some extent it seems to be a continuous role that the Son has. The text first notes the Son's role in the creation of the ages/worlds, then continues by saying he is "upholding everything by his powerful word" (1:3), and we will later learn this will continue until creation perishes, as demonstrated by the inclusion of a creation reference in 1:10–12, which deals with the end to which creation looks forward. Because opening periodic sentences are frequently linked to that which is discussed later in the text, it is notable that it is this idea of Christ's involvement in creation that is picked up explicitly in 1:10–12, since it suggests that it is the more emphasized aspect of the Son's relationship to the divine. Indeed, there has been some discussion in scholarship as to whether we ought to take the "his" in "sustaining everything by his powerful word" to refer to God's word or (more likely) to the Son's in 1:3.[69] However, in the light of this wider co-text of

---

(or, nowadays, daughter), though to some extent we need to draw a distinction between being of nature an heir and having actually inherited (see also Gal 4:1). The former can be said of the Son from the beginning, the latter more likely only after the exaltation.

[67] Attridge, Hebrews, 41. See also Spicq, L'Épître, vol. 2, 6, 9 on the incarnational theme in the exordium, including particularly the union of Father and Son. See also *Weiss, Hebräer*, 142.

[68] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 34. With regards to the possible emphasis on either the exaltation or the sacrifice, Attridge has pointed out that both are essential to Hebrews and the Epistle "develops both with equal insistence." Ibid., 47. Meier, "Structure," 171 sees the inclusio to suggest that the intervening clauses form one section describing the Son.

[69] The question of whose "power" is involved is one of debate. On the one hand, God is the subject of the sentence, up until the end of v. 2, and some have argued that it properly belongs to him, and could be seen as saying that God sustains the world through the Son in the same way he created it (for instance, Lane reads the text this way, Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxxix); or, the description can be taken to suggest that the Son sustains the world through his own powerful word (e. g. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 45). The latter, however, would seem more likely, given the participle construction. Hebrews 1:1–2 has God as the subject, but 1:3–4 has the Son as subject. See also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 97; Meier, "Structure," 171.

the discourse, whether we have a reference that sees God upholding the creation through the Son or the Son as upholding it by his own authority, either way, the agency in creation is presented as continuing into the audience's own day and until the end of time.[70]

At this point, we should consider that Heb 1:2–3, as a reference to the present-day situation of the audience, draws the listener into the flow of the text and makes the statement relevant to them. This is a persuasive technique designed to engage the audience; by establishing this link at the very beginning, it sets a context for the exhortations which follow in the rest of the Epistle and frames them within the origin and end of the universe in the Son. We might also add that God is said to be speaking in the "last one of these days," again placing the audience within the timeframe of the most reportable event itself, and adding a sense of urgency.

As Koester states, "God's speech and actions pervade Hebrews from the opening declaration of how God spoke through the prophets and his Son (1:1–2) to the final benediction that summarizes what God has done and continues to do (13:20–21)."[71] At stake in Hebrews is essentially the role for which humanity is destined, as outlined in 2:5–9, but this is encapsulated within a particular cosmological and eschatological world-view concerning Christ, the word of God.[72] Importantly, Hebrews begins and ends by emphasizing that the world is dependent on this "word": by characterizing the Son as the agent of creation through whom God spoke, thus the world is said to be brought into being through God's speech in 1:2 (see also 11:2–3); stating it is sustained by the Son's word according to 1:3; and by eventually declaring it will be shaken by God's word in 12:25–27.[73] Our examination of the first creation reference thus helps contribute to establishing an eschatological framework for the Epistle.

3.4 Conclusion

In this section, we have seen how the reference to the fact God has spoken through the Son and heir, through whom he made the aeons, is the most reportable event for the exordium. From it flow grammatically the descriptions of Christ and the Christ event which follow, and logically the Son's role as the agent of creation governs his role as heir. Furthermore, we see that the description of the Son as the radiance of God's glory and impress of his substance is a fur-

---

[70] On its most likely meaning the Son's word, see Koester, *Hebrews*, 190 and Attridge, *Hebrews*, 45 n. 126.

[71] Koester, *Hebrews*, 96.

[72] Ibid., 97.

[73] Ibid.

ther explanation of the depiction of the Son as the one through whom he made the aeons, and that it is this divine nature that also enables him to sustain the world. The sacrificial activity of the Son is, in fact, subordinate to this theology, as expressed in the structure of the exordium – nevertheless, it is intrinsically connected to it. The recognition of the importance of our creation reference, however, raises other questions. How we are to understand our reference's signification? What is the meaning of saying the Son is the one through whom the aeons were made and who continues to sustain them, that he is the radiance of God's glory and impress of his nature? What is the creation reference's internal signification, beyond its structural role? To investigate further this foundation stone of the exordium, attention now needs to turn to some of the key vocabulary employed therein and in the surrounding co-text.

Chapter 4

Creation and the Vocabulary of 1:2–3

4.1 Introduction

In order to discuss our first creation reference further, it is necessary to review the meaning of some key vocabulary. The vocabulary of the exordium, in keeping with the author's self-presentation as a skilled orator, is elaborate and there are several key words and phrases which need to be addressed:

τοὺς αἰῶνας· (Heb 1:2)

ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης and χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως (Heb 1:3)

φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (Heb 1:3)

As discussed in the introduction, discourse analysis tries to take account of not just the various linguistic, but also the wider contextual factors which shape a text.[1] It recognizes that communication does not take place in a vacuum. Indeed, the historical situation of composition can have a profound influence on a text, not just in terms of why it is written, but how it is written, since an author would need to employ structures and vocabulary that were current and were meaningful in their own historical situation. In terms of our investigation, we therefore need to take special account of such unusual vocabulary as ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ, hapax legomena in the NT, in order to understand Hebrews' discourse. Since language evolves over time, lexemes may retain older meanings as well as contemporary nuances, and thus it is important to examine their usage in the given discourse in detail against an historical backdrop and possible issues of intertextuality. By looking at the possible meanings the above morphemes and phrases might have had in Hebrews and comparing their usage in other discourses of the time, such as current philosophies of creation or texts that would or could have been known by the author, it is hoped that we will begin to answer two key questions: "what is the Son said to have been involved in creating?" and, "what do they tell us about the Son himself?"

---

[1] Reed, "Discourse Analysis," 194.

4.1.1 What Was the Son Involved in Creating?

Firstly, we can consider *of what* the Son is said to be the agent of creation. The term τοὺς αἰῶνας is ambiguous. Firstly, αἰών can mean "a long period of time, without ref[erence] to beginning or end".[2] We might therefore translate it as "age" or, simply transliterating the Greek itself, *aeon*. In the plural, "τοὺς αἰῶνας" could thus be seen to refer collectively to all ages, all stages in eschatological history. The LXX usage of "to the ages" is fairly common (e.g., Ps 60:5 [61:5]; 76:8 [77:8]; Wis 3:8), and this meaning is adopted multiple times in the NT (e.g., Luke 1:33; Rom 1:25, 9:5; 11:6), including in Hebrews (e.g., 13:8, 21).[3] On the other hand, αἰών can potentially also have a more spatial sense, "the worlds". We likely find this usage in passages such as Wis 13:9 or 18:4. Our term is perhaps therefore synonymous with the Hebrew word, עולם, which, as the *DCH* points out, can be employed similarly, denoting either "everlastingness" or "the created order", which could pertain to the world alone or the heavens and the earth.[4] Scholarship is divided as to which is the more appropriate in Hebrews; however, we shall see below that they are not, in fact, mutually exclusive, and that perhaps both senses are implied. We will consider each of these points in turn.

4.1.2 Αἰών: Life, Generation and Eternity

Firstly, let us examine, briefly, the origins of the word αἰών. It would appear that one of the oldest usages is neither "world" nor "ages", but, in fact, "life". For instance, Homer's *Iliad* has Andromache say of Hector "… from life (αἰών) you were cut off young, and you leave me widowed …" (*Il.* 24.725). It appears to parallel with ψυχή in *Il.* 16.453, where Hera speaks of Sarpedon's ψυχή and αἰών having left him, and would later be found alongside βίος (e.g., Sophacles, *Trach.* 1–3) and alternating with βίος and ζωή in Herodotus' *Histories* (1.32.2–5).[5] The term αἰών appears to have multiple nuances, and in some passages, it appears to mean "lifespan", the *time* lived. This might even be the case in our Herodotus passage, which speaks first of the χρόνος a man might live, and continues to speak of his ending an αἰών well. The two terms appear to be parallel, and thus αἰών takes on the concept of a period of time lived by someone.[6]

---

    [2] "αἰών," *BDAG*, 32–33.

    [3] Ibid. The term has the sense of eternity in 1 Pet 1:23 or 2 Cor 9:9, or even of a periodisation of time, as in Col 1:26 or Eph 3:9. There is no indication in the remainder of the text of Hebrews that "ages" are nominalized in such a manner, but there may be a nuance of "eternity", which is discussed later in this chapter.

    [4] See "עולם," *DCH*, vol. 6, 300–306.

    [5] For detailed study of the use of αἰών, see Heleen M. Keizer, "Life, Time, Eternity: A Study of ΑΙΩΝ in Greek Literature and Philosophy, the Septuagint and Philo" (Academisch Proefschrift, University of Amsterdam, 2010), here, 17, 29–30. This is the corrected version of her 1999 thesis and I briefly summarise some of her key points.

    [6] Keizer discusses this passage, Ibid., 30–31.

Similarly, it acquires the meaning "life time" or "generation" in authors such as Empedocles (fr. B 129, 4–6 DK).[7] This nuance of time would change however, and be brought to the fore by Plato, who ascribed specific philosophical meaning to αἰών.

Plato's *Timaeus* we find the αἰών term used in a cosmological context, where the protagonist, after whom the piece takes its name, gives an account of the genesis of the universe and of humanity. Timaeus poses the question of whether things have an origin, or whether there are eternal things (*Tim.* 33). He speaks of the demiurge making the universe an "eternal living being", and then uses the adjectival form of αἰών to describe it (28–37). The model of our world is called an "ἀΐδίων [eternal] living being" and is said to please the eternal gods. The nature of the "living being" is then said to be αἰώνιος. However, it was not possible to give our universe, the copy of this model, such a quality, its being "generated", and our world is instead said to be made an αἰώνιον image which proceeds according to χρόνος (time). The demiurge is said to set out to finish the world around us to be like it by creating a copy of αἰών, which would appear to be the timeless essence of the model. We thus have αἰών qua a quality of the model of our universe, eternity, and our earthly "time", as it were, is a copy of "eternity".[8]

We certainly have the meaning of αἰών with the connotation of "eternity", in Hebrews. For instance, the throne in 1:8 is said to endure forever, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, as is Melchizedek's priesthood in 5:6, and the Son's in 6:20. Hebrews 13:8 describes Jesus as the same yesterday, today and εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, seemingly meaning "forever". Notably, whereas the *Timaeus* had the singular, we here have the plural and so we might conclude that the use of the same word, αἰῶνας, in the plural in the exordium could in some way imply that the Son is the agent of creation of eternity. In this regard, we might note that the singular and the plural seem to be interchangeable in this stock phrase, since in 7:17 and 7:21 we have the same phrase (quoting LXX Ps 109:4 [110:4]), only using the singular, αἰών, and so "eternity" may be a fair translation of both the plural and singular forms.

---

[7] See Keizer, "Life," 29.

[8] In *Tim.* 38–39, we also find the word αἰώνιος combined with the preposition διά to give διαιώνιος as a description of the universe as a "living being", which would suggest, given the context, "through time", or eternal. Keizer, "Life," 68–77, see also 65 n. 26. However, Keizer prefers the connotation of "life" for our term. She follows George S. Claghorn, *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's 'Timaeus'* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954). Keizer cites p. 84, however the passage that deals with this issue is actually found on p. 45, where Claghorn argues αἰών appears to be another term for "living being". Keizer sees our term as alternating with βίος and ζωὴ, and so agrees. However, it would seem to me more likely that αἰών is contrasted with χρόνος. Not only does it seem tautologous to describe a "living being" as "living", which is the resulting understanding for the adjectival form if we accept Keizer's view, but also Plato seems to use the adjectival form of αἰών with the sense "perpetual" or "eternal" in the *Republic* 2.363d, to describe an almost permanent state of drunkenness.

Applying the idea of "eternity" in its own right to Heb 1:2, as in the *Timaeus*, may therefore be appropriate. However, this becomes problematic when we consider that 11:3 appears to reference Gen 1-2 and the creation of the physical world, and that this verse alludes clearly to the exordium by the use of two very specific terms, αἰῶνας and ῥήματι, suggesting that the exordium and 11:3 should be understood together. In addition, because of its mention of "what is seen", 11:3 is more likely to refer to the creation of the world. This latter issue is discussed later on and in the excursus on 11:3 in more detail, but suffice it to say here, that the meaning "eternity" in the exordium is not obvious.

Furthermore, αἰών, in Heb 1:8, 13:8 and other places where we find this stock phrase more likely reflects the simple meaning "generation", and uses the term εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα/ς idiomatically. The [?] seems to use this same phrase, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα(ς), in relation to perpetual actions, as in 2 Chr 6:2 or Tob 3:11, where, incidentally, in the latter, we find the interchangeability of the singular and the plural, as in Hebrews. In fact, this usage is so common, it would be virtually impossible to list every instance here. I here propose that perhaps αἰών acquired a connotation of "unendingness" which specifically became apparent in writings like the *Timaeus*, but that this nuance possibly blended with the earlier meaning of "lifetime" or "generation" in more common usage.[9] The ideas of generations and eternity seem to have merged in LXX passages such as these so that, by the time we get to Hebrews, the term αἰών, with the sense "generation" or "age", had acquired the idiomatic sense of "unending time" when used in the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα(ς), rather than its necessarily meaning "eternity" in some kind of Platonic sense.[10]

If we were to take a strictly Platonic view, we would also have to ask what it means to say "into eternity", since in Platonic thought, the forms take on the name of their models, and so αἰών might mean either eternity in the sense of the timelessness of the realm of ideas or its copy, time, as in the created αἰών. In fact, when we consider it more deeply, in the Platonic sense, αἰών has more of a con-

---

[9] The many usages of αἰών in the LXX are not the subject of this investigation; however, Keizer, "Life," 113–200 gives a good summary of the use of αἰών therein.

[10] Keizer is right to point out that the precise meaning "eternal" is controversial. She argues that the Greek would also allow for the insertion of "it" in an English translation of *Tim.* 37, to give "he made it of "αἰών". The latter would permit one to see αἰών as either a copy of the heavens, whilst its being omitted suggests a copy of time, (Ibid., 69–72). However, what is important for our purposes is a distinction in the mode of existence as it pertains to time between the heavenly ideas and the earthly forms. Even if we accepted Keizer's nuance of "life", especially in the sense of "lifespan", it is clear from the text that there is a discrepancy between that of the model and that of the copy. As the former is described as "eternal" we can assume that discrepancy lies in the fact the life of the copy is not eternal in some sense. "Χρόνος" also carries with it the sense of changing periods, and so changeability seems to be a further element of the copy of αἰών. For the reading *eternity* see David Theunis Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Philosophia Antiqua 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 220–22.

notation of *eternality* than of eternity, since it is described in terms of a quality, or property, of the model to be copied, not simply as a model itself. Whilst αἰών is said to be copied, it is only copied because of the αἰώνιος quality of the living being (*Tim.* 28–37). Our phrase would become nonsensical in Heb 13:8 in this case, though it could be retained, to some extent, in the exordium, were the Son equated with the demiurge, and if we presumed the same philosophy. The term, δημιουργός (demiurge), however, is only found once in Hebrews, when the term is used in 11:10 of God as the "builder" of the heavenly city and here it is not employed to mean God's intermediary as in Philo or Plato but serves to describe God himself. There is therefore not enough evidence to support this theory.[11]

4.1.3 Αἰών as "World"

It would appear that there is no direct link between the αἰών of the *Timaeus* and that of the exordium of Hebrews. Nevertheless, and perhaps somewhat ironically, conclusions as to the meaning of αἰών not as "eternity", but rather as "world" in Hebrews have come through investigations into the possibility that the author of Hebrews was reliant on the work of Philo and his understanding of the *logos*. Philo's *logos* concept was itself arguably dependent on the idea of an eternal realm and an earthly one, governed by time and temporality, and influenced by the Platonic concept of the demiurge.

The word *logos* could have a number of meanings, from "anything said or written" to "the faculty of reason," but it was also a term taken up by philosophers. In Stoic thought, the *logos* and God were closely associated, the former controlling the universe, pervading it. In Middle Platonism, it could have the sense of rational discourse or thought, though the Middle Platonists also used the language of *logos* when describing the demiurge.[12] Philo, in part, made use of *logos* in a similar way to this latter group, employing the term to denote a

---

[11] However, Valentinus and Ptolemy did read the δημιουργός (demiurge) into Hebrews. The latter read the "aeons" of 1:2 to refer to the pleromic aeons and said that the Son "bears everything" in that he held within himself the whole pleroma, which we read in Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses* 1.2.6; 1.8.5, Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 6.3 and the *Evangelium Veritatis* 23.33–34.8. Some scholars, like Käsemann posited that Hebrews might even have originally been a gnostic text (discussed in relation to Heb 4 in this thesis), Käsemann, *Wandering*, 108. However, since such texts argue from the basis of Hebrews, we can be certain that these, at least, did not pre-date it, and I have chosen to focus here on the texts which more likely have a direct relationship to Hebrews. The majority of scholars now reject the position the Hebrews is gnostic as a result of dating issues, and their understanding that Gnosticism did not originate until much later. I here follow that consensus, but for a discussion about creation in Hebrews in relation to gnostic texts, see Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1992), 141–56.

[12] See Jonathan I. Griffiths, *Hebrews and Divine Speech*, LNTS 507 (London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2014), 64 for a good summary of ancient Greek conceptions of *logos*.

mediator between God and the universe. He even referred to this *logos* as the "image of God" and as being the closest being to him, a "son" or "firstborn" of God who watches over the universe, a concept resonating with the description of the Son in Heb 1:2–14:[13]

But for the Universe it is a still more fitting theme. For land and water and air and fire, and all plants and animals which are in these, whether mortal or divine, yea and the sky, and the circuits of sun and moon, and the revolutions and rhythmic movements of the other heavenly bodies, are like some flock under the hand of God its King and Shepherd. This hallowed flock He leads in accordance with right and law, setting over it His true Word [λόγος], and Firstborn [πρωτόγονος] Son who shall take upon Him its government like some viceroy of a great king. (Philo, *Agr.* 51 [Colson, LCL])

In this capacity of "ruler", *logos* was likewise the agent of God in creation, even sharing his name:

But if there be any as yet unfit to be called a Son of God, let him press to take his place under God's First-born [πρωτόγονος], the Word [λόγος], who holds the eldership among the angels, their ruler as it were. And many names are his, for he is called, "the Beginning," and the Name [ὄνομα] of God, and His Word [λόγος], and the Man after His image, and "he that sees," that is Israel. (*Conf.* 146 [Colson, LCL]).

The *logos* was even said to be a priest:

For there are, as is evident, two temples of God: one of them this universe, in which there is also as High Priest [ἀρχιερεύς] His First-born [πρωτόγονος], the divine Word [λόγος], and the other the rational soul, whose Priest [ἱερεύς] is the real Man. (*Somn.* 1:214–15 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

The descriptions of the *logos* as a "son of God" involved in creation and a "high priest" have clear resonances with passages like Heb 1:2; 1:10–12; 7:17 and 9:7–14. Indeed, if we take into account the heavenly side of Christ's offering, we have a very close parallel between Hebrews and Philo, since the ideal and eternal "high priest" is contrasted with the earthly priesthood and offers sacrifice in heaven in a similar way to the *logos* in Philo's *Somn.* 1:214–15.[14]

   Such parallels have been recognized by many scholars. We recall, briefly, that Philo of Alexandria's work had influenced Hebrews has been a common one, and there was a general consensus by the middle of the twentieth century that Philonic influence was "one of the assured results of criticism."[15] Ceslas Spicq

---

[13] How close Philo is to Hebrews a matter of controversy, however. See Williamson, *Jews*, 117–19. Compare Heb 1:3, 5–6, 8, where the son is depicted as ruling monarch and firstborn son.

[14] Ibid. A summary of Hebrews' relationship to Philo is found in David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, CRINT 3/3 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 76–78. However, we could note that the likening of the Son to an angel in *Conf.* 146 runs contrary to Hebrews 1:4–8.

[15] Hurst, *Epistle*, 7. See also Ménégoz, *La Théologie*, 197–219. However, Spicq himself cited the continuing controversy as his reason for completing his own commentary. See Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 39–40. See also Westcott, *Hebrews*, lxi.

insisted upon it: whilst Philo describes the connection between the eternal realm and the created realm, and Hebrews is fixed on the Son and does not develop other philosophical considerations, Spicq believed that the connection between the *logos* and the Son was borne out in vocabulary links between them. For instance, whilst the term χαρακτήρ, also in Heb 1:3, is *hapax legomenon* in the NT, it is also employed by Philo in the context of describing the human soul in relation to God, to indicate that the former is impressed with the image of God like the stamp of the ruler on a coin (*Leg.* 4.95, Cf. *Virt.* 52). "Here again, if the soul is in the image of the invisible God carrying the engraving of the divine stamp, this mark is the *logos* itself, and imprint of God's stamp,"[16] as in *Plant.* 18; *Fug.* 12, or *Somn.* 2:45.

This last point may assist us in understanding our key term, τοὺς αἰῶνας. The possible link between Philo's *logos* and the Epistle's concept of the Son as an agent of creation becomes important for providing a possible milieu of understanding which might explain how Hebrews is employing the term in question. The Philonic conception of *logos* is intrinsically connected to the idea of an eternal, immutable realm of ideas and the earthly realm, inherited from Platonism, which saw earthly objects as copies of ideal, heavenly, ones.[17] As Philo says in *Ebr.* 1:132–33:

> For since the Creator made both the pattern and the copy in all that He made, virtue was not excepted: He wrought its archetypal seal, and He also stamped with this an impression [χαρακτήρ] which was its close counterpart. The archetypal seal is an incorporeal idea, but the copy which is made by the impression is something else – a material something, naturally perceptible by the senses, yet not actually coming into relation with them. (*Ebr.* 132–33 [Colson, LCL])

With regards to αἰών specifically, we have clear evidence that Philo was influenced by the *Timaeus*. In *Deus* 29–32, for example, God is said to have no need to repent because the course of future events is already clear to him. There, βίος is described as αἰών (most likely: eternity), "the archetype of time and a model" (translation mine), and Philo goes on to say that in αἰών (here almost certainly understood as eternity) "nothing has passed away or is still to occur, but it is only in a state of present existence."[18] The first statement has clear resonances with the *Timaeus*' view of the contrast between the realm of models and the earthly one in terms of the eternality of the former, as discussed above.

The Platonic idea was picked up by Philo with one great modification, however: "he identified the two creation accounts of Gen 1 and 2 with the creation of the two realms," and it would seem that the *logos* was involved in the creation

---

[16] Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 1, 49. See also Michael Theophilos, "The Numismatic Background of χαρακτήρ in Hebrews 1:3," *ABR* 64 (2016):69–80.
[17] Hurst, *Epistle*, 9.
[18] Runia, *Philo*, 220 discusses this in some detail. Translation his.

of earthly and heavenly spheres, but, more importantly, of the creation of the earthly realm out of the heavenly realm:[19]

We must suppose that, when He [God] was minded to found the one great city, He conceived beforehand the models of its parts, and that out of these He constituted and brought to completion a world discernible only by the mind, and then, with that for a pattern, the world which our senses can perceive. As, then, the city which was fashioned beforehand within the mind of the architect held no place in the outer world, but had been engraved in the soul of the artificer as by a seal; even so the universe that consisted of ideas would have no other location than the Divine Reason [τὸν θεῖον λόγον], which was the Author of this ordered frame. (Philo, *Opif.* 19–21 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

Hurst puts it well when he says:

The creation of the ideas was for Philo the laying out of the Great Architect's plan for his creation, a plan Philo identified with the Logos (*Opif.* 16 ff). This concept is still often assumed to explain the notion in Hebrews of creation 'through' the Son (1:2), the belief 'that the origin of the visible universe was at the same time the creation of the material of which the universe consists' (11:3), and the notion of the two tents (8:5, 9:11, 23 f.) … That *Auctor* [the author of Hebrews] could have evolved such thoughts 'independently of the Platonic doctrine' is said to be unthinkable.[20]

If the Philonic conception of *logos* is intrinsically connected to the idea of an eternal, immutable realm of ideas and the earthly realm, inherited from Platonism, which saw earthly objects as copies of ideal, heavenly, ones, the Son could be seen to create these "worlds" in Hebrews.[21] One scholar to take this kind of line of interpretation is Cody, who even declares Hebrews is not concerned with the "cosmological" creation, but rather with the axiological perspectives of heaven and earth:

The cosmological heaven is the work of the Lord's creating hands just as the Lord established the earth in the beginning (Heb 1:10), and the cosmological heaven and earth are involved implicitly, or in 12.26 explicitly, in much that is said axiologically and eschatologically of heaven and earth, but in those cases the axiological and eschatological aspects are those that matter.[22]

Cody believes that these "axiological considerations" take their cue from a Platonic dualism which "makes heaven the place of all that enjoys reality and value, from which the earth and its contents, the earthly, derive what they have of reality and value."[23] Cody argues that in such schemas, "the fact that all reality has come from God leads to an awareness of a unity in all reality at some

---

[19] Hurst, *Epistle*, 9.
[20] Ibid. in part citing Williamson, *Philo*, 524, see also Eccles, "Purpose," 215.
[21] Hurst, *Epistle*, 9.
[22] Cody, *Sanctuary*, 78.
[23] Ibid.

level at least, which is rooted in common origin in God the Creator."[24] This, Cody claims, is the cosmology which underpins passages like Heb 8:5, where the priests of the Old Covenant are said to have exercised a ministry that was earthly, and therefore a "copy and shadow" of heavenly realities.[25] We also find the word αἰῶνας in 11:3, arguably as the product of the creation of visible things out of invisible ones, again possibly a reference to the Platonic realm of ideas. We shall see more on this in our excursus on this latter passage, but if the same word is employed in both 1:2 and 11:3 in relation to the same creative activity of God, it is reasonable to think that what we have in 1:2 is, in fact, a reference to the creation of the world out of invisible things.[26] It is likely that the singular can be used simply of *the world*, from a few late LXX passages (e. g., Wis 13:9; 14:6; 18:4).[27] Alternatively, the plural usage in 1:2 could simply reference the creation of the realms themselves, of heaven and earth, understood in the sense of Platonic realms.

However, there are several problems with seeing Hebrews as dependent on Philo in 1:2, not least the fact that Philo uses αἰών in the sense of "eternity" rather than to denote the realms themselves in *Deus* 29–32. Adams, for instance, is cautious of attributing this conception of the Son to Philonic ideas, preferring to see Hebrews in continuity with the Old Testament Wisdom tradition, as following in the lines of Prov 3:19; 8:22–31; Wis 7:22–8:1; 9:1–2, 9, where Wisdom, too, is seen as an agent of creation and radiance of God's glory, although these texts do not speak of God's Son.[28] We shall speak more of this possible connection when we discuss the terms ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης and χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως (radiance of his glory and impress of his substance), but with regards to τοὺς αἰῶνας specifically, Adams says:

The plural has been taken by some to indicate a Platonic distinction between the sense-perceptible world and the realm of ideas, but this is not an obvious (or Platonic) way of alluding to the Platonic ontology. The words τοὺς αἰῶνας· in v. 2 are contextually synonymous with τὰ πάντα in v. 3, which is a standard term for the universe and which plainly had that meaning here. The term 'ages,' therefore, seems to denote the physical cosmos, with the plural perhaps laying emphasis on the succession of eras allotted to it.[29]

---

[24] Ibid., 79.

[25] Ibid., 80.

[26] For a discussion of this possibility and arguments against direct reliance on Philo, see Williamson, *Philo*, 278. However, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 96, argues that the term αἰῶνας refers to the visible and invisible worlds.

[27] See "αἰών," *BDAG*, 33 and "αἰών," TLNT vol. 1, 203–4 which interpret the plural Heb. 1:2 and 11:3 in this way. I have not been able to find such a usage in Philo, however.

[28] We might actually extend the reference to Wis 8:4, which declares Wisdom to be an associate in all God's works, which presumably includes creation given the previously described pre-existence ascribed to it.

[29] Adams, "Cosmology," 125. Adams will later make the same point as Williamson, that the *Timaeus* envisages the visible cosmos being modelled on the invisible realm, not made out of it – see ibid., 128.

Perhaps, then, our term should be interpreted as "world", not "worlds"?[30] Indeed, certainly, in 8:5, the author of Hebrews speaks of an earthly tabernacle and its heavenly counterpart. Hebrews even uses σκιά at this point, also found in Philo, *Leg.* 3.96 in relation to the created world as "shadows" of that above. However, what seems to be a similarity between Philo and Hebrews, the existence of two worlds — is in fact, arguably not a similarity at all.[31] The idea of two worlds is shared, whereas Philo would have seen the material world as a copy of the Platonic world of Ideas, Heb 11:3 arguably refers to the idea of the world being created out of the Ideas themselves, and possibly actually concludes that the world is not made out of the Ideas.[32]

The fact is that 11:3 can be interpreted in two ways – either that the visible world was made out of non-phenomena, or, if the μή is taken with γεγονέναι, that it was not made out of φαινόμενα.[33] This is the difference between Hebrews as viewing creation as *ex nihilo* or not. Understanding that the author of Hebrews was insisting upon creation *ex nihilo* might also explain how the two halves of the verse connect: when Heb 11:3 states that it is by faith one comes to know the world was created by the word of God:[34]

By faith, but only by faith, we know that God had simply to say 'Let there be light' for light to come into being. This, for the Writer of Hebrews, is a conclusion which no amount of deductive reasoning can lead to, nor can it be reached by detailed inspection of the world of phenomena … If we look at the world without faith in God it is possible to believe and think that it is a system of physical processes which contains within itself its own explanation.[35]

In addition, this statement may well even be an open declaration of hostility towards the thought of Philo who thought it was created out of pre-existent matter (Philo, *Spec.* 1.329; see also Wis 11:17).[36] Moreover, however, the second

---

[30] Indeed, although Hegermann, *Hebräer*, 32 suggests that we should understand our term spatially as meaning "the worlds", I argue here that it may be that we are to understand the creation of the "world" as envisaged at this point. This seems to be a popular interpretation in German Protestant scholarship, following Luther, who uses the rendering "die Welt" in his 1545 bible to Heb 1:2. See also Grässer, *Hebräer*, 47.

[31] Church, *Temple*, 1 suggests that 8:5 should be interpreted as referring not to a "copy and shadow," but rather to a "symbolic foreshadowing." He argues that it is not the desert sanctuary envisaged in this passage, but rather the Jerusalem temple, which "anticipates God's eschatological dwelling with his people." He suggests that the "heavenly things" are "the new things now come, with the exaltation of Jesus to God's right hand." Ibid., 2.

[32] See Williamson, *Philo*, 382. Williamson also comments on the fact that to Philo the invisible world was perceptible by the intellect, not faith, another divergence between the two authors. I discuss this issue more in my excursus on 11:3.

[33] Ibid., 377–78.

[34] The issue of how early we can testify to the theology of *creation ex nihilo* is addressed in the excursus on 11:3.

[35] Ibid., 379.

[36] Ibid., 380.

half of 11:3 explains the significance of that truth only known by faith.[37] The statement that what we see was not made from that which is visible seems itself to be a re-assertion of the principle of creation *ex nihilo.* Indeed:

… it is perfectly possible to make a distinction between what is material and visible and what is spiritual and invisible without committing oneself to the metaphysical doctrines of Plato either in their Platonic or in their Philonic dress.[38]

In addition, we must be careful of doing an injustice to Philo who, in *Somn.* 1.76 explicitly says that God "made things which before were not," thus, one could say, expounding the idea of *creatio ex nihilo*:

And above all, as the sun when it rises makes visible objects which had been hidden, so God when He gave birth to all things, not only brought them to sight, but also made things which before were not, not just handling material as an artificer, but being Himself its creator. (Philo, *Somn.* 1.76 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

Williamson says that whilst Philo does sometimes speak of God as "fashioner" of the world, as though it were made from pre-existent material, we must therefore be cautious of speaking as if he implies God is not a "true creator".[39]

If anything spatial, Hebrews is likely referring, quite straightforwardly, to the creation of heaven and earth, as in Gen 1–2.[40] Because Jesus is presented as both "aid in creation" and "inheritor of all things", he is portrayed as "with God before all time and at the end of all time as the creator, sustainer, redeemer and judge of all creation."[41] Certain passages in the NT show that this theology was widely shared in early Jewish Christianity, such as Col 1:15–16: "he is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation, for in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible." (NRSV).

4.2 αἰών: The "World" of the LXX

In respect of the possibility our term could mean "world/s", in trying to go beyond to a Philonic background to Hebrews, it is particularly interesting that we find αἰών with ποιέω in the exordium. The verb ποιέω is a standard Septuagintal term for God's work in creation, especially in the creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4.[42] The question now arises of whether αἰών has the sense of "world" anywhere in the LXX, and if Hebrews might be drawing on such usage. It is true

---

[37] Ibid., 381.
[38] Ibid., 383.
[39] Williamson, *Philo*, 39.
[40] See also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 95.
[41] Witherington, *Letters*, 102–3.
[42] Adams, "Cosmology," 125.

that when referring to God's making (ποιέω) the world, the LXX usually designates "world" by οἰκουμένη (e. g., Isa 14:17, see also Jer 10:12) or κόσμος (e. g., Wis 9:9).[43] Sometimes, God is said to prepare the world (ἑτοιμάζω), such as LXX Jer 28:15 [MT 51:15], where οἰκουμένη alternates with the created γῆ. Another stock phrase for the creation of the world is to speak of laying its foundations, θεμελιόω, as in LXX Ps 77:69 (78:69) or Prov 3:19, where it is used of Wisdom. Thus Heb 1:10 quotes the Greek version of Ps 102:26 (101:26): "at the beginnings, Lord, you founded (ἐθεμελίωσας) the earth." We also find a similar idea of laying the world's foundations, though using καταβολή, in Heb 4:3 and 9:26. This may be further evidence that Hebrews was referring to the LXX rather than Philo. The recurrence of the metaphor is discussed later in this thesis. However, in a few deuterocanonical verses, αἰών could mean the world created by God. We arguably find such a meaning in passages, such as Tob 3:2; 13:18 and Sir 38:34. However, these readings are controversial. More importantly, we appear to have the meaning "world" for αἰών in a book that we saw earlier is specifically alluded to in the exordium: Wisdom.

4.2.1 Translating αἰών Spatially in the LXX: Tobit and Sirach

The term αἰών and its translation is a controversial subject, and there are several passages in the LXX where translators have been unable to agree a precise meaning. This can sometimes be a result of textual issues, and variations in the different manuscripts which might dramatically affect its meaning. One such passage would be Tobit 13:18 (NRSV 13:17), which varies considerably in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus:

Vaticanus: "And all her streets will cry "Alleluia" and they will praise saying "blessed is God who has exalted all the αἰῶνας."

Sinaiticus: "And the doors of Jerusalem will sing joyfully and all of her houses will sing "alleluia, blessed is the God of Israel and the blessed ones shall bless the holy name unto the ages [τὸν αἰῶνα] and forever."

In the first case, we could conceivably have the meaning "world" or "ages/generations", but in the second case, we undoubtedly have the meaning "age", in the

---

[43] The latter is also preferred in the NT for "the world" in passages like Acts 17:24 or Rom 1:20. Furthermore, those passages where ποιέω occurs alongside the root αἰών, such as Exod 31:16, Deut 29:28 (29) and 1 Kgs 10:9 do not have αἰών as the object of ποιέω, and in fact these words appear to generally have little or no connection to each other in context. For instance, the 1 Kgs 10:9 reference contains the stock phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, and then speaks of making (ποιέω) Solomon a just king. Even Deut 29:28, where we have εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ποιεῖν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα, all the words of which might be significant for our investigation in their own right, is, in fact, concerned with the promise made to obey the law and not the creation of the world.

sense of "generation".[44] Furthermore, a comparison with other uses of αἰών in Tobit reveals just how complicated is the issue of establishing the original text. It is certainly true that we have the meaning "ages" for our term in a number of other verses in this book. The close proximity of 13:4, which uses the phrase εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας (also found in 8:5, 8:15, 11:14), would possibly indicate the originality of the Sinaiticus temporal reading since there would seem to be more of a stylistic parallel between these verses and Sinaiticus than between these verses and Vaticanus. However, where we read βασιλέα τῶν αἰώνων (king of the ages/worlds) in vv. 6, 10 and 13, things become more complicated. This divine title may be an echo of LXX Ps 145:13 (144:3), often translated: "your kingdom is a kingdom of all the ages": ἡ βασιλεία σου βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, but the meaning of αἰών as "ages" is here disputed in vv. 6, 10 and 13 on the grounds that this phrase in fact alternates with "king of heaven", found in v. 7 and 11.

Notably, in v. 6, the context is spatial, and the phrase "king of the ages/worlds" is followed by a reference to the "land of my exile" in the phrase "in the land of my exile I acknowledge him and show his power and majesty to a nation of sinners" (NRSV). This may indicate that αἰών is also to be understood spatially. The nation is singular, suggesting Israel, and recalls the promises made of the Land of Israel to the Israelites, which will be restored if they repent, as implicitly promised in v. 5 but overtly promised in 14:6. The idea is that God has control over Israel's situation in the world and so "king of the *world*" would be contextually appropriate here. Similarly, in the case of v. 10, the context is again the return to Israel, another spatial reference, where it is said that the tent will be rebuilt in Jerusalem and the inhabitants of the earth from "many nations" will come there to praise his name (vv. 10–11; see also Isa 2:2–3, 60:3).

That "nation" is now found in the plural is especially important since it widens the scope of the spatial reference to the whole world, implying God is its king, or at least will eventually be considered as such by the world's nations; interestingly, it is these "righteous" that will sing the praises of the "King of the ages/worlds" in v. 13. In addition, the simple alternation of "king of the ages/worlds" with "God of heaven" in vv. 7 and 11 suggests it is unreasonable to see these two descriptions as separate references to God: rather, they form different parts of an overall depiction: spatially as heaven/earth, or temporally as heavenly eternity/earthly generations. If we accept the proposed argument that αἰών should be understood spatially, we could make sense of this by accepting the suggestion that God is being presented as the "God of heaven and the world", something akin to "Lord of heaven and earth" in Jdt 9:12. Both descriptions are indeed linked

---

[44] Vaticanus could mean either: "Blessed be God who has exalted all the generations [of Israel]," or: "Blessed be God who has exalted [you] for all the ages." The latter interpretation resembles the Old Latin: "Blessed be the Lord who exalts you, and blessed for all ages" (*Benedictus Dominus qui exaltat te, et benedictus in omnia saecula saeculorum*).

in v. 15, where God is given the overarching title of "great king". This increases the possibility of seeing God as "exalting the world" in 13:18 – it becomes a reference to God's exalting the nations by bringing them up to Jerusalem as in vv. 8 and 11, and entering Jerusalem was traditionally understood as an "ascent" (e. g., Zech 14:17; 1 Esdr 2:8; 4:63).[45] The obstacle to be overcome is why we have the plural for "worlds" and the singular for "heaven" if they are parallel terms. However, the reference to the "nations" in the plural may explain this, since a corresponding plural draws the two concepts together more closely.[46] In this way, we can understand Vaticanus as a meaningful reading, in which αἰών might denote "world".

Among the usages of αἰών in the LXX, another example where our term might mean "world", but such a reading is debated, is Sir 38:34. NJB has: "they sustain the structure of the world, and their prayer is concerned with their trade" and RSV has, similarly, "they keep stable the fabric of the world, and their prayer is in the practice of their trade." However, NAB reads "they maintain God's ancient handiwork, and their concern is for exercise of their skill", taking αἰών to have the meaning "ages" in the sense of "ancient", though one might also argue that we should understand our term as referring to the "present age".[47] Again, the trouble here is establishing an original reading. There is no Hebrew available, but the Syriac uses the equivalent of the Hebrew עלם. This has caused Calduch-Benages to translate the Syriac as "because in the doings of the world they are brilliant and their mind is on the practice of their craft," but, in fact, the use of עלם is itself no guide since it could carry with it virtually the same variant

---

[45]　Here, we might question the use of the aorist, which would suggest a past event, but it could also be viewed here as simply denoting a punctiliar action or the author might be anticipating God's accomplishment as though it had already occurred. The question becomes one of how we deal with the variant reading in Sinaiticus. It seems to me that there are two possibilities. The first is that it could be a meaningful reading and represent another tradition. It does also fit the overall context since it addresses the very subject we have just been discussing, namely the in-gathering of the nations, who then become "blessed ones" who worship the Lord. However, the addition of the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι in this verse does not fit the general language of Tobit, where this phrase is not otherwise found. Instead, our text prefers εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας to denote an action extending into eternity, found in 8:15, 13:4, 8:5, 11:14; 13:4 and 13:17 as we saw above. It would therefore seem to me to be a textual addition which should not influence our above reading of "worlds" in 13:18 and the possible acceptance of Vaticanus. That said, the Sinaiticus variant is widely accepted. For instance, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, CEJL (New York: de Gruyter, 2003), 317 translates according to Sinaiticus: "the gates of Jerusalem will sing out with hymns of joy, and all its house will cry out, 'Hallelujah, praised be the God of Israel and (in you) the blessed will praise His holy name for ever and ever'. He bases this on Aramaic 4 Q196 and the Vulgate. However, it is equally possible that a more difficult, reading was smoothed over in later versions. That said, the overlap of αἰών and עלם is something to which we shall later return.

[46]　See "αἰών," *BDAG* 33, the use of the plural to mean, simply, "world" was not unknown, and so this may be a choice made purely for stylistic and rhetorical effect.

[47]　For this possible meaning of αἰών, see Keizer, "Life," 135.

meanings as αἰών.[48] For instance, it is used clearly with the sense of eternity in phrases such as לְעֹלָם וָעֶד (e.g., Exod 15:18, 1 Chr 16:36), conceivably as "genera-tion" in phrases like עַד־עֹולָם וּמֵעֹולָם (e.g. Ps 90:2) and even as "world" in passages such as Genizah Ps 3:17.[49] The n, scholars dispute whether the Genizah Psalms date from the late Second Temple period or centuries later. There is therefore no guarantee that "world" is here an appropriate translation of the Syr-iac and a paraphrase such as that of the NAB is possible given the variant mean-ings of αἰών.

4.2.2 Wisdom 13:9

The case for a spatial understanding of our term is stronger in Wisdom, espe-cially Wis 13:9, where we have similar motif to Heb 11:3 outlined above. Whereas Heb 11:3 has to do with faith as permitting the (believing) Christian community to know God as creator, Wis 13:9 comments upon the (unbeliev-ing) pagans' having failed to know God from his creation. While Wisdom does use εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (forever) in passages such as 3:8, in other places we can demonstrate that Wisdom likely also uses αἰών to mean "world", as in 13:9. To set the scene, Wisdom 13 speaks of the folly of the gentiles. Ignorant of God, they were foolish by nature, and unable to know the Creator himself from the good things of creation (13:1). Instead of knowing the "artisan" (τεχνίτης), they paid attention only to his works. In what appears to be a twist of irony, the gentiles have assumed that those things made by God, like the fire, wind, circle of stars and waters, were the gods ruling the world. In the face of this folly, Wisdom declares "let them know how much better than these is their Lord" (13:3), that is "the author of beauty" who created (ἔκτισεν) them. The God who made these things is more powerful than they are, and "from the greatness and beauty of created things (κτισμάτων) comes a corresponding perception of their Creator (γενεσιουργός) (13:5). Yet, Wisdom is not wholly unsympathetic to the nations. They are "little to be blamed" and "while they live among his works, they keep

---

[48] Nuria Calduch-Benages et al eds. *Wisdom of the Scribe Diplomatic Edition of the Syriac Version of the Book of Ben Sira According to Codex Ambrosianus* (Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 2003), 222.

[49] For a good summary of the different meanings of the Hebrew, see "עֹולָם" *DCH*, vol. 6, 306. It is also worth noting that the same ambiguities in meaning are problematic for the translation of the Genizah Psalms, both here and more generally. See David M. Stec, *The Genizah Psalms: A Study of MS 978 of the Antonin Collection*, Cambridge Genizah Studies 5 (Boston: Brill, 2013), 58, see also 66. The same ambiguities exist in the Targumim, for instance Pseudo-Jonathan has the Aramaic equivalent עלמא suggesting "age" or "generation" in Gen 9:6, but "world" in Deut. 33:17. For the meaning "world" at this point in this Targum, see Ernest G. Clarke (trans.), *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy: Translated with Notes*, Aramaic Bible: The Targums 5B (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 103. Interestingly, Neofiti has "nations/kingdoms" at this point, which may indicate another possible interpretive reading of our term.

searching, and they trust in what they see because the things that are seen (τὰ βλεπόμενα) are beautiful." (13:7). The problem is, though, that if they have the power to know so much that they can investigate the world/age (αἰών), they have still failed to find its master (13:9).

The context here is very much one of the creation of the world, and the exalted status of the God of Israel, who is its Creator. There are no listed major variants of our verse, which might have shed light on whether we are to take our term to mean "world" or "age", and so it is important to consider this co-text very closely. On the one hand, there is another word used for "world" in v. 2: κόσμος. It seems strange that the same author, had he intended to signal the meaning "world" in a similar manner in 13:9 would have chosen to make the choice of αἰών. Stylistically, using the word κόσμος arguably would have more readily indicated to the reader a direct contrast between the ones that the nations *think* rule the world, and the One who actually does. However, there may be more to it.

The term used in v. 2 of their supposed deities and their governance is πρυτάνεις.[50] It was commonly used of deified heavenly bodies, which were seen to govern the world as magistrates and procurators, though there was often thought to be one overarching God who was seen as "King". For instance, Plutarch, *Moralia On Exile*, 601 [de Lacey and Einarson, LCL] has:

… here are the same fire, water, and air; the same magistrates and procurators and councillors [πρυτάνεις] – Sun, Moon, and Morning Star; the same laws for all, decreed by one commandment and one sovereignty – the summer solstice, the winter solstice, the equinox, the Pleiades, Arcturus, the seasons of sowing, the seasons of planting; here one king and ruler, God, holding the beginning, middle, and end of the universe, proceeds directly, as is his nature, in his circuit; upon him follows Justice, who visits with punishment those that fall short of the divine law.

The idea is modelled on worldly leadership and judicial systems. However, God, specifically, the God of Israel, is in Wisdom depicted as much more, and his activity is described particularly in creative terms. He is described as τεχνίτης (artisan) in 13:1, γενεσιάρχης in 13:3 and γενεσιουργός (generator, creator) in v. 5. The contrast that forms this part of Wisdom's argumentation thus hinges on the nations' perceptions of deities in terms of earthly rulers and the reality of God as creator.[51]

---

[50]　Gilbert, *La Critique*, 17–19.

[51]　For more on this view of the gods in Ancient Greek thought as underlying v. 2, see David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, AB 43 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 248–49. He has a different reading, however, that contrasts the manufacturers of idols with the natural elements. Some parallels are drawn between Wisdom and Philo (e. g., *Decal.* 52–53). He does, however, make some interesting remarks as to his chosen translation "universe" for αἰών in 13:9, commenting that the sense of αἰών as the "time of the world" (perhaps as that discussed of the *Timaeus*) sometimes passed over into the meaning "world" as in Mk 4:19, 1 Cor 1:20; 2:6; 3:19). Ibid., 256–57.

It is precisely in this creative capacity that the gentiles are called to recognize the God of Israel as "Lord" of the age/world in 13:9. There is an important inclusio in our verse with the word "power", also in v. 4. We read that the power of the elements, like fire, water and air, (listed in v. 2) and the circle of the stars has so impressed the nations that they have taken them to be gods, and Wisdom almost laments their ignorance, saying "let them perceive from them how much more "powerful" is the one who formed (κατασκευάσας) them" (13:4).[52] The inclusio thus brings out the irony that those considered to be in charge of the world, are, in fact, merely created beings, and that it is the God of Israel who is God, being their creator. In Wis 13:2,4 and 9, the word used for powerful/power is derived from δύναμαι, and so we can be fairly certain that this is a recognizable and intended literary construct, and not merely a conceptual inclusio inferred from the text. As αἰών comes at the end of this inclusio, it is reasonable to expect it to also reference created physical things in the way we found reference to the same at the start of the inclusio, that is, when v. 4 refers back to the fire, wind, circle of the stars and turbulent waters, and the luminaries of heaven in v. 2. The question, then, is why αἰών and not κόσμος, as above? By using αἰών, it is possible that the whole of creation is being envisaged, including heaven, in which some of those deities are clearly found, such as the stars or the luminaries. Κόσμος could simply mean the earth, as is likely the case in Wis 6:24 and 10:1, suggesting the author might have taken the term that way, or is just using αἰών as an alternate term.[53] Employing a different term in fact adds a further differentiation to God from their deities. The important thing for our purposes, however, is that the meaning "ages" would not fit too easily with a passage so focussed on created physical beings.[54]

---

[52] Joseph Reider, *The Book of Wisdom*, JAL 5 (New York: Harper, 1957), 162 notes a conceptual link with v. 1 where it is said that people have failed to "rise up" to God from examining his works. Whilst this is true, I think the inclusio itself is on v. 4 and v. 9, given the shared vocabulary.

[53] The term κόσμος could also envisage the heavens and the earth together, and it is possible to see this meaning even in Wisdom, e. g., 7:17, but in other passages it seems clear that the term is being used of the earth. Symmachus also uses κόσμος not γῆ for in Job 38:4. For more, see Hermann Sasse, "κόσμος," *TDNT*, vol. 3.868–98. I would posit, however, that since we have the likely meaning "world" not "universe" in 6:24; 10:1 and, here argued, 14:6 that we might consider the possibility of that former meaning in other verses of Wisdom, such as 7:17 or 11:22. These verses are posited in *TDNT* to have the meaning "universe", but either meaning would make sense. Ibid., 881. On possible Christian interpolation, see Maurice Gilbert, *La Critique des Dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse*, AnBib 53 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1973), 114–24.

[54] The idea of being unable to perceive God from things that are visible may also be a parallel concept to Heb 11:3.

4.2.3 Wisdom 14:6

The use of our term in 14:6 is perhaps a bit more cryptic than in 13:9: "for in the beginning, when the arrogant giants were being destroyed, the hope of the world (κόσμος), steered by your hand, fled on a raft and bequeathed for the αἰών a seed of generation." However, again, whilst our term could mean "generation", perhaps in the sense of "posterity," another plausible meaning for our term is "world".

Chapter 14 begins by depicting one who is "preparing to sail" on a wooden vessel over tempestuous waves. The vessel is said to be the work of Wisdom, and God's fatherly providence guides it. God's providence is such that he can save from any danger, so that those who trust themselves even to the smallest of such vessels can be saved, for God wills the works of Wisdom to be effectual. This analogy follows on from the ironic depiction of those who build idols and pray to them for various needs when it is quite impossible for these idols to help them, and mocks those who call on a piece of wood, an idol, more fragile than the vessel that carried him (Wis 14:1). The righteous one in our passage, the "hope of the world", clung to such a raft, "for blessed is the wood by which righteousness comes" (v. 7).[55]

The meaning of αἰών here is ambiguous for several reasons. Firstly, there is the close proximity of the word γενέσεως (Wis 14:6) and its connotation of physical birth or descent, and thus "generation", which may be an indication that it is for a generation, or "age" that a seed of generation is being bequeathed with the sense of "for posterity". However, also in close proximity, we have the term κόσμος, and so αἰών might here be an alternative word to denote "world" or "universe". In 14:13, we do appear to have the temporal meaning for αἰών in the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (forever), and so perhaps this weights the argument slightly in favour of a temporal meaning in our own verse. Alternatively, the reference itself is to the Noah story, for the same word for "giants" (14:6) is used in Gen 6:4. Everything besides those in the Ark, was totally destroyed. God blots out that generation in Gen 7:4.[56] Certainly, God wishes to destroy the world (τὴν γῆν) in Gen 6:13, but ultimately it survives and is repopulated by Noah, the "seed of generation", and his family. When looked at in relation to the Genesis story underpinning the reference, we should probably understand αἰών in terms of the γῆν which was repopulated by Noah's "seed". The meaning "world" is arguably more appropriate for our term, in the intertextual circumstances.

---

[55] Some have argued that this is a Christian interpolation intended to signal the Cross, but I dispute this on the lexicographical links between our passage and the LXX Genesis Noah account, the direct reliance on which, whilst not excluding the possibility of Christian influence, does negate the latter's necessity.

[56] The wider context is found in texts like Jdt 16:6; Sir 16:7; Jub 7:22 or 1 Enoch 7:5. See Winston, *Wisdom*, 267.

4.2.4 Wisdom 18:4

We also have good reason for seeing the meaning "world" in Wis 18:4: "For on the one hand they deserved to be deprived of light and imprisoned in darkness, the ones keeping shut up your sons, through whom the imperishable light of the law was going to be given to the αἰών." Here, most major English translations, such as the NRSV, NJB and NAB all agree on "world". Chapter 18 begins by contrasting the situation of the Egyptian people who were living in a "night" by sinning, even though the world was itself illumined by a brilliant light (17:20–21), and the holy ones, the Israelites, for whom there was a great light. God provides a pillar of fire as a guide for his own people's journey and a "harmless sun" for their "glorious wandering" (18:3). The enemies of Israel, by contrast "deserved to be deprived of light and imprisoned in darkness, those who had kept your children imprisoned," those children "through whom the imperishable light of the law was going to be given to the world" (NRSV). The chapter continues to recount how God saved Israel from the Egyptians.

It is indeed difficult to see how αἰών might here be "generation" or "age". The text says that it is God's children through whom the Torah's light is to be given, δι᾽ ὧν denoting their agency. There is also a tradition in *Test. Lev.* 14:4 that sees the same idea of Israel bringing light to the nations by berating them for sin and saying that it will bring a curse upon them because God gave them the Torah as a "light" for everyone, with the variant κόσμος, which would add to the likelihood Israel's actions are at stake and that we should understand our term spatially here.[57]

Our verse is parallel to 17:20 (a reference to Exod. 10:23), where we read ὅλος γὰρ ὁ κόσμος λαμπρῷ κατελάμπετο φωτὶ καὶ ἀνεμποδίστοις συνείχετο ἔργοις: "for the whole world was illumined with brilliant light, and was engaged in unhindered work" (NRSV). In fact, the context of "light" and "darkness" is shared between 17:20–21 and our verse, including "light" and "darkness", which might be an indication that they together demark an inclusio if we ignore the traditional grouping of the chapters. The reason why κόσμος should be chosen at the start and αἰών at the end is unclear, and so there is perhaps a nuance that has been lost, but the parallelism would partially favour the interpretation "world" over that of "age". We also saw the same alternation above in our discussion of 13:9, and so it may have been that the two terms were, to some extent, interchangeable. It is also worth noting that Sinaiticus seems to harmonize these two sections by reading σκότους (darkness in 18:4) as in 17:20, whereas Vaticanus has σκότει (darkness, Wis 18:4). This could be viewed as adding to the argument that these verses were understood together, at least at some stage.

---

[57] For this and further possible parallels, including *Sifre. Deut.* 343 and *Testament of Orpheus* 3, see Winston, *Wisdom*, 310–12.

In conclusion to this section, then, we have three cases in Wisdom where αἰών likely has the meaning "world". We saw above that Hebrews 1:2–3 likely has links with Wis 7:21–27; 9:2, and now it appears that we might have another echo of this book in the use of the term αἰών as the object of God's creative activity. The links between Hebrews and this book already demonstrated would lend credence to such a suggestion. There is, however, one problem. In Wisdom, God is clearly the creator of the "world", but αἰών is singular. How are we to understand the plural usage in Hebrews?

4.3 Eras or Worlds?

The use of αἰών in the plural is rare in ancient pagan Greek manuscripts, even though we do find it with the sense "generations" in passages like Empedocles 2.3 and Theocritus 3.1.[58] This signals that we should pay close attention to the use of the plural in Hebrews. This section will consider this question in relation to the possible meaning "epoch" or "era".

Before we can make any definitive conclusions that αἰών has the sense of "world" in Heb 1:2, it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that Hebrews was much concerned with eschatology: the coming of Christ, and, eventually, what that would entail.[59] Whereas "Philo, apart from one or two concessions to his Jewish background and attitudes, adopted a typically Platonic attitude to time and history which admitted no eschatology at all," and Wisdom was, in our passages above where we find αἰών, concerned with God as the original creator, the author of Hebrews was certainly concerned with "final things", and especially what will happen to the created order, the heavens and the earth, and this forms a fairly close context for αἰών in the exordium, being present in 1:10–12.[60] In addition, 6:5 uses αἰών to speak of an era/world to come. This leads us to return to the possibility that we are to take αἰῶνας in some way having a temporal sense. The latter idea is further supported by the fact that, in the verse prior to our creation reference in the exordium, we read that God has spoken through the Son "at the last of these days," which lends an eschatological hue to the exordium. For Vanhoye, even the opening passages of Hebrews, which so clearly emphasize Christ's role at creation, are focussed on one thing: "[the author] is not concerned with a moralising sermon or an exhortation due to circumstance. He goes to the essential [issue]: his preoccupation concerns the relationship with God."[61] The Epistle is concerned with approaching God (7:19), having true

---

[58] Keizer, "Life," 55.

[59] Williamson, *Philo*, 146.

[60] Ibid., 143. Wis 4:20–5:23 describes a final judgement of the wicked and vindication of the righteous. See Winston, *Wisdom*, 144, 146.

[61] Albert Vanhoye, *La situation du Christ: Hébreux 1–2*, LD 58 (Paris: Cerf, 1969), 52.

access to him (10:19), being transformed by his holiness (12:10) and finding true life (12:9), all made possible through the actions of Christ as High Priest.[62]

For Vanhoye, the "last days", as he translates it, is vitally important for understanding the exordium: it is a Hebraism, which designates in a vague fashion the times to come (e. g. Gen 49:1), but which is applied to the times of God's definitive intervention, his judgment. A similar idea is found in passages such as Dan 10:14 which speak of the "last days" as a kind of name for a final epoch, and accords with passages such as Isa 2:2, Acts 2:17; and 2 Tim 3:1. However, Hebrews, like the other NT passages, adds something new to past tradition. There is a radical change in perspective because in the OT, the idea was always set into the future, but now Hebrews makes it clear that the awaited time has come: "one has passed from the promise to the realisation, from the prefiguration to the accomplishment."[63] To Vanhoye, then, the mention of Christ as the agent of creation serves primarily to underscore this side of the argumentation: by "ages" could it be meant precisely that, the contrasting eras of time are coming to fulfilment in Christ?[64]

Vanhoye is not alone in seeing a heavily eschatological bent to the exordium. We recall that Lane states that "the framing statements … enunciate emphatically the theme of supreme revelation through the Son. The core of the exordium … described Jesus in an arresting way as the royal Son, Divine Wisdom, and the royal Priest,"[65] but this is not done in contradistinction to what has come before, rather the exordium stresses continuity of tradition and its completion in the activities of the Son. This is most noticeable at the start of the exordium, where we find alliteration in πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (in many parts and in many ways):

Although the use of alliterative combinations of πολυ- words in rhetorical openings was a common practice in this period … the initial adverbial phrase in Hebrews is more than a literary convention. These πολυ- compounds express in an emphatic way the writer's conviction concerning the extent of the OT revelation …[the multiplicity of previous revelations] implies that until the coming of the Son the revelation of God remained incomplete."[66]

---

[62] Ibid.

[63] Ibid., 56. However, he does not think there is enough evidence to suggest a Jewish Christian audience, citing the way in which Paul applies a common heritage to both Jews and Gentiles in passages such as Rom 4:16–18 and Gal 3:29. Ibid., 58.

[64] Vanhoye himself now concludes that the answer is "universe" – see Vanhoye, *Letter*, 54. However, in *La situation*, he poses this very question: "Must one speak of the creation of the 'world'? The author has not used the traditional formula, 'God has created the heaven and the earth.' He prefers [to use] a more mysterious expression which speaks of the creation of the 'aeons'. He does the same in 11:3." See Vanhoye, *Situation*, 66.

[65] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 7. See also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 93.

[66] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 10–11. He discusses the use of πολυ- words by Philo, but concludes there is no necessary connection. We might also compare Heb 1:1 with Luke 1:1–4, which opens with a number of π sounds in fairly quick succession. It also functions to introduce the coming passages in an emphatic manner.

What Lane is saying is that the contrast of "many" with the singular implies that the multiple revelations that came before that of the Son were lesser in grandeur and that definitive revelation has come in the Son.

However, there is a sense that whilst this "new era" has been inaugurated, it has not yet itself come to final completion. As it says in 10:13, Christ, having sat down at God's right hand, now waits until his enemies will be put under his feet – again, the eschatology is partially realized, but not yet fully.[67] Similarly, in 2:8, we also possibly read that we do not yet see everything put under the Son's feet. In a sense, we could even argue that by becoming human and offering his sacrifice, and then ascending, Christ has inaugurated a new age of partially realized eschatology, "created" it.

Because of the association between epochs and eschatology, our "ages" reference even possibly has the nuance not only of the "eschatological", but also of the temporal meaning, "everlasting". The "ages" may, as the word is in the plural, be understood as all those eras allotted to heaven and earth, from creation to its final shaking, and then their eternal existence (12:26–27). Having the latter nuance of "eternity" in the use of our term so nearby in 1:8 would support this theory.[68] We saw earlier that the meaning "eternity" is not very appropriate for Hebrews' use of αἰών in the exordium. Nevertheless, there is a sense by which the Son was the agent used in creating the αἰῶνας within the context of eternity – this may link to the idea of the "eternal inheritance" offered to believers (9:15), especially given the proximity of the description of the Son as "heir" in 1:1 which, as a literary technique, serves to foreshadow that same inheritance. We return to the fact that, elsewhere in Hebrews, the term αἰών does not seem to be used purely spatially and often carries with it the sense of eternity. We see this in passages like 5:6–9 and 7:17–24 and the description of Christ's priesthood according to the "eternal" order of Melchizedek, and especially the direct reference to the "world to come" (6:5, referring to LXX 109:4 [110:4]), where the Greek uses the grammatically appropriate variant of αἰών, and in 13:8, 21 as mentioned above.[69]

Mackie believes that "this complex and ambiguous conception, proclaiming that the 'future age' has been inaugurated, but had not yet fully arrived, is ideally suited to the author's hortatory program."[70] It provides a sense of urgency and the expressions of eschatological ambiguity tend to emerge "in a context of "exhortation, warning, and/or moral instruction."[71] The "eschatological con-

---

[67] Barrett, "Eschatology," 363–93 esp. 363–64, 387–88, here 388. The controversy over 2:8 is discussed later.

[68] Mackie, *Eschatology*, 39, n. 1. See also John J. Hughes, "Hebrews IX 15 ff. and Galatians III 15 ff.: A Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure," *NovT* 21 (1979), 27–96, esp. 33.

[69] Compare Weiss, *Hebräer*, 143–44, who also argues for a dual spatial and temporal understanding of our term, but with the emphasis on the temporal aspect.

[70] Mackie, *Eschatology*, 37.

[71] Ibid.

ception of the two ages/worlds fuses exhortation to doctrine, at once creating a mood of impending urgency, relativizing the present age and the honor-shame system it offers, and establishing the temporal and spatial milieu for the heavenly enthronement and high priestly activities of the Son."[72] Understood this way, our reference effectively lays down the temporal framework for the rest of the epistle, and "unmistakable immediacy" is connoted by the word "these" in "these days."[73] Moreover, the exordium of 1:1–4 is clearly connected to the warning of 2:1–4, the use of λαλέω forming an inclusio that links 1:2 and 2:3 – the great salvation which has been spoken by the Son must be heeded, not neglected, and the hearers must not "drift away":

The author's portrayal of the unparalleled position of the exalted Son has effectively shut the door on any possibility of a shift in allegiances … this severe, unequivocal warning is characterized by its stark juxtaposition of the Father's conferral of divine glory upon the Son, and the attendant angelic worship [as portrayed in the rest of ch. 1], with the timid, lacklustre, ungrateful response of the recipients.[74]

In terms of Hebrews' discourse, the portrayal of the Son in the exordium establishes the identity of the one to whom the readers have committed themselves and the aim of this eschatological portrayal is to convince them not to abandon or transfer allegiance.[75] The eschatology of Hebrews with its idea of a final era, then, is closely linked to its rhetoric – this becomes especially clear in 9:15, where we learn Christ has made atonement for the sake of the audience, that they may also receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. However, Mackie points out that this eschatology first becomes obvious in the exordium. The Son, through whom God made the ages/worlds is the one by whom he has spoken in the last days.[76] The use of this term, then, is key to the characterization of Christ in the exordium, contributing to an overall glorifying picture precisely because of its ambiguity. Such a multivalent reading, admitting ideas of both time and space, also fits with the other historical milieu from which Hebrews arguably comes. According to Lindars:

… here, Hebrews reflects the presuppositions of earliest Christianity, shared with Jewish apocalyptic eschatology of the time, that God as creator and controller of history has a predetermined plan. This reaches its goal in the era of salvation, which is even now about to begin.[77]

---

[72] Ibid. Mackie does not think that we should think merely in terms of spatial or temporal dimensions in Hebrews, but that we should consider that both were features of apocalyptic literature. Ibid., 31.

[73] Ibid., 40

[74] Ibid., 41.

[75] Ibid., 42.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Lindars, *Theology*, 30. However, see Karrer, *Hebräer*, 118, who states that an apocalyptic contrast of ages is not necessarily required.

This background would seem a suitable one in which to consider our reference to the "ages/worlds", since, quite often in Jewish apocalyptic literature, we find this overlap of the spatial and the temporal in reference to the "final days" or "world to come", often within a messianic/salvific context. For instance, in 1 Enoch 71:14–15, we read of the world to come, but it is envisaged within a temporal framework set from creation itself:

> And he (i. e. the angel) came to me and greeted me with His voice, and said unto me: 'This is the Son of Man who is born unto righteousness, and righteousness abides over him, and the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes him not.' And he said unto me: 'He proclaims unto thee peace in the name of the world to come; for from hence has proceeded peace since the creation of the world, and so shall it be unto thee for ever and for ever and ever.[78]

In apocalyptic texts in particular, creation was also seen to collapse into the eternity of the heavenly realm as the new age arrived, that which was designated "the world to come". In particular, there was an eschatological hope for a new era in which God and humankind would be in direct contact again, people seeing his glory directly, as exemplified in Deutero-Isaiah (e. g., Isa 40:5, 59:19–60:2; 66:18, see also Rev 5:11–13).[79] This "reunion" amounts to a new relationship with God akin to that in Eden, and therefore to a new creation (e. g. Rev 22:2; 1 Enoch 25:1–6) – indeed, Cody reads Hebrews as saying the earthly will eventually pass away and only the heavenly things will remain (12:27).[80] Cody claims that Hebrews picks up on this distinction from, yet desire for, the heavenly, when Christ is said to "enter the sanctuary which is not a part of the terrestrial and temporal creation but rather of the celestial and eternal one, [he] is thereby making available to humanity the splendour of an eternal redemption (Heb 9:11 f)."[81]

Some of the ideas above attributed to Philonic understandings of the heavenly versus the earthly realms may also be born of Jewish apocalypticism. This has been the subject of detailed investigation by Jody A. Barnard. Whereas Philo "utilizes the texts that speak about the tabernacle to philosophise about the nature of the cosmos and humanity," Hebrews is interested specifically in the heavenly sanctuary and its cultic significance.[82] It is a place into which one can

---

[78] Robert Henry Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha*, vol. 2 of *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913). 237. Attridge, and, indeed, most commentators, points out that the idea continues into later rabbinic literature. E. g., *Midr. Ps.* 15 [72b]. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 41. Some scholars date 1 Enoch 37–71 to the first century CE and others somewhat later.

[79] Cody, *Sanctuary*, 13. This idea of the whole world eventually having access to God was expressed in some prophetic texts in relation to the nations' entry into the Temple to worship God, (e. g., Mic 4:2; Zech 14:16–17).

[80] Ibid., 85.

[81] Ibid., 13–14. For heavenly temple references in the Old Testament, see Ibid., 14–20.

[82] Jody A. Barnard, *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, WUNT 2/331 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 97.

enter and where new events can happen, as when Christ enters, in advance of his followers in Heb 6 and 9 – this is something very foreign to the concept of a realm of unchanging ideas, but it is akin to Jewish mystical apocalyptic texts like the *Testament of Levi* or the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* where key characters, even a congregation, in some way participate in the heavenly liturgy.[83]

In fact, the celestial temple was one of the leading motifs in early Jewish mysticism and can be seen in texts like 1 Enoch 14 or even the New Testament book of Revelation, where visions of the heavenly temple permeate the narrative.[84] Whilst one could argue that Hebrews deals with the tabernacle and not the temple in ch. 9, the general understanding of entering into a heavenly place of divine presence and worship is basically the same. Furthermore, the Son is envisaged in terms of the "glory" of God in 1:3 and this description is closely followed by a statement on his relationship to the angels: "not only are angels virtually omnipresent throughout apocalyptic literature … but the relationship between the angels and someone who ascends to the angelic habitat is very much an apocalyptic mystical question," and only the holiest are said to reach such close proximity to the Lord.[85]

This later world-age would come to be known in Hebrew as הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, and it may be possible to see a connection between the development of עולם in Hebrew and αἰών in Greek.[86] The two terms are semantic cognates, and the usage of the term αἰών even in the LXX mediates the Hebrew. For instance, where we find εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας we find phrases employing עולם in the equivalent Hebrew passage, for instance, עַד־עוֹלָם or even, simply, עוֹלָם, sometimes with the preposition ל (e. g., Exod 12:24; Deut 5:29, 12:28; Josh 5:7; 1 Sam 20:23; Ps 47:15).[87] עולם itself originally had a similar temporal meaning to αἰών, but with eschatological speculation it began to gather the sense of the world in relation to eternity and was used to designate the physical world as envisaged in its final epoch. There was, essentially, an overlap of the temporal and the spatial concepts so that they could not really be separated from each other. This seems to primarily be a later development – we find this meaning most often in later rabbinic texts, such as *Gen. Rab.* 6.3–4, however, we do have some earlier possible references. Pirqe Avot, 4:22 and the reference to the "life of the עולם הבא," and Tosefta Pesachim 4 has a saying attributed to King Monobazus (ca. 1–50 C.E.) concerning the gath-

---

[83] Ibid., 97–98. See also Calaway, *Sabbath*, 91–95.
[84] Barnard, *Mysticism*, 104.
[85] Ibid., 158.
[86] The connection is noted even in dictionary entries, such as Hermann Sasse, "αἰών," *TDNT*, vol. 1, 202.
[87] Phrases pertaining to eternity and using עולם are not alone in being translated with αἰών. For instance, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος (e. g., LXX Ps 91:8) translates Hebrew עֲדֵי־עַד (Ps 92:8). However, the translations of עולם with αἰών in phrases pertaining to eternity are so numerous that we can see the correspondence between the two in the eyes of translators.

ering of riches in the same.[88] We find the same idea of a final eschatological era expressed in the Greek using αἰών in the New Testament, suggesting a similar development in the Greek.

In Mark 10:29–30 (Luke 18:30), we read the promise that those who have left their house or family for the sake of Jesus will receive one hundredfold recompense in this time (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ) and eternal life in the world to come (ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ). In Matt 12:32, we read that sin against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven in this world or the world to come (ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι). One could argue that the idea is simply of an "age" to come, but that a spatial idea overlaps with one temporal in such expressions is seen when we compare these passages to Eph 1:20–21. Here, there appear to be envisaged rulers and authorities for this future world, much the same as those already seen on earth:

God put this power to work in Christ when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rulers and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this αἰών but in the αἰών to be (ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι).[89]

Furthermore, it is clear that there is seen to be more than one αἰών, which might explain the use of the plural in Hebrews. In fact, the conception of αἰών as the eras of the world is marked elsewhere by the use of the plural, such as τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor 10:11) – the end of the "aeons"[90]. We saw earlier that we find similar plural forms in Heb 13:8, 21 and especially 9:26 (the completion of the ages), but now we can see that both a temporal and a spatial nuance may also apply in these cases.

---

[88] This is discussed in Ibid., 206, though one might add that the date of the final redaction of both texts is disputed. Whilst I here refer to the apocalyptic notion of the "world-age to come," it should be added that the concept of עולם הבא could also mean a person's immediate afterlife, and this may be the case in Pirqe Avoth 4:22, which contrasts the life of the world to come with the life of this world/age. The term seems to have had both meanings in the midrashic literature. Louis Finkelstein argued that the dual meaning possibly has its origins in the Shammai/Hillel debate over when one's judgement occurs: at the final resurrection or immediately after death. Louis Finkelstein, *Mavo le-Masekhtot Avot ve-Avot de Rabbi Natan* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 213. Original text in Hebrew. However, whilst individual instances are debated, the fact the term could refer to such an era is generally agreed, and, as I argue here, this seems to be present in other NT texts. José Costa, *L'au-Delà et la Résurrection das La Littérature Rabbinique Ancienne* (Paris-Louvain: Peeters, 2004), 9, 37–71 is one scholar to deal with the meaning of the term in relation to the messianic era of salvation and conclude very positively in regard of this meaning. Offering a survey of scholarly opinions on the afterlife in ancient Judaism in general is Alan J. Avery-Peck, and Jacob Neusner, eds., *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*, vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

[89] Translation adapted from NRSV. There may also be an alternation of κόσμος and αἰών in Slavonic Enoch's Greek *Vorlage*. See Sasse, "αἰών," *TDNT*, vol. 1, 206.

[90] Ibid., 203.

In conclusion, it would seem then, that we cannot be wholly dismissive of either the spatial or the temporal sense of τοὺς αἰῶνας in 1:2. As Vanhoye succinctly puts it: "God has not created only the times, but also everything that exists in the times. The plural can be understood in the sense of two "worlds", present and to come."[91] We now have an answer to the question posed at the start of this section: what is the Son said to have been involved in creating? Quite simply, everything in time and space. We are now in the position to ask our second question: what does our reference tell us about the nature of the Son?

4.4 What does the Creation Reference in the Exordium Tell us about the Son?

The language of the exordium now becomes decidedly difficult to understand. In Hebrews 1:3, we have two uses of meronymy: ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης and χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως.[92] Two words, ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ, one from each description, belong to the semantic field of semblance and both depictions are governed by the same agent, the Son, and linked together by the same participle, "being", suggesting that they ought to be understood together. What is more, these words are hapax legomena in the NT, yet appear here in quick succession.[93] The combination of unique terms, especially given their position in the opening to the Epistle, warrants detailed investigation as to their meaning. It is necessary in our investigation, then, to examine how these words might be understood, especially when used together. Firstly, it is essential to establish the basic sense of the terms being employed in their immediate co-text. We will consider each in turn.

The term ἀπαύγασμα can be understood, broadly speaking, two ways: either actively, as of light radiating out from a source ("radiance"), or passively, meaning "reflection".[94] The Son is thus either seen as radiating from God's glory, or as being in some way a reflection of his glory. Nouns ending in -μα, Ellingworth informs us, regularly have a passive meaning, denoting an object, the result of actions, and many modern scholars follow this reading.[95] For instance, Spicq says that not only is this ending usually passive, but we also find this very term used passively in Philo, *Plant.* 50 for example, or *Opif.*, 146 in a similar way.[96] In

---

[91] Vanhoye, *La situation*, 66.

[92] A *meronym* is a constituent part of something. *Meronymy* is the relationship of the part to the whole. See Halliday, *Functional Grammar*, 4th ed, 647–48.

[93] Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 8.

[94] Gerhard Kittel, "ἀπαύγασμα," *TDNT*, vol. 1, 508.

[95] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 98.

[96] Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 6. Ellingworth also notes the usually passive ending. See also Käsemann, *Wandering*, 75, 101–2, Thompson, *Hebrews*, 35. Attridge remains undecided, but also points to this possibility, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 42.

addition, the prefix ἀπ- can have the sense of "away from", hence "back", again possibly indicative of the idea of "reflection."[97] However, when we look more closely at Philo, as before, we see things are not entirely clear cut in this regard.

We find the expression ἀπαύγασμα three times in Philo's writings. Initially it seems that Spicq might be right – when the term comes in *Opif.* 146, we learn that "Every man, in respect of his mind, is allied to the divine Reason, having come into being as a copy or fragment or ray [ἀπαύγασμα] of that blessed nature" (*Opif.* 146[Colson, LCL]). According to Williamson, the meaning is indeed most likely passive.[98] It describes human reason as a copy of divine reason and, from the context suggesting more of the idea of a "stamp" than a union between the two – we shall later see that the parallel term in Hebrews, χαρακτήρ can be used similarly, and so the plausibility of the passive reading increases since the two phrases would become two expressions of ultimately the same description.[99] Furthermore, in *Plant.* 50, Philo asserts the following:

The world, we read, is God's house in the realm of sense-perception, prepared and ready for Him. It is a thing wrought, not, as some have fancied, uncreated. It is a "sanctuary," an outshining [ἀπαύγασμα] of sanctity, so to speak, a copy of the original; since the objects that are beautiful to the eye of sense are images of those in which the understanding recognizes beauty. Lastly, it has been prepared by the "hands" of God, his world-creating powers. (*Plant.* 50 [Colson, LCL])

However, we also have ἀπαύγασμα in *Spec.* 4.123, which speaks about the breath of God breathed into Adam in the Genesis account:

God breathed a breath of life upon the first man, the founder of our race, into the lordliest part of his body, the face, where the senses are stationed like bodyguards to the great king, the mind. And clearly what was then thus breathed was ethereal spirit, or something if such there be better than ethereal spirit, even an effulgence [ἀπαύγασμα] of the blessed, thrice blessed nature of the Godhead. (*Spec.* 4.123 [Colson, LCL])

The usage, even in Philo, is, in fact, mixed. Spicq is arguably right to see the passive in the first two passages, but in this last passage, the meaning is almost certainly active.[100]

We should be cautious, though, in seeing any direct link between the usage of our term in Hebrews and by Philo. We might also consider the use of ἀπαύγασμα in 1:3 as pointing to the conception of God as light; in *Somn.* 1.175, Philo states "God is light", and continues to say that "for the model or pattern was the Word which contained all his [God's] fullness – light, in fact." However, the term

---

[97] Williamson, *Philo*, 37.

[98] Ibid., 38. However, Gerhard Kittel, "ἀπαύγασμα," *TDNT*, vol. 1, 508 classifies this as active, so there is some doubt raised over its precise nuance.

[99] Thompson, *Hebrews*, 35.

[100] Williamson, *Philo*, 37–38, though, again, there is some dispute, with "ἀπαύγασμα," *BDAG*, 99 preferring to see the active sense in all three Philo passages.

ἀπαύγασμα is absent. Similarly, it is also missing in passages like *Somn.* I.112, which speaks of the "all-illuminating rays" of God.[101] Having cited Spicq, it is only fair to give a quotation from Williamson: "The noun [ἀπαύγασμα] is used in Hebrews of the relationship between the Son and the Father, not of the relationship between human reason and the divine Reason, or between the actual world and the archetypal world, or between the spirit in man and the nature of the Godhead."[102] True enough, our author may be drawing on Alexandrian terms, perhaps even known from Philo, but he is using them for specifically christological purposes.[103]

It is also worthwhile to consider how the Hebrews passage was interpreted by the Christian writers, who tend to take the active reading. Gregory of Nyssa, *On Perfection*, J.187, for example, uses the active interpretation of ἀπαύγασμα to stress the union of Father and Son, using Heb 1:3 as his prooftext, something he also does in *Contra Eunomium* 3.6. Origen deployed a similar argument based on Heb 1:3 to counter the Arians in his *On First Principles* 1.28.[104]

There is, in fact, an alternative, to the Philonic backdrop commonly asserted which may help us understand the exordium more readily and which might account for this: Wisdom theology. Scholars are indeed keen to note that ἀπαύγασμα is hapax legomenon in Wis 7:26 in the Septuagint, and in the New Testament in Heb 1:3, and in his commentary on Wisdom, David Winston, citing de *Plantatione* 50 and *Specialibus Legibus* 4.123, points out that Philo only ever uses this term of the human mind, never the *Logos*, otherwise depicted as God's partner in creation.[105] In favour of the active reading, it is worth considering that we have in both Hebrews and Wisdom the close connection of ἀπαύγασμα to the "glory" of God in terms of surrounding co-text. Ellingworth posits that the Hebrews' description is, in fact, a combination of ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης (emanation of the glory of the Almighty) (Wis 7:25) and ἀπαύγασμα … φωτὸς ἀϊδίου (effulgence … of everlasting light) (Wis 7:26).[106] Although his view runs contrary to that of some translators, for instance, the NRSV having "reflection" in Wis 7:26, the parallel between ἀπαύγασμα and the ἀπόρροια would suggest that they are equivalent terms, both active in the Wisdom text and suggesting emanation, or radiance, out of God in some way.

---

[101] Ibid., 39.

[102] Ibid., 38.

[103] Ibid., 40. See also Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 1, 49.

[104] See Michel René Barnes, "Contra Eunomium III 6" in *Gregory of Nyssa: Contra Eunomium II. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa, 14–17 September 2010, Leuven, Belgium*, ed. Jonathan Leemans and Matthieu Cassin (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 368–82.

[105] Winston, *Wisdom* 187. Winston notes many parallels between Wisdom and Philo in respect of the imagery. For instance, commenting on Wis 7:26, he notes Philo's statement "as in a mirror, the mind has a vision of God as acting and creating the world and controlling all that is" in *Migr.* 190, however, the *logos* is not described as such a mirror.

[106] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 99.

Indeed, the term ἀπαύγασμα is essentially part of a chain of descriptions that see Wisdom described as in some way proceeding from God Himself, and it would appear that Hebrews is in some way drawing on this background.[107] Firstly, Wisdom is described in terms of breathing in Wis 7:25. Wisdom qua this breath is clarified specifically as an emanation, ἀπόρροια, through the use of καί, which signals the description is being expanded in the subsequent clause. It is then said that Wisdom is the ἀπαύγασμα of eternal light.

The meaning of ἀπόρροια is discussed at length by Larcher, who suggests it could be understood in the light of several traditions. Firstly he mentions Stoic thought, where the word served to describe the human soul as an emanation of the soul of the world, something innately connected to it. He also discusses the possibility it should be thought of in the light of Greek-Egyptian traditions such as *Kore Kosmou* 61, where the elements demand that the lord of the universe send "if not yourself, a sacred emanation of your own nature."[108] The basic sense in both cases is that such an emanation represents a detached reality of the same substance of that which emits it and then sends it to have its own existence and undertake its own activities. The emanation remains united to its original source in some way. Notably, our emanation, Wisdom, is said to be "pure", and so nothing defiled can enter into her (Wis 7:25), denoting Wisdom as incorruptible, like the eternal godhead. Moreover, God's glory was traditionally seen as the visible sign of his actual presence and this notion occurs in biblical texts such as Lev 9:23: the reference to God's glory, at this point, is a reference to the Divine Himself, and so Wisdom is again to be seen as an emanation of God.

The term ἀπαύγασμα comes in another expansion of this description of Wisdom, as indicated by the use of the conjunction γάρ in v. 26. Although he translates our term as "reflection" and prefers to see it in parallel with ἔσοπτρον and εἰκὼν in Wis 7:26, Larcher points out the mention of eternal light is significant in that light was seen as emanating from, or enveloping, the Divine in passages like Hab 3:4 or Dan 2:22.[109] This supports Ellingworth's conclusion that "emanation of the glory of the Almighty" (Wis 7:25) and "effulgence … of everlasting light" (Wis 7:26) are in fact parallel descriptions. When we read that Wisdom is the ἀπαύγασμα of eternal light, we are therefore to understand it once again as stressing some union with the divine, since Wisdom is described as the very *emanation* itself of that light, its "emittance". The problem here to the modern mind is the mention of reflection in a mirror, which follows soon after. We know that a reflection is not of the same substance as that which it reflects, since it is a trick of the light. Yet even Larcher, who thinks ἀπαύγασμα has the

---

[107] Winston, *Wisdom*, 184.

[108] Chrystostome Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou La Sagesse de Salomon*, vol. 2 (Paris: Lecoffre, 1984), 489. Italics mine.

[109] Ibid., 502.

sense "reflection", is keen to posit that even the reference to a mirror highlights the unity between the image and the source, since without the source, the reflection cannot be, and so it is essentially dependent on it. Wisdom is at once united to, dependent on, yet in some way distinct from God.[110] Rather than stress the weakness of the reflection in comparison to the reality, the image of a mirror is thus intended to suggest the complete image of God is present in Wisdom.[111] This Wisdom tradition may be the literary reason behind the amalgamation we find Hebrews 1:3 of Wis 7:25–26, since it is effectively a supporting text for the possibility of a distinct being emanating from God. It certainly would have supported his statement that the Son is the "impress of God's substance" in Heb 1:3. Furthermore, in Prov 9:11, the followers of Wisdom will have, long life through Wisdom. In Wis 8:17, this life becomes eternal, and we read that "… in kinship with wisdom there is immortality" and we have similar ideas of participation leading to eternal sanctification in respect of Christ, especially in relation to his sacrificial offering, in Heb 5:9, 9:12.

As in the case of Philo, one might say the same of Wisdom, i. e., that Hebrews is drawing on the same vocabulary and ideas and using them to its own, in Hebrews' case, christologically, rhetorical effect.[112] However, the idea that Heb 1:3 is indebted more to the Wisdom tradition than to Philo is not uncommon and another scholar to investigate this possibility and come to very positive conclusions as to an intertextual link is William Lane. We may here return to and extend a quotation cited earlier:

The conception of the Son as the one through whom God created the universe and who now sustains everything by his powerful word (1:2*c*, 3*b*) is expressed with phrases elsewhere associated with a different construct, that of divine Wisdom. The writer selects rare, evocative vocabulary and striking formulations that occur elsewhere only in the praise of divine Wisdom: the Son is the effulgence of God's glory, the exact representation of his being (cf. Wis 7:21–27). The writer speaks of the Son, but his conception is informed by the biblical and Hellenistic-Jewish tradition that God related to his creation through Wisdom (Prov 8:22–30; Wis 7:21–27). Moreover, the functions of Wisdom are in Hebrews assigned to the Son: the task of creation and of sustaining the creation, of revelation, and of the making of friends for God among the human family. The writer does not say Jesus was divine Wisdom. He does not speak of the personal Word who was with God from the beginning as does John (John 1:1–3). He simply clothes the Son in the garb of Wisdom.[113]

---

[110] Ibid., 498–504.
[111] Ibid., 503.
[112] Williamson, *Philo*, 49.
[113] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, cxxxix. Lane's understanding of an equation between Wisdom and the Son may also explain why we do not find explicit mention of σοφία – by avoiding the term, a comparison is avoided and the Son can simply be seen in terms of Wisdom.

In support of Lane, firstly, we may note that in Prov 8:22–30, Wisdom is described as having been present with God from the beginning, even before the depths of Gen 1:2 were formed (the same word, ἄβυσσος occurs in LXX Gen 1:2 and Prov 8:27–29). Whereas Wisdom is possibly described as being like a "master workman" and thus involved in the creation in the Hebrew of Prov 8:30, in the LXX, Wisdom is here depicted as joined to God through the use of the word ἁρμόζουσα (to be joined, as in marriage). This is significant if we take ἀπαύγασμα to be active, since being the radiance of an object suggests emanation from it, and therefore, ultimately, a kind of union with it, and ἁρμόζουσα has the sense of being united to another. The LXX arguably takes the Hebrew to suggest a kind of unity in the work of God and of Wisdom in creation in a similar way to Hebrews' depiction of the Son in the exordium, though whilst Wisdom is said to have existed "before the age" (πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος) (Prov 8:23), the Son is said to have created "the aeons", and is thus arguably to be seen as having an even more exalted status than Wisdom.[114]

We might also go beyond the reference Lane recognizes, and expand it. At the same time, in Prov 8:31, we read that Wisdom also delights to be in the presence of people, and thus amid the heavenly description of Wisdom, we see emerge a similar spatial contrast to the one for which I argue in Hebrews' exordium, whereby Wisdom, also apparently characterized as "divinized" by depicted unity with God, in some way is also active on earth, and descends. In other traditions, Wisdom suffers rejection, and is even said to return to heaven as a result, as in 1 Enoch 42:2. This V-pattern, so called by Witherington and Beavis, of pre-existence, earthly existence and existence in heaven after rejection is also shared by Phil 2:6–11 and Col 1:15–20.[115] Even if Wisdom is not depicted directly as

---

[114] The interpretation of Prov 8:30 is disputed in the Hebrew. This has been discussed at length by Weeks, "Context," 433–42. The controversy surrounds the meaning of אָמוֹן, which can either be seen as "master craftsman" or "nursling, child". Weeks notes that the latter would not fit well with a passage which seems to stress Wisdom's own power, rather than dependence, but also states that the idea of Wisdom being a master craftsman would be an unusual and sudden attribution at this point. He suggests that it is rather Wisdom's diligence that is being referenced. This does not seem to be the reading in the LXX, however, which has ἁρμόζω (to be joined), an image perhaps of marriage, not childhood, which would denote Wisdom's close union in God's creative work. On the connection with Wis 7:25–26, see also Karrer, *Hebräer*, 121.

[115] Mary Ann Beavis, "Hebrews and Wisdom," 212. See also Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 48. We saw in the literature review that some scholars have tried to link the descending-ascending Christ to gnostic ideas of the *Urmensch* (see especially my comments on Käsemann). However, as Talbert, *Reading John*, 265 has pointed out, the idea of a descending-ascending saviour figure was a) not a necessary component of gnostic speculation, as in Carpocrates' system where Jesus' soul remembered what it had seen in its circuit with the unbegotten God as told in Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 1.25.1–6. See also Origen's *Against Celsus* 6.28, which has an earthly being who fetches *gnosis* from heaven. He, too, points to Wisdom as a more likely backdrop for Christian notions of the descending and ascending Christ, though he suggests that there is a merger in Hebrews of Wisdom-Logos-Angel-Holy Spirit. He also notes that angels were seen to descend to earth in passages like Gen 16, and that there was another tradition of saviour archangels, as in

incarnate, the similarity with Hebrews' depiction of the Son is striking, and may account for why the heavenly Son is seen to descend without any explicit mention of taking flesh at this point. The language of "children" (בָּנִים in Hebrew, υἱέ in the Greek) in Prov 8:32 also rings the proverbial bell with the depiction of humanity as God's children in Hebrews 2:12–14, where we have a term from the same semantic field, παιδία, though Heb 2:12 purports to cite King David by quoting Psalm 22. Furthermore, in Proverbs "the image underscores the intimacy wise human beings have with God through Wisdom," and in Hebrews, they enjoy the same through the salvific actions of the Son.[116]

The rhetorical effect of such an equation in the exordium specifically, however, is to carry on the sense of continuity between what has been revealed before by God and what is revealed in the Son. In 1:1–2, the revelation through the Son is pitched in line with that through the prophets, as the definitive statement of God, and in 1:3 (the equation of the Son to Wisdom), what has come before is woven seamlessly into the latter revelation so that it becomes part of it. The Son through whom God now speaks is precisely the same Wisdom who has always shared in his activity. Moreover, given the position of the description in a reference to creation, the Son is being presented the same agent of creation already known through tradition. This tradition, then, is being employed to support the idea of Christ the agent of creation, and subsequently the narrative of the incarnation that follows (2:14) – by referencing how Wisdom emanated from God, our passage is indicating that Christianity's concept of the incarnation is not something foreign, part of a new religion, but is, in fact, in continuity with all that came before.

4.5 Challenges to Our Reading

Perhaps the major obstacle to understanding ἀπαύγασμα actively, and the Son in relation to Wisdom quite so dramatically, is that ἀπαύγασμα is in fact parallel to χαρακτήρ, which is likely passive, in the description of the Son in 1:3:[117]

---

the *Apocalypse of Moses* where Michael takes Adam to Paradise in the third heaven to await the last day. The *Testament of Job* also sees a descending-ascending angelic figure. He suggests that these two traditions merged with descending/ascending Wisdom, citing 1 Enoch 42:1–2, and he suggests this for Wis 9:1–2 because there Wisdom and the *logos* are equated, and, he argues *logos* itself is identified with an angel in Wis 18:15 interpreted via Exod 12:23. Wisdom is also linked to the Holy Spirit in Wis 9:17, and hence his fourfold description. Ibid., 268–74. I disagree on this latter point, given angels are not mentioned in 18:15, however, acknowledging the motif of descending angels may help contribute to our understanding of why Jesus is said to be above the angels so forcefully in 1:5–14 – he is being made distinct from them perhaps partly in light of their own ability to descend and ascend. Ibid., 268–72.

[116] Yee, "Theology," 95.

[117] Adapted from comments by Thompson, *Hebrews*, 35 and Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 99.

ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης

χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ

The term χαρακτήρ is used only a couple of times in the LXX and is hapax legomenon in the NT. In the LXX, we find it in Lev 13:28, where it occurs in relation to leprosy scars and 2 Macc 4:10 where it refers to Jason's treatment of his countrymen. Neither of these contexts are similar to our context in Hebrews. The other place we find mention of χαρακτήρ in the LXX is 4 Macc 15:4, roughly contemporary with Hebrews, where it denotes a family resemblance. This provides at least a conceptual similarity in that in our Hebrews passage what is being described is the relationship between Father and Son. This sense of "trait" or "characteristic" was common in the ancient world – Philo uses it in this way in *Spec. Leg.* 3.8.9 or *Sacr.* 135 or *Post.* 110, for instance. Its basic, original meaning, was derived from the verb χαράσσω, "engraving" or "stamp" as in the impression on a coin.[118]

In addition, there is a further parallel in 1:3, between the τῆς δόξης and τῆς ὑποστάσεως. In the latter case, what we have is a reference to God's substance, and δόξα can also be seen to be a constituting characteristic of God, part of his substance, in passages such as Isa 42:8; 48:11; and, possibly, 2 Cor 4:4,15.[119] Whilst scholars detail how ὑποστάσεως can have a variety of nuances, for instance, the "substantial nature" or "essence" of a being or object (Pseudo Aristotle, *De Mundo* 4, Ps 38:6), plan (Diod. Sic. 15, 70, 2; 16, 32,3; LXX Ezk 19:5), situation/condition (Jos. *Ant.* 18,24, even Heb. 3:14) or title deed/entitlement (Heb 11:1), it has a basic meaning of that which "stands under".[120] Attridge suggests that the term developed from science and denoted sediment that collects at the bottom of a liquid when it has had time to settle, and eventually came to signify whatever underlies a particular phenomenon, its "fundamental reality."[121] Whilst it does not have the technical sense here, it would come to have as describing a unique person in the Trinity that it would gather in the fourth century, as with the Trinitarian definition at Nicea or in Origen's *Con. Cels.* 8.12, there is a scholarly consensus that it refers here to the essence of God and the relationship of the Son to that essence.[122] At first glance, the use of the term χαρακτήρ seems to be suggesting that the Son bears the stamp of the Father, that is, he resembles him. If this is true, then ought we not to consider ἀπαύγασμα in its passive sense, "reflection", in a similar manner?

---

[118] Williamson, *Philo*, 74–76.
[119] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 99.
[120] Koester, *Hebrews*, 180, and "ὑπόστασις," *BDAG*, 1040–41.
[121] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 44.
[122] Ibid.

There is another, more specific use to which χαρακτήρ was put which might shed light on our passage. In *Leg. All.* 3.95, Philo speaks of a form which God has stamped on the soul. As Williamson explains:

The actual 'image (χαρακτήρ) impressed on the soul, Philo continues, is revealed when we know accurately the meaning of the name Bezalel, about whose work Philo has been speaking. Bezalel means 'in the shadow of God', Philo explains, and 'God's shadow [σκιά] is his Word', the instrument by which God made the world. Humanity, especially in respect of his reason, was made after the Pattern of the Image, i. e. the Word. In other words, humanity is made after the Image, which in turn is the representation of God'.[123]

The above becomes especially significant when we consider that the Son is the one through whom God is said to have spoken in Heb 1:1 – again, there is an implicit, indirect, characterization of the Son as God's word: might it be that there is, in fact, a Philonic link after all? Could this passage explain how Hebrews is using χαρακτήρ ?

The problem here is that, according to Philo, God was a simple being with no definite χαρακτήρ (*Deus* 55); that is, he is completely one and therefore cannot be of the same substance with anything, or anyone, else:

The comrades of the soul, who can hold converse with intelligible incorporeal natures, do not compare the Existent to any form of created things. They have dissociated Him from every category or quality, for it is one of the facts which go to make His blessedness and supreme felicity that His being is apprehended as simple being, without other definite characteristic [ἄνευ χαρακτῆρος τὴν ὕπαρξιν], and thus they do not picture it with form [μορφώσαντες], but admit to their minds the conception of existence only. (Philo, *Deus*, 55 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

The use of χαρακτήρ in Hebrews is therefore virtually a direct contradiction of what Philo says in *Quod Deus* 55. One cannot, under the Philonic description of God here expressed, speak of anything being the χαρακτήρ of his *substance* as in Heb 1:3. In the discussion of the possible intertextual allusions in Hebrews at this juncture, it is important to understand that the primary significance of this phrase in its immediate co-text is to describe the relationship of the Son to the Father. The author of Hebrews may have used terms known to him from his Alexandrian background without taking on the full force of the vocabulary as employed in its original co-text, and it is the immediate co-text of 1:1–4 in which we are to understand both ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ .

We should, in fact, not be so quick to overlook the links between Heb 1:3 and Wis 7:25–26 we discussed earlier, and the likelihood that ἀπαύγασμα is to be understood actively. The term χαρακτήρ might, in fact, be seen as a stronger equivalent of the terms ἀπαύγασμα and εἰκὼν of this passage, which is used

---

[123] Williamson, *Philo*, 76. See also Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 1, 49.

somewhat similarly in Heb 10:1.[124] After all, a stamp is simply a copy of that which made it, a seal which denotes the authenticity of the sender. Williamson concurs: "in 1:3 he uses the word χαρακτὴρ, in the phrase χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, in order to convey as emphatically as he can to his readers his conviction that in Jesus Christ there was given a perfect, visible expression of the underlying truth and reality of God, the truth and reality of God that had hitherto been hinted at [in the prophets]."[125] Williamson continues:

> The Writer is contrasting the real but partial revelation of God vouchsafed through the prophets with the fuller revelation given in Christ 'by a Son'. His readers' immature grasp of Christian doctrine (see 5:11–6:3) needed correction. They had failed to see the splendid fullness of the truth about God displayed in Christ and His unique and pre-eminent status within the divine economy of redemption and revelation. In Christ, the Writer is saying in 1:3, the glory of God blazed forth upon the earth for humanity to see; in Christ the underlying reality of God's Being was laid bare and reproduced in such a way as to display all His essential characteristics. What the Writer of Hebrews uses χαρακτὴρ for in 1:3 is to say something about the significance of the Incarnation, for what he says about the Son is about One who took a real share in human flesh and blood (2:14) … it cannot be denied that the Writer of Hebrews shares the term χαρακτὴρ with Philo and with other Greek philosophers, but in Hebrews it has been pressed into the service of a wholly unphilosophical presentation of the doctrine of the Incarnation.[126]

In this comment by Williamson we see emerge the significance of the terms ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ for the creation reference in 1:2–3. In accordance with the structural analysis of the position of our reference in the exordium, our first creation reference can now also be argued to pertain primarily to the incarnation. We saw earlier how the description of the Son as ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ flowed from the description of the Son as the agent of creation in 1:2, and now we see that it is indeed an elaborate extension of description of the Son in his originally heavenly state, describing him as being one in essence with the Father. This again serves to highlight the status of the one who descends to offer the sacrifice for sin. Whilst we must be careful to distinguish this from later, fuller understandings of the relationship of the persons of the Trinity, as at Nicea, we can argue that what we have in Heb 1:3 is a precursor to such a theology, since "in the present verse χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ reinforces ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης in describing the essential unity and exact resemblance

---

124 Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 99.
125 Williamson, *Philo*, 78. See also, Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 13.
126 Williamson, *Philo*, 79. Altered to avoid gender exclusive language, but capitalization his. See also Cockerill, *Epistle*, 94. Some, like Attridge, see an incarnational reading as anachronistic because the immediate co-text is the pre-existent Son – Attridge, *Hebrews*, 45. However, the exordium, framed by the inclusio on the concept of "heir" in 1:1 and 1:4 groups together the descriptions of Christ and his activity both in the heavenly and the earthly realms and thus can be demonstrated to centre on the incarnation, as described above in this thesis where the structural position of our creation reference is considered.

between God and his Son."[127] This intricate relationship between Father and Son may also explain why we get the change from the Son being the agent of creation in 1:2 to the creator himself in 1:10–12: the Son is joined essentially to the Father, so that his activity is God's own. What is more, the author clothes the Son as Wisdom in this description, again keeping up the focus on the continuity of the revelation to Israel, from the prophets to Christ (1:1). Indeed, as Koester points out, there were occasions when Wisdom was seen to have lived on earth (Bar 3:37) and also to have been exalted to heaven, as in 1 Enoch 42:1–2.[128]

4.6 Φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ (Heb 1:3)

This brings us to the part of 1:3 where we learn the Son is φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, which is translated here as "upholding everything by his powerful word." Among possible meanings, the term φέρω can mean to "bear/carry from one place to another" or "to cause to follow a certain course in direction" but can also mean "to bear/produce," or even to create.[129] The variance in meaning leaves Heb 1:3 open to a diversity of interpretations at this point.

Firstly, let us look at the various meanings of φέρω that might fit the context of Heb 1:3.[130] Some scholars have taken note of the creation context in which we find our term in the exordium. Spicq, for instance suggests the meaning might be to "produce", linking our phrase to Philo's *Her.* 36: "Thou, who givest being [τὰ μὴ ὄντα φέρων] to what is not and generatest all things (*Her.* 36 [Colson, LCL]).[131] We might also consider *Mut.* 256: "And wonder not that God, who brings about [πάντα φέρων] all good things, has brought into being this kind also, and though there be few such upon earth, in Heaven vast is their number" (*Mut.* 256 [Colson, LCL]).[132] In the New Testament, it is worth commenting that we have a similar usage elsewhere, for instance, Mark 4:8 has "other seed fell into good soil and brought forth [φέρω] grain …" (NRSV) and John 12:24 has "very truly, I tell you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain; but if it dies, it bears [φέρω] much fruit" (NRSV). though it

---

[127] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 99.

[128] Koester, *Hebrews*, 187.

[129] "φέρω," *BDAG*, 1052–1053.

[130] It should be noted that the term φέρω had other nuances related to those discussed here. However, I have selected the most appropriate possibilities for Hebrews, based on the co-text of the exordium. For more possible meanings, see "φέρω," *BDAG*, 855 and "φέρω," LSJ, 1922–24.

[131] Notably, Younge's Philo translation takes this phrase τὰ μὴ ὄντα φέρων to suggest "the supporter of things that have no existence", though a comparison with a similar passage in *Mut.* 192 prompts Colson's translation, as he indicates in the footnote to this section. As these usages of φέρω are phrasal, I have retained the original rather than simply indicating the infinitive.

[132] See Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 2, 9.

is used of plants rather than animals/humans. At first, this meaning might seem a nice fit for the context of creation. One could see φέρω having such a meaning since grammatically the description in v. 3 follows on from that in v. 2. If read this way, we would also have a more direct parallel between the exordium's description of the role of the Son in creation, and that of 1:10–12, where he is said to be not merely the agent of creation (as implied in 1:2), but the actual creator. However, there are some other options to consider.

The meaning, "to bear/carry/uphold" given above is arguably the most common, and is the often-cited meaning for Hebrews. This is the translation in NAB, ESV, NASB and Douai-Rheims and is footnoted as an alternative meaning to "sustain" in the NRSV. The general idea is of one physically bearing a load, and was often used of beasts of burden, such as donkeys, as in Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 27. We find similar usage in Luke 23:26, where it is said that Simon of Cyrene carries Jesus' cross. There is, essentially, little to distinguish between the English translations of "to bear/carry/uphold" since the idea is more or less comparable: one is physically holding something and taking its weight. In the case of carrying, there is the additional connotation of movement from one place to another, but it is easy to see why the Greek would employ the same term for any of these English meanings. It could, however, also be used figuratively, as in "to endure". In LXX Num 11:14, for example, Moses says to God: "οὐ δυνήσομαι ἐγὼ μόνος φέρειν τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ὅτι βαρύτερόν μοί ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο," or "I am not able to bear this people alone since this word is a burden to me" (see also Deut 1:9, which recalls this passage). The literal meaning is to "carry" as in a child (Num 11:2), but it is being used metaphorically here to give concrete expression to the burden of God's command.[133] The general idea of the superiority of the Son in 1:4 would fit with the later argument which contrasts Moses with the Son in 3:1–6, where the Son is said to be due more honour than Moses because the builder of the house is more honoured than the house itself, and the "builder of all things is God".

However, we would then have to ask what it means to say the Son "bears/ upholds" the worlds. Hebrews pictures a Son who becomes human in order to offer himself in sacrifice, as we saw earlier, not the stereotyped Atlas who literally "upholds" the world on his shoulders. It is, in fact, due to another figurative sense that we also sometimes have the translation "sustain" in Heb 1:3 (e. g. NJB, NRSV). We have a similar expression in English, "to carry". If I say I am "carrying someone through a bad situation," the suggestion is not that I am physically car-

---

[133]   It may possibly be that we have a textual allusion to Numbers in Heb 1:3, since two words are shared, the word "to bear" and the word for "word", or ῥῆμα. If so, Hebrews ironically reflects on the Numbers verse in that whereas Moses could not "bear" (put up with) Israel, the word, in the sense "command", being too "heavy", by the Son's "word", again in the sense "command", he "bears" (upholds) the "worlds".

rying them, but rather am ensuring they have what they need to get through a difficult situation in terms of support and/or sustenance. In the creative context of Hebrews' exordium, such a meaning is indeed possible, and would be more likely than "to put up with". Although this meaning is not generally listed in the lexicons, absent from LSJ and BDAG, for instance, the Son has just been said to be the agent of creation, so to see him involved in its continual upkeep would seem most logical. The fact φέρων is a present participle in 1:3 and is connected to the creation reference by the conjunction τε would lend credence to such a reading.

Linked to this idea of "sustaining" is ultimately the idea of being in control over the fate of something, even rulership, a known connotation of our term, which refers to God's own governance in passages like LXX Jer 46:16 (MT 39:16) where God says he will φέρω his word against Jerusalem and Judah respectively. The Jeremiah passage also speaks of God's "words" as the vehicle for divine action in such a context of rulership, saying "Behold, I am bringing (φέρω) my words against this city for evil and not for good." (NETS). Perhaps Hebrews gives the Son the same governing powers as that of God in the LXX? The word used in LXX Jer 46:16 here is λόγος, not ῥῆμα, and it is in the plural, not the singular, but the sense of "command" is arguably the same as denoted above, since God has previously uttered these words and is now bringing them to fruition. God's word(s) are in some way the vehicle by which he governs. Whilst we may see a discrepancy between to "rule" and to "sustain" in English, the latter derives from the former in that a ruler was one in charge, whose actions decided the fate of that in their control, and so we can probably accept both nuances.[134]

Spicq was also much taken by the idea of the *logos* as the pilot of the universe, "the ruler and steersman of all" (*Cher.* 36 [Colson, LCL]). This was an analogous idea, where God was said to govern all things by his word.[135] He suggested that what we have in the description of the Son in 1:3 was an analogous concept, as the Son is implicitly characterized as "God's word" since he has spoken through him in 1:1. Spicq makes a valid point and there could be seen here a conceptual link in the two descriptions if we do take *logos* to mean word at this point.[136] However, in *Cher.* 36 we do not find the term φέρω, and in *Migr.* 6, Philo makes it clear that God uses the *logos* as an instrument through which to steer the world – the *logos*, unlike the Son, is not said to bear (φέρων) the universe itself and is but a passive instrument. It is the "rudder" grasped to steer the world, not the helmsman:[137]

---

[134] On the connotation of rulership in Hebrews, see Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 7.
[135] Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 9.
[136] See Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 71.
[137] Ibid. 95–96.

Who, then, can that House be, save the Word who is antecedent to all that has come into existence? The Word, which the Helmsman of the Universe grasps as a rudder to guide all things on their course? Even as, when He was fashioning the world, He employed it as His instrument, that the fabric of His handiwork might be without reproach. (Philo, *Migr.* 6 [Colson, LCL]).

We might also consider that *logos* could refer to the "divine reason" in Philo as much as "word". For instance:

So then the two natures, the reasoning power within us and the divine Word [λόγος] or Reason [λογισμός] above us, are indivisible, yet indivisible as they are they divide other things without number. The divine Word separated and apportioned all that is in nature. Our mind deals with all the things material and immaterial which the mental process brings within its grasp, divides them into an infinity of infinities and never ceases to cleave them. This is the result of its likeness to the Father and Maker of all. (Philo, *Her.* 234–235 [Colson, LCL])

We might, for example, see an echo in the incarnational theology of Hebrews of the idea of the Divine Word separating and "apportioning all that is in nature" and its being like the Father with Heb 1:3. However, the Philonic text continues:

… For the Godhead is without mixture or infusion or parts and yet has become to the whole world the cause of mixture, infusion, division and multiplicity of parts. And thus it will be natural that these two which are in the likeness of God, the mind within us and the mind above us, should subsist without parts or severance and yet be strong and potent to divide and distinguish everything that is. (Philo, *Her.* 236 [Colson, LCL])

We have nothing in Hebrews that compares to the idea that the Godhead becoming "to the whole world the cause of … division and multiplicity of parts", nor of the "mind within us" being made in the likeness of God.[138] In regard of the possibility the Son "sustains/governs", we need to ask if the analysis and understanding of Heb 1:3 as an intertextual allusion to Wis 7, made earlier in this chapter, might help us interpret φέρων in the exordium. Once we recognize that there is an intertextual reference to Wis 7 in the description of the Son as ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης and χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, and given the grammatical link to this description described above, it seems we might finally be able to understand what is being signified in the later section of 1:3 as well.[139] Lane states that the "transcendent dignity of the Son is confessed in Heb 1:3 in language similar to that used in the praise of divine Wisdom in Alexandrian theology," and now we see that, just like Wisdom, the Son "orders (διοικεῖ) all things

---

[138] Some may argue for a parallel with God's mode of speech in "many parts and many ways" in 1:1, but this does not indicate division within the world.

[139] Williamson actually posits that the intertextual link is "sufficient to prove that the Writer of Hebrews, when he came to develop and expound his view of the Person and Work of Christ, applied to Christ titles and appellations applied in the Wisdom literature of Judaism." See Williamson, *Philo*, 97.

well" (Wis 8:1).[140] Wisdom, too, was seen in some way to "uphold" creation, to keep it in order, and actively: the Greek has διοικεῖ in the present tense and active. What we have is thus arguably an extension of what has already been said in 1:3a, just as what we had in 1:3a was an extension of what was said in 1:2b. Whilst one could argue that the verb in Wis 8:1 is different from that occurring in Hebrews, we do find φέρω employed in relation to the divine word's interventional activity towards the world in Wis 18:15–16, which also contains a descent motif for God's word in relation to fidelity: "your all-powerful word leaped from heaven, from the royal throne, into the midst of the land that was doomed, a stern warrior carrying the sharp sword of your authentic command, and stood and filled all things with death, and touched heaven while standing on the earth." (Wis 18:15–16 NRSV). Although the word for sword here is ξίφος, it should indeed be remembered that the Son is indirectly characterized as God's word in Hebrews' exordium, by virtue of the fact it is through him God is said to have spoken (1:2), and the description here of Wisdom as λόγος could be seen as a possible backdrop to the description of the λόγος in Heb 4:12–13, if we accept a christological reading of λόγος at this point: the λόγος in this passage is described in terms of a double edged sword (μάχαιραν δίστομον).

As Williamson rightly stresses:

… if the Writer was doing no more than transposing from the hypostatized Wisdom of Alexandrian speculation to Christ this function of world government, he was not alone among the writers for the N. T. Col 1:17 represents a similar transposition.[141]

Colossians 1:17 describes Jesus as "before all things" and holding them together: καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν. The text does not use φέρω, but appears to apply the sustaining qualities of the *logos* to the Son, in a similar way to that which is often proposed for Hebrews. However, it is not enough to simply note historical considerations – now we understand the presence of this intertextual reference and the extratext, we have to ask what the description means for the internal signification of our passage as we have it located in Hebrews. According to the exordium, the Son is said to sustain all things and is himself active in this – he emanates from God, but is himself distinct and active.[142]

The use of ῥῆμα may be significant here. Whilst the two terms, ῥῆμα and λόγος were sometimes equated, including in relation to God's creative activity in Philo, who says ἀλλὰ διὰ ῥήματος the world was made in *Sacr.* 8 and in *Fug.* 137 stresses God's ῥῆμα as the λόγος from which eternal wisdom flows,

---

[140] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 14.
[141] Williamson, *Philo*, 98.
[142] It is important to remember that God is said to have created the world in Heb 1:2 – the argument is not that Christ is Creator alone as distinct from God.

nevertheless, the exordium of Hebrews does not qualify ῥῆμα as λόγος in the same way as Philo does in the latter and the author could have used λόγος as in 4:12, in which it arguably does also refer to the Son, or as in Wis 18:15.[143] The avoidance of λόγος language, however, may place the emphasis not on Jesus as God's word, but as having a "word" of His own – i. e. the text avoids equating Jesus with λόγος at a point where Jesus' own active role needs to be emphasized. This having been made emphatic, though granted also after mention of the exaltation, the author *then* goes on to say about Jesus having made "purification for sins".[144] In the light of this newly recognized emphasis, we thus see that the act of making purification is itself encapsulated within Christ's own unique role as God's agent of creation who himself actively "sustains" the present created order. This perhaps gives the sense that Jesus' offering the sacrifice was itself envisaged from the beginning and is part of that same sustaining activity.[145]

Understanding the reference to Wisdom, but also how Hebrews takes up this image and employs it in its own context, also helps to explain the combination of the references to Ps 45:6–7 and 102:25–27 in Heb 1:8–12 – the salvific event and subsequent seating of Christ in heaven are bound up with Christ's creative act, his own role in "upholding" creation. The sacrificial act cannot, therefore, be understood apart from Christ's unique description as the agent of creation, and so the primacy of understanding it in relation to the Son's role in creation is, arguably, paramount when considering the rest of Hebrews, which is itself encapsulated in this exordium.

4.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, in this chapter, we have looked at two major aspects of the reference to creation in 1:2–3. First of all, we looked at the structure of the exordium, and where the creation reference comes in relation to the narrative outlined therein. We noted its importance as a key part of a spatial contrast which begins by depicting the heavenly protological role of the Son, then refocuses on his earthly sacrifice before depicting him once more as "above the angels" (1:1–4).

---

[143] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 134 denies that it pertains to Christ; see also Koester, *Hebrews*, 273. The argument is basically that Hebrews does not have a developed *logos* theology like John 1. However, such a reading is ancient, even by Attridge's own admission, since he cites Clement of Alexandria, *Prot.* 27:2, in note 20 among others as having such a reading. On its referring to the Son, see James Swetnam, "Jesus as λόγος in Hebrews 4,12–13," *Bib* 62 (1981):214–24. The focus on the incarnation I propose for the exordium may also be a challenge to the position of Attridge and Koester, since it brings Hebrews more closely in line with John 1 in terms of the unity of the Son and the Father and its connection with the descent to earth to make sacrifice.

[144] Though, as demonstrated above, this is itself subordinate to Christ's salvific act.

[145] This implies that, in Hebrews' logic, the incarnation was itself in some way envisaged from the beginning.

Once recognized, this contrast brought to the foreground the idea of the incarnation in the opening lines to the Epistle. We also noted how an *inclusio* on the notion of "heir" in 1:2 and 1:4 would seem to draw all the aspects of the Christ event as being envisaged together. Grammatically, the description of the Son as heir is both prior to and posterior to the description of the Son who is agent of creation, of one being with the Father, who upholds the world and nevertheless descends and offers sacrifice, before returning to his heavenly position.

In the second section, we looked at the vocabulary choices in the exordium and how they were connected. We saw emerge a close relationship not only between the description of the Son as the radiance of the glory and impress of his substance, but between God as the implied Father and the Son. Crucial to our interpretation was the intertextual allusion to Wis 7:25–26. Whilst some time was given over to historical questions of reliance, in the end the examination of the extratext and intertextuality in which to consider our passage proved most fruitful. It not only helped explicate the relationship between 1:2 and 1:3a, marking the latter as an extension of the former in content as well as structure, but also between 1:3a and 1:3b. In the final analysis of the language employed in Hebrews in relation to the intertextual allusion, we see the support for the proposed stress on the incarnated Christ.

Excursus on Heb 11:3

Although this thesis is focussed on the creation references found in ch. 1–4 of the Epistle to the Hebrews, two of the terms discussed above also occur in 11:3. The two terms are αἰών and ῥῆμα, also in a creation reference, and so we shall discuss them here. The term ὑπόστασις is also found in 1:3 and 11:1. The Greek of 11:1–3 is given below with the NRSV translation:

Ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. ²ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. ³Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι.

Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen. Indeed, by faith our ancestors received approval. By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was made from things that are not visible.

The only variant listed for 11:3 in Nestle-Aland is τὰ βλεπόμενα, which is found in the second hand of D, K, L and Ψ. Attridge suggests that this was probably under the influence of the plural φαινομένων which precedes it.[146] The plural does little to change the overall sense of the verse. However, there are a couple of points which need to be addressed before we can wholly concur with the above translation.

What follows in the rest of chapter 11 is mostly a catalogue of examples of OT figures who "by faith" completed various actions and won God's favour. This raises the question of how the remainder of the chapter relates to this opening declaration. In order to make this verse conform to a similar pattern, some scholars have therefore tried to take the πίστει (by faith) with κατηρτίσθαι (were prepared) to suggest God created the worlds by faith.[147] Others have tried to claim that the reference is to the universe responding by faith to God's word.[148] Grammatically as well as theologically, however, these readings are unlikely. The first would leave the ῥήματι θεοῦ redundant and hard to account for since the dative would signal instrumentality, and the latter is highly improbable because of the passive infinitive "to have been prepared", which, as Attridge makes clear, precludes the possibility that the verse refers in some way to the universe's faithful response.[149] Because of the phrase ῥήματι θεοῦ, what we have, most scholars concur, is a reference to the Genesis account, by which the world is said to be

---

[146] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 305.

[147] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 314 gives the example of Arthur G. Widdess, "A note on Hebrews xi.2," *JTS* 10 (1959):327–29, here, 332.

[148] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 314 refers to Klaus Haacker, "Creatio ex Auditu. Zum Verständnis von Hebr. 11,3," *ZNW* 60 (1969):279–81.

[149] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 314–15.

created when God speaks (Gen 1:1–2:2).[150] In addition, LXX Gen 1:15–17 also shares the verb φαίνω twice regarding the luminaries created to give light to the earth.

That it is the physical creation of the world that is envisaged may also be borne out by the use of the term καταρτίζω. The primary meaning of this verb appears to be "to put in order", so that something might function. It was thus used of cities with the sense "to regulate". For instance, in Dionysus of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* 3.10, we read that the city:

… is still without order and discipline, due to its being newly founded … and it will require long ages and manifold turns of fortune in order to be regulated [καταρτίζω] and freed from those troubles and dissensions with which it is now agitated. [Cary, LCL].[151]

However, although the term does not occur in the Genesis account, καταρτίζω is used in several places in the LXX where most of the above meanings would not make much sense, and the context appears to be, at least in some way, creative. Most notably, we have some instances in the psalms that could shed light on 11:3. Firstly, it could be used of God's creative power.[152] In addition, in LXX Ps 88:38 (MT 89:37), we read: "like the moon, prepared/established forever," ὡς ἡ σελήνη κατηρτισμένη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Here, the Greek seems to carry the sense of being made for a purpose, as it does in LXX Exod 15:17. The latter reads: "Bringing them in, plant them on the mountain of your inheritance, in the ready dwelling place, O LORD, that you prepared [καταρτίζω]."[153] Most importantly for our purposes, however, among the psalm usages of the term καταρτίζω, there even appears to be a direct use of it in relation to the creation account as per Genesis 1 in LXX Ps 73:16 (corrector of Sinaiticus) which speaks about God's creation of the luminaries and the sun using καταρτίζω: σή ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ σή ἐστιν ἡ νύξ σὺ κατηρτίσω φαῦσιν καὶ ἥλιον, "yours is the day and yours is the

---

[150] This is a common motif throughout the Hebrew Bible, LXX, ancient Jewish and early Christian literature: Ps 33(32):6; Wis 9:1; 2 *Bar* 14:17; Philo, *Sacr.* 65; 1 *Clem.* 17:4; *Od Sol.* 16:19 and even John 1:3. In *Fug.* 137, the words ῥῆμα and λόγος appear to be interchangeable and so it is reasonable to conclude they were occasionally used as synonyms, even though I argue that in the exordium the use of ῥῆμα may be to avoid possible confusion with Philo's *logos*. Attridge, Hebrews, 315 n. 117. See also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 569 and Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 330, Thompson, *Hebrews*, 232 and Cockerill, *Epistle*, 523. There is a general scholarly consensus that this is a reference to the Genesis creation account.

[151] It thus had the related sense to "mend" when applied to physical objects. (Matt 4:21; Mark 1:19).

[152] LXX Psalm 17:34 (18:33) has "He made my feet like the feet of a deer, and set me secure on the heights," which refers to the physical creation of the body part, even if a metaphor is being employed that denotes the swiftness attributed to deer.

[153] We find this same connotation in Heb 13:21: "[may God] make you complete [καταρτίζω] in everything good *so that you may do his will*, working among us that which is pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ" (NRSV, italics mine).

night, you prepared illumination and sun."[154] Here, the rare word for "luminaries", φαῦσις, which occurs only four times in the LXX, is the same as that used in LXX Gen 1:14–15. Given what was said above of Heb 11:3 in relation to the Genesis account, and that Hebrews frequently refers to the psalms and so knew them, it is reasonable to argue that καταρτίζω is being deployed similarly in the Epistle at this point.[155]

However, further interpretation is undoubtedly needed to see both what precisely is envisaged in this creation reference and what the significance is of "knowing by faith" that God created it. As with 1:2, we again have to deal with the issue of the plural "ages/worlds". As with the same word in 1:2, some scholars have opted for a wholly spatial understanding – Ellingworth, for example even argues that it is to be understood simply as pertaining to the visible world and is synonymous with βλεπόμενον and that the plural is simply stylistic.[156] An age understood temporally cannot be seen, and a spatial meaning is implied, though one might argue that some NT passages employ such language metaphorically (e.g. Abraham desired to see Jesus' day in John 8:56). Whilst Heb 11:3 shares vocabulary with 1:2–3, such scholars may also argue that is not necessarily to be connected to it. In their view, it is certainly not to be understood as a reference to the Son's activity in creation because the immediate co-text seems to simply be a recalling of the Genesis account of the creation of heaven and earth.[157]

It is also possible to argue that, whilst the verse does indeed point to the Genesis account, and indeed there is no mention of the Son, this does not preclude the possibility of a temporal aspect being envisaged of the creation of the "ages/worlds" as per 1:2.[158] This is especially true when we consider the very

---

[154] The last phrase in Vaticanus says: σὺ κατηρτίσω ἥλιον καὶ σελήνη (you prepared sun and moon).

[155] Gerhard Delling has argued that it has the sense of "to order the aeons" and posits a similar general usage to ἄρτιος, but given the links between this verse and 1:2–3, which uses ποιέω, meaning, simply, to "make", the sense of "create" for καταρτίζω appears more likely. Gerhard Delling, "ἄρτιος," *TDNT* vol. 1, 475–76. See Shepherd of Hermas, Vision 2.4.1: "the world was prepared" [ὁ κόσμος κατηρτίσθη]. The verb καταρτίζω also refers to God's creative actions in early patristic texts, such as regarding the construction of God's temple (*Barn.* 16:6); see also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 315, n. 116. See also *Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate* 1.1: God is one, having created (κτίσας) and prepared (καταρτίσας) all things (τὰ πάντα).

[156] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 569. It is possible to read the second half of the verse in two ways, as we shall see, but in either case, there appears to be some reference to the idea of the world being created from pre-existent material, be that affirmation or denial. We can now also recall that in 1:1, God is said to have spoken through the Son, who is also the agent of creation (1:2). In the light of 11:3, then, it seems that in 1:2 we do, in fact have a reference to the Son as God's creative word. At first, this might seem to contradict what we said above regarding the ῥῆμα of 1:3 belonging to the Son; however, that is not necessarily the case, for what we might have is the interchangeability of their activity as suggested in 1:10–12 where the Son is ascribed the role of creator, previously designated of God in 1:2.

[157] On the range of possible meanings for this term, see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 308–10.

[158] See also Karrer, *Hebräer*, 118.

specific vocabulary links between the two verses. Only in these two verses and 13:8, 21 and 9:26 is the plural used of "world/ages" in Hebrews, and in 11:3, we again have the use of ῥῆμα, when λόγος would equally have been suitable for a depiction of the Genesis account, being from the same verb λέγω used of God's creative speaking in Gen 1:3–29. The latter is also preferred in the LXX, especially in Wisdom when it deals with creation (Wis 9:1) and God's power over it by virtue of being its originator (Wis 12:9). Together, these facts suggest that the author is maybe deliberately recalling that which was said in 1:2–3 specifically. In addition, ῥῆμα may have itself had creative connotations. It is used in the context of God's activity at the exodus in LXX Deut 4:32: "ask about previous days, before your coming to be, since the days God created humanity on the earth, from the furthest heaven if so great a word (ῥῆμα) has happened, or has it ever been heard of?" Here, the author arguably plays on the different meanings for ῥῆμα, which could mean "word" or "thing". The exodus was seen as the time when Israel was created, and here, whilst the meaning "thing" is primary, the other possibility of "word" could be seen to connect the exodus to God's creative act through speech in Gen 1, which is mentioned in the immediately preceding co-text. A further vocabulary link to the exordium is also possibly visible in the use of ὑπόστασις, found in 11:1 and 1:3, though in the former instance it has the sense of "assurance", rather than of "substance" as in the latter.[159] In fact, if we take the "ages/world" to have both a temporal and spatial aspect as in 1:2, it perhaps opens up the possibility of seeing a link between the work of creation envisaged here and the exordium's description of Christ the agent of creation who descends to offer sacrifice. Indeed, Ellingworth suggests:

… the term translated "worlds" also means "ages." It is by the word of God that the "ages" of the world have been ordered and will be brought to their climax (cf. 1:2). The next phrase brings out the significance of these facts – 'so that what is seen has not come into being from things that appear,' or have the quality of visibility. This affirmation is the foundation of the faith exemplified in this chapter – it is not the visible world of daily experience by God and his word that constitute ultimate reality. His word is ultimate because it is the means of creation. Thus, it is also the means of redemption … and final Judgement (12:25–29). To live 'by faith,' then, is from beginning to end to live in accord with the word of God.[160]

The reference to creation in 11:3 serves an exhortative purpose, without any need to try to attach the "through faith" to the "having been prepared" or saying God has created the universe by faith. It introduces a "paradigm of trust" by which to understand the faithfulness of the characters to come, who receive God's promise despite visible obstacles – it is not the visible world of daily expe-

---

[159] On ὑπόστασις in 11:1, see Lane, *Hebrews 9–13*, 325.
[160] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 524. See also Bovon, *New Testament*, 125–26.

rience that matters because it is God who is in control.[161] Understanding 1:2–3 and 11:3 together allows one to see that, ultimately, what is being asked in both the exordium and here is to trust in God's redemptive plan, brought to fruition in the Son: the audience are being asked to act in faith just like their predecessors (11:1–2; see also 2:5–9). Indeed, this exhortation to trust underpins the exhortations which follow in chs. 12 and 13, right up to the very end of the Epistle.

It is interesting that Heb 11:3 speaks of those who were 'ignorant' of God because they failed to perceive he exists 'from the good things that are seen' (cf. Wis 13:1). Instead, they attribute the origin of the visible universe to a created being. The use of the verb νοεῖν in the context of God's creative activity recalls Wis 13:1–5 (see also Rom 1:20). Wisdom there declares: "if they were amazed at their power and working, let them perceive [νοησάτωσαν] from them [created objects] how much more powerful is he who formed them" (Wis 13:4).[162] Lane argues that:

… although the assertion in v. 3*a* that faith is the means through which perception occurs is unusual, it simply makes explicit the basis of the confession of God as Creator in Wis 13:1–5 … Understanding is conferred by faith … The emphasis on knowledge and perception of unseen reality in v. 3 gives to the repeated *πίστει* in vv. 3–31 the meaning "in recognition of what constitutes true reality."[163] Lane posits that the statement that follows in 3b is "a result clause explaining the significance of the truth that is apprehended through faith."[164]

We could add that we also have the verb βλέπω in a creation reference in Wis 13:7: "For while they live among his works, they keep searching, and they trust in what they see, because the things that are seen [βλεπόμενα] are beautiful". This is further evidence of a link between the creation theology of Wisdom and that of Hebrews, and adds to the likelihood of intertextual references in the latter.[165]

However, it is not clear-cut as to how one should understand the second clause of 11:3. The question of where to place the μή (not) equivalent in English translations has been the subject of considerable controversy. There are two main options. Either, it can be placed with the ἐκ φαινομένων (out of the things appearing) to give the sense that the world has an invisible source, or with the perfect infinitive, γεγονέναι (to have become), to deny the world has a visible source. Some scholars prefer the former, others the latter, and both are grammat-

---

[161]   Ibid. See also, Vanhoye, *La Structure*, 184–85.
[162]   Lane, *Hebrews 9–13*, 331.
[163]   Ibid. See also, Williamson, *Philo*, 372–85.
[164]   Lane, *Hebrews 9–13*, 331.
[165]   We also find similar vocabulary in Wis 17:6, though not in a creation context: "Nothing was shining (διεφαίνετο) through to them except a dreadful, self-kindled fire, and in terror they deemed the things that they saw (τὰ βλεπόμενα) to be worse than that unseen appearance."

ically possible.[166] Those who favour placing the "not" with the participle often argue that Hebrews is following a Platonic notion of two realms, and suggesting that earthly things are created out of the heavenly realm of ideas. Again, it is thought that these derive from Philo, as in *Spec.* 1. 328, *Her.* 133–140 or *Cher.* 127.[167] We have seen above that it is not always wise to leap so such conclusions, however. Indeed, Williamson declares:

At first, it seems quite plain that when the Writer of Hebrews came to write 11:3 he was thinking about the creation of the world along Platonic-Philonic lines. But it is possible to come to this conclusion too readily.[168]

Williamson argues, somewhat abruptly, that "what few commentators or interpreters of Hebrews seem to have noticed, perhaps because of their obsession with the problem of correctly correlating the μή in 11:3, is the fact that the preposition the Writer uses before the word φαινομένων is the preposition ἐκ."[169] That is to say:

In 11:3 the Writer of Hebrews is thinking of the stuff *out of* which the world was made. Even where it has been said that the 'invisible realities' allegedly referred to in 11:3, are not particularised, the impression is given that it was 'out of' some kind of supra-mundane, invisible material that the world was made, and this is characterized as 'Platonic' or 'Philonic' doctrine. In fact, if this is the view of the Writer of Hebrews, it is emphatically neither Platonic not Philonic. Nowhere does either of these authors say that the stuff *out of* which the material world was made was the invisible, noumenal reality. The relationship between the intelligible world and the physical world, in both Plato and Philo is that of model to copy. No matter what decision we take about the position of the μήin 11:3 we cannot, it seems to me, read either Platonic or Philonic cosmology out of the verse; in fact, if we are to take the ἐκ seriously, we are bound to conclude that the doctrine in the verse is decidedly un-Platonic and un-Philonic.

Further, in support of this argument, it must be noted that for both Plato and Philo, the 'material' out of which the Creator fashioned the universe was a 'visible' mass, existing at first in the state of chaotic disorder, reduced to order by the Creator using the Ideas or Forms as His patterns. Philo … would presumably have said that this material was itself made by God *ex nihilo*, but not *out of* the Ideas or Forms.[170]

Here, Williamson observes that what seems to be a similarity between Philo and Hebrews – the existence of two worlds – is, in fact, not a similarity at all. The notion of two worlds is arguably shared, but whereas Philo would have seen the material world as a copy of the world of Ideas, Heb 11:3 is perhaps to be

---

[166] Attridge, for example, understands that we should take μή with the participle (*Hebrews*, 315). See also Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 341 and Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 568. However, Lane, *Hebrews 9–13*, 326–27, argues for the alternative. See also Cockerill, *Epistle*, 524.

[167] For Philo's view of creation, a good summary is found in Williamson, *Philo*, 372–83.

[168] Ibid. 377.

[169] Ibid.

[170] Ibid., 378.

understood as referencing the notion of the world being created out of the Ideas themselves:[171]

The Writer of Hebrews in 11:3 is thinking precisely about the stuff out of which τὸ βλεπόμενον was made and is insisting *either* that it was made out of something non-phenomenal (nothing?) *or* that it was *not* made out of anything phenomenal at all. The latter seems to me to be his perfectly clear meaning: that the world we see around us was not manufactured out of anything phenomenal but was created *ex nihilo* by God. The Writer … is affirming the traditional, orthodox Jewish-Christian view of the creation of the physical world *ex nihilo*.[172]

Indeed, as Ellingworth argues, "by the word of God" could conflict with any idea that the visible world was made out of materials in the invisible world.[173] Understanding that the author of Hebrews was insisting upon creation *ex nihilo* might also explain how the two halves of the verse connect: when Heb 11:3 states that it is by faith one comes to know the world was created by the word of God, he is effectively saying:

… by faith, but only by faith, we know that God had simply to say 'Let there be light' for light to come into being. This, for the Writer of Hebrews, is a conclusion which no amount of deductive reasoning can lead to, nor can it be reached by detailed inspection of the world of phenomena … If we look at the world without faith in God it is possible to believe and think that it is a system of physical processes which contains within itself its own explanation.[174]

Moreover, "11:3b expands the statement in 11:3a that 'the world was created by the word of God'. It explains the significance of that truth apprehensible only by faith."[175] Again, we are back to the fact that ch. 11 is an exhortation to

---

[171] See ibid. 382. Williamson also comments on the fact that to Philo the invisible world was perceptible by the intellect, not faith, another divergence between the two authors.

[172] Ibid., 19, see also 378. Lane, *Hebrews 9– 13*, 332, on the other hand, suggests that Hebrews is simply denying the world was created out of pre-existing matter, without it being a direct reference to *creatio ex nihilo*. Whilst this is true, however, one has to ask what the presumed knowledge was on the part of the intended audience, and it would appear that the *creatio ex nihilo* belief was circulating at the time in some Jewish and Christian circles, e. g., 2 Macc 7:28; Rom 4:17. Compare Rom 4:17: "as it is written," I have made you the father of many nations" – in the presence of the God in whom he believed, who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist." (NRSV). Hurst, *Epistle*, 121. This would, however, possibly represent a departure from its reliance on Wisdom, which in 11:17 speaks of God as having created the world from formless matter, though it may have connections to Wis 13:9 and be drawing on the tradition of faithfulness as a way of deducing the work of the creator as against the pagan ignorance of him. Even if God were said to fashion the world from matter he created, as we saw Williamson argued was Philo's view, the general idea was that God was still ultimately the originator of all matter in both Jewish and Christian circles (excepting those gnostic). See also Williamson, *Philo*, 39 on Philo in this regard.

[173] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 569.

[174] Williamson, *Philo*, 379.

[175] Ibid., 381.

faith that God's promises will be accomplished in the Son, and the audience are to trust just as did their forefathers. Importantly, though, by rooting this "faith" in creation, the author is rooting the very essence of being Christian, ultimately, in faith in God the creator, who will eventually shake that which is created (12:26–28, see also 1:10–12). This forms the basis for the exhortations in 12:29–13:21.[176]

The reference in 1:2–3 opens the doorway to everything that follows. In its position in the exordium, it both initiates the discussion of what Christ the Son has accomplished and helps set the incarnational theme for the Epistle that sees the agent of creation offer sacrifice (1:3) and take his seat on high (1:3), the details of which are worked out in the rest of Hebrews, from 2:5–9 that deals with this very incarnation, to the descriptions of Christ's high priestly activity in heaven in chs. 9–10. Then, in 11:3, we find highlighted through a similar reference to creation the basic principle of Christian faith, trust in God despite all appearances, in line with the OT forefathers, which underpins the dramatic exhortations in chs. 12 and 13 that bring the Epistle to a close. It might even be possible to see the two passages, 1:2–3 and 11:3, as in some way scaffolding, perhaps forming a frame for, Hebrews' rhetoric. Heb 11:3 is deliberately recalling the exordium and does so as the Epistle draws to a close, encapsulating all that has been said in between within an *inclusio*, including (as in the *inclusio* on inheritance language in the exordium), the sacrificial actions of Christ, discussed in the intervening chapters. Heb 11:3 then leads on to the description of the effects of faith (11:4–40) and then a section of deliberative rhetoric in the form of exhortations in ch. 12–13, at which point the Epistle ends.

Some discussion of the world behind the text of Hebrews is indeed vital to understanding what is being signified in the Epistle's own world of the text. Hebrews is trying to incorporate preconceived ideas about creation into its own argumentation. Rhetorically, it plays on something familiar to draw the addressees into the Christocentric world the author has created in the Epistle, and thus to become immersed in it. What the creation references do is merge the world behind the text into the world of the text so that the reality experienced by the audience and the reality purported in the Epistle become one in a special way – they root its argumentation not only in the history of Israel, but in the origins of time and space itself, born not of invisible objects, but of the word of God.

---

[176] Hurst, *Epistle*, 121.

Chapter 5

The Hidden Significance of 1:10–12
in the Co-text of 1:5–14

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the reference to creation of the world in 1:10–12. Here, Ps 102:25–27 (101:25–17) is cited so as to proclaim the Son as the one who founded the earth and whose hands made the heavens. The reference comes near the end of a catena of seven scriptural citations. As our second creation reference comes in the form of a quotation, the main DA theory applied to this reference pertains to intertextuality. This chapter will proceed in several stages, beginning with a translation of that catena as a whole. From here, the discussion moves to the perceived focus on the angels in the catena, suggesting an alternative focus. Proposals are then made for a new understanding of the creation reference's significance in the light of the repeated references to the metaphor of "foundations" in the Epistle at 4:3; 6:1; 9:26 and 11:10, and also its proximity to a reference to salvation in 1:14. These proposals pay close attention to how Hebrews uses Scripture, in particular, metalepsis.

5.1.1 Translation of References to Creation in Heb 1:5–14

A translation is given of the whole section in which the creation reference in Heb 1:10–12 is found, in order to make clearer the cohesion present in the catena of which it is a part, which forms a point for discussion.

[5] To which of the angels has he ever said, "You yourself are my son, today I myself have begotten you,
And again, "I myself will be to him a father, and he himself will be to me a son?"
[6] And again, when he leads the firstborn into the world (οἰκουμένη),[1] he says: "Let all the angels of God worship him."
[7] And on the one hand, concerning his angels he says: "the one making his angels winds/spirits and his servants, a flame of fire."
[8] But, on the other hand, to the Son, "Your throne, O God, is to the age of the age,[2] and the sceptre of justice is the sceptre of your kingdom.

---

[1] The precise meaning of "world" will be discussed in the main section of this chapter.
[2] Vaticanus misses the article: lit. 'the age of an age.' However, the meaning remains unaltered and so the presence of the article has been accepted for translation here.

⁹ You loved righteousness and hated lawlessness,
On account of this, God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of rejoicing,
above your companions."
¹⁰ And, "During [the] beginnings, Lord, you yourself laid the foundations of the earth,
and the heavens are [the] works of your hands.
¹¹ They themselves will perish, but you yourself remain,
And they all will be made old like a garment.
¹² And like a cloak you will roll them up, like a garment, and they will be changed, but you
yourself are the same, and your years will not cease."
¹³ But to which of the angels did he ever say, "Seat yourself at my right,
Until I have placed your enemies as a footstool for your feet"?
¹⁴ Are they not all ministering spirits,
being sent out in service for the sake of those about to inherit salvation?

5.1.2 Hebrews 1:5–14 as a Florilegium

The quotation in 1:10–12 comes from Ps 102 (101):26–28, and is the sixth quo-
tation in a catena of seven in Heb 1:5–14. Some scholars, such as Bateman, have
noted that such a string of quotations resembles 4Q Florilegium and similar
ancient texts which linked together quotations from authoritative sources in
a chain to aid their argument. The chain is often likened to a "string of pearls,"
or *haraz*, where each pearl is a citation and the point it makes. These were used
to support a given point or argument.[3] However, to what end Hebrews is using
these citations, what its "point" is, has been the subject of much scholarly debate.

It is relatively easy to see why parallels might be drawn between Heb 1:5–14
and such works when our passage is compared with 4Q Florilegium. William
Lane has identified the following citations in column 1 of the latter, basing his
research on the translation and reconstruction by Allegro:[4]

… And he purposed to build for him a man-made sanctuary in which sacrifices might be made to him; (7) (that there might be) before him works of the Law. And as he said to David, And I shall [give] thee [rest] from all thine enemies – (meaning) that he will give rest to them from a[ll] (8) the sons of Belial who made them stumble to destroy them [and to …] them when they come with the device of [Be]lial to make the s[ons of] (9) Li[ght] stumble and to devise against them wicked imaginations to b[etray] his	2 Sam 7:11b

---

3   Herbert Bateman, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5–13: The Impact of Early Jew-
ish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage*, AUS 193 (New York:
Peter Lang, 1997), 56–77. George H. Guthrie, "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends
in Research," *CBR* 1/2 (2003):271–94, here, 280.
    4   William Lane, "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium," *JBL* 78 (1959):343–46,
here 343, quoting John M. Allegro, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim,"
JBL, 77 (1958):350–54.

[l]ife to Belial through their va[in] error. (10) [And] the Lord [tel]ls you that he will build a house for you, and I will set up your seed after you, and I shall establish his royal throne (11) [for eve]r. I [will be] to him as a father, and he will be to me as a son.	2 Sam 7:11c–14a
He is the Shoot of David who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law, who, (12) [...] in Zi[on in the l]ast days; as it is written, And I shall raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen. That is the tabernacle (13) of David that is fal[len and wh]ich will arise to save Israel.	Amos 9:11

Here, the author cites several texts from the Hebrew Bible, his authoritative collection of texts, and chooses specific passages to support the Qumran community's eschatology. The original text is interpreted in the light of present beliefs and the perceived situation of the community: the sons of the demon Belial are seen to cause the sons of light to stumble (perhaps indicative of temptation or attack) and solace is sought by applying the promise that God will establish a house for David through his descendants and establish for him a royal throne. There is a parallel in the depiction of a messianic and persecuted community (see also Heb 11:37), too, for the text continues

"[Why do] the nations [rag]e and the peoples imag[ine a vain thing? [Ps 2:1] The kings of the earth set] themselves, [and the rul]ers take counsel together against the Lord and against (19) [his anointed. The in]terpretation of the passage [concerns the.. na]tions, and th[ey..] the Elect of Israel in the last days."[5]

There are several parallels with the use of Scripture in Heb 1:5–14. For instance, the use of prooftexts to provide consolation and a promise that the present day community's enemies will be defeated by a Messiah is comparable to Heb 1:13, citing Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1), where the enemies of the Son, Hebrews' own messianic figure, are placed under his feet.[6] It should also be considered that another psalm is ascribed to David in Heb 4:7, suggesting that the psalm citations in our catena are also perceived as Davidic in nature and our text thus stands in another possible parallel with 4Q Florilegium where sayings to David are fulfilled at a later date.[7] Our comparable text even includes the same text from 2 Sam 7:11 as in Heb 1:5, and to more or less the same end: to show that messi-

---

  [5] Lane, "4Q Florilegium," 344.
  [6] However, 2:5–9 suggests an inherent difference in that in Hebrews the eschatology is already partially realized. 4Q Florilegium still seems to see such messianic hope as future, rather than present. The proof text understanding of Hebrews' hermeneutics is disputed, however, with some favouring typology. A good summary of the debate is found in Guthrie, "Recent Trends," 275–91.
  [7] Indeed, the column continues after our citation above with mention of the Levitical priests and a deriding of their activity, which those favouring replacement theology in Hebrews might see as another parallel to its thought. Thompson notes that the citations in 1:5b were once addressed to the Davidic king. Thompson, *Hebrews*, 53.

anic expectation was inherent in the original text. Furthermore, Guthrie notes that Hebrews follows a similar hermeneutical pattern, since both use the catena form and use introductory formulae to open their citations. They also link their quoted passages together on the grounds of "conceptual parallels".[8]

Whilst our catena does appear to take the form of *haraz*, at this point in Hebrews, however, the messianic Son is being contrasted specifically to the angels. The citations are presented in pairs of passages supporting the Son's superiority to the angels, sometimes linked by a catchword.[9]

Hebrews	Quotation	Catchword(s)
1:5	Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14 (1 Chron 17:13)	Son – link to exordium.
1:6	Possibly Ps 97:7 (96:7), more likely LXX Deut 32:43[10]	Angels
1:7	Ps 104:4 (103:4) – this verse also forms a bridge to 1:8–9, with which it is joined more properly in a μὲν … δὲ construction.	
1:8–9	Ps 45:6–7 (44:6–7)	1:8–9 May be connected to v. 13 by the mention of bodily parts: hands/feet, as well as the idea of sitting on a throne.
1:10–12	Ps 102:26–28 (101:26–28)	
1:13–14[11]	Ps 110:1 (109:1)	Angels – inclusio with v. 7

---

[8] Guthrie, "Recent Trends," 280.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Where exactly the citation comes from is the subject of debate. If it is from Ps 97, then Hebrews has adjusted the text from "worship him all (you) angels" to "let all you angels of God worship him." The general consensus is now that it comes from LXX Deut 32:43, which has an addition to MT: "and let [all] the sons of God worship him." Attridge, *Hebrews*, 57. The Deuteronomy reading is lent support by 4Q Deuteronomy[q]. Because LXX Deut 32:43 contains "sons of God" (presumably angels) in a way that would weaken the distinction between the angels and the Son in Hebrews, Ellingworth posits that our author knew it in a slightly different form, which employed "angels". Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 118–19. "The evidence … of the Qumran text (4QDeut[q]) would, therefore, seem to indicate that the author of Hebrews was citing his source faithfully, but that it differed from the text printed as standard in modern critical editions of the LXX." Docherty, "Text Form", 361. For the view that Hebrews is connected to Odes, since Odes 2.43 uses "angels", see Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 28. Our author might also have deliberately changed "sons of God" to angels to suit his own rhetoric contrasting the Son to the angels, or the *Odes* might represent a variant tradition. Docherty concludes "it would be difficult to rule out completely the possibility that the Odes was drawing on earlier textual traditions." Docherty, "Text Form", 361. However, Ellingworth argues against this on the grounds that manuscript evidence indicates this text is no older than the fifth-century Alexandrinus, which shows signs of Christian editing. It may even have been harmonized with Hebrews.

[11] The citation is in 1:13, but v. 14 is co-referential and so I have placed them together.

5.2 The Angels in Heb 1:5–14 – The Usual Understanding

Hebrews 1:5–14 is linked to the exordium by γάρ, indicating that this second subunit in the chapter can be seen to support it.[12] Importantly, there is also lexical cohesion between verses 4 and 5 on "angels", a word which continues to add to the passage's cohesion through lexical repetition in vv. 5, 6, 7 and 13–14. The catena opens with a rhetorical question based on angelology: "to which of the angels has he ever said 'you yourself are my son, today I have begotten you'?" And again, 'I myself will be to him a father, and he will be to me a son'?" In addition, the angels' mutability is stressed in v. 7 where we see that they are transformed at the will of God, and exist merely for his service.[13] They are there to do God's bidding, and God's transformative power over them suggests that they have little say in the matter. Later, in v. 14, we see that angelic service is aimed at aiding the salvation of believers in the Son, and so they are subservient even to humanity. By contrast, the Son behaves willingly in vv. 8–9 by loving righteousness and hating lawlessness. Moreover, he is a king. His kingship is proclaimed, his greatness is declared in vv. 10–12 in relation to his role in creation, serving as a description to highlight his greatness by reflecting anaphorically back to the exordium, where his closeness to God is described by making reference to the Son's own, creative role (1:2–3). Lane also details how Jewish theology traditionally ascribed the to angels a role governing creation, such as Job 38:7; 11Q5 26. 12; 1 Enoch 60:11–21; esp. Jub 2:2 (compare Rev 14:18; 16:5). He thus sees this quotation as further polemic against holding the angels in too high a regard.[14] Our creation reference, then, is nestled in the discourse of the overall passage, which contrasts the Son with these lesser beings. It serves to highlight his superiority even more by re-stating his role in the creation itself, and might be seen as the pinnacle of the contrast between the Son and the angels: the creator Son versus the created and commanded angels.

Notably, whereas the Son was previously described in 1:2 as an agent in creation, here, the Son is himself the Creator: the "Lord" of the psalm applied to him directly (1:10). It may be possible to see an apparent contradiction here in the description of the Son between this citation and 1:2. If we take what was said in our previous chapter concerning the union of the Father with the Son, this is less likely, and the change in the subject of the creative act can be seen rather to be a shift in focus, which switches from the Father's role, to that of the Son in his own right, in order to glorify him.[15] This may have been permitted by the LXX

---

[12] Westfall, *Discourse*, 92.

[13] John P. Meier, "Symmetry and Theology in the OT Citations of Heb 1:5–14," *Bib* 66 (1985):504–33, here, 512–13.

[14] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30.

[15] Koester, *Hebrews*¸ 203 argues that this citation in fact reinforces the original description in 1:2. See also, Thompson, *Hebrews*, 55 and Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30. See also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 126, who notes a link between 1:2 and 1:12 as referring to the Son's eternality.

rendering of the passage. In its original co-text, Hebrew Psalm 102:26–28 (101:26–28) underscores the immutable character of God, where he is contrasted to created order which is subject to decay, but within the context of a suffering penitent, who declared God has afflicted him and shortened his days (v. 24), and he confidently proclaims that God will rescue Israel (v. 25). The LXX takes עָנָה of v. 24 and instead of reading it as the piel form "afflicted", translates with the qal to give ἀπεκρίθη: "he answered" with the result that vv. 23–28 become God's response. It has been suggested that this enabled vv. 25–27 to be interpreted as referring to the creative action of the Son.[16]

Why exactly the Son should be set over and against the angels so emphatically, in this case of *synkrisis*, however, has caused much spilled ink.[17] Typically, in older scholarship, it was ascribed in some way to ancient angel-worship or angel-glorification, and the perceived need for a polemic against it. Henderson, for instance, says: "It was absolutely essential that he should do this [contrast the Son and the angels]; for at the time that this epistle was written there was a strong tendency among the Jews unduly to exalt the angelic hosts."[18] However, this view is now less in favour, given the lack of any explicit discussion or polemic against angel-worship in the rest of the Epistle.[19] Since the catena leads into the exhortation in 2:1–4, to pay greater attention to the word spoken through the Son, it may be simply that it was intended to illustrate the superiority of the Son and that alone.[20] Certainly, modern scholarship tells us that rather than worshipping angels, some Second Temple Jews saw their worship as being *with* the angels, as discussed in Calaway's work.[21] Such a belief is evidenced in first century Judaism, in texts such as 1QSb 4:25–26 as well as in 1 Enoch 39:12–13 and Jubilees 2:2, 18; 15:27; 9:28–33, though such theology might have "compromised the unique mediatorial role he attributes to Christ."[22]

However, it may be that the polemic in 1:5–14 is less to do with angels, and more to so with God's having spoken through the Son. Although there is certainly a contrast between the Son and the angels in 1:5–14, discourse analysis may help us to see that it is not really the angels who are at stake in this passage at all. Whereas the pronoun σύ ("you yourself") appears as the fifth word in LXX Ps 101:26, it would seem, if we presume on the basis of the author's clear knowledge of the LXX that he would have known the original, that the quotation is

---

[16] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30.
[17] Similarly, Heb 3:1–6 uses *synkrisis* to compare the Son and Moses.
[18] George Henderson, *Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: McCall Barbour, 1903), 24.
[19] For example, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 51.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Callaway, *Sabbath*, 168–71. See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 51.
[22] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 51. See also Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 8 and Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 108.

altered in Hebrews so that 'you' (i.e., the Son), becomes the point of departure or 'theme', being placed before 'during the beginnings'. In a sentence with topic-comment articulation, the thematised subject is often, if not usually, the one to whom the author wishes to draw attention and about whom s/he wishes to comment.[23] This matches the use of "you" that comes in the final line of the quotation (v. 12) thus forming an inclusio. This grammatical move serves the purpose of putting the Son at the forefront of the reader's mind, as opposed to the creation itself as the citation continues, and the preceding καί also directly links our passage to the end of v. 9, which ends on "your [companions]". The synophony[24] between σου (your) and σύ (you) cannot be ignored when we consider Hebrews' originally oral character, since the approximately similar nature of the sound lends cohesion to the text so that the quotation from Ps 45 flows directly into that from Ps 102, extending the description of the Son. The placement of the pronoun at the end of the clauses of 9a and 9b is also remarkable, since the usual position would be closer to the start of the sentence, after the verb.[25] The position is retained from LXX Ps 44:7–8, but is a mark of emphasis. In the new co-text, it serves to focalize the Son. Even though the "sceptre of justice" is described, it is the Son who has loved righteousness and hated lawlessness.

When we look at the beginning of v. 9, we see that the Son's actions are also thematized there, albeit without the addition of σύ.[26] This action on the part of the Son in initial position in some way makes the Son himself a propositional topic by virtue of his being the implicit subject of the verb. In fact, the angels are not thematized in v. 8, either, since verse 8 begins πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν (but to the Son), indicating that it is the Son, not the angels in question.[27] Furthermore, because the referent of the point of departure in v. 9 has been featured in the immediate co-text, it may be seen as a point of departure involving renewal for emphasis.[28] This marks a discontinuity in propositional topic from v. 7, where the angels come toward the beginning of the clause, and the emphasis on the Son continues until v. 12. We may note that v. 11 can be seen to begin a separate clause, which starts with a referential point of departure, referring back to the whole of creation as expressed in the merism of v. 10. The comment, stretches into v. 12: "And like a cloak you will roll them up, like a garment, and they will be changed [referents implied: heaven and earth], but you yourself [the Son] are

---

[23] See Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 7–8.
[24] Similarly sounding words are related by "synophony". By contrast, two words which sound the same are called "homophonous".
[25] Ibid., 34–35.
[26] This becomes more obvious in translation since in Greek this is partially obscured by the fact it is a highly inflected language: ἠγάπησας becomes "**you** have loved".
[27] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 122 and Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30.
[28] On points of departure involving renewal, see Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 12.

the same, and your years will not cease."[29] When two or more peripheral, or even core, constituents occur in the same sentence, the ordering principles of Koine Greek suggest that the more focal constituent will follow the less focal one, and thus we can say that the focus of our quotation in that regard is also on the Son's eternality in vv. 11–12.[30] Lane also comments that "the joining of the second extended quotation [vv. 10–12] to the first [vv. 8–9] by conjunctive καί conveys an impression of the mere stringing together of OT texts. The quotations, however, have been purposefully arranged so that they begin and end on the note of the Son's eternal nature," v. 12 being an assertion of the Son's "remaining unceasingly" as much as v. 8 says his throne, i. e. rulership, endures forever.[31] Within the co-text of the first chapter, the author emphasizes that the Son's years will not cease and his throne is "to the age of the age", because he is the one who made the ages (1:2).

Westfall also calls attention to the fact that although the mention of angels in 1:4 might be taken to be an "unanchored brand new entity that indicates a new topic," this term actually belongs to the same semantic domain as "prophets", and both are to be subsumed under the general category of "messenger". We later find the same topic in Heb 2:2, where the message, often thought to be the Torah in line with the tradition that angels were present at Sinai (Deut 33:2; Gal 3:19), is said to have been spoken previously through angels.[32] Thus, the motif of the contrast between God's having spoken formerly and God's speaking in these last days by the Son is continued through the rest of ch. 1 and even into 2:1–4.[33] Indeed, the "finite verb of the joining clauses that link the citations is explicitly a form of λέγω" in vv. 5a, 6, 7, and 13, and the subject of this verb is, in all cases, to be inferred from 1:1, where it is God who speaks.[34] Even the three other joining clauses in vv. 5b, 8 and 10 are connected to their preceding co-texts, and thus to that same motif, but with an ellipsis of both subject and verb:

> 1:5b is dependent on 1:5a for interpretation; and 1:8 and 1:10 are both dependent on 1:7. Therefore, every joining clause has ὁ θεός as the subject and a form of λέγω as the verb, representing each quotation as a message that God spoke, constituting an elaboration of the contrast of the ways in which God spoke in 1:1–2.[35]

---

[29] Alternatively, v. 12b could be seen as initiating a clause, or even sentence, in its own right, with a point of departure that picks up on the preceding comment (see Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 23). Nevertheless, the point about the constituents in v. 12 remains valid.

[30] On constituent order, see Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 32.

[31] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30.

[32] Westfall, *Discourse*, 91. See also Westfall, "Blessed Be," 210–11.

[33] Westfall sees the overall unit ending at 2:4. Westfall, *Discourse*, 89. On the change from exposition to exhortation, however, I follow Guthrie, *Structure*, 144. The change from one to the other as marking subunits is also noted by Neeley, "Discourse," 7.

[34] Ibid., 92. See also Koester, *Hebrews*, 197.

[35] Westfall, *Discourse*, 92.

Westfall notes the interaction of the semantic chain of speech with the first participant chain, which is composed of lexical items that refer to God, who is the speaker in the first nine occurrences of the semantic chain of speech in ch. 1, and the last occurrence of the chain in 2:4.[36] The other two participant chains in fact refer to beneficiaries and intermediate agents of God's speech in 1:1–2:4. The interaction of the semantic chain and first two participant chains in 1:1–14 reflects the focus of the first sentence in Hebrews, God's ultimate messenger to us is the Son through whom he speaks. In 2:1–4, Jesus is the speaker and source of the "things we have heard", the "great salvation" to which one must pay attention. With regards to the third participant chain, which consists of the messengers that God used in the past, every occurrence of the third participant chain provides a contrast with how God has spoken to and through the Son, which gives the reader information about the Son's identity as messenger. The prophets and angels are part of this chain.[37]

The observation that it is God's having spoken that is at stake in the catena of quotations forces us to reassess the significance of the creation reference and its position in the chain of citations, especially since God is said to have spoken through the Son as his agent of creation in 1:2. Indeed, we noted above that it is sixth in a series of seven citations. The number seven in gematria usually pertains to creation (Gen 2:2–3), and so we might be dealing with more of an emphasis on that topic than was first supposed, taking into account the Jewishness of our author as proposed in the introduction of this thesis. With regards to our citation, it is worth mentioning that, whereas the angels more or less disappear after ch. 2 (being mentioned later in 12:2 and 12:22) we see the metaphor of "foundations" elsewhere, often with different words:

Hebrews	Greek	English (NRSV)	Co-text
4:3	… εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου, καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων.	… "They shall not enter my rest," though his works were finished at the foundation of the world.	The threat of Ps 95 is reinterpreted for the Epistle's audience, and the 'rest' it mentions is said to be the rest of God at the end of creation (Gen 2:2). They are threatened that disobedience will lead to their being unable to enter said rest.

---

[36] Westfall, "Blessed Be," 211–13.
[37] Ibid.

Hebrews	Greek	English (NRSV)	Co-text
6:1	Διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα, μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν	Therefore let us go on toward perfection, leaving behind the basic teaching about Christ, and not laying again the foundation: repentance from dead works and faith toward God.	The author of Hebrews chastises his audience for not being more mature in their faith. He wants to move on beyond the basics of Christian teaching.
9:26	ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου· νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν [τῆς] ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται.	for then he would have had to suffer again and again since the foundation of the world. But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself.	The sacrifice of the Son is contrasted to that of the Levitical priests. Had the Son not entered into the "sanctuary not made by human hands," he would have had to suffer since the beginning of the world and make offerings frequently, like the Levitical priests.
11:10	… ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός.	… For he looked forward to the city that has foundations, whose architect and builder is God.	Abraham is said to have set out without knowing where he was going (v. 8) because he had in mind the goal of reaching the eternal city of God.

All but 6:1 are references to a final destiny for the faithful.[38]

---

[38] As the city of a king was where he dwelt (e. g., 2 Sam 6:16) I have included 11:10 as metaphorically referring to being in God's presence. See also 4 Ezra 8:52; 10:27; 2 Bar 5:1–5 and Heb 11:16. Although in 11:10, the reference is specifically to "the city", this might still be subsumed under God's creation of the heavens and earth, since the merism is intended to encompass all creation. The "city" is an image of the eschatological homeland, like the "new Jerusalem" of Rev 21:2). See also Moffitt, *Atonement*, 96–116 on the links to 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.

5.3 The Impact of Heb 1:10–12:
The "Foundations" Metaphor and Salvation

Since all these subsequent passages employ the metaphor of "laying foundations", we can conclude that they are in some way referring back to 1:10–12, and indeed on closer inspection, they attempt in some way to locate the salvific actions of Christ within the context of creation. In 4:3, Christians, by obediently following the Son, are given the opportunity to enter God's rest and in the remainder of that chapter their own salvation history is encompassed within this ultimate goal, which was itself promised to an earlier generation, though they were unable to do so through their disobedience. In 9:26, the Son's offering is contrasted with that of the Levitical priests, and his eternal nature is stressed by reference to our metaphor. Because of this eternal nature, the Son would otherwise have had to suffer "since the foundation of the world", but he has, in fact, appeared "once and for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself" (9:26, NRSV). The reference back to 1:10–12 through this hook phrase serves to contrast the Levitical priesthood, which was part of the old covenant, to that of the Son and allows us to perhaps draw a parallel between its being part of the old covenant which is passing away (8:1–13) and the transformation of heaven and earth in our reference, which will result in the destruction of certain entities (12:26–27).[39] Similarly, 11:10 has an eschatological hue, where Abraham looks forward to the "city that has foundations", designed and built by God, which appears to suggest that Abraham's ultimate destination was heavenly.

Notably, there are also verbal parallels between these passages and our creation reference: in 8:13 we have the same verb, παλαιόω (to grow old) as in 1:11 (the only other time we find it), and in 12:26–27, we not only have the merism of heaven and earth, but also μετάθεσις, which is an emphatic alternative for ἀλλάσσω (to change), found in 1:12. Meanwhile, the Son remains the same, and in 13:8 we have ὁ αὐτός (the same) just as we do in 1:12.[40] Whilst we have the

---

[39] Although 12:26–27 falls without the remit of this thesis, referring more to Hebrews' cosmology than a reference to the biblical creation account, it is important to note that 12:26–27 does not necessarily refer to the destruction of creation. Fildvedt, "Creation," 300–01 argues that 12:26–28 does not refer to the shaking of the earth to its destruction, but rather to an act of "sifting". In 12:26, we read that God intends to shake both heaven and earth, which could mean that he intends to put them to the test. In 12:27, we no longer read about God's intentions, but that the things that were shaken, i.e., did not pass the test, will be taken away whilst those that hold firm will remain. He argues that Hebrews does not claim all created things are to be shaken and removed, but that all things which are shaken and removed are created things, and Hebrews does not speak directly of an uncreated realm that will not be shaken, though he accepts that 1:10–12 could be read as suggesting creation will come to an end. Indeed, μετάθεσις in 12:27 could mean "removal" (as in the NRSV), but it could also be interpreted to mean "transformation" (as in *BDAG*, 639).

[40] Meier, "Symmetry," 518.

yearly (κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν) offering of the high priest in 9:25, the Son's years (τὰ ἔτη) will not cease (1:12) and he is the same forever (1:12) whereas they change over (5:1). The Levitical priesthood is thus situated within the context of creation's overall destiny, which is to be contrasted to the Son's eternality as creator. Again, the thrust of the argument in these latter passages is to adhere to faith in the Son who endures forever. The *qal wahomer* argument (from lesser to greater) in ch. 9 is summarised succinctly in v. 14: "how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to worship the living God!" (Heb 9:14 NRSV).

Furthermore, we should not make too much of the fact that God is said to have created in some of these passages, rather than the Son, given the author's high Christology, as we established in the examination of the exordium. To a reader reading sequentially, the interchangeability of God and the Son in respect of creation is clear (see also 2:10). In fact, 11:10 also reaches back to 3:1–6, by reference to building, which provides direct lexical cohesion between the passages, despite their distance in the Epistle. In 3:1–6, the building activity of the Son is contrasted to Moses' status as servant in God's house in v. 3 as part of an argument to stress the need to follow the Son, again linking salvation to the creative act of Christ. In v. 4, we then have the comment that the builder of everything is God, and thus, I shall argue later in this thesis, we see the same equation of the Son and God's building activity as we have between 1:2 and 1:10–12.

The realization that later passages, scattered throughout the Epistle, refer back to 1:10–12, or, conversely, that our passage might be cataphoric to these references, signals that our creation reference is more important for the discourse of the Epistle than merely forming part of a minor section that pitches the Son against the angels and supports our and Westfall's earlier observations that the angels are not really the objects around which 1:5–13 revolves. Rather, if we employ the DA metaphor of staging, we can see that it provides the initial base for the argumentation to come, through setting the eschatological and salvific situation of the Son's followers within the context of the Son's eternality. There is, in fact, an epideictic quality for our creation citation in 1:10–12 which seems to reflect this in a way, since it places the beginning and end of all creation more firmly in the hands of the Son. In the exordium, the Son is said to bear or sustain creation, but now we see that it can be changed, and the world in fact has no existence apart from the Son. In line with the rhetorical questions that contrast the Son to the angels, the underlying thrust of the argument (using the technique of *synkrisis*) is that it is the Son who is to be followed. Moreover, one's salvation depends on such faith (6:12).[41] In fact, this allows us to see that 6:1 is itself somehow co-textually bound to our citation. The foundational faith

---

[41] Koester, *Hebrews*, 203.

from which our author wishes to move on is in fact what enables believers to partake of the Holy Spirit and through it they have already tasted the powers of the world to come (6:4–5). Notably, there is another reference to creation in 6:7–8 where we have an allusion to Gen 3:17 and the cursing of the land as the result of Adam's sin. The audience are likened to the ground which will either soak up the rain (a metaphor for the message spoken through the Son) and be blessed by God or else fail to accept the rainfall and yield thorns and thistles, as though cursed as it was in Genesis. These things are said "so that you may not become sluggish, but imitators of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises" (Heb 6:12 NRSV).

This prompts us to ask exactly why Hebrews might be employing Ps 102 in 1:10–12, why the author positions the citation in the catena in the first place, and to reassess the prominence that might be ascribed to the Son's creative activity in the context of ch. 1.

5.3.1 Hebrews, Hermeneutics and Intertextuality

Before we begin looking at specific uses of Scripture, it is helpful to have an overview of how the Epistle might use its sources and try to get an overall picture of its hermeneutics, and ask if it deploys the citations arbitrarily or bearing in mind the original co-text from which they came. Various explanations have been given as to Hebrews' use of Scripture and the subject of Hebrews' precise usage of the OT is a delicate one. Scholars even differ in their discernment of exactly how many quotations/allusions the author makes: Longenecker finds about 38, whereas Westcott and Caird find only 29, for instance, and various proposals have been made as to his hermeneutics in general.[42] Whilst it is not the purpose of this thesis to give a thorough account of such theories, there are some key points which need to be made.

Prior to 1960, Hebrews' use of the OT was commonly likened to Philo's allegorical interpretations.[43] To some scholars, the exegesis seemed fairly arbitrary, far-fetched in comparison to today's historical-critical methods.[44] In some circles, the view that Hebrews' exegesis is Alexandrian is making a bit of a comeback. Kenneth Schenck, for instance, argues that there are instances where Hebrews makes "figural" interpretations, and uses "figural intertextuality" whereby a reader makes an intentionally metaphorical reading of a text which

---

[42] For a discussion, see Guthrie, "Currents," 272–75. Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 164; Westcott, *Epistle*, 472; George Bradford Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *CJT* 5 (1959):44–51, here 47.

[43] Moffatt, *Commentary*, xlvi states "the exegetical methods which the author took over from the Alexandrian school are not ours."

[44] Ibid., xliv.

was quite unintended on the part of the author or "sender" of the text.[45] These, he says, are very similar in some respects to those of Philo's allegory, which sought symbolic meaning in biblical texts, especially in respect of the Law. Each commandment is seen by Philo to have an underlying spiritual significance: circumcision, for instance, teaches one to excise pleasures and passions (Philo, *Migr.* 92).[46] He says that keeping the Law will help one to understand the spiritual significance of those commands:

Nay, we should look on all these outward observances as resembling the body, and their inner meanings as resembling the soul … If we keep and observe these, we shall gain a clearer conception of those things of which these are the symbols; and besides that we shall not incur the censure of the many and the charges they are sure to bring against us … (Philo, *Migr.* 93 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

… press on to allegorical interpretations and to recognize that the letter is to the oracle but as the shadow to the substance and that the higher values therein revealed are what really and truly exist (Philo, *Conf.* 190 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

Schenck argues that such non-literal interpretations are found in Hebrews. Rather than think in terms of virtue and vice, however, the Epistle expands such understanding to cover two points in history: the original historical situation of the text, and the eschatological situation of the audience.[47] For instance, Hebrews says in 10:1 that the law has only been a shadow (σκιά) of the good things to come, and not the true form (εἰκών) of these realities.[48] This allegorical interpretation of Scripture, Schenck argues, is what lies behind the mention of the earthly priests offering worship in the sanctuary that is a "sketch and shadow" of the heavenly one (8:5) and the "pattern of the true tent" in 8:2.[49]

Whilst accepting that Hebrews does have some features that are akin to Alexandrian exegesis, other scholars have, however, come to question the conclusion that Hebrews is directly dependent on Alexandrian forms of exegesis. In part, this has been due to the increased understanding of the possible links between Hebrews and apocalyptic literature that we discussed in our previous chapter. Even where there are similarities with Philonic allegory, there are also major differences. For instance, both writers believe in the existence of two temples, but in Hebrews it is the literal, earthly temple which shadows the real one in heaven, whereas Philo thinks of two temples, one being in the world where the High Priest is God's Son and *logos*, the other being the literal soul

---

[45] Kenneth Schenck, "Shadows and Realities," in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*, ed. Brisio Javier Oropeza and Steve Moyise (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2016), 81–92, here 81–83.

[46] Ibid., 86.

[47] Ibid., 87.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., 88.

(*Somn.* 1.215).[50] Moreover, there are some cases where the historical aspect of Hebrews' hermeneutic comes to the fore in a way that shows up the contrast between its partially realised eschatology and Philo's allegory. For instance, both make use of the person of Melchizedek, but to Philo he represents the *logos* and in Hebrews he is "an historical figure who foreshadows the equally historical Christ as high priest:"[51]

But let Melchizedek instead of water offer wine, and give to souls strong drink, that they may be seized by a divine intoxication, more sober than sobriety itself. For he is a priest, even Reason, having as his portion Him that is, and all his thoughts of God are high and vast and sublime: for he is priest of the Most High … (*Leg.* 3.82 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

Here, Melchizedek is seen not as offering sacrifice to God, but rather as feeding human souls, something completely alien to the original text of Gen 14:18–20 where, although he blesses Abraham, Abraham gives him a tenth of everything. Hebrews' argumentation in 7:1–12, however, is no such allegorical interpretation. The author begins with the text itself, and from it draws logical implications, arguably more in line with traditional, even Palestinian, Jewish exegesis than simply that of Philo: Abraham is inferior to Melchizedek, because he pays him a tithe; yes, even the Abraham to whom the promise was made could not compare to this priest. From this deduction, he moves to the Levitical priesthood, to whom a tithe was also due, a connection arguably made behind the scenes by process of *gezerah shavah* to texts like Num 18:21–24. From here, he can compare the two priesthoods in the light of Ps 110:4 (109:4) and then argues: "Now if perfection had been attainable through the levitical priesthood – for the people received the law under this priesthood – what further need would there have been to speak of another priest arising according to the order of Melchizedek, rather than one according to the order of Aaron?" (Heb 7:11 NRSV). Hebrews here has absolute respect for the literal sense of the original text itself, and interprets from it to his own understanding in the light of Christ.

In short, Hebrews' interpretations are less allegorical, and more typological, and this difference is so significant that it cannot be written off as merely a transposition of the allegorical into a temporal framework. Rather, it has to do with Hebrews' own perceived eschatological situation: "the author believed that the old covenant was a valid revelation of God. It had been superseded and

---

[50] Caird, "Exegetical," 45. We might add to Caird's observation that in *Spec.* 1.66, the whole universe is described as a temple, and the sanctuary is designated as heaven. At first, there might seem to be a parallel to Hebrews in respect of a heavenly temple, indeed in *Spec.* 1.67, the temple in Jerusalem is also mentioned, bringing the heavenly and the earthly temples together by saying the latter is made with human hands (compare Heb 8:2; 9:24). However, *Spec.* 1.67–70 goes on to stress the importance of the earthly temple as a place of pilgrimage, whereas in Hebrews, the focus is clearly on the importance of the heavenly sanctuary (8:5–6; 9:24; 10:19).

[51] Ibid.

fulfilled but not abrogated. It contained a genuine foreshadowing of the good things to come, not a Platonic illusion of ultimate reality."[52]

We see that Hebrews had highest regard for the literal sense of Scripture especially clearly when we take into account the mention of the angels in 2:2, where every transgression and disobedience to their message is punished. This is likely a reference to the giving of the Law on Sinai.[53] The angels in ch. 1 are thus not figurative beings, but real ones, serving God (1:7–8) and humanity (1:9), and the law they gave, too, is real and not to be understood as figurative of vice or virtue. It is to be obeyed for what it is: a command ultimately from God. However, as we saw above, the thrust of our own catena in ch. 1 is that God has now spoken through a Son, and disobedience to him is of far greater consequence, and in Hebrews, we can also see that the previous revelation actually itself contained "partial and temporary manifestations of God's *intentions*."[54] Furthermore, in ch. 11, there is a litany of OT characters who did not live long enough to see the fulfilment of the promises, but who nevertheless through faith received that for which they hoped (11:39).[55] This suggests something different from a transmutation of allegorical reading onto a timeframe: if there is something of the Platonic/Philonic "ideal reality" in this, it is a reality in which one already participates in one's earthly life (see also 12:22–24).

We can certainly say that some OT texts were adopted by the Christian community at large as pointing towards the awaited Messiah. Furthermore, these texts were not restricted to those which were openly messianic – Isa 53 on the suffering servant, for instance was used as a proof-text that the Messiah would suffer and die in 1 Cor 15:3.[56] Lindars puts it well when he says "the identification of Jesus with the Messiah not only encouraged the earliest Christians to discover how the messianic prophecies were fulfilled in him, but also enlarged the scope of what was considered to be prophetic," such that OT texts can even be seen to be prophetically spoken by, about or to the Son even in their original co-text.[57] We see this in our own citation in 1:10–12, where the Lord of the Psalm becomes the Son. In fact, such application of texts has caused some schol-

---

[52] Ibid., 46.
[53] This "message" was likely the Torah, given the tradition of angelic mediation on Sinai known through texts such as LXX Deut. 33:2 which has Moses describing angels at God's right hand at the revelation on Sinai, and the reference to transgression. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 37. See also James Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 670–71. According to Gal 3:19, God's giving of the Torah is accompanied by angels. It may be that the author of Hebrews was responding to opponents who were emphasizing that the Torah-giving was accompanied by a great angelic theophany (see also 1 Enoch 1:4 and Heb 12:18–21).
[54] Lindars, *Theology*, 51. Italics his.
[55] Caird, "Exegetical," 46.
[56] Lindars, *Eschatology*, 52–53.
[57] Ibid., 52.

ars, such as Lindars, to question whether even "typology" is an accurate way to describe Hebrews' use of Scripture. Typology specifically refers to a repeated pattern, whereby the "repeat" is the fulfilled version of that which is repeated:

In the modern study of typology it is usually assumed that the Old Testament discloses the pattern of God's saving action in history, which culminates in the act of God in Christ. This then allows the exegete to refer to the fulfilment in Christ in terms of the Old Testament type, so that one can speak of redemption by Christ as a new Exodus or of Christ himself as a new Moses. But that is not the method of Hebrews. In the case of his argument from Psalm 95 [for instance] the application to the future is found within the psalm itself [in ch. 4]. Those who are addressed in the psalm belong to a much later generation, and so the warning cannot apply to the original promised land, but must refer to the future. Thus in this case Hebrews argues on the basis of what he thinks the text actually means.[58]

Essentially, Lindars argues that we have neither allegory nor typology, but rather *analogy* in Hebrews' use of the OT, or at least in some of it.[59] David Moffitt also takes up the question of whether Hebrews is employing analogy when it relates Christ's atoning activity to a heavenly high priesthood.[60] He argues that Hebrews does not, as some claim, develop metaphors out of the biblical depictions of the earthly cult and its sacred space in these descriptions, but rather that:

The affirmation and depiction of Jesus' high-priestly status and heavenly work in Hebrews, together with the author's conception of 'the heavens' as progressively sacred space that contains a heavenly tabernacle/temple, suggest instead that the author assumes a cosmology that allows him to draw analogies between the atoning offering of blood in the holy of holies on earth and Jesus's atoning offering of himself in the ultimate sacred space, the holy of holies in heaven."[61]

His argument that "Hebrews' ways of speaking about the relationship between heavenly and earthly cultic realities work by drawing analogies between assumed heavenly realities and biblically depicted earthly ones" is convincing, since the descriptions of Christ's high priestly activity in heaven do not say, for instance, that by ministering in the earthly tabernacle/temple he ministers in heaven, which would be a metaphor, but rather that he ministers in another space in a like way.[62] Indeed, he discusses how, whilst some Second Temple texts imply heaven as a whole is a sanctuary, others depict a distinct area in the heavens that is a sanctuary, a belief to which the author of Hebrews seems to have

---

[58] Ibid., 54.
[59] Ibid., 55.
[60] David Moffitt, "Serving in the Tabernacle in Heaven: Sacred Space: Jesus's High-Priestly Sacrifice, and Hebrews' Analogical Theology," in *Hebrews in Contexts*, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91, ed. Gabriela Gelardini and Harold Attridge (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 259–79.
[61] Ibid., 260.
[62] Ibid., 261.

ascribed, and indeed the earthly sanctuary was a copy of this, not the other way around (Heb 8:5).[63]

However, even *analogy* might not be a wholly accurate description of the Epistle's use of Scripture: the author of Hebrews certainly draws parallels between his perception of the Christ event and the OT, but this term does little to stress the fulfilment aspect of his theology. Indeed, there is nothing to say that Hebrews cannot employ any or all of these hermeneutical principles at different points in the Epistle. What we can say, however, is that the "proof texts" employed by Hebrews are not necessarily chosen arbitrarily, nor are they necessarily allegorical. Indeed, there is a growing consensus that citations are not plucked completely out of their co-text from their OT situation and applied to Christ. Rather, as can be seen in a number of cases, Hebrews is interpreting its source text as in some way directed to a fulfilled reality in the Son.[64] Moreover, this exegesis, if it were to be effective, must have had some perceived logic or it would not have been able to be employed in such a rhetorical piece, because arbitrary use of source material could have had a severely detrimental effect on the argumentation: the author would risk being criticised by his opponents, and thus diminish his own authority.[65] The question now becomes for us when looking at the citation of Ps 102 in 1:10–12, and especially in the co-text of a catena of quotations, how is he using the quotation, to what extent is he reliant on the original context of the citation in his exposition and to what end? Furthermore, to what extent does that catena form a new context, based on the interaction of Hebrews with other texts, in which to understand our citation?

5.3.2 Reassessing the Co-text of Our Citation: Understanding the Catena and the Significance of vv. 5–6

An understanding of Hebrews' hermeneutics as clarified by DA can help us see how the catena in 1:5–14 might be better understood, and so help us situate our own reference more clearly within it. Firstly, we have some observations that might help rule out the temporal ambiguity we have at the beginning of the catena in vv. 5–6.

Verse 5 is connected to the inheritance of the Son in v. 4, to which verse the introductory formula connects by use of the term γάρ. Here, the author asks

---

[63]   Ibid., 268–69.
[64]   Docherty, *Old Testament*, 4–82 offers a very helpful summary of scholarship and observing that "there is a growing recognition that his [Hebrews' author's] exegesis may be based at least partly on some ambiguity or problem which he perceived within the scriptural text itself, rather than be due entirely to the arbitrary importing of his own ideas into it." Ibid., 82.
[65]   Guthrie, "Currents," 284, indicates that we can no longer assume that Hebrews' use of citations is arbitrary, nor can we ignore the original text from which they came when we come to discuss Hebrews' usage of them.

rhetorically when God has ever said to the angels "today I have begotten you?" and "I will be to him a father and he will be to me a son."[66] It might be seen to form a loose chiasm with v.6, where the Son is described as God's firstborn, with all the inheritance rights that entails, where begetting and bringing into the world can be seen as parallel expressions of the act of fathering:[67]

A   To which of the **angels** has he ever said,

    B   "you yourself are my **son**, today I myself have **begotten you**,

    B' And again, "I myself will be to him a father, and he himself will be to me a son"?

    And again, when he leads the **firstborn into the world** (οἰκουμένη), he says:

A' "let all the **angels** of God worship him." [68]

In the case of v.5, it is often wondered to when the "today" of the Son's being begotten actually refers, and when the Son was declared Son. It is thought the verse might refer to one of a number of points in time, mainly to the eternal generation of the Son, the incarnation or else to his baptism. Others have argued strongly that what we have is a reference to the exaltation overall, and the idea that the Son inherits that title at that point, even if he is in some way seen to be Son from the beginning.[69] Similarly, in the case of v.6, scholarly debate centres around when the Son enters into the world, which partly depends on whether the πάλιν (again) belongs with the verb "he brings", in which case we have a reference to God bringing the Son a second time into the world, or whether it is intended simply as a connective to link together two quotations.[70] Depending on this interpretation, the reference is thought to refer to the exaltation, or per-

---

[66]   He seems here to be stressing a Hellenistic Jewish tradition which preferred not to think of angels as "sons of God". On the preference of the LXX to translate "sons of God" as "angels", though there are exceptions (e.g. Gen 6:2; LXX Ps 28:1), see Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 111.

[67]   On the mention of the firstborn as resuming the theme of inheritance, see Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 26, though the mention of sonship alone is enough to have connotations of inheritance, since in the ancient world the firstborn did not alone inherit, though he had a greater portion. Nevertheless, the verses are to be understood together. Lane also notes a chiasm within v.5 itself:

    A   You are my Son
    B   today I have become your Father
    B' I will be his Father
    A' he will be my Son Ibid., 25. An alternative position is Meier's explanation that the "firstborn" may allude to LXX Ps 88:28, where God declares to David that he will make him the firstborn and "highest among the kings of the earth." Thus, 1:6 is seen to continue the reference to the exaltation. Meier, "Symmetry," 510.

[68]   The precise meaning of "world" will be discussed in the main section of this chapter.

[69]   A good summary of the reasons for and against each of these is given in Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 113–14.

[70]   Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 26. Lane offers a good summary of the debate and argues for the latter.

haps the second coming, or the incarnation.[71] The arguments for the respective positions in each verse can be seen as somewhat interdependent, so I have chosen here to discuss these verses together.[72]

Firstly, perhaps the most obvious sense would be the incarnation, where the "today" could be seen as the moment of it. The word used for "world" is οἰκουμένη, which usually has the meaning of the "inhabited world".[73] This interpretation could also explain the inclusion of the idea of the Son as "firstborn", given that this term was used elsewhere by Christians in connection to the incarnation as in Lk 2:7, though one could argue it is here more properly used in relation to Mary's motherhood, than God's fatherhood.[74] Similarly, the magi are said to worship the Son in Matt 2:11 using προσκυνέω, found in v. 6. Here, the πάλιν of v. 6 might be seen simply as an introductory formula, which opens the citation.[75] However, when the incarnation is specifically spoken of elsewhere in Hebrews as the Son entering the world, the word for "world" is κόσμος (10:5).[76] Also, the Son's entrance into the earthly world signals his being made lower than the angels, not his being exalted above them, in 2:7, 9.[77] By contrast, οἰκουμένη occurs in reference to the world to come in 2:5. If we consider 1:5–6 in the light of 2:5, given the immediately preceding context of 1:3–4, where the Son enters heaven, we could more likely infer a reference to the exaltation in 1:5–6, though this would rely on an equation, to some extent, of the world to come

---

[71] For a sample of the debate, on the possibility of the exaltation, see ibid., 27. I here argue on the main interpretations of vv. 5–6, but other suggestions have been made. Another possibility might be that Hebrews is alluding to the creation of Adam. In the *Life of Adam and Eve* 12:1; 13:2–3; 14:1–3, Satan says that he is envious of Adam because Michael had made the angels worship him because he was made in the image of God. Kugel, *Traditions*, 122–23. As the Son was described in 1:3 as being the "impress of his substance", it might be possible to here see the Son and Adam being equated, perhaps in light of a second Adam tradition, as known in 1 Cor 15:22, though there would be a key difference in that the Son is Adam, rather than a successor to him. The dating would possibly fit, with some scholars positing a first century CE date for it. However, this is debatable. See John Joseph Collins and Daniel C. Harlow, *Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 302–306.

[72] See also Meier, "Symmetry," 506 on their apparently being "spoken" at the same time.

[73] "οἰκουμένη," *BDAG*, 699. Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 2, 17 argues, however, that the reference to οἰκουμένη, which usually refers to the known world, would suggest our author references the incarnation (see also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 56).

[74] For a discussion of this possibility, see Church, *Temple*, 288. He notes the obvious obstacle that it refers to birth from Mary, not God, and also suggests that the term "firstborn" might actually refer to primacy in rank, citing Exod 4:22 and MT Ps 89:28 (LXX 88:28) as examples of such usage. However, I suggest that the language of "heir" and "inheritance", and especially the description of Jesus as "Son" in the immediate co-text would more likely be suggestive of a descendant.

[75] Another suggestion often posited by scholars is that the citation in v. 6 is dependent on LXX Ps 96. In v. 4, we have mention of the οἰκουμένη. Here, it is clearly "the world", as in parallel to "the earth".

[76] Vanhoye, *Letter*, 63; Church, *Temple*, 291.

[77] Koester, *Hebrews*, 193.

and heaven, which is not necessarily the case.[78] Alternatively, it could refer to Christ's entrance into the world at the Parousia, which would also fit with the "world to come" in 2:5.[79] We might here rather see πάλιν as suggesting the Son being brought into the οἰκουμένη a second time, which would point firstly to his eternal generation, as described in the exordium, and then to his exaltation, though not necessarily, since the remarks regarding the use of οἰκουμένη could stand alone.[80]

Another possibility is that these two verses refer to the baptism of the Son. This option rests on the baptismal accounts in Mark 1 and Luke 3, and the possibility that Hebrews knew them. In these passages, Jesus is declared God's Son from the heavens, a not dissimilar depiction to our own catena, where God, assuredly in heaven, is seen to speak concerning his Son, pronouncing him as such. However, Hebrews makes no other reference to the baptism of Jesus, and this would not fit his pattern of introducing a theme and then expanding upon it later. The pneumatology of the gospel baptism accounts is also absent. Nevertheless, the possibility of a reference to the baptism raises the issue of when exactly the Son is, in some way, being declared Son. If it is a reference to the baptism, this may be the point our author envisages.[81] Indeed, scholars have sometimes noted a tension in the designation of Jesus as Son, since it is used of him as pre-existent in the exordium, and later in 1:5, which some scholars take to designate the incarnation.[82] Other scholars propose that the Son inherits the "name" (1:4) Son at the exaltation.[83] However, Jesus is designated as Son from the beginning in Hebrews, as can be deduced from the application of this title specifically in relation to his creative activity in 1:2, especially as understood in conjunction with the description of his being the "impress" of the Father's "substance" in 1:3. In the exordium, the descriptions seem to be of the Son as, essentially, begotten from before creation.[84] Hebrews' theology is evidently not

---

[78] Ibid. For a a very detailed discussion of the use of the term οἰκουμένη in the Epistle, which includes a survey of the debate here mentioned as to its meaning in 1:6, see Moffitt, *Atonement*, 53–119.

[79] Westcott argues for the Parousia in *Epistle*, 22–23; however, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 117–18 notes that the nearest possible reference to this is in 1:13 and argues that the context more strongly suggests the exaltation. As the image is one of enthronement in 1:13, it may be possible to see it as a reference back to the exaltation in 1:3 itself. Meier also adds that this would require the Son to enter the earthly world, which would seem to contradict the use of οἰκουμένη in 2:5. Meier, "Symmetry," 508.

[80] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 26.

[81] On the debate over the meaning of "today", see Koester, *Hebrews*, 191.

[82] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 25–26 is one example, though he sees v. 2 as a proleptic reference to the incarnation. See also Schenck, "Appointment," 98–100.

[83] Schenck, "Appointment," 98–100.

[84] Indeed, Aquinas saw the reference to his being begotten "today" as pertaining to the Son's eternal generation (*Ad Heb.* 49).

one of adoption, because the Sonship is given an eternal and thereby heavenly setting in the exordium.[85]

Nevertheless, one could argue that the immediate co-text of vv. 5–6 still seems to be the exaltation. Although, I stress that the Christ event is to be considered as related strongly to his status as the eternal agent of creation in ch. 1 of this thesis, the movement of the exordium sequentially leads up to the exaltation, as, arguably, does our catena, which in v. 13 refers to God's putting his enemies under the Son's feet.[86] Our citations in vv. 5–6 can be seen as framed by references to the exaltation, or at the very least flowing from the description of it in the exordium.[87]

5.4 *The Meaning of* οἰκουμένη

Once we realize how Scripture is being deployed elsewhere in Hebrews, we can see that the texts behind the citations might guide us to the more likely answer as to the point in Christ's activity that 1:5–6 reference, and in turn see the direction in which the quotations leading up to 1:10–12 lead us.

We have some significant indications that Hebrews is applying Scripture to Christ in a way akin to Lindars' *analogy* in the opening citation from Ps 2:7. The Psalm shares an initial similarity with the co-text in Hebrews by virtue of the fact it deals explicitly with divine speech, and "the fact that the words of this psalm are presented as being spoken by God in heaven (Ps 2:4) raises an interesting question about their addressee."[88] The heavenly setting provides the possibility that the psalm is not spoken to an earthly king, but to another heavenly being, whose identity can then be assigned exegetically.[89] Docherty has observed that there is evidence here of the rabbinic technique of "segmenting" a passage of scripture and assigning it a new co-text.[90] The key term, "son" was

---

[85] Weiss, *Hebräer*, 143 makes a similar argument.

[86] In 2:5–9, the exaltation of the Son is set in parallel to the originally intended putting of enemies under humanity's feet, suggesting that, at least in part enemies are under his feet at this point.

[87] On the connection between these verses and 1:4 as further evidence, see Meier, "Symmetry," 505 and on the framing of the catena in relation to the exaltation in general, ibid., 519.

[88] Docherty, *Old Testament*, 145.

[89] Ibid.

[90] This technique was identified by Alexander Samely, *Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture in the Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 31–39. Notably, the segment is placed in a co-text and key terms in it can be assigned a new reference, topic or meaning. This happens even when the new co-text is intended to be an explication of the older text. The present co-text is our only guide, however, for understanding how its author understood the original co-text for the citation, and this is part of a process of interpretation. Ibid., 31–33. At times, the text is possibly interpreted atomistically, but this does not seem to be the case in Hebrews 1:5. See Docherty, *Old Testament*, 146.

probably originally intended for an Israelite king, as in 2 Sam 7:14. However, the ambiguity of the addressee in the original co-text allows the author of Hebrews to segment off this verse and use it to assert a heavenly origin for Jesus.[91] He asks, and answers, the question "who is the heavenly being to whom this citation is addressed, this heavenly king?" by applying the psalm to the Son. We might add that he may even have seen the mention in Ps 2:2 of God's anointed one as indicating the future messiah.[92]

The original co-text thus becomes important for interpreting the citation in its new position in Hebrews. Since the citation is applied with the original co-text in mind, to solve the riddle of to whom it is addressed originally, we need to ask if and when the Son might become a *king* in Hebrews. Establishing when this happens could help us understand the point in the Son's history to which 1:5 refers.

The Son appears to become king at the exaltation. This is confirmed in 1:8–9 where he is said to have been anointed with the oil of gladness, anointing being part of being enthroned as king, on account of his having loved righteousness, which refers to his earthly life. Historically speaking, in terms of context as well as co-text, we might further comment that the King of Israel was generally considered to become God's son at his enthronement, and in 1:3 the Son takes his place seated at the right of God's majesty after his earthly activity, also described as God's throne in 8:1 and 12:2.[93] Even if one adopts the position that the exordium does see the Son as son eternally, it may be that this filial vocabulary was intended to evoke scriptural memories of kingly exaltation, about which a Jewish-Christian audience could reasonably be presumed to have known.

One could here argue that God is portrayed in Hebrews as King, rather than the Son. However, the Son is specifically designated as a king in his own right in 1:8 by the mention of the sceptre "of his kingdom". It thus seems that the contrast to the angels in 1:5 is the contrast between servants and a king (see also vv. 7, 14), and alludes to the exaltation as the setting for the Son's being declared as such.[94]

Similar observations might be made regarding the second citation in 1:5. By process of *gezerah shavah*, the quotation from Ps 2 is linked by the catchwords υἱός (son) and ἐγώ (I myself) to another citation, which is possibly from

---

[91] Docherty, *Old Testament*, 145. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 53 argues that ancient Israelite monarchs were adopted as sons at their enthronement. Secondly, we might consider the fact that, on one interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10–16, Solomon will become God's Son specifically once the Temple is completed and it is after offering sacrifice, that the Son takes his seat in heaven in 1:3.

[92] Docherty, *Old Testament*, 150.

[93] See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 53.

[94] See also 2:18 where the Son is said to have been tempted whilst on earth. Church, *Temple*, 280 also suggests that there is an echo of Ps 2 in Heb 1:2 and says that it and the quotation in 1:5 complement the reference to Ps 110 "by identifying the Son as the ideal king in whom the promises to the ancient Davidic monarch have now found their eschatological fulfilment."

2 Sam 7:14, but more likely 1 Chr 17:13.[95] This text deals with the promise made to David that a son, Solomon, would build a temple for the Lord, and that God would be as a father to Solomon when he establishes a kingdom for him (1 Chr 17:11–12). On the one hand, this supports the idea of the Son's being declared such at the exaltation. However, as Ellingworth queries, "how can the author apply to Jesus, apparently without question, a text in which, in its OT setting, God is said to deliver a message to David through the prophet Nathan about David's Son Solomon?"[96] Firstly, it should be mentioned that "son" in the original text has its narrow meaning and not the wider sense of "descendant".[97] Moreover, the promise is that his throne will last "for ever", ἕως αἰῶνος, in 17:14. This could be seen as requiring the son of 1 Chr 17 to be eternal. Since the promise was unfulfilled in Solomon, whose kingship did come to an end, this left open the possibility of messianic interpretation. Again, the citation is segmented and lifted into Hebrews to be applied directly to the Son, but with view to resolving an ambiguity in the original text. It is the author's perception of *the* Son as eternal by sharing in the nature of God (Heb 1:2–3) that allows him to apply it to Jesus, and conversely the promise of an eternal kingdom for a specific son, not in fact fulfilled in Solomon, which permits it.[98] The author possibly holds in parallel the idea that the Son is both Son eternally, and Son at the moment of his exaltation, which might help to at least partially resolve the aforementioned temporal tension regarding the designation, "Son".[99] Whatever

---

[95] Chronicles better suits Hebrews' argumentation since the reference to the son's sin present in 2 Samuel is omitted in this text, and the Son of Heb 4:15 is said to be sinless, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 114. Hebrews 3:2 echoes the Chronicler's next verse 1 Chr 17:14.

[96] Ibid., 115.

[97] Ibid.

[98] A messianic interpretation is itself not alien to the original text, however, given the covenantal setting as indicated in 2 Sam 7:10/1 Chr 17:10 and the promise of the Land, especially when we consider that intertextuality is not limited merely to citations. Indeed, in the words of Stephen Moyise, "no text is an island and "it can only be understood as part of a web or matrix of other texts, themselves only to be understood in the light of other texts," and we may speak more properly of dialogical intertextuality. Steve Moyise, "Dialogical Intertextuality" in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*, ed. Brisio Javier Oropeza and Steve Moyise (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2016), 3–15, quotations from 3–4. The matrix set for us is in Hebrews, evidently, the LXX and as Ellingworth puts it: "the texts also resemble, in form and content, statements throughout the Bible about the relationship between God and his people, Israel or the Church (Exod 25:8; 29:45: Lev 26:12; Jer 31:1, 33 [= Heb 8:10]; Ezek 37:27; 2 Cor 6:16; Rev 21:3), statements which summarize the terms of the covenant. It is therefore not surprising that God's promise to David should have been understood as extended beyond Solomon to an ideal King of Davidic descent, known as the Messiah." Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 115. The question of Hebrews' reliance on the LXX is generally accepted. However, some questions have been raised over certain quotations, which vary from the LXX as we know it in either Alexandrinus or Vaticanus. For arguments as to Hebrews' knowledge of the LXX in relation to our own catena, see Docherty, "Text Form," 358–65.

[99] In terms of what was said earlier regarding Jesus as being the Son from eternity, we might also consider that in biblical terms, in the relationship of earthly events to heavenly time, time

one thinks of this proposal, though, when we consider the co-text of the original citation, we still have a reference to kingship, specifically being made a king, which lends further support to the argument that we have a reference to the exaltation of the Son in 1:5.[100]

5.4.1 Metalepsis

What we have in Hebrews' use of the OT at this point is arguably *metalepsis* to support the author's position on the fulfilment of OT prophecy in the Son, and thus the argument that the word spoken through him is superior to that spoken previously. Richard Hays offers a succinct definition of this term as "a rhetorical and poetic device in which one text alludes to an earlier text in a way that evokes resonances of the earlier text *beyond those explicitly cited*. The result is that the interpretation of a metalepsis requires the reader to recover unstated or suppressed correspondences between the two [or more] texts."[101] This continues for the rest of the catena, and the author of Hebrews employs similar exegetical moves when interpreting Deut. 32:43 in Heb 1:6. The speaker would appear in the original to be Moses, who is responding to God's declaration that he will destroy Israel's enemies in vv. 39–43. The text suddenly switches from God's promising that he will "make his arrows drunk with blood … from the head of the commanders of the enemies" (32:43 NETS) to the call "Be glad, O skies, with him, and let all the divine sons do obeisance to him." However, at the same time, there is no explicit indication of a change of speaker and no new speaker is introduced. If God is seen to still be speaking, then to whom does he say these

---

can be seen to telescope, as in Ps 90:4, where a thousand years are like a day to God (see also 2 Pet 3:8, where the converse is also said to be true). Thus, we can consider that Christ's seemingly "becoming" Son and being Son from eternity may in fact be two sides of the one coin, seen to happen simultaneously from a heavenly perspective. In support of such a possibility, we may have evidence for the collapsing of time in Heb 12:22, where Christians are already said to have come in their earthly lives to Mount Zion, a metaphor for heaven. From a DA perspective, the use of the term Son would also not necessarily have to do with Jesus' becoming Son at the exaltation, but could just have provided a hook word in the mind of the reader to the practice of calling a king God's Son at his exaltation, again playing on their presuppositions.

[100] It was mentioned earlier that there is another possibility for the source of the citation – LXX Ps 96. There are certainly verbal parallels with this psalm and the surrounding co-text of our catena, and it may be that the author of Hebrews had both passages in mind. In LXX Ps 96:2, there is reference to δικαιοσύνη καὶ κρίμα righteousness and justice (compare also Heb 1:9 with LXX Ps 96:10); in v. 3 we have πῦρ … φλογιεῖ, which is similar to Heb 1:7, and the heavens of Heb 1:10 find mention in Ps 96:6. Whilst οἰκουμένη in this psalm (v. 4) clearly refers to the earth as part of a merism with heavens in v. 2, nevertheless, the psalm in fact describes the kingship of the Lord (v. 1). It may be that the author is combining echoes of this psalm with a reference to Deuteronomy in order to stress the heavenly kingship of the Son, echoes of which continue in the rest of the catena.

[101] Richard Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 2.

words? Whom does he command to be worshipped? Although metalepsis is sometimes hard to identify, not least because it relies specifically on not making overt references to other parts of the source text, the particular use of this citation in Hebrews appears to try to answer these questions by applying the citation to Jesus: the one whom God commands them to worship is none other than the Son.[102] The fact the author resolves an issue in the original text indicates that he had in mind the overall co-text of the original citation, and it may even be that he assumed a similar query might have been made by his audience. Furthermore, rather than simply segmenting, as described above, this specific use of metalepsis can be seen as encompassing a specific type of intertextuality known as *hypertextuality*. This term, coined by Gérard Genette, refers to the placing of an older *hypotext* into a new co-text called a *hypertext*.[103] Genette begins with two main types of relationship between the text: transformations and imitations, where the basic elements are taken up and adopted for a new purpose, that is a transformation, whereas an imitation is more "stylistic mimicry".[104] In Hebrews, what we have is a transformation of the original text. We might further qualify it by saying that we have a *transposition* called *transdiegetization* where there is a change in the time or place of the action.[105]

There is also the possibility that we might extend the (implicit) reference to Deuteronomy further, and in this we may argue 1:6 to be another reference to the exaltation within the citation's new surrounding co-text in Hebrews. The wording of the introduction to the citation in 1:6 comes very close to Deut 6:10 ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ σε κύριος ὁ θεός[106] σου εἰς τὴν γῆν (whenever the Lord your God brings you into the land [NETS]).[107] What seems to have happened is that the term "you" has been replaced with "firstborn" (πρωτότοκος). Lane and Andriessen both propose that this is under the influence of the tradition of Israel as God's firstborn Son (e. g., Exod 4:22; Hos 2:1; 11:1; Sir 17:17–18). We might add

---

[102] On the issues of divine speech in the preceding co-text, see Docherty, *Old Testament*, 157. On the Son as solving the issue of the mysterious figure, see Church, *Temple*, 287.

[103] Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 5.

[104] Ibid., 7, 25–28. He offers a helpful chart which gives subcategories of such hypertextuality. Whilst it is not the purpose of this thesis to weigh up Genette's theory, a good summary and critique for its usage in the NT is found in Gil Rosenberg, "Hypertextuality" in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*, ed. Brisio Javier Oropeza and Steve Moyise (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2016), 16–28. Although Genette's theory pertains mainly to the use of one entire work in another, Rosenberg establishes its helpfulness in understanding intertextual references in the NT, though he proposes that some additional terms may be added, such as "fulfilment" as specific categories for biblical studies.

[105] Genette, *Palimpsests*, 295–96.

[106] κύριος ὁ θεός indicates the subject, which is shared by Hebrews, though the latter uses a process of ellipsis and the subject is simply carried through from v. 1, where it is ὁ θεός.

[107] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 27. This idea originated with Paul Andriessen, "La Teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de He I 6 et II 14B–III 2" *NovT* 18 (1976):293–313.

to Lane and Andriessen's observation on such possible dialogical intertextuality
the emphasis placed on the firstborn in Deut 21:15–16 in the context of inher-
itance, which is bound by its own wider co-text which includes Israel's safety in
the Land in 33:29–34:5.[108] Seen against this backdrop, the writer might be sug-
gesting that just as God brought Israel to the promised Land, so he is bringing
his Son, to the οἰκουμένη – heaven.[109]

 We said above that this term οἰκουμένη occurs only once more in Hebrews,
in 2:5, where it refers to the "world to come," over which Christ rules, not the
angels. However, we should now follow through on the observation above that
the Son enters heaven after his having tasted death for the salvation of his sib-
lings (1:3; 2:9), at which point he becomes *king*. That is, we have another refer-
ence to the exaltation in 1:6, when we read it in conjunction with v. 5. An objec-
tion might be the use of term οἰκουμένη in place of γῆ (found in Deut 6:10).
However, both are from the same semantic field and οἰκουμένη may even have
been used synonymously with γῆ. While the term οἰκουμένη usually has the
sense of the whole inhabited world, in LXX Psalm 23:1, we find "The earth
[ἡ γῆ] is the Lord's and its fullness, the world [οἰκουμένη], and the living things
in it." (my translation).[110] Hence we can regard οἰκουμένη (world) in 1:6 as in
some ways equivalent to the concept of "rest" in 3:7–4:11, which is also likened
to entrance into the promised Land as a metaphor for entrance into heaven.[111]

---

 [108] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 27. Lane also notes that Christ's entrance into the physical world at
the incarnation, makes him lower than the angels (2:7,9) whereas here he is said to be wor-
shipped by them.

 [109] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 27. Whether Hebrews sees Israel as reaching the promised Land is
disputed, something I discuss later in this thesis.

 [110] Lane (ibid.) offers a good summary of the possible uses of οἰκουμένη and their impact on
one's reading. The use of this term is what has prompted some scholars to conclude the incarna-
tion is being referenced, when it is taken to mean simply "the inhabited world." Attridge, *Hebrews*,
56; Spicq, *L'Épître*, vol. 2, 17.

 [111] Here, οἰκουμένη stands in parallel to ἡ γῆ and may be being used simply as an alternative.
As our author quotes from the Psalms in the immediate co-text, he may possibly have had such
synonymous meaning in mind. Another objection might be that there would be a logical impli-
cation following such an introduction that Israel the "firstborn" would need to be worshipped in
Deuteronomy, in order for there to be a parallel between the original text and the introductory
formula when used specifically with the citation from Deut 32:43, in the co-text of Heb 1:6. This
is not strictly necessary, given two separate statements could equally be being combined to fit the
rhetoric of the author; though, it would be worth considering that following the declaration for
all the angels to "worship him" in Deut. 32:43, there is another command, this time to the nations:
"be glad, O nations, with his people, and let all the angels of God prevail for him … the Lord shall
cleanse the land of his people" (NETS). Respect for Israel is brought into parallel with worship of
the mysterious figure, within the context of angelic loyalty, and the promised land. Although not
strictly worship of Israel, this might have been enough to combine the references in the mind of
the author of the Epistle.

5.5 The Co-text and Creation: the Backwards Motion of the Catena

These observations on other biblical citations in the catena are of utmost importance for our own citation in 1:10–12, both in terms of establishing how the author of Hebrews is reliant on the background of his citations and also for the creation reference's place within the structure of the catena. I here propose that the catena deals with the same events detailed in the exordium, the same descent-ascent motif, but presenting the elements thereof in reverse order, when we see vv. 5–6 as referring to the exaltation, because from the exaltation, we move backwards to the Son's earthly activity in v. 9, where he is said to have loved righteousness and hated lawlessness.

We may begin by looking at the cohesion of the catena, and the cohesive ties used in it. Essentially, the contrast begun in vv. 5–6 between the exalted Son and the angels continues in v. 7, where God's control over them stresses the angels' changeability and servitude (see excursus below). This contrast is indicated by the conjunction δέ. There is then cohesion between vv. 7–8 on the word πρός. However, whilst πρός is generally taken to mean "concerning" in v. 7, it is more likely to have the meaning "to" in v. 8. The dual meaning in the Greek allows for cohesion between the two citations which, in the light of the use of metalepsis, again serves to highlight the contrast between the angels' subservience and the Son's kingship (something which recurs in 2:5–9). Originally, the words cited in 1:8–9 were directed to an Israelite king, but in the LXX we have the ambiguous term ὁ θεός, which could be taken as a nominative or a vocative.[112] This is further complicated by the repetition of σου, begging the question of who the addressee might be.[113] Hebrews resolves these ambiguities by applying the ὁ θεός as a vocative to the Son.[114] The likely use of metalepsis is supported by the μέν … δέ construction between the two verses, where adversative δέ indicates the emphasis the writer intends to place on the Son whose throne endures forever.[115] Hebrews again exploits an ambiguity in the addressor/addressee in the original text to apply it so the *anointed king* is interpreted as Christ the Son, and there is another instance of *transdiegetization*.

The citation from Ps 45:7–8 (44:7–8) is continued past the mention of the sceptre and kingship itself so as to stress that it is precisely *because the Son has loved righteousness and hated lawlessness that he is anointed above his companions*, that he is now a king (v. 9), even though the term "king" is not present. The link between the Son's righteous behaviour and his being anointed king is emphasized by making the "sceptre of justice" the subject of v. 8 by placing

---

[112] Docherty, *Old Testament*, 163–64.
[113] Ibid., 164.
[114] Ibid., This vocative reading is a debated issue, which I discuss in Appendix A.
[115] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 122 and Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30.

the article before it. Although two different terms are used pertaining to "justice" and "righteousness", εὐθύτητος (lit. straightness, denoting one who lives an honest and just life) in v. 8 and δικαιοσύνη (righteousness in the sense of justice and uprightness) in v. 9, the use of two terms from the same semantic domain in turn links the Son's kingship directly to the "righteousness" of v. 9.[116] Notably, Heb 1:9 is a reference to the earthly activity of the Son. There is thus a movement from the exaltation in vv. 5–6 to the incarnation in vv. 7–9, made smooth by the cohesive ties and also the fact that the citations used in 7–9, as those in vv. 5–6, were kingly in the original co-text. This theory is strengthened when we consider the wider original co-text of the citation, based on the author's use of metalepsis: the psalm primarily concerns the righteous actions and nature of the Israelite king: fairer than the sons of men, graciousness is poured on his lips in Ps 45:2, and he rides on for the cause of truth and righteousness in v. 4. Importantly, we know from the rest of the Epistle that the Son's own righteous behaviour is intrinsically linked to his becoming human as "high priest" to offer sacrifice for sin, in that he was tempted on earth but did not sin (2:10,17–18; 4:15), but instead did God's will. The likening of the Son to Melchizidek specifically as King of Righteousness as well as priest in 7:2 is very significant, too, in that it specifically highlights the link between the Son's righteousness and his priesthood, particularly his sacrificial activity.

The increased likelihood that we have two references to the exaltation at the opening of the catena makes visible that same descent/ascent motif we saw present in the exordium, only moving in reverse. Instead of moving from the heir and agent of creation (v. 2) to the earthly activity of Christ and then exaltation (vv. 3–4), we have moved from the greatness of the Son above the angels to his earthly activity. Verses 5–6 correspond to v. 4, where the Son's being given the name "above the angels" is the result of the exaltation. We then move back to the incarnation, corresponding to v. 3, since vv. 8–9 stress the importance of the Son's obtaining his throne as a result of his righteous behaviour on earth. Our own citation in vv. 10–12 continues the reversal of the exordium by bringing it to the creative activity of the Son as in v. 2. We may observe in this regard the use of an organic cohesive tie, the conjunction καί to aid the transition. This signals that our citation in 1:10–12 is to be understood directly in relation to what has come before, and indeed we can see that v. 8 is brought into parallel with v. 12 by means of expressions of eternity: in the first instance, the throne will

---

[116] On the unlikelihood that Hebrews is making two separate points about the Son, see Docherty, *Old Testament*, 165. The Ps 104:4 (103:4) was also linked to God's rule over the world, and Hebrews' author may have seen fit to place it in his catena on the grounds of the tradition comparable to 4 Ezra 8:22, which speaks about God's throne as being beyond measure and his glory beyond comprehension, before describing how the angels tremble before him at whose will they are changed into wind and fire.

endure forever, but the Son will also remain the same, and never grow old.[117] The link between v. 2 and v. 10–12 is often mentioned by scholars, but now we can now add to that observation: the catena of 1:5–14 is, in fact, recapitulating and extending the comments made concerning the Son in the exordium as a whole.[118] John Meier makes a significant observation:

In Heb 1:2b–4 the author was free to write what he wanted, down to the individual words, and to arrange what he wrote in whatever order and pattern pleased him. Obviously, in the case of a catena of OT quotations, he does not enjoy the same absolute freedom. He is not free to undertake a massive rewriting of the OT texts; this would undermine the very purpose of quoting the OT as an authority. Rather, the author can insinuate his theological program by means of the order he gives the catena.[119]

5.5.1 A Break in the Chain

What is interesting, is that our citation is, strictly speaking, the last in the chain to reverse the pattern in the exordium. We would expect our string of quotations to then perhaps move on to the heirship of the Son, as in v. 2. In v. 14, we see the verb κληρονομεῖν resume the noun κληρονόμος in v. 2, but we have mention of the Christian community, whom the angels are to serve as they will one day inherit salvation, and without a back-up citation. The proverbial buck seems to stop with the creator-Son, just as it was the creator-Son around which the exordium pivoted. The only remaining citation in fact, refers back to the exaltation, through the mention of the enemies being placed under the Son's feet (Ps 110:1 [109:1]). Undoubtedly, the scene is set for this citation in v. 3, where the Son sits at the right of God's majesty, as the same text is alluded to there, for the psalm verse begins "The Lord said to my Lord," (κάθου) on my right until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet" (NETS).[120] In the Hebrew, the speaker is originally God, called by name using the Tetragram, speaking to the king, אֲדֹנִי, but the LXX has κύριος in both instances, and it would appear that, as above, Hebrews has, given

---

[117] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 30.

[118] See also Lane, *Hebrews*, 24. Closer attention to the use of the psalms reveals that the motion moves in the opposite way to that which he proposes: instead of following the general pattern of the exordium, it moves backwards through the descriptions found in the exordium. I acknowledge Lane's point that there may be a reference to being heir in v. 6 in virtue of the fact that the Son is described as "firstborn" with all the inheritance rights that entails in ancient Israel and the ancient world more widely; however, I think that it more rightly belongs with the mention of inheritance we have in v. 4 than with 2b. On the backwards movement of exordium see also Thompson, *Hebrews*, 51–52, though he sees the exaltation of the Son as beginning in v. 2 and that this verse is connected to the Son's exaltation, which is when he becomes heir; nevertheless, he does recognize the presence of the pattern of pre-existence, incarnation and exaltation, understanding the Son to become truly heir only after his exaltation (ibid., 38–39). See also Meier, "Symmetry," 523–24.

[119] Meier, "Symmetry," 505.

[120] See Docherty, *Old Testament*, 168.

the application of this title to Christ generally speaking, again transposed its hypotext so that in the Epistle it becomes God speaking to the Son.[121]

An understanding of how the author of Hebrews had in mind the background co-text of the original of Ps 102 (101) in Heb 1:10–12, though, may help us to understand this break in the pattern that comes at this point, and in an acknowledgement of it, the significance of the creation reference really comes to the fore – and here we move on to the importance of having identified the reversed descent/ascent motif.

There are some interpretive issues concerning the original Psalm, and the verses employed in Hebrews. Firstly, much of it is written in the first person singular, which begs questions of its origins, and form-critics have argued that it is the lament of an individual, not of the community.[122] However, the superscription "A prayer of the afflicted when he is faint and pleading before the Lord," suggests the psalm may have served as "a kind of pattern, which was used in public worship … for the prayers of lament of an individual."[123] This raises the question of how original the prophetic elements are in our psalm. It is somewhat difficult to understand how vv. 12–22 and vv. 24–29 from which our citation comes (vv. 26–28), fit into this overall schema, and this has sometimes led to the conclusion that there were originally several psalms which were joined together.[124]

However, some scholars have called this presupposition of multiple sources into doubt. Weiser, for example, states that the psalm would likely have been recited in a cultic context, and:

… the essential theme of the cultic ceremony, the appearance of God before the cult community (v. 16), at which his dominion and his salvation are revealed and realized afresh, is for the worshipper, too, the point at which he becomes assured that his supplications have been granted (vv. 17, 20).[125]

---

[121] See also, Ibid.

[122] For a summary of the debate, see Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, Continental Commentaries, trans. Hilton C. Oswald (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); trans. of *Psalmen*, vol. 2, BKAT 15 ((Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), 283.

[123] Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*, OTL (London: SCM, 1962), 652. For more on the possible division of the psalm, see Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101–150*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005), 20–22. They argue that the stylistic agreements between the lament and the Zion sections of the psalm may be the result of imitation rather than original unity and state that v. 25 and the profession of God's existence from generation to generation continues the fundamental psalm in vv. 2–12. Nevertheless, our citation represents a closed segment. Ibid., 21. Interestingly, they note how vv. 26–28 take the statement about God's nature in v. 25 further, since God is said to exist before the initial creation, and if the cosmos vanishes, God remains: "he remains one who is, and his years are not the years that follow one another in the course of time but a constant present." Ibid., 22. We recall what was said earlier about the possible collapse of time in Hebrews, and Ps 102 may have also influenced our author in regard of this theology.

[124] See Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms I: 1–50*, AB 16 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), 10.

[125] Weiser, *Psalms*, 653.

Kraus disagrees in part with this proposal, saying that an interpretation that fits the content would need to adhere more strictly to the conventions of the category.[126] However, arguing more for its unity, Kraus notes that it is not extraordinary for hymnic elements to be included in laments, and that we see the lamenting person hymnically recalling God's activity either at creation or to save within other psalms (e. g., Ps 9, 77). He also posits that the more prophetic element of the psalms can be accounted for by considering the historical situation in which it was likely written and argues that "at the time of the exile all those hymnic contents to which the lamenting petitioner clung in earlier times became doubtful," because it seemed God had abandoned his people.[127] It was difficult to recognise the Lord as the judge of the nations once Israel had been handed over to gentile powers, and so he comforts himself with hopes and prophecy.[128] Rolf A. Jacobson argues similarly:

V. 11 laments the brevity of the psalmist's mortal existence while the latter section praises and expresses confidence in the eternity of the Lord's reign. The confession of confidence, therefore, takes up exactly where the complaint section left off … the existential crisis of the psalmist leads, at least metaphorically, to that dead end where all human existence ends: mortality. The answer, at least metaphorically, to human finitude and mortality is the divine infinitude and immortality. The answer to both the crises of the individual and the crises of the community arises from the same well: the Lord. Your memorial endures throughout each generation.[129]

In any case, it seems that the psalm was known in its unusual form by the time of the LXX, which is the text cited in the Epistle.[130] In its overall pattern, what emerges is a motif of time, which ties the psalm together.

We can propose the following structure for the psalm: there is a long section of complaint in vv. 3–11 where the person lamenting complains to God about their situation and loneliness, a long section expressing confidence in vv. 12–22, asserting that God will act on behalf of his people, and the appointed time has come, followed by a brief petition in vv. 23–24, and a final expression of confidence in vv. 25–28, where it is said that because of God's magnitude and eternal greatness as creator of the world, whilst the world will be changed like a garment, the children of his servants will live secure, established in his presence (v . 28).[131] Psalm 102 (101) contains the assurance for future generations to be in God's presence, on account of his role as the creator, and ultimately as the sustainer

---

[126]   Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 283.

[127]   Ibid.

[128]   Ibid., 284.

[129]   Rolf A Jacobson, "Psalm 102" in Nancy deClaissé-Walford et al., *The Book of Psalms*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 749–58, here, 754.

[130]   In addition, the latter part of Ps 102 is found at Qumran in 4Q84 and 11Q5.

[131]   Jacobsen, "Psalm 102," 748–49. Verse 19 (LXX 101:19) commands that a record be made for a future generation, so that "the people being created" (λαὸς ὁ κτιζόμενος) will praise the Lord.

of creation with power to change that creation. Moreover, it is steadfastness and fidelity to him, which ensures the survival of generations to come. And, crucially, the appointed time is here for deliverance. Hossfeld and Zenger comment:[132]

> The starting point is the central position of v. 19, where the commission to write down the future promises for Zion is issued to a present addressee. The purpose is to confirm the promise made to Zion for a future generation that is to praise YHWH. The content of praise or program for the future, is given in vv. 20–23, in which the distant future is described in final infinitive clauses. Therefore, the time frames within the whole section of vv. 13–22 must be distinguished … Verse 14 … announces the future beginning of YHWH's engagement on behalf of Zion. Verse 15 … reports the human acts that are the present reason for YHWH's actions, the goal of which in the distant future is indicated in v. 16 … vv. 17–18, 20 refer to the present conditions for the goals of the distant future, things that have already happened in the present or are in progress.[133]

In terms of Hebrews, how the structure of the psalm relates to the citation in 1:10–12 has been taken up by Philip Church.[134] He proposes that what the psalm says about created order is subsumed under the main topic emerging throughout the psalm: the Lord will endure and will restore Zion and redeem his people.[135] He argues thus:

> [that it would] seem incongruous that a psalm reflecting the traditions of the restoration of Zion and a new act of salvation, and concluding that the descendants of the servants of YHWH will live securely and be established in YHWH's presence, should then deconstruct it with the suggestion that the earth on which those servants live will ultimately disappear.[136]

Rather, creation, will be renewed, as is the case with Zion, and future generations will prosper there.[137]

To make his argument, Church goes back to the Hebrew. He notes the ambiguity in the use of the imperfect in the Hebrew, which means v. 27 could be translated "they may perish, but you will continue," and the fact that the image of a garment wearing out and being changed does not necessarily imply its dissolution but rather a change in its state as would be usual with the hiphil of חלף (as in the renewal of the grass in Ps 90:5–6). These facts mean that we could read the psalm as anticipating the renewal of creation, not its destruction in the original.[138] He then looks at the LXX translation, and makes a similar argument that it reflects the Hebrew wording. Although the LXX uses the future middle of

---

[132] Notably, the term καιρός in LXX Ps 101:14 occurs in Heb 9:9–10 and 11:11, 15, and appointed time is a motif in Hebrews.

[133] Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 3*, 24:

[134] Church, "Renewal," 273.

[135] Ibid.

[136] Ibid., 274.

[137] Ibid., 2.

[138] Ibid., 276–77.

ἀπόλλυμι which can mean destruction, its semantic range also includes situations where this is not permanent. It is even used this way of creation in the NT: in 2 Pet 3:6 the antediluvian world 'perished' (ἀπώλετο), but we know that this was not once and for all.[139] Furthermore, the notion of perishing is elaborated by the future passive indicative of παλαιόω (to become old) which "paves the way" for the passive use of ἀλλάσσω in "you will roll them up and they shall be changed," and as in the Hebrew "the symbolism pictures, not the destruction of the created order, but its deterioration, followed by its eventual renewal in a new creative act of God."[140] Moreover, in the psalm, this promise of the new creation is held out to the future generations: "The children of your servants shall live secure; their offspring shall be established in your presence" (Ps 102:28, NRSV).

From here, Church discusses Hebrews' use of the psalm to conclude that this is how the Epistle understood it. There are some minor changes from the LXX, such as ἀλλάσσω (change) becomes ἑλίσσω (roll up), and the additional repetition of the phrase "like a garment," and he argues that these strengthen the elaboration in 1:11b-12a to emphasize the same sense of deterioration with view to renewal. The additional "like a garment" is in fact important in this regard because it turns the three lines into a concentric structure:[141]

A: all of them like clothing will grow old,

B: and as a cloak you will roll them up,

A: like clothing they will also be changed

Dealing with the A lines, Church argues that the fact the created order will grow old can be seen to complement the statement of the previous line in the same way as it did in the Hebrew and Greek Psalter. The verb παλαιόω in fact occurs only four times in the NT, and three of those are in the Epistle. Whilst at 8:13

---

[139] Ibid., 278.

[140] Ibid.

[141] See also Ibid., 284. In this regard it is also interesting that in the B line, there is the presence of the LXX of Ps 102 of ἑλίσσω (Ps 102:27 [101:27] has ἀλλάξεις in the original of Sinaiticus, but ἑλίξεις in Vaticanus). This usage can be argued to suggest a link to Isaiah 34–35, to which, incidentally, the description of creation's being shaken in 12:22–24 is also linked by allusion to Isa 35:3 and the lifting of drooping hands and strengthening weak knees. In Isa 34:4, the rolling up of the heavens is a prophetic hyperbole which depicts God's judgement in cosmic terms, with the outcome of a temporary return to primordial chaos (in 34:10, for instance, there is said to be no more night or day). However, the scroll is not destroyed, but stored until it is reused, and in Isa 34, the wicked are judged and removed, and the human dwelling depopulated before it is re-inhabited with wild animals and birds (34:9–17). Church says that "if this echo is correctly heard, then, this context [co-text] can be brought into Hebrews 1:10–12, indicating not the dissolution of the created order, but the removal of the old to make way for the new as the created order is 'changed.'" Ibid., 284–85. We might add to his observations that whilst at first a relatively bleak description is given in Ch. 34 of the depopulated earth, in ch. 35, a very positive picture is then painted of a renewed world where deserts are revived by streams and Arabah blossom (35:1,6) and so those who are fearful are to be exhorted to be strong because God will come to save them (35:4).

it is found in the sense of becoming obsolete, to indicate the passing of the old covenant, it is there used with the noun ἀφανισμός (vanishing), not the verb ἀλλάσσω (change) as here. The image is one of change, not destruction, something emphasized by the addition of the second A line due to the repetition of the image of clothing and its subsequent qualification as "being changed". Although the creative order grows old, a qualification is stressed in terms of this verb ἀλλάσσω to indicate that the idea of destruction is not permanent.[142]

I posit that what Hebrews does, however, is hold out this promise of a future renewed creation to believers in 1:14 by the use of the rhetorical question regarding the angels in 1:13. In the psalm, there is visibly a partially realised eschatology which sees the salvation of future generations linked to the promise of creation's renewal. What the author of Hebrews has done is apply the concept of a promised salvation in Ps 102 to his own situation. The transposition of the creation citation itself is made to apply the creative activity of God to the Son (vv. 10–12), by applying the term "Lord" specifically to him. The promise of salvation which comes in the psalm is then transposed in vv. 13–14 onto that same Son's salvific activity, where the descendants who will experience salvation in the psalm become believers in the Son. This is a feat, once again, of *transdiegetization* whereby the partially realized salvation of the psalm is transposed to the present-day situation of the Epistle's author and audience and becomes the Epistle's partially realized eschatology.

5.5.2 The Implications of the Above Intertextuality for the Link Between Creation and Salvation

Verse 13, which recapitulates the exaltation, can now be seen as a link between vv. 10–12 and the rest of the catena, and between the catena and the Epistle's argumentation more generally. We saw how the catena reiterates the descent/ascent motif of the exordium, but in such a way as to mention near the end the Son as creator. In v. 13, we have another reference to the exaltation, something that can be seen when we examine the link between the phrase "under his feet" here and in 2:8–9, where it is implied Christ has everything under his feet as a result of being "crowned with glory and honour" following his death. Moreover, harking back to 1:3 is indicated by the use of "glory" in 2:9. Because of 1:13's close association with the creation reference in vv. 10–12, the brief recapitulation regarding the exaltation reminds the audience that it is specifically the *creator* Son who has descended (v. 9) and then ascended, and he is the one under whose feet the enemies have been placed (v. 13). This may explain the *inclusio* between "to which of the angels …" (1:13) and "to which of the

---

[142] Indeed, ἀλλάσσω is used elsewhere in the NT to indicate being changed for the better, as in 1 Cor 15:51–52, which is also a divine passive. Ibid., 283.

angels …" (1:5): all that was to be said in the catena, has now been said regarding the Son, and the Epistle can move on to more fully discuss the salvation of believers (v. 14).[143] Our creation citation can now be viewed in conjunction with vv. 13–14 as a cataphoric reference to 2:5–9, which specifically casts the salvific work of Christ within the context of the incarnation. As in the exordium, the divine origins of the Son and his role in creation are the basis for the salvific act, and salvation is once again seen as linked to his governing of all creation.

In a sense, this partially realized eschatology governs subsequent references to creation in the Epistle, something perhaps supported by the repeated metaphor of "foundations" we examined earlier, which links them directly back to the citation in 1:10–12. We saw above that our pattern ends on the sixth citation, but the seventh in conjunction with v. 14 points to the salvation of believers. The significance of having seven citations in total comes to the fore in ch. 4. The seventh day was the day of rest, and the seventh quotation is arguably linked implicitly to it in Heb 4:3 via that same partially realised eschatology as Hebrews recalls God's rest at the "foundation" of the world.[144] The ultimate salvation of the audience, by the following of the Son into heaven, is described in terms of entering eternal rest and the foundations of the world are linked to that salvation with the reference to Gen 2:2 in 4:3, that is, to the Sabbath. Furthermore, that said salvation is also partially realized, is implied in the words of 4:14–16:

Since, then, we have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast to our confession. For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but we have one who in every respect has been tested as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore approach the throne of grace with boldness, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need. (Heb. 4:14–16 NRSV)

We also find a link between the salvation of Christians in the same eschatological framework in conjunction with a reference to the "foundation of the world," in 9:25–26. Here, the creator Son can only offer sacrifice once on account of his eternal status, and that salvific act is linked to his status as creator within the context of Hebrews' partially realized eschatology by the catch-metaphor of "foundations", as indicated by the mention of the "end of the age": "For then he would have had to suffer again and again since the foundation of the world. But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Heb 9:26 NRSV)

Finally, in 11:10, we noticed the linkword "foundations" forming a connection with 1:10–12, this time with regards Abraham's faithfulness. Although not a ref-

---

[143] We saw earlier how there are seven citations in the catena in 1:5–14, the mention of sitting in the seventh citation in 1:13 may perhaps also match the idea of Sabbath rest.

[144] Incidentally, the term καταβολή (foundation) occurs in 4:3, a link to 1:10–12 (the sixth citation) where we find ἐθεμελίωσας (you laid the foundations).

erence to the foundations of the world, it nevertheless pertains to the creative power of God, and his building of the heavenly city (v. 16), which can be seen as a metaphor for the creation of heaven itself (see also 1:10–12, where God is the creator of heaven). We may further observe the mention of "descendants" in the subsequent verses, and the shift in focus to their own heavenly goal. In 11:12, we see the same realization that it is the descendants who will benefit and not Abraham himself, just as at the end of Ps 102, it is the future generation who will be in God's presence.

5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, we began by looking at the traditional way in which the catena of 1:5–14 is understood. It is usually seen as contrasting the Son with the angels. Discourse analysis of the passage, however, revealed that it was not really the angels at stake. Whilst the repetition of this term undoubtedly lends cohesion to the chapter, the acknowledgement that the focus was placed on the Son led to the conclusion that there was more at stake than simply an angelic battle for the audience's attention. Furthermore, whilst the angels disappear from the following discourse, the key metaphor of laying the foundations was repeated at various points throughout the Epistle, right up until ch. 11 (4:3; 6:1; 9:26 and 11:10). Preliminary observations suggested that the influence of 1:10–12 stretched much further than one might have thought. This prompted a detailed investigation of the catena, to assess if we could establish a purpose for mentioning the creator-Son in the reference's immediate co-text. An acknowledgement of the author's application of metalepsis led me to conclude that vv. 5–6 were, in fact, references to the exaltation. From here, I was able to see the catena, including v. 14, as referencing the descriptions of the Son as per the exordium, but in reverse order and with the twist that the focus on inheritance shifted to the community:[145]

Exordium	Catena
1:4 – Inheritance	Mention of firstborn in 1:6
1:3c – Exaltation	1:5–6, 1:8, recapitulated in v. 13
1:3b – Activity on Earth	1:9 – Activity on Earth
1:2 – Son as agent making the aeons	1:10–12 – Son as Creator of Heaven and Earth
1:1 – Inheritance of all things by the Son	1:14 – inheritance of salvation by believers

---

[145] As with Meier, I accept the correspondences are not exact. However, like Meier, I see a general pattern to have emerged. Meier, "Symmetry," 505.

The fact that this narrative arc properly ended on our citation, however, prompted the question of what enabled the author to move from the inheritance of the Son, to the inheritance of faithful Christians. Having established the use of metalepsis earlier in the catena, the original co-text of our citation in Ps 102 was examined. During this examination, a motif of a partially realised eschatology was uncovered in the psalm. This motif was then demonstrated to be transposed into Heb 1:10–14 through a process of *transdiegetization* by which the author applied the psalm to his present situation and that of the audience as Christians living in a similar time of partially realised eschatology. The reference to creation in 1:10–12, then, has far reaching implications for the rest of the Epistle. Whilst, indeed there is a definite contrast made forcefully between the angels and the Son in the catena, these conclusions demonstrate that we can no longer continue to concern ourselves only with the references to angels when discussing Heb 1:5–14.[146]

Excursus: The Angels as Created Beings in Heb 1:7–8

Ambiguity exists in the phrase ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα in 1:7. The phrase could either mean that God makes winds (or "spirits") his angels (RSV, NIV, NAS) or angels his winds (or "spirits") (NJB), and equally that he makes his ministers a flame of fire (RSV, NIV, NASB), or a flame of fire his ministers (NJB). The Hebrew of the original psalm reads:

Ps 104:4 (103:4) עֹשֶׂה מַלְאָכָיו רוּחוֹת מְשָׁרְתָיו אֵשׁ לֹהֵט:

The Hebrew would usually be translated "making the winds his messengers and a flaming fire his servants." However, the LXX appears to reverse the predication by the placement of the article thus: ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον (LXX Ps 103:4), so that God is said to make his angels winds and his servants a flame of fire. Most commentators note this change in Heb 1:7, too, which appears to be a result of Hebrews' reliance on the LXX.[147] The idea that God made his angels into elements was not unknown.

---

[146] Indeed, Neeley, "Discourse," 43. has noted that contrast is a common feature of Hebrews' discourse at various stages. 1:5–2:18; 3:1–6; 3:7–4:13; 4:14–5:10; 7:1–28; 8:1–10:18; 12:4–11; 12:18–28; 13:8–16. She is right to note that the exposition in ch. 1 is built around the superiority of the Son to the angels, ibid., 67, but I argue here for more complexity in the discourse than is usually noted, and suggest that whilst there is some prominence attached to the topic of angels, ultimately it is the role of the Son in salvation history that is at stake and that we miss the argumentation of the discourse if we focus on the angels themselves. Neeley, too, recognizes that the remainder of ch. 1 follows up on the descriptions modifying the Son in 1:1–4. See also Ibid., 69–71.

[147] A key exception is Ellingworth, who argues that the LXX and the Hebrew in fact mean the same thing. Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 120–121.

In Jubilees 2:2, we read about the creation of the angels (though, on day 1), including the spirits of fire and of the winds; however, this may have more to do with the ancient belief that angels controlled the weather.[148] For instance, in a later tradition, *Pirqe Rab. El.* 4 tells of the angels who are sent out by God's word and become "winds" and similarly are "made of fire" when they minister before him, even though it takes the original reading of the Hebrew text.[149] Notably, this text also makes specific reference to their having been created on the second day, and so we know that this text was seen elsewhere as in some way connected to God's original creative activity.

To some extent, this divergence of interpretations does not have much of an impact on one's reading of the text. The emphasis is on God's governing power, whichever translation is chosen. However, one may ask the further question of whether the concern is primarily power over the angels or over creation more generally. Whilst πνεύματα could refer to "spirits" in an ethereal sense as much as the meteorological phenomenon of winds, the πυρός properly refers to actual fire.[150] In a number of Old Testament texts, fire was said to be commanded by God to act in a particular way in order to enact his verdict or realize his will on earth. This is clearest in the case of lightning, deemed simply "fire" in the LXX, which was thought to be used by God to enact his will (Exod 9:22, 24; Sir 39:39; 43:13; and Ps 18:14 [17:15]; 148:8 [147:8]). This extratext could suggest we are dealing in Hebrews with God's control over phenomena as much as angels, especially given that the two descriptions are placed in parallel to each other, both here and in the original LXX psalm. Indeed, Ellingworth observes the co-text of the psalm itself, which refers to 'clouds' and 'winds' and suggests that it probably means, in co-text 'who makes winds his messengers …', and proposes that theophanies may be in mind.[151] Even if this is not the case, the word order, specifically the placement of the nouns, suggests that we are dealing with parallel ideas, and if one element is likely meteorological, that assists us in determining that the other is, too: God is making his angels winds, not simply's pirits'. At this point, we may also note a slight change in Hebrews from the psalm. The LXX has πῦρ φλέγον (flaming fire), but Hebrews reads πυρὸς φλόγα (flame of fire).[152] The construction in Hebrews actually corresponds more to Exod 3:2 (φλογὶ πυρός), and so there may be an allusion here to the theophany experienced by Moses

---

[148] See below. Kugel, *Traditions*, 76.

[149] See Ibid., 75.

[150] Whilst fire is an attribute of angels in some biblical passages, such as Isa 6:2 and Dan 7:20; as well as those pseudepigraphal works such as 1 Enoch 14:22, this does not seem to be the suggestion in Hebrews. The idea rather appears to be one of total conversion from one state to another.

[151] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 120–121.

[152] There is a textual variant. This is the Vaticanus reading. However, Alexandrinus has ἐν φλογὶ πυρός (flame of fire).

whereby fire signified the presence of the angel. This passage is referenced later in Hebrews in 12:18–19, suggesting the author might have had it in mind, and the possible echo here is, I posit, in some way cataphoric, at least formally.[153]

Furthermore, the combination of wind and fire in such a context is found in passages such as Jer 51:16 (28:16) [where the previous verse speaks of lightning] and Wis 13:2, and this would suggest that it was not unknown to link these two climatic elements together. The latter gives especial pause for thought since we have just had another reference to Wisdom in 1:3 (to Wis 7:26) through the use of the rare word ἀπαύγασμα, and this passage in Wisdom makes the point that fire and wind are not in fact deities.[154] Against this, however, we have the comparison of angels to λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, "ministering winds/spirits", where "spirits" might seem more appropriate in 1:14. However, authors can play on the dual meaning of a word, and the subordination of the angels in 1:14 may in fact build on that of 1:7 by a possible use of variant meaning in 1:14.[155] This verse in fact likely forms an analeptic reference to 1:7, even though one would expect in a true analepsis to find both comparative terms in both instances, and "fire" is missing for comparison in 1:14. Because it is only partial, one might say that it contributes to the emphasis switching from God's control over the angels/elements to their subservient role for Christians – by not recalling both parallels, it stresses the subservient nature of the angels in particular and their role as ministers.[156]

Nevertheless, in the ancient world, the link between angels and the elements was regarded as strong. In apocalyptic texts such as in the Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 8:3 and 6:7), for instance, we find the details of a number of angels who are given control over the weather and other natural phenomena. Traditionally,

---

[153] However, Docherty has called into question the conclusion that this version was not known to the LXX of the psalm itself since it is contained in Papyrus Bodmer XXIV, a Christian but possibly pre-Hexaplaric manuscript. There are also alternative readings for this phrase in Symmachus (πύρινην φλόγα) and Aquila (πῦρ λάθρον) and so Hebrews might simply have another variant reading. Susan Docherty, "The Text Form of the OT Citations in Hebrews Chapter 1 and the Implications for the Study of the Septuagint," *NTS* 55 (2009):355–65, here, 58.

[154] Some scholars have posited that Hebrews was written to counter the worship of angels, finding a parallel between Heb 1 and Col 2:18. For instance, see Hans Windisch, *Der Hebräerbrief*, HNT 14 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1931), 17; Moffatt, *Commentary*, 7.

[155] Todorov describes how rhetorical figures, such as the angels/winds and ministers/fire here, are based on one "essential property" of language: "the absence of a relation between the sounds and the meaning." Tzvetan Todorov, *The Poetics of Prose*, trans and ed. Richard Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 1977, trans. of *Poètique de la Prose*. Paris: Seuil, 1971), 22. They rely on synonymy in some instances, the basis of wordplay by which makes puns on the dual meanings of words, but in others they play on the fact that words can have more than one meaning, employing both (or all) meanings simultaneously. See also Ibid., 23. I here posit that whilst Hebrews is referring to the action of the elements, nevertheless there is another level of wordplay to 1:7.

[156] See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 62 who argues that they are not presented as heavenly ministers, but as merely performing 'service' on earth for Christians.

the earthly creation was considered of a lower status than that of the angelic realm. We might even consider a psalm cited later in Hebrews 2, Ps 8, as well as Ps 148 which appear to indicate this hierarchy of creation. If we take Ellingworth's reading, that the LXX of Ps 104:4 (103:4) means the same as the Hebrew, given the fact the angels are commanded to worship the Son in 1:6, God is said even to make the wind and fire like them, subverting the control they were traditionally thought to have over the elements, and so their presumed authority contrasts to that of the Son, the same root, λειτουργός, being employed (see also 8:6; 9:21 and 10:11 where cognate terms are employed similarly). The sudden mention of the "sceptre of justice" as the "sceptre of your [the Son's] kingdom" at this point (1:8) would also make sense if we consider the fallen angels traditions, whereby those angels whom God had appointed over certain domains rebelled, doubly so when we consider that in later tradition (e.g. LAE 13:2–14:3; Apoc Sedrach 5:1) this rebellion was thought to take place when they refused to worship Adam, made in the image of God, which is precisely how Jesus was described in 1:3.[157]

---

[157] According to Wis 2:24, it is because of the devil's envy that death entered the world, and its co-text is also interesting because Wis 3 goes on to say how the righteous will in some way survive death and "be at peace", which could be seen as corresponding to Hebrews' salvation of believers. Also, 2 Enoch 29:4 says that the rebellious archangel wanted his throne to be placed higher than the clouds above the earth, and so have power like God's. The underlying premise here is that the devil originally had his own domain over which to rule. In 2 Enoch 31:3–6, we learn that he was jealous of the heavenly Adam because God wanted to create another world, which would be subjected to Adam, where Satan would have a lower niche because of his previous sin. Kugel, *Traditions*¸ 122–24. It may be that Hebrews is alluding to such a tradition here, by contrasting the Son to the angels, of whom Satan was one. There are a number of fallen angels traditions, a good summary of which is found in Bernard J. Bamberger, *Fallen Angels* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1952), here 35–37. A recent publication to deal with this issue is Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblentz Bautch and John C. Endres, eds., *The Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Developments and Reception History*, CBQMS 53 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014), which contains a number of chapters dealing with this theme, especially in relation to the Watchers traditions. The above tradition could also be behind Luke 10:18. In the context of v. 9, it would also appear that there is a contrast between the behaviour of Christ and the angels: it is because Jesus has loved justice and hated iniquity that he has been raised above them, which could be taken to suggest that at least some of the angels have not had the same attitude. See also Moffitt, *Atonement*, 134–36. He also points out that Adam is the "image" of God to be worshipped in this account, which may be a link to the descriptions in 1:3. Moffitt also draws attention to the fact the angels are commanded to worship the Son in Heb 1:6. He draws here on the work of Joel Marcus, "Son of Man as Son of Adam, Part 1," *RB* 110 (2003):38–61, who draws especial attention to the role of glory in Heb 2, and how to be crowned with glory was to be second only to God in the divine economy.

Chapter 6

The Descent of the Son for the Ascent of Humanity

6.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters, we have seen the emergence of a descent/ascent motif, in relation to the Son's heavenly origins, incarnation and salvific action. We have already looked at the exordium and how the brief mention of the Son's earthly sacrifice is framed by references to his heavenly pre-existence and exaltation, so that his earthly activity was contrasted to his heavenly origin and final destination at the right of God's majesty. An examination of the possible intertextual allusions in Hebrews at this point revealed similarities with certain Wisdom traditions. When we examined the catena of 1:5–13, the pattern of descent/ascent was presented in reverse order, the catena beginning with references to the exaltation (1:5–6; compare 1:3–4) and working through to the Son's role at creation (1:10–12; compare 1:2). This led into the prophetic interpretation of Ps 110 that the Son will have all his enemies put under his feet, a reference to the exaltation. Certainly, the allusion to this psalm was made in such regard in 1:3, but more importantly, from here, the Epistle moved to the promised inheritance for those who follow him. The topic of the Son's becoming human recurs in ch. 2 (see also 4:14–15, 10:5–8 and 13:20), where, for the first time in the Epistle, the Son is named as Jesus. What is more, this motif is set within the destiny of humanity by quoting Ps 8, and we move from the creation of all things to the creation of humankind. This chapter will look at the discourse features of 2:5–9, including the particular use of Ps 8 within this passage and argue for another link between a creation reference and the Son's saving activity as one who descends and ascends. In order to understand the co-text, I supply a literal translation of Heb 2:5–18.

6.1.1 Translation of Heb 2:5–18

⁵ For he did not subject to the angels the world to come, about which we are speaking,
⁶ But a certain person has somewhere solemnly testified, saying:
"What is man [ἄνθρωπος] that you are mindful of him,[1]

---

[1] Due to the usual rendering of the "son of man" in the following stich, I have retained the term "man" for humanity, though it is to be understood as including both men and women: "hu-

or the son of man [υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου] that you visit[2] him?

[7] You made him lower, for a little while, than the angels;

with glory and honour you crowned him.

[8] You subjected everything under his feet."

For in having subjected everything [to him],

he permitted nothing not subject to him.

But, now, we do not yet see everything having been subjected to him.

[9] But the one who has been made lower than the angels for a little while, we do see – Jesus,

Through the suffering of death, having been crowned with glory and honour,

So that by the grace of God, on behalf of everyone, he might taste death.

[10] For it was fitting for him for the sake of whom is everything and through whom is everything, in leading many sons [children] to glory, to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

[11] For the one who sanctifies and those who are sanctified are all from one, on account of which he was not ashamed to call them brothers [and sisters]

[12] "Saying," I will proclaim your name to my brothers [and sisters], in the midst of the congregation, I will praise you."

[13] And again "I myself shall put my trust in him," and again "Here I am, and the children God has given me."

[14] Since therefore the children have a fellowship in flesh and blood, and he likewise shares [in them] himself, in order that through death he might nullify the one who had power over death, that is, the devil.

[15] And free all those who, by fear of death, all their lives were bound in slavery.

[16] For surely he does not take hold[3] of the angels, but he does take hold of the offspring of Abraham.

[17] Therefore he had to become like his brothers [and sisters] in every respect, in order to be a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God to make atonement for the sins of the people,

[18] for in as much as he himself has suffered, having been tempted, he is able to help those who are being tempted.

---

manity". The use of the singular ἄνθρωπος is important, since it enables the author to apply the psalm to the Son in the Greek, and so I have chosen to retain it in my translation.

  [2] Or 'to have a care for' or 'inspect'. On the reason for my translation, see Appendix A.

  [3] Hebrews 2:16 is variously translated, such as "he did not come to help angels" (NRSV) to "it was not the angels that he took to himself" (NJB). It seems to denote God's loving care over humanity. The same verb, ἐπιλαμβάνομαι, which literally means "to take hold of," also occurs in Heb 8:9 (Jer 31:32) where it refers to God's taking the Israelites out of Egypt and there may be a projection forward in this regard. On the allusion to the Exodus account at this point more generally, see Koester, *Hebrews*, 239–40. On the literal meaning of the verb, see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 94.

6.1.2 The Citation from Psalm 8: Understanding Its Co-text and the Implications for Hebrews

The citation is taken from Ps 8:5–7 (NRSV 8:4–6). Following a formal opening, the psalm proper begins, and will also close, with the praise of God, praise which is specifically related to his role as creator of all things. The MT has מֶה־אַדִּיר שִׁמְךָ בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר תְּנָה הוֹדְךָ עַל־הַשָּׁמָיִם, or "how majestic is your name in all the earth! You have set your glory above the heavens" (Ps 8:1 NRSV). The LXX renders this with ὡς θαυμαστὸν τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ὅτι ἐπήρθη ἡ μεγαλοπρέπειά σου ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν "how admirable is your name in all the earth, because your magnificence was raised beyond the heavens" (v. 2 NETS). In the Hebrew, the merism of earth and heaven, as in other psalms dealing with creation (such as Ps 19, 65, 93, 104), is intended to testify to God's creation of all that exists.[4] However, in the LXX, the Lord is glorified specifically because (ὅτι) his magnificence has been lifted above the heavens. This might be significant for Hebrews' interpretation, which links the psalm to Christ's exaltation (2:9), and it may be that the author of Hebrews, interprets the Lord of the psalm prophetically in respect of the Son in another case of *transdiegetization*. We shall discuss the possibility of a prophetic reading below.

The psalmist goes on to detail how the praise God received from infants is a bulwark to silence God's enemies. It is commonly stated that he moves from this to overwhelmed contemplation of the heavens because it says he will observe the heavens and the moon and stars in v. 4 (LXX v. 3): "the poet himself is overwhelmed by the impression which the illimitable expanse of the firmament with its sparkling splendor makes upon him," in comparison to which humanity appears wholly insignificant (v. 4, LXX v. 5).[5] Whilst there is undoubtedly an element of this behind his meditations, from the point of view of discourse analysis, there is also the possibility that the psalmist likens himself to these children through the use of "because", present in the Greek (ὅτι, LXX v. 4).[6] The second clause concerning the psalmist's adulation of God the creator is seen to extend the primary clause regarding the defeat of God's enemies. We recall that:

in EXTENSION, the secondary clause 'expands' the primary clause by moving beyond it, that is, adding to it, giving an exception or primary clause by qualifying it with a circumstantial feature of time, place, cause or condition.[7]

---

[4] Konrad Schaefer, *Psalms*, Berit Olam. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), 23. However, the Hebrew is itself complicated and the subject of dispute. See Schaefer, *Psalms*, 121, n. 5.

[5] Weiser, *Psalms*, 142. See also, Guthrie and Quinn, "Discourse Analysis," 236.

[6] The Greek ὅτι seems to translate כִּי as "because", rather than "when". It is usually understood that he is contrasting children to enemies, e. g., Schaefer, *Psalms*, 121, n. 6.

[7] Reed, "Cohesiveness," 32. Capitalization his.

In this reading, the praise of such children is found because of the psalmist's own wonder at creation, that is, he places himself in the role of one such child:

Out of the mouths of infants (νηπίων) and nurslings you furnished praise for yourself, for the sake of your enemies, to put down enemy and avenger, **because** I will observe the heavens, works of your fingers – moon and stars – things you alone founded. (LXX v. 3–4, NETS, emphasis mine).[8]

It may therefore be that such praise is seen to lead to deliverance.

6.1.3 An Exodus Background for Ps 8 and Ps 95 in Hebrews

Interestingly, when it comes to the defeat of enemies, it would seem that the author has in mind specifically the exodus narrative, because in Ps 8:1 (LXX Ps 8:2), we have possible lexical parallels the Exodus account.[9]

עֹז (Strength) but αἶνον (praise) (Ps 8:3)	עָזִּי (my strength) (Exod 15:2) [The Greek translates idiomatically with βοηθὸς, "helper".]
שֶׁמְךָ (your name) ὄνομά σου (your name) (Ps 8:2)	שְׁמוֹ (his name) ὄνομα αὐτῷ (the name for him) (Exod 15:3)
אוֹיֵב (enemy), ἐχθρὸν (Ps 8:3)	אוֹיֵב (Exod 15:6, 9) ἐχθρούς/ἐχθρός (enemy) (Exod 15:6,9)
אַדִּיר (majestic) θαυμαστὸν (wonderful) (Ps 8:2)	נֶאְדָּר (having been made majestic) θαυμαστὸς (wonderful) (Exod 15:11)

In favour of a tradition which saw praise and deliverance as linked, we find a similar phrase in Wis 10:20–21, connecting the praise of God with the exodus account: "they praised (ᾔνεσαν) with one accord your defending hand, for Wisdom … made the tongues of infants (νηπίων) speak."[10] In the Wisdom text, the righteous are said to plunder the ungodly, and Israel to defeat its enemies (vv. 19–20), and this may suggest that the praise of God is what secured success. Specifically, this again seems to be attached to the exodus story. This Wisdom text also contains an explicit mention of the crossing of the Red Sea (v. 18), and goes on to speak of Israel as journeying through the wilderness. It should be noted that Chapter 11 also goes on to contrast God's treatment of the Egyptians with the favour bestowed on the Israelites.

---

[8] This links to the praise of God in the final verse, where the creator God is specifically the God of Israel ("our Lord"), in contrast to the nationalistic gods of the pagans. On this historical backdrop to Ps 8, see Weiser, *Psalms*, 141. Interestingly, there may be a connection, via *gezerah shavah* where we have the identical verb, θεμελιόω (to found) in LXX Ps 101:26, quoted in Heb 1:10.

[9] A similar link between creation and the exodus account is also found in Ps 136, which poetically moves from God's actions as creator to his deliverance of Israel.

[10] It could also be that the LXX translator has had the crossing of the Red Sea in mind – the Hebrew עֹז (strength) in Ps 8:3 has been translated as αἶνον (praise). Compare αἴνεσις in LXX Ps 105:12, where there is a connection to the exodus.

This underlying tradition might help us understand the cohesion between chs. 2 and 3–4 in Hebrews and account for why Hebrews includes commentary on Ps 8 and its interpretation of Ps 95 in relation to the exodus so closely to each other. We will observe the connection between creation and deliverance in Ps 95 later on, and the combination of deliverance and creation imagery in Ps 8 may have been connected to it in the author's mind, another case of dialogical intertextuality. Furthermore, there may even again be traces of Wisdom theology in Hebrews because in the remainder of ch. 2, as we shall see, the deliverance is connected to the salvific actions of the Son, and Wis 10 in fact speaks about Wisdom protecting the holy ones of Israel. From Adam through to the exodus generation, Wisdom intervenes so as to deliver the various righteous biblical figures like Noah and Joseph from various ills, in a similar way to how Jesus saves God's children from death (2:10–18).[11] The idea of such an agent of salvation, especially one involved in creation, may indicate Hebrews has once again connected the Son and Wisdom. There is, however, no evidence of a direct reliance on Wisdom 10–11 in Hebrews' vocabulary at this point, and although we find the term τέκνον in Wis 10:5 and the virtually synonymous term παιδία in Heb 2:13, the latter verse is actually taken from Isa 8:18.

6.2 Ps 8 and the Role of Humanity

Whilst possible allusions to the exodus in the psalm might be thought provoking, concerning the intertextual usage of Ps 8 and Ps 95, we should be more concerned that in his praises, the psalmist pays particular attention to the position God has given humanity. It is this to which the author of Hebrews draws atten-

---

[11] Bovon, *New Testament*, 119–32 notes Wisdom's role watching over Israel from Adam might be related to Heb 11, citing parallels in the way the historical list in Wisdom immediately follows an affirmation of salvation by an acclaimed virtue (wisdom, as opposed to Hebrews' "faith"), and the paradigmatic punishment of God's children, present in Wis 11:10 and Heb 12:5–6, among other features. However, Bovon's ultimate conclusion is that Hebrews 11 might also be likened to a number of other texts, including 4 Macc, or even Sirach in its mention of Enoch, and so the wisdom tradition is arguably used, but not one precise source. Nevertheless, a possible subject for future research might also be to compare Hebrews' interpretation and use of Scripture with that of Wisdom. For instance, in Wis 2:24, we read that it was through the devil's envy that death entered into the cosmic order, and in Hebrews the Son is said to overcome death and the devil in 2:14. Both appear to have interpreted the Genesis 3 account along similar lines, seeing the serpent as the devil; that is, they may have interpreted that chapter somewhat allegorically. In terms of Gen 1-2, it also appears that when God speaks, they in some way see his "word" as active: in the exordium of Hebrews we move from God speaking to the actions of the one through whom he speaks, arguably depicting the Son as his word, and in Wis 9:1 we similarly find his "word" as the one through whom he governs creation, just as the Son "upholds all things" in Heb 1:3. This suggests a certain freedom in interpretation which may have been born from an attempt to explain Scripture in terms that could be understood by a Hellenistic audience faced with *logos* speculation on the part of Middle Platonists or writers like Philo.

tion in 2:6–8: "What is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you visit him?" he asks, citing LXX Ps 8:5 (Ps 8:4). In the psalm, on the surface, humanity seems insignificant, yet God pays him heed. Reflecting on Gen 1:26 where God makes humankind in his own image and places them in control over all the beasts of creation, the psalm continues:

You diminished him a little in comparison with angels; with glory and honour you crowned him. And you set him over the works of your hands; you subjected all under his feet, sheep and cattle, all together, and further the beasts of the plain, the birds of the air and the fish of the sea – the things that pass through paths of seas. (NETS LXX vv. 6–9).

This could be seen as an extension of his wonderment at God's care for humankind: how great is God to place lowly man over his wondrous creation! However, it also appears that the psalmist may be answering his own question: God pays attention to humankind because he has placed it over all creation. The role of humanity as given at the creation is thus the point to which he draws attention.

The Hebrew phrase מְעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים, which could mean "a little less than God" or "a little less than the heavenly beings," has been interpreted in the LXX to say that humanity is "a little less than (βραχύ τι) the angels."[12] The term used is βραχύς, which can also have a temporal sense, seems in the LXX psalm to be indicative of humanity's slightly lower station.[13] In ancient Jewish thought, the angels were sometimes thought to govern the nations, and even parts of heaven. Such an idea is alluded to in the Life of Adam and Eve 12–16, where Satan refuses to bow down to Adam, saying that he has been created after him, and therefore Adam should worship the previously-created Satan. In this text, Satan claims he will place his throne above the heavens to be like God if he is made to bow down to Adam, arguably alluding to the fact he had in some way control over either the earthly sphere or a heavenly realm lower than God's own. Similarly, we read in Jub 15:31 that God has placed spirits over the nations, though strangely this is said to lead them astray from following him.[14] The view is, in fact, a more ancient one, and present even in the biblical text itself in LXX Deut 32:8, which says God fixed the boundaries of the peoples according to the numbers of the angels.[15] This psalm, however, asserts that God willed humanity's dominion over the created world, from the first moments of its existence:

---

[12] For a detailed discussion of this change in vocabulary, see Dale F. Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms*, NAPBR 10 (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1994), 88–91.

[13] See Small, *Characterization*, 273–74.

[14] See also Sir 17:17: "he appointed a ruler for every nation, but Israel is the Lord's own portion". The "ruler" is often interpreted as referring to an angel. See Kugel, *Traditions*, 664–64, 701. In another tradition, Michael is seen to rule over Israel, Dan 10:13, where Michael is described as a "prince" or "ruler" (ἄρχων). That said, his duties are rather to guard Israel than to govern it in Dan 12:1, where he is said to be caused [by God] to stand over (ἑστηκὼς ἐπί) Israel to protect it.

[15] The MT has according to the number of "the sons of Israel". However, some scholars have posited that the original reading might have been "angels" on the basis of the LXX reading and

… human worth, according to this psalm, is not located in our own existence, but rather in the twin sources of the God who created us and the creation over which that God has directed us to exercise responsibility.[16]

Indeed, the poem consists of two stanzas which are enclosed in a poetic *inclusio*: the first stanza focuses on the glory of God, and asks what is humanity in comparison, but in his response to his own question, the psalmist then declares that God has crowned humanity with glory (v. 6, LXX v. 60).[17] The indication here is that humanity even shares in God's royalty, ruling over creation, as indicated by the metaphor of crowning.[18] The question for this thesis, is of how far Hebrews adopts the psalm's position on the initial status afforded to humanity.

6.2.1 Hebrews 2:5–9 and Psalm 8 in Hebrews 1–2

To begin discussing Hebrews' exegesis of the psalm, it is worth drawing attention to the position of our passage within the opening of Hebrews itself. It is often argued that there is an *inclusio* between 2:5 and 2:16 on the mention of angels, even though 2:5–9 is widely accepted as a subunit in its own right.[19] Moreover, the term "angels" also provides a link back to ch. 1, especially the catena of 1:5–14. This causes us to look more closely at the surrounding co-text of our citation and assess the cohesion between this passage and the verses surrounding it.

6.2.2 Hebrews 2:5–9 and Its Cohesion with What Came Before

Firstly, the angels in 2:5 offer us our first clue that 2:5–9 is to be related to ch. 1.[20] However, we have already established that the angels in their own right might

---

also 4Q37, which has בני אלים DJD 14:90. See Carmel McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, Biblia Hebraica: quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis, elaborato (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2007), 140–41.

[16] Schaefer, *Psalms*, 120.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] E. g., Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 143, Westfall, *Discourse*, 100, Vanhoye, *Structure*, 24.

[20] For instance, see Westfall, *Discourse*, 100; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 108; Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 52–53; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 56. I follow Guthrie, *Structure*, 102, where he identifies a transition in which a characteristic term in the first block finds expression in the introduction of the second bock and a characteristic term from the second block is utilized in the conclusion of the first. The key word "glory", used in 2:5–9 at 2:7 and 2:9 also comes in the introduction to 2:10–18, whereas the key words "suffering" and "death" occur in the conclusion of 2:5–9. However, the inclusio has caused controversy over how to split the text (Westfall, *Discourse*, 100). Westfall notes how Vanhoye, *Structure and Message*¸ 23–24 places 2:17–18 in the "First Part" of 1:5–2:18, but nevertheless treats it as separate from the preceding co-text and labels it as an announcement. See ibid. n. 49. Also compromising the integrity of the unit is another possible *inclusio* on "must/ought" in v. 10 and v. 17–18 (Guthrie, *Structure*, 77–78). Firstly, the ἔπρεπεν (it was fitting, 2:10) roughly

not seem as significant as at first glance. Whilst there is certainly a polemic against exaggerating their importance, ultimately the purpose of that polemic is to highlight the significance of God's speaking through the Son. Then, at the end of ch. 1, we saw the catena move from a backwards presentation of the events of the exordium to progress to a creation reference, and thence, under the partially realized eschatology of Ps 102 (101), to pass to the promise of salvation to believers, at whose service those angels actually are. There is a further link between our current passage and the catena provided by the mention of "a footstool for his feet" in 1:13, where Ps 110 is cited and "under his feet" in 2:8. The precise cohesive relationship of our passage to what came before, then is of great value for any understanding of the use of Ps 8 in 2:5–9.

The term γάρ in 2:5 is the point of departure for our unit. That is, it tells us how it is to be related to the preceding co-text.[21] It generally signifies that the following unit will be support material. However, our unit does not explicitly support a central clause in the preceding co-text.[22] Rather, 2:5 picks up on implied submission of the world to God and the Son from the previous unit. This thread was present in the catena, as in 1:6, but notably for our purposes culminated in 1:10–12, where it pertains specifically to the Son whose hands made the heavens and earth, and who ultimately will "roll them up" like a garment.

---

corresponds to ὤφειλεν (he ought) in 2:17, where it is used with the sense of its being fitting that the Son should become human in every respect (except sin – 4:15). In both instances, the necessity of an aspect of the incarnation is set forth. Secondly, in 2:10 the Son is perfected and in 2:17 becomes a merciful and faithful high priest. Thirdly, in both he aids humanity, the sons of 2:10 and the brothers of 2:17. Finally, the Son's perfection and becoming high priest both involved suffering, which we see in v. 18. It is partly for concerns over the interweaving of sections and high level cohesion at this point that I consider the two main sections of ch. 2 together in one chapter here. At this point, it should also be said that there is much debate as to when the Son became high priest, be that at the crucifixion or ascension. This is summarized well in Michael Kibbe, "Is it Finished? When did it Start? Hebrews, Priesthood, and Atonement in Biblical, Systematic and Historical Perspective," *JTS* 65 (2014):25–61. However, on a DA reading of ch. 2, it would seem that the Son's high priestly activity is intricately connected to his incarnation, even if the fruits of that office become later evident in his sacrificial offering, which should be seen in relation to both the crucifixion and the entry into heaven with his blood, as immolation and blood offering together form part of the unified Yom Kippur ritual of Lev 16 on which description Hebrews draws.

    21 Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 8.
    22 Westfall, *Discourse*, 101. This is not to say that it does not carry with it, in some respects, the rhetorical force of 2:1–4. See deSilva, *Perseverance*‚ 108. What I am discussing here is the manner in which cohesion is built between our passages, looking at the "scaffolding", as opposed to the building itself at this stage. Whilst Westfall sees the exordium as stretching into 2:4 as a result of various cohesive features, (*Discourse* 89), other scholars have, in the light of the link between our passage and Heb 1:13–14, seen 2:1–4 as a digression. E. g., Guthrie, *Structure*, 61–65 finds a high level cohesion shift between 1:14 and 2:1. In 2:1, the author, he says, changes topic to the necessity of taking God's word seriously and changes genre from exposition to exhortation, whereas he returns to the genre of exposition in 2:5 and begins another topic, the subjection of the world to the Son.

Hence the author states in the clause dependent on γάρ that the *world to come* is not *submitted* to *angels*. The words ὑπέταξεν (submitted) and ἀγγέλοις (angels) provide phonological and lexical links to ὑποπόδιον (footstool) and ἀγγέλων (angels) in 1:13, a verse which itself is intended to support the superior status of the Son as creator in 1:10–12. The image of a "world to come" also evokes the imagery in 1:10–12 of the Son's control over all creation in 1:10–12, which has a future status by virtue of the fact it will be "changed". In co-text the phrase in 2:5 thus implies that the world to come will be submitted to the Son who governs creation, and can be seen in some ways to continue the comparison between him and the angels.[23]

Westfall correctly observes that, the phrase about the non-submission of this world to come to the angels is also a cataphoric device which "introduces the following projection of Ps 8:5–7."[24] Whereas the angels were previously described as God's messengers, like the prophets (2:2), but were portrayed in the catena as being hierarchically lower than the Son (1:6), they will be depicted in our passage as above him in 2:5–9, a contrast to their previous roles.[25] Nevertheless, the Son's subjection lasts but a little while, the term βραχύ of the psalm being interpreted in its temporal sense: instead it is Jesus who will see all things under his feet (2:8–9).[26] This is not only a repetition of a phrase from 1:13, rather Hebrews brings together Ps 110 and Ps 8 through the process of *gezerah shavah* centring on the word "feet" to stress the ongoing process of the subjection of everything to the Son. In Ps 8, humanity has had everything under its feet from the beginning, but Hebrews reinterprets the psalm in terms of the Son's dominion by combining Ps 8 with Ps 110 to give the phrase a future reference. In terms of modern discourse analysis, we may also say that the author employs this phrase as a "distant hook". In this technique, selected words serve as a transition device which had the effect of joining units of the same genre, here exposition, to each other, even though they are structurally separated by an intervening unit of another genre (2:1–4 being exhortation), suggesting that there is some form of interrelationship between the sections in which the distant hook words are found.[27] Here, the phrase is repeated so that we can see a link between what was said of the Son's dominion over his enemies in the catena and the interpretation of Ps 8. This cohesive tie between the passages suggests that the citation from Ps 8 is to be understood in the light of Ps 110 so that his

---

[23] Westfall, *Discourse*, 101, though she does not draw the link specifically to 1:10–12.

[24] Ibid. See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 69–75; Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 32–34, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 150–52.

[25] Westfall, *Discourse*, 101.

[26] On the temporal sense of βραχύ in Hebrews, there is a general consensus. E. g., Guthrie and Quinn, "Discourse Analysis," 245. This temporary situation will be the topic even more in 2:10–18, ibid. See also Thompson, *Hebrews*, 30 and all major commentaries to 2:7.

[27] See Guthrie, *Structure*, 100.

conquering his enemies and the subjection of everything to Christ in 2:8–9 are seen to be part of the same event. The main verb ὑποτάσσω (to subject) in 2:5 verbally anticipates what will come in v. 8, but, essentially, in itself introduces no new thought. It simply repeats in a different way what has been said earlier about Christ's supremacy.[28]

6.3 *How is Hebrews Using Ps 8?*

Hebrews' linking of Ps 8 with Ps 110, and the connection of 2:5–9 with the preceding co-text of ch. 1 causes us to question exactly how the Epistle is employing Ps 8. Rather than any reference to humanity's original dominion over creation, we appear to have the re-emergence of Hebrews' "now and not yet" eschatology. In almost apocalyptic style, in 2:9 the Son's dominion is presented in an eschatologically ambiguous way through the combining of these two psalms. As Mackie summarizes:

The triumphant, perhaps even pleonastic, declaration drawn from Ps 8 – "You subjected everything under his feet, while subjecting all things to him, he left nothing unsubjected to him" – is immediately followed by an interpretive qualification, "but we do not yet see all things that are subjected to him" … This interpretive qualification … also serves to preserve continuity with Ps 110:1 – quoted in 1:13 – whose ἕως clause clearly indicates the Son's present enthronement still awaits its full expression, when God will "make his enemies a footstool for his feet."[29]

In this reading, it would appear that Hebrews also does not share the psalm's "once and for all" idea that humanity has governance over creation. Rather, the psalm is seen to refer prophetically to the dominion of the Son following his exaltation. Has the "Son of Man" of the psalm been interpreted in Hebrews as the Son of God (Heb 1:2)? Furthermore, it would seem that the view in the psalm is entirely positive when it comes to the creation of humanity, saying it has been crowned with "glory and honour" (v. 5), a position which is not currently experienced by humanity according to Hebrews. Leschert argues that the psalmist ignores the introduction of sin into the world:

Ignoring Genesis 3, the poet works back from mankind in general to the creation mandate given to the first humans in Gen 1:26–30. There he finds God made man in his own image, male and female, and delegated authority to them to rule over all of animate creation.[30]

---

[28] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 144.
[29] Mackie, *Eschatology*, 44.
[30] Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 87.

Hebrews, by contrast, says the Son makes atonement for sin and *leads* people to glory (v. 10). Hebrews thus suggests that the world was not visibly subjected to humanity at all at the time of writing. Furthermore, a closer look at the vocabulary may also suggest that it was not ever subjected to it. The term οὔπω in v. 8, "not yet", may suggest that the world never was subject to humanity in the first place, though this depends on how we take the "him" in v. 8. So far, we have interpreted it as referring to the Son: the world is not yet seen to be subject to him, but he is now exalted, and his rule has begun. However, one could take it as referring to humanity, "man", and then the indication is that creation has never been subjected to it as was originally ordained by God.[31]

What could have prompted such a christologically prophetic interpretation of Ps 8? On a literary level, this might have been possible because of a connection in the mind of the author between this psalm and Ps 102 (101), with its partially realized eschatology. In addition to what has been said above about the connection of Ps 110 and Ps 8, LXX Ps 101 and Ps 8 have also possibly been connected in the mind of Hebrews' author via a background *gezerah shavah*. We have the identical verb, θεμελιόω (to found) in LXX Ps 101:26 (founding the moon and stars), quoted in Heb 1:10, and LXX Ps 8:4 (founding the earth). This enables them both to be connected in terms of the status of the earth as of the first acts of creation, and if Ps 102 (101) can be seen to apply, through a process of transdiegetization to creation by the Son, so, too can Ps 8 be seen as a reference to his power over that which he created. Through a process of transdiegetization, what is said in the second half of the psalm is made to apply to the Son who has been crowned with glory and honour in 2:9. A more direct connection between these two psalms would also explain how Hebrews' interpretation of Ps 8 is governed by his reading of LXX Ps 101 and its partially realized eschatology.

In contrast to the citations in the catena, there is slightly more significant textual variation in the manuscripts for 2:5–9, including in the presentation of the psalm citation itself. I have dealt with most of these in Appendix A, but there is one which is important at this stage of the investigation, the variant τίς in place of τί in verse 6. This has the force of changing the question in the psalm from "What is man [humanity] that you are mindful of him, or a son of man that you visit him?" to "Who is man that you are mindful of him, or [the] son of man that you visit him?" If original, it could be possible to see Hebrews' author as having read the psalm as asking about a specific person. Effectively, the rest of this section would be answering that question: who? Jesus![32]

---

[31] This is the view of Mackie in the above quotation.
[32] Grässer, *Hebräer*, 116–118 recognizes that the NT tends to link Ps 8 and Ps 110:1 messianically as in 1 Cor 15:25–27; Eph 1:22 and Phil 3:21 and 1 Pet 3:22, and suggests that this passage in the co-text of Hebrews has to do with the solidarity of the redeemer with the redeemed. Weiss, *Hebräer*, 197 also argues for a chrisological reading of "Son of Man" at this point in Hebrews.

However, although this reading is found in P[46] and the first hand of C, there is little other attestation of it, with Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Vaticanus retaining τί, even though Alexandrinus has τίς in the psalm itself. Rather, it tends to be found in later minor manuscripts such as P 81, 104 and 1881, and may be a later scribal correction under influence from the gospels, to identify Jesus as the psalm's "Son of Man". The reading also creates difficulties in the discourse. Leschert, for instance, suggests the second half "[or who] is the Son of Man?" could be seen as superfluous, since the audience would have known the Jesus was the son of man intended – "this reading smuggles the answer in to the question itself."[33] He follows this up by saying that an attempt to avoid this conundrum by reading the first line as a question, "who is man ..." and the second line as its answer, "truly, the Son of Man ..." fails because of the inclusion of ἤ, which puts the two parts of the question in parallel.[34] The anarthrous ἄνθρωπος also makes it difficult to see the first half of the verse as referring specifically to one person – the term can mean either "humanity" or "a man", but one would more likely expect the article if a specific person were in question. Furthermore, the idea of "Son of Man" as a christological title is a complicated matter, as we shall see. Suffice it to say for now that the reading τί is preferable on the strength of the manuscript and grammatical evidence. It would seem, then, that transdiegetization is a more likely reason for Hebrews' interpretation of Ps 8.

6.3.1 Does Hebrews Read the Psalm Anthropologically or Christologically?

We begin to touch here on another issue that has divided scholarship over Hebrews' exegesis of Ps 8, one crucial to any DA approach to Hebrews which seeks to pay adequate heed to its use of intertextuality: whether Hebrews understands the psalm as pertaining to humanity at all, or whether it is read purely christologically. After all,

In the light of the paschal [Easter] mystery of Christ, the author of Hebrews understands it [Ps 8] differently. He distinguishes three successive stages of God's plan in it: 1) abasement in comparison with the angels, 2) glorification, and 3) universal domination.[35]

It would at first appear that the author of Hebrews offers a christological midrash of Ps 8. Midrash takes a text, and explains its meaning in order to sup-

---

[33] Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 102. See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 71.

[34] Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 102. The suggestion of "truly, the Son of man" was made by Günther Zuntz, "*The Text of the Epistle: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*," The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946 (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 180–91. Zuntz proposes that instead of ἤ (or) the word is ἦ (truly) as in Gen 22:17. See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 71. This word occurs in some late manuscripts of Heb 6:14 in the strengthened phrase ἦ μὴν (indeed, truly), but it is spelt εἰ μὴν in P[46], ℵ, A and B.

[35] Vanhoye, *Letter*, 73.

port a theological proposition; here it serves to support the descent/ascent motif already recognized in Hebrews.[36] The author has separated it into parts in order to make distinct points, sometimes alluding to the psalm but offering slight alterations, each of which he applies to the Son who descends from heaven, offers sacrifice for sin, and then ascends again and is crowned with glory and honour:[37]

Psalm 8	Hebrews	Element of Descent/ Ascent Motif
8:6–8 World submitted to humanity	2:5 World to come not submitted to the angels	Angels set the heavenly spatial setting necessary for the Son's descent
8:5 Humanity made a little lower than the angels	2:7 God has made "him" for a little while lower than the angels	Christ descends to offer sacrifice for sin (in the co-text of 2:10–18)
8:5 Humanity crowned with honour and glory with everything under his feet	2:9 Jesus is now seen crowned with glory and honour	Exaltation

As *midrash* is such an open ended term, it might also be specifically said that the author employs the rabbinic technique of dispelling confusion when he combines these psalms christologically, as Guthrie explains:

Confusion could result from the juxtaposition of the two scriptural passages, however, for Ps 110 seems to present this subjugation as still in the future, while Ps 8 presents it as an accomplished fact. So, which is it according to Hebrews? The writer asserts that Ps 8 means that all things indeed have been submitted to Christ. Psalm 110, on the other hand, is explained with 'but now we do not yet see all things as subjected to him' [2:8]. He here dispels confusion Ps 8 might cause for his hearers, who are struggling with powers obviously not submitted to God's rule. He asserts that the reality perceived by the hearers does not contradict the Old Testament text. A full interpretation of scriptural truth can only be had by reflection on both scriptural texts, which together witness to the now and not yet nature of Christ's rule over all things.[39]

---

[36] Guthrie, "Recent Trends," 279. On midrashic technique in Hebrews more generally, see also Daniel Boyarin, "Midrash in Hebrews, Hebrews as Midrash," in *Hebrews in Contexts*, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91, ed. Gabriela Gelardini and Harold Attridge (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 15–30 and Elke Tönges, "The Epistle to the Hebrews as 'Jesus-Midrash,'" in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*, ed. Gabriella Gelardini, BibInt 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 89–105.

[37] See Docherty, *Old Testament*, 165 on this technique.

[38] ▪▪▪

[39] Guthrie, "Recent Trends," 281. See also, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 151.

[40] See Schenck, *Cosmology*, 55.

We bear in mind again that intertextuality can pertain not only to the actual usage of other texts, but also to background ideas circulating at the time with which our own text can be argued to be interacting. The argument is sometimes made that Hebrews is doing as other NT texts in interpreting this psalm, and applying it solely to the reign of Christ.[40] For example, in Eph 1:20–22, every ruler, authority, power and lordship are placed under the feet of the exalted Christ who now sits in heaven (see also Heb 1:3; 2:8–9):

God put this power to work in Christ when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this age but also in the age to come. And he has put all things under his feet and has made him the head over all things for the church (Eph 1:20–21 NRSV)

In 1 Cor 15:25–27, we even see Ps 110 and Ps 8 being combined to this very end:

For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For "God has put all things in subjection under his feet." But when it says, "All things are put in subjection," it is plain that this does not include the one who put all things in subjection under him. (1 Cor 15:25–27 NRSV)

Here, the "all" of Ps 8:7 is transposed to the "enemies" of Ps 110:1 so that Paul might say that the last of the enemies to be put under Christ's feet is death.[41]

Some scholars arguing for a christological reading of Ps 8 in Heb 2:5–9 have also pointed to the use of "Son of Man" in the citation, a well known christological title for Jesus, especially in the gospels. Whereas in the original psalm, "son of man" is basically another phrase for "humanity", they claim Hebrews has separated these two designations and applied "son of man" to Jesus. Interestingly, Cockerill argues that this phrase cannot be separated from the exalted, eternal Son without compromising the link between the two psalms, and that this term is to be understood as a christological title is confirmed in v. 9, where specifically Jesus is seen to be made less than the angels.[42] In addition, Buchanan argues that the image of the Son crowned with glory and honour corresponds to other passages where the Son of Man is seen to be a king who would sit on a throne (esp. Dan 7:13–14, see also Heb 12:28) including, according to his interpretation, the portrayal of the one at God's right in Ps 110 (though the term "king" itself is not used there). In Rev 14:14, for instance, the Son of Man wears a gold crown, and in Stephen's vision, Jesus as the Son of Man was seen standing at God's right hand (Acts 7:55–56, see also Heb 1:3).[43] From the point of view

---

[41] Ibid. Note that both Ps 109 (110):1 and Ps 8:3 employ plural of the same term ἐχθρός (enemy).

[42] Cockerill, *Epistle*, 128.

[43] Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 111–13. Another scholar famous for drawing attention to the possible links between the "Son of Man" in the psalm and Jesus in Hebrews is William Manson, *The*

of discourse analysis, the term "son" in the phrase "son of man" undoubtedly helps build cohesion between this passage and the first chapter, where it occurs in vv. 2, 5 and 8.[44]

On this note, it is sometimes asserted that the NT has a much more positive view of Ps 8 than Jewish texts.[45] Some of these rather stress the insignificance of humanity. For instance, 1QS 3:17–18, whilst asserting that God created humanity to rule the world, also poses the question of who humanity is in comparison to the rest of his glorious creation, and goes on to say that one's body is the food of worms, hence underscoring the insignificance of people, as opposed to their exalted status as stewards of creation.[46] Guthrie and Quinn also draw attention to *B. Sanh*, 38b which puts Ps 8 into the mouths of the angels, who ask God why he even bothered to create humanity in the first place, especially given that the flood generation did not turn out well.[47] Nevertheless, such Jewish texts basically pose a similar question to Hebrews with regards the current status of humanity vis à vis its supposed original dominion over creation.[48] Hebrews essentially answers that same question in 2:8–9 by pointing to the person of Christ, and so might be viewed as a christological response to questions being asked at the time of its own writing.[49]

6.3.2 Are We Being Too Quick to Opt for a Christological Reading?

However, not all scholars agree that the Psalm is interpreted purely christologically, or even christologically at all. Indeed, others have argued, including from the point of view of DA, that there is indeed an anthropological understanding of the psalm, at least in part. Blomberg has brought the debate to the fore, and seeks to look closely at the discourse of Hebrews at this point, even if his approach is not strictly systemic-functional. He draws attention to 2:8, and criticizes those who think Hebrews interprets the psalm christologically for overlooking it. Such scholars, he contends, interpret this verse as referring to the fact that we do not

---

Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsideration, The Baird Lecture, 1949 (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), 27–36.

[44] Guthrie and Quinn, "Discourse Analysis," 243.

[45] E. g., Ibid., 236–37.

[46] Ibid., 237.

[47] Ibid., though this text is much later than our own.

[48] Ibid.

[49] It may even be that the variant reading χωρίς (see Appendix A) in v. 9, to say that Christ dies apart from God, was made under the influence of this Pauline text, especially given the attribution of Hebrews to Paul and the fact that it insists that the only thing not under subjection to Christ is God. Both texts share the idea that God has sent the Son to die (2:10) and in separating the Son from God at this point in the plotline, Hebrews would be separating God from the act of death, and thereby the general subjection in a similar way to the movement 1 Cor 15:26–27 from the subjection of all things to Jesus, to the exception of the one who sent him (who is not subjected to Jesus), who is none other than God.

presently see all things in subjection to Christ in the way that we will, follow-
ing his return, which contrasts with v. 9, where "although Christ scarcely appears
sovereign over the cosmos now, we *do* see that his sufferings started the process
that will culminate in his complete reign."[50] It is significant that the name Jesus
is used here, they claim, introducing him for the first time by his earthly name, a
clear reference to his incarnation, which will be unpacked in 2:10–18.[51]

Blomberg disputes the idea that 2:5–9 does not support 2:1–4 and refers
directly back to 1:13–14. Rather, in contrast to what was said above, he argues
that the reader would have encountered a tension in their interpretation if
they did so because 1:13 indicated that this promise of "submission under feet"
remained unfulfilled. Christ had returned to heaven where he was seated at the
right hand of God, but this was to last for a period of time *until* God placed
all his enemies under his feet. In fact, 2:5 uses a simple aorist for what is most
naturally interpreted as a simple past event. That God did not subject the com-
ing world to angels implies, he argues, that God did subject it, in the past, in
its entirety to someone else. The obvious stewards would be Adam and Eve, as
per Gen 1:26–30, where "Adam and Eve are being created to have dominion or
exercise stewardship over a coming world, the world of all God's creatures and
created things that is only just beginning to open up before them."[52] In addition,
the title "Son of Man" is not used elsewhere in Hebrews as a title, or even at all![53]
Dating Hebrews to the 60s, he also argues that the Gospels would not yet have
been circulating, and we have no knowledge of what portions of the Jesus-Tradi-
tion would have been well-known among the Jewish-Christian house churches
in Rome, to which he believes Hebrews was sent. Instead of reading 2:7–8 chris-
tologically, he says, these verses should be seen as following from the psalm's
anthropological reading pertaining to the Genesis narrative. Before their sin,
Adam and Eve did have everything in subjection to themselves, whereas this
language is never used in Scripture for Christ's role during this period of his-
tory, only for his future role, 10:13 making it clear that Hebrews also sees such
subjection as future. When we examine 2:9, it is certain that the christological
interpretation of the psalm begins, but it is not necessary to argue that Christ
has been in view all along.

---

[50] Craig Blomberg, 'But we see Jesus': The Relationship Between the Son of Man in He-
brews 2:6 and 2:9 And the Implications for English Translations" in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The
Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*, ed. Richard Bauckham et al., LNST 387 (London:
T&T Clark, 2008), 88–99, here, 90.

[51] He also points to some of the arguments above, such as the supposed similarities with
1 Cor 15, and the way parallels are drawn with the usage of Ps 8 there, only to dismiss them.Ibid.,
90. See also and compare Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand
Rapids: Baker, 1984), 67.

[52] Blomberg, "Jesus," 92–93. He also argues from the lack of messianic interpretation of Ps 8
in Jewish tradition.

[53] Ibid., 94.

Blomberg makes some valid observations. Indeed, the phrase "Son of Man" is not used elsewhere in Hebrews, and, more to the point, is anarthrous, unlike in the Gospels, where it occurs with the article (e.g., Mark 8:38; 9:9; Luke 2:22; John 8:28; 9:25 – in fact, it is usually found with the article as such a christological title, save for John 5:27).[54] Sometimes, when reading a text, it is not only worth looking at what an author has done, but also at what they might have done, and Hebrews does not introduce the article at this point, even though it would have made a christological reading more obvious. In addition, Koester remarks on the ambiguity over the "him" in verse 8, and says it need not necessarily be understood as referring to Christ as in v. 9, but could in fact still refer to humanity, "man", in the psalm, something we mentioned briefly above ourselves.[55]

However, his argument that the "world to come" in fact refers to the original creation of the world is hard to substantiate on the basis of Genesis 1, where the animals are, in fact, created before humanity. The birds of the air and fish of the sea to which Ps 8 refers in v. 8 are created on the fifth day, and have already been commanded to increase and multiply, and humans are created only on the sixth day, *after* the beasts and cattle. Humanity is not born into a "world to come"; it rather comes into existence in a world which has been very much already prepared for it. In fact, humanity is the last thing to be created. Blomberg's argument is thus somewhat anachronistic to the account as presented in Genesis ch. 1, to which Ps 8 does undoubtedly refer.

Furthermore, where we find the phrase "to come" (μέλλω) in Hebrews, it frequently refers to the final eschatological age, which is indeed presented as already inaugurated:

Verse	Phrase
6:5	μέλλοντος αἰῶνος (aeon to come)
10:1	τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν (good things to come)
10:27	πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους (a fury of fire about to consume the adversaries)
13:14	πόλιν ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν (we seek for the city to come)

---

[54] Koester, *Hebrews*, 215.

[55] Ibid. Most major commentaries have a note on this point, whether to support or argue against the christological reading of "son of man". However, the lack of the article in 2:6 reflects the anarthrous poetic text of LXX Ps 8. Moreover, the author of Hebrews sometimes makes anarthrous use of the term "Son" for Jesus (e.g., 1:2; 1:5 [2x], 3:6; 5:5, 8; 7:28). However, as this is the only occurrence of the phrase "son of man" in Hebrews, it seems to me unlikely that it is used here as a christological title.

In 6:5, it is said that believers who have already tasted the heavenly gift (v. 4) have "tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the aeon to come" (μέλλοντος αἰῶνος); in 10:1, the law is described as a shadow of the "good things to come" (τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν) in Christ, which have already begun from the point of view of Hebrews' author, and, similarly, the participle is used to describe the "city to come" in 13:14, when the audience is already said to have reached the heavenly Jerusalem in 12:22. Perhaps the most important of these verses is 10:27, which describes the "fury of fire about to consume the adversaries (μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους)." There is a possible link to our discussion here on the term "adversaries", ὑπεναντίος being from the same semantic field as ἐχθρός in 1:13 and given the use of *gezerah shavah* on the phrase "under his feet". In 2:8, where the phrase is repeated from 1:13, the enemies are to be kept in view as part of the "all" that is subjected to the Son. The idea of a world to come where enemies are subjugated later in Hebrews would strengthen the likelihood of a link between our passage and Ps 110, and of Ps 8 to Ps 110 in ch. 2.

Nevertheless, even if the link between Ps 110 and Ps 8 as made by scholars taking a christological reading is once again to be accepted, the concerns Blomberg raises over the interpretation of v. 8 are very real. The γάρ in 2:8, despite being in a somewhat unusual position in the sentence (third, not second), signals background support material to that which has come before.[56] If we accept that "son of man" in 1:6 is unlikely as a christological designation, then Hebrews might well be interpreting the psalm anthropologically in v. 8, even if v. 9 moves to a christological interpretation.[57]

We might add to this that the νῦν δέ, which follows in v. 8c, signals a contrastive clarification that reveals a possible contradiction from the addressor and addressees' perspective in that they do not see all things subjected to "him/it", and that, too, needs to be taken seriously.[58] In v. 9 there is another clarification as heralded by δέ, and a cohesive tie through the verbs of seeing, and specifically Jesus is then revealed as fulfilling the quotation, his name being postponed until the end of the sentence for emphasis, and perhaps the Son is not really introduced until that point.[59]

However, it may be that an anthropological reading of 8a and a christological reading of 8b–9 are compatible.[60] There are also a further two important cohesive ties which need to be mentioned here. Firstly, there is the term πάντα, placed before the verb for emphasis in v. 8a as in Ps 8:6. There is a certain ambiguity in its usage in that, on the surface, the first πάντα appears to be as though

---

[56] Westfall, *Discourse*, 101.
[57] It should be remembered that the term for humanity in Hebrews and the psalm is singular: ἄνθρωπος.
[58] Westfall, *Discourse*, 101–02.
[59] Ibid., 101.
[60] See also Moffitt, *Atonement*, 121–23.

everything were intended to be straightforwardly subjected to humanity, given it is still part of the straightforward citation of Ps 8. Indeed, the Son has not been mentioned at all so far in ch. 2, even if he is alluded to in 2:1–4 by mention of God's speaking (see 1:1–2). However, this term is clearly cataphoric to the same term in v. 8b and then in v. 9, where the subjection of everything is interpreted christologically, and in these latter clauses πάντα functions as an anaphoric distant hook word to 1:3, where the Son is said to be the sustainer of everything (πάντα) by his word. Even if we were to see the πάντα in 8a as also anaphoric to 1:3, such thought does not become obvious until the later usage of this term, i. e., when πάντα is used directly in relation to the rule of Christ in 8b-9. We might therefore recognise a movement in v. 8 from humanity to the Son. It may be that vv. 8–9 moves the focus from humanity, denoted by two separate phrases in the psalm quotation (i. e., "man" and "son of man," in v. 6 and "him" in 8a), to Jesus.[61]

Secondly, there is the cohesive tie and contrast on the verbs of seeing: "but now we do not see … but … we do see Jesus …" Hebrews could be viewed as moving from our not seeing humanity as having everything subjected to it, through to Christ to whom everything will eventually be subjected, and whose reign has already begun.[62] Church offers a pertinent suggestion in this regard, based on the fact that whilst the words quoted from Ps 8 are aorist indicatives (ἠλάττωσας [you made lower] and ἐστεφάνωσας [you crowned], 2:7) they become perfect passive participles in 2:9, and can be understood as functioning adjectivally to describe characteristics of Jesus "as we see him", that is as "a member of the class of those 'made a little lower than the angels' who is now 'crowned with glory and honour'.[63] This has the effect that the Son is presented as a "true human" and 2:8–9 can be seen as arguing that "through Jesus, God is restoring humans to the dominion over the cosmos celebrated in the psalm."[64]

Moreover, we can add to this observation that the eschatological is directly linked to the protological: the protological πάντα in 2:10 picks up on the eschatological πάντα in 2:8, which stresses the Son's dominion over all creation, in both eras, or, one could say, *aeons*, a link back to 1:2.[65] Indeed, since the realm over which Jesus is given dominion is not only designated as "all things", but also "the world to come" in 2:5, this implies that the world to come must also be seen as part of the things created and sustained through and by the Son (1:2–3).[66]

---

[61] Church, *Temple*, 302.
[62] Westfall, *Discourse*, 101. See also Koester, *Hebrews*, 221–22, who argues for an almost dual anthropological and christological reading.
[63] Church, *Temple*, 302.
[64] Ibid., 301–3, quotation from 303.
[65] Filtvedt, "Creation," 283.
[66] Ibid. This would still be true even given the word here is οἰκουμένη not αἰών, based on our analysis of the meaning of the latter term as being both spatial and temporal. Filtvedt suggests that the use of οἰκουμένη points deliberately to the idea of an inhabited world, based on its normal usage, and so stresses the spatial nature of the world to come. Ibid., 284.

Indeed, salvation is still held out to believers, and notably the salvific process still seems to be in progress when we read in 2:11 that the Son sanctifies believers, using the present ἁγιάζων and they are the ones sanctified, οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι, a participle which is present and passive, suggesting an ongoing process.

6.3.3 Suffering and Salvation in Heb 2:10 and Heb 2:10–18

Such observations prompt me to conclude that Hebrews begins with the anthropological reading of the psalm, but ends on a christological note, that is, it moves from the lack of everything being subjected to humanity through to the promise that everything will once again be under its control – this time, under Christ's leadership. Whilst it does appear that a certain level of transdiegetization of Ps 8 has taken place in its application to the Son, especially with regards to the latter half of the psalm and 2:9, the argumentation of Hebrews appears to be even more intricate than first assumed, and we cannot take it for granted that Hebrews *only* applies Ps 8 to the Son. There is an element by which the Psalm is applied in the first place to the originally intended status of humanity and then christologically to the Son.[67] What is particularly interesting, however, is the way in which Jesus is crowned with glory and honour specifically because he had "tasted death" in v. 9. Why might it be considered important to mention this? Moreover, humanity is said also to enter into glory by virtue of his sacrificial activity in 2:10. As humanity was crowned with "glory and honour" in Ps 8, it would appear that Hebrews is in some way implying that humanity will gain its originally intended glory through the actions of the Son. In terms of the Son's descent/ascent, while we can say that the earlier creation references were found within the context of the heavenly Christ, we have in ch. 2 the same motif, but from the point of view of the earthly Jesus, and it is to his earthly life that the reference to death points in v. 9. This topic of the Son's descent continues into the next section, 2:10–18, and we would therefore do well to discuss it and 2:1–9 together. Here a link between creation and salvation once more becomes apparent, and again we see the descent/ascent motif.

In 2:10, we have another instance of γάρ, which suggests that what comes next is support material for our own passage, and we move specifically to a discussion of the incarnation and how the Son has become human for humanity's sake.[68] Indeed, after our passage, the use of angels as a "spatial anchor" foregrounding the heavenly setting, to echo Westfall's terminology, is no longer active.[69] Notably, there is a slight separation of the Son from his creative role at this point, for Hebrews tells us that it was fitting that the one through whom

---

[67] Koester, *Hebrews*, 215–16.
[68] Westfall, *Discourse*, 101.
[69] Ibid.

and for whom everything exists has made the pioneer perfect through suffering. Whilst there are lexical links to the Son's own role in creation with διά (compare 1:2) and πάντα (see also 1:3), which arguably keep the overall cosmic role of the Son in view, we not only find διά + genitive οὗ but διά + accusative ὅν in order to stress that the world was created by and for someone, who, although not named, must be God since it would logically be God that makes the Son perfect through suffering (2:10b). On the one hand, the inclusion of the δι᾽ οὗ has the effect of equating the creative activity of the Son and God, since the same term was applied to God's activity through the Son in 1:2, who in 1:10–12 is indeed designated as actual creator. However, the δι᾽ ὅν also draws attention to God as the one in control of the world, the one for whom all creation came into existence, when the description is juxtaposed with that of the Son, who is here denoted as the "pioneer of their salvation" (τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας), whom God makes perfect through sufferings. This creates a contrast between the God of heaven and the Son who is now sent to earth. In terms of linearization, this sets up the co-text in which to understand what follows: it is as creator of the world that God sends the Son to bring other sons' to glory, and that he perfects this pioneer of their salvation through suffering. The placing of διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι (to make perfect through suffering) at the end of 2:10 focuses attention on the Son's earthly humanity.[70]

The focus on the humanity of Jesus continues in vv. 11b–13, as the semantic chain of vocabulary pertaining to kinship relations initiated in 2:10 continues to stress his solidarity with humanity, and joins the previous section to 2:10–18. Hebrews speaks of those sanctified by the Son as "siblings" (ἀδελφοί) in 2:11, the logical progression from their having also been designated as "sons" in 2:10 as Jesus himself is "son", and "children" (παιδία) in 2:13. The relationships are, in the light of 2:10, seen to exist between Jesus and humanity by virtue of his becoming human, even if in 2:12–13 we have a possible declaration of said relationships in a heavenly setting.[71] This emphasis on the earthly Jesus actually lasts until 2:18. The descent-ascent motif is still present, however. The passage begins to move back to a heavenly setting when it then goes on to say that it is as a result of this suffering that he becomes a great high priest in 2:17 to make propitiation for sin. Whereas I have argued that in earlier passages this is a reference to the earthly

---

[70] It would appear to me here that the "being made perfect" implies a reference to the Son's earthly perfection, even though it may lead, finally, to his returning to heaven. In the discourse of Heb 2, it is closely connected to his human life and death in the neighbouring co-text, and appears to be a pre-requisite to his leading the children to glory, not part of it i.e. it is presented with his suffering and death, rather than exaltation. See also Moffitt, *Atonement*, 195–98, who argues it is after suffering that the Son is perfected, and after that that he can become high priest.

[71] It might be possible to argue that Jesus declares the children brothers and sisters in the midst of the heavenly congregation, given that ἐκκλησία is conceivably used in some passages to mean the heavenly congregation, e. g., LXX Ps 34:18, 89:5. See also Heb 12:23.

sacrifice of the Son, here the concept of Christ the High Priest is directly linked to a heavenly calling nearby, in 3:1, where the term is repeated, and so we see that a gradual movement heavenward begins as the result of said sacrifice at this point in the discourse. Moreover, in 3:1, the calling is also held out to the above "siblings", (ἀδελφοί).

In fact, a closer look at v. 10b reveals that the ultimate goal of this becoming human is to return to heaven, and to allow humanity, specifically those who are faithful to the Son, to enter therein: "For it was fitting for him for the sake of whom is everything and through whom is everything, in leading many sons [children] to glory, to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings." (NRSV).[72] This term, "glory", is anaphoric both to the mention of humanity's original crowning with glory in 2:7 and to the fact that the Son has been crowned with glory and honour in v. 9 (see also 1:3). Humanity is thereby depicted to achieve the original glory promised to it through the sacrifice and exaltation of the Son. The fact that the faithful are not also said to receive "glory *and honour*" in the same way as the Son may in fact be to emphasize the word "glory" so as to ensure that the link is made primarily with the original promise to humanity, and secondarily to the glory of the Son. Nevertheless, at the same time, it is the heavenly glory of the Son in which they will share.[73] This has caused some scholars to argue that Hebrews may have a theology of Christ as a Second Adam.[74]

We recall the parallels with 1 Cor 15, mentioned above. 1 Cor 15:20–23 describes the Son as the "first fruits" of those who are asleep, and thus views Christ as in some way being the "first" to overcome death in a similar way to Hebrews' concept of his being a "pioneer" in 2:10. There is one difference, how-

---

[72] See also Moffitt, *Atonement*, 110–16, which likens the Hebrews depiction to that of 2 Baruch, where we also have a possible link to Ps 8:6 when it is said that humanity will, after enduring suffering in this world, obtain the world to come as a Footnote: "crown with great glory" (2 *Bar.* 15:8). Notably, this text makes reference to the Adam account in Genesis and his sin, but says that Adam was shown a city and sanctuary prepared for him in addition to paradise (2 *Bar.* 4:2–6). Even though this is denied to Adam because of his sin, God does still hold that this was created for the righteous, who will inherit it. This casts the promise, as in Hebrews, into an eschatological frame and suggests another promised world which might be comparable to the οἰκουμένη of Heb 2. Interestingly, God's people are not able to exercise authority in the world because they die (2 *Bar.* 21:19–25). A renewal of creation is also envisaged in 2 *Bar.* 32:1–7, which I think may prove another similarity with Heb., esp. 1:10–12 and its being changed, as discussed above in this thesis. We also recall what was said about the "aeons" of 1:2, and the creation of two world-ages.

[73] We find the topic of the Son leading humanity, specifically believers, to heaven expressed later in the Epistle in a variety of ways, such as enabling their entering into God's rest or the heavenly city (4:3; 6:4–5; 10:26–30; 13:14). There is, however, a question of whether the παντός in 2:9 might refer to humanity or to the whole of creation. The latter is possible if it is taken to be neuter. However, Leschert argues successfully that the co-text focuses on the redemption of human beings (see also vv. 10, 15, 16). Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 124–25.

[74] E.g., Schenck, *Cosmology*, 56; Mackie, *Eschatology*, 46–48; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 75.

ever, as Fitzmyer remarks: "Paul is affirming not only the certainty of Christ's resurrection, but also Christ's resurrection as the guarantee of the futurity of the resurrection of the dead," but in Hebrews it seems Christ's death brings with it the possibility of heavenly ascent.[75] Moreover, as in Hebrews, this is the promise made to faithful believers – in 1 Cor 15:18, there is a reference to all who have fallen asleep specifically in Christ, and so v. 20 refers back to them.[76] This would correspond to Hebrews' argument to "hold fast" in 4:14. Whilst we should be cautious in ascribing such a precise theology to Hebrews, especially given the lack of the name Adam in the Epistle, it may be significant that the Son and his "brethren" are said to be descended from "the same one" (ἐξ ἑνός) in 2:11, possibly also used of descent from Adam in Acts 17:26.[77]

We also have the interesting statement that:

… since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared the same things, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and free those who all their lives were held in slavery by the fear of death (Heb 2:14–15 NRSV).

As death entered the world through Adam's sin in Gen 3 (see also Rom 5:12), and through death Jesus is able to complete his duties as great high priest (2:14; 9:26),[78] there may be another reference here to Gen 3 whereby Christ is seen to reverse the punishment placed on humanity when Adam sins. We saw above that in its usage of Ps 8 and 110 together, Hebrews is similar to 1 Cor, and this also suggests a parallel between Hebrews and that text: "for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ." (1 Cor 15:22 NRSV). In the Pauline text, all

---

[75] Joseph Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, (London: Yale University Press, 2008), 570.

[76] Charles Kingsley Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1971), 748.

[77] Scholars have debated the force of this phrase, suggesting that it could pertain either to descent from Adam or descent from Abraham. The latter becomes a possibility in the light of 2:16. See Christopher Richardson, *Pioneer and Perfector of Faith: Jesus' Faith and the Climax of Israel's History in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, WUNT 2 >338 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 18; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 88 esp. nn. 112–15. The role of the Son as the one leading people to heaven has sometimes been interpreted in terms of gnostic mythology. E. g., Käsemann, *Wandering People*, 94–96, suggesting that a "Primal Man" myth lies behind the interpretation of Ps 8. However, Attridge discusses how the latter relies heavily on Mandean parallels and whilst it is clear that some classical gnostic sources such as *Gos. Thom.* 49, contain the notion of the transcendent origin of the saved, it is unlikely that they derive from an Iranian "Primal Man" myth. As discussed previously, the application of gnostic theology to Hebrews is anachronistic in any case, given that some gnostic sources seem to rely on Hebrews itself, and possible gnostic influences on Hebrews are now widely accepted not to be likely.

[78] I hereby recall again that whilst the priestly activity is complete in heaven, it is begun on earth with Christ's death. It should be understood that sacrificial references may, as I argued earlier, include an element of his being the victim, or even focus on this (indeed, "priestly" and "sacrificial" are not necessarily the same thing) and it should always be considered that when the Son acts as High Priest, it is his own blood he offers. See also Moffitt, *Atonement*, 283.

human beings are seen as somehow incorporated into the historical Adam, the first human, and so they share in his condemnation to death, and through incorporation into Christ they can instead have life.[79] There is a distinct possibility that Hebrews might see the Son as fulfilling such a Second Adam role, even if Adam is not mentioned by name. This may be the result of presupposition on the part of the addressor, whereby his addressees were supposed to understand the allusions to Gen 3 in terms of a Second Adam or similar theology.

It is possible that our creation reference, then, is employed in the discourse of Hebrews not just in terms of the psalm itself, but in terms of the Genesis creation accounts, and not simply Gen 1:26 to which the psalm itself pertains, but also to the wider account in Gen 1–3. There are several other hints that Hebrews has a view to the wider narrative of Gen 1–3 to support such a claim. With reference to ch. 2, it is further significant that Jesus' suffering is not limited to his death. In 2:18, the verb πάσχω is used in conjunction with πειράζω and he is also said to suffer temptation/be tested, and overcome it.[80] This would stand in contradistinction to the tempting of Eve in Gen 3:1–6, who succumbs to it.[81] We also have reference in 6:8 to the ground yielding thorns and thistles, the result of the

---

[79] Adam is understood as a "corporate personality". Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 570. The Adamic theology of this passage is often known in common parlance as the 'fall', though as Fitzmyer points out, this is a later, patristic, term and, more properly speaking, this passage deals with humanity's incorporation into Adam's death, rather than his sin as in Rom 5:12. Nevertheless, I retain the term "fall" elsewhere in this thesis since Hebrews appears to also make veiled reference to the act of Adam's sin in 4:13. Although this is a patristic, rather than biblical, term, I use it here in its traditional sense. Not all scholars agree that Paul had in mind incorporation into Adam's physical death. For instance, Henry Ansgar Kelly, "Adam Citings before the Intrusion of Satan: Recontextualizing Paul's Theology of Sin and Death," *BTB* 44 (2014):13–28, argues that Paul in Romans speaks of death metaphorically in some places (e. g. ch. 7), and that in 5:21, "referring to life in the next age tells us that the death he speaks of as caused by Adam's transgression does not refer to physical death" (Ibid., 21–22). However, I contest this reading on the grounds that physical death was the promised punishment to Adam in the text that Paul would have had in mind, LXX Gen 2:17, and that his sin and death are very closely connected in Rom 5:12–13 so that death appears as his punishment in the thought of Paul. Kelly's comments come as part of a wider argument that Adam's sin was not, in fact, punished by immediate death as promised in Gen 2:17, but that is not to say that death was not still his punishment in some way, perhaps delayed, something Kelly also discusses in relation to a variety of ancient texts. It is interesting that the punishment for Adam's transgression includes toil in Gen 3:17. In the Gen 1 account, humanity is said to be created on the sixth day, that is, before the day of rest. That Adam has to toil for the remainder of his life could be seen symbolically as his not reaching the seventh day. However, in Gen 3:3, the woman does not say that she has been told she will die on the same day, but simply that she will die. The caveat in 2:17 might therefore be a later addition for emphasis on the punishment of death, but more likely a Hebrew idiom.

[80] The term πειράζω can have either sense. See "πειράζω," *BDAG*, 792–93.

[81] Although passive of the verb πειράζω is not found in this account, it is found in relation to this narrative in a text, which it has been established Hebrews likely knew: Wis 2:24. This text may also reflect the tradition mentioned in the Life of Adam and Eve 12–16 that the devil was envious of humanity, or a similar tradition, and that is why he hated humanity and sought its demise, but it also seems to reference the Genesis account because it mentions death entering the

punishment under which it is placed in Gen 3:17. Perhaps the mention of God's blessing in connection with rain falling on crops is also an echo of Gen 1:11–12.[82]

There is also possibly a nod to Adam and Eve's discovery that they are naked in Gen 2:15 (see also 3:7, 10–11). Whilst κτίζω does not occur in the LXX of Genesis, which favours ποιέω, the use of κτίσις, in Heb 4:13 in conjunction with the term γυμνός in the co-text of "hiding" would seem to me to hint at Gen 3:10–11 where Adam and Eve hide from God in their shame at having broken his command not to eat of the fruit of the tree: "He said, 'I heard the sound of you in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.' He said, 'Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?'" (NRSV). The term κτίσις in the LXX was generally used of creatures and creation, as they pertained to the creator, and the inclusion of γυμνός in Hebrews would suggest that it might be that the human creature is specifically at stake, the narrative in Gen 2–3 following on from that of 1. This would fit with what was established with regards possible Adamic theology in ch. 2, and can be argued to refer back to it. Although the verb κρύπτω denotes the action of hiding in the Genesis account, the ἀφανής of Heb 4:13 can be seen as describing the same action in view of the hook word between Hebrews and Genesis is γυμνός, present in Gen 2:25 and 3:7–11. In regard to

---

world. For Wis 2:24 as referring to the sin of Eve, then Adam, tempted by the devil, see John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997, 190. However, some have suggested it refers to Cain's killing of Abel, for instance, Kelly, "Adam Citings," 13–28. Kelly argues that Adam was rehabilitated without being punished on the basis of Wis 10:1 where Wisdom is said to have protected the "firstformed father of the world … delivered him from his transgression," and that in 3:1–3, the righteous are said to seem to have died, but are really at peace. Adam was not punished and so this would have been his fate. The account of the envy of the διάβολος of Wis 2:24 therefore does not refer to the serpent in Gen 3. He concludes it refers to Cain, in the light of Clement of Rome's Epistle to the Corinthians 3:4–4:7, which reference Wis 2:24 explicitly and then goes on to discuss Cain's killing of Abel. His argument is problematic in some regards. Firstly, his argument is partly one from silence. The idea that Wisdom protected the first father does not necessarily suggest that Adam went unpunished, though the punishment may have been muted so that Adam did not die that same day (see above footnote and Gen 2:17.) In addition, the imperfect תּוּמָת in Gen 2:17 could also be read as a continuous, which in English we would express in the phrase "shall be dying", and so it is not clear if the Genesis account itself viewed Adam's originally promised punishment as literally dying the same day he ate the fruit. Secondly, in the Clement text, the reference to Cain flows from the citation of Wis 2:24, not the other way around. Immediately preceding the citation of Wis 2:24 is a section on not going after one's own lusts and respecting one's own appointments, which could be an allusion to Eve's succumbing to the temptation to become like God in Gen 3:5–6. As for Wis 3:1–3, the mention of Hades would indicate that Wisdom is referring to an afterlife, indicating that even the righteous do physically die (see also the "shameful death" of Wis 2:20). Wisdom tradition may have been combined with other strands of thought that saw the messiah as overcoming demonic forces. See Dyer, *Suffering*, 87 on the latter, particularly in apocalyptic literature, including *1 Enoch* 10:13, *T. Levi* 18:2 and *T. Dan* 5:10 (n. 36). However, given Hebrews' links with Wisdom in the co-text, I posit that it is more directly drawing on Wisdom tradition at this point.

[82] See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 173 n. 79.

the possible link with Gen 3, it is interesting that Genesis places a lot of emphasis on God's having spoken when Adam and Eve are found out. In particular, we find the cognate verb λέγω applied to God at 3:9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17. It may be that Hebrews is making some allusion here to God's word as effecting his judgement when he uses the noun λόγος.[83]

Interestingly, we encounter the same issues as raised by scholars concerning Paul's new-creation theology: is Hebrews envisaging individual incorporation into Christ at this point, or a cosmological renewal of creation? The immediate co-text here would seem to suggest a more subjective reading, that incorporation into Christ's saving activity is dependent upon fidelity to him, especially given the exhortation in 2:1–3, and the emphasis on not neglecting so great a salvation. Nevertheless, we saw in our discussion of the meaning of αἰών that Hebrews does seem to have an apocalyptic understanding of eschatology regarding the "world-age to come", and in our investigation of 2:5–9, this seemed to have been inaugurated. This apparent contradiction is perhaps resolved when we consider that the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Rather, later in the Epistle, it is because Jesus has passed through the veil and entered God's sanctuary in his holy city, the faithful can be confident that they will endure the shaking of creation (12:26) and themselves reach that city.[84] Their incorporation into Christ's sacrificial activity in 2:10–18 might thus be seen as part of the overall inauguration of the new world, and as permitting believers to survive after the shaking of creation which marks its ultimate change from old to new. This would correspond to Paul's concept of salvation only being complete at the Parousia, and indeed his use of Adamic theology in Rom 5:10–21 and theology of incorporation into Christ as the means to salvation immediately after in Rom 6:1–11 to encourage fidelity and correct behaviour.[85] The redemptive power of God is already seen to be at work in the world within the Christian community, but it awaits its final consummation when all creation will be changed (1:10–12).[86] It is also interesting that whilst it is clear that believers are the ones to profit from the Christ event (2:10 speaks of "many sons" being brought to glory, not all humanity), the atoning sacrifice does not seem to have been offered for them alone, but by virtue of the human condition for all, if the above reading that it is descent from Adam at stake in 2:16 is accepted. This suggests a certain impact of the Christ event for the whole of humanity which is effective for believers, again a parallel with Paul in Rom 5–6.

---

[83] On the meaning of κτίσις, see Eberhand Bons, "Le Verb κτίζω Comme Terme Technique de la Création dans la Septante et dans le Nouveau Testament," in *Voces Biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament* ed. Jan Joosten and Peter Tomson, CBET 49 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 1–18.

[84] Ibid., 382–83.

[85] See Hays, *Moral*, 20–21, 30–31.

[86] Ibid, 31.

6.4 Hebrews in Context: Further Insights from the Extratext

It was stated in the introduction to this thesis that in DA, intertextuality does not pertain only to texts cited/alluded to in a work, but also encompasses the network of textual interactivity that was known in the era a text was written. This observation becomes very important for this part of our investigation, and this theory can be argued to support what was said above. In terms of the proposed Adamic theology, it may be significant that the concept of Christ's priesthood is explicitly stated for the first time in ch. 2, especially in 2:10. In some strands of ancient Jewish tradition, Adam was a priest who offered sacrifice. In Jub 3:27, for instance he offers the priestly elements of frankincense, galbanum, stacte, and spices each morning after he has experienced shame, likely a reference to when he discovered he was naked (see also Exod 30:34 and Sir 24:15). This tradition may even be hinted at in the Bible itself. Some have posited that Ezek 28:12–13, which mentions the "son of man" in the garden of Eden, who is said to be covered with the precious stones that adorned the high priest's breastplate, refers to Adam, and a later interpretation of Gen 2:15 occurs in *Gen Rab.* 16.5, where the instruction to till and keep the earth is seen as a reference to making sacrificial offerings in the temple.[87] If a notion of Adam as a priest was known to our author, perhaps he even connected the son of man in the psalm to this son of man, though to what extent the first man can be seen to be a "son of man" is debatable.[88]

However, significant in regard both to Adam as priest and to what was said earlier about Hebrews' links to Wisdom theology, Kugel also suggests that Ben Sira might be invoking the clothing of the priesthood in 6:29–31: "Given his conception of Eden as the very place of divine wisdom, it may not be irrelevant to observe that Adam, serving … as a priest in that place might have been similarly clothed in glory in Ben Sira's mind."[89] Philip Church has also drawn attention to Ben Sira's depiction of Wisdom in Sir 24. In Sir 24:3–7, Wisdom here speaks of her origin in the mouth of God, which alludes to God's creative act by speaking in Gen 1, and like the spirit of God in 1:2, Wisdom covers the earth in a mist (Sir 24:3) and pitches her tent in the heights.[90] The stanza ends with Wisdom's looking for a place to rest (ἀνάπαυσις), and inheritance (κληρονομία. See

---

[87] See Kugel, *Traditions*, 118 and Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 110–12. The Targum in Codex Reuchlinianus also speaks of Adam having had canopies made from such stones. See Ibid., 110, n. 104. See also Kugel, *Traditions*, 118. Hebrews' author may have had at the back of his mind the reference to the Son of Man in the gospels, which could have triggered christological associations in his mind, even if he did not employ them in his exegesis.

[88] See Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 118.

[89] Kugel, *Traditions*, 118.

[90] Church, *Temple*, 31–36.

also Heb 9:15). The next stanza in Sir 24:8–12 describes the resting place and inheritance, the former also being a tent (σκηνή. See also Heb 8:2, 5; 9:3–21) in Israel. Wisdom is said to minister before God in the holy tent and to be established in Zion, but in an allusion to the temple rather than the sanctuary, God is said to give her a resting place in Jerusalem. Interestingly for our purposes, the chapter continues on to make references to the creation in the likening of Wisdom to cedars, cypresses, palms, roses, olive and other trees, indicated in 24:19 to be the trees of Eden when all who desire wisdom are invited to come and eat of her fruit (compare Gen 2:16). Wisdom is also likened to six rivers, including the four from Eden in 24:28, and the poem ends with a likening of Ben Sira to Adam as the gardener and guardian of the word's irrigation who spreads wisdom to future generations.[91]

There seems to be a link here between the Garden of Eden and the construction of the tabernacle in Exod 25–30, and indeed the temple in Jerusalem. Church argues that the Cosmos in Gen 1 and Eden in Gen 2 are to be understood as archetypal sanctuaries.[92] Moreover, there are story parallels between Hebrews' Son and Ben Sira's figure of Wisdom: with God who created the aeons in 1:2, he has descended to be with God's people in ch. 2 and ministers before God in a sanctuary (Heb 7–9), albeit a heavenly one.[93] The language of inheritance might also be significant, since, as we have established, the inheritance of the Son becomes that of believers in Heb 1:13–14 (see also Heb 9:15). Perhaps, even, the idea of "rest" is shared with Heb 4, though I will later argue that there it is a questionable exegetical move to equate ἀνάπαυσις and κατάπαυσις.

However, it would seem unfair to mention Wisdom, however briefly, and not to mention Philo. In the same thread, but not as priest, Philo also connects Adam and Eve to the ceremonies of Yom Kippur specifically in *Leg.* 2.49–64. Here, he speaks of the ways in which the soul can be made naked when it is in an unchangeable state and is free from all vices, and one has laid aside all passions, and the need to clothe oneself with virtue. He specifically references Yom Kippur when the priest offered two goats, one as a scapegoat, and goes on immediately to discuss Adam and Eve's state before they were tempted as a form of this spiritual nakedness. Their initial moral "nakedness" is linked to the child-like state of the mind when it is clothed neither with vice nor with virtue (2:53, 64). Granted, this is a far cry from Christ's sacrificial offering in Hebrews, but

---

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid., 33 Church argues that Wisdom is at once seen to dwell in heaven and on earth however, and so it may be possible to argue that Wisdom is in some way ministering in a temple which transcends the two. See also ibid., 36–43 where Church argues that in Ben Sira it is not a case of a heavenly vs. earthly temple, but as a microcosm of the universe, so that in the temple one is seen to be in the presence of God in heaven, as was the first man Adam in the Eden sanctuary (ibid., 43).

nevertheless it does show that there was a link in contemporary Jewish thought between the priestly sacrifices on Yom Kippur and Adam and Eve's original state. The need for the soul to become naked of vice and covered in virtue appears in Philo to be in some way thought to be effected at Yom Kippur, when the sufferings of those who do not attempt to rid themselves of vice and cling to virtue are cast onto the scapegoat (2.49–51). The Levites become united to God, who is said to be their inheritance (2:49–53). Adam and Eve serve to represent those whose minds are destitute of reason and have no share in virtue or vice (2:64), and the high priest has to put off the robe of opinion and appear naked to make an offering of the blood of his soul, and sacrifice his whole mind to God (2:56) and so in some way might be said to be likening himself to them as a stage in his communing with God. It might even be possible to draw a link here with Hebrews in that the Son takes on the form of humanity remaining free from sin (4:15), and so is like Adam and Eve before their transgression when he offers sacrifice. Philo's concept, if known to the author of Hebrews, would prepare the way for the Epistle's reinterpretation of Yom Kippur in Heb 9:7–14, and help explain the link between Christ's priestly and salvific activity, which seems to begin to develop explicitly in ch. 2.

Also significant in this regard might be Philo's use of the term ἀρχηγέτης (first leader, founder) which is related to ἀρχηγός (pioneer) used of Jesus in Heb 2:10 and 12:2. Notably, this term is not used of the *logos*, but it refers to Adam in *Opif.* 142, and specifically in reference to his control over creation:[94]

If we call that original forefather [lit. first leader, founder, ἀρχηγέτης] of our race not only the first man but also the only citizen of the world we shall be speaking with perfect truth. For the world was his city and dwelling-place. No building made by hand had been wrought out of the material of stones and timbers. The world was his mother country where he dwelt far removed from fear, inasmuch as he had been held worthy of the rule of the denizens of the earth, and all things mortal trembled before him, and had been taught or compelled to obey him as their master. So he lived exposed to no attack amid the comforts of peace unbroken by war. (*Opif.* 142 [Colson, LCL])

The reference to "all things mortal" being "taught or compelled to obey their master" is a reference to Gen 1:26, and so we also have a reference to the human control of creation which Hebrews references in ch. 2, albeit through the use of Ps 8. The author of Hebrews may also have known this designation, ἀρχηγέτης (first leader, founder), for Adam, and in his using a related term of the Son, we might find further support for the suggestion above that Hebrews does know a Second Adam theology.[95] Even though we cannot be certain of the author's knowledge, the very existence of the connection of a ἀρχηγέτης (first leader,

---

[94] See also Williamson, *Philo*, 486.
[95] Admittedly, it is also used of Abraham in *Mos.* 1.7, though I would argue that the *Opif.* passage cited here more closely matches the co-text of the term in Heb 2.

founder) to Adam in the extratext, and from a writer to which Hebrews is often thought to have connections, should be at least be noted.[96]

6.5 The Interpersonal Component
of the Creation Reference in Heb 2:5–9

It is in these latter comments pertaining to the likely implicit Second Adam Christology in Hebrews 2 that the interpersonal component of the creation reference in Heb 2:5–9 for the discourse of Hebrews comes to the fore. Our creation reference serves to underpin the notion of the Son as pioneer and perfector, the one who leads Christians to their heavenly home. In doing so, he reverses the punishment of Adam and Eve, and thus the death that afflicts all humanity. Whereas the devil once had power over death (2:14) as a result of his trickery in Eden, the Son can lead them to eternal life.[97]

In terms of lexical cohesion, 2:5–9 picks up on threads from ch. 1, rather than 2:1–4. However, in the light of these discussions and conclusions, we can now understand our passage's relationship to 2:1–4, with its exhortation to adhere to the message the addressees have received. In 2:1–4, an important question is posed: "how can we escape if we neglect so great a salvation?" (Heb 2:3 NRSV). In our passage, the author of Hebrews puts forward what exactly that salvation entails – a return to the glorious status of humanity before the "fall", since humans are able to share in the same glory as the Son. The author leads from his exhortation into a description of how things should have been in the beginning, through to the present situation (2:8) which seems so different from that proposed in the psalm, through to the solution to this existential dilemma in Christ (2:9). Peterson summarizes well the act of communication between addressor and addressee in this regard:

The Devil is deprived of his power over death when Christ provides forgiveness for sin through his atoning sacrifice (Cf. 10:15–18) and thereby the possibility of passing through death into the "promised eternal inheritance" (9:15). Men can be released from

---

[96] See also Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 39, who further suggests a connotation of "leader" in Philo's usage.

[97] David Peterson, *Hebrews and Perfection*, SNTSMS 47 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), esp. 52–62 covers many of the topics here, including the possible allusions to Gen 3: "In its reflection on the status of man in creation, Psalm 8 does not appear to take into account the Fall narrative of Gen 3, but speaks of man in ideal terms. For Paul and the writer of Hebrews, however, this glory is the eschatological goal of man in Christ: it is the promise of becoming like Christ in his glorified state." Ibid., 56. Richardson, *Pioneer*, 29–46, also deals in part with the question of when the Son becomes priest, which may have been in his pre-existent form, at his incarnation or after his death, as well as the importance of Christ's obedience in leading others to perfection.

the 'fear of death' (2:15) and therefore, in a sense, from bondage to the Devil's power, by coming to believe in the effectiveness of the redemption achieved by Christ.[98]

Furthermore, as deSilva explains, our passage in some ways offers a rationale for the exhortation in 2:1–4 because if the world is subjected to the Son, those who enter it must "behave becomingly toward the Son."[99]

Moreover, this same motif of Christ's leading believers to salvation and the necessity of remaining faithful to reach the final goal will be repeated at various other points in the Epistle – from chs. 3–4 and the rhetoric of rest, to ch. 11 where the faithful examples of the past all persevered. We can therefore conclude by saying that the force of the creation reference in Heb 2:5–9 is to strengthen the persuasive argumentation of the Epistle as a whole. This has been discussed, to some extent, in a DA study by Robert Brawley, who employs Greimas and Courtes' theory that a formal relationship exists between the presentation of a need or problem, and how that be solved.[100] To do this, the addressor ("enunciator") attempts to bring addressees (termed "enunciatees") around to his own view point by creating a disjunction from their own viewpoint, and bringing them into conjunction with a desired value. In essence, Hebrews seeks to move the addressees from their inadequate faith perspective to the enunciator's confidence in and fidelity to the Son. Brawley's investigation sees ch. 2 as a part of this overall movement of Hebrews' discourse, the complexity of which arises from the fact there is actually a hierarchy of transformations which each need to happen in turn for the author to facilitate the necessary shift in their position:

In order for the enunciator to become competent for the primary performance, it is necessary for God to speak by a Son (Heb 1:1) and it is necessary in turn for the Son to be conjoined to the divine promise of the ultimate subjection of all things to him (1:13–2:8). Then, in order for the enunciatee to become competent to be disjoined from the inadequate point of view and conjoined to the enunciator's point of view (hope), it is necessary for Jesus to have suffered in identification with the enunciatee (2:10–11) and to have sanctified the enunciatee through the sacrifice of his own blood (2:17; 9:12–14). In addition, in order for Jesus to be competent to sanctify human beings, it is necessary for God to make him a high priest after the order of Melchizedek (5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1–17), etc.[101]

---

[98] Peterson, *Perfection*, 62.
[99] deSilva, *Perseverance*, 108.
[100] Robert Brawley, "Discoursive Structure and the Unseen in Hebrews 2:8 and 11:1: A Neglected Aspect of the Context," *CBQ* 55 (1993):81–99. See Algirdas Julien Greimas and Joseph Courtes, *Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982), 105.
[101] Brawley, "Discoursive," 85.

The "inheritance" by believers hangs on the subjection of all things to Jesus (1:13; 2:8) and the threat of their "falling away" is related in ch. 2 to their inability to see themselves as siblings of Jesus and, therefore, heirs with him.[102]

However, from the perspective of this thesis, recognising the incarnational theology of 1:5–13 and the possibility of Adamic theology of ch. 2 leads us to ask a question: which is more important to the discourse of Hebrews: the Son's humanity, or his status as creator? On the one hand, scholars such as Attridge and Grässer have traditionally placed the emphasis on the contrast between the Son's role as creator and the angels as created beings (2:5), whereas Moffitt has called this into question, saying that the Son has been exalted above his human peers and so "the writer bases the fundamental contrast between the Son's invitation to sit upon the heavenly throne and the angels' lower position on the fact that the latter are *spirits*, while the former is a human being."[103] However, if we consider that it is because of his "fatherhood" of all humanity that Adam is the cause of everyone being implicated in his sin, it follows that it is precisely one who is creator of everything, i. e., the "father" of it, that has the ability to restore the whole of creation to its original state. Thus the tension is resolved: it is precisely because he is the Creator of 1:10–12 (or agent of creation, 1:2), that the Son becomes human in order to lead all people heavenward.

6.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, we have covered much ground in this chapter. We began by discussing its cohesive links to chapter 1 and then discussed in depth the way in which the motif of the Son's descent/ascent was present also in 2:5–9 – this

---

[102] Ibid., 85–91. Brawley in fact seeks to uncover the relationship between 2:8 and 11:1, believing that there is a misperception that Heb 11:1 represents faith as a power that confers that for which it hopes. He posits an intratextual recall of 2:8, which enunciates what "we" cannot see, namely the ultimate subjection of all things to Jesus. According to 11:1, faith is the conjunction of the addressee with a conviction about what is not seen, and thus represents an inverted parallel of 2:8 with the effect that faith becomes a conviction about the consummation of divine victory, not yet seen. Although I may differ in my view of the movement from an anthropological to christological interpretation of 2:8–9, as opposed to his christological one, Brawley's observation of the relationship of 2:8–11:1 does indeed raise the interesting possibility that both the things hoped for and the things unseen refer to the subjection of creation to the Son, and that the ultimate subjection of all things to him is the object of hope, and in part upholds my conclusion in the excursus on 11:3 that 11:3 has in focus God's creative act, rather than any Platonic speculation. This would also enable us to see that the control of the Son over creation first enunciated in 1:10–12 to some extent governs the Epistle's discourse as it draws to a close.

[103] deSilva, *Perseverance*, 52. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 58–59, Grässer, *Hebräer*, 81–82. Moffitt argues that the peers cannot be the angels, since the rhetorical questions in 1:5 and 1:13 imply that the peers are not angels: "for if they were, the Son's being designated 'Son' and being invited to sit at God's right hand would stand as instances of God doing the very thing vv. 5 and 13 say he has never done – elevate *any* of the angels to the throne at his right hand." Moffitt, *Atonement*, 51.

time, from the point of view of the incarnation. Discussion moved then to a discourse analysis of the use of Ps 8 in the text, and the implication that different readings of its intertextual usage, christological and anthropological, might have on our understanding of Hebrews' discourse at this point. Further application of DA, however, revealed that there is a combination of both anthropological and christological readings of the psalm. This recognition uncovered an implicit theology of the fall in Hebrews, and the likelihood that Hebrews shared with 1 Cor not only the linking of Ps 8 to Ps 110, but also the theology of a Second Adam. This view was supported by identifying other key points in Hebrews' argumentation that pertain both to the fall and to the addressors' final heavenly goal as the result of the Son's sacrificial activity. Historical investigations into the extratext bearing in mind DA's inclusion of background intertextual activity also revealed a possible link between the priesthood of Christ in Hebrews and the priesthood of Adam in Jewish tradition and even Scripture. From here, we were able to see how the passage links to the rhetoric of the remainder of the Epistle, the thread of the Son's leading believers to salvation pervading Hebrews through to its finish. One of the key aims of DA is "the identification of the distinct role of the various units in a discourse," and in the case of our creation reference, that is seen to be the explication of what salvation entails according to Hebrews, and how that salvation is to be achieved.[104]

---

[104] Guthrie and Quinn, "Discourse Analysis," 245.

Chapter 7

The Creation and the Exodus, Joshua and Jesus

7.1 Introduction

In the last chapter, we looked at Hebrews' understanding of the purpose of the Son's activity, namely to restore humanity to its originally intended state. The discourse of Hebrews moves on in the next two chapters to make several further references to creation, which, I shall argue, should be dealt with together. These come in 3:1–6 and 4:3–11, beginning just after the opening of a new section of exhortation in 4:1.[1] In 3:1–6, the creation reference specifically comes in the declaration that "the one having constructed everything is God" in v. 4. In 4:3–13, we hear that God swore an oath, to the disobedient generation of Israelites that "they will not enter my rest", even though "his works were finished at the foundation of the world," leaving open the possibility of future generations to enter the primordial rest God enjoyed on the seventh day. Hebrews 4:10–11 picks up on this latter interpretation of Ps 95 (94) in the light of Gen 2:2 to exhort the audience to be diligent in their pursuit of said rest. For brevity's sake, and in order to see how the passages link together more clearly, I omit in my translation the remaining verses in these chapters. However, this important co-text will be taken into account in the analysis itself, with translations either taken or slightly amended from the NRSV.

7.1.1 Translation of Heb 3:1–6

   [1] Hence, holy brothers [and sisters], partakers in a heavenly calling,
   contemplate the apostle and high priest of our confession: Jesus,
   [2] being faithful to the one who appointed him
   as also Moses [was] in his [whole] house.
   [3] For he was considered worthy of more glory than Moses,
   in as much as the one who has constructed it has more honour than the house.
   [4] For every house is constructed by someone,
   but the one having constructed everything is God.

---

   [1] See also Guthrie, *Structure*, 67.

[5] And on the one hand, Moses was faithful in his whole house as an attendant, as a testimony to the things to be spoken,

[6] But, on the other hand, Christ, as Son, [was faithful] over his house, whose house we ourselves are, if [indeed] we hold fast the proud confidence of [our] hope.[2]

7.1.2 Hebrews 3:1–6: An Exhortation Centred on the Creative Son?

In 3:1–6, Jesus the Son is compared to Moses the attendant. Here, there is no attempt to denigrate Moses. The term θεράπων is commonly translated "servant" (NRSV). However, it more properly designated a close and devoted aide, sometimes with a liturgical connotation, and is Moses' self-designation in LXX Exod 4:10 (see also Exod 14:31; Num 12:7).[3] Hebrews' argumentation is founded on *synkrisis*, and first sets forth the argument that Jesus is due the greater honour than Israel's greatest prophet as the builder of the house has more honour than the house itself (3:3). The Epistle continues, also using a house analogy, to discuss how, whilst Moses was faithful in all God's house as an attendant, the Son is even greater.[4]

The reason for considering 3:1–6 in this investigation is the apparent reference made to creation in 3:4–5. We saw in a previous chapter how the metaphor of laying foundations is employed at several points in Hebrews' discourse: 1:10–12; 4:3; 6:1; 9:26 and 11:10. Here, we have another construction metaphor. Firstly, the Son is said to be worthy of more glory than Moses just as the builder of a house has more honour than the house itself (3:3), and then comes the statement that the builder of everything is God (3:4). This section will look at this creation reference in the light of DA theory pertaining to cohesion.

---

[2] On the origins of the designation "over his house" in relation to stewardship in the OT, see Scott Layton, "Christ Over His House (Hebrews 3:6) and Hebrew אשר על־הבית," *NTS* 37 (1991):473–77.

[3] See "θεράπων," *BDAG*, 453. It also has a liturgical usage in relation to Moses, see LXX Josh 8:30–35, which could tie in with the immediate co-text of Hebrews, which mentions Joshua by name in 4:8, and given the cultic understanding, it may also aid the contrast between Moses and Jesus in terms of the latter's priesthood, mentioned in 3:1. The unit can be divided into two main sections, an exhortation in 3:1–2, and the grounds upon which that exhortation is made in 3:3–6 Guthrie, *Structure*, 65.

[4] Lane points out that whilst this is commonly associated with Num 12:7, alluded to just after in our passage, it might echo LXX 1 Chr 17:14, where God says he will make the Davidic ruler "faithful in all his house," that is, appoint him. The dual meaning of the term is reflected in the form of the allusion in v. 2a, where Moses is said to be faithful to the one who appointed him in his house (see Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 76). See also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 203; Koester, *Hebrews*, 245–46.

7.1.3 A Closer Look at the Creation Reference (Heb 3:3)

At first, it appears that we have a reference to the constructive, i. e., creative, activity of the Son: he is said to be greater than Moses as the builder is greater than the house. The matter of what the "house" actually is will be discussed below, but at this stage, suffice it to say that this would suggest that he is said to be the one who "creates" it. One could argue that the language of "construction" suggests that the "house" is being created out of "pre-existing matter", but nevertheless there seems to be some kind of creative designation being applied to the Son. However, the focus then appears to switch from the creative activity of the Son to God as the one who constructs all things, the term "God" being at the very end of the sentence for emphasis.

Such a change in focus seems abrupt, and indeed the sudden focus on God and his creative power seems to be out of step with the rest of the section, which specifically compares the Son to Moses. To resolve this issue, some scholars have suggested that the phrase "the one having constructed all things is God" might be parenthetical.[5] In this view, the "unresolved tension in the logic of vv. 3 and 4 indicates that v. 4 must be a parenthetical statement which separates the first comparison (v. 3) from the second (vv. 5–6)."[6] That is to say, the comparison of the Son to Moses in 3:3 is distinct from both the comment in 3:4 and also from the *synkrisis* in 3:5–6 which compares the position of the Son and Moses in relation to the "house".

Others have even questioned the idea that the Son is seen as a "builder/constructor" at all. For some scholars, this is simply the employment of a standard idiom.[7] For instance, Lane says that the statement that the one who constructs the house is greater than itself is not of any real theological significance:

> Such an argument does not entail a one-to-one equivalence but establishes a relation of proportion by means of analogous comparison … like the correlative statement in v. 4*a* ('for every house is constructed by someone'), it simply enunciates a truism.[8]

He proposes that the purpose of v. 4 is to clarify the comparison asserted in v. 3a, and suggests that "Jesus is worthy of more glory than Moses in the same measure as God has more honour than the universe he created."[9] Indeed, the idea that one who constructs is greater than a house might simply be a stan-

---

[5] Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 57–58, Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 66–68, Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 40–43 and Weiss, *Hebräer*, 247.
[6] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 72.
[7] E. g., Attridge, *Hebrews*, 110. See also Vanhoye, *Structure*, 89. It is in fact an analogy made in Philo *Migr.* 193, see also Justin, 1 *Apol.* 20 and Pseudo-Clement *Hom.* 10.19.2 as Attridge points out in n. 68. There is a possible parallel in Matt 12:6, where Jesus compares himself to the Temple: "I tell you, something greater than the temple is here" (NRSV).
[8] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 77.
[9] Ibid.

dard proverb, akin to the statement in Justin, *First Apology* 20 "the workman is greater than the work."[10] Verse 4 is not parenthetical, Lane says, but neither is it to be understood with v. 3b; rather, it marks a point of transition as the argument moves from assertion to explanation.[11] If this were the case, it would even be possible to suggest that there is no comparison between the Son and Moses in 3:3–4, but rather that the comparison is between Moses and God. This is the position of Ellingworth, who suggests the ἠξίωται (to be considered worthy) refers to activity of God, who is ultimately in charge of the creation of the world in 1:2.[12] He states that the explicit reference to Jesus in 3:1 is followed by a reference to God as ποιήσαντι (the maker) in v. 2 and that whilst the following αὐτός refers to Jesus, the αὐτός at the end of v. 2 could refer either to God, Jesus or Moses. He argues it refers to God on the grounds it is part of an adapted quotation from Num 12:7, repeated in v. 5.[13]

However, whilst it may be possible that the comment regarding the builder of the house was a popular proverb of the time, one needs to ask why it has been included here. In respect of Lane's argument that 3b properly belongs with 4a, the cohesion of the passage may suggest otherwise. Hebrews 3:3a is linked to 3:3b by κατά ὅσον in a stock phrase "in as much as". In this stock phrase, a close link is envisaged between the elements of comparison, and the sense of κατά (just as) is amplified so as to stress the connection between them. In fact, when it is used elsewhere in Hebrews, the phrase καθ᾽ ὅσον serves to stress a direct comparison which emphasizes the importance of the Son, specifically. In 7:20 it contrasts the Son to stress his superiority to the ancient priesthood, who were not sworn an oath by God whereas the Son was, and in 9:27–28, it is said that:

… in as much as [καθ᾽ ὅσον] it is appointed for humans to die once, and after that comes judgement, so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to deal with sin, but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him (amended from NRSV).

The fact that it serves as a co-ordinating conjunction and is employed elsewhere in the Epistle increases the likelihood that we are here dealing with a continuation of the comparison of the Son to Moses.

In addition, to suggest that the comparison between Moses and the Son is not carried through from 3:2 would be unlikely when cohesive ties are considered. The reading which separates 3:3–4 from the remainder of the *synkrisis* would require that οὗτος in v. 3 referred to God, but he has not been mentioned by name yet in this section and so to refer to him simply by using a pronoun, outside an obvious citation or allusion, as in 2b, would be unusual. Rather, this pro-

---

10   Koester, *Hebrews*, 242.
11   Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 73.
12   Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 195–96.
13   Ibid., 195.

noun more likely refers back to the Son in v. 2, just as πιστὸν ὄντα in 3:2 refers back to the emphatic Ἰησοῦν at the end of 3:1.

In fact, 3:4 is not grammatically parenthetical. Rather, it follows on from v. 3, with πᾶς (all) … οἶκος (house) reinforcing τοῦ οἴκου in a move from the generic, to an even greater generalization.[14] Ellingworth also argues, the γάρ (for) should be related to the allusion in v. 2, usually taken to be from Num 12:7. There, in response to the complaints of Aaron and Miriam, Moses is said by God to be greater than any of the other prophets who receive divine revelation only through dreams and visions because he has had direct communication with God "mouth to mouth" (Num 12:8). In this case it can be seen as a further part of the *synkrisis*, in that even the incredibly great Moses is "outdone" by the status of the Son.[15] The γάρ is also "prolonged" by the καί at the beginning of v. 5, suggesting that v. 4 is also to be understood in relation to vv. 5–6.[16]

If we take it that v. 4 is not parenthetical, it actually opens up another possibility, which may help us understand the link between vv. 3–4. Either, the Son is described as the builder in 3:3 and God is such in 3:4, as proposed above, and the discourse moves from emphasis on the Son to emphasize God momentarily, or the Son is assimilated to God in terms of construction activity, in much the same way we saw he was said to be not only the agent of creation (1:2), but also the creator himself (1:10–12). This latter reading would see the Son as creator of "everything" in v. 4, and understand "God" almost adjectivally, as designating his divine status.

7.1.4 *The Cohesion Between Heb 3:1–6 and Chapter 2*

This view that the Son is the builder in 3:3a–4 is not widely accepted in scholarship. It was famously proposed by Spicq, but is now often rejected.[17] Indeed, for some scholars, the suggestion is out of the question. Attridge, for example, says that it makes no sense to consider 3:4 as denoting a divine quality to the Son since "the current argument … does not hinge on an identification of Christ and creator, and the equation of Christ and God would make the title "Son" in v. 6 anticlimactic."[18] Ellingworth, whilst accepting the application of the title "God" to the Son in 1:8, states that there is no parallel in Hebrews to the use of θεός, and it is better to understand Heb 3:4 in the light of 1:2, and indeed

---

[14] Ibid., 205.
[15] Ibid. This would, in fact, hold true if we took Lane's suggestion that it might echo LXX 1 Chr 17:14, which in fact actually references the Davidic ruler, since the comparison to the superb Moses would still be present. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 76. Attridge also says that the idea the Son is "builder" is often assumed, but not necessarily correct. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 110 n. 69.
[16] Vanhoye, *La Structure*, 88–89.
[17] Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 68.
[18] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 110.

2:10, where the Son is presented as being "intimately concerned" with an activity which is ultimately God's own.[19] However, DA reveals that there may be closer links between 3:1–6 and what has been said regarding the Son, making this possibility more likely.

That the Son is in question in 3:3–4 is also suggested by the use of the word δόξα. Although this term is used in relation to God in 1:3, it has more recently been applied to the Son in 2:9, and the connection ὅθεν at the start of 3:1 would suggest that 3:1–6 is to be understood in relation to the immediately preceding chapter. Furthermore, it is used in 3:4 in connection with τιμή, which is another indication that the author is harking back to 2:9, where τιμή is also applied to the Son. This leads us to suspect that the author is playing on what was said about the Son in 2:9 and is in some way referring back to the description of him there. These facts, in conjunction with what was observed above with regards cohesive ties, significantly increase the likelihood that the Son is being likened to a builder in 3:3b. Firstly, the "he" in v. 3a refers to the Son, as evidenced in the cohesion discussed above, then the "glory" from 2:9 is applied to the Son in 3:3a, and then "honour" from the same 2:9 is applied to the builder in v. 3b, completing the echo of that verse, which suggests that the author is basically giving another description of the Son. The argument is that, this time, the glory of the Son which surpasses that of Moses (3:3a) is to be understood with the "honour" applied to the Son as builder (3:3b).

Having concluded that v. 3 applies to the Son, and that the comparison is not between Moses and God, we can now reassess v. 4. Firstly, v. 4a is linked to both parts of v. 3 by γάρ, for we can now understand v. 3a and v. 3b to be part of one unit stressing the superior status of the Son in comparison to Moses. That is, it is connected to the latest description of the Son. As has been said before, γάρ usually suggests that what comes next is support material to what has come before, rather than making any kind of entirely separate point. Secondly, intriguingly, we also find in v. 4 the word for "all" twice: πᾶς and πάντα. Ellingworth is indeed right to note that the two verses are to be understood together, but we also need to consider that, just as "glory" and "honour" appeared in 2:9, πᾶς/πάντα was also found, again twice, in 2:10.

In my last chapter, I argued that we had a slight separation of the role of the Son as creator, and his role as descended saviour. I noted in particular that in 2:10 we had a reference specifically to God as creator where it says "For it was fitting for him for the sake of whom is everything and through whom is everything, in leading many sons [children] to glory, to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings." However, I suggested that whilst this was the main topic of 2:10–18, the Son's role in creation was still kept in view in 2:10 by use of the terms διά (compare 1:2) and πάντα (see also 1:3). This observation

---

[19] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 196.

now becomes important. On the one hand, the inclusion of the δι᾽ οὗ in 2:10 stresses God as creator, but on the other, it has the effect of equating the role in creation of the Son and God, since the same term was applied to God's activity through the Son in 1:2. This would indeed make sense in the light of, and be corroborated by, the transformation of the Son from agent of creation in 1:2 to creator in 1:10–12.

In favour of the minority view that the Son is said to be the builder of everything, I argue that as we have just had a link to 2:9, we have a reference now to 2:10, and that the same equation of the creative activity of the Son and God found in 1:10–12 and 2:10 could be argued to happen here. Whilst it is true that the Son is sometimes presented in Hebrews as being God's "instrument", so to speak, in the case of creation, there is a distinct movement in 1:10–12 from this idea of the Son as "agent" to the Son as creator himself, and in 2:10, things are seen to be created through God using the same expression as 1:2 uses of creation through the Son, and so this distinction between instrument and cause is not to be stressed too much when it comes to creation.[20] It would therefore be commensurate with Hebrews' creative theology at this point to understand the Son as both the builder of the house in 3:3 and of all things in v. 4, and that this is borne out in vocabulary links between 3:3–4 and 2:9–10.

That the Son is the "agent" (i. e., the "doer" in the sentence) is also made grammatically possible by the fact θεός (God) is anarthrous in 3:4. The phrase "but the one who constructed all things" (ὁ δε πάντα κατασκευάσας) contains an independent substantive participle with the article which basically functions as a noun and one could argue that it is the subject in this sentence, given it has two nominatives: ὁ δὲ πάντα κατασκευάσας θεός.[21] In other words, the anarthrous θεός, being such, is the complement.[22] Whilst it is not impossible that God (rather than the Son) is the agent despite this, there is also an argument that if God were envisaged as the one constructing in 3:4, one would rather have expected the term θεός to be used as a grammatical subject. Furthermore, if the "one constructing" is the Son in v. 3, then it would make sense in terms of cohesion for that same term to be applied to him in the following verse, especially given the strong cohesive ties between v. 3 and v. 4, and subordination of the latter to the former, by means of γάρ. At a push, one could perhaps argue that θεός

---

[20] Adams, "Cosmology," 125 makes a similar point.
[21] The verb "to be" is missing here, as is not unusual in Greek. Spicq, L'Épitre, vol. 2, 68 also supports a christological reading of 3:4 on the basis of what has been said in ch. 1. The subject of whose house it is, that of Moses, the Son or God, is slightly contested with some scholars seeing it as referring to Christ's house. For discussion, see Attridge, Hebrews, 109 n. 54, who refers to Anthony T. Hanson, "Christ in the Old Testament According to Hebrews," SE II (1964):393–407, here 394. However, judging from the original co-text of the citation in v. 2, I concur with Attridge and Ellingworth that the house is God's own. See Ellingworth, Epistle, 195. Attridge, Hebrews, 111 and Koester, Hebrews, 245.
[22] "Predicate nouns as a rule are anarthrous": BDF § 273; cf. θεός in John 1:1.

is subject, separated from the ὁ at the beginning of the clause, but this would make little sense, and the article more likely belongs with κατασκευάσας. The author does not elsewhere tend to separate the article from θεός, which limits the possibility the ὁ belongs with θεός specifically here. Wherever we find θεός (God) elsewhere in Hebrews in the nominative as the subject, we find the definite article in collocation with θεός.[23]

In fact, we do have another reference where specifically God is the builder in a creative sense, 11:10, where ὁ θεός is said to be the τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργός of the [heavenly] city. Since the description in a relative phrase pertains to the creative power of God in 11:10, it is interesting to note the use of the article and placement of the term θεός, which conforms to the idea of God as subject/nominative as it is usually expressed in Hebrews.

Having responded to Ellingworth, I now wish to respond to Attridge's assertion that the notion of the creation of the world is not in view.[24] To do this we need to look at the cohesion between ch. 2 and 3:1–6 more deeply. The first thing to consider is that the exhortation in 3:1–6 is intrinsically linked to ch. 2, and the role of the Son in restoring humanity to its originally created state. Discourse analysis is helpful in uncovering this observation. One clue is the use of the distant hook word ἀδελφοί (brothers, siblings – 2:11–12, 17; 3:1). This links us back to the previous unit in 2:10–18, which, we saw in the last chapter dealt with the incarnation of the Son.[25] Furthermore, two full noun phrases are employed, "holy siblings" and "partakers of a heavenly calling" in 3:1, and, as opposed to the use of pronouns or monolectic references to the recipients, this foregrounds the addressees.[26] Their role as recipients is specifically linked to the saving role of the Son by mention of the "heavenly calling", harking back to the main topic of 2:10–18, which I have termed the descent of the Son for the ascent of humanity.

The precise meaning of "heavenly calling" is disputed, and could refer either to the origin of the call, or to its destination. Koester, for instance, suggests it refers primarily to the latter, looking at the use of "heavenly" elsewhere in the Epistle, particularly the "heavenly sanctuary" and "heavenly city" we have in 8:5;

---

[23] In the nominative: 1:1, 8, 9; 2:13; 4:4,10; 6:3, 10,13,17; 9:20; 11:5,10, 16, 19; 12:7; 13:4, 16, 20. In fact, there are only a few cases of θεός without the article in Hebrews generally: 1:6; 3:12; 6:1,5, and 6:18 lacks the article in ℵ², B, D, K and L); 8:10; 10:31; 11:3,16 (θεός occurs twice, once with, once without); 12:22, and in these cases θεός is used mainly either adjectivally (e. g., angels of God in 1:6) or following a preposition (e. g., 6:1), which may have influenced the author's choice to omit it. However, the article is omitted following the LXX in 1:6 and 8:10.

[24] Attridge also shares the concern with Ellingworth that the Son as builder is merely "assumed" but not demonstrable. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 110.

[25] Neeley, "Discourse," 46 also details how this term connects the expositionary and exhortative sections. See also Church, *Temple*, 311.

[26] Westfall, *Discourse*, 111.

9:23 and 11:16; 12:22.[27] Likewise, Thompson suggests it refers to the final destination of believers, and likens it to the "upward calling" of Phil 3:14.[28] However, it could also be indicative that the call comes from heaven. Cockerill, for example, whilst accepting the idea that it signals the final "destination" of believers, also points out that the call is "heavenly" because "it has been issued by God, made available through the mediation of the exalted Son (12:22–25)."[29] Attridge similarly compares it to the "heavenly gift" in 6:4, and says the application of the term "heavenly" likely "suggests something about the quality" of the call, which "depends on the source and goal of the call, the 'true' realm of God's presence, which Christ by his sacrifice has entered."[30] In either case, though, it reflects the heavenly Son and his role in leading them to salvation.[31] At the very basis of the exhortation, then, is the Son's saving role as defined in ch. 2, which as we saw in the previous chapter is itself intrinsically linked to, and unpacks, the descent-ascent motif of the exordium.

The depiction of the Son as high priest is significant because it unites 3:1–6 and what is said there of the Son's creative activity with the previous discourse of Hebrews, that is, with his descent and subsequent ascent. The same term, "high priest" was previously connected to the Son's saving descent in 2:17, where it is qualified by the term "faithful" as is Jesus described in 3:2.[32] The term high priest will also later be applied to the Son's redemptive sacrificial activity in 5:1, 5, 10; 6:20 (where he is depicted as a "forerunner", πρόδρομος, which is comparable to the description in 2:10), 7:26; 8:1; and 9:7–25, and this section can be seen as part of the overall staging of the Epistle's discourse.

It is particularly interesting that the term "high priest" (qualified in 3:2 as "faithful") should in 3:1 be used in a joint designation of the Son as "apostle".

---

[27] Koester, *Hebrews*, 242. He does accept a secondary aspect as pointing to the origins of the call on the basis of 6:4.

[28] Thompson, *Hebrews*, 88–89. See also deSilva, *Perseverance*, 133.

[29] Cockerill, *Epistle*, 158.

[30] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 106.

[31] Cockerill, *Epistle*, 158. The term "confession" is equally disputed, but here is intended to stress the binding obligation and commitment due to faith in the Son. See Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 74–75. See also, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 106–7, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 198–201. Also noting the force of the exhortation is deSilva, *Perseverance*, 138–39.

[32] The exact sense of the fidelity is the subject of debate. Attridge suggests it pertains to his faithfulness to the role of high priest. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 109. Koester sees it more in terms of the Son's trustworthiness, despite testing. Koester, *Hebrews*, 243. It might also refer to his fidelity to his mission. See Todd D. Still, "Christos as Pistos: The Faith(fullness) of Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *CBQ* 69 (2007):746–55. There may be multiple connotations, however. Given the use of the term elsewhere in Hebrews, especially at 10:23 and 11:11, where it refers to faithfulness to promises, it is probably likely to encompass the trustworthiness of the Son in respect of his salvific role, even though it is here specifically applied to his governing role in God's house, be that the temple or the people of God (see discussion to follow on the possible meanings of "house"). What concerns us in terms of DA, however, is more the way the term is used to link the two passages, however.

The noun "apostle" is conspicuous by being a designation unique for Christ in the New Testament.[33] Its use with the designation high priest is significant for understanding the position of 3:1–6 in the overall discourse of Hebrews, and thereby the importance of creation references to Hebrews' argumentation, because it could be seen as anaphoric to the implicit description of the Son as God's word in 1:2, where the Son is designated as the one through whom God speaks. Indeed, he is the one sent by God with a message, and such a carrier could conceivably be called an "apostle" in Greek (e.g., Luke 11:49). The designation of the Son as apostle is constrained by what has already been said about his function as the supreme messenger. Westfall details how "apostle" is from the same semantic chain of "messengers" found in 1:1–2:4, and that the preceding discourse effectively prepares the grounds for the application of the title "apostle" to Jesus in 3:1. Meanwhile, the description of high priest summarizes 2:5–18. One can argue, then, that 3:1 summarizes the first two chapters of Hebrews as it encourages the readers to focus on Jesus as an apostle/messenger and a high priest.[34]

The term comes from the verb ἀποστέλλω (to send out), and frequently denotes one who is sent by God to achieve a certain objective, as in Paul's being sent out to proclaim the good news (Rom 1:1).[35] A link between being an apostle and a herald, that is, one who bears the "word" of the one sending them, is present in the New Testament, in the Pastoral Epistles: "For this I was appointed a herald (κῆρυξ) and an apostle (I am telling the truth, I am not lying), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth." (1 Tim 2:7 NRSV; and "For this gospel I was appointed a herald (κῆρυξ) and an apostle and a teacher" (2 Tim 1:11 NRSV)[36] The term with which "apostle" is juxtaposed here is κῆρυξ, which connotes one who is sent out specifically to convey the message of the one who sends them.

When we understand this possible nuance for "apostle", the focus on this idea of the Son as both God's apostle and high priest could be seen to form a link between the image of the Son as the agent of creation in ch. 1, since he is there said to be the one through whom God spoke (1:2), and the descent motif of ch. 2, in which co-text the term "high priest" first occurs in 2:17.[37] Attridge's

---

[33] Small, *Characterization*, 191. The cognate verb is found in Hebrews referring to ministering angels (1:14). The same verb appears in John's Gospel to report the Father's sending of the Son: "As the Father sent me into the world, so I sent them into the world." John 17:18.

[34] Westfall, "Blessed Be," 215–16.

[35] For further references, see "ἀπόστολος", *BDAG*, 122. The related verb is used for a prophetic "sending" in Isa 6:8 and Zech 2:13 (NRSV 2:9).

[36] NRSV here interpolates "gospel" from v. 10.

[37] Various propositions have been made as to the origin of this term "apostle" as a description of Jesus. One proposition, based on the title "forerunner" given to him in 6:20, is to see the term "apostle" as deriving from Exod 23:20, where God promises to send a figure to lead the Israelites to the promised land. Lane notes a variant reading preserved in *Sam. Targ.* which may have been known in a Greek version to the author, which has שליח (one sent out). See Lane, *Hebrews 1–8,*

argument that creation is not on view at all is now called into question.[38] Furthermore, the argument "Son" would be anticlimactic if creation were envisaged does not stand so well when we consider the possibility of such a strong connection of 3:1–6 to what came before. Understood in the light of the exhortation's being based upon and stemming from the exposition in ch. 2, and how that is connected to ch. 1 via the joint description of the Son as both "high priest" and "apostle", the term "Son" would not in fact be anti-climactic, but would, in fact, recall again to the reader the extraordinary way in which God is now speaking through Jesus as per 1:1–2, where he is first designated as Son. As he is there designated as the one through whom God created, creation could in fact be on view, albeit in peripheral vision, on two fronts, then: the use of the term "apostle" and the use of the term "Son".

7.2 What Exactly is the "House" in Heb 3:1–6?

However, we now have to ask the question of what exactly is meant by "house" in this passage. Indeed, the switch from constructing a house to creating all things seems a bit of a jump. The precise meaning of "house" is the subject of much debate. There are three possible senses of "house" in 3:1–6: "people", as in "the house of Israel/the faithful Christian community", the sanctuary, or the cosmos. I shall present the case for each on, before discussing the possibility that the author may be playing on polysemy.

7.2.1 The Difficulty Establishing the Correct Referent of "House": God's People

To begin, the term house in 3:2 could simply refer to God's people.[39] As stated above, 3:2 is most likely a reference to Num 12:7, where God declares that he entrusts his whole house to Moses. The Greek has οὐχ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστιν (Num 12:7), "not thus with my servant Moses. In my whole house he is faithful". Noth suggests that the position given to Moses is "compared with that of the chief slave who is at once the confidant of his master and the person to whom his whole 'house' is entrusted,"

75–76. Nevertheless, the nature of an apostle is to spread the message of someone else, and so it is possible to draw a parallel between this description and the concept of God's having spoken through the Son in 1:1. On the notion of an apostle of someone sent, see also Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 199–200 and Westfall, *Discourse*, 114.

[38] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 110.

[39] As Moses is said to be faithful "in" this "house", and the term "house" is applied to the Christian community in 3:6, it would seem that no distinction is made between God's people Israel and the Christian community.

much as in Heb 3:5.[40] Given the co-text of Miriam and Aaron's complaint in Num 12:1–2 that the Lord has spoken through them and not just Moses, it would be possible to see the "house" as referring to all God's people, and the claim as being that whilst God did speak through other people, the prophet par excellence was in fact Moses, who was given authority over all God's people. The metaphor of the "house of Israel" is also present in Num 20:29, and there is textual evidence this was a traditional understanding of Num 12:7, given that *Tg. Onq.* Num 12:7 paraphrases this verse as "my people", עמי. Ellingworth draws attention to the fact that the "house" is given the sense of community in Heb 3:6, and to understand it this way would indeed provide a certain level of consistency to our section.[41] The metaphor of God's people as such was widespread, as in 1 Tim 3:15 which speaks about knowing how one ought to behave "in the household of God, which is the church of the living God" (NRSV – ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ … ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος). The use of κατασκευάζω (to construct) could well suggest a similar "live spatial metaphor" is being employed here.[42]

This way of referring to God's people is found in the Exodus narrative as well, as in Exod 16:31 where the "house of Israel" names the food from heaven *manna*, or Exod 40:38 where the Lord leads the "house of Israel" and is with them at every stage of their journey. Given that the remainder of Hebrews 3–4 will reference the Exodus, albeit in conjunction with Joshua account, the understanding of the "house" in 3:2 as the "house of Israel" would indeed seem sensible at this point. Ellingworth argues that the use of πᾶς … οἶκος and πάντα in v. 4 are in fact to be understood together and that since it is possible to give οἶκος the meaning "family" or "people" one could argue not for reference to the creation of the universe at 3:4, but rather to God as the creator of all peoples.[43] This would indeed fit with a more general understanding of the renewal of humanity to its original created state as per ch. 2, and so is within the possible bounds of our own thesis.

Hebrews 3:6 moves to claim Jesus' own authority as Son over God's house and thence to emphasize the possibility of the inclusion of the audience in said house if they hold firm to their confidence as believers in the Son. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that "house" in 3:1–6 most likely refers to "God's people", first understood as the Israelites, but then as believers in the Son.[44] However, I contest Ellingworth's suggestion that we should understand πάντα (neuter plu-

---

[40] Martin Noth, *Numbers: A Commentary*, OTL, trans. James D. Martin (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), trans. of *Das Vierte Buch Mose, Numeri* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 96.

[41] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 196.

[42] Ibid., 197.

[43] Ibid.

[44] See Ibid., 205.

ral) as referring to all peoples, rather than all things. It seems evident that we should see the "all things" as a reference to the creation of the universe in 3:4 on the basis of its usage so far in Hebrews' discourse as a word used for creation in general: in 1:3 to signal the Son's sustaining of all things, in 2:8 with regards the subjection of all things "under his feet", and specifically in 2:10 to refer to all things that exist.[45] The term πάντα in its own right will make a return in relation to created things in 4:13 where it is found in conjunction with κτίσις meaning "created thing", and so whilst it is used later in 8:5 and 9:21–22 in relation to cultic activity. The evidence for chs. 1–4 is more in favour of seeing πάντα in 3:4 as creation generally speaking.

7.2.2 "House" as The Sanctuary

Another possibility is to see the "house" of 3:1–6 as pertaining to the sanctuary, especially in the light of the Son's priesthood (3:1). There is also a possibility that 3:2 is allusion not to Numbers, but to 1 Chr 17. Lane posits that the source of the citation in 3:2 is actually a reference to 1 Chr 17:14 LXX, and a statement made not of Moses, but of David's future Son, Solomon. In the LXX Chronicles account, Nathan delivers an oracle to David (already cited from 1 Chr 17:13 in Heb 1:5, that "I will make him faithful in my house" (πιστώσω αὐτὸν ἐν οἴκῳ μου). In 17:1, David complains to Nathan that he is dwelling in a house of cedar, while the ark of the covenant is housed beneath curtains. In 17:4, in a play on the meaning of "house", God tells Nathan to say to David that he is not to build God a house, rather, the Lord will build a house (i. e. dynasty) for David (17:10), and his son will build God a "house", qua a physical resting place (οἴκον 17:12). On the basis of intertextuality, and taking into account the original co-text of 1 Chr 17, the "house" in Heb 3:1–6, in this view, is possibly taking up the reference to the temple, conflating it with the sanctuary in which Moses served, given the sanctuary was the precursor to the temple. Hence, we find the reference to Jesus as a high priest in 3:1 and the comparison of the faithful Moses and faithful Son in our passage that culminates in the exhortation of 3:6.[46] The author

---

[45] Only in 2:17 so far does it have a slightly different meaning, and that is due to its inclusion in the idiomatic κατὰ πάντα as an expression for "in every respect", which recurs in 4:15.

[46] Lane argues that the precise form of the allusion to this text in 3:2 reflects a modification of the Nathan oracle under the influence of the oracle of Eli in 1 Sam 2:35, which speaks of God raising up a "faithful priest" and building up for him a "faithful house". The Chronicles passage in fact deals not so much with the raising up of a "dynasty" for David, but the establishment also of a permanent temple. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 76. See also Church, *Temple*, 313–14. In its co-text, 1 Sam 2:35 is generally interpreted as referring to Zadok. See Peter Kyle McCarter, *1 Samuel: A New Translation*, AB 8 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), 91–93. However, this suggestion is tied to Lane's understanding that 3:3a–4b are to be isolated from the surrounding co-text as independent comparisons simply stating truisms, rather than as part of the *synkrisis*.

is making a rabbinic-style comparison of Moses' fidelity and Solomon's fidelity, both of which were in connection with God's "house."

While our author, with his careful knowledge of the Scriptures has hardly confused Solomon and Moses, it is possible that there may have been a connection in the mind of the author, another background *gezerah shavah*, between the 1 Chr 17:14 and Num 12:7. Having said this, a cultic reading of "house" as "*sanctuary*" (Exod 34:26; Num 9:15; Deut 23:18) rather than temple could be the case if the originally proposed reading from Numbers were at stake. The sanctuary is very much the setting for the part of the narrative from which our citation would be taken, where in Num 12:4 Miriam and Aaron have been summoned outside the tent of meeting.[47] There is also some primary evidence for such a reading, though again later than Hebrews, and even later than the *Tg Onq* tradition regarding Num 12:7 and the people of God. In Midrash Tanhuma, *Pekudei*, 7, we read "These are the accounts of the Tabernacle" [Exod 38:21] … Why did he [Moses] feel he had to give an accounting? The Holy One trusted him, as is said: 'He is trusted in all my house' (Num 12:7).[48]

7.2.3 *"House" as The Cosmos*

Hebrews does not tend to make references to the temple as such. Rather, it seems to reference the desert sanctuary in Heb 9–10. This observation may itself be significant, especially combined with the observation that we have the mention of Christ being over all God's house again in 10:21, specifically in the role of "high priest". Blenkinsopp has observed regarding the construction of the sanctuary in Exodus 39–40 that it has echoes of the Genesis creation account (e.g., Exod 39:43 echoes Gen 1:31–2:3).[49] It is possible that Heb 3:1–6 alludes to the creation of the desert sanctuary in a similar way by moving in v. 4 from "house" to the creation of the cosmos more generally. In a few septuagintal texts, the term οἶκος (house) can refer to the cosmos (e.g., Bar 3:24) or to heaven (e.g., Deut 26:15; Bar 2:16; Isa 63:15).[50] This shift in meaning is done by means

---

[47] Others have suggested that Moses might be here described as a trusted servant, like one of a king who is able to enter into any room in the palace. See Kugel, *Traditions*, 779. If so, perhaps there is another link between 3:1–6 and 1:8 and 2:9 in Hebrews on the grounds the Son is there described as "crowned" and perhaps this offers another dimension to the *synkrisis* on Moses as servant.

[48] Hayim Nahman Bialik, Yehoshua Hana Ravnitzky and William G Braude, "*The Book of Legends, Sefer haAggadah: Legends from the Talmud and Midrash* (New York: Schocken, 1992), 87–88.

[49] Joseph Blenkinsopp. *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books*, AYBRL (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1992), 218–19. For further example, Exod 40:33 corresponds to Gen 2:2. See also Church, *Temple*, 331.

[50] Weiss, *Hebräer*, 248. Harald Hegermann, *Hebräer*, 88 also draws attention to the use of πάντα in 3:4, and suggests it might be used of the cosmos at this point.

of an implicit word play. An allusion in Heb 3:1–6 to the construction of the desert sanctuary may serve as a preparation for the focus on the sanctuary in Heb 9–10, and Laansma has also discussed the background of the rest motif which follows in the resting of chs. 3–4 in relation to this passage.[51] Understood in the light of this tradition, we could propose that a cultic reading of the "house" would easily permit a change from the creation of the sanctuary in 3:4a to the whole universe in 3:4b. The suggestion would be that Moses' role as a priest in the sanctuary would be at stake in 3:2–3.

The difficulty here is that Aaron was high priest and not Moses, although Moses consecrated Aaron as high priest. The comparison might therefore be fraught with difficulty. However, in some texts, Moses is assigned a priestly role. For instance, in Exod 8:25 the command is given jointly to Moses and Aaron to "sacrifice to your God within the land," he also enters into the tent of meeting with Aaron in Lev 9:23. Numbers 3:38 also specifically says "those who were to camp in front of the tabernacle on the east – in front of the tent of meeting toward the east – were Moses and Aaron and Aaron's sons, having charge of the rites within the sanctuary ..." (NRSV). This would seem to suggest at least some kind of link between the role of Moses and that of the priests in the life of the sanctuary.

7.3 Word Plays and Multiple Meanings of "House": Some Insights From DA

At first, then, the meaning of "house" appears to be quite a conundrum. There are several different things that it could mean, and all meanings are to some extent plausible.[52] However, there could possibly be more than one meaning, and that this meaning changes as the discourse progresses. Below, I offer an interpretation based on DA theory pertaining to cohesion which elucidates the use of the house metaphor more clearly than simply concerning ourselves with its possible referent apart from the *synkrisis* at this point.

At first glance, it could well be argued that in the background of 3:1–6 stands the "house" as a place of worship and sacrifice, to which the designation of the Son as "high priest" in 3:1 alludes. It is in this capacity that the Son is specifically asked to be considered, and also in his role of apostle, which we saw earlier might itself have links to what was said in 1:2. The liturgical tone is thus set. This could be seen to grow in emphasis in 3:2, depending on one's reading of the

---

[51] See Jon C. Laansma, *I Will Give You Rest*, WUNT 2/98 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 35–38.

[52] Similarly, where 10:21 declares that Jesus is "great high priest over God's house," we could interpret "house" as "the people of God" (Koester, *Hebrews*, 444) or the "heavenly sanctuary" (BDAG 699) or the "cosmos" possibly.

Numbers text, and even to stretch through to the use in 3:5 of θεράπων (attendant), given this term specifically describes Moses' liturgical activity in LXX Josh 9:2.[53] In 3:6, the Son is also for the first time called "anointed one", and priests were anointed before beginning their ministry, as was Aaron in Exod 28:21. The comparison between Moses in a liturgical capacity, with him as a non-priestly minister and the Son as an actual "high priest" would in fact fit the *synkrisis* of Hebrews 3:1–6 well and seems to be hinted at in the discourse of 3:1–6.

However, a close look at the cohesion of the passage reveals a more complex story. There is an inclusio on "faithful" and "house" between 3:2 and 3:5–6, and that would suggest that they are to be understood together. In 3:6b, we certainly have the meaning of "house" as "people" since there is an exhortation to "hold fast" to the confidence and pride that belong to hope in the Son, and such fidelity results in being God's house. By deduction, then, we can infer that the same meaning is intended for "house" in 3:2. It would thus appear that the metaphorical "house" language begins and ends on the sense of the "house" being the people of God.[54]

In support of the meaning "people of God" for house in 3:2, we also have the reference to the Son's fidelity, which could be seen as related to his obedience, "faithfulness" and "obedience" being from the same semantic field of loyal fulfilment of duty/obligation. Love of righteousness characterizes the Son's earthly activity in 1:9, whilst fidelity characterizes his high priesthood in 2:17, specifically relating there to his role leading humanity into glory (2:10–18), where he is the pioneer, tempted but ultimately sinless (4:15). In 2:10–18, it is also probable that we have a sense of the Christian community being God's 'people', which emerges with the familial language of siblings (2:10–11, 17) and "sons/children" (2:13–14). As it is the case that where we find "house" meaning "people" in the OT, it is usually in relation to a dynasty/family, as, indeed, in the 1 Chr 17 passage mentioned above, or in the very title "House of Israel". Hence, it would be possible in view of the cohesion between 2:10–18 and 3:1–6 to suggest that God's people is in view as 3:1–6 opens. Cohesion with 2:10–18 passage is in fact created in 3:1 on ὅθεν and ἀδελφοί, and so it would seem we are to understand the reference to the faithful high priesthood of Christ in 3:1 in terms of what has just been said about his descent to make atonement for what is essentially the "family", or "house", of God.[55]

It is important, however, to consider the meaning of "house" in the co-text of what was said about the possibility of the Son being here depicted as the creator

---

[53] See also Koester, *Hebrews*, 245–6.
[54] That is not to say, however, that the image of the "house" as temple is not in the background, I simply caution against such a monolithic reading.
[55] Karrer, *Hebräer*, 192–95 who also finds an echo of 1 Sam 2:35 in the notion a faithful priest in 3:1–6. In the Samuel passage, God promises to raise up a faithful priestwho will "go about before his anointed one". However, this reading this passage into Hebrews is problematic in that Jesus is presented as the anointed in 3:6, not as any kind of pre-cursor to God's anointed one.

of "all things" in 3:4 before we can make any firm conclusions as to the meaning "people of God" for "house". Additional evidence for a reading which sees the Son as creator in 3:4 is that 3:1–6 provides a direct link back to the description of the Son at the start of the exordium: 3:5 is linked to 1:2 by the hookword "Son" and the verb λαλέω. Because of its connections to 3:4 on the cohesive tie καί, suggesting an extension of the previous verse, this allusion to 1:2 lends credence to the proposal that we have a reference to the Son as creator of all things in 3:4, since it takes us from Christ's earthly activity to his heavenly, creative activity. Such a movement is commensurate with what we have seen of Hebrews interaction of creation and salvation discourse threads so far, especially in the reversal of the exordium themes in 1:5–14. The comparison of Moses and Jesus is based on the depiction of Moses as an attendant in the created house vs the Son directly involved in creation, and this may have implications for our term, "house".

Let us take the discourse step by step. At first, the Son is simply likened to Moses, both are considered "faithful" in God's house (3:2), that is, both are faithful in their role leading God's people. The Son is then said to be worthy of more glory than Moses as a builder of a house has more honour than the house itself, and we saw above that this was a matter of direct comparison, as indicated by the cohesive tie γάρ, used to introduce support material. This begins a synkritic argument that contrasts one with the other, and results in the Son's role in creation once again being asserted. Indeed, 3:4 acts to join the *synkrisis* which sees the Son as creator to the argument of the Son's greatness in comparison to Moses on γάρ, indicating that the statement is support material to what was said in 3:3.

The text begins by acknowledging the great role Moses played, but this movement from depicting the building of a "house" to the building of the whole universe (πάντα) subtly and simultaneously points out that the Son has been greater from the very beginning as it designates him first as the creator of the people of God (3:3), and then of all things (3:4). To put it another way, the Son, as creator of all things (v. 4) is *de facto* the creator of said house, meaning "people" (3:3a), and thereby commands absolute authority. The Son's creation of all things necessarily means that he is the creator of the "house". The importance of the Son's authority to the discourse is confirmed in v. 5, where Moses is said to be faithful as an attendant in the house rather than being a Son over the house. Far from being an unconnected piece of *synkrisis*, it is linked to what has been said about the Son as the creator of all things by καί, and the cohesion on "faithful" also links us back to what was said in v. 2. This indicates that vv. 5–6 clarifies the type of fidelity each had as the argument progresses, and it is limited in degree by virtue of their different roles: Moses was a close attendant indeed, but he was never the creator Son, and so his "faithfulness" was barely even comparable.

What is interesting is that the word "house" seems in some way to facilitate the move from lesser to greater, and aid the comparison of the Son to Moses by

providing a bridge between 3:3 and 3:4a. I propose that "house", strictly speaking, is the "people of God" in 3:1–6, but what happens is that the author plays on other *possible* meanings of this term to enhance the *synkrisis*. To this end, it acquires a secondary meaning of "cosmos" in 3:4a, in order to launch the creation reference. In making the jump from the Son as the builder of the house to the one who constructs everything in 3:3–4, the discourse moves from the idea of God's house being his people, to its being the universe. This very move to the creation of all things is permitted to happen because of the other understanding of what constitutes God's house: the cosmos.[56]

The question is, how do we move from one meaning of "house" to the other if we do not at this stage admit a link to the construction of the sanctuary. The truth is, no such reference is actually needed, even though it would be possible to argue for such a reading. The above implicit word play may simply be the result of a view of the cosmos present at the likely time of Hebrews' writing that sees the whole of creation as God's house. This appears in Philo: "But what dwelling (οἶκος) apparent to the senses could God have, save this world, for the quitting of which no power or device avails? For all created things are enclosed and kept within itself by the circle of the sky …" (Colson, LCL, Philo, *Post.*, 5, see also *Leg.* 3.99).[57] It could be argued that Bar 3:24–25 take a similar stance when it says God's house is without bounds: "O Israel, how great is the house (οἶκος) of God, how vast the territory that he possesses! It is great and has no bounds; it is high and immeasurable" (Bar. 3:24–25 NRSV).[58] Nevertheless, the language of priesthood in 3:1 is somewhat cataphoric to the descriptions of the Son entering the heavenly sanctuary. There may be some allusion to the ministerial role of Moses. Indeed, Nathan's oracle in 1 Chron 17 itself exploited the ambiguity between the dynastic "house" and temple "house".[59]

---

[56] See also Weiss, *Hebräer*, 247–51.

[57] Compare Philo *Opif.* 21–22; *Cher.* 106; 127; *Spec.* 1.66; *Plant.* 50. See Weiss, *Hebräer*, 248 n. 35.

[58] An objection to this theory might be the purportedly localized dwelling place of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, in 12:22. To some extent, however, such an idea of the whole of creation as God's dwelling place is present in the OT and would have been known to the author of Hebrews. Specifically in Isaiah, this notion is not thought incompatible with God's dwelling, at least in some sense, in the temple or Jerusalem: "Thus says the LORD: Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool; what is the house that you would build for me, and what is my resting place?" (Isa 66:1 NRSV) And then, later: "They shall bring all your kindred from all the nations as an offering to the LORD, on horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and on mules, and on dromedaries, to my **holy mountain Jerusalem**, says the LORD, just as the Israelites bring a grain offering in a clean vessel to the house of the LORD." (Isa 66:20 NRSV). The possibility that the universe as God's house is alluded to in 3:3–4 is therefore not in contradiction to Hebrews' later imagery of the heavenly Jerusalem in 12:22, where the term "house" is absent.

[59] Church, *Temple*, 331 adds that the "idea of the temple as a microcosm extends to the pattern of the temple and tabernacle with its three parts, the holy of holies representing heaven, the dwelling place of God, and the inner and outer courts representing the earth and the sea respectively," as in passages like Philo *Her.* 221–229 and Josephus, *Ant.* 3.123. See n. 92. This or a similar tradition could also lie behind the interplay of the three meanings of "house".

Stefan Svendsen also suggests that the meaning of "house" changes as the discourse develops, again from cosmos in v. 4 to people in v. 6. He too agrees that this is all part of a synkritic argument: "In all events, the superiority of Christ is established on the basis of the fact he, as a son, stands outside or above the house of God, whereas Moses, as servant, belongs to it."[60] On the issue of whether Jesus is envisaged as a builder, he also concludes that "while it is true that the author does not explicitly identify Jesus as the fashioner of the οἶκος, the argument would lose much of its rhetorical force if such an identification was not implied."[61] He says that the change of meaning for "house" from cosmos to people also facilitates the transition to exhortation in the following verses, which emphasizes the need for fidelity.[62]

7.4 Κατασκευάζω

The meaning of κατασκευάζω, however, now comes into question. I have here translated κατασκευάζω as "constructing". Nevertheless, its usage was not uniform at the time Hebrews was likely to have been written, and whilst it could simply mean "to build/construct", it could also convey the meaning "to prepare" or even "to furnish". However, it could also mean "to create". Understanding how this term is used could help us to better understand the "house" metaphor.

One of the most ancient meanings of κατασκευάζω appears to be simply "prepare." For example, an inscription likely dated to around 320 BCE mentioned in Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, SIG 313, 22 discusses the "way" along which a procession in honour of Zeus and Dionysus will pass and contains the phrase "in order that they might prepare the best": ὅπως κατασκευασθῶσιν ὡς βέλτιστα (BDAG 536–27). This usage was still common in the Second Temple and subsequent periods, with the sense of "getting ready". For example, in Philo *De Cherubim* 2:99 actually speaks of preparing "houses" for the reception of kings:

What house shall be prepared for God the King of kings, the Lord of all, who in His tender mercy and loving-kindness has deigned to visit created beings and come down from the boundaries of heaven to the utmost ends of earth, to show His goodness to our race? (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

---

[60] Svendsen, *Allegory*. 103.
[61] Ibid. In a reading similar to mine regarding the Son as builder, he also poses the question, "would it make sense to claim Jesus surpasses Moses in glory 'to the extent that (καθ᾽ ὅσον) the builder of a house is superior to the house itself, if he was not in any way involved in the construction of the house to which Moses 'materially' *did* belong?" See also Hegermann, *Hebräer*, 88–89.
[62] Ibid., 104.

This usage can be seen in the New Testament itself. For instance, the sense of preparing a way recurs in Matt 11:10, echoing LXX Exod 23:20. Here it refers to John the Baptist, whereas Hebrews applies the passage to Christ: "This is the one about whom it is written, 'See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare [κατασκευάσει] your way before you.'" (Matt 11:10 NRSV, see also Mark 1:2); and in Luke:

With the spirit and power of Elijah he will go before him, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous, to make ready a people prepared [κατεσκευασμένον] for the Lord. (Luke 1:17 NRSV)

This latter passage from Luke could be considered significant for our purposes in that we have suggested above that the "house" in 3:2–3 is a reference to the people of God, as per 3:6. The idea that the Son could be the "preparer" of the house, with "house" meaning the people of God becomes possible, with the knock on effect that he would be seen to also "prepare all things" in 3:4.[63] Our own passage might be a variation on the standard idiom of the time: the one who gets things ready in the house is due more honour than the house itself if we see our term as referring to "preparation."

However, this makes little sense in Hebrews. Firstly, such an argument would not fit squarely with the idea of preceding prophets and servants of God in Heb 11 and God's speaking first through the prophets and now through the Son in 1:1–2. If we took "house" in 3:2 and 3:3 together, the metaphor would in fact be not that the Son constructed the house, but that he prepared it, or made it ready, for Moses, perhaps to serve in as an attendant. This could fit with its usage in 9:2, where we read "For a tent was constructed (κατεσκευάσθη), the first one, in which were the lampstand, the table, and the bread of the Presence; this is called the Holy Place." (Heb 9:2 NRSV) – the placing of objects would suggest that rather than simply "construction" in the sense of building, we have a sense of the placement of furnishings.[64] However, in Heb 1:1, we see that God has previously spoken through the prophets, which would suggest rather that they prepared the way for the message spoken through the Son. Similarly, in 2:2, the message received through God's other servants, the angels is held up as an example for the future generation.[65] If anything, Hebrews would be more likely to suggest that Moses prepared the "house", meaning "people", for Jesus. This reading for κατασκευάζω now appears less likely.

---

[63] This would arguably not impact on his status as creator, since "preparing all things" could be seen as another metaphor for creative activity, as in the laying of foundations metaphor discussed earlier (e. g., 1:10).

[64] "The first tent was prepared" (9:2), according to Koester, *Hebrews*, 393. Perhaps, though, there could be an overlap of these possible meanings.

[65] Admittedly the angels are a different type of servant to Moses the "attendant" and are called λειτουργοὺς in 1:7. However, this term also has a liturgical connotation.

That said, how we understand this verb does in fact rely on our under-standing of what is meant by "house". It would possibly make more sense to see κατασκευάζω as "prepare" if we considered "house" in 3:2–3 as "sanctuary", especially when we take into account the comment in 8:5 that the sanctuary was constructed upon a plan shown to Moses:

They offer worship in a sanctuary that is a sketch and shadow of the heavenly one; for Moses, when he was about to erect the tent, was warned, 'See that you make everything according to the pattern that was shown you on the mountain.' (Heb 8:5 NRSV).

Perhaps the heavenly Son is said to have prepared the sanctuary for Moses in terms of the provided blueprint? Hebrews 8:6 goes on to stress the superior sta-tus of the Son's ministry in comparison to that of Moses in a similar way to 3:1–6: "But Jesus has now obtained a more excellent ministry, and to that degree he is the mediator of a better covenant, which has been enacted through better promises" (Heb 8:6 NRSV).

However, Moses was an attendant not in the heavenly sanctuary, but in the earthly one, and that is indeed the thrust of the argument in ch. 8–9. Moreover, the offerings in said sanctuary paved the way for the way for Christ's own in the heavenly sanctuary, and the earthly sanctuary itself becomes obsolete with the sacrificial activity of the Son:

Now even the first covenant had regulations for worship and an earthly sanctuary. For a tent was constructed (κατεσκευάσθη), the first one, in which were the lampstand, the table, and the bread of the Presence; this is called the Holy Place. Behind the second cur-tain was a tent called the Holy of Holies … But when Christ came as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation), he entered once for all into the Holy Place, not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption. (Heb 9:1–3, 11–12 NRSV)

Again, there would appear to be an anachronism in a reading that proposes that the Son prepared the sanctuary for Moses, though it should be noted that Moses does not prepare the sanctuary for the Son anywhere in Hebrews, since he enters the tent "not made with hands" in 9:11, and so it would not be as strong an anachronism as the first reading proposed in this section.[66] This again dimin-ishes the idea that we have a reference to the sanctuary in 3:1–6.

---

[66] We might also see a second possible meaning for κατασκευάζω in 9:2, that is to "furnish", though this would still not alter the anachronism in the possible reading of the "house" in 3:2–3 as "sanctuary". The description here seems to be of placing things in the sanctuary (Exod 25), and "to furnish" is another known meaning of our term according to most dictionaries. See "κατασκευάζω," *BDAG*, 527. However, this would make little sense in 3:1–6, for the same anach-ronistic reasons cited in our rejection of the possible meaning "to prepare" by virtue of the fact the earthly sanctuary would be clearly furnished by human hands in ch. 9.

This leaves us with the third possibility, the one opted for in my own translation, that κατασκευάζω means "to construct". This very meaning is found elsewhere in Hebrews:

By faith Noah, warned by God about events as yet unseen, respected the warning and constructed (κατεσκεύασεν) an ark to save his household; by this he condemned the world and became an heir to the righteousness that is in accordance with faith. (Heb 11:7 NRSV)

In this passage, it would indeed seem somewhat odd to suggest that κατασκευάζω meant to "prepare" in the sense suggested above, since the tale of Noah's having to construct the ark is well known. It is a reference to LXX Gen 6, where the verb ποιέω (to make) is used for the ark's construction. However, the reason I suggest "to construct" is more likely for the translation of 3:1–4 is in fact because it was used in such a sense in relation to the construction of God's house at the time Hebrews was likely written. From the point of view of intertextuality, an important consideration in discourse analysis, although Philo by no means uses κατασκευάζω exclusively in the sense of constructing, it is particularly interesting that he employs our term in relation to the construction of a house for God in *Cher.* 100.

The Loeb edition understands the first instance as "to prepare" but the second instance as "build":

What house shall be prepared [κατασκευάζεσθαι] for God the King of kings, the Lord of all, who in his tender mercy and loving-kindness has deigned to visit created being and come down from the boundaries of heaven to the utmost ends of earth, to show His goodness to our race? Shall it be of stone or timber? Away with the thought, the very words are blasphemy. For though the whole earth should suddenly turn into gold, or something more precious than gold, though all that wealth should be expended by the builder's [κατασκευαζόντων] skill on porches and porticos, on chambers, vestibules, and shrines, yet there would be no place where his feet could tread. One worthy house there is – the soul that is fitted to receive him. (Colson and Whitaker, LCL, Philo *Cher.* end 99–100)

This passage is clearly a reference to Isa 66:1–2. The verb "to build" appears in Isa 66:1, οἰκοδομέω, and as Philo is clearly intending to convey the sense of this passage with regards to the unnecessary nature of a physical house for God, it is reasonable to conclude that to some extent Philo saw οἰκοδομέω and κατασκευάζω as interchangeable.[67] In some cases, it may even have had the creative sense in its own right. For instance, Philo employs it on a number of occasions in this sense, such as *Leg.* 2:13 where he is specifically speaking of God's creative activity in Gen 2: "You see who are our helpers, the wild beasts, the soul's passions: for after saying, 'Let us make [κατασκευάζω] a helper corre-

---

[67]   However, one could argue that he removes it from the co-text given my above comment on Isaiah and Jerusalem. Note that Isa 66:1 employs the term κατάπαυσις (rest), which will be taken up in Heb 3:11.

sponding to him,' he adds the words, 'He moulded the wild beasts,' implying that the wild beasts are our helpers.", *Leg.* 2:13). Philo is here utilizing our term as an alternative for ποιήσωμεν (from ποιέω, to make) in LXX Gen 2:18, which deals with the creation of woman, the same verb used to describe God's creative activity through the Son in Heb 1:2.[68] Philo does similarly with regards to Moses' making the bronze serpent in *Leg.* 2.79 where the term κατασκευάζω replaces the ποιέω found in LXX Num 21:9. Moreover, LXX Gen 1:2 describes the earth at the beginning of the creation story "yet the earth was invisible and unformed [ἀκατασκεύαστος]" (NETS).

It would appear to me that by analogy with the construction of buildings, by the time of Hebrews, κατασκευάζω was not only employed of the construction of buildings, but with the construction of beings and objects more generally speaking. This observation can help us understand Heb 3:1–6 more clearly, especially the "house" metaphor". The use of this verb in Heb 3:4 would seem to have the meaning "to build/construct" in 4a, but as the *synkrisis* moves to the creation of all things in 4b, so too does the verb κατασκευάζω acquire its broader meaning "to create" in order to facilitate the move to the description of the Son as creator of all things.[69] It also allows v. 3 to be connected to v. 4 more closely by providing lexical cohesion so that the *synkrisis* is seen to develop seamlessly.

7.5 Conclusion to the Section on Heb 3:1–6

By means of a mini-conclusion at this juncture, we can posit that 3:1–6 does indeed contain a link to the Son's role in creation. In the first instance, there is close cohesion between this exhortation and the preceding exposition that came before concerning the descent of the Son in order to rectify the fact that humanity is not in its originally intended status over creation, as was intended from the beginning. Secondly, there appears to be a reference to the Son as creator, which, as 1:10–12, amalgamates the role of the Son with that of God as the creator of "all things" (3:4). Thirdly, the meaning of "house" in 3:1–6 can be seen as fluid, with an implicit word play on the cosmos as God's own dwelling place in 3:4 which aids the comparison of Moses to the Son. Finally, the term κατασκευάζω binds the creative activity of the Son in v. 3 to the creation of "all things" in 3:4 in a word play to gently stress the Son's superiority by virtue of his role in creation. What we see in Hebrews is a move from exposition on the status of the creative Son, first evident in 1:1–4 and reiterated in 1:10–12, and the purpose of whose descent is expanded upon and elucidated in 2:5–9, to an exhortation based upon

---

[68] In addition, LXX Gen 1:26 employs the identical word ποιήσωμεν (let us make) in relation to humanity.

[69] The verb κατασκευάζω refers to the act of creating in LXX Isa 4:28; 43:7; Bar 3:32; Wis 9:2.

said theology, which becomes particularly evident in 3:6 and the mention of holding firm to the confidence and pride that belong to hope. Here, salvation is also specifically linked to the role of the Son as high priest (2:17; 3:1). This sets the stage for what will come in ch. 4.

7.6 Hebrews 4:1–11

¹ Therefore, let us be afraid lest, while the promise remains to enter into his rest, someone of you might seem to have failed.

² For indeed we have been brought the good news, as also were they. But the word they heard did not profit those that were not united by faith to those who heard.

³ For we who believed enter into [the] rest, just as he has said: "As I swore in my anger, if they will enter into my rest!"⁷⁰ in spite of "the works" having come to be from the foundation of the world.

⁴ For he has said somewhere concerning the seventh [day] as follows: "And God rested on the seventh day from all his works."

⁵ and in this [place], again, "If they will enter into my rest!"

⁶ Since therefore it remains [for] some [people] to enter into it, and the ones who were formerly brought the good news did not enter on account of [their] disobedience,

⁷ Again he fixes a certain day, "today", saying through David after so great a time, just as it has been said before, "Today, if you listen to his voice, do not harden your hearts!"

⁸ For if Joshua had caused them to rest, he would not be speaking concerning another day after these things.

⁹ So then, a Sabbath keeping remains for the people of God.

¹⁰ For he who entered into his rest, he himself also rested from his works just as did God from his own.

¹¹ Therefore, let us hasten to enter into that rest, lest someone falls by [following] the same example of disobedience.

7.6.1 From Creation to Rest: Hebrews 4

The connection between humanity and the saving acts of the creator Son will be further expanded in ch. 4. The result of fidelity to him is revealed to be the promised rest of Ps 95 (94), which, through *gezerah shavah* on Gen 2:2 is revealed as none other than the resting of God himself at creation (4:3–4; 9–10). The sub-

---

⁷⁰ NRSV: "They shall not enter my rest." See notes in Appendix A to this verse as to why I have kept the Greek wording in my translation.

ject of "rest" in Hebrews has been much discussed, both in the commentaries, and in monographs, such as Laansma's volume.[71] In this section, I will look specifically at the implications of interpreting the resting of Ps 95 (specifically in the form of LXX Ps 94) in terms of God's rest at the end of creation for understanding the discourse of Hebrews.

7.6.2 Situating the Creation Reference in Heb 4:3–4

Before we begin to investigate the creation reference in 4:3–4, it is first worthwhile to briefly outline what is said in the preceding section (3:7–19). The subunit of 3:7–9 is introduced by the term διό (therefore) which joins it to the passage discussed above, so as to draw inference from 3:1–6. There then follows an injunction not to "harden your hearts", which is attributed to a command from the Holy Spirit, taken from Ps 95:8 (94:8). In contrast to the MT, the LXX does not make specific reference to the places of Massah and Meribah, but translates these terms of "rebellion" and "testing": μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ (rebellion) κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ (testing) ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (do not harden your hearts as on the day of rebellion, like the day of testing in the desert).[72] In another skilled intertextual application of a past text to a present situation, Hebrews picks up on the LXX version and the reference to rebellion, from the same semantic field of disobedience in 4:6, 11, to apply the warning of the psalm to his own audience as a caution against falling away from faith in the Son. Although God might be the speaker and the subject/actor of three verbs in the projection/quotation, the audience are either the subject/actors of nine finite verbs in 3:7–19, which makes the desired response from them, the topic under present consideration.[73]

We should indeed pay careful heed to Hebrews' use of Scripture at this point, because the use of the LXX as opposed to the MT enables the author to connect it not to Exodus 17 as in the Hebrew Psalm, but to Num 14 and the failure of the Israelites to follow the message of Joshua and Caleb (4:2).[74] It is noteworthy

---

[71] Laansma, *Rest*.

[72] The LXX hapax legomenon παραπικρασμός, often rendered "rebellion", originally meant "embitterment" (BDAG, 770).

[73] Westfall, *Discourse*, 122.

[74] Richard Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*¸ WUNT 2/238 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 57. However, this reading is disputed. According to the best attested reading, the participle συγκεκραμένους modified the object pronoun ἐκείνους (P[13], P[46], A, B, C, D* and Ψ), with the sense that "they" would not have been united in faith with the ones who "heard" the word "in a deeper sense". However, ℵ has a variant reading, συγκεκραμένος (nominative plural, as opposed to accusative), and if the τῇ πίστει were taken as the object of the mixing and the ἀκούσασιν as referential, the phrase could mean "the word met with no faith in those who heard it". Even so, if the τῇ πίστει were taken instrumentally and the ἀκούσασιν as the object of the mixing, we could still get "the word was not joined to those who heard it through faith." Attridge, *Hebrews*, 122, 125. See also Ounsworth, *Typology*, 65–66.

that the narrative of Num 14, recounting the people's failure to enter the promised land, follows closely after the assertion that Moses is faithful in God's house (Num 12:7). Furthermore, the author inserts διό after προσώχθισα (I was angry) at 3:10 which changes the application of the forty years. The MT and the more natural reading of the LXX conforms the psalm events to those of Exodus 17 and the punishment of forty years follows on from the events at Massah and Meribah, but in Heb 3:10, the forty year period was the time during which the Israelites saw God's works in the wilderness before he swore the oath, with the implication that God's wrathful response comes at the end of the forty years. Hebrews therefore refers to Num 14, where the Israelites do not want to enter the Holy Land, and only Joshua and Caleb stand as examples of those willing to do God's will.[75] Indeed, the "today" of the psalm is taken to signal that the promise of rest still remains open (4:1), and just as those who perished in the desert fell because of their unbelief (3:19), the present community is warned not to refuse to listen to God's warning, as the Israelites refused to listen to Joshua and Caleb regarding entry into the holy land of Israel.[76] It is at this point that we find the next creation reference, in Heb 4:3–4. The connection between "rest" in Ps 95 (94) and that of God at the end of creation will again be made apparent in 4:6–11. The question now becomes, of what significance is it to the discourse of Hebrews at these points to include a reference to God's resting at the end of creation?

7.7 *The Traditional Understandings of Rest in Hebrews*

Whilst many scholars have recognized that Hebrews redefines the rest in Ps 95 (94) in terms of the Genesis account, this fact is often overlooked in the pursuit of understanding what is meant by "resting" in the chapter. Arguments concern whether the noun κατάπαυσις should rather be interpreted as "resting place", and how such a place might be understood in the light of Hebrews' historical situation. Käsemann made the suggestion that we are not dealing with God's act of resting at all, but rather with his "resting place". This suggestion began a debate involving Otfried Hofius and Gerd Theissen. I consider their arguments here briefly.

---

[75] Ibid. 57–58. Docherty, *Old Testament*, 182, 186 suggests that this might be a deliberate attempt on the part of the author to make two distinct points from the psalm quotation by placing it in a new co-text. On the possibility of a tradition in Jewish exegesis that knew two periods of "forty years", one of testing and one of punishment, see Hofius, *Katapausis*, 129, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 115, 120 and Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 88–89, though as Docherty states, the evidence for this is inconclusive. On the link between Hebrews 3:10 and 4:2 to Numbers 14, see further Hofius, *Katapausis*, 127–39.

[76] The other Hebrew reference to Meribah occurs in Num 20:13, after the rebellion and the announcement that Moses and Aaron will not lead the Israelites into the promised land, but here the LXX renders "Meribah" by the noun ἀντιλογία (dispute), found later in Heb 6:16; 7:7 and 12:3.

Laansma describes the problem being addressed thus:

Auctor's [the author's] treatment of our theme [rest] in Heb 3–4 tells us that Gen 2:2 was always embedded in the warning of LXX Ps 94:7–11 (95:7–11). This by itself appeared unconvincing to most moderns, though they might indulge *Auctor*, given the exegetical conventions of his day. Yet his manner of pursuing the midrash on these OT passages has proved difficult to follow, leaving us with the impression that the original readers knew more than we do. The quest for this background knowledge is thus commissioned.[77]

Ernst Käsemann effectively "set the agenda" for future discussions of Heb 3–4 and, specifically, the κατάπαυσις (rest) therein. He argued in his thesis *Wandering People of God* that the motif "wandering" of the Christian community, which is compared to the wandering of the Israelites by Hebrews' exegesis of Ps 95 (94) is the central theme (DA "topic") in Hebrews, even if Hebrews did culminate in the description of the Son's high priestly activity.[78] As part of his thesis, he posited that the concept of striving to enter "rest" (κατάπαυσις) was employed in order to couch the Kerygma in terms that would be familiar to a Hellenistic community, and hence references had been made that would be understood in relation to the gnostic Urmensch [primeval human being] and its journey heavenward.[79] In part, the link between κατάπαυσις and the Sabbath was, in his opinion, to be understood in relation to the aeons present in gnostic writings, and also in Philo, since, according to Käsemann, the highest aeon, the Sabbath and the rest were identical in Philo's writings. Upon examining such texts, he concluded: "κατάπαυσις is construed spatially, thus as aeon-like, as a heavenly sphere, and is linked to Sabbath speculation."[80] This argument, he based on a supposed interchangeability of κατάπαυσις with ἀνάπαυσις, which is favoured in Philo and also denotes "rest". Käsemann's thought would later be picked up by several scholars, including Grässer and Theissen.[81]

Käsemann's work sparked a debate. Otfried Hofius offered a counter argument in his thesis *Katapausis*. Hofius, too, argued for a spatial understanding of κατάπαυσις, but on very different grounds. He argued that Käsemann made the unnecessary assumption that the idea of rest as a resting place was based on gnostic speculation. The psalm itself seemed to contain the meaning "resting place" in that it referred to rest in the land of Canaan, and thence to God's dwelling place in the temple at Jerusalem. One could see the same suggestion in Hebrews itself in 11:14–16, where entrance into the "homeland" is ultimately at stake.[82] In addition, there was no need to see the same equation of rest and the

---

[77] Laansma, *Rest*, 10.
[78] See Käsemann, *Wandering*, 240.
[79] Ibid., 87–90.
[80] Ibid., 73–74. My translation. For the alternative, see Williamson, *Philo*, 539–57.
[81] Grässer, *Hebräer*, 210–11 and Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 124–52, though Theissen argues that there are in fact two strands of thought in Philo, one of which is anti-gnostic.
[82] Hofius, *Katapausis*, 53–54.

Sabbath in Hebrews as in gnostic literature. Käsemann's reading essentially held that κατάπαυσις was to be equated with σαββατισμός (Sabbath keeping) in 4:9. However, Hofius claimed σαββατισμός was better understood as a Sabbath *celebration* characterized by joy rather than rest. In particular, he pointed to texts like *Jub.* 50:9, which as well as resting, requires eating and drinking as part of the Sabbath celebration. He argued that 4:10 is not an explanation of the word σαββατισμός, but of the whole of 4:9.[83]

In other words, 4:10 does not explain why the future rest of the redeemed can be called a Sabbath rest, but it states why a σαββατισμός can be possible in the final place of rest. Whoever has entered into God's place of rest finds there the rest that is required to be able to hold a Sabbath celebration of praise and prayer to God.[84] From an analysis of the term κατάπαυσις in the LXX and contemporaneous literature, Hofius concluded that it was a technical term, used for rest in the temple. To be specific, he looked at the Septuagintal form of Deut 12:9; 1 Chr 6:16 (6:31); 2 Chr 6:41; Ps 94; Ps 131:14; Isa 66:1 and Jdt 9:8.[85] Furthermore, the idea of an eternal Sabbath celebration had its roots in Jewish eschatological tradition, such as that later expressed in Mishnah Tamid 7:4 where the Levites sing a song that is "for the time to come" which will be "all Sabbath and rest in the everlasting life."[86]

As a result of his thesis, Hofius found himself under scholarly attack, most notably from Gerd Theissen. In his study of the rest motif in Philo, Theissen argued that Philo picked up and developed certain gnostic ideas, but then "drops them" for more "Jewish" ideas. Such a gnostic strand could be seen in Philo's *Deus*.[87]

Indeed of the nature of the soul beloved of God no clearer evidence can we have than that psalm of Hannah which contains the words "the barren hath borne seven, but she that had many children hath languished" (1 Sam. 2:5). And yet it is the mother of one child – Samuel – who is speaking. How then can she say that she has borne seven? It can only be that in full accordance with the truth of things, she holds the One to be the same as the Seven, not only in the lore of numbers, but also in the harmony of the universe and in the thoughts of the virtuous soul. For Samuel who is appointed to God alone and holds no company with any other has his being ordered in accordance with the One and the Monad, the truly existent. But this condition of his implies the Seven, that is a soul which rests (ἀνάπαυσις) in God and toils no more at any mortal task, and has thus left behind the Six, which God has assigned to those who could not win the first place, but must needs limit their claims to the second. (Whitaker, LCL, Philo, Deus, 10–12)

---

[83] Ibid., 106–9.
[84] Ibid., 106, 108.
[85] Ibid., 49–50. However, as we shall see, Laansma, *Rest*, 95–98 calls some of these "local" usages into question.
[86] Hofius, *Katapausis*, 111–13. He also mentions Barnabas 15.
[87] Laansma, *Rest*, 115, who also notes Käsemann, *Wandering*, 70 does the same.

According to Theissen, in this passage, the concept of "resting in God" has the sense of "communion in God", the "true being", a very mystical goal which is not achieved by all.[88] This idea of "resting in God" is linked in Philo to an interpretation of the Genesis creation account whereby "humankind's cessation of work is parallel to God's on the seventh day of creation; in that context, then, God's 'rest' is a *cessation* of work."[89]

Theissen also took particular interest in Philo's use of the numbers six and seven in relation to creation. For instance, in *Q. E.* 2.46, Philo has Moses experiencing a "second birth" on the seventh day, whereas the creation of the earth took place in six days. Furthermore, there was a similar concept to the *Urmensch* when Philo spoke of both an earthly and an ethereal human:[90]

The even number, six, He apportioned both to the creation of the world and to the election of the contemplative nation, wishing to show first of all that He had created both the world and the nation elected for virtue … But the calling above of the prophet is a second birth better than the first … Wherefore the calling above or, as we have said, the divine birth happened to come about for him in accordance with the ever-virginal nature of the hebdomad. For he is called on the seventh day, in this (respect) differing from the earth-born first moulded man, for the latter came into being from the earth and with a body, while the former (came) from the ether and without a body. (Marcus, LCL, Philo, *Q. E. 2.46*)

Elsewhere, he uses Pythagorean speculation about the number seven. In one passage, the rest of God is not an experience following creation, but an attribute of God himself:[91]

It is the nature of 7 alone, as I have said, neither to beget nor to be begotten. For this reason … the Pythagoreans liken it to the chief of all things: for that which neither begets nor is begotten remains motionless; for creation takes place in movement, since there is movement both in that which begets and in that which is begotten, in the one that it may beget, in the other that it may be begotten. There is only one thing that neither causes motion nor experiences it, the original Ruler and Sovereign. Of Him 7 may be fitly said to be a symbol. (Colson, LCL, Philo, *Opif.*, 100)

Theissen argued that there was another strand of thought in Philo, however, in which he rejects the idea that humans rest in God, and also denies that the essence of God is rest.[92] In *On the Cherubim*, we read:

---

[88] Laansma, *Rest*, 115.
[89] Ibid., 116.
[90] Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 126.
[91] Laansma, *Rest*, 117, Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 126.
[92] Laansma, *Rest*, 117, Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 127. Some scholars have suggested that the anthropomorphism of God's "resting" seems to have been the subject of controversy in the OT itself, e. g. Isa 40:28 denies the possibility God can become weary. See Gunkel, *Genesis*, 116. However, God is not said to become weary in the Gen 2 account, simply to rest at the completion of creation, though see Exod 31:17, where he stopped (LXX ἐπαύσατο) and rested (LXX

For the good and beautiful things in the world could never have been what they are, save that they were made in the image of the archetype, which is truly good and beautiful, even the uncreated, the blessed, the imperishable. And therefore Moses often in his laws calls the Sabbath, which means 'rest,' God's Sabbath (Exod 20:10, etc.), not man's, and thus he lays his finger on an essential fact in the nature of things. For in all truth there is but one thing in the universe which rests (ἀναπαύω), that is God. But Moses does not give the name of rest to mere inactivity. The cause of all things is by its nature active; it never ceases to work all that is best and most beautiful. God's rest (ἀνάπαυλα) is rather a working with absolute ease, without toil and without suffering … For weariness is the principal cause of change … Since then weariness is the natural cause of change in things that turn and vary, and since God turns not and changes not, he must be by nature unwearying. (Colson, LCL, Philo, *Cher.* 86–90.)[93]

This position, Theissen claimed, was in tune with the Jewish concerns over the transcendence of God as creator "to *ward off* overly ambitious longings for an unmediated vision of God and a share in his rest."[94] It also stresses that the "rest" belongs solely to God, and is rather a "restless activity".[95]

Theissen argued that this latter strand was in contrast to Hebrews, where the idea of "rest" pertains to a cessation of activity.[96] He posited that Hebrews was closer to the gnostic strand.[97] Theissen also suggested that in 4:10, resting and working are contrasted, since God is said to rest at the end of his works.[98] Furthermore, in Heb 4:10, the move from "my rest" in the LXX to "his rest" separates the resting of humanity from God's resting, but at the same time, the two are set in parallel by the use of the term ὥσπερ, and he sees in this something similar to *Deus* 11–12 quoted above.[99]

Theissen also saw other gnostic patterns in Hebrews. When deciding that Hebrews is linked to Gnosticism, Theissen said we have to ask whether the intention of creation is to be fulfilled in a new world as in apocalyptic literature, or in one's elevation and departure from it as in Gnosticism. Hebrews 4:10 effectively contrasts the works of creation and salvation, and it can be argued that the works are judged negatively since a person longs to desist from them, and rest in a parallel way to the primordial coming to rest of God. Moreover, this suggests an

---

κατέπαυσεν). Wenham has pointed out that if God finishes his work on the seventh day in Gen 2:2, it might imply that he was in fact working for at least part of it. Wenham, *Genesis* 1–15, 35. However, Wenham observes that in Gen 17:22 and 49:33 the same phrase indicates the action in question was past and so there is no implication in the Hebrew of Gen 2:2 that God was working on the seventh day.

[93] A similar idea is found in John 5:17 "My Father is still working, and I also am working." (NRSV)

[94] Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 127. Translation mine.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Ibid., 124.

[97] Ibid., 125.

[98] Ibid., 128.

[99] Ibid.

attitude that seeks salvation away from the created world, to a resting beyond it. Whilst it is not purely gnostic in the sense that there is no attempt to return to a state/time before creation existed, it is closer to Gnosticism than to apocalyptic.[100] He also argues that what is created is not of itself salvific in 12:27, where everything that is made is seen to disappear not in order to give place to a new creation, but so that the unshakeable remains.[101] Here, the eternal world will emerge, and this world will disappear: salvation lies not in the coming of what is new, then, but rather in the fact that God's eternal world is again "alone with itself."[102]

Hofius, however, countered that the various writings of Philo above did not represent different strands of thought, but were compatible with each other. The "rest", and "activity" present in God were complementary. When Philo compared God's being to "rest" it was to contrast him with creation.[103] Furthermore, those passages that speak of God as eternally active are arguing against any idea of God's inactivity, that is, against the concept of *Deus Otiosus*.[104] As Laansma puts it, such passages do not deny God's rest, because "God's activity differs from creation's movement precisely in that 'God turns not and changes not'; his activity is, unlike creation's movement, without toil … Philo is thus arguing that God's rest and his activity are not antithetical but that they interpenetrate."[105] Furthermore, again contrary to the claims of Theissen that in *Cher.* Philo had moved away from the idea that people share in God's rest, in *Cher.* 86 we have:[106]

He Himself has imparted of His own to all particular beings from that fountain of beauty – Himself. For the good and beautiful things in the world could never have been what they are, save that they were made in the image of the archetype, which is truly good and beautiful, even the uncreated, the blessed, the imperishable. (Colson, LCL, Philo, *Cher.* 86).[107]

Furthermore, the passage from *Deus* is by no means alone in hinting at humanity's rest in God. There are other places where people attain rest, such as in *Det.* 121–122 where it is the result of righteousness:[108]

Our witness for this shall be the birth of Noah. "Noah" means righteous, and it is said of him, "This man shall cause us to rest from our works and from the pains of our hands and from the earth which the Lord God hath cursed" (Gen 5:29). For it is the nature of

---

100 Ibid., 120–21.
101 Theissen's interpretation depends on interpreting μετάθεσις in 12:27 to mean "removal" (as in the NRSV), but it could also be interpreted to mean "transformation" (as in *BDAG*, 639). I have argued for the later understanding earlier in my discussion of 2:10–12 and the relationship between this passage and 12:26–27. See also Koester, *Hebrews*¸ 547–48.
102 Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 121.
103 Hofius, *Katapausis*, 252–54.
104 Laansma, *Rest*, 118.
105 Ibid.
106 Theissen, *Untersuchungen*, 127; Hofius, *Katapausis*, 248–53.
107 See Hofius, *Katapausis*, 253.
108 Ibid., 252.

justice in the first place to create rest in the place of toil, owing to its complete indifference to objects on the border-land between vice and virtue, such as wealth, fame, official posts, honours, and everything of that sort, with which the majority of mankind are busy. (Colson, LCL, Philo, *Det.* 121–122)

It is clear that, elsewhere in Philo, humans share in God's rest specifically:[109]

I am greatly struck by the perfect sequence of cause and effect in all this. Proximity to a stable object produces a desire to be like it and a longing for quiescence. Now that which is unwaveringly stable is God, and that which is subject to movement is creation. He therefore that draws nigh to God longs for stability, but he that forsakes Him, inasmuch as he approaches the unresting creation is, as we might expect, carried about. (Colson, LCL, Philo, *Post.* 123)

Moreover, God and rest were not interchangeable, as in gnostic thought and as Theissen had suggested. Although God's rest might be the goal of the righteous, the righteous are not depicted as originating in it, as in Gnosticism.[110] Laansma again offers a helpful summary:

The ethical alignment of Philo's conception is very different than the gnostic conception. The restlessness of the fool does not, for Philo, stem back to a pre-existent fall out of the divine rest into the domain of the demonic world, but rather to the fool's disobedience and godlessness (*Dec.* 86; *Post.* 22 ff.). On the other hand, the rest in God is granted only to those who strive after perfection, on whose volition the issue is dependent.[111]

This debate has had long-lasting consequences on Hebrews' scholarship. The historical critical debate initiated by Käsemann, Hofius and Theissen still concerns many modern commentaries and monographs on Hebrews when it comes to the "rest" motif in Hebrews. Laansma's I Will Give You Rest again takes up the arguments of Hofius, albeit with modifications and some necessary credit to his academic sparring partners and examines the topic of rest in the MT, LXX, Gnosticism and the Rabbis, before he commences his investigation into that same motif in Heb 3–4 and Matt 11:28–30.

However, when rest is considered as a motif in isolation, it is possible that certain nuances of the argumentation of Hebrews might have been missed. Furthermore, by struggling to ascertain the extratext, scholarship has sometimes neglected to afford a proper investigation into the precise intertextual usage of Psalm 95 in Heb 4 in favour of possible indirect intertextual references. Some scholars have failed to ask if there might be something therein which permits Hebrews to make the link with Gen 2:2 in the first place. Such an investigation would be beneficial to understanding the cohesion of Hebrews 3–4 in relation to that which has come before – specifically to the descent/ascent motif that has

---

[109] Ibid., 252–53. For a discussion of rest elsewhere in Hebrews according to Hofius, see Laansma, *Rest*, 119 and Church, *Temple*, 322–25.

[110] Hofius, *Katapausis*, 254.

[111] Laansma, *Rest*, 120–121. He also notes that they do not become God, citing *Somn* 2:238.

so far influenced the discourse of Hebrews in a very significant way to relate the topic of creation to Christ's saving activity.

7.8 Intertextual Insights: Ps 95(94) and Creation

It is here necessary to try to understand the text being used by Hebrews on its own terms. As we saw earlier, Hebrews often picks up on questions raised in the cited text. Looking at the use of Ps 95(94) in Hebrews, Steyn remarks that it was associated in the Second Temple period and just after with New Year, Rosh Hashanah. This is suggested in the psalm itself on the basis of the verb נָרִיעָה in the Hebrew, which is related to the noun תְּרוּעָה in Lev 23:24, where it refers to the blast of horns on a festival close to Yom Kippur.[112] This link to New Year is important for our purposes because of what New Year was considered in early Jewish thought: a renewal of creation.[113] In terms of understanding Hebrews' argumentation, this is vital because creation and Exodus themes would have been understood together implicitly when reading Ps 95 (94) itself, at the time Hebrews was written, as in a number of psalms which were likely used at festivals (e. g. Ps 74:12–17).[114]

---

[112] Gert J. Steyn, *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*, FRLANT 235 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2011), 173. See also, Weiser, *Psalms*, 625. See also Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, vol. 1, trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 106, 121–22.

[113] Gert J. Steyn, "The Reception of Psalm 95 (94):7–11 in Hebrews 3–4," in *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*, ed. Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 194–228, here, 202. Steyn is here referring to Rosh Hashanah, not to be confused with some of the other "new years" such as Tu b'Shevat, the New Year of trees. How early this tradition is, however, is sometimes questioned. There is certainly a later connection between Rosh Hashanah and creation because in the Babylonian Talmud, Rosh Hashanah 10b–11a, Rabbi Eliezer says that the world was created in the month of Tishri, whereas Rabbi Joshua says the world was created in the month of Nisan, in which takes place Rosh Hashanah. To this day, Rosh Hashanah is commemorated as the anniversary of creation, especially the creation of Adam and Eve and in Leviticus Rabbah 29.1 it is said that Adam's children will receive pardon because this was the day on which Adam was supposedly pardoned for his own transgression. Jacob Neusner, *Leviticus Rabbah*, vol. 4 of *A Theological Commentary on the Midrash*, Studies in Ancient Judaism (Lanham, MD: University of America Press, 2001), xxxiv. Nevertheless, the Feast of Trumpets in LXX Lev 23:23–25, which later became Rosh Hashanah, does specify a Sabbath-like rest from work, which would suggest a link between the festival and creation from at least the postexilic period. It is also closely linked to the Day of Atonement fast ten days later, with similar punishments for breaking the prohibition on work in Lev 23:26–33, and so to find an implicit reference to Rosh Hashanah by using this psalm would make sense in the co-text of Hebrews, specifically Christ's high priestly activity. See Heb. 9:3 where the priest enters into the Holy of Holies, which only happened on Yom Kippur.

[114] Steyn posits this usage based on the work of Mowinckel cited above. The general theory of an "enthronement feast", on which Mowinckel bases his theory, is highly criticised. See Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 2nd Edition, trans. John McHugh (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1965), 504–6.

Enns offers an exploration of the structure of Ps 95 which helps us under-
stand Hebrews' employment of the psalm more clearly. It is often thought that
Ps 95 was originally two different works.[115] However, in its present form, and
its form known at the time Hebrews was written, Ps 95 consists of distinct
but related sections, pulled together by what Enns calls a creation/re-creation
theme.[116] Broadly speaking, Enns says there are two sections: vv. 1–7a concern
the idea of God as creator/maker, and the second section from 7b–11 contains
a warning about hardening one's heart. Significantly, vv. 1–5 deal with God's cos-
mic creation as a motivation for worshipping the Lord, whilst vv. 6–7a speak
of the exodus event, which also inspires the followers to worship the Lord. The
remaining verses conclude by *then* warning the audience to be faithful, drawing
upon the incidents at Meribah and Massah, which typify the whole exodus nar-
rative and thus link to the preceding section of the psalm.[117]

Although, as we saw earlier, Hebrews interprets LXX Ps 94 in terms of the
Joshua account, this twofold idea of creation is still important. In the first sec-
tion, the focus is very much on the traditional view of God as creator: "Not ony
is God greatest by virtue of his ownership of all creation, but he himself is the
creator," having made the sea and the land (v. 5).[118] Verses 6 and 7 parallel this;
however the focus switches to the creation of a people – God is described as
Israel's "maker" (ποιήσαντος, from ποιέω, as used in Heb 1:2 for the creation of
the aeons).[119] This in turn poses the question of when God made the people,
Israel. Enns argues that tradition said this was during the exodus, as indicated
in texts such as such as Hos 8:13–14, which appear to see the exodus event as a
creative act by which the people are formed.[120]

Though they offer choice sacrifices, though they eat flesh, the LORD does not accept
them. Now he will remember their iniquity, and punish their sins; they shall return to
Egypt. Israel has forgotten his Maker, and built palaces; and Judah has multiplied for-
tified cities; but I will send a fire upon his cities, and it shall devour his strongholds.
(Hos 8:13–14 NRSV)

Similarly, in Isa 43:15–17, in a co-text of the exodus we have reference to God as
Israel's creator, again suggesting that to some extent God's creative activity and
the exodus were connected:

I am the LORD, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King. Thus says the LORD,
who makes a way in the sea, a path in the mighty waters, who brings out chariot and

---

[115] Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51–100*,
Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005), 459.
[116] Peter Enns, "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and Its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1–
4:13," *WTJ* 55 (1993):255–80, here 256.
[117] Ibid., 256, 266–67.
[118] Ibid., 258.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Ibid., 258–59.

horse, army and warrior; they lie down, they cannot rise, they are extinguished, quenched like a wick … (Isa 43:15–17 NRSV).[121]

Enns thus concludes the Psalm is arguing that "in the same way that the worshippers respond properly (i.e. worshipfully) to the event of God's first creation … ought they not also to respond properly to the events of the second creation, an event that brought them into existence in history as the people of God?" After all, the "today" in v. 7b is the "today" of the worshipper.[122]

Whilst, broadly speaking, Enns is correct to say that the argument to "harden not your heart" is connected to the concept of God as the creator of Israel at the exodus and also of the world, the particular exhortation does not necessarily begin at 7b as he suggests; rather, from a DA perspective, it could be seen to start at 7a with the connective ὅτι [translating כִּי] which is in fact a subordinating conjunction. This introduces a metaphor which describes the people Israel as the "people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand," designating the overseeing of Israel by God, which can itself be seen as an inference from what has just been said regarding God as the creator of Israel. By asyndeton, the injunction not to harden one's heart follows directly. The use of a subordinating conjunction at the start, as opposed to before the command, has the effect of closely connecting the metaphor to the call to worship in v. 6. As the metaphor is itself linked to the idea of God as the maker of Israel, so the notion of God as Israel's maker is incorporated into the exhortation itself.

A similar sense of urgency applies to the "today" as it is transposed into Hebrews. In its original position in a psalm of David, as Heb 4:7 sees it, Ps 95 (94) was holding out the promise of rest to a present generation, and in Hebrews, it is again picked up for similar usage to a present generation of the house of Israel, as it specifically refers to the re-creation of the people of God in the Christian

---

[121] Ibid., 259. This concept, as Enns points out, can arguably be found in Exod 15:16, where God is said to have "purchased/acquired" Israel (LXX ἐκτήσω [from κτάομαι acquire], MT קָנִיתָ from קנה to buy]. This verb is in fact often understood as "to create/make" in Gen 14:19,22; Deut 32:6; Ps 139:13, as in the NRSV translations. Although the verb used is not specifically creative, Enns argues there seems to be the idea that Israel is in some way formed in the Exodus event. However, since the verb employed could suggest a kind of "ransoming", rather than creation of Israel. It could be argued that the people was formed before the exodus event, given that God tells Moses he has heard the cried of his people and seen their affliction in Exod 3:7. Nevertheless, the link is definitely present between the two in ancient Jewish literature. The link is made in another biblical text, Ps 136 (135), which praises God first as Creator and then as liberator of Israel from Egypt. Similarly, Neh 9:6 prays to God as Creator before vv. 9–11 recall the exodus. The link is still found in the synagogue liturgy for Yom Kippur, which makes frequent references to both creation and the exodus. For instance, Herbert M. Adler and Arthur Davis (eds.), *The Service of the Synagogue: A New Edition of the Festival Prayers with an English Translation in Prose and Verse, Day of Atonement, Part 2* (London: Routledge, 1905), 57–58, 232–33, 241. This matter is also taken up by Steyn: "Reception," 194–228.

[122] Enns, "Creation," 268.

community.[123] "The use of Psalm 95 … serves as an example of past apostasy and the consequences thereof … and his understanding of 'rest', the goal of the new exodus community, as God's creation rest establishes the creation/re-creation connection" in Hebrews itself.[124] In the same way that the initial generation that rebelled was a community wandering through the wilderness, so the Christian people is depicted as a "community of wilderness wanderers living between Egypt and Canaan with the ever present possibility of rebellion," and denying its maker.[125] In fact, the seemingly separate pitching of Jesus over Moses in Heb 3:1–6 serves to introduce this exegesis by "making overt references to his readers, a move necessary in establishing the admonitory posture of the remainder of the pericope."[126] We saw how 3:3–4 makes a word play on "house" as the people of God and the universe, and the move on to the creation of the universe, and understanding Heb 4 in the light of the original creation-focus of Ps 95 now helps us to see it as introductory to the exegesis that follows, and as the framework by which to understand the subsequent exegesis of Ps 95(94). The comparison between Jesus and Moses "establishes the typological connection between Israel and the church," and the contrast between the two mediators "yields an *a fortiori* argument that heightens the motive for heeding the warning: disobedience had dire consequences then; how much more so now?"[127]

By linking Ps 95 (94) and Gen 2:2 in Heb 4:4, Hebrews might be interpreting the psalm christologically, but we can now see that it does so within the very Jewish framework of the psalm itself: it links a psalm of exhortation based on the idea of God as creator to the creation narrative itself. There is, then, no need to look at the extratext to understand "rest" in Hebrews, as per Käsemann, Hofius and Theissen. Such readings overlook the fact that Ps 95 is itself a creation psalm, and so could readily be associated with the creation narrative in and of itself, including the "rest". Instead, we need to look more closely at the use of Ps 95(94).

Sandwiched in between the two references to Ps 95 (94) in vv. 3 and 5, we find the quotation from Gen 2:2. The quotation is introduced vaguely, but it is obviously a reference to the creation account, and the rest God took on the seventh day.[128] Hebrews attempts to resolve the tension in the psalm itself, that the "rest"

---

[123] On "today", see Enns, "Creation," 268. On Hebrews' understanding of the Davidic origin of the psalm in 4:7, see Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 251–52.

[124] Enns, "Creation," 269.

[125] Ibid., 272.

[126] Ibid., 269–70. Enns points out that Moses' greatness is not diminished, but Jesus is simply presented as a better Moses, 270.

[127] Ibid., 271. Other scholars look at the passage purely as a comparison between Israel and the Christian community to whom Hebrews is addressed. See, for example, Lamp, *Greening*, 37–38.

[128] Docherty, *Old Testament*, 189, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 128–29. Hofius, *Katapausis*, 55 suggested that the κατάπαυσις might itself be a work. This is on the basis of the wording in Heb 4:3–4.

could be open to a later generation, especially in the co-text of the LXX, where the Israelites did eventually enter the rest of Canaan. Moreover, the Psalm also has the prohibition on entering "my rest", that is, God's own, not that of Israel, which would be rest in Canaan. Hebrews resolves this tension by the application of Gen 2:2 to interpret Ps 95 (94), since it refers specifically to God's rest.[129] It does this by exploiting the co-text of the exhortation, that is, the psalm's own link to creation, by interpreting the psalm in the light of Gen 2:2. It is widely recognised that the author uses a *gezerah shavah* technique, and twofold consideration of the terms καταπαύω (to rest, the verbal form of κατάπαυσις) and ἔργα (works) permits the author of Hebrews to conclude that the rest that was originally promised was the rest that God experienced at the end of creation.[130] It now becomes clear that in the case of *both* generations, it is the primordial rest that is thought by Hebrews to be open. The motif of rest in this passage is thus firmly rooted in God's Sabbath rest after he created everything, and this day becomes a symbol of eschatological salvation.[131] Moreover, doing this serves to aid the exhortation based on the psalm itself. In the citation of Gen 2:2, the core of a "ring argument" can be discerned in a transition from καταπαύσιν as the promised rest of *that* generation to καταπαύσιν as a Sabbatical rest period for *this* generation.[132]

7.9 The Neglected Allusion: Heb 4:3,8 and the book of Joshua

A counter position to my own could be to say that Hebrews does not in fact see the Israelites as entering the promised land. It is often noted that the author has considered that the psalm is written by David (4:7) and thereby inferred, since it was written a long time after the exodus events, that in some way the Israelites did not enter into the promised rest, and thus he is free to apply the

---

However, this seems unlikely on the grounds of 4:10, where "rest" is found in verbal from (κατέπαυσεν, he rested), and refers to rest from work as something God did on that same day. See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 128–29.

[129] Enns, "Creation," 279.

[130] On the twofold *gezerah shavah*, see Docherty, *Old Testament*, 190. See also Docherty, "Genesis in Hebrews," 130–33, Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 95 and Attridge, *Hebrews*, 128–29.

[131] Steyn, "Reception," 220 argues that it moves from the rest in Canaan to rest for Christians. However, it seems that, for the author of Hebrews, the rest promised to both generations was, in fact, the same primordial rest.

[132] Steyn, "Reception," 220. This has an interesting impact on one's reading of the Epistle's christology. It could be seen to imply that something happened so that humans have not experienced this rest from the beginning, which may fit with Hebrews' proposed Adamic theology in ch. 2, and that it was offered to the Israelites. This poses the question of whether, if the Israelites had entered into it, the Christ event would have been necessary, and then whether salvation would ever have been opened to the Gentiles. It may be that the failure of Israel to enter into God's rest is in some way the impetus for the Christ event.

"today" of the psalm to his own audience. Hence, he makes the comment in 4:8, "For if Joshua had caused them to rest, he would not be speaking concerning another day after these things."[133] Some scholars have even argued that the Israelites never reached Canaan, according to Hebrews.[134] This could be suggested by 3:16: "Now who were they who heard and yet were rebellious? Was it not all those who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses?" (Heb 3:16 NRSV). It is argued that, in fact, no earthly rest is ever entered into – Matthew Thiessen suggests that characters such as Abraham are seen as only sojourners in the land in ch. 11, and that this would indicate that in some way they never achieved the promised rest, and so their situation acts as a type for Hebrews in terms of entrance: just as disobedience meant they would not enter the land, so too would disobedience mean that the Christian community could not enter into its own equivalent, the κατάπαυσις.[135]

However, the statement that if Joshua had given them rest, God would not have spoken about a later day in 4:8 does not necessarily mean that they did not enter any rest provided by Joshua, since entrance into it would not have precluded entrance into the primordial rest.[136] As Laansma puts it:

Our point is not that the land is unimportant to the passage, for the events surrounding the historical κατάπαυσις are obviously recalled and lend shape to the idea of the eschatological entrance into God's κατάπαυσις. Nevertheless, the passage betrays no *typology* between the "earthly/past" and "heavenly/future" land. The parallel (typology) which we do encounter is that between the two *situations* – communities confronted by the one word/voice of God.[137]

---

[133] As we saw above, Hebrews interprets Ps 95 in terms of the Joshua account. See, for instance, Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 251–52.

[134] Matthew Thiessen, "Hebrews and the End of the Exodus", *NovT* 49 (2007):252–69. Thiessen mentions he is following the lead of Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, WMANT 23 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967), in which Steck argues that the Jews of the Second Temple period saw themselves in a state of exile. Thiessen also mentions NT Wright, who has suggested that the Israelites of the Second Temple period saw themselves as "in exile" even in the Land because of the oppression experienced therein from gentile rulers. Nicholas Thomas Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 268–72. On entering into the one rest, see also Laansma, *Rest*, 275.

[135] Thiessen, "Hebrews," 257–261.

[136] Laansma, *Rest*, 303. See also Church, *Temple*, 333: "Here, the rest promise is seen from the perspective not of those who failed to enter the promised land, but of those who actually entered it, effectively denying that their entry was entry into God's rest." Although I differ with Church over some of his understanding of the wilderness imagery and the meaning of rest, since he places a greater emphasis on the temple qua the universe (see 328–332), it is significant that he, too, has come to a similar conclusion in regard of their having entered the promised Land.

[137] Laansma, *Rest*, 275. See also Ibid., 303. Although Laansma does not here appear to accept the definition provided of rest in Gen 2:2 as the ultimate definition for the κατάπαυσις of Hebrews, he does make the point that if it were accepted, entrance into the land by Joshua is not precluded.

From a DA perspective, things are not so simple as Thiessen would argue. At 3:16, we do indeed read: "Now who were they who heard and yet were rebellious? Was it not all those who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses?" (Heb 3:16 NRSV). However, this is to be understood in relation to the rhetoric of the surrounding co-text, and in doing so it is revealed as an example of hyperbole.

In 3:17–19, we see 3:16 introduces an argument not to be disobedient as that generation was, which culminates in 4:1–2, as indicated by the co-ordinating conjunction δέ: "But with whom was he angry forty years? Was it not those who sinned, whose bodies fell in the wilderness? And to whom did he swear that they would not enter his rest, if not to those who were disobedient?" (Heb 3:17–18 NRSV). This argument leads into an exhortation: "Therefore, let us be afraid lest, while the promise remains to enter into his rest, someone of you might seem to have failed. For indeed we have been brought the good news, as also were they. But the word they heard did not profit those that were not united in faith to those who heard" (4:1–2). The latter verse refers to the Israelites' refusal to enter the promised land because they would not listen to Joshua and Caleb in Num 14. At this point in the discourse, then, Hebrews stresses that those who were disobedient to God would not enter into rest. However, Hebrews holds out God's mercy to those who have believed in 4:3, and that, too draws on the Numbers account. According to Num 14, it is true that God brings retribution on those who refuse to enter the land, punishing them for 40 years until they have died off (Num 14:32–35), but he spares the faithful and all those under the age of 24 (14:29); those of Caleb's house (Num 14:24), and Joshua (14:38). Eventually, Joshua does lead the remaining Israelites into the promised land, as narrated in the book of Joshua. We should not, therefore, consider that Hebrews references the punishment of the disobedient generation in isolation to the rest of the Numbers account.

Hence the remark in 4:8 that if "Joshua had given them rest" can be argued to refer to those to whom God *did* show mercy. It *presumes* on the part of the audience an assumption that Joshua did give the Israelites "rest" of a sort, and offers a correction of said assumption by reinterpreting the Joshua account in the light of what the author of Hebrews deems Ps 95 (94) to itself reference: the primordial rest.[138] This is supported by the use of the verb καταπαύω, cognate with κατάπαυσις, which is a hook word with the narrative not of Numbers, where it is absent, but with the Joshua account. In Josh 1:15, Joshua's leading the remaining Israelites into the land is described in terms of rest, and we find the cognate καταπαύω:[139]

---

[138] Koester, *Hebrews*, 278.
[139] Similarly, that Joshua did lead them to rest, see Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 134–35.

Let your wives and your little ones and your livestock settle in the land he gave you. But you shall cross over well-equipped before your kindred, every strong man, and you shall fight on their side until the Lord your God gives rest (καταπαύσῃ) to your kindred, and also to you, and they too inherit the land that the Lord your God is giving them (Josh 1:14–15, NETS)[140]

It would seem, then that we can come to two conclusions. Firstly, Hebrews does not deny that the earthly promise of the Land was fulfilled to past generations, with the caveat that they were obedient, and secondly, Hebrews interprets Ps 95 in relation to Christ as part of a process of resolving the ambiguity of how David could write a psalm whose wording would suggest that a "rest" is still open.[141] The Epistle does this with a creation reference, which is appropriate given the very link in the psalm itself between the exodus events and the creation of both Israel and the world. As a result, the κατάπαυσις of the psalm, whatever its original meaning, becomes a state in Hebrews.[142]

7.9.1 Ἀνάπαυσις and Κατάπαυσις

Here, we need to raise another point about the work of Hofius and Theissen, namely the confusion of the terms ἀνάπαυσις and κατάπαυσις. Käsemann and Theissen both looked at the rest motif in Philo, and conflated the two Greek terms to argue for similarities between his writings and Hebrews. In fact, Philo generally employs ἀνάπαυσις, especially in the passages cited above. It is significant that in *Leg.* 1.5, where Philo does use καταπαύω in relation to God's creative activity, he actually denies that God ever rests completely from his works. He interprets καταπαύω as being transitive: "First of all, then, on the seventh day the Creator, having brought to an end the formation of mortal things [καταπαύσας τὴν τῶν θνητῶν], begins the shaping of others more divine." (Colson, LCL, Philo, *Leg.* 1.5). This indeed seems to be in contradiction to what we find in Heb 4:4, where the whole point appears to be that God does rest completely, and creation

---

[140]   See also Josh 3:13–14 and 23:1.

[141]   However, Koester does point out that the rest was only ever temporary, since rest would give way to war (and, we might add, exile). Koester, *Hebrews*, 278. Yet even this reading does not necessarily imply the idea that Joshua did not enter the land with the remaining Israelites.

[142]   On the argument that Ps 95(94) knew κατάπαυσις as a place, see Laansma, *Rest*, 94–101. Laansma's book, in dialogue with Hofius, offers a very good summary of the theologies of rest in the MT and the LXX, as well as extrabiblical literature. In this section, he notes that in passages such as Isa 66:1 κατάπαυσις is indeed used of a state, and that it can be used interchangeably as a state and a locality, as in JosAsen 8:8,15:7. See also Ibid, 278–82. On another note, Ounsworth has suggested that the idiom "if they should enter my rest!", meant as a prohibition, might have been understood differently by the audience as signalling that a time for entering rest remained, further aiding the application of the psalm to the present day community. See Ounsworth, *Typology*, 67.

has been finished. The Greek of LXX Gen 2:2 says that he rested ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, that is, "from all his works."[143]

In fact, whilst there is indeed considerable overlap in relation to κατάπαυσις and ἀνάπαυσις, the former does appear to have slightly more non-local usage in the LXX and contemporaneous Greek literature. This not only cautions against the equating of the terms as in Käsemann and Theissen, but also against the idea of Hofius that κατάπαυσις must be a technical term for the temple. This is visible from a table offered by Laansma, where he underlines several passages where Hofius put down κατάπαυσις as having "local" connotations, but where he disagrees:[144]

Term	Local	Non-local
ἀνάπαυσις	Gen 8:9; 49:15; Num 10:33; Ruth 1:9; 3:1; LXX Ps 131:8; Isa 11:10; 17:2; 37:28; 65:10; Mic 2:10; Sir 24:7	LXX 1 Chr 28:2; Isa 25:10; Jer 51:33 [45:3]; Lam 1:3 and *passim*
κατάπαυσις	Deut 12:9; 2 Kgs 6:41; LXX Ps 131:14; JosAsen 8:9	Exod 35:2; Num 10:35; LXX 1 Kgs 8:56; LXX 1 Chr 6:16 [6:31]; <u>Isa 66:1; Jdt 9:8;</u> 2 Macc 15:1; <u>JosAsen 22:13</u>

Furthermore, we saw how Hofius argued for a technical usage of κατάπαυσις in order to distinguish it from σαββατισμός. However, in Hebrews, it would appear that the rest is being defined specifically in terms of the Sabbath in 4:3. That verse has the comment that some failed to enter the rest even though it was completed at the foundation of the world, which would suggest that the rest offered is to be considered precisely that which God himself enjoyed on the seventh day of creation. This is confirmed in 4:4 with the citation from Gen 2:2. From the point of

---

[143] It is sometimes suggested that the "rest" is one of the created works (e. g., Hofius, *Katapausis*, 55). However, as Attridge points out, the more natural reading is to see the rest as sequel to the completed works, in view of the quotation that follows and in view of the paraphrase of the quotation in 4:10, where rest is distinguished from works. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 129.

[144] Laansma, *Rest*, 97, see also 96–101. I have slightly amended the form of the references to the more familiar way of citing the LXX. The table does not represent an exhaustive use of this term. For instance, I would add that there is a non-local usage of ἀνάπαυσις in Sir 6:28; 11:19; 22:13 and Wis 4:7. It would also be possible to include here passages from Philo, such as *Deus.* 12; *Cher.* 87 and *Fug.* 174. One could also include the NT, from Matt 11:29. Conversely, this term has a local meaning in Luke 11:24 or Matt 12:43. On κατάπαυσις, we similarly have local usage in LXX 1 Chr 6:16 (6:31) and LXX 2 Chr 6:41, and a non-local usage in Acts 7:49. There are, in fact over sixty uses of ἀνάπαυσις in the LXX alone, and so he offers only a fraction of possible references. However, Laansma highlights that the reading of these terms as being either local or non-local in usage can be controversial. On the confusion of ἀνάπαυσις and κατάπαυσις see also Karrer, *Hebräer*, 221.

view of cohesion, the term σαββατισμός in 4:9 is clearly intended to recall these previous statements, and so it is reasonable to conclude that σαββατισμός and κατάπαυσις are in fact being used somewhat interchangeably within the co-text of Heb 4, though the former is more specific and thereby emphasizes the link between rest and creation already begun at 4:3–4. Indeed, I here refer to Louw and Nida's principle that the correct "meaning" for any word is to be established from which possible "meaning" best fits the co-text *and* context, since this maximizes coherence within a text, and one could indeed expect a text in such an elevated style as Hebrews to have a high level of coherence.[145]

We are, in fact, arguably better off looking firstly looking at Hebrews' co-text itself to understand its use of κατάπαυσις, rather than establishing a possible historical context and working from that back to the text, since surrounding lexemes in combination construct meaning: "cohesion involves the interpretation of some element in the text as depending on another element."[146] Hence, it is worth observing the parallelisms between 4:3–4 and 4:9–10. The structure of 4:3–4 is mirrored in 4:9–10, which consists in a reversal of the concepts whereby 4:9 and 4:10 form a cross-reference to 4:4 and 4:3 respectively. The parallels can also be expressed in tabular format.

4:3–4	4:9–10	Parallel
[4:3] For we who believed enter into [the] rest, just as he has said: "As I swore in my anger, if they will enter into my rest!" in spite of the works having come to be from the foundation of the world.	[4:10] For he who entered into his rest, he himself also rested from his works as did God from his own.	The concept of entering into rest.
[4:4] For he has said somewhere concerning the seventh [day] as follows: "And God rested on the seventh day from all his works."	[4:9] So then, a Sabbath keeping remains for the people of God.	Reference to the Sabbath rest specifically

The reversed parallelism suggests that the two passages are to be taken together. This is supported further by an inclusio between 4:3 and 4:11 on the concept of entering into rest. The author opens with "For we who believed enter into

---

[145] L&N, vol., 1, xvi. Dyer, *Suffering*, 50 uses this same notion from L&N to argue for an emphasis on situational context in constructing meaning, but I think this does not do justice to Louw and Nida's observations regarding the situation of a lexeme in relation to other lexemes in a given work. However, as I argue in my section on methodology, I see that words gather meaning from co-text and context from the point of view of the analyst, and the author himself would have used lexemes in accordance with the conventions of his time.

[146] Westfall, "Blessed Be," 202.

[the] rest …" and closes with "Therefore, let us hasten to enter into that rest."[147] Hebrews 4:3–4 and 4:9–10 are, then, part of the same argument, and given that "where two words that share a semantic domain occur in the same context, their meaning is constrained," we should take σαββατισμός and κατάπαυσις together.[148] As Louw and Nida have identified, word variation can sometimes serve a rhetorical purpose, and the apparent interchangeability of these terms underscores the point first made in 4:3–4 about the rest of the original creation being made available for all generations.[149] The use of the term σαββατισμός breaks the chain of repetition whilst employing a term from the same semantic domain to emphasize a particular aspect of the rest being described – its Sabbath quality.[150]

7.9.2 Σαββατισμός

However, the term is not without controversy. We recall Hofius' argument against Käsemann, that σαββατισμός does not literally mean "rest", but rather denotes a "Sabbath celebration".[151] Could he be right? If so, the argument above could be nullified.

Whilst we gather words' meanings from context and co-text, it is also important to note that they do always have basic meanings, and these also have to be considered. One would not, for instance, conclude a passage were about a dog if it described a cat. Part of the problem is that the origins of σαββατισμός remain a mystery. The term is not found in Greek literature prior to Hebrews, and some scholars have suggested that the term may have even been coined by the author of Hebrews.[152] It is sometimes suggested that it is present in Plutarch, *Superstitions*, 3 (166A). However, the manuscript is unclear, and Loeb edition reads

---

[147] Guthrie, *Structure*, 79.

[148] Westfall, "Blessed Be," 202.

[149] L&N, vol. 1, xvi.

[150] The question now arises of how this "rest" relates to the coming world/age. Is this a post-mortem rest, or an eschatological rest? Is it both? This is further complicated by the fact that the Christian community is said to already enter it in the present tense in 4:3. It may be that this rest is something into which Christians enter even during their lives, in the same way they are already said to have reached the heavenly Jerusalem in 12:22. Indeed, whilst the "rest" of the psalm is here a state, it is also true that this state become spatialized in 1:10–14, as I shall argue, when the Son passes through the heavens. We might therefore see a link between the entering rest and entering the heavenly kingdom. The key to seeing how this theology of rest relates to the world to come may be in 13:14, where that city is described as "to come". It is as though Christians in some way already participate in the coming world through faith in Jesus. They have in part already reached that place which will survive the shaking of 12:26–28, even if they experience it in totality in the final epoch. It is as though the "world/age" to come has been inaugurated, but not yet brought to full fruition.

[151] Hofius, *Katapausis*, 102–16.

[152] E. g., Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 83; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 53.

the manuscript as βαπτισμοὺς (Babbitt, LCL).[153] Attridge, though, has argued Plutarch "knows of and castigates the superstitious Jewish observance of the Sabbath," and so σαββατισμός is more likely.[154]

What can be said with some certainty, however, is that σαββατισμός is derived from the verb σαββατίζω.[155] We can demonstrate that in the LXX, this verb is indeed used in terms of Sabbath rest. For instance, in Exod 16:29, the Lord is said to give bread for two days on the sixth day, and every person is not to go out looking for some on the seventh day, but in 16:30, we read "and the people ἐσαββάτισεν on the seventh day." From the co-text, the suggestion is that they did not gather manna on the Sabbath day, and so can be seen to have "rested". The verb σαββατίζω here translates וַיִּשְׁבְּתוּ, which has the sense of ceasing from activity. Similarly, in Lev 23:31–32, in relation to Yom Kippur, the Sabbath is said to be a day of complete rest, on which no work is to be done, (ἔργον οὐ ποιήσετε – you shall not do work), and on this "Sabbath of Sabbaths", (σάββατα σαββάτων), they are to "keep Sabbath" (σαββατιεῖτε) from evening to evening. Again, the co-text would suggest an association of σαββατίζω with rest. Moreover, this is a good fit with the idea of having ceased from work (καταπαύω) in Heb 4:10.

It is true that in other co-texts, the idea of a festive celebration is suggested for σαββατίζω. For instance, in LXX Lev 26:34, the land said to be enjoying (εὐδοκήσει, from εὐδοκέω, to enjoy or consider good) its "Sabbaths" and will σαββατιεῖ them, suggesting that our verb has connotations of enjoyment. We should not dismiss this aspect from our interpretation of Hebrews, especially given the close connection between rest and celebration that still exists in Judaism today and can be found in such ancient texts. However, we cannot accept Hofius' argument that σαββατισμός must be significantly different from "rest" in Hebrews. Rather, it would seem from the parallel between 4:3–4 and 4:9–10 detailed above that it is the "rest" aspect of σαββατισμός that is being drawn to the fore in Hebrews.[156] Once again, the argument does indeed return to God's primordial rest, which is being held out for those who are obedient, and the argumentation of Hebrews is intrinsically linked to the topic of creation as the discourse strands of rest and Sabbath intertwine.

---

[153] On the possible use in Plutarch, see Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 255.

[154] Attridge is paraphrasing Plutarch's own convictions. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 131 n. 103.

[155] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 255; Koester, *Hebrews*, 272.

[156] It would be possible, however, to suggest that σαββατισμός retains both senses. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 102 commenting on 4:11: "whoever has entered the consummation-rest will experience the completion of his work, as did God after the creation (vv. 3d–4), and will enjoy the rest that is necessary for the festivity and praise of a Sabbath celebration." However, Lane is here drawing on Hofius, *Katapausis*, 109–10.

7.10 And the Saving Son? Hebrews 4:10.

However, what about the descent/ascent motif that we have discussed earlier in Hebrews? In our examination of the topic of creation so far, it has always been in some way connected with the descent/ascent motif we first saw in the exordium. Even in 3:1–6, this was still true to some extent, since the Son was both seen to be the creator of the house and described as faithful high priest, a reference to his sacrificial activity that will end in the heavenly sanctuary of 1:3. In ch. 4, however, it is precisely God's rest that is held out as the goal of Christians.

At this point, we should pay attention to the implications of saying that the *primordial* Sabbath rest is held out. In 4:3, we read that God issued his warning even though his works were finished at the "foundation of the world". This metaphor has occurred earlier in 1:10, where the *Son* is held to be the one who laid the foundations.[157] Once again, then, whilst we may not have a direct reference to the Son as the creator in ch. 4, we do have an anaphoric reference to his role in creation. Indeed, the equation of the Son with God in 3:1–6 may serve to prepare us for this sudden shift in the argumentation, so that the creative role of the Son is still in mind.[158] The slight separation of God from the Son in ch. 4 might serve a certain purpose. This depends largely on one's reading of 4:10. Who is the "he" to have entered the rest?

On the one hand, it would be possible to read 4:10 in a general sense, as in the NRSV: "for those who enter God's rest also cease from their labours as God did from his." DeSilva, for instance, has argued that we are to understand this "entering" in relation to the "realm beyond creation."[159] The question is, when are the audience said to enter it? There is an obvious discrepancy in the tense in Hebrews 3:7–4:11. On the one hand, the future aspect of the "rest" is found in the fact it is characterized as a promise (4:1), and indeed the audience is exhorted to "strive to enter that rest" in 4:11.[160] However, on the other hand, we have the statement that "we who believe enter that rest" (4:3) and even the assertion that "For he who entered into his rest, he himself also rested from his works

---

[157] Although a different word, θεμελιόω is used in 1:10, the term καταβολή also denotes "foundation".

[158] The connection between 3:1–6 and 3:7–4:13 has been considered in great detail by John Michael McKay, *Jesus as Faithful in Testing: A Key to the Rhetorical Connection Between Hebrews 3:1–6 and 3:7–4:13* (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016). He also argues for a christological reading of 4:10, but rather than focusing on the creation references, he sees testing as the significant leitmotif underpinning the cohesion of 2:17–4:16, and argues that chs. 3–4 pick up on this same topic.

[159] David deSilva, "Entering God's Rest: Eschatology and the Socio-Rhetorical Strategy of Hebrews," *TJ* 21 (2000):25–43, here 26.

[160] See also Weiss, *Hebräer*, 283. Karrer, *Hebräer*, 221, however, suggests that the rest need not be eschatological, and suggests Christians may enter into the rest during their life time in the style of Middle Platonism. He does not, however, deny the possibility of an eschatological reading such as that presented here.

as did God from his own" (4:10).[161] DeSilva argues that the different tenses used all serve to spur the reader into action, and the aorist in 4:10 is to be understood in the sense of putting forward what happens once one has obeyed and entered into rest ultimately.[162] However, the present tense in 4:3 has caused some scholars to posit that the rest is something into which the audience currently enter, though it is preferable to see it as use of the present tense with connotations of a future sense ("we are going to enter").[163]

On the other hand, it is possible to see 4:10 as a reference to the Son who leads the obedient heavenward.[164] Attridge puts it succinctly:

It is also possible to understand this remark of the leader of the people of God, the Jesus who leads to true rest in heavenly glory. Although he is never explicitly described as entering the rest, his exalted position, seated at the right hand of God, will later be contrasted with constant activity of the priests of the old covenant [7:27; 9:6; 10:1]. In any case, the solidarity between Christ and his brothers and sisters and the paradigmatic role that he plays in their salvation indicate that the notion of this verse could be applied to him, even though it is not relevant to him alone.[165]

Similarly, Vanhoye has:

The members of the people of God (4:9), for whom is reserved a *sabbatismos*, are none other than the *participants in Christ* of 3:14; and the *sabbatismos*, which will be accorded

---

[161]　Ibid., 30. However, Alexandrinus and Ephraimi Rescriptus have the hortatory subjunctive, "let us enter" in 4:3. This would change the sense, but its presence in two manuscripts alone makes the reading less likely to be original.

[162]　deSilva, "Entering," 33, n. 24.

[163]　Ibid., 30–31, see also Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 99 and Andrew T. Lincoln, "Sabbath, Rest and Eschatology in the New Testament," in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical and Theological Investigation*, ed. Donald Arthur Carson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 197–220, here, 212. Both these scholars argue for a "true present" at this point. deSilva says such a reading misunderstands the term "today" in the psalm, which has the rhetorical effect of encouraging them to enter the rest because the "today" becomes an opportunity to respond. However, he too notes that there is a sense of immediacy and that this is strengthened by the author's using a present tense rather than a future tense. Barrett has argued that precisely because the rest is God's own, entrance into it can be both present and future. Barrett, "Eschatology," 372. It seems to me that response in the present determines whether one will enter into the rest in the future, and so one can be seen as being in a continuing position of "entering" the rest with the decision to obey in this life. DeSilva agrees with this position ultimately, deSilva, "Entering," 33. Church, *Temple*, 329–30 offers some helpful designations. It could be read a gnomic present ("we believers are the ones who enter rest"), a true present, as proleptic ("we enter already, but will not fully enter until the eschaton") or a futuristic present ("we who believe will enter"). Ibid., 329.

[164]　deSilva, "Entering," 38–39, n. 44 offers a good summary of the various positions taken on this suggestion.

[165]　Attridge, *Hebrews*, 131–32. It might also be possible that Hebrews again has Solomon's kingship in the background. Solomon, who sat (ἐκάθισεν) on the throne of David in 1 Kgs 2:12 says God has given him rest in 1 Kgs 5:18 (5:4) ἀνέπαυσε κύριος ὁ θεός μου. If the Son is being depicted as the enthroned king at rest, it could help us understand why in Heb 4:16 we have "let us therefore come (προσερχώμεθα) with boldness to the throne (θρόνῳ) of grace …" i.e., where the Son is seated as king (see also 1:8).

them, *if, at least, they hold firm to the end their first confidence* (3:14), is conceived very naturally as participation in the rest of Christ himself, seated at the right of God.[166]

Indeed, that the Son is "apostle", and, we might add high priest, is found in 3:1–6, which we established earlier sets the co-text in which to understand the exegesis of Ps 95; furthermore, just as Jesus is the the "pioneer" in 2:10, he will be said to have passed through the heavens ahead of his followers in 4:14.[167] From the point of view of the narrative cohesion of Hebrews, one would indeed expect a christological reference at this point.

Nicholas Moore has taken up this matter of the expectation of a christological reference in Heb 4:10 in considerable detail.[168] He begins by admitting that the question of whether verbal forms grammaticalize time remains contested, and so a timeless reading of the aorist to suggest someone, generally speaking, who enters into rest in 4:10 is possible.[169] However, the form κατέπαυσεν has occurred twice in the preceding co-text, at 4:4 in the citation of Gen 2:2, stating God has rested from his works, and in 4:8, where it is transitive and is found in the first half of the counterfactual conditions. Both these instances clearly have a past reference.[170] This makes it more likely that someone in particular is being said to have already entered the rest.

Indeed the action of entering rest is logically prior to the state of resting from works.[171] Furthermore, Hebrews' general usage of substantive participles may suggest that the aorist was chosen in 4:10 to imply past force. According to Moore, seventeen of the thirty-three substantive aorist participles in Hebrews are plural and 16 are singular, and all the plural instances refer to a group of people who have done something in the past, and 11 of the singular instances refer to actions in the past, too, making a gnomic use of the aorist participle at 4:10, whilst not impossible, much less likely, based on Hebrews' usage of such participles in general.[172]

---

[166] Vanhoye, *Structure*, 99–100, translation my own.

[167] Ibid., 100.

[168] Nicholas Moore, "Jesus as 'the One Who Entered his Rest': The Christological Reading of Hebrews 4:10." *JSNT* 36 (2014):383–400.

[169] Ibid., 387. See Stanley Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, SBG 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 237 where he says Heb 4:10 is a case of the aorist being "timeless."

[170] Moore, "Christological," 387–88.

[171] Moore, "Christological," 388. He goes on to counter Ellingworth's objection that the author has used the aorist instead of the present to stress the entrance is a punctiliar act. Ellingworth argues for the use of the gnomic aorist at this point, though he notes that Hebrews usually uses the plural when addressing the community (he suggests 4:10 is an exception). Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 256.

[172] Ibid., 388–89. What is more, a case can be made for seeing the remainder as having a past force – the activity of construction in 3:3–4 (x2), and the case of ὁ διαθέμενος (testator) in 9:17 similarly requires that someone made a will in the past. The remaining substantive participle is the one in 4:10.

In addition, we should consider the mention of "Joshua" in 4:8, which is the same in Greek as Jesus, Ἰησοῦς. The use of the pronoun in αὐτοῦ in 4:10 could be argued to be making a word play on the name: Joshua did not enter the rest, but the other Joshua, *Jesus*, well, *he* did.[173] Indeed, Moore asserts:

The only available referent of this participle is Jesus. Of the three different groups in view in chs. 3–4 (the wilderness generation, Joshua's generation and the audience of the letter), none has yet entered rest; the only agents of whom this can be affirmed are God and Jesus – and as ὁ εἰσελθών is compared to God, this leaves Jesus as the only possible referent.[174]

The γάρ in v. 10 can now be more fully understood: it introduces an explanation of σαββατισμός, and how one is able to achieve in the *sabbatismos* remains open because of the salvific activity of the Son.[175] In terms of the parallelism with 4:3–4 detailed above, we now also see an advancement of the argumentation that brings the descending and ascending Son back into focus in a way commensurate with the use of creation references that we have seen so far in this thesis. The pioneer (2:10) of their faith has gone before them into the promised rest, or, as it is put in 4:14, the great high priest has passed through the heavens.[176] What we have is the interplay of the spatial and temporal, whereby the Sabbath rest applies to a state primarily, but that state becomes "spatialized", and whilst the term κατάπαυσις primarily has the sense of signifying a state of being, in order to enter this state, the entrance of the Son, and later the people of God, into a specific heavenly realm is presupposed.[177]

Here we may note the work of Jared Calaway. He examines the Letter to the Hebrews against the backdrop of a Jewish vs Christian debate over who could mediate access to the Divine, a topic of much controversy especially after the

---

[173] Ibid., 389–90. Church, *Temple*, 335 also notes the nominative absolute construction in the first half of 4:10, which places emphasis on the subject, whom he takes to be the Son.

[174] Moore, "Christological," 390.

[175] Ibid., 389–92. Though, he does not specifically observe the use of a pun, Moore does note the force of the name causing the reader to slow down and consider the similarity between the two figures. Ibid., 392–93.

[176] Church, *Temple*, 371–75 argues against a reference to the ascension, which he seems to suggest would require 4:14 to refer to an idea of a heavenly journey through various spheres of heaven. He says that οὐρανός is in the plural in 4:14, which specifically refers to the "transcendent dwelling place of God," and the use of διέρχομαι represents an intertextual echo of 1 Sam 2:30, 35 where "it is a metaphor for priestly service." Ibid., 372. I contest Church's assertion that the reference is not to the ascension, but rather to the Son as "a great high priest ministering in the heavens," on the grounds that the ascension of the Son back to heaven necessarily precedes the blood offering of 9:12, and, therefore, the two are not mutually exclusive. I also concur with Moffitt that what we are dealing with in Hebrews is not metaphor, but rather a form of anaology by which the Son's ministering is akin to that of the priests on Yom Kippur. See Moffitt, "Serving", 260–77. Rather, I think we should understand the ascension and the high priestly activity of the Son as interconnected and his destination as the heavenly sanctuary.

[177] Filtvedt, "Creation," 286 makes a similar argument.

destruction of the Second Temple. Calaway maintains that Hebrews joined this debate by appropriating and countering traditional priestly frameworks of sacred access that aligned the Sabbath with the sanctuary, and it did so in ways similar to its contemporary and prior-existing Jewish priestly accounts, most notably the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, attested at Qumran and Masada.[178]

Calaway argues that "[the Epistle] deftly layered spatial and temporal dimensions upon both the Sabbath and the tabernacle; the Sabbath acquired spatial characteristics as the tabernacle gained temporal ones, collapsing sacred space and sacred time into a singular heavenly reality denoting proximity to God's presence."[179] Related to this is the idea that the Day of Atonement in Hebrews is both a Sabbath (Lev 23:32) and a day on which creation is renewed and returned to its original restful state accorded it at the end of the first creation.[180] Calaway states that "instead of entering into the heavenly sanctuary through the weekly Sabbath, as among its contemporaries, in Hebrews one only experiences the heavenly realities of Sabbath rest and the tabernacle through faithfulness and obedience to Jesus, who, in turn, is the faithful and obedient heavenly high priest who purifies, sanctifies and perfects his followers."[181] This could explain why the language of Christ's high priesthood becomes more prevalent from this point on in the Epistle: the discourse has moved from the focus on the Son's work in relation to creation, both in terms of his role sustaining it (1:3; 1:10–12) and ruling over it (1:8–12), to his restoring humanity to its originally intended status over it (2:5–9), to explain that he does this by leading the people heavenward (4:9–10). It would seem that what is left to do is explain the mechanism by which this happens, and the discourse moves onto the comparison of Christ with the priestly offerings on Yom Kippur (6:19; 9:3–7).[182]

Indeed, Calaway notes that the entering into the rest is akin to entering into God's heavenly presence, the language of "entering" (εἰσέρχομαι) being used in relation to rest and also to the heavenly sanctuary and heavenly homeland.[183]

---

[178] Calaway, *Sabbath*, 93.

[179] Ibid., 2, see also 162, 168, 177.

[180] There is much debate over how early this tradition is. For a summary, see Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*, WUNT 163 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 208–9. However, 1Q34. 3.2 and 4Q509 97+98 include the motif of creation and 4Q508 2.1–6 mentions God's "indwelling" with the community (Ibid., 210 n. 320). These texts are often held as being prayers for Yom Kippur.

[181] Ibid., 3.

[182] Interestingly, it may be that the Yom Kippur style offering is not yet complete itself. We have seen him enter behind the heavenly veil, but not return back outside, as in accordance with the ritual described in Lev 16. He will, however, come again in Heb. 9:28, for those still waiting for him, presumably the Christian community still living at that point. We find a similar idea in Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.5.107–12. See also David Moffitt, "Jesus' Heavenly Sacrifice in Early Christian Reception of Hebrews: A Survey," *JTS* 68 (2017):46–71.

[183] Callaway, *Sabbath*, 79, 59–95. The idea of "entering in" recurs at 3:11, 18–19; 4:1, 3, 5–6, 10, 11, 6:19–20; 9:12, 24–25. The reference in 10:5 refers to his entering into the human world.

Furthermore, the very language of "originator" (of salvation) and "completer" forms an inclusio over the central portions of Hebrews, appearing in 2:10–11 and in 11:39–12:2, and the language of entering into rest thus falls within a wider section of discourse pertaining specifically to the Son's saving activity.[184] In 2:10, we have the Son as the ἀρχηγός (pioneer) of salvation whom God makes perfect through suffering (παθημάτων τελειῶσαι) and who sanctifies people (ἁγιαζόμενοι). Then, in 11:39–12:2 we return to the idea of perfection when the cloud of witnesses in the OT (11:41) are said ultimately to be made perfect (τελειωθῶσιν) through the actions of the Son (11:40). This is part of an exhortation to endurance in the faith by laying aside sin (12:1), fixing their eyes on Jesus who is the "pioneer and perfector" of faith (ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτήν, 12:2). This inclusio assists in charting the development of perfection throughout the homily, and there is a "narrative arc of perfection between these two points, amplifying the themes of Jesus being perfected and of the imperfection of Levitical sacrifices, and delaying and anticipating the climactic proclamation that the one who is perfected now perfects."[185]

Calaway argues that Hebrews turns the Sabbath into "temporal access to sacred space" by means of the polyvalent κατάπαυσις to transition from "rest" in the Holy Land to the temporalized Sabbath and age to come in ch. 4, and "while the land has been temporalized into the Sabbath, the Sabbath has acquired spatial dimensions as the homilist enjoins one to enter it as one enters the heavenly sanctuary and comes to the heavenly homeland."[186] Entering the sanctuary, then, is entering heaven, and equivalent to entering God's Sabbath rest in ch. 4 as the addressees are encouraged to draw near to the throne in 4:16 and to God in 10:22, in both cases through Jesus' perfect offering.[187]

The findings above would in part support his conclusions, though the establishment that "rest" in Heb 4 refers to a state would seem at first to contradict Calaway's idea that the land is temporalized. Nevertheless, it is true that to some extent entering the rest and entering the "heavenly" city are placed in parallel in Hebrews. Indeed, we will have a reference specifically to Jesus' ascent in 4:14, when it says he has passed through the heavens, using the title "Son" as in 1:1, there is a reference to the descent in 4:15, which speaks of his being tempted as any other human. Here, we also specifically find the term "high priest", that is, a reference to his status as perfecting saviour.[188] These latter observations help us to see the re-emergence of our descent/ascent motif, and Calaway's identification of the above important inclusio also lends credence to our own argument

---

[184] Ibid., 146.

[185] Ibid., 29, 146.

[186] Ibid., 26.

[187] Ibid., 158.

[188] I argue for a similar pattern in 2:10–18. The mention of the "throne of grace" in 4:16 also suggests Jesus' enthronement (compare 1:3, 8, 13).

in respect of that same motif at the level of the overall discourse. I argue that the temporary separation of the Son from the activity of God at creation in ch. 4 facilitates the overall high priestly argument because it enables a final emphasis on the saving activity of the Son at the end of the chapter, before the main part of the high priestly argumentation begins.[189]

7.11 Conclusion

In this section, we began by discussing 3:1–6, and the imagery of the Son as the builder of the "house", the people of God, and indeed, the builder of all things. We then moved on to the reference to God's rest at the end of creation in 4:3–4 and 4:9–10, examining the interpretation of Ps 95 in the light of Gen 2:2, and positing against the theories of Käsemann, Theissen and Hofius that the κατάπαυσις held out to both generations was the primordial rest. This revealed a slight separation in the creative roles of the Son and God, because at the start of ch. 4, what seemed to be at stake was "God's" rest at the end of creation. However, I have proposed that the one who rested like God is indicated as the glorified Son (4:10), who after making his sacrifice enters the primordial divine rest, returning to his heavenly position. Indeed, it is possible to suggest that by doing the latter, the Son might even be seen to return to that rest which was once his own, given his own role in creation (1:2; 1:10–12). Importantly, though, the Son goes ahead of humanity. Once again, creation and salvation were intrinsically linked in the discourse of Hebrews, and in this case the rest that was God's own at the end of creation is held out as the ultimate goal for faithful believers.

---

[189] The increase in high priestly references from this point is discussed in the introduction to this thesis.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

8.1 Summary of the Research

In the introduction to this study, I proposed that it was significant that the cluster of creation references outnumber high priestly references in Heb 1–4. The term high priest is used in 2:17; 3:1; 4:14 and 4:15, a total of four times, whereas we have references to the creation in 1:2–3; 1:10–12; 2:5–9; 2:10; 3:1–6; 4:3–4 and 4:9–10. References to Christ's salvific activity intertwine with the creation references, or are at least found very nearby. My initial observations in this regard were that Heb 1:3 mentions the Son's sacrifice for sin, 2:3–4 holds out the warning not to neglect "so great a salvation" whilst 2:6–7 draws on Ps 8's idea of God's visiting his people, something picked up in 2:9–18, which deals with the Son becoming human to lead the "sons" [children] to glory. Chapters 3–4 then centre on the warning to "listen to God's voice" in a christological exposition of Ps 95 with the hope that one may enter God's "rest". This, I proposed, suggested that the creation references are in some way linked to Hebrews' soteriology, and might be equally as important in understanding this soteriology in the opening chapters as the preponderance of high priestly images we find later in the Epistle. I wished to argue that the creation references in Hebrews 1:1–4 should be considered as integral to Hebrews' discourse. At the end of this study, I am in a position to conclude in the affirmative.

The body of this thesis has been dedicated to examining the creation references in their co-text. It was revealed that an underpinning descent-ascent motif for the Son governed 1:1–4, and that the creation reference was key to understanding it, and indeed 1:5–14, which presented the events in reverse order. This motif would emerge later on, in 2:5–9 with God's visitation of humanity to restore it to its original, exalted, position over the created world. This passage proved to be closely related to the next creation reference in 2:10, in which the incarnation of the Son for the salvation of humanity was stressed, a topic which reached through to 2:18. I proposed that there might be a theology of a Second Adam underpinning Hebrews' Christology at this point. Whilst 3:1–6 would be more centred on the comparison of Jesus to Moses as son to servant, its use of the house metaphor also linked Christ's creative and salvific activity, setting the stage for the rest of ch. 3 and ch. 4. Chapters 3–4 combined images of creation with those of salvation by interpreting Ps 95 in relation to Gen 2:2, so that the

Son who entered the rest ahead of believers was seen to lead them to experience the Sabbath rest envisaged from the beginning. It became apparent that the idea of Christ's salvific activity in ch. 4 was linked to the creation references in that the goal of salvation was again presented as that which should have been from the beginning. The paragraphs below summarize my main findings.

My first major observation was that Hebrews opens with the declaration that whereas God once spoke through the prophets, he now speaks through an heir, a Son, and, crucially, this Son is the one "through whom he made the aeons (worlds/ages)". This turned out to be what discourse analysts call the 'most reportable event' in the exordium. The most reportable event is the one on which all other events depend as the story unfolds, the one that needs to be told, or 'reported', for everything else to make sense. Even though it might not be the most emphasized event in the communicative act, the most reportable event is thus key to one's interpretation, and this discourse analysis observation allowed me to see that as the exordium continues, the reader is building on the initial point that God has spoken definitively through his heir and agent of creation. I began to see that a descent/ascent motif emerged regarding the Son's activity. This same Son has offered sacrifice and then sat down at the right of God's majesty (1:3b). When we consider that in other places such as 2:14–17, the Son is said to take flesh for the express purpose of offering that same sacrifice (compare 4:14–15, and 13:20), the earthly depiction of the Son's sacrifice in 1:3a is seen to be surrounded by heavenly descriptions, encompassed within them: we see the Son descend from heaven in order to be immolated, and then ascend back to heaven. This had the effect of linking the Son's sacrificial activity to his heavenly status, a status he has from the beginning of creation as creation's originator, and to which he returns in his exaltation.

Interestingly, this descent-ascent motif re-emerged with the application of Ps LXX 101 in Heb 1:10–12, where the Son is said to be the one who laid the foundations of the earth and made the heavens. It is the sixth quotation within a catena of seven in Heb 1:5–14. An examination of the intertextual references in the catena led me to conclude that vv. 5–6 were, in fact, references to the exaltation, something suggested by scholars like Paul Ellingworth.[1] Verse 5 references Ps 2:7, dealing with the appointment of a king, for instance, whilst v. 6 sees the Son entering the οἰκουμένη rather than the κόσμος as in 10:5's description of the incarnation, the word choice in 1:6 suggesting a reference to the world to come as when οἰκουμένη is used in 2:5. From here, I was able to see the catena, including v. 14, as referencing the descriptions of the Son as per the exordium, but in reverse order and with the twist that the focus on inheritance shifted to the community:[2]

---

[1] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 113–14.
[2] As with Meier, I accept the correspondences are not exact. However, like Meier, I see a general pattern to have emerged. Meier, "Symmetry," 505.

1:6 referred to 1:4 and the Son's superior status and also to the exaltation of 1:3c, which was present in 1:5–6, 8, though recapitulated in v. 13, the activity of the Son on earth alluded to in 1:3b was present in v. 9, together with the return heavenward also found in 1:3–4, and the role of the Son in creation at 1:2 was reiterated in 1:10–12 before the inheritance of all things by the Son in 1:1 became the inheritance of salvation by believers in 1:14. The descent-ascent motif was thus again presented, but in more or less reverse order, bringing us back to the Son's creative role, and moving from it to the results of the saving activity of the creator Son and then to the impact of that activity on the Christian community.

The full force of the link between creation and the salvific role of the Son came to the fore in my investigation of the creation references in Heb 2 especially Hebrews' treatment of Ps 8.[3] This psalm asserts humanity's dominion over the created world as God's will, from the first moments of its existence. However, whilst the *intended* original status of humanity is adopted wholesale in Heb 2:6 as what *should* be, Hebrews made the point that the world is not *visibly* subject to humanity (2:7–8). This actual state is contrasted to that of the Son, for we do see Jesus with all things under his feet (2:9). This is because he has become human, sharing in flesh and blood (2:14), and has now been exalted, crowned with glory and honour (2:9). He was only made "for a little while lower than the angels" (2:9), a pun on the Greek βραχύ in Ps 8:6/Heb 2:7, which can not only mean a little lower in rank, but can also pertain to time.[4] The Son's own ascent back into heaven would result in the restoration of the status originally given to humanity in the psalm being restored. The recurrence of the descent/ascent motif which linked the creation reference to Christ's salvific activity was again confirmed. Moreover, the Son specifically becomes human so that he may bring "many children to glory" (2:10), sanctifying them (2:11): "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, to make a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the people." (2:18). Again, creation and salvation were intrinsically linked in Hebrews' discourse.

The link between the Son's descent and his creative activity in Hebrews' discourse became still more apparent in 3:1–6. Firstly, the Son was said to be worthy of more glory than Moses "just as the builder of a house has more honour than the house itself" (3:3), and then came the statement that "the builder of everything is God" (3:4). The latter comment has been considered by some to be parenthetical, partly since there is an apparent switch from the Son to God's

---

[3] As discussed earlier in the thesis, I see these as two separate creation references, based on my division of the text.

[4] On the temporal sense of βραχύ in Hebrews, there is a general consensus. E. g., Guthrie and Quinn, "Discourse," 245.

building activity.[5] This has also caused some commentators to reject the notion that the Son is here denoted as "housebuilder" at all.[6] However, v. 4 is not grammatically parenthetical. Rather, it follows on from v. 3, with πᾶς … οἶκος (γάρ is in its usual post positive position) reinforcing τοῦ οἴκου in a move from the generic, to an even greater generalization.[7] Taking it that v. 4 is not parenthetical, it opened up two possibilities. Either, the Son is described as the builder in 3:3 and God in 3:4, or, the Son is assimilated to God in terms of building activity, in much the same way we saw he was previously said to be not only the agent of creation (1:2), but the creator himself (1:10–12).

For some scholars, the second suggestion was out of the question. Ellingworth, whilst accepting that on the grounds of the application of the title "God" to the Son in 1:8, had stated that there is no parallel in Hebrews to this use of θεός, and it is better to understand Hebrews in the light of 1:2, and indeed 2:10, where the Son is presented as being "intimately concerned" with an activity which is ultimately God's own.[8] In response to Ellingworth, I argued that whilst it is true that the Son is sometimes presented in Hebrews as being God's "instrument", so to speak, in the case of creation, there is a distinct movement in 1:10–12 from this idea of the Son as "agent" to the Son as creator himself. This seemed to be something played on in 2:10, where God is said to be the one for whom and through whom all things were made: δι' ὅν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, a phrase echoing God's creation of the aeons through the Son in 1:2. It would therefore be commensurate with Hebrews' specifically creative theology at this point to understand him as both the builder of the house in v. 3 and of all things in v. 4. Furthermore, cohesion on the distant hookwords "honour" and "glory" which were used to describe the Son in 2:9 and "all things" in 2:10 suggested that 3:1–6 was recalling the description of the Son and the interchangeability of his creative role with that of God specifically.

The Son, then, was greater than Moses not just in terms of being a son over a household, but because he is the creator, and 3:4 was in fact part of one overall comparison which played on the creative role of the Son first introduced in 1:2. Examinations of the possible referents of the term "house" and an understanding of the possible word play on the word "house" meaning cosmos increased the likelihood that we had a reference to the Son as creator in this passage. Furthermore, the description of the Son as apostle and high priest (3:1) was here significant, uniting 3:1–6 to the Son's saving descent in 2:10–18. Indeed, the description "apostle" could be seen to refer to his descent, and "high priest" to his ascent when we take into account the later heavenly descriptions of the Son's

---

[5] Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 57–58, Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 66–68, Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 40–43.
[6] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 72.
[7] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 205.
[8] Ibid., 196.

high priestly activity. There was cohesion on the term "faithful" in 2:17 when this word was used to describe Jesus in 3:6. The fact that we were to understand 3:1–6 in the light of ch. 2 was also strengthened by the use of ὅθεν at the very beginning of the exhortation, which signaled an inference from facts already expressed in the immediately preceding co-text.[9] We could thereby demonstrate a subtle, but nevertheless present, hint once again at the connection between the Son's saving activity and his role as creator.

This set the scene for what we would encounter in ch. 4, where there was a further connection between creation and the Son's salvific role, following the exegesis of Ps 95 (LXX 94) in the light of Gen 2:2 in 4:3–4 and 4:9–14. Here, creation is linked first to the salvation of Israel, and then to the salvation of believers in order to again suggest that there is a state of perfection that awaits them. Here, we read that those who are faithful believers enter the rest God himself experienced after the foundation of the world. The linking of Gen 2 and Ps 95 like this at first appeared a bit strange. However, in its present form, and its form known at the time Hebrews was written, Ps 95 consists of distinct but related sections, pulled together by a creation/re-creation theme.[10] Verses 1–7a of the psalm concern the idea of God as creator/maker, and the second section from 7b–11 contain a warning about hardening one's heart. Significantly, vv. 1–5 deal with God's cosmic creation as a motivation for worshipping the Lord, whilst vv. 6–7a speak of the exodus event and God as Israel's maker, which also inspires the followers to worship the Lord.[11] This creation motif in the psalm itself was very important. Assumed to be by David, Ps 95 (94) was holding out the promise of rest to a present, post-exodus, generation, that is, the rest must have been different from that of the final arrival in the promised land. The original connection of this psalm to creation helped Hebrews to resolve the tension by linking it to God's rest at the end of creation, which it did on the hook words ἔργα (works) which is found in Ps 95:9 (94:9) and Gen 2:2, and κατάπαυσις (rest), which is found in Ps 95:9 (94:9), cognate to the verb καταπαύω (to rest) in Gen 2:2. Hebrews thus presented the "rest" that God promised to the exodus generation and now to the Christian community as being the same rest, available since the foundation of the world, when God rested on the seventh day (Heb 4:3–4). The "today" of the psalm speaks to a present generation, and in Hebrews, it is again picked up for similar usage to a present generation of the re-visioned house of Israel, as it specifically refers to the re-creation of the people of God in the Christian community.[12]

---

[9] See also Westfall, *Discourse*, 111.
[10] Enns, "Creation," 256.
[11] Ibid, 256, 266–67.
[12] Ibid., 268. On Hebrews' understanding of the Davidic origin of the psalm, see Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 251–52.

Significantly for this investigation, in 4:9–16, we saw that this Sabbath rest, σαββατισμός, is now able to be entered into precisely because the Son has entered in ahead of believers: "For he who entered into his rest, he also rested from his works as did God from his own" (4:10). The Greek subject here is actually singular, as opposed to the NRSV translation, which takes this verse as referring to one in general who enters rest and thus employs the so-called 'singular they'. Whilst some scholars do see v. 10 as a general statement, I argued on the grounds of co-text and the use of the aorist participle in Hebrews more generally that this is unlikely to be a use of the gnomic aorist that the generalised interpretation would require. As Nicholas Moore had pointed out, in all the surrounding co-text, the aorist has had a past force, and the only one who could have already entered this rest is Jesus.[13] The following exhortation confirmed this: "Since, then, we have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast to our confession." (Heb 4:14 NRSV).

A close analysis of the final creation reference in 4:9–10 had brought us back full circle, and we had returned to the salvific role of the creative Son. Importantly for our purposes, in this discovery, we see and can highlight the co-joining of the discourse threads of creation and salvation in the first four chapters of Hebrews.

8.2 The Creation References as a Whole

The creation references in Heb 1–4 provide a cosmic backdrop to the incarnational activity of the Son as the narrative of salvation history unfolds stage by stage: we began with reference to the Son as the agent of creation in the exordium where God's having spoken through the Son through whom he created the aeons was the most reportable event. The emphasis on his role in creation was enhanced in 1:10–12 where the Son came to be described as the creator himself in the reversed presentation of the events of the exordium in 1:1–4. Crucially, in this passage, the inheritance of the Son in 1:2 became the inheritance of salvation by believers in 1:14. We then moved through his creative activity to his incarnate status in ch. 2, which was centred on humanity's originally intended status at the beginning of creation, based on Ps 8 (2:1-9), and we saw the Son enabled them to achieve this salvation by being the pioneer high priest that led them to glory (2:10–18). We then saw a recapitulation of the creative status in 3:1–6 to keep in mind the close link between God and the Son as temporarily their roles separated so that the Son could be seen to enter the "rest" in ch. 4, that is, to return to heaven, so that humanity may enter in (4:9–16). With the

---

[13] Moore, "Jesus," 383–400.

exordium, the V-pattern descent-ascent motif was opened, and in ch. 4, it closed, and just as the exordium itself, it encompassed the whole Christ event. Thus, the creation topic in Hebrews can be seen to support the theological position of the author as to the salvific role of the Son, and, especially the exhortation to remain faithful to him.

It is interesting to see how the creation references set up an interplay of God's creative activity with that of the Son. The presence of δι' οὗ at both 1:2 and 2:10 pertaining to creative activity, first to the Son, then to God, adds to the amalgamation of the Son and God's creative role that has already been noted at 1:10–12, as too does the increased probability of a christological reference at 3:4. Coupled with the use of the terms ἀπαύγασμα and χαρακτήρ in 1:2, it would add to the indicators that Hebrews has a very high Christology. Although this thesis focuses on creation, as opposed to cosmology, it is undoubtable that this will impact upon future research into the latter, and it would appear that in Hebrews the divine Son has permeated the earthly realm, as much as the congregation is said to have arrived at the heavenly Jerusalem. It is as though Hebrews weaves a thread from heaven to earth and back again. From an inter-personal perspective, the fact this is not spelled out explicitly, but rather the Epistle moves freely between ascribing creation to God and to the Son, may imply that this high Christology was something with which the community was already familiar, which may be of interest to scholars trying to trace the origins of trinitarian theology.[14]

8.3 Considerations for Further Research

The recognition of the prominence of the creation topic in Heb 1–4 brings with it a possibility for a shift of perspective in Hebrews research as it pertains to the high priestly theology that becomes prominent from ch. 5 onwards. Firstly, it could be argued that creation is a supporting motif of Christ's high priest-hood, laying the basis for the argumentation that comes afterward. References to creation peter out from this point on, and the discourse moves on to the high priestly theology of Christ. It might therefore be suggested that creation is sim-ply a supporting motif from which the Epistle springboards into what is often considered its main theological discussion. In this respect, it would be interest-ing to evaluate what, if any, impact the findings here would have on the Epistle's later sections. Indeed, we have touched already on the metaphor of "laying foun-dations", and its connection to the first mention of that metaphor in 1:10–12,

---

[14] This subject is gaining renewed interest. For example, Matthew W. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God and Spirit in the New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 2015). 163–74.

and there could surely be more work on the cohesion of Hebrews around this metaphor and how the priestly theology is related to it in the immediately surrounding material of each use of this metaphor, especially at 9:26, not least given the return to the creation topic at 11:3.

However, it could also be argued that creation is the dominant motif, in comparison to Hebrews' priestly depiction of the Son, in chs. 1–4, and thus it should be understood not merely as a supporting beam in the scaffolding of the high priestly theology of Hebrews as the discourse progresses. From the point of view of linearization, after all, Hebrews' theology of the creative Christ sets the scene for what will follow, and thereby governs our reading of the rest of the Epistle. It seems that Hebrews deliberately sets the salvific role of the Son within the context of his descent from and ascent back to heaven, and that this is linked to his governance over all creation, as per 1:10–14. In terms of the spatial setting for the activity of Christ, we see a shift in emphasis from creation through the Son being the most reportable event in the exordium, to an emphasis on his earthly activity (ch. 2) as a necessary precursor to his ascent, which then forms the focus at the end of ch. 4, and this in itself sets that priesthood within more than just a celestial setting. The movement brings with it the implication that the Son's sacrificial activity is intrinsically bound to the creation of the world itself in 4:3–4 and 4:9–10, and indeed, the intended status of humanity "in the beginning", i.e. at creation, in 2:5–9. We would thereby do well to ask what relationship there is between the creation theology of 1:1–4, and the heavenly priestly theology of Hebrews 7 and 9 within the linear progression of Hebrews' discourse into the later chapters.

There may well be other places in Hebrews where the Son's role of creator is active in the background as Christ's saving activity is detailed. In the main body of this thesis, we also briefly discussed 12:26–27, with its "shaking" of creation, to which we linked 1:10–12 and the Son's control over that which he created, but what link might the covenantal theology of Heb 8–9 have to creation, too? I have argued against seeing a link between the creation of the world and the building of the sanctuary in the house imagery of 3:1–6, but in 9:2 we have a repetition of the word κατασκευάζω, and it might be used here to that effect, given its employment to enable a switch to the creation of all things in 3:4. As the Son is the creator of all things, did he not make the heavenly sanctuary? Does this mean that the Christ event was envisaged from even before Adam's first sin, according to Hebrews? In respect of the priesthood, what of the description of the Son's being without beginning or end in 7:3? This would appear to be a reference to the Son's pre-existence in heaven and his existence in heaven post exaltation. As the priesthood of the Son is so closely linked to this description of the Son in the remainder of that chapter, could it be that the Son is priest because of his being pre-existent and becoming human, and how might this relate to his role in creation? Could this be part of the Epistle's under-

lying logic of the resurrection, that the eternal Son could not be overcome by death?[15]

   We might thus say that the observations as to the significance of Hebrews' creation references to the discourse of the Epistle have only just begun. And because of this, the conclusion to this thesis can only be the beginning of more research.

---

[15] See also Moffitt, *Atonement*, e. g., 228 views Christ's humanity as the basis for his entering into heaven and becoming above the angels (1:4) and argues throughout for an implicit logic of the resurrection in Hebrews. Whilst I agree he enters as a glorified human, I suggest here that, fundamentally, it is because the Son is pre-existent in the first place that he is able to overcome death.

Appendix A

Notes on Translations

Whilst the language of the text of Hebrews is itself very complex evidencing the rhetorical skill of the author, textual variations tend to be minor. In this section, I will look at some of the variations between the manuscripts, explaining the choices made in my translations, found at the beginning of each chapter. The abbreviations of the textual sources follow the conventions of Nestle-Aland 28, as does my dating of the pertinent manuscripts. I here only provide justification for my translation of the creation references themselves, even if I provide a translated co-text in the main body of the thesis.

Heb 1:1–4

Two early papyri, P[12] and a corrector of P[46], as well as the Peshitta, insert ἡμῶν (our) following πατράσιν, to give "our fathers" (v. 1). Whilst this would fit with the theory that there is both a Jewish-Christian author and audience for the epistle, and may have been a harmonization with the superscription "to the Hebrews", defining the fathers specifically as those of the Israelite audience. The superscription is noticeably absent from the major codices. Such an absence would suggest that it is not to be considered the original reading.[1] Attridge argues convincingly that the variation is an unnecessary correction that in fact disrupts the alliterative effect of the clause, and is to be rejected.[2] I have therefore opted to omit it from my translation.

Another possible intra-textual harmonization found in some manuscripts is the plural ἐσχάτων in place of the singular ἐσχάτου (v. 2). This is found in later manuscripts, such as the Paris Latin MS d (ca. 500) and the Athos Greek manuscript Ψ (ca. 900). The text in the major codices such as ℵ, A, B and D literally

---

[1] Other scholars disagree on the audience, as discussed in my introduction. On the association of the fathers with a Jewish audience and the probability of gentiles in the audience being the reason for not using "our", see Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 92, Vanhoye, *Situation*, 58, Erich Grässer, "Hebräer 1:1–4. Ein Exegetischer Versuch," *EKKNT Vorarbeiten* 3 (1971):55–91, here 57. One could also argue that the fathers of the Old Testament were sometimes described as the ancestors of the audience in texts suspected to have been written to gentiles or mixed gentile and Jewish audiences, e. g., 1 Cor 10:1, or Rom 4:11. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 35. See also Westcott, *Epistle*, 6. It may also be a harmonization with Luke 1:55, the end of the Magnificat where God is said to "have spoken to our fathers."

[2] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 35.

reads "in the last one of these days," whereas the variation harmonizes the ἐσχάτων with the noun, ἡμερῶν, and gives a plural: "in the last ones of these days."[3] It is possible that the choice of the singular adjective, in contrast to the plural, carries some weight given the theological context and co-text of Hebrews. The singular is more nuanced in that it stresses the single finality of the current epoch and thus of the Christ event, contrasting deliberately with the combination of plural references to God's previous ways of speaking in v. 1. Similar contrasts of a past "many" and a present "singular" event in Christ are found in 7:27; 9:12 and 10:10, so it is reasonable to conclude the same distinction is emphasized in the exordium. Moreover, the addition of τούτων is distinctive from the typically Septuagintal usage, thus indicating the last days have already begun, so this reading would be suitable for its co-text.[4] The plural/singular contrast between the times of the prophets and the revelation in Christ is generally acknowledged by the major commentators.[5] The singular is therefore retained in my translation.[6] We might here also compare 1 Pet 1:20 προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι᾽ ὑμᾶς, NRSV: "He was destined before the foundation of the world but was revealed at the end of the ages for your sake," which again employs the singular in most of the major early codices.

There is one ambiguity to be examined at this point, however. The verb γίνομαι could here have been translated "having become" or "having been" (v. 4). It is true that γίνομαι is used elsewhere in the Epistle with the sense "to become": 2:17; 5:11; 6:4, 20, 7:15 and 12:25. On the average of probabilities, it would therefore seem reasonable to understand this meaning in the exordium, and the reading "having become" is the translation favoured by the NRSV. However, the idea of the Son's suddenly becoming higher than the angels seems a little strange when we consider that the Son has already been portrayed in divine terms in vv. 2–3 – the Son has, thus, already been described, in some way, as "being above

---

[3] Ibid. We do in fact find a similar variation in LXX Jer 23:20 and 25:19 (MT 49:39) where B has ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν and A has ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. The reverse variant occurs in LXX Jer 37:36 (MT 30:24).

[4] Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 93.

[5] For instance, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 39; Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 10–11; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 16–17; Cockerill, *Epistle*, 45–45.

[6] The other variation worth mentioning is the omission of the conjunction καί introducing the description of the Son as the agent through whom God created the ages. In its position, we should likely accept the adverbial meaning "also", which marks a continuation in the description from the preceding verse (the additional καί could be seen to add stress to the description.) In all likelihood, it is original, being omitted only in P[46], 0150 and some Coptic manuscripts. The omission does little to change the sense of the passage, though the use of the conjunction is more consistent with the style of the author at a more general level for the exordium and thus is retained here. Similarly, we sometimes find a variation in word order τὸ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν (found in D[1], Ψ, ar, b, sy[h]), which·may add a slight emphasis to the verb, but as Attridge points out it does not change the basic sense of the stich. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 35.

the angels". This tension is noted by several commentators, such as Attridge and Vanhoye.[7] When a word is employed one way in given text, we cannot exclude the possibility that the same word is used differently elsewhere in the same work. The term γίνομαι can also carry the sense of "being born" or "originating" as in Matt 21:19, John 8:58 or Rev 1:3, and the immediate co-text for γίνομαι in the exordium might suggest that we understand his being greater than the angels as an innate quality of the Son. In Heb 1:5, we see another verb, γεννάω (to beget), which arguably provides a co-text of "origins" in which to understand γίνομαι in 1:4, and so we see the Son as having been above the angels from the beginning. In fact, in the light of the Son's becoming little less than the angels for a "short time" in 2:9, it would suggest not that the Son became higher than the angels after his sacrifice, but that he was such before his descent. That said, the description may well here refer to the fact he has for a little while been made lower than them, especially if we see in 1:3 an implicit reference to the incarnation as argued here, and a descent-ascent motif in the exordium.[8] However, it may be, in fact, that the use of the term γίνομαι in 1:3 is ambiguous, referring at once to the Son's original, innate, status and to his status as it appears to humanity following the sacrificial act, a literary tension arguably resolved in 2:5–9. For this reason, I have retained the traditional translation.[9]

Perhaps the most interesting variation we actually find in v. 3, in place of φέρων (lit. bearing; upholding), φανερῶν (revealing) which occurs uniquely in the original hand of B. This was crossed out by a subsequent scribe to match all other versions. The latter was himself later rebuked by a third scribe for correcting the "original".[10] In the context of divine revelation (vv. 1–2), the variation could be taken to contribute to a messianic depiction of Jesus, who is now said to reveal everything by the power of his word. This has conceptual resonances with passages such as Col 1:26, Gal 3:23, and Eph 3:5 which have Jesus as Christ the "revealer" of divine truths hitherto unknown.[11] However, there is little justi-

---

[7] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 47, Vanhoye, *Letter*, 57.

[8] E. g., Vanhoye, *Letter*, 57.

[9] We also have the verb γίνομαι in 7:26, where it describes the qualities of the Son as priest. The sense could be "to become"; the point is made in 7:3 that the Son is like Melchizedek, who has no beginning or end, but who is eternally a high priest and so the qualities listed in 7:26 might also be demonstrably innate, giving another use of γίνομαι in the sense of simply "being". Similarly, perhaps the two meanings are being played on in 7:20–22, where other priests are described as not having become such by an oath, whereas the Son is priest because of an oath. The translation of γίνομαι as "having been" in 1:3 does not alter the later theology of passages like 1:9, which sees God as having in some way rewarded the Son for his righteousness. Moreover, the Son is appointed heir of everything in 1:2. It is possible to argue that he is seen to actually inherit the "name" in v. 4 only after his sacrificial acts, as indicated by the use of the perfect, κεκληρονόμηκεν. However, it may be that he has inherited this name from the beginning.

[10] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 35. The verb φανερόω occurs later in 9:8, 26.

[11] A similar idea occurs in John 15:15, but using another verb, γνωρίζω (make known, reveal, declare).

fication for including the variation in the translation here, given that it survives only in one manuscript. What exactly was meant by "upholding everything by the power of his word" is discussed in the main thesis; however, the phrase seems to have been the subject of controversy for some time. The "his" is omitted in several important manuscripts, though it occurs in A, B, H*, P, and Ψ, and others substitute "through him", δι' αὐτοῦ, (P⁴⁶) or "through himself", δι' ἑαυτοῦ (D², 0243/0121b) at the beginning of the next clause: "through him, having made purification …" The question arises whether "through him" (P⁴⁶) belongs with what precedes ("word of his power") or with what follows ("making purification"). The reading "through himself" in D², 0243/0121b would belong with "making purification". Such alterations have the force of emphasizing the role of the subject, perhaps to remove the ambiguity of whose word is in question. The suggestion seems to be that it is Jesus' own word, whereas the Father might otherwise equally be the one to whom the powerful word belongs.¹² Another minor variation is the addition of "our" to qualify "sins". This is found in ℵ², D¹, H, K and L, but not in the earliest manuscripts. This has the effect of identifying the author with his audience, and is found elsewhere in the NT to similar effect; for example, Gal 1:4 and 1 Cor 15:3.

The only apparent deviation in v. 4 appears to be the omission of the article before ἀγγέλων, which suggests that Christ is "above" angels in general. It is difficult to imagine here, though, that there is specific group of angels envisaged by the inclusion of the article, especially given that there is no mention of such a group. The omission is found in the two earliest manuscripts, P⁴⁶ and B, but the change in sense in minimal and I have kept the majority reading here in order to smooth the translation.¹³

Heb 1:7–9

Since Heb 1:7 is a citation of Ps 104 (103):4, not much variation is found in the manuscripts of this verse. Regarding my translation, the πρός in 1:7 could also be translated as "to", giving the sense that the angels are being addressed directly. This would correspond to vv. 8, 13. Equally, we may not have "angels", but simply "messengers", though there is lexical cohesion lent by the repetition of this word between this passage and ch. 2, especially 2:2, 5–7, 9 and 16, that makes it certain we are dealing with the heavenly beings less/lower than whom the Son becomes in 2:5–9. In the Greek, the repetition of the same preposition as well as allitera-

---

¹² Others conflate the two readings, having αὐτοῦ δι' ἑαυτοῦ (Hᶜ, ar, b, sy, saᵐˢˢ) or αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ (D*, 365). Attridge suggests that it is to reinforce the middle form ποιησάμενος that follows, which would fit this theory since it refers to Christ. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 35.

¹³ It should be noted that v. 5 has τῶν ἀγγέλων, and so there may have been an attempt at harmonizing the verse.

tion adds a certain symmetry between the stichs, strengthening the overall anti-
thetical parallelism between the angels and the Son. However, it is not necessary
to translate said preposition the same way in each case, since the same word
can have a variety of nuanced meanings in Greek. Since the words which follow
are in the third person, and so are not directly addressing any entity, it appears
that "concerning" would be more appropriate than "to" in this instance.[14] This
rendering is followed by a number of modern translations, including the NRSV,
NIV and NASB, though the NJB does prefer "to". In addition, D inserts "his"
in addition to the article. This not only defines more strongly the relationship
between God and the angels as one of master to servant, but also strengthens
the link between the opening and the main clause in this stich through the third
person pronoun. D also has the singular 'wind/spirit', also found in the Syriac,
though this appears to simply be a harmonization with the singular φλόγα in
the parallel line and is likely to be a scribal correction, rather than the original.[15]

In v. 8, there is also some discrepancy over whether to read "sceptre of your
kingdom" (following LXX Ps 44:6 [45:6]) or "sceptre of his kingdom". The latter
is found in P[46], ℵ and B. This problem is connected in some ways to the case pre-
sumed in the noun ὁ θεός in the phrase ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ
αἰῶνος (your throne O God is to the age of the age), where we might understand
"God" to be nominative (e. g., Westcott) or a vocative (most modern commenta-
tors).[16] This has been the subject of much investigation by Dale F. Leschert.[17]
Leschert looks closely at both Hebrews and the original psalm, and offers a
number of reasons why either is technically possible. As a nominative, the "God"
might be either a subject or a predicate which would result in "God is your
throne for ever and ever" or "your throne is God" as a metaphor akin to, say, God
as rock in 2 Sam 22:2. This may be possible given the ellipsis of λέγει in the
introductory formula of 1:8, which is also put in parallel with v. 7 using the
μὲν … δέ formula. However, the πρός could have different meanings between
vv. 7 and 8, meaning "concerning" in the former and "to" in the latter, and the
conjunction καί in v. 10 joins the quotation in 1:8–9 to the one from Ps 102 in
vv. 10–12, suggesting they are to be understood similarly. Thus, it might (more
likely) be a vocative.[18] However, whilst he does give other possible reasons that
would suggest a nominative reading, Leschert concludes that such an idiom that
sees God as a "throne" would be otherwise unknown, and concludes the vocative

---

[14] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 57. The same meaning of πρός occurs in 2:17; 5:1 and 6:11. However, in
1:8, πρός is clearly "to" since the son is addressed.

[15] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 49.

[16] Westcott, *Epistle*, 25. Contrast Attridge, *Hebrews*, 49, Koester, *Hebrews*, 194 and see also
Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 123. The vocative reading, speaking of the Son's throne, fits the rhetoric of
the chapter which speaks of his sitting at God's right hand (1:3 and 13).

[17] Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 24–65. See also, Meier, "Symmetry," 514–17.

[18] Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 24–27.

reading is more likely on the grounds of the coherence of such a meaning for the co-text of ch. 1: "the writer of Hebrews governs all of the introductory formulae in the catena of vv. 5–14 by verbs of speech that consistently refer back to God in v. 1 for their subject."[19]

On balance, it would seem Ps 45 was adopted precisely because the ambiguity could permit the author of Hebrews to apply it to the Son as a vocative, and whilst "his kingdom"[20] is a more difficult reading, which is usually taken to suggest it is the original, "your kingdom" would thus seem more likely, and it would rule out the awkward change from second to third person between 8a and 8b.[21] In addition, the article is sometimes placed next to the second instance of "sceptre" rather than the first instance of "sceptre", attested in D and Ψ, thereby reversing the subject and the complement. However, it would seem that this was a later correction to try to make the text of Hebrews conform more closely to the LXX psalm.[22] By making the "sceptre of justice" the subject, it lends emphasis to the moral status of the Son, in whose person it stands metaphorically. Furthermore, the addition of καί may indicate that the author or Hebrews is making two separate points in 8a and 8b, the first stressing his authority, the second his royal power in comparison to the servitude of the angels.

Verse 9 has one variant. In place of ἀνομίαν (lawlessness), found in most manuscripts including P[46] and B, the near synonym ἀδικίαν (injustice, wrongdoing) occurs in ℵ and A. The original text of D had the plural (lawlessnesses), but a corrector changed it to the well attested ἀνομίαν (lawlessness), the reading accepted here.

Heb 1:10–12

Following mention of the exaltation of Jesus above his companions (perhaps the angels) in v. 9, vv. 10–12 return to the subject of creation proper. The significance of the creation reference itself is dealt with in the exegetical chapter, and some textual notes have been discussed there to avoid repetition. However, there are some text-critical issues which remain to be addressed. Regarding v. 10, there is no noted variation between the manuscripts in Nestle-Aland 28, although, it should be acknowledged that there is some ambiguity in the meaning of διαμένεις in v. 11. This verb could be read in either a present or future sense, depending on the accenting, since διαμένεις means "you remain", but διαμενεῖς means "you will remain". According to Attridge, the latter is made explicit by

---

[19]   Ibid., 30–37, quotation from 36.

[20]   This likely refers to God's kingdom, an image often used in other NT passages, particularly the Gospels (e. g., Luke 1:33). This idea of God's kingdom was also applied to Christ elsewhere (e. g., Matt 26:29).

[21]   Ibid., See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 49, 58–59.

[22]   Attridge, *Hebrews*, 49.

the second corrector of D and in some of the later manuscripts such as 0121b (also called 0243), 365 and 629, as well as the Vulgate; however, I believe the present better conveys the sense of "now and not yet" eschatology found in Hebrews more generally, whereas the future would suggest purely a final age yet to arrive.[23] The antithetical parallelism between the Son as creator and the created world is, however, what is ultimately at stake in these verses. The former is eternal and the latter subject to both wearing out and the Son's authority.

However, whilst the general focus of 1:10–12 may be immediately apparent, the psalm citation has some textual variants. The phrase "like a garment" in v. 12 repeated from v. 11b is not found in the LXX of Ps 102 (101), which appears to have been quoted in the surrounding co-text. Perhaps for this reason, it is omitted from D[1], and Ψ and the Syriac, amongst others, though it is present in the earliest manuscripts.[24] There are several possibilities. On the one hand, it may be the case that Hebrews simply wishes to stress through repetition of "garment" the transience of the universe. The repetition could be simply an insertion for emphasis. Where the Hebrew of Ps 102:27 has כַּלְּבוּשׁ and כַּבֶּגֶד Heb 1:11–12 has three comparisons: ὡς ἱμάτιον, ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον and ὡς ἱμάτιον. What is interesting, however, is that there is a link in the very mention of garments between Ps 104 (103) cited in 7–8 and Ps 102 (101) here. Hebrews leaves Ps 104 at v. 4, but vv. 5–6 go on to say "He has laid the foundation of the earth on its security, it will not be tipped over to the age of the age. The deep like a garment (ὡς ἱμάτιον) is his cloak (τὸ περιβόλαιον), over the mountains he caused the waters to stand," which shares much vocabulary with his opening quotation from 102:25–27 in 1:10–12. It is as though Hebrews has picked up where it left off, only this time with another psalm, perhaps through *gezerah shavah*, or perhaps the opening in 1:10 is in fact a polyvalent citation to which the second "like a garment" alludes.[25] It is in view of the later possibility and the number of early witnesses in support that I include this phrase in the translation here.

Heb 2:5–9

In contrast to the citations in the catena, there is slightly more significant textual variation in the manuscripts for 2:5–9, including in the presentation of the

---

[23] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 49. Hebrews' initiated, but as yet unfulfilled, eschatology has already been discussed in the literature review. See Mackie, *Eschatology*, 37, 42, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 22, 36; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 67, Barrett, "Eschatology," 384. See also Mackie, *Eschatology*, 42, Koester, *Hebrews*, 122 and Cockerill, *Epistle*, 199.

[24] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 49.

[25] Notably, Ps 102 (101) is primarily the cry of one who is facing great trials, but nevertheless has utmost confidence in the God who saves and raises up Zion (102:16 [101:17]). The image of growing old like a garment also occurs in LXX Isa 50:9 and 51:6, however the evidence in Hebrews does seem to point to a polyvalent citation in my opinion.

psalm citation itself. The first of these is the variant τίς in place of τί in verse 6. This has the force of changing the question in the psalm from "what is man [humanity] that you are mindful of him, or a son of man that you visit him?" to "who is man that you are mindful of him, or [the] son of man that you visit him?" If original, it would be possible to see Hebrews' author as having read the psalm as asking about a specific person. Effectively, the rest of this section would be answering that question: who? Jesus! However, although this reading is found in P[46] and the first hand of C, there is little other attestation of it, with both A and B retaining τί, even though A has τίς in the psalm itself. Rather, it tends to be found in later minor manuscripts such as P, 81, 104 and 1881, and may be a later scribal correction under influence from the gospels, which perhaps identified Jesus as the "Son of Man". The reading also creates difficulties in the discourse. Leschert, for instance, suggests the second half "[or who] is the Son of Man?" could be seen as superfluous, since the audience would have known the Jesus was the son of man intended – "this reading smuggles the answer in to the question itself."[26] He follows this up by saying that an attempt to avoid this conundrum by reading the first line as a question "who is the man …" and the second line as its answer, "truly, the Son of Man …" fails because of the inclusion of ἤ, which puts the two parts of the question in parallel.[27] The very possibility that Hebrews sees "Son of Man" as a christological title is a complicated matter, as we saw. On balance, the reading τί is preferable on the strength of the manuscript and grammatical evidence.

At this point, I wish to discuss my translation of ἐπισκέπτομαι as "to visit". This word has multiple translations in English, and usually has the sense of "to care for" or "look after" (e. g., Num 1:3), sometimes with view to selection (Acts 6:3). There can be little question that this was the intended meaning in Ps 8: here, as frequently in the LXX, ἐπισκέπτομαι translates the Hebrew verb פקד. However, it also has the nuance of going to see a person with a helpful intent.[28] We find this meaning in Acts 7:23, where Moses is said to have felt strongly about visiting his people, and in Sir 7:35, it has the meaning of visiting the sick. In this respect, the term is sometimes found specifically in relation to God's saving intervention in passages such as Gen 21:1 where God visits (ἐπισκέπτομαι) Sarah, actually speaking to her, or Gen 50:24 where Joseph tells his brothers God will "visit" (ἐπισκέπτομαι) them and bring them up (ἀνάγω) to

---

[26] Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 102. See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 71.

[27] Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 102. The suggestion of "truly, the Son of man" was made by Günther Zuntz, "*The Text of the Epistle: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*," The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946 (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 180–91. Zuntz proposes that instead of ἤ (or) the word is ἦ (truly) (Gen 22:17). See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, 71. This word occurs in some late manuscripts of Heb 6:14 in the strengthened phrase ἦ μὴν (indeed, truly), but it is spelt εἰ μὴν in P[46], א, A and B.

[28] *BDAG*, "ἐπισκέπτομαι," 378.

the promised land – that it here means a divine intervention on earth supported by the inclusion of the noun ἐπισκοπή, "visitation" and we might also argue the verb ἀνάγω usually connotes a physical leading.[29]

Crucially, our verb is similarly found in Exod 3:16, where we also have ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπέσκεμμαι (I have visited [you] with a visitation), in relation to God's promise to bring his people out of Egypt, to which passage we saw earlier the author makes possible allusion in 1:7 and again in 12:18–19, and to which narrative we have detailed references in chs. 3–4, though arguably via the Joshua account. In the Exodus narrative, God 'visits' his people specifically to lead them 'up' out of Egypt to the promised land (e.g., Exod 32:7; 33:3). Similarly, the co-text of Heb 2 outlines how the Son, by becoming human, has come as a pioneer to take humans into glory (2:10). Having seen the divine origins of the Son in ch. 1, especially the exordium, and given that this is God's majesty (1:3) which the Son eventually reaches in his exaltation, it is possible to see a transformation of the Exodus account, an imitation of it, in Heb 2:5–9, whereby God visits humanity. The Christian situation might be here presented as a successful version of the Exodus, and the emphasis on the obedience and faithfulness of the Christian community in the Epistle generally, but especially in chs. 3–4, perhaps makes more sense when we see Hebrews' christological exodus as a successful sequel in salvation history (4:6), the "other day" of 4:7–8. In this case, disobedience would lead to history repeating, rather than participation in the culmination of salvation history in Christ (4:1–3). It is therefore possible that the author interpreted the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι to mean "visit" in the sense of God's providing saving intervention in the psalm itself, which allows him to move from an interpretation of Ps 8 to the wider discourse in chs. 3–4.

In conformity with the LXX of Ps 8:6, many manuscripts insert "And you appointed him over the works of your hands" at the end of v. 7. These include א, A, C, D*, P and Ψ. However, the shorter text form is also well attested (being found in P[46] and B), and could be a result of Hebrews' eventual goal to interpret the psalm in the light of Jesus' temporary subjection and eventual eschatological reign. Since this line in the original psalm refers quite clearly to humanity's control from the creation from the beginning, usage of it could have detracted from such christological argumentation.[30] Furthermore, in 1:10, quoting Ps 102:25 (101:26), the writer has just said that creation is the work of Christ's hands, and as he goes on, at least in part, to interpret the psalm christologically (v. 9), it would seem unnecessary to add that Christ has been placed over the works of God's hands.[31] Its inclusion in such a sense would also contradict 2:8, applied to

---

[29]   For discussion, see *BDAG*, "ἀνάγω," 61. This same verb refers to the resurrection in 13:20: "the God of peace who brought up from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep."

[30]   Attridge, *Hebrews*, 71.

[31]   Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations*, 108.

either the Son or humanity, where it is said "we do not yet see all things subject to him."[32] I therefore follow P[46] and B in omitting the extra line. The extra line is more likely to have been added than omitted.

In v. 8, γάρ appears to be in an unusual position, placed third in the sentence, according to א and B. This is corrected in P[46], A and C as well as some other minor manuscripts, to its usual postpositive position of second in the sentence, though the meaning remains unchanged.[33]

A dative αὐτῷ is present in some manuscripts to give "For in having subjected everything to him" in v. 8. א, A, C and D all have this reading. Attridge observes that since Hebrews at this point refers to the text to be interpreted and that text does not have such a pronoun, it is probably a scribal addition, and that it makes for an inelegant sentence, since "to him" is present towards the end of the verse.[34] It may have been added for emphasis, to redouble the insistence of the subjection of everything to Jesus in the light of v. 9, or possibly humanity, depending on whether we read the citation christologically in totality, or only in part. It adds emphasis by creating a parallel between the initial phrase and the subsequent "he permitted nothing not submitted to him." This would fit with the preposing of πάντα at the start of v. 8, since in the later clause οὐδέν is preposed to give emphasis to the fact that nothing was left unsubmitted to the Son. The adjectival noun had been placed first for emphasis.[35] Nevertheless, the meaning itself hardly changes, and on the basis of P[46] and B, I include it in square brackets.

The final major textual issue in this section comes in v. 9, where we read that "by God's grace" the Son has tasted death.[36] The term for grace is here χάρις, but there is an alternative reading χωρίς, meaning "without", or "apart from".[37] Although we only find the latter attested in late manuscripts such as 0234 and 1739, it is clear that it was known to the patristic exegetes.[38] Theodore of Mopsuestia in his commentary on Hebrews (2:9–10), for example, maintained the variant reading to argue that the Son died "distinct from his deity", whereas fragments attributed to Oecumenius suggested that the Nestorians, like Theodore,

---

[32] Ibid. There is some ambiguity over whether "to him" refers to the Son or to humanity, given that the latter is singular in the Greek. Some scholars suggest this might be intentional, resolved in v. 9, e. g., Westfall, *Discourse*, 102. This may have been a literary device to keep the audience's attention, and this would be in line with the rabbinic technique of offering clarification of a verse where multiple interpretations are possible.

[33] Similarly, in 11:32, א and A, place γάρ third in the phrase ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ ("for [time] will fail me). Note that γάρ is the fourth word in 2 Cor 1:19; see also BDF § 475(2).

[34] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 69.

[35] See Levinsohn, *Discourse*, 29, 38.

[36] The phrase the "grace of God" (with articles) also occurs in 12:15.

[37] See Paul Garnet, "Hebrews 2:9: ΧΑΡΙΤΙ or ΧΩΡΙΣ?" in *Papers of the Ninth International Conference on Patristics Studies, Oxford, 1983*, ed. Elizabeth Livingstone, StPatr 18 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian, 1985), 321–25 and James Keith Elliott, "When Jesus was Apart from God: An Examination of Hebrews 2:9," *ExpTim* 83 (1972):339–41.

[38] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 77.

had introduced it.[39] Modern scholars are similarly divided. For instance, Spicq argues forcefully for the grace of God as active given the necessity of God's grace to make sense of the Son's suffering, whereas Montefiore argues for χωρίς on the grounds Hebrews uses this word eleven times, though he rejects the idea that it refers to his dying only in his humanity. His position in regard of the latter is in contrast to Ehrman who emphasizes the co-text of Hebrews as referring to Jesus' suffering a fully human death.[40] Various proposals have been made as to how the variant came about. Metzger has suggested that χωρίς was inserted as a scribal gloss to v. 8b under the influence of 1 Cor 15:27, which later found its way into v. 9.[41] Thompson has suggested that the author had in mind Jesus' cry of dereliction on the Cross.[42] Evidently, that the variation is an early one, to which the primitive Epistle manuscripts do not apparently bear adequate witness.

However, there is another understanding of Hebrews' argumentation at this point which could support the majority manuscript reading. When we look at Hebrews' use of the psalm, we see that the author is interpreting it, as in the catena in ch. 1, possibly to answer questions posed by a contrast between the real situation of the community, who do not see humanity in control of creation, and the divine declaration in the psalm itself. This is evident especially if we take the αὐτῷ in the final clause of 2:8 to refer to humanity, which is represented by the singular ἄνθρωπος in v. 6. It is therefore possible that the reading "by the grace of God" has in view God's gracious fulfilling of that original declaration in Gen 1:26, which the psalm itself has in view, that humanity is to be in control over creation. In this view, Hebrews refers to "the gracious disposition of God who addresses humanity's failure to achieve its destiny by the provision of a redeemer through whose death many will be led to the experience of sonship and glory."[43] I discuss this issue in detail in the exegetical sections. It is, however, the manuscript evidence that leads me to favour the reading χάριτι θεοῦ in 2:9.

Heb 2:10

There are no noted variants in the manuscripts. I have retained the masculine "sons" in my translation in order to make obvious the connection of the rela-

---

[39] A good summary is found in Paul A. Hartog, "The Text of Hebrews 2:9 in its Patristic Reception," *BSac* 171 (2014):52–71, here, 52.

[40] Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 2, 36; Montefiore, *Commentary*, 59. See also Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of the Early Christian Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 171–72, 175; and Ellingworth, *Epistle*, 156.

[41] Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd Edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 594.

[42] Thompson, *Hebrews*, 71, though Moffatt argues that this would have been better expressed with ἄτερ than χωρίς. Moffatt, *Commentary*, 27.

[43] Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, 49.

tionship of Jesus to God and the relationship in which followers share with God by virtue of the actions of the Son.

Heb 3:1–6

There are very few variations in the manuscripts regarding these verses. Perhaps one of the most often noted is the inclusion in v. 2 of the word ὅλῳ, meaning "all" or "whole", so that Moses is said to be master in "his whole house". This variation is found in ℵ, A, C, D and Ψ, and was included in the Syriac and Vulgate translations. However, it is omitted in three of the oldest manuscripts, P[13], P[46] and B. Attridge suggests that the omission may have been an accidental result of homoioteleuton.[44] However, he also considers the possibility that the adjective was added to harmonise this verse with the citation from Num 12:7 in v. 5.[45] As Metzger puts it, "both external evidence and transcriptional probabilities are singularly difficult to evaluate," because ὅλῳ becomes "suspect as having been conformed to the text of v. 5 and/or Num 12:17 LXX," but on the other hand, "several early and excellent witnesses … lack ὅλῳ."[46] However, he suggests that the omission might have been a deliberate attempt to make the OT citation more appropriate to the argument of the passage, in that the introduction of the word ὅλῳ disturbs the parallelism between Moses and Jesus. He thus includes it in square brackets.[47]

I follow this strategy of using square brackets in my own translation. From the point of view of DA, the inclusion of ὅλῳ would make a clearer parallel between v. 2 and v. 5. However, it is questionable whether the author would have sought to do that at this point. It would have served to perhaps over-exaggerate the role of Moses by drawing attention to his faithfulness over the *whole* house, rather than to Jesus as the "apostle and high priest," to whom the attention is otherwise drawn in this passage. This emphasis on Jesus is especially obvious in v. 6 in his identification as Son, compared to Moses as "attendant". By contrast, however, the inclusion of the ὅλῳ in v. 5, as well as being part of the original quotation, has the opposite effect. It serves to elevate the status of Moses so that his role is positively stressed as one of responsibility; however, it is followed by δέ and a clause stressing the superiority of Jesus as the Son, and this distinction in terms of responsibility and power is not lost even on the modern reader. The ὅλῳ here serves as a springboard to elevate the status of the Son – surely Moses' role was great, but the Son's was even greater. The δέ in v. 6 indicates that more qualitative information is to follow, and what comes next is the information to be considered the most important. Recent research into the function of ancient

---

[44] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 104.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 664.
[47] Ibid.

Greek conjunctions has highlighted that the primary purpose of this co-ordi-
nating conjunction is as a forward-pointing device. The conjunction δέ is, gen-
erally speaking, simply a development marker. In English, we tend to associate
"but" with discontinuity, rather than simple comparison as is often connoted by
δέ in Greek, but any contrast or discontinuity is, in fact, present in the semantics
of the surrounding co-text, rather than in the conjunction itself.[48] The presence
of δέ thereby serves to underscore a contrast that is already present in the text,
that Jesus' role as Son is even greater than that of Moses as attendant, and the
latter half of the contrast mutes the otherwise emphatic ὅλῳ when the second
clause is read. Collocation might just have easily signaled the contrast, whereas
δέ might be seen to highlight it. On the historical evidence, we cannot deny that
ὅλῳ may have been original to v. 2, but on the basis of DA, we equally cannot say
that its inclusion was certain, given the surrounding co-text.

The second textual variant also concerns the "house", this time in v. 6. How-
ever, the implications are not so forceful. The majority of texts read οὗ οἶκός, or
"whose house", including P[13], ℵ, A, B, C, D[2] and Ψ. However, P[46] and some later
manuscripts like D* and 0121b or 1739 have ὅς οἶκος meaning "which house".
Attridge argues that "whose house" is the easier reading produced by making the
relative conform to αὐτοῦ, and Metzger also concurs that the ὅς was likely a
scribal modification for the sake of "logical exactitude" since it more precisely
designates the house in this passage as "God's house" not "Christ's house".[49] How-
ever, the co-text already makes this clear by the citation of Num 12:7 where it is
clearly God's house at stake. I retain the better attested οὗ here.

Of all the verses in this passage, v. 6 is perhaps the most textually problematic.
It has two other variants worth a brief mention. The first is that P[46], ℵ[2], A, C, D[2]
and Ψ read ἐάνπερ (akin to "if indeed") as opposed to ἐάν, which is found in P[13],
ℵ[1], B, D* and P. It is possible that the longer form was introduced to harmonize
this verse with v. 14, which reads: ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι
τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, which NRSV aptly renders "if only we hold our
first confidence firm to the end."[50] Further evidence of such harmonization
comes from the fact that D, A, C and Ψ also include μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν (firm
until the end) after ἐλπίδος, which is absent in P[13], P[46], and B. Again, this could
be seen to bring 3:6 into line with 3:14, since, essentially, they contain the same
exhortation to stand firm in one's christological convictions. However, it is not
necessary to conclude that ἐάνπερ is also a harmonization because the addition
of μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν is likely a later harmonization, also supported by the

---

[48] Runge, *Discourse*, 28–36 offers a good introduction to this topic. A helpful book on the
topic of conjoiners is Jacob Karl Heckert, *Discourse Conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles* (Dallas,
TX: SIL International, 1996).
[49] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 104; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 664–65.
[50] See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 104

mismatch of gender because one would have expected βέβαιον in 3:6.[51] The possibility that both are harmonizations is strengthened, though, because the insertion of the longer form ἐάνπερ is found in the second hand of א, which could be seen as a further indication that ἐάν is original, especially since א has the μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν insertion from v. 14 and the corrector can thus be argued to be bringing the two variants into line with each other. I therefore place "indeed" in square brackets, and omit the addition of μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν in my own translation. The addition of "indeed" would actually do little from a discourse analysis position in any case, since the thrust of the argument is that unless one holds firm to one's confidence and pride in one's christological convictions, one will not be a "son". The inclusion of "indeed", in the longer form ἐάνπερ, helps to bring out the force of the conditional phrase more clearly so as to strengthen the implicit injunction in a force quite in tune with the Epistle's argumentation.

Heb 4:1–11

Some of the variations in this section are very minor. For instance, D* inserts "the" before promise in 4:1, but since it is the only witness to do so, we can be fairly confident it is not original. The definite article also appears in A, C and D² and Ψ at v. 3 to speak of entering specifically "the rest". It is, however, missing in P¹³, P⁴⁶, B and D*. From a DA perspective, the insertion of "the" would be cataphoric to the specified rest that comes later in ch. 4. However, it seems unlikely given that this at this stage in Hebrews' argumentation, the point is to argue that the present community has a "rest" left open to them which is different from the rest in Canaan, and the specification that they enter a specific type of rest, that God experienced at creation, does not come until 4:4.[52] I therefore place the definite article in brackets because the evidence is divided. Another variation, that we can be fairly certain is incorrect, however, is the omission in P¹³ of εἰ in the formula "if they enter my rest!", which follows a Semitic idiomatic formulation for a prohibition found in the Hebrew of Ps 95:11. Without the εἰ, the passage could be read positively as suggesting that someone, like the future generation in which the audience now finds itself, could enter God's rest. However, this omission is found only in P¹³ and is therefore disregarded.[53]

---

[51] On the mismatched gender, see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 665. However, one could argue against Metzger, that there is no mismatch of gender in 3:6 or 3:14. In manuscripts of 3:6 the feminine adjective βεβαίαν (firm) does not agree with the neuter noun τέλους (end) but rather with the preceding feminine noun, ἐλπίδος (hope) – or possibly more distantly παρρησία (lit., boldness). In 3:14 again, the feminine adjective βεβαίαν (firm) does not agree with the neuter noun τέλους (end) but rather with the preceding *feminine* noun phrase, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως (the beginning of our confidence), where both nouns are feminine.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 665 also comments that it may have been a result of haplography before εἰσελεύσονται (they will enter). As only one manuscript attests this, haplography

Similarly, there is some attestation of οὖν in place of γάρ in 4:3. The word οὖν is found in א, A and C and some minor manuscripts, whereas γάρ is found in P¹³, P⁴⁶, B, D and Ψ. The term γάρ is to be preferred not only on the strength of its being more commonly found in the more ancient witnesses, but also because it better suits the co-text. The term γάρ is defined in the BDAG as a conjunction "used to express cause, clarification, or inference," as a marker of cause or reason, and Robertson also argues that it is primarily used in relation to explanations.[54] Its position is essentially to provide support material, to "direct the audience to strengthen a preceding proposition."[55] By contrast, οὖν demonstrates close continuity and advancement of what precedes. It effectively introduces a new development.[56] It is often found at high-level boundaries in the discourse where a subsequent major topic proceeds from what has been previously discussed.[57] The co-text of Hebrews would be more suggestive of γάρ since 4:3 finds itself as part of an exhortatory passage beginning at 4:1 which draws out the moral implications of the preceding passage in 3:7–19.[58] In the case of A and C, this variant might have come about in conjunction with the insertion of the subjunctive εἰσερώχμεθα, which would have perhaps encouraged the use of οὖν given its cohortative force.[59] However, the use of the exhortative subjunctive at this point seems less likely given the οἱ πιστεύσαντες, which is an aorist participle (having believed) suggesting those who have already believed are at stake.[60]

Another weak attestation is the active in place of the passive προείρηται (has been said before) in 4:7. The active verb προείρηκεν (he has said before) is found in B, though D² has another simplified form, εἴρηται (it has been said). The

---

is a distinct possibility in this instance. One would also have expected the omission of καίτοι (in spite of) if it were intended. That said, it may have been deliberate since it is also omitted in v. 5, see also D⋆, though in the latter case this may have been intended to contrast the present audience with the past community, since the change from a positive statement about the possibility of entering rest back to the negative prohibition could have been confusing. Ibid., 123 suggests there may have been phonological confusion with η, either as an interrogative ἤ or as an adverb ἤ (truly). However, it is interesting that the γάρ is omitted in P¹³ in v. 4, since this does little to aid the flow of the argument when γάρ again serves the purpose of demonstrating an inference from what has been explored previously, which is what happens in Hebrews at this point. The omission of γάρ is also found vgᵐˢ and syᵖ, though it is unlikely to be original on the basis of such scarce attestation.

[54] "γάρ," *BDAG*, 189–90. See also Archibald Thomas Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Investigations* (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), 1190.

[55] Stephanie L. Black, *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew*, JSNTSup 216 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 280.

[56] See "οὖν," *BDAG*, 736.

[57] Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 43.

[58] See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 665.

[59] See also Attridge, *Hebrew*, 122. However, although he suggests this was the case generally speaking, the subjunctive is not present in א and so I think it better to comment on A and C separately here. See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 664–65.

[60] See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 666.

active found in B would actually introduce ambiguity into the text, asking the reader to consider whether to attribute the words to David or God, though the overall sense that it was God speaking through David would still be present in the text. The scarcity of attestation is alone enough to make either variation, in B or D², unlikely and so I have gone with the passive form found in P¹³, P⁴⁶, ℵ, A and C (also in D*).[61] Similarly, in 4:12, the variant ἐναργής, only attested in B, meaning "clear" is a highly unlikely alternative to ἐνεργής (active) as is "body" in place of spirit, which is not found at all in the older witnesses, and only in some minuscules (2464 and 2495). A more important vocabulary shift would be the move from ἀπείθεια (disobedience) to ἀπιστία (unbelief) in 4:6 and 4:11 (see also the verb in 3:18), notably found in P⁴⁶ (also in ℵ* at v. 6). As one of our oldest manuscripts, one has to pay heed to the possibility it was original. However, that it could be a harmonization could be argued from the fact that such a change would bring the vocabulary of this section into line with the references to unfaithfulness found at 3:12 and 3:19, which warn of the dangers of having an unbelieving heart. However, in the section presently under consideration, the emphasis is rather on obedience, as indicated by the reference to the ones who fell in the desert, who in 3:17 sinned by not "listening".[62] The comment in 3:19 is, in fact, in relation to that disobedient generation, and the repetition of the idiomatic "if you listen to my/his voice" at 3:7,15; 4:7 would indicate obedience as a prominent topic at this point in the discourse. I therefore follow the majority witness of "disobedience" at 4:6 and 4:11.

---

[61] B also, somewhat confusingly, has ἄρα in place of ἄν in v. 8. As ἄρα, like οὖν, introduces information proceeding from what has come before, this would be possible, but the ἄν is more likely, again on the overwhelming textual evidence. See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 123.

[62] Equally, at this point in my translation, I translate ἀκούω (listen) since it carries with it connotations of obedience not always present with the alternative "to hear".

Appendix B

Brief Summary of Approaches to Hebrews' Macrostructure, Looking At the Work of Vanhoye, Koester, deSilva and George Guthrie

Part of the problem in establishing the Epistle's (macro)structure is not that Hebrews lacks a number of structural indicators, but that it has too many. Topics that are treated more extensively later on are also often introduced briefly at an earlier stage in the discourse: "any structural scheme captures only a portion of this web of interrelationships and does only partial justice to the complexity of the work."[1] Previously, macrostructures of Hebrews have largely been based around literary features and topics, such as that of Christ the High Priest. Vanhoye, for instance highlights the following, based on a number of textual features, such as *inclusios*, vocabulary and symmetrical arrangements:

I:	1:1–4	Exordium
	1:5–2:18	A name so different from the name of the angels
II A	3:1–4:14	Jesus faithful
III ---	5:11–6:20	Preliminary exhortation
A	7:1–28	Jesus, high-priest according to the order of Melchizedek
B	8:1–9:28	Come to fulfilment
C	10:1–18	Cause of an eternal salvation
---	10:19–39	Final exhortation
IV A	11:1–40	The faith of the men of old
B	12:1–13	The endurance required
V	12:14–13:18	The peaceful fruit of justice
z	13:20–21	Peroration[2]

---

[1] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 16–17. Attridge uses the term 'structure', whereas, in DA terms, we would distinguish it in particular as the macrostructure.

[2] On the basis of literary techniques, Vanhoye famously structured Hebrews around the topic of the High Priest, which he took to be Hebrews' main focus. Albert Vanhoye, *A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, trans. James Swetnam (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964), 7; trans. of *Traduction structurée de l'Epître aux Hébreux* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963). V. 19 is seen as a "word of parting" in Vanhoye, *Structure and Message*, 108. For a summary of the various theories for Hebrews' macrostructure, consult George Howard Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*, NovTSup 73 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3–44.

For Vanhoye, the changes in rhetorical genre mark a shift in the discourse, and thus he views Hebrews as alternating between expositional christological comments and addressing his audience directly (exhortation), as noted by Guthrie.[3] The expositions on Christology, however, are essentially considered the "backbone material", and he organizes his structure around them. Spicq likewise emphasized the christological passages, focusing on the following:

1:5–2:18	The Son of God incarnate is king of the universe
3:1–5:10	Jesus, a faithful and compassionate High Priest
7:1–10:18	The true priesthood of Christ
10:19–12:29	Persevering faith
13:1–19	Appendix[4]

Attridge comments that such thematic structures usually built on the expository sections of the text and focus on christological affirmations, they also highlight what they perceive to be "oppositions" between Christ and the OT figures, especially with regards the ancient priesthood. However, in doing so, they "do little to indicate the function of the various sections of the text and often skew the interpretation of the text as primarily a dogmatic work."[5] Conversely, other scholars have looked to Hebrews' paraenesis as being the central topic. Nauck, for instance, says that 4:14–16 and 10:19–31 are parallels that parenthesize what he considers to be central section of the Epistle and frame the exposition from 5:1–10:18. He argues that this central block of material, concerning the Christian's need to remain faithful in order to reach the final goal, is the key to understanding the macrostructure of the Epistle.[6] Either way, such scholars do not always pay sufficient attention to the integration of the forms necessary to a homily in Hebrews as part of the overall discourse. One would expect a homily to contain sections of both exposition and exhortation, for example, as points of faith are explained, and admonishments or pastoral advice given.

Some attempts have been made by comparison with what was known of Greek oratory at the time, however. These are significant, given the comments above about the lack of knowledge concerning ancient homilies. Viewing Hebrews as a piece of Greek oratory and acknowledging the combination of types of rhetoric in Hebrews, Koester argues for the following structure, on the

---

[3] Guthrie, *Structure*, 113.
[4] Spicq, *L'Épitre*, vol. 1, 27–38, 49.
[5] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 14.
[6] Wolfgang Nauck, "Zum Aufbau das Hebräerbriefes," in *Judentum Urchristentum Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, ed. Walther Eltester, BZNW 26, (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), 199–206. See Guthrie, *Structure*, 114–15 for a good summary of Nauck's view. See also Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 9th ed, KEK 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 29–35.

basis of ancient Greek works which contained several standard elements. They would open with an *exordium* to prepare the listeners to give proper attention to the speaker. They would then narrate the facts pertaining to the topic (*a narratio*). This would contain the points to be made and would argue for them. There would then come a *peroration* which brought the speech to a close.[7]

> 1. EXORDIUM (1:1–2:4)
> I. PROPOSITION (2:5–9)
> II. ARGUMENTS (2:10–12:27)
> A. First Series (2:10–6:10)
> 1. Argument: Jesus received glory through faithful suffering – a way that 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 Series (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)
> III. PERORATION (12:28–13:21)
> IV. EPISTOLARY POSTCRIPT (13:22–25)[8]
> V.

Koester believes that the exordium, as he envisages it (1:1–2:4), is divided into two parts. In the first, the Son is introduced as "the heir and creator of all things, who is seated at God's right hand (1:1–4). The second part provides OT support for these claims (1:5–14). The final paragraph calls for attention by warning of the consequences of neglecting the Christian message (2:1–4)."[9] Koester continues that "The proposition (2:5–9) is a discrete section consisting of a quotation from Ps. 8:4–6, followed by a brief exposition of the text."[10] In its co-text, the proposition is situated at a juncture. Attention moves "from the glory of the exalted Christ to the significance of his suffering," and the author now indicates that he will be discussing "Christ's movement from suffering to glory, his suffering on the part of others and the idea that one can 'see' the fulfillment of God's promises" to humankind at creation fulfilled in Christ.[11] Thereafter, 2:10–5:10

---

[7] Koester, *Hebrews*, 84.
[8] Ibid., 84–85.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid., 85.
[11] Ibid.

focuses on Christ's suffering before the exaltation, and the passages with *synkrisis* "comparing Christ's glory to Moses and Aaron's, together with images from the exodus and wilderness help to unify the section."[12]

A digression then interrupts the argument, (5:11–6:20) "to reprove the listeners for their lack of learning."[13] The mention of Melchizedek in 6:20 refers the reader back to 5:10, and signals the resumption of the main argument, that Christ is a priest forever, elaborating that this is according to the order of Melchizedek. Hebrews 7:1–10:25 then demonstrates Christ's suffering was to "make the sacrifice that allows his followers to enter God's presence," and is served by the *synkrisis* which contrasts his offering to that of the Levitical priests.[14] The segment concludes formally, with "a digression which echoes earlier warnings about the danger of turning away from God, and which encourages the listeners to be faithful" (10:26–39).[15] The author links back in this final section to 10:22–23 and takes up the matter of faith, which then becomes the central topic in the next section (11:1–12:24), which begins and ends with an *inclusio*, the blood of Abel. Various faithful OT figures are employed, and "the depiction of the faithful in the heavenly Jerusalem demonstrates that their perseverance has not been in vain."[16] Another short digression urging the faithful to heed the word of the author follows (12:25–27), and this section ends with an inclusio on the "word" of God: the Word created the world in the beginning (11:3), and will shake it at the end (12:26). The peroration of 12:28–13:21 then refers to the service which pleases God [deliberative rhetoric], before the final benediction of 13:21 and epistolary postscript of 13:22–25.[17]

Koester's structure for Hebrews is generally convincing, since it allows for a recognition of the rhetoric of the Epistle in terms of those features which would have been known in his own era. It also allows one to see the movement of the argumentation from topic to topic and the place of the sections of deliberative and epideictic rhetoric in that movement.[18]

Attempts at discussing Hebrews' structure in terms of rhetoric have been, on the whole, successful in deliminating the stages in which the author unfolds his argument. Another such structure is that of deSilva. His structure is fairly lengthy, so I simplify it below, focusing on how he considers the chapters in question in this thesis:[19]

---

12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., 86.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid., 85–86.
18 As detailed in Ibid., 82–86.
19 Abbreviated from David A. deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*: *A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 71–75.

1:1–2:18 First Appeal to heed properly the word of God in the Son
    1:1–4 Thesis: God's final and complete word has been spoken through the Son, who has greater honour even than the angels
    1:5–14 Confirmation of final element of thesis (Jesus is greater than the angels)
    2:1–4 Inferential conclusion based on "lesser to greater" argument presented in the form of an exhortation (since the lesser message of the lesser beings was strictly enforced, the threat is correspondingly greater for those who disregard the Son's message)
    2:5–18 Argument in support of the exhortations: Attachment to Jesus is the path to share in his honour as well as the path of gratitude for past benefits and Jesus' ongoing mediation
3:1–4:13 Second appeal to honour God's word through trust and perseverance
    3:1–6 Argument: Jesus, as Son, over God's house, has greater honour than Moses, the servant of God's house
    3:7–4:13 Exhortation: Do not imitate those who rejected God's patronage under the servant, Moses, for we would find ourselves similarly subject to judgement: rather, let us strive to enter the 'rest' that remains open to us
4:14–10:18 Central Exposition – the "long and difficult word"
    4:14–16 Exhortation: We have a high priest who has secured and will maintain God's favour toward us, so let us draw near to God for sustaining help
    5:1–10 Argument: Jesus' appointment to high priesthood (hence to position of principal broker of God's favour)
5:11–6:20 Digression (a second *captatio benevolentiae*)
    6:1–3 Exhortation to move forward in Christian journey (rather than drift away, 2:1–4)
    6:4–8 Argument in support of exhortation: those who do not persevere in gratitude and trust show dangerous contempt for God and God's gifts
    6:9–12 Palliation: You, of course, will continue to invest yourselves in your fellow believers and your common enterprise, so we can be confident of the outcome
    6:13–20 Argument confirming cause for confidence. God's oath as prop for perseverance in trust
    7:1–10:18 Resumption of argument: the Christians' access to God's favour is superior to anything enjoyed previously in the history of God's dealings with humanity, because Jesus' priestly mediation is superior in every way
10:19–13:25 Climactic Exhortation to persevere in gratitude for the benefactions bestowed by Jesus and God

The macrostructure for the Epistle provided by deSilva takes into account the different subgenres of discourse that we find in Hebrews. He is right to distinguish between the types of argumentation, such as digression and exhortation,

and his breakdown is a helpful one. He argues that the Epistle discusses Jesus' superior status to the angels and to Moses, and builds upon these comparisons to stress the necessity of fidelity and gratitude to God, which forms the basis for Christian living according to the Epistle. In many respects, deSilva avoids the excesses of purely thematic approaches because his macrostructure enables us to look at the unfolding of the argumentation in sequential stages. For instance, we see how the Epistle moves from the thesis of the exordium, God's word in relation to Christ's sonship, to its conclusion, that he is above the angels, and thence to the exhortations which ultimately hinge on the Son's superior status. It is a good example of how a sequential reading might help us in the process of an exegetical interpretation.[20]

However, whilst a sequential reading is indeed important, especially because of the principle of linearization discussed above, in this thesis, we are not concerned simply establishing the different sections in the Epistle, but also understanding how those sections interrelate. This has been most clearly emphasized in the work of George Guthrie. According to Guthrie, Hebrews is also essentially a combination of exposition and hortatory rhetoric. We need to look at these units together and examine each different section carefully to help deduce the implied authorial intent behind them:

… why the author alternates between these two forms must be investigated and the unique function of each ascertained. While it may be true that exhortation and exposition in the book are intertwined in accomplishing the overall purpose of the author, the unique roles of each in accomplishing that purpose need attention."[21]

First he scrutinizes the expositionary units, and then moves on to the hortatory passages to reveal considerable semantic overlap between the two.[22]

Guthrie argues that the exposition can be divided into an introduction followed by two main movements, the first of which deals with the position of the Son in relation to the angels (1:5–2:18) and the second (4:14–10:25) deals with the position of the Son as high priest, presenting him in relation to the earthly sacrificial system.[23] These, he says, are essentially "embedded discourses" and are linked together "spatially and logically".[24] Spatially, the Epistle begins with a heavenly orientation, which transitions to an earthly one in 2:5–9, before we switch back to the heavenly sphere in 8:1–2. The transition to the earthly emphasis enables the author to zoom in on the Son's solidarity and the suf-

---

[20] Koester, *Hebrews*, 82. It should be noted that some scholars have seen the paraenesis as at the centre of the author's purpose.

[21] Guthrie, *Structure*, 115–16.

[22] Ibid., 116–26 and 127–34.

[23] Ibid., 116–17.

[24] Ibid., 126.

fering he experiences for the sake of humankind (1:10–2:18).[25] However, that exposition effectively continues with the second movement where the Son is appointed as "the superior high priest".[26] In 5:1–7:28 we see the Son's permanent priesthood set in contrast to the temporary earthly priesthood.[27] When the discourse transitions back to the heavenly realm, in 8:1–2, we see that the heavenly sacrifice of the new high priest is set in contrast to the earthly sacrificial system.

Logically, Guthrie suggests, the movements are constructed around a series of biblical citations and *midrashim* which betray a high level of cohesion between their subunits. The citation of Ps 110:1 (109:1) in Heb 1:13 semantically links with the quotation of Ps 8:4–6 at Heb 2:6–8.[28] The incarnation of the Son is seen as a logical prerequisite for the Son's glorification and for him to deliver the sons (see 2:12–13).[29] However, we read that he had to become "lower than the angels" in order to be made a superior high priest, who has been tempted and can thus assist those going through temptation (2:18).[30] This marks the transition to the next movement on "The Position of the Son, Our High Priest, in relation to the Earthly Sacrificial System."[31] After the hortatory digression of 5:11–6:20, the author shows the superiority of Melchizedek with a citation of Ps 110:4 (109:4) and a midrash on Gen 14:17–20, before referring to Ps 110:4 (109:4), to demonstrate that the "Son's priesthood is superior to that of the Levitical priests because it will never end" (7:11–28).[32] The "appointment" of 5:1–7:28, is the logical prerequisite for the sacrifice he offers as the ultimate high priest.[33] The proclamation of the Son's appointment is then supported by a new allusion to Ps 110:1 (109:1) in the intermediary transition in 8:1–2.[34] Based on various allusions to the Torah in 9:1–22 and a quotation of Ps 40:6–8 (39:6–8) in 10:5–7, the author expounds the superiority of the new covenant (8:7–13) and then that of Christ's offering under the new covenant (9:1–10:18).[35] The logic is that "the appointed Son's offering, as the new covenant offering of the superior priest, finds its superiority in its heavenly locale (9:11, 23–24), the high priest's shed blood (9:12–22), and its permanence (10:1–18)."[36]

Having established this basic structure, we may now superimpose the hortatory units in Hebrews over it:

---

[25] Ibid., 121–22.
[26] Ibid., 121.
[27] Ibid., 122.
[28] Ibid., 124.
[29] Ibid., 125.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid. Capitalization his.
[32] Ibid., 126.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid., 123–16, quotation from 126.

… through the reiteration of central motifs – by encouraging words, warnings and examples – the author hammers home repeatedly the reward of a right decision on the part of the community and the punishment awaiting those who make a bad decision.[37]

Every time in Hebrews that the expositional material is followed by hortatory material, the latter utilizes semantic material from the expositional discussion. For instance, the "Son Superior to the Angels" motif of 1:5–14 is the basis for the argument of 2:1–4:

By the end of the chain quotation in the first chapter the hearers are shaking their heads in agreement that the Son is indeed superior to the angels. The preacher then turns to address the community directly, hitting them with the argument from lesser to greater: "if rejection of the word delivered through angels deserved punishment, how much more does rejection of the word delivered through the Son deserve punishment?" The exhortation "borrows" semantic material from the exposition to accomplish its purpose.[38]

Similarly, in Heb 2:10–18, Guthrie argues that the author draws on the category of sonship; this is then picked up in 3:1–6 which follows up by discussing Jesus' faithfulness as God's Son, and the human "sons" are exhorted to follow the example of his faithfulness.[39] This topic continues until 4:11. In addition, 6:13–20 draws on semantic material from 5:1–10 to move the discourse forward and on to Melchizedek's priesthood and then Jesus' own priesthood in similarity to him in 7:1–28.[40] In 10:26–13:21, the overlapping transition at 10:19–25 takes advantage of *gezerah shavah* to move from the Son's superior offering (8:3–10:18) to the hortatory material. The warning at 10:26–31 also includes references to the sacrifice for sins and the blood of the covenant (10:26, 29), topics also found in chs. 8 and 9. Hebrews 12:18–24 brings us back to heaven with the mention of angels (12:22), whilst the concluding exhortations and benediction of 13:1–21 mention angels (13:2), the altar, the tabernacle and sacrifices (13:10–15) and covenant (13:20), all of which came previously in the Epistle (esp. chs. 8–9). There can therefore be no denying that "the hortatory material builds on elements from the expositional material."[41]

The overlap between the expositional material and the hortatory material, Guthrie argues, "lies in the relationship of the community to whom God has spoken his word, with the Son, of whom and to whom God has also spoken."[42] He posits that:

In the expositional units the discourse deals with information about the Son. In the hortatory units the author turns to his hearers and exhorts them to take action. It is espe-

---

[37] Ibid., 139.
[38] Ibid., 140.
[39] In this paragraph, I summarise Ibid., 140–141.
[40] Ibid., 141.
[41] Ibid., 140–41, quotation from 141.
[42] Ibid., 143.

cially on the basis of the hearers' relationship with the Son that they have a superior basis for taking the desired action.[43]

Guthrie's argument is indeed largely convincing. He helps to demonstrate the connections between the different kinds of material in the Epistle so as to elucidate Hebrews' inner cohesion in a unique way. In this thesis, I largely adopt his approach to the interrelationship of the sections of exposition and exhortation in the Epistle, though I argue for a slightly different emphasis in ch. 1 from the traditional emphasis on the angelic argumentation.[44]

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] A diagrammatic representation of his structure is present in Guthrie, *Structure*, 144. It is, however, difficult to reproduce here due to its complicated diagrammatic format.

Bibliography

Adams, Edward. "The Cosmology of Hebrews." Pages 122–39 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Adler, Herbert M. and Arthur Davis, eds. *The Service of the Synagogue: A New Edition of the Festival Prayers with an English Translation in Prose and Verse, Day of Atonement*, Part 2. London: Routledge, 1905.

Aland, Barbara and Kurt, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Alba Juez, Laura. *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.

Allegro, John M. "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim." *JBL* 77 (1958):350–54.

Anderson, Bernhard, ed. *Creation in the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

– *Creation Versus Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible*. New York: Association Press, 1967.

Anderson, David R. *The Priest-King of Psalm 110 in Hebrews*. StBibLit 21. New York: Lang, 2001.

Andriessen, Paul. "La teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de He I 6 et II 14B–III 2." *NovT* 18 (1976):293–313.

Attridge, Harold. "Jesus the Incarnate High Priest." Pages 283–98 in *Hebrews in Contexts*. Edited by Gabriela Gelardini and Harold Attridge. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

– "Let Us Strive to Enter that Rest': The Logic of Hebrews 4:1–11." *HTR* 73 (1980):279–88.

– *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Austin, John Langshaw. *How to do Things With Words*. 2nd ed. Edited by James Opie Urmson and Marina Sbisá. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Avery-Peck, Alan J. and Jacob Neusner, eds. *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Vol. 4 of Judaism in Late Antiquity. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Backhaus, Knut. *Der Hebräerbrief*. RNT. Regensburg: Pustet, 2009.

Bamberger, Bernard J. *Fallen Angels*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1952.

Barclay, John M. G. "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case." *JSNT* 31 (1987):73–93.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. BLS 17. Translated by Dorothea Shefer-Vanson. Sheffield, Almond, 1989. Translation of second Hebrew edition. Tel Aviv: Sifriat Poalim, 1984.

Barnard, Jody A. *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/331. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Barnes, Michel René. "Contra Eunomium III 6." Pages 368–82 in *Gregory of Nyssa: Contra Eunomium II. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gregory of Nyssa, 14–17 September 2010, Leuven, Belgium*. Edited by Jonathan Leemans and Matthieu Cassin. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1971.

– "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 363–93 in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Edited by William David Davies and David Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1964.

Bateman, Herbert. *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5–13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage*. AUS 193. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Bates, Matthew, W. *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God and Spirit in the New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Beavis, Mary Ann. "Hebrews and Wisdom." Pages 201–18 in *Mark, Manuscripts and Monotheism: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado*. Edited by Chris Keith and Dieter T. Roth. LNTS 528. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Ben Ezra, Daniel Stökl. *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*. WUNT 163. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Bialik, Hayim Nahman. Yehoshua Hana Ravnitzky and William G. Braude. "*The Book of Legends*" *Sefer haAggadah: Legends from the Talmud and Midrash*. New York: Schocken, 1992.

Black, David Alan. "Hebrews 1:1–4: A Study in Discourse Analysis." *WTJ* 49 (1987): 175–94.

Black, Stephanie L. *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew*. JSNTSup 216. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Blass, Fredrich, Albert Debrunner and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*. AYBRL. London: Doubleday: 1992.

Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Blomberg, Craig. "'But we see Jesus': The Relationship Between the Son of Man in Hebrews 2:6 and 2:9 and the Implications for English Translations." Pages 88–99 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Trevor Hart, Nathan MacDonald and Daniel Driver. LNTS 387. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Blowers, Paul. *Drama of the Divine Economy: Creator and Creation in Early Christian Theology and Piety*. OECS. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Bons, Eberhand. "Le Verb κτίζω comme terme technique de la création dans la Septante et dans le Nouveau Testament." Pages 1–18 in *Voces Biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament*. Edited by Jan Joosten and Peter Tomson. CBET 49. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

Bonting, Sjoerd L. *Creation and Double Chaos: Science and Theology in Discussion*. Theology and the Sciences. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Boyarin, Daniel. "Midrash in Hebrews, Hebrews as Midrash." Pages 15–30 in *Hebrews in Contexts*. Edited by Gabriela Gelardini and Harold Attridge. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1983.

Bovon, François. *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*. Translated by Jane Haapiseva-Hunter. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 36. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 1995.

Bowman, Thorleif. *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*. London: SCM, 1960.

Brawley, Robert. "Discursive Structure and the Unseen in Hebrews 2:8 and 11:1: A Neglected Aspect of the Context." *CBQ* 55 (1993):81–99.

Bredin, Mark. *The Ecology of the New Testament: Creation, Re-creation and the Environment*. Colorado Springs, CO: Biblica, 2010.

Brooks, Cleanth and Robert Penn Warren. *Understanding Poetry*. 4th ed. New York: Heinle & Heinle, 1976.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Bruce, Alexander Balmain. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The First Apology for Christianity*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.

Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Brueggemann, Walter and William H. Bellinger. *Psalms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Brünner, Gisela and Gabriele Graefen. "Einleitung: Zur Konzeption der Funktionalen Pragmatik." Pages 7–24 in *Texte und Diskurse: Methoden und Forschungsergebnisse der Funktionalen Pragmatik*. Edited by Gisela Brünner and Gabriele Graefen. Opladen: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 1994.

Buchanan, George Wesley. *To the Hebrews*. AB 36. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007; translation of *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984.

Burke, Sean. *The Death and Return of the Author: Subjectivity in Criticism in Barthes, Derrida and Foucault*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 1998.

Burrell, David, Carlo Cogliati, Janet Soskice and William Stoeger, eds. *Creation and the God of Abraham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Burtness, James. "Plato, Philo and the Author of Hebrews." *LQ* 10 (1958):197–219.

Butler, Christopher S. "Focusing on focus: A Comparison of Functional Grammar, Role and Reference Grammar and Systemic Functional Grammar." *Language Sciences* 27 (2005):585–618.

Caird, George Bradford. "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *CJT* 5 (1959):44–51.

Calaway, Jared. *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary: Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and its Priestly Context*. WUNT 2/349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Calduch-Benages, Nuria, Joan Ferrer and Jan Liesen. *Wisdom of the Scribe Diplomatic Edition of the Syriac Version of the Book of Ben Sira According to Codex Ambrosianus*. Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 2003.

Callow, Kathleen. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

Carson, Donald Arthur, ed. *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical and Theological Investigation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.

Charles, Robert Henry, ed. *The Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2 of *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Edited by Robert Henry Charles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

Charlesworth, James H. "The Odes of Solomon – Not Gnostic." *CBQ* 31 (1969):357–69.

Church, Philip. *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*. NovTSup 171. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

– "Hebrews 1:10–12 and the Renewal of the Cosmos." *TynBul*, 67 (2016):269–86.

Cicero. Translated by Harry Caplan 30 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913–2010.

Claghorn, George S. *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's 'Timaeus'*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954.

Clarke, Ernest G., trans. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy: Translated witith Notes*. Aramaic Bible: The Targums 5B. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Clements, Pamela. "The Effects of Staging on Recall from Prose." Pages 287–330 in *New Directions in Discourse Processing*. Edited by Roy O. Freedle. Advances in Discourse Processes 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1979.

Clines, David J. A. *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1993–2014. [= *DCH*]

Cockerill, Gareth Lee. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

Cody, Aelred. *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspective*. St. Meinrad: Grail, 1960.

Collins, John Joseph *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Collins, John Joseph and Daniel C. Harlow, eds. *Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Costa, José. *L'au-Delà et la Résurrection das La Littérature Rabbinique Ancienne*. Paris-Louvain: Peeters, 2004.

Cox, Ronald. *By the Same Word: Creation and Salvation in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. BZNW 145. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Dahl, Östen. "Causality in Discourse." Pages 251–61 in *Focus and Coherence in Discourse Processing*. Research in Text Theory. Edited by Gert Rickheit and Christopher Habel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms I: 1–50*. AB 16. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965.

Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. [= *BDAG*]

deSilva, David. *Persevering in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

– "Entering God's Rest: Eschatology and the Socio-Rhetorical Strategy of Hebrews." *TJ* 21 (2000):25–43.

de Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. 2nd Edition. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1965. Translation of *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament*. 2 vols. Paris: Cerf, 1958.

Dey, Kalyan Kelan. *Intermediary Worlds and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*. SBLDS 25. Missoula, MT: SBL, 1975.

Dik, Simon. *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*. 2nd ed. Functional Grammar Series 20. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997.

Docherty, Susan Elaine. "Genesis in Hebrews." Pages 130–46 in *Genesis in the New Testament*. Edited by Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise. LNTS 446. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

– *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews: A Case Study in Early Jewish Bible Interpretation*. WUNT 2/260. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

– "The Text Form of the OT Citations in Hebrews Chapter 1 and the Implications for the Study of the Septuagint." *NTS* 55 (2009):355–65.

Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd Edition. London: SCM, 1989.

– *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Dunnill, John. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Dupont, Jacques. "Assis à la droite de Dieu: L'Interprétation du Ps 110 dans le Nouveau Testament." Pages 340–422 in *Resurrexit: Actes du Symposium International sur la Résurrection de Jésus*. Edited by Éduard Dhanis. Rome: Editrice Vaticana, 1974.

Dyer, Bryan R. *Suffering in the Face of Death: The Social Context of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. LNTS 568. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Eccles, Robert S. "The Purpose of the Hellenistic Patterns in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 206–26 in *Religions in Antiquity, Festschrift for E. Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. NumenSup 14. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

Egger, Wilhelm. *How to Read the New Testament: An Introduction to Linguistic and Historical-Critical Methodology*. Edited by Hendrikus Boers. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of the Early Christian Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Eisenbaum, Pamela. "Locating Hebrews within the Literary Landscape of Christian Origins." Pages 213–37 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

– *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*. SBLDS 156. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Elior, Rachel and Peter Schäfer, eds. *Creation and Re-Creation in Jewish Thought: Festschrift in Honour of Joseph Dan on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Elliott, James Keith. "When Jesus was Apart from God: An Examination of Hebrews 2:9." *ExpTim* 83 (1972):339–41.

Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993.

Endo, Masanobu. *Creation and Christology*. WUNT 2/149. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Enns, Peter. "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1–4:13." *WTJ* 55 (1993):255–80.

Euripides. Translated by Kovacs, David, Christopher Collard and Martin Cropp. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985–2008.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. "Critical Discourse Analysis." Pages 258–64 in *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Vol. 2 of *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Edited by Teun A. Van Dijk. London: Sage, 1997.

Fewster, Gregory P. *Creation Language in Romans 8: A Study in Monosemy*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 8. Leiden: Brill, 2013. Filson, Floyd. *"Yesterday": A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13*. SBT 4. London: SCM, 196

Finkelstein, Louis. *Mavo le-Masekhtot Avot ve-Avot de Rabbi Natan*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AYB 32. London: Yale University Press, 2008.

–   *The Gospel according to Luke I–IX*. AB 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.

–   *Tobit*. CEJL. New York: de Gruyter, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la Prison*. Paris: Gallimard, 1975.

Fretheim, Terence E. *God and World in the Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2005.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated and edited by Garrett Barden and John Cumming. London: Sheed and Ward, 1975. Translation of *Hermeneutik 1: Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960.

Garnet, Paul. "Hebrews 2:9: XAPITI or ΧΩΡΙΣ?" Pages 321–25 in *Papers of the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 1983*. Edited by Elizabeth Livingstone. StPatr 18. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian, 1985.

Gee, Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. 4th ed. London: Routledge, 2014.

Gelardini, Gabriella. "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for Tisha be-Av: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation." Pages 107–27 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. BibInt 75. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Gibbs, John. *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology*. NovTSup 26. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Gilbert, George Holley. "The Greek Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *AJT* 14 (1910):521–32.

Gilbert, Maurice. *La Critique des Dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse*. AnBib 53. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1973.

Givón, Talmy. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Gleason, Randall. "Angels and Eschatology in Hebrews 1–2." *NTS* 49 (2003):90–107.

Goulder, Michael. "Hebrews and the Ebionites." *NTS* 49 (2003):393–406.

Gourges, Michel. *À la droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et actualisation du Psaume 110:1 dansle Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Gabalda, 1978.

Grässer, Erich. *An die Hebräer*. Vol. 1. EKK 17. Zürich: Benziger and Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.

–   "Hebräer 1:1–4. Ein Exegetischer Versuch." *EKKNT Vorarbeiten* 3 (1971):55–91.

–   "Der Hebräerbrief 1938–1963." *TRu* 30 (1964):138–236.

Gray, Patrick. Review of *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. *JBL* 125/3 (2006):608–10.

Green, Gene. "Relevance Theory and Biblical Interpretation." Pages 217–40 in *The Linguist and Pedagogue: Trends in Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell. NTM 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

Greimas, Algirdas Julien and Joseph Courtes. *Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982.

Grice, Herbert Paul. "Logic and Conversation" in *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. Edited by Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Griffiths, Jonathan I. *Hebrews and Divine Speech*. LNTS, 507. London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2014.

Grimes, Joseph Evans. *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Gunkel, Herman. *Genesis*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Gunther, Carsen, Claudia Maienborn and Andrea Schopp. "Processing of Information Structure." Pages 18–42 in *Focus: Linguistics, Cognitive & Computational Perspectives, Studies in Natural Language Processing*. Edited by Peter Bosch and Rob van der Sandt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Gupta, Nijay. "Mirror-Reading Moral Issues in Paul's Letters." *JSNT* 34 (2012):361–81.

Guthrie, Donald. *Hebrews.* TNTC 15. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 2008. Reprint of *The Letter to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity Press, 1983.

Guthrie, George Howard. "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research." *CBR* 1 (2003):271–94.

– *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. NovTSup 73. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Guthrie, George Howard and Russell Quinn. "A Discourse Analysis of the Use of Psalm 8:2–6 in Hebrews 2:5–9." *JETS* 49/2 (2006):235–46.

Haacker, Klaus. "Creatio ex Auditu Zum Verständnis von Hebr. 11,3." *ZNW* 60 (1969): 279–81.

Habel, Norman C. *Readings from the Perspective of Earth*. Earth Bible 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Habel, Norman C. and Vicky Balabanski, eds. *The Earth Story in the New Testament*. Earth Bible 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2005.

Habel, Norman C. and Shirley Wurst, eds. *The Earth Story in Genesis*. Earth Bible 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Hegermann, Harald. *Der Brief and die Hebräer*. THKNT 16. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 1998.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, Part 2." *Journal of Linguistics* 3 (1967):199–224.

– *An Introduction to Functional äammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 1985.

– *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. Revised and enlarged by Christian Matthiessen. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Halliday Michael Alexander Kirkwood and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.

Hanson, Anthony T. "Christ in the Old Testament According to Hebrews." *SE* II (1964): 393–407.

Harkins, Angela Kim, Kelley Coblentz Bautch and John C. Endres, eds. *The Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Developments and Reception History.* CBQMS 53. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014.

Harper, William R. *The Priestly Element in the Old Testament: An Aid to Historical Study*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1905.

Harris, Zellig. "Discourse Analysis." *Language* 28 (1952):1–30.

Hartog, Paul A. "The Text of Hebrews 2:9 in its Patristic Reception." *BSac* 171 (2014): 52–71.

Hays, Richard. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Heckert, Jacob Karl. *Discourse Conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles*. Dallas, TX: SIL International, 1996.

Heidel, Alexander. *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Heil, John Paul. *Hebrews: Chiastic Structure and Audience Response*. CBQMS 46. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2010.

Hickling, Colin J. A. "John and Hebrews: The Background of Hebrews 2:10–18." *NTS* 29 (1983):112–16.

Hieke, Thomas and Tobias Nicklas, eds. *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. TBN 15. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Karrer, Martin. *Der Brief and die Hebräer Kapitel* 1,1–5,10. ÖTKNT 20/1. Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2003.

Hoey, Michael. *Patterns of Lexis*. Describing English Language Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hofius, Otfried. *Katapausis*. WUNT 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1970.

Homer. Translated by Augustus Taber Murray. 4 Vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919–1926.

Horton, Fred L. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A. D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger. *Psalms*. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005.

Hubbard, Moyer. *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*. SNTSMS 119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hughes, John J. "Hebrews IX 15 ff. and Galatians III 15 ff.: A Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure." *NovT* 21 (1979):27–96.

Hurst, Lincoln Douglas. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*. SNTSMS 65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

– "Eschatology and 'Platonism' in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 41–74 in *Seminar Papers, One Hundred Twentieth Annual Meeting, Dec. 8–11, 1984*. SBLSP. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.

Hymes, Dell. "Towards Ethnographies of Communicative Events." Pages 21–44 in *Language and Social Context*. Edited by Pier Paolo Giglio. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

Jackson, T. Ryan. *New Creation in Paul's Letters*. WUNT 2/272. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Jacobson, Rolf A. "Psalm 102." Pages 749–58 in Nancy deClaissé-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson and Beth LaNeel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.

Johnson, Bruce C. *To All the Brethren: A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to 1 Thessalonians*. ConBNT, 16. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1987.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Hebrews: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

Käsemann, Ernst. *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the He-brews*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984. Translation of *Das wandernde Gottesvolk: Eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.

Keenan, Edward L. "Two Kinds of Presupposition in Natural Language." Pages 45–54 in *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. Edited by Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terence Langen-doen. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Keizer, Heleen M. "Life, Time, Eternity: A Study of ΑΙΩΝ in Greek Literature and Philos-ophy, the Septuagint and Philo." Academisch Proefschrift, University of Amsterdam, 2010.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. "Adam Citings before the Intrusion of Satan: Recontextualizing Paul's Theology of Sin and Death." *BTB* 44 (2014):13–28.

Kibbe, Michael. "Is it Finished? When Did It Start? Hebrews, Priesthood, and Atonement in Biblical, Systematic, and Historical Perspective." *JTS* 65 (2014):25–61.

Kindt, Tom and Hans-Harald Müller. *The Implied Author: Concept and Controversy.* Ber-lin: de Gruyter, 2006.

King, Karen L. *What is Gnosticism*? Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard Univer-sity Press, 2005.

Kistemaker, Simon J. *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976. [= *TDNT*]

Kobelski, Paul J. *Melchizedek and Melchireša´*. CBQMS 10. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.

Koester, Craig. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

Kolarcik, Michael. "Creation and Salvation in the Book of Wisdom." Pages 97–107 in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*. CBQMS 24. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical As-sociation of America, 1992.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1–59*. Continental Commentaries. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989. Translation of *Psalmen 1–59*. Vol. 1. BKAT 15/1 Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.

– *Psalms 60–150*. Continental Commentaries. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minne-apolis: Fortress, 1989. Translation of *Psalmen 60–150*. Vol. 2. BKAT 15/2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.

Kugel, James. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it Was at the Start of the Com-mon Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Laansma, Jon C. *'I Will Give You Rest': The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 1–4*. WUNT 2/98. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

– "Hidden Stories in Hebrews: Cosmology and Theology." Pages 9–18 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauck-ham, Trevor Hart, Nathan MacDonald and Daniel Driver. LNTS 387. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2008.

Laansma, Jon C. and Daniel J. Treier. *Christology, Hermeneutics, and Hebrews: Profiles from the History of Interpretation*. LNTS 423. London: T&T Clark, 2012.

Labov, William. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Lamb, Sydney M. and Leonard E. Newell. *Outline of Stratificational Grammar*. Washing-ton, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1966.

Lamp, Jeffrey S. *The Greening of Hebrews?* Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.

Lane, William. *Hebrews 1–8 and Hebrews 9–13*. WBC 47A and 47B. Dallas, TX: Word
      Publishers, 1991.

–   "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium." *JBL* 78 (1959):343–46.

Larcher, Chrysostome. *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou La Sagesse de Salomon*. Vol. 2. Paris: Le-
      coffre, 1984.

Layton, Scott. "Christ Over His House (Hebrews 3:6) and Hebrew אשר על־הבית." *NTS* 37
      (1991):473–77.

Legarreta-Castillo, Felipe de Jesús. *The Figure of Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15:
      The New Creation and its Ethical and Social Reconfiguration*. Emerging Scholars. Min-
      neapolis, MN: Fortress, 2014.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the
      Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International,
      2000.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed.
      Oxford: Clarendon, 1996. [= *LSJ*]

Lindars, Barnabas. *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*. New Testament Theology.
      Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Longenecker, Richard. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,
      1975.

Louw, Johannes P. *Semantics of New Testament Greek*. SBL Semeia Series. Atlanta: Schol-
      ars Press, 1982.

Louv, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament
      Based on Semantic Domains*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
      [= *L&N*]

Lund, Nils Wilhelm. *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in Formgeschichte*. Madi-
      son, WI: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.

Mackie, Scott D. *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/223.
      Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 2007.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers and Edgar McKnight. "Introduction." Pages 15–26 in *The
      New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Elizabeth Struthers Malbon
      and Edgar McKnight. JSNTSup 109. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Manson, William. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsider-
      ation*. The Baird Lecture, 1949. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.

Marcus, Joel. "Son of Man as Son of Adam, Part 1." *RB* 110 (2003):38–61.

Mason, Eric. "Hebrews and Second Temple Jewish Traditions on the Origins of An-
      gels." Pages 63–93 in *Hebrews in Contexts*. Edited by Gabriela Gelardini and Harold
      Attridge Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

–   *'You are a Priest Forever': Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christol-
      ogy of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. STDJ 74. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Mays, James L. "What is a Human Being? Reflections on Psalm 8." *ThTo* 50 (1994):511–20.

McCarter, Peter Kyle. *1 Samuel: A New Translation*. AB 8. Garden City, NY: Doubleday,
      1979.

McDonough, Sean. *Christ as Creator: Origins of a New Testament Doctrine*. Oxford: Ox-
      ford University Press, 2009.

McFarland, Orrey. *God and Grace in Philo and Paul*. NovTSup 164. Boston: Brill, 2016.

McGowan, Andrew B. *Ancient Christian Worship: Church Practices in Social, Historical
      and Theological Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

McKay, John Michael. *Jesus as Faithful in Testing: A Key to the Rhetorical Connection Between Hebrews 3:1–6 and 3:7–4:13*. Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016.

Meier, John P. "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1–14." *Bib* 66 (1985):168–89.

– "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5–14." *Bib* 66 (1985):504–33.

Ménégoz, Eugène. *La Théologie de L'Épître aux Hébreux*. Paris: Fischbacher, 1894.

Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 9th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984. Reprint of KEK 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Minear, Paul Sevier. *Christians and the New Creation: Genesis Motifs in the New Testament*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

Mitchell, Alan. *Hebrews*. SP 13. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007.

Mitchell, Margaret. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of Corinthians*. Westminster: John Knox, 1993. Reprint of HUT 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

Moffatt, James. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924.

Moffitt, David. "Jesus' Heavenly Sacrifice in Early Christian Reception of Hebrews: A Survey." *JTS* 68 (2017):46–71.

– "Serving in the Tabernacle in Heaven: Sacred Space: Jesus's High-Priestly Sacrifice, and Hebrews' Analogical Theology." Pages 259–79 in *Hebrews in Contexts*, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91. Edited by Gabriela Gelardini and Harold Attridge. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

– *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. NovTSup 141. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Montefiore, Hugh. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. BNTC. London: Black, 1964.

Moore, Nicholas. "Jesus as 'the One Who Entered His Rest': The Christological Reading of Hebrews 4.10." *JSNT* 36 (2014):383–400.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Vol. 1. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Moyise, Steven. "Dialogical Intertextuality." Pages 3–15 in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*. Edited by Brisio Javier Oropeza and Steve Moyise. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2016.

Muddiman, John. "Wrestling with Hebrews: A Note on τετραχηλισμένα." Pages 165–74 in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton*. Edited by Christopher Rowland and Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis. JSNTSup 153. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Nauck, Wolfgang. "Zum Aufbau das Hebräerbriefes." Pages 199–206 in *Judentum Urchristentum Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*. Edited by Walther Eltester. BZNW 26. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960.

Nebe, Gottfried. "Creation in Paul's Theology." Pages 111–37 in *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow and Yair Hoffman. JSOTSup 319. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 2002.

Neeley, Linda Lloyd. "A Discourse Analysis of Hebrews." *Occasional Papers in Translation and Text Linguistics* 3–4 (1987):1–178.

Neusner, Jacob. *Leviticus Rabbah*. Vol. 4 of *A Theological Commentary on the Midrash*. Studies in Ancient Judaism. Lanham, MD: University of America Press, 2001.

– *Judaism's Story of Creation: Scripture, Halakhah, Aggadah*. Edited by Alan Avery-Peck, William Scott Green, Günter Stemberger, Ithamar Gruenwald, and José Faur. BRLAJ. 3. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

Nida, Eugene A. "The Role of Context in the Understanding of Discourse." Pages 20–27 in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Noth, Martin. *Numbers*: *A Commentary*. OTL. Translated by James D. Martin. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968. Translation of *Das Vierte Buch Mose, Numeri*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

Ounsworth, Richard. *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*. WUNT 2/238. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Paul*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1992.

Paltridge, Brian. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Continuum Discourse Series. London: Continuum, 2006.

Pannenberg, Wolfhard. *Jesus – God and Man*. 2nd ed. Translated by Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977. Translation of *Grundzüge der Christologie*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1990.

Pennington, Jonathan T. and Sean M. McDonough, eds. *Cosmology and New Testament Theology: A Brief Introduction*. LNTS 355. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2008.

Perelman, Chaim. *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities: Essays on Rhetoric and its Applications*. Boston: Reidel, 1979.

Perfetti, Charles and Susan Goldman. "Thematization and Sentence Retrieval." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13 (1979):70–79.

Peterson, David. *Hebrews and Perfection*. SNTSMS 47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Philo. Translated by Francis Henry Colson et al. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.

Pike, Kenneth Lee. *Linguistic Concepts: An Introduction to Tagmemics*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.

Pontifical Biblical Commission. *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1993.

Pople, John A. *John's Creation: A Model for Understanding the Gospel of John*. Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2005.

Porter, Stanley E. "The Concept of Covenant in Paul." Pages 269–85 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo. JSJSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

– "Is Critical Discourse Analysis Critical? An Evaluation using Philemon as a Test Case." Pages 47–70 in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley Porter and Jeffrey Reed. JSNTSup 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

– "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies." Pages 14–37 in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*. Edited by Donald Arthur Carson and Stanley Porter. JSNTSup 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

– *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. SBG 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Porter, Stanley E. and Matthew B. O'Donnell. "Semantics and Patterns of Argumentation in the Book of Romans: Definitions, Proposals, Data and Experiments." Pages 154–204 in *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. JSNTSup 193. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Ransom, John Crowe. *The New Criticism*. Norfolk, CT: New Directions, 1900.

Reed, Jeffrey T. "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria for Analyzing New Testament Discourse." Pages 28–46 in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley Porter and Jeffrey Reed. JSNTSup 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

– "Modern Linguistics and Historical Criticism: Using the Former for Doing the Latter." Pages 36–62 in *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*. Edited by Stanley Porter and Donald Arthur Carson. JSNTSup 168. Studies in New Testament Greek 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

– "Discourse Analysis." Pages 188–218 in *Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*. Stanley E. Porter. NTTS. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

– *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. JSNTSup 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Reider, Joseph. *The Book of Wisdom*. JAL 5. New York: Harper, 1957.

Reisigl Martin and Ruth Wodak. "The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)." Pages 87–121 in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. Edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer. London: Sage, 2001.

– *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and AntiSemitism*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Rhee, Victor (Sung-Yul). "The Author of Hebrews as a Leader of the Faith Community." *JETS* 55/2 (2012):365–75.

Rhoads, David and Kari Syreeni. *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. JSNTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Ruhl, Charles. *On Monosemy: A Study in Linguistic Semantics*. SUNY Series in Linguistics. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989.

Richardson, Christopher. *Pioneer and Perfecter of Faith: Jesus' Faith as the Climax of Israel's History in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/338. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

Robertson, Archibald Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Investigations*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.

Ronning, John. *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009.

Rosenberg, Gil. "Hypertextuality." Pages 16–28 in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*. Edited by Brisio Javier Oropeza and Steve Moyise. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2016.

Rudolph, Kurt. *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*. Translated and edited by Robert McLachlan Wilson. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2008. Translation of *Die Gnosis: Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion*. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1977.

Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Runia, David Theunis. *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

– *Philo in Early Christian Literature*. CRINT 3/3. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

– *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Philosophia Antiqua 44. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Samely, Alexander. *Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture in the Mishnah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Samuelson, Norbert. *Judaism and the Doctrine of Creation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Schmid, Hans Heinrich. "Creation, Righteousness and Salvation: 'Creation Theology' as the Broad Horizon of Biblical Theology." Pages 102–7 in *Creation in the Old Testament*, ed. Bernhard Anderson. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Scott, Ernest F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Doctrine and Significance*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.

Smith, Mark S. *The Priestly Vision in Genesis 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010.

Schaefer, Konrad. *Psalms*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.

Schenck, Kenneth. "Shadows and Realities." Pages 81–92 in *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*. Edited by Brisio Javier Oropeza and Steve Moyise. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2016.

– *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings for the Sacrifice*. SNTSMS 143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

– "Keeping His Appointment: Creation and Enthronement in Hebrews." *JSNT* 66 (1997):91–117.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Hermeneutics: The Handwritten Manuscripts*. Edited by Heinz Kimmerle. Translated by James Duke and Jack Forstman. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

Schmid, Wolf. "Implied Author." Pages 161–73 in *Handbook of Narratology*. Edited by Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, Jörg Schönert. Narratologia 19. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

Schneiders, Sandra. *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture*. 2nd ed. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999. Schunack, Gerd. *Der Hebräerbrief*. ZBK Neues Testament *14*. Zürich:

Theologischer Verlag, 2002. Seland, Torrey, ed. *Reading Philo*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.

Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.

Small, Brian C. *The Characterization of Jesus in the Book of Hebrews*. Bib Int. 128. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Smillie, Gene R. "The Other ΛΟΓΟΣ at the End of Heb 4:13." *NovT* 47 (2005):19–25.

– "'ὁ λόγος του θεου' in Hebrews 4:12–13." *NovT* 46 (2004):338–59.

Snyman, Andries. "Hebrews 6:2–6: From a Semiotic Discourse Perspective." Pages 355–67 in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Sowers, Sidney. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1965.

Spicq, Ceslas. "L'Authenticité du chapitre XIII de l'Épître aux Hébreux." Pages 226–36 in *Coniectanea Neotestamentica in Honorem Antonii Fridrichsen*. ConBNT 11. Lund: Gleerup, 1947.

– *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 2 Vols. Paris: Lecoffre, 1952–1953.

– "L'Épître aux Hébreux, Apollos, Jean-Baptiste, les Hellénistes et Qumran." *RevQ 1* (1959):365–90.

Stather Hunt, Bernard Patterson Wathen. *Primitive Gospel Sources*. London: James Clarke, 1951.

Stec, David M. *The Genizah Psalms: A Study of MS 978 of the Antonin Collection*. Cambridge Genizah Studies 5. Boston: Brill, 2013.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. WMANT 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967.

Sterling, Gregory E. "Prepositional Metaphysics in Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Early Christian Liturgical Texts." *SPhiloA* 9 (1997):219–38.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Steyn, Gert, J. "The Maccabean Literature and Hebrews: Some Intertextual Observations." *JSem* 24 (2015):271–91.

– "The Ending of Hebrews Reconsidered." *ZNW* 103 (2012):235–53.

– *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*. FRLANT 235. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2011.

– "The Reception of Psalm 95 (94):7–11 in Hebrews 3–4." Pages 194–228 in *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. LHBOTS 527. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Still, Todd D. "Christos as Pistos: The Faith(fullness) of Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *CBQ* 69 (2007):746–55

Svendsen, Stefan Nordgaard. *Allegory Transformed: The Appropriation of Philonic Hermeneutics in the Letter to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/269. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Sweeney, Marvin A. *Reading Prophetic Books*. FAT 89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Swetnam, James. "Jesus as λόγος in Hebrews 4,12–13." *Bib* 62 (1981):214–24.

Swinburne, Richard. *Was Jesus God?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Synge, Francis Charles. *Hebrews and the Scriptures*. London: SPCK, 1959.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading John*. London: SPCK, 1992.

Theophilos, Michael. "The Numismatic Background of χαρακτήρ in Hebrews 1:3." *ABR* 64 (2016):69–80

Theissen, Gerd. *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief*. SNT 2. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1969.

Thiessen, Matthew. "Hebrews and the End of the Exodus." *NovT* 49 (2007):252–69.

Thiselton, Anthony C. "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation." Pages 75–104 in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Edited by Ian Howard Marshall. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1977.

Thompson, James. *Hebrews*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

– *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CBQMS 13. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.

Thyen, Hartwig. *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*. FRLANT 47. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.

Timmer, Daniel C. Creation, *Tabernacle and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:12–17; 35:1–3 in Exegetical and Theological Perspective*. FRLANT 227. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

Tobin, Thomas H. "Interpretations of Creation in the World of Philo of Alexandria." Pages 108–28 in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*. Edited by Richard J. Clifford and

John J. Collins. CBQMS 24. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992.

– *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. CBQMS 14. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Poetics of Prose*. Translated and edited by Richard Howard. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977. Translation of *Poètique de la Prose*. Paris: Seuil, 1971.

– *Introduction to Poetics*. Vol. 1 of *Theory and History of Literature*. Translated by Richard Howard. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1981. Translation of *Qu'est-ce que la Structuralisme: Poétique*, and later in a revised edition, *Poétique*. Paris: Seuil, 1968, 1973.

Tönges, Elke. "The Epistle to the Hebrews as 'Jesus-Midrash.'" Pages 89–105 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods, New Insights*. BibInt 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Trobisch, David. *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*. Bolivar, MO: Quiet Waters, 2001.

van Dijk, Teun. "Discourse, Power and Access." Pages 84–106 in *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edited by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard. London: Routledge, 1996.

– "Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach." Pages 62–85 in *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Vol. 2 of *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Edited by Teun van Dijk. London: Sage, 1997.

Vanhoye, Albert. *A Different Priest: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Series Rhetorica Semitica. Translated by Leo Arnold. Miami: Convivium, 2011. Translation of *L'Épître aux Hébreux: Un prêtre différent*. Rhétorique Sémitique 7. Paris: Gabalda, 2010.

– *The Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Sub Bi 12. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989. Translation of *Le message de l'Épître aux Hébreux*. Translated by James Swetnam. Paris: Cerf, 1977, combined with *A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Translated by James Swetnam. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.

– *Old Testament Priests and the New Priest According to the New Testament*. Studies in Scripture. Petersham, MA: St. Bede's Publications, 1986. Translation of *Prêtres anciens. Prêtre nouveau selon le Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Seuil, 1980.

– Le Christ est notre prêtre: *la doctrine de l'Épître aux Hébreux*. Vie Chrétienne 118. Toulouse: Fournié, 1969.

– *A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Translated by James Swetnam. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964. Translation of *Traduction structurée de l'Épître aux Hébreux*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

– *La situation du Christ: Hébreux 1–2*. LD 58. Paris: Cerf, 1969.

– *The Letter to the Hebrews: A New Commentary*. New York, NJ: Paulist, 2015.

Von Harnack, Adolf. "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Translated by Luther D. Lazarus. *Lutheran Church Review* 19 (1900):448–471.

Von Soden, Hermann. "Der Hebräerbrief." *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 10 (1884):435–93, 627–56.

Walker, Jeffrey. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wallis, Richard T. and Jay Bregman eds. *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*. Vol. 6 of *Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern*. Edited by R. Baine Harris. Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1992.

Walser, Georg. *Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews*. WUNT 2/356. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Weber, Max. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, Grundriss der Sozialökonomik* 3. 5th ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1980.

Wedderburn, Alexander J. M. "The 'Letter' to the Hebrews and its Thirteenth Chapter." *NTS* 50 (2004):390–405.

Weeks, Stuart. "The Context and Meaning of Proverbs 8:30." *JBL* 125 (2006):433–42.

Weiser, Arthur. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1962.

Weiss, Hans-Friedrich. *Der Brief and die Hebräer*. KEK 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1991.

Welch, John Woodland. *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981.

Wellhausen, Julius F. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Berlin: Reimer, 1883.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1–15*. WBC 1. Dallas, TX: Word, 1987.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays*. London: Macmillan, 1889.

Westfall, Cynthia Long. "Blessed Be the Ties that Bind: Semantic Domains and Cohesive Chains in Hebrews 1:1–2:4 and 12:5–8." *JGRChJ* 6 (2009):199–216.

– A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship Between Form and Meaning. LNTS 297. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

White, John. "Stratificational Grammar: A New Theory of Language." *College Composition and Communication* 20:3 (Oct. 1969):191–97.

Whitlark, Jason. Resisting Empire: Rethinking the Purpose of the Letter to 'the Hebrews'. LNTS 484. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.

Widdess, Arthur G. "A note on Hebrews xi.2." *JTS* 10 (1959):327–29

Williams, Michael Allen. Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Williamson, Ronald. *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

– "The Incarnation of the Logos in Hebrews." *Exp.Tim.*95 (1983):4–8.

– *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ALGHJ 4. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Wills, Lawrence. "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and early Christianity." *HTR 77* (1984):277–99.

Wilson, Andrew J. "Hebrews 3:6B and 3:14 Revisited." *TynBul* 62 (2011):247–68.

Windisch, Hans. *Der Hebräerbrief*. HNT 14. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1931.

Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. AB 43. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

Witherington, Ben. *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Hebrews, James and Jude*. Downers Grove, IL. Inter-Varsity, 2007.

– *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

Wodak, Ruth and Michael Myer. "Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology." Pages 1–33 in in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. Edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer. London: Sage, 2001.

Worthington, Jonathan D. *Creation in Paul and Philo: The Beginning and Before*. WUNT 2/317. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Wray, Judith Hoch. Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth: Early Christian Homiletics of Rest. SBLDS 166. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Wright, Nicholas Thomas. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Yadin, Yigael. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 36–55 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. ScrHier 4. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958.

Yee, Gale A. "The Theology of Creation in Proverbs 8:22–31." Pages 85–96 in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*. Edited by Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins. CBQMS 24. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992.

Zuntz, Günther. "*The Text of the Epistle: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum.*" The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Websites:

http://www.codexsinaiticus.org/en/manuscript.aspx?book=46&chapter=2&lid=en&side=r&zoomSlider=0tat