Hebrews

George H. Guthrie

Introduction

At the end of a group of parables on things gathered into the kingdom of heaven, Matthew records these words of Jesus: "For this reason every scholar who has become a disciple of the kingdom of heaven is comparable to a man with property who brings out of his storeroom both new and old things" (Matt. 13:52). Whatever the identity of the scholar who wrote the NT book of Hebrews, he fulfills this description admirably, bringing to his task a rich mix of skills, both rhetorical and rabbinic, drawing from the ancient texts at his disposal and presenting them in light of his received christocentric tradition, with the intention of offering strong encouragement to a beleaguered community. With good reason, the book recently has been called the "Cinderella" of NT studies (McCullough 1994: 66), but its astute scholar has crafted what might be called the "Queen" when it comes to the use of the OT in the NT. No NT book, with perhaps the exception of Revelation, presents a discourse so permeated, so crafted, both at the macro- and microlevels, by various uses to which the older covenant texts are put, and his appropriation of the text is radically different from the book's apocalyptic cousin. (For a more complete introduction to the use of the OT in Hebrews than follows here, see G. H. Guthrie 1997; 2003.)

As we come to the task of analyzing in detail the appropriation of the OT text by Hebrews, we immediately are presented with striking challenges. To a great extent Hebrews marks overt quotations well, but the exact line between quotation and allusion is not always perfectly clear (e.g., the use of Gen. 15:5 at 11:12, which has no introductory formula). With recent work on OT echoes in the NT (e.g., Hays 1989), identifying echoes and distinguishing them from allusions also has become a factor. Furthermore, Hebrews is so permeated with general references to OT topics, allusions to historical events, and repetition or exposition of those passages that have been introduced overtly, that the task of exact enumeration of the author's uses of the OT has taxed the efforts of many a student of the book. Longenecker (1975: 164), for instance, counted thirty-eight quotations, whereas Westcott (1909: 472) and Caird (1959: 47) each found only twenty-nine. Michel (1986: 151) discerned thirty-two, Spicq thirty-six (1952–1953: 1:331), and Bratcher (1969: 57–67) forty.

Based on the treatment of the OT in Hebrews that follows, I count roughly thirty-seven quotations, forty allusions, nineteen cases where OT material is summarized, and thirteen where an OT name or topic is referred to without reference to a specific context. As for echoes, Hays's tests have been utilized (for an explanation of these tests

see Hays 1989: 29–32). Yet, while cognizant of these criteria, as a methodological approach I have given special weight to aspects of the third test: recurrence. In light of the extent and pervasiveness of Hebrews' uses of the OT, I suggest that the tracking of echoes might best begin with a consideration of the broader contexts of the book's citations. Of course, there are places where an author uses echoes not originating in the contexts of his or her direct quotations, as is demonstrated below. However, when one is stepping out on uncertain ground, it is better to step first on the firmer parts of a path rather than the softer spots of a wide-open field, and the contexts of the quotations are, at least, an appropriate place to begin our search, for here we are assured both of Hays's first and third criteria: availability and recurrence.

As Hays (1989: 20) points out, "Allusive echo functions to suggest to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed." In his study on the influence of Isa. 7–9 on Matthew's soteriology, Carter (2000: 505), following Lars Hartman, suggests that intertextual elements invoke the authority of the source text, using the words of that text but at times pointing beyond the intertextual element to a larger complex of ideas. In line with Hartman, Carter (2000: 506) is concerned to move away from atomistic treatments of citations, which detach them from any scriptural context and ignore "the audience's knowledge of a larger common tradition." This is much in line with the suggestions of Dodd (1961), who proposed that a quotation from the OT serves to bring to mind a broader OT context. It also makes sense in communication contexts, such as the preaching of sermons today. Imagine, for instance, a preacher, expounding on the theme of the need for love in the church, who exhorts, "Let's not be clanging cymbals!" This reference calls to mind, of course, the whole of 1 Cor. 13. That chapter is so foregrounded in the conscience of most Christian congregations, both by its distinctiveness and its popularity, that the allusion would be readily identifiable.

In line with this dynamic, it may be suggested that the author of Hebrews, rather than taking an atomistic approach to citations from Israel's Scriptures, had in mind, and at times used, OT references in light of their broader contexts. For instance, the author's reasons for using the brief quotation from Isaiah at 2:13 are barely discernible until one considers the broader, messianic context from which the quotation hails. The broader contexts of many of Hebrews' quotations, moreover, would have been familiar to the hearers, stemming from their Scriptures, though some contexts certainly would have been more familiar than others, depending on the level of popularity and use. Such a circumstance, therefore, challenges us not to be atomistic in our analysis of the OT citations and allusions. In my study of the uses of the OT in Hebrews, therefore, I have systematically examined the broader contexts of every quotation (as presented in the LXX), looking for elements that might be echoed elsewhere in Hebrews.

There are a number of places where interpreters have already noted what might be considered echoes of the OT text. For instance, Lane (1991) points to Ps. 92:1 LXX (93:1 MT) and Ps. 95:10 LXX (96:10 MT) as the source for *tēn oikoumenēn* in Heb. 1:6; 2:5, which he equates with the age to come (6:5) and the city to come (13:14). Both psalm passages proclaim that this "world," established with the reign of God, "shall not be shaken," a part of these psalms alluded to overtly at 12:28. Lane (1991: 1:46) comments, "The explicit allusion to 'a kingdom that cannot be shaken' in Heb. 12:28 indicates that these passages were not far from the writer's mind when he penned v. 5." Thus, the uses of *tēn oikoumenēn* at 1:6; 2:5 echo these two psalms.

Elsewhere I have argued that the author's use at 3:16–19 of *subiectio*—a rhetorical pattern of asking and answering a series of questions in rapid-fire manner—takes its questions from Ps. 95:7b–11 and its answers from a network of passages bemoaning the wilderness rebellion (G. H. Guthrie 1998: 131). That those who came out of Egypt with Moses were the ones who rebelled against the Lord (3:16) may be concluded from Ps. 106, Num. 14:1–38, or Deut. 9. That it was "those who sinned, whose bodies fell in the desert" with whom God was upset (3:17) echoes either Ps. 106 or Num. 14:1–38. The concept of the disobedient ones as those to whom God swore that they would not enter his rest (3:18) finds expression in Deut. 9:7, 24. Finally, the unit concludes with a summary statement in 3:19, explaining that at its core the wanderers' inability to enter God's

rest stemmed from their unbelief, thus linking the concepts of unbelief and disobedience. This important "unbelief" motif occurs in Deut. 9:23; Num. 14:11; Ps. 78:22, 32. These allusions, rather than being overt—some of them cannot be pinpointed as to location—constitute recollections (to use Hays's word) of prominent concepts. Thus, these interrelated passages form somewhat a hall of echoes from which the author draws.

Other examples could be given. My interest in Hebrews research originates from a 1954 article by August Strobel in which he suggests that the "cries and tears" of 5:7, although not part of the Gethsemane accounts, probably stem from Ps. 116, a "prayer of righteous suffering" (Strobel 1954). The faintness of the allusion, however, would suggest that these be considered echoes expressing, however faintly, reflection on Jesus' experience in Gethsemane in light of early Christian appropriation of "righteous sufferer" psalm material.

More recently, Mathewson (1999) has offered a highly suggestive article entitled "Heb 6:4–6 in Light of the Old Testament." Mathewson (1999: 214) argues that "the author's language in 6:4–6 is colored by OT references by means of allusion and echo apart from direct citation." Thus, the descriptions of those who have fallen away—descriptions so elusive and divisive in the history of interpretation—stem from the passages about wilderness wandering, continuing an exhortation dynamic begun in 3:7–19. For instance, Mathewson (1999: 216–17) suggests that those who were "enlightened" echoes the pillar of fire by which the Israelites were "enlightened" on their way (Neh. 9:12, 19; Ps. 105:39). The "heavenly gift" that those under consideration had tasted echoes those passages that refer to the heavenly gift of manna, which the Lord gave to people of the wilderness generation. In texts such as Exod. 16:15; Neh. 9:15; Ps. 78:24 (77:24 LXX) the heavenly bread is said to have been given (*edōken*) to them. For Mathewson, that those who have fallen away had become companions of the Holy Spirit (6:4c) echoes the experience of the wilderness wanderers, who had extensive interaction with the Spirit of God, as witnessed in numerous passages (e.g., Neh. 9:20; 11:17, 25; Isa. 63:11). Having considered the elements describing the fallen in 6:4–6, Mathewson (1999: 223) concludes, "The author is not just alluding to snippets of texts and isolated vocabulary for rhetorical color, but by alluding to texts which belong to a larger matrix of ideas he is evoking the entire context and story of Israel's experience in the wilderness." Thus, the author of Hebrews utilizes the language of the OT to describe a particularly grievous abandonment of the Christian community in his day.

In a few cases I will add to this list in the pages that follow. The identifiable echoes in Hebrews are not many, the author wishing rather to carry forward his discourse on the strength of his considerable quotations and overt allusions. Nonetheless, a couple of the echoes have import for interpretation at key points (e.g., 1:4; 3:3–6).

In terms of his employment of different parts of the Scriptures, the author of Hebrews depends most heavily by far on Psalms, drawing from this well especially in support of his christological proclamations. Nineteen of the quotations and another fifteen allusions come from this portion of the OT. The Pentateuch is accessed via nine quotations (three from Genesis, two from Exodus, four from Deuteronomy) and another fifteen allusions (eight from Genesis, one from Exodus, two from Levicitus, two from Numbers, two from Deuteronomy), often in relation to redemptive history. Among the prophets, Isaiah holds pride of place with three quotations and four allusions, and Jeremiah follows closely with two quotations and three allusions. Habakkuk, Haggai, Proverbs, and 2 Samuel each are quoted once, and Joshua is alluded to a single time, as possibly are Proverbs and Job.

The quotations are introduced normally as falling from the lips of God, forms of the verb *legō* being employed most often. In fact, twenty-three of the quotations in Hebrews have God as the speaker. Four passages put the words of the OT on the lips of Christ, and four others are attributed to the Holy Spirit. In addition, Moses speaks a command of God at 9:20 and is terrified at God's revelation at 12:21. Yet, the context is still that of divine revelation. The introductory formula at 2:6 is an anomaly ("But somewhere one has testified, saying . . ."). The ambiguity of the formula, which acknowledges this messianic psalm as framed from a human perspective, may serve to keep the focus on God as the primary speaker of Scripture.

The issues surrounding the text form used by Hebrews have been studied extensively since the middle part of the last century and have increasingly focused on the differences that we find between the author's form of quotation and known forms of the Old Greek text. With rare exception, the assumption is that a Greek, rather than a Hebrew, text was used by the author. Bleek initiated the format for the debate in the nineteenth century. In his commentary Bleek (1828) argued against Pauline authorship of Hebrews, partly on the basis that Paul used a text similar to Codex Vaticanus (Codex B) when quoting a Greek text. According to Bleek, Hebrews gives evidence of its author's partiality to a text similar to Codex Alexandrinus (Codex A). However, scholars such as Katz (1958) questioned Bleek's observations about LXX A, and discussions for most of the twentieth century focused on how the author's text related to one, or both, of these major codices. Arguing that Hebrews follows neither Codex A nor Codex B exclusively, Thomas (1965) suggested that Hebrews combines the more primitive elements of each, probably utilizing an earlier form of the Greek text. Howard (1968), on the other hand, proposed that Hebrews reflects a form of the Hebrew text earlier than the MT that was used in the revision or standardization of the LXX, a suggestion mentioned also by Barth (1962) and others.

McCullough, in his 1971 dissertation and later in a 1979–1980 article, concluded that for several books of the OT, such as Jeremiah and Psalms, the recension from which the text quoted is taken is fairly clear, whereas definite conclusions concerning other OT books were elusive. Therefore, he emphasized the need to study the Greek text forms on a book-by-book basis rather than drawing wide-ranging conclusions concerning specific recensions of the Old Greek text. All these explanations, of course, have to do with issues of textual transmission. Other explanations of the form of the OT quotations in Hebrews are possible: (1) corruption of the Epistle to the Hebrews; (2) adjustments based on prior tradition of interpretation (e.g., in the Christian community); (3) a lapse of memory on part of the author as he is quoting the OT text; (4) the author accommodated himself to the Greek text form at hand for his audience; (5) a freedom on the part of the author to make adjustments to the Greek text for stylistic reasons; (6) a freedom on the part of the author to make slight adjustments or paraphrases that are theologically motivated.

The last two of these suggestions form the dominant view in discussions of the past two decades. Silva (1983: 155) moves in this direction by suggesting that the NT authors exercise freedom in paraphrasing the OT text as they interpret and apply it. He also leaves open the possibility that the author of Hebrews exercises freedom in proactively using the LXX form for theological reasons. Leschert (1994: 245–47) suggests that the author handled his *Vorlage* as authoritative and generally followed it consistently. Yet, the author may have altered the *Vorlage* slightly to improve on its literary style or to emphasize points of theology, but it is difficult, Leschert notes, to determine which departures from the septuagintal texts that we have were actually in his form of the Greek text and which were his own adjustments. Bateman (1997: 240) concludes the same, that in keeping with his historical milieu, the author freely edits his OT both for stylistic balance and for theological emphasis. G. Hughes (1979: 59) suggests that by doing new-covenant reflection on the old-covenant text, the author of Hebrews creates a new *logia*, and this process may, in line with the techniques utilized by exegetes of the day, involve altering the text to suit the author's interpretation. Very similar is the conclusion by Enns regarding the author's use of Ps. 95 in chapter 3. Enns (1997: 362) states, "Apparently, the author seems to have no difficulty in taking certain liberties with the text in order to make his theological point. His exegetical technique is similar to what we find, for example, in the commentaries of the Qumran community." Jobes (1992: 183–85) proposes that the changes that we find in the author's quotation of Ps. 40 create a phonetic assonance, a pleasing style, and she notes similar dynamics in five other quotations in Hebrews. Further, Jobes (1992: 191) suggests that such changes accomplish a theological purpose: they highlight the discontinuity between the old and the new eras.

These authors feel varying degrees of comfort in suggesting that the author of Hebrews is making substantive changes in the message of the OT text. Most argue that he makes interpretive renderings that in essence are in line with the basic meaning

of the OT text but bring out the greater significance of that meaning as fulfilled in Christ. At the same time, they acknowledge that the variants in the textual histories of both the Hebrew and Old Greek texts may account for some of these changes. Thus, one rather substantial current in research on Hebrews' use of the OT consists of a move away from focus on the question of a specific textual form behind the book and a move toward consideration of the author's own minor adjustments in presentation of the text for stylistic and theological purposes.

All issues concerning the OT in Hebrews come down to the author's uses or appropriations of the text for specific ends, and I offer the following as a brief summary on that topic. There are striking uses of the OT that assimilate numerous OT texts in an overarching method, such as the use of *ḥāraz* (the "string of pearls" method) at 1:5–14 and the beautiful *exempla* (example list) of chapter 11. These treatments rest on the building up of an impressive amount of evidence for the point being made. In the case of 1:5–14, the superiority of the Son to the angels comes through forcefully by the number of quotations offered. The *exempla*, on the other hand, by providing concisely expressed example after example, drives home the necessity of a life of faith for one who would please God. To these uses of a method that takes in numerous texts may be added, for instance, the running exposition on Ps. 95:7–11 that extends from 3:7 to 4:11. The exposition of the psalm is aided by the echoes from other "wandering" passages of the OT (3:16–19) and the addition of Gen. 2:2 at 4:4. On the other end of the spectrum, some of the author's arguments turn on a minute detail of the text in question, such as his seizing on the word "new" (*kainē*) from Jer. 38 LXX (31 MT) at 8:13 or the temporal logic inherent in Ps. 39 LXX (40 MT) at 10:8–9.

Of Hillel's principles or guidelines for appropriating the Scriptures, the author uses both verbal analogy and a fortiori argument consistently. The former serves to bring together sibling texts for support of a topic (such as those paired in the catena of 1:5–14) or to make a transition in the argument at hand (e.g., the move from exaltation in chap. 1, which culminates in the quotation of Ps. 110:1, to the focus on incarnation facilitated by the quotation of Ps. 8 at 2:5–9, these two psalms having a key phrase in common). The latter technique forms a basis for the author's harsh warnings, for instance, and thus does much to support the hortatory purpose of the book.

More than any other technique, and sometimes in conjunction with other techniques, the author of Hebrews uses "reinforcement" (G. H. Guthrie 1997: 843–44) either to support a theological point just made or to bolster a word of exhortation (2:5–8a, 12–13; 3:15; 4:7; 5:5–6; 7:17, 21; 8:5, 7; 10:16–17, 30, 37–38; 12:26; 13:5–6). The form normally followed is that of the theological point or exhortation immediately followed by the reinforcing quotation. This technique highlights a general orientation in Hebrews' use of the OT, one that certainly is related to the book's genre. For, more than any other NT book, Hebrews, from beginning to end, *preaches* the OT. The author's explanations of the text serve ultimately to communicate a forceful message aimed at convincing the hearers/readers to respond by persevering in following Christ and standing with his church. His Christology vies for a christocentric life. His hortatory material has one aim: to present a resolute call to endurance and holy living. This is the task that he takes up in taking up the OT, and he carries it out with rhetorical power and artistry.

Hebrews 1

The book of Hebrews begins with a ceremonious, beautifully constructed period concerning the climax of revelation (1:1–2a) and the person, work, and status of God's Son (1:2b–4). The sentence begins by contrasting the revelation given during the time prior to the coming of the Messiah, expressed with "formerly" (*palai*), with that given "in these last days" (*ep' eschatou tōn hēmerōn toutōn*). Then the author turns to a series of three relative clauses describing the Son.

1:2

The first relative clause in the book's introduction (1:2b) concerns the Son's appointment as "heir of all things" (*klēronomon pantōn*), an allusion to Ps. 2:8. Just a few verses later, at 1:5, the author quotes Ps. 2:7, which should be taken as God's induction of the Messiah to his position as king of the universe upon his exaltation to the right hand. The allusion to the eighth verse of the

psalm, however, is eschatological in force, pointing ultimately to Christ's total rule (e.g., Heb. 2:5–9), and is balanced with a confession of the Son's role as agent of creation in the following clause ("through whom he made the universe"). The author has taken the "nations" and "ends of the earth" of the psalm verse and interpreted them expansively as "all things." Inheritance serves as a key theme of Hebrews (1:14; 6:12, 17; 9:15; 11:7–8; 12:17).

1:3

The introduction's third relative clause (1:3–4) forms the climax of the introduction, and at the heart of this third clause is "he sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high," an overt allusion to Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX). Whereas "God" is the subject of the sentence prior to this third relative clause, the sentence now shifts to the Son as subject, which some have seen as an indication that traditional material is in play (e.g., Martin 1967: 19; Sanders 1971: 19). Further, this third relative clause is supported by four subordinate clauses, three in 1:3 ("being . . . , bearing . . . , having made . . .") and one in 1:4 ("having become . . ."), which point to the Son's person, work, and status. These all have the exaltation to the right hand as their central reference. In this way the author brings the Son's exaltation into sharp focus. Psalm 110:1 serves as a key to the structural development of the book, being quoted at 1:13 and alluded to here and at 8:1; 10:12; 12:2 (see commentary on Heb. 1:13 below).

1:4

At 1:4 the author speaks of the superior "name" (*onoma*) inherited by the Son. Recent commentators have given various interpretations of this *onoma*, but most understand it as a stylistic replacement for the title "Son." Others have suggested the title "Lord" or even "High Priest" is in mind. Still others have understood the term *onoma* to be a title in and of itself connoting the Messiah's power, divinity, and superior rank (e.g., G. H. Guthrie 1998: 50).

Interpretations of the use of *onoma* at 1:4 typically overlook the broader context of several of the OT passages in the "string of pearls" found in 1:5–14, among them 2 Sam. 7:14 (2 Kgdms. 7:14 LXX), quoted by the author in his next breath at 1:5. The Nathan oracle of 2 Sam. 7 and 1 Chron. 17 plays a vital role in OT thought concerning the house of David. In the Samuel version the passage is introduced saying, among other things, that the Lord had given David an inheritance on every side (7:1). The passage continues with God telling David, "I made a name for you according to the names of the great ones of the earth" (7:9 = 1 Chron. 17:8). In 7:13, the verse immediately prior to the quotation used by the author of Hebrews in 1:5, we find this promise concerning David's son: "He shall build a house for me for my name [*tō onomati mou*], and I will establish his throne forever." Here the OT author associates the name of the Lord and the throne of David's son, as is the case in Heb. 1:3–4. At 7:23 David says to the Lord, "What other nation on earth is like your people Israel, in that God guided him, to redeem for himself a people, to make himself a name, to accomplish greatness and visibility?" and in 7:26, "Let your name be magnified forever." In each of these last two uses of *onoma* the name of the Lord is emphasized. Thus, the author of 2 Sam. 7 uses *onoma* four times (7:9, 13, 23, 26), the name of David and the name of the Lord both coming into play. At Heb. 1:6 there also may be an association of Ps. 88 (89 MT) with the Nathan oracle of 2 Sam. 7/1 Chron. 17, that psalm offering a possible origin for the use of *prōtotokon* in the introductory formula. That psalm also places emphasis on the name of the Lord in 88:17, 25 (89:17, 25 MT; 89:16, 24 ET). In 88:25 (89:25 MT; 89:24 ET) God says of David, "And my truth and my mercy will be with him, and in my name [*en tō onomati mou*] his horn will be exalted."

The proposition that the *onoma* of 1:4 echoes 2 Sam. 7 finds further support by the occurrence of *megalōsynē* in both 1:3–4 and 2 Sam. 7. In 1:3 the author makes an allusion to Ps. 110:1 with the words "he sat down at the right hand of majesty." At this position at the right hand of majesty Jesus has been exalted, having become as much better than the angels as his inherited name is superior to theirs.

The term *megalōsynē*, found in the NT twice in Hebrews (1:3; 8:1) and at Jude 25, occurs fairly infrequently in the Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures as well. It occurs only in about nine contexts in some form of association with the name of God (Deut. 32:3; 1 Chron. 17:19–21; 22:5; 29:11–13; Prov. 18:10; Dan. 2:20; Odes

2:3; Sir. 39:15, and, in our text under consideration, 2 Sam. 7:21–23). At 2 Sam. 7:21–23, in the prayer in which David answers the oracle of God given through Nathan, David praises God for having brought about all this greatness (*megalōsynēn* [7:21]), speaking of the establishment of David's royal house, his kingdom, and his throne. Indeed, according to the passage, God has made a name for himself by accomplishing the greatness (*megalōsynēn*) of David's reign (7:23). Further, the cognate verb is used in 7:22, 26. In 7:22 David proclaims that God has worked great things on David's behalf that he might magnify (*megalynai*) the Lord, and in 7:26 David, speaking to the Lord, says, "Let your name be magnified [*megalyntheiē*] forever." The greatness of a name also is expressed at 7:9, where God says to David, "I will make your name like the names of the great ones [*tōn megalōn*] of the earth." Although the evidence should not be pressed too far, it may be that the descriptor of God's right hand as *tēs megalōsynēs* by the author of Hebrews in 1:3 is picked up from this context and used by him to describe God's work in the exaltation.

Thus, the use of *onoma* in 1:4, in association with God's right hand as *tēs megalōsynēs*, could be understood as an anticipatory echo of that broader messianic context of 2 Sam. 7 to which our author immediately will point in 1:5. The inherited "name," then, mentioned in 1:4, is, on this reading, not to be understood as an allusion to the title "Son," but rather as an honor conferred by God on the Messiah as the Davidic heir at the establishment of his throne and in association with God himself. This fulfills Hays's criteria of availability, volume (especially in terms of source text), recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, and satisfaction.

1:5

A. The Immediate NT Context: A Chain Quotation on the Son's Superiority to the Angels. Teachers in broader Judaism, among both the rabbis and the interpreters of Qumran, at times used "catchwords" to string together OT texts revolving around a particular theme. These chain quotations, or *ḥāraz*, brought to bear a quantity of scriptural evidence to support the teacher's topic. The text of 1:5–12 consists of three movements, each one having a pair of OT quotations from the Septuagint that supports the superiority of the Son over the angels. The Son's unique relationship to the Father, and his enthronement, constitute the focus of Ps. 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14 at 1:5, joined by the catchwords *huios* ("son") and *egō* ("I"), as well as, perhaps, the pronoun *mou/moi* ("my," "to me") and the verb of being. The second pair of texts, Deut. 32:43/Ps. 96:7 LXX (97:7 MT/ET) and Ps. 103:4 LXX (104:4 MT/ET) at 1:6–7, treat the angels, who worship the Son and function as servants, in terms of their inferior status and are joined by their common use of *angeloi/angelous*. The Son's eternal reign and role in relation to the cosmos is the concern of the third pair of texts, Ps. 44:7–8 LXX (45:7–8 MT; 45:6–7 ET) and Ps. 101:26–28 LXX (102:26–28 MT; 102:25–27 ET), at 1:8–12. These are joined by the various forms of the second-person personal pronouns in both passages. The climax of the chain occurs with the quotation of Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX) at 1:13, capping off a chain of OT texts that speak eloquently of the superiority of God's Son. Moreover, the chain functions to set up the argument "from lesser to greater" (*qal wahomer*) found in 2:1–4. Thus, the quotation of Ps. 2:7 introduces the chain quotation on the superiority of Christ to the angels.

Psalm 2:7, moreover, is introduced at 1:5 with the rhetorical question "For to which of the angels did God ever say . . . ?" (*tini gar eipen pote tōn angelōn*), an approximation of which is repeated at 1:13. These rhetorical questions, along with these conceptually related psalms, form an *inclusio* that brackets the chain quotation. Further, Ps. 2:7 stands at the front of the first main christological movement of the book, which concerns the position of the Son in relation to the angels (1:5–2:18), and is used also at 5:5 to introduce the book's second main christological movement, which concerns the position of the Son in relation to the earthly sacrificial system. These two uses of Ps. 2:7 form "parallel introductions" to these two great christological movements of the book.

B. The Original OT Context. In its original context Ps. 2 speaks of the rebellion of the nations and their rulers against God and his Anointed One. This rebellion, however, will be smashed by the awesome, overwhelming power of the king whom God has enthroned on Mount Zion. The first movement of the psalm (2:1–3) depicts the insolence of the heathen nations. They rage

against the Lord, make empty plots (2:1), take a united stand (2:2), and proclaim their desire to get out from under the rule of the Lord and his Anointed One (2:3). The second movement of the psalm (2:4–6) constitutes the Lord's response. He laughs at and ridicules these rebellious kings (2:4), and then he speaks harshly to them (2:5). In 2:6, the MT has the Lord's proclamation that he has installed his choice of king on Mount Zion, while the LXX places the confession in the mouth of the king himself ("I have been appointed [*katestathēn*] king" [aorist passive indicative of *kathistēmi*]). The passage then shifts to a confession of confidence based on the Lord's decree. God has proclaimed that the Davidic king is his heir and that the nations, even to the ends of the earth, are his inheritance (2:7–8). The "I have begotten you" does not refer to the king being physically born of God, as might be expected in ancient eastern Mediterranean mythology; rather, "the father-son relationship so expressed connotes divine sponsorship, support, or assistance for the king, and by implication for his dynasty" (Fitzmyer 2000: 66). Consequently, being supported by God, the king's rule will constitute victory over the rebellious nations (2:9). The final movement (2:10–12), therefore, expresses a warning to the leaders of the earth. They should serve the Lord in fear and rejoice in trembling (2:11). They should accept his correction (LXX) or submit to the son (MT) and allow themselves to find refuge in him. Thus, the psalm displays a resounding confession of the Lord's support of his vicegerent, the Davidic king.

Finally, we should note a number of lexical parallels between the broader context of this psalm and Ps. 110 (109 LXX), which is alluded to at 1:3 and quoted at 1:13. The two, both royal psalms, are connected by the following: "Lord" (110:1; 2:2, 4, 7, 11); the concept of "sitting" or "dwelling" (110:1; 2:4); the concept of "enemies" (110:1–2; 2:2); "scepter" (110:2; 2:9); "Zion" (110:2; 2:6); the concept of "shattering" (110:5–6; 2:9); "wrath" (110:5; 2:12); "judge" (110:6; 2:10); "nations" (110:6; 2:1).

C. Relevant Uses of the OT Reference in Jewish Sources. Appendix A of *The Manual of Discipline* describes the "last days" as an ideal period in the future. In this appendix is described a feast that will take place upon the arrival of Messiah (1Q28a II, 11–12), which is reminiscent of the marriage feast of the Lamb in the NT (Rev. 19:6–9). God is said to "beget" the Messiah of Israel, who comes from the line of David, although this reading is disputed (Wise, Abegg, and Cook 1996: 144). If it is authentic, as many conclude, it constitutes an allusion to Ps. 2:7.

Although not specifically alluding to Ps. 2:7, both 4Q174 1 I, 10–II, 5 and *Pss. Sol.* 17:14–20 deal with the broader context of Ps. 2 as a whole. 4QFlor174 1 I, 18–II, 2 quotes Ps. 2:1–2, speaking of the nations raging and setting themselves against the Lord and his anointed. *Psalms of Solomon* 17:14–20 also speaks of the Lord raising up a king for his people, and it contains a plea that the king have the strength to destroy the unrighteous rulers, driving them from the inheritance. This destruction is described in the words of Ps. 2:9 and concerns the "shattering" of the sinners with a rod of iron.

Both Ps. 2:7 and Ps. 110:1 seem to be alluded to at *T. Levi* 4:2, where the concepts of "son" and "priest" occur together. In this passage "son" refers to the anointed priest, and the statement constitutes a parallel to the king as God's son (*OTP* 1:789 note 4a).

Much later, *b. Sukkah* 52a reads, "Our Rabbis taught, The Holy One, blessed be He, will say to the Messiah, the son of David (May he reveal himself speedily in our days!), 'Ask of me anything, and I will give it to thee,' as it is said, *I will tell of the decree* etc. *this day have I begotten thee, ask of me and I will give the nations for thy inheritance*" (italics added). Here Ps. 2:7 is used to reinforce that the Holy One will give the Messiah anything he asks, with the line from the psalm "I will give the nations for thy inheritance" understood as expressing God's limitless giving to the Davidic heir.

Thus, Ps. 2:7 is applied consistently to the Messiah in the Jewish literature through several centuries. For the most part, the psalm is associated with hearty anticipation of Messiah's coming and the vindication of God's people before the unbelieving nations.

D. The Textual Background. At Ps. 2:7 there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the Hebrew and the Septuagint texts (the text of the Greek OT seems very stable at this point), and between the Septuagint text and the quotation

as found in Hebrews. This seems to point to Hebrews' use of the Septuagint, since the two would be unlikely to translate the Hebrew in exactly the same way. Two interesting dynamics in the immediate context of Ps. 2:7, however, might be mentioned. First, at 2:6, the Qal perfect in the Hebrew text, "I have installed," has become an aorist passive in the LXX, "I have been appointed." Thus, in the Hebrew the Lord speaks of his appointment of the king, whereas in the Greek the king himself speaks of his appointment by the Lord. Also, in 2:12 the Hebrew text presents an exhortation to the earthly rulers to submit themselves reverently to the son, the appointed king, and it is the son who is the subject of the rest of the verse. In the Greek translation, however, the rulers are to accept correction and seek refuge from the Lord.

E. How Ps. 2:7 Is Understood and Used at Heb. 1:5. On one level, as indicated in our consideration of the use of Ps. 2 in broader Judaism, and certainly in the case of early Christianity, Ps. 2 was read at times as messianic. The psalm builds on the 2 Sam. 7 promise to David regarding the world dominance to be accomplished by his dynasty. Yet, of course, such dominance was not realized by any of the kings of David's line. Thus, Ps. 2:7 must have anticipated a greater fulfillment. At both Acts 13:33 and in Heb. 1:5; 5:5 the psalm seems to be understood as a direct verbal prophecy fulfilled in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ.

On another level, the psalm is used rhetorically to reinforce the central proclamation of the chain quotation: the Son of God is superior to the angels. The rhetorical question that opens the chain constitutes a proclamation of that superiority, and the quotations that follow, given with no elaboration, are to be taken at face value as witnesses to the Son's supremacy from various vantage points. Further, this psalm, along with 2 Sam. 7:14, to which it is tethered by verbal analogy, is programmatic due to the concept of sonship, a concept that has great influence in Hebrews from the introduction through 5:11.

Of the seven interpretive principles attributed to Hillel (*t. Sanh.* 7:11; *'Abot R. Nat.* [A] §37), verbal analogy (*gezerah shavah*) is one of two that the author of Hebrews uses extensively in appropriating the OT. The principle of verbal analogy suggests that two passages having the same or similar wording may be interpreted one in light of the other. Psalm 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14, appearing together in 1:5, are joined by catchwords: *huios* ("son") and *egō* ("I"), as well as, perhaps, the pronoun *mou/moi* ("my," "to me") and the verb of being. Both have the form of proclamations, and both work to speak of God's open proclamation of the Son, as Messiah, heir of all creation, upon his exaltation to the right hand (Heb. 1:3; Ps. 110:1).

F. The Theological Use of the OT Material. It seems clear from the uses of Ps. 2:7 in broader Jewish literature that the concept of the Messiah as God's Son was an aspect of Jewish thinking in some quarters even prior to the Christian era. A plethora of passages in the Gospels speak of Jesus' unique relationship to God, describing that relationship as Son to Father (e.g., Mark 1:9–11; Luke 1:32; 2:41–50; 3:21–22; 4:1–13). In both overt statements and inferences Jesus defines himself as God's Son, and as used by other characters in the divine drama, the title often is closely associated with the title "Christ" ("Messiah") (Matt. 16:16; 26:63; Mark 8:29; Luke 4:41; John 11:27; 20:31). This title, "Son," became an important aspect of early Christian preaching about Jesus (e.g., Acts 9:20–22). Early Christian preachers specifically applied Ps. 2:7 to Jesus as Messiah and saw in it the promise of victory over those earthly forces opposed to the church (e.g., Acts 4:23–31; 13:33–34). Although this certainly is in play in the broader context of Hebrews (e.g., 2:5–9), the author, in using the psalm, has exaltation theology at the center of his thought. His primary point in 1:5 is that Jesus has been shown to be the Son of God by his exaltation to the right hand, his enthronement over all creation demonstrating his unique relationship to the Father.

What, then, of the temporal imagery communicated by the psalm? What does it mean that God has "begotten" the Son "today"? These cannot be references to bringing the Son into existence, since the reference in early Christian usage is associated with the exaltation to the right hand, and the Son has already been praised as the Father's agent in creation of the world (1:2; also 1:10). Thus, Jesus was considered "the Son" prior to creation itself. Nor can the use of the psalm here be considered a statement of adoption as Son, for Jesus is referred to as "Son" with reference to the incarna-

tion (e.g., 2:10–18; 5:8). Rather, the early church understood Ps. 2:7 to refer to Jesus' induction into his royal position as king of the universe at the resurrection and exaltation. In these events God vindicated Jesus as Messiah and established his eternal kingdom (see Acts 13:32–34; Rom. 1:4). God becoming the Son's father, then, refers to God's open expression of their relationship upon Christ's enthronement—an interpretation that fits the OT context well.

1:5

A. The Immediate NT Context: A Chain Quotation on the Son's Superiority to the Angels. See §A of commentary on Heb. 1:5 (quoting Ps. 2:7) above.

B. The Original OT Context. In terms of the broader OT context, this passage has a number of parallels with Ps. 110 (109 LXX) and Ps. 2 considered above, parallels related to the theme of a royal heir being invested to rule. The context of 2 Sam. 7 begins by stating that the Lord had given King David "an inheritance" (2 Sam. 7:1; cf. Ps. 2:8) and provided freedom from "his enemies" (2 Sam. 7:1, 9, 11; cf. Ps. 2:2 [in concept]; 110:1–2). Further, David's seed would be given a throne (2 Sam. 7:13, 16; cf. Pss. 2; 110 [implied]) forever (2 Sam. 7:13, 16; cf. Ps. 110:4). Each of the passages also mentions a "rod" (2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:9; 110:2). Thus, the connections between these psalms extend beyond the verbal analogy between 2 Sam. 7:13 and Ps. 2:7.

As to the context of 2 Sam. 7, the chapter has an introduction (7:1–3) and two main divisions: the Lord's oracle to David through the prophet Nathan (7:4–17) and David's response, given in the form of a prayer (7:18–29). It is in the oracle that God makes the proclamation quoted at Heb. 1:5. In the introduction to 2 Sam. 7, David's security as king gives him time for reflection on the incongruity between the quality of his house of cedar and the quality of the Lord's dwelling, a dwelling made of tents (7:1–2). Initially, Nathan tells David to act on his instincts, but then the prophet receives a word from the Lord (7:4). The oracle begins with God's reasons for not allowing David to build him a house (7:5–7). It has not been God's habit to dwell in a house when among the Israelites, and he has never given a command to build him a house of cedar (7:6–7). In 7:8–11 the narrative recounts God's goodness to David. The king was taken from very humble beginnings and made a prince over God's people, and God supported David against his enemies and made his name great in the earth (7:8–9). The oracle shifts to a future orientation in 7:10–11 (use of Qal *waw* consecutive perfect in the MT and future tense in LXX), the Lord promising a place for his people in which they will find security and freedom from enemies. At a future time the Lord will grant David's desire to build a house for the Lord. The house, however, will be built by a son in David's line rather than by David himself (7:12–17). The Lord will establish the kingdom of David's son, and that son will have a throne that will be established forever (7:12–13). In the primary verse under our consideration, 7:14, the oracle proclaims that God will be a father to David's heir, and that son will be adopted as God's heir. Also in 7:14 God promises accountability to the son, saying when the son sins, he will correct him with "the rod of men." In the parallel, 1 Chron. 17:13, these words of accountability do not occur. There, as in 2 Sam. 7:15, the relationship is stated more positively, giving the assurance that God will not remove his mercy from the heir as he had removed it from Saul. The oracle concludes with God's triple promise that the heir's kingdom would endure forever (7:16). Therefore, 7:14 occurs as part of a series of promises to King David concerning one of his descendants. God will adopt David's son as heir, the heir will build a house for God's name, and God will establish that son's kingdom irrevocably. The proclamation here fits the pattern of early Hittite promissory grants by which the property gained in the establishment of a dynasty could not be revoked (Bateman 1997: 157).

C. Relevant Uses of the OT Reference in Jewish Sources. With 2 Sam. 7 as a foundation, subsequent writings of the OT focused on the father-son relationship between Yahweh and the Davidic heir (1 Chron. 17:13; 22:10; 28:6; Ps. 2:7), the permanence of David's dynasty (Ps. 89:30–34, 49; 132:11–12), and the certainty of the Lord's covenant love toward David's house (Ps. 89:28–35). The permanence of God's covenant with David formed the basis for Israel's hope in a future king who would carry on David's line and be the inheritor of covenant promises (Isa. 11:1–5; Jer. 23:5; 33:15; Amos 9:11; Zech. 3:8;

6:12) (Bateman 1997: 158–59). Thus, it is understandable that 2 Sam. 7 would be appropriated by later generations as a vital messianic text. For instance, the reference in 7:12 to God raising up David's "seed" (LXX: *sperma*) fostered messianic interpretations of the passage in broader Judaism (Lane 1991: 1:25), and 7:12 is alluded to in John 7:42: "Has not the Scripture said that the Christ comes from the descendants of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was?" The dominant use of 2 Sam. 7 in Jewish sources seems to be to emphasize especially the dynastic permanence of David's line (4Q252 V, 1–6; Sir. 47:11, 22; *Pss. Sol.* 17:4).

Further, in the context of this messianic passage, in the words of our passage under consideration, some in ancient Judaism found a basis for the belief that Messiah would be God's son. At 4Q174 1 I, 10–11 we read,

> [And] YHWH [de]clares to you that "he will build you a house. I will raise up your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom [for ev]er. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me." This (refers to the) "branch of David," who will arise with the Interpreter of the law who [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the [l]ast days, as it is written. . . .

The author of 4Q174 wrote an interpretation of the last days that involved the coming of Messiah along with "the Interpreter of the law." The Messiah is described by the writer in words taken from 2 Sam. 7. Yahweh will fulfill the promise to build David a house and raise up his descendant, whose throne will be permanently established. Further, God promises, "I will be a father to him, and he will be a son to me." It is significant that here this king whose kingdom will last forever, who is declared God's son, is identified with the "branch of David" (cf. Jer. 33:15), a designation used elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but nowhere else in connection with the declaration that the branch is God's son.

D. The Textual Background. There exists a fairly direct correspondence between the Hebrew of 2 Sam. 7:14, the LXX, and the quotation as found in Hebrews. Once again this offers evidence of Hebrews' use of the LXX, for it would be highly unlikely that the LXX and Hebrews would translate the Hebrew with exactly the same wording and word order. Therefore, as broad evidence in the book constantly affirms, Hebrews uses the LXX text rather than translating from the Hebrew.

E. How 2 Sam. 7:14 Is Understood and Used at Heb. 1:5. As is the case with the author's use of Ps. 2:7 in 1:5, 2 Sam. 7:14 serves to reinforce the central proclamation that the Son of God is superior to the angels. Thus, it constitutes a direct confession of Christ's unique relationship to the Father as Son. This verse from 2 Samuel offers scriptural grounding for the concept of sonship, which plays a prominent role in this first main movement of Hebrews and in the theology of the book as a whole.

Further, we have already noted that 2 Sam. 7:14 is joined to Ps. 2:7 by virtue of verbal analogy (*gezerah shavah*), an interpretive principle that Hebrews uses extensively in appropriating the OT. The principle of verbal analogy suggests that for two passages having the same or similar wording, one may be interpreted in light of the other. Psalm 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14, appearing together in 1:5, are joined by catchwords: *huios* ("son") and *egō* ("I"), as well as, perhaps, the pronoun *mou/moi* ("my," "to me") and the verb of being. Both have the form of proclamations, and both address God's investment of the Son, as Messiah, on the throne of the universe, upon his exaltation to the right hand (Heb. 1:3; Ps. 110:1).

What, then, of the author's basis for appropriating this passage? In what sense is the Christ event a fulfillment of the OT text? First, as was the case with Ps. 2, 2 Sam. 7 was read as messianic by some Jews of the day. They certainly understood aspects of the prophecy to have been fulfilled in Solomon (i.e., the building of the original temple [see, however, commentary on Heb. 3:2–5 below]). Yet, in other respects, notably the establishment of a perpetual rule for the Davidic heir (2 Sam. 7:13), the prophecy was not realized by any of the kings of David's line and therefore must have anticipated a greater fulfillment. The OT context of 2 Sam. 7 clearly constitutes a prophetic oracle offered by the prophet Nathan. Thus, it is most likely that the author of Hebrews read the quotation as having a double fulfillment, aspects of the prophecy being fulfilled in the more immediate Davidic heir but finding its ultimate fulfillment in the exaltation of the Messiah.

F. The Theological Use of the OT Material. As we saw in the theological use of Ps. 2:7 in 1:5, that psalm, along with 2 Sam. 7:14, provided one scriptural basis for the confession that the Messiah was to be God's son. Also as noted in our discussion of Ps. 2:7, the Gospels speak extensively of Jesus' sonship in relation to God the Father, and that relationship constitutes a central focus for treatments of key events—for instance, Jesus' birth (Matt. 2:15; Luke 1:32), baptism (Matt. 3:17 pars.), transfiguration (Matt. 17:5 pars.), and crucifixion (Matt. 27:54 par.). Further, Jesus defines himself as the Son of God, and other characters in the Gospels define him as such. This title, "Son," became an important aspect of early Christian preaching about Jesus.

In Heb. 1:5, the quotation of 2 Sam. 7:14 plays at least a dual role theologically. First, it underscores this unique relationship the Son shares with the Father, which is a filial relationship, over against the status of the angels, who the author will go on to demonstrate are mere servants who worship this Son and serve him (1:6–7). Continuing on with emphases first found in the book's introduction (1:2–3), the quotation thus serves to highlight closeness of relationship and identity between the Father and Son. Second, it joins Ps. 2:7, along with the other passages in the chain quotation of Hebrews 1, in celebrating the Son's exaltation to the right hand of God. For the author of Hebrews, the passage constitutes, therefore, the Father's bold proclamation that the Son, as the Davidic heir, is indeed heir of the whole universe. The passage from 2 Samuel 7:14 should be seen, therefore, as a statement of induction of the Son into the position as ruler of the universe, rather than a statement of adoption.

1:6

A. The Immediate NT Context. The chain quotation at 1:5–14 builds overwhelming biblical support for the superiority of the Son of God to the angels (see commentaries on Heb. 1:5 above). Contributing to the chain quotation of 1:5–14 in this way, the quotation of Deut. 32:43 LXX in 1:6 comes as the first in a pair of passages focusing on the unique role of the angels, as that role is set over against the superior status of the Son. It is joined by verbal analogy to the quotation of Ps. 104:4 (103:4 LXX), which follows, by virtue of their common reference to "the angels" (*angelos*). Several aspects of the introductory formula require attention. First, some have suggested that the term rendered "again" (*palin*) should be given temporal significance and associated with the verb "he brings into" (*eisagō*) (e.g., Michel 1986: 113), referring to a second entrance into the "world" by the Son. Rather, *palin* should be read as a connective of which the author is fond in his introductory formulae. As such, he uses it simply to communicate "and here is another passage." Second, the reference to the "firstborn" (*prōtotokos*) may stem from Ps. 89:27 (88:28 LXX), which refers to God exalting David above the kings of the earth. Significantly, in light of Hebrews' use of Ps. 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14 in 1:5, God says that David will call him "Father," and he will make David *prōtotokos* (Ps. 89:26–27 [88:27–28 LXX]). This, then, continues the theme of the unique relationship of the Messiah as God's Son, established thus far in Hebrews. Third, although the term for "world" (*oikoumenē*) most often refers to the world inhabited by humans, here it probably refers to the heavenly realm, as it does in 2:5 (Lane 1991: 1:27; *contra* Attridge 1989: 56). The author does not turn to a consideration of the incarnation until the transition effected by the quotation of Ps. 8:4–6 at 2:5–9, and not with full force until 2:10–18. Reading *oikoumenē* in 1:6 as referring to the heavenly realm keeps the emphasis of the chain quotation on the exaltation of Christ and thus fits better with the immediate context. The point of the introductory formula is that the angels react a certain way upon the Son's entrance into the heavenly realm: they worship him. This posture of worship demonstrates the stark contrast between the person of the Son and the angels.

B. The Original OT Context. Traditionally, Deut. 32:1–43 is referred to as the Song of Moses. The passage, called "hauntingly beautiful" by one scholar (Christensen 2002: 785), has received more attention by both ancient scribes and modern researchers than any other passage in Deuteronomy and more than most other passages of the OT. The song was used for liturgical purposes in the temple, synagogue, and early church, and its popularity among Greek-speaking Jews is evidenced by its presence in the Odes at the end of the Greek version of Psalms (Lane 1991: 1:28). In the Talmud, rules are given that require two hymns from the Pentateuch, Exod. 15 and Deut.