HEBREWS 1, 5-14: A NEW LOOK

James Swetnam, S.J.

Introduction

The present writer during the past few years has attempted to present in *Melita Theologica* a new structure for the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] The present article will concentrate on a relatively small segment of the structure, Heb 1, 5-14, and will attempt to show not only how the verses are coherently organized into a meaningful unit, but also how this organization fits into the structure of Heb 1, 1-3, 6 which was previously proposed.[2] A key factor in the interpretation of Heb 1, 5-14 being presented here is the use of Jewish hermeneutical techniques. They are adduced to help discern the structure. "Structure" is probably the most disputed aspect of the

1. Cf. especially: J. Swetnam, "The Structure of Hebrews 1,1 - 3,6", *Melita Theologica* 43(1992) 58-66; *idem*, "A Possible Structure of Hebrews 3,7 - 10,39", *Melita Theologica* 45(1994) 127-141; *idem*, "Hebrews 11,1 - 13,24", *Melita Theologica* 47(1996) 27-40.
2. Swetnam, "The Structure of Hebrews 1,1 - 3,6" (1992). In this article not much attention was paid to the structure of the subsection 1, 5-14; the present article hopes to remedy this lack. Of considerable help in the writing of the present article has been the publication of a recent book on Heb 1,5-14: H. W. Bateman, IV, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5-13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage* (American University Studies, Series VII, Theology and Religion, Vol. 193; Peter Lang; New York, 1997). Cf. also: J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge; New York, 1969 [reprint 1979]), 315-319; W. S. Towner, "Hermeneutical Systems of Hillel and the Tannaim: A Fresh Look", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53(1982) 101-118. Bateman, in the opinion of the present writer, makes a major contribution to the study of the epistle by showing how Jewish exegetical techniques contemporary with the writing of Hebrews help explain the meaning of the individual verses in 1, 1-14. But, also in the opinion of the present writer, Bateman's suggested structure for the 1, 5-14 is not well done for two basic reasons: 1) it does not take into account the indications in the text of a three-fold structure of 1, 5-14; 2) it does not take into account the way 1, 5-14 fits into the larger structure of 1, 1-3, 6.

study of the Epistle to the Hebrews at the present time.[3] But it is crucial for the understanding of Hebrews as a whole: macroexegesis is essential if both it and microexegesis are to be understood as the original author intended.[4]

The Threefold Division of Hebrews 1, 5-14

Heb 1, 5-14 seems to be delimited by two parallel expressions: *tini gar eipen pote tôn aggelôn* ("to which of the angels did he [sc., God] ever say") in 1, 5 and *pros tina de tôn aggelôn eirêken pote* ("to which of the angels has he [sc., God] ever said") in 1, 13.[5] This is a rather common observation.[6] Both verses are questions beginning with an expression involving the interrogative pronoun, which is used nowhere else in the intervening verses. Further, both verses contain the word *aggeloi*. Finally, both verses contain a form of the verb *legô*. The combination of these elements is found nowhere else in the intervening verses. Hence the two verses seem to indicate a deliberate framing technique on the part of the author of Hebrews.

But for a complete view of the way the author has organized the passage, in addition to the framing verses 5 and 13 the expression at 1, 7 would also seem necessary: *pros men tous aggelous legei* ("to which[7] of the angels does he [sc., God] say"). For this verse contains another form of the verb *legô*, *legei*, also with mention of the *aggeloi*. The form *legei* would seem to be parallel to the forms *eipen* in v. 5 and *eirêken* in v. 13, for it is a still different tense of the same verbal root in

---

3.   For a convenient summary of some of the attempts to outline the structure of the epistle cf. G. W. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 73; Brill; Leiden, 1994). Also worth consulting is W. L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8* (Word Biblical Commentary, 47; Word Books; Dallas, 1991) lxxxiv-xcviii. No attempt will be made in the present article to discuss in detail the structure of 1, 5-14 proposed by different authors. One can consult advantageously J. P. Meier, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14", *Biblica* 66(1985) 168-189, and *idem*, "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations in Heb 1:5-14", *Biblica* 66(1985) 503-533.

4.   One reason why the several of the proposals made in this article are new is that they are based on Jewish hermeneutical techniques for interpreting the use of the citations in the passage, as will be explained.

5.   Translation of the Greek here and elsewhere is by the author of the present article.

6.   Cf.: Bateman, p. 362, n. 39; E. Grässer, *An die Hebräer*. 1. Teilband. Hebr 1-6 (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, XVII/1; Benziger Verlag; Zürich-Braunschweig / Neukirchener Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), p. 73, n. 15. Grässer points out that vv. 5, 7, and 15 are used for introducing a rabbinic interpretation of Scripture.

7.   For a justification of the translation "to" for *pros* cf. below, n. 9.

these verses which frame the passage. This diversity in similarity seems to constitute a pattern distinctive enough to warrant attribution to the intention of the author. Thus the basic elements which structure the passage seem to be the three forms of *lego*: *eipen* (1, 5): *legei* (1, 7); and *eireken* (1, 13), present, aorist, and perfect tenses respectively.[8]

The way vv. 5, 7 (with 8), and 13 make use of interlocking wording strengthens the view that they are formal signs of the author's organization of his discourse, especially when viewed in conjunction with the appropriate citations from scripture:

I)   1, 5:   rhetorical question: *tini* (A) + verb *legô* (B) + *pote* (C) +
                two citations from Scripture addressed to Son
       1, 6:   statement: *de* + one citation from Scripture about angels
II)   1, 7:   statement: *pros* (A [equivalently])[9] + verb *legô* (B)[10] + *men* + one
                citation from Scripture about angels
       1, 8   statement: *pros* (A [equivalently]) + *de* + two citations from Scripture
                addressed to Son

8.   Cf.: Lane, 22-23, W. G. Übelacker, *Der Hebräerbrief als Appell. I. Untersuchungen zu* exordium,
       narratio *und* postscriptum *(Hebr 1-2 und 13,22-25)* (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series,
       21; Almqvist & Wiksell; Lund, 1989) 141; J. Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac A Study of the Epistle
       to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah* (Analecta Biblica, 94; Rome 1981) 142. A threefold
       division of the passage into the subsections vv. 5-6, 7-12, and 13-14 is also upheld by A.
       Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1 - 2* (Lectio Divina, 58; du Cerf; Paris, 1969) 121-123,
       on the basis of the content.
9.   *Pros* in the sense of "to". This *pros* in v. 7 is usually taken in the sense of "about" (e.g., Grässer,
       p. 81, n. 73; Ellingworth, 120). But the sense "to" seems indicated: 1) by the implied contrast
       between 1, 7 and 1, 6—in the citation in the latter verse the angels are spoken "about" and the
       use of *pros* would seem to be the sign of a change of some sort, i.e., *pros* in the sense of "about"
       in v. 7 would seem repetitious; 2) by the implied parallelism between the use of *pros* in v. 7 and
       v. 8—in v. 8 *pros* means "to"; 3) by the implication in v. 13 that God can speak "to" (*pros*) the
       angels—this use seems to imply a continuity with the use of *pros* previously with regard to
       angels; 4) by the context—it seems more appropriate that when the Son is being reintroduced
       into the *oikoumenê* that he be pictured as not being alone with the Father. In v. 7, then, God
       speaks to the angels but uses a citation of scripture which speaks about them. This is a somewhat
       harsh transition, from a *pros* meaning "to" to a citation which is in the third person, not the
       second. But the conventional interpretation—that *pros* means "about"—is also harsh, involving
       as it does two meanings of *pros* in parallel positions in vv. 7 and 8. For a discussion which
       takes into account the possibility that *pros* means "to" in Heb 1, 7 cf. H. W. Attridge, *The
       Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Fortress; Philadelphia, 1989) 57, n. 80.
10.   The *legei* of v. 6 belongs properly to what precedes, v. 5, and not to what follows, as is indicated
       by the particle de which contrasts what the angels should do with respect to the Son.

III)   1, 13   rhetorical question: *pros* (A [equivalently]) + verb *legô* (B) + *pote*
                 (C) + one citation from Scripture addressed to Son
         1, 14   rhetorical question about angels with no citation
Or, more abstractly still:
I)   1, 5:   question: (A) + (B) + (C)
         1, 6:   statement: *de*
II)   1, 7:   statement: (D) + (B) + *men*
         1, 8:   statement: (A) + *de*
III)   1, 13: question: (A) + (B) + (C)
         1, 14: question

The (A) of vv. 7 and 8 and the (A) of v. 13 are parallel in meaning to the (A) of v. 1.
        The *men* of v. 7 and the *de* of v. 8 bind together vv. 7 and 8 and help separate
        them from v. 6, which is linked by way of contrast to v. 5 by the particle *de*.

The resulting structure viewed from the standpoint of the contrast between Son and
        angels would accordingly be as follows:

I)	1, 5:	God speaks to the Son (two citations)	a
	1, 6:	God speaks about the angels (one citation)	b
II)	1, 7:	God speaks about the angels (one citation)	b
	1, 8-12	God speaks to the Son (two citations)	a
III)	1, 13	God speaks to the Son (one citation)	a
	1, 14	The author speaks about the angels (no citation)	b

A primary consideration concerning this structure of 1, 5-14 is that, even though
it is complicated in the analysis, it is basically simple in the result, and can be
grasped instinctively because of the parallelisms and repetitions and other formal
elements in conjunction with the particles of transition.

The tenses of *legô* are so chosen as to give a progression to the whole passage
and situate it precisely with regard to the addressees of the epistle. The introductory
aorist of *legô*, *eipen*, situates the passage with regard to the past from the standpoint
of the present time of the author of the epistle and his addressees; it conveys the
idea of some definite point in past time which serves in the passage as the basis for
what is being said in the letter.[11] The use of the present tense of *legô*, *legei*, situates

---

11.   Cf. Vanhoye, 124: "Içi [i.e., in v. 5], le verbe grec est à l'aorist, temps qui indique un fait
        historique bien défini, apte à servir de base à l'argumentation".

the passage with regard to what follows this point of the past and serves to bring the scripture citations to bear on the ensuing present.[12] Finally, the use of the perfect tense of *legô, eirêken*, situates the passage with regard to the future by stressing the continuation of the established fact contemporary with the writing and receiving of the epistle which was introduced by the aorist tense and commented on by the present tenses.[13]

This threefold division perhaps corresponds to the three stages of an enthronement ceremony occasionally suggested as the basic structure of the passage.[14] This ceremony is usually presented under labels such as the following: Exaltation, Presentation, Enthronement.[15] The evidence for such a ceremony are slight but, where apparently existing, striking as regards possible relevance for Hebrews 1, 5-14. For example, in "The Testament of Levi", one of "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", there are three stages of a ceremony, each of which is introduced by a form of the verb *legô*.[16] The ceremony involves three stages: a

---

12.   "… le verb «dire» est mis au présent (1, 7.7), qui actualise la parole citée" (Vanhoye, 124-125).
13.   "Pour conclure (1, 13), le verbe sera repris au parfait grec, qui exprime la persistance du fait établi" (Vanhoye, 125).
14.   Cf. Grässer, 71; Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 142-145.
15.   Grässer, p. 71, n. 4; Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac*, 142, n. 45. Cf. P. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Eerdmans; Grand Rapids / Paternoster; Carlisle, 1992) 108-109: "This formal threefold division, already noted by some older commentators, has been explained as corresponding to the three stages of a coronation liturgy, for which there is evidence in the OT and other ancient Near Eastern Texts, especially in Egypt.… The three stages of such a liturgy are typically (a) a declaration by God that he has adopted the king as his son (cf. v. 5); (b) the presentation of the king to his people, and his proclamation as king (cf. vv. 6-12); (c) the enthronement proper (cf. v. 13). The influence of any such liturgy on the author of Hebrews is likely to have been via the Greek OT. The formal parallels are striking, but it is necessary to allow for at least three phases of reinterpretation, (a) as a foreign liturgy was adapted to Israelite views of God and of kingship; (b) as statements about a particular king were generalized and idealized in pre-Christian messianic expectation; and (c) as the coming of Christ stimulated Christians to relate the scriptures to him in new ways." As noted above, the present writer would include v. 6 with the first stage.
16.   Cf. M. De Jonge (ed.), *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum* (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti, 1; Brill; Leiden, 1970) 14-15. The three verbal forms are *legontas* (VIII.2), *eipan* (VIII,3), and *eipan* (VIII.11). Cf. the analysis in H. L. Jansen, "The Consecration in the Eighth Chapter of Testamentum Levi", in *The Sacral Kingship*. Contributions to the Central Theme of the VIIIth International Congress for the History of Religions (Rome, April 1955) (Studies in the History of Religions [Supplements to *Numen*), 4; : Brill; Leiden, 1959) 356-365.

ritual humiliation and exaltation, an investiture with symbols of office, and a long oracle. Angels are involved. Levi will become the son of Elyon, i.e., God.[17] The whole liturgy seems to have reference to what actually obtained in the time of the Hasmoneans.[18] The evidence for a Jewish background to the enthronement ritual is thus real but elusive. But there is enough to warrant a suggestion that it perhaps stands behind the three-fold division of Heb 1, 5-14.

It remains to be seen how these formal considerations pointing to a threefold structure of 1, 5-14 contribute to the understanding of the meaning of these verses: form demands corroboration by content.

II. The Meaning of Hebrews 1, 5-14

A. Hebrews 1, 5-6

Heb 1, 5-6 reads as follows:

1, 5   *For to whom of the angels did He ever say,*
              My Son are you, today I generated you.
       and again,
              I shall be a Father to Him, and He will be to me a Son?
1, 6   Then, when he again leads the first-born into the world, he says,
              And let all the angels of God worship Him.

V. 5 contains two citations from the Old Testament, one from Ps 2, 7 and the other from 2 Sam 7, 14. The key insight for interpreting the relationship between these two citations is that the relationship would seem to be based on the exegetical rule of *gezerah shawah*.[19] This rule has been defined as follows: "Verbal analogy from one verse to another; where the same words are applied to two separate cases,

---

17.   Cf. also G. Widengren, "Royal Ideology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *Promise and Fulfilment Essays Presented to Professor S. H. Hooke* (F. F. Bruce [ed.]; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963 [impression of 1979]) 202-212.

18.   Cf.: Jansen, 363-365; Widengren, 209.

19.   Bateman, 220. Bateman here follows the pioneering lead of R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 177.

it follows that the same considerations apply to both".[20] Thus, what is true of Ps 2, 7 is true also of 2 Sam 7, 14, and vice versa. Ps 2, 7 in Hebrews seems best taken as an allusion to the resurrection of Jesus (cf. Acts 13, 33).[21] It illumines, by reason of *gezerah shawah*, the following quotation from 2 Sam 7, 14 in which the original context seems to refer to the actual taking of the throne by the Davidic king, i.e., the enthronement in the strict sense of the word.[22] This act of enthronement in turn illumines, by reason of *gezerah shawah*, the previous text. The result is that the reader is to know that the resurrection of Jesus involves his enthronement/exaltation, and his enthronement/exaltation involves his resurrection: there are two distinct citations from scripture because there are two distinct realities under discussion, and it is the function of the *gezerah shawah* to show that they are intimately linked.

20.   Bateman, 13. Bateman (220) brings in another exegetical rule, *kayose 'bo bemaqom 'aher*, according to which "a difficulty in one text may be solved by comparing it with another which has points of general though not necessarily verbal similarity" (Batemen, 18). Resort to this second rule seems unnecessary and perhaps even confusing, given the appropriateness of *gezerah shawah* based on the common occurrence of the word "son" in both passages. Bateman suggests that the linking of the two verses points out that "in the progress of Jewish history and God's revelation, Psalm 2:7 and 2 Samuel 7:14 are exegetically linked, conceptually linked, and fulfilled in the Son". But this interpretation seems to be too general, and does not take into account the context of Chapter 1 of Hebrews, related as it seems to be to Chapter 2, as will be explained.

21.   The exact relevance of the citation of Ps 2, 7 in Hebrews is, of course, much discussed. For a presentation of this discussion cf. Ellingworth, 112-114. The interpretation which seems to commend itself from the general context of the epistle (cf. Swetnam, "The Structure of Hebrews 1,1 - 3,6", 59-60) is that of B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations* (SCM Press; London, 1961) 140: "This use of Ps. 2.7 [sc. at Acts 13, 33) is legitimate according to the proper meaning of the psalm. The verse about God's 'begetting' of his son is equivalent to v. 6, being a poetic metaphor for the religious significance of the act of enthronement. In later days, when all such psalms were interpreted eschatologically, this became a truly messianic psalm in the strict sense, and a grasp of its poetry would suggest that this verse should be connected with the moment of revelation of the Messiah, rather than literally with the time of his physical birth (for which the thought of God's begetting would be felt to be inappropriate and distasteful, if not blasphemous). To the early Church the Resurrection, and its special aspect of Heavenly Session, was precisely the moment of this expected revelation. Granted that Ps. 2.7 is a metaphor of enthronement, then it can be claimed that the expectation embodied in the whole psalm has been fulfilled in Jesus. The argument is very close to that of Ps. 110.1" (ibid., 141). Lindars also has Ps 2, 7 refer to the resurrection in the citation at Heb 5, 5 and in the allusion at 7, 28 (ibid., 140). Cf. a presentation of the various opinions given in Ellingworth, 113. For the present writer the resurrection should be carefully distinguished from the exaltation or enthronement, though the two are intimately linked. Cf. J. Swetnam, "Ps 110, 1 and New Testament Christology: An Interpretation", *Melita Theologica* LJI(1999) 37–55..

The distinction is crucial for the christology of the author of Hebrews, for he conceives the resurrection of Jesus as being in function of Jesus as man, not in function of Jesus as God. Only as man can Jesus die;[23] hence, only as man can Jesus rise from the dead.[24] Heb 1,5 indicates that what follows in vv. 6-14 is about the enthronement of Jesus which takes place at the moment of his resurrection-exaltation. As was noted above, the introductory *eipen* in the aorist tense, which situates the passage with regard to the past and conveys the idea of some definite point in time, serves in vv. 5-14 as the basis for what is being said. The moment of the resurrection is that point in time, and the resurrection is the basis for what is said. Thus Heb 1, 5 corresponds well to the possible label "Exaltation" of a presumed enthronement ritual by showing that the resurrection of Jesus (v. 5a) really involves also his exaltation (v. 5b).

Heb 1, 6a refers not to the moment of Christ's incarnation nor to the moment of His second coming but to the moment of his exaltation.[25] The use of the present tense, *legei*, situates the passage with regard to what follows the moment of the resurrection-exaltation and serves to bring the scripture citation to bear on the resulting present. The word *prôtotokos*, "first-born", in the context is an allusion to the Son as first-born from the dead.[26] As he is reintroduced into the heavenly world he now has a (glorified) body.

The second part of the verse, 6b, is a citation from Dt 32, 43. It states simply that the angels of God should prostrate themselves before him who has been enthroned: what is the special concern of the author of Hebrews here is the difference

---

22.   Cf. Grässer, 75-76.
23.   That this is the opinion of the author of Hebrews can be inferred from Heb 2,14.
24.   Cf. Swetnam, "Ps 110, 1", passim.
25.   "Pour s'accorder vraiment au contexte, la phrase doit s'entendre, non pas d'une venue du Christ sur terre, mais de son intronisation céleste" (A. Vanhoye, *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1 – 2* [Lectio Divina, 58; du Cerf; Paris, 1969) 155. Cf. also Grässer (77): "Hier [sc., Heb 1,6a] geht es nicht darum, dass jemand ein zweites Mal erscheint oder ankommt, sondern das er zurückgeführt wird en einen ihm angestammten (2,10) oder zugewiesenen Ort (13,20 «hinaufführen»aus den Toten) durch einen anderen, der dazu die Macht hat. Das passt nicht zur Parusie, wohl aber zur Erhöhung als einer Inthronisation, bei der die Engel die Huldigung darbringen (Phil 2,11; Offb 5,6-10)".
26.   Cf. Col 1, 18; Rom 8, 29; 1 Cor 15, 20; Acts 26, 23; and Grässer, 79.

between the Son's relation to God—implied parity[27]—and the angels' relation to the Son—implied subordination.[28]

B. Hebrews 1, 7-12

Heb 1, 7-12 reads as follows:

1, 7 Now to the angels he says,
> *He is the one making his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire,*

1, 8 But to the Son ,
> *Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever,*
> *and the scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom.*

1, 9
> *you loved justice and hated lawlessness;*
> *because of this, God your God anointed you with the oil of rejoicing beyond all your companions.*

1, 10 and,
> *You, Lord, in the beginning founded the earth,*
> *and the heavens are the works of your hands;*

1, 11
> *they will perish, but you will abide,*
> *and all will grow old as a cloak,*

1, 12
> *as a garment you will roll them up;*
> *as a cloak they will also be changed;*
> *but you are the same and your years will never stop.*

The introductory verse, v. 7, is a statement about the angels as creatures. It seems to contain two anomalies: 1) the use of *pros* in the sense of "with regard to" and not "to", as for the other uses of *pros* in the passage (vv. 8 and 13); 2) a scripture

---

27. Grässer (76) seems to regard this parity as merely involving "honorific titles" on the part of the Son, invoking as background the Hellenistic world which regarded a plurality of titles as indicating a high position. But this is to ignore the fact that in vv. 5-14 the principal titles given to Jesus—"Son", "God", and "Lord"—are taken from the scriptures, not from Hellenistic sources. Further, this is to ignore the fact that elsewhere in the epistle the author alludes to the Son in a way which implies parity with God and the Spirit (e.g., Heb 2, 4). Cf. C. Spicq, *L'épître aux Hébreux*. II. *Commentaire* (Etudes bibliques; Gabalda, Paris, 1953) 28.

28. Grässer, 81.

reference which does not seem to refer to the Son, in contrast with the all other scripture citations which, when not referring to the angels, refer to the Son (cf. vv. 5 [2x], 8-9, 10-12, 13]).[29] Under closer inspection the anomalies disappear when the texts in question are given a different interpretation. On the basis of formal considerations the *pros* of v. 7 is better translated as "to".[30] The expression *ho poiôn* of v. 7 is better taken as referring to the Son for two reasons: 1) the verb *poiôn* echoes the verb *epoiêsen* of v. 2 where it was stated that God created through the Son;[31] 2) the understanding of the expression *ho poiôn* as referring in the context to the Son much improves the relevance of the citation which it introduces: the angels must do reverence to the Son (citation of v. 6) because it is the Son who has created them (v. 7). The underlying supposition seems to be that even though the angels are "spirits" (*pneumata*) and "a flame of fire" (*puros ploga*), they must do obeisance to the Son even though he has a (glorified) body now that he is being reintroduced into the *oikoumenê* (v. 6): this supposition explains the otherwise rather gratuitous reference to the Son as being *prototokos*, "first-born", which alludes to the Son as now being the first-born from the dead.[32] This supposition leads one to reexamine the objects of address in v. 6. They would seem to be not only the angels but the Son as well: this seems to be implied by the lack of any explicit reference to anyone spoken to in the context of the rubric "as he (i.e., God) introduces again the first-born into the world". The resulting presentation from the standpoint of the addressees would seem to be as follows:

v. 5: address to Son (implied by the rhetorical question introduced by *tini* and the direct address used in the citations);

v. 6: address to Son and the angels (implied by the use of *legei* with the rubric of introducing the first-born into the world—both the person being introduced (the Son) and the world he is being introduced to (the angels) are present;

v. 7: address to the angels (in contrast with v. 6 where both angels and Son are being addressed);

v. 8: address to the Son (in parallel with v. 7 where the angels are being addressed).

29.   Cf. Attridge, 57.
30.   Cf. above, n. 9.
31.   This possibility is noted, only to be rejected, by Ellingworth on the grounds that the angels are "more naturally understood as God's angels or servants, rather than the angels or servants of the Son, though the Son's participation in creation was mentioned in v. 2c" (120).
32.   Cf. above, n. 26.

The citation in v. 6 refers to both parties being addressed, angels and Son, and the citation in v. 7 refers to the one party being addressed, the angels, but with reference to the Son who has just been jointly addressed in v. 6 and will again be solely addressed in vv. 8-12.

Thus the *pros* of v. 7 is intelligible in the sense of "to", and the citation which follows is intelligible as a reference to the Son.

The two passages in the passage introduced by *pros de ton huion* in v. 8—quotations from Ps 45, 6-7 (vv. 8-9) and Ps 102, 25-27—are linked by the Jewish principle of *kayose 'bo bemaqom 'aher*.[33] That is to say, the two passages are mutually illuminating even without a verbal link. The illumination consists in showing that the two titles, "God" (*theos*)[34] and "Lord" (*kyrios*) are both equally applicable to the Son.[35] This is of crucial significance. The two principal Old Testament designations for the divinity are here applied to the Son without qualification. This, of course, is a major statement about the identity of the Son, situating the names within the context of the even more fundamental—for the

---

33.   Bateman, 230-231. Cf. above, n. 20.
34.   The textual problems involved with interpreting *theos* as a vocative are discussed in Ellingworth, 122-123; cf. also Vanhoye, 179-184.
35.   In the original Hebrew text it is not clear how the word for "God" is to be interpreted, whether as a vocative or as a genitive (cf. Attridge, 58; Vanhoye, 176-177). But in the Greek text of the Epistle to the Hebrews the vocative use seems clear (cf. Ellingworth, 122; Vanhoye, 181-184). Ellingworth (122) notes that the two quotations are used to show that the Son is addressed both as God and as Lord in Scripture, with the fact that the titles occupy corresponding positions at the beginning of the quotations aiding this interpretation. This overt parallelism between the *theos* of Ps 45, 6 cited at Heb 1, 8 and the *kyrios* of Ps Ps 102, 25 cited at Heb 1, 10 eliminates any ambiguity about the function of *theos* in the former citation in Hebrews: it is clearly intended to be taken as a vocative; God is speaking to the Son as divine. Ellingworth (122) further says that neither title is emphasized or enlarged on here or later on in the epistle. But the Jewish principle of *kayose 'bo bemaqom 'aher* would explain why the quotations are used with no further comment or development: their mutual illumination is contained within the verses in question. The implications of this mutual illumination are in play throughout the epistle, of course, but in function of who Jesus is as Son, with no explicit reference to the Old Testament quotations contained in vv. 8-12.
36.   On the view that these titles are being used in an "honorific" sense cf. above, n. 27. The citation from Ps 110, 1 at Heb 1, 13 is also relevant for a refutation of the view that the titles "God" and "Lord" in vv. 8 and 10 are merely honorific, as will be explained.

purposes of the author of Hebrews—name of "Son": Jesus is fully "God" and "Lord" in the scriptural (i.e., Old Testament) sense of these words because he is Son.[36] Such is the force of the quotations in the context of the structure of 1, 5-14.

This section, vv. 7-12, corresponds to the second possible division of a presumed enthronement ritual, "Presentation". The Son would then be being presented by the formal procedure of identifying him through the use of the two scripture quotations. The way the scripture quotations are being used lends credence to the theory of such a ritual. The section presents the angels as being inferior to God, and then asserts that the Son is God. By inference, the angels are thus inferior to the Son.

C. Hebrews 1, 13-14

The final division of 1, 5-14 reads as follows:

1, 13   To whom then of the angels has he ever said,
         Sit at my right hand until I place your enemies as a footstool of your feet?
1, 14   Are not all of them ministering spirits sent out for service for the benefit
         of those about to inherit salvation?

V. 13 begins with the introductory words which echo the question at the beginning of 1, 5, thus framing the whole section. The use of the perfect tense of *lego, eirêken*, situates the passage with regard to the future by stressing the continuation of the established fact, the resurrection-exaltation, to the time of writing of the epistle.[37] The scripture quotation introduced by *eirêken*, is from Ps 110,1, the classic exaltation/ enthronement text in the New Testament.[38] The text has God saying to the Son to wait at his right hand until he, God, places the Son's enemies under the Son's feet; that is to say, the present result of the action of the enthronement is to continue until some future, unspecified time.[39]

---

37.   Cf. above, nn. 11-13.
38.   Cf. D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 18; Abingdon Press; Nashville-New York, 1973), passim. Ps 110, 1 is also the most widely used Old Testament text in the New Testament. Cf. Ellingworth, 129-130.
39.   That the Son's sitting is to be construed as a waiting until the enemies are placed under his feet would seem to be inferred from the allusion to Ps 110,1 at Heb 10, 13, where the verb *ekdechomai* replaces *kathizô*. Cf. the discussion in Ellingworth, 131.

The present writer has attempted to show that the way Ps 110,1 is used in the New Testament indicates that the New Testament writers were consciously using this passage to show that Jesus as God, and precisely as God, did not die.[40] This conclusion is inferred from the way Ps 110,1 is used in Hebrews 1 - 2, 1 Corinthians 15, Ephesians 1, and Acts of the Apostles 2.

In Heb 1, 13 the Ps 110, 1 is used in a *gezerah shawah* construction paired with a citation from Ps 8, 5-7 cited at Heb 2, 6-8. The connecting phrase is *hypodion tôn podôn sou / hypokatô tôn podôn autou*. In the section following Heb 2, 6-8 the author of Hebrews is thinking of Jesus in the context of his death, speaking about his glorification through his sufferings (2, 9) and the liberating power of his death (2, 14-15). In contrast, Heb 1, 5-14 does not mention the death of Jesus. Reference to the resurrection, according to the interpretation followed in this paper, is limited to an allusion in 1, 5 which serves as an introduction to the exaltation culminating in the enthronement in 1, 13. This pattern of contrast between Ps 110, 1 and death is found in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 15, 25-27, again in a *gezerah shawah* construction with Ps 8), in Ephesians (Eph 1, 20-22, an implied *gezerah shawah* construction with Ps 8), and in Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2, 25-35, in a *gezerah shawah* construction with Ps 16, 1-8). In these four passages the citation of Ps 110, 1 is presented consistently according to the following five patterns as: 1) indicating a recognized, widespread and early tradition with regard to establishing the identity of Jesus; 2) saying something distinctive about the identity of Jesus; 3) elaborating on the relation of Jesus to God through the imagery of subjection; 4) referring to a future subjection in establishing the relation of Jesus to God; 5) standing in contrast with a text representing Jesus' past subjection to death.[41]

The patterns visible in 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Acts of the Apostles help sharpen the vision with regard to what the author of Hebrews is doing: he is using Ps 110, 1 as part of a recognized, widespread tradition (pattern 1), in order to say something distinctive about the identity of Jesus (pattern 2) with regard to the relation of Jesus to God using the imagery of subjection (pattern 3). The imagery of a future subjection is conveyed through the citation of Ps 110, 1 (pattern 4) in a stylized contrast with the imagery of a past subjection to death (Ps 8). Putting these patterns together results in the following picture: Jesus is portrayed in early Christian tradition

---

40.   Cf. Swetnam, "Ps 110, 1 and New Testament Christology: An Interpretation". Cf. above, n. 23.

41.   Cf. "Ps 110, 1 and New Testament Christology", pp. 39–52, for the appropriate argumentation.

as having a distinctive identity which involves a past subjection to death according to one aspect (Ps 8, Ps 16), but which involves a contrasting future subjection which is based on his exaltation/enthronement (Ps 110, 1). *Death is accordingly outside the purview of Ps 110, 1 precisely as such, even though the death of Jesus is an essential element for the proper understanding of who Jesus is.*[42] In other words, Ps 110, 1 conveys the idea that Jesus does not die even though from the context it is clear that Jesus does die. The antecedent context of Heb 1, 13 explains why this can be: Jesus is Son and God and Lord and as such is exalted and enthroned at the moment of his resurrection. The context subsequent to Heb 2, 6-8 explains what is involved in the resurrection: Jesus is man and as such suffers death and is glorified. The two passages are linked by *gezerah shawah* so that what can be affirmed about Jesus according to Ps 110, 1 can also be affirmed about him as regards Ps 8, 6-8. Thus a complete picture of Jesus as God and man emerges from the way the two texts figure in the structure and in the way the structure serves as a basis for further elaboration. This is the God-man of Nicea, Ephesus and Chalcedon, but not in the formally ontological terminology of Greek philosophic culture but in the authoritative terminology of Hebrew scripture. In Catholic theology the latter would seem to be the prime analogate. But texts from scripture can be reductively ontological unless the statements of the above councils are to be considered as lacking in relevance and validity.

The first division (vv. 5-6) had two scripture references referring to the Son (vv. 5-6), mutually illuminating; the second division (vv. 7-12) had two scripture references referring to the Son (vv. 8-12), mutually illuminating. This third division has only one scripture reference. In the light of what was said above about the relation of Ps 110, 1 and Ps 8, 6 it is clear why there is only one scripture reference in the third division: it is paired in a *gezerah shawah* construction with the latter psalm cited at Heb 2, 6-8, a citation which serves as basis for comment in Heb 2, 9-18 just as Ps 110, 1 serves as a basis for comment in Heb 1, 5-14.

Heb 1, 14 rounds out the treatment of the exalted Jesus with a final reference to the angels to their role as ministering spirits sent for service. This verse not only ends the section 1, 5-14 but introduces the following parenetic section, 2, 1-4, with its mention of angels at 2, 2. The opening words, *dia touto*, indicate that what

---

42.   Cf. "Ps 110, 1 and New Testament Christology", pp. 39–44 for the appropriate argumentation.

follows is a conclusion from what went before.[43] Again, in view of what was said above, it is clear why no scripture citation is given in this comment on the angels: such a citation would have detracted from the symmetry of the *gezerah shawah* involving Ps 110, 1 and Ps 8, 5-7. As the text of Hebrews stands now there is no scripture citation intervening between the use of the two texts at Heb 1, 13 and Heb 2, 6-8.

Summary and Conclusion

Heb 1,5-14 can be structured into three parts, each containing a scriptural component referring to the Son and a reference to the angels. The scriptural components in the first two parts, vv. 5-6 and vv. 7-12, each consist of two quotations from the Old Testament about the Son and one scriptural component about the angels. The quotations about the Son are related by Jewish exegetical devices, *gezerah shawah* (v. 5) and *kayose 'bo bemaqom 'aher* (vv. 8-12). Thus the two Old Testament quotations about the Son in v. 5 and the two Old Testament quotations in vv. 8-12 are mutually illuminating.

In v. 5 of the first part, the illumination is that the Jesus who has been raised from the dead is the same Jesus who has been exalted, and the Jesus who has been exalted is the same Jesus who has been raised from the dead. Given that being raised from the dead in the perspective of Hebrews (cf. 2,14) presumes humanity and that exaltation is used in the restricted sense of a divine being glorified without death (cf. 1,13), v. 5 is thus a miniature scriptural testimony to what later generations would term the two natures of Christ (cf. Chalcedon). The scripture quotation in v. 6 becomes, in the context, an indication of the subordination of the angels.

In the second part, vv. 7-12, the illumination from the interplay of the two scripture quotations is that the Jesus who has been exalted is both God and Lord in the scriptural sense. Thus vv. 8-12 constitute a miniature scriptural testimony to what later generations would term the full divinity of Christ (cf. Nicaea). The antecedent scriptural quotation at v. 7 again indicates the subordination of the angels by reason of their being created by the Son. The constrasting particles *men* and *de* of vv. 7 and 8 also imply that the subordination is to be understood with relation to Jesus insofar as he is God and Lord.

---

43.   Cf. Grässer, 99.

In the third part, vv. 13-14, there is only one scripture text about Jesus. The other, matching, text is found at 2, 6-8. The Old Testament quotation at 1, 13 sums up what has preceded and is the classic New Testament summary of the exaltation. In Hebrews this means what happened at the resurrection to Jesus insofar as he was God. The scripture citation at 2, 6-8 is the Old Testament text used for the development of what follows in vv. 9-18, a summary of the resurrection. In Hebrews this means what happened at the resurrection to Jesus insofar as He was man. Thus the combination of the Old Testament quotations at 1, 13 and 2, 6-8, when combined in the Jewish hermeneutical construction of *gezerah shawah*, constitute a mutually illuminating presentation of who Jesus is: God and man, and what the implications of this identity is in the perspectives of the epistle. The reference to the angels in this third part (v. 14) serves again to indicate their subordination to Jesus as spirits sent on a mission. Thus the verse also serves to introduce the parenesis which follows at 2,1-4.

These three parts of 1, 5-14 constitute a structure which is clearly an integrated whole in the mind of the author of Hebrews. There is good reason to assert that this structure follows the structure of the ancient enthronement ceremony which involves exaltation, presentation, and enthronement. But apodictic conclusions are not possible given the present knowledge of such a ceremony as it was known at the time the author of Hebrews was writing.

When viewed in the context of the entire passage 1, 5 - 2, 18, i.e., Jesus as enthroned and risen, the added nuance suggests itself that what is ultimately at stake here is not simply the subordination of angels to Jesus but the subordination of angels to one who has a body. For the Jesus as enthroned and risen has a body, albeit a glorified one. It is this body which may have been a sticking point for the addressees of the epistle, given the *prima facie* primacy of the spirit.[44]

The entire discussion which takes place in Heb 1, 5-14 is presented under the rubric of the "name" (1, 4). This "name" or "title" would seem to be the word "Son" itself. This is the word used in the prologue to introduce the subject of the discourse (1, 2). This is the word which links the two Old Testament quotations to form a *gezerah shawah* construction immediately following the introduction of v. 4

---

44.   Cf. above, nn. 26 and 32. Cf. also Heb 2, 9 in which the temporary inferiority of Jesus as man with respect to the angels is contrasted with his risen glory. The temporary inferiority is not caused by the body of Jesus, but by the body of Jesus which made him subject to death.

in v. 5. This is the word which is used to introduce the identification of that subject as God and Lord (v. 8). This is the word which seems to be used as a title for 2, 5-18 in a quotation from Ps 8, 5 ("Son of man").[45] And, finally, this is the title used of Jesus in 3, 6, the final verse of the parenesis which ends the entire section 2, 5-3, 6.[46]

The name "Son" is important for understanding the relation of Jesus to God the Father (cf. 1, 5b) in the entire passage 2, 5 - 3, 6. Not only is the word "Son" important for understanding the Son as "heir" to the promises made to Abraham, but also for understanding the word "Son" as enthroned in relation to the right of the Father.[47] In the Hebrew way of thinking, the word "son" indicates similarity.[48] In Heb 1, 5-14 the sonship of Jesus indicates similarity with the Father in an ontological sense: Jesus is ontologically God and Lord but he is so as "Son", not as "Father". Thus the implications of the passage—no more can be affirmed than this—point to a relationship of the Son to the Father based on distinction within parity.[49]

45. Cf. the implication of the phrase "many sons" in 2, 10, and the way the following verse, 2, 11, gives Jesus as sanctifier and those being sanctified a common origin.
46. Cf. "The Structure of Hebrews 1,1 - 3,6", passim.
47. "Der Begriff des Erbes spielt im Hebr eine wichtige Rolle (vg. 1,4.14; 6,12.17; 11,7.8; 12,17). Er fusst auf einer breiten und vielschichtigen biblischen Traditionsgrundlage, die im Früjudentum eine eschatologische Zuspitzung erfährt und im Hebr ganz auf die zukünftige Welt ausgerichtet ist: das ewige Erbe (9,15; 11,8), das 'Besitztum in der "Ruhe"', das einen betont räumlichen Klang hat. Wenn der Sohn als 'Erbe von allem' eingesetzt wird, so eben als *prototokos Erstgeborener* (1,6), der vorlaufend von der himmlischen Heimat Besitz ergriffen hat. Die Inklusion *kekleronomêken onoma er hat einen Namen geerbt* V 4 und die Ausgestaltung dieser Belehnung in Form eines feierlichen Inthronisationsaktes V 5-14 entscheiden die Datumsfrage: Durch die Erhöhung wurde der Sohn zum Erben des alls eingesetzt" (Grässer, 57-58).
48. "*huios mit Genitivus der Sache*, um den zu beziehen, der dieser Sache teilhaftig oder wrdig ist oder sonst in enger, sich oftmals aus dem Zusammenhang ergebender, Beziehung zu ihr steht, ist wohl berwiegend Hebraismus" (W. Bauer - K. Aland - B. Aland, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* [Berlin-New York [6]1988], "*huios*", l.c.d. [col. 1664]). The importance this definition gives to the context should be noted.
49. Bateman (223) says that "The designation 'God' [sc., as found in Heb 1, 8-9] ... is not necessarily an ontological statement, but rather as the catena develops, it serves as a link and a reference to the Davidic Son's divine activities as God which have already been mentioned in Hebrews 1:2c, 3b and then supported in Hebrews 1:7, 10-12." This seems to ignore the ontological implications of the word "Son". The author of Hebrews thought ontologically, but not qua ontologically as do those who are accustomed to view Christ in a thought frame arising from Greek philosophy. Cf. again the implications of Heb 2, 14.

Thus Jewish hermeneutical techniques seem to be of service in the proper understanding of the structure, and hence of the meaning, of Heb 1, 5-14: the use of such techniques results in an interpretation which is elegant in its simplicity and unforced in its profundity.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 27
1-00187 Rome, Italy