

The Pneumatology of the Letter to the Hebrews:

Confused, Careless, Cavalier or Carefully Crafted?

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements

of the University of Chester

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By Rev. Alan Keith Hodson

Dip. Theol. BA, BSc, BD (Hons), MA (Distinction)

May 2019

Supervised by Rev. Dr Keith Warrington, BA (Hons), MPhil, PhD

Declaration:

The material being presented for examination is my own work and has not been submitted for an award of this or another HEI except in minor particulars which are explicitly noted in the body of the thesis. Where research pertaining to this thesis was undertaken collaboratively, the nature and extent of my individual contribution has been made explicit.

Acknowledgements

There are so many people whom I should acknowledge here: fellow students, tutors, the librarian and other administrative staff. They have all, in different but significant ways, contributed. My long-suffering supervisor deserves special mention for he has provided unstinting guidance, encouragement and friendship. Any shortcomings in this thesis, whether by mistake, illogicality or omission are, obviously, mine.

I also want to thank family, friends and the people I worship with in the church family. They have provided constant encouragement, sometimes ‘nagging’ me to ‘get on with it’! The mantra that rang out from so many who trod the PhD path before me, ‘A completed PhD is better than a perfect one’ served to challenge my pedantry!

I do not want to name people in this acknowledgement, not because I have forgotten anyone but because the list would be titanic. They know who they are and have, I trust, been thanked personally over and over again as this process has unfolded. Their encouragement is a blessing from the Lord. The coffees, the walks, the discussions have all helped, so too have those men and women who provided translations of French, German, Dutch and Catalan articles that I wasn’t sure if I needed or not!

Most of all, the Lord himself has been constant – I believe that he wanted me to engage in this study and it has certainly deepened my appreciation of Hebrews, my prayer-life and my love of the Scriptures generally. I trust it has fed into my Christian walk and affected my witness positively. I hope it has improved my preaching and teaching ministry. It has certainly enriched my time in the study. It has also enlarged my library!

To God alone be the glory, Easter 2019.

Abstract

It is the majority position that Hebrews has little to add to NT pneumatology (see §1.1). However, that is far from the case. Indeed, on all seven occasions that the author of Hebrews refers to the Spirit, he does so using language and concepts that are unique in the NT. The Spirit both speaks (λέγω) words of Scripture (3:7) and testifies (μαρτυρέω) from Scripture (10:15) using words elsewhere described as God's words to the congregation. Elsewhere in the NT, when the Spirit 'speaks' he does so through human agents (see §§4.3-4.4). However, in Hebrews he speaks directly to the hearers without the need for an intermediary (see §4.5). Furthermore, the Spirit interprets (δηλώω) Scripture (9:8) and this is the only place in the NT where the Spirit is said to function as hermeneut (see §§4.5.3, 8.3.1). The phrase 'Spirit of grace' (10:29) is also a NT *hapax* and 'Eternal Spirit' (9:14) is a Biblical *hapax*. In addition, the concept of believers becoming μέτοχοι of the Spirit (6:4) and the description of God validating the gospel message by 'distributing' (μερισμός) the Holy Spirit to followers of Christ (2:4) are also unique to Hebrews.

After undertaking a close examination of all seven divine-πνεῦμα texts in Hebrews this thesis concludes that Hebrews has a significant, developed and unique pneumatology (§8.1). The author portrays the Spirit as personal, eternal and divine (§§8.2.2-8.2.4). He is actively involved in the atonement and the New Covenant (§8.3.3), showing the need for such a covenant (§8.3.1) and providing a partnership with each member of the New Covenant Community such that the Spirit enables that which the Covenant requires (§8.3.3). The Holy Spirit plays a crucial role in Hebrews. Both author and congregation experienced him as God, co-equal with the Father and the Son. In fact, Hebrews' underlying pneumatology displays what might be called 'Trinitarian coinherence' (§§8.2.1, 8.4).

Contents:

	Title page	1
	Declaration	2
	Acknowledgements	3
	Abstract	4
	Contents	5
	Tables etc.	8
	Abbreviations	9
1	Introduction	14
	1.1 Thesis to be defended	14
	1.2 Overview of the thesis	16
	1.2.1 ‘Fellow Travellers’ – for parts of the journey	17
	1.2.1a Martin Emmrich	18
	1.2.1b David M. Allen	20
	1.2.1c Jack Levison	22
	1.2.1d Madison N. Pierce	24
	1.2.1e This thesis	26
	1.3 Methodology	27
	1.4 Preliminary matters	29
	1.4.1 Overview	29
	1.4.2 Terminology	30
	1.4.3 The article and πνεῦμα	33
	1.4.4 The ‘meaning’ of the genitive	36
	1.4.5 πνεῦμα statistics for the NT	37
	1.5 Style, structure and use of language in Hebrews	39
	1.5.1 Introduction	39
	1.5.2 Vocabulary	40
	1.5.3 Word pairs/triplets in Hebrews	42
	1.5.4 Use of rhetoric	42
	1.5.5 Conclusions	45
2	Background of Hebrews	46
	2.1 Purpose and congregation	47
	2.2 Genre	51
	2.3 Intellectual and spiritual background	55
	2.4 The Old Testament	60
	2.5 The ‘Christ tradition’	65
	2.6 Conclusions	68
3	Aspects of the pneumatology of the OT and Second Temple Judaism	69
	3.1 The Spirit in the OT: Introduction	70

3.2	The Spirit as Proof-of-Presence	71
3.2.1	New Testament developments	75
3.2.2	Hebrews: preliminary remarks	76
3.3	The Spirit of Prophecy / Bringer of Revelation	77
3.3.1	The Old Testament	77
3.3.2	‘Judaisms’ pre-dating and contemporary with the NT	80
3.3.3	The New Testament	81
3.3.4	Hebrews: preliminary remarks	82
3.4	Did the Spirit ‘cease’?	83
3.4.1	New Testament implications	85
3.4.2	Implications for Hebrews	86
3.5	The Spirit in Hebrews: Overview	86
4	Spirit and Scripture	88
4.1	Introduction	88
4.2	The Greek world prior to and contemporary with the NT	89
4.3	The OT and Second Temple texts	90
4.3.1	The OT	90
4.3.2	Two Second Temple Texts	91
4.3.2.1	Tractate <i>Sotah</i> 9.6	91
4.3.2.2	4 Ezra 14:22	94
4.4	The NT, apart from Hebrews	95
4.4.1	Mark 12:36 // Matthew 22:43; Acts 1:16; 4:25	96
4.4.2	Acts 28:25	97
4.4.3	2 Peter 1:20-1	98
4.4.4	2 Timothy 3:16	99
4.4.5	Conclusions	99
4.5	What is said in Hebrews: Introduction	100
4.5.1	How Hebrews quotes Scripture: overview	101
4.5.2	The Holy Spirit speaks through Scripture: 3:7; 10:15	103
4.5.3	The Holy Spirit interprets Scripture: 9:8	108
4.5.4	The context and content of the Spirit’s words	113
4.6	Conclusions	114
5	The Holy Spirit, <i>μερισμός</i> and <i>μέτοχος</i> , Hebrews 2:4 and 6:4	116
5.1	Introduction	116
5.2	Hebrews 2:4	116
5.2.1	‘Distributions’ (<i>μερισμός</i>) of Holy Spirit	117
5.2.2	<i>πνεύματος ἁγίου</i> , gift or giver?	119
5.2.3	Hebrews 2:4, preliminary conclusions	120
5.3	Hebrews 6:4	122
5.3.1	Whom does 6:3-4 describe?	123

	5.3.2 Partnered by (μέτοχος) the Holy Spirit	125
	5.3.2.1 μέτοχος in the NT, apart from 6:4	126
	5.3.2.2 μετέχω in Hebrews and 1 Corinthians	131
	5.3.2.3 μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου	133
	5.4 Conclusions	137
6	The Eternal Spirit, πνεύματος αἰωνίου, Hebrews 9:14	141
	6.1 Introduction	141
	6.1.1 Locating 9:14 within the letter	142
	6.2 Sacrificial terminology in 9:11-14	143
	6.2.1 Blood	144
	6.2.2 Goats and Calves	147
	6.2.3 Goats and Bulls	147
	6.2.4 Spotless	149
	6.2.5 Conclusions	152
	6.3 ‘Eternal’ in Hebrews	152
	6.3.1 αἰώνιος, Introduction	154
	6.3.2 αἰώνιος in Hebrews (apart from 9:14)	156
	6.3.3 Conclusions	162
	6.4 The Identity and Function of πνεύματος αἰωνίου	163
	6.4.1 Introduction	163
	6.4.2 πνεύματος αἰωνίου as Christ’s S(s)pirit	163
	6.4.3 πνεύματος αἰωνίου as Holy Spirit	169
	6.4.4 The Function of πνεύματος αἰωνίου	176
	6.5 Conclusion	180
7	The Spirit of Grace, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος, Hebrews 10:29	182
	7.1 Introduction	182
	7.2 Collocations of χάρις and πνεῦμα – overview	182
	7.2.1 Revelation 1:4-5	184
	7.2.2 Philo, <i>De Gigantibus</i> 24	187
	7.2.3 The Testament of Judah 24:2	189
	7.2.4 Zechariah, Introduction	190
	7.2.4.1 Zechariah 12:10	191
	7.2.4.2 Zechariah 4:6-7	195
	7.2.4.3 Zechariah: Conclusions	197
	7.3 ‘Grace’, Introduction	200
	7.3.1 ‘Grace’ in Hebrews	201
	7.4 An exegesis of 10:29	204
	7.4.1 Introduction	204
	7.4.2 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας	205
	7.4.3 τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγῆσάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη	207

	7.4.4 τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας	209
	7.5 Conclusions	211
8	Conclusions and Overview of the thesis	214
	8.1 Introduction	214
	8.1.1 Hebrews has a developed pneumatology	214
	8.1.2 Hebrews has a significant pneumatology	214
	8.1.3 Hebrews has a unique pneumatology	215
	8.2 The Spirit – Who he is	216
	8.2.1 Trinitarian language?	217
	8.2.2 The Spirit is personal	220
	8.2.3 The Spirit is eternal	220
	8.2.4 The Spirit is divine	221
	8.3 The Spirit – What he does	222
	8.3.1 The Spirit is the speaking hermeneut	223
	8.3.2 The Spirit, atonement and covenant	224
	8.3.3 The Spirit and enabling partnership	225
	8.4 Conclusion	227
9	Bibliography	229

Tables etc.¹

1:1	Standardised analysis of the frequency of the word πνεῦμα in various NT texts and text groups	38
2:1	Elements of a Covenant Reinforcement Document (CRD)	53
2:2	Source of OT quotations in the NT	62
2:3	The Christology of Hebrews compared	66
2:4	Other comparisons	67
3:1	God's Spirit interacting with people (in the OT)	70
Fig. 3:1	God's Spirit interacting with people (in the OT)	71
4:1	OT text and y. <i>Sotah</i> 9.6 compared	93
4:2	To whom the quotation is attributed	100
4:3	How the book/author introduces the quotation	101
4:4	The tense employed to introduce the quotation	101
4:5	Speakers in 3:7-4:7	105
5:1	A Comparison of Acts 2 and Hebrews 2:3-4	120
5:2	Spiritual Immaturity described by Hebrews and Paul	132
5:3	Christian foundations or basics	135
7:1	The pouring out of Spirit in Zechariah, Joel and Ezekiel	195

¹ Tables are numbered with two digits separated by a colon. The first digit indicates in which chapter the table is found and the second is a sequential numbering of tables within that chapter.

Abbreviations

Journals:

<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
<i>EQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
<i>FM</i>	<i>Faith and Mission</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JPT</i>	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>Rbib</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RBL</i>	<i>Review of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>SWJT</i>	<i>Southwestern Journal of Theology</i>
<i>TynB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>

Publishers:

CBA	Catholic Biblical Association of America
CUP	Cambridge University Press
DB	Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft
IVP	Inter-Varsity Press
MM&S	Marshall Morgan and Scott
MUP	Manchester University Press
OUP	Oxford University Press
SAP	Sheffield Academic Press
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SCM	Student Christian Movement
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
UBS	United Bible Society
UCP	University of California Press
UChP	University of Chicago Press
UP	University Press

UPA	University Press of America
WJK	Westminster John Knox
WS	Wipf and Stock
YUP	Yale University Press

Bibles:

ASV	<i>American Standard Version.</i>
AV	<i>Authorized Version.</i>
CEV	<i>Contemporary English Version</i>
ESV	<i>English Standard Version.</i>
HCSB	<i>Holman Christian Standard Bible</i>
JB	<i>Jerusalem Bible</i>
LXX	Rahlfs-Hanhart, <i>Septuaginta, Editio altera</i> ; Stuttgart: DB, 1996.
MT / BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.</i>
NA ²⁷	<i>Nestle Aland Greek New Testament</i> , (27 th Edition).
NASB	<i>New American Standard Bible</i>
NETS	<i>New English Translation of the Septuagint.</i>
NIV	<i>New International Version—Anglicized.</i>
NJB	<i>New Jerusalem Bible</i>
NKJ	<i>New King James Version.</i>
NRSV	<i>New Revised Standard Version.</i>
TEV	<i>Today's English Version</i>
OSB	<i>Orthodox Study Bible.</i>
UBS ⁴	<i>UBS Greek New Testament</i> (4 th Edition).
UBS ⁵	<i>UBS Greek New Testament</i> (5 th Edition).
Wycliffe	<i>Wycliffe New Testament</i> , London: British Library, 2009 [1388].

Other:

AB	Aramaic Bible: The Targums. Various translators, dates and publishers	
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls	
LCL	Loeb Classical Library	
LXX Ap.	Apparatus to the Göttingen Septuaginta; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Various editors, 24 vols, 1931-2006	
MT OT	Masoretic text;	Old Testament;
HB NT	Hebrew Bible;	New Testament;
LXX	Septuagint;	Cf. the discussion at §1.4.2
NC	New Covenant	
OC	Old Covenant	
v.l.	<i>varia lectio</i> (variant reading)	

The works of Philo (with the *LCL* volume in which they are found)

<i>Abr.</i>	On Abraham	VI
<i>Aet. Mundi</i>	On the eternity of the world	IX
<i>Agric.</i>	On husbandry	III
<i>Conf. Ling.</i>	On the confusion of tongues	IV
<i>Congr.</i>	On the preliminary studies	IV
<i>Deus Imm.</i>	On the unchangeableness of God	III
<i>Ebr.</i>	On drunkenness	III
<i>Flacc.</i>	Flaccus	IX
<i>Fuga</i>	On flight and finding	V
<i>Gig.</i>	On the giants	II
<i>Heres</i>	Who is the heir	IV
<i>Jos.</i>	On Joseph	VI
<i>Leg. All.</i>	Allegorical interpretation	I
<i>Migr. Abr.</i>	On the migration of Abraham	IV
<i>Mut. Nom.</i>	On the change of names	V
<i>Omn. Prob. Lit.</i>	Every good man is free	IX
<i>Op. Mundi</i>	On the creation	I
<i>Plant.</i>	On Noah's work as a planter	III
<i>Post.</i>	On the posterity and exile of Cain	II
<i>QG.</i>	Question and answers on Genesis	Sup. I
<i>Sacr.</i>	On the sacrifices of Abel and Cain	II
<i>Somn.</i>	On dreams	V
<i>Spec. Leg.</i>	On the special laws	VII, VIII
<i>Virt.</i>	On the virtues	VIII
<i>Vit. Mos.</i>	Moses	VI

Primary texts, collected essays and reference works:

<i>A New Translation</i>	Wise, M.O. Abegg, M.G. Jr. & Cook, E.M. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation</i> , New York: HarperOne, 2005.
<i>ABD</i>	Freedman, D.N. (Ed.), <i>The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary</i> (6 vols), New York: Doubleday, 1996.
<i>ANF</i>	Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J. (Eds), <i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</i> , (10 vols) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994 [1885-87].
<i>As it is Written</i>	Porter, S.E. and Stanley, C.D. (Eds), <i>As it is Written</i> , Atlanta: SBL, 2008.

- Bauckham (2008) Bauckham, R. Driver, D.R. Hart, T.A. & MacDonald, N. (Eds), *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Bauckham (2009) Bauckham, R. Driver, D.R. Hart, T.A. & MacDonald, N. (Eds), *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- BDAG Bauer, W. Danker, F.W. Arndt, W.F. & Gingrich, F.W. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Chicago: UChP, 2000.
- BDF Blass, F. Debrunner, A. & Funk, R.W. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other early Christian Literature*, Chicago: UChP, 1961.
- DCH Clines, D.J.A. (Ed.) *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 8 vols, Sheffield: SAP, 1993-2011.
- DLNTD Martin, R.P. & Davids, P.H. (Eds) *Dictionary of the Later New Testament & Its Development*, Leicester: IVP, 1997.
- EDG Beekes, R. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols, Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Firth, *Presence* Firth, D.G. & Wegner, P.D. (Eds), *Presence, Power and Promise*, Nottingham: Apollos, 2011.
- Four Views* Bateman IV, H.W. *Four Views on the Warning Passages in Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2007.
- Gelardini (2005) Gelardini, G. (Ed.) *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*, Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- LN Louw, J.P. & Nida, E.A. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, New York: UBS, 1996.
- Marshall (2012) Marshall, I.H. Rabens, V. and Bennema, C. (Eds) *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Metzger Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd Edition, New York: UBS, 1994.
- MNS Bauckham, R. Davila, J.R. Panayotov, A. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Montanari	<i>The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> , Leiden: Brill, 2015.
NIDNTT	Brown, C. (Ed.), <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> , 3 Vols, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992.
NIDOTTE	VanGemeren, W.A. (Ed.), <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> , 5 vols, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997.
NPNF ¹	Schaff, P. (Ed.), <i>The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, First Series</i> , (14 vols) Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969 [1886-89].
NT use of OT	Beale, G.K. & Carson, D.A. (Eds), <i>Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament</i> , Nottingham: Apollos, 2008.
Oropeza and Moyise	Oropeza, B.J. and Moyise, S. (Eds) <i>Exploring Intertextuality</i> , Eugene: WS, 2016.
OTP	Charlesworth, J.H. (Ed.) <i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , 2 vols, London: DLT, 1985.
Sovereign	Schreiner, T. & Ware, B.A. (Eds), <i>Still Sovereign</i> , Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
SPA	<i>Studia Philonica Annual</i> .
TDNT	Kittel, G. & Friedrich, G. (Eds), <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , 10 vols, tr. and ed. Bromiley, G.W. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76.
TDOT	Botterweck, G. & Ringgren, H. (Eds), <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> , 15 vols, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1974-2006.

1. Introduction

This thesis aims to examine the use of the word $\piνεῦμα$ ² to designate the divine Spirit³ in the letter to the Hebrews.⁴ In so doing, the pneumatological assumptions held by its author will be revealed. To expose his⁵ underlying pneumatology is not to say that Hebrews offers a formal presentation of such teaching. It is simply to recognise that the language/terminology employed required that such a theology was already present in his mind and that, to a significant degree, his congregation⁶ would read/hear his words with understanding.

1.1 Thesis to be defended

The suggestion made by Swete that there is no theology of the Spirit in Hebrews⁷ is still the consensus among NT scholars.⁸ However, recently a number of commentators have

² And its cognates – unless otherwise stated, this is so when any word is discussed.

³ There are five references to the Holy Spirit (2:4; 3:7; 6:4; 9:8; 10:15) and one to each of the eternal Spirit (9:14) and the Spirit of grace (10:29). Verse references that are unattributed (as here) are from Hebrews. The use of the capital ‘S’ here and throughout this paper in referring to the divine/Holy Spirit is not presumptive eisegesis, it is merely a convenient convention. For an interesting but inconclusive discussion of the issues, see Austin, M.R. “The Curse of the Metaphysical Capital”, *ExpTim*, 103 (1992), 104-107. On the difficulty of deciding whether to use ‘spirit’ or ‘Spirit’ see Isaacs, M.E. *Sacred Space*, Sheffield: SAP, 2002 who, on page 68, has four occurrences of ‘holy spirit’ while on page 185 n.1 capitalizes her two uses of ‘Holy Spirit’ and her two uses of ‘Spirit’.

⁴ Unless otherwise stated, Scripture quotations are from: UBS⁵ and BHS, (English, NRSV); LXX, (English, OSB).

⁵ The use of masculine singular pronouns (he/his/him) is not to be taken as an indication of the author’s gender but is simply a convenient circumlocution. The suggestion that the masculine singular participle $\deltaιηγούμενον$ in Heb. 11:32 (one of only four first person remarks) “is decisive” in ruling out feminine authorship [so, Marshall, I.H. *New Testament Theology*, (Downers Grove: IVP, 2004), 605] is as convincing as saying that Luke 24:27 proves Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch or that 2 Tim. 1:1 demonstrates Pauline authorship of the Pastorals.

⁶ The use of the term congregation does not necessarily identify Hebrews as a homily rather than a letter/epistle. ‘Congregation’ can imply ‘readership’ as well as ‘audience’ in a way that ‘readership’ does not necessarily imply ‘audience’. It is used as a neutral word to designate the community to which Hebrews was addressed. See §§1.5.1; 2.1; 2.2. The author of Hebrews will be referred to as ‘the author’, ‘our author’ or ‘its author’ depending on context.

⁷ Swete, H.B. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, (London: McMillan, 1909), 248-49.

⁸ E.g. Montefiore, H.W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: A&C Black, 1975), 5; Isaacs, M.E. *The Concept of Spirit*, (London: Heythrop College, 1976), 125; Attridge, H.W. *Hebrews*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 250; Ellingworth, P. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993), 66-67; Miller, J.C. “Paul and Hebrews: A Comparison of Narrative Worlds”, Gelardini (2005), 262; Thiselton, A.C. *The Holy Spirit*, (London: SPCK, 2013), 15-56. See also the discussion of the individual divine- $\piνεῦμα$ texts, §§4-7.

begun to explore Hebrews' pneumatology more positively.⁹ This thesis will specifically engage with four of these scholars, outlining and evaluating their contribution to the debate. In so doing it will show where this thesis 'sits' within the conversation.¹⁰

Hebrews' pneumatology has been variously called "indistinct",¹¹ "diffuse and ill-defined"¹² and "Judaic and less developed" than elsewhere in the NT.¹³ In contradistinction to these opinions, this thesis will argue that the author's (unstated) pneumatological assumptions, which consistently and constructively underpin the divine-*πνεῦμα* statements made in his letter, are well developed (§8.1.1), highly significant (§8.1.2) and unique (§8.1.3). To do this, all the verses in Hebrews where *πνεῦμα* refers to the divine Spirit will be examined.¹⁴ This exercise will show that the pneumatology of Hebrews not only stands within mainstream Christian tradition but also adds to that tradition, building on the same foundations that underpin Lucan and Pauline pneumatology. Indeed, our author offers his own unique pneumatological insights which make a significant contribution to the overall NT picture of the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, it will be demonstrated that Hebrews can be said to represent the pinnacle of NT pneumatology. In fact, it will be argued that underlying the divine-*πνεῦμα* language of Hebrews is a theology of Trinitarian coinherence (§§ 8.2.1, 8.4).

⁹ Bieder, W. "Pneumatologische Aspekte im Hebräerbrief", Baltensweiler, H. & Reicke, B. (Eds), *Neues Testament und Geschichte*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1972), 251-59; Vanhoye, A. "Esprit éternel et feu du sacrifice en He 9,14", *Biblica*, 64 (1983), 263-74; Lewicki, T. "Der Heilige Geist in Hebräerbrief", *Theologie und Glaube*, 89 (1999), 494-513, Accessed 23 April 2014, at <http://www.theol-fakultaet-pb.de/thgl/thgl1999/4lewicki.htm> (13 pages); Emmrich, M. *Pneumatological Concepts in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Lanham: UPA, 2003); *idem*, "'Amtscharisma': Through the Eternal Spirit (Hebrews 9:14)", *BBR*, 12 (2002), 17-32; *idem*, "'Pneuma in Hebrews: Prophet and Interpreter", *WTJ*, 63 (2002), 55-71; *idem*, "Hebrews 6:4-6 – Again! (A Pneumatological Enquiry)", *WTJ*, 65 (2003), 83-95; Allen, D.M. "The Holy Spirit as Gift or Giver? Retaining the Pentecostal Dimension of Hebrews 2.4", *Bible Translator*, 59 (2008), 151-58; *idem*, "The Forgotten Spirit: A Pentecostal Reading of the Letter to the Hebrews", *JPT*, 18 (2009), 51-66; Motyer, S. "The Spirit in Hebrews: No Longer Forgotten", Marshall (2012), 213-27; Hodson, A.K. "Hebrews", Burke, T.J. and Warrington, K. (Eds), *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*, (London: SPCK, 2014), 226-37; Levison, J. "A Theology of the Spirit in the Letter to the Hebrews", *CBQ*, 78 (2016), 90-110; Pierce, M.N. *Divine Discourse in the Epistle to the Hebrews: An Encounter with a God who Speaks*, (Durham: PhD Thesis, 2017); Carroll, J.T. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 2018), 127-31.

¹⁰ See §1.2.1. Emmrich, *Concepts*; Allen, "Gift or Giver"; *idem*, "Forgotten Spirit"; Levison, "Theology"; Pierce, *Divine Discourse*.

¹¹ Spicq, C. *L'Épître aux Hébreux (2 Vols)*, (Paris: Gabalda, 1952-3), 1:147: "*si estompe*" ("so blurred").

¹² Attridge, *Hebrews*, 250.

¹³ Emmrich, *Concepts*, 88.

¹⁴ Note that Hebrews also uses *πνεῦμα* to designate angels (e.g. 1:7) and the human spirit (e.g. 4:12).

Hebrews, alone in the NT, employs the phrase ‘The Holy Spirit says’ in OT quotation formulae and explicitly connects the Spirit to the Atonement. Also emphasised is the role of the Spirit in both establishing and authenticating the people of God individually and as members of the ‘New Covenant’ (NC) community. The Spirit actively interprets Scripture, 9:8 being the only place in the NT where the Spirit is said to act as an independent hermeneut. The phrase ‘Spirit of grace’ (10:29) is a NT *hapax* and ‘Eternal Spirit’ (9:14) is a Biblical *hapax*. In addition, the concept of believers becoming μέτοχοι of the Spirit (6:4) and the description of God validating the gospel message by ‘distributing’ (μερισμός) the Holy Spirit to followers of Christ (2:4) are also unique to Hebrews. In fact, on all seven occasions when the author of Hebrews refers to the Spirit, he does so using language and concepts that are unique in the NT.

1.2 Overview of the thesis

The first chapter of this thesis will proceed by commenting on some recent positive contributions to the discussion of Hebrews’ pneumatology showing how this thesis adds to the discussion (§1.2.1). Then, after discussing methodology (§1.3), a few preliminary matters will be addressed (§1.4). Firstly, the issue of terminology – specifically relating to terms like ‘Old Testament’, ‘Scripture’, ‘the Septuagint’ *et al* – will be discussed (§1.4.2). Next two grammatical issues that affect the interpretation of most of the divine-πνεῦμα texts in the letter will be addressed (§§1.4.3; 1.4.4). Finally, some statistical observations will be offered concerning Hebrews’ use of the word πνεῦμα (§1.4.5).

After discussing these preliminary issues, an examination of the literary style and structure of Hebrews and its use of language will be undertaken, including an analysis of its vocabulary (§1.5). These analyses will demonstrate both the overall richness of language and the importance of πνεῦμα in Hebrews. The ‘subtitle’ of this thesis is “Confused, Careless, Cavalier or Carefully Crafted?” It will be shown in the introductory sections that, far from being ‘careless’ in his use of language, our author is precise, deliberate and specific in his choice of word, phrase, clause and sentence. This literary integrity has the twin corollaries that nothing in Hebrews can be overlooked as

irrelevant to the author's purposes and the overall effect of this 'word of exhortation' can be fully appreciated only when the individual linguistic/textual units are understood in their own right.¹⁵

The second chapter of this thesis begins with some brief comments concerning the background that the author and recipients shared in order for him to write to them as he did (§2.1). Then, after some discussion of Hebrews' genre (§2.2), the intellectual and spiritual background (and foreground) of thought within which Hebrews sits will be explored (§§2.3-2.5). Chapter three will examine aspects of the use of *πνεῦμα* in the OT and Intertestamental Judaism that impinge upon this thesis. The role of the Spirit as both 'proof-of-presence' (§3.2) and 'prophetic Spirit' (§3.3) touch on more than one section of this thesis, as does the question of the 'cessation of the Spirit' (§3.4); consequently, they will be introduced in chapter three. An overview of *πνεῦμα* as divine-Spirit in Hebrews will then be presented (§3.5). The main body of the thesis comprises a close exegesis and comparative analysis of the divine-*πνεῦμα* (and other relevant) passages in Hebrews (§§4-7). Finally, an overview of the pneumatology of the Letter to the Hebrews will be proffered (§8).

1.2.1 'Fellow-Travellers' – for parts of the journey

As has been noted (§1.1), there has been a growing recognition amongst commentators that Hebrews does have something positive to contribute to NT pneumatology. This thesis will engage with four of these scholars. Both Emmrich and Allen have made significant and recognised contributions to the pneumatology of Hebrews and have moved that discussion in new directions. Emmrich's monograph¹⁶ is said to be the first

¹⁵ Even if the total effect of Hebrews is greater than the sum of its parts, nonetheless the 'parts' (the smallest units of text) were specifically chosen by its author. Consequently, the part they play within the whole cannot be ignored. It is not a case of 'can't see the wood for the trees'; rather, the 'wood' can only be properly appreciated when individual 'trees' are also kept in view. At the same time, individual 'trees' are appreciated all the more when the whole 'forest' is kept in view – see §1.3.

¹⁶ See §1.2.1a for details. Note that, unless otherwise stated, the works of others will be referenced by page number and references to the text of this thesis will be by section number (§...).

modern “published full study on Hebrews and the Spirit”.¹⁷ Allen’s work¹⁸ is a challenge to the Pentecostal community to explore how the pneumatology of Hebrews can add to their own understanding of the Spirit and his works.¹⁹ Levison²⁰ builds on the work of Allen, writing that in Hebrews, “the Spirit plays an essential role in... salvation” and that the letter brings “an indispensable pneumatology” to the overall NT understanding of the Spirit.²¹ Pierce, focusing on ‘divine speech’ in Hebrews,²² correctly recognises that, “The God who speaks in Hebrews is a God identified as three distinct speakers, Father, Son and Spirit... and each one offers a distinct contribution to the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews”.²³ The contributions that each of these scholars bring to the study of Hebrews’ pneumatology will now be outlined (§§1.2.1a-1.2.1d). A brief statement showing how this thesis fits into the discussion and moves the debate on will form part of these reviews and conclude this section (§1.2.1e).²⁴

1.2.1a Martin Emmrich

Martin Emmrich calls his *Pneumatological Concepts* (2003) a “reader-friendly, streamlined” re-presentation of his 2001 doctoral thesis submitted to Westminster Theological Seminary.²⁵ In this monograph he examines all seven divine-πνεῦμα texts in Hebrews, beginning with the designation ‘eternal Spirit’ (9:14). Showing that the phrase does not refer to Christ’s own spirit or his divinity, Emmrich correctly concludes that the eternal Spirit is the Holy Spirit.²⁶ The import of this identification lies in the fact

¹⁷ So, Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 52 n.2.

¹⁸ See §1.2.1b for details.

¹⁹ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 51.

²⁰ See §1.2.1c for details.

²¹ Levison, *Theology*, 90.

²² In some senses this is a development of and corrective to the work of Emmrich.

²³ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 1. I am indebted to Madison Pierce for graciously making a copy of her thesis available to me as this one was nearing completion.

²⁴ Obviously, the main body of this thesis (§§4-7) and its conclusions (§8) will make this more explicit.

²⁵ Emmrich, *Concepts*, vii. Emmrich’s three articles overlap to a significant degree with material in *Concepts*, very little material being either added or subtracted: “Amtscharisma”, see *Concepts*, 1-13; “Pneuma”, see *Concepts*, 27-51; “Again!”, see *Concepts*, 57-64, 69-74. For details of *Concepts* and the articles, see §1.1 n.9.

²⁶ Emmrich, *Concepts*, 1-5. See §6.4.

that 9:14 is the only text in the NT which explicitly links the Spirit to the atonement.²⁷ Emmrich suggests that the Spirit is a divine gifting to enable Christ to fulfil his office as high priest.²⁸ Turning to 10:29, Emmrich attempts to show that the designation ‘Spirit of grace’ “describes the Spirit’s gifting and equipping God’s people for priestly service”.²⁹

In his discussion of the relationship of the Spirit to Scripture (3:7; 9:8; 10:15), Emmrich writes that “God speaks *through* the Spirit as his agent of speech”³⁰ i.e. in “charismatic (prophetic) utterances”³¹ and is parallel to the Pauline designation ‘the Spirit of wisdom and revelation’ (Eph. 3:17). Emmrich interprets 6:4 and 2:4 in a similar way. On 6:4 he writes that the μέτοχοι of the Spirit “experience Pneuma... by way of Spirit-inspired utterances and Spirit-induced wisdom”.³² On 2:4 he identifies the πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς with “spiritual gifts that revolve around utterances and guidance. Such (as) prophecy, tongues, and... wisdom”.³³ Thus, he concludes that 2:4 and 6:4 both relate to the Spirit bringing enlightenment and guidance to the community “through invasive charismatic speech”.³⁴ However, as this thesis will show, in 2:4 it is the Spirit who is given, rather than ‘charismatic gifts’.³⁵ His presence with the followers of Christ authenticates both the NC message and the NC community.³⁶

Emmrich has ‘opened a door’ for a new discussion of Hebrews’ pneumatology, thereby enabling others to walk along a path that earlier generations did not believe existed. He is to be applauded for much of what he writes although his focus is too narrow. The Spirit is not simply God’s agent through whom he speaks to his people. Whether through Scripture or charismatic utterance, the Spirit speaks *as* God and, far from having “a

²⁷ Clearly, Swete’s observation that there is no theology of the Spirit in Hebrews and the statement that 9:14 is the only NT text linking the Spirit and the atonement cannot both be correct.

²⁸ Emmrich, *Concepts*, 6.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 13-16.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 28, (emphasis original).

³¹ *Ibid.*, 44.

³² *Ibid.*, 58.

³³ *Ibid.*, 67.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ See §5.2. Cf. Allen, “Gift or Giver”, 151-52.

³⁶ See §§5.3.2; 5.4. Cf. Allen, “Gift or Giver”, 157.

subordinate role... in Hebrews,³⁷ the Spirit has a central role to play.³⁸ Whilst 9:14 does refer to the divine equipping of Christ as sacrificing priest, it also refers to his being equipped as spotless sacrificial lamb (§§6.2; 6.4.4; 6.5). Similarly, the Spirit of grace (10:29) brings the totality of God’s grace into the lives of Christ’s followers. He enables individual believers not only to function as priests but also to satisfy all the covenant obligations that result from being part of the NC community (§§2.2; 5.4). The Spirit of grace (10:29) as the gift of grace (2:4) enters into what might be called ‘an enabling partnership’ (6:4) with those living under the NC (§§5.3; 8.3.3). Furthermore, his presence with the members of the NC community authenticates them as the family of God (§§5.2; 8.3.1).

1.2.1b David M. Allen

David Allen has progressed the discussion with the publication of two significant articles, “The Holy Spirit: Gift or Giver” (2008) and “The Forgotten Spirit” (2009), both of which explore the ‘Pentecostal’ dimension of Hebrews’ pneumatology.³⁹ In “Gift or Giver”, Allen focuses primarily on 2:4 and shows that the majority translation “distributions of gifts from the Holy Spirit”, with its unwarranted introduction of “gifts from... rob(s) Hebrews of its own seminal “Pentecostal” moment (or moments)”.⁴⁰ After a detailed discussion of the translational issues and possibilities, Allen links 2:4 with 6:4 and concludes that “while the *visible* evidence of... partake(ing) of the Spirit may well have been the manifestation of spiritual gifts,” the author’s focus was on “the evidential partaking of the Spirit”.⁴¹ The presence of the Spirit confirms “the divine presence among the faithful of the community”.⁴² Drawing out some of the parallels with the Lukan Pentecost narrative (Acts 2) and Cornelius’ reception of the Spirit (Acts 10:44-48), Allen is surely correct when he writes “that “Pentecost-like” experiences happen...

³⁷ Emmrich, *Concepts*, 28. See §4.5.2. Cf. Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 172.

³⁸ So, Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 66; Levison, “Theology”, 9. See §§6.4.4; 8.1; 8.3.

³⁹ See §1.1 n.9 for full details of these papers.

⁴⁰ Allen, “Gift or Giver”, 151-52.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 157, emphasis original. See §§5.2.3; 5.4.

⁴² Allen, “Gift or Giver”, 151.

to other (or all?) believers” and for Hebrews these “distribution(s) of the Spirit testify to the superiority of the New Covenant”.⁴³

In “Forgotten Spirit”, Allen further develops the thesis which underlies “Gift or Giver” and examines all seven divine-πνεῦμα texts with a view to showing that “the ‘Pentecostal’ gift of the Spirit (is) the framework for new covenant discourse” in Hebrews.⁴⁴ In his discussion of 3:7 and 10:15, Allen identifies the Spirit as one who voices Scripture, is the “source of its prophetic empowering” and “speaks in tandem with... God”.⁴⁵ Without repeating the critique of Emmrich (above), this thesis argues that 3:7 and 10:15 reveal so much more about Hebrews’ understanding of the person and work of the Spirit.⁴⁶ On 2:4 and 6:4 Allen adds little that is not in “Gift or Giver”,⁴⁷ although he does recognise that in describing believers as μέτοχοι of the Spirit (6:4) “the experiential language... suggests a more personal encounter or engagement”.⁴⁸

On 10:29 Allen suggests that the genitival noun χάριτος which qualifies ‘the Spirit’ indicates that “the Spirit is a gift of grace” and “to reject the new covenant is to refuse the very gracious ‘gift’ (of the Spirit) that... marks out that new covenant”.⁴⁹ He correctly notes that by “gift and presence” the Spirit demonstrates “the presence of the new age”.⁵⁰ This eschatological referent is further supported by the “potential intertextual relationship” between 10:29 and Zechariah 12:10⁵¹ which, if correct, carries the “overtones of the Spirit ‘poured out’ as the agent of divine restoration” and will go some way to explain our author’s choice of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος to designate the Holy Spirit.⁵²

Allen correctly identifies 9:8 as a key pneumatological text in the epistle. The rhetorical ‘play on words’ – the Spirit τοῦ ἁγίου reveals the inaccessibility of the way τῶν ἁγίων –

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 158. So too §§5.2; 5.3; 5.4.

⁴⁴ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 66. See §§2.2; 8.3.2; 8.3.3.

⁴⁵ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 53-54.

⁴⁶ See §§4.5.2; 4.5.4; 4.6.

⁴⁷ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 56-57.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 57. See the development of this idea in §§5.2; 5.3.2; 8.2.2; 8.3.1.

⁴⁹ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 58. However, the genitive is more than attributive, see §7.4.4.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 59. See §§7.2.4; 7.4.3.

⁵² Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 59. See also the discussion on ἐνυβρίζω, §7.4.4.

is designed to show the inadequacy of the old order “from the perspective of the new age... (and) the author is writing now within a community whereby the access has been made available.”⁵³ Commenting on 9:14 Allen recognises that the eternal Spirit is the Holy Spirit and the use of this designation has eschatological implications. The πνεύματος αἰωνίου “evidences, or testifies to, participation in the eternal age” and “makes the new covenant evidential and efficacious for its recipients”.⁵⁴ Valuable as Allen’s observations on Hebrews’ divine-πνεῦμα texts are, the implications of the texts for the person and divinity of the Holy Spirit are not as fully explored as they might be. However, this thesis would agree with the general thrust of his analysis; whilst not technically ‘building on’ Allen’s work, it seeks to expand the thoughts expressed therein in new directions, not least to demonstrate the underlying Trinitarian coinherence in the author’s theology.⁵⁵

1.2.1c John R. (Jack) Levison

Jack Levison’s article, “A Theology of the Spirit in the Letter to the Hebrews” (2016)⁵⁶ seeks to show that Hebrews’ pneumatology is coherent, creative and integral to the letter.⁵⁷ Levison builds on the work of Allen⁵⁸ and begins his exploration by dividing the divine-πνεῦμα texts into two sets – 3:7-8; 9:8 and 10:15 relating to the Spirit and Scripture and 2:4; 6:4; 9:14 and 10:29 which link the Spirit to salvation.⁵⁹ On the Spirit and Scripture his thesis is that “the Spirit inspires the *extension* of (Scriptural) texts to the recipients of this letter”.⁶⁰ This is based on three factors – the use of the present tense in describing the Spirit’s activity, the alterations to the OT text and no clear distinction

⁵³ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 61.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 62. However, see the development of the implications for the NC community, §§6.4.4; 8.3.

⁵⁵ See the body of this thesis, §§4-7 and the conclusions drawn from that exegesis, §§8.2; 8.4.

⁵⁶ See §1.1 n.9 for full details of Levison’s paper.

⁵⁷ Levison, “Theology”, 90.

⁵⁸ He also acknowledges Motyer, “The Spirit”. See §1.1 n.9 for full details.

⁵⁹ Levison, “Theology”, 91-93.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 96.

between the quotation and its application to the congregation.⁶¹ He concludes that “the Spirit speaks directly, via Scripture, to the community of faith at the time of the letter”.⁶²

Turning to the other four references to the Spirit in Hebrews, Levison correctly sees the link between *μερισμός* in 2:4 and *διαμερίζω* in Acts 2:3, noting that Hebrews’ ‘distributions of the Spirit’ is “reminiscent of Pentecost”.⁶³ The plural *μερισμοῖς* indicates that the outpouring of the Spirit “was not a one-time experience” and was part of “the experience of the letter’s recipients”.⁶⁴ Indeed, Levison asserts that “the work of the Holy Spirit... is still in play, still attested by signs, wonders, and miracles, still distributed to people of faith”.⁶⁵ Looking at 6:4 Levison seeks, unconvincingly, to show that there is a similar ‘Pentecostal’ dimension to *μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου*. This he does by appealing to the cognate *μετέχω* in 5:13 and identifying the ‘heavenly gift’ (6:4) with the Holy Spirit “distributed among them”.⁶⁶ Writing that the ‘ingesting’ of milk (5:13) and ‘tasting’ the heavenly gift (6:4) are metaphorical, Levison then suggests that in Acts 2:3 the word ‘tongues’ in the phrase “tongues as of fire” is also metaphorically “evocative of ingestion”.⁶⁷ His conclusion that the recipients have an authentic experience of the Spirit which unites them with Jesus and the first disciples⁶⁸ is likely correct but does not require the rather ‘forced’ link between 6:4 and Acts 2:3. The consistent and integrated pneumatology of Hebrews enables the implications of 2:4 (as a restatement of the Acts Pentecost narrative) to influence the overall theology of the letter (§5).

On 9:14 Levison is disposed to accept the views of Bonsirven and Attridge that the eternal Spirit is “the spirit within Jesus”.⁶⁹ Nonetheless, he brings his discussion of 9:14

⁶¹ *Ibid*, 96-100.

⁶² *Ibid*, 100.

⁶³ *Ibid*, 101. See §5.2.2.

⁶⁴ Levison, “Theology”, 101.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 102.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 103-104.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 103. However, the use of *μετέχω* in 2:14 can hardly carry the notion of ingestion: “Since, therefore, the children share (*κοινωνέω*) flesh and blood, he himself likewise *μετέσχευεν* (ingested?) the same things”. See §5.3.2 of this thesis for a discussion of *μέτοχος* and specifically §5.3.2.2 to see how *μέτοχος* relates to *μετέχω*.

⁶⁸ Levison, “Theology”, 105.

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, 106. See §§6.4.2; 6.4.3 for the details (and rebuttal) of these views.

to a conclusion by stating that whether the verse refers to an inner disposition that motivated Jesus or to the Holy Spirit's strengthening of Jesus, either way it shows "the author's pneumatology" to be creative.⁷⁰ However, Levison seems not to realise that, if 9:14 is referencing Jesus' 'inner disposition', it is not a pneumatological statement. This thesis will argue that the eternal Spirit in 9:14 is the Holy Spirit who enabled Jesus to fulfil his ministry as both sacrificing priest and sacrificial victim.⁷¹

There is much in Levison's article that advances the debate about the Spirit in Hebrews in a very positive manner. Not least his correct concluding comment that the pneumatology of Hebrews "offers a crucial witness to the experience and belief of the early church".⁷² However, on 10:29 Levison recognises that 'the Spirit of grace' is an intertextual allusion to Zechariah 12:10 but then fails to explore the 'Pentecostal' dimension to the Spirit of grace being 'poured out'.⁷³ Rather, he focuses on outraging (ἐνυβρίζω) the Spirit of grace and seeks to interpret this in the light of Isaiah 63:7-14 and the Synoptics reference to blasphemy against the Spirit, concluding that "divine vengeance and judgment" await the perpetrators.⁷⁴ However, as will be seen, this betrays a misunderstanding of the Biblical *hapax* ἐνυβρίζω.⁷⁵

1.2.1d Madison N. Pierce

Madison Pierce's 2017 doctoral thesis, "*Divine Discourse in the Epistle to the Hebrews: An Encounter with a God who Speaks*", advances the discussion by showing that "the Spirit speaks in precisely the same way as the Father and Son, though his voice and the character revealed by his words are distinct."⁷⁶ This is not the arena in which to discuss

⁷⁰ Levison, "Theology", 106.

⁷¹ See §§6.4; 8.3.2.

⁷² Levison, "Theology", 110.

⁷³ See §7.2.4.

⁷⁴ Levison, "Theology", 107-108.

⁷⁵ For a discussion of ἐνυβρίζω in 10:29 see §7.4.4.

⁷⁶ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 251. So too §§4.5; 8.2.2; 8.2.3.

her “prosopological exegesis”⁷⁷ of the speeches in Hebrews. However, in a number of places her work does impinge on the propositions advanced by this thesis and it is those pneumatological matters that will be addressed.⁷⁸ In a disarmingly ‘self-evident’ observation, Pierce points out that if the Father, Son and Spirit “can be in conversation with one another, then they are not the same person”.⁷⁹ Furthermore, our author always portrays the relationships “between the Spirit and the Father or Son with language about interactions”.⁸⁰ Indeed, in Hebrews they are identified as three separate speakers.⁸¹ Not only does Pierce affirm the Spirit’s individuality and ‘person-hood’, she affirms his divinity. She writes that the Spirit “could both speak of God and speak as God”.⁸² That his pre-existing and developed pneumatology enabled the author to write to his congregation as he did is also recognised by Pierce⁸³ when she writes that in 3:7 the author attributes Psalm 95 to the voice of the Spirit “in accordance with his own existing cognitive framework”.⁸⁴

Pierce is comfortable writing of Father, Son and Spirit as “personal, distinct entities” and “that the use of “Trinitarian” or “the Trinity” with regard to Hebrews in a minimalist way would be appropriate”.⁸⁵ Indeed, the author understands the relationships between Father, Son and Spirit in such a way that “Hebrews offers a level of complexity regarding these intradivine dynamics that are at times unparalleled in the rest of the New Testament”.⁸⁶

The bold strokes with which Pierce presents her arguments and the (Trinitarian) pneumatic insights flowing from the observation that the Spirit speaks *as* God are to be

⁷⁷ From *πρόσωπον*, face, person, character, *BDAG*, 887-88. Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 5 describes it as “assigning “faces” or characters, to ambiguous or unspecified personal (or personified) entities represented in the text in question”.

⁷⁸ See also Pierce, M.N. “Hebrews 3.7-4.11 and the Spirit’s Speech to the Community”, Hockey, K.M., Pierce, M.N., Watson, F. (Eds) *Muted Voices of the New Testament*, (London: T&T Clark, 2017), 173-84.

⁷⁹ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 22.

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, 30. See e.g. §§5.4; 6.4.4; 7.4.4; 8.2.

⁸¹ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 1.

⁸² *Ibid*, 172. This is affirmed in this thesis, see §§4.5.2; 4.6; 8.3.1.

⁸³ See §§1; 8.2; 8.4.

⁸⁴ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 252. However, this thesis disagrees with Pierce concerning the identity of the speaker in 4:3-7, see §4.5.2.

⁸⁵ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 23. Cf. her section, “one speaker in three persons”, *ibid*, 26-31.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 31. This thesis would concur with this judgement, but argue for the presence of more than a ‘minimalist’ Trinitarian theology in Hebrews. See §§4.6; 5.4; 6.5; 7.5; which are brought together in §8.2.

applauded. Pierce has moved the debate forward in these particulars and this thesis would accept much of what she offers in her discussion of three of the divine-πνεῦμα texts (3:7; 9:8; 10:15). Nonetheless, helpful as her observations are, her focus is not specifically on the pneumatology of Hebrews. Pierce's focus is on prosopological exegesis and, as part of that, she attempts to show that the Spirit is the divine agent who communicates with the congregation.⁸⁷ This thesis also examines the other four divine-πνεῦμα texts in Hebrews (§§5-7) to show the full creative, consistent and complete (trinitarian) pneumatology shared by our author and his congregation (§8).

1.2.1e This Thesis

One major difference between this thesis and the four 'fellow travellers' concerns how 10:29 should be understood.⁸⁸ Neither Emmrich, Allen nor Levison explore the Spirit's role in 'enabling covenant fidelity' as fully as they might.⁸⁹ It will be seen that 'the Spirit of grace' (10:29) brings the totality of that grace won by Christ's self-offering into the lives of believers.⁹⁰ Furthermore, just as the Spirit equipped Christ for his role as sacrificing priest and sacrificial offering (9:14), so too the Spirit enables Christ's followers to persevere in their faith to the end (6:4).⁹¹ In addition, 10:29 contributes significantly to the appreciation of the individuality and divinity of the Holy Spirit.⁹²

⁸⁷ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 253-54; cf. 183. The essence of her thesis is that in Hebrews God speaks in three persons, the Father speaks to the Son, the Son to the Father and the Spirit addresses the community. As has been said, this thesis is not the place for a full critique of Pierce's thesis; consequently, comments will be restricted to issues relevant to Hebrews' pneumatology.

⁸⁸ See §7.4.4.

⁸⁹ They are not alone in this; for example, Whitlark [J.A. *Enabling Fidelity to God*, (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008) 152-63], in his discussion of what he calls "God's ongoing enablement for continuing fidelity" makes no mention of the role of the Holy Spirit.

⁹⁰ Whilst this results in 'the priesthood of all believers' (Emmrich, *Concepts*, 13-16), it is not limited to that. See §§7.3.1; 7.5; 8.3.3.

⁹¹ See §§5.3.2; 6.4.4; 7.4.4; 8.3.3.

⁹² *Contra*, Emmrich, who writes that Hebrews does not recognise "the Spirit as a person equal to God" (*Concepts*, ix) and that "the divine Spirit is the agent through whom God operates" (*ibid*, 4). See §§7.4; 8.2

1.3 Methodology

The wider use of *πνεῦμα* will be explored: in Hebrews, in documents pertinent to its background and in those roughly contemporary with it. This ‘wider use’ is of significance because our author was writing for others with whom he had an ongoing relationship and shared a degree of commonality of background. Underlying this ‘letter’ (or homily) there is, between author and congregation, an unexpressed but significant shared understanding, shared history and shared extra-literary experience.⁹³ Therefore, the starting point for hermeneutics will be the question of what the author meant and what his first readers shared with him that enabled his text to be both produced and received. As Goldingay argues, one cannot begin to interpret a text without reference to the author and first audience.⁹⁴ Indeed, an author (and/or text) has a right to be heard (as far as that is possible across time and culture) and the reader has the responsibility at least to attempt to listen. As will become apparent, this thesis seeks to follow what might be called ‘Philip’s hermeneutic’ (Acts 8:35), starting by seeking for the meaning intended by the original author and understood by the original readers.⁹⁵

The discipline known (loosely) as ‘intertextual studies’ recognises that no piece of literature is produced in isolation from other texts that are significant for our author and/or his readers.⁹⁶ Intertextuality is much more than identifying where and what earlier text is employed in another later text.⁹⁷ In terms of the use of the OT in the NT, it is

⁹³ Walker [P. “A First Century Sermon”, Williams, P.J. Clarke, A.D. Head, P.M. and Instone-Brewer, D. (Eds), *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting*, (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004), 233] writes that the author’s rapport with his readers came from “building on concepts they share” and cites Lindars’ [B. “The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews”, *NTS*, 35 (1989), 390] statement that our author “starts with propositions that are not in dispute”. See §8.1.3.

⁹⁴ Goldingay, J. *Models for the Interpretation of Scripture*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 33-35.

⁹⁵ As far as is possible when dealing with a text written by an unknown author to an unknown audience.

⁹⁶ See Moyise, S. “Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament”, Moyise, S. (Ed.) *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, (Sheffield: SAP, 2002), 37 who quips, “no text is an island”.

⁹⁷ On the methods and scope of ‘intertextuality’, see e.g. Oropeza and Moyise, xiii-xvi and the essays there referred to. Cf. Moyise, “Intertextuality”, 14-41; Hays, R.B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, (New Haven: YUP, 1989); Whitlark, J.A. *Resisting Empire: Rethinking the Purpose of the Letter to “the Hebrews”*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 62.

more akin to ‘rewritten Scripture’⁹⁸ and includes allusion, paraphrase and ‘echoes’.⁹⁹ However, it is not always easy to differentiate between these categories: not only may the echo be faint but “sometimes the echo will be so loud that only the dullest... could miss it”.¹⁰⁰ This leads Hays to “make no systematic distinction between” allusion and echo.¹⁰¹ He prefers to use the term “allusive echo” to indicate that the new text has “a broad interplay... encompassing aspects of text A (the earlier text) beyond those explicitly echoed”.¹⁰² Thus, an earlier text must be allowed a ‘voice’ in interpreting the text in which it is ‘echoed’. Consequently, the *context* in which a motif is found in the OT may well be significant for understanding what the motif might mean when (in the context of this thesis) it is reused in Hebrews.¹⁰³ Rather than using phrases from the OT as ‘proof texts’, these “verses or sentences were... pointers to the whole context” in which they occurred and this is “the starting point for the theological constructions of... the author to the Hebrews”.¹⁰⁴

A note of caution has been sounded by Moyise, among others, to the effect that an overuse of the term ‘intertextuality’ could render that designation “meaningless”.¹⁰⁵ He states that ‘intertextuality’ “is best used as an ‘umbrella’ term for the complex interactions between ‘texts’ (but) such interactions are rarely straightforward”.¹⁰⁶ This thesis will address issues of intertextuality as appropriate. The criteria, specifically

⁹⁸ E.g. see Crawford, S.W. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 39-59; Moyise, S. *The Old Testament in the New*, (London: Continuum, 2001), 9-20.

⁹⁹ See *As it is Written*, specifically: Moyise, S. “Quotations”, 15-28; Porter, S.E. “Allusions and Echoes”, 29-40; Ciampa, R.E. “Scriptural Language and Ideas”, 41-57. On the place of ‘metaphor’ in Hebrews, see Schenck, K. “Shadows and Realities”, Oropeza and Moyise, 82-85.

¹⁰⁰ Hays, *Echoes*, 29.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* Cf. Moyise, “Intertextuality”, 23-25.

¹⁰² Hays, *Echoes*, 20, 154-56.

¹⁰³ See Brown, J.K. “Metalepsis”, Oropeza and Moyise, 29-41. Cf. Brodie, T.L. MacDonald, D.R. and Porter, S.E. (Eds), *The Intertextuality of the Epistles*, (Sheffield: Phoenix, 2006), 1-9, 98-110.

¹⁰⁴ Dodd, C.H. *According to the Scriptures*, (London: Fontana, 1965 [1952]), 126-27. Whitlark [*Resisting Empire*, 62 n.48] describes Dodd’s book as ‘programmatically’. Cf. Gheorghita, R. “The Minor Prophets in Hebrews”, Moyise, S. & Menken, M. *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament*, (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 120; *idem*, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 56-57, 70-71.

¹⁰⁵ So, Moyise, “Intertextuality”, 40-41. So too Porter, S.E. “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology”, Evens, C.A. & Sanders, J.A. (Eds), *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, (Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 84-85.

¹⁰⁶ Moyise, “Intertextuality”, 41.

Hays' seven criteria,¹⁰⁷ for identifying an intertext will occupy §7.2.4.3 and the question of what constitutes an OT quotation in Hebrews will form part of §2.4.

It must not be overlooked that Hebrews is 'a word of exhortation' (13:22), intended to take the first readers 'out of their comfort zone'. This has two important corollaries. Firstly, the rhetorical style and rich language that our author employs indicate that he is a careful and articulate 'word-smith'. This will be demonstrated in the observations on language and rhetorical style that follow (§1.5).¹⁰⁸ Secondly, it is also important to recognise that there is teaching in Hebrews that goes beyond the shared; there is material that the first readers would find innovative, distinctive and challenging.

This thesis will employ a historical-critical approach, use intertextuality to locate the background from which the author of Hebrews builds his pneumatology¹⁰⁹ and will utilise the findings of rhetorical studies to demonstrate his precision in use of language. Socio-linguistics and a discussion of the genre of Hebrews (§2.1) will also reveal something of how our author saw himself.

After this lexical and exegetical study, the full breadth of Hebrews' pneumatology will be demonstrated. Consequently, chapters four to seven of this study of the pneumatology of Hebrews will explore the word *πνεῦμα*, the phrases in which it occurs and the place the divine-*πνεῦμα* texts occupy within the whole document.

1.4 Preliminary matters

1.4.1 Overview

The word *πνεῦμα* occurs twelve times in the letter to the Hebrews: twice relating to angels,¹¹⁰ thrice (apparently) to the human spirit¹¹¹ and seven times to designate the

¹⁰⁷ Hays, *Echoes*, 29-33.

¹⁰⁸ It is not within the remit of this thesis to discuss whether the author of Hebrews was or was not a *trained* rhetorician; it is sufficient to demonstrate that he was familiar with, and competent in using, rhetorical devices and method. As a result, his language is carefully chosen, precise and purposeful.

¹⁰⁹ This will be particularly relevant for the designation 'Spirit of grace' (10:29), see §7.2.

¹¹⁰ 1:7, 14.

¹¹¹ 4:12; 12:9, 22.

divine Spirit. Of the eleven occurrences of *πνεῦμα* that are dependent on our author's turn of phrase,¹¹² six are anarthrous and five are articular. In particular, of the seven divine-*πνεῦμα* texts, three do not take the article while four do. A further grammatical issue relates to the use of genitival phrases. Of the seven texts with which this thesis is concerned, five are genitival constructions. The meaning of three of these (2:4; 6:4 and 10:29) depends on how the genitive is to be understood.¹¹³

This 'overview' raises a further three preliminary issues that will now be addressed. The first relates to the statistical significance of the number of occurrences of *πνεῦμα* in Hebrews. Then the theological significance (or otherwise) of the use (or non-use) of the article in the divine-*πνεῦμα* texts will be examined. Finally, some remarks will be offered about what, if any, objective 'rules' can be applied to determine how, in specific situations, the genitival 'of' is best understood. First, however, issues of terminology must be addressed.

1.4.2 Terminology

The focus of this thesis is the pneumatology of the letter to the Hebrews. Of its seven texts that treat the divine Spirit, three specifically link the Holy Spirit with texts/concepts in the Hebrew Bible¹¹⁴ and one designation, 'Spirit of Grace' (10:29), may well depend on a verse from the OT.¹¹⁵ However, before discussing these pericopes, it is necessary to make some remarks about the terminology employed – both generally and in this thesis in particular – in order to avoid possible misunderstandings.

Among the many issues raised by attempts to talk about aspects of the NT's use of the OT, there are two specific and fundamental dangers that one needs to be aware of. On the one hand, there is the Scylla of terminological inexactitude and on the other, the

¹¹² I.e. texts original to Hebrews, not citations from source texts, therefore excluding 1:14 (= Ps. 104:4 [103:4]). All OT references will correspond to the English versification; if the LXX differs it will be given after the reference and in square brackets, as here.

¹¹³ They have been variously 'labelled' subjective, objective, epexegetical, possessive or absolute.

¹¹⁴ 3:7; 9:8; 10:15.

¹¹⁵ See §7.2.4.

Charybdis of excessive pedantry. The words and phrases commonly employed are often at best misleading and anachronistic, and at worst, worse. The phrases Old Testament (OT), Hebrew Bible (HB) and Masoretic Text (MT) properly belong to a time which is decades (or centuries) after the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, as does ‘New Testament’ as a description of a collection of ‘approved’ or canonical writings.¹¹⁶ ‘The Septuagint’ (LXX) has become an inexactitude, representing whatever Greek text the (NT) author had recourse to.¹¹⁷ As Aitken points out, “there is no one Septuagint, not only in terms of the books included, but in terms of the text itself... a number of versions... have left their mark”.¹¹⁸

In many minds, ‘Scripture’ carries with it the concept of ‘canonicity’ – even though in the mid to late decades of the first century AD none of the sacred texts could properly be described by either word.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, words like ‘canon’, ‘canonicity’ and ‘extra-canonical’ are also misleading and anachronistic.¹²⁰ McLay makes a plea to use the word ‘Scripture’ to designate “a book that enjoys authoritative status for a faith community” and ‘canon’ as those books which have “official status as THE inspired Scriptures for a faith community”.¹²¹ However, this distinction is not universally accepted (let alone applied); indeed, some would argue that the word ‘Scripture’ assumes canonicity.¹²²

¹¹⁶ E.g. see Epp, E.J. “Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, with an Excursus on Canon”, Porter, S.E. (Ed.), *A Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 45-97, particularly 73-91; McDonald, L.M. *Forgotten Scriptures*, (Louisville: WJK, 2009), 5, 11-33.

¹¹⁷ E.g. Gheorghita, *Role*, 6-7 who writes that ‘Septuagint’ is a term “denoting nothing more than the Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures used by the Author”. Cf. *Ibid*, 29; Docherty, S.E. *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 121-32; Cross, F.M. *From Epic to Canon*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1998), 208-10. See §2.4.

¹¹⁸ Aitken, J.K. (Ed.), *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 2, 5.

¹¹⁹ E.g. see Kruger, M.J. “The Definition of the Term ‘Canon’: Exclusive or Multi-Dimensional?”, *TynB*, 63 (2012), 1-20; Hengel, M. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), *passim*.

¹²⁰ So are words or phrases that suggest that, in the NT period, there was an ‘orthodox Judaism’ or that Hellenistic Judaism existed as a geographical concept. Furthermore, the decision to use the designation, ‘Old Covenant (OC) people’, Jews, Israelites or Hebrews and to refer to their home as Israel, Judah, Canaan or Palestine, is often seen as a political one. However, to avoid confusion, for the sake of consistency and with no political motivation, this thesis will generally refer to the people as ‘Jews’ and the land as ‘Israel’, unless the context demands otherwise.

¹²¹ McLay, R.T. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 8 – emphasis original. See also Lim, T.H. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, (New Haven: YUP, 2013), *passim*.

¹²² So, Koskie, S.J. “Seeking Comment: The Commentary and the Bible as Christian Scripture”, *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, 2 (2007), 243, “Reading the Bible as Scripture also acknowledges its authority for the common life of the church and assumes for it a canonical “wholeness”.”

Furthermore, there was a significant degree of fluidity in the transcription of the texts such that scribes not only copied but also reworked and updated them for a new generation.¹²³ One conclusion is that since “there was no canon of Scripture for the NT writers... there was no biblical text either”.¹²⁴

It would be almost impossibly verbose to maintain terminological precision when talking about ‘the NT’s use of the OT’. Furthermore, the documents that were to become the NT not only refer to those writings that were to become the HB/OT/MT but also call upon texts that are included in the so-called Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha¹²⁵ and reference secular authors such as Aratus,¹²⁶ Epimenides¹²⁷ and Menander¹²⁸ in support of their arguments.

Unless otherwise indicated, this thesis will designate those texts that would become the HB as the OT, call the Hebrew text (BHS) the MT and refer to the Greek translations of the OT as the LXX.¹²⁹ Furthermore, this thesis will employ the word ‘Scripture’ to designate those books that were eventually included in the (Protestant) canon. It is notoriously difficult to ‘draw a line’ between the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha.¹³⁰ For the purposes of this thesis, the apocryphal books are those listed in the NETS but not in the MT. Pseudepigraphical books are those listed in *OTP* and *MNS* but excluding those in NETS.

¹²³ See Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 1-15, *passim*. She references, for example, the “two different and parallel forms of the book of Jeremiah”, one represented by the LXX and 4QJer^{a, c} and the other in the MT and 4QJer^{b, d}, *ibid*, 4. See also McLay, R.T. “Biblical Texts and the Scriptures for the New Testament Church”, Porter, S.E. (Ed.), *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 38-58.

¹²⁴ *Ibid*, 58. See also the brief but useful discussion in Charlesworth, J.H. “Review of *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture* Ed. L.H. Feldman, J.L. Kugel and L.H. Schiffman (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 3 vols”. Accessed on 11/01/15 at: <http://www.biblicalarcheology.org/reviews/outside-the-bible/>. However, see the remarks on the Pastorals designation of Luke 10:7 as ‘Scripture’ in Meier, J.P. “The Inspiration of Scripture: But What Counts as Scripture?”, *Mid-Stream*, 38 (1999), 76-78.

¹²⁵ E.g. Heb. 11:37 alludes to *Asc. Isa.* 5:11-14; Luke 11:21-22 to *Ps. Sol.* 5:4; Eph. 1:17 to *Wisd.* 7:7.

¹²⁶ *Phaenomena* 5 in Acts 17:28.

¹²⁷ *De Oraculis* in Titus 1:12.

¹²⁸ *Thais* (218) in 1 Cor. 15:33.

¹²⁹ See the brief note in Oropeza and Moyise, xviii.

¹³⁰ See the useful discussion in McDonald, L.M. *The Biblical Canon*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 142-49.

1.4.3 The article and πνεῦμα

Of the seven πνεῦμα-texts in Hebrews with which this thesis is primarily concerned, four are articular and three are anarthrous. Some commentators have suggested that the lack of the article, particularly at 9:14 and 6:4 and to a lesser extent at 2:4, militates against the possibility that those texts refer to the *personal* Holy Spirit.¹³¹ On the other hand, there are commentators who regard the use or non-use of the article as having no *theological* significance.¹³² Moffatt suggests that the author of Hebrews has a liking for the genitive absolute, a construction which does not need the use of the article.¹³³ Furthermore, he states that “the definite article is sparingly used”¹³⁴ but this is not the case; Paul uses the article slightly less than Hebrews does.¹³⁵ The use or non-use of the article is, in fact, a matter of style and personal choice.¹³⁶ Consequently, it is as well to make some general remarks at this juncture about the significance (or otherwise) of the article when it is used (or not used) with πνεῦμα. This will avoid repetition each time πνεῦμα is discussed.

The article in Greek does not have a ‘one-to-one’ correspondence with the English definite article. To refer to ὁ as ‘the definite article’ is, therefore, somewhat misleading,

¹³¹ E.g. Hughes, P.E. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 359 n.7; Milligan, G. *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899), 147; Moffatt, J. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924), 124; Peake, A.S. *Hebrews*, (Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, nd [1902]), 185; Westcott, B.F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977 [1889]), 261; Schenck, K. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), 133-39.

¹³² Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 456. Cf. Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: MM&S, 1967), 121; Mounce [W.D. *Pastoral Epistles*, (Nashville: Nelson, 2000), 450] writes: “not much should be made of its absence”.

¹³³ Moffatt, *Hebrews*, lxi.

¹³⁴ *Ibid*, lix.

¹³⁵ However, there is little difference in the frequency of the article across the NT. Hebrews uses it once every 7.08 words (698x in 4,942 words), Paul once every 7.34 words (4,402x in 32,303 words), Luke-Acts once every 7.05 words (5,355x in 37,778 words). The usage for the whole NT is once every 6.91 words (19,863x in 137,328 words).

¹³⁶ Moule [C.D.F. *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1975 [1953]), 111-12] writes: “It is sometimes claimed that an important theological issue is involved in the use or non-use of the article – e.g. with πνεῦμα; but each instance needs to be discussed on its own merits, and in some instances, it is hard to avoid the impression that usage is arbitrary”. So too, Dunn, J.D.G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, (London: SCM, 1974), 70. He writes that the use or non-use of the article with πνεῦμα: “is... stylistic (and) lacks... theological significance” (*ibid*).

not least because there is no ‘indefinite article’ in Greek.¹³⁷ In just over a page of text outlining how the article is used in what he calls ‘special cases’,¹³⁸ Wenham uses words such as ‘usually’, ‘often’ and ‘prefers’ six times.¹³⁹ He goes on to say that the rules for the use of the article are neither “rigid (nor) without exceptions”,¹⁴⁰ and with regard to personal names “it seems to be largely a matter of the author’s whim whether he uses the article or not”.¹⁴¹ Furthermore, the suggestion that all anarthrous nouns are ‘indefinite’, while those with the article are ‘definite’, does not accord with the evidence. Whilst it is true that the article can be used to particularise the noun it is associated with,¹⁴² there are many occasions when the anarthrous form is also definite.¹⁴³ Furthermore, there are times when the articular form is used not to particularise but to make the substantive qualitative.¹⁴⁴ In the same way, there are times when a noun without the article represents a category not an individual item.¹⁴⁵ Indeed, all the so-called ‘rules’ for determining how to understand, interpret or translate articular or anarthrous nouns are hedged about with copious exceptions, restrictions and preconditions.¹⁴⁶

Turner, however, uses the presence or lack of the article as the basis of his attempt to determine when Luke is referring to the Holy Spirit and when to “a vaguer and less personal divine spirit”.¹⁴⁷ He acknowledges that his results are “short of infallibility” but nonetheless concludes, “we can feel certain whether St Luke refers to a holy spirit or to

¹³⁷ Whilst the pronoun τις can indicate that a substantive is indefinite, there is no indefinite article as such.

¹³⁸ I.e. with Θεός, Ἰησοῦς, ἄνθρωπος as a class and abstract nouns.

¹³⁹ Wenham, J.W. *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1965), 35-36.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 35 n.1.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid*, 36.

¹⁴² E.g. 1:1 ὁ θεός... τοῖς πατράσιν and τοῖς προφήταις.

¹⁴³ E.g. 1:2 where υἱὸς and κληρονόμον are not the indeterminate ‘a son’ and ‘an heir’ but ‘the Son’ and ‘the heir’.

¹⁴⁴ E.g. 3:13a, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται is not a specific day but all the ‘todays of grace’, although it might be possible to claim that this is an anaphoric use of the article (such categorisation is not ‘clear cut’), it still makes ‘today’ the representative of ‘days of grace’. Cf. 3:13b, τῆς ἁμαρτίας is not ‘the sin’ but ‘sin’ as a category; similarly, 5:14 ἡ στερεὰ τροφή is ‘solid food’ not a specific meal.

¹⁴⁵ E.g. 5:14 καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ – the categories ‘good’ and ‘evil’, not a specific manifestation of either.

¹⁴⁶ See the helpful discussions in Porter, S.E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, (Sheffield: SAP, 1995), 101-14; Carson, D.A. *Exegetical Fallacies*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984); and the more ‘turgid’ but still very useful Wallace, D.B. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 216-31, 243-54; Cf. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 106-17; *BDF*, §§252-62.

¹⁴⁷ Turner, N. *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004 [1965]), 17-22, here 19.

the Holy Ghost himself'.¹⁴⁸ Unfortunately, Turner fails to realise that his conclusions effectively reduce his argument to the level of *reductio ad absurdum*.¹⁴⁹

If 'Holy Spirit' is understood to be a proper name, it would not *require* the article to be definite. Blass and Debrunner state that, "In Lk τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is rather the Pentecostal Spirit, ἅγ πν rather an unknown power".¹⁵⁰ They cite the authority of Procksch for this statement; however, Procksch actually advises caution in pressing too hard the distinction between articular and anarthrous.¹⁵¹ Furthermore, Blass and Debrunner suggest that Acts 10:44 is a virtual personification of the Holy Spirit and (by their own assertion) in the case of personal names the article is not required.¹⁵² Furthermore, while the nouns 'father', 'son' and 'spirit' are not monadic (one-of-a-kind), the noun-phrases 'Heavenly Father' and 'Son of God' clearly are. Similarly, 'Holy Spirit' can be considered monadic, "and refers only to *the* Holy Spirit".¹⁵³ In this case, πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον does not need the article to be definite since there is but one Holy Spirit.

Any attempt to use the presence or absence of the article alone to suggest that Hebrews is referring in one place to *the* Holy Spirit and in another to *a* holy spirit (or power, impulse or motivation) is destined to fail.¹⁵⁴ Indeed, it is "rather forced to interpret the anarthrous uses... as uniformly meaning something less than God's Holy Spirit".¹⁵⁵ The

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 20, 22.

¹⁴⁹ Turner concludes (*ibid*, 19-22) that The Holy Spirit was involved with Pentecost (Acts 2:4, 33, 38), with Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:3), the 'Gentile Pentecost' (Acts 10:19; 11:12, 15), Paul's converts in Galatia (Acts 15:8), the prophetic utterances of Agabus (Acts 11:28; 21:11) and the Antiochene prophets (Acts 13:2). However, it was an "indefinable holy power from God" that overshadowed Mary (Luke 1:35) and guided/inspired John the Baptist, Elizabeth and Zechariah (Luke 1:15, 41, 67). This same 'holy influence' motivated Simeon (Luke 2:25), filled Jesus (Luke 4:1) and allowed him to deal with evil spirits (Acts 10:38), was the 'good gift' of Luke 11:13 and accompanied 'fire' in the baptism Jesus offered (Luke 3:16). Keener [C.S. *Acts Vol. 1*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 520 n.184] writes that Turner's "approach leads to absurd results". Fee [G.D. *God's Empowering Presence*, (Peabody: Hendrickson 1994), 15] writes that Turner "has given us no "grammatical insights" into this matter at all".

¹⁵⁰ *BDF*, §257.

¹⁵¹ Procksch, O. ἅγιος, *TDNT*, 1:104.

¹⁵² *BDF*, §260.

¹⁵³ Wallace, *Grammar*, 248, emphasis mine. See also the discussion of the anarthrous ἐν υἱῷ (1:2) in O'Brien, P.T. *The Letter to the Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 50 n.40.

¹⁵⁴ This does not pretend to be a complete treatment of the use of the article. It is concerned to ask how far one can use the presence or absence of the article with 'Spirit' or 'Holy Spirit' to determine the theological intent of an author.

¹⁵⁵ Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 112-13.

context alone will determine whether or not any theological significance can be adduced from the presence or absence of the article in any specific text.

1.4.4 The ‘meaning’ of the genitive

Of the seven divine-πνεῦμα texts in Hebrews, five are genitival constructions.¹⁵⁶ The translation of three of these (2:4; 6:4 and 10:29) hinges on how the genitive is to be understood.¹⁵⁷ Furthermore, at 9:14 (διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου) διὰ with the genitive can indicate instrumentality, causality or origin.¹⁵⁸ It is therefore appropriate to discuss what, if any, ‘rules of translation’ apply to understanding genitival constructions.

The genitive often functions as an adjective but can also function as an adverb.¹⁵⁹ The grammars list the various ways in which the genitive can act; Blass and Debrunner, for instance, have 24 separate sections each describing a different use of this case.¹⁶⁰ Wallace devotes 169 pages to ‘The Cases’,¹⁶¹ 69 of which discuss over 40 uses of the genitive. These discussions of the genitive case (by both *BDF* and Wallace) demonstrate how apposite is Moule’s observation that the genitive “is so immensely versatile and hard-working a case that anything like an exhaustive catalogue of its uses would be only confusing and unnecessarily dull”.¹⁶² Whenever ‘guidance’ is offered for determining how to categorise a particular genitive, it is given in very tentative language. Wallace, for example, writes: “Other things being equal, and, if the context allows, then...”¹⁶³ Porter, similarly, couches his advice with, “if... then... maybe”.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁶ 2:4; 6:4; 9:8; 9:14 and 10:29.

¹⁵⁷ Objective, subjective, possessive or absolute.

¹⁵⁸ See Montanari, 479; *BDAG*, 223-26; Harris, M.J. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 69-82.

¹⁵⁹ *BDF*, §§162, 169.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid*, §§162-86. This compares with just three sections for the nominative, 13 for the accusative and 15 for the dative.

¹⁶¹ Wallace, *Grammar*, 36-205.

¹⁶² Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 37.

¹⁶³ Wallace, *Grammar*, 82 n.29.

¹⁶⁴ Porter, *Idioms*, 94-95.

When more than one option is possible, the decision as to whether the genitive is objective, subjective or partitive (or any other category) is itself subjective. There are no independent, consistent or objective rules or tests one can apply. The commentator makes a subjective decision based upon his or her understanding of the substantive in question, its place within the pericope under discussion, the (presumed) theology of the author and, indeed, how the commentator perceives the pericope's place within the larger text unit or whole document. Consequently, each of the divine-πνεῦμα texts in a genitival construction must be analysed on its own merits.

1.4.5 Πνεῦμα statistics for the NT

In Hebrews, the word πνεῦμα occurs twelve times in a text of about 5,000 words. Statistical analysis can help to give an indication of the importance of a word or concept for an author. However, two notes of caution need to be sounded. Firstly, the importance (or otherwise) of a subject is not necessarily dependent on the number of times a lexical term occurs. Nonetheless, the frequency of significant words/concepts can indicate particular interests and/or concerns of an author. In Hebrews, 'key-words' include: Ἰησοῦς (14x), Χριστός (12x), κρείττων (12x), ἱερεύς (14x), Μελχισέδεκ (8x) and 'perfection' (14x).¹⁶⁵ πνεῦμα (12 times) fits into such a list quite easily. Secondly, it must be acknowledged that, for a statistically significant comparison, the documents being examined should be of a similar length and be a minimum of about 10,000 words. Hebrews is about half that length and in the region of 15% of the length of the other document groups [13.2% of Luke/Acts and 17.6% of John].¹⁶⁶ Nonetheless, some tentative conclusions can be drawn from a statistical analysis of word usage in Hebrews; some (again tentative) comparisons can also be made between Hebrews and the other document groups.

¹⁶⁵ Τελειόω (9x), τέλειος (2x), τελειότης, τελείωσις and τελειωτής (once each). Τελευτάω (die) and τέλος ('end' in terms of 'time') are not included – their contexts do not connote aspects of 'perfection'. Cf. §8.1.1.

¹⁶⁶ The smaller the sample text the less reliable the statistical evidence. One extra (or fewer) use of πνεῦμα in Hebrews would change the statistical data significantly compared to a single extra use in, say, Luke/Acts.

**Table 1:1 Standardised analysis of the frequency of the word *πνεῦμα*
in various NT texts and text groups**

Book/author	Total words of text	Every occurrence of <i>πνεῦμα</i>	<i>πνεῦμα</i> per 1000 words	<i>πνεῦμα</i> as divine Spirit	<i>πνεῦμα</i> as divine spirit per 1000 words
Hebrews	4,942	12	2.43	7	1.42
The whole NT	137,446	379	2.76	260	1.89
Paul ¹⁶⁷	32,149	146	4.54	106	3.30
Luke/Acts	37,560	106	2.82	74	1.97
John ¹⁶⁸	28,203	60	2.13	45	1.60
Rest of NT	34,592	55	1.59	28	0.81

A statistical analysis of the frequency of *πνεῦμα* in Paul, Luke/Acts, John and the NT as a whole, challenges the view that Hebrews has a paucity of references to ‘spirit’¹⁶⁹ (see Table 1:1). Indeed, if the frequency of the word *πνεῦμα* determines the extent of a document’s pneumatology, Hebrews makes a similar contribution to that of Luke/Acts, John’s gospel and, indeed, the NT as a whole.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ The ‘disputed’ and ‘undisputed’ Paulines.

¹⁶⁸ ‘John’ comprises the Gospel, the three letters and Revelation. For the sake of completeness, the figures for the Gospel of John and Revelation respectively are: Gospel: 24 uses of *πνεῦμα* (1.53 times per 1,000 words) – 19 of which are regarded as referring to the divine Spirit (1.21 times per 1,000 words); Rev: 24 uses of *πνεῦμα* (2.43 times per 1,000 words) – 19 of which are regarded as referring to the divine Spirit (1.92 times per 1,000 words).

¹⁶⁹ In fact, the standard deviation (all occurrences of *πνεῦμα* – see Table 1.1) is 1.12, giving a range of 1.58-3.82 with Hebrews well within that at 2.43. For the divine-*πνεῦμα* occurrences, the SD is 0.93, the overall range is 0.89-2.75 with Hebrews again within the range at 1.42. It could be argued that Paul is somewhat of an ‘outlier’ and if his statistics are ignored, the range for all occurrences of *πνεῦμα* becomes 1.72-2.76 (a SD of 0.52) and his divine-*πνεῦμα* occurrences fall between 0.97-1.93 (SD 0.48). However the data is analysed, the frequency of *πνεῦμα* in Hebrews is well within the overall range for the NT.

¹⁷⁰ *Contra* Ellingworth, *Hebrews* 66-67; Lindars, B. *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 55-56; Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 155-56.

1.5 Style, structure and use of language in Hebrews

1.5.1 Introduction

The import of this section of the thesis is to show that “la magnifique pièce de littérature apostolique”¹⁷¹ which is Hebrews came about because our author was carefully crafting a considered composition. His style, choice of words and rhetorical structure show that he was neither careless nor cavalier in his writing. He chose to call his missive λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως ‘a word of exhortation’ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ‘conveyed in a few written words’ (13:22). It was a ‘word’ designed to be read aloud in the receiving congregation.¹⁷² The way the message is expressed, the arguments formulated, the turn of phrase and the richness of vocabulary employed, all demonstrate conclusively that Hebrews is a carefully crafted piece of rhetoric, *written* but designed to be *heard*.¹⁷³ Our author shows no confusion or imprecision in the presentation of his ideas or argument. This will be demonstrated both in the general remarks that follow immediately and in the exegesis which follows later (§§4-7). Some of the rhetorical and linguistic devices he employs in the letter will be identified.¹⁷⁴ Specifically, some of the ‘word pairs’ (and larger groupings) used to emphasise, explicate and expound his message will be explored. These will include examples of ‘word-play’ based on assonance, alliteration and, particularly in ‘couplets of completion’, the use of synonyms. However, as this is not the main purpose of the thesis, it will be sufficient to indicate the breadth of rhetorical and other literary devices employed in the letter. Indeed, there is general agreement among the commentators that the author of Hebrews was a ‘word-smith’ of significant ability.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷¹ Coppens, J. *Les affinités qumrâniennes de l’Épître aux Hébreux*, (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1962), 6.

¹⁷² E.g. the frequency of words with auditory and/or vocal reference: λαλέω (2:5; 6:9; 12:25), λέγω (5:11; 8:1; 9:5; 11:32; 13:6), ἀκούω (2:1) and ἀκοή (5:11). Hebrews uses these 58x.

¹⁷³ As Lane [W.L. *Hebrews 1-8*, (Dallas: Word, 1991), 113] writes: “It must be remembered, however, that he [Hebrews’ author] is a master of the intricate, disciplined and yet lucid sentence”.

¹⁷⁴ For a detailed list of such devices see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 19-21; Spicq, *Hébreux* 1:361-66.

¹⁷⁵ See O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 20: “polished literary character”; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 62: “displays skill in both written and (indirectly) oral communication”; Deissmann, A. *Light from the Ancient East*, (New

1.5.2 Vocabulary

This thesis will first comment on the vocabulary employed in Hebrews. This will help demonstrate the breadth of the author's linguistic prowess. Hebrews¹⁷⁶ has a text length of 4,942 words, a vocabulary of 1,038 words and 160 NT *hapax legomena*,¹⁷⁷ of which 68 are found nowhere else in the Bible.¹⁷⁸ Our author employs a further 109 words that have at least half of their NT occurrences in Hebrews and of these 76 are used elsewhere only once. There are at least eight words that he seems to have coined.¹⁷⁹ All this indicates that Hebrews has a significant richness of language and breadth of vocabulary. This can be further illustrated by comparing the opening words of the Letter to the Hebrews with those of John's Gospel. The first 24 words of John's gospel use a vocabulary of 10 words, whereas the first 25 words of Hebrews have a vocabulary of 21

York: Doran, 1927), 244: "the earliest example of Christian artistic literature", quoted by deSilva, D.A. *Perseverance in Gratitude*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 35. Hebrews is "artistic prose by reason of the composition of its words and sentences", so, *BDF*, §464. Cf. Allen, D.L. *Hebrews*, (Nashville: B&H, 2010), 25; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 20-21; Bruce, *Hebrews*, xlii; Isaacs, M.E. *Reading Hebrews and James*, (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 17; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, lxiv; Thompson, J.W. *Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 6.

¹⁷⁶ The statistics used in this chapter are derived from NA²⁷.

¹⁷⁷ Commentators differ in the number of NT *hapax* they assign to Hebrews. Lane [*Hebrews 1-8*, 1, quoting Morgenthaler, R. *Statistik Des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, (Gotthelf-Verlag: Frankfurt, 1958), 164] recognises 169 *hapax* in Hebrews. However, Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 12-13, citing Spicq, *Hébreux*, 1:154] lists 154. Koester, C.R. *Hebrews*, (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 96, agrees with Ellingworth but makes no reference to Spicq. However, in Ellingworth's list there are some mistakes. It includes, ἐπισυναγωγή (cf. 2 Thess. 2:1) and Σαλμών (Matt. 1:4, 5 but not in Hebrews). Furthermore, ἀγιότης (12:10) occurs as a v.l. at 2 Cor. 1:12 (see *BDAG*, 11). Morgenthaler's list does not include these three words although, on balance, ἀγιότης should be included in a list of *hapax* since the reading ἀπλότητι in 2 Cor. 1:12 is preferred – see Metzger, 507. Ellingworth omits three *hapax*, ἐπεισαγωγή (7:19), Σαμψών (11:32), and Ἰεφθάε (11:32) and two other words unique to Hebrews, Μελχισέδεκ (5:6 *et al*) and Σαλήμ (7:1, 2) that Morgenthaler correctly includes. Morgenthaler also includes two more words in his list of *hapax* in Hebrews (making his list 158 words long not 169): αἰτίος (5:9) [which is not a *hapax* as it occurs three times in Luke and once in Acts (see *BDAG*, 31)] and ἐπισκοπέω (12:15) [which should probably not be included since it is used (by some witnesses) at 1 Pet. 5:2 – see Metzger, 625 for an inconclusive discussion]. On the other hand, the textual evidence for ῥαντίζω (9:13) in Mark 7:4 is so slight that it should be regarded as a *hapax* in Hebrews (Metzger, 80). Finally, ἀφοράω (12:2) should be included as a *hapax* since ἀφίδω at Phil 2:23 (also a *hapax*) is from the verb ἀπεῖδον – which functions as the second aorist of ἀφοράω.

¹⁷⁸ As a comparison, note that 2 Cor. has a text length of 4,448 words with a vocabulary of 792 words and 99 NT *hapax*. Furthermore, 1 Cor. with 6807 words has a vocabulary of 967 words and 110 NT *hapax*.

¹⁷⁹ These are: μισθαποδοσία (2:2; 10:35; 11:26), ἀγενεαλόγητος (7:3), αἵματεκχυσία (9:22), μισθαποδότης (11:6), συγκακουγέομαι (11:25), πρόσχυσις (11:28), εὐπερίστατος (12:1) and τελειωτής (12:2). See Koester, *Hebrews*, 87-96.

words. Intuitively one recognises that, in these opening words, Hebrews has the greater/richer vocabulary. However, the issue of *scientifically* quantifying such an observation must now be addressed.

Simply comparing the text length (L) and the vocabulary (V) to arrive at a numerical value for richness (R) is not enough. The simple relationship $R=L/V$ does not hold because as L increases so the frequency with which new V is added would be expected to decrease.¹⁸⁰ Plotting the graph of V (y axis) against L (x axis)¹⁸¹ produces the positive half of a parabolic curve. This suggests a relationship of the type $L \propto V^2$.¹⁸² Therefore, a formula of the form $L = C + RV^B$ should best describe the relationship between text length, vocabulary and vocabulary richness.¹⁸³ Since texts with a length of 0 words have a vocabulary of 0 (obviously), the intersect of the y axis is zero; consequently, $C = 0$. Rearranging and simplifying the formula will give $R = V/L^b$ ($b = B^{-1}$) as a measure of vocabulary richness. Furthermore, Pruscha¹⁸⁴ has shown that this relationship works well where $b \cong 0.574$.

If the vocabulary richness of the whole NT is calculated, the relative richness (or paucity) of individual texts within the corpus can be expressed as a percentage of the NT average. The frequency of *hapax* could be another indication of a rich and varied vocabulary. However, ‘hapax richness’ could simply be an indication of idiosyncratic subject matter. Consequently, ‘vocabulary richness’ is the more reliable measure of overall richness of language and the literary ability of an author.

When the statistical analysis is done, it reveals that Hebrews has one of the richest vocabularies in the NT.¹⁸⁵ It has a vocabulary-richness almost 30% greater than the NT average¹⁸⁶ and has the second highest NT *hapax* frequency – one *hapax* about every six

¹⁸⁰ There is less ‘new’ vocabulary in, say, the 5,000-10,000 words bracket than in the 0-5,000 words range.

¹⁸¹ For all the individual NT documents.

¹⁸² This holds whether one is comparing total vocabulary or unique vocabulary (*hapax legomena*).

¹⁸³ Where C is a constant given by the point at which the graph intersects the y axis, $B \cong 2$ and A is the gradient of the line joining the origin and the point (L, V^B) for each text under consideration.

¹⁸⁴ Pruscha, H. “Statistical Models for Vocabulary and Text Length with an Application to the NT Corpus”, *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 13 (1998), 195-98.

¹⁸⁵ Statistical analysis of text length, total vocabulary and numbers of *hapax* has been carried out for Hebrews – and all the other NT works – by this writer and the figures used here come from that analysis.

¹⁸⁶ 28.75%, second only to 1 Tim. with 28.80%; Acts is 18.95% greater than the average.

words of vocabulary.¹⁸⁷ Borrowing from Worthington’s description of the whole Babylonian corpus, it might be said that Hebrews “vaunts a vertiginously vast, varied and vibrant” vocabulary.¹⁸⁸

1.5.3 Word pairs/triplets¹⁸⁹ in Hebrews

It is plain that the author of Hebrews enjoys manipulating words. He does this using a variety of linguistic devices, always with a view to making his thought more explicit and persuasive. Below are just a few of the ‘word-pairs’ he uses, employing such devices as ‘couplets of completion’, puns, word-plays, alliteration and assonance.

(1:1) πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως many (or various) ways and many (or various) parts

(2:2) παράβασις, παρακοή – transgression, disobedience (faulty walking, faulty hearing)

(2:10) δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα – for whom and through whom are all things

(5:8) ἔμαθεν... ἔπαθεν – assonance (*learning through suffering*)

(12:18) γνόφω καὶ ζόφω – γνόφω, darkness or gloom; ζόφω, gloom or darkness

These examples simply demonstrate that our author exercises a significant degree of precision and care in his use of language.

1.5.4 Use of rhetoric

Ancient rhetoric categorised speeches into three basic forms: judicial, deliberative or epideictic.¹⁹⁰ Hebrews exhibits aspects of both the deliberative and epideictic discourse and it is inappropriate to try and categorise it as one or other. Indeed, Hebrews is

¹⁸⁷ One *hapax* for every 6.1 words of vocabulary, second only to Acts with one per 4.3; 1 Tim. has one per 6.6 words.

¹⁸⁸ Worthington, M. *Complete Babylonian*, (London: Hodder, 2010), 1.

¹⁸⁹ More properly *bicola/tricola*; exhibiting rhythmic and structural equivalence, they are examples of *isocola*.

¹⁹⁰ Deliberative is an appeal to the audience to pursue a recommended course of action. This is done by a ‘carrot and stick’ method, encouraging the audience to follow the beneficial and shun the harmful. Epideictic reinforces the present values and/or lifestyle of the listeners by applauding what is worthy of praise and condemning what isn’t.

deliberative for those at risk of falling away (e.g. 4:11; 12:1-2) and epideictic for those who remain faithful (e.g. 4:14; 10:23).¹⁹¹

A simple list of some of the devices used in Hebrews shows our author's familiarity, comfort and ability with traditional rhetorical form and technique:¹⁹² alliteration (1:1; 4:16);¹⁹³ anaphora (Ch 11); antithesis (7:18-20, 28); antonomasia (1:4; 2:10; 5:7); assonance (6:20; 10:26); asyndeton (7:3; 11:37); brachylogy (1:4; 12:24); chiasm¹⁹⁴ (2:8-9; 4:16; 7:3); ekphrasis (9:1-5; 12:18-24); ellipse (7:19; 12:25); hendiadys (2:2 5:2; 8:5); homoeoptaton¹⁹⁵ (2:4); hyperbaton (4:8; 9:15); hyperbole (7:9-10); isocolon (1:3; 7:3, 26); litotes (4:15; 6:10; 9:7); metaphor (6:19); metonymy (4:6; 10:20); paronomasia (3:11; 7:9), polysyndeton (4:12-13; 12:18-21); synecdoche (13:10); and synkrisis (1:5-14; 3:1-6; 7:1-25; 8:4-10:18).¹⁹⁶

Other rhetorical devices employed in Hebrews include:

- Hook words: e.g. τῶν ἀγγέλων (1:4; 1:5) ties together 1:1-4 and 1:5-14 while ἀρχιερεὺς (2:17; 3:1) ties together 2:10-18 and 3:1-6;
- Summaries: (2:17-18; 8:1);
- *Inclusio*: e.g. νῶθοι γεγονάτε (5:11) and νῶθοι γένησθε (6:12) frames 5:11-6:12.

¹⁹¹ See O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 25-26; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, lxxix; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 46; Koester, *Hebrews*, 82; Johnson, L.T. *Hebrews*, (Louisville: WJK, 2006), 13.

¹⁹² For details see Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:351-78. Cf. Trotter Jr, A.H. *Interpreting the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), 164-84; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 24.

¹⁹³ However, it must also be recognised that, when it suits his purposes, he deliberately avoids alliteration. At 8:9 he alters τὴν διαθήκην ἣν διεθέμην to τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ἐποίησα; however, at 10:16 he retains ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι.

¹⁹⁴ See the extensive (or excessive?) analysis of Hebrews based on a perceived chiasmic macro-structure (1:1-5:10; 5:11-9:28 and 10:1-13:25) with each section sub-divided into second, third and fourth level chiasms: Heil, J.P. *Hebrews: Chiasmic Structures and Audience Response*, (Washington: CBAA, 2010), 13-16.

¹⁹⁵ DeSilva [*Perseverance*, 37] defines this as “similar sounds at the endings of words or phrases”; however, that is more correctly homoeoteleuton. Homoeoptaton is a narrower form of homoeoteleuton and relates specifically to **nouns** with the same case endings. In fact, both are seen in 2:4, the dative plural nouns, σημείοις, ποικίλαις and μερισμοῖς show homoeoptaton, while τέρασιν, δυνάμεσιν and θέλησιν (two dative plurals and an accusative singular) exhibit homoeoteleuton.

¹⁹⁶ See Witherington III, B. *New Testament Rhetoric*, (Eugene: Cascade, 2009), 203-205; Koester [*Hebrews*, 87-96] writes that our author coins seven new words to better serve his literary purposes (*ibid*, 96). Mitchell [A.C. *Hebrews*, (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007), 39-40] writes that our author “has mastered the principles of advanced rhetoric”. deSilva [*Perseverance*, 35] calls him “a gifted orator, an expert in rhetoric and style”. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 29; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 19-21; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 8; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 3.

These three devices often occur together.¹⁹⁷

Hebrews also employs:

- Metaphors from a wide variety of ‘arenas’: e.g. law (2:3-4; 9:16-17); education (5:12-14); athletics (5:14; 12:1-3, 11-13); agriculture (6:7-8; 12:11); seafaring (6:9).¹⁹⁸
- Tracking words: e.g. κρείττων (12 times: 1:4; 7:7, 19, 22; 8:6a, 6b; 9:23; 10:34; 11:16, 35, 40; 12:24) and τελειόω (nine times: 2:10; 5:9; 7:19, 28; 9:9; 10:1, 14; 11: 40; 12:23).
- The so-called oratorical imperative: 3:1 (κατανοήσατε); 3:12 (βλέπετε); 7:4 (θεωρεῖτε); 10:32 (ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε).
- The hortatory subjunctive 4:1 (φοβηθῶμεν); 4:11 (σπουδάσωμεν); 6:1 (φερώμεθα); 12:1 (τρέχωμεν); 13:13 (ἐξερχώμεθα).
- Rhetorical questions: (7:11; 11:32).
- Rhythmic parallelism: (4:11 & 12; 7:21 & 22; 8:13 & 9:1; 10:10 & 11).
- Direct address to the listeners: (6:9-12; 10:32-4; 12:15-16).
- ‘Foreshadowing’: (Jesus as high priest, introduced in 2:17; discussed in 4:14-16; Melchizedek, mentioned in 5:6; discussed in 7:1-28).
- *a fortiori* arguments: (2:2-4; 9:13-14; 10:28-29).

Our author “uses a variety of embellishments (and) ornaments pointing to his rhetorical artistry and acuity. (There are) numerous skilfully employed rhetorical techniques... Hebrews is a carefully crafted piece of rhetoric”.¹⁹⁹ However, the warning sounded by Cheung is apposite: “Functional similarities between the argumentative pattern of the New Testament letter writers and the rhetorical handbooks are no proofs that there is a formal relationship between them”.²⁰⁰ Demonstrating the literary prowess of our author is not to say that he had formal rhetorical training. It simply shows that his careful use

¹⁹⁷ See Buchanan, G.W. *To the Hebrews*, (New York: Doubleday, 1982), xxvi.

¹⁹⁸ See Attridge, H.W. “Hebrews”, *ABD*, 3:99.

¹⁹⁹ deSilva, *Perseverance*, 37-39. Cf. Trotter, *Interpreting*, 67-75; Witherington, *Rhetoric*, 196.

²⁰⁰ Cheung, L.L. *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of the Epistle of James*, (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2003), 56.

of language and deliberate choice of words was no accident. He is both familiar with and comfortable using the rhetorical forms of his day.

1.5.5 Conclusions

This analysis of Hebrews' use of language has shown it to have an obvious rhetorical coherence and literary integrity. The letter was written by a 'rhetorician', someone well-versed in the literary and intellectual requirements of such a craftsman.²⁰¹ He not only understood rhetorical theory but, with his rich vocabulary and apposite turn of phrase, he was more than capable of producing a piece of carefully crafted literature. It is highly unlikely that he was 'slovenly' or 'careless' in his use of language. This would indicate that his use of *πνεῦμα* was equally carefully crafted to achieve his deliberate rhetorical and theological purposes. His language is precise, and as the foregoing analysis would indicate, there is nothing incidental or tangential to his overall argument. Therefore, if the purposes and intentions of the author are to be correctly understood, the role of *πνεῦμα* in Hebrews must not be lightly dismissed or overlooked.²⁰²

²⁰¹ Whether formally trained or 'self-taught' this appellation is not inappropriate. Indeed, as Cockerill [G.L. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), xiii-xiv] observes, Hebrews "offers a higher degree of rhetorical sophistication" than any other NT document. However, see Keener [C.S. *Spirit Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 329 n.46]: "the author of Hebrews writes on a less sophisticated level than does Philo" cf. *ibid*, 243. Nonetheless, Keener acknowledges: "Hebrews 11 is a rhetorical masterpiece", *ibid*, 274.

²⁰² *Contra* Ellingworth [*Hebrews* 66-67] who writes: "the few references to the Spirit (are made) in passing (or are) incidental".

2 Background of Hebrews

Without a shared linguistic and/or ideological framework, an author can only meaningfully interact with his readership if he supplies them with an extensive and perhaps idiosyncratic glossary. The author of Hebrews does not supply such a glossary. It is appropriate, therefore, to ask what ‘Spirit-theology’ he and his audience shared such that he could write as he did.²⁰³

When examining a NT letter’s theological import, it is usual to address such issues as authorship, place and date of composition, destination and the structure of its argument. However, there is no scholarly consensus about any of these issues in relation to Hebrews. Lane has rightly called all attempts to engage with these ‘introductory’ issues “a delight for (those) who enjoy puzzles” and an attempt to “define the undefinable”.²⁰⁴ Recent scholarship has described the background to the letter as “shrouded in obscurity”,²⁰⁵ “enigmatic”,²⁰⁶ “difficult... challenging... elusive (and) uncertain”²⁰⁷ and “a conundrum”.²⁰⁸ Little wonder that the letter as a whole has often been compared to the character of Melchizedek, both being ‘without father or mother or genealogy’.²⁰⁹

However, it will be appropriate to comment on some suggestions that have been made concerning the type of congregation addressed – insofar as that might impinge on the letter’s pneumatology; this will include some brief remarks about the purpose of the letter (§2.1).²¹⁰ Some remarks will then be offered on Hebrews’ genre (§2.2). Furthermore, just as no piece of literature is produced in isolation, so too, no author is insulated from his contemporaries and predecessors. Therefore, it is important to explore

²⁰³ And so that they could, presumably, understand what they were reading/hearing.

²⁰⁴ Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, xlvii.

²⁰⁵ Allen, *Hebrews*, 23.

²⁰⁶ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 1.

²⁰⁷ O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 2.

²⁰⁸ Brown, R.E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*, (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 683.

²⁰⁹ This observation is generally credited to Overbeck (1880) who wrote that Hebrews is like a “*melchisedekitisches Wesen ohne Stammbaum*” – cited by Gelardini, G. “From “Liturgical Turn” and Hebrews Scholarship to “Anadiplosis Iterata”: The Enigma of a Structure”, *HTR*, 102 (2009), 55. However, in 1849 Delitzsch [F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: vol. 1*, (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1978 [1857]), 4] compared Hebrews to Melchizedek, writing: “Like him it... is ἀγενεάλογητος; we know not whence it cometh or whither it goeth”.

²¹⁰ Although, for reasons that will become apparent, it will be more convenient to discuss how the author achieves his purposes at §6.4.4.

the background of thought, ideas and ideology that lay behind both the production of the ‘letter’ and the ‘production’ of the author. Consequently, before embarking on a detailed analysis of the pneumatology of Hebrews, some observations will be offered concerning the intellectual and spiritual background (and foreground) within which the letter was composed (§§2.3-2.5). In so doing, it will be seen that Hebrews’ author stands within the mainstream of the then contemporary Christian thinking but is also innovative and pioneering. He, like so many of the NT authors, seeks to interpret the OT in the light of the Christ-event, and the Christ-event in the light of the OT.

2.1 Purpose and congregation

It is not possible to deduce the purpose of the letter from a knowledge of its destination or the makeup of the congregation to which it is addressed.²¹¹ Anything that can be said on this subject must, of necessity, be conjecture gleaned from the contents of the letter, a document which its author calls “a word of encouragement” (παράκλησις).²¹² However, it is generally accepted that a major concern of the author is to encourage his congregation to both hold on to and grow in their Christian faith. Indeed, many commentators regard this as *the* major concern of Hebrews.²¹³ It would seem that members of the congregation were in danger of ‘falling away’ from their Christian profession either by ‘drifting away’ (2:1), ‘hardening their hearts’ (3:8, 15; 4:7) or ‘growing weary’ (12:3) and these tendencies would be exacerbated by the external pressures of persecution and abuse.²¹⁴

²¹¹ Since these things are not known.

²¹² Various understood as ‘emboldening’, ‘exhorting’ or ‘comforting’, see *BDAG*, 766; Montanari, 1552-53.

²¹³ See Allen, *Hebrews*, 82; cf. Carson, D.A., Moo, D.J. and Morris, L. *An Introduction to the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 392-94; Guthrie, *Introduction*, 703-10; Marohl, M.J. *Faithfulness and the Purpose of Hebrews*, (Eugene: Pickwick, 2008), 184-85; Marshall, *NT Theology*, 605; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 9-13; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 13-15. See also §2.2, specifically Table 2.1 and the accompanying discussion.

²¹⁴ So, Mackie, *Eschatology*, 10-12. Cf. Whitlark, *Resisting Empire*, 2, 49.

The potential falling away has been variously identified²¹⁵ as the temptation to return to Judaism,²¹⁶ to find honour and security in a relapse to the Roman imperial culture,²¹⁷ to return to their former way of life – without specifying what that was,²¹⁸ or simply falling away from their Christian profession.²¹⁹ The difficulty in identifying to where the addressees might ‘fall away’ lies, not least, in the uncertainty both of their location in space and time and of the composition of the congregation. In many ways this ‘cloud of unknowing’ is no bad thing. It prevents the exploration of Hebrews’ underlying theology being ‘coloured’ by what is known of the author from other texts and what is known (or suspected) about the climate of opinion in the city or congregation to which (or from which) the letter was sent.

Nonetheless, some scholars have seen in 2:3-4 a clue to help identify the type of congregation (or group) addressed. The ‘signs, wonders and miracles’ along with ‘distributions of the Spirit’ (2:4)²²⁰ are seen as an indication that the author and congregation shared an understanding and/or experience of the Spirit that might be designated ‘charismatic’. The commentators who follow this trajectory fall into two basic groups: those who identify the ‘charismatic spirituality’ as the congregation’s foundational experience²²¹ and those who regard it as also being part of their present experience.²²² As with much else in the scholarly debates about the background of the letter to the Hebrews, there are almost as many suggestions about the congregation’s past and/or present experience of the Spirit as there are commentators.

²¹⁵ See the summary of options in Johnson, R.W. *Going Outside the Camp*, (Sheffield: SAP, 2001), 18-20.

²¹⁶ E.g. Allen, *Hebrews*, 79; Bruce, *Hebrews*, xxii, xxx; Dunnill, J. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 21-25, 37-39; Motyer, “The Spirit”, 222-27; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 12-13; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 13-15.

²¹⁷ Whitlark, *Resisting Empire*, 192-198 and *passim*. See the brief discussion of his thesis, §6.3.

²¹⁸ See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 12-13; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, xxiv-xxvii. Other suggestions include: a general lack of commitment (e.g. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 13, 21-25) or a failure to engage in world mission (e.g. Manson, W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), 23-24, 159-61).

²¹⁹ Marohl, *Faithfulness*, 184-85; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 13.

²²⁰ See §5.2.

²²¹ E.g. Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 122-23; Dunn, J.D.G. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, (London: SCM, 2010), 211; Kärkkäinen, V-M. *Pneumatology*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 35.

²²² E.g. Allen, “Gift or Giver”, 157-58; *idem*, “Forgotten Spirit” 57-58; Emmrich, *Concepts*, 67; Levison, “Theology”, 102; Motyer, “The Spirit”, 215; Rissi, M. *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987).

Cockerill, commenting on 2:4, points out that our author's argument would fail if the 'signs and wonders' referenced had not accompanied the congregation's reception of the Gospel. However, he goes on to write that there is no suggestion of such charismatic experiences being reproduced in their present situation; Hebrews' author simply "bases his argument on their past occurrence".²²³ On the other hand, on the basis of 2:4, Levison writes that underlying the letter is "a shared charismatic experience common both to the author and the addressees".²²⁴

Dunn, having stated that Christianity in its earliest form was "an enthusiastic sect",²²⁵ goes on to suggest that Hebrews was written to a group of Christians who regard the miracles and spiritual gifts "as attesting God's approval". One purpose was to warn "those who presume too boldly on their experience of the Spirit" that in their arrogance they "may well fail to attain" the promises of God.²²⁶ In a similar vein, Rissi sees similarities between the situation addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians and that addressed by Hebrews. He suggests that an almost arrogant overconfidence in their possession of the Spirit has led to the formation of an exclusive group of charismatic 'spiritual elite' who had a 'Corinthian-type' pneumatology.²²⁷ As the subtitle of his *Theologie* indicates (*Ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und seiner Leser*), Rissi believes that the theology of Hebrews (and therefore its pneumatology) is anchored in the (spiritual) situation of the author and his readership. He then proceeds to interpret the divine- $\piνεῦμα$ texts in the light of his reconstruction of that situation.²²⁸ However, "the polemic against spiritual elitism is not sufficiently pronounced in Hebrews to establish the thesis that Hebrews is intended chiefly to address the problem of spiritual arrogance".²²⁹ Motyer also tries to reconstruct the situation of the first readership of Hebrews from an exposition of 2:4. He writes that 'signs, wonders and miracles' "were a regular, maybe prominent, part of the addressees' experience".²³⁰ However, Motyer goes on to suggest

²²³ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 122-23. Cf. Kärkkäinen, *Pneumatology*, 35.

²²⁴ Levison, *Theology*, 91. So too, Motyer, "The Spirit", 226 cf. §5.2.

²²⁵ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 191.

²²⁶ *Ibid*, 211.

²²⁷ Rissi, *Theologie*, 9.

²²⁸ See the comments in Allen, "Forgotten Spirit", 55; Motyer, "The Spirit", 227.

²²⁹ So, Buck, E. "Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs, A Review", *Consensus* 14 (1988), 124.

²³⁰ Motyer, "The Spirit", 215. He writes that this was also the experience of the author, *ibid*, 226.

that this congregation wanted to forsake their belief in Jesus as Messiah and return to Judaism but, at the same time, keep their charismatic/ecstatic experiences.²³¹ He concludes that Hebrews was written to affirm “*the inseparability of Christ and the Spirit*” and that they “cannot keep their charismatic gifts just as Jews, no longer attached to Jesus”.²³²

Whilst agreeing that the author and congregation almost certainly shared an experience of the Spirit that could be described as ‘charismatic’, it is not their common experience that this thesis is investigating; it is the author’s underlying theology that enabled him to describe the experience of the Spirit in the life of members of the NC community as he did. Consequently, the theories outlined above, although ‘pneumatological’, do not address the same questions. Admittedly, “long before the Spirit was a theme of doctrine, he was a fact in the experience of the community”.²³³ However, Hebrews was written by an able theologian and rhetorician²³⁴ who used ‘shorthand’ phrases (e.g. Eternal Spirit, 9:14; Spirit of grace, 10:29) to describe the person and work of the Spirit. This thesis is seeking to analyse the divine-πνεῦμα texts in order to ascertain the author’s pneumatology, a pneumatology which enabled him to write as he did. It is not seeking to describe the group or congregation addressed by Hebrews; therefore, this is not the place to critique the specific suggestions of congregational identity (and/or the purpose of the letter).

Suffice it to say that whether the addressees looked back (with or without ‘longing’) to an overtly charismatic beginning or were currently employing charismatic gifts in their community life or were an extreme ‘ultra-charismatic’ group on the edge of the wider Christian community, an analysis of the divine-πνεῦμα texts in the epistle will reveal aspects of the *author’s* pneumatology. It is that enquiry that this thesis is seeking to undertake.

²³¹ *Ibid*, 222.

²³² *Ibid*, 216 (emphasis original), 227.

²³³ Schweizer, E. πνεῦμα, *TDNT*, 6:396.

²³⁴ See §§1.1; 1.3; 1.5; 2.5.

2.2 Genre

There is little agreement between the commentators about how to categorize Hebrews.²³⁵ It has been called a letter or epistle,²³⁶ and some commentators attempt to draw a distinction between the two designations.²³⁷ Hebrews has also been referred to variously as: a treatise, a piece of artistic literature, a theological meditation or a kind of liturgical text.²³⁸

Many scholars prefer to describe Hebrews as a ‘homily’ or ‘sermon’.²³⁹ However, so little is known of contemporary Jewish and Christian preaching²⁴⁰ that this designation, although likely to be correct, is of limited help.²⁴¹ Even the extrapolations, ‘homiletic midrash’,²⁴² ‘homiletical treatise’,²⁴³ ‘sermon with epistolary ending’,²⁴⁴ ‘sermonic letter’,²⁴⁵ ‘synagogue sermon’²⁴⁶ or ‘early Christian sermon’²⁴⁷ do not really describe the genre. In fact, the style or form called ‘synagogue homily’ (or similar) is not unique to Judaeo-Christian preaching. It is also common to the speeches of the Greek orators.²⁴⁸ However, such designations do indicate that its method of delivery was oral and its reception aural.²⁴⁹ Indeed, it certainly appears to be a precisely written document²⁵⁰ that

²³⁵ See the discussion of genre in Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 13-17.

²³⁶ Dunnill, *Covenant*, 22-23; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 35; Kistemaker, S.J. *Hebrews*, (Welwyn: Evangelical Press, 1984), 3-4; Lindars, *Theology*, 6-7; Mosser, C. *No Lasting City: Rome, Jerusalem and the Place of Hebrews in the History of ‘Earliest’ Christianity*, (St. Andrews: PhD Thesis, 2004), 210-15.

²³⁷ E.g. Kistemaker [*Hebrews*, 3-4] suggests that ‘letter’ is non-literary and personal, ‘epistle’ is more formal, literary and impersonal. However, see Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 59.

²³⁸ For these four designations see Koester, *Hebrews*, 80 n.171.

²³⁹ So, Bruce, *Hebrews*, xlviii; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, xix; MacRae, G.W. “Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews”, *Semeia*, 12 (1978), 190-91.

²⁴⁰ Lane [*Hebrews* 1-8, lxxi] suggests that Hebrews may be the sole “completely preserved homily from this period”.

²⁴¹ See Mosser, *No Lasting City*, 216.

²⁴² Buchanan [*Hebrews*, xix] asserts that Hebrews “is a homiletic midrash based on Ps 110”. Cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, xlviii; Hagner, D.A. *Hebrews*, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 14; Tönges, E. “The Epistle to the Hebrews as a “Jesus Midrash””, Gelardini (2005), 89-105.

²⁴³ Lehne, S. *The New Covenant in Hebrews*, (Sheffield: SAP, 1990), 121.

²⁴⁴ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 13-14.

²⁴⁵ Allen, *Hebrews*, 24-25; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 15; Hagner, D.A. *Encountering the Book of Hebrews*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 29-30; Peeler, A.L.B. *You are my Son: The Family of God in Hebrews*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 1 n.1; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 20-22; Schreiner, T.R. *Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation: Commentary on Hebrews*, (Nashville: B&H, 2015), 10.

²⁴⁶ Gelardini, G. “Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha be-Av*”, Gelardini (2005), 107-27.

²⁴⁷ Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, lxxii-lxxv; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 17.

²⁴⁸ Thompson, *Hebrews*, 12.

²⁴⁹ See Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, lxxiv; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 20-22; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 11.

²⁵⁰ See §1.5.

was intended to be read aloud²⁵¹ to a group with whom the author had a significant relationship.²⁵² It takes the recipients' situation into account²⁵³ and has been referred to as either deliberative rhetoric²⁵⁴ or epideictic oration²⁵⁵ – most likely it is a mixture of both.²⁵⁶

It has been suggested that Hebrews' self-designation, λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως (13:22), defines its purpose rather than its genre.²⁵⁷ However, this self-designation does help towards an understanding of its genre. In common with some other Biblical books,²⁵⁸ Hebrews displays significant elements of what has elsewhere been called a 'covenant reinforcement document' (Table 2:1).²⁵⁹ 17 of the 33 NT occurrences of the word διαθήκη are in Hebrews. It "is introduced in 7:22 without further explanation" suggesting that "the audience was already familiar" with the concept of covenant.²⁶⁰ However, Hebrews goes beyond a simple "proclamation of a new and better covenant (and) a reinterpretation of the symbolism of the old covenant."²⁶¹ It seeks "to encourage covenant fidelity in the face of suffering"²⁶² and to ensure there would be no "turn(ing) away from Jesus and the new covenant".²⁶³ The "exhortation to be faithful... focus(es) the overall paraenetic program of Hebrews".²⁶⁴

²⁵¹ As Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 62] puts it, the "author displays skill in both written and (indirectly) oral communication". So too, Eisenbaum, P. "Locating Hebrews within the Literary Landscape of Christian Origins", Gelardini (2005), 222.

²⁵² Evidenced by inclusive language used throughout, e.g. 2:1; 3:1, 6, 14; 4:14-16; 10:19-23; 12:1; 13:22. Cf. Hagner, *Hebrews*, 5.

²⁵³ 5:11-12; 6:9-10; 10:32-33; 12:4; 13:7, 18-19.

²⁵⁴ See Johnson, *Hebrews*, 15; however, see *ibid*, 13. Cf. §1.5.4 n.190.

²⁵⁵ See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 14. Cf. §1.5.4 n.190.

²⁵⁶ See Koester, *Hebrews*, 82; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 25-26; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 12. Cf. n.119.

²⁵⁷ So, Wilson, R. McL. *Hebrews*, (Basingstoke: MM&S, 1987), 16-17.

²⁵⁸ Notably, but not exclusively, Amos, Hosea, Zechariah, Jeremiah.

²⁵⁹ See Bramer, S.J. "The Literary Genre of the Book of Amos", *BSac*, 156 (1999), 45-46. Our author, along with Amos, Hosea and Jeremiah, might also be called a Covenant Reinforcement Mediator. Cf. Seifrid, M.A. "The Death of Christ", *DLNTD*, 278.

²⁶⁰ So, Allen, D.M. *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 115.

²⁶¹ Dunnill, *Covenant*, 261.

²⁶² Whitlark, *Resisting Empire*, 2.

²⁶³ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 14.

²⁶⁴ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 22. Cf. the discussion in Allen, *Deuteronomy*, 115-26.

Table 2.1 Elements of a Covenant Reinforcement Document (CRD)

The CRD	Hebrews
1. It would be written to those who had agreed to be bound by the covenant.	6:4-5, (you) have tasted the heavenly gift, and have shared in the Holy Spirit; 3:6, Christ was faithful over God's house as a son, and <i>we are his house</i> ; 12:22-24 you have come to... Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant.
2. Written on God's behalf, it represents him to the covenant people	6:10, God is not unjust; he will not overlook your work; 6:13, God made (you) a promise; 10:15-16, the Holy Spirit also testifies... saying, "This is the covenant that I will make".
3. It would remind the recipients of covenant responsibilities, punishments and benefits ²⁶⁵	2:1-3a, we must pay greater attention to what we have heard... not drift away from it... every transgression or disobedience received a penalty, how can we escape if we neglect so great a salvation? 6:9, we are confident of better things in your case, things that belong to salvation; 6:19, this hope is an anchor for the soul, firm and secure. See also 10:14-18.
4. It would call for either a reaffirmation of or a return to covenant loyalty and fidelity ²⁶⁶	12:1, 12, throw off everything that hinders and the sin that so easily entangles... lift your drooping hands and strengthen your weak knees; 3:12-14, Take care... that none of you may have an evil, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God. But exhort one another every day, as long as it is called "today," so that none of you may be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin. For we have become partners of Christ; See also, 13:1-9.
5. It would bring a message of hope based on the covenant promises	4:16 Let us therefore approach the throne of grace with boldness, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need; 6:19 We have this hope, a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul; 12:28 We are receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken.

²⁶⁵ See the lists of negative and positive consequences of the covenant, Lehne, *New Covenant*, 104-106.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 117. She suggests, correctly, that the paraenetic sections of Hebrews serve as "warnings against abandoning the N.C. (and are) exhortations to embrace it and to continue on the journey of the N.C. people". Cf. Marohl, *Faithfulness*, 99-124 and *passim*, for whom this is the primary purpose of Hebrews.

Lehne correctly identifies that “the two elements of covenant and newness” both represent the authorial concerns and address the situation of the recipients of Hebrews.²⁶⁷ She concludes that the purpose behind the letter is to remind the addressees that they are “members of God’s *covenantal* λαός (and) reconfirm their self-identity”.²⁶⁸ Indeed, the message of Hebrews, including its pneumatology, is best understood within this (new) covenantal framework.²⁶⁹

Our author is adamant that the New Covenant is initiated by divine action alone,²⁷⁰ and this unilateral intervention is brought about by the self-offering of Christ (9:14-15).²⁷¹ However, “its ongoing observance and adherence is avowedly bilateral, with faithfulness and obedience demanded from the NC community”.²⁷²

It will be shown that the presence of the Spirit in the lives of Christ’s followers not only validates them as members of the NC community (§§5.2; 8.3.2) but also enables them to fulfil the covenant obligations that accompany such membership of the new community.²⁷³ The Spirit, as divine hermeneut, reveals “the self-confessed inadequacy”²⁷⁴ of the OC dispensation (9:1-10), ‘voices’ the NC promise (10:15-17) and warns the community of the covenant obligation to remain faithful (3:7-13).²⁷⁵ Four of the five ‘warning passages’ involve the Holy Spirit as a ‘player’ in the establishment and/or authentication of the NC or in reinforcing covenant obligations.²⁷⁶ Furthermore, the Spirit was involved in the central act which establishes the NC (9:14).²⁷⁷ As the Spirit of grace (10:29), he is the one who makes real in the lives of believers the grace Christ won by his self-offering (§7.4.4) and, as each Christian’s μέτοχος (6:4), he provides the

²⁶⁷ Lehne, *New Covenant*, 120.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 121.

²⁶⁹ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 66. Cf. Motyer, “The Spirit”, 216, 218-19. See §§7.4.4; 8.3.2.

²⁷⁰ Kaiser Jr, W.C. with Rata, T. *Walking the Ancient Paths: A Commentary on Jeremiah*, (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2019), 370. Cf. Allen, *Deuteronomy*, 116.

²⁷¹ See §§6.4.4; 8.3.2.

²⁷² Allen, *Deuteronomy*, 116-17.

²⁷³ §§5.3.2; 7.5; 8.3.3. Cf. §§3.2.1; 3.2.2.

²⁷⁴ Laansma, J.C. “The Living and Active Word of God”, Friedeman, C.T. (Ed.), *Listen, Understand, Obey*, (Eugene: WS, 2017), 65. Cf. §§4.5.3; 8.3.2.

²⁷⁵ See §§4.5.2; 4.5.4; 8.3.2. Cf. Allen, *Deuteronomy*, 115-22.

²⁷⁶ 2:1-4; 3:7-11; 6:4-6; 10:26-31. Discussed in §§5.2; 4.5.2; 5.3.2; 7.4.41 respectively.

²⁷⁷ See §§6.4; 6.5; 8.3.2.

enabling grace for them to remain faithful to the NC obligations.²⁷⁸ Consequently, the Spirit functions as part of the covenant reinforcement and as the covenant enabler. God the Holy Spirit enables the brothers and sisters of God the Son to remain totally faithful to God the Father (§§8.2.1; 8.3.3).²⁷⁹ That which he requires he also provides (§5.3.2).

2.3 Intellectual and Spiritual Background

The suggested backgrounds for and influences on Hebrews are many. They have included: Plato, Middle-Platonism and Philo; Gnosticism; Qumran; Apocalyptic Judaism and *Merkabah* mysticism and the Old Testament. These,²⁸⁰ and what might be called ‘the Christ tradition’ (Christian thought contemporary with Hebrews), will be reviewed briefly below.

Plato (and so-called Middle-Platonism) reworked and combined with Jewish ‘spirituality’ by Philo, has been suggested as a possible background for Hebrews.²⁸¹ However, many scholars have expressed caution about that possibility,²⁸² suggesting that, at most, Philo and our author simply inhabited the same world or ‘breathed the same air’.²⁸³

²⁷⁸ See §§5.3.2; 8.3.3.

²⁷⁹ Whitlark [*Enabling Fidelity*, 166-71] includes a section headed “The Paradox of Divine Enablement and Human Responsibility”, although he makes no mention of the role of the Spirit in such enablement.

²⁸⁰ This is merely illustrative of the breadth of suggested backgrounds. See the analyses in Wilson, *Hebrews*, 18-27; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, civ-cx; Hurst, L.D. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1990), *passim*.

²⁸¹ Bruce, *Hebrews*, lvi-lvii, 166-68; Burtneiss, J.H. “Plato, Philo, and the Author of Hebrews”, *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 2 (1958), 54-64; Eagar, A.R. “The Hellenic Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Hermathena*, 11 (1901), 276-81; Howard, W.F. “The Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Interpretation*, 5 (1951), 82; Lehne, *New Covenant*, 129 n.6; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, xxxi-xxxiv; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 8, 36-37; Nash, R.H. “The Notion of Mediator in Alexandrian Judaism and the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *WTJ*, 40 (1977), 89-100; Robinson, T.H. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: Hodder, 1944), xvi; Sterling, G. “Ontology versus Eschatology: Tensions between Author and Community in Hebrews”, *SPA*, 13 (2001), 190-211; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 23-26. Cf. Dey, L.K.K. *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*, (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), *passim*; Runia, D.T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993), 74-78; Sowers, S. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews*, (Zürich: Evz-Verlag, 1965), *passim*; Thompson, J.W. *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Washington: CBAA, 1982), *passim*; *idem*, “What has Middle Platonism to do with Hebrews?”, Mason, E.F. & McCruden, K.B. (Eds), *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 31-52.

²⁸² Especially since the publication of the DSS.

²⁸³ See Allen, *Hebrews*, author’s preface; Carlston [C. “The Vocabulary of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews”, Guelich, R.A. (Ed.), *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, (Grand Rapids:

The two scholars who exemplify the extremes of the argument²⁸⁴ are Spicq²⁸⁵ and Williamson²⁸⁶. Spicq saw not only a common use of language between the writer of Hebrews and Philo, but also that Hebrews was “imprégné, en effet, de sa philosophie”.²⁸⁷ He suggested that the author of Hebrews was “un philonien converti au christianisme”²⁸⁸ and that Philo and the author of Hebrews were known to one another.²⁸⁹ Williamson’s comparison of the worldviews, language and exegetical methods of Hebrews and Philo showed Spicq’s “research and logic to be flawed.”²⁹⁰ For Williamson “the influence of Philo on the Writer of Hebrews was minimal, perhaps even non-existent”.²⁹¹ However, Williamson does acknowledge that the author of Hebrews “moved in circles where, in broad, general terms, ideas such as those we meet in Philo’s works were known and discussed”.²⁹²

This is not the place to analyse nor yet resolve the differences between Spicq and Williamson. What does need to be recognised, however, is that our author was writing fairly soon after the time that Philo (d. c.45-50 AD) was working. Consequently, any discussion of Hebrews’ pneumatology will require that, among other possible

Eerdmans, 1978), 148] writes that although they “lived in the same general “platonic” world (they) were citizens of quite different countries”; Caird, G.B. “The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Canadian Journal of Theology*, 5 (1959), 44-51; D’Angelo, M.R. *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*, (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 38 n.31; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 48; Fairhurst, A.M. “Hellenistic Influences in the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *TynB*, 7-8 (1961), 17-27; Hurst, *Background*, 41-42; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 16-17.

²⁸⁴ Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 46] writes, “the exhaustive discussions... by Spicq and Williamson... come to generally opposite conclusions”. See also the review of the commentaries by Johnson and O’Brien, Gundry, R.H. “To Plato or Not to Plato”, *Books and Culture*, March/April 2011, 25-26.

²⁸⁵ Spicq, C : “Le Philonisme de L’Épître aux Hébreux”, *RBib*, 56 (1949), 542-72, 57 (1950), 212-42; *idem*, “Alexandrinismes dans L’Épître aux Hébreux”, *RBib*, 58 (1951), 481-502 ; *idem*, “L’Épître aux Hébreux, Apollos, Jean-Baptiste, les Hellénistes et Qumran”, *RQ*, 1 (1959), 365-90; *idem*, *Hébreux*, 1:39-91.

²⁸⁶ Williamson, R. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Leiden: Brill, 1970); *idem*, “Platonism and Hebrews”, *SJT*, 16 (1963), 415-24; *idem*, “The Background of the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *ExpTim*, 87 (1975), 232-37; *idem*, “The Incarnation of the Logos in Hebrews”, *ExpTim*, 95 (1983), 4-8.

²⁸⁷ Spicq, *Hébreux*, 1:89.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 91.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 89.

²⁹⁰ Guthrie, G.H. “Hebrews in its First Century Contexts”, McKnight, S. & Osborne, G.R. (Eds), *The Face of New Testament Studies*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 428.

²⁹¹ Williamson, *Philo and Hebrews*, 493.

²⁹² *Ibid*. Cf. Schenck, “Shadows”, 85-91.

backgrounds, Philo be recognised. Thus, his understanding of the divine Spirit will be referred to when and if appropriate.²⁹³

The first full treatment of the thesis that a pre-Christian Gnosticism exercised a major influence on Hebrews is generally credited to Käsemann.²⁹⁴ Supposed Gnostic motifs in Hebrews were seen in the redeemed Redeemer sent from heaven to rescue those who, also being of a heavenly origin, had become ensnared in the physical realm. This rescue is depicted as a journey to heavenly ‘rest’ and a progression towards ‘perfection’. Others have seen the similarity between Gnostic myth and Hebrews but concluded that Hebrews counters such tendencies.²⁹⁵ However, Gnosticism as a potential background for Hebrews, or any other NT document, is “yesterday’s news... abandoned by most scholars”.²⁹⁶

With the availability of the *DSS* texts,²⁹⁷ many commentators have remarked on the similarities between Hebrews and those texts.²⁹⁸ Among the suggested points of

²⁹³ E.g. §§6.3.1; 7.2.2.

²⁹⁴ Käsemann, E. *The Wandering People of God*, (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984 [1957]), 174-82.

²⁹⁵ Jewett, R. *Letter to Pilgrims*, (New York: Pilgrims Press, 1981), 10-13.

²⁹⁶ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 15. Cf. Hurst, *Background*, 67-75; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 19 n.33; Lincoln, A. *Hebrews: A Guide*, (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 47; Lindars, *Theology*, 24-25; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 38.

²⁹⁷ The literature is vast and the issues are discussed in most modern commentaries. It will be possible to mention only a small selection of the literature here. See the brief account of the history of the study of the relationship between Qumran and Hebrews, Fensham, F.C. “Hebrews and Qumran”, *Neotestamentica*, 5 (1971), 9-13. Spicq’s exhaustive presentation of his data re Philo was coincidental with the publication of some of the then newly-discovered Qumran scrolls. Subsequently, Spicq [“Apollos”, 390] wrote: “Apollos s’adressait à des esséno-chrétiens à des prêtres juifs – parmi lesquels pouvait se trouver un certain nombre d’ex-qumrâniens”.

²⁹⁸ Cross Jr, F.M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, (New York: Doubleday, 1961), 220-22; Daniélou, J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity*, (New York: Mentor-Omega, 1962), 111-13; Flusser, D. “The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity”, *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1958), 215-66; Yadin, Y. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1958), 36-55. Cf. Bateman, H.W. *4QFlorilegium 1:1-19 and Hebrews 1:5-13*, (Vancouver: Evangelical Theological Society Conference Paper, Nov. 1993), 1-25; Fensham, “Hebrews and Qumran”, *passim*; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 11-15; Mason, E.F. “Hebrews and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Some Points of Comparison”, *PRSt*, 37 (2010), 457-79.

contact²⁹⁹ mention might be made of angels,³⁰⁰ Messianism³⁰¹ and Melchizedek.³⁰² However, it must be acknowledged that, significant as these issues were at Qumran, they were also matters of intense speculation in late Judaism.³⁰³ Many, if not all, of the supposed parallels between Qumran and Hebrews exist in other contemporary corpora.³⁰⁴ In fact, a significant number of scholars are not persuaded that Hebrews and *DSS* have any inter-dependence and see closer parallels elsewhere.³⁰⁵

²⁹⁹ These include: ritual washings, 1QS 3:9; 4:21 // Heb. 6:2; 9:10; ritual meals, 1 QS 6:4-6 // Heb. 13:9-10, see Williamson, R. "The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews", *NTS*, 21 (1975), 300-12; a new covenant community, CD-A vi:19; viii:21 // Heb. 9:15; 12:24, with an eternal covenant, 1 QS 4:22 // Heb. 13:20; the impossibility of restoring the apostate, 1 QS 7:16-17 // Heb. 6:4-6, see Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 108-10.

³⁰⁰ Bruce, F.F. "To the Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes'?" *NTS*, 9 (1963), 218-19; Charles, J.D. "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews", *JETS*, 33 (1990), 171-78; Gleason, R.C. "Angels and the Eschatology of Heb 1-2", *NTS*, 49 (2003), 102-103; Yadin, "DSS and Hebrews", 39-40, 45-48.

³⁰¹ See Knibb, M.A. "Apocalypticism and Messianism", Lim, T.H. & Collins, J.J. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 417-26; Martinez, F.G. "Divine Sonship at Qumran", Hempel, C. & Lieu, J.M. (Eds), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 109-32; Mason, "Comparison", 464-71; Yadin, "DSS and Hebrews", 41-45, 48-53. However, Evans, C.A. & Flint, P.W. [*Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 5-9] write that Heb. 9:11-28 "is profoundly at variance with the messianic ideas of the Dead Sea Scrolls", (*ibid*, 8).

³⁰² De Jonge, M & Der Woude, A.S. "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament", *NTS*, 12 (1966), 314-23; Delcor, M. "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews", *JSJ*, 2 (1971), 125-27; Fitzmyer, J.A. "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11", *JBL*, 86 (1967), 31; Mason, E.F. "Hebrews 7:3 and the Relationship between Melchizedek and Jesus", *Biblical Research*, 50 (2005), 41-62; *idem*, "Comparison", 471-79; Yadin, Y. "A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran", *Israel Exploration Journal*, 15 (1965), 152-54. Horton [Jr, F.L. *The Melchizedek Tradition*, (Cambridge: CUP, 1976), 152-72] concludes: "Hebrews is (not) related to the speculation about Melchizedek demonstrated in... 11Q Melchizedek". Also, Knohl, I. "Melchizedek: A Model for the Union of Kingship and Priesthood in the Hebrew Bible, 11QMelchizedek, and the Epistle to the Hebrews", Clements, R. & Schwartz, D.R. (Eds), *Text, Thought and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity*, (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 255-66; Kobelski, P.J. *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*, (Washington: CBAA, 1981), 115-29. Kobelski [*ibid*, 127] writes: "11QMelch offers little, if any, direct evidence of its having been used in the portrayal of Melchizedek in Hebrews".

³⁰³ From the Maccabees to 70AD.

³⁰⁴ Hurst, *Background*, 66; Longenecker, R. "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews: A Study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression on New Testament Thought", Guelich, *Unity and Diversity*, 161-85; Pearson, B.A. *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 108-23; Reiss, M. "The Melchizedek Traditions", *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, 26 (2012), 259-65; Horton, *Melchizedek*, 54-86. See also AB, *Tg. Ps-J.* Gen. 58 n.44 and the additions to the MT text of Gen. 14:18-20.

³⁰⁵ Allen, *Hebrews*, 65-66; Schaeffer [J.R. "The Relationship between the Priestly and Servant Messianism in the Epistle to the Hebrews", *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 368-70] focuses attention on Hebrews' use of the OT, particularly the parallels with Zechariah. Also, Johnson, *Hebrews*, 27-28; Bruce, "Essenes", 231-32.

Apocalyptic Judaism³⁰⁶ is another suggested background against which Hebrews might be read.³⁰⁷ Although neither uniform nor consistent, it has some characteristics or concerns that are generally, but not invariably, found in the genre. Key beliefs include, a developed angelology;³⁰⁸ the soul being on a journey of ascent to and through “the curtain of the Omnipresent one”³⁰⁹ and a complete functioning temple in heaven.³¹⁰ God is very often envisioned seated on his throne, surrounded by unapproachable glory.³¹¹ Mackie suggests that Hebrews interacts with these motifs and transforms them: “These elements (are) depicted as presenting nearly insurmountable obstacles to the presence of God, (but) Hebrews depicts them as encouraging, facilitating, and even ensuring access to a welcoming God”.³¹² However, the motifs found in Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism are not peculiar to it.³¹³ Nor does everyone agree that Hebrews employs an apocalyptic hermeneutic.³¹⁴

The most that can be said about the wide array of suggested backgrounds against which to read Hebrews is that: “There is no single strand of Judaism that provides a clear and simple matrix within which to understand the thoughts of our author or his text”.³¹⁵ However, one thing that cannot be denied is the influence, centrality and importance of

³⁰⁶ Including the Enochic literature; the Apocalypses ascribed to Abraham and Zephaniah; the Testament of Abraham; the Testament of Levi and 3 Baruch. See *OTP*, 1:3-4; *MNS*, 1:xi-xxxviii.

³⁰⁷ Barnard, J.A. *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012); *idem*, “Jewish Apocalyptic Traditions and Hebrews”, (Bangor University [Wales]: PhD seminar paper, 2009); Charles, “The Angels”, 171-78; DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 27-32; Gleason, “Angels”, 97-107; Mason, “Comparison”, 463-64; *idem*, “Cosmology, Messianism and Melchizedek: Apocalyptic Jewish Traditions and Hebrews”, Mason & McCruden, *Reading Hebrews*, 53-76; Rowland, C. *The Open Heaven*, (Eugene: WS, 2002), 94-113; Steyn, G.J. “Addressing an Angelomorphic Christological Myth in Hebrews”, *Hervormde Teologiese Studies*, 59 (2003), 1107-28; Williamson [“Background”, 232-37] regards *Merkabah* mysticism as a partial background against which to read Hebrews, (*ibid*, 236).

³⁰⁸ Angels are described as: innumerable, 1 En. 14:22; 60:1 (12:22 ten thousand times a million); pictured as ‘wind’ and ‘lightening’ 1 En. 43:1-3; 60:14-19 (1:7); and can appear in the guise of human beings 1 En. 17:1 (13:2). Their prime function is to worship the Lord, 1 En. 39:12-13 (1:6, 14).

³⁰⁹ 3 En. 45:1; see *OTP*, 1:296 n.45a.

³¹⁰ E.g. 1 En. 4:8-25; *T. Levi*, 3:4-7.

³¹¹ 1 En. 14:18-20; 47:3; *T. Levi*, 5:1.

³¹² Mackie, S.D. “Ancient Jewish Mystical Motifs in Hebrews’ Theology of Access and Entry Exhortations”, *NTS*, 58 (2011), 88-104. Cf. *idem*, *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 151-52, 229-32.

³¹³ E.g. MacRae, “Temple”, 179-99; Williamson, “Background”, 236-37; Hurst, *Background*, 82-85.

³¹⁴ Mosser [C. “Review of Jody A. Barnard, *The Mysticism of Hebrews*”, accessed on 29/09/2015 at <https://independent.academia.edu/CarlMosser/Book-Review>, 7 (of 7)] writes: “the book’s novel proposal is unconvincing”. Also, Guthrie, “Contexts”, 425.

³¹⁵ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 29-30. So too, Brown, *Introduction*, 693; Guthrie, “Contexts”, 425-30.

the OT.³¹⁶ Knohl rightly argues that the source of Hebrews' theology is "rooted in... the Hebrew Bible" and that any similarity between Hebrews and Qumran (specifically in regard to Melchizedek and the Davidic high priest/messiah) is because they address the same concerns by recourse to the same authoritative body of texts.³¹⁷ As Caird writes, "Hebrews is one of the earliest and most successful attempts to define the relation between the Old and the New Testaments".³¹⁸

In fact, it would be more correct to think of two main influences on our author. Hebrews interprets *the OT* in the light of *the Christ event* and *the Christ event* in the light of *the OT*.³¹⁹ It is to these two 'conjoined' factors that this thesis now turns its attention, offering a brief overview.

2.4 The Old Testament

That the author of Hebrews built his arguments from the OT cannot be denied. More than any other of the NT writers, he explicitly founds his arguments on Scripture.³²⁰ Indeed, his "indebtedness to and command of the Scriptures are second to none among the New Testament writers".³²¹ Almost 15% of Hebrews is taken directly from the OT³²² and the teaching about faith in chapter 11 relies heavily on OT characters and events. There are no direct quotations from the OT Apocrypha in Hebrews.³²³

³¹⁶ So, Bruce, *Hebrews*, xlix-lxiii; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 41; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 37; Guthrie, D. *Hebrews*, (Leicester: IVP, 1983), 39-40; Hagner, *Encountering*, 34-35; *idem*, *Hebrews*, 15; Mason, E.F. "The Epistle (Not Necessarily) to the Hebrews", *PRSt*, 37 (2010), 10; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 15; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 19-20; Witherington, III, B. *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians* [hereafter *Hebrews*], (Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 37.

³¹⁷ Knohl, "Melchizedek", 265-66.

³¹⁸ Caird, "Exegetical Method", 45.

³¹⁹ Hagner, *Hebrews*, 16. Cf. Clements, R.E. "The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews", *SWJT*, 28 (1985), 36-45; France, R.T. "The Writer of Hebrews as a Biblical Expositor", *TynB*, 47 (1996), 245-46; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 40; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, cix-cx.

³²⁰ See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 23-25; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 41-59; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 37-42, a useful but (all too) brief summary of his 1977 Aberdeen PhD thesis, *The Old Testament in Hebrews: Exegesis, Method and Hermeneutics*; Gheorghita, *Role*, 32-33; Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 68; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, cxii-cxxiv; Marshall, *NT Theology*, 606; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 15.

³²¹ Gheorghita, "Minor Prophets", 115. Cf. *idem*, *Role*, 37.

³²² 742 of the 4968 words or 14.94%.

³²³ However, the comments about Enoch (11:5) suggest a knowledge of some form of the assumption of Enoch speculation (1 En. 12:3; 15:1; 2 En. 22:8; 71:14). Also, 11:36a, "were sawn in two", cf. *The*

There is no agreement on the number of citations or allusions to the OT in Hebrews.³²⁴ Decisions on this matter are made harder to reach because, on seven separate occasions, a quotation (or part thereof) is repeated within a sentence or two, sometimes after the inclusion of other material and sometimes with a new introductory formulation.³²⁵ Furthermore, the distinction between quotation and allusion is not always clear-cut.³²⁶ Obviously, the smaller the accepted unit for quotations, the more will be found. This thesis will not recognise a unit of three words or fewer as a quotation unless it is taken from a longer citation used elsewhere in Hebrews.³²⁷ Ignoring close allusions³²⁸ and not counting as separate quotations those that are repeated within a single ‘discussion unit’, there are 38 quotations from 31 OT passages in Hebrews, the second highest frequency of OT quotes per unit text of any NT work.³²⁹ “The many allusions in Hebrews to OT material are the result of the Author’s vast knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures.”³³⁰

Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah 5:1-14; 11:36b, “went about in sheepskins and goatskins”, cf. 2 Macc. 5:27; the language of 2 Macc. 6:11; 10:6 is reflected in 11:38.

³²⁴ E.g. Lane [*Hebrews* 1-8, cxvi] finds 31 explicit and four implicit quotations and notes that Caird finds 29 citations, Michel 32, Spicq 36 and Longenecker 38. An example of the difficulty of precision in this matter is afforded by Guthrie, G.H. who variously finds, “roughly 35 quotations (and) 34 allusions” [“Hebrews Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research”, *CBR*, 1 (2003), 274], “roughly thirty-seven quotations (and) forty allusions” [“Hebrews”, *NT use of OT*, 919] and “roughly thirty-six quotations and thirty-five allusions” [“Old Testament in Hebrews”, *DLNTD*, 842]. Cf. Gheorghita, *Role*, 32 n.1, 33-35.

³²⁵ The issue of ‘introductory formulae’ and other matters relating to Hebrews use of OT quotations will be discussed further at §4.5. Here, all that is in view is demonstrating Hebrews’ dependence on the OT.

³²⁶ See §1.3 and the comments re ‘allusive echoes’; cf. Hays, *Echoes*, 20-33; Moyise, “Intertextuality”, 23-25.

³²⁷ Therefore, the phrase *μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον* (10:37) would be discounted, *contra* Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 39, who sees it as a quotation from Isa. 26:20. However, *μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον* is also found in Ode 5:20, suggesting that it could have been ‘common currency’ rather than (consciously) taken from Isaiah. It is also difficult to maintain that a three-word introduction to a significant quotation from Habakkuk has come from an otherwise unquoted passage of Isaiah.

³²⁸ For example, the word order and grammatical forms in Heb. 12:13 // Prov. 4:23 (“Make level paths for your feet”) do not correspond closely enough to justify adding it to a list of quotations. However, Heb. 12:29 // Deut. 4:24 (our/your “God is a consuming fire”) should be included as a quotation because the alteration of *σου* (LXX) to *ἡμῶν* is insufficient to warrant reclassifying it as an allusion.

³²⁹ Romans has 60 quotes in 7,097 words of text (8.5 quotes per 1,000 words). However, as might be expected, half of these are in Rom. 9-11, discussing Israel in the purposes of God. Excluding these three chapters, the figure for Romans is 5.3 quotes per 1,000 words. This compares with the frequency in Hebrews of 7.5 quotes per 1,000 words. For completeness, the Synoptics and Acts together have a frequency of 2.2 quotes per 1,000 words; Paul in total, 3.2; John’s Gospel, 0.9; and the NT as a whole, 2.2. 1 Pet. has 12 quotes in just 1,669 words or 7.2 quotes per 1,000 words. To ensure a ‘fair’ comparison of data, these statistics are derived from the lists in *UBS⁴*, 888-90.

³³⁰ So, Gheorghita, *Role*, 99. Cf. Glasson [T.F. “‘Plurality of Divine Persons’ and the Quotations in Hebrews 1.6ff”, *NTS*, 12 (1966), 272] writes that it is likely that author and congregation “had studied the Old Testament together”.

Table 2.2 Source of OT quotations in the NT

Book/corpus	Psalms		Pentateuch		Prophets		Other	
Hebrews	17	45%	14	37%	5	13%	2	5%
Synoptics/Acts	32	22%	64	44%	47	32%	2	1%
Romans	13	22%	21	35%	22	37%	4	7%
Rest of Paul	7	16%	20	45%	15	34%	2	5%
Rest of NT	9	29%	6	19%	12 ³³¹	39%	4	13%
All NT excl. Hebs	61	22%	111	40%	96	34%	12	4%

The Psalms and the Pentateuch are the parts of the OT most frequently quoted in Hebrews and more than a fifth of all the Psalm citations in the NT occur in Hebrews.³³² There are relatively few quotations from the prophetic books³³³ but the longest OT quote in the NT (Jer. 31:33-4) is in Hebrews (8:8-12, partially repeated in 10:16-17).

It is generally agreed that the author of Hebrews used a Greek text as his OT source document.³³⁴ Furthermore, it seems that, when the LXX and MT diverge, Hebrews prefers to reproduce (or modify) the LXX,³³⁵ leading some to suggest that its author did not have access to a Hebrew text.³³⁶ Indeed, Gheorghita begins the conclusion to his study on Hebrews and the LXX with the observation that “the author (of Hebrews) depended solely on the Septuagint”.³³⁷ However, such a conclusion is unwarranted.³³⁸ In fact, Gheorghita seems to acknowledge as much. Recognising the “creativity, ingenuity and theological boldness” of our author, he admits it would be “too presumptuous” to restrict what such “a creative writer... would have been able to argue

³³¹ Isaiah ten times, Zechariah twice.

³³² 21.8% (17 of 78). See Table 2.2.

³³³ Five in total: one from Isaiah, one from Jeremiah (twice) and two from the Minor Prophets.

³³⁴ See Gheorghita, *Role*, 91. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 84; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 23; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 41 n.181; Hering, J. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: Epworth, 1970), xi; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 21-28; Kistemaker, S.J. *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Amsterdam: van Soest, 1961), 13-14; Lincoln, *Guide*, 70; Lindars, *Theology*, 21; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 13; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 35-36.

³³⁵ Koester, *Hebrews*, 34, 49. Cf. Motyer, S. “The Psalm Quotations of Hebrews 1: A Hermeneutic-free Zone”, *TynB*, 50 (1999), 20.

³³⁶ Moffatt [*Hebrews*, ix] writes: “The writer of Πρὸς Ἑβραίους knew no Hebrew and his readers were in no sense Ἑβραῖοι”. Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 23; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 37; Schenck, K. *Understanding the Book of Hebrews*, (Louisville: WJK, 2003), 58.

³³⁷ Gheorghita, *Role*, 25.

³³⁸ So, Allen, *Hebrews*, 84-85.

by expounding from a Hebrew text”.³³⁹ Before commenting further on these judgements, it is necessary to address two preliminary issues. The first relates to the place of the LXX in the first century and the second to how closely the OT quotations in Hebrews follow either the MT or the LXX.

It cannot be denied that the Septuagint was held in high regard by both Jews³⁴⁰ and early Christians alike.³⁴¹ In fact, “Paul generally relied on the LXX for his scriptural quotations”³⁴² and both “Philo and Josephus used it preferably, if not exclusively”.³⁴³ Indeed, Philo calls Greek τὴν ἡμετέραν διάλεκτον (*Congr.* 44) and differentiates between ‘Hebrew’ and ‘our own tongue’ (*Conf. Ling.* 129). The ubiquity of the LXX as the primary source of the OT quotations in the NT is generally acknowledged.³⁴⁴ However, the choice to defer to the language of the LXX does not in itself preclude an author having access to a Hebrew OT text³⁴⁵ and/or being aware of the different nuances or textual variations between the MT and LXX. Indeed, a few scholars have pointed out that there are times when the OT quotations in Hebrews are closer to the MT than the

³³⁹ Gheorghita, *Role*, 230.

³⁴⁰ Gleason [R.C. “Moderate Reformed Response”, *Four Views*, 159] writes: “Greek biblical texts found at Qumran and Nahal Hever provide ample evidence that even Hebrew speaking Jews living in Palestine used the LXX”. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 85; Hannah, D.D. “Isaiah Within Judaism of the Second Temple Period”, Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. (Eds), *Isaiah in the New Testament*, (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 10; Witherington III, B. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2004), 23.

³⁴¹ Gheorghita [*Role*, 5] writes of “the essential and unique roles that the Septuagint played in the Christian Church from its inception”.

³⁴² Abasciano, B.J. *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1-9*, (Aberdeen: PhD thesis, 2004), 363. Cf. Dunn, J.D.G. *Romans 1-8*, (Dallas: Word, 1988), 45; Grant, M. *Saint Paul*, (London: Phoenix, 2000 [1976]), 6; Thiselton, A.C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000), 161.

³⁴³ So, Rahlfs, A. “History of the Septuagint Text”, Rahlfs, A. and Hanhart, R. (Eds), *Septuaginta, Editio altera*, (Stuttgart: DB, 2006), xxxvi. Cf. Kamesar, A. “Biblical Interpretation in Philo”, Kamesar, A. (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 65-67. See Philo’s own testimony, *Vit. Mos.* 2:37-40.

³⁴⁴ E.g. Brooke [G.J. “The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls”, Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. (Eds), *The Psalms in the New Testament*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 7] writes that quotations from the Psalms in the NT are “heavily dependent upon the LXX”. Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. [(Eds), *Genesis in the New Testament*, (London: T&T Clark, 2014), 5] affirm that “When quotations from Genesis occur... it mostly is (from) the LXX”. Moyise and Menken [*Isaiah*, 5] write, “The large majority of the quotations from... Isaiah... comes from the LXX (as) one would expect with first-century authors writing in Greek for a Greek speaking audience”.

³⁴⁵ E.g. regarding Paul, Abasciano [*Paul’s Use*, 363 n.30] writes, “Paul read Hebrew... it is the simplest construct to account for various data”. This is developed in much greater detail in Abasciano, B.J. *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.10-18*, (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 156-62; Cf. Bruce, F.F. *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 42-44.

LXX.³⁴⁶ In fact, of the 38 OT quotations in Hebrews, 30 are examples of the LXX and MT agreeing or being very close, five agree with the LXX against the MT, two agree with the MT against the LXX and one differs from both the MT and all known Greek recensions. Gheorghita writes of our author's "dependence on the Greek Bible" but recognises that not all occasions when Hebrews' OT 'echoes' vary from "the Hebrew OT account can be resolved by appealing to the Greek Scriptures".³⁴⁷ Furthermore, the discovery at Naḥal Ḥever of a Greek translation of the minor prophets, dated to the end of the first century BC which is much closer to the Hebrew text than any LXX text previously known, has 'muddled the waters' somewhat. As does "the likelihood that copies of the Septuagint were altered... to conform to readings in Hebrews".³⁴⁸ Recognising that discoveries in the Judean desert reveal "the existence of divergent Hebrew textual traditions contemporary with the Author", Gheorghita writes that "one must leave open the possibility of the Author using Hebrew text forms less divergent from the Septuagint textual tradition".³⁴⁹

It is neither surprising nor as significant as has been suggested that the author of Hebrews should (apparently) default to a Greek translation of the OT. However, "even the Septuagint texts suffer modifications that diverge from the core meaning of the Greek

³⁴⁶ So, Howard, G. "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations", *NovT*, 10 (1968), 208-16. Howard [*ibid* 209-11], identifies six quotations which he describes as: "Like Heb. against LXX. Heb. influence". Buchanan [*Hebrews*, xxvii-xxviii] follows Howard; so too, Fitzmyer, J.A. *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*, (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 243-44. Cf. Kistemaker, *Psalms Citations*, 58; Lane [*Hebrews 1-8*, cxviii] writes that Howard "correctly... demonstrated how complex the problem of the source of the (OT) quotations in Hebrews actually is". However, Attridge [*Hebrews*, 23] rejects Howard's (and Buchanan's) analysis of Hebrews' OT quotations and suggests that one reason why our author sometimes diverges from the LXX "may be due to tendentious handling of the text". Thomas [K.J. "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews", *NTS*, 11 (1965), 324] put the differences, including those when Hebrews is closer to the MT than any known LXX text, to the use of an unknown "LXX text of a generally primitive nature".

³⁴⁷ Gheorghita, *Role*, 91.

³⁴⁸ So, Docherty, *Use of OT*, 142. Note also the discovery at Qumran of a Hebrew text of Deut. 32:43 containing "and let all the angels worship him" – as *per* LXX and Hebrews, *contra* MT (see France, "The Writer", 274 n.39). These discoveries show that we do not have all the evidence and, therefore, statements about the OT text(s) available to a NT author should be couched in terms of 'probability' or 'possibility', not 'certainty'. Note that Gheorghita ["Minor Prophets" 119] writes that "the possibility of the New Testament text influencing the LXX text was just as real as the reverse". See *Idem*, *Role*, 171-75 for a discussion of how the NT text influenced the LXX text (including how Heb. 10:37-38 influenced the transmission of Hab. 2:3-4 LXX).

³⁴⁹ Gheorghita, *Role*, 229.

textual tradition”.³⁵⁰ Consequently, the matter of a preferred source is not as clear-cut as many have supposed. Apart from any other consideration, the data set is far too small to allow for certainty in the matter of source text(s). There are no sure grounds for supposing that our author (or Paul, Philo and Josephus) did not have access to and/or familiarity with a Hebrew OT text. It is not improbable that the author chose his texts and textual sources to serve his theological agenda. Consequently, when discussing the divine- $\pi\tau\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ texts in Hebrews, the MT cannot be ignored.³⁵¹

2.5 The ‘Christ Tradition’

The lens through which the author of Hebrews not only views the OT but also focuses his overall world-view is what has been called ‘the Christ-event’.³⁵² The single most significant interpretative tool or hermeneutic principle that fashions the whole epistle is Christology.³⁵³ In this, Hebrews fits well within the mainstream of early Christian theology,³⁵⁴ while at the same time, having unique insights to offer.³⁵⁵

There are similarities between the opening verses of John (1:1-5) and Hebrews (1:1-4) and both authors emphasise that Jesus is ‘Son of God’ (or ‘Son’).³⁵⁶ Although the designation ‘high priest’ and/or ‘priest’ applied to Jesus is unique to (and ubiquitous in) Hebrews, nonetheless, there are intimations of his priestly role elsewhere in the NT. The description of Jesus as ‘lamb of God’,³⁵⁷ a sacrifice (Rom. 3:25) or a ‘sin-offering’ (Rom. 8:3) is a use of priestly language, as is Christ’s intercessory ministry in the

³⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 227.

³⁵¹ This is particularly important when discussing 10:29, see §§7.2.4; 7.4.4.

³⁵² So, Guthrie, *NT use of OT*, 919-21. Cf. Johnson, *Hebrews*, 44; Lincoln, *Guide*, 73-75; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 41; Treier, D.J. & Atwood, C. “The Living Word versus the Proof Text”, Laansma, J.C. & Treier, D.J. (Eds), *Christology, Hermeneutics and Hebrews*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 192; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 67.

³⁵³ See Table 2.3 for a comparison of the Christology of Hebrews with the rest of the NT.

³⁵⁴ See the discussions in Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 24-41; Hagner, *Encountering*, 34-35; Koester, *Hebrews*, 54-58; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, cxii; Lindars, *Theology*, 25; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 40-43; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 15-17; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 33-35.

³⁵⁵ See Hughes, *Hermeneutics*, 3; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, cxii.

³⁵⁶ See Spicq, *Hébreux*, 1:109-38, quoted by Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 24.

³⁵⁷ John 1:29, 36; 1 Cor. 5:7; 1 Pet. 1:19-21; Rev. 5:6, 12.

heavenly realm (Rom. 8:34). The description of the risen Christ in Revelation (1:13) pictures him in priestly attire.³⁵⁸

Table 2.3 The Christology of Hebrews compared

Hebrews	Statements about Christ ³⁵⁹	Where else to be found ³⁶⁰
1:2, 3b.	His pre-existence	1 Cor. 8:6; Phil. 2:5-6; Col. 1:15-17.
2:14-17.	His incarnation	Rom. 8:3; Gal. 4:4-5; Phil. 2:7.
2:10; 2:18; 5:7-8; 13:12.	His humiliation/suffering	Matt. 20:17-20; 26:36-43; 27:46, 50 (and parallels).
5:8.	His death: An act of filial obedience	Rom. 5:19; Phil. 2:8.
9:28.	A sacrifice	John 1:29; 1 Pet. 1:18-19; 1 Cor. 5:7; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2.
2: 9, 14-17.	An atonement for sin	Rom. 3:25; 5:6-19; 8:1-4.
7:27; 9:12, 26-28; 10:10.	Once for all, unrepeatable	Rom. 6:9-10.
9:12, 15.	Provides redemption	Rom. 3:24; 1 Cor. 1:30; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14.
9:11-14; 10:19, 29; 12:24; 13:12, 20.	By the shedding of his blood	Rom. 3:25; 5:9; Eph. 1:7; 2:13; Col. 1:20.
2:14.	Defeated the devil and all his powers	Col. 2:15.
13:20.	His resurrection	Rom. 6:9; Eph. 1:20.
1:3d; cf. 1:13; 2:9; 8:1; 10:12.	His exaltation and session	Eph. 1:20-21; Phil. 2:9; Col. 3:1.
7:25; 8:1-2; 9:24.	His heavenly/priestly intercession	Rom. 8:34.
1:2b.	Christ: active in creation	1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16; cf. John 1:1-3.
1:3c.	sustains the creation	Col. 1:17.

³⁵⁸ Beale, G.K. *The Book of Revelation*, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 207-208. So too, Bruce, *Hebrews*, lii n.126.

³⁵⁹ In this Table, no distinction is drawn between 'Jesus', 'Jesus Christ', 'Christ', 'Son', 'Son of God', 'Lord'...

³⁶⁰ An illustrative not exhaustive list.

5:9.	God's definitive provision of salvation	John 14:6.
1:1-3;	God's full and final revelation	Col. 2:9.
1:3b.	the image of God	2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15; cf. John 14:9.
1:3a.	the radiance of God's glory	2 Cor. 4:6.
1:4.	a name above all others	Phil. 2:9-10.
2:8-9.	will have all things under his rule	1 Cor. 15:25-28; Phil. 3:21.
7:11-19.	makes the power of the law ineffective	Gal. 3:23-29.
7:22; 8:6-13; 9:15.	instituted the new covenant	2 Cor. 3:6.
8:6; 9:15; 12:24.	the mediator between God and man	1 Tim. 2:5.
13:20.	the shepherd	John 10:11; Mark 14:27-28; 1 Pet. 2:25; 5:4; Rev. 7:17.

Table 2.4 Other comparisons

Hebrews	Comparison	Elsewhere
11:11.	Sarah's pregnancy was 'by faith'	Rom. 14:19-20; 9:9.
2:2.	The law given 'through angels'	Acts 7:53; Gal. 3:19.
11:8-16; 12:22; 13:14.	The Christian: an 'alien/stranger/pilgrim'	1 Pet. 1:1; 2:11.
8:2, 5; 9:1-3, 11, 21; 13:10.	The Tabernacle as meeting place	Acts 7:44.
11:8-28.	Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Moses: significant examples of faithfulness	Acts 7:2-44.
3:7-4:11.	The wilderness generation: examples of unbelief and disobedience	Acts 7:39-43.
4:8.	Joshua takes the Israelites into the land ³⁶¹	Acts 7:45.

³⁶¹ Joshua (son of Nun) is mentioned only twice in the NT.

The comparison between Hebrews and other NT works (Tables 2.3, 2.4) is not intended to suggest that there are no distinctive elements peculiar to our author. Far from it. Every NT author has his own theological emphases and this is clearly true of the writer of Hebrews. His use of *κρείττων*³⁶² is one such, as is his use of ‘promise’ and ‘faith’.³⁶³ His focus on the New Covenant, emphasis on the (high) priestly ministry of Christ and unique pneumatological contribution (as will be shown) show him to be a theologian standing alongside Paul and John.³⁶⁴

2.6 Conclusions

Philo, Qumran, nascent Gnosticism, Jewish mysticism and apocalyptic speculation are not major background philosophies or movements against which to read Hebrews. Our author relies heavily on the OT. He interprets the OT’s Messianic hope in the light of the Christ event (something that could be said of the NT as a whole) and he interprets the ‘Christ-event’ in the light of the OT Scriptures. As has been seen (§2.5 and Table 2.3) he takes what is contemporary and develops it to serve his purposes. This is also something he does in developing his unique pneumatology. Consequently, when discussing Hebrews’ divine-*πνεῦμα* texts, this thesis will look to the OT and the ‘Christ-tradition’ as the primary backgrounds against which to interpret them. Pneumatological ideas from other forms of second-temple ‘Judaisms’ will be considered when, only or if it is appropriate to the discussion of a specific text in Hebrews.

³⁶² 12 of the 15 NT occurrences are in Hebrews. It is used to describe a *better* hope (7:19), covenant (7:22; 8:6a), promise (8:6b), sacrifice (9:23), country (11:16), resurrection (11:35) and word (12:24).

³⁶³ For a discussion of the distinctive use of these two concepts see Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, cxii.

³⁶⁴ See Lindars, *Theology*, 25. O’Brien [*Hebrews*, 1] calls Hebrews “theologically profound”. Cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, xlii; Hagner, D.A. “Hebrews: A Book for Today”, Laansma & Treier, *Christology*, 213; Hurst, *Background*, 132-33; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 30; Lincoln, *Guide*, 108-10.

3. Aspects of the pneumatology of the OT and Second Temple Judaism

Since this thesis is an exploration of the pneumatology of Hebrews, an exhaustive discussion of the role of the Spirit in the OT (or Intertestamental Judaism) is not called for.³⁶⁵ However, there are themes/issues relating to OT and Second Temple pneumatology that impinge on more than one section of this thesis. They all relate to the interaction of God's Spirit with God's people. To avoid unnecessary repetition, it is advisable to deal with these issues in discrete sections preliminary to the exegesis of the individual Spirit texts. As this chapter unfolds, and as the overall thesis proceeds, the relevance of these issues will become more apparent.³⁶⁶

After dealing with some introductory issues, the question of the Spirit as exclusive to, or the distinguishing mark of, the OC people will be addressed. Then, the Spirit as 'prophetic Spirit' and/or 'bringer of revelation' will be examined before considering whether the Spirit withdrew after the last canonical prophets ceased. This chapter will conclude with a brief overview of the texts that will be discussed in the body of the thesis. The similarities and differences between the pneumatology of Hebrews and that of the rest of the NT will be discussed, if and where necessary, in the exegesis of Hebrews' divine-πνεῦμα texts.

³⁶⁵ This has been thoroughly covered elsewhere. For relatively recent discussions, e.g. see Burke & Warrington, *Holy Spirit*, 1-83; Firth, *Presence*; Levison, J.R. *Filled with the Spirit*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); *idem*, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism*, (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Hamilton, J.M. *God's Indwelling Presence*, (Nashville: B&H, 2006); Hildebrandt, W. *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God*, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995); Fossum, J.E. *The Image of the Invisible God*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); Sekki, A.E. *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989); Isaacs, *Concept*; Neve, L. *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*, (Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972). See also the literature cited by these authors.

³⁶⁶ Points at which the issues discussed in this chapter impinge on the main sections of this thesis (§§4-7) will be indicated in the footnotes and/or the text thus, §...

3.1 The Spirit in the OT: Introduction

The Hebrew word רֹחַ occurs 389 times in the OT³⁶⁷ and the LXX renders it πνεῦμα in 277 instances. About 100 occurrences of רֹחַ refer to God's Spirit³⁶⁸ and 81 of these relate to God's Spirit interacting with a person or with the covenant community.³⁶⁹ Of these divine-human interactions, those producing physical effects (craftsmanship, movement or strength) and those relating to equipping leaders find no parallel in the pneumatology of Hebrews.

Table 3.1 God's Spirit interacting with people in the OT

- i. ***Inspires prophetic speech*** (26x): Gen. 41:38; Num. 11:25b, 26, 29; 24:2; 1 Sam. 10:6, 10; 19:20, 23; 2 Sam. 23:2; 2 Kgs 2:9, 15; Isa. 48:16; 59:21; Ezek. 11: 2, 5a; Hos. 9:7; Joel 2:28; 2:29 [3:1; 3:2]; Mic. 3:8; Zech. 7:12; Neh. 9:30; 1 Chron. 12:18[19]; 2 Chron. 15:1; 20:14; 24:20.
- ii. ***Produces physical effects*** (18x): He gives strength, Judg. 14:6, 19; 15:14. He moves or lifts, 1 Kgs 18:12; 2 Kgs 2:16; Ezek. 2:2; 3:12; 3:14a, 24; 8:3; 11:1, 24a; 37:1; 43:5. He gives ability in craftsmanship: Exod. 28:3; 31:3; 35:31; 1 Chron. 28:12.
- iii. ***Affirms/confirms/restores God's presence/covenant*** (16x): Ps. 51:11; 139:7; Isa. 32:15; 34:16; 44:3; 59:21; 63:10, 11, 14; Ezek. 36:27; 37:14; 39:29; Joel 2:28-3:1 [3:1-4:1]; Hag. 2:5; Zech. 4:6; 12:10.
- iv. ***Produces leadership ability*** (10x): Num. 11:17, 25a; 27:18; Deut. 34:9; Judg. 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 1 Sam. 11:6; 16:13.
- v. ***Brings revelation/understanding/direction*** (10x): Job 32:8; Prov. 1:23; Neh. 9:20; Ezek. 11:24b; Dan. 4:8[5], 9[6], 18[15]; 5:11, 12, 14.
- vi. ***Equips the Messianic King / Servant of the Lord*** (3x): Isa. 11:2;³⁷⁰ 42:1; 61:1.

³⁶⁷ 378x in the Hebrew text and 11x in the Aramaic portions of Daniel.

³⁶⁸ "The exact number depends on how one reads certain passages", so, Averbeck, R.E. "Breath, Wind, Spirit and the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament", Firth, *Presence*, 27.

³⁶⁹ See Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.1 – the total number of verses listed in these charts is 83; Isa. 59:21 and Joel 2:28-29 [3:1-2] are each listed under two categories. This is a subjective categorization of the texts; the line of demarcation between 'prophecy', 'revelation' and 'leadership' is not always clear cut, particularly in Num. 11:17-29 and Ezek. 11:1-5, 24.

³⁷⁰ The three-fold description of the "Spirit of the Lord" as "the spirit of wisdom... counsel... and knowledge" is counted as one reference to the Spirit equipping the Davidic Messiah.

Figure 3.1 God’s Spirit interacting with people in the OT



As will be seen, the Spirit as both ‘proof-of-presence’ (§§5.32; 8.3.2) and as ‘bringer-of-revelation’ (§§4.5; 4.6 8.3.1) does figure significantly in Hebrews’ pneumatology. Consequently, this thesis will now proceed to explore these aspects of OT pneumatology and then refer to the conclusions of these investigations as appropriate when Hebrews’ divine-*πνεῦμα* texts are exegeted.

3.2 The Spirit as ‘Proof-of-Presence’

The phrase ‘God’s Spirit’³⁷¹ (or equivalent)³⁷² is juxtaposed in various places in the OT with ‘God’s presence’ to indicate that God’s Spirit is equivalent to his presence with a person or a people. The synonymous parallelism in Psalms 51:11³⁷³ and 139:7³⁷⁴ links

³⁷¹ “*rûah* *’ēlōhîm* ...occurs 15x in Hebrew, and its equivalent five times in Aramaic... *rûah* *yhwh* ...occurs about twenty-seven times”, so, Hildebrandt, *Theology*, 18.

³⁷² E.g. ‘your Holy Spirit’, addressed to God (Ps. 51:11[13]).

³⁷³ “Do not cast me away from your presence / do not take your Holy Spirit from me.” Psalm 51 is replete with such ‘internal’ parallelism, “the synonyms in the second part (supplying) additional meaning”, so Ross, A.P. *A Commentary on the Psalms*, (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011), 1:89.

³⁷⁴ “Where can I go from your Spirit / where can I flee from your presence?” See further the discussion in Grant, J.A. “Spirit and Presence in Psalm 139”, Firth, *Presence*, 135-46.

the Spirit of God with God's presence in an individual. Similarly, the prophetic declaration in Isaiah 44:3³⁷⁵ and Ezekiel 39:29³⁷⁶ link God's Spirit to his presence with the covenant community.

Exodus 33: 12-17 records a decisive exchange between Moses and Yahweh. Moses pleads that Yahweh accompany the people on their onward journey to the Promised Land. Having previously said he would not accompany them because of their disobedience (33:3), Yahweh now accedes to Moses request, saying "my presence will go with you and I will give you rest" (33:14). Moses continues the exchange by asking how it would be apparent that Israel were distinct from all other peoples on earth unless Yahweh went with them (33:16). The drama of these verses lies in the movement from Yahweh's 'threat of absence' to his 'promise of presence'. Without his presence, "they have lost their identity as a "special treasure", Yahweh's "own kingdom of priests and holy people" (19:5-6)".³⁷⁷ This 'special identity' is based on the covenant (19:5) and leads to Israel taking (and remaining in) the Promised Land.

God's presence, which marked out his covenant people as unique, was later specifically identified as his Holy Spirit. Moses asks Yahweh: "Remove the Spirit of prophecy from the nations and speak in the Holy Spirit to me and to your people so that we become different from all the peoples that are on the face of the earth".³⁷⁸ God's gift of the Holy Spirit affirmed membership of the covenant community and distinguished Israel from all other peoples.³⁷⁹

Isaiah describes Yahweh's covenant loyalty (רַחֲמָנָה) towards Zion in terms reminiscent of the Exodus event (63:7-9). However, despite every expression of רַחֲמָנָה, Israel rebelled, "grieving his Holy Spirit" (63:10).³⁸⁰ Yahweh turned against them, whereupon, in a clear reference to the Exodus, the prophet asks: "Where is the one who brought them up out

³⁷⁵ "I will pour my Spirit on your offspring / my blessing on your descendants."

³⁷⁶ "I will not hide my face [presence] anymore from them / when I pour out my Spirit upon the house of Israel."

³⁷⁷ Durham, J.I. *Exodus*, (Waco: Word, 1987), 447.

³⁷⁸ *Tg. Ps-J. Exod. 33:16b.*

³⁷⁹ See McNamara, M. *Targum and Testament Revisited*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 168-69. See §§5.2.3; 5.4; 8.3.3.

³⁸⁰ This description of disobedience as 'grieving the Holy Spirit' is rare in the OT. See Ps. 51:11.

of the sea with the shepherds of his flock? Where is the one who put within them his Holy Spirit?” (63:11). This short passage describes Israel progressing to the Promised Land and concludes: “the Spirit of the Lord gave them rest” (63:14).³⁸¹ Childs correctly identifies the Spirit here as “the holy presence of Yahweh... theologically retrojected to the period of the nation’s inception”.³⁸² Indeed, the LXX translates 63:9 (re the exodus events) as: “It was no messenger or angel but his presence that saved them”.³⁸³ Flusser argues that this is the ‘correct’ reading and one that was known in Qumran.³⁸⁴

The Holy Spirit is the presence of God, both in the Exodus narrative and in subsequent covenant renewal events.³⁸⁵ In a drama played out time and again in the OT, the ‘absence’ motif³⁸⁶ is transformed by Yahweh’s covenant faithfulness into ‘actualised presence’, a renewal of covenant and Israel’s renewed obedience to the covenant statutes. In several other places in the OT prophetic books this covenant renewal is linked specifically to reception of God’s Spirit.³⁸⁷ Isaiah 32:15 is an example: “when the Spirit is poured out” one consequence is that God’s covenant people will live “in undisturbed places of rest” (Isa. 32:18).³⁸⁸ The outpoured Spirit “represents the divine activity that immediately precedes the restoration of peace and prosperity... the consequence of the reestablishment of the covenant”.³⁸⁹

The phrase ‘pouring the Spirit upon’ is a dynamic metaphor also linked to covenant renewal,³⁹⁰ “represent(ing) a sign and seal of the covenant... the divine mark of ownership”.³⁹¹ The covenant context of Isaiah 44:1-5 is clear. Israel is described in terms of God’s servant, whom he has chosen, created, formed and nurtured (44:1-2). Just as water poured on a parched land both refreshes and makes fruitful, so Yahweh

³⁸¹ See the development of this idea in Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 178-99, particularly 198-99.

³⁸² Childs, B.S. *Isaiah*, (Louisville: WJK, 2001), 524.

³⁸³ The MT has וּמַלְאֲךְ פָּנָיו הוֹשִׁיעָם (the angel of his presence saved them).

³⁸⁴ Flusser, D. *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 1.61-65.

³⁸⁵ See Wenk, M. *Community-Forming Power*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 58-61; Keener, *Acts*, 1.529.

³⁸⁶ Whether depicted as exile, fruitlessness, desolation or God’s wrath or ‘threatened absence’.

³⁸⁷ See Isa. 34:16; 59:21; Ezek. 36:24-28; 37:11-14; Hag. 2:4-5; Zech. 4:6.

³⁸⁸ A positive response to the Spirit’s warning (3:7-11) enables the members of the NC to enjoy God’s Sabbath rest now (4:3) and in the eschaton (4:9-11). See §§5.2; 8.3.2.

³⁸⁹ Block, D.I. *Beyond the River Chebar*, (Eugene: Cascade, 2013), 155.

³⁹⁰ So too, Ezek. 39:27-29; Joel 2:28-29 [3:1-2]; Zech. 12:10. See the comparison of these texts, §7.2.4.1 and Fig. 7.1.

³⁹¹ Block, *Beyond the River*, 154.

will pour out his Spirit on Jacob's descendants (44:3). They will prosper and joyfully acknowledge the Lord and serve him exclusively (44:4-5).

As they journeyed towards the Promised Land, the Presence of Yahweh validated Moses' leadership and marked out the covenant people (Exod. 33:12-17). The Spirit of Yahweh authenticated Moses and the seventy elders (Num. 11:16-27). Moses expressed his longing that the Lord would put his Spirit on all his people (Num. 11:29).³⁹² Reading the Exodus narrative in the light of Isaiah 63:7-14 "roots opposition to the holy spirit in the exodus tradition".³⁹³ Isaiah 63:7-14 is an example of the 'threat of absence' and 'promise of presence' motif. This motif also finds clear expression in Psalm 51³⁹⁴ where the double parallelism between and within verses 9 and 11 is telling. In verse 9, David pleads: "Hide your face from my sins" which is paralleled by "blot out all my iniquities". In verse 11, his prayer: "Do not cast me away from your presence" is equivalent to: "do not take your Holy Spirit from me". The antithetic parallelism between verses 9 and 11 shows that the only options are the 'absence of sin' or the 'absence of Yahweh'.³⁹⁵ This same presence/absence is seen at the point David was anointed for kingship (1 Sam. 16:13-14). The Spirit 'rushed' upon David and simultaneously left Saul. The Spirit's presence was the authentication of kingship. "The difference between Saul and David is... framed in part by the presence or absence of God's Spirit."³⁹⁶

In Ezekiel 39:27-29, Yahweh's presence with his people is identified with the presence of his Spirit in, with or upon them as a community. His covenantal presence (by his Spirit) is linked to the Exodus in Haggai 2:4-5: "I am with you, says the LORD of hosts, according to the covenant I made when you came out of Egypt. My Spirit abides among you".

³⁹² This was reiterated in Joel 2:28-29, fulfilled on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4, 38-39) and in Hebrews, confirms membership of the NC community (2:4; 6:4). See §§5; 8.3.2; 8.3.3.

³⁹³ Levison, *Filled*, 230.

³⁹⁴ See the discussion in Estes, D.J. "Spirit and the Psalmist in Psalm 51", Firth, *Presence*, 122-34.

³⁹⁵ Or, between the 'presence of sin' or the 'presence of the Spirit'.

³⁹⁶ Chapman, S.B. *1 Samuel as Christian Scripture*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 115.

3.2.1 New Testament developments

The apostle Paul made the bald and bold statement that unless a person has the Spirit of God³⁹⁷ he/she is not a follower of Christ (Rom. 8:9-11). For Paul, the authenticating mark of the New Covenant is the indwelling Spirit.³⁹⁸ Similarly, Peter had to recognise that Gentiles had been incorporated into the NC community when he saw that they had received the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:44-48; 11:15-18). Their reception of the Spirit validated the claim that the Lord had brought Gentiles into his new community, the Church. “And that conclusion was forced on them *by the action of the Spirit*”.³⁹⁹

Peter and Paul were Jews and, although they were apparently surprised that ‘all flesh’ (Joel 2:28 [3:1]) included Gentiles, the actual ‘authentication marker’ was no surprise. As has been seen, the Holy Spirit was regarded as the peculiar possession of God’s people and his presence is the defining mark of Covenant membership.⁴⁰⁰ The Spirit being given to the Gentiles (Acts 10:44-48) was sufficient; they had been incorporated into the household of faith. Consequently, they could not be refused baptism and admission to full fellowship and no other demands were placed upon them. Thus, reception of the Spirit is not the source of the community’s life but testimony to the reality of the life of faith already present. “The reception of the Spirit is thus God’s witness to the existence of faith (which) is the prerequisite for receiving the Spirit.”⁴⁰¹ If God had accepted and sealed them, how could anyone require anything else?

A fundamental difference between the authenticating presence of God’s Spirit in the OC and the NC becomes apparent. It relates to entrance into the community. Proselyte baptism and acceptance of the Torah might bring a non-Jew into the covenant but being born a Jew gave automatic entry to the community.⁴⁰² Clearly in Acts, with “the

³⁹⁷ The phrases ‘God’s Spirit’, ‘the Spirit of Christ’, ‘the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead’, *et al* are here taken as equivalent to the ‘Holy Spirit’.

³⁹⁸ Terminology is difficult. Some scholars speak of ‘possessing the Spirit’, others of ‘being possessed or taken over by the spirit’ and still others of ‘receiving the Spirit’ or of ‘the gift of the Spirit’. Without prejudice, this thesis will generally use phrases suggestive of an inter-personal relationship with the Holy Spirit.

³⁹⁹ Dunn, J.D.G. “Towards the Spirit of Christ”, Welker, M. *The Work of the Spirit*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 20, emphasis original.

⁴⁰⁰ See further, §5.3. See also §3.2 n.379 and associated text.

⁴⁰¹ So, Gunkel, H. *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979 [1888]), 17.

⁴⁰² As Dunn [“Towards”, 19] writes, “Judaism was not an evangelistic religion (it) was an ethnic religion”.

incorporation of new groups of people (into the covenant community), reference is made to the manifestation of the Spirit's presence".⁴⁰³ However, this is not the full picture. On the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit did not simply affirm the 120 in the upper room as a new community but "he rested on *each one* of them" (Acts 2:3). The instruction that Peter gave to the crowd was that 'every single one' (ἕκαστος) should be baptised (βαπτισθήτω, 3rd singular imperative) and each one who was baptised would receive the promised Holy Spirit. The gift is for "*everyone* whom the Lord our God calls" (Acts 2:38-39). This is an "individualizing of the response"⁴⁰⁴ to Peter's demand: "Μετανοήσατε". Later, Peter enraged the leaders of Israel when, testifying to the reality of Christ's resurrection, he said, "We are witnesses to these things and so is the Holy Spirit whom God has given to those who obey him" (Acts 5:32-33). By implication, Peter was saying that God had authenticated the disciples' testimony but hadn't validated the Jewish leaders' claim to be part of God's covenant community. The authenticating presence of God's Spirit is no longer a 'birthright' but is a gift from God to each one who, through repentance and faith, has been 'born again' into the NC community.

3.2.2 Hebrews: preliminary remarks

As will be seen, for Hebrews, the presence of the Holy Spirit with Christ's followers authenticates them and individualizes the New Covenant.⁴⁰⁵ In 2:4, the 'distributions' of the Holy Spirit parallels the Pentecostal outpouring of Acts 2:1-4 and validates the NC message (§§5.2.3; 8.3.2). In 6:4, being partnered by the Spirit authenticates the members of the NC community and facilitates them satisfying the covenant obligations (§§5.3.2; 8.3.2). The designation Spirit of grace (10:29) is one which indicates that the Spirit brings to the members of the NC the 'grace gifts' needed to fulfil the obligations of the

⁴⁰³ Block [*Beyond the River*, 157 n.40] references "the Jews of Jerusalem (Acts 2:4, 33, 38), the Samaritans (8:14-17), the Gentile proselytes of Judea (10:44-48, cf. 11:16) and the Gentiles of Asia Minor (19:1-6)".

⁴⁰⁴ Barrett, C.K. *Acts 1-14*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 154. So too, Kaiser, *Ancient Paths*, 369.

⁴⁰⁵ The individualization of the covenantal promises is not alien to the OT, e.g. Ps. 23; 27:1-13; 28:1-7; 51:1-17; 121; 128. See Allen, L.C. "Types of Actualization in the Psalms", Ma, W. & Menzies, R.P. *The Spirit and Spirituality*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 25-27; Kaiser, *Ancient Paths*, 369. See also the discussion of Hebrews as a covenant reinforcement document, §2.2.

covenant established by the death of Christ (§§7.4.4; 8.3.3). It will be seen that the Holy Spirit authenticates both the NC and the NC members, his presence demonstrating the reality of the new relationship between the triune God and the followers of Christ (§§5.4; 7.5; 8.3.2; 8.3.3).

3.3 The Spirit of Prophecy / Bringer-of-Revelation

This section will examine the role of the Spirit in inspiration and revelation. A detailed analysis of the texts which juxtapose ‘Spirit’ and ‘prophecy’ is neither possible nor required, nonetheless it is appropriate to have an overview of the OT ‘Spirit of prophecy’ or ‘bringer of revelation’.⁴⁰⁶ After reviewing relevant OT texts, some observations will be offered about Second Temple and Targumic concepts of the ‘prophetic Spirit’. Finally, in this section, there will be a brief comment showing how this theme ‘plays out’ in the NT generally and Hebrews specifically.

3.3.1 The Old Testament

Ezekiel uses a striking phrase describing the Spirit as ‘falling on him and speaking to him’⁴⁰⁷ (Ezek. 11:5).⁴⁰⁸ Ezekiel twice remarks that the Spirit spoke with him, the first time commanding him to prophesy against “men who devise iniquity” (Ezek. 11:2-4) and then dictating the contents of that prophetic word (11:5-12). On two other occasions, Israel is reminded that God had spoken “by his Spirit through his prophets”⁴⁰⁹ and the synonymous parallelism of Hosea 9:7 equates “man of the Spirit” and “the prophet”.

⁴⁰⁶ ‘Prophecy’ in this context includes inspired wisdom or knowledge, revelation and ecstatic praise. See Turner, M. *Power from on High*, (Sheffield: SAP, 2000), 104; Menzies, R.P. *Empowered for Witness*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 182; Keener, *Acts* 1.534-37.

⁴⁰⁷ Unique to him in the OT. So, Block, D.I. *By the River Chebar*, (Eugene: Cascade, 2013), 158.

⁴⁰⁸ This and Ezek. 8:1, where the hand of the Lord ‘falls on him’, are the only OT references to the Divine ‘falling’ on a person; however, Isa. 9:7 records that the word of the Lord “fell on Israel”.

⁴⁰⁹ Zech. 7:12; cf. Neh. 9:30.

Elsewhere in the OT, the Spirit comes (or is) upon,⁴¹⁰ rests upon,⁴¹¹ clothes,⁴¹² fills,⁴¹³ rushes upon⁴¹⁴ or is poured upon⁴¹⁵ someone who then prophesies. Indeed, almost half of the OT passages relating to the Spirit's interactions with humanity relate to him bringing revelation, wisdom, teaching or prophecy and two-thirds of these are specifically in the context of prophecy.⁴¹⁶

In addition to actual or promised prophetic utterance, the Spirit is linked with or is the producer of other aspects of revelation and instruction. He brings wisdom (Prov. 1:23), understanding (Job 32:8) and instruction (Neh. 9:20). He gives visions (Ezek. 11:24) and the ability to solve riddles and interpret dreams.⁴¹⁷ The Isaiah passages that refer to the Spirit anointing the Messiah indicate that he will bring truth, revelation, proclamation and/or instruction. Isaiah 11:1-5 describes "The Spirit of the Lord" as the "Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel... the Spirit of knowledge". His ministry will involve teaching (Isa. 42:4), while in Isaiah 61:1-2 the anointing of the Spirit will facilitate the Messiah bringing good news, proclaiming liberty and proclaiming the year of the Lord's favour.

Although David is never called a prophet in the OT,⁴¹⁸ his relationship with the Spirit of God is significant. He was passionate that, despite his sin (Ps. 51:11, see §3.2), the Lord should not remove the Holy Spirit from him. Furthermore, when Samuel anointed David for kingship "the Spirit of the Lord rushed upon David *from that day forward*", indicating the life-long presence of the Spirit with David (1 Sam. 16:13).⁴¹⁹ When Josephus retells this incident he writes: "the Deity abandoned Saul and passed over to David who, when the divine Spirit had removed to him, began to prophesy" (*Ant.* 6:166).

⁴¹⁰ Num. 24:2; 1 Sam. 19:20, 23; 2 Kings 2:9; 2 Chron. 15:1; 20:14; Isa. 59:21.

⁴¹¹ Num. 11:25, 26; 2 Kings 2:15.

⁴¹² 1 Chron. 12:18 [19]; 2 Chron. 24:20.

⁴¹³ Mic. 3:8.

⁴¹⁴ 1 Sam. 10:6, 10.

⁴¹⁵ Joel 2:28 [3:1], 2:29 [3:2]. The metaphor of 'pouring out Spirit' is also employed in Prov. 1:23.

⁴¹⁶ See Table 3.1 and Fig. 3.1.

⁴¹⁷ Joseph interprets Pharaoh's dream (Gen. 41:38); see also Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 4: 8 [5], 9 [6], 18 [15]) and Daniel and Belshazzar (Dan. 5:11, 12, 14).

⁴¹⁸ The NT recognises David as someone through whom the Holy Spirit spoke (Acts 1:16; 4:25) and one who spoke words that were 'prophetic' (Matt. 22:42-5 and parallels; Acts 2:25, 34; Rom. 4:6; 11:9).

⁴¹⁹ So, Schuele, A. "The Spirit of YHWH and the Aura of Divine Presence", *Interpretation*, 66 (2012), 20 n.10; Chapman, *1 Samuel*, 149; Klein, R.W. *1 Samuel*, (Waco: Word, 1983), 162.

In his so-called ‘last words’ (2 Sam. 23:1-7), David testifies: “The Spirit of the LORD speaks through me, his word is upon my tongue” (v2) and describes this relationship in terms of ‘an everlasting covenant’ (v5). He calls this statement an ‘oracle’ (אָרַקְל), a designation normally reserved for prophecy.⁴²⁰ This is how the Targum understood the ‘oracle’ introducing it as “the words of the prophecy of David” and records David continuing: “By a Spirit of prophecy... I am speaking” (*Tg. J.* 2 Sam. 23:1-2).

While the OT does not describe the interactions of the Spirit of God with humanity exclusively in terms of ‘the Spirit of prophecy’, nonetheless a significant part of his ministry is revelatory. As this brief sketch has shown, he brings truth, direction and correction from God through anointed prophets and leaders. Moses’ programmatic longing “that all the LORD’s people were prophets, and that the LORD would put his Spirit on them” (Num. 11:29) finds prophetic expression and expectation in Joel’s declaration that God will pour out his Spirit on all flesh (Joel 2:28).⁴²¹ For Joel, this outpouring would be after the Lord had restored the fortunes of his people and re-established them in the promised land (Joel 2:25-26). The vision is of renewed covenant relationships evidenced by the Lord being tangibly present with his people (Joel 3:1, 16-21). Speaking through his prophet, Yahweh says: “You shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I, the LORD, am your God and there is no other (Joel 2:27), for the Lord dwells in Zion” (Joel 3:21). Present with his people, the Lord will pour out his Spirit on each of them, irrespective of class, age or gender, thereby creating a prophetic covenant community where “No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other, “Know the LORD,” for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the LORD” (Jer. 31:34).

⁴²⁰ Clines [*DCH*, 5:579] writes: “אָרַקְל... **utterance**, usu. of Y., given through prophet, **prophetic oracle**”. Anderson [*A.A. 2 Samuel*, (Dallas: Word, 1989), 268] writes: “David is here understood as a prophetic figure”.

⁴²¹ See §§5.2; 7.2.4.1.

3.3.2 ‘Judaisms’ pre-dating and contemporary with the NT

Second Temple ‘Judaisms’ regarded God’s Spirit as functioning predominantly, but not exclusively, as the ‘Spirit of Prophecy’.⁴²² Although that actual phrase is rare in Jewish texts that are demonstrably pre-Christian, nonetheless “we may be relatively assured that Jews of (the NT) time did indeed think of the Spirit in this way”.⁴²³ As has been noted, Josephus rewrites 1 Samuel 16:13 (*Ant.* 6:166) to show that the effect of the Spirit falling on David was that David prophesied.⁴²⁴ For Philo too, the Spirit and prophecy are linked as cause and effect. He writes that Balaam received “the truly prophetic Spirit which banished (his own) wizardry” enabling him to function as God’s mouthpiece (*Vit. Mos.* 1:277). Philo generalizes this effect stating that when the divine Spirit comes upon a prophet “the mind is evicted... but when that departs, the mind returns to its tenancy” (*Heres* 265).⁴²⁵ Similarly *Pseudo-Philo*⁴²⁶ adds ‘missing details’ to the OT which identify the Spirit of God with prophecy.⁴²⁷

In *Jubilees* there are additions to the Jacob narrative of Genesis. When Jacob is looking for a wife, Genesis 28:1-5 records that Isaac blessed Jacob and sent him to Laban. *Jubilees* 25:14 records that Rebecca lays hands on Jacob, “a Spirit of truth descended upon her mouth” and she prophesied over him. Expanding on the reunion of Jacob and Isaac (Gen. 35:27-29), *Jubilees* 31:12 reports that “a spirit of prophecy came down upon (Isaac’s) mouth” and he spoke a prophetic blessing on Jacob’s sons Levi and Judah.

Qumran also associated the Holy Spirit with prophecy. For example, 1QS 8.15-16 juxtaposes the law “decreed by God through Moses” with “what the prophets have revealed by His holy spirit”.⁴²⁸

⁴²² Keener, C.S. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 12. Cf. Barrett, C.K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, (London: SPCK, 1975 [1947]), 108-109; Chilton, B.D. *The Glory of Israel*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 48-52; Fee, *Presence*, 908-10; Levison, *First-Century Judaism*, 244-54; Turner, *Power*, 88-101. For a brief overview of the Spirit and prophecy in early Christian texts see Levison, *Filled*, 232-35.

⁴²³ Turner, *Power*, 104.

⁴²⁴ This link between the Spirit and prophecy is also seen in *Ant.* 6:222-23; 8:408.

⁴²⁵ See also *Spec. Leg.* 1:65; 4:49; *QG.* 3:9.

⁴²⁶ “An imaginative retelling of parts of the Old Testament story”, so, Harrington, D.J. “Pseudo-Philo”, *OTP*, 2:297.

⁴²⁷ See *LAB* 9:10; 28:6; 31:9; 62:2.

⁴²⁸ *A New Translation*, 129.

The Targumists make prolific reference to the Spirit of prophecy (or similar), where the MT has ‘Spirit of the Lord’ (or similar). The Ezekiel Targum is a typical example.⁴²⁹ This Targumist also regularly renders the MT’s ‘hand of the Lord’ as ‘Spirit of prophecy’⁴³⁰ and ‘word of the Lord’ as ‘the word of prophecy from before the Lord’.⁴³¹ Examples from the Targumim where the MT’s ‘Spirit’ is translated as ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ could be multiplied.⁴³² Nonetheless, it is an overstatement to say that, for the Targumists, “The expression “holy spirit” (is) synonymous with “the spirit of prophecy”, a divine power... in virtue of which (one) speaks the word of the Lord”.⁴³³ They know of the ‘Spirit of power’ coming on individuals⁴³⁴ and of the anointing of the Spirit producing craftsmanship.⁴³⁵ Furthermore, the Holy Spirit also acts as God’s voice, independent of human agency.⁴³⁶ There is no uniformity of expression amongst the Pentateuchal Targumists.⁴³⁷ However, even when the designation used is ‘Holy Spirit’, the most frequent consequence is that the recipient prophesies or has some other divine revelation.⁴³⁸

3.3.3 The New Testament

On about 200 occasions the NT references the Spirit’s interaction with humankind, approximately 75 of which result in either divinely inspired utterance or special revelation (§4.4). These range from the promises made by Jesus recorded in the

⁴²⁹ E.g. Ezek. 11:5, 24b; 37:1b.

⁴³⁰ E.g. Ezek. 3:22; 8:1; 37:1a.

⁴³¹ E.g. Ezek. 3:16; 11:14; 37:15.

⁴³² E.g. Judg. 3:10; 1 Chron. 28:12; Isa. 61:1; Mic. 3:8.

⁴³³ Alexander, P.S. *AB*, 17A (Cant.), 109 n.77.

⁴³⁴ See *Tg. Judg.* – Gideon (6:34), Jephthah (11:29) and Samson (13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14).

⁴³⁵ *Neof. I* Exod. 31:3; 35:31; *Onq.* Exod. 31:3; *Ps-J.* Exod. 31:3. All three Targumists attribute this ability to the ‘Spirit of wisdom’ in Exod. 28:3 and all three recognise that the ‘Spirit of wisdom’ given through Moses laying hands on Joshua (Deut. 34:9) equipped him to take on the leadership after Moses’ death.

⁴³⁶ See *Tg. Cant.* 2:12, where the turtledove’s voice becomes that of the Holy Spirit proclaiming redemption.

⁴³⁷ *Onq.* (apart from Gen. 45:27) uses the phrase ‘Spirit of prophecy’ exclusively, whilst in *Neof. I*, ‘Holy Spirit’ occurs more than a dozen times. *Ps-J.* uses both phrases, preferring ‘Holy Spirit’, 15 times to 11 (58% of the time).

⁴³⁸ See McNamara, M. *AB*, 1A (*Neof. I* Gen.), 38-39.

Johannine farewell discourse⁴³⁹ to ‘speaking in tongues’ as the Spirit filled the followers of Christ.⁴⁴⁰ More pertinent, for this thesis, is the NT’s witness to the Spirit bringing revelation through the OT scriptures. On three occasions⁴⁴¹ NT writers report that the Holy Spirit spoke through David. Although the OT does not actually call him a prophet, nonetheless David does confess himself to be the recipient of words from God’s Spirit (2 Sam. 23:2) and Luke explicitly calls him a prophet (Acts 2:30).⁴⁴² On one other occasion, Paul’s statement/defence before the Jewish leaders (Acts 28:17-28), the Holy Spirit is said to have spoken through Isaiah (Acts 28:25).⁴⁴³ Two other NT texts seem relevant to this study, 2 Peter 1:20-21 (§4.4.3) and 2 Timothy 3:16 (§4.4.4). However, as will be seen, although these links between prophecy and/or Scripture ‘spring from’ the OT and intertestamental understanding of the ‘Spirit of prophecy’, nonetheless they do not explicitly link the Holy Spirit with either the inspiration or interpretation of Scripture (§4.4.5). That is the unique contribution of Hebrews (§§4.5; 4.6).

3.3.4 Hebrews: preliminary remarks

Hebrews begins with the declaration that God spoke through the prophets but that he now speaks in/through his Son (1:1-2). Hebrews also portrays the Spirit as “an active participant and guide communicating the meaning of Scripture to the community of the letter”.⁴⁴⁴ Hebrews shows that the OT Spirit of prophecy and/or revelation is the same Spirit who now addresses the NC community directly and speaks as God (§1.2.1d).⁴⁴⁵ Indeed, a “Spirit-empowered prophetic interpretation underlies the radical and creative handling of Scripture” in Hebrews (§§4.5; 8.3.1).⁴⁴⁶

⁴³⁹ The Holy Spirit will teach them all things (John 15:26), guide them into all truth (John 16:13) and declare to them the things that are to come (John 16:13).

⁴⁴⁰ As in Acts 2:4; 10:44-46; 19:6. Cf. 1 Cor. 12:7-11.

⁴⁴¹ Mark 12:36 and the parallel Matt. 22:43; Acts 1:16; and 4:25.

⁴⁴² Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 6.166: “David, who upon this removal of the Divine Spirit to him, began to prophesy”. See also §4.4.1.

⁴⁴³ See §4.4.2.

⁴⁴⁴ Levison, “Theology”, 109. See §4.5 re 3:7; 9:8; 10:15-17.

⁴⁴⁵ See Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 172. Cf. Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 53-54; Levison, “Theology”, 100.

⁴⁴⁶ So, Motyer, “The Spirit”, 226.

3.4 Did the Spirit cease?

It has been argued that the Spirit's presence with a person or a people is the authenticating mark of covenant membership.⁴⁴⁷ Consequently, if the Spirit withdrew from Israel prior to the Christ-event, that would have profound implications for the covenant community and the continuance of covenant relationships. Therefore, this thesis needs to address the question of how far the Spirit ceased in post-Biblical Judaism.

One of the Spirit's primary functions is revelatory, often making known to God's people his word and/or personal requirements via anointed prophetic leadership.⁴⁴⁸ Hence, Saul 'is among the prophets' (1 Sam. 10:6), David speaks the oracles of God (2 Sam. 23:2) and the Spirit who was upon Moses causes the 70 elders to prophesy when he rested upon them (Num. 11:25). However, the Holy Spirit is not equivalent to the Prophetic Spirit. Although the Prophetic Spirit is the Holy Spirit, the greater designation (Holy Spirit) includes the partial designation (Spirit of prophecy, wisdom or power). Therefore, while the Prophetic Spirit is the Holy Spirit in one of his 'modes of being', the Holy Spirit is not co-terminus with the Prophetic Spirit. Consequently, in discussing the question of whether the Spirit ceased, it must be recognised that this is a much larger issue with significantly greater ramifications than 'did prophecy cease'. If the Spirit withdrew from Israel, then genuine prophecy ceased. However, if prophecy ceased, it is possible that the Spirit functioned in other ways, perhaps through inspired interpretation. If so, this might explain the Targumists rewording of the question about the Spirit falling on Saul: "Is Saul among the teachers?"⁴⁴⁹

As has already been intimated, the question of the cessation of the Spirit is not as simple as might first be supposed, not least because Judaism in the Second Temple period satisfies Neusner's observation that "there has never been "a Judaism" only "Judaisms"."⁴⁵⁰ Furthermore, while the 'cessation of prophecy' and the 'withdrawal of

⁴⁴⁷ So, §3.2. This will be fully explored with regard to Hebrews' pneumatology in §§5.2; 5.3.2; 8.3.2.

⁴⁴⁸ So, §§3.3.1; 3.3.2. See §§4.3; 8.3.1 where Hebrews' development of the Spirit's revelatory role is explored.

⁴⁴⁹ Tg. 1 Sam. 10:11; cf. Tg. 1 Sam. 19:24 "Is Saul among the scribes?"

⁴⁵⁰ Neusner, J. *Transformations in Ancient Judaism*, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 11. See §2.2.

the Spirit' in the Second Temple period are linked, they are not identical.⁴⁵¹ Obviously, the absence of the Spirit would have implications much wider than just the cessation of genuine Spirit-inspired prophecy. In addition, it is uncertain whether the so-called 'cessation texts'⁴⁵² apply to the whole intertestamental period⁴⁵³ or provide 'snapshots' of specific moments. Indeed, these texts could describe the existential reality but may simply reflect what was generally believed to be the case. These 'cessation texts' might even show that prophecy was no longer regarded (or wanted) as the primary vehicle of revelation.⁴⁵⁴ It is plausible that in the late intertestamental period the feeling was that "prophets belonged to the past, scribes to the present. Authority is now vested in the scribes who have the right to determine the meaning even of the prophetic utterances contained in the sacred text."⁴⁵⁵

It is a matter of current debate how far one can demonstrate that the Spirit had actually ceased in Israel.⁴⁵⁶ However, what seems beyond doubt is that authentic prophecy and Spirit-led acts were very rare.⁴⁵⁷ Jesus' appraisal of John the Baptist (Matt. 11:7-9; Luke

⁴⁵¹ The designation 'Prophetic Spirit' focuses on but one aspect of his activity.

⁴⁵² E.g. Josephus, *Ap.* 1.41; Pr. Azar. 15. Cf. *t. Sota* 13:3; *y. Sota* 9.13, 24b; *b. Sanh.* 11a; *Cant. Rab.* 8:9#3. See also Isa. 63:10-12; Zech. 13:2-6; 1 Macc. 9:27; 14:41; Matt. 11:13; Mark 6:15; John 8:52; Acts 19:2; Heb. 1:1-2.

⁴⁵³ This is further confounded as there are texts suggesting that the cessation was from the destruction of the First Temple, or the death of the last canonical prophets or from the destruction of the Second Temple. See Davies, W.D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, (London: SPCK, 1962), 208-10.

⁴⁵⁴ Hengel [M. "The Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism", Beattie, D.R.G. & McNamara, M.J. *The Aramaic Bible*, (Sheffield: SAP, 1994), 163-64] writes of the "last flash of prophecy" and that "(t)he mention of the abolition of prophecy in Zech. 13.2-6 documents the end of this institution".

⁴⁵⁵ Alexander, P. "'A Sixtieth Part of Prophecy': The Problem of Continuing Revelation in Judaism", Davies, J. Harvey, G. & Watson, W.G.E. *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed*, (Sheffield: SAP, 1995), 432.

⁴⁵⁶ Davies [*Rabbinic Judaism*, 208-209] references texts showing that "the Holy Spirit ceased altogether from Israel" and texts "which suggest that the Holy Spirit was still active in Israel". However, the texts that Davies cites as showing the Spirit's active presence with Israel refer not to actual pneumatic activity but to the potential for it (see *Lev. Rab.* 35.7). This 'potential' or 'possibility' of pneumatic or prophetic activity is discussed by Levison, J.R. "Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel?" *NTS*, 43 (1997), 35-57; Greenspahn, F.E. "Why Prophecy Ceased", *JBL*, 108 (1989), 37-49; Overholt, T.W. "The End of Prophecy: No Players without a Program", *JSOT*, 13 (1988), 103-15. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to resolve how far the Spirit ceased in post-exilic Judah. See further the discussions in Barton, J. *Oracles of God*, (Oxford: OUP, 2007 [1986]); Gray, R. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine*, (Oxford: OUP, 1993); Cook Jr, L.S. *The Question of the Cessation of Prophecy in Ancient Judaism*, (Catholic University of America, Washington: PhD Thesis, 2009); Meyers, E.M. "Messianism in First and Second Zechariah and the "End" of Biblical Prophecy", Coleson, J. and Matthews, V. *Go to the Land I Will Show You*, (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 127-42.

⁴⁵⁷ Barton [*Oracles*, 269], commenting on the discontinuity between pre-exilic and post-exilic Judaism, notes that "post-Ezra, the prophets were characters in a book written by the finger of God". Cf. Menzies, *Empowered*, 102, "Contemporary experience of the Spirit was deemed either an impossibility or less

7:24-26) serves to illustrate this. Whatever else “a reed swaying in the wind” might refer to,⁴⁵⁸ the fact that there would be many such reeds on the banks of the Jordan makes this a metaphor for something commonplace.⁴⁵⁹ John was not commonplace, he was out of the ordinary. “The crowds went out to see a prophet (since) an authentic prophet had not been seen in Israel for generations.”⁴⁶⁰

3.4.1 New Testament implications

There was a dearth of genuine prophetic and/or pneumatological activity in the period immediately preceding the ‘Christ-event’. John the Baptist heralded a new day of the Spirit; Christ embodied that new day and it was ‘universalized’ at Pentecost with the eschatological statement: “This is what was spoken through the prophet Joel” (Acts 2:17). The Pentecostal experience – every convert receiving a dynamic filling of the Holy Spirit – inaugurated the ‘last days’. The Spirit’s presence authenticates both the New Covenant and the NC Community. However, this “newly constituted people of God had been written about beforehand... this is that which was spoken...” and this experience of Pentecost led to a new reading of Scripture⁴⁶¹ (§4.5) and a new understanding of what it means to be part of the NC people (§5.3).

profound than in the past”; Keener [*Acts* 1.886-909] comments that “the title ‘prophet’ belongs only to the past and the future” (*ibid*, 891) and “Even where prophecy continued, it was rarely seen in the same terms as OT prophecy. Josephus and Philo did not associate current inspiration with the Holy Spirit, Qumran documents associated prophecy and the Spirit only with the past” (*ibid*, 894). Indeed, Jeremias [*J. New Testament Theology I*, (London: SCM 1971), 81] subtitles sec. 9, “the return of the Quenched Spirit”. In the same vein, see Von Rad, G. *Old Testament Theology*, (London: SCM, 1985), 2:297; Sommer, B.D. “Did Prophecy Cease? Evaluating a Reevaluation”, *JBL*, 115 (1996), 31-47; Fee, *Presence*, 914-15.

⁴⁵⁸ Whether an emblem on a coin from the reign of Herod or the idea of weakness and vacillation.

⁴⁵⁹ So, Allen, W.C. *Matthew*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1972 [1907]), 114-15. Also, Fitzmyer, J.A. *Luke I-IX*, (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 673; Nolland, J. *Luke 1-9:20*, (Dallas: Word, 1989), 335, 339; Davies, W.D. & Allison, D.C. *Matthew, Vol. 2*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 247.

⁴⁶⁰ Hagner, D.A. *Matthew 1-13*, (Dallas: Word, 1993), 305. So too, Morris, L. *The Gospel According to Matthew*, (Leicester: IVP, 1992), 279. Dunn [*Baptism*, 27] notes that at the baptism of Jesus “the long drought of knowing the Spirit comes to an end” and “the Rabbinic dogma that prophecy had ceased (was) long established (so) the reappearance of the prophetic Spirit in John and Jesus met with scepticism”, *idem*, “Prophetic ‘I’ sayings and the Jesus Tradition”, Dunn, J.D.G. *The Christ & the Spirit, Vol. 2 Pneumatology*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 156. Cf. Carson, D.A. “Do the Prophets and the Law quit Prophesying Before John?”, Evans, C.A. & Stegner, W.R. *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, (Sheffield: SAP, 1994), 179-94.

⁴⁶¹ So, Fee, *Presence*, 915.

3.4.2 Implications for Hebrews

This thesis will demonstrate that, for the author and recipients of Hebrews, the πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς (2:4) and μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου (6:4) authenticates them as individual members of the NC community.⁴⁶² Furthermore, the Spirit of grace (10:29), by partnering every member of the NC community, enters into an ‘enabling’ relationship with those he also authenticates.⁴⁶³ So, whether the Spirit ceased from Israel or not, he now fills, authenticates and equips all the followers of Christ as recipients of the New Covenant; this is a significant pneumatological statement which will be demonstrated in the main body of this thesis (§§4-7) and in the conclusions drawn from that exploration of Hebrews’ pneumatology (§8).

3.5 The Spirit in Hebrews: Overview

Over half of the occurrences of διαθήκη in the NT are found in Hebrews.⁴⁶⁴ This covenant in Christ’s blood (9:20; 10:29; 13:20) is variously called ‘better’ (κρείττων, 7:22; 8:6), ‘new’ (καινός, 8:8; 9:15; νέος, 12:24) and ‘eternal’ (αἰώνιος, 13:20). Hebrews focuses on covenant reinforcement and/or covenant renewal (§2.1.4) and, when quoting the OT, uses verbs of speaking, often with a divine speaker and generally in the present tense (see Tables 4.2-4.4).

Hebrews has the longest OT quotation in the NT⁴⁶⁵ (Jeremiah’s New Covenant prophecy) which, when referred to a second time is introduced by: “the Holy Spirit testifies to us” (10:15). As will be seen (§§4.5.2; 4.5.3), in Hebrews the Spirit, as bringer-of-revelation (§3.3), not only speaks through Scripture (3:7; 10:15-17) but also interprets it, showing its relevance for the life of the NC community (9:8).⁴⁶⁶ Furthermore, the

⁴⁶² See §§5.2; 5.3; 8.3.2.

⁴⁶³ See §§5.4; 7.5; 8.3.3.

⁴⁶⁴ 17 of 33.

⁴⁶⁵ Jer. 31:31-34 [38:31-34] in 8:8-12; Jer. 31:33-34 [38:33-34] is repeated in 10:16-17.

⁴⁶⁶ See Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 28, 166-72, 183, 253-54. Cf. §§4.5; 8.3.1.

post-Pentecost believers addressed in Hebrews experience the Holy Spirit both as ‘proof-of-presence’ (§3.2, cf. §§5.2; 5.3) and as the one who authenticates them as the new and/or renewed prophetic covenant community (§3.3, cf. §§4.5.2; 5.3). They live in the fulfilment of Joel’s vision and Moses’ programmatic longing that each one of God’s people would have an intimate relationship with the Spirit. Hebrews⁴⁶⁷ testifies to this dawning of a new day of the Spirit and shows its author to be a pneumatic prophet in the line of Jeremiah.⁴⁶⁸ Consequently, it has been necessary to explore the role of the Spirit as ‘proof-of-presence’, ‘bringer-of-revelation’ and as the one who authenticates the covenant community because these functions undergird Hebrews’ pneumatology. This thesis will now proceed to exegete the divine-πνεῦμα texts.

The letter to the Hebrews uses πνεῦμα seven times to designate the divine Spirit. For Hebrews, the Holy Spirit both speaks through and interprets the Scriptures (§4).⁴⁶⁹ The distribution (μερισμός) of Holy Spirit (2.4) and the experience of “becoming partakers (μετόχους γενηθέντας) of the Holy Spirit” (6.4) authenticate the NC community and the individuals within it (§5). Hebrews, alone in the NT, connects the Spirit with the Atonement (9:14), designating him ‘the eternal Spirit’ (§6), a title which is unique to Hebrews. Also used in Hebrews, another NT *hapax*, is the designation ‘Spirit of grace’ (10:29). As will be shown, Zechariah 12:10 (and, most probably, Zech. 4:6-7) was in the author’s mind when he spoke thus of the Spirit (§7). This thesis will now examine each of these aspects of the nature and work of the divine Spirit in the order outlined above.

⁴⁶⁷ And the NT as a whole.

⁴⁶⁸ See the comparison of Josephus and Jeremiah in Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 72-74. Much of what she says applies equally to Hebrews and Jeremiah.

⁴⁶⁹ 3:7; 9:8; 10:15.

4 Spirit and Scripture

4.1 Introduction

There are three points in Hebrews where a connection is made between the Spirit and Scripture (§4.5). In two of these (3:7; 10:15), the Holy Spirit is specifically said to speak through Scripture. That this is probably not a reflection of traditional teaching⁴⁷⁰ is indicated by the fact that elsewhere in the NT when the Holy Spirit ‘speaks’, he does so through human agency and not the written text quoted (§4.4). The other place where the Spirit is linked to Scripture is 9:6-10. Here, rather than speaking through Scripture, “the Holy Spirit indicates” (9:8) the significance of the Day of Atonement rituals (§4.5.3).

Thus, for Hebrews, the Holy Spirit not only speaks through but also interprets Scripture. As will be shown, this association of the Spirit with Scripture is a significant development in pneumatology. To demonstrate this assertion, it will be necessary to review briefly what is said about pneumatic inspiration elsewhere. First, in the Greek world prior to and contemporary with the NT (§4.2) and then in the OT (§4.3.1). Two ‘Second Temple’ texts will be discussed, one rabbinic and one apocalyptic, as they have been offered as evidence that pneumatic inspiration of the Scriptures was understood in the Second Temple period (§4.3.2).⁴⁷¹ Before focusing on Hebrews, what the rest of the NT contributes to an understanding of the role of πνεῦμα in the inspiration of Scripture will be treated (§4.4). This chapter will then discuss the way Hebrews generally introduces OT quotations before proceeding to exegete its three texts which link Spirit and Scripture (§4.5).

⁴⁷⁰ Contra e.g. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 114 n17. See also §4.3.

⁴⁷¹ On *t. Sotah* 9.6, see Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 84; Koester, *Hebrews*, 254; Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 52. On 4 Ezra 14:22, see Levison, *Filled*, 196-98; Keener, *The Spirit*, 11.

4.2 The Greek world prior to and contemporary with the NT

Blowing or breathing into or onto something or someone was regarded as somehow imparting to the other, for good or ill, something of the essence, power or life of the one blowing.⁴⁷² Arguably the most significant Biblical example of this is Genesis 2:7 when “The LORD God formed the man... and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and the man became a living being.” Perhaps the most intriguing Biblical example is John 20:22; Jesus breathed on his disciples and said “λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον”.

In secular antiquity there was little (if any) talk of ‘inspired writing’. As Kleinknecht observes, πνεῦμα was “the cause and source” of *inspired speech*,⁴⁷³ suggesting that the movement of the πνεῦμα is usually linked with what he calls “φωνή-effects”.⁴⁷⁴ When inspired speech was written down – often as poetry but also in prose – the written word itself was regarded as inspired. This was not because the act of writing involved pneumatic inspiration but because the written record shared the inspiration that caused the speech to be uttered in the first place. It must also be recognised that an important facet of ‘inspiration’ – for the Greeks and for others – was ‘inspired acts’ wrought because of either human or divine example.⁴⁷⁵ However, although associated with the presence of a great man or one of the gods, such inspired actions are not linked to the actions of the πνεῦμα. In fact, “(w)hile Greco-Roman writers certainly had a concept of inspiration, they did not normally associate that conception with *pneuma*”.”⁴⁷⁶

⁴⁷² Kleinknecht, H. πνεῦμα, *TDNT*, 6:343.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid*, 345, emphasis mine.

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 346. This is true whether the φωνή-effect is the ecstatic utterances of the Sibyl, the sound of a ‘flute’ (Virgil, *Aen.* 6,82ff) or a ‘farting gnat’, τὸν πρωκτὸν ἤξειν ὑπο βίαω τοῦ πνεύματος (Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 164). Also, Diodorus Siculus, *Library*, 15, 33:2; 16, 26:3; 26:4; 92:3. Cf. the brief discussion and literature cited in Keener, *Acts*, 1:530-32.

⁴⁷⁵ See Diodorus Siculus, *Library*, 11, 21:1; 13, 46:2; 15, 38:3; 17, 12:2; 34:1; 100:5. So too, in Pharaonic Egypt, e.g. the Great Sphinx Stela of Amenhotep II at Giza: “It is the god who inspires him to act (as) the protector of Egypt” [Lichtheim, M. *Ancient Egyptian Literature Vol. 2*, (Berkley: UCP, 1976), 42].

⁴⁷⁶ So, Keener, *Acts*, 1.532, quoting Aune, D.E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 34.

4.3 The Old Testament and Second Temple Texts

4.3.1 The Old Testament

There is much said in the OT about the Spirit bringing inspired speech through people. Of the 81 occasions when the OT speaks of God's Spirit interacting with humanity, 26 times the result is prophetic utterance and a further ten times the Spirit brings an interpretative revelation from God.⁴⁷⁷ When the Spirit of God came upon the seventy elders (Num. 11:25), the result was that they prophesied. Moses expressed the desire that the Spirit of prophecy would be the common property of the whole people of God (Num. 11:29). Joel 2:28 [3:1] promises that the significant sign of the presence of God's Spirit with God's people will be that they will all prophesy. 'Spirit' and 'word' are collocated 17 times in the OT but only five are significant for this study.⁴⁷⁸ David testifies that the Spirit of the Lord declares God's word through him (2 Sam. 23:2);⁴⁷⁹ in Proverbs 1:23, 'wisdom' says: "I will pour out my spirit (Heb. רִנָּה LXX πνοή) upon you and make my words known to you' and in Isaiah 59:21 God's Spirit upon a person or people enables them to speak God's word and is evidence of their participation in the covenant.⁴⁸⁰ There are two collocations of word and Spirit in Zechariah, 4:6⁴⁸¹ and 7:12, where Zechariah complains that God's people did not (or would not) listen to God's word "sent by his Spirit through the former prophets".

In the OT, the Spirit is never connected to the production of inspired writings.⁴⁸² The OT clearly understands the concept of authoritative writings but this authority is never linked to the action, authorship or inspiration of the Spirit.⁴⁸³ The OT does not claim for itself that it is the product of pneumatic inspiration. The most that can be said is that the

⁴⁷⁷ See Table 3.1.

⁴⁷⁸ The others are Gen. 45:27; 1 Sam. 11:6; 2 Sam. 23:2; 2 Chron. 36:32 // Ezra 1:1; Job 15:13; 26:4; 32:18; Ps. 106:33; Prov. 17:27; Isa. 40:7-8; 66:2; Zech. 12:1.

⁴⁷⁹ See §§3.3.1; 3.3.2.

⁴⁸⁰ See §§3.2; 5.3.2; 7.5; 8.3.2.

⁴⁸¹ "The word of the Lord (is) not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit" See §7.2.4.2.

⁴⁸² Moses' programmatic longing was that all God's people would receive the Spirit and prophesy (Num. 11:29) not that they would become scribes. However, see n.385.

⁴⁸³ 2 Kings 22-23 suggests that "the book of the law" (Deuteronomy?) was regarded as authoritative; Neh. 8 counts the Torah (or at least the legal sections thereof) as authoritative and Dan. 9 similarly regards Jeremiah's prophecies as authoritative.

‘Spirit of prophecy’ inspires the prophet to speak and when that word is written down it shares the inspiration that produced the spoken word. Nowhere are the narrative sections of the OT said to be pneumatically dependant.

4.3.2 Two Second Temple Texts

Two non-Biblical texts have been suggested which appear to link the Holy Spirit either to voicing/owning Scripture or to inspiring the writing of Scripture.⁴⁸⁴

Before exploring the texts in question, it is important to recognise that rabbinic literature generally seeks to avoid both anthropomorphisms and the suggestion of personal interactions between God and humanity. The Targumim, for instance, avoid the use of phrases like ‘the hand of the Lord’.⁴⁸⁵ Hebrews, however, is comfortable with such language.⁴⁸⁶ To avoid speaking about divine/human interaction, the rabbinic devices employed include Memra, Shekinah, Dibbera and Spirit.⁴⁸⁷ The author of Hebrews does not use the divine Spirit texts as circumlocutions and he writes about human interaction with the divine.⁴⁸⁸ The understanding of the Spirit and use of ‘Spirit-language’ in Hebrews is fundamentally different from that of rabbinic Judaism.

4.3.2.1 Tractate *Sotah* 9.6

Before examining the context and content of *Sotah* 9:6, it is instructive to examine another mention of the Holy Spirit in this tractate. Later (*b. Sotah* 9.15), in a sequential list, it is said that: “piety leads to the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit leads to the resurrection of the dead, and the resurrection of the dead comes through Elijah, blessed be his memory, Amen.” To state that one Holy Spirit text in *Sotah* supports the idea of a

⁴⁸⁴ See §4.1 n.471.

⁴⁸⁵ See McNamara, *AB*, 1A, 28, 33-35.

⁴⁸⁶ E.g. see 1:10; 10:31.

⁴⁸⁷ See McNamara, *AB*, 1A, 35-39; *idem*, *Targum and Testament*, 141-54.

⁴⁸⁸ E.g. see 7:19; 8:9; 12:22-24.

traditional designation of the Spirit's relationship to Scripture⁴⁸⁹ is to be guilty of a selective reading of the text. No one would want to cite *b. Sotah* 9.15 as traditional teaching that the resurrection is effected through Elijah!⁴⁹⁰

The ninth chapter of *Sotah* is an exposition of Deuteronomy 21:1-9 during which the phrase "the Holy Spirit informs them" introduces a quotation from there. Lane, commenting on Hebrews' use of καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (3.7) to introduce an OT quotation, writes that the formula "is one found elsewhere in Jewish sources (cf. *m. Sota* 9:6)".⁴⁹¹

The Jerusalem Talmud (*y. Sotah* 9) discusses the minutiae involved in the sacrifice of a heifer when a murder victim is discovered and there is no suspect (Deut. 21:1-9). Deuteronomy 21:7 stipulates that, after the heifer's neck has been broken, the elders of the town declare that they were not involved in the murder and then they petition the Lord for mercy. However, in *y. Sotah* 9.6 these two utterances are attributed to different groups; the elders make the declaration and the priests the petition. The Holy Spirit then declares that they are forgiven. The tractate is seeking to demonstrate the principle that: "you have three things side by side, and the one who said this one did not say that one, and whoever said that one did not say the other" (*y. Sotah* 9.6 [I:2 I]). To underline this principle, *y. Sotah* references a further four OT passages. However, in all five passages, there are significant differences between the HB and the Talmud. In each case, the Talmud apportions statements, comments and opinions to a triad of speakers and/or actors in a way that differs from the HB (Table 4.1). Comparing the HB and *y. Sotah* 9.6 it becomes evident that whenever it is possible to find the requisite 'three speakers' that the Talmud requires, the dialogue is so apportioned. In Numbers 13:27, a third speaker (Joshua) is invented. In 1 Samuel 4:5-9, a whole triad of 'proper, evil or heroic Philistines' is imported into the text. However, when it is not so easy to find a third voice *y. Sotah* 9.6 employs 'the Holy Spirit' as that voice. It cannot be adduced, from *y. Sotah*

⁴⁸⁹ *Contra* Attridge, *Hebrews*, 114 n.17: "The notion that the "holy spirit" is the source of Scripture is no doubt traditional".

⁴⁹⁰ McNamara [*Targum and Testament*, 168] cites *b. Sotah* 15: "possession of the holy spirit leads to the resurrection of the body" and links this to Rom. 8:11. However, he ends his citation of *Sotah* without mentioning Elijah.

⁴⁹¹ *Hebrews* 1-8, 84. Note that this is the only text Lane offers.

9.6 that ‘the Holy Spirit says’ is a traditional formula used in Judaism to introduce an OT quotation. In fact, it serves, like ‘Joshua’ or ‘the proper, evil or heroic ones’, simply as a literary device to make the number of speakers up to the requisite ‘three’. The tractate *Sotah* does not contribute to explicating καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον in Hebrews.

Table 4.1 OT text and y. *Sotah* 9.6 compared

Text	HB	y. <i>Sotah</i> 9:6
Deut. 21:1-9	The elders declare their innocence and petition for absolution. The text then declares the people ‘not guilty’.	The elders declare their innocence, the priests petition for absolution and the Holy Spirit pronounces them forgiven.
Num. 13:27-31	The spies speak, Caleb then speaks and the spies respond.	Joshua begins the conversation, then Caleb speaks and the spies respond.
Gen. 38:20-26	Tamar asks a question; Judah replies and the narrative concludes: “And he did not lie with her again”.	Tamar asks a question; Judah replies and the Holy Spirit declares: “And he did not lie with her again”.
1 Sam. 4:5-9	The Philistines make three comments about the forthcoming battle with Israel: woe to us... they smote the Egyptians... take courage and fight.	The ‘proper ones’ in the Philistine army said, woe to us; the ‘evil ones’ said, they smote the Egyptians; the ‘heroic ones’ said, take courage and fight.
Judg. 5:28-31	Deborah and Barak sing out: Sisera’s mother’s words, her ‘wise ladies’ comments and the story’s ‘punch-line’. One voice, reported speech.	First Sisera’s mother speaks; his wife and daughters-in-law respond; and the ‘punch-line’ is delivered by the Holy Spirit.

4.3.2.2 4 Ezra 14:22

The fourth book of Ezra, written in the name of the Biblical Ezra, dates from about 100 AD.⁴⁹² The 14th chapter tells of Ezra's commission to 'write' 94 books (vv. 23-26),⁴⁹³ his request for the Holy Spirit's help in the task (v. 22), the reception of the Holy Spirit (vv. 38-41) and the subsequent execution of the commission (vv. 42-44). Ezra, under the Holy Spirit's anointing, produces the books.⁴⁹⁴ However, this is not a case of the Spirit inspiring written works. It would be more correct to say that the Spirit gave supernatural ability to Ezra (memory/dictation) and the five scribes (speed and accuracy in writing in a script they did not know). Furthermore, Ezra and his colleagues did not so much write Scripture but re-write from memory (admittedly, enhanced by God's Spirit) those Scriptures which were supposedly lost or destroyed in the fall of Jerusalem. As Keener puts it: "Ezra restores the Scriptures by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit".⁴⁹⁵ Thus, this Ezra mirrors the Biblical Ezra who returned the Torah to Jerusalem after the destruction of the first temple (Neh. 8:1-8)⁴⁹⁶ and echoes Moses: "as Moses gave the Torah, Ezra restored it".⁴⁹⁷ 4 Ezra 14:22 has no contribution to make to a discussion on the role of the Spirit in authoring, voicing or interpreting the Scriptures. Ezra was inspired to dictate the words as the Holy Spirit quickened his mental powers. His scribes could write as they did because they too were 'lifted above themselves'. The men, not the books they produced, were the recipients of the Spirit's 'inspiration'.

⁴⁹² Helyer, L.R. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period*, (Downers Grove: IVP, 2002), 392-93; Metzger, B.M. "The Fourth Book of Ezra", *OTP*, 1:520. 4 Ezra 1-2, 15-16 are regarded as Christian additions from the middle or late 3rd century.

⁴⁹³ Comprising the 24 books of the HB which were to be made public and 70 esoteric works that were for restricted circulation (4 Ezra 14:45-47).

⁴⁹⁴ Levison [*The Spirit*, 204] writes: "Ezra's inspired scribal experience begins with... the holy spirit". Also, *idem*, *Filled*, 198: "Ezra, the quintessentially inspired scribe, produced books".

⁴⁹⁵ Keener, *The Spirit*, 33 n.76.

⁴⁹⁶ Nickelsburg, G.W.E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 275.

⁴⁹⁷ Stone, M.E. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 414.

4.4 The NT, apart from Hebrews⁴⁹⁸

Of the 367 occurrences of *πνεῦμα* in the NT over 70% refer to the divine-*πνεῦμα*⁴⁹⁹ and of these about 205⁵⁰⁰ are direct interactions between the Spirit and people. Many of the interactions between the Spirit and believers involve what might be called ‘inspired utterance’. Approximately 14% of the Spirit’s interactions with humankind in the NT result in some form of inspired utterance while a further 15% of these engagements see him bringing teaching or revelation to believers.⁵⁰¹ A further 27% (75x) of such interactions either enable or authenticate Christ and/or his followers as part of the covenant community. For completeness, note that 23% (60x) of the occurrences of *πνεῦμα* see other effects in the lives of Christians, be they miracles, joy, sanctification or hope⁵⁰² and 21% (55x) occur in general references to God’s Spirit that fall outside the categories mentioned in this paragraph.⁵⁰³

The focus of this thesis is pneumatology; the focus of this chapter of the thesis is the Spirit speaking through or interpreting Scripture; therefore, the focus in this section is those NT texts which indicate that the Spirit speaks through OT texts or figures. Consequently, OT quotations that are unattributed or introduced by ‘it is written’ or ‘as David said’ (or similar) will not be considered here. Nor will this thesis look at those places where the Lord (or similar) is said to speak through Scripture.⁵⁰⁴ Neither will 1 Timothy 4:1 be examined since that which “the Spirit clearly says” is not from the OT.⁵⁰⁵

There are seven places in the NT where there appears to be a link between the Holy Spirit and the text of the OT.⁵⁰⁶ Both Isaiah (once) and David (thrice) are said to speak

⁴⁹⁸ All the data in §4.4 relates to the NT excluding Hebrews.

⁴⁹⁹ About 265x, depending on how some texts are read (see n.316). These include phrases such as ‘Spirit of holiness’, ‘Spirit of the Father’, ‘Spirit of his Son’, etc. The other occurrences of *πνεῦμα* are: evil spirits (about 50x); the human spirit (almost 50x) and occasional references to ghosts (Luke 24:37, 39), wind (see the wordplay at John 3:8) and breath (2 Thess. 2:8).

⁵⁰⁰ The numerical breakdown that follows is necessarily approximate.

⁵⁰¹ About 35 and 40 occurrences respectively.

⁵⁰² This is an illustrative not exhaustive list of the Spirit’s effects in the life of the covenant community.

⁵⁰³ For a breakdown of the OT statistics for the interaction of the Spirit with humanity, see §3.1.

⁵⁰⁴ E.g. Matt. 1:23; 2:15; Rom. 9:25.

⁵⁰⁵ Most likely it was a Spirit-given prophetic word similar to the one delivered through Agabus; see Acts 11:27-28.

⁵⁰⁶ Mark 12:36 // Matt. 22:43; Acts 1:16; 4:25; 28:25; 2 Pet. 1:20-21; 2 Tim. 3:15-16.

under the influence of the Spirit. Two other texts make more general comments without reference to a specific OT character or text.

4.4.1 Mark 12:36 // Matthew 22:43;⁵⁰⁷ Acts 1:16; 4:25.

Owing to the similarities between these texts, they will be discussed together.⁵⁰⁸

Mark 12:36 states that David was ‘inspired by the Holy Spirit’ when he delivered Psalm (‘Yahweh’ and ‘Adonai’ / κύριος and τῷ κυρίῳ μου) is taken as David speaking prophetically about the Messiah. Similarly, in Acts 1:16, Peter regards Psalms 69:25 and 109:8 as words “which the Holy Spirit through David foretold concerning Judas”. Obviously, when ‘David’ produced these Psalms he was not aware of Judas’ betrayal of Jesus, yet Peter justified restoring the Apostolic group to twelve by recourse to these verses from the Psalms. Peter’s logic seems to be that since these Psalms concern God’s enemies and the judgement ultimately due to them, they must have an application to Judas as God’s ‘enemy-in-chief’. Finally, at this juncture, Acts 4:25 quotes Psalm 2:1-2. The setting is a prayer meeting held after the release of Peter and John from custody following their arrest for preaching about Jesus. Psalm 2:1-2 describes the rulers of this world opposing the Lord and his Messiah. Peter sees these words as also referring to both the persecution of Jesus and the then current persecution experienced by his disciples. Consequently, Peter can incorporate these words into a prayer asking the Lord to deal with the threats that now come to them from the Jewish religious leaders. The appeal is made on the basis that God spoke by the Holy Spirit through David.⁵⁰⁹ Therefore, as part of their reasoning or argument, the Apostles could base their request for boldness on these words. A similar hermeneutic is employed in both Acts quotations. This is not the place to discuss that hermeneutic; however, these three texts are examples of the NT author (and/or speaker) understanding the OT ‘Spirit of prophecy’ as bringing

⁵⁰⁷ The Matthean parallel omits ‘holy’ and Luke 20:41 simply has ‘David himself says’ (cf. Acts 2:34-5).

⁵⁰⁸ See also the brief introduction in §3.3.3 and the general introduction, §§3.3.1; 3.3.2.

⁵⁰⁹ For a discussion of this complex triple-genitival phrase within the participial phrase ὁ... εἰπὼν, see Bonnah, G.K.A. *The Holy Spirit, A Narrative Factor in the Acts of the Apostles*, (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2007), 257-60. Barrett [*Acts 1-14*, 240 n.2] writes that Acts 4:25 “is virtually untranslatable”.

a direct word through a named individual on a specific occasion which was applicable not only to his own day but also for a now-current situation. On all three occasions, the NT writer simply reports that the Holy Spirit inspired David ‘back then’ and that that word is appropriate for ‘today’.

Barrett is typical, and overstates his case, when writing that Acts 1:16 “convey(s) Luke’s belief about the OT as a whole”.⁵¹⁰ This may or may not be correct but to extrapolate from a comment about the Spirit inspiring David at a specific point to a general comment about the pneumatic inspiration of the whole OT is unjustified. The only thing that can be said with certainty about Acts 1:16 and 4:25 is that they accord with Luke’s interest in the Spirit as the *author of prophecy*.⁵¹¹

4.4.2 Acts 28:25.

Acts 28:26-27, recorded as Paul’s parting comment to the Jewish leaders in Rome, quotes Isaiah 6:9-10. Paul attributed this quotation to the Holy Spirit speaking to their forefathers through the prophet (Acts 28:25). However, Isaiah’s commissioning (Isa. 6:8-10) is from “the voice of the Lord” and there is no OT record of Isaiah speaking the words of his commissioning. Isaiah 6:9-10 is quoted elsewhere in the NT⁵¹² but Acts 28:25 uniquely identifies the Holy Spirit as speaking through the words of the commissioning. Furthermore, the quotation in Acts alone includes the command: “Go to this people and say...”. Luke, therefore, records Paul as appealing both to the Holy Spirit and to prophetic tradition. This ‘double authority’ gives the incident added significance.⁵¹³ This quotation is an echo, both reflective and projective, of Acts 1:8. The focus of the gospel message has moved on from Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria to ‘the ends of the earth’ (Acts 28:28). Furthermore, this quotation also serves as the second

⁵¹⁰ *Ibid*, 96.

⁵¹¹ E.g. see Stronstad, R. *The Prophethood of all Believers*, (Sheffield: SAP, 2004), 121-22 and *passim*.

⁵¹² See Matt. 13:14-15 (// Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10); Mark 8:18; John 12:39; Rom. 11:8 (although this conflates Isa. 6:10 with Isa. 29:10). Bruce [F.F. *Acts of the Apostles [Greek Text]*, (London: Tyndale, 1965 [1951]), 479] comments that: “this repeated quotation... show(s) that the Jewish rejection of Jesus as the Christ was a fulfilment of prophecy”.

⁵¹³ So, Pao, D.W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 104. Cf. Parsons, M.C. *Acts*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 364-65.

‘bookend’ to Luke-Acts.⁵¹⁴ The ministry of Jesus begins (Luke 4:18-19) with him taking the scroll of Isaiah and reading 61:1-2. There the motifs of ‘The Spirit of the Lord’, ‘anointing’, ‘proclaiming’ and ‘recovery of sight’ mark a positive start whereas, in Acts 28:25-27, the Spirit of God declares judgement on those who refuse to hear and whose eyes are deliberately shut.⁵¹⁵ Consequently, the attribution of this Isaianic text to the Holy Spirit is less of a theological statement about the authorship of Scripture⁵¹⁶ and more a literary device to conclude both Acts and the two volume Luke-Acts.

4.4.3 2 Peter 1:20-1

The meaning of 2 Peter 1:20-21 depends on whether the translation is:

“no prophecy of Scripture *is a matter of one’s own interpretation*” or

“no prophecy of Scripture *comes from the prophet’s own interpretation*”.

Is Peter talking about the *present interpretation* or *original inspiration* of prophecy? Bauckham presents a cogent argument for the second option; Peter is talking about the source and therefore the authoritative nature of prophetic words.⁵¹⁷ For the purposes of this thesis, it matters little either way because Peter is speaking of Spirit-induced prophetic utterance, not of the OT as a *written document*. Any authority/inspiration that a *written* prophecy possesses is due to it having first been *spoken* under the influence of the Holy Spirit. 2 Peter 1:20-21 “affirms the Spirit’s role in initiating prophecy”.⁵¹⁸ Authentic OT prophets spoke ἀπὸ θεοῦ as they were carried along (φέρω) by the Holy Spirit. It is going beyond the scope of that text, however, to suggest that these verses affirm “the prophetic authority of the Holy Spirit with regard to the inspiration of the

⁵¹⁴ This is so whether the first ‘bookend’ is regarded as the righteous Jewish priest Zechariah and the prophetic word about John the Baptist (Luke 1:5-17), the Isaianic introduction to John’s ministry (Luke 3:4-6), Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, being led by the Spirit into the wilderness (Luke 4:1) or Jesus, in the power of the Spirit (Luke 4:14), reading Isa. 61:1-2 in the Synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:18-19).

⁵¹⁵ See Pao, *New Exodus*, 108-109.

⁵¹⁶ *Contra* Barrett, C.K. *Acts 15-28*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 1244, who writes: “Belief in the inspiration of the OT is plainly expressed”.

⁵¹⁷ Bauckham, R.J. *Jude, 2 Peter*, (Waco: Word, 1983), 229-33. So too, Skaggs, R. *1 Peter, 2 Peter, Jude*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 112.

⁵¹⁸ Warrington, K. *Discovering the Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 198.

Scriptures”.⁵¹⁹ The statement made in these verses “give(s) classic expression (to) the involvement of the spirit of God in the inspiration of the OT prophets”⁵²⁰ not in the production of the written texts which carry their message to succeeding generations.

4.4.4 2 Timothy 3:16

2 Timothy 3:16 may be thought to impinge on this study because of its use of the words θεόπνευστος and γραφή. Θεόπνευστος is a composite word from Θεός and πνέω (I breathe/blow) and simply means ‘God-breathed’.⁵²¹ The force of the Biblical *hapax* θεόπνευστος is passive. In the context of this paper, it matters little whether God ‘breathed out’ the γραφή or ‘breathed authority into’ the γραφή, although the former is to be preferred.⁵²² The pertinent issue, however, is that the focus of the action is Θεός not πνεῦμα. It is the action of God that gives the γραφή its authority. This verse is not teaching the pneumatic origin of the Scriptures.

4.4.5 Conclusions

It is evident that the NT writers regarded the OT as an authoritative corpus of literature that both testified to Jesus as Messiah and provided insight into current situations.⁵²³ However, apart from the letter to the Hebrews, nowhere does the NT link the OT Scriptures *per se* with either pneumatic inspiration or pneumatic interpretation. The texts examined above neither ascribe authorship of the Scriptures to the Holy Spirit, nor suggest that the Spirit is the interpreter of the Scriptures. Indeed, the link between ‘word’

⁵¹⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵²⁰ Block, *By the River*, 158.

⁵²¹ The verb πνέω and the noun πνεῦμα are related. See Schweizer, E. πνέω, ἐμπνέω, πνοή, θεόπνευστος, *TDNT*, 6:452. This relationship enables, for example, the ‘play on words’ at John 3:8 “the wind blowing” and “the Spirit breathing”.

⁵²² See the discussion in McGowan, A.T.B. *The Divine Spiration of Scripture*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 38-42.

⁵²³ However, it would be wrong to talk about a universally accepted OT canon. E.g. Jude 14-15 quotes 1 Enoch 1:9 as authoritative. As late as c. 125 AD, *Ep. Barn.* 16:5 introduces a prophecy from 1 Enoch 89:56 with λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή (as Scripture says) and concludes: “And it has happened just as the Lord said”. Cf. §§1.4.2; 2.3.

and ‘Spirit’ that allows Warrington to say that “the Spirit as well as inspiring the ancient text itself... seeks to inspire the believers”⁵²⁴ is made only in the letter to the Hebrews.

4.5 What is said in Hebrews: Introduction

As has been seen (§2.4), Hebrews has a strong dependence on the OT as the basis of its theology. However, a close examination of Hebrews’ use of and interaction with the OT reveals some significant differences between it and the rest of the NT.

Hebrews invariably introduces its quotations with a verb of speaking or hearing and in two thirds of the cases that verb is in the present tense. This differs from the rest of the NT where just half of the quotations that have an introductory formula employ a verb of speaking or hearing and less than a quarter are in the present tense.⁵²⁵

Table 4.2 To whom the quotation is attributed⁵²⁶

Book/corpus	Book/ corpus the quote is from	Human author/ speaker	Divine author/ speaker	unattributed ⁵²⁷
Hebrews	1 ⁵²⁸ 2.5%	3 7.5%	30 75%	6 15%
Synoptics & Acts	4 2.5%	49 32%	19 12%	83 53.5%
Romans	0 0	11 18%	4 7%	45 75%
Rest of Paul	0 0	2 5%	2 5%	38 90%
Rest of NT	0 0	3 9%	2 6%	27 84%
All NT excl. Hebs	4 1%	65 23%	27 9%	192 67%

⁵²⁴ Warrington, K. *Pentecostal Theology*, (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 205.

⁵²⁵ See Tables 4.3, 4.4.

⁵²⁶ Some quotations are introduced: ‘as the Spirit said through David...’ (or similar). In such cases it will be listed under two attributions.

⁵²⁷ One of which, 13:6 from Ps. 118:6-7, is placed on the lips of the congregation to which Hebrews is written as a response to God’s word to them.

⁵²⁸ Taking ἐν Δαυὶδ (4:7) not as ‘through David’ but as ‘in David’, thus another way of saying ‘in this place’, ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν (4:5), i.e. ‘in the Psalter’, cf. Rom. 9:25 (ἐν τῷ Ὡσηε) and Acts 7:42 (ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν). Elsewhere, the preposition διὰ (e.g. Matt. 1:22; 8:17; 21:4; Acts 28:25) is employed to designate the Lord speaking *through* someone. See Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 251.

Table 4.3 How the book/author introduces the quotation⁵²⁹

Book/corpus	Speech		Written	
Hebrews	36	100%	0	
Synoptics/Acts	48	56%	38	44%
Romans	19	53%	17	47%
Rest of Paul	6	29%	15	71%
Rest of NT	8	42%	11	58%
All NT excl. Hebs	81	50%	81	50%

Table 4.4 The tense employed to introduce the quotation⁵³⁰

Book/corpus	Aor/Imperf. ⁵³¹		Present		Perfect	
Hebrews	4	11%	24	67%	8	22%
Synoptics/Acts	41	48%	11	13%	34	40%
Romans	2	4%	17	48%	17	48%
Rest of Paul	1	5%	5	24%	15	71%
Rest of NT	8	42%	4	21%	7	37%
All NT excl. Hebs	52	32%	37	23%	73	45%

4.5.1 How Hebrews quotes Scripture: overview

Before turning to the three pericopes which treat the Spirit and Scripture, it will be of value to examine Hebrews' use of introductory formulae and other statements made about God speaking to his people. The importance of this investigation lies in the fact that the author of Hebrews often uses the third person singular verbal form without specifying who the subject is. The speaker has to be inferred from the context and/or

⁵²⁹ Specifically, where there is an introductory formula, whether it relates to speaking/hearing or writing/reading and, in the case of Table 4.4, whether it is in the past or present.

⁵³⁰ In the 36 introductory formulae where a verb introduces the quotation, the verbs used are: λέγω, pres. 20x; λαλέω, aor. 1x; εἶπον, aor. 3x; εἶπον, perf. 8x and once each (all present tense), μαρτυρέω, φημί, διαλέγομαι, διαστέλλω.

⁵³¹ Only twice in the NT (Acts 8:32; Rom.7:7) is the verb introducing an OT quotation in the imperfect tense.

contents of the quotation. However, from time to time the author does specify a change in the identity of the one who voices Scripture.

Hebrews begins with the statement that, in the past, God spoke through (ἐν) the prophets but that in these last days he has spoken in (ἐν) the Son. However, God speaking ἐν τοῖς προφήταις means neither:

- Everything they uttered (recorded and unrecorded) was the ‘Word of God’. See e.g. Obadiah’s misunderstanding of God’s purposes (1 Kings 18:9-14) or Elijah’s depressive longing for death (1 Kings 19:4).
- Nor that God spoke only through prophets; this does not deny the divine inspiration of the Torah and the writings.

The key thought is that God was speaking to the fathers. When quoting from the OT, Hebrews mentions the human author of the text on only three occasions,⁵³² while the rest of the NT mentions some 64 times the human origin of the OT quotations used. Statistically, these figures are not remarkable, since the text length of the NT is twenty-seven times that of Hebrews. However, what is noteworthy is that Hebrews’ author attributes divine origin to his OT quotations 30 times⁵³³ while the rest of the NT does so just 27 times. Of these 27, only four take an OT ‘word’ and apply it to a ‘current’ situation.⁵³⁴ Eleven of them simply record what God said as reported in the OT while the other twelve are ‘proof-texts’ inserted into an argument or line of reasoning to justify what is being asserted.

More than any other NT work, Hebrews acknowledges the divine origin of the OT. Indeed, the OT quotations in Hebrews are “consistently introduced with verbs of speaking (... generally in the present tense) with God, the Holy Spirit and Jesus as the speakers”.⁵³⁵ Furthermore, the only times that the human author is acknowledged are

⁵³² See §4.5 n.528

⁵³³ Named or implied: 21x God (52.5%), 5x Holy Spirit (12.5%) and 4x Jesus/Christ (10%); i.e. 75% of the quotations in Hebrews. See Table 4.2.

⁵³⁴ Isa. 7:14 and the conception of Jesus (Matt. 1:23) and Hos. 11:1, the infant Jesus’ return from Egypt on the death of Herod (Matt. 2:15). See also Acts 1:16-20; 13:47.

⁵³⁵ Griffiths, J.I. *Hebrews and Divine Speech*, (London: T&T Clark, 2014), 12. See Tables 4.2-4.4.

when quoting the actual words of the OT figure in a way that reinforces the argument of Hebrews (e.g. 2:6; 9:20; 12:21). However, even when God is speaking, sometimes the quotation is rooted in its OT context and is introduced to bolster the argument in Hebrews (e.g. 8:5). Finally, some quotations are simply ‘lifted’ from the OT text and seamlessly incorporated into Hebrews’ narrative with no discourse markers identifying their original context (e.g. 7:1-2).

4.5.2 The Holy Spirit speaks through Scripture: 3:7; 10:15

Hebrews does not usually specify who speaks through Scripture; the quotations are usually introduced with third person singular forms of verbs of speaking (e.g. ἐλάλησεν, εἶπέν, λέγει, εἵρηκέν, φησίν). Hebrews begins with the declaration: “God spoke in the past” and this is its ‘default position’.⁵³⁶ Consequently, the context and/or content of the quotation will determine who is speaking. The opening catena of Scriptures is a case in point; the context and content require that God is the speaker, speaking to or about the Son and/or the angels. Similarly, the quotations from Psalm 22:22 and Isaiah 8:17-18 in 2:12-13, introduced by λέγων and καὶ πάλιν, are clearly voiced by the Son.⁵³⁷

In 2:6, a nebulous “someone, somewhere” (πού τις) introduces a quotation from Psalm 8:2-4; however, the first named ‘speaker-through-Scripture’⁵³⁸ is in 3:7 when the Holy Spirit ‘speaks through’ and, in fact, ‘owns’ the text of Psalm 95:7-11. These verses from Psalm 95 are applied to the author’s congregation and, in part, are re-quoted in the discourse unit 3:7-4:13.⁵³⁹ It is not necessary for this thesis to explore how Hebrews uses Psalm 95, but it is important to address a couple of issues that are germane to Hebrews pneumatology.

⁵³⁶ Amounting to “unless the context demands otherwise, God is the speaker-of-Scripture”. See Lee, G.W. *Today When You Hear His Voice*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 143-45.

⁵³⁷ See Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 1-4.

⁵³⁸ Although, God voices Scripture in 1:5-13 and the Son likewise at 2:12-13, they are not named.

⁵³⁹ Commentators disagree as to where this discourse unit concludes; see Greenlee, J.H. *An Exegetical Summary of Hebrews*, (Dallas: SIL, 2008), 95-96.

When, in 3:9, the Psalm quotation moves into the first person, it is still the Holy Spirit who is speaking and intimating that the people rebelled against him. The personal pronouns within the quotation are as the LXX but may well be significant. In 3:7, the Holy Spirit is speaking and the quotation continues with the Spirit still speaking in the first person: “my works... I was angry... I said... my ways... I swore in my anger... my rest” (3:9-11).⁵⁴⁰ Furthermore, the grammatical structure of 3:12 is such that Hebrews calls the Holy Spirit ‘the Living God’. Although the person of Christ is introduced into the argument in 3:14, it does not indicate a change of ‘speaker-of-Scripture’. In 3:15, another reference is made to Psalm 95, introduced by ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. The articular infinitive with the dative generally expresses the time at which something happens, i.e. ‘during’ or ‘while’.⁵⁴¹ Given the context, perhaps “as has just been said” makes best reading.

The context of the exposition of Psalm 95 that follows (3:16-4:3) implies a change of subject. It seems likely that the ‘he’ who was angry is God.⁵⁴² It appears that the author of Hebrews is seeking to explicate the Psalm in its original context, so that the one who ‘speaks-through-Scripture’ is now God. Consequently, when the text asks: “to whom did he swear that they would not enter his rest?” (3:18), the subject clearly is ‘God’ and so, when Psalm 95 is quoted again (4:3, 5, 7), it is as the voice of God. This change in speaker is further supported by the reference to God having enjoyed Sabbath-rest (4:4 quoting Gen 2:2) but preventing the disobedient Israelites from participating in his rest (4:5). The conclusion of Hebrews’ exposition of Psalm 95 confirms the matter. The OT Ἰησοῦς did not bring the people into rest (4:8); consequently, there remains a Sabbath-rest, God’s σαββατισμὸς, which he now offers to his faithful people (4:10). With no discernible difference, the author of Hebrews moves interchangeably and seamlessly between ‘the Holy Spirit says’ and ‘God says’.

⁵⁴⁰ See Pierce, “Hebrews 3.7-4.11”, 173-84; *idem*, *Divine Discourse*, 177-78, 187-88.

⁵⁴¹ Duff, J. *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 205; cf. *BDF*, §404.

⁵⁴² *Contra* Pierce, “Hebrews 3.7-4.11”, 173-84; *idem*, *Divine Discourse*, 177-78, 187-88 who seeks to show that the Holy Spirit is the speaker throughout.

Table 4.5 Speakers in 3:7-4:7

3:7-11	λέγει	Ps. 95:7-11	Holy Spirit	The Holy Spirit says λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον
3:15	λέγεσθαι	Ps. 95:7-8	Holy Spirit	It has just been said... so, the Holy Spirit by continuation
4:3	εἶρηκεν	Ps. 95:11	God	Just as he said, καθὼς εἶρηκεν
4:4	εἶρηκεν	Gen. 2:2	God	For he has said somewhere, εἶρηκεν γάρ που
4:5	----	Ps. 95:11	God	Again, in this place, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν
4:7	λέγων	Ps. 95:7-8	God/David	He says in David, ἐν Δαυιδ λέγων ⁵⁴³

The Spirit speaks as God and it seems that the Spirit is the one who performs the works in the wilderness and passes judgement on the disobedience in the wilderness (3:7-15). However, the same OT text and activity is also attributed to God (4:3-10). Both the Holy Spirit and God owned and spoke through (and continue to own and speak through) these words of Scripture.⁵⁴⁴ 4:7 records God repeating and rewording, for David’s own generation (Ps. 95:7-11), what he formerly said to/about the wilderness generation (Num. 14:23, 28-30; Deut. 1:35; 12:9). The MT of Psalm 95 does not have a title ascribing authorship but the LXX has Αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυιδ – a song of praise by David. God, by taking and reusing his words about the wilderness generation, made them live again for a people that lived ‘a long time later’ (μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον). For Hebrews, the Holy Spirit, as God, reiterates these words for a new situation. Re-applying them to demonstrate that God’s word testifies to the ‘New Covenant Ἰησοῦς’ as the bringer of true rest, the Spirit makes God’s word live again. In fact, for Hebrews, God speaks now to his people ἐν υἱῷ (1:2) and just as surely the Holy Spirit too speaks God’s word to God’s people. For our author, it matters not whether it is Jesus, the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit through a prophet or God who is speaking or acting – it is all one.⁵⁴⁵

⁵⁴³ See §4.5 n.528

⁵⁴⁴ See Table 4.5.

⁵⁴⁵ As Allen [“Forgotten Spirit”, 55] puts it, the Holy Spirit “speaks in tandem with” God. So too, Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, cxvii; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 121, 479.

The New Covenant prophecy of Jeremiah 31:31-34 is used twice in Hebrews. First in 8:8-12 and then (abbreviated and modified) in 10:15-17 where it is described as the Holy Spirit's testimony. In 8:8, the quotation is introduced simply by the third person singular, λέγει. However, the context and content clearly indicate that the speaker is God. The Son is described as "seated at the right hand of the majesty in heaven" (8:1 cf. 1:3) as a minister in the true tabernacle set up by the Lord not by man. Human priests minister in a copy and shadow (ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ) of the true, heavenly sanctuary (8:5). Hebrews quotes Exodus 25:40 to show both that God told Moses to build the tabernacle to the divinely approved pattern (τύπον) given to him and that Moses did so. Exploiting the distinction between the true tabernacle (8:2) and the copy (8:5), Hebrews – again using third singular verbs but clearly referring to the Son – states that he (Jesus) has obtained a more excellent ministry (than Moses) and effected a better covenant (8:6). If the first covenant had been faultless (ἄμεμπτος), this second and better one would not have been necessary (8:7). Now, in 8:8, the quotation from Jeremiah 31:31-34 is introduced: μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοὺς λέγει (for finding fault... he says).⁵⁴⁶ The speaker introduced at 8:8 is God. He was the previous speaker (7:21); he issued directions to Moses in 8:5 (implied in Hebrews, explicit in Exod. 25:40); and in the comparison between Moses and the Son, Jesus *mediates* the NC but God *establishes* it.

Hebrews quotes Jeremiah 31 again in 10:15-17; however, the author both rewords and abbreviates the quotation, concluding with a different application. These are significant alterations.⁵⁴⁷ The rewording includes changing τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ (8:10; Jer. 38:33 LXX) to πρὸς αὐτοὺς (10:16) thereby broadening the promise⁵⁴⁸ to include any gentiles in his congregation.⁵⁴⁹ The reversal of διάνοια and καρδία (10:16; cf. 8:10; Jer. 38:33 LXX)

⁵⁴⁶ The textual issue, αὐτοῖς or αὐτοὺς, need not be resolved for this thesis. "If αὐτοῖς is taken with... λέγει, instead of with μεμφόμενος... God found fault not simply "with them" ...but with the first covenant". So, Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 202.

⁵⁴⁷ See the overview in Michaels, J.R. *Hebrews* [Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews], (Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 2009), 416.

⁵⁴⁸ O'Brien [*Hebrews*, 359 and n.94] writes of the covenant being "universal". Cf. Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 204.

⁵⁴⁹ A similar effect is produced in 3:7-11 when the author has the Holy Spirit addressing τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ (3:10) rather than τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ (Ps. 94:10 LXX).

may reflect the author's use of "the word "heart" as a description of the true person".⁵⁵⁰ However, it may also be significant that the reversal juxtaposes 'my laws' and 'their hearts' indicating that the laws⁵⁵¹ of God written upon the heart effect the transformation that the NC offers. Indeed, all the earlier occurrences of καρδία in Hebrews refer to hearts that are hard (3:8, 12; 4:7), astray (3:10) and unbelieving (3:12) leading to judgement (4:12) while, after the NC promise of a transformed heart (8:10; 10:16), the references are to true (10:22a), clean (10:22b) and strengthened (13:9) hearts.⁵⁵² By replacing ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν (8:12; Jer. 38:34 LXX) with τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν (10:17), the contrast between God's νόμος (10:16) and his people's ἀνομία (10:17) is emphasised. 10:17 continues with the promise that, under the NC provisions, God will both forgive and forget these sins and lawless acts. However, by substituting the aorist subjunctive μνησθῶ (8:12; cf. Jer. 38:34 LXX) with the future indicative μνησθήσομαι (10:17), the author (or the Holy Spirit) "makes that promise more vivid and emphatic".⁵⁵³ Furthermore, the abbreviation⁵⁵⁴ of the quotation focuses attention on the inner transformation of heart and mind under the NC (10:16).⁵⁵⁵ The overall effect of all the abridgement and rewording of Jeremiah 31:31-34 is to "reinforce the application of the text to the readers".⁵⁵⁶ Sin will be forgiven and permanently forgotten (10:17); consequently, the sacrifices required under the OC are redundant (10:18), replaced by the one full and final sacrifice of the body of Jesus Christ (10:11-14). Indeed, the quotation from Jeremiah 31:31-34 in 8:8-12 was God's declaration that the OC is obsolete. In 10:16-17 the Holy Spirit testifies that the NC brings into reality that which

⁵⁵⁰ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 457.

⁵⁵¹ 8:10 and 10:16 are in the plural and refer to the inward laws of God that supersede the Mosaic law. All the other twelve references to 'law' in Hebrews are to the Mosaic law (singular).

⁵⁵² See Kistemaker, *Psalms Citations*, 129-30; cf. Thomas, "Citations", 311-12; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 204.

⁵⁵³ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 281. See Thomas, "Citation", 312 and n.3; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 458 and n.17.

⁵⁵⁴ Lane [*Hebrews 9-13*, 269] writes that only "salient features of Jer 31:33-34" are incorporated into what he calls a "free repetition of this oracle". Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 512] calls this abbreviation: "skilfully selected and modified".

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. Westfall, C.L. *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews*, (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 223-24; Koester, *Hebrews*, 441.

⁵⁵⁶ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 514.

the OC pointed to but could not provide.⁵⁵⁷ 9:1-10:14 describes “how Christ’s high-priestly work has made the provisions of Jeremiah’s promise a present reality”.⁵⁵⁸

Earlier (8:8), Jeremiah 31:31-34 is quoted as God’s direct address to his people. God voiced, owned and applied it to declare the first covenant ‘old, obsolete and near destruction’ (8:13). The author of Hebrews makes no mention of the prophet through whom these words were delivered, “the divine authorship is all that he is concerned with”.⁵⁵⁹ Now our author introduces part of the same text with μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Although the Holy Spirit is frequently acknowledged as speaking through the prophets (see §3.3), nowhere does the OT affirm that the Spirit spoke through Jeremiah.⁵⁶⁰ However, our author shows no hesitation in making such an affirmation.

Not only does the Spirit voice the text of Jeremiah 31:33-34, the significant alterations between 8:8-12 and 10:15-17 indicate that he ‘owns’ the text to such a degree that he can freely modify and reapply it in the light of the Son’s sacrifice. However, at the same time, this text is the word of God, God’s voice. Consequently, the Holy Spirit can be free to take hold of God’s word and recycle or update it only if he is God. In fact, the Holy Spirit, by taking Jeremiah 31:33-34 to himself, also ‘owns’ the first-person singular pronouns in that word. He speaks, not *for* God, but *as* God.⁵⁶¹

4.5.3 The Holy Spirit interprets Scripture: 9:8

In Hebrews 9 the priestly action of Christ is compared to the Jewish rituals surrounding the tabernacle ‘Day of Atonement’ worship.⁵⁶² 9:1-7 outlines the physical arrangements

⁵⁵⁷ See Bruce, *Hebrews*, 242.

⁵⁵⁸ So, Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 453. Cf. Westfall, *Discourse Analysis*, 222-25; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 241-42.

⁵⁵⁹ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 169. Cf. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, cxvii, “the ultimate source of the biblical text is God”. So too, Hagner, *Encountering*, 67; Hewitt, T. *Hebrews*, (London: Tyndale, 1969), 80; Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 5; Koester, *Hebrews*, 254.

⁵⁶⁰ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 309.

⁵⁶¹ See Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 172, 210-13.

⁵⁶² Simplified, e.g. no mention of scapegoat; compare 9:1-7 with Lev. 16. It is recognised that the material in ch. 9 is part of the larger section, 8:1-10:18 which itself flows from 6:19-7:28 and flows into 10:19-39. However, the subject of this thesis justifies this narrower focus.

in the tabernacle and culminates with the observation that the high priest enters the inner room once a year with a blood offering for the people's (and his own) sin. Hebrews states that the Holy Spirit is 'making clear' (δηλοῦντος, present participle of δηλόω) that this ritual is (and perhaps always was) ultimately ineffective (9:8-10). The author then proceeds to demonstrate the superiority of Christ's priestly act over that of the OC priests (9:11-15).

9:1-15 is replete with exegetical and/or hermeneutical difficulties,⁵⁶³ including: Do the first and second 'tent' have spatial or temporal reference?⁵⁶⁴ Is the antecedent of the pronoun ἥτις the whole of vv6-8⁵⁶⁵ or specifically τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς which immediately precedes it?⁵⁶⁶ Does the Holy Spirit reveal the 'not yet'⁵⁶⁷ or the 'now' of full access?⁵⁶⁸ In 9:9, is the 'present age': "a symbol of 'the time then present'" during the period of its validity",⁵⁶⁹ the time when Hebrews was written⁵⁷⁰ synonymous with the "καιροῦ διορθώσεως" (9:10)⁵⁷¹ or the overlap between the two ages?⁵⁷² However, it is not within the purview of this thesis to address these issues.⁵⁷³ Indeed, their resolution does not materially affect our author's understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in 9:8.

⁵⁶³ 9:6-10 is "one compound and complex sentence", so Stanley, S. "Hebrews 9:6-10: The "Parable" of the Tabernacle", *NovT*, 37 (1995), 387. As Allen ["Forgotten Spirit", 59] puts it: "grasping the full contours of Hebrews' argument (here) is not without difficulty". See the discussions in Ellingworth, P. and Nida, E.A. *A Translator's Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews*, (New York: UBS, 1983), 176-96; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 370-403; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 297-303; Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 303-306; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 223-27.

⁵⁶⁴ See the discussion in Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 218-19, 223. Allen ["Forgotten Spirit", 59] is likely correct that up to 9:7 the references are spatial but that in 9:8 the πρώτης σκηνῆς "is now temporal". Cf. Isaacs, *Sacred Space*, 205-19, who concludes: "for all the spatial character of the images it uses to depict heaven [including sacred shrine] they always have simultaneously a time reference".

⁵⁶⁵ So, Bruce, *Hebrews*, 209; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 149.

⁵⁶⁶ So, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 241; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 177; Stanley, "Hebrews 9:6-10", 389. Hagner [*Hebrews*, 133-34] prefers this option but admits that the antecedent could possibly be the whole of vv. 6-8.

⁵⁶⁷ So, Bieder ["Pneumatologische Aspekte", 258]: "Der καιρὸς διορθώσεως ist mit dem αἰὼν μέλλων identisch". Cf. Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 149; Isaacs [*Sacred Space*, 219] writes of: "the language of approach rather than attainment".

⁵⁶⁸ Lewicki [*Heilige Geist*, 4-5] sees the μὲν (9:1) δὲ (9:11) construction as indicative of what is now, "der Weg zum Thron der Gnade steht offen". Cf. Allen, "Forgotten Spirit", 61; Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 183-85.

⁵⁶⁹ So, Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 383-84. See the discussion in Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 440-41.

⁵⁷⁰ So, Allen, *Hebrews*, 466.

⁵⁷¹ So, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 241; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 441; Emmrich, "Pneuma", 65.

⁵⁷² So, Koester, *Hebrews*, 398: "the new covenant has been inaugurated but the old has not yet vanished". Cf. Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 177.

⁵⁷³ However, see §6.3.

According to 9:8 the Holy Spirit reveals the inadequacy of the OC high-priestly and priestly activity. It has been suggested that the Spirit imparted to our author some “special insight which was not previously available to the readers of the OT”.⁵⁷⁴ On the other hand, it can be argued that when the actions of the OC priests and high priest are viewed through the lens of Christ’s once-for-all sacrifice it becomes glaringly obvious that they are incapable of providing access to God. The Holy Spirit provides that spiritual insight by simply pointing out “the biblical description of (the OC) limitations”.⁵⁷⁵ It may well be that “in 9:8... the Holy Spirit bears witness... through the logical implications drawn from Scripture”⁵⁷⁶ but nothing is specified in the text about how the Spirit makes this clear (δηλοῦντος).

The verb δηλόω is found twice in Hebrews (here and 12:27) and a further five times in the rest of the NT.⁵⁷⁷ It expresses the idea of revealing something that was not previously understood, grasped or known.⁵⁷⁸ The method by which the ‘revelation’ is imparted varies depending on what the information is and who is imparting it. Paul was *told* by ‘Chloe’s people’ about the divisions in the Corinthian church (1 Cor. 1:11) and Epaphras *made known* to him the extent of the Colossians’ love for him (Col. 1:8). No doubt this ‘revelation’ would have been conveyed to Paul either verbally or by letter. However, the Spirit of Christ *informing* the OT prophets about what was to come (1 Pet. 1:11)⁵⁷⁹ and Peter’s knowledge of his imminent death “as our Lord Jesus Christ has *made clear*” (2 Pet. 1:14)⁵⁸⁰ entails a spiritually discerned revelation perhaps through a word of

⁵⁷⁴ Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 223. Cf. Johnson, *Hebrews*, 223; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 176; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 312. See also the discussion in §8.3.1.

⁵⁷⁵ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 380-81. Cf. deSilva, *Perseverance*, 299; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 437; Hagner, *Encountering*, 120; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 180; Vanhoye, A. *A Different Priest*, (Miami: Convivium Press, 2011), 254. Laansma [“Living and Active”, 65] writes of one “interpretative principle” employed by our author being “the OT’s “self-confessed inadequacy”.”

⁵⁷⁶ Stanley, S.K. *A New Covenant Hermeneutic: The Use of Scripture in Hebrews 8-10*, (Sheffield: PhD thesis, 1994), 218. See the discussion in Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 303.

⁵⁷⁷ 1 Cor. 1:11; 3:13; Col. 1:8; 1 Pet. 1:11; 2 Pet. 1:14. The cognate noun δῆλος is found thrice in the NT, Matt. 26:73; 1 Cor. 15:27; Gal. 3:11.

⁵⁷⁸ However, it can have a more general meaning; Ellingworth and Nida [*Handbook*, 185] offer: “shows... indicates... signifies (and) means us to see”.

⁵⁷⁹ As Michaels [J.R. *1 Peter*, (Waco: Word, 1988), 43] writes: “The imperfect verb ἐδήλου refers to a process of revelation that took place in the prophets’ ministry”.

⁵⁸⁰ It has been suggested that John 21:18-19 underlies this comment; so, Davids, P.H. *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 195-96; Skaggs, *2 Peter*, 105-106; Bauckham [2 *Peter*, 200-201], despite raising serious objections to this suggestion, concludes: “John 21:18 seems to be the

knowledge or prophecy (see 1 Cor 12:8-10).⁵⁸¹ The quality of a person's 'work/walk' will become self-evidently apparent as 'the day' will *reveal* (δηλώσει) it (1 Cor. 3:13). For our author the word ἄπαξ, in a quotation from Hag. 2:6, is a self-evident *indication* of how that text should be understood (12:27). Similarly, the 37 occurrences of δηλώ in the LXX display the same breadth of revelatory methods. It describes Divine revelations,⁵⁸² human explanations⁵⁸³ and self-evident truths.⁵⁸⁴ Emmrich suggests that δηλώ indicates that the Holy Spirit gives a new revelation in the light of "the Christ event".⁵⁸⁵ This may or may not be the case, but it cannot be demonstrated by recourse to the meaning of δηλώ. There is nothing intrinsic to δηλώ that shows either the nature of the revelation or how it is given.⁵⁸⁶ Each text needs to be examined in its own context. All the more so since the phrase 'the Holy Spirit indicates' in 9:8 is unique in the NT.

Allen comments on the rhetorical symmetry between the two phrases, τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου and τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν.⁵⁸⁷ However, that symmetry also extends to the parallelism between δηλώ and φανερώ; consequently, 'the Holy Spirit now reveals that the Holy way is not yet revealed' (δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν). This is not to say that 'the Holy Spirit' is here reduced to a mere rhetorical device. It has been seen that the author is careful and deliberate in his choice of language, here and throughout the letter.⁵⁸⁸ It is significant that no clarity is offered as to how the Spirit shows the ineffectiveness of the OC. It is also significant that there is no mention of a human intermediary through whom the Spirit acts. Cockerill writes that "the pastor claims no esoteric divine disclosure" for himself.⁵⁸⁹ Just as the human authors of Scripture are generally treated by our author as incidental, so the human

only basis for 2 Pet 1:14". If this is so, it would be a self-evident truth to the now aged Peter that Christ's word (of some 35 years earlier) was nearing fulfilment.

⁵⁸¹ This was not uncommon in the NT period, e.g. the words and action of Agabus (Acts 21:10-11).

⁵⁸² Exod. 6:3; 33:12; 2 Macc. 2:8; Isa. 42:9; Dan. 2:27-30 (δηλώ occurs 4x in the context of God revealing the meaning of a dream).

⁵⁸³ Josh. 4:7; Tob. 10:9; 4 Macc. 4:14; Dan. 2:16.

⁵⁸⁴ 2 Macc. 4:17; Jer. 16:21.

⁵⁸⁵ Emmrich, "*Pneuma*", 64.

⁵⁸⁶ See further, §8.3.1.

⁵⁸⁷ Allen, "Forgotten Spirit", 60.

⁵⁸⁸ See the discussion of the author's use of language, §1.5 and rhetoric specifically, §1.5.4.

⁵⁸⁹ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 380-81.

vehicle through whom the revelation is made is also incidental, even if that vehicle is our author himself.

Elsewhere in the NT, when earlier Scriptures are called on to describe or justify a later action, it is a human agent who is the hermeneut. For instance, on the day of Pentecost Peter recognised that the experience in the upper room (Acts 2:1-4) was the fulfilment of Joel 2:28-32 and declared as much (Acts 2:16-21). It may well be that the ‘this is that’ of Acts 2:16 was a Spirit-inspired revelation but it is not described as such. However, even as a ‘Spirit-inspired’ revelation (from the Pentecost experience), it was the Spirit ‘speaking’ to Peter’s mind so that he could make it clear to his audience. Similarly, without getting into the debate about the date and purpose of the Book of Daniel, Daniel 9:2 reports that Daniel was considering Jeremiah’s 70 years of Babylonian domination⁵⁹⁰ when he felt able to pray for a return to Jerusalem because the 70 years were up. It wasn’t a revelation from the Spirit but a self-evident truth from Scripture, described in Daniel 9:2 thus: “I, Daniel, perceived in the books the number of years that, according to the word of the LORD to the prophet Jeremiah, must be fulfilled for the devastation of Jerusalem, namely, seventy years.”

The Holy Spirit is integral to the logical flow of Hebrews’ argument in 8:1-10:18. The author has declared that God has made the OC obsolete (8:13). He is about to write that Jesus is the mediator of the NC (9:15) because “through the eternal Spirit (he) offered himself without blemish to God” (9:14).⁵⁹¹ In 10:1-4 Hebrews repeats the statement about the OT’s “self-confessed inadequacy”⁵⁹² as the reason for the Son ‘owning’ Psalm 40:6-8. The section ends with the Holy Spirit testifying about both the inauguration of the NC (10:15) and the once-for-all efficacy of Christ’s sacrifice (10:17-18). Without the use of a human agent, the Spirit made clear that the setting and the activity described in 9:1-7 was ineffectual. Whatever else can be said, 9:8 ‘clearly reveals’ that the Holy Spirit not only inspired Scripture but that he also interprets it.⁵⁹³ This is more than what

⁵⁹⁰ Twice in Jeremiah (25:11-12 and 29:10) the prophet states that the Babylonian enslavement will last 70 years.

⁵⁹¹ That the ‘eternal Spirit’ is the Holy Spirit will be demonstrated below, §6.4.

⁵⁹² See §4.5.3 n.575.

⁵⁹³ So, e.g. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 240; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 380; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 176; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 149; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 184; Vanhoye, *Different Priest*, 254.

might be called ‘Spirit hermeneutics’.⁵⁹⁴ Indeed, 9:8 is the only place in the NT where the Spirit is specified as the hermeneut.⁵⁹⁵ For Hebrews, the one who inspired them is the only appropriate interpreter of the Scriptures. This is unique to Hebrews.

4.5.4 The context and content of the Spirit’s words

When the context and content of that which Hebrews ascribes to the Holy Spirit is examined, it is found that:

- in 3:7-19 the context is the first covenant, Moses leading the people out of Egypt and into the promised land; the content reminds the congregation that the wilderness generation’s sin prevented them entering the promised rest (enjoying the full provision of the covenant relationship)
- in 9:1-11 the context is the failure of the first covenant; the inability of the priestly actions to procure forgiveness and access to God (and his rest) was built into the rituals, thereby pointing out the need for and provision of a once-for-all sacrifice for sin that would open up access to God
- in 10:5-18 the context is the establishment of the New Covenant which does indeed usher in the full provision of rest, access and relationship.

In 3:7-4:11 both the Holy Spirit and God voice all or parts of Psalm 95:7-11 with its warning, “do not harden your hearts”. This call to perseverance is underpinned by the affirmation that Christ was a faithful Son over God’s household and that household comprises believers who hold firm (3:6). Indeed, in 3:14 perseverance is declared to be a NC requirement and a consequence of being partnered by Christ (see §5.3). In the same way, both the Holy Spirit (10:15) and God (8:10) voice all or part of Jeremiah 31:31-34. This promise of a new covenantal relationship with God is effected by Christ’s once-

⁵⁹⁴ Borrowing the phrase from Keener’s *Spirit Hermeneutics*. He writes of “the Spirit’s activity in interpretation” of the Biblical text (*ibid*, 12) and that “expecting the Spirit’s presence and pedagogy as we read Scripture is a Spirit hermeneutic” (*ibid*, 18). Nonetheless he makes no mention of 9:8.

⁵⁹⁵ Lewicki [*Heilige Geist*, 5 (citing Grässer)] writes: the Spirit “ist hier ‘autorisierter Hermeneut ihrer παραβολή’.”

for-all sacrifice (10:12-14) and, as will be shown (§7.4), is applied to the believer by the Spirit of Grace (10:29).

It is not incidental that on both occasions that the Holy Spirit is specifically named as speaking Scripture, the Son was the immediate previous speaker of Scripture (2:11-13 and 10:5-10) and the words ascribed to the Spirit are elsewhere ascribed to God. Indeed, the Scriptures are “the living speech of God, uttered as the Holy Spirit speaks, whose speech is always and exclusively God’s speech ἐν υἱῷ”.⁵⁹⁶

As will be seen,⁵⁹⁷ the fact that all three members of the Trinity are involved in the voicing of Scripture and in the establishment of the NC relationship is a significant aspect of our author’s overall pneumatology.

4.6 Conclusions

Many scholars have commented that the author of Hebrews has a high view of Scripture.⁵⁹⁸ True as that is, he also has a ‘high view’ of the Holy Spirit. “The author thinks of God and the Holy Spirit as the same speaker.”⁵⁹⁹ However, what is most striking in Hebrews is not that the Holy Spirit speaks but that that activity is the prerogative of God. God spoke ἐν τοῖς προφῆταις (1:1) and he speaks ἐν υἱῷ (1:2). He told the angels the limits of their authority (1:5-7) and he spoke words of enthronement to the Son (1:8-12; 5:5). He speaks to his people (4:3-7; 8:8-12; 13:5) explaining both his offer and his demand. Thus, a key factor in the pneumatology of Hebrews is not just that the Spirit inspires, authors, owns, speaks, applies and/or interprets/reinterprets

⁵⁹⁶ Laansma, “Living and Active”, 68. Cf. Kleinig, J.W. *Hebrews*, (St. Louis: Concordia, 2017), 179-80, who writes of “(t)he triune God’s voice... speak(ing) to the congregation”.

⁵⁹⁷ See the discussion of ‘Trinitarian language’ in Hebrews, §8.2.1.

⁵⁹⁸ See §2.3. Johnson [*Hebrews*, 113] writes: “such texts... have “power” because they are inspired by God’s own Spirit... a high estimation of Scripture”. So too, Barth, M. “The Old Testament in Hebrews”, Klassen, W. & Snyder, G.F. (Eds), *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, (London: SCM, 1962), 61; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 454; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 37-42; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 141; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 184. Isaacs [*Sacred Space*, 68] writes: “The divine origin of Scripture is affirmed by its ascription to the holy spirit”.

⁵⁹⁹ So Schenck, K. “God Has Spoken: Hebrews’ Theology of the Scriptures”, Bauckham (2009), 334-35. Cf. Barth, “OT in Hebrews”, 61-62; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 479; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 171.

Scripture but that these activities are the prerogative of God. Our author shows that these activities are also the prerogative of the Holy Spirit. Hebrews does not distinguish between God speaking in/through Scripture and the Holy Spirit speaking in/through Scripture. It is one and the same. The Spirit was establishing the New Covenant and the NC Community. However, this “newly constituted people of God had been written about beforehand... this is that”;⁶⁰⁰ this experience of Pentecost led to a new reading of Scripture and a new understanding of what it means to be part of the NC people (see §5).

Hebrews builds from that which is ‘contemporary’; the prophetic Spirit speaks to and through human agents. As the ‘bringer of revelation’ (§3.3), the Spirit inspires them and the works they produce. His words to and through them are from God for his covenant community. At the same time, as has been shown, Hebrews is a development of that which is ‘contemporary’ in that the Spirit also acts or speaks, as and for God, independently of human agents. Furthermore, Hebrews uniquely portrays the Spirit as the true hermeneut, the indispensable hermeneut. The one who inspired the words of Scripture is the only one who can truly interpret and apply them for succeeding generations. Consequently, Hebrews’ understanding of the Scriptures is intimately intertwined with its pneumatology. The revelation in Hebrews that the Holy Spirit inspires, speaks and interprets Scripture, independently of human agency, is not only the pinnacle of Scripture’s ‘self-understanding’, it is also a significant development in the pneumatology of the NT.

⁶⁰⁰ So, Fee, *Presence*, 915.

5 The Holy Spirit, μερισμός and μέτοχος, Hebrews 2:4 and 6:4

5.1 Introduction

It will be convenient to explore 2:4 and 6:4 in the same section of this thesis since they have much in common; for instance, both occur within so-called ‘warning passages’ and, *prima facie*, both relate to the initial evidences of the Christian life.⁶⁰¹ 2:4 (§5.2) and 6:4 (§5.3) will first be examined individually before assessing the import of both verses for the pneumatology of Hebrews (§5.4).

5.2 Hebrews 2:4

Hebrews has five distinct paraenetic sections, 2:1-4 being the first of them.⁶⁰² This first warning is about the consequences of rejecting the Gospel. The import and unique significance of the message of salvation is that it was announced not by angels but by the Lord himself (2:2-3). Those who first heard Jesus also testified to the veracity of that message (2:3). It received further validation⁶⁰³ from God himself who, in an echo of the Exodus events, provided signs, wonders and various miracles (2:4).⁶⁰⁴ In the NT, this triad provides God’s authentication of: “Jesus of Nazareth” (Acts 2:22), true apostleship (2 Cor. 12:12) and Paul’s ministry which was “ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος” (Rom. 5:18-19). However, signs, wonders and acts of power prove nothing in themselves (2 Thess. 2:9); what matters is the S(s)pirit in or by which these signs are performed. Consequently, our author affirms that the authentication of the message was accompanied by ‘*distributions* of the Holy Spirit according to his will’.⁶⁰⁵

⁶⁰¹ In this regard, they are similar to 10:29. However, that text will be examined separately because of its use of the distinctive title ‘Spirit of grace’, see §7.4.

⁶⁰² The other four are 3:7-4:13; 6:4-8; 10:26-39; 12:25-29. However, the termini are debated, see Bateman IV, H.W. “Introducing the Warning Passages in Hebrews”, *Four Views*, 27.

⁶⁰³ *συνεπιμαρτυρέω*, a Biblical *hapax*, ‘to testify at the same time’.

⁶⁰⁴ The ‘couplet’ *σημεῖον* and *τέρας* occurs 24x in the OT, 16 in the context of the Exodus. In the deuterocanonical books of the LXX, *σημεῖον* and *τέρας* are used together three times, once of the Exodus (Bar. 2:11) where the triad, *σημεῖοις, τέρασιν, δυνάμει μεγάλη* occurs.

⁶⁰⁵ See §1.4.3 for a discussion of the significance (or otherwise) of the absence of the article with *πνεύματος ἁγίου*.

Each part of the phrase πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν presents its own problems of interpretation. μερισμός is unique to Hebrews in the NT. In 2:4, the plural ‘distributions’ [of Holy Spirit] is used. This could indicate either more than one ‘giving of’ or more than one ‘gift from’ the Spirit. The translational problem is compounded by the genitival πνεύματος ἁγίου which may be subjective, objective or even a second genitive absolute.⁶⁰⁶ Furthermore, the phrase κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν can be taken with all four indicators (signs, wonders, miracles and ‘distributions’ of Holy Spirit) or just with πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς. Finally, if ‘according to his will’ is understood as relating only to μερισμός, then it is possible to take θέλησις as either God’s will or the will of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁰⁷ These issues are interdependent and will be examined before a translation/interpretation of the verse is offered.

5.2.1 ‘Distributions’ (μερισμός) of Holy Spirit

Hebrews 2:4 Many translators supply the word ‘gifts’,⁶⁰⁸ however, the text simply reads: “...and by distributions (μερισμοῖς) of Holy Spirit”.

μερισμός is found twice in the NT, both times in *Hebrews*, here and 4:12. In 4:12, μερισμός has the idea of ‘divide’ as in ‘separate one part from another’. This use is most probably metaphorical⁶⁰⁹ since the separation of soul from spirit⁶¹⁰ and joints from marrow⁶¹¹ was generally regarded as impossible.⁶¹² This figurative use of μερισμός

⁶⁰⁶ See the discussions at §§1.4.4; 5.2.2.

⁶⁰⁷ See Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 30-31, for further explanation of these translation/exegetical issues/options.

⁶⁰⁸ So NRSV & ESV: “...and by gifts of the Holy Spirit, distributed according to his will”. So too, Allen, *Hebrews*, 189-90; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 30 n.7; Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 83; Hagner, *Hebrews*, 43; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 64; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 89; Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 40; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 90; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 83, 478; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 46.

⁶⁰⁹ Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 103, “figurative language”; Allen, *Hebrews*, 289, “metaphorical”; Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 84, “figure of speech”.

⁶¹⁰ Both O’Brien [*Hebrews*, 177] and Koester [*Hebrews*, 274], comparing 10:39 with 12:23, write: “spirit and soul are virtually identical”.

⁶¹¹ Attridge [*Hebrews*, 135] calls the language “paradoxical” since neither “soul and spirit (nor) joints and marrow join”; Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 263] also points out that “joints and marrow do not touch” adding that it is “misconceived to seek precise definition in such a poetic passage”.

⁶¹² Cockerill [*Hebrews*, 216] writes of “divid(ing) the indivisible”. See also n.535-37.

neither helps nor hinders in understanding its use in 2:4. In the literature that impinges most directly on this study, *μερισμός* occurs infrequently. It is used to describe God's distribution of the nations across the earth (Philo, *Post.* 90), the dividing of the promised land among the twelve tribes (Josh. 11:23),⁶¹³ apportioning the times at which each priestly or Levitical family was responsible for serving the Lord (Ezra 6:18; Josephus, *Ant.* 7.366) and Job's distribution of his estate between his seven sons (*T. Job* 46:1).

The cognates,⁶¹⁴ *μερίζω* (7:2) and *μέρος* (9:5), both occur in Hebrews just once. 7:2 records that Abraham apportioned Melchizedek a tithe, while in 9:5 *κατὰ μέρος* has the force of 'part by part' and thus 'in detail'.⁶¹⁵ Indeed, the basic meaning of the family of '-μερ-' words is 'part' or 'share'⁶¹⁶ and, subject to the requirements of grammatical form, are used virtually interchangeably.⁶¹⁷ They describe geographical regions,⁶¹⁸ the dividing up of Jesus' garments at the crucifixion,⁶¹⁹ a share in or part of some larger thing (e.g. a meal, aid or inheritance)⁶²⁰ and the division between the believer and the non-believer.⁶²¹ They are also used to describe 'having a share' in something or someone in such a way that the number of participants does not diminish the 'share' each enjoys.⁶²² In 2:4, *μερισμός* has this connotation. There is no diminution of the 'share' whether experienced by few or many. All receive the totality of 'what he wills'.

⁶¹³ Josephus (*Ant.* 1.146) explains that Phaleg was so named because he was born at the time of the partition (*μερισμον*) of the territories and the Hebrew for 'partition' is *Phalek*.

⁶¹⁴ *Μερισμός* belongs to a larger 'family' of NT words: the nouns: *μερίς* (5x), *μεριστής* (1x), *μέρος* (42x), *διαμερισμός* (1x), and the verbs: *μερίζω* (14x), *διαμερίζω* (11x), *συμμερίζω* (1x). *ἐφημερία* is not a related word but a compound with *ἡμέρα* and becomes 'division' only because the class of priests in question performed their daily duties for a fixed period; (cf. Luke 1:5, 8 'the division (*ἐφημερίας*) of Abijah'). It is highly unlikely that *ἡμέρα* is a compound of *ἡ* (the symbol for 8) and *μερίς* thus, 'a division of eight' [as in the French *aujourd'hui*].

⁶¹⁵ So, *BDAG*, 633.

⁶¹⁶ See Schneider, J. 'μέρος', *TDNT*, 4:595-98.

⁶¹⁷ E.g. see Polybius, *Histories*, 31:10, a classical usage, which describes the partition of a kingdom or the allotted portions of the land using *μερισμός*, *μερίς* and *μερίζω* as synonyms to avoid bland repetition.

⁶¹⁸ *μέρος*, Matt. 2:22; 15:21; 16:13; *μερίς*, Acts 16:12.

⁶¹⁹ *μέρος*, John 19:23a, 23b; *διαμερίζω*, John 19:24; Luke 23:34.

⁶²⁰ *διαμερίζω*, Luke 22:17; Acts 2:45; *μερίζω*, Mark 6:41; Luke 12:13; *μέρος*, Luke 15:12; Acts 5:2; *συμμερίζω*, 1 Cor. 9:13.

⁶²¹ *διαμερισμός*, Luke 12:51; *μερίς*, 2 Cor. 6:15.

⁶²² *μέρος*, part of a group or trade (Acts 19:27; 23:6, 9); sharing in Christ (John 13:8; 1 Cor. 12:27); sharing in the first resurrection (Rev. 20:6) or the lake of fire (Rev. 21:8); having a part with hypocrites (Matt. 24:51); sharing in the faith *μερίζω*, (Rom. 12:3; cf. 1 Cor. 1:13) and *μερίς*, (Acts 8:21; Col. 1:12); the better

5.2.2 πνεύματος ἁγίου, gift or giver?

There are no universally recognised rules for determining how a genitive is to be understood.⁶²³ The context in which a phrase is found is the overriding factor in translation and interpretation. Consequently, it is inappropriate to merely state that in 2:4 “it is impossible to construe the anarthrous “holy spirit” as anything but an objective genitive”.⁶²⁴ The case needs to be argued and where there is doubt one cannot simply state certainty. Indeed, other options are not only possible but also advocated by several scholars.⁶²⁵ In 2:4, the translational issues hinge on how the genitive ‘πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς’ is understood. It could be subjective (the Spirit gives), objective (the Spirit is given) or even a second genitive absolute with συνεπιμαρτυρέω (‘bearing witness together with’, in which case the distribution is according to the will of the Spirit).

The text simply states that the message declared by the Lord (2:3) was confirmed by God with signs, wonders and miracles and by distributions of Holy Spirit. 1 Corinthians 12:11 (if 2:4 is taken as a subjective genitive) or Galatians 3:5 (if an objective genitive) have been suggested as parallels to 2:4.⁶²⁶ However, neither suggested parallel uses μερισμός. 1 Corinthians 12:11 has διαιροῦν and is in the context of orderly worship. The gifts that the Spirit apportions are not ‘authentication’ for the individual or community; they are “given for the common good” (1 Cor. 12:7) and to be exercised “for the strengthening of the church” (1 Cor. 14:26). Galatians 3:5 has ἐπιχορηγῶν and the context is a debate about faith and works, grace and law, the climax being the declaration that “the promise of the Spirit” is received by faith (Gal. 3:14). Neither the vocabulary

portion chosen by Mary but also fully available to Martha (Luke 10:42); the apportionment of the Holy Spirit διαμερίζω, (Acts 2:3) and μερισμός, (Heb. 2:4).

⁶²³ See §1.4.4.

⁶²⁴ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 68 n.67.

⁶²⁵ Emmrich [*Concepts*, 66] argues for πνεύματος ἁγίου being a subjective genitive and cites Lane, Braun, deSilva, Hagner, Jewett, Smith and Hegermann in support, *ibid*, 82 n.60. Cf. Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 30-31; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 81; Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 60-62; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 46.

⁶²⁶ See Bruce, *Hebrews*, 30 n.7.

nor the contexts make these two putative parallels actually parallel. In fact, Acts 2:3 provides a much closer parallel.⁶²⁷

- Acts 2:3 uses the cognate verb διαμερίζω with the plural ‘tongues of fire’ and thereby mirrors the plural ‘distributions’ in Hebrews 2:4.
- The Pentecost narrative contains the only other NT text, juxtaposing the distribution of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2: 3-4, 17-21) with ‘signs, wonders and miracles’ (Acts 2:22).
- The context of the Acts narrative mirrors that of Hebrews 2:2-4. The Spirit is given (Acts 2:3-4, 17, 38-39) accompanied by miraculous ‘signs following’ (Acts 2:4, 43) as God ‘bears witness’ both to the veracity of Jesus’ person and ministry (Acts 2:22) and to the Apostles’ experience and preaching (Acts 2:16). In Hebrews, God authenticates both Jesus’ message and the apostolic preaching (2:3) by ‘bearing witness together with them’, as he provides signs, wonders, miracles and distributions of Holy Spirit (2:4).⁶²⁸

Table 5:1 A Comparison of Acts 2 and Hebrews 2:3-4

Acts 2		Hebrews 2	
3-4, 17, 38-39	The Spirit is distributed/given (διαμερίζω)	4	The Spirit is distributed/given (μερισμός)
4, 43	Accompanied by miraculous signs	4	God provides signs and wonders
22	God authenticates Jesus’ ministry	3	God authenticates Jesus’ message
16-19, 43	Scripture and miracles validate the apostolic preaching	3	God authenticates the apostolic preaching through miracles

⁶²⁷ Without developing the thought, Mitchell [*Hebrews*, 63] writes: “Interestingly, Luke portrays the bestowal of the Holy Spirit as something divided or distributed (*diamerizomenoi*)... at the first Christian Pentecost (Acts 2:3)”.

⁶²⁸ See Table 5.1.

5.2.3 Hebrews 2:4, preliminary conclusions

Given the complexity of the exegetical and translational options, it is important to re-emphasise that the pericope as a whole (2:1-4) is a piece of carefully crafted rhetoric.⁶²⁹

Our author uses:

- Alliteration: περισσοτέρως, προσέχειν, παραρυῶμεν (2:1); πᾶσα, παράβασις, παρακοή (2:2).
- Hendiadys: παράβασις καὶ παρακοή – violation and disobedience (2:2).
- Rhymes: τέρασιν, δυνάμεσιν, θέλησιν (2:4).
- An *a fortiori* argument (2:2-3): from the law mediated through angels to the gospel declared by the Lord.
- Irony: ‘earned wages’ being used to mean ‘deserved punishment’ (2:3). μισθαποδοσία seems to have been coined by our author.⁶³⁰

Hebrews 2:1-4 warns those who might be tempted to ‘drift away’ from the message they have heard that they risk rejecting that which originated with Christ, was affirmed by God and was further authenticated as the Holy Spirit was distributed to each of them individually.

If it is accepted that the Pentecost narrative in Acts 2 and the distribution of Holy Spirit in Hebrews 2:4 are closely parallel in both language and emphasis, then the grammatical issues resolve themselves. The Holy Spirit is the gift, ‘distributed’ in accordance with the will of God as part of the validation of the Christ-event and the authentication of both the New Covenant and the members of the New Covenant community.⁶³¹ The plural ‘distributions’ (μερισμοῖς) most likely points to the Spirit being given to more than one

⁶²⁹ See §1.5. Lane [*Hebrews*, 34] writes of this pericope that our author’s “gifts as an orator are displayed in the richness of his rhetorical style and vocabulary”.

⁶³⁰ μισθαποδοσία [from μισθός and ἀποδίδωμι, payment of wages] is also found at 10:35 and 11:26 meaning ‘reward’; cf. μισθαποδότης, paymaster (11:6), used of God who rewards those who seek him. There is no evidence of any use of either word earlier than Hebrews. See Montanari, 1351. They are not found in classical Greek, LXX, DSS or Philo. μισθαποδοσία is found in a late first/early second century AD document (4 Bar. 6:6) and twice in the mid second/late third century AD ‘Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers’ (Apost. Con. 7.35.10; 8.12.22).

⁶³¹ Cf. Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 55-56; Motyer, “The Spirit” 218-19.

recipient and, in fact, to every new member of the Covenant community, possibly through the foundational ‘laying on of hands’ (6:2)⁶³² as often as new believers were added to the church.⁶³³

This is one of the occasions where the author has all three members of the Godhead involved in the same work.⁶³⁴ Here, their ‘simultaneous testimony/presence’ authenticates the New Covenant. It was inaugurated in the ‘Christ event’, confirmed by God giving signs, wonders and miracles, and it transformed the lives of everyone to whom the Holy Spirit was distributed.

5.3 Hebrews 6:4

The interpretation of this warning passage in Hebrews has been (and still is) controversial.⁶³⁵ 6:4-8 presents the exegete with various interrelated difficulties revolving around the question of whether a Christian can lose his/her salvation?⁶³⁶ These include: How should ἀδύνατος be understood? What is involved with παραπίπτω? Does πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετένοιαν imply that those for whom this warning was intended had, at some earlier time, exercised genuine repentance? Do the participial phrases in 6:4-5 describe genuine Christians or ‘almost Christians’?⁶³⁷ Although the argument cannot be reduced to a simple Calvinist versus Arminian one, this thesis needs to ask whether 6:4-6 describes *full* members of the New Covenant community. The

⁶³² An exploration of ‘laying on of hands’ in 6:2, as a rite accompanying baptism and symbolizing the reception of the Spirit, would be tangential to this study of Hebrews’ pneumatology.

⁶³³ See Allen, “Gift or Giver”, 151-52, 158; Levison, “Theology”, 102; cf. §§1.2.1b; 1.2.1c; 5.4.

⁶³⁴ See Motyer, “The Spirit, 214-15; cf. §8.2.1.

⁶³⁵ So, O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 217. Cf. e.g. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 167; Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, 1:283-94; Verbrugge, V.D. “Towards a New Interpretation of Hebrews 6:4-5”, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 15 (1980), 61; Gray, P. “The Early Reception of Hebrews 6:4-6”, Gray, P. & O’Day, G.R. *Scripture and Traditions*, (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 321; Emrich, M. “Hebrews 6:4-6 – Again”, *WTJ*, 65 (2003), 83.

⁶³⁶ Allen [*Hebrews*, 377] affirms both “Heb 6:4-6 refers to genuine believers” and “the impossibility of genuine believers apostatizing”. As Fanning [B.M. “A Classical Reformed View”, *Four Views*, 172] puts it: “In most Reformed circles the warning passages in Hebrews require a “solution” because they seem to go against our larger doctrinal stance regarding security of salvation.”

⁶³⁷ Terminology is difficult here. The language commentators use to describe those addressed in 6:4-6 includes: ‘real’, ‘true’ and ‘genuine’; ‘false’, ‘almost’ and ‘non-’; ‘Christians’, ‘New Covenant people’ and ‘believers’. This thesis will regard the members of each of these sets of terms as interchangeable and, in what follows, will not again put the terms within inverted commas.

interpretation of 6:4-6 is made even more difficult because of its vocabulary. With four NT *hapax*⁶³⁸ and at least five other relatively rare words,⁶³⁹ it seems that the author chose his words with deliberate precision.

5.3.1 Whom does 6:3-4 describe?

Before proceeding to exegete μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, it will be necessary to examine the implication – for this thesis – of the various interpretations of this warning passage. This is not the place to enter, let alone resolve, the debate about whether the warning is addressed to almost-Christians or true-Christians.⁶⁴⁰ However, if the ones who ‘fell away’ (παραπεσόντας) were not Christians, some justification will need to be offered for taking μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου as a descriptor of genuine New Covenant life.

Allen complains that many analysts of this passage “fall into the trap of putting theology before exegesis”.⁶⁴¹ Ellingworth correctly counsels: “apply normal exegetical methods as strictly as possible” to 6:4-6 and let the text speak for itself before making any attempt to incorporate its message into a systematic theology.⁶⁴²

Clearly, if 6:4-6 (or 5:11-6:12⁶⁴³) indicates that Christians can lose their salvation,⁶⁴⁴ then the participial phrases do describe genuine believers. This would also be the case if

⁶³⁸ παραπίπτω, ἀνακαίνιζω, ἀνασταυρόω, and παραδειγματίζω – a poorly attested *v.l.* at Matt. 1:19, not mentioned in Metzger.

⁶³⁹ ἀδύνατος, 10x in NT, 4x in Heb. ἄπαξ, 14x NT, 8x Heb. φωτίζω, 11x NT, 2x Heb. γέομαι, 15x NT, 3x Heb. μέτοχος, 6x NT, 5x Heb.

⁶⁴⁰ For such a discussion compare Grudem, W. “Perseverance of the Saints”, *Sovereign*, 133-82 with Marshall, I.H. *Kept by the Power of God*, (Carlisle: Paternoster 1995 [1969]), 137-57. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 344-93 and the literature referenced therein.

⁶⁴¹ Allen, *Hebrews*, 344. Cf. Witherington, *Hebrews*, 215, who warns: “Theological systems... can often lead to very strained interpretations of biblical texts, especially when the system is the primary intellectual grid through which the text is being read”.

⁶⁴² Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 317. Cf. Marshall, *Kept*, 259-61; Fanning, “Classical Reformed View”, 174-75.

⁶⁴³ νῶθοι (5:11; 6:12) functioning as an *inclusio*.

⁶⁴⁴ So, Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 268-77; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 317; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 216-27; Osborne, G.R. “A Classical Arminian View”, *Four Views*, 114; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 215-18.

our author is raising a hypothetical case⁶⁴⁵ or writing hyperbolically.⁶⁴⁶ Another resolution to the ‘problem’ suggests that ‘falling away’, παραπίπτω, is a ‘failure to press on to maturity’ and consequently the ‘burning up’⁶⁴⁷ of 6:8 is a ‘loss of rewards’.⁶⁴⁸ Again, in this case, the people in view are genuine Christians.

On the other hand, “the vast majority of reformed commentators (argue) that Heb 6:4-6 describes only apparent believers who are, in fact, not Christians”.⁶⁴⁹ This view, generally known as ‘the test of genuineness’, argues that if someone falls away, it indicates that they were, at best, nominal members of the church rather than real members of the New Covenant community. Bruce writes that “continuance is the test of reality” and then goes on to describe those who fall away as being “immunized against Christianity by being inoculated with something that looks like the real thing”.⁶⁵⁰ Grudem is typical of those who regard the addressees as almost-Christians.⁶⁵¹ He argues that there is nothing in the positive descriptions of 6:4-5 that belongs exclusively to believers. Indeed, he writes: “they speak of events that are experienced both by genuine Christians and by some people who participate in the fellowship of a church but are never really saved.”⁶⁵² The argument is not that the terms employed describe non-Christians but that, of themselves, the descriptors are inconclusive. Thus, Grudem states: “One could not tell, until they fell away, whether they were believers or not.”⁶⁵³ After discussing each of the positive participial phrases Grudem concludes: “*all of the terms* can be used to *describe* either *Christians* or non-Christians who have heard the gospel

⁶⁴⁵ See Johnson, *Hebrews*, 161; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 108-11; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 165. Schreiner [*Hebrews*, 188, 480-91] advances what he calls a ‘means of salvation’ position. The addressees are Christian but, since true Christians cannot apostatize, “the warnings were intended to be a means to preserve the believers from apostasy”, *ibid*, 485. See also Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 145, who suggests that this is a hypothetical case but one that “was a real possibility”.

⁶⁴⁶ So, *LN*, 1.688: “In He 6:4 the use of ἀδύνατον seems to be an instance of hyperbole... Therefore, one may translate... ‘it is extremely difficult to’.”

⁶⁴⁷ Similar to 1 Cor. 3:1-17.

⁶⁴⁸ Emmrich, “Again!”, 89-90. Also, Allen, *Hebrews*, 370 n.393, 376-93 and the literature he cites.

⁶⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 357 and n.333. Proponents include Hughes, *Hebrews*, 222 and Carson, D.A. “Reflections on Assurance”, *Sovereign*, 267.

⁶⁵⁰ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 118-19.

⁶⁵¹ Grudem provides the focus for this analysis of the ‘test of genuineness’ since he “gives the best defence for the readers being almost Christians”, (Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 182); he offers “the most effectively argued presentation”, (Fanning, “Classical Reformed”, 179 n.13) and he is “its ablest contemporary defender” (Allen, *Hebrews*, 373).

⁶⁵² Grudem, “Perseverance”, 139.

⁶⁵³ *Idem*, 140 n.14.

and been attracted to it”.⁶⁵⁴ If Grudem’s overall view of the pericope is right,⁶⁵⁵ the terms in 6:4-5 could apply equally to true Christians or to almost Christians.⁶⁵⁶ Consequently, however 6:4-5 is incorporated into a wider systematic theology, μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου should be examined as a descriptor of NC life. In fact, it is most likely that this participial phrase (and the other three) were meant to describe and challenge full members of the NC community to which Hebrews was addressed.⁶⁵⁷

5.3.2 Partnered by (μέτοχος) the Holy Spirit

This thesis will proceed on the basis that the article (τοὺς) governs all five aorist participles: φωτισθέντας, γευσάμενους, γεννηθέντας, γευσάμενους and παραπεσόντας and that the experience of New Covenant life is described by the four participial phrases within the relative clause, τοὺς... παραπεσόντας (the ones who fall away). It is not necessary, in the context of this thesis, to pass judgement on whether ἅπαξ should be taken with all four participial phrases or just the first.⁶⁵⁸ Either way, “the aorist tense of the participles therefore is significant: they *were* once for all enlightened, they *did* taste, they *had* been made partakers!”⁶⁵⁹ There was a time when they did not participate in the life of the Spirit and now they do share in the Spirit’s life. There must, therefore, have been a point when the ‘partnership’ began.

Before exegeting the phrase μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, this thesis will first examine the other five NT occurrences of μέτοχος (§5.3.2.1). Then μετέχω (the only

⁶⁵⁴ *Idem*, 152 (emphasis mine). However, he fails to explain how non-Christians might experience “using some spiritual gifts”, *idem*, 148. See n.566-67 and associated text; cf. Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 269-70 n.7.

⁶⁵⁵ And this is far from proven.

⁶⁵⁶ See the discussion in Emmrich, *Concepts*, 56-64. He argues, from the parallel with the Exodus ‘grumblings’, that looking for distinctions (in 6:1-8) between true and false believers is as inappropriate as talking about true and false Israelites in the Exodus generation. However, this seems to ignore the different basis of entry into the two communities.

⁶⁵⁷ See §5.4.

⁶⁵⁸ Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 319] notes that Spicq and Moffatt take τοὺς ἅπαξ with the four participles as expressing different aspects of Christian initiation. However, Ellingworth, *ibid*, and Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 269-70, take ἅπαξ as part of the first phrase; even so, Cockerill [*ibid*, 269] recognises that “this term echoes in the reading of the following participles emphasising the reality and finality of the experiences described”. Cf. O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 220.

⁶⁵⁹ Johnson, *Hebrews*, 162, emphasis original.

cognate of μέτοχος found in Hebrews) will be discussed (§5.3.2.2).⁶⁶⁰ Finally, some interim observations on μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου will be offered (§5.3.2.3) before proceeding to discuss the contribution that it and πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς together bring to the pneumatology of Hebrews (§5.4).

5.3.2.1 μέτοχος in the NT, apart from 6:4

Apart from 6:4, μέτοχος is found a further five times in the NT, four of which are in Hebrews.⁶⁶¹ It occurs in 1:9 in a direct quote from Psalm 45:7 [44:8]. The Psalm is a ‘wedding song’ in which the king, celebrating his nuptials, appears to be addressed as God (45:6 [44:7]). The king (Ps.) and/or Son (Heb.) is differentiated from his μέτοχοι either by being anointed⁶⁶² or by being anointed temporally before⁶⁶³ or, more probably, to a greater degree than,⁶⁶⁴ these ‘companions’. This latter suggestion is the most natural and, in the context of a bridegroom and his companions, the most appropriate (his joy is full; they rejoice with, and for, him). The μέτοχοι here (1:9) have been identified as either the angels⁶⁶⁵ or followers of the Son.⁶⁶⁶ However, the angels are portrayed as fundamentally inferior to the Son, so it is unlikely that they would now be described as his μέτοχοι, a word elsewhere in Hebrews (3:1, 14; 6:4; 12:8) applied only to the followers of the Son. The context in Psalm 45 indicates that the ‘companions’ are human

⁶⁶⁰ 2:14; 5:13; 7:13; elsewhere in NT only in 1 Cor. 9:10-12; 10:16-30.

⁶⁶¹ 1:9; 3:1, 14; 12:8. The other is Luke 5:7, where it refers to those who were *partners* in a business enterprise (fishing).

⁶⁶² Taking παρά as ‘instead of’ rather than the more usual ‘more than’. So, NIV: “God has set you above your companions by anointing you”, cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 181; BDAG, 758; Riesenfeld, H. “παρά”, TDNT, 5:735. Craigie [P.C. *Psalms 1-50*, (Waco: Word, 1983), 336] translates מְחַבְּרֵי as “rather than your companions”. Lane [*Hebrews 1-8*, 21g] admits this possibility but prefers the more natural ‘more than’ *ibid*, 30.

⁶⁶³ So, Koester, *Hebrews*, 195.

⁶⁶⁴ So, AV; ESV; NKJ; NRSV; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 21; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 111; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 124; Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 19-20; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 30; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 47; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 74-75. This is the more usual sense of παρά [and מן] and how used at Ps. 44:3 [45:3]; cf. Tg. Ps. 45:8. DCH, 3:155: “מן of comparison, (*more*) *than*, + מִשָּׁח anoint Ps 45:8”.

⁶⁶⁵ Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 30; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 49; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 14; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 47.

⁶⁶⁶ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 111; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 80; Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 44; Koester, *Hebrews*, 195; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 74.

and that they were most probably the king's friends rather than other monarchs.⁶⁶⁷ Thus, the μέτοχοι in Hebrews are best understood as the 'many sons' (2:10) whom the Son 'is not ashamed to call brothers' (2:11-12), who are specifically called Christ's μέτοχοι (3:14) and with whom, through incarnation, he identifies himself (2:14-18).⁶⁶⁸ In saying that the Son has been anointed παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου the implication is that his μέτοχοι are also anointed and share in his joy.⁶⁶⁹

In 3:1, the author of Hebrews refers to his congregation as "μέτοχοι in a heavenly calling". It is possible to understand the 'calling' as either a call from heaven or a call to heaven.⁶⁷⁰ The immediate context might suggest that the writer was drawing attention to the call of God (see the reference to 'hearing the voice of God', 3:7). However, the wider context (entering God's rest, 3:11, 15-19 and chapter 4) might indicate a call to heaven. Most probably, both aspects are present in the phrase. Consequently, the 'heavenly calling' is best seen as a call *from* God *to enter* his Sabbath-rest. By referring to the readers as μέτοχοι, the author is focusing on the believers' relationship with himself and with each other.⁶⁷¹ However, the familial relationship of 'sharing in a heavenly calling' is only made possible because the Son himself partook of the same 'blood and flesh' that humans share (2:14).⁶⁷²

The third occurrence of μέτοχος is at 3:14 where, using inclusive language and again associating himself with the readers, our author writes: "μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν". There are three translational issues in this phrase. First, how is μέτοχοι to be understood? It is a noun⁶⁷³ but can be classified as an adjective⁶⁷⁴ while Lane

⁶⁶⁷ Anderson, A.A. *Psalms Vol. 1*, (London: Oliphants, 1972), 351; *Contra* Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 124.

⁶⁶⁸ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 21. See further, §5.4.

⁶⁶⁹ See Koester, *Hebrews*, 195; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 75. Cf. the discussion, below, on 3:14.

⁶⁷⁰ See the discussion in Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 51-52.

⁶⁷¹ Isaacs [*Reading Hebrews*, 50] writes: "This is the language of kinship".

⁶⁷² Koester [*Hebrews*, 195] writes that the Son shared (μετέχω) the human condition (2:14) so that "humans might become companions (*metochoi*) in his glorious condition (1:9; cf. 12:22)". Cf. §§5.3.2.2; 5.4.

⁶⁷³ It is specifically identified as a noun by Allen, *Hebrews*, 265; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 149; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 149; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 77. It is translated as a noun by DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 150-51; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 87-88; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 90; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 78; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 128.

⁶⁷⁴ *BDAG*, 643 is ambivalent, classing μέτοχοι here as an adjective but notes that perhaps it should be classed as a substantive.

translates it as a participle in 3:1⁶⁷⁵ and a noun in 3:14. Suggested translations include, ‘sharers’,⁶⁷⁶ ‘partakers’,⁶⁷⁷ ‘participants’,⁶⁷⁸ and ‘partners’.⁶⁷⁹ Ellingworth comments that there is little difference in meaning between these options.⁶⁸⁰ The choice depends, in part, on how the rest of the phrase is taken. The second issue concerns how the genitival expression τοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be understood. It is variously translated ‘in’, ‘with’ or ‘of’ Christ. The first option echoes the Pauline phrase ‘in Christ’ (e.g. Rom. 12:5; 2 Cor. 5:17) and the focus is partnership within the Christian community; believers “share with one another in Christ”.⁶⁸¹ The second possibility is reminiscent of the description of believers as “joint heirs with Christ” (Rom. 8:17). The focus here is sharing or participating with Christ in his inheritance, in the heavenly kingdom.⁶⁸² The third option, ‘partners of Christ’, is a literal translation of the genitival phrase. Its focus is on Christ and his relationship with the individual believer.⁶⁸³

The three options outlined above are not mutually exclusive and each has something to contribute to the understanding of the phrase μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν. This is underlined by the perfect, γεγόναμεν, ‘we have become’. The perfect creates a progressive *Aktionsart*,⁶⁸⁴ describing how things are now because of a past action.⁶⁸⁵

⁶⁷⁵ Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 70; however, he offers no explanation and later translates the phrase as ‘sharers in a heavenly calling’, *ibid*, 74.

⁶⁷⁶ ESV; NIV; RSV. Also, Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 97; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 128. However, O’Brien also refers to those who ‘share in Christ’ as ‘Christ’s partners’ (*ibid*, 151) and ‘partners of Christ’ (*ibid*, 222).

⁶⁷⁷ Tyndale’s NT [1526]; NKJ; AV; ASV; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 68 n.68; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 158; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 162.

⁶⁷⁸ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 106; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 67; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 175.

⁶⁷⁹ NRSV; Bateman, “Introduction”, *Four Views*, 48-49; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 67; Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 67; Isaacs, *Reading Hebrews*, 50; Koester, *Hebrews*, 259-60; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 87-88; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 90; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 78; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 77; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 175 n.297.

⁶⁸⁰ So, Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 226.

⁶⁸¹ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 117; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 187; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 227; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 118; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 93; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 149; NIV.

⁶⁸² So, Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 107. Cf. Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 67; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 87-88; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 78; NRSV.

⁶⁸³ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 68; Buchanan, *Hebrews*, 66; DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 150-51.

⁶⁸⁴ Campbell, C.R. *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 110.

⁶⁸⁵ Zerwick, M. *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*, (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963), 96. Wallace [*Grammar*, 573] categorizes 3:14 as indicating the present result of a past action; Porter [S.E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*, (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), 269] writes: “The author draws a timeless conclusion”; so too, Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 66; Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 227] offers: “we have become, and are now partners with Christ”. Cf. Moule, *Idiom-Book*, 13-16; Carson, *Fallacies*, 88.

The language points back to an ‘enlightenment’ moment which continues as a present reality in the life of the believer. Thus, being ‘partners with Christ’ implies having ‘partaken of Christ’ or ‘shared in Christ’ at some point in the past and this continues in the present and into the future.⁶⁸⁶ To be a ‘joint heir with Christ’, one must also be ‘in Christ’. In the same way, to participate in Christ is also to participate with Christ as part of his ‘unshakable kingdom’ (12:28).⁶⁸⁷ Discussing Christ’s priesthood and the “close identification of the priest and his followers” Vos writes: “so close is the connection between the priest and the believers that a contact with God on his part at once involves also a contact with God for them”.⁶⁸⁸

The partnership with Christ that believers enjoy is intimate, tangible and complete. In fact, it must be recognised that the focus of μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ is Christ himself. It is not simply that ‘we have become’ companions with one another in the things of Christ.⁶⁸⁹ Any ‘companionship’ enjoyed is because ‘we’ have become – and are – partners of Christ. However, the clear and overriding message of Hebrews, and the whole NT, is that this “is no partnership of equals... the benefits are all provided by Christ”.⁶⁹⁰ It is Christ who ‘took the initiative’ in joining himself to the believer. He has partnered the Christian and, consequently, individual followers of the Son become partners with each other ‘in Christ’. It is only because each one is partnered by Christ that Christians can partner each other.

The final occurrence of μέτοχος in Hebrews is in 12:8; to share in the Father’s παιδεία is a mark of true ‘sonship’. παιδεία is instruction designed to promote responsible living and enable the recipient to make appropriate choices. It is corrective education that, in

⁶⁸⁶ This is how many commentators understand the perfect tense here. See previous footnote, cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 265; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 117 n65; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 188; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 84; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 149 n.49; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 118; Koester, *Hebrews*, 259; Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 82p, 87-88; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 90; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 78; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 150; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 128.

⁶⁸⁷ Johnson [*Hebrews*, 118], writes: “the readers shared participation in the Messianic reality” while Nardoni [E. “Partakers in Christ (Hebrews 3:14)”, *NTS*, 37 (1991), 457] observes: “μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ includes both partnership and participation”. Allen [*Hebrews*, 265-66] suggests that a combination of ‘partners with’ and ‘participation in’ Christ “gets nearest the mark”. However, it is still difficult to imagine what ‘participating’ in a person would ‘look like’. See §8.3.3.

⁶⁸⁸ Vos, G. *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Nutley: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1975), 95.

⁶⁸⁹ *Contra* Johnson, *Hebrews*, 118.

⁶⁹⁰ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 188.

the literature of the NT, is often accomplished by discipline.⁶⁹¹ Receipt of divine instruction and/or discipline is proof of status. In a human family, instruction and discipline are essential in the relationship between a father and his children. Neither the slave nor the illegitimate child experiences the same ‘guidance’ as the ‘true’ child; nor do they experience the same privileges. All ‘true’ children have become⁶⁹² partakers of, and still enjoy, the Fatherly instruction and discipline that will lead to them sharing in God’s holiness. The One Son “learned obedience through what he suffered” (5:8; cf. 2:10) and just as he became like his siblings in every respect (2:17) so too his siblings learned that the Father’s παιδεία authenticates them as children of God and therefore as brothers and sisters of Christ (12:3-13).

The only other NT occurrence of μέτοχος is in Luke 5:7 where it describes the business partners of Simon Peter. Luke refers to James and John, the sons of Zebedee, as Peter’s μετόχοις (5:7) and his κοινωνοὶ (Luke 5:10). Whether μέτοχοι can be called “the technical term for partners” and κοινωνοὶ classified as “more generic ‘companions’”⁶⁹³ is debatable.⁶⁹⁴ What is clear is that the crew of both boats worked together because of a prearranged agreement. Peter signalled (κατανεύω), perhaps by a simple ‘nod of the head’,⁶⁹⁵ and the other boat came and shared the work. Whether the crews be called κοινωνοὶ or μέτοχοι they were ‘business partners’ with each other. Luke begins a major section of his narrative (5:1-6:16) by recounting the calling of the first disciples (5:1-11) and ends the section with Jesus choosing the twelve and designating them ‘apostles’ (6:12-16). Thus, Luke ‘bookends’ this section by showing his interest in “Jesus’ apostolic partners”.⁶⁹⁶ The section begins with the fishermen described as μέτοχοι (partners) with one another and ends with them being called ἀποστόλους (“fully accredited representative(s)”⁶⁹⁷) of Jesus.

⁶⁹¹ BDAG, 748-49.

⁶⁹² γεγόνασιν. See also the comments on γεγόναμεν in the discussion of 3:14 above.

⁶⁹³ So, Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 567; Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 222-23.

⁶⁹⁴ See Reiling, J. and Swellengrebel, J.L. *UBS Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*, (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 230.

⁶⁹⁵ See BDAG, 522.

⁶⁹⁶ So, Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 224.

⁶⁹⁷ See the discussion in Marshall, I.H. *The Gospel of Luke*, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 238-39.

5.3.2.2 μετέχω in Hebrews and 1 Corinthians

The verb, μετέχω, occurs three times in Hebrews (2:14; 5:13; 7:13). In the first of these passages, the verbs κοινωνέω and μετέχω are used as synonyms. Humanity (τὰ παιδιά) share blood and flesh (κεκοινωνήκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός) and in the same manner (παραπλησίως) Christ shares the same (μετέσχευεν τῶν αὐτῶν). Elsewhere in Scripture, this ‘flesh and blood-ness’ defines being human,⁶⁹⁸ emphasises the frailty and impermanence of the human condition (Sir. 14:18) and can describe close kinship.⁶⁹⁹ The couplet is also used in contrast to divinity (Matt. 16:17), spiritual beings (Eph. 6:12) and heavenly realities (1 Cor. 15:50). Its use here, in 2:14, emphasises the reality of the incarnation.⁷⁰⁰ μετέχω indicates “a full participation in a shared reality”⁷⁰¹ and the “radical solidarity that Jesus enters into with humanity”.⁷⁰² Indeed, “the choice of this word points to the voluntary assumption of humanity by the Lord... He was of His own will so born”.⁷⁰³

Using a metaphor designed to rouse his audience from their spiritual immaturity, the author writes that, although they should be teaching others by now, they “need milk, not solid food” (5:12). He continues by stating that “everyone who lives on milk (ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος), (is) still an infant” (5:13). The overall unit (5:11-6:12) is bounded by the *inclusio* νωθρός,⁷⁰⁴ and warns against being or becoming ‘spiritually lazy’. The writer of Hebrews complains that this congregation have been Christians long enough to be teaching others. Consequently, he urges them to move on from the milk of which the immature ‘partake’ (5:13) and to take the solid food (5:12) of the spiritually mature (5:14). This warning passage does, to some degree, echo 1 Corinthians 3:1-16. Although much of the vocabulary is different, the message is the same (see Table 5.2).

⁶⁹⁸ 1 Chron. 11:1; 2 Chron. 6:9; John 1:13; Gal. 1:16.

⁶⁹⁹ Gen. 29:14; 37:27; Judg. 9:2; 2 Sam. 5:1.

⁷⁰⁰ So, Chrysostom, “Homilies on Hebrews; Homily IV”, *NPNF¹*, 385.

⁷⁰¹ Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*; 60. McCrudden [K.B. *A Body You Have Prepared for Me*, (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2013), 114] states that Jesus “participate(s) completely in their flesh and blood existence”.

⁷⁰² *Ibid*, 51. Cf. Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 103; Hagner, *Hebrews*, 52.

⁷⁰³ Westcott, *Hebrews*, 182. So too, Allen, *Hebrews*, 422; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 318-19; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 375; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 254 n.14.

⁷⁰⁴ Found only twice in the NT, Heb. 5:11; 6:12.

Table 5.2 Spiritual Immaturity described by Hebrews and Paul

Descriptor	Heb. 5:12-14	1 Cor. 3:1-2
solid food	ἡ στερεὰ τροφή	βρῶμα
mature / spiritual	τελείων	πνευματικοῖς
immature	νήπιος	νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ
partake / give	μετέχων	ἐπότισα
milk	γάλακτος	γάλα

Philo similarly links a growth in spiritual/intellectual maturity with a move from a diet of milk to one of solid food.⁷⁰⁵

Although νήπιος can refer to any prepubescent child (including a foetus),⁷⁰⁶ the context (5:11-14) indicates an infant not yet weaned is in mind.⁷⁰⁷ μετέχω does not refer to partaking of an occasional glass of milk alongside other food. It is used in contradistinction to having solid food and therefore carries the force of ‘living on a diet of’ milk.⁷⁰⁸ Thus, in 5:13, μετέχω bespeaks a total and exclusive dependence.

The third and final occurrence of μετέχω in Hebrews is in 7:13 where the author states that the coming priest, promised in Psalm 110:4, will be part of a different, non-priestly, tribe. Three statements are made about this priest: he will be part of (μετέσχηκεν) a different tribe; that tribe will never have officiated (προσέσχηκεν) at the altar; he will come from (ἀνατέταλκεν) Judah. μετέσχηκεν (perfect active) is emphatic and describes both “the voluntary nature of Christ’s humanity (and) its permanence”.⁷⁰⁹

The only other NT occurrences of μετέχω are in 1 Corinthians 9:10-12 and 10:16-30. In the first of these it is used twice, both times in relation to workers ‘sharing’ a material benefit from their toil; ‘the labourer is worthy of his hire’. Paul writes that both the ploughman and the thresher work together with a view to sharing in the harvest. Since

⁷⁰⁵ *Omn. Prob. Lit.* 160; *Agric.* 9; *Congr.* 19. Cf. *Somn.* 2:10; *Migr. Abr.* 29.

⁷⁰⁶ So, *BDAG*, 671.

⁷⁰⁷ Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 105. Attridge [*Hebrews*, 160] uses the phrase “suckling babe”.

⁷⁰⁸ See Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 131g, 145; Allen, *Hebrews*, 336-37; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 191.

⁷⁰⁹ So, Allen, *Hebrews*, 422. Cf. Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 375; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 120; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 259 n.14; Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 199; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 182.

Paul ‘sows’ spiritual seed amongst the Corinthians, he can expect material support from that toil. He concludes: “If others share this rightful claim on you, do not we still more?” (1 Cor. 9:12). The ploughman and the thresher work in harmony for their mutual benefit. Indeed, the reaper would have nothing to do if it were not for the actions of the sower and the sower would have no benefit from his toil if the reaper failed to act. Their relationship as *μέτοχοι* ensures a good return on their individual investments. Similarly, Paul argues, if the Gospel is to advance in Corinth, the Corinthians have a responsibility to stand alongside Paul as *μέτοχοι* in the task that lies before them. There is a mutual reciprocity to be recognized and embraced.

The second passage is a discussion of eating either at the Lord’s table or the table of demons. Here, *μετέχω* (thrice, 10:17, 21, 30), *κοινωνία* (twice, 10:16a, 16b) and *κοινωνός* (twice, 10:18, 20) are used with no discernible difference of meaning. Breaking and ‘sharing’ bread in the eucharist demonstrates “*a partnership of the body of Christ*”.⁷¹⁰ However, sharing in the offerings to demons is “entering into an unholy partnership with them, (this) partnership Christians must renounce and be partners only of God in Christ”.⁷¹¹ The believers, by sharing bread and wine, demonstrate their union with Christ and thereby their fellowship with one another. “The one bread of which we partake makes us one... united in union with Christ.”⁷¹²

5.3.2.3 μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου

This clause is replete with exegetical possibilities and/or difficulties. One issue is how to understand the aorist passive participle, *γενηθέντας*. This is not the place to address, let alone resolve, the vexed question of deponency.⁷¹³ However, there are good reasons to take *γενηθέντας* as a genuine passive. *γίνομαι* occurs 29 times in Hebrews, five of

⁷¹⁰ Orr, W.F. and Walther, J.A. *1 Corinthians*, (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 251.

⁷¹¹ *Ibid*, 253.

⁷¹² So, Fitzmyer, J.A. *First Corinthians*, (New Haven: YUP, 2008), 391.

⁷¹³ See the remarks in Porter, S.E. Reed, J.T. and O'Donnell, M.B. *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 125; also, Campbell, C.R. *Advances in the Study of Greek*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 91-104.

which are aorist passives⁷¹⁴ and 11 are aorist middles.⁷¹⁵ The simple fact that the author of Hebrews employs both middle and passive forms of the lexeme γίνομαι must suggest that, for him, there was some semantic significance behind the choice of which to employ.⁷¹⁶ Whilst it has been commented that there is a degree of confusion in both the LXX and NT between the active and middle voices, no such confusion exists between the active and passive.⁷¹⁷ Indeed, the context of 6:4-5 requires γενηθέντας to be translated as a passive. The aorist participial phrases use different voices according to the statements being made: φωτισθέντας is passive, ‘the ones who were enlightened’, the focus being on both the giver and the gift of enlightenment not the individual’s attainment of the same; γευσάμενους, ‘having tasted’, is middle voice: “the subject not only performs the action but the action is performed in the subject’s interest or with the subject’s involvement”;⁷¹⁸ παραπεσόντας is active, the ‘apostates fall away’. These aorist participles all reflect the grammatical ‘voice’ with which they ‘speak’. γενηθέντας is no exception. The focus is on the Holy Spirit who identifies every individual believer as his ‘μέτοχος’. Thus, in 6:4, the descriptor is ‘**being made** μετόχους of the Holy Spirit’.⁷¹⁹

Before discussing what μέτοχος might mean here, it is necessary to seek an understanding of the phrase ‘πνεύματος ἁγίου’. Some commentators suggest that it is just the charismatic gifts that are in view here;⁷²⁰ others suggest that the author is referring to receiving the Holy Spirit⁷²¹ and yet others, the reception of the Spirit with his attendant gifts.⁷²² Just as in 6:1-2 the author describes one foundation not six, so too in 6:4-5 he is describing one category of person, the apostate. The four participial

⁷¹⁴ 4:3; 5:5; 6:4; 10:33; 11:34.

⁷¹⁵ Hebrews also uses γίνομαι in the present mid/pass 4x and the perfect active 9x.

⁷¹⁶ Campbell, *Advances*, 101.

⁷¹⁷ See Caragounis, C.C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 152-53, 331.

⁷¹⁸ Hewett, J.A. *New Testament Greek*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011), 110.

⁷¹⁹ Wycliffe translates γενηθέντας as passive, “are made”; Farrar [F.W. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, (Cambridge, CUP, 1893), 82] as, “and being made”. Contra Kistemaker [*Hebrews*, 163] who states: γενηθέντας “is deponent and is therefore translated in the active voice”.

⁷²⁰ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 141-43; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 107; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 210.

⁷²¹ Allen, *Hebrews*, 349; DeSilva, *Perseverance*, 224; Dunn, *Baptism*, 208-10; Hagner, *Hebrews*, 91; Jewett, *Pilgrims*, 102; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 124; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 222.

⁷²² Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 159; Koester, *Hebrews*, 321; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 111; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 141-42.

phrases: ‘being enlightened’, ‘tasting the heavenly gift’, ‘sharing in the Holy Spirit’ and ‘tasting the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the coming age’, although logically distinct from each other, nonetheless describe members of the NC. Indeed, these phrases (and 2:3-4), whilst not having a one-to-one correspondence with 6:1-2, do describe the fundamental and definitive NC life (See Table 5:3).

Table 5:3 Christian foundations or basics

2:3-4	6:4-5	6:1-2
salvation, announced by the Lord,	have once been enlightened	the foundation of repentance ...and of faith
God also testified to it	tasted the heavenly gift,	...
μερισμοῖς of the Holy Spirit	μετόχους of the Holy Spirit	the laying on of hands,
signs, wonders and various miracles.	the goodness of God’s word / powers of the age to come.	the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment.

Clearly, as Table 5:3 shows, there is no absolute parallelism between the three descriptions of salvation or NC life but there is a significant degree of similarity. Each one is a different way to describe the beginning or basics of Christian experience. Consequently, it is difficult to see how μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου could be “a less than fully personal activity of the Holy Spirit”.⁷²³ Indeed, it is hard to understand what “less than fully personal” might mean in the context of the Divine breaking into human experience with ‘enlightenment’ (6:4) or with ‘so great a salvation’ (2:3). As O’Brien puts it: “the description in vv. 4-5 implies that God is the author of a range of wonderful blessings”.⁷²⁴ Being made a μέτοχος of the Holy Spirit implies that he takes the initiative and enables believers to receive him into their lives.⁷²⁵

⁷²³ So, Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 321.

⁷²⁴ O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 220.

⁷²⁵ *Ibid*, 222; cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 349; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 269-70.

The use of μέτοχος elsewhere in Hebrews carries with it the idea of an intimate and personal connection between those who are μέτοχοι.⁷²⁶ As has been seen, believers are described as μέτοχοι of the Son (1:9; 3:14) and of one another (3:1). They also share in the Father's παιδεία (12:8) which authenticates familial relationship. μέτοχοι of the Holy Spirit enjoy a fully inter-personal relationship with him which "bespeaks a genuine experience of God's presence".⁷²⁷ It is not inappropriate to render μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου as 'being made partners of the Holy Spirit' or as 'being partnered by the Holy Spirit'. Indeed, Wycliffe translates the phrase as "and are made partners of the Holy Ghost", while Jewett writes: "To **share** is to become a partner... with **Holy Spirit**... a relationship they share as active partners".⁷²⁸

It has been seen that the author of Hebrews is careful in his choice of language (§1.5) and that he is indebted to the OT as his primary ideological background (§2.3). Just as God's gift of his Spirit established and/or renewed his old covenant people (§3.1), so too the relationship he establishes with Christ's followers as 'μέτοχοι of the Holy Spirit' "serves as the permanent witness and seal" of his New Covenant.⁷²⁹ This is similar to Paul's concept of being 'sealed with the Spirit' (Eph. 1:13) but our author expresses the truth in more personal language and thereby chooses to describe the relationship as one of familial intimacy. Believers are 'true children of the Father' (12:8), 'brothers and sisters of the Son' (2:11-12) and consequently 'brothers and sisters to each other'. The presence of the Holy Spirit in/on the members of the New Covenant community is the authentication of 'family life' in God's household (3:5-6).

⁷²⁶ This idea is also at the heart of the use of μετέχω and μέτοχος throughout the NT.

⁷²⁷ Emmrich, "Again!", 85. Allen [*Hebrews*, 349] writes that it "denotes a close association with the Holy Spirit". Koester [*Hebrews*, 314] writes of: "receiving God's Spirit into oneself. Cf. "partaking" of milk (*metechein*, 5:13)."

⁷²⁸ Jewett, *Pilgrims*, 102, (*emphasis original*). HCSB translates 3:14 as "companions of the Messiah" and 6:4 as "companions with the Holy Spirit".

⁷²⁹ Block, *Beyond the River*, 157.

5.4 Conclusions

Hebrews 2:4 and 6:4 make it clear that the presence of the Holy Spirit with believers authenticates them as New Covenant people.⁷³⁰ This would have been readily understood within the Jewish culture of the day. Indeed, the Spirit's presence with Israel was regarded as authenticating them as God's covenant community, "different from all other people" (*Tg. Ps-J. Exod. 33:16*). The understanding was that the Torah had been offered to other nations of the world who rejected it (4 Ezra 7:23) and was now a divine gift to Israel (4 Ezra 3:19; 9:31). In giving them the Law God established his covenant with Israel. It was held that, prior to Israel accepting the Torah, the Holy Spirit was active throughout the world but "after the Torah was given to Israel, the Divine Spirit stopped from among the Gentiles" (*Seder Olam*, 15). However, the Holy Spirit was never a universal presence in Israel, even though Moses expressed the desire that all God's people might experience him (Num. 11:29). The Holy Spirit marked out the ancient people of God by anointing Moses and working through anointed leadership.

In the Second Temple period, there was a perceived dearth of pneumatic experience (see §3.4). Nonetheless, at the same time, there was a longing for and an expectation of a new 'day of the Spirit' dawning for God's people.⁷³¹ Consequently, when Hebrews asserts that the Holy Spirit was distributed to every member of the Christian community (2:4) as on the day of Pentecost and that they are now partnered by the Holy Spirit throughout life (6:4), it is saying something profound. The stress on the universality of the Spirit was revolutionary. This was the fulfilment of Joel's prophetic word; the new day had dawned.⁷³² The New Covenant was established by the life, death and resurrection of the Son of God (9:14-15; 13:20); membership of the NC community was confirmed as the Holy Spirit was distributed to each individual Christian (2:4). The fact that every member of the community "experienced the gift of the Spirit implied that the

⁷³⁰ Allen ["Forgotten Spirit", 58] correctly acknowledges that "by gift and presence" the Spirit "is the one who marks out and testifies to the new age".

⁷³¹ E.g. see Ezek. 36:26-28; 37:14; 39:29; Joel 2:28-29 [3:1-2].

⁷³² The new day was heralded by the teaching and praxis of John the Baptist, actualized in the Christ-event and authenticated in the Pentecost experiences, including the so-called Gentile Pentecost of Acts 10.

Spirit functioned as a principle of democratization”.⁷³³ This is not a transient experience; 6:4 makes the bold declaration that the Holy Spirit authenticates the NC people by forming a ‘partnership-for-life’ with every individual in that community. The Spirit “join(s) them in their journeys through life”.⁷³⁴

It is significant that the author of Hebrews uses the word μέτοχος to describe believers’ relationships not only with himself and one another (3:1) but also with Christ (1:9; 3:14) and with the Holy Spirit (6:4). Similarly, by sharing in the Father’s παιδεία they are authenticated as his true children. Therefore, to be μέτοχοι of the Father’s παιδεία, of Christ and of the Holy Spirit is not to experience three distinct relationships. Each presupposes the others and fully describes NC life.

In the NT, being a μέτοχος implies a relationship between persons. There is a recognition by each party of the worth or value of the other. This relationship is properly described in terms of partnership. Luke 5:17 and Hebrews 3:1 describe partnerships of equals whereas the believer’s partnership with Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Father is clearly that of a junior to a senior partner. However, some commentators find the concept of being companions or partners of Christ and/or the Holy Spirit difficult.⁷³⁵

Johnson, commenting on the translation ‘partners of Christ’ at 3:14, writes that “the egalitarian tone of “partner” in English makes it less suitable to the point being made by Hebrews”. He goes on to say: “they are not partners of Christ but, rather, have become sharers in him”.⁷³⁶ However, Johnson has lost sight of the ‘bigger picture’. Christ became one with humanity so that believers would become one with him. There is a significant interplay in the way Hebrews describes Christ and the Christians. There is an emphasis on ‘Sonship-Christology’ in the letter. Beginning with the declaration that the Son is God’s full and final word (1:2), over and again Christ is referred to simply as ‘the

⁷³³ So, Koester, H. “Writing and the Spirit: Authority and Politics in Ancient Christianity”, *HTR*, 84 (1991), 354.

⁷³⁴ Warrington, K. “The Synoptic Gospels”, Burke, T.J. and Warrington, K. (Eds), *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*, (London: SPCK, 2014), 103.

⁷³⁵ Johnson, *Hebrews*, 118 and Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 184-85, are two such and this thesis will now address their reservations.

⁷³⁶ Johnson, *Hebrews*, 118.

Son'; however, the believers are also called 'sons'.⁷³⁷ The Son is called 'the heir of all things' (1:2) while the believers will both share his inheritance and inherit salvation (1:14; 6:12; 9:15; 11:7). Christ is the radiance of God's *glory* (1:3), crowned with *glory* and honour (2:9) and the believers will receive *glory* (2:10; 7:22).⁷³⁸ Where Christ went (heaven), his disciples will follow (6:19-20; cf. 13:12). Just as all humans share in (κεκοινώνηκεν) flesh and blood, so the Son likewise shared (μετέσχευεν) the same (2:14). To effect true redemption he became, in every respect (κατὰ πάντα), like his brothers (2:17-18). The incarnational theology is further emphasised at 10:5 where the author records that Christ said to his Father: "a body you prepared for me". Furthermore, Christ is the one who sanctifies (2:11) and believers are the ones he sanctifies (10:10, 14). Indeed, Hebrews states that the Son will bring many sons to glory (2:10; cf. 9:28; 10:19-22; 12:28) and that Christ refers to his followers as "the children whom God has given me" (2:13) and he is not ashamed to call them "brothers" (2:11-12). 'Being partnered by Christ' or 'partners of Christ' is not an over-statement of how his followers find themselves, it is a simple statement of fact.⁷³⁹ Indeed, precisely because of its egalitarian nature, partnership is the right word to describe the relationship that Christ invites his followers to enjoy.

Turning to 6:4, Schreiner finds that the notion of being "companions or partners or friends" with the Holy Spirit "makes little sense".⁷⁴⁰ However, this simply betrays a misunderstanding of the nature of the Holy Spirit. If "the author [of Hebrews] puts the Holy Spirit on par with God"⁷⁴¹ and Hebrews has "trinitarian reference(s)",⁷⁴² then what can be predicated of God (or Christ) can be predicated of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁴³ If 'being partnered by Christ' makes sense, then so does 'being made partners of/with the Holy Spirit'. If 'Father' is an appropriate descriptor of God, and this speaks of a familial

⁷³⁷ Of the 24 occurrences of υἱός in Hebrews, half refer to Christ and a quarter to his followers.

⁷³⁸ See Hagner, *Hebrews*, 65.

⁷³⁹ Wilson [*Hebrews*, 77] writes: "We have become Christ's partners. This then is another mark of the status into which the readers have entered".

⁷⁴⁰ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 185 n.287.

⁷⁴¹ *Ibid*, 480.

⁷⁴² *Ibid*, 479.

⁷⁴³ The formulation of the *communicato idiomatum* is obviously later than Hebrews. Nonetheless, it is reflected in how our author speaks of the members of the Trinity. The 'appropriateness' of using Trinitarian language in relation to Hebrews will be addressed in §8.2.1.

relationship, it is also appropriate to use similar familial language of the believer's relationship with both the Son and the Holy Spirit. Indeed, it is difficult to understand how 'becoming sharers in' can adequately describe a personal, reciprocal relationship with someone.

Since "partners" place themselves and their possessions at the service of each other, Christ's "partners have the hope of sharing in the honour and dignity that he has obtained".⁷⁴⁴ Members of the New Covenant people are Christ's 'brothers' (2:11) and consequently 'partnership' is the correct word to use of that relationship. Our author's hearers are partners (with him and each other) in a heavenly calling (3:1) because they are all individually partnered by Christ (3:14), partnered by the Holy Spirit (6:4) and share in the Father's παιδεία. In Hebrews, 'μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου' (6:4) is not just receiving 'power to witness' (Acts 1:8) but is the enjoyment of a 'partnership-for-life' with the Holy Spirit.

⁷⁴⁴ Koester, *Hebrews*, 266.

6 The Eternal Spirit, πνεύματος αἰωνίου, Hebrews 9:14

6.1 Introduction

Bieder states that 9:14 demonstrates “den Zusammenhang zwischen Christologie und Soteriologie”.⁷⁴⁵ Ellingworth concurs, suggesting that 9:11-14 is at “the heart” of this link.⁷⁴⁶ However, it will be shown below that these verses demonstrate a fundamental connection between soteriology and pneumatology without which any understanding of the link between Christology and soteriology would be impoverished.⁷⁴⁷

For this study, the primary issue in 9:11-14 is the identity and function of the ‘eternal Spirit’. Given the unique nature of the phrase πνεύματος αἰωνίου, it is important to examine both the immediate and wider contexts in which it is found. This will necessitate locating 9:11-14 within the letter before briefly discussing the pericope’s use of four key terms relating to OC sacrifice.⁷⁴⁸ It is important then to ask how the adjective αἰώνιος is used elsewhere, particularly elsewhere in Hebrews, after which the suggestions that πνεύματος αἰωνίου refers to Jesus’ human spirit⁷⁴⁹ or “Christ as the divine and therefore eternal Son of God”⁷⁵⁰ will be addressed.⁷⁵¹ Finally, it will be shown that πνεύματος αἰωνίου is indeed the Holy Spirit and that Hebrews alone in the NT both calls him ‘eternal’ and makes an explicit link between the Spirit and the atonement.

⁷⁴⁵ Bieder, “Pneumatologische Aspekte”, 251.

⁷⁴⁶ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 445.

⁷⁴⁷ See further, §6.4.4.

⁷⁴⁸ I.e. ‘blood’, ‘goats and calves’, ‘goats and bulls’ and ‘spotless’. The reasons for this analysis will become apparent.

⁷⁴⁹ E.g. Bonsirven, J. *St Paul, Epître aux Hébreux*, (Paris: Beauchesne, 1943), 390-91; Jeremias, J. “Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern”, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 42 (1949), 194-201; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 251; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 238; McCruden, *A Body*, 121-23.

⁷⁵⁰ So, Hughes, *Hebrews*, 358-59. Cf. Davidson, A.B. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, n.d. [1882]), 178; Gouge, W. *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: Joshua Kirton, 1655), 356-57; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 148; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 124; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 154-55; Narborough, F.D.V. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), 117; Spicq, *Hébreux*, 2:258-59; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 261-62.

⁷⁵¹ See the very helpful review of the possibilities in O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 324-25. See also the historical overview in McGrath, J.J. “*Through the Eternal Spirit*”: *An Historical Study of the Exegesis of Hebrews 9:13-14*, (Rome: Pontifica Universitas Gregoriana, 1961), 1-89.

6.1.1 Locating 9:14 within the letter

The discourse unit 9:11-14 is situated at the theological centre of Hebrews. Vanhoye writes that 9:11 is “the central point... of the central section (8,1 – 9,28) of the central part (5,11 – 10,39)” of Hebrews.⁷⁵² However, Westfall has argued persuasively that 9:14 is “the most prominent verse in the unit”.⁷⁵³ Indeed, the complex sentence, 9:11-12, is taken up in the equally complex *a fortiori* argument, 9:13-14, which brings the whole sub-unit, 9:11-14, to its climax. Consequently, 9:11-14 is regarded as “the core of the writer’s argument”.⁷⁵⁴

It is debated whether 9:11-14 should be regarded as the conclusion to the larger unit 9:1-14 or the introduction to 9:11-28.⁷⁵⁵ On the one hand, if the *μὲν* in 9:1 corresponds to the *δὲ* at the beginning of 9:11, then it is better to regard 9:11-14 as the conclusion of the paragraph 9:1-14. Therefore, the entire paragraph contrasts the rituals of the ‘earthly sanctuary’ with the reality of Christ’s entry to the ‘true sanctuary’.⁷⁵⁶ On the other hand, word frequency points to 9:11-28 being the larger unit; for instance, *τράγος* occurs in Hebrews only at 9:12, 13, 19 and 10:4. Similarly, *αἷμα* is found in a sacrificial context 19 times and although it is first used in that context in 9:7, all other 18 uses occur after 9:11, ten of them in 9:11-28.⁷⁵⁷ Furthermore, if the larger discourse unit is 9:11-28, it is marked by the *inclusio* ‘Christ’ (9:11, 28) and the opening paragraph is marked by the same *inclusio* (9:11, 14), as is the concluding sub-unit (9:24, 28).⁷⁵⁸ However, given that

⁷⁵² Vanhoye, A. *Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1989), 36. However, other commentators subdivide Hebrews differently, e.g. O’Brien [*Hebrews*, 286] refers to 8:1-10:18 as ‘the heart of the christological exposition’ and writes that 9:11-14 is the “high point in this central section”, *ibid*, 317-18. Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 216; Allen, *Hebrews*, 439. It is likely that the quotation from Jer. 31:33-34 (10:16-17) closes the larger unit, forming an *inclusio* with the longer quotation of Jer. 31:31-34 in 8:8-12. Cf. O’Brien, P.T. “The New Covenant and its Perfect Mediator”, Griffiths, J. (Ed.), *The Perfect Saviour*, (Nottingham: IVP, 2012), 13-14.

⁷⁵³ Westfall, *Discourse Analysis*, 202-203. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 468-69.

⁷⁵⁴ Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 235. Cf. Grayston, K. “Salvation Proclaimed III. Hebrews 9:11-14”, *ExpTim*, 93 (1982), 165; Koester, *Hebrews*, 411-12; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 316-17.

⁷⁵⁵ See the data in Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 290, 310.

⁷⁵⁶ So, Johnson, *Hebrews*, 235. Westfall [*Discourse Analysis*, 196] writes: “the two parts of the comparison cohere through a cohesive tie of antonymy”.

⁷⁵⁷ DeSilva [*Perseverance*, 305] writes that *αἷμα* gives “thematic coherence” to the unit.

⁷⁵⁸ Vanhoye, *Structure*, 39. Cf. Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 448; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 216, 232-33; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 317-18.

our author is comfortable using rhetorical devices,⁷⁵⁹ it is quite possible that he was using what has been called “overlapping constituents” where a unit of text acts simultaneously as the summary or conclusion to one discourse unit and the introduction to the next unit.⁷⁶⁰ One such is 8:1 which both summarises 7:1-28 and introduces 8:2-6 which itself is developed in 9:1-14.⁷⁶¹ It is a matter of debate where these devices occur⁷⁶² but it is widely recognised that they are a feature of our author’s style. Rather than assign 9:11-14 to either 9:1-14 or 9:11-28, it is better to regard it as both concluding the argument of 9:1-10 and introducing 9:15-28 (or better still, 9:15-10:4 with 10:1-4 ‘overlapping’ with 10:1-18). However, Cockerill argues, not without merit, that the discourse unit should be 9:11-15 with 9:15 both concluding 9:11-14 and introducing 9:16-22.⁷⁶³ Indeed, Joslin argues persuasively that 9:15 is the climax of 9:11-14 and that 9:16-22 furnishes an explanation of 9:15.⁷⁶⁴ Whether 9:11-14 (or 11-15) belong with 9:1-10 or 9:16-28 it cannot be denied that these verses are crucial to the development of the author’s argument. Consequently, this paragraph would have been carefully constructed. Choosing his words with precision, the author draws together his arguments about the inadequacy of the first covenant (9:1-10) and prepares to show that Christ’s effectual self-offering for sin makes him the perfect mediator of the NC (9:15-10:4).

6.2 Sacrificial terminology in 9:11-14

Having declared that the promised NC renders the first one obsolete (8:13), the author now begins to develop the implications of this argument. He begins and ends (9:12, 13; 10:4) the next section by stating that it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to deal with sin. The juxtaposition of various words and motifs in 9:11-14 is designed

⁷⁵⁹ See §§1.5.3; 1.5.4.

⁷⁶⁰ See Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, xciii. Longenecker [B.W. *Rhetoric at the Boundaries*, (Waco: Baylor UP, 2005), 30-42] classifies similar rhetorical devices under the headings, “Anticipatory” or “Retrospective” “Transitions”, “*Transitio*” and “The Bridge Paragraph” – 9:11-14 fits these categories.

⁷⁶¹ Löhr, H. “Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews”, Gelardini (2005), 202.

⁷⁶² E.g. Lane [*Hebrews 1-8*, xciii] suggests that one such is 4:14-16, whereas Allen [*Hebrews*, 284-99] argues that 4:12-13 is the ‘overlap’.

⁷⁶³ Cockerill *Hebrews*, 387-88, 401-403. Cf. *idem*, “Structure and Interpretation in Hebrews 8:1-10:18: A Symphony in Three Movements”, *BBR*, 11 (2001), 187-89.

⁷⁶⁴ Joslin, B.C. *Hebrews, Christ, and the Law*, (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008), 233-35. Cf. §6.4.3.

specifically to ‘compare and contrast’ the OT blood-sacrifices and Day of Atonement with their fulfilment in Christ. The author’s deliberate choice of language also serves to demonstrate both the failure of the OC system and God’s rejection of it. It is necessary to examine aspects of the cultic language because the rejection by some commentators of the idea that ‘eternal Spirit’ is ‘Holy Spirit’ is based on their understanding of some of the sacrificial terminology in these four verses. In 9:12-13, the phrases αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων (blood of goats and calves) and τὸ αἷμα τράγων καὶ ταύρων (the blood of goats and bulls) are clearly meant to indicate OT cultic rituals. They stand in the ‘minor’ arm of the *a fortiori* argument and are contrasted with τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος (9:12) and τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (9:14) respectively. 9:11-14 is replete with covenantal and cultic language.⁷⁶⁵ This “sacrificial language... is metaphorical, and (is) a means towards a theological understanding of the death of Christ”.⁷⁶⁶ The author’s argument concludes that the effect of Christ’s blood cleansing the conscience enables his followers to “serve the living God”.⁷⁶⁷ Indeed, the cultic terminology heightens the ‘compare and contrast’ motif between the OC ‘service’ in an earthly sanctuary (8:5; 9:1) and the acceptable ministry (λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ) offered to God by the NC community (12:28; 9:14).⁷⁶⁸

6.2.1 Blood

Blood is obviously a material substance which flows through the arteries and veins of human and animal life carrying oxygen to tissue, limbs and organs. If through any trauma enough blood is lost, the organism dies. Consequently, ‘blood’, αἷμα, becomes a metaphor for life itself (Lev. 17:10-14; cf. Gen. 9:4-5). Since “the life is in the blood”,

⁷⁶⁵ High priest, perfect tabernacle, Holy Place, the blood of goats and calves, his own blood, redemption, the blood of goats and bulls, the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer, sanctifies, defiled, flesh is purified, the blood of Christ, offered, without blemish, purify, to serve.

⁷⁶⁶ Stegemann, E.W. & Stegemann, W. “Does the Cultic Language in Hebrews Represent Sacrificial Metaphors?”, Gelardini (2005), 15.

⁷⁶⁷ ‘To serve God’, λατρεύειν θεῷ, is a first covenant obligation, ἀγαπᾶν κύριον τὸν θεόν σου καὶ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, (Deut. 11:13) and a NC privilege.

⁷⁶⁸ Allen [*Hebrews*, 473-74] writes: “Jesus, the eternal high priest has fitted them (believers) to serve God as spiritual priests themselves”. Cf. Thompson, *Hebrews*, 187.

the sacrificial context in which the metaphor occurs in Hebrews indicates ‘life poured out’.⁷⁶⁹ When Hebrews refers to blood in the OC setting, not only is ‘αἷμα’ the material which is manipulated (sprinkled or applied) to cleanse that which it touches,⁷⁷⁰ it is also shorthand for the life of the ‘spotless’ sacrificial animal.⁷⁷¹

The OT sacrificial system alluded to in 9:11-14 required that the sacrificial animal was ‘blemish-free’ (ἄμωμος) and was slain at the door of the tent of meeting. Some of its blood was then taken inside and presented ‘before the curtain’ (Exod. 29:11-12; cf. Lev. 4:4-6, 14-17). This two-part ritual has led some to suggest that a similar two-stage process applies in the eternal redemption effected through the self-offering of Christ, with him carrying his blood into the heavenly sanctuary.⁷⁷² However, in 9:12 διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος does not mean ‘with his own blood’ but ‘through’, ‘due to’ or ‘because of’ his sacrificial death.⁷⁷³ διὰ with the genitive here is instrumental.⁷⁷⁴ Indeed, Hebrews uses the preposition διὰ some 57 times, 41 of which are in genitival constructions and almost invariably⁷⁷⁵ indicate ‘by means of’, ‘by’, ‘due to’ or similar.⁷⁷⁶ Hebrews never employs διὰ with the genitive in an associative sense.⁷⁷⁷ Harris’s observation is apposite:

⁷⁶⁹ Occurring 21x in Hebrews, αἷμα is used in an OC setting 12x [αἱματεκχυσίας (shedding of blood, 9:22) is used once in this context], in a non-cultic setting just twice (2:14; 12:4) and of the blood of Jesus and/or NC 7x.

⁷⁷⁰ See 9:13, 21, 22; 11:28.

⁷⁷¹ See 9:12, 25; 11:28; 13:11.

⁷⁷² Jeremias, “Zwischen”, 201; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 435; Marshall, I.H. “Soteriology in Hebrews”, *Christian Theology*, 266, 277; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 185; McKelvey, R.J. *Pioneer and Priest*, (Eugene: WS, 2013), 36-37; Moffitt, D.M. *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 296 and *passim*. However, see the critique of Moffitt in O’Brien, P.T. *God has Spoken in his Son*, (London: Apollos, 2016), 219-28. Thompson [*Beginnings*, 108] distinguishes between ‘the blood of Christ’ in 9:12 which he regards as offered in heaven and that in 9:14 which he sees as a metaphor for Christ’s self-giving on the cross. However, in his 2008 commentary, Thompson [*Hebrews*, 186] writes of 9:12: “‘Blood’ is not a substance that the exalted Christ brings into the sanctuary but a metaphor for Jesus’ sacrifice of himself”.

⁷⁷³ See the notes and extended excursus in Hughes, *Hebrews*, 328-54. Cf. Bruce, *Hebrews*, 201; Gordon, R.P. *Hebrews*, (Sheffield: SAP, 2000), 100; Joslin, *the Law*, 231; Lane, *Hebrews 1-9*, 240; Lindars, *Theology*, 94; O’Brien, *Spoken*, 100; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 271.

⁷⁷⁴ See Montanari, 479; *BDAG*, 223-26; Harris, *Prepositions*, 69-82. Cf. O’Brien, *Spoken*, 80 n.126.

⁷⁷⁵ It has spatial reference in 9:11; 10:20 and 11:29. See Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 450-51, 520-21.

⁷⁷⁶ On three occasions (2:15; 9:6; 13:15) it is in the phrase διὰ παντός, ‘through all’ i.e. ‘throughout’, ‘always’. In 3:16 διὰ Μωϋσέως means ‘due to Moses’ i.e. ‘under his leadership’ (see NRSV).

⁷⁷⁷ This observation would lack force if the preposition διὰ was rare in Hebrews; however, comprising just 3.60% of the NT text, Hebrews accounts for 8.55% of the NT occurrences of διὰ (2.4 times more frequent than the NT as a whole).

“when the usual meaning of a preposition yields a satisfactory sense that does not contravene a writer’s thought, that meaning should be preferred over an appeal to a possible exceptional usage”.⁷⁷⁸ Had the author wanted to suggest that Christ entered God’s presence *with* his own blood in order to present it to his Father, *μετά* or *σύν* would have been more appropriate.⁷⁷⁹ In fact, “Our author deliberately avoids” any suggestion “that Christ carried his own blood into the heavenly sanctuary”.⁷⁸⁰ There is nothing in Hebrews to suggest a ‘two-part’ act, Christ being crucified and then his blood presented in the true sanctuary.⁷⁸¹

Clearly, in Leviticus 16:11-14 the blood of the *μόσχος* was brought into the sanctuary and presented to God by sprinkling it on the ‘mercy seat’. However, in 9:13 the blood of *τράγων καὶ ταύρων* is not presented to God but cleanses the flesh of the worshippers (covers their ritual impurity) as it is sprinkled on them. Similarly, in 9:14 the blood of Christ is not offered to God but is that which cleanses the consciences of those who come to Christ. He offers *himself* to God as an unblemished sacrifice and thereby secures eternal redemption (9:12). When Hebrews uses the phrase ‘the blood of Christ’ (or similar)⁷⁸² it “refers not to the material substance but to our Lord’s *action* of offering himself to God as an unblemished sacrifice”,⁷⁸³ and that sacrificial offering took place ‘once for all’ on the cross.⁷⁸⁴

⁷⁷⁸ Harris, *Prepositions*, 82.

⁷⁷⁹ See Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 394 n.35. For *μετά* see Montanari, 1320; *BDAG*, 636-38; Harris, *Prepositions*, 161-70; for *σύν* see Montanari, 2016; *BDAG*, 961-62; Harris, *Prepositions*, 69-82.

⁷⁸⁰ O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 321. Cf. §6.2.1 n.772.

⁷⁸¹ So, Lindars, *Theology*, 94; Seifrid, “Death”, 274-75; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 271. *Contra* Jeremias, “Zwischen”, 201.

⁷⁸² 9:12, 14, 19, 29; 12:24; 13:12, 20.

⁷⁸³ O’Brien, *Spoken*, 80; *idem*, *Hebrews*, 323. Cf. Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 717; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 452; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 240; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 121-23. Kleinig [*Hebrews*, 435-37] is both unconvincing (and incorrect) in identifying the blood of Christ in Hebrews with the eucharistic drink.

⁷⁸⁴ Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 238; Allen, *Hebrews*, 471; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 201; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 393-94; Gordon, *Hebrews*, 100; Joslin, *the Law*, 232 n.33; Seifrid, “Death”, 275; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 269.

6.2.2 Goats and Calves

All four NT occurrences of *τράγος* are in Hebrews (9:12, 13, 19; 10:4) and it is found 34x in the Greek OT, 12 of which refer to sacrificial goats. *μόσχος* occurs six times in the NT, two of which are in Hebrews (9:13 and 10:4)⁷⁸⁵ and 228 times in the Greek OT, 164 of which are in the context of sacrifice or offerings to God. 21 of these specify that the *μόσχος* should be *ἄμωμος* and a further twice (Lev. 22:23; Deut. 17:1) that the *μόσχος* should be rejected if any physical defects are present.⁷⁸⁶

In 9:12 the phrase *αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων* is employed to describe what Christ does not use to gain access to God's presence. The more usual order, 'bulls and goats', is reversed perhaps because in the Day of Atonement ritual (designated a *νόμιμον αἰώνιον*, Lev. 16:34) the priest sacrificed the bull (*μόσχος*) first as his own sin offering (Lev. 16:6-14) before sacrificing the goat (Lev. 16:15-19) for the people's sin. Jesus had no need to offer a sacrifice for his own sin. The purpose of his offering of himself was for the sin of humanity. Consequently, by putting 'the blood of goats' first, our author focuses primary attention on the offering for humanity. Christ did not secure eternal redemption for his followers by the offering of the blood of goats but by the offering of himself (9:14). Furthermore, by using the plural *μόσχων* the author generalizes the sacrificial idea.⁷⁸⁷ Our author now changes his terminology not just to emphasise the superiority of Christ's self-offering but to show that the old cultic rituals had no standing (*στάσις*, 9:8) at all (see §6.2.3).

6.2.3 Goats and Bulls

Two of the four NT occurrences of *ταῦρος* are in Hebrews (9:13; 10:4).⁷⁸⁸ In 9:13 the traditional order is reversed, *τράγων καὶ ταύρων*.⁷⁸⁹ In 9:12, the bovine part of the

⁷⁸⁵ The others are Luke 15:23, 27, 30 (the fatted calf slain to celebrate the prodigal's return); Rev. 4:7.

⁷⁸⁶ For a discussion of *ἄμωμος* as applied to Christ, see §6.2.4.

⁷⁸⁷ Westcott, *Hebrews*, 258.

⁷⁸⁸ The other occurrences are Matt. 22:4; Acts 14:13.

⁷⁸⁹ For the same reason suggested for *τράγων καὶ μόσχων* in 9:12, see §6.2.2.

sacrifice is referred to by the term *μόσχος*; however, in 9:13 it is *ταῦρος*. This change is significant, not accidental nor incidental. The OT usage is revealing. *μόσχος* is a much more common word in the LXX.⁷⁹⁰ *ταῦρος* is found just 29 times in the Greek OT and only twice does it designate a sacrificial bull.⁷⁹¹ Furthermore, both these texts link *ταῦρος* and *τράγος* in the context of God rejecting (or not needing) sacrifice.

In Psalm 50:13 [49:13], God asks his covenant community: “Do I eat the flesh of *ταύρων* or drink the blood of *τράγων*?”. Although Psalm 50 [49] relates to God not needing to be ‘fed and watered’ through sacrifice,⁷⁹² nonetheless the juxtaposition of *ταῦρος* and *τράγος* in a rhetorical question implying God does not want sacrifices may explain why our author chose to use *ταῦρος* in 9:13 rather than *μόσχος* as he had in 9:12. It is very likely that the author knew, and used, Psalm 50. Indeed, the NT *hapax* *αἰνεσις* (praise) occurs in 13:15, as the author encourages his congregation to offer a sacrifice of praise to God (*θυσίαν αἰνέσεως... τῷ θεῷ*) using words almost identical to those found in Ps 50:14 [49:14], *θῦσον τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*.⁷⁹³

In Isaiah 1:11, God declares, “I do not delight... in the blood of *ταύρων καὶ τράγων*”.⁷⁹⁴ The Lord criticises the outward performance of cultic ritual that is not accompanied by moral and ethical behaviour (Isa. 1:10-17). The conclusion, perhaps in a ‘wordplay’ on blood, begins with the Lord saying to those who were bringing blood-sacrifices: “I will not listen to you for your hands are full of blood” (Isa. 1:15). He demands: “Remove your vices (*πονηρίας*) from yourselves... learn to do good... If your sins be like crimson I will whiten them like snow, if they be like scarlet I will whiten them like wool” (Isa. 1:16-18). The context is the call to replace (or unite) the external sacrificial ritual with a

⁷⁹⁰ Statistics for *μόσχος* (and *τράγων*) are given in §6.2.2.

⁷⁹¹ Ps. 50:13 [49:13] and Isa. 1:11.

⁷⁹² See the discussion in Ross, *Psalms*, 2:165-66; and Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 365-66.

⁷⁹³ Cf. Ps. 50:23 [49:23], *θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάσει με*, “Those who bring thanksgiving as their sacrifice honor me”. Note that the only other comparable OT text is Ps. 69:30-31 [68:30-31], “Thanksgiving (*αἰνέσει*)... will please the Lord more than an ox (*μόσχον*)”. However, there is no indication in Ps. 69 [68] of the Lord not wanting animal sacrifice.

⁷⁹⁴ The Hebrew has: “the blood of bulls, or of lambs, or of goats” but the LXX does not have ‘or of lambs’.

clean heart and pure life. “Yahweh... lectures (his people) about the inadequacy of sacrifice and prayer to deal with her problems.”⁷⁹⁵

It is not improbable that our author chose the less usual ταύρων καὶ τράγων precisely because of the LXX usage. If so, he was reinforcing the declaration that Jeremiah’s New Covenant had dawned (8:13). God’s law and requirements were to be written in the hearts of his people (10:16) and he would “remember their sins and lawless deeds no more” (10:17). Our author therefore concludes that “there is no longer any offering for sin” (10:18). Indeed, “No animal sacrifice can be offered that is acceptable to God, who has given his own Son as the Lamb.”⁷⁹⁶

6.2.4 Spotless

Christ offered himself ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ (9:14). He was ‘spotless’ or ‘without blemish’. Some commentators have linked the two adjectives αἰώνιος and ἄμωμος with πνεῦμα thereby taking 9:14 to refer to Christ’s eternal and blameless “internal disposition”.⁷⁹⁷ However, the ways in which the OT uses ἄμωμος must be explored before discussing its significance in 9:14.

It was a requirement under the OT law that the animals sacrificed were ‘without blemish’⁷⁹⁸ (ἄμωμος or οὐκ μῶμος).⁷⁹⁹ The red heifer, whose ashes were to be mixed with water and used as needed for purification, was also required to be ἄμωμος (Num. 19:2). The LXX also uses ἄμωμος or οὐκ μῶμος of people. It has been suggested that, when

⁷⁹⁵ Watts, J.D.W. *Isaiah 1-33*, (Waco: Word, 1985), 22. Cf. Oswalt, J.N. *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1-39*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 94-99; Motyer, A. *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 45-47.

⁷⁹⁶ Clowney, E.P. “The Final Temple”, *WTJ*, 35 (1973), 189.

⁷⁹⁷ Johnson, *Hebrews*, 238; so too, McCrudden, *A Body*, 122-23.

⁷⁹⁸ 58 of the 83 occurrences of ἄμωμος in the LXX are of blemish-free animal sacrifices. Cf. οὐκ μῶμος (or similar) in Lev. 22:20, 21, 25; Num. 19:2; Deut. 15:21a, 21b; 17:1 also references animal sacrifices.

⁷⁹⁹ No semantic or logical distinction can be maintained between the compound word ἄμωμος and the phrase οὐκ μῶμος (or similar). E.g. Lev. 22:19-21 where οὐκ μῶμος and ἄμωμος are used to describe the same animals and Dan. 1:4 where the youths are described as ἄμωμος (OG) or οὐκ μῶμος (Θ). Any distinction is stylistic, see Hauck, F. μῶμος, ἄμωμος, *TDNT*, 4:829-31; cf. *BDAG*, 56, 663; Montanari, 125, 1375.

used of animal sacrifices, ἄμωμος means ‘without physical blemish’ but when used of persons it refers to moral purity or innocence.⁸⁰⁰ However, whilst ἄμωμος (and/or οὐκ μῶμος) is often used in this way,⁸⁰¹ it is also used to mean ‘without physical defect’ when describing people.⁸⁰² The LXX uses μῶμος 15 times with either an actual or implied negative to indicate being physically ‘blemish-free’.⁸⁰³ Three of these describe the *physical* appearance of various people,⁸⁰⁴ seven stipulate the *physical* condition required of the sacrificial animals⁸⁰⁵ and five describe the necessary *physical* condition of the priests.⁸⁰⁶ In fact, for a sacrifice to be acceptable, both the sacrificial animal and the sacrificing priest had to be *physically* ἄμωμος.

When ἄμωμος is used of Christ “offering himself without blemish to God”, it applies to him as both the ‘priest who offers’ *and* the ‘sacrifice being offered’ and may well carry physical overtones. In 7:26 Jesus is described with the words ὁσιος, ἄκακος and ἀμίαντος.⁸⁰⁷ He is also said to be ‘without sin’ (4:15) and ‘separated from sinners’ (7:26). The author did not use ἄμωμος in 7:26 and yet he chose to employ it in 9:14 (with all its cultic overtones of ‘without physical blemish’) to conclude a paragraph replete with other cultic terminology.⁸⁰⁸

To link πνεύματος αἰωνίου with ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ in 9:14, so as to refer to the blameless “internal disposition” shown in Jesus’ total commitment to do God’s will (10:5-10),⁸⁰⁹

⁸⁰⁰ Johnson, *Hebrews*, 238.

⁸⁰¹ 20 are of human moral integrity, either as a statement of fact (e.g. Ps. 18:23; 64:4; 101:2) or as an aspiration (Ps. 15:2; 19:13; 37:18) that depends on the action of God (Ps. 18:32). Only one of these refers to a blameless woman (Sir. 40:19) and that is as a vain hope more than a realistic expectation. A further three times God, his law and his ways are called ἄμωμος (2 Sam. 22:31; Ps. 18:30; 19:7). It is also used in Ezek. 28:15 of the King of Tyre. 1 Macc. 4:42 requires that priests are morally ἄμωμος.

⁸⁰² One such use of ἄμωμος is in Dan. 1:4 where it describes the physical appearance of Daniel and the three youths taken into exile with him.

⁸⁰³ μῶμος is found a further 8x in the LXX without a negative: 6x of human moral failings (Sir. 11:31, 33; 18:15; 20:24; 33:23; 47:20) and twice of human physical injuries (Lev. 24:19, 20).

⁸⁰⁴ Absalom (2 Sam. 14:25), the Shulamite (Songs 4:7) and the exiled youths (Dan. 1:4, Θ) are all said to be ‘without physical blemish’.

⁸⁰⁵ Lev. 22:20, 21, 25; Num. 19:2; Deut. 15:21a, 21b; 17:1.

⁸⁰⁶ Lev. 21:17, 18, 21a, 21b, 23.

⁸⁰⁷ ὁσιος ‘holy’, *BDAG*, 728; ἄκακος ‘innocent, guileless’, *BDAG*, 34; ἀμίαντος ‘pure in a religious and moral sense’, *BDAG*, 54, ‘uncontaminable, incorruptible’, Montanari, 109.

⁸⁰⁸ See §6.2 n.765.

⁸⁰⁹ See §6.2.4 n.797.

is to ignore the fact that 9:11-14 is full of cultic language and is designed to transition from the inadequacy of the old to the excellence of the new.

When our author said that “Christ... offered himself without blemish to God”, he was reflecting not only on the blemish-free sacrifice but also on the physical requirements for priesthood. Indeed, the metaphor is best understood in this way. Christ could make the blood-offering only if he were fully qualified as high priest. Our author has already dealt with the genealogical qualifications by recourse to Melchizedek⁸¹⁰ but Christ could function as a priest only if he were without physical defect.⁸¹¹ Now our author presents a sublime mystery: just as the sacrificial lamb remains the blemish-free offering, even as its throat was slit, so too the crucified sacrifice is still the blemish-free high priest. Christ was perfectly qualified to be both the one sacrificed and the one sacrificing, not because he had an ‘eternally blameless spirit’⁸¹² but because he was *physically* ἄμωμος.⁸¹³

Wilson rightly comments that the use of ἄμωμος in 1 Peter 1:19⁸¹⁴ parallels its use in 9:14.⁸¹⁵ He points out that it would remind the congregation that the OT sacrificial animals “were required to be perfect, without spot or blemish. In other words, Christ’s sacrifice is perfect in every respect, fulfilling every least requirement.”⁸¹⁶ Indeed, Christ satisfies “every least requirement” not only as sacrifice but also as sacrificing priest. Lane notes that ἄμωμος “denotes the absence of defects in a sacrificial animal. It was chosen to emphasize the perfection of Christ’s sacrifice. The sinless high priest (4:15; 7:26) was also the spotless victim.”⁸¹⁷

⁸¹⁰ Jesus “was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests” (7:14). See 7:1-4, 11-17, 21-22.

⁸¹¹ Lev. 21:17, 18, 21a, 21b, 23.

⁸¹² This is not to deny or question his sinlessness (4:15; 7:26).

⁸¹³ Both prior to his death and throughout the whole process of dying including the torture, the scourging, being spat upon and the crucifixion itself.

⁸¹⁴ “The precious blood of Christ like that of a lamb without spot or blemish” (ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἁμώμου).

⁸¹⁵ Wilson, *Hebrews*, 154.

⁸¹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸¹⁷ Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 240. Cf. O’Brien, “Perfect Mediator”, 22.

6.2.5 Conclusions

“The tabernacle is both a barrier and an avenue.”⁸¹⁸ Only one person was allowed access through the curtain (and then only once a year) and yet the tabernacle was still ‘the tent of meeting’. Christ’s once-for-all offering of himself (9:14) on the cross (9:28) removes the barrier and opens the way for all his followers to obtain unhindered access to God (10:19-22). He enters heaven by virtue of his self-offering (διὰ... τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος) and his followers enter ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ. As has been said, 9:11-14 is replete with (old) cultic terminology and serves as an ‘overlap’, facilitating the transition from inadequate and repeated sacrifices to the once-for-all offering that inaugurates the NC, brings the eternal inheritance and removes sin (9:15). The phrase διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου is part of this transition between earthly tabernacle and heavenly sanctuary and that provides a key to understanding the force of αἰώνιος in this appellation. However, before discussing the identity and function of πνεύματος αἰωνίου in 9:14, it is necessary to make some observations about the use of αἰώνιος generally and in Hebrews specifically.

6.3 ‘Eternal’ in Hebrews

Hebrews employs both αἰώνιος (six times)⁸¹⁹ and αἰών (15 times)⁸²⁰ to connote ‘eternal’.⁸²¹ The use of αἰώνιος will be discussed below. However, αἰών is used twice to denote ‘the created universe’ (1:2; 11:3) and twice in a ‘generalized’ eschatological sense.⁸²² It is employed a further eleven times in descriptions linked to the Son.⁸²³

For the sake of completeness, note that Hebrews also uses: διὰ παντός (2:15, ‘throughout’; 9:6, ‘regularly’; 13:15, ‘continually’), εἰς τὸ παντελές (7:25, ‘for all

⁸¹⁸ Clowney, “Final Temple”, 161. Cf. Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 139.

⁸¹⁹ 5:9; 6:2; 9:12, 14, 15; 13:20.

⁸²⁰ 1:2, 8a, 8b; 5:6; 6:5, 20; 7:17, 21, 24, 28; 9:26; 11:3; 13: 8, 21a, 21b. However, 13:21b is regarded by some as a scribal gloss, see Metzger, 606-607.

⁸²¹ There is a significant degree of overlap in the use of αἰώνιος and αἰών. *BDAG*, 32-33; Montanari, 61.

⁸²² ‘The age to come’ (6:5); ‘the end of the ages’ (9:27).

⁸²³ See §6.4.3.

time'),⁸²⁴ πάντοτε (7:25, 'always'), ἀεί (3:10, 'always') and διηνεκής (7:3, 10:1, 12, 14).⁸²⁵ μένω is used with εἰς τὸ διηνεκές to describe Melchizedek's priesthood (7:3) and with εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα to designate Christ's priesthood (7:24). It is also used of the better and 'more lasting (or permanent) possession' that belongs to salvation (10:34). However, on the use of μένω in the phrase, 'we have no lasting city',⁸²⁶ Whitlark suggests that the author is using figured speech or covert allusion⁸²⁷ to challenge Rome's claim to be 'the eternal city'.⁸²⁸ Whitlark writes that, in portraying Jesus as the eternal priest/king, our author indicates "the impotency of the Roman emperor to secure the eternity of the imperial city" and that "the Christian community addressed by Hebrews... has a king that secures access to a perpetual city".⁸²⁹ In seeing 13:14a as a covert critique of Rome's claim to be eternal, Whitlark contrasts Rome with the heavenly, eschatological and truly eternal city (12:22) that is to come (13:14b). However, his conclusions rest on the assumption that the community addressed in Hebrews was a Gentile group living in Rome during the Flavian dynasty, exposed to imperial persecution, shame and pressure and that "the only safety and honor were to be found in a 'relapse' to the imperial culture".⁸³⁰ However, there is no certainty that such was the case. Furthermore, Whitlark acknowledges that many commentators prefer to see 13:14a as "an oblique reference... generalizable to any city".⁸³¹ In fact, the contrast between what is temporary and what is eternal does not depend on an identification of the earthly city. Whether it be Rome "which foolishly claimed to be eternal" or Jerusalem "which some mistakenly claimed would become an eternal city here on earth",⁸³² the focus is on the heavenly or

⁸²⁴ This can be understood as qualitatively or temporally 'fully' or 'for all time'. See *BDAG*, 754; Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 157; Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 255-56.

⁸²⁵ The only NT occurrences of διηνεκής are in Hebrews, always as εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (perpetually, forever). Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 359] has demonstrated that εἰς τὸ διηνεκές and εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα are simply stylistic variants.

⁸²⁶ οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν (13:14a).

⁸²⁷ This rhetorical device is "saying one thing but meaning another" where the speaker leaves more to be suspected than has actually been said" and is "a way of saying something without saying it directly or plainly or even at all". So, Whitlark, *Resisting Empire*, 21-23.

⁸²⁸ *Ibid.*, 100. The 'eternal city' is one epithet used to designate Rome, then and now.

⁸²⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸³⁰ *Ibid.*, 192-93, cf. 4-16. Cf. 2.1. Specifying destination, date and congregation so absolutely, Whitlark risks falling foul of Occam's razor (it is not good to multiply one's imponderables).

⁸³¹ Whitlark, *Resisting Empire*, 102. He references Attridge, Bruce, Ellingworth, deSilva, Isaacs, Johnson, Moffatt, Mitchel and Thompson in this regard.

⁸³² Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 708.

eschatological city to come.⁸³³ However, our author does not use the word αἰώνιος to describe that city. As will be seen (§6.3.2), he reserves αἰώνιος to designate heavenly reality breaking into time, not something that simply transcends time. Consequently, the contrast between ‘the city that will not abide’ and ‘the city that is to come’ has little to contribute to an understanding of the phrase διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου in 9:14.

6.3.1 αἰώνιος, Introduction

The adjective αἰώνιος is found 114 times in the Greek OT and a further 33 times in the OT Apocrypha.⁸³⁴ Its basic meaning is ‘lasting for an age (αἰών)’; it is regularly employed to render עוֹלָם into the Greek of the LXX and in the NT it is “particularly linked to the divine realm”.⁸³⁵ In the OT it can convey either the notion of ‘eternity’ or the temporal idea of a long passage of time.⁸³⁶ Hence αἰώνιος can refer to the distant past, ‘long ago’,⁸³⁷ and to the future, ‘for a long time’.⁸³⁸ It is also used 16 times in the sense of ‘eternal’ to designate God, his ways or pathways and various of his attributes. However, by far the most common usage is in the twin contexts of covenant and obligation.⁸³⁹ αἰώνιος is used in descriptions of both the fate that befalls those who reject the covenant (14 times) and the blessings that await those who fulfil the covenant obligations (also 14 times). Of the 33 occurrences in the OT Apocrypha, 14 designate God as ‘the Eternal’. Blessings for the righteous (11 times) and punishment for the

⁸³³ As Allen [*Hebrews*, 621] rightly notes, the contrast is between Jerusalem and the heavenly Jerusalem.

⁸³⁴ See the discussion in Guhrt, J. “Time”, *NIDNTT*, 3:826-33.

⁸³⁵ Portalatín, A. *Temporal Oppositions as Hermeneutical Categories in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 98 n.362.

⁸³⁶ This reflects the breadth of meaning in the Hebrew עוֹלָם. See further, Preuss, H.D. עוֹלָם, *TDOT*, 10:530-45; Tomasino, A. עוֹלָם, *NIDOTTE*, 3:345-51; Verhoef, P.A. “Time and Eternity”, *NIDOTTE*, 4:1252-55. Also, the brief note on ’ēl ’ōlām, Fretheim, T.E. *NIDOTTE*, 1:401.

⁸³⁷ Or ‘ancient’, 12x.

⁸³⁸ 9x, meaning either ‘life-long’ or ‘forever’.

⁸³⁹ The covenant that God enacts is ‘eternal’ (18x) and his requirements are ‘everlasting ordinances’ (31x).

ungodly (four times) are also described as eternal. The phrases ‘eternal covenant’ (Bar. 2:35) and ‘everlasting ordinance’ (Tob. 1:6) both occur once.⁸⁴⁰

Philo uses the word αἰώνιος just 29 times, eleven of which designate the name, nature or person of the eternal God.⁸⁴¹ Heaven, the dwelling place of God, is called ‘the eternal kingdom’ (*Somn.* 2:285) and is described as an ‘eternal day’ (*Jos.* 146) where darkness cannot exist. Philo mentions the eternal covenant only once (*Spec. Leg.* III:85) but does talk about the demands of God’s eternal law four times.⁸⁴² Blessings for, or qualities of, the godly person account for a further seven occurrences.⁸⁴³ Philo holds that ignorance leads to everlasting darkness (*Ebr.* 155) and that to achieve wisdom or virtue demands an everlasting battle against ignorance (*Fuga* 211). Failure to overcome ignorance will lead to an eternal slavery to the lower, sensual passions (*Spec. Leg.* III:199). The one who loves true wisdom, the real ‘philosopher’, aligns his thinking with that ‘eternal order’ which characterises all divine things (*Omn. Prob. Lit.* 24).

In the NT outside Hebrews, αἰώνιος is found 65 times, most commonly in the phrase ‘eternal life’.⁸⁴⁴ It also occurs in the phrases ‘eternal gospel’ (Rev. 14:6), and ‘the eternal God’ (Rom. 16:26) and once in a doxology ascribing eternal dominion to God (1 Tim. 6:16). Other occurrences relate to eternal or eschatological blessings⁸⁴⁵ or punishments.⁸⁴⁶ It is rarely used with any temporal limitations.⁸⁴⁷

⁸⁴⁰ The other two occurrences are 1 Macc. 2:54 (Phinehas’ everlasting priesthood) and 1 Macc. 6:44 (an ‘everlasting name’ earned by valiant fighters).

⁸⁴¹ *Deus Imm.* 142; *Post.* 121; *Plant.* 8; 73; 74; 85; 89; *Congr.* 105; *Mut. Nom.* 12; *Abr.* 51; 54. Furthermore, *Aet. Mundi* 75 implies that God is the eternal bond that holds the Cosmos together.

⁸⁴² *Post.* 123; *Ebr.* 127; 141; 142.

⁸⁴³ The blessings described as ‘eternal’ are: life (*Fuga* 78), wisdom (*Virt.* 129), peace (*Ebr.* 76), order (*Omn. Prob. Lit.* 24) and healing (*Sacr.* 127). Furthermore, virtue is called an eternal inheritance (*Omn. Prob. Lit.* 117) and the wise man prefers a day in the light to an eternity of darkness (*Heres* 290).

⁸⁴⁴ 43x. Every occurrence of αἰώνιος in John (17x) and 1 John (6x) is in the phrase ‘eternal life’.

⁸⁴⁵ An eternal dwelling (Luke 16:9; 2 Cor. 5:1) and kingdom (2 Pet. 1:11). Eternal encouragement (2 Thess. 2:16), salvation (Mark 16:8 shorter extra ending) and glory (2 Cor. 4:17; 2 Tim. 2:10; 1 Pet. 5:10). Paul writes that the glory that is yet to be revealed “is eternal” (2 Cor. 4:18).

⁸⁴⁶ Eternal fire (Matt. 18:8; 25:41; Jude 7), punishment (Matt. 25:46a) and destruction (2 Thess. 1:9). Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is an eternal sin (Mark 3:29).

⁸⁴⁷ It is used of ‘long ago’ or ‘ages long past’ only thrice (Rom. 16:25; 2 Tim. 1:9; Titus 1:2b) and is used once to denote ‘the foreseeable future’ (Philem. 15), Philemon will have Onesimus ‘back for ever’ (αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχης).

6.3.2 αἰώνιος in Hebrews (apart from 9:14)

Before exploring the identity and function of ‘eternal Spirit’ (§6.4), it will be profitable to look briefly at the other five phrases in which the author uses αἰώνιος. These are: *eternal salvation* (5:9), *eternal judgment* (6:2), *eternal redemption* (9:12), *eternal inheritance* (9:15) and *eternal covenant* (13:20). Two of these uses of αἰώνιος occur within a few verses of *eternal Spirit*; consequently, they will be addressed after discussing *eternal salvation*, *judgement* and *covenant*.

In 5:9 the author writes that Jesus is the source of eternal salvation.⁸⁴⁸ To understand the significance of αἰώνιος in the phrase in Hebrews, it is first required that the concept of ‘salvation’ in the letter be examined. The noun σωτηρία is found seven times in Hebrews,⁸⁴⁹ six of which might be called ‘theological’ uses.⁸⁵⁰ The verb σώζω is used twice but only once in a context germane to this discussion (7:25, Jesus is able σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές).⁸⁵¹ These references to ‘salvation’ display a classic ‘now and not yet’ motif.⁸⁵² The salvation declared and offered in ‘the Christ-event’ (2:3) is the current experience of the followers of Christ (6:9). However, the author also writes of inheriting salvation (1:14) and that Christ will return “to save those who are eagerly waiting for him” (9:28). For Hebrews, salvation is both an eschatological event and a current experience.⁸⁵³ Consequently, he saves now and for all time (σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές) those who approach God through him (7:25).⁸⁵⁴ Salvation is rightly called ‘eternal’, “since it

⁸⁴⁸ The phrase is found just once in the OT (Isa. 45:17), where the eternal salvation (σωτηρίαν αἰώνιον) is further qualified by ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος (to all eternity). Both αἰώνιος and αἰών in Isa. 45:17 translate the Hebrew עוֹלָם.

⁸⁴⁹ This is more often than in any other NT book (e.g. Acts, 6x; Rom. 5x; 2 Cor. 4x).

⁸⁵⁰ 1:14; 2:3, 10; 5:9; 6:9; 9:28. In 11:7, Noah’s ark is said to have ‘saved’ its occupants.

⁸⁵¹ In 5:7 Jesus prayed “to the one who was able to save him from death”.

⁸⁵² Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 73-77; Koester, *Hebrews*, 210; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 87; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 498; Marshall, “Soteriology”, 277.

⁸⁵³ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 498.

⁸⁵⁴ However, see §6.3 n.824 and the discussion in Portalatín, *Temporal Oppositions*, 155-57. Cf. Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 334-37; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 391; Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 176.

is based on the sacrifice of Christ, which was accomplished once for all and is permanently valid”.⁸⁵⁵

One element of what the author calls “the basic teaching about Christ” (6:2) is “instructions about... eternal judgment”. *κρίματος αἰωνίου* is unique to Hebrews in the Bible⁸⁵⁶ but is reminiscent of Isaiah 9:7, ἐν κρίματι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, ‘in judgement from now and unto the aeons’ (with justice now and forevermore). The word ‘judgement’ (*κρίμα*) is closely linked to both rewards and punishments and is based on a person’s relationship with Christ and obedience to him.⁸⁵⁷ In 6:2 eternal judgement logically follows ‘resurrection’⁸⁵⁸ in a list of six διδαχῆς that “move from initial repentance to final judgement”.⁸⁵⁹ Furthermore, in 9:27-28 the author specifies that after death comes the judgement and in 10:27-31 that God effects judgement.⁸⁶⁰ The phrase ‘eternal judgement’ not only indicates that God is judge but also that his judgement is final⁸⁶¹ and “αἰώνιος signifies specifically “of the world to come” ...judgement will take place in the next world”.⁸⁶²

In 13:20 the author writes that God “brought back from the dead our Lord Jesus... by the blood of the *eternal covenant*” (*διαθήκης αἰωνίου*). Although it is intriguing to speculate how ‘the blood of the covenant’ was used by God to bring Jesus back from the dead, the issue that this thesis needs to address is how the adjective ‘eternal’ modifies the noun ‘covenant’. The phrase eternal (*αἰώνιος*) covenant is found 16 times in the Greek

⁸⁵⁵ O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 202. Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 66; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 105; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 250; Koester, *Hebrews*, 290; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 122; Mackie, *Eschatology*, 179.

⁸⁵⁶ It is a poorly attested *v.l.* in Mark 3:29, so, Metzger, 70.

⁸⁵⁷ E.g. see 2:1-4; 3:6, 7-11, 13-14; 4:1, 13; 6:7-8; 9:27-28; 10:26-31.

⁸⁵⁸ BDF, §444.4: “H 6:2 τε... τε... καὶ... (*ἀναστάσεως* and *κρίματος* are closely connected by *καὶ*)”.

⁸⁵⁹ O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 216. Cf. Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 313; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 204-205; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 174.

⁸⁶⁰ 6:2 has *κρίμα* and both 9:27 and 10:27 have *κρίσις*; however, they are virtual synonyms. See Büchsel, F. *κρίνω*, TDNT, 3:921-23, 933-54. Cf. Montanari, 1177-78.

⁸⁶¹ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 165; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 316; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 205.

⁸⁶² Ramelli, I.L.E. & Konstan, D. *Terms for Eternity: Aiōnios and Aīdios in Classical and Christian Texts*, (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2013), 66.

OT⁸⁶³ and a further twice in the Apocrypha.⁸⁶⁴ When the OT describes the covenant as αἰώνιος, 13 times the context or focus is on God who makes and keeps this eternal covenant, twice on the covenant obligations of God's people (Exod. 31:16; Lev. 24:8) and once in a complaint that the people have broken the eternal covenant (Isa. 24:5). The OT recognises as eternal the covenant with Noah (Gen. 9:16), Abraham (Gen. 17:7) and David (2 Sam. 23:5).

In Hebrews, the eternal covenant, sealed in Christ's blood (10:29; 13:20) is variously described. It is new (8:8; 9:15a; 12:24), better than the first covenant (7:22; 8:6) and, unlike the OC (8:9) which was passing away (8:13), it is eternal. Furthermore, it is internal, written on the heart and mind (8:10; 10:16) and can set people free from sin (9:15b). The juxtaposition of 'blood' and 'covenant' with 'eternal' and 'resurrection' reflects the now and yet to come eschatology of Hebrews. The covenant is established by Christ's death (10:10), confirmed by his resurrection (13:20) and exaltation (1:3; 10:12)⁸⁶⁵ and stretches on into the coming age (7:20-25; 9:28). That to which the OT points has become full reality through the blood/death of Christ.⁸⁶⁶ The use of the term διαθήκης αἰωνίου is deliberate; just as Christ "holds his priesthood permanently, because he continues forever" (7:24), so too the covenant established by his priestly and sacrificial act is truly eternal.⁸⁶⁷

Three uses of αἰώνιος occur within four verses of text addressing Christ's once-for-all sacrifice: Christ "obtained *eternal redemption*" (αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν, 9:12) and "through the *eternal Spirit*" (πνεύματος αἰωνίου, 9:14) his self-offering procured "the promised *eternal inheritance*" (αἰωνίου κληρονομίας, 9:15). The phrase 'eternal Spirit' will be discussed below (§6.4).

⁸⁶³ Gen. 9:16; 17:7, 13, 19; Exod. 31:16; Lev. 24:8; 2 Sam. 23:5; 1 Chron. 16:17; Ps. 105:10 [104:10]; Isa. 24:5; 55:3; 61:8; Jer. 27:5; 32:40 [39:40]; Ezek. 16:60; 37:26. 'Eternal (αἰών) covenant' is found in Judg. 2:1; 1 Chron. 16:15; Ps. 105:8 [104:8]; 111:9 [110:9].

⁸⁶⁴ Ps. Sol. 10:4; Bar. 2:35; both focus on the 'Godward' side of the covenant.

⁸⁶⁵ See Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 395.

⁸⁶⁶ Vanhoye, *Different Priest*, 427.

⁸⁶⁷ See Bruce, *Hebrews*, 411; Hagner, *Encountering*, 174; Peeler, *My Son*, 175; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 250.

The family of words⁸⁶⁸ variously translated ‘redeem’, ‘redemption’ and ‘redeemer’ often carry the idea of ‘paying a ransom’ or ‘a redemption price’.⁸⁶⁹ This is the case, for example in the redemption of a slave (Lev. 25:48) and the liberation provided in the year of Jubilee (Lev. 25:52).⁸⁷⁰ God is his people’s ‘rock and redeemer’ (λυτρωτής),⁸⁷¹ and his actions in the Exodus events are described in terms of redemption.⁸⁷² Nonetheless, redemption from human oppression (Ps. 119: 134 [118:134]) and the freedom enjoyed by the Exodus generation was both limited and transitory.⁸⁷³ Indeed, both the liberation provided in the year of Jubilee and the freedom from Egypt under Moses prefigure the redemption provided through the self-sacrifice of Christ.⁸⁷⁴ However, the redemption ‘purchased’ by Christ’s self-sacrifice is far superior to that procured by the Day of Atonement ritual. In contrast with the repeated, external and limited effects of the old annual atonement ritual,⁸⁷⁵ it is rightly designated ‘eternal’.⁸⁷⁶ Not only is it complete in both its efficacy and benefit,⁸⁷⁷ but also its effect is: retrospective,⁸⁷⁸ a present transformative experience,⁸⁷⁹ “stretches into the future to cover future sins as well”⁸⁸⁰ and is eschatological.⁸⁸¹ Indeed, Lane renders αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν here as “eschatological redemption”⁸⁸² and writes: “eschatological finality characterizes (Christ’s) ministrations”.⁸⁸³

⁸⁶⁸ λύτρον, λυτρώω, λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, λυτρωτής.

⁸⁶⁹ See *BDAG*, 117, 605-606; Montanari, 259, 1262.

⁸⁷⁰ However, see Isa. 52:3, οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε.

⁸⁷¹ Ps. 19:14 [18:15]; 78:35 [77:35]. Cf. Isa. 41:14; 43:1, 14; 44:22, 23, 24; Jer. 27:34; 38:11. The believer’s redemption is ‘διὰ τοῦ αἵματος’ of Christ (Eph. 1:7). In language reminiscent of 9:11-15, Eph. 1:14 links together ‘promise’, ‘Holy Spirit’, ‘inheritance’ and ‘redemption’. Cf. Eph. 4:30.

⁸⁷² Exod. 6:6; 15:13; Deut. 7:8; 9:26; 13:5 [13:6]; Mic. 6:4.

⁸⁷³ Israel was oppressed by Midianites and Amalekites (Judges 6:1-6), Philistines (Judges 13:1), Assyrians (2 Kings 17) and Babylonians (2 Kings 24), (not to mention Canaanites, Moabites, Greeks and Romans).

⁸⁷⁴ So, Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 269.

⁸⁷⁵ Westcott, *Hebrews*, 264.

⁸⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 259.

⁸⁷⁷ Allen, *Hebrews*, 472; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 395; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 236.

⁸⁷⁸ It deals with sins committed under the first covenant (9:15; cf. 11:39-40). Attridge, *Hebrews*, 255; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 402; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 74; Gordon, *Hebrews*, 103; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 127; O’Brien, “Perfect Mediator”, 23; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 264; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 272.

⁸⁷⁹ Peeler [*My Son*, 131] writes that αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν. Hagner [*Hebrews*, 141] writes that Christ’s sacrifice “is the answer to sin in every era, past and present”.

⁸⁸⁰ Gray, P. *Godly Fear: The Greco-Roman Critiques of Superstition*, (Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 148.

⁸⁸¹ Allen, *Hebrews*, 472; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 395; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 230; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 269.

⁸⁸² Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 239.

⁸⁸³ *Ibid*, 236. Cf. §7.2.4.1.

The way that αἰώνιος in 9:15 is understood is largely dependent on how the phrase τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας is understood. There are two key issues to discuss: Who are ‘the called’ (οἱ κεκλημένοι) and do they receive the promise of the inheritance or the promised inheritance?

In 9:12 the author writes that Christ’s sacrifice obtained αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν. Now, in 9:15, he rewords and develops that statement, writing that Christ’s death “occurred for the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσιν) of transgressions under the first covenant”.⁸⁸⁴ This phrase acts as the ‘hinge’ or logical link between the first and third parts of 9:15.⁸⁸⁵ The verse begins “and for this reason (i.e. Christ’s offering of himself, 9:11-14) he is the mediator of a New Covenant, so that...”. After this follows what might be regarded as a ‘parenthesis’ (“a death having occurred...”); before it concludes with the consequence of Christ mediating the NC “so that those who are called (οἱ κεκλημένοι) might receive the promised eternal inheritance”. Thus, the structure of this complex sentence indicates that οἱ κεκλημένοι are ‘those redeemed from the transgressions under the first covenant’. They are God’s faithful people who died before the ‘Christ event’.⁸⁸⁶ Indeed, this is how the NRSV understands the verse.⁸⁸⁷ However, the author has already referred to his congregation as ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι who are κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι (3:1; ‘partners in a heavenly calling’). The ‘called’, therefore, comprise the faithful members of the OC community, the author’s audience and all believers, past, present and future.⁸⁸⁸ In this discussion of the NC⁸⁸⁹ the author manifests his “tendency to emphasise continuity in the chosen people under both covenants”.⁸⁹⁰

⁸⁸⁴ There is little real difference between λύτρωσις and ἀπολύτρωσις; both convey the idea of deliverance, release or redemption. See Allen, *Hebrews*, 476; *BDAG*, 606, 117; Montanari, 1262, 259.

⁸⁸⁵ See Allen, *Hebrews*, 475; Westfall, *Discourse Analysis*, 206-208.

⁸⁸⁶ See §6.3.2 n.878.

⁸⁸⁷ “Those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, because a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions under the first covenant.”

⁸⁸⁸ See §6.3.2 n.878-83.

⁸⁸⁹ For Jer. 31:31-34 and Jer. 31:33-34 forming an *inclusio* around 8:1-10:18, see n.676.

⁸⁹⁰ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 462. Cf. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 10-11; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 275; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 170. This is not to deny that there are also elements of discontinuity, see Hagner, *Encountering*, 101.

‘Inheritance’ is a key term in Hebrews⁸⁹¹ and is used to designate an inheritance received (1:4), one that will (and did) happen in the inheritor’s lifetime (11:8, 9; 12:17), an inheritance actualized by the sacrifice of Christ (6:12; 11:7)⁸⁹² and an eschatological inheritance that will not be enjoyed in its fulness until the end of the age (1:2; 1:14). Three of the occurrences of heir/inheritance have a ‘now and not yet’ connotation (1:14; 6:17; 9:15).⁸⁹³ In addition, the Son has already inherited a superlative name (1:4) and will inherit all things at the end of the ages (1:2). In the same way, our author employs the word ‘promise’ (ἐπαγγελία) to convey the same ‘now and not yet’ idea. This ‘already received’ and ‘still to come’ dichotomy is particularly seen in Hebrews’ narration of the ‘Abraham story’ (6:11-20; 11:8-17). Abraham inherited what was promised (Isaac, 6:13-15; the land, 11:8-9)⁸⁹⁴ yet God’s promises to him still had an eschatological element (‘the hope’, 6:17-20; ‘the heavenly city’, 11:10, 16).⁸⁹⁵

Hebrews’ author has already affirmed that Christ’s death has obtained eternal redemption (9:12) and is the means to “purify our conscience from dead works”, thereby enabling Christ’s followers to serve the living God (9:14). It is highly improbable, therefore, that he would portray this NC, established through the death of God’s Son, as being totally in the age to come. “The called” (9:15) not only obtained promises but also received that which was promised, at least in part.⁸⁹⁶ In fact, by exploiting the double meaning of διαθήκη (covenant, 9:15 and will, 9:16-17), the author indicates that, just as the provisions in a will are realized on the death of the testator, so the inheritance

⁸⁹¹ Words relating to ‘inheritance’ occur 52x in the NT, 10 of which are in Hebrews; κληρονομέω (to inherit, 1:4,14; 6:12; 12:17), κληρονομία (inheritance, 9:15; 11:8), κληρονόμος (heir, 1:2; 6:17; 11:7) and συγκληρονόμος (joint heir, 11:9); κατακληρονομέω (“to assign as a possession”, Montanari, 1056) is a NT *hapax* (Acts 13:19). Cf. Koester, *Hebrews*, 417; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 341.

⁸⁹² See §6.3.2 n.884-887. Cf. 11:39-40.

⁸⁹³ Hammer [P.L. “Inheritance (NT)”, *ABD*, 3:416] writes: “inheritance language in the NT exhibits a tension between the present and the future”.

⁸⁹⁴ Of the present active participle κληρονομούντων (6:12) Allen [*Hebrews*, 396] writes: “To “inherit” the promises means to receive them for oneself”; cf. Ellingworth and Nida [*Handbook*, 123] who suggest: “What is “received” is not here the promise itself, but the thing promised”.

⁸⁹⁵ Cf. 11:33 ‘they received promises’ and 11:39 ‘they did not receive what was promised’.

⁸⁹⁶ Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 198. This is similar to the Pauline ‘ἄρραβών’ (Eph. 1:14): “the promised (ἐπαγγελίας) Holy Spirit who is the pledge (ἄρραβών) of our inheritance (κληρονομίας) toward redemption (ἀπολύτρωσιν) as God’s own people” (cf. 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5). Cf. Cockerill, “Structure”, 189 n.42; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 461-62; Koester, *Hebrews*, 417; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 231; O’Brien, *Spoken*, 81-82, 213; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 275 n.446; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 272.

‘bequeathed’ under the NC provisions is made available because *the* “death has occurred”.⁸⁹⁷ Part of the inheritance comprises the benefits of the NC now enjoyed by the people of God, including forgiveness (8:12, 10:18), salvation (7:25), a purified conscience (9:14), access, grace and mercy (4:16) and the Spirit’s presence and power (2:4; 6:4). In addition, the inheritance ‘yet to come’ includes the full eschatological “Sabbath-rest” (4:9), the “city of the living God” (11:16), the “better country, that is, a heavenly one” (12:22) and “a kingdom that cannot be shaken” (12:28). It is an ‘eternal inheritance’ because Christ’s death “perfected *for all time* those who are sanctified” (10:14) and when Christ returns (9:28) his faithful will “receive what was promised” (10:36). Believers are truly *κλησεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι* “partners in a heavenly calling” (3:1) and Christ’s death enables the *μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (3:14)⁸⁹⁸ “to participate in the inheritance he has won”⁸⁹⁹ now and in the age to come.

6.3.3 Conclusions

As has been seen,⁹⁰⁰ when the NT uses *αἰώνιος* in the sense of ‘eternal’ it sometimes designates that which properly belongs to ‘eternity’ and/or ‘the life to come’.⁹⁰¹ However, it also designates that foretaste of heaven enjoyed by the followers of Christ now.⁹⁰² The descriptions of eternal life (*ζωὴ αἰώνιος*) in the NT, for example, clearly manifest the ‘now and not yet’ dichotomy.⁹⁰³ Hebrews’ use of *αἰώνιος* similarly has this double edge. Christ’s sacrificial death procured eternal salvation (5:9), redemption

⁸⁹⁷ See Hagner, *Hebrews*, 144; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 368-71; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 191; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 158-59.

⁸⁹⁸ For a discussion of *μέτοχος*, see §5.3.

⁸⁹⁹ Johnson, *Hebrews*, 240.

⁹⁰⁰ See §6.3.1.

⁹⁰¹ God (Rom. 16:26); Christ’s ‘kingdom’ (2 Pet. 1:11); ultimate rewards (2 Cor. 5:1); judgement (Matt. 25:41; 2 Thess. 1:9).

⁹⁰² E.g. ‘eternal encouragement’ (2 Thess. 2:16); the eternal gospel (Rev. 14:6); eternal life (John 3:15, 16).

⁹⁰³ *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is a present reality in John 5:39; 6:47, 54; 10:28; 17:3; 1 Tim. 6:12. *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is a future promise in John 4:14; 6:27; 12:25; Rom. 6:22; Gal. 6:8. It must not be overlooked, however, that the NT was written from a post-resurrection perspective and Christ’s “resurrection had already inaugurated the resurrection era”, so, Keener, C.S. *The Gospel of John*, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:329. Cf. Barrett, C.K. *The Gospel According to St John*, (London: SPCK, 1978), 215.

(9:12) and inheritance (9:15) for believers who will have nothing to fear from the eschatological eternal judgement (6:2). However, “because a death has occurred” (9:15-17) the eternal inheritance is made actual in the present experience of the author and his congregation.⁹⁰⁴ The security offered under the eternal covenant (13:20), ratified in Christ’s blood (10:29), begins when an individual becomes ‘partnered by Christ’ (3:14) and continues into the next life when believers ‘rest from their labours and enter the sabbath-rest of God’ (4:9-11). This ‘eternal’ provision was brought about because Christ offered himself to God διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου as an unblemished, perfect sacrifice for sin (9:14). This thesis will now discuss the identity and function of the πνεύματος αἰωνίου through whom Christ’s offering is effected.

6.4 The Identity and Function of πνεύματος αἰωνίου

6.4.1 Introduction

The appellation πνεύματος αἰωνίου is unique and the identity of the Eternal Spirit is debated. ‘Eternal Spirit’ either designates Christ’s person⁹⁰⁵ or the Holy Spirit. It is necessary to evaluate, briefly, the arguments employed by those commentators who understand the title to refer in some way to Christ’s human or divine nature (§6.4.2) before showing that the Eternal Spirit is the Holy Spirit (§6.4.3).

6.4.2 πνεύματος αἰωνίου as Christ’s S(s)pirit

The reasons for identifying πνεύματος αἰωνίου with either Jesus’ human spirit or with his eternal and divine nature vary, as do the implications drawn from that identification. Consequently, it will be convenient to make a few remarks about the views of specific commentators before concluding with more general observations. However, the

⁹⁰⁴ See Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 461; Hagner, *Encountering*, 86; Lincoln, *Guide*, 94; Mackie, *Eschatology*, 90; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 275 n.446.

⁹⁰⁵ Whether his human spirit or his divine nature. See §6.1 n.749-51 for representative lists of such commentators.

commentators' understanding of Hebrews' pneumatology often colours how they interpret 9:14. For instance, Attridge calls the references to the Spirit in Hebrews "diffuse and ill-focussed" and on that basis states that the Eternal Spirit "most likely refers to Christ and the interior or spiritual quality of his sacrificial act".⁹⁰⁶ This circular argument is unjustifiable; Hebrews' references to the Spirit are focused and depend on a developed pneumatology that both author and recipients shared.⁹⁰⁷

It has also been stated that *πνεύματος αἰωνίου* cannot refer to the Holy Spirit because, even though God is called 'eternal' (Rom. 16:26), nowhere does the Bible call the Holy Spirit 'eternal'.⁹⁰⁸ This statement is meaningless! As the phrase *πνεύματος αἰωνίου* is a Biblical *hapax*, the same comment could be made about any suggested identification.⁹⁰⁹ Interestingly, however, the same commentator identifies the NT *hapax* τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος in 10:29 as a reference to the Holy Spirit⁹¹⁰ despite it not being used elsewhere in the NT to designate him.

Bonsirven takes the phrase *πνεύματος αἰωνίου* to be similar to the Pauline phrases 'spirit of meekness' (1 Cor. 4:21) and 'spirit of faith' (2 Cor. 4:13) because *πνεῦμα* "prend parfois ce sens de disposition".⁹¹¹ Consequently, the 'disposition' in which Jesus acted is called 'eternal' since he 'lives forever' (7:24, 28; 10:12) and everything he did was marked by eternity.⁹¹² That the NT does indeed use the word *πνεῦμα* with a wider application than (Holy) Spirit, including designating Christ's own human spirit, cannot be denied.⁹¹³ Furthermore, Bonsirven is undoubtedly right to say that whenever Jesus

⁹⁰⁶ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 250-51.

⁹⁰⁷ See particularly §§1.1; 1.4.5; 3.5; 8.1.3.

⁹⁰⁸ Bonsirven, *Hébreux*, 391, "on ne voit jamais ce qualificatif appliqué à l'Esprit Saint".

⁹⁰⁹ McGrath [*Eternal Spirit*, 44] answers Bonsirven: "To his remark that *eternal* is never applied to the Holy Spirit, one must reply, It is! Once! Where? Here!"

⁹¹⁰ Bonsirven [*Hébreux*, 446] describes the phrase "τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας" as "malice suprême... d'orgueil outrageant... le crime inexpiable... contre l'Esprit Saint".

⁹¹¹ *Ibid*, 391.

⁹¹² *Ibid*, "...il doit donc marquer d'éternité tous ses gestes". However, using Bonsirven's own criterion, nowhere in the Bible is Jesus' inner disposition described by the word *αἰώνιος*.

⁹¹³ There are seven references to Jesus' human spirit in the NT, all occurring in the Gospels. Four are in the context of his emotional reactions to events during his earthly ministry (Mark 2:8; 8:12; John 11:33; 13:21). These 'pre-Calvary' texts could be replaced with words like 'disappointed', 'distressed' and 'saddened'. The other three are all in the context of Jesus' death (Matt. 27:50; Luke 23:46; John 19:30). None of the seven references to Jesus' spirit are qualified by an accompanying adjective. They do not

spoke or acted he was bringing something of eternity into the present. However, it is very doubtful that *πνεύματος αἰωνίου* would have been understood, either by author or readers, as the ‘disposition’ with which Jesus endured the cross.⁹¹⁴

Jeremias has suggested, in what Emmrich calls “a creative but... remote interpretation”,⁹¹⁵ that Jesus’ spirit separated from his body at death, to be reunited at resurrection but while separate Jesus’ spirit entered heaven to present the blood offering.⁹¹⁶ Jeremias proposes that this separation of body and spirit is indicated in 10:10.⁹¹⁷ However, the language employed in the phrase ‘the sacrifice of the body of Jesus’ (10:10) is dependent on the LXX text the author used in 10:5. 10:10 does not imply that the body and spirit of Jesus were separated at death; still less is there any suggestion in 9:14 of such a separation in Christ’s self-offering.⁹¹⁸ Furthermore, as has been seen, Jesus did not present his blood in heaven as the second part of a two-stage atonement.⁹¹⁹

Attridge suggests that the phrase *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* reinterprets the two earlier prepositional phrases *διὰ σκηνῆς* (9:11) and *διὰ αἵματος* (9:12). He writes that taking these phrases together indicates two things. First, “the “locale” where the true sacrifice takes place, not in a temple of bricks and mortar, but in the spiritual realm” and then that “Christ’s self-offering was... made with that portion of his being (spirit) that was most truly himself”.⁹²⁰ However, the ‘true sacrifice’ took place on the cross⁹²¹ and Christ’s self-offering was made with *himself*, not with a “portion of his being”.⁹²² Indeed, it is difficult to envisage what “portion of his being” was not “truly himself”. In this over-spiritualization of 9:11-14, Attridge goes “beyond the limits observed by our author”.⁹²³

contain any suggestion that his (human) spirit was, in essence, different from anyone else’s spirit or inner disposition.

⁹¹⁴ So, Emmrich, “Amtscharisma”, 19; Koester, *Hebrews*, 411; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 324 n.103.

⁹¹⁵ Emmrich, *Concepts*, 2.

⁹¹⁶ Jeremias, “Zwischen”, 201.

⁹¹⁷ *Ibid*, 198.

⁹¹⁸ See Emmrich, “Amtscharisma”, 19.

⁹¹⁹ See §6.2.1.

⁹²⁰ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 251.

⁹²¹ So, Bruce, *Hebrews*, 201; Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 249; O’Brien, *Spoken*, 80-81.

⁹²² See 2:9, 14; 7:27; 9:14, 28; 10:10; 12:2; cf. 6:6; 12:24; 13:12.

⁹²³ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 200.

Furthermore, in the *four* ‘διά with a genitive’ prepositional phrases in 9:11-14 διά is employed differently. In 9:11 it has a spatial reference⁹²⁴ whereas in 9:12 both uses of ‘through blood’⁹²⁵ are instrumental, ‘by means of’⁹²⁶ and in 9:14 ‘διά πνεύματος αἰωνίου’ is similarly instrumental, ‘because of’.⁹²⁷

The suggestion that both ἄμωμος and αἰώνιος modify πνεῦμα and refer to Christ’s ‘eternally blameless spirit’⁹²⁸ has, in part, been addressed.⁹²⁹ However, it is also worth noting that the two adjectives ‘eternal’ and ‘unblemished’ occur in separate phrases; αἰώνιος modifies διὰ πνεύματος while ἄμωμος modifies ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν. πνεύματος αἰωνίου is not modified by ἄμωμος. Consequently, 9:14 cannot refer to the eternally blameless spirit that motivated everything that Christ did during his life and death.

Some commentators hold that πνεύματος αἰωνίου should be understood as referring to Christ’s divine nature or deity.⁹³⁰ Their reasoning is that “the eternal efficacy of Christ’s sacrifice” was dependent on it being “offered by Christ in his eternal nature”.⁹³¹ However, in Hebrews there is a distinct focus on Christ’s humanity (e.g. 2:5-18) and the author has affirmed that it is because Christ was fully human that his sacrifice was efficacious. For a little while he was made lower than the angels (2:7). As the pioneer of humanity’s salvation, he was made perfect through suffering (2:10) and is pleased to call his followers his siblings (2:11-12). He took on ‘blood and flesh’ (2:14) and became like his siblings in every respect (2:17) so that he could become high priest and make atonement (2:17). He can help those going through trials because he himself has suffered (2:18).⁹³²

⁹²⁴ See §6.2.1 n.775.

⁹²⁵ δι’ αἵματος and διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος.

⁹²⁶ See §6.2.1 n.773-74 and §6.4.3.

⁹²⁷ See Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 318; Ellingworth and Nida, *Handbook*, 195.

⁹²⁸ Taken to mean that he offered himself unreservedly in complete unswerving obedience, so, Johnson, *Hebrews*, 250-52.

⁹²⁹ See §6.2.4.

⁹³⁰ See §6.1 n.750 for a representative list.

⁹³¹ Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 154. Cf. Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 124; Hewitt, *Hebrews*, 148; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 358-59.

⁹³² See §5.3.2.1, particularly n. 688-90 and the associated text. Cf. §6.4.4.

This is not to deny that the eternal nature and divinity of the Son is affirmed throughout Hebrews. He is the one through whom creation was effected (1:2) and is sustained (1:3). He who has seen Jesus has seen the Father (1:3) and he is the object of the angels' worship (1:6). He is eternally enthroned (1:8) at God's right hand (1:3) and is addressed by God as God (1:8) and Lord (1:10). In the beginning, as 'Lord', he laid the foundations of the earth and the heavens (1:10). The earth is transient, unlike himself (1:11) for "his years will not come to an end" (1:12, τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσιν). When the author of Hebrews wants to describe the Son as eternal, whether his person, life, actions, priesthood or sacrifice, he uses a variety of expressions but he never uses the adjective αἰώνιος.⁹³³ Christ's throne (1:8) and glory (13:21) are eternal (τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος and τοὺς αἰῶνας [τῶν αἰώνων] respectively) and he is a priest (5:6; 7:17, 20) or high priest (6:20) forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). In 10:12 Christ's self-sacrifice is 'perpetual' and it perfects his followers 'for all time' (10:14).⁹³⁴ Indeed, in 7:24 the author states that it is because Christ continues forever (τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) that he has a permanent priesthood (ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην). Consequently (7:25), the salvation he brings is 'for all time' (εἰς τὸ παντελές) because he lives forever (πάντοτε ζῶν) to intercede for his followers. In 7:28 he is called the Son who has been made eternally perfect (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον)

If 7:1-25 makes clear that Christ's efficacious and perpetual⁹³⁵ priesthood is dependent on his eternal Sonship, 2:9-17 indicates that it was his humanity that made his self-offering valid and that self-offering is enabled by the eternal Spirit.⁹³⁶ Christ entered into a real partnership with his followers (3:14; see §5.3.2.2) and was one with those he came to redeem. Indeed, "Hebrews nowhere contrasts Jesus' spiritual nature with his human nature".⁹³⁷ Consequently, the eternal efficacy of Christ's sacrifice was dependent on him

⁹³³ As has been seen (§6.3.2), the author reserves αἰώνιος to designate eschatological reality breaking into history. Cf. §6.4.3.

⁹³⁴ Both verses employ the phrase εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (perpetually, forever).

⁹³⁵ 7:24 describes Christ's priesthood using another Biblical *hapax*, ἀπαράβατος, 'permanent, unchangeable', *BDAG*, 97; 'inviolable, immutable, infallible, perpetual', Montanari, 226.

⁹³⁶ So, Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 457; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 187.

⁹³⁷ Lindars, *Theology*, 57-58.

offering himself in the ‘body prepared for him’ by his Father and assumed by him at his incarnation (10:5-10).⁹³⁸

It is inappropriate to interpret διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου as a reference to Christ’s ‘eternal nature’. Still less is there any reason to suggest that ‘the power of an indestructible life’ (7:16) is equivalent to Christ’s ‘eternal spirit’ (9:14).⁹³⁹ Such an identification is more than questionable.⁹⁴⁰ To equate these two Biblical *hapax* is not only to use the obscure word ἀκατάλυτος⁹⁴¹ to explain an unusual expression but also arbitrarily to link two verses that have no semantic connection. ‘Indestructible life’ is a powerful interpretation of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (‘forever’, Ps. 110:4) quoted in 7:17. “Christ... is actually what Melchizedek was symbolically, an eternal priest.”⁹⁴² The author chose to use the obscure word ἀκατάλυτος because it would have appeared that Jesus was subject to κατάλυσις by crucifixion. However, death could not hold him; consequently his life is truly ἀκατάλυτος. Christ was both priest and victim on the cross and, as the risen and ascended ‘God-man’,⁹⁴³ he continues as a priest forever (7:24-26). His ‘indestructible life’ is his resurrection life, not his own eternal (human or divine) spirit.⁹⁴⁴

If our author had intended that πνεύματος αἰωνίου be understood as a reference to Christ’s own (human or divine) spirit, he could have said so unambiguously by the addition of the personal pronoun ‘his’ (i.e. διὰ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ αἰωνίου).⁹⁴⁵ The author has been shown to be meticulous in his use of language and this paragraph (9:1-14) has been

⁹³⁸ *Contra* Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 154.

⁹³⁹ So, Büchsel, F. ἀκατάλυτος, *TDNT*, 4:339. *Contra* Hughes, *Hebrews*, 358-59; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 183; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 124; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 155; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 261-62; cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 203. See §6.4.4.

⁹⁴⁰ See Emmrich, *Concepts*, 3-4. Cf. Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 399; Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 251-52; Koester, *Hebrews*, 411; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 184; Peterson, *Perfection*, 111; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 155; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 270.

⁹⁴¹ ἀκατάλυτος, ‘pertaining to being indestructible’ (*BDAG*, 35); ‘indissoluble, perpetual’ (Montanari, 65); ‘indissoluble, indestructible, endless’ (*TDNT*, 4:338).

⁹⁴² Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 183.

⁹⁴³ See Witherington, *Hebrews*, 270.

⁹⁴⁴ So, Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 184. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 424; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 148; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 188; Koester, *Hebrews*, 355, 411; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 264; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 155.

⁹⁴⁵ It is not ‘best practice’ to exegete a phrase (particularly a Biblical *hapax*) on the strength of a word, αὐτοῦ, that doesn’t occur in the text. See Bruce, *Hebrews*, 205; Emmrich, *Concepts*, 3; Hagner, *Hebrews*, 140; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 324; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 270; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 271.

shown to be a critical transitional unit.⁹⁴⁶ Consequently, it is unlikely that his precision would waver such that he uses both αἰώνιος and πνεῦμα in 9:14 in ways that are not related to αἰώνιος in 9:12 and 9:15 and πνεῦμα in 9:8 and 10:15. Indeed, “it is not customary for (our) writer to use language so cryptically”.⁹⁴⁷

6.4.3 πνεύματος αἰωνίου as Holy Spirit

Many modern commentators hold that the πνεύματος αἰωνίου is the Holy Spirit,⁹⁴⁸ as did the Greek and Latin Fathers.⁹⁴⁹ This is the most natural understanding of the phrase. There is no cogent reason to suggest that the author would have intended any other, nor would his congregation have thought differently. However, because of the opinions expressed by some commentators (§6.4.2), it is necessary to offer some justification for identifying πνεύματος αἰωνίου with πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. This will be a two-part discussion,⁹⁵⁰ based firstly on rhetoric and context and secondly on the similarity with and development of Pauline and Johannine pneumatology.

⁹⁴⁶ See §§1.5; 6.1.1.

⁹⁴⁷ Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 237. Paraphrasing Harris’ remark about the meaning of prepositions [*Prepositions*, 82]: ‘when the usual meaning of a phrase yields a satisfactory sense that does not contravene a writer’s thought, that meaning should be preferred over an appeal to a possible exceptional usage’.

⁹⁴⁸ Allen, *Hebrews*, 473; Bieder, “Pneumatologische Aspekte”, 251, 259; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 205-206; Carroll, *Holy Spirit*, 129; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 397-99; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 457-58; Emmrich, *Concepts*, 9-13; Guthrie, *D. New Testament Introduction*, (London: Tyndale, 1970), 731, however, see *idem. Hebrews*, 188-89; Hagner, *Encountering*, 122-23; Joslin, *the Law*, 233; Kistemaker, *Hebrews*, 251-52; Koester, *Hebrews*, 415; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 240; Lindars, *Theology*, 57-58; McGrath, *Eternal Spirit*, 102-103; Miller, “Paul and Hebrews”, 262; Motyer, “The Spirit”, 226-27; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 324-25; O’Collins, G. & Jones, M.K. *Jesus Our Priest*, (Oxford: OUP, 2010), 48-49; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 270-71, 478-79; Son, K. *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews*, (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005), 97; Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 115, 403; Vanhoye, *Esprit éternel*, 263; Whitlark, *Enabling Fidelity*, 152 n.93; Wilson, *Hebrews*, 154-56; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 270-71. Robinson, [*Hebrews*, 125-26] translates πνεύματος αἰωνίου as ‘the Spirit of the Eternal’.

⁹⁴⁹ McGrath, *Eternal Spirit*, 2-4, surveys the Greek Fathers from Origen to Euthymius, the Latin Fathers from Ambrose to Aquinas and Nicholas of Lyra and the Latin commentators up to the Council of Trent (1545-63) and concludes that “During these three periods... the interpretation is always constant: the text is Trinitarian and... refers to an action of the Holy Spirit”. Cf. §8.2.1.

⁹⁵⁰ However, see also the discussion of the function of the Holy/Eternal Spirit, §6.4.4.

The triple use of αἰώνιος in 9:11-15 not only links the ‘transitional unit’ 9:11-14 with what follows⁹⁵¹ but also combines the rhetorical devices known as epiphora or epistrophe⁹⁵² and tricolon. In 9:15 the unusual word order gives “rhetorical emphasis to the final words”⁹⁵³ (τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας) thereby linking them with the closing phrases of 9:12, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν. Mid-way between these two epistrophes is the other use of ‘eternal’ in this unit: πνεύματος αἰωνίου in 9:14 and here αἰώνιος is emphatic by word order,⁹⁵⁴ so much so that Moffatt translates the phrase as “the spirit of the eternal”.⁹⁵⁵ It is highly unlikely that the author would, without clearly signalling it, switch from αἰώνιος as designating an eschatological gift affecting current experience⁹⁵⁶ to an aspect of Christ’s human or divine nature and then back again. Furthermore, it must not be ignored that in the larger discourse unit, 9:1-10:18, there is a three-fold use of πνεῦμα (9:8, 9:14; 10:15) and there is nothing in the text of this larger unit to signal that a different ‘Spirit’ is in view at 9:14. In fact, there is a logical link between these three verses and, for that matter, the phrase ‘Spirit of grace’ in 10:29.⁹⁵⁷ In 9:8 the Holy Spirit reveals that the way into τοῦ ἁγίου was not yet revealed. In 9:14 the eschatological Spirit equips Christ to offer the sacrifice that enabled him (as fore-runner) to enter τὰ ἅγια (9:12). In 10:15 the Holy Spirit testifies that the NC people are freed from the consequences of sin (10:17) and therefore free to enter τῶν ἁγίων (10:19). This logical progression, with the Spirit identifying the barrier preventing access, facilitating its removal and then proclaiming free access for the NC people, would suggest that all three uses of πνεῦμα have the same referent.

The three phrases, ‘eternal redemption’, ‘eternal Spirit’ and ‘eternal inheritance’ provide an example of the rhetorical device known as tricolon.⁹⁵⁸ Tricola often come at the start

⁹⁵¹ Indeed, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο begins 9:15 and firmly links it to 9:11-14; see Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 241. Cf. §6.1.1.

⁹⁵² The repetition of a word or phrase at the end of a clause or sentence for emphasis.

⁹⁵³ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 462.

⁹⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 242-43; Cf. Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 584.

⁹⁵⁵ Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 120, although this is not how he treats the phrase in the body of his commentary, *ibid*, 124.

⁹⁵⁶ It will be argued that this is exactly how the Holy Spirit functions in 9:14, see §6.4.4.

⁹⁵⁷ See further, §7.4.

⁹⁵⁸ Although many examples of tricola are short, even pithy, (e.g. *veni, vidi, vinci*) they need not be so. For a full discussion of tricolon, and its function with ‘worked examples’ from Isa. 19:1-4 and Ps. 123,

or conclusion of a unit of text⁹⁵⁹ (sometimes both), can express merismus and serve to mark a climax in an argument.⁹⁶⁰ The effect of a tricolon is strengthened by the repetition of a key word as with the triple occurrence of αἰώνιος in 9:11-15.⁹⁶¹ Watson discusses the chiasmic tricolon of the form (ABA') which has two parallel cola (AA') separated by an isolated line (B) and forms a unit.⁹⁶² This is the rhetorical form employed in 9:11-15, albeit also exhibiting what is known as 'distant parallelism'.⁹⁶³ Christ's death obtains 'eternal redemption' (A), was made through the 'eternal Spirit' (B) and provides an 'eternal inheritance' (A'). Indeed, the 'distant parallelism' and three-fold repetition of αἰώνιος produces a feeling of completeness, as the author intended, not least because the complex sentence which is 9:15 concludes with αἰωνίου κληρονομίας.⁹⁶⁴ This comfortably fits within the Epistle as a whole as the author presents the eternal Son of God (1:1-3 *et. al.*), in partnership with the eternal Spirit (9:14), procuring eternal redemption (9:12) and the promised eternal inheritance (9:15) for those under the New (and eternal) Covenant (13:20).⁹⁶⁵

Although the phrase 'Eternal Spirit' in 9:14 is a Biblical *hapax*, nonetheless in both John and Paul collocations of these two words 'pave the way' for our author's designation of the Holy Spirit as πνεύματος αἰωνίου. As will become apparent, it will be instructive to examine some texts from John's gospel and Paul's letters to Titus and the churches of Galatia.

John⁹⁶⁶ recognises that Christ "comes from heaven and is above all" (3:31). He is loved by God (3:35) and is sent by God. He speaks the words of God and has been given "the

see Watson W.G.E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 177-85, 363-68.

⁹⁵⁹ 9:11-15 functions as a transition paragraph, concluding 9:1-10 and commencing 9:16-28, see §6.1.1.

⁹⁶⁰ Watson, *Poetry*, 183.

⁹⁶¹ *Ibid*, 178-79.

⁹⁶² *Ibid*, 181.

⁹⁶³ Explored in Watson, W.G.E. *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*, (Sheffield: SAP, 1994), 289-95. Although he focuses on 'word pairs in distant parallelism', he also gives examples of 'triple sets' and 'groups of four' (*ibid*, 291-94).

⁹⁶⁴ Cf. Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 124-25.

⁹⁶⁵ See Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 457.

⁹⁶⁶ In this and the next paragraph all the references are from John's Gospel.

Spirit without measure” (3:34).⁹⁶⁷ Those who accept his testimony (3:33) and believe in Him have ζῶν αἰώνιον, “eternal life”, (3:36). This linking of ‘eternal life’, ‘belief in the Son’ and the ‘reception of the Spirit’ is also hinted at in 3:5-15. Being ‘born of the Spirit’ enables entry into the kingdom of God (3:5) and is equated to the ‘new birth’ (3:7). The Son is from heaven (3:13), therefore eternal, and gives eternal life to all who believe in him (3:15). At this juncture, and for the purposes of this thesis, it is sufficient to note that the phrases ‘born of the Spirit’ and ‘receiving eternal life’ speak of the same experience, an experience which is dependent on the death of the man from heaven (3:14).⁹⁶⁸

A similar interplay is seen in the ‘bread of life’ discourse (6:27-59) and its repercussions (6:60-69). Jesus is the bread of life (6:35) who has come from heaven (6:33) as the gift of the father (6:32). Those who believe in him receive eternal life (6:40, 44;) and the ‘living bread’ which is his flesh given (in sacrificial death) for the life of the world (6:51). John then records that Jesus describes the eternal life that he imparts as ‘eating his flesh and drinking his blood’ (6:53-54). This metaphor for being one with Christ (6:56) has clear sacrificial overtones. Jesus refers to his words as ‘Spirit and life’ (6:63) and, indeed, it is the Spirit who gives this life, this eternal life (6:63). John goes on to record that many who had hitherto followed Jesus now withdrew (6:66) prompting Jesus to ask the twelve if they too were going to leave him (6:67). Peter responds by declaring that Jesus has “the words of eternal life” (6:68). Consequently, John juxtaposes the sacrificial language of Jesus’ flesh and blood being offered for the life of the world with the Spirit imparting eternal life to the world for which Jesus offered himself. John also reports that Jesus’ words are ‘Spirit and life’ and ‘words of eternal life’. John brings together the motifs of ‘sacrificial death’, ‘eternal life’, ‘Christ’s flesh and blood offered for the world’ and the Spirit enabling the transaction between Christ and his followers.

⁹⁶⁷ For the purposes of this thesis, it is not necessary to discuss whether 3:31-36 is part of the Baptist’s statement or John’s theological reflections, although the latter is most likely. Nor is it necessary to enter the debate whether the Son receives or gives the Spirit without measure (3:34), although the former is more likely.

⁹⁶⁸ See Keener, *John*, 1:544-58. Cf. Brown, T.G. *spirit in the writings of john*, (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 113-29. She writes: “in John 3, spirit opens up the possibility of receiving eternal life” (*ibid*, 129), and “for one to have eternal life... become ‘born of the spirit’” (*ibid*, 125).

For John, ‘life in the Spirit’ is ‘eternal life’ which is begun now but only fully realized in the age to come.⁹⁶⁹

Titus 3:4-7 provides another juxtaposition of words and phrases that link the Spirit and eternal life. “God saved us... through the washing of rebirth and renewal by the Holy Spirit whom he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs (κληρονόμοι) according to the hope of eternal life (ζωῆς αἰωνίου).” It is not necessary to enter the discussion of whether ‘washing’ has any reference to baptism, nor whether ‘washing’ and ‘renewal’ bespeak one or two experiences. What is important, from the perspective of this thesis, is the link here between Spirit and eternal life. Indeed, the presence of the Spirit “poured out on us” (Titus 3:5-6) not only guarantees the eschatological “hope of eternal life” (Titus 3:7)⁹⁷⁰ “but also make(s) visible this new reality in the ‘here and now’.”⁹⁷¹ The Spirit is the one who brings the life of the age to come into the present experience of the followers of Christ.⁹⁷²

Whilst it is acknowledged that John and Titus are probably late documents, the same cannot be said of Galatians.⁹⁷³ There is the same ‘now and not yet’ understanding of the ministry of the Spirit in Galatians as is found in Hebrews.⁹⁷⁴ On the one hand, the Galatians have ‘received the Spirit’ (3:2), ‘started in the Spirit’ (3:3) and are encouraged to walk in the Spirit (5:16). Paul also reminds them that God ‘sent the Spirit of his Son’ into their hearts as confirmation of their sonship (4:6)⁹⁷⁵ and he both gives the Spirit to them and works miracles among them (3:5).⁹⁷⁶ On the other hand, Paul links the Spirit

⁹⁶⁹ See Carson, D.A. *The Gospel According to John*, (Leicester: IVP, 1991), 196-98, 202-203. Cf. Köstenberger, A.J. and Swain, S.R. *Father, Son and Spirit: The Trinity and John’s Gospel*, (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008), 176-77, 187-90; Keener, *John*, 1:692-99.

⁹⁷⁰ “Becoming heirs of eternal life (is) the result of the pouring out of the Spirit upon us”, so, Kelly, J.N.D. *The Pastoral Epistles*, (London: A&C Black, 1976), 253.

⁹⁷¹ Saarinen, R. *The Pastoral Epistles with Philemon and Jude*, (London: SCM, 2008), 193. Cf. Marshall, I.H. *Pastorals*, (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 324; Mounce, *Pastorals*, 451; Towner, P.H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 784-86.

⁹⁷² See further, §6.4.4.

⁹⁷³ All the references in this paragraph, unless otherwise specified, are from Galatians.

⁹⁷⁴ See Witherington III, B. “The Influence of Galatians on Hebrews”, *NTS*, 37 (1991), 146-52.

⁹⁷⁵ Fee [*Presence*, 400-401] writes that 4:4-7 shows “the thoroughly Trinitarian basis of Pauline soteriology”. Cf. Dunn, J.D.G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, (London: A&C Black, 1993), 220-22.

⁹⁷⁶ The verses referenced thus far in this paragraph are similar in thrust to Heb. 2:4; 6:4. However, it would be wrong to press any linguistic parallels between them. See §5.2.2.

with “the hope of righteousness” (5:5) and both “the blessing of Abraham” (3:14) and “the promised inheritance” (3:18). His conclusion is: “If you sow to the Spirit, you will reap eternal life from the Spirit” (6:8). Indeed, this ‘hope’, ‘blessing’, ‘promise’ and ‘eternal life’ is the ultimate outcome of sowing to the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is presented as “the primary reality of our eschatological existence (who is) already and not yet”.⁹⁷⁷ Not only is he the evidence of NC life and the guarantee of eternal life but also, he brings eternity into the ‘here and now’ experience of the NC people. The harvest of ζῶν αἰώνιον (6:8) depends on the Galatians present ‘sowing to the Spirit’ and is eschatological in its focus.⁹⁷⁸ The Holy Spirit “institutes and constitutes a new state of affairs (which) is itself promissory of more”.⁹⁷⁹

This brief discussion of the collocations of ‘Spirit’ and ‘eternal life’ shows that our author’s understanding of the Spirit here is both ‘at one’ with that of John and Paul whilst also ‘pushing the boundaries’ of NT pneumatology. It is a significant step for Hebrews to call the Holy Spirit ‘Eternal Spirit’ – but it is just a step. The author of Hebrews has been seen to be a theologically astute rhetorician. His use of language is both rich and precise. He even coined words to express more clearly the truth he was presenting.⁹⁸⁰ ‘Eternal Spirit’ (9:14), and for that matter ‘Spirit of Grace’ (10:29),⁹⁸¹ are phrases employed by the author not because they were in common usage but because they perfectly suited his pneumatological intent.

In Hebrews αἰώνιος is always ‘now and not yet’, conveying the blessings that the faithful will enjoy in the coming αἰών but which have begun already. Our author is not lax or casual in his use of language,⁹⁸² he reserves αἰώνιος to describe eschatological reality

⁹⁷⁷ So, Fee, *Presence*, 467; cf. Witherington III, B. *Grace in Galatia*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 432 n.49.

⁹⁷⁸ Fung, R.Y.K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 295-96; Schulz, S. *σπείρω*, *TDNT*, 7:546.

⁹⁷⁹ So, Martyn, J.L. *Galatians*, (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 323. Cf. Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1992), 265.

⁹⁸⁰ See §1.5.2, specifically n.179.

⁹⁸¹ See §7.4.

⁹⁸² See §1.5.

breaking into time. In 9:14 πνεύματος αἰωνίου is the eschatological Spirit⁹⁸³ working within the present dimension, bringing the eternal realities of heaven and the life to come into every ‘today’.⁹⁸⁴ 9:14 “speaks of the action in time of an eternal Spirit”⁹⁸⁵ who makes real “the powers of the age to come” (6:5) in the lives of Christ’s followers.

This thesis argues that Hebrews’ references to the Spirit are focused and manifest a developed pneumatology shared by both author and recipients alike. Ellingworth, commenting on 6:2, writes that αἰώνιος “qualifies the judgement as being distinctively God’s”.⁹⁸⁶ In Hebrews, αἰώνιος has “the characteristic semantic feature of permanence... the eschatological age (cf. 9,12; 13,20) (and) the eschatological future... (cf. 5,9; 6,2; 9,15)”.⁹⁸⁷ However, “eternity... is only possible as an attribute of God”.⁹⁸⁸ Consequently, the designation, ‘eternal Spirit’ also points to his ‘God-ness’ and in 9:14 he is revealed as Christ’s ‘eternal partner’ in the drama of redemption.⁹⁸⁹

Thus, 9:11-15 declares that through the Holy Spirit who is Eternal, Christ, the Eternal Son – as both sacrifice and priest – procures eternal redemption and eternal inheritance, now and for eternity for those who are partnered by him⁹⁹⁰ and the Holy Spirit (6:4). The function of the Spirit in this divine drama and transaction will now be addressed.

⁹⁸³ Indeed, Bieder [“Pneumatologische Aspekte”, 251] translates 9:14 as “through the eschatological spirit” and notes that Michaelis [W. *Versöhnung des Alls*, (Gümligen: Siloah, 1950), S. 47] writes that αἰώνιος should not be translated with ‘eternal’ but with ‘eschatological’. Cf. O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 324.

⁹⁸⁴ Mackie [*Eschatology*, 90] correctly notes that Hebrews’ eschatology reveals “a breach in the fabric of time (and) the powers of the coming age have been manifest”. Cf. Emmrich, “Amtscharisma”, 22.

⁹⁸⁵ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 457.

⁹⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 316.

⁹⁸⁷ Portalatín, *Temporal Oppositions*, 98 n.362. Cf. EDG, 46.

⁹⁸⁸ Cullmann, O. *Christ and Time*, (London: SCM, 1951), 62.

⁹⁸⁹ This will be returned to in §§8.2; 8.3.

⁹⁹⁰ 1:9; 3:14; See §5.3.2.1.

6.4.4 The Function of πνεύματος αἰωνίου

In 9:14 the διὰ of διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου is instrumental⁹⁹¹ and refers to the divine sustaining or empowering experienced by Christ enabling him to fulfil his ministry as priest and sacrifice.⁹⁹² True as that is, it would be more correct to say that “the Holy Spirit anointed Jesus... for every aspect of his ministry, including his sacrificial death”.⁹⁹³ Furthermore, once it is recognised that ‘eternal Spirit’ is ‘Holy Spirit’, it is hard to construe the verse as referring to anything other than this. In fact, such a role for the Holy Spirit in the life of Christ fits well with the theology of Hebrews. Indeed, this interpretation of 9:14 fits well with the fundamental purposes of the author.

It is not possible to deduce the purpose of the letter from a knowledge of its destination or the makeup of the congregation to which it is addressed.⁹⁹⁴ Anything that can be said on this subject must be gleaned from the contents of the letter, a document which its author calls “a word of encouragement” (παράκλησις).⁹⁹⁵ However, it is generally accepted that a major concern of the author is to encourage his congregation to both hold on to and grow in their Christian faith. Indeed, many commentators regard this as *the* major concern of Hebrews.⁹⁹⁶ Using a mixture of exhortation, warning and encouragement,⁹⁹⁷ the author seeks to address the crisis which he perceives as threatening the continued existence of his congregation. That crisis has been variously identified⁹⁹⁸ as the temptation to return to Judaism⁹⁹⁹ and/or to their former way of

⁹⁹¹ See §6.2.1, especially the data relating to and comments contained in n.773-79.

⁹⁹² So, Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 240. Cf. Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 457; Emmrich, “Amtscharisma”, 17; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 430; Levison, “Theology”, 105-106; Miller, “Paul and Hebrews”, 262.

⁹⁹³ O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 324-25. Cf. Hagner, *Hebrews*, 137; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 399; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 271.

⁹⁹⁴ Since these things are not known.

⁹⁹⁵ Various understood as ‘emboldening’, ‘exhorting’ or ‘comforting’, see *BDAG*, 766; Montanari, 1552-53.

⁹⁹⁶ See Allen, *Hebrews*, 82; cf. Carson, D.A. Moo, D.J. and Morris, L. *An Introduction to the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 392-94; Guthrie, *Introduction*, 703-10; Marohl, *Faithfulness*, 184-85; Marshall, *NT Theology*, 605; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 9-13; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 13-15. See also §2.5.4, specifically Table 2.1 and the accompanying discussion.

⁹⁹⁷ A combination of deliberative and epideictic rhetoric, see §1.5.4 n.190.

⁹⁹⁸ See the summary of options in Johnson, R.W. *Going Outside the Camp*, (Sheffield: SAP, 2001), 18-20.

⁹⁹⁹ E.g. Allen, *Hebrews*, 79; Bruce, *Hebrews*, xxii, xxx; Dunnill, *Covenant*, 21-25, 37-39; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 12-13; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 13-15.

life,¹⁰⁰⁰ or to relapse into the Roman imperial culture¹⁰⁰¹ or, more simply, falling away from their Christian profession.¹⁰⁰²

Key to the author's encouragement and challenge is the call to his audience to focus on Jesus.¹⁰⁰³ This exhortation has two distinct yet interrelated dimensions to it. At one level, he portrays Jesus as an example of resolute fortitude that the congregation should emulate.¹⁰⁰⁴ He states that Jesus, although severely tested, did not fall (4:15), he endured the suffering and shame that accompanied crucifixion (12:2) and remained completely faithful to God (3:1, 6). The author also urges the congregation to think about the hostility that Jesus endured from sinners to challenge them not to abandon their confidence (12:3).¹⁰⁰⁵ Throughout the letter he employs words and phrases translated as 'hold firm',¹⁰⁰⁶ 'endure',¹⁰⁰⁷ and 'take care',¹⁰⁰⁸ to challenge his congregation to remain faithful. The author writes that one reason Jesus could endure as he did was that he was focused not on the suffering but on "the joy that was set before him" (12:2). He sets a similar eschatological reward before his audience, reminding them of the eternal benefits that will accrue to them if they do remain faithful to the end. These eschatological 'rewards' are described as: entering and enjoying the 'sabbath rest of God' (4:1-11), eternal salvation (5:9), the promised eternal inheritance (9:15), a kingdom that cannot be shaken (12:25) and a city that is to come (13:14).¹⁰⁰⁹

¹⁰⁰⁰ See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 12-13; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, xxiv-xxvii. Other suggestions include: a general lack of commitment (e.g. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 13, 21-25) or a failure to engage in world mission (e.g. Manson, W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951), 23-24, 159-61).

¹⁰⁰¹ Whitlark, *Resisting Empire*, 192-93, cf. the discussion in §6.3.

¹⁰⁰² Either by 'drifting away' (2:1), 'hardening their hearts' (3:8, 15; 4:7) or 'growing weary' (12:3). See Mackie, *Eschatology*, 10-12, who notes that these tendencies would be exacerbated by the external pressures of persecution and abuse. Cf. Marohl, *Faithfulness*, 184-85; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 13.

¹⁰⁰³ E.g. 2:9; 3:1-2; 6:20; 7:22; 12:1-3.

¹⁰⁰⁴ E.g. 3:6, 14; 4:14-15; 13:12-13. See Marshall, *NT Theology*, 610.

¹⁰⁰⁵ E.g. 6:17-20; 10:35-36; 12:28; 13:14. See Schenck, *Cosmology*, 27; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 66. Carson, Moo and Morris [*Introduction*, 394] write: "it is infinitely better to share his disgrace than to defect from his grace".

¹⁰⁰⁶ κρατέω (3:6, 14; 10:23) and κρατέω (4:14; 6:18).

¹⁰⁰⁷ ὑπομονή (10:36; 12:1, 7). Cf. προσέχω (2:1, pay greater attention), φέρω (6:1, go on), σπουδή (6:11, diligence) and ἀκλινής (10:23, without wavering).

¹⁰⁰⁸ βλέπω (3:12) and φοβέω (4:1) cf. μὴ νωθροὶ (6:12, not sluggish), μὴ ἀποβάλητε (10:35, do not abandon) and οὐκ ὑποστολῆς (10:39, do not shrink back).

¹⁰⁰⁹ Cf. 2:9, 14-15; 6:11-12, 17-20; 9:28; 10:35-36.

However, at another (and perhaps more fundamental) level, the author's injunction to 'focus on Jesus' includes the recognition that, in his humanity, Christ needed divine help to complete his ministry.¹⁰¹⁰ That Hebrews places an emphasis on the humanity of Jesus is without question. Indeed, Hebrews is adamant that Christ's priesthood and sacrifice were efficacious only because he was fully human.¹⁰¹¹ One aspect of his humanity is what has been called the 'Gethsemane tradition'.¹⁰¹² This is the tradition, reflected in the Gethsemane narratives,¹⁰¹³ that Jesus needed his Father's strengthening as he 'wrestled' to do the will of God. The prayer in the garden, the anguish, the sweat that came as great drops of blood (Luke 22:44)¹⁰¹⁴ and the cry of dereliction on the cross were a real part of Jesus' struggle and this 'Gethsemane tradition' underlies 5:7-9.¹⁰¹⁵ Furthermore, the use of phrases such as 'he learned obedience through what he suffered' (5:8), 'being perfected through suffering' (2:10) and 'he was tested by what he suffered' (2:18) indicate that his suffering was not only didactic but also real and difficult to endure.

In 2:17-18 he writes that Christ became like (ὁμοιόω) his brothers in every respect (κατὰ πάντα) and because he has been tempted (πειράζω) he is able to help all those who are themselves tempted (πειράζω). Similarly, in 4:15-16 he writes that because Christ has been tempted (πειράζω) in every way (κατὰ πάντα) just as (ὁμοιότης) the congregation

¹⁰¹⁰ E.g. 2:18; 4:15; 5:7-9. As will be seen, 9:14 is best understood in this context.

¹⁰¹¹ See the discussion of 2:5-18, §6.4.2.

¹⁰¹² For the purposes of this thesis, the 'Gethsemane tradition' covers the whole period from the prayer in the garden to the crucifixion and death.

¹⁰¹³ Matt. 26:39, 42, 44; Mark 14:36, 39; Luke 22:42.

¹⁰¹⁴ There is significant doubt about the provenance of Luke 22:43-5. Fitzmyer [J.A. *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1444] rejects Lucan authorship; Brown [R.E. *The Death of the Messiah Vol. 1*, (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 186] thinks the verses are probably Lucan, while Marshall [Luke, 832] accepts their originality "with very considerable hesitation". Metzger, 151 regards the passage as a later addition but writes of "its evident antiquity and its importance in the textual tradition". However, "unlike some other critical Greek New Testaments, the *Tyndale House Edition* considers Luke 23:43-44 to be part of the original text" – so Jongkind, D. *An Introduction to the Greek New Testament Produced at Tyndale House, Cambridge*, (Wheaton: Crossway, 2019), 84-85. The pericope containing the account of the angelic assistance is both contemporaneous with the production of the Synoptics (so, Marshall, *Luke*, 831) and "appropriate for its context" (so, Brown, *Death*, 186). Leaney [A.R.C. *The Gospel According to St Luke*, (London: A&C Black, 1976 [1958]), 273] writes of God enabling Jesus to face the cross: "(it) makes real both the suffering and its divine control and acceptance". Whether these verses are genuinely Lucan or not they are, nonetheless, generally recognised as part of the wider 'Gethsemane tradition'.

¹⁰¹⁵ Allen [*Hebrews*, 327] writes: "the description in Heb 5:7... is virtually identical to... Luke 22:44". Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 148-50; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 241-50; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 197-200; Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 121-24; Richardson, C. "The Passion: Reconsidering Hebrews 5:7-8", Bauckham (2008), 51-67; Seifrid, "Death", 274; Stanton, G.N. "Jesus Traditions", *DLNTD*, 566-67.

had, yet without sin, they are able to approach his throne of grace for help to overcome their struggle. The statement that Jesus was tempted in the same way as the congregation has been understood to refer to his sinless life in general.¹⁰¹⁶ However, 4:15 cannot be interpreted apart from 4:14-16 and the situation of the first congregation. The key, which few if any, recognise is *κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα* which expands on *ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν* whose resolution lies in the *ἔλεος καὶ χάριν* which Christ provides as *εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν* from his *θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος*. This call to ‘hold fast their faith/confession’ (*κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας*) would indicate that their ‘weakness’ was the temptation to escape the pressure and persecution they were being exposed to by walking away from their calling. Christ was made like his brothers in every respect (2:17) and in every respect has been tempted like his brothers.¹⁰¹⁷ The “temptation to escape from the cross as pictured in the prayer in Gethsemane... is the ultimate temptation”¹⁰¹⁸ and it is this that specifically links the temptation faced by the congregation with that of Christ. Rather than a generalised ‘he faced every temptation that humankind can face’ the *πειράζω*¹⁰¹⁹ in common between Christ and the author’s congregation was “to derail the divine mission, first in Christ then in Christians and the Church”.¹⁰²⁰

The author states that Jesus’ own suffering is the basis for his compassion towards and help for those who suffer in his name. Being himself divinely strengthened for his self-sacrifice, he is therefore aware that his followers will need similar help. Consequently, without any perceived shame or failure, they can call for divine assistance in order to fulfil their calling.¹⁰²¹ They do not need to rely solely on their own strength of character; they can draw on the grace that God supplies,¹⁰²² reliant on “the inward working of the

¹⁰¹⁶ So, Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 114; Allen, *Hebrews*, 304-13; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 226.

¹⁰¹⁷ As Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 269] points out, “*κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα* (in 4:15) is equivalent to *κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι* in 2:17”.

¹⁰¹⁸ Baker, W.R. “Temptation”, *DLNTD*, 1167.

¹⁰¹⁹ *πειράζω* is the word used to describe: Christ’s temptations in the wilderness (Matt. 4:1, 3; Mark 1:13; Luke 4:2, 13); the demands for a sign from heaven (Matt. 16:1; Mark 8:11; Luke 11:16) and as a constant feature of Christ’s ministry (Luke 22:28).

¹⁰²⁰ Baker, “Temptation”, 1167. Attridge [*Hebrews*, 141] writes: “The accent in this verse is finally on the likeness of the suffering human Jesus to the addressees”.

¹⁰²¹ E.g. 2:16-18; 4:16; 5:9; 7:25; 9:24; 10:19-22; 13:9, 21.

¹⁰²² 4:16; 10:22. So, Allen, *Hebrews*, 82; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 79; Schenck, *Cosmology*, 27; see §7.4 for a discussion of the Spirit of Grace (10:29).

power of God (13:21) to provide them with the spiritual resources they need for their pilgrimage”.¹⁰²³ This is so even when, or especially when, their faithfulness to Christ necessitates suffering, shame or persecution (13:5-6). Indeed, in 10:32-33 the author reminds his congregation that they too had already been “publicly exposed to abuse” (ὀνειδισμοῖς) and he uses the same word in 13:13 to describe Christ’s sufferings. Thus, the author portrays both the members of the NC community and Christ himself as experiencing ὀνειδισμός. Furthermore, because God responded to Christ’s prayer for help (5:7), so too God will enable Christ’s followers to overcome any amount of ὀνειδισμός that they suffer in his service (13:20-21).

6.5 Conclusions

The Spirit’s role in 9:14 should be seen as a divine equipping of Christ for the faithful execution of his calling or ministry. It was through, or owing to, the Holy Spirit’s enabling that Christ functioned as both sacrificing priest and sacrificial victim. Father, Son and Holy Spirit united in the great dramatic event that secured eternal salvation for those whom Christ came to redeem. However, although 9:14 asserts that the Holy Spirit was involved in the passion of Christ, it does not address the mechanics of that involvement.¹⁰²⁴ Nonetheless, Hebrews alone in the NT links the Holy Spirit and the salvific event. Furthermore, the phrase διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου suggests that the Spirit was central to the drama of salvation.

The ‘consistent character’ shown by Jesus on the road to the cross (and on the cross) depended, to a significant degree, on him receiving divine strengthening. It was not due solely to Jesus’ own consistent inner disposition, will or ‘spirit’. Nor was it because he was divine. Indeed, the emphasis on Christ’s oneness with his siblings (§5.4) and his

¹⁰²³ Marshall, *NT Theology*, 611; cf. *ibid*, 618 where Marshall “lists a catalogue of current blessings... which indicate (believers) strengthening by contact with the Trinity”.

¹⁰²⁴ It is important, when seeking to discover what a text affirms, that questions are not asked of it that it does not address. Hebrews’ author, for instance, affirms Christ’s full humanity and his divinity but “standing at a relatively early point in the development of Christianity... he does not say how he envisaged the relationship between the exalted Son of his prologue and the earthly Jesus, except that they are one and the same. The resolution of this question was for a later age” [Wilson, *Hebrews*, 156].

ability not only to sympathise but also to help the congregation in their struggles would be undermined by any suggestion that in his earthly life he had advantages they could not access. If ‘the eternal Spirit’ relates to Jesus as a divine being, the author’s whole Christological argument would be damaged.

The appellation αἰώνιος applied to the Spirit indicates his divinity, he is ‘of heaven’. It is no problem that the phrase is unique in the NT,¹⁰²⁵ so too are the phrases ‘the eternal God’ (Rom. 16:26) and the Spirit of holiness (Rom. 1:4). Of the 142 occurrences of πνεῦμα in Paul, the phrases ‘the Spirit of his Son’ (Gal. 4:6), ‘the Spirit of Christ’ (Rom. 8:9) and ‘the Spirit of Jesus Christ’ (Phil. 1:19) are each found only once. It would seem that the NT writers, including the author of Hebrews, felt able to coin or adapt phrases to better serve their theological or pastoral message. Having emphasised the eternal nature of the Son in his prologue and writing about the eternal efficacy of the death of Christ and the eternal redemption it procured, it is not unnatural that he should refer to the Holy Spirit, through whom Christ’s self-offering was made, as the Eternal Spirit.

¹⁰²⁵ As Levison [“Theology”, 105-107] points out, this unique title is further evidence of our author’s theological creativity; similarly, the designation ‘Spirit of grace’ and the *hapax* ἐνυβρίζω (§7.4) testify to his creativity.

7 The Spirit of Grace, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος, Hebrews 10:29

7.1 Introduction

The phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος is a NT *hapax* and therefore it is important to understand why our author chose to use it. Consequently, a close examination of the context in which it occurs in Hebrews will be undertaken, as will an exploration of any possible background to this title. A collocational analysis¹⁰²⁶ of χάρις and πνεῦμα may reveal the source of the phrase and possibly throw light on the reason(s) why the author chose to call the Holy Spirit τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος. After a brief discussion of the concept of ‘grace’ in Hebrews, an exegesis of 10:29 *in its own context* will conclude this discussion of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος.

7.2 Collocations of χάρις and πνεῦμα – overview

In the NT, the words χάρις and πνεῦμα occur 155 times and 379 times respectively. Apart from 10:29, they are found in close proximity just seven times.¹⁰²⁷ However, Revelation 1:4-5 is the only NT text which could conceivably help in understanding ‘the Spirit of grace’ in Hebrews.¹⁰²⁸ In the LXX, χάρις is found 164 times and πνεῦμα 381 times. They are in close proximity on six occasions. Four are coincidental juxtapositions.¹⁰²⁹ It will be shown that the collocations in Zechariah 4:6-7 and 12:10 are probably the most significant for our author’s use of the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος and may well supply an OT/LXX background for their use in 10:29.¹⁰³⁰ In the so-called Pseudepigrapha, there are five collocations of the words πνεῦμα and χάρις. Only one of these (*T. Jud.* 24:2) is

¹⁰²⁶ In the NT, the LXX, the OT Pseudepigrapha, Philo and Josephus.

¹⁰²⁷ Twice the juxtaposition is coincidental (2 Tim. 4:22 and 1 Pet. 1:2). Elsewhere, grace is a blessing bestowed by Christ on his followers – once in the Trinitarian benediction of 2 Cor. 13:13 and thrice as ‘the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit’ (Gal. 6:18; Phil. 4:23; Philem. 25).

¹⁰²⁸ See §7.2.1.

¹⁰²⁹ 1 Sam. 16:22-3; Sir. 34:12-13; 1 Macc. 13:6-7; 4 Macc. 11:11-12.

¹⁰³⁰ See §7.2.4.

pertinent to this study.¹⁰³¹ In the non-Biblical Qumran documents, ‘spirit’ (רוח) occurs 365 times while ‘grace’ (חֲנּוּן and cognates) occurs 33 times. ‘Grace’ is in close proximity to ‘spirit’ on six occasions; however, none of the six collocations of these words have a bearing on this study.¹⁰³² In Philo, the words χάρις and πνεῦμα occur together just four times. Three of these are coincidental¹⁰³³ and in *De Gigantibus* 24 he writes that the Spirit of God effects a growth in grace.¹⁰³⁴ Philo reflects a Hellenistic-Jewish perspective and is broadly contemporary with Hebrews. There are no collocations of the words χάρις and πνεῦμα in Josephus.

For the sake of completeness, note that the Apostolic Constitutions 6:18 refer to “those who blasphemed the Spirit of grace.” This work is probably Antiochene and from the last quarter of the fourth century.¹⁰³⁵ It significantly post-dates Hebrews and reflects traditions current in the Syrian church by the end of the fourth century. Much closer to the period in which Hebrews was produced, Clement of Rome wrote that the Church’s unity comes from “*one* God... *one* Christ (and) *one* Spirit of grace who has been poured out upon us” (1 Clem. 46:6).¹⁰³⁶ This triad (or Trinity) explicitly demonstrates that ‘Spirit’ not ‘spirit’ is being referred to. Whether Clement was referring to the Spirit being poured out at Pentecost or to subsequent outpourings, he clearly refers to the personal Holy Spirit as the ‘Spirit of grace’ and is comfortable in ranking him alongside the Father and the Son. This reflects (Trinitarian) traditions current in late first-century Corinth and Rome and shows that, in the period in which some of the NT documents were produced,

¹⁰³¹ On *T. Jud.* 24:2, see §7.2.3. The coincidental collocations are: *T. Ben.* 4:5; Jub. 10:3; 2 Bar. 3:2; and Syb. Or. 4:46, which links πνεῦμα, ζωή and χάρις as independent gifts from God.

¹⁰³² These state that God has ‘favoured’ or ‘graced’ the recipient with either ‘holy spirit’ (1Q28b 2:22, 24; 4Q506 125:3), a ‘spirit of knowledge’ (1QH 14:25) or ‘a spirit of mercy’ (1QH 16:9). 11Q5 9:14 is also a coincidental collocation (‘grant me a faithful spirit ...let me not be disgraced’).

¹⁰³³ *Leg. All.* III:14; *Virt.* 135 and *Deus Imm.* 60.

¹⁰³⁴ See §7.2.2.

¹⁰³⁵ Not least because of the mention of Christmas in a list of recognised feasts (*Apost. Con.* 5:13; 8:33). Christmas was celebrated in Antioch from c. 375 AD but nowhere else in the East until c. 430 AD.

¹⁰³⁶ Most scholars date 1 Clement to about 95 AD. 1 Clem. shows a knowledge of Heb. E.g. 1 Clem. 36 – six verses long and containing six quotations or clear allusions to Hebrews. Ellingworth [P. “Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?” *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 23 (1979), 269] affirms “1 Clement’s literary dependence on Hebrews”. Also, Cockerill, G.L. “Heb 1:1-14, 1 Clem. 36:1-6 and The High Priest Title”, *JBL*, 97:3 (1978), 437-40.

the post-Apostolic church was comfortable calling the Holy Spirit ‘the Spirit of grace’ and knew him as both personal and divine.

7.2.1 Revelation 1:4-5

John writes, “Grace to you and peace from him who is and who was and who is to come and from the seven spirits who are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ”. Revelation 1:4-5 is unique in that it is the only place in the Bible where all three members of the Trinity are invoked for the impartation of grace. However, before it is possible to draw any inferences about grace proceeding from the Spirit, it must be demonstrated that Revelation is here using the sobriquets ‘him who is and who was and who is to come’ for God the Father and ‘the seven spirits who are before his throne’ for the Holy Spirit.

ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος is “an arresting way of stressing the changelessness and eternity of God”.¹⁰³⁷ In all probability, it is an allusion to Exodus 3:14-15, where God declares his name – ‘I am who I am’ – to Moses.¹⁰³⁸ Furthermore, this same designation for God is found in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Deuteronomy 32:39.¹⁰³⁹ This is not to suggest literary dependence (between *Tg. Ps-J. Deut.* and *Rev.*) one way or the other; it is enough to recognise that, within Second Temple Judaism, ‘he who is, was and is to come’ was a recognised way of referring to God.¹⁰⁴⁰ Indeed, the context in Revelation 1:4 does not permit any other identification than God the Father.¹⁰⁴¹

Commentators are divided as to the identity of “the seven spirits who are before God’s throne”. Many scholars prefer to see “the seven spirits” as angels or, more specifically,

¹⁰³⁷ Morris, L. *Revelation*, (London: Tyndale, 1969), 47-48.

¹⁰³⁸ So, Aune, D. *Revelation 1-5*, (Dallas: Word, 1997), 30-31; Beale, *Revelation*, 177-78; Smalley, S.S. *The Revelation to John*, (London: SPCK, 2005), 32.

¹⁰³⁹ “See, now, that I am *the one who is, was, and I am the one who shall be in the future*, and there is no other god besides me.” *AB, Ps-J. Exod.* 3:14, reads: “I am who I am and who will be”.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Titus Flavius Clemens (Clement of Alexandria), writing in the last decade of the second century (*Strom.* 5:6), states that the name of God “is called Ἰαουέ, which is interpreted, “Who is and shall be”.”

¹⁰⁴¹ In addition to Morris, Aune, Beale and Smalley (see n.1037-38), see also Charles, R.H. *The Revelation of St. John, Vol. 1* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1971 [1920]), 10; Ford, J.M. *Revelation*, (New York: Doubleday, 1975), 376-77; Hughes, P.E. *The Book of Revelation*, (Leicester: IVP, 1990), 18.

the seven ‘throne angels’ (or archangels)¹⁰⁴² of 1 Enoch 20:1-8. However, there are a significant number of scholars who understand the phrase to refer to the Holy Spirit in all his fullness (echoing Isa. 11:2, LXX).¹⁰⁴³ In fact, this interpretation, based on the LXX reading of Isaiah 11, provides the earliest Christian understanding of “the seven spirits” in the Book of Revelation.¹⁰⁴⁴ Indeed, it is highly unlikely that ‘the seven spirits of God’ (Rev. 1:4) could be angels. The collocation of the ‘seven spirits’ with the Father and the (divine) Son militates against such a view. Furthermore, elsewhere in the book of Revelation all creatures in heaven (including angels – Rev. 5:11-14) are portrayed as being subservient to Jesus. Indeed, the angel who spoke to John even describes himself (in a way that is reminiscent of Heb. 1:14) as a fellow servant (of Christ) with all Christians (Rev. 19:10). Charles, having referenced two pericopes where the angel prohibits John from worshipping him (Rev. 22:8-9; 19:9-10),¹⁰⁴⁵ goes on to state that the author of Revelation produced an “emphatic polemic against angel worship”. Charles acknowledges the impossibility of this benediction containing a plea to the seven (arch)angels. However, he still holds to the view that the seven spirits are the seven chief angels and, with no corroborating textual evidence, says that the clause must, therefore, be “from the hand of an interpolator”.¹⁰⁴⁶

¹⁰⁴² So, Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 34; Barker, M. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, (London: T&T Clark, 2000), 131 (although she also adds that each of the seven archangels was one aspect of the Lord resting upon Messiah); Charles, *Revelation*, 1:13; Ford, *Revelation*, 377; Witherington III, B. *Revelation*, (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 75.

¹⁰⁴³ So, Beale, *Revelation*, 189; Masterman, J.H.B. *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, (London: SPCK, 1918), 20; Bratcher, R.G. & Hatton, H.A. *A Translator’s Handbook on the Revelation to John*, (New York: UBS, 1993), 19; Morris, *Revelation*, 48; Smalley, *Revelation*, 33-34. Swete [*Holy Spirit*, 272-75] refers to the “*septiformis Spiritus*” and Beasley-Murray [G.R. *The Book of Revelation*, (London: Oliphants, 1974), 55-56] to “a representation of the Holy Spirit... in his fullness of life and blessing”. Unfortunately, Waddell [R. *The Spirit of the Book of Revelation*, (Blandford Forum: Deo, 2006), 9 n.7] has misread Beasley-Murray and thereby misrepresents him in saying that he holds an angelic interpretation of the ‘seven spirits’.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Victorinus (d. 304), “Commentary on the Apocalypse”, *ANF*, 7:344. Furthermore, it seems that Isa. 11:2 was commonly understood as referring to the fullness of the sevenfold Holy Spirit – see Justin Martyr (110-165), “Dialogue with Trypho”, 87, cf. 39, *ANF*, 1:243, 214; “Hortatory Address to the Greeks”, 32, *ANF*, 1:287.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Charles, *Revelation*, 9.

¹⁰⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 12. It seems that this kind of argument borders on the: “This verse doesn’t fit with my understanding of the Apocalypse’s theology. The phrase ἐπὶ πνευμάτων must, therefore, be an interpolation from the hand of someone whose understanding of Revelation, unlike mine, is flawed”. Without appropriate textual evidence, it is eisegesis not exegesis to excise ‘inconvenient’ sections of text.

The non-Biblical Qumran literature regularly uses the plural word ‘spirits’ to designate angels (whether good or evil)¹⁰⁴⁷ but only once in the OT is the plural so used (Ps. 110:4). There are a few places in intertestamental Judaism where angels are designated by the plural ‘spirits’ (e.g. Jub. 2:2; 15:31-32).¹⁰⁴⁸ Hebrews 1:14 shows that such a designation was known and used by Christians but nowhere are ‘angelic spirits’ afforded divinity. Indeed, both Hebrews and Revelation are at pains to stress the subservient nature of angels, either sent to serve the saints (1:14) or called ‘fellow servants’ with the saints (Rev. 19:10).

The fact that the benediction ‘grace and peace to you’ invokes the ‘I AM’, the ‘seven spirits’ and ‘Jesus Christ’, *in that order*, begs the question: “How in a Christian writing should angels come between God and Christ in a benediction?”¹⁰⁴⁹ Had John intended to refer to the seven chief angels of intertestamental Judaism, he could have referred to them as ‘seven angels’ (as he does at Rev. 8:2, τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλους οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστήκασιν). In Revelation 1:4-5 it is most likely that the number seven is to be taken figuratively for ‘fullness’, ‘totality’ or ‘completeness’¹⁰⁵⁰ and therefore the ‘seven spirits’ (*septiformis Spiritus*) represents the fullness of the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁵¹

Thus, the prayer ‘grace... to you’ is answered by the action of all three members of the Trinity and this is unique in the NT. Revelation 1:4 is the only place in the NT where the Spirit is *specifically* said to administer grace to the Christian. However, if the

¹⁰⁴⁷ In all the texts where *ruah* unequivocally designates ‘angels’, it is in the plural (e.g. 1QH 1,11; 1QM 10,12; 4Q502 27,1; 8Q5 2,6). Only four of the 34 uses to designate demons have the singular רוח (e.g. 4Q 511 81, 3; 4Q286 Ber^a 10 II, 7-8). See Sekki, *Ruah at Qumran*, 145-71, 225-39. Newsom [C. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 25] says that רוחות/רוחי is “one of the most common designations for angels at Qumran”.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Written c. 160-140 BC.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Beasley-Murray, *Revelation*, 55.

¹⁰⁵⁰ This is how ‘seven’ is used throughout Revelation, both explicitly (seven trumpets, seven bowls, indicating the universality of judgement) and implicitly (the seven historic churches representing the church throughout time and space and the seven *makarism* [1:3; 14:13; 16:15; 19:9; 20:6; 22:7, 14] representing the full blessing of God for his people).

¹⁰⁵¹ Beasley-Murray [*Revelation*, 56] writes: “The seven spirits of God represent the Holy Spirit in his fullness of life and blessing”.

genitive τῆς χάριτος in 10:29 is taken as adjectival its meaning would be “the Spirit from whom grace is received”.¹⁰⁵²

7.2.2 Philo, *De Gigantibus* 24

Philo (*Gig.* 24) retells the story from Numbers 11:17 of the Spirit, which was on Moses, anointing the seventy elders. He adds the observation that they then experienced ‘a growth in grace’ (βελτιωθῆναι χάριν). This growth in grace is, for Philo, a consequence of the action of God’s Spirit meeting a desire for moral betterment in the said elders. That Philo was not writing systematic theology cannot be overstated. A consistent, definitive statement developing his understanding of ‘grace’ or ‘Spirit’ (and most other ‘theological’ terms) is nowhere to be found in his extant works. However, be that as it may, there are a few things that can be said.

- The grace (and/or Spirit) of God are only for the virtuous whose life-choices show that they are worthy recipients of such gifts.¹⁰⁵³
- Yet, at the same time, the goal of moral perfection is unattainable.¹⁰⁵⁴
- However, the impossible is possible for God. The action of God on an individual, either by the impartation of χάρις¹⁰⁵⁵ or πνεῦμα,¹⁰⁵⁶ is transformative.
- This impasse is resolved, somewhat, by Philo’s understanding of ‘repentance’. He asserts that “the second place after hope is given to repentance for sins and to improvement.”¹⁰⁵⁷ This is developed with a wordplay between ‘Enoch’ (חנוך) and ‘grace’ (ἡ), with Philo calling Enoch “recipient of grace”. With the help of

¹⁰⁵² On the difficulty of interpreting the genitive see §1.4.4.

¹⁰⁵³ *Leg. All.* III:14, 77.

¹⁰⁵⁴ *Leg. All.* III:211-5; cf. *Somn.* 2:25.

¹⁰⁵⁵ *Deus Imm.* 104-7; *Somn.* 2:25.

¹⁰⁵⁶ *Gig.* 24.

¹⁰⁵⁷ *Abr.* 17. However, see *Abr.* 26 where Philo writes that repentance occupies the second place to perfection. This highlights the difficulty of reading Philo as ‘systematic theology’.

God, Enoch becomes an example of repentance and is transformed “from the worse life to the better”.¹⁰⁵⁸

Abraham himself is similarly portrayed as in need of repentance¹⁰⁵⁹ and, on the basis of divine inspiration, leaves his fatherland to seek the Lord.¹⁰⁶⁰ Philo writes that Abraham “is the first person spoken of as believing in God” and, as a consequence, “the divine Spirit... lodg(ed) in his soul” transforming him so that “He is the standard of nobility for all proselytes”.¹⁰⁶¹

For Philo, *χάρις* is not a discrete gift from God; it is the power (*δύναμις*) behind all God’s good gifts.¹⁰⁶² This reaches its zenith in Philo’s ‘doctrine’ of redemption. There is no ‘works’ versus ‘grace’ dichotomy – Philo is ‘too Jewish’ for that – but there is a Hellenistic/Jewish synergy whereby grace is the necessary equipping for one to attain and maintain a virtuous life. Even those OT figures whom Philo regards as supremely virtuous – like Noah, Melchizedek and Moses¹⁰⁶³ – were recipients of the unmerited, and needed, gift of grace. Through *μετάνοια*, the virtuous person experiences God’s *πνεῦμα* and *δύναμις* which overcomes any ‘lower urges’ and consequently lives perpetually within the realm of God’s *χάρις*.¹⁰⁶⁴ For Philo, ‘grace’ is a moral power or enabling that equips virtuous persons for righteous living. However, much the same can be said about *πνεῦμα θεῖον* in Philo. God’s Spirit produces both ‘virtue’ and an increased longing for virtue in the recipient.¹⁰⁶⁵ For Philo, both *χάρις* and *πνεῦμα* are pragmatic not ontological. They are ethical rather than spiritual, being evidenced by transformed

¹⁰⁵⁸ *Abr.* 17. See the discussion in Stuckenbruck, L.T. “To What Extent did Philo’s Treatment of Enoch and the Giants Presuppose a Knowledge of the Enochic and Other Sources Preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls?”, *SPA*, 19 (2007), 131-33.

¹⁰⁵⁹ *Virt.* 212-13 – needing to remove himself from the influences of his father’s astrology and worship of the heavens.

¹⁰⁶⁰ *Virt.* 214-15.

¹⁰⁶¹ *Virt.* 216-19. See the discussion in Borgen, P. *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 262-63.

¹⁰⁶² *Leg. All.* III:78; *Op. Mundi* 23; *Migr. Abr.* 31.

¹⁰⁶³ *Leg. All.* III:77, 79, 135.

¹⁰⁶⁴ *Congr.* 38; *Leg. All.* II:32. In this, Philo is almost Pauline: “God is at work in you, both to will and to do his good pleasure” (Phil. 2:13). However, he is only ‘almost Pauline’; he never gets to the heights of “By grace you are saved, through faith and that...is the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8). See the discussion in Conzelmann, H. “*χάρις* (Philo)”, *TDNT*, 9:389-91.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Bieder, W. “*πνεῦμα* (in Hellenistic Judaism)”, *TDNT*, 6:372. Cf. §7.2.4.1.

praxis not renewed spirituality.¹⁰⁶⁶ In this, Philo's understanding of Spirit and grace is fundamentally different from that in Hebrews. At 10:29 'Spirit of grace' is the Spirit who allows one to find grace, "Der Geist der Gnade ist der Geist, der Gnade finden läßt".¹⁰⁶⁷

7.2.3 The Testament of Judah 24:2.

It may well be that the *Testament of Judah* dates from the Maccabean period¹⁰⁶⁸ and, since its author was well acquainted with both Hellenistic philosophy and the LXX wisdom literature, it may also be a product of Hellenistic-Judaism.¹⁰⁶⁹ There is no doubt that the *Testimonies of the Twelve Patriarchs* (hereafter T12P), as they have come down to us, are overtly Christian. The question is whether they were authored or redacted by a Christian. The only texts of the T12P that have survived are copies made by Christian scribes. Origen (c. 200 AD) refers to *T. Reuben* 2-3¹⁰⁷⁰ and mentions, positively, the "*testamentum duodecim patriarcharum*". The T12P are also included in various Greek, Armenian and Slavonic lists of canonical and extra-canonical books.¹⁰⁷¹ This has led some scholars to suggest that the T12P is a Christian work which made use of Jewish traditions.¹⁰⁷² However, it is far more probable that the T12P is a Christian reworking of an original Jewish text. The existence of significant parallels with some Qumran 'Levi' materials¹⁰⁷³ and with material from the Cairo synagogue genizah¹⁰⁷⁴ points towards a Jewish original. Furthermore, the existence of a Hebrew *Testament of Naphtali* (with

¹⁰⁶⁶ So, Bieder, "Pneumatologische Aspekte", 254.

¹⁰⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶⁸ Kee, H.C. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *OTP*, 1:777-78. However, see §7.2.3.

¹⁰⁶⁹ See Hollander, H.W. and De Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 47.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Origen, Homilies in Joshua 15:6, cited by Hollander & De Jonge, *Testaments*, 15.

¹⁰⁷¹ See De Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, (Leiden: Brill, 1978), xxx-xxxii.

¹⁰⁷² See Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 314.

¹⁰⁷³ See 1Q21 *TLevi* ar; 4Q213 *TLevi*^a ar; 4Q214 *TLevi*^b ar; also, 3Q7 *TJud*; 4Q215 *TNaph*; 4Q538 *TJud* ar; 4Q539 *TJos* ar. See further, Hollander & De Jonge, *Testaments*, 16-19; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 161-65.

¹⁰⁷⁴ For a discussion of the texts see Hollander & De Jonge, *Testaments*, 17-8; for a translation, *ibid.*, 457-69.

considerable similarity to the Greek *T. Naph.* in the T12P) would suggest that, as it now stands, the T12P is a Christian redaction of an earlier Jewish text.¹⁰⁷⁵

T. Judah 23 concludes with the exhortation to “return to the Lord with a perfect heart”, which sets the scene for an explicitly Messianic pericope that follows (*T. Jud.* 24). It describes the Messiah as a sinless man, the sun of righteousness, who will come from the tribe of Judah. For him the heavens will be opened and upon him will be poured God’s Spirit. Subsequently, he will “pour out the Spirit of grace” on the returnees with the result that they “will be sons to him in truth and will walk in his commandments from first to last” (*T. Jud.* 24:1-2). Repentance (*T. Jud.* 23:5) is evidenced by a change of praxis which in turn paves the way for an outpouring of the Spirit of grace whose presence and anointing enables both a transformation in relationship and a total change of praxis.¹⁰⁷⁶ This narrative about a saviour from the tribe of Judah is obviously referring to Jesus Christ.¹⁰⁷⁷

Clearly, by the end of the second century (and probably much earlier too¹⁰⁷⁸), Christians had no problem designating the Holy Spirit as ‘the Spirit of grace’.

7.2.4 Zechariah, Introduction

It is the contention of this thesis that both Zechariah 12:10 and Zechariah 4:6-7 were in our author’s mind when he used the phrase ‘Spirit of grace’ in 10:29.¹⁰⁷⁹ Consequently, these verses will be examined along with the wider context in which they are found. Since Zechariah 12:10 contains the only other Biblical occurrence of the phrase ‘Spirit of grace’ this will be exegeted first. Zechariah 4:6-7 will then be examined to see how that pericope contributes to the use of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος in Hebrews. It is important

¹⁰⁷⁵ So, Kee, “Testaments”, 778.

¹⁰⁷⁶ This is different from Philo, for whom spirit/grace is purely ethical, see §7.2.2. However, as noted above (n.1064 and accompanying text), for Philo, God’s Spirit produces both virtue and a longing for more of the same.

¹⁰⁷⁷ So, correctly, Hollander & De Jonge, *Testaments*, 227.

¹⁰⁷⁸ See the remarks on 1 Clem. 46:6, §7.2.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Other themes and images from Zechariah probably influenced the author of Hebrews but it is beyond the scope of this thesis to either investigate or demonstrate this. However, see §§7.4.2; 7.4.3.

to understand how the book of Zechariah was received in Second Temple Judaism. Consequently, the LXX, MT and the Aramaic Targum will all have a part to play in reaching an understanding of the texts in their own context and how they served the purposes of Hebrews.

The language and imagery of Zechariah has been variously described as prophetic, messianic, eschatological, apocalyptic and rich in metaphor.¹⁰⁸⁰ There is much in this genre that cannot, and should not, be interpreted literally. Furthermore, the hermeneutic employed when seeking to investigate the Biblical text must not ignore the divine origin and inspiration of Scripture. It must be recognised that some Spirit-inspired prophecy was truly messianic and/or eschatological. Although it would have meaning for both the prophet and the first audience, the full significance of the message would only become apparent in the light of the Christ event.

7.2.4.1 Zechariah 12:10

Zechariah 12:10 provides a use of the actual phrase ‘the Spirit of grace’ and, as will be shown, is in all probability the source of the phrase in Hebrews 10:29. Like so much in Zechariah 9-14, the pericope within which the phrase ‘the Spirit of grace’ is found (Zech. 12:9-14) is fraught with difficulties. It is part of a larger oracle (or a connected group of smaller oracles), Zechariah 12:1-13:6,¹⁰⁸¹ which is marked off from the sections which precede and follow it by the oft repeated ‘on that day’.¹⁰⁸² The ‘day’ in which the described events take place is clearly the ‘eschatological day’.¹⁰⁸³ It has been noted that

¹⁰⁸⁰ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 64; Drane, J. *Introducing the Old Testament*, (Tring: Lion, 1987), 177-78; Harrison, R.K. *Introduction to the Old Testament*, (London: Tyndale, 1970), 955. Russell [D.S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), 74] describes Zech. 9-14 as ‘cryptic’, ‘prophetic’ and ‘apocalyptic’.

¹⁰⁸¹ So, Petersen, D.L. *Zechariah 9-14 & Malachi*, (London: SCM, 1995), 105-28; Petterson, A.R. *Behold Your King*, (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 205; Smith, R.L. *Micah-Malachi*, (Waco: Word, 1984), 280-82.

¹⁰⁸² Zech. 12:3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11; 13:1, 2, 4. Petersen [D.L. “Zechariah 9-14”, *ABD*, 6:1067] regards ‘on that day’ as “the connective tissue” of this oracle. The six further uses of the phrase ‘on that day’ (Zech. 14:4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 20, 21) form another oracle prefaced by ‘a day is coming’ at 14:1 and separated from 12:1-13:6 by 13:7-9 which revisits the ‘shepherd’ motif of Ch.11.

¹⁰⁸³ So, Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 278; Bruce, F.F. *This is That*, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1982), 110; Meyers, C.L. & Meyers, E.M. *Zechariah 9-14*, (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 316, 330.

“a quintessential characteristic” of Hebrews is “a theology that is thoroughly eschatological”.¹⁰⁸⁴

For Zechariah, ‘that (eschatological) day’, will see the Lord destroy the nations who waged war against Israel. Then, as part of the New Day of restoration, he will pour forth ‘a spirit of grace and supplication’ on the house of David and all the people of Jerusalem. The consequence of this outpouring is that “they will look to me whom they have pierced and they shall mourn”.¹⁰⁸⁵ There is no consensus over the identity of the one pierced, although parallels have been drawn between ‘the one pierced’ and ‘the wounded servant’ of Isaiah 53:5.¹⁰⁸⁶ As it stands, the text of Zechariah 12:10 has God saying: ‘they will look *to me* whom they have pierced’ (וְהָבִיטוּ אֵלַי אֶת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקְרוּ). All attempts to see ‘the one pierced’ as a historical, human, figure require that the text be emended¹⁰⁸⁷ or ‘interpreted’¹⁰⁸⁸ to remove the clear statement that YHWH and ‘the one stabbed’ are one and the same.¹⁰⁸⁹ Indeed, the only figure who speaks in the first person in Zechariah 12-14 is YHWH.¹⁰⁹⁰ Perhaps Zechariah’s use of language (in Zech. 12:10) was designed simply to ‘grab the attention’ of the first audience and then, with ‘prophetic hyperbole’, to suggest that God’s heart was ‘wounded’ by his people’s rejection of the covenant.¹⁰⁹¹

¹⁰⁸⁴ So Gheorghita, “The Minor Prophets”, 115; *idem*, *Role*, 127-35. Cf. Williamson, *Philo*, 145; Mackie, *Eschatology*; Schenck, *Cosmology*. See also §6.3.2.

¹⁰⁸⁵ That this was seen by the first Christians as Messianic is evidenced by its use in various NT documents. See Matt. 24:30; John 19:33-37; Rev. 1:7. In the post NT period see: *Barn.* 7:9; Justin, *1 Apol.* 52; *Dial.* 14:8 (incorrectly ascribed to Hosea); 32:2 (explicitly linked with Isa. 53); 64:7; 118:1.

¹⁰⁸⁶ E.g. Petersen [*Zechariah 9-14*, 121] suggests a victim of child sacrifice. See the discussions in Petterson, *Your King*, 225-31; cf. Klein, G.L. *Zechariah*, (Nashville: B&H, 2008), 365-70.

¹⁰⁸⁷ There is no textual warrant for any reading other than ‘they will look to/on me...’ see Clark, D.J & Hatton, H.A. *A Handbook on Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*, (New York: UBS, 2002), 321-22.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Meyers and Meyers [*Zechariah 9-14*, 336] point out: “*to me...* is supported in all the major versions” but then say that the text as it stands is “difficult to understand (since) Yahweh... could not be the one stabbed... Even Gesenius regards the text as unintelligible”.

¹⁰⁸⁹ See Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 713-17 and the literature cited therein. Cf. Morris, J.S. *Hebrews 10:29; The Holy Spirit Which Produces Enabling Grace*, (Dallas Theological Seminary: MTh thesis, 2007), 39-40.

¹⁰⁹⁰ See Boda, *Zechariah*, 717.

¹⁰⁹¹ Boda [*ibid*] writes, “Yahweh here likens the people’s past treatment of him as a fatal stabbing”. Smith [*Micah-Malachi*, 276 n.10a] suggests it is ‘metaphorical’. Calvin [J. *Commentary on John – Volume 2*, 211, (on John 19:37), accessed at <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom35.pdf> on 27/01/2012] writes, “God speaks there after the manner of men, declaring that He is wounded by the sins of His people”. Calvin [J. *Commentary on Zechariah and Malachi* Lecture 161, on Zech. 12:7-10, accessed on 28/01/2012 at <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom30.iii.xiii.xiii.html>] also says, “this piercing is to be taken metaphorically for continual provocation... the Jews (had) goaded and pierced God by their wickedness

The reception of ‘the Spirit of grace’ brings the realization of the pain that had been inflicted on the Lord and consequently his people would look to him with heart-felt mourning and repentance. This in turn results in cleansing and restoration (Zech. 13:1-6).

However, the issue that concerns this thesis is the ‘identity’ of the S(s)pirit of grace.¹⁰⁹² Commentators are divided as to whether this is the divine Spirit¹⁰⁹³ or a compassionate human disposition.¹⁰⁹⁴ A key to discovering the identity of Zechariah’s ‘Spirit of grace’ is to recognise that it is God himself who will ‘pour forth’ this Spirit on his people. “The language of outpouring (שפך) is used elsewhere not for an outpouring of *a spirit* but for the outpouring of *the Spirit*”.¹⁰⁹⁵ The verb שפך, meaning ‘to pour out’, is found 117 times in the MT in a wide variety of contexts, both literal¹⁰⁹⁶ and metaphorical.¹⁰⁹⁷ It is used in connection with the Spirit on only four occasions: here, Ezekiel 39:29 and twice in Joel 2:28. In all four places, the LXX translates שפך with ἐγχεῖω.

There are significant parallels between the Zechariah usage and that in both Joel and Ezekiel. God initiates the outpouring, which is ‘universal’ in that there is no exception made on the grounds of class, age or gender. This is one aspect of God’s restoration of the fortunes of his people and is accompanied by both a moral and spiritual ‘awakening’. In all three prophets, the outpoured Spirit is either part of, or the precursor, to the eschaton. Zechariah’s ‘Spirit of grace’ and the eschatological Spirit of Joel and Ezekiel are one and the same (as shown by the parallels displayed in Fig. 7.1 below).

(and) rebellion”. However, see Shepherd, M.B. *A Commentary on the Book of the Twelve*, (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2018), 464, who understands this ‘stabbing’ as referring “to the piercing of the Messianic King”.

¹⁰⁹² MT: רִיחַ חֵן וְתַחֲנוּנִים ‘...grace and supplication (for more grace)’; Targum: רִיחַ נְבוּאָה וְצַל ‘...prophecy and prayer’; LXX: πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ οἰκτιρμοῦ.

¹⁰⁹³ So, Mitchell, H.G. “A Commentary on Haggai and Zechariah”, Mitchell, H.G. Smith, J.M.P. & Bewer, J.A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), 329; Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14*, 121; Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 278.

¹⁰⁹⁴ So, Clark & Hatton, *Handbook*, 321; Meyers & Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14*, 335.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 463.

¹⁰⁹⁶ E.g. pouring out water (Exod. 4:9) or blood (Deut. 21:8).

¹⁰⁹⁷ Pour forth anger (Hos. 5:10); pour out one’s heart (Lam. 2:19).

The MT (Zech. 12:10) says that a spirit of grace and of supplication, רוּחַ חֵן וְתַחֲנוּנִים, will be poured out. חֵן is used 70 times in the MT and it is rarely found as part of a couplet and never elsewhere with תַּחֲנוּנִים. Therefore, the meaning of this unique pairing in Zechariah 12:10 can be determined only from its own context. Both חֵן and תַּחֲנוּנִים come from the same Hebrew root and mean, respectively, ‘grace or favour’ and ‘supplication for grace or favour’.¹⁰⁹⁸ This being so, it is not improbable that Zechariah was deliberately making a ‘play on words’. Consequently, the text is saying that God’s action in pouring out the Spirit of grace, will thereby create the desire in the recipients to ‘pray for yet more grace’. God gives the *arrabon* of that which he desires to see in the lives of his people. Thus, the shout of ‘grace, grace’ in Zech. 4:7 is prompted by God’s outpoured Spirit (Zech. 12:10) and “is in response to the answer to supplications for divine grace or favour”.¹⁰⁹⁹

A fragment of the Aramaic Jerusalem Targum of Zechariah 12:10 reads: רוּחַ נְבוּאָה וְצִלּוּתָא – ‘spirit of prophecy and prayer’.¹¹⁰⁰ This is part of the Codex Reuchlinianus, dated to 1105AD.¹¹⁰¹ Although a late manuscript, it is important because it purports to have incorporated materials from six earlier manuscripts and possibly contains notes from the pre-Babylonian Targum Prophets.¹¹⁰² This correspondence between חֵן and prophecy is not an isolated one. Numbers 6:25, “and be gracious unto you” is

¹⁰⁹⁸ See *BDB*, 336b, 2b; 337d, 2; respectively. The ESV renders the couplet ‘a spirit of grace and pleas for mercy’; Clark & Hatton, *Handbook*, 321, NLT, JB all translate וְתַחֲנוּנִים ‘and prayer’. Boda [*Zechariah*, 714] has, “a spirit of favour and pleading for favour”, while Baldwin [J.G. *Haggai Zechariah Malachi*, (London: Tyndale, 1972), 190] writes: “the Hebrew...means “seeking for grace”.” See §2.3 re our author’s use of LXX and/or MT.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 415

¹¹⁰⁰ Kasher, R. (Ed.), *Targumic Toseftot to the Prophets*, (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1996). See §3.3, the Spirit of prophecy/revelation.

¹¹⁰¹ Gordon, R.P. “The Ephraimite Messiah and the Targum(s) to Zechariah 12:10”, Exum, J.C. & Williamson, H.G.M. (Eds), *Reading from Left to Right*, (Sheffield, SAP, 2003), 184. Cf. the discussion in Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 464 n.80.

¹¹⁰² See Cathcart & Gordon, *AB*, Minor Prophets, 19.

understood, in one place, to mean: “may he raise up prophets from you” (*Num. Rab.* 11:6).¹¹⁰³

Fig. 7.1 The pouring out of Spirit in Zechariah, Joel and Ezekiel.

	Zechariah 12:10	Joel 2:28	Ezekiel 39:29
How	I will pour out	I will pour out	When I pour out
When	Eschatological day	Eschatological day	After the exile/return
Context	After God had defeated their enemies	After God restores their fortunes	After God restores their fortunes
Who	God initiates the outpouring	God initiates the outpouring	God initiates the outpouring
Upon whom	All Jerusalem and the House of David ¹¹⁰⁴	On all flesh ¹¹⁰⁵	Upon the whole house of Israel ¹¹⁰⁶
The result	Causes repentance and leads to renewed obedience	Creates a Spirit-led prophetic community	Creates a closeness between the people and God
The underlying need for God’s intervention	They had wounded God by rejecting his covenant with them	They had rejected the covenant	They had acted treacherously towards God
Significance	Part of the eschaton	Part of the eschaton	Part of the preparation for the eschaton

7.2.4.2 Zechariah 4:6-7

Zechariah 4:6-7 is an oracle addressed to Zerubbabel, the central message of which (Zech. 4:6) is that the rebuilding of the temple is not a human work (“not by might nor by strength”) but is a work of God (“but by my Spirit”). This echoes the (earlier?) word of the Lord delivered to Zerubbabel through Haggai (Hag. 2:1-5) and reflects the

¹¹⁰³ Cf. *Ibid.*, 218 n.26. Note also the connection between ‘Spirit’ and the prophetic, see §3.3.

¹¹⁰⁴ By implication this is irrespective of age, gender or social class.

¹¹⁰⁵ This is explicitly irrespective of age, gender or social class.

¹¹⁰⁶ This is explicitly irrespective of age, gender or social class.

understanding of the Psalmist (Ps. 33:16-22) that it is folly to place one's trust anywhere other than in the Lord and his provision. The restoration of the temple (and the accompanying renewal of the covenant) depends on a human/divine synergy – with the Spirit of God as the 'senior partner'.¹¹⁰⁷ Any 'mountain' that stands in Zerubbabel's way will be reduced to a plain. He will bring forth the temple's capstone (אֶת־הָאֶבֶן הָרִאשׁוֹנָה)¹¹⁰⁸ and, in acknowledgement of the (completed) work of the Spirit, the people shout: חֲנֹן חֲנֹן לָהּ (grace, grace to it).¹¹⁰⁹ The shouts of 'grace, grace' could be either a prayer or an exclamation¹¹¹⁰ but, whatever else might be in view, חֲנֹן חֲנֹן לָהּ was an appeal to God to put "his seal of acceptance upon the completed sanctuary".¹¹¹¹ However, Zechariah was looking beyond the immediate. There is an eschatological dimension to the whole pericope, and one cannot mistake the similarity of the language here with that of Isaiah 40:4 and 42:16.¹¹¹² It was the coming of the Kingdom of God, not just a rebuilt temple, that was uppermost in Zechariah's mind.¹¹¹³

What must not be overlooked is that the author had an LXX text (possibly alongside a Hebrew text) as his 'Scripture'.¹¹¹⁴ There is a significant difference between the MT text and the LXX. The Septuagint declares that the 'mountain' standing in Zerubbabel's way will be transformed by the Spirit of the Lord into "the stone of inheritance, its grace

¹¹⁰⁷ See §5.3.

¹¹⁰⁸ The phrase אֶת־הָאֶבֶן הָרִאשׁוֹנָה has been translated in a variety of ways. As Baldwin [*Haggai*, 121] points out, this phrase is a *hapax* and indicates the "stone of primary importance". Translations include: capstone (NIV, NASB); coping stone (Moffatt); keystone (JB/NJB); top stone (RSV); last stone (TEV); most important stone (CEV).

¹¹⁰⁹ This stone is *not* the foundation-stone, [*contra* Meyers, C.L. and Meyers, E.M. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 248] because the context in Zechariah relates to the completion, not the commencement, of the rebuilt temple. Indeed, the majority of scholars agree that it is the 'last-stone' not the first one that is in view – see Clark & Hatton, *Handbook on Haggai*, 140; However, see Boda, *Zechariah*, 296-97.

¹¹¹⁰ JB translates it as 'blessings on it' while the Moffatt has 'splendid, splendid'. TEV has 'beautiful, beautiful'; CEV has (the rather anaemic) 'God has been very kind'; and NEB renders it in indirect speech, 'while men acclaim its beauty'.

¹¹¹¹ Mitchell, "Zechariah", 192.

¹¹¹² 'Mountains reduced to a plain; rough places made smooth'.

¹¹¹³ So, Klein, *Zechariah*, 161; Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 206. Cf. Shepherd, *The Twelve*, 412, 415. Tg. Zech. 4:7 translates the 'stone of inheritance' as 'he will reveal his Messiah (מְשִׁיחָה)'. Cf. Cathcart & Gordon, *AB, Minor Prophets*, 194 n.10.

¹¹¹⁴ See §2.3.

equalling my Grace” (Zech. 4:7 LXX). Furthermore, this ‘stone of inheritance’ is the top-stone that Zerubbabel brings to complete the temple. Thus, the rebuilt temple would be the sign of God’s presence with his people and the key-stone, the stone of inheritance, would be the symbol of God graciously re-establishing his covenant with his people. This would be God’s doing – “by my Spirit” – and would parallel the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit that Joel speaks of (Joel 2:28). The new day of restoration, fellowship and intimacy was symbolized by the new temple with the stone of the inheritance (fashioned by God’s Spirit) put in place as the most important stone in the building. The Spirit of God effects the tangible presence of the Grace of God with his people.¹¹¹⁵ This is how the LXX understands the events that Zechariah describes prophetically, and it is also one of the ways in which our author would have received this tradition.

7.2.4.3 Zechariah: Conclusions

Hays suggests seven criteria for determining whether there is intertextual interplay between two texts.¹¹¹⁶ In this specific case, would ‘Spirit of grace’ in 10:29 bring to the congregation’s mind Zechariah 12:10 and the wider context in Zechariah?

Hays criteria fall into three categories and the suggested intertextual link between ‘Spirit of grace’ in Hebrews and Zechariah will be measured against these general tests.¹¹¹⁷ Availability, volume and recurrence can be taken together, as can coherence, plausibility and satisfaction. The first group asks if the literary evidence makes it likely or possible that the text in question could be used by an author and/or recognised by the recipients. The second group asks the theological question of whether the intertextual ‘echo’ fits in with the overall flow of argument in its new context. Hays’ other criterion is more pragmatic: has such an intertextual link been posited by others?¹¹¹⁸

¹¹¹⁵ See §§3.2; 5.4.

¹¹¹⁶ Hays, *Echoes*, 29-31.

¹¹¹⁷ Hays calls his criteria “serviceable rules of thumb to guide” such an investigation. Cf. §1.3.

¹¹¹⁸ Among those who have suggested that “Spirit of grace” in 10:29 is an ‘echo’ of Zechariah 12:10 are: Attridge, *Hebrews*, 295 n.46; Cervera, “Insultar”, 309; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 539; Harris, D.M. *Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament: Hebrews*, Nashville: B&H, 2019), 284; Kleinig, *Hebrews*,

Much of the material in §§7.2.4.1, 7.2.4.2 addressed the second group of criteria – albeit not explicitly. Those discussions and both the discussion of Hebrews’ understanding of ‘grace’ (§7.3.1.) and the exegesis of 10:29 (§7.4) show that the proposed intertext fits the overall pneumatology of Hebrews. It is difficult to say with absolute certainty whether a congregation whose make-up and location is unknown (§2.1) would have access to a ‘portable library’ which included Zechariah 9-14. Furthermore, given that we know of only this one document from the pen of our author, the question of recurrence or volume of use are not strictly appropriate. In fact, on the question of volume of echoes, Gheorghita identifies just two from Zechariah in Hebrews.¹¹¹⁹ However, as this is not the place to engage in a full-scale comparison of Zechariah and Hebrews, it will be sufficient to adduce availability and the likelihood of use from an understanding of Zechariah’s reception in Second Temple Judaism and the NT.

Zechariah is the longest of the Minor prophets and, with a Greek text of about 5,000 words, it is about the same length as Hebrews but is still a relatively short work. However, its echoes in the NT are more prolific than its size would warrant statistically.¹¹²⁰ In addition, Zechariah is used by the majority of the NT writers¹¹²¹ and, in the first century AD, Zechariah 9-14 was “widely used in Jewish circles (and) contain(ed) many of the church Testimony texts”.¹¹²² Lindars refers to a selection of five texts from Zechariah which Matthew weaves into his Passion narrative,¹¹²³ while Dodd cites eight texts from Zechariah, including Zechariah 12:3 and 12:10, used either in the Passion narratives or in understanding the events leading to the Passion.¹¹²⁴ He concludes that Zechariah 9-14 “was one of the scriptures which from a very early time

530; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 294; Levison, “Theology”, 110; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 326. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 526; Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 59.

¹¹¹⁹ Zech. 6:11 in 10:12 and Zech. 9:11 in 13:20. Gheorghita, “Minor Prophets”, 116, 132.

¹¹²⁰ Although not an ‘absolute’ measure, the OT quotations and allusions in the NT listed in UBS⁴ include, Zechariah 71x, Hosea (text length c. 4,000 words) 22x, Ezekiel (c. 30,000 words of text) 141x and Jeremiah (c. 35,000 words long) 124x. Thus, in the NT, Zechariah is echoed about three times more than Hosea or Ezekiel and four times more than Jeremiah, per unit text.

¹¹²¹ It is found in 13 NT documents: all four Gospels, four of Paul’s letters, Heb., Jas., 1 Pet., Jude and Rev.

¹¹²² Instone-Brewer, D. “The Two Asses of Zechariah 9:9 and Matthew 21”, *TynB*, 54.1 (2003), 90.

¹¹²³ Lindars, B. *New Testament Apologetic*, (London: SCM, 1973), 111-12.

¹¹²⁴ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 64-67. Three of these are cited by Lindars; therefore, between them Dodd and Lindars offer ten different texts from Zech. 9-14 that are used in the Gospels to explicate the events of the Passion.

were adduced in illustration of the Gospel facts”.¹¹²⁵ Indeed, the last six chapters of Zechariah “had an extraordinary significance for the early Christian community”.¹¹²⁶ Furthermore, it has been suggested that the author of Hebrews has a “kinship of spirit with Zechariah”, as they both call their congregations to keep the faith at a time of “unrealized hopes”.¹¹²⁷

In Zechariah 12:10, one consequence of the outpouring of the Spirit of grace and supplication is that “they shall look upon me whom they have pierced”. In the LXX ἡρῶν (pierced) becomes κατωρχήσαντο¹¹²⁸ (dance in triumph over, treat despitefully). Hebrews 10:29 has καταπατήσας and, although not synonymous with κατορχέομαι, there can be little doubt that κατορχέομαι was in our author’s mind when he used καταπατέω to describe one aspect of the disrespect shown to the salvific events. Furthermore, Zechariah 12:3 actually uses καταπατέω twice to describe Jerusalem as “a stone to be walked upon (καταπατούμενον) by all the nations (and) everyone trampling her underfoot (ὁ καταπατῶν) will utterly mock her (ἐμπαίζων ἐμπαίξεται)”. From his use of the language of Zechariah 12:10, it seems highly likely that our author regarded the rejection of the Son of God, the blood of the covenant and the Spirit of grace as deserving ‘a fearful prospect of judgement’ because such apostasy was tantamount to ‘wounding God’. Finally, the author of Hebrews chose to ignore the LXX καὶ οἰκτιρμοῦ in the designation ‘Spirit of grace’. The word οἰκτιρμός is comparatively rare,¹¹²⁹ with just five occurrences in the NT, one of which is Hebrews 10:28 – as the ‘minor’ part of the *a fortiori* argument, the climax of which is 10:29. This is another indication that the language of Zechariah 12:10 (LXX) could well have been in the author’s mind as he penned the severe warning of 10:28-9, albeit that he chose to contrast the Mosaic law

¹¹²⁵ *Ibid*, 67.

¹¹²⁶ Dentan, R.C. “Zechariah: Exposition, Chs. 1-8”, *Interpreter’s Bible*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), 6:1089. Cf. Klein, *Zechariah*, 61 who writes that “Zechariah (held) a place of paramount importance” to both the NT writers and the early Church.

¹¹²⁷ Speers, T.C. “Zechariah: Exposition, Chs. 1-8”, *Interpreter’s Bible*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), 6:1057. So too Bruce, F.F. *This is That*, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1982 [1968]), 100-14.

¹¹²⁸ From κατορχέομαι, a Biblical *hapax* – although its root verb, ὀρχέομαι (I dance), occurs 7x in the LXX and 4x in the NT. For a discussion on the meaning, see *EDG*, 2:1115; Montanari, 1491.

¹¹²⁹ Apart from Zech. 12:10 it is found another 30x in the OT.

which was exercised ‘without mercy’ (χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν) with the Spirit who brings God’s grace.

7.3 ‘Grace’, introduction

Apart from its eight occurrences in Hebrews¹¹³⁰ χάρις is found a further 147 times in the rest of the NT.¹¹³¹ “Grace is a central term in Pauline soteriology and important in the vocabulary of Acts, Hebrews and 1 Peter.”¹¹³² Before examining the concept of grace in Hebrews, it will be expedient to provide a brief overview of its use elsewhere in the NT.¹¹³³

Outside Hebrews, χάρις is used with a human subject,¹¹³⁴ with Jesus as the subject¹¹³⁵ and of the grace of God (or similar).¹¹³⁶ In addition, grace is said to ‘rest upon’ or to be ‘a gift to’ God’s people¹¹³⁷ and Paul specifies that his ministry was dependent upon and owing to divine ‘grace’.¹¹³⁸ Grace is the gift of the Father and Son together 21 times¹¹³⁹ and is declared to be the ground or source of salvation 11 times.¹¹⁴⁰ Grace also occurs as one element in a clearly Trinitarian blessing (2 Cor. 13:13) and there is also one other probable occurrence of all three members of the Trinity involved in the impartation of grace.¹¹⁴¹ On six occasions the benediction ‘grace be with you’ (or similar) has no specified subject¹¹⁴² and in Galatians 5:4 Paul writes of those who “want to be justified by the law” and thereby “cut (them)selves off from Christ” and consequently, they “have

¹¹³⁰ 2:9; 4:16 (twice); 10:29; 12:15, 28; 13:9, 25.

¹¹³¹ The associated words, χαρίζομαι, χαριτόω, ἀχάριστος, χάρισμα, εὐχαριστέω, εὐχαριστία and εὐχάριστος (see *TDNT*, 9:372-415) occur a combined 98x in the NT but are not found in Hebrews, therefore there is no need to include them in this discussion.

¹¹³² So, Shogren, G.S. “Grace (in the NT)”, *ABD*, 2:1087.

¹¹³³ For a statistical and linguistic analysis of χάρις *et al.* see Esser, H-H. “Grace”, *NIDNTT*, 2:115-24.

¹¹³⁴ 34x, e.g. Luke 6:32-34; 2 Cor. 1:15; Eph. 4:7.

¹¹³⁵ 24x, e.g. John 1:14, 17; 2 Cor. 8:9; 1 Pet. 1:13.

¹¹³⁶ 16x, e.g. Acts 13:43; Gal. 2:21; Jude 4.

¹¹³⁷ 17x, e.g. Acts 4:33; Eph. 4:7; 1 Pet. 5:5.

¹¹³⁸ 15x, e.g. Rom. 12:3; 1 Cor. 15:10; Gal. 2:9.

¹¹³⁹ 11 of these have the couplet ‘grace and peace’ (e.g. Gal. 1:3; Col. 1:2) and three have ‘grace, mercy and peace’ (1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2; 2 John 3).

¹¹⁴⁰ E.g. ‘by grace you are saved’, Eph. 2:5.

¹¹⁴¹ Rev. 1:4; see §7.2.1.

¹¹⁴² Col. 4:18; 1 Thess. 1:1; 1 Tim. 6:21; Titus 3:15; 2 Tim. 4:22; 1 Pet. 1:2.

fallen away from grace”. Although this verse has echoes of 10:29, it is a statement of fact rather than a warning.

7.3.1 ‘Grace’ in Hebrews

The first occurrence of χάρις in Hebrews is in 2:9¹¹⁴³ which is a key verse in the letter. Thus far the author has introduced his congregation to the Son as God’s final and complete revelation (1:2) who supersedes all that has come before him. The Son’s eternal nature and reflection of God’s glory (1:3), his superiority to angels (1:4-6), his anointing and divinity (1:8-12) and his heavenly enthronement (1:8, 13) all testify to the supreme greatness of the Son. However, this Son is not identified as Jesus until 2:9 with the declaration that by the grace of God, his Son Jesus, experienced a sacrificial death for humanity. The superlative description of the Son in the first chapter of the letter emphasises the extent of the grace that God lavished upon humanity when Christ “tasted death for everyone”. When Jesus “made purification for sin” (1:3), it was because of the grace of God. It was God who initiated the events which procured redemption and it was the outworking of his grace that led to “bringing many children to glory” (2:10).¹¹⁴⁴

In 2:9 παντὸς (everyone) is singular and indicates that the benefits that accrue from the death of Christ are appropriated individually and therefore the covenant that that death established was not simply for the community but for each individual within the community.¹¹⁴⁵ It is hardly surprising then that the author, in bringing his word of exhortation to a conclusion, should seek to ensure that “no one falls short of (i.e. ‘loses’)

¹¹⁴³ The *v.l.* χωρὶς θεοῦ probably arose as a marginal gloss that was later incorporated into the text and should be rejected. So, Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 43g; also, Metzger, 594; Allen, *Hebrews*, 210; Koester, *Hebrews*, 217-18. If it be argued that ‘apart from God’ signifies something like the cry of dereliction (Matt. 27:46; Mark 15:34), note that 2:10 makes it clear that God was involved with the death of the Son and in 5:7, far from being ‘apart from God’, Jesus was heard by God. On the other hand, if ‘apart from God’ is taken to mean that Jesus died for everyone *except* God, then it is both an overly pedantic statement (which might have been better employed in 2:8b) and an incomplete one, since the Son did not die for the angels either (2:16). For a full presentation and refutation of the reasons for preferring χωρὶς θεοῦ see Hughes, *Hebrews*, 92-94.

¹¹⁴⁴ See Allen, *Hebrews*, 211; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 134-35; Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 49; Moffatt, J. *Grace in the New Testament*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931), 346-49; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 100; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 90.

¹¹⁴⁵ See Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 135; Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 87; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 46.

the grace of God” (12:15).¹¹⁴⁶ Indeed, the three *μή τις* phrases in 12:15-16 are not only all followed by singular words but also complement each other and show that God’s grace can be forfeited even if one “formi part d’una comunitat”.¹¹⁴⁷

In 12:15 and 13:25, ‘grace’ is shorthand for every benefit and blessing that God provides through Christ.¹¹⁴⁸ Indeed, in Hebrews grace is “nothing less than the “great salvation” of 2:3”.¹¹⁴⁹ In 12:28 *ἔχωμεν χάριν* is probably idiomatic, meaning ‘let us be thankful’,¹¹⁵⁰ and in 13:9 the NC grace is contrasted with the OC rituals and regulations, here about ‘foods’.¹¹⁵¹

In 4:16, the author employs the phrase ‘throne of grace’ and he reminds his congregation that they can ‘draw near’ or ‘approach’ (*προσέρχονται*)¹¹⁵² that throne to receive grace for every need. Nowhere else in Scripture does the phrase ‘throne of grace’ occur. However, there are similar designations in both the NT and the OT such that it is not surprising that our author felt able to coin this phrase in the context of God’s people asking for God’s grace to help in times of need.¹¹⁵³ The ‘throne’ is a circumlocution for the God whose throne it is.¹¹⁵⁴ The context (4:14-16) indicates that it is because of the high-

¹¹⁴⁶ The context of 12:14-16, Esau wilfully abandoning his birth-right, gives *ὑστερέω* this nuance. Cf. Num. 9:13 where *ὑστερέω* is used in the context of someone wilfully failing to meet a cultic obligation. So, Wilckens, U. “ὕστερος, *et al.*”, *TDNT*, 8:595-96; cf. *BDAG*, 1043-44; Lane, *Hebrews* 9-13, 452; Marshall, *Kept*, 149-51.

¹¹⁴⁷ Cervera (i Valls), J. “Insultar l’Espirít de la gràcia”, Puig (i Tàrrach) A. (Ed.), *L’Espirít Sant en la Bíblia*, (Tarragona: Scripta Biblica, 2013), 307. Cf. Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 637; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 663; Hagner, *Hebrews*, 221; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 474.

¹¹⁴⁸ Guthrie, *Hebrews*, 257; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 92; Lane, *Hebrews* 9-13, 452.

¹¹⁴⁹ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 135.

¹¹⁵⁰ So, Lane, *Hebrews*, 443ff, 486. Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 382; Barclay, J.M.G. *Paul & the Gift*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 577-78; *BDAG*, 10; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 671-72 n.47; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 499; Koester, *Hebrews*, 557; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 406-407. Hagner [*Encountering*, 78] ignores *ἔχωμεν χάριν* in 12:28, writing that “*charis* as “grace” occurs seven times”. However, see Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 236, who argues that, in 12:28, ‘let us hold onto God’s grace’ is a more appropriate exhortation; so too, Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 639-40, 664-65; Cervera, “Insultar”, 307. Westcott [*Hebrews*, 422] seems to favour “*let us have* (i.e. realise) *grace*”.

¹¹⁵¹ See Conzelmann, *χάρις*, 398.

¹¹⁵² Occurring 7x in Hebrews, *προσέρχονται* is a key (liturgical) term in the letter, so, Allen, *Hebrews*, 514; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 226-27; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 105. Cf. O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 185; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 154. However, see §8.1.1 and n.1132.

¹¹⁵³ E.g. ‘Throne of glory’ (Jer. 17:12; Matt. 19:28; 25:31); ‘Royal throne’ (Wisd. 18:15); ‘Eternal throne’ (Lam. 5:19); ‘Holy throne’ (Ps. 46:9).

¹¹⁵⁴ So, Lane, *Hebrews* 1-8, 115-16; cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 305; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 142; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 270. However, Cervera [“Insultar”, 305-306] sees it as the throne of Christ. See Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 148.

priestly ministry of Christ that the throne of grace is both approachable and the place where grace is given. In this, Christ has provided the NC community with what Israel could never enjoy, namely a full and immediate invitation to approach God without fear,¹¹⁵⁵ “a constant availability of divine aid in all their need”.¹¹⁵⁶ Cervera writes that 4:16 demonstrates “dos matisos de gràcia en majúscula i en minúscula”¹¹⁵⁷ and that from this throne (or repository) of grace individual gifts of grace may be received.¹¹⁵⁸ Indeed, the invitation to come to the throne of grace is in itself a demonstration of remarkable grace. 4:16 is reminiscent of Zechariah 12:10 in that there God pours out his Spirit of grace with the result that the recipients petition him for more grace.¹¹⁵⁹ As Bulgakov expresses it: “this *gift of grace* (is) bestowed... by a *synergistic* union of the gift of the Holy Spirit and man’s efforts directed at receiving this gift”.¹¹⁶⁰ Commenting on Zechariah 12:10. Klein writes that “Grace... comes from the Lord... pleading for grace, represents the human side of the equation”.¹¹⁶¹ Christians are not merely passive recipients of grace, they have to “find grace” (χάριν εὑρωμεν) and to do that, “bedüsie des Geistes, der sie ihnen zukommen läßt”.¹¹⁶²

In Hebrews, with the probable exception of the idiomatic use in 12:28,¹¹⁶³ grace, χάρις, is always seen from the perspective of God’s action for his people. The new and eternal covenant, established by the blood of Christ (10:29; 13:20) and made by God, is the ultimate expression of his grace. It is offered by God, established by the death of his Son and, despite any covenant responsibilities that might be required of the covenant community, it is totally dependent on God’s grace.¹¹⁶⁴ The phrase ‘the grace of the Lord

¹¹⁵⁵ So, Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 154; Koester, *Hebrews*, 284; Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, 115-16; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 186. Luther (cited by Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 227) translates τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος as, “zudem Gnadenstuhl” (the mercy seat).

¹¹⁵⁶ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 86-87.

¹¹⁵⁷ Cervera, “Insultar”, 305.

¹¹⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 306-307.

¹¹⁵⁹ See §7.2.4.1.

¹¹⁶⁰ Bulgakov, S. *The Comforter*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 316, *emphasis original*.

¹¹⁶¹ Klein, *Zechariah*, 364-65

¹¹⁶² Bieder, “Pneumatologische Aspekte”, 254, (they need the Spirit who will supply them with it).

¹¹⁶³ However, see n.1150.

¹¹⁶⁴ See Moffatt, *Grace*, 346-49.

Jesus' (or similar) does not occur in Hebrews;¹¹⁶⁵ however, the author “directly links the sacrifice of Christ with grace”.¹¹⁶⁶ The Son is the climax of God's gracious self-revelation (1:1-3). Indeed, it might be said that, in Hebrews, Christ is the embodiment of the grace of God,¹¹⁶⁷ and the Holy Spirit of Grace applies all the benefits won by Christ's sacrificial death to the believers.

7.4 An exegesis of 10:29

7.4.1 Introduction

Employing an *a fortiori* argument in 10:28-29, the author reminds his readers of the serious consequences involved in rejecting the law of Moses. He then proceeds to show the extreme consequences faced by those who walk away from their Christian faith. In 10:26-27 he prepares his congregation for the “vivid language” he employs to describe “the horrific nature of apostasy”.¹¹⁶⁸ In an echo of 6:4-6, he warns any who would “willfully persist in sin”¹¹⁶⁹ that such a lifestyle is tantamount to rejecting Christ, the source of eternal salvation, and – since there is no other acceptable sacrifice – they are exposing themselves to “a fearful prospect of judgment, and a fury of fire” (10:27).

In 10:29 the author uses three parallel aorist participial phrases:

- τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας
- τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη
- τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας

¹¹⁶⁵ Paul writes often of ‘the grace of (the Lord) Jesus (Christ)’ – usually in the body or at the close of his letters e.g. Rom. 5:15; 16:20; Gal. 6:18; Philem. 25, or ‘grace from’ Jesus – usually in the opening greetings, e.g. Rom. 1:7; Gal. 1:3; Philem. 3).

¹¹⁶⁶ So, Moffatt, *Grace*, 356. Koester, *Hebrews*, 222, writes that “the salvific effect of Christ's death is grounded in the grace of God”.

¹¹⁶⁷ Conzelmann, *Χάρις*, 398. Cf. Hughes, *Hebrews*, 92; Moffatt, *Grace*, 346.

¹¹⁶⁸ Witherington, *Hebrews*, 288. Cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 294; Hagner, *Encountering*, 137-38; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 264; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 529; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 377; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 326.

¹¹⁶⁹ Cockerill [*Hebrews*, 481] prefers “persist in willfully sinning” but, for this thesis, it matters little whether the persistence or the sinning (or both) is done wilfully.

These three phrases are of the same form and do not contain a main verb. They give three perspectives on the same sin; they are not three distinct sins. Consequently, the three phrases may be regarded as an example of a ‘parallelism of greater precision’;¹¹⁷⁰ each phrase adds to the others to present a picture of a complete rejection of the Christian gospel.¹¹⁷¹ They are parallel not synonymous and provide “cumulative force to the argument”.¹¹⁷² Thus, the one who ‘treads underfoot’ the Son of God is the same one who regards the blood of the covenant as ‘unclean’ and ‘arrogantly insults’ the Spirit of grace. This use of extreme imagery to describe the apostasy employs the rhetorical device known as *deinosis*¹¹⁷³ which “gives additional force to things unjust, cruel, hateful”.¹¹⁷⁴ Furthermore, the language used in each participial phrase throws light on that used in the other two. Consequently, it will be important to examine the first two phrases before examining the author’s use of the NT *hapax*, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος.

7.4.2 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας

Although the author refers to Jesus as God’s Son 12 times, he uses the full expression ‘Son of God’ in just four of those.¹¹⁷⁵ In 10:29, coming before καταπατήσας, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is emphatic by word order¹¹⁷⁶ and is designed to shock the audience.¹¹⁷⁷ It is not *what* is done but *to whom* it is done that is the shock. Indeed, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the action itself, e.g. in Judges 9:27 (A), καταπατέω is used of trampling grapes to produce wine.

¹¹⁷⁰ See Clines, D.J.A. ‘The Parallelism of Greater Precision: Notes from Isaiah 40 for a Theory of Hebrew Poetry’, Clines, D.J.A. *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays 1967-1998*, Vol. 1, (Sheffield: SAP, 1998), 314-36.

¹¹⁷¹ See Hagner, *Encountering*, 138; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 295.

¹¹⁷² Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 538. So too, Allen, *Hebrews*, 525; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 294; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 488; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 264; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 515, 524-25; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 294; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 377; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 209; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 330.

¹¹⁷³ For a discussion of the author’s rhetorical skill see §1.5.4.

¹¹⁷⁴ Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 6.2.24, cited by Witherington, *Hebrews*, 288-89.

¹¹⁷⁵ 4:14; 6:6; 7:3; 10:29.

¹¹⁷⁶ In the same way, τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης and τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος are also emphatic.

¹¹⁷⁷ In effect exclaiming, ‘it is the Son of God! and they trample him underfoot!’ See Allen, *Hebrews*, 525; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 488-89; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 264; Koester, *Hebrews*, 457; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 378.

καταπατέω, ‘trample underfoot’ or ‘tread upon’, is found just five times in the NT. On four of those occasions it has its literal sense¹¹⁷⁸ and in 10:29 it is used figuratively. The metaphorical use is also found in Josephus (*War* 4.386) and the LXX (Hos. 5:11; 1 Macc. 3:45; 2 Macc. 8:2). However, used with ‘the Son of God’ as its object,¹¹⁷⁹ the verb καταπατέω has an added ironic dimension that would seriously shock the congregation. The image of Christ trampled underfoot by those who were once his followers stands in stark contrast to that of him enthroned (1:3, 8) at God’s right hand (8:1-2) waiting for his enemies to be put under his feet (1:13; 10:12-13).¹¹⁸⁰

In the LXX, καταπατέω occurs 52 times in various contexts including metaphorically to mean ‘discarded’ or ‘rejected’¹¹⁸¹ and the associated word, ἀποπάτημα, means ‘excrement’.¹¹⁸² However, the most common context in which καταπατέω is found is that of oppressing or overrunning an enemy or its territory.¹¹⁸³ Often it is Jerusalem, the sanctuary or the people of God who are so treated;¹¹⁸⁴ for example, Zechariah 12:3 (where καταπατέω occurs twice) describes Jerusalem as being trampled underfoot and utterly mocked. Having examined Zechariah 12:10 (§7.2.4.1) and 4:6-7 (§7.2.4.2) as the probable OT background to the author’s use of the phrase ‘Spirit of grace’, the double occurrence of καταπατέω in Zechariah 12:3 is worth considering as the probable source for the language employed in the first of the three participial phrases in 10:29.¹¹⁸⁵

When καταπατέω has “a personal object (it) denotes contempt of the most flagrant kind” and the metaphor of ‘trampling underfoot’ is equivalent to ‘re-crucifying’ Christ

¹¹⁷⁸ Matt. 5:13; 7:6; Luke 8:5; 12:1.

¹¹⁷⁹ καταπατέω “is not used elsewhere in the Greek Bible with God or Christ as the object”, so, Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 540.

¹¹⁸⁰ See Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 489-90; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 516; Lane, *Hebrews* 9-13, 294.

¹¹⁸¹ See Lam. 2:8; Isa. 5:5. Cf. *BDAG*, 523 – ‘treat with disdain’.

¹¹⁸² Not used in Scripture; see Montanari, 263 for examples in classical Greek literature, cf. *EDG*, 2:1157.

¹¹⁸³ Over 80% of its occurrences.

¹¹⁸⁴ This accounts for about 40% of its occurrences, while just less than 25% find Israel (or the Lord) trampling upon their enemies and in a further 15% the rich and powerful Israelites trample on their poor and needy fellows. Ellingworth [*Hebrews*, 540] and Schreiner [*Hebrews*, 326] both suggest that καταπατέω “recalls the trampling of the temple by the pagans in Maccabean times”.

¹¹⁸⁵ Indeed, Moffatt [*Hebrews*, 151] writes that the use of καταπατέω in 10:29, “recalls Zec 12³”. So too, Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 539, who writes: “The language of this verse recalls at several points that of Zechariah, especially 12:3”.

(6:6).¹¹⁸⁶ Consequently, by employing this stark metaphor in 10:29, the author is portraying the apostate as one who has utterly rejected and abused the Son of God and now regards Christ as less than nothing.¹¹⁸⁷

7.4.3 τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθή

It is generally accepted that the author's source for the phrase, 'the blood of the covenant' is Exodus 24:8 since he quotes that passage in 9:20.¹¹⁸⁸ However, the only other use of the phrase in the LXX is in Zechariah 9:11 and the probable source of 10:29a is Zechariah 12:3.¹¹⁸⁹ In the NT, the phrase occurs in connection with the Last Supper¹¹⁹⁰ but no 'sacramentalism' is in view in Hebrews.¹¹⁹¹ Here, as elsewhere in Hebrews,¹¹⁹² 'blood' signifies 'life given up', in this case, the sacrificial death of Christ which effects the NC (10:19; 13:20-21).¹¹⁹³ The focus in this phrase is threefold; the cost, the uniqueness and the effect of Christ's death. Firstly, the cost of the NC was the death of the Son of God, not that of bulls or goats.¹¹⁹⁴ The NC 'in his blood' required him to suffer on behalf of those who would come into that covenant.¹¹⁹⁵ Secondly, Christ suffered 'once for all' in an unrepeatable and totally effective sacrifice for sin.¹¹⁹⁶ Thirdly, the effect of Christ's blood-shedding is both temporal and eternal.¹¹⁹⁷ Indeed, the 'blood of the covenant' (10:29) is also called the 'blood of the eternal covenant'

¹¹⁸⁶ Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 151; cf. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 294; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 217; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 209.

¹¹⁸⁷ See the simile in Matt. 5:13, if the salt loses its saltiness it is worth less than nothing, only fit to be trodden underfoot. For the apostate, the Saviour has lost his savour! Cf. Brown, R. *The Message of Hebrews: Christ Above All*, (Leicester: IVP, 1988), 190-91; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 529.

¹¹⁸⁸ So, Allen, *Hebrews*, 525; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 540; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 378.

¹¹⁸⁹ See n.1082 and the associated text.

¹¹⁹⁰ Mark 14:24 // Matt. 26:28; Luke 22:20 // 1 Cor. 11:25. Cf. Eph. 2:12-13.

¹¹⁹¹ So, Attridge, *Hebrews*, 294; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 540; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 217. *Contra* Healy, *Hebrews*, 219; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 423; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 306; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 179.

¹¹⁹² See §§6.2.1; 6.3.2.

¹¹⁹³ So, Allen, *Hebrews*, 525; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 489-90; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 529; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 294; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 209.

¹¹⁹⁴ See 9:11-14; 10:4-5. Cf. §§6.2.2; 6.2.3.

¹¹⁹⁵ See 2:9-10, 17-18; 5:7-8.

¹¹⁹⁶ See 9:24-26; 10:12-16.

¹¹⁹⁷ It 'sets free' now (2:9, 14-15; 9:15, 28; 10:10), provides access to the throne of grace for divine assistance to face whatever happens from now on (4:16; 7:9, 25; 10:19), and provides eternal life (5:9).

(13:20). The apostate effectively regards this blood (and the covenant it procures) as κοινός. However, the ‘covenant blood’ is both holy and consecrates all that it touches.¹¹⁹⁸

In the 14 occurrences of κοινός in the NT, it has a neutral sense of ‘(in) common’ or ‘share’ four times¹¹⁹⁹ and the negative connotation ‘unclean’ or ‘defiled’ in the other ten cases.¹²⁰⁰ The verbal cognate, κοινώω, is employed in 9:13 and occurs a further 13 times in the NT, on every occasion with the meaning ‘to defile’ or ‘profane’.¹²⁰¹ In 10:29 κοινός cannot simply mean ‘common’ or ‘ordinary’. By contrasting κοινός with its antonym ἀγιάζω the author indicates that the apostate regards Christ’s blood as ‘unclean’ or ‘defiled’.¹²⁰² However, it is the apostate who defiles himself by his rejection of the provision of God. He denies the efficacy of Christ’s sacrifice and denies himself access to the only means of redemption. No wonder the author comments that ‘there no longer remains any sacrifice for sins’ (10:26).

Jesus was both perfect high priest and spotless sacrifice¹²⁰³ and consequently his blood (which established the covenant) was both sanctified and sanctifying. In 10:29, the apostate is not simply rejecting the covenant blood or denying its efficacy, he regards it, and Christ himself, as κοινός. Such a judgement counts Christ’s blood as less effective than the blood of bulls and goats. The OC blood sacrifices were not κοινός; they were effective for ceremonial and outward cleansing (9:13). The apostates, in effect, classify Christ’s blood as akin to pigs’ blood, not realising that they are the pigs who metaphorically trample on the pearl of great price (Matt. 7:6; 13:45-46). Not only does this reject the blood’s cleansing power but also denies that the life and death of Messiah

¹¹⁹⁸ So, Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 372-73. Cf. Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 294.

¹¹⁹⁹ Acts 2:44; 4:32; Titus 1:4; Jude 3.

¹²⁰⁰ In addition to 10:29, see Mark 7:2, 5; Acts 10:14, 28; 11:8; Rom. 14:14 (thrice); Rev. 21:27.

¹²⁰¹ Matt. 15:11 (2x), 18, 20 (2x); Mark 7:15 (2x), 18, 20, 23; Acts 10:15; 11:9; 21:28.

¹²⁰² Attridge, *Hebrews*, 294; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 489 n.35; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 540-41; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 378-79. Kleinig [*Hebrews*, 529] is imprecise in saying, “the apostate... desecrates (the) saving blood”. The apostate does not and cannot desecrate the blood, he simply ‘regards it’ as κοινός. See also the discussion of ἐνυβρίζω in §7.4.4.

¹²⁰³ The apostate’s assessment of Christ’s blood as κοινός contrasts powerfully with the fact that God reckoned Christ to be ἄμωμος (9:14). See §6.2.4.

was sanctified and sanctifying. This is a both a rejection of the Son and a fundamental insult to God himself.

7.4.4 τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας

The consensus, with which this thesis concurs, is that ‘the Spirit of Grace’ (10:29) “is a periphrasis for πνεῦμα ἅγιον”.¹²⁰⁴ Genitival constructions are difficult to interpret with certainty.¹²⁰⁵ Here, the genitive is more than attributive – the Spirit is indeed gracious, and this stands in stark opposition to the hubris exercised against him – and is best understood as adjectival,¹²⁰⁶ or, as Wallace designates it, a genitive of production.¹²⁰⁷ The Spirit of grace is the one who applies the grace of God to the followers of Christ.¹²⁰⁸

ἐνυβρίζω is a Biblical *hapax*¹²⁰⁹ and is found only once in Philo, where it has the sense of ‘to abuse’ (desecrate) the corpse of an enemy (*Spec. Leg.* IV, 202). It is also found in Josephus in the context of flouting God’s commands or insulting and abusing his written law.¹²¹⁰ It belongs to a family of words¹²¹¹ that occur another ten times in the NT and 89 times in the LXX. The semantic range includes: insult (Luke 11:45), despise, hold in

¹²⁰⁴ Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 151. So too, Allen, *Hebrews*, 526; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 295; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 259 n.139; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 541; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 423-24; Koester, *Hebrews*, 453-57; Lane, *Hebrews* 9-13, 294; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 217-18; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 377; Robinson, *Hebrews*, 147; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 331-2.

¹²⁰⁵ See §1.4.4.

¹²⁰⁶ For this designation see O’Brien, *Spoken*, 184 n.97. In fact, this genitive is also a genitive of content; the Spirit is, in his own right, full of grace.

¹²⁰⁷ Wallace, *Grammar*, 106.

¹²⁰⁸ Allen, *Hebrews*, 526 n.99; Bieder, “Aspekte”, 254; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 259 n.139; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 541; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 423; Mitchell, *Hebrews*, 218; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 179; O’Brien, *Spoken*, 184; *idem*, *Hebrews*, 379; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 331. Ellingworth and Nida [*Handbook*, 238] write that the German common language translation (*Die Gute Nachricht*) makes this meaning explicit.

¹²⁰⁹ It is found as a poorly attested *v.l.* in Lev. 24:11, see Weaver, *LXX Ap. Leviticus*, 2:262.

¹²¹⁰ See *Ant.* 1:47, after the fall, God accuses Adam of abusing or flouting his purposes (νῦν δ’ εἰς ταύτην μου τὴν γνώμην ἐνυβρίσας) by disregarding his command. See *Ant.* 20:117, during the procuratorship of Cumanus (AD 49) a soldier, who publicly tore up a copy of the law of Moses, was beheaded because he had ‘insulted (God’s) laws’ (τὸν ἐνυβρίσαντα τοῖς νόμοις). *Ant.* 20:116 uses two other compound verbs from ἐνυβρίζω (περιυβρισμένων and κατυβρίσθησαν) to define the charge that was brought against the soldier.

¹²¹¹ Those that occur in the NT and LXX are: ἐνυβρίζω (5x NT, 6x LXX), ὕβρις (3x NT, 62x LXX), ὑβριστής (2x NT, 8x LXX), ὕβριστος (Prov. 6:17), ὑβριστικός (Prov. 20:1), ὑβρίστρια (Jer. 27:31), ὑβριστέος (Sir. 8:11) and the compound words, ἐξυβρίξω (4x LXX), κατυβρίξω (3x LXX), ἐφυβριστος (Wisdom 17:7) and, meaning ‘hating insolence’, μίσυβρις (3 Macc. 6:9).

contempt (2 Sam. 19:44 [19:43]), mock or scorn (Prov. 1:22), mistreat or abuse (Prov. 27:13), treat with disdain (Matt. 22:6), proud (Nah. 2:3 [2:2]; Zech. 10:11), violent (Sir. 21:4), turbulent or unstable (Gen. 49:4) and insolent or arrogant (Lev. 26:19; Sir. 8:11; Rom 1:30). The vast majority of the occurrences of this word group in the LXX and NT have a person or persons as the object of the hubris and in almost a quarter it is God (or holy things) being so treated.¹²¹² An arrogant or insolent attitude, with no object being specified, accounts for a further 28 occurrences. Finally, note that ἐξυβρίζω is used metaphorically in two LXX texts. Describing Ezekiel’s ‘river that no one can cross’ as a “rushing torrent” (Ezek. 47:5) ἐξυβρίζω translates נאג, (arise, be exalted).¹²¹³ In this context, the waters had “swelled to an impassable torrent”¹²¹⁴, ‘hubristically’ preventing Ezekiel from crossing to the other side. ἐξυβρίζω is also used as a simile for Reuben’s hubris against his father when Jacob describes him as: “Unstable as water (ἐξυβρίσας ὡς ὕδωρ) in your insolence” (Gen. 49:3-4).¹²¹⁵

Whenever ὕβρις is used with a specified object, that object is always personal (explicitly or implicitly). The sin against the Spirit of grace is a sin against the *personal* Holy Spirit, not against some impersonal spiritual or ethical motivation.¹²¹⁶ Unfortunately, some translators and commentators have failed to recognise that ἐνυβρίζω is exercised against, not by, the Spirit. They write of the apostate “‘outraging’ (ἐνυβρίσας) the Spirit of grace”¹²¹⁷ with the consequence that, “insulting the Spirit invited judgment”.¹²¹⁸ However, in 10:29, the Spirit does not ‘*take* offence’ but *receives* grievously offensive treatment; the focus being on “the brazen insolence of the apostate”.¹²¹⁹ When this is

¹²¹² Not counting Hebrews 10:29, ‘hubris’ is directed at people(s) 47x and God (or ‘his holy place/hill’) 22x.

¹²¹³ Related to words elsewhere translated ‘pride’ or ‘proud’. See *DCH*, 2:292.

¹²¹⁴ So, Thompson, C. in his translation of the LXX: *The Old Covenant*, (London: Skeffington & Son, 1904). NETS has ‘violently rushing’ while OSB has ‘rushing torrent that man cannot cross’.

¹²¹⁵ NETS renders it, “Rouben, you are... hard, self-centered... wanton like water”.

¹²¹⁶ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 259 n.139; Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 541; Moffatt, *Hebrews*, 151; Montefiore, *Hebrews*, 179; O’ Brien, *Hebrews*, 379-80; Robinson, *Hebrews*, 147.

¹²¹⁷ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 58; so too, Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 184. Cf. NRSV.

¹²¹⁸ Keener, C.S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*, (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993), Heb. 10:29; Levison, “Theology”, 107-108; Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 224.

¹²¹⁹ Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 490; Koester, *Hebrews*, 453; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 379-80. *Contra* Levison, “Theology”, 107-108; Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 182-84. See Greenlee, *Exegetical Summary*, 393. Cf. §1.2.1e.

recognised, the parallelism between the three phrases becomes clearly obvious. They describe not only the same person or group of people but also the same form of action; an arrogant rejection of God and his gracious provision through the self-offering of his Son.

To treat the Spirit of grace with disdain is to reject both the sign of God's presence with his people and his actual presence.¹²²⁰ Consequently, those who so act divorce themselves from any and all the benefits that accrue from the sacrificial death of Christ and his continuing intercession. Indeed, the apostate deliberately and utterly rejects the salvific provision of God.¹²²¹

7.5 Conclusions

In all three participial phrases in 10:29, the author emphasises the object of the apostasy and shows that the apostate's attitudes and actions are utterly contemptable.¹²²² The apostate is not passively 'drifting away' (2:1) but, by a deliberate act of rejection, he is arrogantly 'marching away' from the salvific provision of God in Christ.¹²²³ Commenting on 10:29 Bruce writes, "Our author is not given to wild exaggeration, and when he uses language like this, he chooses his words with his customary care".¹²²⁴ Indeed, by choosing to define the object(s) of the apostasy as he does, 'our author' is making significant soteriological and pneumatological statements. The Spirit who was active in the sacrificial death of God's Son (9:14, see §6.4) is one and the same Spirit who imparts God's grace to Christ's followers.¹²²⁵ Lane writes that, if Zech. 12:10 provides the background for 10:29, then the Spirit of grace would be "the Spirit poured out at Pentecost who... effects salvation. Alternatively, the presence of the Spirit... is the sign of the eschatological grace of God expressed through Christ."¹²²⁶ However,

¹²²⁰ See §3.2.

¹²²¹ See Allen, *Hebrews*, 526; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 641; Hagner, *Encountering*, 138; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 295; Levison, "Theology", 109-10.

¹²²² See §7.4.1 n.1168.

¹²²³ See Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 294-95; Robinson, *Hebrews*, 147-48; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 209.

¹²²⁴ Bruce, *Hebrews*, 259.

¹²²⁵ See Attridge, *Hebrews*, 295; Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 490; Koester, *Hebrews*, 453; O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 379.

¹²²⁶ Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 294. Cf. Allen, *Hebrews*, 526; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 530.

there is no need for these two to be mutually exclusive. The eschatological Spirit (9:14) authenticates the members of the NC community (2:4; 6:4 see §5) and he is the one who makes effective the grace of God in the lives of believers.¹²²⁷

Given the strong language with which the author describes the apostate and the likelihood that Zechariah 12:10 is in his mind, it may be that he is suggesting that this apostasy is akin to a knife going through God's heart.¹²²⁸ If this is the case then there is an underlying Trinitarianism here (see §8.2.1). To reject the Son, insult the Spirit and regard the blood which establishes God's covenant as impure, is tantamount to stabbing God in his heart. The author continues in 10:30-31 by stating explicitly that God himself will mete out judgement on this apostasy.¹²²⁹

In 2:9, it was by the grace of God that Jesus' sacrificial death procured salvation. However, in 9:14, it was "through the eternal Spirit" that he "offered himself without blemish to God". Now, in 10:29, those two thoughts coalesce. The Spirit of grace, the Son of God and the covenant blood together establish and authenticate God's new community. The Son of God – active in creation (1:2), enthroned in heaven (1:3, 8) and to be involved in the dissolution of this created order (1:10-12) – is eternal. The Spirit of grace is the eternal Spirit (9:14). Furthermore, in 13:20 the author reminds his audience that God's new covenant, established by Christ's blood-shedding, is an eternal covenant. As has been seen, 'eternal' connotes the life of heaven, the life of God breaking into time,¹²³⁰ the life-eternal in the life-now. The fact that the three aorist participial phrases – insulting the Spirit, treating the covenant blood as being of less value than the blood of goats and bulls¹²³¹ and trampling on the Son of God – are parallel statements indicates that the Spirit is not only eternal but also personal and divine.

In his interaction with Christ's followers, the Holy Spirit – as the Spirit of Grace – brings and actualizes God's grace. The Spirit of Grace is the assurance that grace is available

¹²²⁷ See Allen, *Hebrews*, 541; Hughes, *Hebrews*, 423; Lane, *Hebrews 9-13*, 294; Koester, *Hebrews*, 453; Robinson, *Hebrews*, 147-48; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 331.

¹²²⁸ See §7.2.4.1 and n.1091.

¹²²⁹ *Contra* Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 182-84.

¹²³⁰ See §6.3.

¹²³¹ See the discussions in §6.2.

for the believer (12:15) and is the one who brings ‘enabling grace’ so that they can approach the throne of grace and find grace for a time of need (4:16). Indeed, he is “the sum of all God’s gracious gifts... (2:4; 6:4)”.¹²³² Father, Son and Spirit working graciously together for the benefit and blessing of those partnered by the Son (3:14) and the Spirit (6:4) within the household of God (3:6). 10:29 demonstrates “a Trinitarian ground-plan (which is) all the more striking because there is nothing in the context to necessitate it... the trinitarian pattern which was to dominate all later creeds was already part and parcel of the Christian tradition of doctrine”.¹²³³

¹²³² So, Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 530.

¹²³³ So, Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds*, (London: Longmans, 1964), 23. See further, §8.2.1.

8 Conclusions and Overview of the Thesis

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 Hebrews has a developed pneumatology

This thesis began by questioning and rejecting the oft-made claim that there is a paucity of references to the Holy Spirit in Hebrews. In addition to the statistics and examples cited in §1.4.5, two other words should be mentioned. The word *χάρις* is found eight times in the letter,¹²³⁴ and is said to be “an important word in Hebrews”.¹²³⁵ The verb ‘approach’ (*προσέρχομαι*) is found seven times in Hebrews and has been called a frequently occurring key term within the letter.¹²³⁶ If commentators recognise that *χάρις* and *προσέρχομαι* are significant concepts in Hebrews because of their frequency and the role they play in the argument of the whole letter, ‘how much more’ should *πνεῦμα* be recognised as important? The word *πνεῦμα* occurs twelve times in Hebrews, seven of which are in the divine-Spirit texts.¹²³⁷ Those seven occurrences are at significant places in the development of the letter and provide unique descriptions of the person and work of the Spirit.¹²³⁸ Failure to recognise the importance of the Holy Spirit in Hebrews, whilst at the same time focusing on the significance of words such as *χάρις* and *προσέρχομαι*, betrays a surprising lack of consistency.¹²³⁹

8.1.2 Hebrews has a significant pneumatology

The foundational premise of this thesis is that the pneumatology of Hebrews is at least as significant as that of Paul or Luke (§1.1). It proceeds by arguing that the author was

¹²³⁴ One of which (12:28) is probably idiomatic, ‘let us be thankful’, see §7.3.1.

¹²³⁵ Hagner, *Hebrews*, 83. Cf. Shogren, “Grace”, 1087.

¹²³⁶ E.g. Allen, *Hebrews*, 514; Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 226-27; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 185; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 154; Thompson, *Hebrews*, 105. Cf. §7.3.1 n.1152; §8.1.1 n.1239.

¹²³⁷ See Table 1:1.

¹²³⁸ See §8.2.

¹²³⁹ E.g. Schreiner [*Hebrews*, 154] lists the seven occurrences of *προσέρχομαι* and discusses their importance in the flow of the author’s argument, commenting that “it is used often in Hebrews”. He subsequently writes: “The Spirit is only mentioned seven times and thus he doesn’t play a major role”, *ibid*, 477.

precise in his use of language (§1.5). Stylistic, rhetorical and linguistic analysis suggests that our author was able to use OT ideas, language and concepts to demonstrate – for a congregation who recognised the authority of those texts¹²⁴⁰ – both the continuity of God’s revelation in his Son (1:1) and the newness of the covenant established through the Christ event (§1.5). Given that Hebrews’ main concern is to prevent members of the congregation slipping back – most probably into some form of Judaism but certainly into their pre-Christian life-style and values – its description as a covenant reinforcement document (§2.1.4) seems apposite. Indeed, the comments about the blood of the new and eternal covenant (10:29; 13:20-21) lend weight to this designation. As Allen expresses it, “Hebrews... becomes a new Deuteronomy... rewrit(ten) through christological spectacles”.¹²⁴¹

It was shown that, in general, Hebrews sits well within the framework of the ‘Christ tradition’ (§2.4) and that, although using language and ideas common in the author’s day (§2.2), nonetheless Hebrews is a document that primarily comes from a Christological re-interpretation of the OT (§2.3). Finally, by way of introductory matters, the OT concept of the Spirit as the ‘Spirit of revelation and prophecy’ (§§3.3; 4.5) and ‘proof-of-presence’ (§§3.2; 5.2) were shown to be concepts reworked and developed by our author. As ‘proof-of-presence’, the Spirit authenticates the members of the NC community and this is all the more significant because of the apparent belief that the Spirit had ‘ceased’ in the three or four centuries prior to the Christ event (§§3.4; 5.3; 7.5).

8.1.3 Hebrews has a unique pneumatology

The pneumatology that undergirds our author’s divine-*πνεῦμα* texts is discoverable by a ‘back-reading’ of those texts.¹²⁴² The author does not argue for the validity of the statements he makes about the Spirit ‘voicing’ Scripture (§4.5.2), interpreting Scripture (§4.5.3) or interacting with the members of the NC community (§5). Nor does he explain

¹²⁴⁰ See Glasson “‘Plurality’”, 272; cf. §2.4 n.330.

¹²⁴¹ Allen, *Deuteronomy*, 225.

¹²⁴² See Hodson, “Hebrews”, 236-37. So too, Motyer, “The Spirit”, 226; Levison, “Theology”, 91.

why he uses the appellations ‘eternal Spirit’ (9:14) and ‘Spirit of grace’ (10:29). It must be assumed that both he and his congregation were familiar, or at least comfortable, with this language and to some degree understood and accepted the theology that lay behind this use of language.¹²⁴³ Consequently, in his ‘brief word of encouragement’ (13:22) our author was able to employ words, phrases and concepts without the need of an explanation or argument. This thesis has attempted to look behind the divine-πνεῦμα texts to discover this underlying theology. Indeed, as Rowe puts it, Hebrews is written in such a way that “requires us to look behind the texts to the theological judgements that makes such language possible”.¹²⁴⁴ At this point it will be convenient to discuss what Hebrews’ ‘Spirit’ texts reveal about the ‘person’ of the Holy Spirit and this will necessitate a discussion of whether Trinitarian language is appropriate in a study of Hebrews’ pneumatology (§8.2). This thesis will then draw together what our author explicitly writes about the ‘work’ of the Spirit and in so doing will delineate his unique contribution to NT pneumatology (§8.3). Finally, the thesis will offer a summary conclusion underlining the centrality of the Holy Spirit to our author’s work (§8.4).

8.2 The Spirit – Who he is

In some ways the division between what are called ‘the person’ and ‘the work’ of the Spirit¹²⁴⁵ is a false one because how he functions is intimately tied up with who he is. Nonetheless, it is a convenient way of addressing the texts that refer to him. In addition, the ‘attributes’ of the Spirit overlap with one another as do the facets of his work. However, the divine-πνεῦμα passages reveal some significant things about how the author perceives the Holy Spirit. Much of this is not unique to Hebrews. In terms of the identity of the Spirit, the author shares many of the same basic understandings as other NT writers. Nevertheless, it is instructive to be reminded of the foundations from which

¹²⁴³ See Glasson, “Plurality”, 271-72.

¹²⁴⁴ Rowe, C.K. “The Trinity in the Letters of Paul and Hebrews”, Emery, G. and Levering, M. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 41.

¹²⁴⁵ Or of the Father or Son for that matter.

his pneumatology springs. However, before looking at these foundations one other issue must first be addressed.

8.2.1 Trinitarian language?

It is appropriate at this point to offer some justification for the use of Trinitarian language in the body of the thesis (§§4-7). Clearly, ‘Trinitarian’ language properly belongs to the theological pronouncements coming from the fourth century (and later). Consequently, it is important to be aware of “the danger... of reading distinct Trinitarian categories into an epistle that predates such formulations”.¹²⁴⁶ Emmrich comments that there are “few (if any) traces of a trinitarian understanding of the deity” in Hebrews.¹²⁴⁷ In the same vein, commenting on 2:4, Attridge writes that “the reference to the holy spirit is hardly evidence of Trinitarian speculation”.¹²⁴⁸ However, others have written of “the author exhibiting theological quality with his ‘pre-Trinitarian’ exposition in 2:3-4”¹²⁴⁹ and that Hebrews provides “some of the raw material” for a doctrine of the Trinity.¹²⁵⁰ Pierce writes that “the God who speaks in Hebrews is a God identified as three distinct speakers, Father, Son, and Spirit”.¹²⁵¹ Consequently, she writes, “the use of Trinitarian or the Trinity with regard to Hebrews in a minimalist way would be appropriate”.¹²⁵²

In six of the seven divine-πνεῦμα passages the Son and the Spirit are mentioned along with God, who has clearly been identified as the Son’s Father (1:5), and they are spoken of as distinct from each other. It will be expedient to briefly revisit these passages before making some observations about the appropriateness (or otherwise) of Trinitarian language. In the sections that then follow it will be shown that, for Hebrews, the Spirit is personal (§8.2.2), eternal (§8.2.3) and divine (§8.2.4). He is God but is distinct from the Father and the Son.

¹²⁴⁶ So, Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 52.

¹²⁴⁷ Emmrich, *Concepts*, ix.

¹²⁴⁸ Attridge, *Hebrews*, 67.

¹²⁴⁹ Cervera, “Insultar”, 304.

¹²⁵⁰ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 448.

¹²⁵¹ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 1. Cf. Bates, M.W. *The Birth of the Trinity*, (Oxford: OUP, 2016), 15.

¹²⁵² Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 23.

In 2:1-4, the gift (μερισμός) of the Holy Spirit is one aspect of God's authentication (συνεπιμαρτυρέω) of the message proclaimed by Christ and transmitted by the apostles.¹²⁵³

The context of the second warning passage (3:7-11) is given in 3:6: "Christ, however, was faithful over God's house as Son, and we are his house if we hold firm". The Holy Spirit then warns the congregation of the consequences of not 'holding firm' to their faith.

The third warning passage (6:4-6) declares that it is impossible to restore one who has – among other things – 'been partnered by the Holy Spirit' if he falls away because that act of apostasy is tantamount to crucifying again the Son of God.

In 9:14 it is through the Eternal (Holy) Spirit that the Son's self-offering is made to the Father.

The Holy Spirit bears witness to the NC (10:15), which was effected by the self-sacrifice of Christ (10:9, 12) who subsequently "sat down at the right hand of God," (10:12).

Finally, the fourth warning passage (10:26-31) declares that the apostate, who tramples the Son of God underfoot and treats the (Holy) Spirit of grace with hubris (10:29), will taste the wrath of the living God (10:31).

However, these passages in Hebrews show that the members of the NC community "interact with all three persons of the Trinity"¹²⁵⁴ and "Hebrews is certainly congruent with a "trinitarian" approach to the Spirit".¹²⁵⁵ Furthermore, "all three persons of the Godhead (are) involved in intra-Trinitarian relationships"¹²⁵⁶ and the Spirit enables God's people to "participate in the community of Father and Son", a community that the Spirit "not only displays but brings about".¹²⁵⁷ The author and his congregation

¹²⁵³ This is similar to Paul's comments in Gal. 3:1-5 and Peter's justification of the Gentile mission, Acts 10:44-47. However, although the presence of the Spirit is seen as authentication of faith, neither of these texts make an explicit link between the Son, the Father and the Spirit.

¹²⁵⁴ So, Kleinig, *Hebrews*, 106.

¹²⁵⁵ So, Motyer, "The Spirit", 214.

¹²⁵⁶ So, Holsteen, N.D. "The Trinity in the Book of Hebrews", *BSac.* 168 (2011), 338.

¹²⁵⁷ Oberdorfer, B. "The Holy Spirit – a Person?", Welker, M. (Ed.) *The Work of the Spirit*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 44.

experienced the Spirit as God but distinct from the Father or the Son.¹²⁵⁸ Consequently, ‘Trinitarian’ language should not be regarded as anachronistic when used in connection with Hebrews’ pneumatology. Recognising that terms like ‘Trinity’ and ‘Trinitarian’ belong to a much later period should not prevent such language being a useful ‘shorthand’ to express what Hebrews is describing. “Like the term ‘binitarian’, it is used, within New Testament studies, to indicate that the Son and the Spirit are in various ways strongly ‘identified’ with the one God of Israel – while yet appearing to be distinguishable personal beings from the Father.”¹²⁵⁹ In fact, Hebrews “can only be rightly interpreted through Trinitarian conceptions”.¹²⁶⁰

When seeking to discover what a text affirms, it is important that questions are not asked of it that it does not address. Hebrews’ author affirms the Holy Spirit’s divinity but does not articulate the ontological relationship between the Son, the Father and the Holy Spirit. Nonetheless, he presents “a picture of interconnectedness among these characters identified as God”.¹²⁶¹ Although our author does not “work out a doctrine of the Trinity, we are well on the way to such a doctrine with statements... put(ing) the Holy Spirit on par with God”.¹²⁶² Indeed, Hebrews provides “some of the raw material” for the doctrine of the Trinity¹²⁶³ but the eventual “resolution... was for a later age”.¹²⁶⁴ Whilst not arguing for the legitimacy of his Trinitarian premises, our author presupposes their legitimacy and his pneumatology flows from those premises.¹²⁶⁵

¹²⁵⁸ Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 57; cf. Holsteen, “The Trinity”, 336-39; Levison, *Filled*, 229; *idem*, “Theology”, 109; Motyer, “The Spirit”, 226.

¹²⁵⁹ See Turner, M. “The Churches of the Johannine Letter as Communities of ‘Trinitarian’ *KOINŌNIA*”, Ma, W. & Menzies, R.P. (Eds), *The Spirit and Spirituality*, (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 57 n.7 and the literature cited there.

¹²⁶⁰ Rowe, “The Trinity”, 41. Cf. Kelly, *Creeds*, 23; Levison, “Theology”, 110; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 73-74.

¹²⁶¹ Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 31.

¹²⁶² Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 480.

¹²⁶³ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 448. Cf. Glasson, “Plurality”, 271-72.

¹²⁶⁴ Wilson, *Hebrews*, 156; cf. §6.5 n.1024.

¹²⁶⁵ See Rowe, “The Trinity”, 52.

8.2.2 The Spirit is personal

The key to understanding Hebrews' pneumatology is the recognition that the author writes of the Spirit "in a way that makes clear the relational determination of the Spirit's identity".¹²⁶⁶ 'The Spirit' is not an impersonal 'presence', the designation is not a "metaphor for God's presence, 'Spirit language' is not another way of speaking of God's immanence".¹²⁶⁷ The relationship between the Spirit and the Father and/or the Son or between the Spirit and believers demonstrates what Allen calls "a personal encounter or engagement".¹²⁶⁸ Indeed, "the presence of relationship implies a distinction of persons."¹²⁶⁹ This experience of, or relationship with, the Spirit is what differentiates Christianity from Judaism. "The essence of NT Christianity is an experience (γεύεσθαι) – an experience of the Holy Spirit."¹²⁷⁰ In Hebrews the Spirit is a distinct individual who is not other than God, even though he is other than the Father and the Son, just as the Son is other than the Father.¹²⁷¹ He is 'personal' and enters into an affirmative partnership with the members of the NC community (6:4) – as do Jesus (3:14) and the Father (12:7-10).¹²⁷² Other indications of individuality or 'personhood' are that he speaks (3:7), he testifies (10:15) and he teaches/reveals (9:8).¹²⁷³ Furthermore, as has been seen, ἐνυβρίζω can be exercised only against a person (10:29) and consequently, "τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας in 10:29 most vividly shows him as personal".¹²⁷⁴

8.2.3 The Spirit is eternal

The Holy Spirit is eternal (9:14). 'Eternal' in Hebrews carries with it a strong sense of the eschatological.¹²⁷⁵ When used in the appellation 'Eternal Spirit', an eschatological

¹²⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 48.

¹²⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 49.

¹²⁶⁸ Allen, "Forgotten Spirit", 57.

¹²⁶⁹ So, Holsteen, "The Trinity", 338.

¹²⁷⁰ So, Dunn, Baptism, 210; cf. Allen, "Forgotten Spirit", 57.

¹²⁷¹ See §8.2.1 n.1258-59. Also, Rowe, "The Trinity", 45; cf. Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 73-74.

¹²⁷² See §5.3.2.

¹²⁷³ See Levison, *Filled*, 229.

¹²⁷⁴ Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 143. See §7.4.4.

¹²⁷⁵ See §6.3.2.

dimension is (at least) something the author is pointing to.¹²⁷⁶ “The power of the age to come (is) breaking into and operative in the present age.”¹²⁷⁷ However, it must not be forgotten that ‘Eternal’ properly and peculiarly belongs to the nature and being of God. God is the only truly eternal being. He is outside time. Eternal, therefore, points to the ‘God-ness’ of the Holy Spirit. He is the Eternal Spirit because he is not other than God. In this sense, sharing the eternal life that belongs to God, the Eternal Spirit lives the life that God lives. It is the life of one who lives in eternity – and that eternal life rightly belongs to the Holy Spirit. Consequently, the Spirit is not just eternal in contradistinction to the time-restricted OC sacrifices, he is eternal as God. Thus, as he is the one through whom Christ offers his self-sacrifice to God, that sacrifice is made *by* God the Son, *through* God the Spirit *to* God the Father. Every aspect is thus ‘Godly’, once-for-all and eternally significant. This overtly ‘Trinitarian’ drama, played out on earth and in time, is truly heavenly and eternal. The ‘eternal’ salvation (5:9), judgement (6:2), redemption (9:12), inheritance (9:15) and covenant (13:20) are so called because they are eschatological benefits that the Eternal and Triune God grants through this Trinitarian drama. It is an ‘eternal’ once-for-all offering and an ‘eternal’ event because it is invested with the quality and efficacy of God’s own eternal life. Consequently, the Eternal Spirit is much more than the power of the age to come breaking into this age. He is the very life of God bringing that life into this age and interacting with the Son, his eternal partner, to meet the demands of the Father and the needs of humanity.

8.2.4 The Spirit is divine

In addition to revealing the deity of the Holy Spirit by the designation ‘Eternal Spirit’, the author provides other indications of this, not least in the Spirit’s ‘voicing’ of Scripture. Hebrews begins by affirming that God is a God who speaks (1:1). He spoke through the prophets, he speaks in the Son and he speaks through Scripture to the NC community.¹²⁷⁸ However, the author also affirms that the Spirit speaks through Scripture

¹²⁷⁶ See O’Brien, *Spoken*, 184.

¹²⁷⁷ So, Dunn, *Baptism*, 209.

¹²⁷⁸ See Pierce, *Divine Discourse*, 1-4 and *passim*. Cf. §4.5.1.

to Christ's followers in such a way as to indicate that he "thinks of God and the Holy Spirit as the same speaker".¹²⁷⁹ The Holy Spirit takes ownership of Scripture that God has 'voiced' to this congregation (Jer. 31:31-34 in 8:8-12) and repeats, abridges and extends it as his own voice to the same congregation. The citation from Jeremiah 31:33-34 is introduced in 10:15 with the words "as the Holy Spirit says". It is then abridged but concludes: "their sins and lawless acts I will remember no more", reinforcing God's promise¹²⁸⁰ by the addition of the phrase "lawless acts" (10:17). He then applies the quotation to the congregation, acting as hermeneut (10:18). In the light of the Son's sacrifice, the Spirit freely "alters Scripture to intensify its relevance (and) extends the meaning (to) speak directly to the community of faith".¹²⁸¹ The only one who can take hold of God's word and both update and reinterpret it is God himself. When our author writes that this is how the Holy Spirit can legitimately function, he is clearly affirming that the Spirit is God.

8.3 The Spirit – What he does

The Holy Spirit declares that the OC is intrinsically flawed or incomplete (9:8)¹²⁸² and shows the need for a New Covenant (of grace) (10:15). He was involved in the death of Christ (which purchased grace) (9:14), applies the grace of God to the people of God (10:29), authenticates / validates the gospel message (2:4) and the members of the New Covenant community (6:4) and encourages faithfulness (3:7). The Holy Spirit is also linked to four of the five warning passages (in 2:4; 3:7; 6:4 and 10:29).

¹²⁷⁹ Schenck, "God has Spoken", 334-35. Cf. Barth, "OT in Hebrews", 61-62; Fee, *Presence*, 915; Rowe, "The Trinity", 49; Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 121, 479; Witherington, *Hebrews*, 171.

¹²⁸⁰ O'Brien, *Hebrews*, 359; cf. Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 458; Koester, *Hebrews*, 436.

¹²⁸¹ Levison, "Theology", 100.

¹²⁸² Griffiths [*Divine Speech*, 13 n.9] writes that our author believes that the OT "recognised its own incompleteness and contained within itself the expectation of later fulfilment". See §4.5.3.

8.3.1 The Spirit is the speaking hermeneut

Hebrews does not say how the Spirit functions as a hermeneut. It is not specified whether it is through “invasive charismatic speech”,¹²⁸³ receiving a ‘word of wisdom’ or a ‘word of knowledge’, through a prophetic word or by the exercise of tongues and interpretation (1 Cor. 12:8-10). Given that ‘signs, wonders and miracles’ both established and authenticated the congregation, such overt ‘charisms’ are likely the vehicle through which the Spirit ‘spoke’ (3:7), ‘testified’ (10:15) and ‘revealed’ (9:8) truth to the congregation. However, this thesis is not primarily concerned with *how* the Spirit brings his revelations. It is concerned with *who* the Spirit is. What underlying pneumatological assumptions are there between the author and congregation that allow statements about the Spirit as ‘the speaking hermeneut’ to be made without any supporting argument being offered?

On all seven occasions that the author of Hebrews refers to the Spirit, he does so using language and concepts that are unique in the NT. The Spirit both speaks (λέγω) words of Scripture (3:7) and testifies (μαρτυρέω) from Scripture (10:15) using words elsewhere described as God’s words to the congregation. Elsewhere in the NT, when the Spirit ‘speaks’, he does so through human agents.¹²⁸⁴ However, in Hebrews he speaks directly to the hearers without the need for an intermediary.¹²⁸⁵ Furthermore, the Spirit interprets (δηλόω) Scripture (9:8) and this is the only place in the NT where the Spirit is said to function as hermeneut.¹²⁸⁶ The Holy Spirit is, therefore, seen not simply as the one who inspires the prophets and the writers of Scripture, nor just as the inspirer of Scripture but as one who legitimately takes hold of Scripture and invests it with current meaning and relevance. He interprets the text and applies it to the lives of Christ’s followers just as God himself does. Indeed, the same two OT texts that the author specifically identifies

¹²⁸³ Emmrich, *Concepts*, 67.

¹²⁸⁴ See §§4.3; 4.4.

¹²⁸⁵ See §4.5.

¹²⁸⁶ See §4.5.3.

as the Holy Spirit's words are elsewhere attributed to the voice of God.¹²⁸⁷ Thus, the Holy Spirit speaks not just *for* God but *as* God.¹²⁸⁸

8.3.2 The Spirit, atonement and covenant

In 9:8, the Spirit reveals the inadequacy of the OC and its human high-priestly and priestly actions, especially when they are viewed from the perspective of Christ's high-priesthood and once-for-all sacrifice. In 10:15-17, taking hold of Jeremiah's prophecy of a NC, the Holy Spirit uses that promissory word as his own. The NC was established by the sacrificial death of Christ, (9:15) which was effected 'through the Eternal Spirit' (9:14).¹²⁸⁹ Furthermore, the appellation 'Spirit of grace' (10:29) indicates that the Holy Spirit is involved in imparting God's grace to Christ's followers.¹²⁹⁰ It was by God's grace that 'Jesus tasted death' for humanity (2:9). However, the Holy Spirit who enabled Christ's self-offering to God (9:14) is the same Spirit (of grace, 10:29) who applies the grace won by Christ's death to Christ's followers. He "makes the new covenant evidential and efficacious for its recipients".¹²⁹¹ Thus, the Spirit is the one who links the death of Christ to the Father and also the one who links Christ's death to the members of the NC community. Indeed, although 9:14 is the only NT verse that explicitly "affirms the Spirit's involvement in the atonement"¹²⁹² nonetheless, 10:29 also links soteriology and pneumatology.¹²⁹³ Furthermore, God's gift (μερίσμός) of the Holy Spirit to the followers of Christ (2:4) validates the 'eternal salvation' (5:9) won by Christ's suffering and death. Consequently, having demonstrated the need for a new relationship between God and humanity, he is involved in the establishment of that covenant relationship. The Spirit's presence, distributed to each of the members of the NC, authenticates them.¹²⁹⁴

¹²⁸⁷ In 3:7 the Holy Spirit 'voices' Ps. 95:7-11 (or parts thereof) and in 4:3, 5, God does. In 8:8-12, Jer. 31:31-34 (or parts thereof) is voiced by God and in 10:15-17 by the Holy Spirit.

¹²⁸⁸ See §4.5.2.

¹²⁸⁹ See §§6.4; 6.5.

¹²⁹⁰ See §7.5.

¹²⁹¹ So, Allen, "Forgotten Spirit", 62.

¹²⁹² Levison, "Theology", 107; cf. Emmrich, *Concepts*, 5.

¹²⁹³ See §§6.1; 7.3.1.

¹²⁹⁴ See §5.2.

In 3:7-11, the Holy Spirit indicates the failure of the OC community to maintain the faithfulness that was needed if they were to enjoy the ‘sabbath rest’ of God. He goes on to warn the members of the NC community that they must not fall in the same way. In fact, as Allen correctly observes, “Hebrews alternates between rehearsal of God’s saving actions... and exhortations to respond to these with obedience”.¹²⁹⁵ However, the Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of grace (10:29) distributed to every member of the NC community (2:4), provides for them the enabling grace (4:16) to remain true to their calling. Indeed, no one need fail to obtain (and remain in) the grace of God (12:15). It is significant that the three points at which the author has the Spirit interacting with Scripture comprise a unified narrative. The Spirit declares the “the self-confessed inadequacy”¹²⁹⁶ of the OC (9:8), speaks about the coming NC (10:15-18) and urges the members of the NC to hold on to their faith (3:7-15) in order to enjoy the ‘sabbath rest’ of God (3:18-19).

8.3.3 The Spirit and enabling partnership

The concept of believers becoming μέτοχοι of the Spirit (6:4) has far reaching implications for the believers’ faithful perseverance. The wider use of μέτοχος in Hebrews is instructive in this matter.¹²⁹⁷ In 3:14 the author writes that believers have become μέτοχοι of Christ and the underlying thought is one of a full and tangible partnership with Christ, a partnership which he initiates.¹²⁹⁸ In Hebrews, the Son is “not other than God, but is in fact God expressed or externalized – embodied – in relation to the world”.¹²⁹⁹ That is, he is an individual, a person. It is very difficult to envisage what ‘sharing in a person’ or ‘participating in a person’ would ‘look like’. In 3:14, the focus of the phrase ‘in Christ’ is Christ himself who, by his obedience, has enabled human beings to become partners with him in his ongoing mission and in his resurrection life. As O’Brien puts it, μέτοχοι... τοῦ Χριστοῦ “points to the intimate relationship that

¹²⁹⁵ Allen, *Deuteronomy*, 117, quoting Dunnill, *Covenant*, 133.

¹²⁹⁶ Laansma, “Living and Active”, 65. See §4.5.3.

¹²⁹⁷ For a full discussion see §5.3.2.

¹²⁹⁸ See §5.3.2.1.

¹²⁹⁹ Rowe, “The Trinity”, 45.

believers have with their crucified and exalted Lord”.¹³⁰⁰ Similarly, in 3:1, being “partners with one another in a heavenly calling” (κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι) also reflects the intimate relationship that Christians have with one another as God’s household (3:1-6). In fact, this interpersonal relationship that members of the community of faith enjoy with each another led the author to encourage them to “see to it that no one fails to obtain the grace of God” (12:15). They were to help, encourage and facilitate one another’s maintenance of and growth in grace.¹³⁰¹

The NT uses the word μέτοχος exclusively of inter-personal relationships. It is clearly so when the author refers to believers as μέτοχοι with one another (3:1) and μέτοχοι of Christ (3:14). It is also the case in 12:8 – it is not παιδεία *per se* that is ‘shared’ but God’s Fatherly παιδεία (instruction/discipline) that authenticates believers as true children of God, brothers and sisters of Christ.¹³⁰² In 6:4 those who have been made μέτοχοι of the Holy Spirit (μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου)¹³⁰³ enter into a partnership with the him, a partnership of the Spirit’s instigation. In fact, 6:4 shows the believers’ intimate relationship with the personal Holy Spirit. It is not a relationship between equals; the benefits of the partnership come from the ‘senior partner’.¹³⁰⁴ Just as the Holy Spirit ‘enabled’ the ministry of the Son, so too he enables the walk and work of each member of the NC family in a true partnership-for-life that enables the believer to “hold firm the confidence and the pride that belong to hope” (3:6). In fact, the Spirit facilitates that which he requires.

Christ’s self-offering was made through (or in partnership with) the Holy Spirit (9:14).¹³⁰⁵ Believers are partnered by the Son (3:14) and partner each other (3:1). They are partnered by the Holy Spirit (6:4) and are genuine ‘children of God’ not just because Jesus calls them his ἀδελφούς but because they share in God’s Fatherly παιδεία (12:8). It is a complete integrated picture. By becoming part of God’s eternal covenant

¹³⁰⁰ O’Brien, *Spoken*, 154.

¹³⁰¹ See Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 663; Koester, *Hebrews*, 541; O’Brien, *Hebrews*, 473.

¹³⁰² See §5.3.2.1.

¹³⁰³ γεννηθέντας is an aorist passive participle and has the force ‘being made’. See §5.3.2.3.

¹³⁰⁴ See Cockerill, *Hebrews*, 188. Cf. §5.3.2.3.

¹³⁰⁵ See §6.4.4.

community, every believer has the privilege and benefit of a full, tangible and intimate relationship with Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Trinity in unity, in and for the children of God.

8.4 Conclusion

Far from “not playing a major role” in Hebrews,¹³⁰⁶ it is clear that “the Spirit plays an essential role (and) the pneumatology of Hebrews is coherent (and) integral to the letter”.¹³⁰⁷ The author presupposes that which was current thinking about the Holy Spirit. However, as has been seen, he develops that pneumatology in unique ways. In 6:4-6 and 10:29, “(t)he inclusion of the spirit... alongside enlightenment, Jesus, and his blood indicate how integral the spirit is to the process of initiation and the prospect of future salvation”.¹³⁰⁸ He alone in the NT connects the Holy Spirit to the atonement (9:14), to soteriology (2:4; 10:29), to perseverance (3:7-11; 6:4) and to hermeneutics (9:8). Indeed, all seven divine-πνεῦμα texts are unique to Hebrews. The judgement that our author is creative in his pneumatological statements is apposite.¹³⁰⁹ The Spirit’s activities and ‘names’ are all relationally based. He speaks and acts not in a vacuum but to people with whom he, as God, interacts. “To speak of the Holy Spirit is also to speak of God and of the Lord Jesus.”¹³¹⁰ The Holy Spirit is co-equal with Father and Son in the Trinity and this is what is “called in Trinitarian theology “coinherence”. Whatever is true of one member of the Trinity in terms of shared divine nature is true of the others”.¹³¹¹ These developments might indicate a date for Hebrews in the region of 75-85 AD, allowing time for the ‘Spirit language’ employed by our author to become normative in his congregation.¹³¹²

¹³⁰⁶ So, Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 477.

¹³⁰⁷ So, Levison, “Theology”, 90.

¹³⁰⁸ Levison, *Filled*, 231

¹³⁰⁹ Levison, “Theology”, 107.

¹³¹⁰ Rowe, “The Trinity”, 49.

¹³¹¹ Schreiner, *Hebrews*, 74.

¹³¹² See §8.1.

The congregation that first received this letter might be called, ‘a community of Trinitarian μέτοχοι’.¹³¹³ In fact, the pneumatology that underlies Hebrews and the shared experience of its author and recipients provides “a crucial witness to the experience and belief of the early church.”¹³¹⁴ The author and his congregation *experienced* the Holy Spirit as God and this experience of the Spirit provided the basis for the NC hermeneutic that runs through the letter.¹³¹⁵

¹³¹³ Borrowing from the title of Turner’s article, see §8.2.1 n.1260.

¹³¹⁴ Levison, “Theology”, 110.

¹³¹⁵ See Allen, “Forgotten Spirit”, 64; Dunn, *Baptism*, 211; Levison, “Theology”, 91; Motyer, “The Spirit”, 226.

9. Bibliography

- Abasciano, B.J. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.10-18*, London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Aitken, J.K. (Ed.) *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Alexander, P. "“A Sixtieth Part of Prophecy”: The Problem of Continuing Revelation in Judaism”, Davies, J. Harvey, G. & Watson, W.G.E. *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed*, Sheffield: SAP, 1995, 414-33.
- Allen, D.L. *Hebrews*, Nashville: B&H, 2010.
- Allen, D.M. “The Forgotten Spirit: A Pentecostal Reading of the Letter to the Hebrews”, *JPT*, 18 (2009), 51-66.
- Allen, D.M. “The Holy Spirit as Gift or Giver? Retaining the Pentecostal Dimension of Hebrews 2.4”, *Bible Translator* 59 (2008), 151-58.
- Allen, D.M. *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Allen, L.C. “Types of Actualization in the Psalms”, Ma, W. & Menzies, R.P. *The Spirit and Spirituality*, London: T&T Clark, 2004, 18-27.
- Allen, W.C. *Matthew*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1972 [1907].
- Anderson, A.A. *2 Samuel*, Dallas: Word, 1989.
- Anderson, A.A. *Psalms* (2 vols), London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Attridge, H.W. “Hebrews”, *ABD*, 3:97-105.
- Attridge, H.W. *Hebrews*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Aune, D.E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Aune, D.E. *Revelation 1-5*, Dallas: Word, 1997.

- Austin, M.R. "The Curse of the Metaphysical Capital", *ExpTim*, 103 (1992), 104-7.
- Averbeck, R.E. "Breath, Wind, Spirit and the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament", Firth, *Presence*, 25-37.
- Baker, W.R. "Temptation", *DLNTD*, 1166-70.
- Baldwin, J.G. *Haggai Zechariah Malachi*, London: Tyndale, 1972.
- Barclay, J.M.G. *Paul & the Gift*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Barker, M. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, London: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Barnard, J.A. *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Barrett, C.K. *Acts* (2 vols), London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Barrett, C.K. *The Gospel According to St John*, London: SPCK, 1978.
- Barrett, C.K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, London: SPCK, 1975 [1947].
- Barth, M. "The Old Testament in Hebrews", Klassen, W. & Snyder, G.F. (Eds), *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, London: SCM, 1962, 53-78.
- Barton, J. *Oracles of God*, Oxford: OUP, 2007 [1986]).
- Bateman IV, H.W. "Introducing the Warning Passages in Hebrews", *Four Views*, 23-85.
- Bates, M.W. *The Birth of the Trinity*, Oxford: OUP, 2016.
- Bauckham, R.J. *Jude, 2 Peter*, Waco: Word, 1983.
- Beale, G.K. *The Book of Revelation*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. *The Book of Revelation*, London: Oliphants, 1974
- Beattie, D.R.G. & McNamara, M.J. (Eds) *The Aramaic Bible*, Sheffield: SAP, 1994.

- Bieder, W. "Pneumatologische Aspekte im Hebräerbrief", Baltensweiler, H. & Reicke, B. (Eds), *Neues Testament und Geschichte*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1972, 251-59.
- Bieder, W. "πνεῦμα (in Hellenistic Judaism)", *TDNT*, 6:372-75.
- Block, D.I. *Beyond the River Chebar*, Eugene: Cascade, 2013.
- Block, D.I. *By the River Chebar*, Eugene: Cascade, 2013.
- Boda, M.J. *The Book of Zechariah*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Bonnah, G.K.A. *The Holy Spirit, A Narrative Factor in the Acts of the Apostles*, Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2007.
- Bonsirven, J. *St Paul, Epître aux Hébreux*, Paris: Beauchesne, 1943.
- Borgen, P. *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Bramer, S.J. "The Literary Genre of the Book of Amos", *BibSac*, 156 (1999), 42-60.
- Bratcher, R.G. & Hatton, H.A. *A Translator's Handbook on the Revelation to John*, (New York: UBS, 1993.
- Brodie, T.L. *The Intertextuality of the Epistles*, Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2006.
- MacDonald, D.R. Porter, S.E. (Eds)
- Brooke, G.J. "The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls", Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. (Eds), *The Psalms in the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2004, 5-24.
- Brown, J.K. "Metalepsis", Oropeza and Moyise, 29-41.
- Brown, R. *The Message of Hebrews: Christ Above All*, Leicester: IVP, 1988.
- Brown, R.E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Brown, R.E. *The Death of the Messiah Vol. 1*, New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Brown, T.G. *spirit in the writings of john*, London: T&T Clark, 2003.

- Bruce, F.F. “‘To the Hebrews’ or ‘To the Essenes’?” *NTS*, 9 (1963), 217-32.
- Bruce, F.F. *Acts of the Apostles [Greek Text]*, London: Tyndale, 1965 [1951].
- Bruce, F.F. *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.
- Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, Exeter: Paternoster, 1992.
- Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: MM&S, 1967.
- Bruce, F.F. *This is That*, Exeter: Paternoster, 1982 [1968].
- Buchanan, G.W. *To the Hebrews*, New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- Büchsel, F. ἀκατάλυτος, *TDNT*, 4:338-39.
- Büchsel, F. κρίνω, *TDNT*, 3:921-23, 933-54.
- Buck, E. “Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs, A Review”, *Consensus* 14 (1988), 122-24.
- Bulgakov, S. *The Comforter*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Burke, T.J. and Warrington, K. (Eds) *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*, London: SPCK, 2014.
- Burtress, J.H. “Plato, Philo, and the Author of Hebrews”, *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 2 (1958), 54-64.
- Caird, G.B. “The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Canadian Journal of Theology*, 5 (1959), 44-51.
- Campbell, C.R. *Advances in the Study of Greek*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.
- Campbell, C.R. *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Caragounis, C.C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Carlston, C. “The Vocabulary of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews”, Guelich, R.A. (Ed.) *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, 133-60.

- Carroll, J.T. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, Nashville: Abingdon, 2018.
- Carson, D.A. “Do the Prophets and the Law quit Prophesying Before John?”, Evans, C.A. and Stegner, W.R. *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, Sheffield: SAP, 1994, 179-94.
- Carson, D.A. “Reflections on Assurance”, *Sovereign*, 247-76.
- Carson, D.A. *Exegetical Fallacies*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Carson, D.A. *The Gospel According to John*, Leicester: IVP, 1991.
- Carson, D.A.
Moo, D.J. and
Morris, L. *An Introduction to the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Cervera (i Valls), J. “Insultar l’Espirit de la gràcia”, Puig (i Tàrrach), A. (Ed.), *L’Espirit Sant en la Bíblia*, Tarragona: Scripta Biblica, 2013, 291-312.
- Chapman, S.B. *I Samuel as Christian Scripture*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Charles, J.D. “The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews”, *JETS*, 33 (1990), 171-78.
- Charles, R.H. *The Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1971 [1920].
- Cheung, L.L. *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of the Epistle of James*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2003.
- Childs, B.S. *Isaiah*, Louisville: WJK, 2001.
- Chilton, B.D. *The Glory of Israel*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.
- Ciampa, R.E. “Scriptural Language and Ideas”, *As it is Written*, 41-57.
- Clark, D.J &
Hatton, H.A. *A Handbook on Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*, New York: UBS, 2002.
- Clements, R. &
Schwartz, D.R.
(Eds) *Text, Thought and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity*, Leiden: Brill, 2009

- Clements, R.E. "The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews", *SWJT*, 28 (1985), 36-45.
- Clines, D.J.A. "The Parallelism of Greater Precision: Notes from Isaiah 40 for a Theory of Hebrew Poetry", Clines, D.J.A. *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays 1967-1998, Vol. 1*, Sheffield: SAP, 1998, 314-336.
- Clowney, E.P. "The Final Temple", *WTJ*, 35 (1973), 156-89.
- Cockerill, G.L. "Heb 1:1-14, *1 Clem.* 36:1-6 and The High Priest Title", *JBL*, 97:3 (1978), 437-40.
- Cockerill, G.L. "Structure and Interpretation in Hebrews 8:1-10:18: A Symphony in Three Movements", *BBR*, 11 (2001) 179-201.
- Cockerill, G.L. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Coleson, J. & Matthews, V. (Eds) *Go to the Land I Will Show You*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- Conzelmann, H. "χαρίς (Philo)", *TDNT*, 9:388-402.
- Coppens, J. *Les affinités qumrâniennes de l'Épître aux Hébreux*, Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1962.
- Craigie, P.C. *Psalms 1-50*, Waco: Word, 1983.
- Crawford, S.W. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Cross Jr, F.M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, New York: Doubleday, 1961.
- Cross, F.M. *From Epic to Canon*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U.P. 1998.
- Cullmann, O. *Christ and Time*, London: SCM, 1951.
- D'Angelo, M.R. *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Daniélou, J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity*, New York: Mentor-Omega, 1962.
- Davids, P.H. *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

- Davidson, A.B. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, n.d. [1882].
- Davies, J.
Harvey, G. &
Watson, W.G.E.
(Eds) *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed*, Sheffield: SAP, 1995.
- Davies, W.D. &
Allison, D.C. *Matthew*, (3 vols), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001 [1988-1997].
- Davies, W.D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London: SPCK, 1962.
- De Jonge, M &
Der Woude, A.S. “11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament”, *NTS*, 12 (1966)
301-26.
- De Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of
the Greek Text*, Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Deissmann, A. *Light from the Ancient East*, New York: Doran, 1927.
- Delcor, M. “Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle
to the Hebrews”, *JSJ*, 2 (1971), 115-35.
- Delitzsch, F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*: (2 vols), Minneapolis: Klock &
Klock, 1978 [1857].
- Dentan, R.C. “Zechariah: Exposition, Chs. 1-8”, *Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 6,
Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- deSilva, D.A. *Perseverance in Gratitude*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Dey, L.K.K. *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and
Hebrews*, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Docherty, S.E. *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews*, Tübingen: Mohr
Siebeck, 2009.
- Dodd, C.H. *According to the Scriptures*, London: Fontana, 1965 [1952].
- Drane, J. *Introducing the Old Testament*, Tring: Lion, 1987.
- Duff, J. *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
- Dunn, J.D.G. “Prophetic ‘I’-sayings and the Jesus Tradition”, Dunn, J.D.G.
The Christ & the Spirit, Vol. 2 Pneumatology, Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, 1998, 142-69.

- Dunn, J.D.G. "Towards the Spirit of Christ", Welker, M. *The Work of the Spirit*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006, 3-26.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, London: SCM, 1974.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *Romans 1-8*, Dallas: Word, 1988.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *The Christ & the Spirit, Vol. 2 Pneumatology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, London: A&C Black, 1993.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, London: SCM, 2010.
- Dunnill, J. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*, Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
- Durham, J.I. *Exodus*, Waco: Word, 1987.
- Eagar, A.R. "The Hellenic Element in the Epistle to the Hebrews" *Hermathena*, 11 (1901), 263-87.
- Eisenbaum, P. "Locating Hebrews within the Literary Landscape of Christian Origins", Gelardini (2005), 213-37.
- Ellingworth, P. "Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?" *Biblische Zeitschrift* 23 (1979), 262-69.
- Ellingworth, P. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993.
- Ellingworth, P. *A Translator's Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews*, New York: UBS, 1983.
- Emery, G. & Levering, M. (Eds) *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, Oxford: OUP, 2011.
- Emmrich, M. "'Amtscharisma': Through the Eternal Spirit (Hebrews 9:14)", *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, 12.1 (2002), 17-32.
- Emmrich, M. "Hebrews 6:4-6 – Again! (A Pneumatological Enquiry)", *WTJ*, 65 (2003), 83-95.
- Emmrich, M. "*Pneuma* in Hebrews: Prophet and Interpreter", *WTJ*, 63 (2002), 55-71.

- Emmrich, M. *Pneumatological Concepts in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Lanham: UPA, 2003.
- Epp, E.J. “Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, with an Excursus on Canon”, Porter, S.E. (Ed.), *A Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, Leiden: Brill, 2002, 45-97.
- Esser, H-H. “Grace”, *NIDNTT* 2:115-24.
- Estes, D.J. “Spirit and the Psalmist in Psalm 51”, Firth, *Presence*, 122-34.
- Evans, C.A. & Flint, P.W. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Evans, C.A. & Stegner, W.R. (Eds) *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, Sheffield: SAP, 1994
- Exum, J.C. & Williamson, H.G.M. (Eds) *Reading from Left to Right*, Sheffield, SAP, 2003.
- Fairhurst, A.M. “Hellenistic Influences in the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *TynB*, 7-8 (1961), 17-27.
- Fanning, B.M. “A Classical Reformed View”, *Four Views*, 172-219.
- Farrar, F.W. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, Cambridge, CUP, 1893.
- Fee, G.D. *God’s Empowering Presence*, Peabody: Hendrickson 1994.
- Fensham, F.C. “Hebrews and Qumran”, *Neotestamentica*, 5 (1971), 9-21.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. “Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11”, *JBL*, 86 (1967), 25-41.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. *First Corinthians*, New Haven: YUP, 2008.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. *The Gospel According to Luke* (2 vols), New York: Doubleday, 1981, 1985.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*, New York: Crossroad, 1981.

- Flusser, D. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity", *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1958), 215-66.
- Flusser, D. *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: 2 Vols*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007-09.
- Ford, J.M. *Revelation*, New York: Doubleday, 1975.
- Fossum, J.E. *The Image of the Invisible God*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- France, R.T. "The Writer of Hebrews as a Biblical Expositor", *TynB*, 47 (1996), 245-76.
- Fretheim, T.E. 'el 'ôlām, *NIDOTTE*, 1:401.
- Friedeman, C.T. (Ed.) *Listen, Understand, Obey*, Eugene: WS, 2017.
- Fung, R.Y.K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Gelardini, G. "From "Liturgical Turn" and Hebrews Scholarship to "Anadiplosis Iterata": The Enigma of a Structure", *HTR*, 102 (2009), 51-73.
- Gelardini, G. "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha be-Av*", Gelardini (2005), 107-27.
- Gheorghita, R. "The Minor Prophets in Hebrews", Moyise, S. & Menken, M. (Eds) *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2009, 115-33.
- Gheorghita, R. *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Glasson, T.F. "'Plurality of Divine Persons' and the Quotations in Hebrews 1.6ff", *NTS* 12 (1966), 270-72.
- Gleason, R.C. "Angels and the Eschatology of Heb 1-2", *NTS*, 49 (2003) 90-107.
- Gleason, R.C. "Moderate Reformed Response", *Four Views*, 157-71.
- Goldingay, J. *Models for the Interpretation of Scripture*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.

- Gordon, R.P. “The Ephraimite Messiah and the Targum(s) to Zechariah 12:10”, Exum, J.C. & Williamson, H.G.M. (Eds), *Reading from Left to Right*, Sheffield, SAP, 2003.
- Gordon, R.P. *Hebrews*, Sheffield: SAP, 2000.
- Gouge, W. *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: Joshua Kirton, 1655.
- Grant, J.A. “Spirit and Presence in Psalm 139”, Firth, *Presence*, 135-46.
- Grant, M. *Saint Paul*, London: Phoenix, 2000 [1976].
- Gray, P. “The Early Reception of Hebrews 6:4-6”, Gray, P. & O’Day, G.R. *Scripture and Traditions*, Leiden: Brill, 2008, 321-39.
- Gray, P. *Godly Fear: The Greco-Roman Critiques of Superstition*, Atlanta: SBL, 2003.
- Gray, P. & O’Day, G.R. (Eds) *Scripture and Traditions*, Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Gray, R. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine*, Oxford: OUP, 1993.
- Grayston, K. “Salvation Proclaimed III. Hebrews 9:¹¹⁻¹⁴” *ExpTim*, 93 (1982), 164-68.
- Greenlee, J.H. *An Exegetical Summary of Hebrews*, Dallas: SIL, 2008.
- Greenspahn, F.E. “Why Prophecy Ceased”, *JBL*, 108 (1989), 37-49.
- Griffiths, J. (Ed.) *The Perfect Saviour*, Nottingham: IVP, 2012.
- Griffiths, J.I. *Hebrews and Divine Speech*, London: T&T Clark, 2014.
- Grudem, W. “Perseverance of the Saints: A Case Study from the Warning Passages in Hebrews”, *Sovereign*, 133-82.
- Guelich, R.A. (Ed.) *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Guhrt, J. “Time”, *NIDNTT*, 3:826-33.

- Gundry, R.H. “*To Plato or Not to Plato*”, *Books and Culture*, March/April 2011, 25-6.
- Gunkel, H. *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979 [1888].
- Guthrie, D. *Hebrews*, Leicester: IVP, 1983.
- Guthrie, D. *New Testament Introduction*, London: Tyndale, 1970.
- Guthrie, G.H. “Hebrews in its First Century Contexts”, McKnight, S. & Osborne, G.R. (eds) *The Face of New Testament Studies*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004, 414-43.
- Guthrie, G.H. “Hebrews Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research”, *CBR*, 1 (2003), 271-94.
- Guthrie, G.H. “Hebrews”, *NT Use of OT*, 919-95.
- Guthrie, G.H. “Old Testament in Hebrews”, *DLNTD*, 841-50.
- Guthrie, G.H. “The Case for Apollos as the Author of Hebrews”, *FM*, 18 (2001), 41-54.
- Hagner, D.A. “Hebrews: A Book for Today”, Laansma, J.C. & Treier, D.J. (Eds), *Christology, Hermeneutics and Hebrews*, London: Bloomsbury, 2013, 213-24.
- Hagner, D.A. *Encountering the Book of Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Hagner, D.A. *Hebrews*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Hagner, D.A. *Matthew 1-13*, Dallas: Word, 1993.
- Hamilton, J.M. *God’s Indwelling Presence*, Nashville: B&H, 2006.
- Hammer, P.L. “Inheritance (NT)”, *ABD*, 3:415-17.
- Hannah, D.D. “Isaiah Within Judaism of the Second Temple Period”, Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. (Eds), *Isaiah in the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2005, 7-33.
- Harrington, D.J. “Pseudo-Philo”, *OTP*, 2:297-377.
- Harris, D.M. *Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament: Hebrews*, Nashville: B&H, 2019.

- Harris, M.J. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.
- Harrison, R.K. *Introduction to the Old Testament*, London: Tyndale, 1970.
- Hauck, F. $\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$, *TDNT*, 4:829-31.
- Hays, R.B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, New Haven: YUP, 1989.
- Heil, J.P. *Hebrews: Chiastic Structures and Audience Response*, Washington: CBAA, 2010.
- Helyer, L.R. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2002.
- Hempel, C. & Lieu, J.M. (Eds) *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hengel, M. “The Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism”, Beattie, D.R.G. and McNamara, M.J. *The Aramaic Bible*, Sheffield: SAP, 1994, 158-75.
- Hengel, M. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002.
- Héring, J. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: Epworth, 1970.
- Hewett, J.A. *New Testament Greek*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011.
- Hewitt, T. *Hebrews*, London: Tyndale, 1969.
- Hildebrandt, W. *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Hockey, K.M., Pierce, M.N., Watson, F. (Eds) *Muted Voices of the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2017.
- Hodson, A.K. “Hebrews”, Burke, T.J. and Warrington, K. (Eds), *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*, London: SPCK, 2014, 226-37.
- Hollander, H.W. & De Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, Leiden: Brill, 1985.

- Holsteen, N.D. "The Trinity in the Book of Hebrews", *BSac.* 168 (2011), 334-46.
- Horton Jr, F.L. *The Melchizedek Tradition*, Cambridge: CUP, 1976.
- Howard, G. "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations", *NovT*, 10 (1968), 208-16.
- Howard, W.F. "The Epistle to the Hebrews", *Interpretation*, 5 (1951), 80-91.
- Hughes, P.E. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Hughes, P.E. *The Book of Revelation*, Leicester: IVP, 1990.
- Hurst, L.D. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*, Cambridge, CUP 1990.
- Instone-Brewer, D. "The Two Asses of Zechariah 9:9 and Matthew 21", *TynB*, 54.1 (2003), 87-97.
- Isaacs, M.E. *Reading Hebrews and James*, Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.
- Isaacs, M.E. *Sacred Space*, Sheffield: SAP, 2002.
- Isaacs, M.E. *The Concept of Spirit*, London: Heythrop College, 1976.
- Jeremias J. *New Testament Theology I*, London: SCM 1971.
- Jeremias, J. "Zwischen Karfreitag und Ostern", *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 42 (1949), 194-201.
- Jewett, R. *Letter to Pilgrims*, New York: Pilgrims Press, 1981.
- Johnson, L.T. *Hebrews*, Louisville: WJK, 2006.
- Johnson, R.W. *Going Outside the Camp*, Sheffield: SAP, 2001.
- Jongkind, D. *An Introduction to the Greek New Testament Produced at Tyndale House*, Cambridge, Wheaton: Crossway, 2019.
- Joslin, B.C. *Hebrews, Christ, and the Law*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Kaiser Jr, W.C. with Rata, T. *Walking the Ancient Paths: A Commentary on Jeremiah*, Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2019.

- Kamesar, A. “Biblical Interpretation in Philo”, Kamesar, A. (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, Cambridge: CUP, 2009, 65-91.
- Kärkkäinen, V-M. *Pneumatology*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Käsemann, E. *The Wandering People of God*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984 [1957].
- Kasher, R. (Ed.) *Targumic Toseftot to the Prophets*, Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1996.
- Kee, H.C. “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs”, *OTP* 1:775-828.
- Keener, C.S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* (4 vols), Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012-15.
- Keener, C.S. *Spirit Hermeneutics*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Keener, C.S. *The Gospel of John* (2 vols), Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Keener, C.S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*, Downers Grove: IVP, 1993.
- Keener, C.S. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds*, London: Longmans, 1964.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *The Pastoral Epistles*, London: A&C Black, 1976.
- Kistemaker, S.J. *Hebrews*, Welwyn: Evangelical Press, 1984.
- Kistemaker, S.J. *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Amsterdam: van Soest, 1961.
- Klassen, W. & Snyder, G.F. (Eds) *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, London: SCM, 1962
- Klein, G.L. *Zechariah*, Nashville: B&H, 2008.
- Klein, R.W. *I Samuel*, Waco: Word, 1983.
- Kleinig, J.W. *Hebrews*, St. Louis: Concordia, 2017.
- Kleinknecht, H. $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$, *TDNT*, 6:332-59.

- Knibb, M.A. "Apocalypticism and Messianism", Lim, T.H. & Collins, J.J. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford: OUP, 2012, 403-32.
- Knohl, I. "Melchizedek: A Model for the Union of Kingship and Priesthood in the Hebrew Bible, *11QMelchizedek*, and the Epistle to the Hebrews", Clements, R. & Schwartz, D.R. (Eds) *Text, Thought and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity*, Leiden: Brill, 2009, 255-66.
- Kobelski, P.J. *Melchizedek and Melchireša^c*, Washington: CBAA, 1981.
- Koester, C.R. *Hebrews*, New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Koester, H. "Writing and the Spirit: Authority and Politics in Ancient Christianity", *HTR*, 84 (1991), 353-72.
- Koskie, S. J. "Seeking Comment: The Commentary and the Bible as Christian Scripture", *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, 2 (2007), 237-49.
- Köstenberger, A.J. Swain, S.R. *Father, Son and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel*, Nottingham: Apollos, 2008.
- Kruger, M.J. "The Definition of the Term 'Canon': Exclusive or Multi-Dimensional?", *TynBul*, 63 (2012), 1-20.
- Laansma, J.C. "The Living and Active Word of God", Friedeman, C.T. (Ed.) *Listen, Understand, Obey*, Eugene: WS, 2017, 54-74.
- Laansma, J.C. & Treier, D.J. (Eds) *Christology, Hermeneutics and Hebrews*, London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Lane, W.L. *Hebrews* (2 vols), Dallas: Word, 1991.
- Leaney, A.R.C. *The Gospel According to St Luke*, London: A&C Black, 1976 [1958].
- Lee, G.W. *Today When You Hear His Voice*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Lehne, S. *The New Covenant in Hebrews*, Sheffield: SAP, 1990.
- Levison, J.R. "A Theology of the Spirit in the Letter to the Hebrews", *CBQ*, 78 (2016), 90-110.

- Levison, J.R. "Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel?" *NTS*, 43 (1997), 35-57.
- Levison, J.R. *Filled with the Spirit*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Levison, J.R. *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism*, Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Lichtheim, M. *Ancient Egyptian Literature 3 Vols*, Berkley: UCP, 1975-1980.
- Lim, T.H. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, New Haven: YUP, 2013.
- Lim, T.H. & Collins, J.J. (Eds) *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford: OUP, 2012.
- Lincoln, A. *Hebrews: A Guide*, London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Lindars, B. *New Testament Apologetic*, London: SCM, 1973.
- Lindars, B. "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews", *NTS*, 35 (1989), 382-406.
- Lindars, B. *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*, Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- Löhr, H. "Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews", Gelardini (2005), 199-210.
- Longenecker, B.W. *Rhetoric at the Boundaries*, Waco: Baylor UP, 2005.
- Longenecker, R. "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews: A Study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression on New Testament Thought", Guelich, R.A. (Ed.) *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, 161-85.
- Lyons, J. *Structural Semantics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.
- Ma, W. & Menzies, R.P. (Eds) *The Spirit and Spirituality*, London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Mackie, S.D. "Ancient Jewish Mystical Motifs in Hebrews' Theology of Access and Entry Exhortations", *NTS*, 58 (2011), 88-104.
- Mackie, S.D. *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

- MacRae, G.W. "Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews", *Semeia*, 12 (1978), 179-99.
- Manson, W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.
- Marohl, M.J. *Faithfulness and the Purpose of Hebrews*, Eugene: Pickwick, 2008.
- Marshall, I.H. "Soteriology in Hebrews", Bauckham (2009), 253-77.
- Marshall, I.H. *Kept by the Power of God*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995 [1969].
- Marshall, I.H. *New Testament Theology*, Downers Grove: IVP, 2004.
- Marshall, I.H. *Pastorals*, London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Marshall, I.H. *The Gospel of Luke*, Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- Marshall, I.H. (Ed.) *New Testament Interpretation*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992 [1977].
- Martinez, F.G. "Divine Sonship at Qumran", Hempel, C. & Lieu, J.M. (Eds), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, Leiden: Brill, 2006, 109-32.
- Martyn, J.L. *Galatians*, New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Mason, E.F. "Cosmology, Messianism and Melchizedek: Apocalyptic Jewish Traditions and Hebrews", Mason, E.F. & McCruden, K.B. (eds), *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 53-76.
- Mason, E.F. "Hebrews 7:3 and the Relationship between Melchizedek and Jesus", *Biblical Research*, 50 (2005), 41-62.
- Mason, E.F. "Hebrews and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Some Points of Comparison", *PRSt*, 37 (2010), 457-79.
- Mason, E.F. "The Epistle (Not Necessarily) to the Hebrews", *PRSt*, 37 (2010), 7-20.
- Mason, E.F. & McCruden, K.B. (Eds) *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Atlanta: SBL, 2011.

- Masterman, J.H.B. *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, London: SPCK, 1918.
- McCrudden, K.B. *A Body You Have Prepared for Me*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2013.
- McDonald, L.M. *Forgotten Scriptures*, Louisville: WJK, 2009.
- McDonald, L.M. *The Biblical Canon*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- McGowan, A.T.B. *The Divine Spiration of Scripture*, Nottingham: Apollos, 2007.
- McGrath, J.J. *“Through the Eternal Spirit”: An Historical Study of the Exegesis of Hebrews 9:13-14*, Rome: Pontifica Universitas Gregoriana, 1961.
- McKelvey, R.J. *Pioneer and Priest*, Eugene: WS, 2013.
- McKnight, S. & Osborne, G.R. (Eds) *The Face of New Testament Studies*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- McLay, R.T. “Biblical Texts and the Scriptures for the New Testament Church”, Porter, S.E. (Ed.), *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006, 38-58.
- McLay, R.T. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- McNamara, M. *Targum and Testament Revisited*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Meier, J.P. “The Inspiration of Scripture: But What Counts as Scripture?”, *Mid-Stream*, 38 (1999), 71-78.
- Menzies, R.P. *Empowered for Witness*, London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Metzger, B.M. “The Fourth Book of Ezra”, *OTP*, 1:516-59.
- Meyers, C.L. & Meyers, E.M. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Meyers, C.L. & Meyers, E.M. *Zechariah 9-14*, New York: Doubleday, 1993.

- Meyers, E.M. "Messianism in First and Second Zechariah and the "End" of Biblical Prophecy", Coleson, J. and Matthews, V. *Go to the Land I Will Show You*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996, 127-42.
- Michaelis, W. *Versöhnung des Alls*, Gümligen: Siloah, 1950.
- Michaels, J.R. *1 Peter*, Waco: Word, 1988.
- Michaels, J.R. *Hebrews*, (*Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews*), Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 2009.
- Miller, J.P. "Paul and Hebrews: A Comparison of Narrative Worlds", Gelardini (2005), 245-64.
- Milligan, G. *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.
- Mitchell, A.C. *Hebrews*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Mitchell, H.G. "A Commentary on Haggai and Zechariah", Mitchell, H.G. Smith, J.M.P. & Bewer, J.A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912, 1-362.
- Moffatt, J. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1924.
- Moffatt, J. *Grace in the New Testament*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931.
- Moffitt, D.M. *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Montefiore, H.W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: A&C Black, 1975.
- Morgenthaler, R. *Statistik Des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, Gotthelf-Verlag: Frankfurt, 1958.
- Morris, L. *Revelation*, London: Tyndale, 1969.
- Morris, L. *The Gospel According to Matthew*, Leicester: IVP, 1992.
- Motyer, A. *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, Leicester: IVP, 1993.

- Motyer, S. "The Psalm Quotations of Hebrews 1: A Hermeneutic-free Zone", *TynB*, 50 (1999), 3-22.
- Motyer, S. "The Spirit in Hebrews: No Longer Forgotten", Marshall (2012), 213-27.
- Moule, C.D.F. *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge: CUP, 1975 [1953].
- Mounce, W.D. *Pastoral Epistles*, Nashville: Nelson, 2000.
- Moyise, S. "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament", Moyise, S. (Ed.) *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, Sheffield: SAP, 2002, 14-41.
- Moyise, S. "Quotations", *As it is Written*, 15-28.
- Moyise, S. *The Old Testament in the New*, London: Continuum, 2001.
- Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. (Eds) *Genesis in the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. (Eds) *Isaiah in the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Moyise, S. and Menken, M.J.J. (Eds) *The Psalms in the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Narborough, F.D.V. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Nardoni, E. "Partakers in Christ (Hebrews 3:14)", *NTS*, 37 (1991), 456-72.
- Nash, R.H. "The Notion of Mediator in Alexandrian Judaism and the Epistle to the Hebrews", *WTJ*, 40 (1977), 89-115.
- Neusner, J. *Transformations in Ancient Judaism*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Neve, L. *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*, Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972.

- Newsom, C. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Nolland, J. *Luke 1-9:20*, Dallas: Word, 1989.
- O'Brien, P.T. "The New Covenant and its Perfect Mediator", Griffiths, J. (Ed.) *The Perfect Saviour*, Nottingham: IVP, 2012, 13-33.
- O'Brien, P.T. *God has Spoken in his Son*, London: Apollos, 2016.
- O'Brien, P.T. *The Letter to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- O'Collins, G. & Jones, M.K. *Jesus Our Priest*, Oxford: OUP, 2010.
- Oberdorfer, B. "The Holy Spirit – a person?", Welker, M. (Ed.) *The Work of the Spirit*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006, 27-46.
- Orr, W.F. and Walther, J.A. *I Corinthians*, New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Osborne, G.R. "A Classical Arminian View", *Four Views*, 86-128.
- Oswalt, J.N. *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1-39*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Overholt, T.W. "The End of Prophecy: No Players without a Program", *JSOT*, 13 (1988), 103-15.
- Pao, D.W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Parsons, M.C. *Acts*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- Peake, A.S. *Hebrews*, Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, nd [1902].
- Pearson, B.A. *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Peeler, A.L.B. *You are my Son: The Family of God in Hebrews*, London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Petersen, D.L. "Zechariah 9-14", *ABD*, 6:1065-68.
- Petersen, D.L. *Zechariah 9-14 & Malachi*, London: SCM, 1995.

- Petterson, A.R. *Behold Your King*, New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Pierce, M.N. “Hebrews 3.7-4.11 and the Spirit’s Speech to the Community”, Hockey, K.M., Pierce, M.N., Watson, F. (Eds) *Muted Voices of the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2017, 173-84.
- Portalatín, A. *Temporal Oppositions as Hermeneutical Categories in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Porter, S.E. “Allusions and Echoes”, *As it is Written*, 29-40.
- Porter, S.E. “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology”, Evens, C.A. & Sanders, J.A. (Eds), *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, Sheffield: SAP, 1997, 79-96.
- Porter, S.E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Sheffield: SAP, 1995.
- Porter, S.E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*, Bern: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Porter, S.E. (Ed.) *A Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Porter, S.E. (Ed.) *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006, 38-58.
- Porter, S.E.
Reed, J.T. and
O’Donnell, M.B. *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Preuss, H.D. $\epsilon\lambda\eta\gamma\chi\eta$ *TDOT*, 10:530-45.
- Procksch, O. $\alpha\gamma\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, *TDNT*, 1:88-97, 100-15.
- Pruscha, H. “Statistical Models for Vocabulary and Text Length with an Application to the NT Corpus”, *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 13:4 (1998), 195-98.
- Puig (i Tàrrach) A. (Ed.) *L’Espirit Sant en la Bíblia*, Tarragona: Scripta Biblica, 2013.
- Rahlfs, A. “History of the Septuagint Text”, Rahlfs, A. Hanhart, R (Eds), *Septuaginta Editio altera*, Stuttgart: DB, 2006, xxxv-xliv.

- Ramelli, I.L.E. & Konstan, D. *Terms for Eternity: Aiônios and Aídios in Clasical and Christian Texts*, Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2013.
- Reiling, J. and Swellengrebel, J.L. *UBS Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*, Leiden: Brill 1971.
- Reiss, M. "The Melchizedek Traditions", *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, 26 (2012), 259-65.
- Richardson, C. "The Passion: Reconsidering Hebrews 5:7-8", Bauckham (2008), 51-67.
- Riesenfeld, H. *παρά*, *TDNT*, 5:726-36.
- Rissi, M. *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.
- Robinson, T.H. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1944.
- Ross, A.P. *A Commentary on the Psalms* (3 vols), Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011-16.
- Rowe, C.K. "The Trinity in the Letters of Paul and Hebrews", Emery, G. and Levering, M. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, Oxford: OUP, 2011, 41-54.
- Rowland, C. *The Open Heaven*, Eugene: WS, 2002, 94-113.
- Runia, D.T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.
- Russell, D.S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Saarinen, R. *The Pastoral Epistles with Philemon and Jude*, London: SCM, 2008.
- Schaeffer, J.R. "The Relationship between the Priestly and Servant Messianism in the Epistle to the Hebrews", *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 359-85.
- Schenck, K. "God Has Spoken: Hebrews' Theology of the Scriptures", Bauckham (2009), 321-36.
- Schenck, K. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews*, Cambridge: CUP, 2007.

- Schenck, K. "Shadows and Realities", Oropeza and Moyise, 81-92.
- Schenck, K. *Understanding the Book of Hebrews*, Louisville: WKJ, 2003.
- Schreiner, T.R. *Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation: Commentary on Hebrews*, Nashville: B&H, 2015.
- Schuele, A. "The Spirit of YHWH and the Aura of Divine Presence", *Interpretation*, 66 (2012), 16-28.
- Schulz, S. σπείρω, *TDNT*, 7:546.
- Schweizer, E. πνεῦμα (in the New Testament) *TDNT*, 6:396.
- Schweizer, E. πνέω, ἐμπνέω, πνοή, θεόπνευστος, *TDNT*, 6:452-55.
- Seifrid, M.A. "The Death of Christ", *DLNTD*, 267-87.
- Sekki, A.E. *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Shepherd, M.B. *A Commentary on the Book of the Twelve*, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2018.
- Shogren, G.S. "Grace (in the NT)", *ABD*, 2:1086-88.
- Skaggs, R. *1 Peter, 2 Peter, Jude*, London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Smalley, S.S. *The Revelation to John*, London: SPCK, 2005.
- Smith, R.L. *Micah-Malachi*, Waco: Word, 1984.
- Sommer, B.D. "Did Prophecy Cease? Evaluating a Reevaluation", *JBL*, 115 (1996), 31-47.
- Son, K. *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005.
- Sowers, S. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews*, Zürich: Evz-Verlag, 1965.
- Speers, T.C. "Zechariah: Exposition, Chs. 1-8", *Interpreter's Bible vol 6*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- Spicq, C. "Alexandrinismes dans L'Épître aux Hébreux", *Rbib*, 58 (1951), 481-502.

- Spicq, C. "L'Épître aux Hébreux, Apollos, Jean-Baptiste, les Hellénistes et Qumran", *RQ*, 1 (1959), 365-90.
- Spicq, C. "Le Philonisme de L'Épître aux Hébreux", *Rbib*, 56 (1949), 542-72 ; 57 (1950), 212-42.
- Spicq, C. *L'Épître aux Hébreux 2 Vols*, Paris: Gabalda, 1952-3.
- Stanley, S. "Hebrews 9:6-10: The "Parable" of the Tabernacle", *NovT*, 37 (1995), 385-99.
- Stanton, G.N. "Jesus Traditions", *DLNTD*, 565-79.
- Stegemann, E.W. & Stegemann, W. "Does the Cultic Language in Hebrews Represent Sacrificial Metaphors?" Gelardini (2005), 13-23.
- Sterling, G. "Ontology versus Eschatology: Tensions between Author and Community in Hebrews", *SPA*, 13 (2001), 190-211.
- Steyn, G.J. "Addressing an Angelomorphic Christological Myth in Hebrews", *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 59 (2003), 1107-28.
- Stone, M.E. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Stronstad, R. *The Prophethood of all Believers*, Sheffield: SAP, 2004.
- Stuckenbruck, L.T. "To What Extent did Philo's Treatment of Enoch and the Giants Presuppose a Knowledge of the Enochic and Other Sources Preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls?", *SPA*, 19 (2007), 131-42.
- Swete, H.B. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, London: McMillan, 1909.
- Thiselton, A.C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000.
- Thiselton, A.C. *The Holy Spirit*, London: SPCK, 2013.
- Thomas, K.J. "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews", *NTS*, 11 (1965), 303-25.
- Thompson, C. *The Old Covenant*, London: Skeffington & Son, 1904.
- Thompson, J.W. "What has Middle Platonism to do with Hebrews?" Mason, E.F. & McCruden, K.B. (Eds), *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 31-52.

- Thompson, J.W. *Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- Thompson, J.W. *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Washington: CBAA, 1982.
- Tomasino, A. עֲלֵי NIDOTTE, 3:345-51.
- Tönges, E. “The Epistle to the Hebrews as a “Jesus Midrash””, Gelardini (2005), 89-105.
- Towner, P.H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Treier, D.J. & Atwood, C. “The Living Word versus the Proof Text”, Laansma, J.C. & Treier, D.J. (Eds), *Christology, Hermeneutics and Hebrews*, London: Bloomsbury, 2013, 173-201.
- Trotter Jr, A.H. *Interpreting the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.
- Turner, M. “The Churches of the Johannine Letters as Communities of ‘Trinitarian’ KOINŌNIA”, Ma, W. & Menzies, R.P. (Eds), *The Spirit and Spirituality*, 53-61.
- Turner, M. *Power from on High*, Sheffield: SAP, 2000.
- Turner, N. *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*, London, T&T Clark, 2004 [1965].
- Vanhoye, A. “Esprit éternel et feu du sacrifice en He 9,14”, *Biblica*, 64 (1983), 263-74.
- Vanhoye, A. *A Different Priest*, Miami: Convivium Press, 2011.
- Vanhoye, A. *Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1989.
- Verbrugge, V.D. “Towards a New Interpretation of Hebrews 6:4-5”, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 15 (1980), 61-73.
- Verhoef, P.A. “Time and Eternity”, *NIDOTTE*, 4:1252-55.
- Victorinus “Commentary on the Apocalypse of the Blessed John”, *ANF*, 7:344-60.

- Von Rad, G. *Old Testament Theology, Vol. 2*, London: SCM, 1985.
- Vos, G. *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Nutley: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1975.
- Waddell, R. *The Spirit of the Book of Revelation*, Blandford Forum: Deo, 2006.
- Walker, P. “A First Century Sermon”, Williams, P.J. Clarke, A.D. Head, P.M. and Instone-Brewer, D. (Eds), *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting*, Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004, 231-249.
- Wallace, D.B. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Warrington, K. *Discovering the Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Warrington, K. *Pentecostal Theology*, London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Warrington, K. “The Synoptic Gospels”, Burke, T.J. and Warrington, K. (Eds), *A Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit*, London: SPCK, 2014, 84-103.
- Watson, W.G.E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- Watson, W.G.E. *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*, Sheffield: SAP, 1994.
- Watts, J.D.W. *Isaiah 1-33*, Waco: Word, 1985.
- Welker, M. *The Work of the Spirit*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Welker, M. (Ed.) *The Work of the Spirit*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Wenham, J.W. *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge: CUP, 1965.
- Wenk, M. *Community-Forming Power*, London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Westcott, B.F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977 [1889].
- Westfall, C.L. *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews*, London: T&T Clark, 2005.

- Whitlark, J.A. *Enabling Fidelity to God*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Whitlark, J.A. *Resisting Empire: Rethinking the Purpose of the Letter to “the Hebrews”*, London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Wilckens, U. “ὑστερος” *TDNT*, 8:592-601.
- Williams, P.J.
Clarke, A.D.
Head, P.M.
Instone-Brewer,
D. (Eds) *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting*, Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Williamson, R. “Platonism and Hebrews”, *SJT*, 16 (1963), 415-24.
- Williamson, R. “The Background of the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *ExpTim*, 87 (1975), 232-37.
- Williamson, R. “The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *NTS*, 21 (1975), 300-12.
- Williamson, R. “The Incarnation of the Logos in Hebrews”, *ExpTim*, 95 (1983), 4-8.
- Williamson, R. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Wilson. R. McL. *Hebrews*, Basingstoke: MM&S, 1987.
- Witherington III, B. “The Influence of Galatians on Hebrews”, *NTS*, 37 (1991), 146-52.
- Witherington III, B. *Grace in Galatia*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Witherington III, B. *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians*, Nottingham: Apollos, 2007
- Witherington III, B. *New Testament Rhetoric*, Eugene: Cascade, 2009.
- Witherington III, B. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Witherington III, B. *Revelation*, Cambridge: CUP, 2003.

- Worthington, M. *Complete Babylonian*, London: Hodder, 2010.
- Yadin, Y. “A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran”, *Israel Exploration Journal*, 15 (1965), 152-54.
- Yadin, Y. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews”, *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 4 (1958), 36-55.
- Zerwick, M. *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963.

Unpublished Theses/papers

- Abasciano, B.J. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1-9*, Aberdeen: PhD thesis, 2004.
- Barnard, J. *Jewish Apocalyptic Traditions and Hebrews*, Paper presented to the Doctoral Research Seminar, Bangor University (Wales), June 2009.
- Bateman, H.W. *4QFlorilegium 1:1-9 and Hebrews 1:5-13*, Conference paper presented at The Evangelical Theological Society, Vancouver, 1993.
- Cook Jr, L.S. *The Question of the Cessation of Prophecy in Ancient Judaism*, Catholic University of America, Washington: PhD thesis, 2009.
- Ellingworth, P. *The Old Testament in Hebrews: Exegesis, Method and Hermeneutics* Aberdeen: PhD thesis, 1977.
- Morris, J.S. *Hebrews 10:29; The Holy Spirit Which Produces Enabling Grace*, Dallas Theological Seminary: MTh thesis, 2007.
- Mosser, C. *No Lasting City: Rome, Jerusalem and the Place of Hebrews in the History of 'Earliest' Christianity*, St. Andrews: PhD thesis, 2004.
- Pierce, M.N. *Divine Discourse in the Epistle to the Hebrews: An Encounter with a God who Speaks*, Durham: PhD Thesis, 2017.
- Stanley, S.K. *A New Covenant Hermeneutic: The Use of Scripture in Hebrews 8-10*, Sheffield: PhD thesis, 1994.

Websites etc.

- Calvin J. *Commentary on John – Volume 2*, 211 (on John 19:37), accessed on 27/01/2012 at <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom35.pdf>.
- Calvin J. *Commentary on Zechariah and Malachi*, Lecture 161 on Zech. 12:7-10, accessed on 28/01/2012 at <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom30.iii.xiii.xiii.html>.
- Charlesworth, J.H. “Review of *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture* Ed. L.H. Feldman, J.L. Kugel and L.H. Schiffman (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 3 vols. Accessed at: <http://www.biblicalarcheology.org/reviews/outside-the-bible/> on 11/01/2015
- Lewicki, T. “Der Heilige Geist in Hebräerbrief”, *Theologie und Glaube*, 89 (1999), 494-513, (13 pages), accessed on 23/04/2014 at <http://www.theol-fakultaet-pb.de/thgl/thgl1999/4lewicki.htm>
- Mosser, C. “Review of Jody A. Barnard, *The Mysticism of Hebrews*”, [RBL, 8 (2014), (7 pages), accessed on 29/09/2015 at <https://independent.academia.edu/CarlMosser/Book-Review>