

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

6-1-1958

### He Learned Obedience, Hebrews 5:18

Charles Froehlich

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Froehlich, Charles, "He Learned Obedience, Hebrews 5:18" (1958). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 138.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/138>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

"HE LEARNED OBEDIENCE,"

HEBREWS 5:8

---

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Exegetical Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Charles Donald Froehlich

June 1958

72151

Approved by: Paul H. Bretcher  
Advisor

Martin H. Schaefer  
Reader

51840

BV  
4070  
C69  
M3  
1958  
no.3

51840

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
C.2

| Chapter  | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .  | 1    |
| II. PRELIMINARY STUDY . . . . .  | 4    |
| Establishment of the Text . . . . .  | 4    |
| Verse Seven . . . . .  | 14   |
| Verse Nine . . . . .   | 26   |
| Verse Ten . . . . .  | 31   |
| III. <sup>21</sup> επισθεν IN VERSE EIGHT . . . . .                                    | 36   |
| Verse Eight . . . . .  | 36   |
| επισθεν . . . . .  | 42   |
| Thesis 1. . . . .  | 43   |
| Thesis 2. . . . .  | 45   |
| Thesis 3. . . . .  | 48   |
| Thesis 4. . . . .  | 51   |
| Lutheran Dogmaticians . . . . .  | 53   |
| IV. OTHER PASSAGES IN HEBREWS WHICH PUNCTUATE<br>CHRIST'S HUMANITY . . . . .           | 66   |
| V. FINAL THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE<br>STATEMENT: HE LEARNED OBEDIENCE. . . . . | 92   |
| Development in the Life of Jesus Accord-<br>ing to the Gospels. . . . .                | 92   |
| Obedience and Sacrifice . . . . .  | 97   |
| Two Wills in Christ: Human and Divine. . . . .   | 100  |
| VI. CONCLUSION. . . . .  | 104  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .   | 105  |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper has been to arrive at the meaning of Hebrews 5:7-10 and, more specifically, to answer the question: What does it mean when the text says that "Christ learned obedience" (verse 8)? Was Christ "sufficiently human" to learn anything? If so, what was He able to learn?

In Chapter II the establishment of the text and the precise linguistic meaning have been the objectives.

In Chapter III the purpose of this exploration, namely, to determine what it means that "He learned obedience from the things which He suffered" is continued. An investigation is made whether this question has been posed in this form by orthodox Lutheran dogmatists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The works consulted were

1. Chemnitz, Libellum De Duobus Naturis in Christo and Loci Theologici
2. Hunnius, Libelli III De Persona Christi
3. Hutter, Loci Communes Theologici
4. Gerhard, Commentarius Super Epistolam ad Hebraeos and Loci Theologici
5. Calov, Exegema Augustanae Confessionis, Systema Locorum Theologicorum and Biblia Novi Testamenti Illustrata, Volumes 1, 2, and 4
6. Quenstedt, Theologia Didactico-Polemica Sive Systema Theologicum

7. Koenig, Theologia Positiva Acrosmatica
8. Scherzer, Systema Theologiae
9. Baier, Compendium Theologiae Positivae
10. Hollaz, Examen Theologicum Acrosmaticum

If this question has been posed, what answers have these dogmaticians supplied? Do they take Christ's human nature seriously as affording the possibility of His learning, or is this possibility denied Him, if only a silentio? Are these dogmaticians not courting a latent docetistic danger if the only New Testament passages used by them to show Christ's humanity are Hebrews 2:14ff.; 2:9; Philippians 2:6-8; John 1:14, and certain others? None of these passages says anything about His "learning" obedience. In fact, Windisch observes that only Hebrews 5:8 and Philippians 2:8 speak of Christ's "learning" obedience.<sup>1</sup> Actually Windisch exaggerates a bit because Philippians 2:6, although it explicitly speaks of Christ's obedience, asserts nothing about His learning it. In their extensive Christological loci, in which the dogmaticians ask and answer many questions, is the query "Did Christ learn anything" also included? If so, what answers do they supply?

A major problem was under what topics to subsume the pertinent comments of the dogmaticians, whose Christological

---

<sup>1</sup>Hans Windisch, "Der Hebraerbrief," Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1913), Vierter Band, Dritter Teil, p. 43.

loci embrace a mass of material. The constant temptation, which at times bordered on inescapable necessity, to be steered into dogmatic treatments of Christology as well as anthropology was assiduously guarded against because such a systematic treatment was not the purpose of this paper.

Rather, the investigation centered in the query: How have the dogmatists employed Hebrews 5:7-10? This chapter includes also a detailed study of verse 8 as it has been treated by commentators and Lutheran dogmatists.

Chapter IV gives special attention to those passages which deal with the human nature of Christ, or make explicit wherein it consisted, or what it involved. Also some passages apposite from other sections of the Scriptures have been included.

Chapter V contains a grouping of passages from the four evangelists bearing on Christ's human life, an analysis of the equality or inequality of sacrifice and obedience, and an explication of Chemnitz' pregnant sentence: "Est enim obedientia quando humana voluntas divinae subicitur."<sup>2</sup>

In the final chapter a general conclusion of the study is presented.

---

<sup>2</sup>M. Chemnitz, Locis Theologicis (Francofurti & Wittebergae, 1690), p. 69.

## CHAPTER II

### PRELIMINARY STUDY

#### Establishment of the Text

The first task in the interpretation of a given passage of the Sacred Scriptures is the establishment of the text. This study is based on the twentieth edition of Nestle's Greek New Testament. Nestle's critical apparatus contains no variant readings from other manuscripts for Hebrews 5:7-10. The only difference between the text of Nestle and the texts of Tischendorf (Éditio octava critica maior) and Westcott and Hort (Revised American edition) is the inclusion of a comma in Westcott and Hort's text after the words  $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ .<sup>1</sup>

That textual criticism can thus be dispensed with in the present exegetical task is confirmed by a study of the variants in the manuscript p<sup>46</sup>. The text of Hebrews 5:7-10 in p<sup>46</sup> differs from that in Nestle only by the addition of the words  $\sigma\upsilon$   $\epsilon\iota$  before  $\alpha\rho\chi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  in verse 10.<sup>2</sup> The manuscript p<sup>46</sup> also includes  $\epsilon\iota$  between  $\sigma\upsilon$  and  $\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ , although

---

<sup>1</sup>Constantinus Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece (Éditio octava critica maior; Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872).

<sup>2</sup>H. C. Hoskier, A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus p<sup>46</sup> (circa 200 A. D.), (London: Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., 1938), p. 37.

Nestle does not adopt that reading, as found in 5:6.

One conjecture about the text has attracted much attention. It is that of Harnack, who inserted an  $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\kappa$  before  $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  in verse 7. A thorough refutation of Harnack's conjecture is that of Jeremias. Jeremias dispels the cogency of Harnack's conjecture by showing: (a) that it is possible to explain the text in such a way that Christ was heard, although prima facie it may not so appear; (b) that the interpretation of  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\pi}\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  as a protasis rather than a concluding clause is linguistically tenable. Jeremias shows his disinclination to accept the  $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\kappa$  by parenthetically describing it as "nicht bezeugten!"<sup>3</sup>

The linguistic premise upon which Harnack's conjecture rests is that  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\pi}\epsilon\rho$  introduces only concluding clauses. Granting this premise, one would need to accept the  $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\kappa$ , for "He was heard although he was a son" is nonsensical. However, Harnack's premise about the position of a  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\pi}\epsilon\rho$  clause in a sentence is refuted by examples which Jeremias arrays. Jeremias observes that in 1929 Harnack, in a note to Michel, offered a prize to anyone who could adduce passages in which  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\pi}\epsilon\rho$  introduces a protasis.<sup>4</sup> The prize goes to Jeremias, who showed that the LXX alone furnishes a

<sup>3</sup>J. Jeremias, "Hbr 5.7-10," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche (n.p., 1952/3), XLIV, 107.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 108, fn. 3.



number of examples in which the conjunction  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho$  introduces a protasis, e.g., Prov. 6:8; II Macc. 4:34; IV Macc. 3:10,15; 4:13; 15:24.<sup>5</sup>

The lexical, syntactical, and theological interpretations of the various parts of Hebrews 5:7-10 can be challenged and substitutes offered. This study attempts to take note of all significant interpretations. For investigating the linguistic meaning of this passage, the commentaries of Riegenbach and Spicq are especially good aids. In fact, they are primi inter pares. They have condensed more variations and marshalled superior evidence in support of their own conclusions than most other commentators. Therefore, the linguistic interpretation of this passage will closely follow that of Riegenbach and Spicq, departing from them only occasionally. Because of its special difficulty, Hebrews 5:8 is not dealt with in this chapter, but in Chapter III.

There are two basic views regarding the grammatical structure of verses 7-10. The one which I have adopted is that these verses are a compound sentence whose two principal verbs are  $\epsilon\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu$  and  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ . The other view is that this is a simple sentence with the verb  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$  limited by three coordinate participles  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , and  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . Those who support the latter interpretation regard  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \dots\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}$  a

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 108.

mere parenthetical adjunct. Among the proponents of this latter are Kuebel: "ὅς, Hauptverb dazu ἐγένετο v. 9; der v. 8 ist eine Zwischenbemerkung";<sup>6</sup> and Jeremias, who holds the view that verse 8 is a parenthesis explaining the word εὐλαβία = Froemigkeit.<sup>7</sup> Michel also offers this as one possibility.<sup>8</sup>

The evidence is much stronger, however, for the paratactic construction.

Periocha haec, in diebus etc. duas habet partes. Prior est, in diebus--obedientiam: altera, et consummatus--aeternae. Prior pars valde humilia loquitur. . . . Altera plane laeta est et gloriosa. . . .<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, Bengel points up the contrast between the eternal salvation which Christ has wrought and the short period of His life.

Observandum etiam epitheton aeternae salutis, quod brevitati dierum carnis Jesu opponitur. . . . De ipsa salute respice cap. 2, 10. 14 seqq. Aeternitas salutis memoratur Es. 45, 17, Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται ὑπὸ Κυρίου σωτηρίαν αἰώνιον.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Robert Kuebel, "Der Brief an die Hebraer," Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments, herausgegeben von Hermann Strack und Otto Boeckler (Vierte Abteilung; Nordling: Verlag der C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1888), p. 170.

<sup>7</sup>Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 109-10.

<sup>8</sup>Otto Michel, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar ueber das Neue Testament, begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer (Dreizehnte Abteilung, 8. Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), p. 137.

<sup>9</sup>J. A. Bengel, Gnomon Novi Testamenti (Secundum Editionem Tertiam 1773; Berolini, 1855), p. 575.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 576.



Strong support for the paratactic construction is also offered by Westcott, Spicq, and Moll.

The complicated sentence is divided into two main propositions by the two finite verbs (1) ὅς . . . *περσευθηκας και εἰσακουσθεις* . . . ἔμαθεν . . . (2) *και τῆσειωθεις ἐγένετο* . The first sentence describes the divine discipline through which Christ was perfected in His human nature: the second, the efficacy of the work which He was fitted to accomplish in His perfected humanity.<sup>11</sup>

Toutes ces idées, déjà évoquées II, 17, 18; IV, 15, 16, sont exprimées dans une longue période qui se divise, grâce à deux verbes à un mode personnel, en deux propositions principales (vv. 7-8, ὅς . . . ἔμαθεν; vv. 9, 10, *και* . . . ἐγένετο . . . ἀϊτιος σωτηρίας), et qui rappelle la conception théologique de la vie de Jesus dans Philip. II, 6-11. La première proposition indique le moyen--la souffrance--par lequel s'est effectuée la mission salutaire du Christ; la seconde en indique le résultat, pour lui-même et pour ceux qui s'attachent à lui.<sup>12</sup>

The phrase, "in the days of His flesh," i.e., of His human life on earth, is contrasted with His perfected state, mentioned ver. 9, and belongs to the main verb, ἔμαθεν . . . . To put in parenthesis the clause, *και περ - υπακοην*, and thus . . . carry the ὅς over to ἐγένετο as its first principal verb, is totally inadmissible. For *και περ* can never be constructed with a finite verb . . . which would require *ει και*, or some combination with *ει*. But neither is the clause, *και περ ων υιος* to be connected, . . . with *εισ ακουσθεις*.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Brooke Foss Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews (3rd edition; London: Macmillan and Company, 1909), p. 126.

<sup>12</sup>C. Spicq, L'Épître Aux Hébreux (Deuxième édition; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Éditeurs, 1953), p. 112.

<sup>13</sup>Carl B. Moll, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, edited by John Peter Lange and translated by A. C. Kendrick (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), Vol. VIII of the New Testament, p. 104.

Having considered the structure of the entire sentence, we shall now examine several individual grammatical items. Concerning the relative pronoun  $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  in verse 7, Riggenschach says:

Dasz sich das Relativ  $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  nicht auf das Subjekt von 5b sondern auf die in den Citaten v. 5 und 6 angere-dete Person, naemlich auf Christus 5a bezieht, hat nichts Befremdliches, da Christus das logische Subject des ganzen Abschnitts ist.<sup>14</sup>

Bengel seems to make an unwarranted, and insignificant, lin-guistic claim about the force of the relative pronoun. He maintains that qui is used instead of hic because of the great significance of the relative pronoun.<sup>15</sup>

Two anarthrous and one articular noun merit attention. The anarthrous  $\acute{\upsilon}\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  in verse 8, which appears also in Hebrews 1:2 in the phrase  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\acute{\iota}\acute{\omega}$ , in no way diminishes the supreme glory of the Sonship. The predicative position accounts for the absence of the definite article. "Only be-cause  $\acute{\upsilon}\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  is the predicate is the article absent; hence 'a Son' in our versions is incorrect."<sup>16</sup>

$\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\epsilon \acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  . . . means "Son though he was," not "son though he was." The writer knows that painful

<sup>14</sup>Edward Riggenschach, Der Brief an die Hebraeer, in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1913), XIV, 129.

<sup>15</sup>Bengel, op. cit., p. 574.

<sup>16</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle to James (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938), p. 164.

discipline is to be expected by all who are sons of God the Father; he points out, in 12.5f, that every son, because he is a son, has to suffer. Here the remarkable thing is that Jesus had to suffer, not because but although he was υἱός, which shows that Jesus is Son in a unique sense; as applied to Jesus υἱός means something special.<sup>17</sup>

The absence of the definite article in Greek emphasizes quality or character. The translation should read, "Though He was Son by nature." The deity of the Messiah is referred to here.<sup>18</sup>

Likewise, the fact that no definite article is present with <sup>ο</sup>υἱός in verse 9 is no reason for construing it as anything less than the unique Cause, the only one. The absence of the article is accounted for by its predicative position.

On the other hand, the presence of the article before <sup>ο</sup>υπακογῆν in verse 8 is also significant. "The Obedience," with the article, means the well-known complete obedience, as distinguished from obedience in general."<sup>19</sup> "He learned His (the Art. τῆν being specific) obedience."<sup>20</sup>

Der Art. bei <sup>ο</sup>υπακογῆν besagt, dass der Gehorsam nach seinem Wesen und vollen Umfang gemeint ist. Jesus hat an seinem Leiden gelernt, was es um den Gehorsam ist,

<sup>17</sup>James Moffatt, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), XXXIX, 66.

<sup>18</sup>Kenneth S. Wuest, Hebrews in the Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), p. 101.

<sup>19</sup>Lenski, op. cit., p. 164.

<sup>20</sup>Moll, op. cit., p. 104.

was ihn ausmacht, nicht bloß was es heißt einmal zu gehorchen.<sup>21</sup>

In the phrase ἀπο τῆς εὐλαβείας in verse 7, the force of the preposition ἀπό and other features of this phrase are treated more extensively below.<sup>22</sup> One item, however, should be included here. It has to do with the absence of αὐτοῦ.

Obwohl nach dieser Auffassung ein possessives αὐτοῦ bei τῆς εὐλαβείας nicht unpassend stüende, ist ein solches doch keineswegs notwendig. Der Artikel genuegt, um darauf hinzuweisen, und also das persönliche Verhalten Jesu die Erhoerung ermoeeglichte.<sup>23</sup>

Cette interprétation, qui est celle de la Vulgate: exauditus est pro sua reverentia, supposerait l'insertion du pronom αὐτοῦ, mais cette construction elliptique est normale (cf. XII, 17, où l'on hésite à préciser κτ' αὐτοῦ par αὐτοῦ ou τοῦ πατρὸς).<sup>24</sup>

The concessive force of the phrase καίπερ ὡν in verse 8 is undoubted and hardly debatable. "To avoid ambiguity the Greek often used particles to make the concessive idea plain, and this idiom survives in the N. T., . . . καίπερ more frequently as in . . . Heb. 5:8; 7:5; 12:17. . . ."<sup>25</sup> In his discussion of particles with participles Robertson says, "Under the concessive participle we saw

<sup>21</sup>Riggenbach, op. cit., p. 136, fn. 56.

<sup>22</sup>Infra, pp. 23-26.

<sup>23</sup>Riggenbach, op. cit., p. 134.

<sup>24</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 115.

<sup>25</sup>A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th edition; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 1129.

examples of . . .  $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\epsilon\rho$  (Heb. 5:8, etc.).<sup>26</sup>  $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\epsilon\rho$  is often joined with the participle to emphasize its concessive use. . . .<sup>27</sup> The same views are set forth by Arndt-Gingrich in their lexicon, page 395.

The phrase  $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\epsilon\rho\ \omega\upsilon\ \upsilon\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$  attaches itself to what follows rather than to what precedes. This is also the opinion of Moffatt and Riggerbach, who write: " $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\epsilon\rho\ \omega\upsilon\ \upsilon\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$  attaches itself to  $\epsilon\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$  rather than to the preceding participles  $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\varsigma$  and  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  (Chrys. Theophyl.)."<sup>28</sup> "Die Verknuepfung von  $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  mit v. 8 ist unzulaessig. . . ."<sup>29</sup>

Moffatt admits, however, that there is some opposition to this interpretation.

Some . . . take  $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  with what follows; this was the interpretation of the Peshitto ("and, although he was a son, he learned obedience from fear and the suffering which he bore"). But the separation of  $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  from  $\alpha\phi' \omega\upsilon$  and the necessity of introducing a  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  before the latter phrase point to the artificiality of this construction.<sup>30</sup>

Windisch makes an observation similar to that of Moffatt: "Blasz . . . verbindet  $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  mit

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 1140.

<sup>27</sup>Marcus Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), IV, 289.

<sup>28</sup>Moffatt, op. cit., p. 66.

<sup>29</sup>Riggerbach, op. cit., p. 131.

<sup>30</sup>Moffatt, op. cit., p. 66.

"ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν 'er lernte aus seiner Gottesfurcht und aus seinen Leiden,' aber dagegen spricht die Stellung von κλίπε ὧν υἱός .<sup>31</sup>

The genitive ὧν in the phrase ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν is due to assimilation and attraction. The antecedent τούτων of the relative pronoun ὧν has been assimilated into the relative pronoun, which is attracted by the case of its assimilated antecedent. "ἀφ' ὧν = ἀπὸ τούτων ὧν" .<sup>32</sup>  
 "ἀφ' ὧν (Heb. 5:8) ἀπὸ τούτων ὧν . . . ."<sup>33</sup>

Verse 10 makes us ask: At what time did the activity described in the participle προσφορευθεῖς occur? Scripture does not seem to answer this question. It seems best to say that this address of God to the Son occurred both before and after the Son's perfection. Yet some commentators limit the time of the address. We quote some:

It cannot be certainly concluded either from the tense or the context that this "naming" is to be assigned to the date of the ascension and not to the original appointment.<sup>34</sup>

Spicq's interpretation of the time force of the aorist participle is as follows:

Quand le Père a-t-il attribué ce titre à son Fils? Des son incarnation, celle-ci étant essentiellement une

<sup>31</sup>Hans Windisch, "Der Hebraerbrieff," Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1913), Vierter Band, Dritter Teil, p. 43.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>Robertson, op. cit., p. 721.

<sup>34</sup>Dods, op. cit., p. 290.



consecration sacerdotale, et le fruit de l'obéissance (x, 5-9); mais il salue à nouveau son Fils de ce titre, lorsque Jésus exerce l'acte suprême et décisif de son sacerdoce, grâce à son obéissance héroïque (v. 8), enfin et surtout après la résurrection et dès l'entrée au ciel, lorsque le Christ en possession de ses droits souverains et de sa puissance plénier est en mesure de causer le salut de tous ceux qui lui obéiront au cours des siècles; ainsi  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  et  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\theta\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  sont grammaticalement synchrones. . . .<sup>35</sup>

Both Bengel and Kuebel accent God's addressing His Son before the perfection ( $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ).  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ , ad-  
nellatio sacerdotis, non solum secuta est consummationem  
Jesu, sed antecessit etiam passionem, tempore Psalmi, 110.4.<sup>36</sup>  
"Das Part. Aor. steht zu v. 9 so, dass das dort ausgesprochene Urteil begründet wird: 'wie er ja von G. benannt wird.  
. . . ."<sup>37</sup>

#### Verse Seven

When did Jesus utter the prayers referred to in this verse? The majority of exegetes limit the occasion of these prayers to the Gethsemane struggle of the Savior. However, others include His prayers on Calvary and/or prior prayers of Jesus. A few exclude Gethsemane entirely, e.g., Wuest (cf. p. 18). Quotations from different interpreters who limit the prayers here mentioned to Gethsemane are given first.

La mention des prières et des supplications, des larmes et du danger de mort . . . situe sans erreur possible

<sup>35</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 119.

<sup>36</sup>Bengel, op. cit., p. 576.

<sup>37</sup>Kuebel, op. cit., p. 170.

épreuve à un moment précis de la vie terrestre (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκός) du Sauveur, à savoir à Gethsémane (Mat. 26. 36-46 par.).<sup>38</sup>

It is the night of Gethsemane, for there "he brought both petitions and supplications to him who is able to save him from death, together with strong crying and tears."<sup>39</sup>

Le Christ a plusieurs fois pleuré à grands sanglots (Lc. XIX, 41; Jo. XI, 33) et il a crié sa détresse sur la croix (Mt. XXVII, 46, 50), mais Hebr. se réfère certainement à l'agonie de Gethsemani dont il commente le récit évangélique ou dont il est informé par une autre source.<sup>40</sup>

Abgesehen von dem sachlich durchaus parallelen Vorgang Jo 12, 27f. ist uns kein anderes Gebet des Herrn um Bewahrung vor dem Tode ueberliefert als das, welches er unmittelbar vor seinem Leiden in Gethsemane an Gott gerichtet hat Mc 14, 35f. Die Gebetsrufe Jesu am Kreuz Mc 15, 34.37; Lc 23, 46 hatten nicht mehr diesen Inhalt und fallen daher ausser Betracht. Der Seelenangst des Herrn in Gethsemane Mc 14, 34; Lc 22, 44 entspricht auch der von den Evangelien nicht berichtete, von dem Vf offenbar aus muendlicher Ueberlieferung (cf 2, 3) geschoepfte Zug, wonach Jesu Gebet von starkem Geschrei und Traenen begleitet war. Das laute Gebet wird ohnehin auch von den Evangelien vorausgesetzt cf Mc 14, 35. 39; Lc 22, 41.<sup>41</sup>

Die richtige Betrachtung der theologischen Grundgedanken mit ihrer eigentuemlichen Verwendung des Begriffes  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$  (vgl. noch Hbr 2:10  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\alpha\theta\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$   $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ) erweist Hbr 5.7 mit groeszter Wahrscheinlichkeit als Beschreibung der Gethsemane-Stunde des angefochtenen Christus, der beim Antritt seines Opferganges vor dem Tode zurueckschreckt.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup>Jean Hering, L'Épître aux Hébreux in Commentaire du nouveau testament (Neuchâtel Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1954), XII, 53.

<sup>39</sup>Lenski, op. cit., p. 160.

<sup>40</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 113.

<sup>41</sup>Riggenbach, op. cit., pp. 130-31.

<sup>42</sup>August Strobel, "Die Psalmengrundlage der Gethsemane-

Others who concur in the above interpretation are Moffatt (p. 66), Meyer (Way into the Holiest, pp. 101-10), Jeremias (p. 109), and Strathmann. The latter writes: "Offenbar ist an die Szene von Gethsemane gedacht."<sup>43</sup> Michel comments: "Aus den 'Tagen seines Fleisches' hebt Hb die Anfechtung in Gethsemane hervor."<sup>44</sup>

Maclaren speaks in a more homiletic and parenetic than expository manner but seems to be of the same opinion as the commentators referred to. He writes:

We may take these great and solemn words as a commentary on the gospel narrative of Gethsemane. They . . . point to Gethsemane showing us Christ, as the companion of our sorrows and supplications, as a pattern of our submissive, devout resignation, and as a lesson for us all how prayer is most truly answered.<sup>45</sup>

Many other interpreters include in the "prayers and supplications" of verse 7, prayers not spoken by Christ in Gethsemane. Some relegate the Gethsemane incident to a position of lesser importance than other events of His life. The varying degrees of importance attached to the Gethsemane

Parallele Hbr 5.7ff," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche (n.p., 1954), XLV, 260.

<sup>43</sup>Hermann Strathmann, Der Brief an die Hebraer in Das Neue Testament Deutsch, herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Johannes Behm (5. Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), IX, 95.

<sup>44</sup>Michel, op. cit., p. 133.

<sup>45</sup>Alexander Maclaren, Expositions of Holy Scripture (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1938), pp. 342-43.

scene are illustrated by the following quotations:

Most probably . . . reference is here made to the prayer in Gethsemane, and reference in the plural nouns to its successive repetitions. The added clause, "with strong outcrying" . . . leads Calv. . . . to regard the language as referring, along with these prayers, to the loud crying of Jesus on the cross; Cajetan, Este., Calov, and Strauss, refer the whole exclusively to this latter, and Klee confines it even to the loud outcry with which Jesus died. These applications of the passage are by no means . . . to be regarded as unsuited to the context. . . . The words allude, however, preeminently, to the suffering in Gethsemane; and we have here, perhaps, given us, in close accordance with the account of Luke xxii. 39-46, a scene of evangelical history resting upon tradition, which has also found its way even into the text of some recensions of Lk himself. For according to Epiphanius (Ancor. 31), the mention of tears is found *ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἁδίοις αὐτοῖς ἀντιγράφοις.*<sup>46</sup>

Christ, in the days of his flesh, offered up prayers and supplications to his Father, as an earnest of his intercession in heaven. This refers to his prayer in his agony (Matth. 26.39 and ch. 27.46) and to that before his agony (John 17), which he put up for his disciples, and all who should believe on his name.<sup>47</sup>

ἡμεῖς κτλ. hauptsächlich in Gethsemane, worauf *κατὰ Κραυγῆς κτλ.* sicher weist. Doch passt *ἐν ἡμέραις* besser, wenn d. V. auch sonst derartige Bit-  
ten Jesu voraussetzt, vgl. John 12,27, auch (Calv. u.a.) das *Eli Eli*, obgleich dieses zu dem *σωζ. κτλ.* nicht so ganz passt.<sup>48</sup>

*ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*, in diebus carnis suae . . . in diebus illis, duobus praecipue, quibus ea passus est, quae ut pateretur, carnem peccaminosae et mortali similem assumpsit . . . processus passionis . . . a Gethsemane usque ad Golgotha, &

<sup>46</sup>Moll, op. cit., p. 105.

<sup>47</sup>Matthew Henry, An Exposition of the Old and New Testament (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.), V, 618.

<sup>48</sup>Kuebel, op. cit., p. 170.

adhibentur eadem locutiones, quae ab evangelistis, conf. etiam Ps 22.3, 20ss.25; 69, 4.11; 109.22.<sup>49</sup>

There is no documentation of this verse or of the verses that follow. . . . There is no explicit reference to writing of any kind. . . . The Gethsemane incident (Matt. 26:36-46 and parallels) affords the closest parallel.

Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears. This likely refers to the agony of Gethsemane and the repeated prayer, "Father, all things are possible to thee; remove this cup from me" (Mark 14:36). The loud cry may refer to the desolate word on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mark 15:34)<sup>50</sup>

Apostolus sine dubio respicit ad preces & supplicationes, quas Christus fecit ultimis horis passionis suae. In horto Gethsemane, . . . Postea in ipsa cruce . . . Deus mi, Deus mi, quare me dereliquisti. Vide & Ps. 69:4, 7.<sup>51</sup>

Wuest excludes the Gethsemane scene entirely and restricts this prayer to that uttered on the cross.

The prayer here was a petition to be saved out from under death. It was a prayer for resurrection, uttered on the Cross. It is believed, and with good reason, that our Lord uttered the entire twenty-second Psalm while hanging on the Cross. It is His own description of what took place there. Verses 1-13 speak of His heart sufferings; those due to His abandonment by God in verses 1-6, those due to the fact that mankind spurned Him in verses 7-13. His physical sufferings are described in verses 14-18. His prayer for resurrection is recorded in verses 19-21, and His thanksgiving for answered prayer in verses 22-31.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>Bengel, op. cit., p. 575.

<sup>50</sup>Harry J. Cotton and Alexander C. Purdy, The Epistle to the Hebrews in The Interpreter's Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955), XI, 643-44.

<sup>51</sup>John Braun, Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebraeos (Amstaelodami, 1705), p. 291.

<sup>52</sup>Wuest, op. cit., p. 100.

For whom did Jesus pray? Did He pray for others, or for Himself, or for both? Is He, in the function of a priest, making an offering both for others and for Himself (cf. 5:3)? The answer "No" must be given to the last question. He prayed only for Himself, but not for the same cause that the priests of the Old Covenant prayed for themselves. This truth Gerhard captures beautifully in his commentary when he observes that some try to apply this to Christ because earlier in Chapter 5 it is said of the Old Testament priest that ipse circumdatus est infirmitate, verse 2. But verse 2 refers to infirmities of the flesh which do not apply to Christ. According to verse 3 a priest should pray for the people and for himself, i.e., for his own sins. This cannot apply to Christ.<sup>53</sup> The correct interpretation as Gerhard sees it, which is quoted with approval by Calov, follows:

B. Gerhardus censet Apostolum hisce ad Christum accommodare, quod Pontifex non solum pro populo, sed etiam pro seipso preces obtulerit quamvis non ex eadem causa. Pontifex preces obtulit in Veteri Testamento pro impetranda peccatorum suorum remissione, Christus vero pro impetranda ex angustiis liberatione.<sup>54</sup>

Jesus' prayer was not part of His sacrifice, but it was a prayer for Himself.

---

<sup>53</sup>J. Gerhard, Commentarius Super Epistolam ad Ebraeos (Editio secunda; Jenae, 1561), p. lll. Hereafter cited as Gerhard, Commentary.

<sup>54</sup>A. Calov, Biblia Novi Testamenti Illustrata (Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1719), IV, 1225.

<sup>55</sup>Riggenbach, op. cit., p. 129.

Some go to greater lengths than others in insisting upon precise differences in meaning between the words  $\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  and  $\kappa\epsilon\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$ . The general consensus of commentators seems to be that the author uses two terms closely related in meaning chiefly for the sake of emphasis. Some refer the plurals of the terms to the fact that Jesus prayed three times in Gethsemane. This latter notion has even been extended by Schoettgen to indicate an increasing intensity of the three prayers, yes, that the plural suggests three different kinds of prayer.

Depuis Schoettgen, on cite la sentence rabbinique: "Il y a trois sortes de prières, et chacune est plus forte que la précédente: prière, cri et larmes. La prière se fait en silence, le cri à haute voix, mais les larmes les surpassent toutes."<sup>56</sup>

Quotations from other commentators who try to find a difference between the two terms follow:

Pluralis. nam in Gethsemane ter oravit. Particula  $\tau\epsilon$  que indicat, non esse mera synonyma hoc loco. Orationes sunt animi; supplicationes, etiam corporis, ut docet etymon vocabuli  $\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega$  supplico. . . .<sup>57</sup>

$\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\kappa\epsilon\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$ . /Vulg. proces supplicationesque. The first word  $\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is the general term for a definite request (e.g., James v. 16). The second  $\kappa\epsilon\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$  (here only in N. T. in which no other word of its group is used) describes the supplication of one in need of protection or help in some overwhelming calamity. The one ( $\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ) is expressed completely in words: the other ( $\kappa\epsilon\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$ ), properly an olive branch entwined with wool borne by

<sup>56</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 113.

<sup>57</sup>Bengel, op. cit., p. 575.

suppliants) suggests the posture and external form and emblems of entreaty (comp. Mark xiv.35).<sup>58</sup>

Statements of others who do not discriminate between the meanings of the two terms but are satisfied that the author is merely being emphatic are: "Note the strong doubling in 'petitions (beggings) and supplications,'" ;<sup>59</sup> and "The conjunction of words in this verse is for emphasis."<sup>60</sup> The latter interpretation is to be preferred.

What was the content of the prayer? The investigation of this question also entails the meaning of εἰσακουθεῖς . Various interpretations have been offered.

- a. To be kept from death. Such a prayer was unanswered. But compare John 11:42 πάλυτοτέ μου ἀκουεῖς . Harnack's conjecture would be appropriate, yes, even necessary.
- b. To be saved from death via resurrection. "Patrem, qui posset eum salvum facere a morte, non per conservationem a morte, sed per resuscitationem. . . ."<sup>61</sup> But against this view see Windisch, "σω/ειν ἐκ θανάτου ist nicht auferwecken,"<sup>62</sup> and Riggensbach:

---

<sup>58</sup>Westcott, op. cit., p. 127.

<sup>59</sup>Lanski, op. cit., p. 160.

<sup>60</sup>Dods, op. cit., p. 288.

<sup>61</sup>Lanski, op. cit., p. 160.

<sup>62</sup>windisch, op. cit., p. 43.



suppliants) suggests the posture and external form and emblems of entreaty (comp. Mark xiv.35).<sup>58</sup>

Statements of others who do not discriminate between the meanings of the two terms but are satisfied that the author is merely being emphatic are: "Note the strong doubling in 'petitions (beggings) and supplications'";<sup>59</sup> and "The conjunction of words in this verse is for emphasis."<sup>60</sup> The latter interpretation is to be preferred.

What was the content of the prayer? The investigation of this question also entails the meaning of εἰσακούσθεις . Various interpretations have been offered.

- a. To be kept from death. Such a prayer was unanswered. But compare John 11:42 πάντοτε μου ἀκούεις . Harnack's conjecture would be appropriate, yes, even necessary.
- b. To be saved from death via resurrection. "Patrem, qui posset eum salvum facere a morte, non per conservationem a morte, sed per resurrectionem. . . ."<sup>61</sup>  
But against this view see Windisch, "πάντοτε μου ἀκούεις" ist nicht auferwecken,<sup>62</sup> and Riggenbach:

<sup>58</sup>Westcott, op. cit., p. 127.

<sup>59</sup>Lenski, op. cit., p. 160.

<sup>60</sup>Dods, op. cit., p. 288.

<sup>61</sup>Martin Luther, "Divi Pauli apostoli ad Hebreos epistola," Nachschriften der Vorlesungen ueber Roemerbrief, Galaterbrief und Hebraeerbrief. LVII in Werke kritische Gesamtausgabe (Weimar: Hermann Boehlaus, 1939), pp. 28-29.

<sup>62</sup>Windisch, op. cit., p. 43.

Freilich darf nun die Erhoerung nicht mit Oekum., Euthym., Haimo u. a. in die Auferweckung gesetzt werden, denn diese entspricht dem angedeuteten Inhalt der Bitte nicht und bildet vor allem kein dem  $\mu\alpha\upsilon\theta\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon\tau\eta\upsilon$   $\upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\gamma\upsilon$  untergeordnetes Moment.<sup>63</sup>

c. For strength, which was answered, via an angel.

"Unde etiam per angelum est corroboratus."<sup>64</sup>

Against this Riggerbach says:

Aber auch die Staerkung durch den Engel Lc 22, 43 kann nicht gemeint sein, denn auch, wenn diese Tatsache sicherer bezeugt waere, als sie es ist, hat sie nach der Darstellung von Lc 22, 44 keineswegs die Wendung im Gebetskampf Jesu herbeigefuehrt.<sup>65</sup>

Both Gerhard and Calov give answers which combine the interpretations b and c. Gerhard explains  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\ \alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\ \theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  :

(a) Quia Deus in angonibus & doloribus istis eum confortavit;

(b) Quia per gloriosam resurrectionem brevi insecuta, cum ex morte liberavit.<sup>66</sup> Compare Calov: "Non tantum confortatus in cruce, ac liberatus ex infernali horrorre & cruciatu . . . sed etiam e morte temporali & exigui spatii in vitam aeternam resuscitatus est."<sup>67</sup>

However, the question, "What did Jesus pray for?" essentially resolves itself into a choice between: (a) being

<sup>63</sup>Riggerbach, op. cit., p. 134.

<sup>64</sup>Bengel, op. cit., p. 575.

<sup>65</sup>Riggerbach, op. cit., p. 134.

<sup>66</sup>Gerhard, Commentary, p. 112.

<sup>67</sup>Calov, Biblia Novi Testamenti Illustrata, IV, 1226.

freed from the fear of death; (b) making His will conform with the Father's will. The latter, it seems to me, is the better answer; it conforms with the petition: Thy will be done. In this case, the freedom from fear would be only a symptom that the prayer had been heard. "Betrachtet man dagegen die voellige Einigung mit dem goettlichen Willen als das Ziel des Flehens Jesu, so kann die Befreiung von der Todesangst doch nur als Symptom der Erhoerung, nicht als diese selbst gelten."<sup>68</sup>

The choice between two possible interpretations of the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας is difficult. The preposition ἀπὸ can mean either "from" followed by the ablative of separation, or "because." The noun εὐλαβεία can mean either "fear," i.e., Todesangst, or "piety, reverence." The combinations to be compared are "from fear," i.e., aus der Todesangst, and "because of His piety." These alternatives are clearly articulated in the Arndt-Gingrich lexicon under εὐλαβεία : "Hb 5:7 . . . heard because of his piety. But others . . . prefer to take the word here in the sense fear, anxiety . . . heard (and rescued) from his anxiety."<sup>69</sup>

These alternatives are also stated by Michel.

---

<sup>68</sup>Riggenbach, op. cit., p. 133.

<sup>69</sup>William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 322. Hereafter cited as Arndt-Gingrich, Lexicon.

Jesus, wurde, "erhoert aus der Furcht" (εὐλαβεία  
= Lk αὐχὼν ἰα) oder "auf Grund seiner Gottesfurcht."  
Beide Uebersetzungen sind wegen der Zweideutigkeit  
des Begriffes moeglich.<sup>70</sup>

In footnote four on the same page Michel continues:

Allerdings sollte man darauf achten, dass die Todesnot  
in Hb 2.15 eben, nicht εὐλαβεία, sondern einfach  
φόβος, τοῦ θεοῦ genannt wird. Der Sprachgebrauch  
der εὐλαβεία-Gruppe im Hb, das Verstaendnis von Hb 5.7  
in der griech. Exegese und der Vergleich mit den bib-  
lischen Texten, die gerade den Ausdruck der "Nichter-  
hoerung" vermeiden, draengen dazu, von einer "Erhoerung  
auf Grund der gottesfurcht" zu reden (Bauer Woert.  
137).<sup>71</sup>

The same lexicon gives as one of the many usages of the  
preposition ἀπὸ "V. To indicate cause, means, or outcome.  
1. gener., to show the reason for someth. because of, as a  
result of. . . ."<sup>72</sup> Robertson expresses the same opinion  
about the meaning of ἀπὸ. "But it is not alone a form of  
agency that ἀπὸ comes to express. It may also be used for  
the idea of cause, an old usage of ἀπὸ. For instance,  
. . . Heb. 5:7, etc. The LXX gives abundant illustration of  
the same idiom, the causal use of ἀπὸ."<sup>73</sup> Also Riggensbach  
supports this meaning of ἀπὸ. "Die Einfuehrung des Grundes  
durch ἀπὸ entspricht ganz dem Sprachgebrauch der spaeteren  
Graecitat."<sup>74</sup>

<sup>70</sup>Michel, op. cit., p. 134.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., fn. 4.

<sup>72</sup>Arndt-Gingrich, Lexicon, p. 87.

<sup>73</sup>Robertson, op. cit., pp. 579-80.

<sup>74</sup>Riggensbach, op. cit., p. 134.

Higgenbach, Farrar, Moffatt, Spicq, and Jeremias all arrive at the same conclusion, namely, that  $\alpha\pi\omicron$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$  means "because of His piety, reverent fear of God," as the following quotations demonstrate:

Vollkommen glatt ist dagegen der sprachliche Ausdruck und der Gedankenzusammenhang, wenn man, den Spuren der griech. Exegeten folgend, fn. 51 (Cf Chrys., Phot., Oekum., Theophyl., Euthym., ebenso Ithac. c. Varia. I 67: propter timorem, vulg: pro sua reverentia, aeth: ob iustitiam eius, ar: propter reverentiam suam. . . .) unter der  $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha$  die ehrfurchtsvolle Scheu versteht, mit der Jesus sich dem goettlichen Willen untergeordnet und in deren Gefolge er die Erhoerung empfangen hat. Der Artikel bei  $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha$  kann allerdings nicht auf  $\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\iota\kappa\sigma\tau$ . zurueckweisen, da diese Ausdruecke das Gebet nach der Seite des Verlangens, nicht nach der der Ergebung bezeichnen; allein wie bereits bemerkt worden ist, hat der Vf. absichtlich vermieden, von einer Bitte Jesu um Bewahrung vor dem Tode zu reden. Er hat damit vorbereitet, was erst in  $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$  zur Aeuszerung gelangt, was aber den Lesern des Briefes aus der muendlichen Ueberlieferung ebenso bekannt gewesen sein wird, wie es heute den Lesern der Evangelien ist, dasz naemlich das hoechste Gebetsanliegen Jesu in Gethsemane nicht in der Bewahrung vor dem Todesgeschick, sondern in der vollkommenen Einigung mit dem goettlichen Willen bestand.<sup>75</sup>

$\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha$  . . . is "reverent fear," as opposed to terror and cowardice. . . . It is a bulwark against the heresies which never will see or allow the perfect Humanity of Christ, as well as His true Divinity.<sup>76</sup>

In  $\alpha\pi\omicron$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$ , the sense of  $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha$  in 12.28 and of  $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  in 11.7 shows that  $\alpha\pi\omicron$  here means "on account of" (as is common in Hellenistic Greek) and that  $\alpha\pi\omicron$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$  must be taken, as the Greek fathers took it "on account of his reverent fear of God," pro sua reverentia (vg), "because he had

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

<sup>76</sup>Frederick W. Farrar, The Early Days of Christianity (New York: A. L. Burt, 1882), p. 240, fn. 12.

God in reverence. . . ." The writer is thinking of the moving tradition about Jesus in Gethsemane . . .  
 ἀλλ' οὐτι ἐρω θίλω, ἀλλὰ τ' ἰσοῦ. This is his  
 εὐλαβία, the godly fear which leaves everything to  
 the will of God. Such is the discipline which issues  
 in ὑπακοή. Ps. Sol 6.8 καὶ κυρίου εἰσηκουσε  
 πρ. ο. ευχ. γ. παντός ἐν φόβω θεού.??

Avec presque tous les medievaux et la majorite des modernes (Bisping, Luenemann, Delitzsch, Reuss, Edwards, Westcott, Lemonnyer, Peake, Farrar, Menegoz, Nairne, Riggerbach, Moffatt, Wickham, Medebielle, Bonsirven, Venard, Lenski, Wuest, J. Ungeheuer, p. 130), nous donnons a ἀπο le sens de "en consequence, a cause de, " . . . et a εὐλαβία celui de "crainte de emplois du N. T., Lc. II,25; Act. II,5; VIII,2; XXII,12). D'ou: "Il fut exauce a cause de (sa) pieté. . . ." Il prie a la fois pour echapper a la mort, si possible, mais principalement pour que la volonte du Pere se fasse sur la terre comme au ciel.<sup>78</sup>

In diesem Sinn der Scheu vor Gott (nicht: der Todesfurcht) haben jedenfalls die alten griechischen Ausleger εὐλαβία Hbr 5:7 verstanden.<sup>79</sup>

Osiander and Edwards came to the same conclusion as the authors of the five previous quotations.

Et exaudivit eum Pater propterea, quod Christus Patrem suum coelestem reveretur, atque in omnibus illi obedientiam perfectissimam praestitisset.<sup>80</sup>

Because there was in His prayers and supplication, in His crying and weeping, this element of entire self-surrender to His Father's will which is the truest piety, His prayers were heard.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>77</sup>Moffatt, op. cit., p. 65.

<sup>78</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 115.

<sup>79</sup>Jeremias, op. cit., p. 107, fn. 1.

<sup>80</sup>Lucas Osiander, Sacrorum Bibliorum Para III (Tuebingae, 1592), p. 698.

<sup>81</sup>Thomas Charles Edwards, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," The Expositor's Bible, edited by W. R. Nicolli (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1898), p. 77.

There is something to be said, however, for the other interpretation. The interpretation that Jesus was delivered from the fear of death is advanced by the following:

En quoi consiste alors l'exaucement? En ceci qu'il fut delivré de la peur. Et c'est bien ce que nous enseignent aussi les synoptiques.<sup>82</sup>

exauditus est, non ut ne biberet calicem, sed ut jam sine ullo horrore biberet: unde etiam per angelum est corroboratus.<sup>83</sup>

Bengel renders  $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$  "ab horrore."<sup>84</sup>

Die Uebers . . . 'wegen seiner Gottesfurcht' hat gegen sich, dasz dieser Ausdr. ein kaum fuer Chr. passender, ein im N. T. total analogieloser ist. Daher besser mit Cod., It., Pesch., Ambr., Calv., Beng., Thol., Hofm., . . . "erhoert u. errettet von seiner Angst," Todesangst.<sup>85</sup>

Moffatt admits that "The alternative sense of 'fear' appears as early as the Old Latin version (d=exauditus a metu).<sup>86</sup>

#### Verse Nine

It must be remembered that any kind of fragmentation of Christ's entire work of redemption and of His eternal being is fraught with danger. He had been addressed as "priest

<sup>82</sup>Hering, op. cit., p. 54.

<sup>83</sup>Bengel, op. cit., p. 575.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid.

<sup>85</sup>Kuebel, op. cit., p. 170.

<sup>86</sup>Moffatt, op. cit., p. 66.

forever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110:4). The Father showed His approval and acknowledgment of the Son's saving work by addressing the Son who sat at the right hand only after achieving the καθ' ἑαυτὸν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν, Heb. 1:3. If the consummation of Christ's work, the τελειώσις, had not been completed, His earlier designation in Psalm 110 would have become ineffective. But, on the other hand, He would not have been so addressed in the Psalm if the success and completion of His work had not been ensured. Therefore, τελειώσις in verse 9 is to be taken proleptically, at least partially so (cf. John 17:4 for a similar proleptic use of the same word) when Christ made the complete surrender of Himself in Gethsemane. Actually it was some twelve to fifteen hours later when He said τετέλειόταται (which in itself was proleptic, for He had not yet died).

τελειώσις (v.11.10) having been perfectly equipped with every qualification for the priestly office by the discipline already described. Several interpreters . . . include in the word the exaltation of Christ, but illegitimately. The word must be interpreted by its connection with ἐμαρθεὺν ὑπακοῆν; and here it means the completion of Christ's moral discipline, which ended in His death.<sup>87</sup>

Concerning τελειώσις, Cotton says:

Jesus is qualified to be priest, . . . because he is completely fitted to deal with human weakness and human sins in a radical way, having faced these facts from inside humanity itself.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup>Dods, op. cit., pp. 289-90.

<sup>88</sup>Cotton and Purdy, op. cit., p. 646.



Quenstedt, discussing Hebrews 5:8-9, quotes the commentary of B. Hunnius to the following effect:

et hac ratione perfectus est redditus non, respectu suae personae, sed quoad plenam, perfectam & exuberantem hostiam, quam pro nobis obtulit, . . . causa, autor & fons salutis factus est. . . .<sup>89</sup>

A few sentences earlier Quenstedt had said:

Dicitur . . . causa salutis aeternae, quod non intelligendum est de productione aliqua Christi a causa superiori & prima, sed de suorum operum ex aeterno consilio SS. Trinitatis (Rom. XVI.25 . . .) susceptorum executione & adimplitione.<sup>90</sup>

Lenski observes that this ninth verse contains the same thought as that expressed in Hebrews 2:10:

In neither passage is there an idea of God making Jesus morally complete. . . . We completely reject the claims that Jesus underwent a moral development, and then attained completeness in his personal Lebenstand. "Made complete" means complete as "the cause of eternal salvation." Without suffering the death which Jesus suffered he would not have been the complete Savior. To be Prophet and King would not have been enough; he had also to be High Priest and bring the blood of the all-sufficient atonement. Those who regard Jesus as being morally perfected go outside of the text to find the completeness referred to in  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\ \theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ; but it always lies inside the text: "made complete as the cause of eternal salvation. . . ."<sup>91</sup>

Robert Grant makes the following observation about

$\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\ \theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  : "he was made perfect only by his obedience which resulted in his death (Heb. 4:15, 5:9).<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 253.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid.

<sup>91</sup>Lenski, op. cit., pp. 165-66.

<sup>92</sup>Grant, op. cit., p. 36.

Kuebel explains the meaning of  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  as follows:

Ohne dass wir hier auf die Versoehnungslehre d. HB. naeher eingehen koennen, sei nur bemerkt, dass der eigentliche Zentralbegriff desselben  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  und  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ist, und zwar sowohl fuer die Christologie, als fuer die Soteriologie. Christus selbst, obgleich Gottessohn, ist durch die Bestehung der Versuchung (4, 15) und das Leiden (2,10; 5,9) erst vollkommen gemacht, d.h. nicht bloss erst als sittlich Bestandener auch zur  $\delta\omicron\phi\alpha$  erhoben, sondern wirklich selbst erst sittlich auf diesem Weg vollendet, zur gottgleichen Heiligkeit (wie Herrlichkeit) gebracht worden.<sup>93</sup>

Spicq insists that the  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  was the product of the sufferings.

v.9 Le souverain Prêtre a commencé son immolation à Gethsemani. Ce sont ces souffrances mortelles qui lui ont conféré la  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (v.9; II,10) de son sacerdoce, le rendant apte à sauver tous les hommes.<sup>94</sup>  
(Italics mine)

Does the word  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  mean that He had not been the Cause of eternal salvation before? Riggerbach's answer to this question captures the double truth that Christ had both been the Cause of salvation before and yet became the Cause when He was "perfected."

Erst mit der Vollendung in diesem Sinne ist Jesus fuer alle, die ihm gehorsam sind . . . und also sein Verhalten gegen Gott v.8 fuer ihr Verhalten gegen ihn massgebend sein lassen, Urheber eines Heiles geworden, das nicht bloss Rettung von zeitlichem Untergange ist, sondern gemaez der einzigartigen Bedeutung seines Begrueenders . . . absolute Geltung und unvergaenglichen Bestand besitzt of Jes 45,17. Damit ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass Jesus schon waehrend seines irdischen Lebens durch sein Wort (2,3) und ueberhaupt durch seine

<sup>93</sup>Kuebel, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

<sup>94</sup>Spicq, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

ganze Person Vermittler des Heils gewesen ist; aber er war dies doch nur insofern, als er schon waehrend seines irdischen Lebens in bestaendig fortschreitender Entwicklung das wurde, was er mit seiner Vollendung in abschliessender Weise geworden ist.<sup>95</sup>

who are those persons within the class described by the words  $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ ? To obey Christ means to believe in Him. These words, "to all those who obey Him," are a description of those who are saved rather than a presentation of the grounds and cause of their salvation; for it is decisively affirmed in the next word  $\alpha\iota\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$  that Jesus Himself is the Cause of their salvation. The following quotations all substantiate this interpretation. In his commentary Gerhard uses the phrase "obedientia fidei" as the definition of wherein this obedience consists.<sup>96</sup>

To obey him, namely Jesus, means above all to believe in him, to yield to him the obedience of faith, which then naturally results in doing his will by moral living, the fruit of such faith. The disobedience of 3, 18 is the unbelief of 3, 19. As "the believing ones" we enter into God's rest (4, 3). Note "the disobedience" in 4, 11, which again means unbelief.<sup>97</sup>

The words "that obey Him" are descriptive of those who are saved. They do not present the grounds of their salvation.<sup>98</sup>

Le Christ qui avait demande d'etre sauve de la mort, obtient par sa mort de sauver les hommes. Avant appris a obeir, il sauve ceuz qui obeissent.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>95</sup>Riggenbach, op. cit., p. 137.

<sup>96</sup>Gerhard, Commentary, p. 115.

<sup>97</sup>Lenski, op. cit., p. 166.

<sup>98</sup>Wuest, op. cit., p. 102.

<sup>99</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 119.

Beati sunt obedientes, Hebr. V,9. Beati sunt credentes. Credentes sunt obedientes, & consequenter fides & obedientia sunt unum idemque.<sup>100</sup>

The fact that Christ and not our faith is the cause of our salvation, is also stated by Quenstedt.

Fructus ergo passionis & obedientiae Christi est nostra aeterna salus, quia per obedientiam usque ad mortem crucis non meruit tantum nobis salutem aeternam, sed etiam eandem credentibus confert.<sup>101</sup> (Italics mine)

That there is no diminution of the uniqueness of the noun *διτιος* in the phrase *διτιος σωτηρίας διώντιον* because it is anarthrous was demonstrated gramatically supra, page 10.

The words "eternal salvation" call to the minds of many interpreters the passage Isaiah 45:17 *Ἐργάζησθε σωσάμενοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου σωτηρίαν διώντιον* e.g., Bengel (p. 576), Spicq (p. 118), and Riegenbach (p. 137). Compare also Acts 3:15 *τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ἰουδαίας ἀπεκτείναντες* and Hebrews 2:10 *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας*.

#### Verse Ten

When was Christ addressed, *πρὸς ἀφορῆς ἐπιθέσις*, as *ἱερεῖος*? (Compare supra, Chapter II, pp. 13f) An excellent explanation of the tension between the commencement of His priesthood with His death and the commencement of it upon His ascension and session is contained in an article by Schille.

<sup>100</sup>Hollaz, op. cit., p. 1184.

<sup>101</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 253.

Der in Leiden vollendete Christus wird Hohepriester. . . . Und sofern er dies nach 5.9f erst mit seiner Erweckung wird, bricht die schon beobachtete tiefgreifende Differenz zur Theologie des Verfassers auf, nach welcher Christus bei seinem Tode bereits sein hohepriesterliches Werk wirkt, die Darbringung des eigenen Leibes.

Schille therefore correctly observes: "Gottes Ja zu Jesu Leiden gibt dessen Tod einen besonderen, tiefsten Ernst."<sup>102</sup>

This is a magnificent commentary on II Corinthians 1:20

οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο ἰσχυρὸν ἰσχυρῶς ἔσθ' ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναί.

We cite Quenstedt's observations about the way in which Christ's regency had a beginning and the sense in which it did not have a beginning:

Tum demum coepit Christus . . . gubernare, quando coepit ad dextram DEI Patris sedere. At non ante, sed demum post resurrectionem ex mortuis, & ascensionem in coelos Christus ut homo coepit sedere ad dextram DEI Patris.<sup>103</sup>

Christum non secundum utramque naturam, sed tantum secundum humanam naturam ad dextram DEI Patris sedere, probamus ex . . . [No mention of Heb. 5:10] quae & similia dicta clare docent, . . . quia divina natura est ipsa omnipotentia & dextra Dei.<sup>104</sup>

An exhaustive treatment of the phrase *κατὰ τὴν τὰς* *Μετὰ Χριστόν* would fall within the province of an exegesis of chapter 7 rather than of 5:7-10. In 5:6,10 the readers of the Epistle are given a mere taste, a preview, a sampling of the Melchizedek relation, the full consumption of which they

<sup>102</sup> Gottfried Schille, "Erwaegungen zum Hohepriesterlehre des Hebraeerbriefes," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aeiteren Kirche (n.p., 1955), XLII, 99.

<sup>103</sup> Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 391.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., p. 446.

are not afforded until after the rather lengthy digression from 5:11 through 6:20. We must, however, at this point make a few remarks about this phrase. Further amplification is offered in Chapter IV, p. 80ff.

Two quotations from Quenstedt in which the eternal character of Christ's priesthood is accented follow.

Non terminabitur illa Intercessio consummatione seculi, sed in omnem aeternitatem durabit. . . . Non esset autem Sacerdos perfectus in aeternum, nisi intercederet in aeternum pro Electis.<sup>105</sup>

Christus Sacerdos maneat post diem novissimam, . . . quod nempe id non intelligendum de omnibus actuum Sacerdotium exercitiis, sed de gloriosa, interpellatione ad dextram Dei, nunquam desitura, sed perpetuo duratura. . . .<sup>106</sup>

Three captions under which can be summarized the chief specific resemblances between Christ's priesthood and that of Melchizedek are here presented. But first there is offered one general statement of the meaning of the identification of Christ's high priesthood with that of Melchizedek rather than with that of Aaron.

Jesus was a high priest *κατὰ τὴν ταύτην Μεληχισσείκ* according to the nature of just like Melchizedek. . . . The reference is not only to the higher "rank" but also to the entirely different nature of Melchizedek's priesthood as compared w. that of Aaron 7:11b.<sup>107</sup>

a. Christ's priesthood is eternal (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*)

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p. 258.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., p. 259.

<sup>107</sup>Arndt-Gingrich, Lexicon, p. 811.

Hebrews 5:6; 6:20; 7:21;  $\square \begin{matrix} \zeta \\ \tau \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \eta \\ \nu \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \delta \\ \sigma \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \zeta \\ \tau \end{matrix}$  Psalm 110:4).

Melchizedek's likewise endures  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron \delta\iota\omicron\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma$

Hebrews 7:3.

- b. Aaron was a priest but not a king. Melchizedek was both priest and king. "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God" (Gen. 14:28). This conjunction within one person of both offices, the sacerdotal and the regal, is another similarity between Christ's high priesthood and that of Melchizedek.

Imprimis praefiguravit Christum Melchisedek in utriusque officii Regii & Sacerdotalis in una persona conjunctione. . . .<sup>108</sup>

Mit dieser [Erhoehung] wird er Melchisedek'scher Hohepr., der zugleich Koenig ist.<sup>109</sup>

The meaning of the name Melchizedek also sets forth the characteristics of the king, as Luther states in his commentary on Psalm 110.

Ueber den Namen Melchizedech, heiszt er auch Melchizalem, id est, rex pacificus, rex pacis, das ist, ein Kuning des Frieds. Wann wahrhaftige Fried des Gewissen kann nit sein, wo die Sund ist. Darumb ist die Gerechtigkeit vor dem Fried, und beid von Christo, dem wahrhaftigen Melchizedech und Melchizalem.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>108</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 221.

<sup>109</sup>Kuebel, op. cit., p. 169.

<sup>110</sup>Martin Luther, Exegetische deutsche Schriften. Vol. VIII edited by Johann Konrad Somischer in Saemmtliche Werke (Erlangen: Carl Heyder, 1846), p. 28.

c. For the Aaronic priesthood the continuity of one's family tree, beginning with Levi, was essential.

The high priesthood of Melchizedek is quite un-

genealogical (Hebrews 7:3 ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ,

ἄγενεαλόγητος). "Sic Melchisedecus dicitur

ἄγενεαλόγητος, ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἀμήτωρ Hebr. 7, v. 3,

quia scilicet parentum et generis ipsius nulla

fit in Scripturis mentio."<sup>111</sup> Likewise, Christ

is without a human father and without a divine

mother. "Christus enim in his terris fuit ἀπάτωρ,

sicut in coelis ἀμήτωρ, Ebr. VII, 3."<sup>112</sup>

Melchisedecus fuit ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἀμήτωρ καὶ  
ἄγενεαλόγητος etc. Gen. 14, v. 18. Psalm  
110, v. 4. Hebr. 7, v. 3, ut praefiguraret  
Christum sine patre secundum humanitatem,  
sine matre secundum divinitatem.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup>J. Gerhard, Loci Theologici (Tomus primus; Berolini, 1863), p. 509.

<sup>112</sup>J. Scherzer, Systema Theologiae (Editio Tertia Auctior & Correctior; Lipsiae & Francofurti, 1691), p. 179.

<sup>113</sup>Gerhard, Loci, p. 461.



CHAPTER III

ἔμαθεν IN VERSE EIGHT

Verse Eight

The linguistic meaning of the phrase καίπερ ὢν υἱός has already been determined in Chapter II. It has concessive force (cf. Chapter II, pp. 11f.). It is the protasis, to which the apodosis, ἔμαθεν . . . is attached (cf. Chapter II, p. 12). The term υἱός is anarthrous because of its predicative position.

The phrase ἔμαθεν ἀλλ' ὢν ἔπαθεν has rhetorical significance.

Parachese, d.h. lautlicher Anklang verschiedener Wörter, kommt in alten volkstümlichen Verbindungen vor: . . . H 5,8 ἔμαθεν ἀλλ' ὢν ἔπαθεν (Sprichwort παθὲν μάθος, Aeschyl. Ag. 164).<sup>1</sup>

Paronomasia is rather loosely applied in the books. Winer uses it only for words of similar sound, while Blass confines it to the recurrence of the same word or word-stem, . . . and uses parechesis for different words of similar sound, like . . . ἔμαθεν ἀλλ' ὢν ἔπαθεν (Heb. 5:8). . . .<sup>2</sup>

The rhetorical figure of parechesis is not the only brilliant thrust. A truth known to the Greeks, as well as to the

<sup>1</sup>Albert Debrunner, Friedrich Blas' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch (Fünfte, durchgesehene Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), p. 285.

<sup>2</sup>A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th edition; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 1201.

Hebrews, is captured in a form which recalls, even by its linguistic structure, many earlier references in Greek literature to this truth, namely, that παθήματα issue in μαθήματα.

The paronomasia goes back to a common Greek phrase which is as old as Aeschylus, (*Agam.*, 177f.), who describes Zeus as τὸν πάθει μάθος θεῶντα κυρίως ἔχτιν, and tells how (W. Headlam)

"The heart in time of sleep renews  
Aching remembrance of her bruise,  
And chastening wisdom enters wills that most  
refuse"--

which, the poet adds, is a sort of χάρις βίβλιος from the gods.<sup>3</sup>

"He learned obedience by the things He suffered," thus supremely illustrating in His person the truth of the Greek adage immortally expressed in the famous lines of Aeschylus:

By Zeus in heaven,  
Who set us mortals on the road of thought,  
Was the rule given--  
"Wisdom by suffering must for man be wrought!"  
This a compelling grace man owns  
Of heavenly Spirits on their august Thrones.<sup>4</sup>

Das Wortspiel ἐμάθεν δὲ ὅν σπαθεν ist sehr verbreitet vgl. das Sprichwort Aeschyl, *Agam.* 170 πάθει μάθος. Herodot I 207 τὰ ἰδέσ μοι παθήματα εἶντα ἀχάρτα, μαθήματα γέγονε.<sup>5</sup>

learned . . . by the things which he suffered) Proverbial in Greek from Hdt. to Philo, but the acc.

<sup>3</sup>James Moffatt, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), XXIX, 66.

<sup>4</sup>William Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1951), p. 110.

<sup>5</sup>Hans Windisch, "Der Hebraerbrief," Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1913), Vierter Band, Dritter Teil, p. 43.

"obedience" gives the phrase distinction here.

In Ignatius "suffer" has almost the same sense as in the creed, "suffered and died. . . ." In I Pet. the verb is very frequent, and generally illustrative of the idea that Christ's disciples are made one with Him by suffering. The theology of I Pet. iv.1 is near akin to that of our author. . . .<sup>6</sup> (Italics mine)

Perhaps comparable Latin proverbs would be per aspera ad astra and per angusta ad augusta. And, if a pun be permitted, the former maxim could be extended per aspera ad astra, etiam super astra (caelos). Compare Hebrews 4:14 penetravit caelos; Ephesians 4:10 super omnes caelos; Hebrews 8:1 consedit in dextra sedis magnitudinis in caelis.

The word  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon$  suggests the question: How could the impassible, eternal Son of God suffer? The answer to this, as to so many other questions about the person of the Savior, lies in the communicatio idiomatum. Quenstedt says that the divine nature is  $\alpha\pi\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ .<sup>7</sup> "Divina [natura], quae simpliciter  $\alpha\pi\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$  est."<sup>8</sup> However, the impassible God suffers according to the primum genus, i.e., He suffered according to the human nature, but He suffered. "Passus est in carne impassibilis Deus: & in carne nostra mortali

---

<sup>6</sup>A. Nairne, The Epistle to the Hebrews, in the Cambridge Bible, edited by R. St. John Parry (Cambridge: University Press, 1921), p. 38.

<sup>7</sup>J. Quenstedt, Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologicum (Wittebergae, 1696), p. 333.

<sup>8</sup>J. F. Koenig, Theologia Positiva Acroamatica (Editio Decima Quarta; Hostockii & Lipsiae, 1719), p. 163.

mortuus ac sepultus immortalis Dei filio. . . ."<sup>9</sup> "Cujus naturae proprietates sit <sup>1</sup> pati & mortificari, nempe humanae, non vero Deitatem a passione separat & excludit."<sup>10</sup>

Not only the human nature suffered, but He suffered according to the human nature. Gerhard ascribes the passibility to the person of Christ, rather than to a nature.

Actiones et passiones sunt personae, non naturae, recte igitur dico: Deus passus est carne, sed non possum dicere: divinitas τοῦ Λόγου est in carne passa. . . ."<sup>11</sup>

In response to the question, "Ob die Gottheit in Christo auch gelitten habe?" Luther says, "nicht allein die menschliche Natur, sondern auch die goettliche Natur oder der rechte wahre Gott fuer uns gelitten hat and gestorben ist."<sup>12</sup>

In a similar vein Christ's human nature is taken seriously by Manson.

No demonstration could be clearer of the place which the human life of Jesus has in the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews . . . no refusal here to know Christ "after the flesh," as in 2 Corinthians v.16: no discrimination of any essential kind between a first manifestation of the Son of God after the flesh and a second post-Resurrection stadium in which the manifestation is "after the Spirit of holiness," as in Rom. i. 3-4. Nor are the human attributes of Jesus visibly

<sup>9</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 95.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 94.

<sup>11</sup>J. Gerhard, Loci Theologici (Tomus primus; Berolini, 1863), p. 541. Hereafter cited as Gerhard, Loci.

<sup>12</sup>Martin Luther, Vermischte deutsche Schriften, Vol. VI edited by Johann Konrad Irmischer in Saemmtliche Werke, Vol. LVIII (Erlangen: Heyder and Zimmer, 1853), p. 35.

pervaded and penetrated at every point, as in the Fourth Gospel, by the divine. It is a real incarnation which is described in Hebrews. The Passion of the Savior is apprehended in the deeply emotional character of His human experience, and "in words of exquisite feeling" is presented for the response of feeling on our part. In this respect, . . . the Epistle to the Hebrews comes nearer to modern sentiment than, perhaps, any book in the New Testament.<sup>13</sup>

The word "obedientia" (τὴν ὑπακοήν in verse 8) occurs too often in the Lutheran dogmatists to permit, or require, a listing of the passages, but it never occurs with "discre." The word ὑπακοή occurs only once in the Septuagint. "L'unique emploi d' ὑπακοή dans les LXX traduit  $\overline{\tau\tau} \overline{\overline{\tau}} \overline{\overline{\tau}} \overline{\overline{\tau}}$ , humilité, II Sam. XXII, 36."<sup>14</sup> Moffatt makes the same observation as Spicq.<sup>15</sup> The force of the definite article with ὑπακοήν has been treated in Chapter II, p. 10. Do the different words for "obey" in the Vulgate, "obedientia" and "obtempero" perhaps suggest that the one is regarded as obedientia par excellence, the τὴν ὑπακοήν τὴν κατ' ἐξοχήν?

When did Christ learn this obedience? Much of His obedience is posterior to the Gethsemane scene and must be subsumed under the category τὴν ὑπακοήν, which was the result of what He suffered, the execution and application of the

<sup>13</sup>Manson, op. cit., pp. 110-11.

<sup>14</sup>C. Spicq, L'Épître Aux Hébreux (Deuxième édition; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1953), p. 117.

<sup>15</sup>Moffatt, op. cit., p. 67.

lesson which He had already learned. Our text would seem to indicate that  $\overline{\omega\nu}$  <sup>21</sup>  $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu$  ( $\tau\alpha\hat{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$   $\alpha$  <sup>21</sup>  $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu$ ) refer exclusively to the experiences described in verse 7, i.e., those of Gethsemane. The ultimate obedience was learned in Gethsemane. After Gethsemane and on the cross the obedience was only carried out. "But he won the victory [i.e., in Gethsemane] and was now ready for Calvary."<sup>16</sup>

In the Formula of Concord (Thorough Declaration, III, 32) the limitless benefits of His obedience are summarized:

Cum enim inchoata illa iustitia seu renovatio in nobis propter carnem in hac vita imperfecta sit et impura, eius iustitiae ratione persona coram Dei iudicio consistere non potest. Sola autem iustitia obedientiae, passionis et mortis Christi (quae fidei imputatur) coram iudicio Dei stare potest; ita quidem, ut tantum propter hanc obedientiam persona (etiam postquam renovata est et multa bona opera habet atque iam honeste et innocenter vivit) Deo placeat et accepta, in filium Dei adoptata atque heres vitae aeternae scripta sit. (Italics mine)

The Lutheran Confessions, especially in Article III, "Righteousness of Faith," of the Formula of Concord (Thorough Declaration) eloquently affirm the benefits accruing to us from Christ's obedience. At the same time, however, it seems strange that the article fails to establish a nexus between Christ's learning obedience and our benefits from it. While the consummate character of Christ's obedience is frequently adduced, mention of His learning of it or of any kind of

---

<sup>16</sup>A. T. Robertson, Studies in the New Testament (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1915), p. 107.

turmoil or difficulty that Christ might have experienced in learning to obey are absent. The word "obedientia" is used frequently, often with "perfectissima." It occurs in the following paragraphs of the Formula of Concord (Thorough Declaration, III): 4 (2); 9 (2); 11; 12 (cf. also Romans 5:19); 14; 15; 22 (2); 30 (2); 54; 55; 56 (3); 57 (3); 58 (3); 63; 64. Hebrews 5:8 is never used as evidence for Christ's obedience.

<sup>1</sup>  
εμαθεν

Wherein the learning ( <sup>1</sup>εμαθεν ) consisted and what it did and did not involve are summarized in the following four theses:

1. The learning process was not an incrementum sapientiae. However, that Christ acquired such incrementa in His life from the cradle to the cross is not denied by the dogmatists.
2. The learning process was a psychological enrichment, experientially acquired. The circumstances were difficult ones. The learning occurred in and by means of rebus difficilibus, i.e., those of Gethsemane.
3. The learning process was a bringing of His human will into complete submission to the will of the Father. The Father's will is always identical with the divine will of the Savior. Physical evidences of this struggle were also present--demonstrations of the difficulty of this submission of His own

human will to the will of the Father.

4. I reject emphatically the notion that the learning of obedience which occurred via the sufferings in Gethsemane requires, or implies, or even permits, a prior disobedience, or even truncated obedience. What it implies is that His submission to the will of the Father had never been put to such a crucial test earlier, nor would it ever be later. It was the unique moment in the history of the human race when the Creator required obedience from His creature,<sup>17</sup> not merely obedience, but the obedience *κατ' ἐξοχήν* Romans 5:19 *διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δικαίου καταστάθουσιν οἱ πολλοί*, a death whose benefit resulted in freedom from the fear of death for all who believe.<sup>18</sup>

#### Thesis 1

The dogmaticians frequently use "crescere" and "proficere" (especially with "sapientia," but not with "voluntate"), but rarely "discere." When increase, or learning,

---

<sup>17</sup>For an explanation of Christ's creaturehood, compare *infra*, Chapter IV, p. 70f.

<sup>18</sup>"He also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:14-15).



or advance, is ascribed to the Savior, the passages usually cited are Luke 2:40,52.

By observing the distinction employed by the dogmaticians between *κτῆσις* and *χεῖσις*, it is possible to understand the double truth of His knowing all things (cf. Colossians 2:3) and yet being ignorant of many things. The following quotations from the Lutheran dogmaticians point up this paradoxical truth.<sup>19</sup>

An Christus in statu exinanitionis vere quaedam ignoraverit? Affirmat Lutherus in Post. eccles. in Epist. fest. nativ.: Quamvis, inquit humanitas Christi domicilium sit et organicum divinitatis illaque personaliter cum omni sua plenitudine in carne tanquam in proprio suo templo habitet tamen in statu exinanitionis non quovis tempore omnia cogitavit, intellexit, scivit, eo quod divinitas suam *επεργεῖαν* non semper per illam exseruerit. Hanc Lutheri sententiam confirmavimus superius c. 12. q.9 ex Marc. 6, v. 6, c. 13. v. 32; Luc 2, v. 40; Phil 2, v. 7; Heb 2, v. 17.<sup>20</sup>

In commenting on Isaiah 7:15-16, Quenstedt says:

Donec sciat reprobare malum & eligere bonum. Ergo non scivit, ut homo, a primo conceptionis puncto & statim in infantia discernere malum a bono. Idem liquet ex graduall profectu, sive proficientia sapientiae Luc. II.52.<sup>21</sup>

Quaeritur autem hoc loco: Quomodo habitualis illa scientia in Christi humanitate crescere potuerit, cum Omniscientia, quae ipsi in primo conceptionis momento, vere ac realiter communicata est, omnem prorsus ignorantiam excludat?

---

<sup>19</sup>In addition, Quenstedt pp. 172,175,179; Hollaz pp. 710-12; Gerhard, Loci, pp. 471,584 could be compared.

<sup>20</sup>Gerhard, Loci, p. 601.

<sup>21</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 336.

Sed rectissime respondetur: ex distincta consideratione diversorum Statuum CHRISTI: Exinanitionis, & Exaltationis. Nam si Christus jam inde a pueris communicatam Omniscientiam plene usurpare atque exerere voluisset: utique stare non potuisset accretio, vel potius augmentum habitualis illius scientiae.<sup>22</sup>

Scherzer twice states that Christ emptied Himself of omniscience. "Omniscientia se evacuavit, . . . omniscientia evacuavit se ita, ut revera ignoraverit."<sup>23</sup>

### Thesis 2

The fourth meaning of  $\mu\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  in Arndt-Gingrich's lexicon is the one they apply to Hebrews 5:8.

$\mu\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  (4): learn, appropriate to oneself less through instruction than through experience of practice:  $\epsilon\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\phi'\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\eta\nu$  he learned obedience through what he suffered Hb 5:8 . . . [he then illustrates this experiential learning]  $\epsilon\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\mu\iota\ \delta\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$  I have learned, in whatever state I am, to be content Phil 4:11.<sup>24</sup>

Passages are extremely scarce which speak of Christ's empirically acquired knowledge without including mention of the difficulty of the circumstances in which He gained this knowledge. Therefore, most of the quotations which are given stress both factors in Christ's learning. Even the words about the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 42:4, "He shall not

<sup>22</sup>L. Hutter, Loci Communes Theologici (Wittebergae, 1619), p. 172.

<sup>23</sup>J. Scherzer, Systema Theologiae (Editio Tertia Auctior & Correctior; Lipsiae & Francofurti, 1691), p. 222.

<sup>24</sup>William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 491. Hereafter cited as Arndt-Gingrich, Lexicon.

fail nor be discouraged . . ." do not imply ease of victory or a victory accomplished without overcoming obstacles and temptations to deviate from the goal, i.e., the cross. However, the Servant's fiducia cordis was equal to the occasion and overcame the temptation, Isaiah 50:7, "For the Lord God will help me; therefore shall I not be confounded: therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed."

Jésus a acquis une expérience psychologique enrichissante, une compréhension pratique et une appréciation de la souffrance qui lui était indispensable pour compatir comme prêtre à celle de ses frères (cf. μετεπιπαθει, v.2). "Didicit obedientiam, id est quam grave sit obedire, quia ipse obedivit in gravissimis et difficillimis, quia usque ad mortem. Et hic ostendit quam difficile sit bonum obedientiae. Quia qui non sunt experti obedientiam, et non didicerunt eam in rebus difficilibus, credunt quod obedire sit valde facile; sed ad hoc quod scias quid sit obedientia, oportet quod discas obedire in rebus difficilibus. . . . Christus ergo licet ab aeterno sciret simplici notitia quid est obedientia, tamen didicit experimento obedientiam, ex iis quae passus est, id est difficilibus, scilicet per passionem et mortem" (S. Thomas).<sup>25</sup> (Italics mine)

Cum esset Filius, didicit (non tam doctrinae perceptione, quam experimentalis notitia), ex iis quae passus est, obedientiam (i.e. experimento cognovit, sive reipsa expertus est, quanta & quam difficilis res sit, sic DEO obedire, tot cruciatus tolerando, & tandem mortem crucis ignominiosissimam oppetendo). . . ."<sup>26</sup>

reipsa expertus est, quod difficile sit, Deo talem

<sup>25</sup>Spicq, op. cit., pp. 117-18.

<sup>26</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 354.

obedientiam in passione praestare.<sup>27</sup>

Calov interprets the words ἔμαθεν ἁπ' ὧν ἴσπαθεν τῆν  
ὑπακοήν:

Sensus est, Expertus est, in tantis tentationibus, quam sit arduum Deo obedire, ἁπ' ὧν idem est quod ἐξ ὧν . . . Practicus & experimentalis hic est profectus, quomodo apud Herodotum Croesus sibi dicit (γεγενησθαι μάθηματα τὰ παθήματα), id est rebus adversis se redditum esse doctiorem.<sup>28</sup>

That the means of Christ's learning were difficult circumstances is stated by many. Some of them explicitly identify these difficult circumstances with those portrayed in verse 7.

Dieser seiner damaligen Existenzweise gemäsz musste er am Leiden Gehorsam lernen. Wie das geschah, zeigen die dem Hauptsatz ὅς ἔμαθεν vorausgeschickten Participialsätze v.7, die wegen ihres Verhältnisses zum Hauptverbum ebenfalls durch die Zeitbestimmung 7a näher bestimmt sein müssen. In den Tagen seines Fleisches befand sich Christus in einer Lage, dass er Bitten und dringliches Flehen vor den bringen musste, der ihn vor dem Tod bewahren konnte.<sup>29</sup>

Later Riggenbach speaks of a "Gebetskampf [*italics mine*] in Gethsemane."<sup>30</sup> Likewise, Gerhard observes that ἔμαθεν

<sup>27</sup>J. Gerhard, Commentarius Super Epistolam ad Ebraeos (Editio secunda; Jenae, 1561), pp. 110f. Hereafter cited as Gerhard, Commentary.

<sup>28</sup>A. Calov, Biblia Novi Testamenti Illustrata (Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1719), IV, 1226.

<sup>29</sup>Edward Riggenbach, Der Brief an die Hebraeer, in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Nachf., 1913), XIV, 129.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 131.

<sup>2</sup>αφ' <sup>1</sup>ων <sup>2</sup>επαθεν refers back to verse 7.<sup>31</sup> Lenski says of the two subordinate participles προσενεγκας and εὐακουθεῖς :  
 "By means of this ordeal of pleading and this answer of God, Jesus . . . learned the (full) obedience from what he suffered."<sup>32</sup> Compare also "Cette obéissance, il l'a apprise non seulement dans des souffrances, mais par elles (<sup>2</sup>αφ' <sup>1</sup>ων <sup>2</sup>επαθεν)."<sup>33</sup> (Italics mine)

### Thesis 3

Did Christ have a will of His own? The anthropology of the dogmaticians is a dichotomy, consisting of a corpus organicum and an anima, which includes a voluntas. The most succinct definition of obedience that I have uncovered is that of Chemnitz: "Est enim obedientia, quando humana voluntas divinae subicitur."<sup>34</sup> That Christ's death was voluntary, self-motivated, is discussed further (cf. infra in regard to Hebrews 10:7-9). However, at this point we are most concerned with showing that the learning process involved for

<sup>31</sup>Gerhard, Commentary, p. 111.

<sup>32</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle to James (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938), p. 164.

<sup>33</sup>Jean Hering, L'Épître aux Hébreux in Commentaire du nouveau testament (Neuchâtel Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1954), XII, 54.

<sup>34</sup>M. Chemnitz, Loci Theologici (Francofurti & Wittebergae, 1690), p. 69. Hereafter cited as Chemnitz, Loci.

Jesus the submission of His human will to the divine will of His Father. Probably the clearest delineation of this that I have read is Riggerbach's.

Die ihm als Sohn eignende Gewisheit uneingeschraenkten Anteils an Gottes Leben und ungetruebten Besitzes der goettlichen Liebe liesz ihm das Leidensgeschick als etwas Fremdartiges empfinden und stellte ihn vor die Versuchung, seinen eignen Willen dem goettlichen entgegenzusetzen (2,18). Diese Versuchung ueberwand Jesus nur dadurch, dasz er seine von vornherein vorhandene Willigkeit zum Gehorsam gegen Gott auch dieser besonderen und besonders schweren Aufgabe gegenueber zur Tat werden liesz. Indem er auch da sich dem Willen Gottes unbedingt unterordnete, wo dieser die Aufopferung seiner eigenen Person von ihm forderte, lernte er den Gehorsam im vollen Sinne, d.h. den Verzicht auf die Geltendmachung des eigenen Wuenschens und Begehrens in freier Untergebung unter Gottes Willen. Zu ihrem Abschluss kam diese tatsaechliche Einuebung des Gehorsams erst mit dem Tode Jesu, aber ihre entscheidende Betaetigung fand sie in Gethsemane, als Jesus in der Gewisheit, von Gottes Macht und Liebe die Bewahrung vor dem Tode erbitten zu koennen, sich in ehrerbietiger Scheu Gott unterordnete und in der voelligen Einigung mit Gottes willen die Erhoerung seines Flehens erlangte.

Diese unbedingte Unterordnung Jesu unter Gottes Willen, die das Widerspiel aller eigenmaechtigen Selbsterhoehung bildete, machte seine Bekleidung mit der wuerde des koeniglichen Hoepriestertums von seiten Gottes moeglich.<sup>35</sup>

Many have called attention to the difficulty which this learning process, i.e., submitting His own will to that of the Father, entailed. Some have cited physical evidences of the internal struggle. In his Loci Chemnitz repeats in effect everything that he says in the following quotation:

In Christo vero praeter ingentem moestitiam, fuit etiam inenarrabilis lucta contra illam consternationem,

---

<sup>35</sup>Riggerbach, op. cit., pp. 135-36.

quod tamen voluit Patri obedientiam illam praestare. Ita ex maxima illa consternatione facta est in Christo tanta naturae resolutio, ut nec cor nec venae sanguinem retinuerint. Accessit etiam propter luctam naturae, ex contrariis motibus, qui vehementissimi fuerunt, expulsio sanguinis. Cumque natura fortitudinem suam consumsisset, sicut inquit Isa, cap. 49, sanguis calore naturali destitutus, concretus & inspissatus decurrit, tanquam *ὄρη βου*.

Hae Physicae considerationes non sunt aspernandae, deducunt enim nos, si non ad plenam cognitionem, ad qualemcunque tamen, & piam considerationem agonis Christi, humilitatis & exinanitionis ipsius, ut cogitantes, quid sit, quod Hebr. 5, scriptum est. Ex his, quae passus est, didicit obedientiam, aliquo modo consideremus, quanti Filio Dei Mediatori constiterit nostra redemptio.<sup>36</sup>

Recognition of the extent of the difficulty of the struggle, as well as the ensuing physical results of it, is evident also in the following quotations:

The intense mental struggle manifests itself in several outward phenomena. The words of prayer become more intense, persistent, pleading; and perspiration appears like clots of blood falling to the ground.<sup>37</sup>

Aber so schwer stand die Aufgabe, Priester zu werden, vor ihm, dasz er im Ringen mit dem Leiden, Schritt fuer Schritt, die Haltung des Gehorsams "lernen," sich immer neu erkaempfen musste.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>M. Chemnitz, Libellum De Duabus Naturis in Christo (Francofurti & Wittebergae, 1690), p. 16. Hereafter cited as Chemnitz, De Duabus.

<sup>37</sup>William F. Arndt, Bible Commentary The Gospel According to St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), p. 448.

<sup>38</sup>Hermann Strathmann, Der Brief an die Hebraer in Das Neue Testament Deutsch, herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Johannes Behm (5. Auflage; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), IX, 95.

Non dicimus, Christum post mortem inferni horrores sensisse, sed ante mortem, in horto oliveti; quando sanguineum sudorem profudit, & in cruce.<sup>39</sup>

Additional insight into the real internal struggle of the Suffering Servant can be gained by studying those passages in Isaiah which portray Him. Concerning Isaiah 42:1-4, Delitzsch remarks:

Aber der Knecht Jahve's, der uns hier vorgestellt wird, hat zu starke individuell-persoенliche Zuege, als dasz er ein personificiertes Collectivum sein koennte.<sup>40</sup>

Delitzsch's commentary on Isaiah 50:4ff. reads:

Der Knecht Jahve's gewahrt uns hier einen tiefen Einblick in sein verborgenes Leben. . . . Sein Beruf geht auf Betten, nicht auf Verderben, und fuer diesen Beruf hat er J. zum Bildner, dem er in gelehriger Empfaenglichkeit und unerschuetterlichem Gehorsam sich untergeben. . . . Seit er den Weg dieses Berufes gewandelt ist er vor den Leiden, mit denen er verknuepft ist, so wenig furchtsam zurueckgewichen. . . . Sein Berufsweg fuehrt also durch einen schmachvollen Stand der Erniedrigung hindurch.<sup>41</sup>

#### Thesis 4

In his commentary Gerhard rejects the notion that Christ's learning involves His not having known before. In confirmation of this view he quotes Theodoret:

Theodoretus hoc modo exponit: Ex iis, quae passus est, obedientiam didicit, non quod ante non fuisset obediens

<sup>39</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 409.

<sup>40</sup>Franz Delitzsch, Commentar ueber Das Buch Jesaia (Vierte durchaus neubearbeitete Auflage; Leipzig: Doerfling & Franke, 1889), p. 431.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 495-96.



sed quia passionibus ita fuit exercitatus, ut ex illis obedientiam discere potuisset.<sup>42</sup>

The following three quotations likewise emphasize the absence of any prior disobedience as well as the consummate character of Christ's obedience, which He learned in Gethsemane and which took Him to the cross.

Le Christ, parfait des sa conception, savait obeir a son Pere et n'a pu faire aucun progres dans l'obeissance, mais il avait a deployer cette vertu en toutes circonstances et jusqu' a l'heroisme.<sup>43</sup>

He learned experientially what obedience was.

It was not that He had to learn to obey, for He said, "I do always those things that please him" (John 8:29). Vincent says that "He required the special discipline of a severe human experience as a training for His office as a high priest who could be touched with the feeling of human infirmities. He did not need to be disciplined out of any inclination to disobedience; but as Alford puts it, "the special course of submission by which He became perfected as our high priest was gone through in time, and was a matter of acquirement and practice." This is no more strange than His growth in wisdom (Luke 2:52). Growth in experience was an essential part of His humanity.<sup>44</sup>

Christ made improvement by his sufferings; he learned obedience by his passive obedience; he learned active obedience; that is, he practiced that great lesson, and made it appear that he was well and perfectly learned in it; though he never was disobedient, yet he never performed such an act of obedience as when he became obedient to death, even to the death of the cross.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Gerhard, Commentary, p. 114.

<sup>43</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 117.

<sup>44</sup>Kenneth S. Wuest, Hebrews in the Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), p. 101.

<sup>45</sup>Matthew Henry, An Exposition of the Old and New Testament (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.), V, 618.

## Lutheran Dogmaticians

My study of Lutheran dogmaticians with the intention of discovering how they used Hebrews 5:7-10 in their Christologies has been disappointing because of the paucity of references to this passage, especially to verses 8 and 9. This passage, Hebrews 5:7-10, has indeed been used to advantage by the dogmaticians, but scarcely, and not at all significantly in comparison with their widespread usage of other passages--often less appropriate, it seems to me, as "proof passages."

How often was the passage Hebrews 5:7-10 used? Which of the four verses were used and which were not? When these verses were employed, for what purpose are they used?

The only place in the Lutheran confessions that I have observed in which Hebrews 5:7-10 is used is in the Apology (XXIV), where it is used to refer to the priesthood of Christ.

In his Loci Chemnitz uses Hebrews 5:8 to prove that the Son of God assumed a human nature which is "integra, incorrupta, habens omnes vires & appetitiones naturae proprias."<sup>46</sup> He mentions that Apollinarius misused Hebrews 5:7 to show that Christ had a true corpus but omitted mentioning anything about His anima intelligens.<sup>47</sup> For his use of this passage

---

<sup>46</sup>Chemnitz, Loci, p. 64.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 67.

in De Duabus Naturis compare Chapter III,

Hunnius does not use this passage. Hutter uses it to show that Christ "ter flevisse."<sup>48</sup>

Gerhard uses Hebrews 5:8 to support the first genus of the communication of attributes, according to which the properties of the human nature of Christ are predicated of the Son of God.<sup>49</sup> He says that the phrase "dies carnis" in 5:7 refers to the whole activity of Christ on earth in the state of humiliation.<sup>50</sup> In showing the triple nature of Christ's office, he cites 5:10 to show that Jesus was called "pontifex magnus."<sup>51</sup>

Calov uses Hebrews 5:9 to show that Christ is the only cause of eternal salvation.<sup>52</sup> Concerning the communication of attributes he says that those properties which are human are ascribed to the divine, as 5:8 shows.<sup>53</sup> Of the twelve volumes of Calov's Systema, Tomus Tertius contains the Locus De Filio Dei. Within this vast compass the only use of Hebrews 5:7-10 that I noted is on page 614, where the intention

<sup>48</sup>Hutter, op. cit., p. 125.

<sup>49</sup>Gerhard, Loci, p. 536.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 602.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

<sup>52</sup>A. Calov, Exegema Augustana Confessionis, Art. III, X.III (Editio Altera; Wittebergae, 1665).

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

is that since the Son is equal to the Father except for the subjection to obedience which He adopted, He could not have rendered obedience to Him unless He adopted formam servi.

Quenstedt cites Psalm 110:4 as evidence for Christ's sacerdotal office and observes that Psalm 110:4 is used by Paul in Hebrews 5:10. Among the many passages which Quenstedt cites pointing to the fulfilling of the satisfaction of His sacerdotal office, the purpose of which was acquisition for us of perfect justice, eternal redemption, and salvation, is included Hebrews 5:8-9. This he quotes, and he makes three observations: (a)  $\epsilon\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon$  : experimental character of Christ's learning; (b)  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is a sacerdotal word to show the full completion of all the cleansing; (c) He has become the cause of eternal salvation.

Regarding the other munus of his priesthood, intercessio, Quenstedt notes this difference, that the satisfactio was made in the form of a servant,

Cum clamore valido & lacrymis Hebr. V.7, . . . ista ipsius precatio (cum tota ipsius obedientia conjuncta) fuit pro nostris peccatis & poenis satisfactoria & nostrae salutis, vitaeque aeternae nobis acquirendae, meritoria, Hebr. V.7.9,"

but the intercessio, which is an application of the work He has completed, He continues to offer.<sup>54</sup>

After defining the "Duratio Exinanitionis" as extending from the first moment of the personal union through the time

---

<sup>54</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 329.

in the sepulchre, he corroborates this interpretation:

Hoc Christo in his terris curriculum Paulus Hebr. V.7. appellat dies carnis Christi: Quibus verbis per Hebraismum significatur illud tempus, quo Christus inter homines passibilis versatus fuit 2 Cor. V.17. quo fuit infirmitatibus carnis, absque omni tamen peccato, obnoxius.<sup>55</sup>

He then quotes Dorscheus to the effect that the days of His flesh are contrasted with His eternal existence.<sup>56</sup>

The purpose of Christ's suffering was two-fold: the removal and abolition of evils and the restitution of the gifts. In speaking of this latter benefit, he says: "Coeli reseratio, sive spei ac juris ad vitam aeternam reparatio Hebr. V.8.

...<sup>57</sup> On page 354 he repeats in essence (and almost verbatim) what he had said on pages 252-53: Hebrews 5:7 shows the intensity and profundity of Christ's suffering; the "dolores" were not only of the "corporis, sed etiam & quidem praecipue animae," as is shown "quando dicitur, Christum deprecationes & supplicationes obtulisse  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \kappa\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  ἰσχυρὰς καὶ δακρυόωδους."<sup>58</sup>

Koenig does not use the passage. To establish Christ's sacerdotal function and intercession--even for eternity--Scherzer quotes Psalm 110:4 and Hebrews 5:10 together.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 338.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., p. 353.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., pp. 357-58.

"Apostolus sacrificium Christi proprie in expiatione & intercessione pro nobis Hebr. V, 6.7."<sup>59</sup> There are only two references to it in Baier: on page 106 in a quotation from Gerhard to show that in verse 7 the phrase "days of His flesh" refers to Jesus' whole life on earth and on page 108, where the reason for the reference to verse 7 is doubtful.<sup>60</sup> Hollaz uses 5:9 to show that Christ is the author of eternal salvation. "Jesus est Salvator. . . . Est igitur Jesus . . . auctor salutis aeternae, Hebr. v.9. in quo solo nostra salus quaeritur & invenitur, . . . sive ex jure sanguinis noster redemptor."<sup>61</sup> "Alio nomine, huic simillimo, quando quidem non ipsa Christi humanitas, sed eius humilitas indicatur nomine dierum carnis, Hebr. V,7."<sup>62</sup>

A cause of this neglect of Hebrews 5:7-10 by the dogmatists is not any kind of scruple regarding the dubious canonical character of the Epistle to the Hebrews because the epistle is quoted with extreme frequency, especially 1:3; 2:9-10,14-18; 4:14-18; 10:5-9, and others.

The Lutheran dogmatists stoutly champion the veritas,

---

<sup>59</sup>Scherzer, op. cit., p. 215.

<sup>60</sup>J. G. Baier, Compendium Theologiae Positivae, denuo edendum curavit Walther (Editio auctior et emendatior; in urbe Sancti Ludovici, 1874), Vol. III, Pars Tertia, Sectio Prima, pp. 106,108.

<sup>61</sup>D. Hollaz, Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum (Holmiae et Lipsiae, 1710), p. 654.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 652.

integritas, et <sup>ς</sup> ομοουσία naturae humanae Christi against all heretics, ancient and contemporary.<sup>63</sup> This effort of theirs is no sham. The quotations which follow illustrate this. However, hardly ever is Hebrews 5:7-10 used. It can be said with certainty that this passage is never used as a sedes doctrinae.

Est autem vera scripturae sententia, Filium Dei assumpsisse humanam naturam, veram, integram, seu totam, consubstantiali nobis, habentem omnes conditiones, vires & appetitiones naturae, proprias & ordinatas, non vitiosam, sed sine peccato, incorruptam & sanctam, in qua tamen infirmitates, quae, ut poenae propter peccatum in naturam nostram ingressae sunt, volens sine vitio assumpsit, propter nos, ut fieret victima pro nobis.<sup>64</sup>

Si Christus non assumpsisset animam ab anima Mariae, animam humanam non redemisset. Nam τὸ ἀπροσλήπτον, ἂ θεοῦ πνεύματος, quod Christus non assumpsit, non sanavit,<sup>65</sup> inquit GREGOR. NAZIANZENUS epist. 2. ad Cleodonium.

Similarly, Gerhard allows no foreshortening of Christ's humanity as the following excerpts from his Loci evidence.

Natura Christi humana est essentia seu substantia humana anima rationali et corpore organico constans, qua Christus nobis hominibus consubstantialis est.<sup>66</sup>

In Christo est vera, integra et perfecta natura humana, ac proinde etiam Christus est verus, perfectus et naturalis homo.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>63</sup>Cf. e.g., Quenstedt, p. 125 and Hutter, p. 122.

<sup>64</sup>Chemnitz, De Duabus, p. 9.

<sup>65</sup>Hollaz, op. cit., p. 662.

<sup>66</sup>Gerhard, Loci, p. 463.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 483.

Gerhard also quotes with approval John the Damascene:

"Θεὸς ὢν τέλειος ἄνθρωπος τέλειος γίνεται."<sup>68</sup>

Having determined that the dogmaticians have established the genuineness of Christ's humanity, it is necessary to investigate what this entails: What is man and what are the proprietales essentialis humanitatis? The anthropology of the dogmaticians is a dichotomy, corpus organicum and anima, which is rational as well as sensitive and vegetative.<sup>69</sup>

Their indebtedness to Aristotle for this is explained later.

"Verus homo constat e corpore organico & anima intelligente."<sup>70</sup>

Gerhard emphasizes the genuineness of Christ's corpus by reference to two passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews:

Collationis gratia huc referri posset, quod Christus corpus suum vocat τὸν ἄνθρωπον Joh. 2, v. 19, quod apostoli illud vocant σκηνήν Joh. 1, v. 14. Hebr. 9, v. 11 κατὰ πῆξασμα Hebr. 10, v. 20.<sup>71</sup>

What was the nature of Christ's anima, i.e., the true human anima? It was not merely vegetative but rational, and this latter description involves the will. There is an interesting passage in which Hollaz ascribes to Christ's anima intelligens growth in sapientia and possession of a voluntas, but nothing is said of any progress in the voluntas. "Habet

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 592.

<sup>69</sup>Chemnitz, Loci, p. 68.

<sup>70</sup>Hollaz, op. cit., p. 657.

<sup>71</sup>Gerhard, Loci, p. 511.



animam intelligentem, secundum quam profecit sapientia Luc. II.52 & voluntate praeditam, Io. V,21. Matth. XXVI,39."<sup>72</sup>  
(Italics mine)

Gerhard also observes that Christ's human nature involved willing. "Filius Dei assumpsit integram et perfectam humanam naturam. Ergo etiam veram animam intelligendi et volendi facultate praeditam."<sup>73</sup>

Chemnitz describes Christ's anima: "Humana natura in Christo, habet suam propriam voluntatem, quae non in anima vegetativa, sed rationali & intelligenti collocatur."<sup>74</sup>

What are the proprietaes essentialis naturae humanae? In all the catalogues of human attributes presented by the dogmatists there is never included "to learn" (although the terms "proficere" and "crescere" appear) nor "to obey." Gerhard's list includes "edere, bibere, dormire, esurire, pati etc."<sup>75</sup> Quenstedt gives "crescere, pati, mori."<sup>76</sup> The Formula of Concord (Thorough Declaration, VIII, 10) includes "finitum et circumscriptum esse, pati, mori, ascendere, descendere, de loco in locum moveri, esurire, sitire, algere,

---

<sup>72</sup>Hollaz, op. cit., p. 657.

<sup>73</sup>Gerhard, Loci, p. 590.

<sup>74</sup>Chemnitz, Loci, p. 68.

<sup>75</sup>Gerhard, Loci, p. 484.

<sup>76</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 96.

aestu affligi, et si quae sunt similia." "Crevit coram Deo simul et hominibus."<sup>77</sup>

Luther observes that everything that belongs to the human nature in Christ is also communicated to the divine nature.

Also dasz recht und wahrhaftig gesagt wird: Gott wird geboren, gestillet oder gessaueget, lieget in der Krippen, frieret, gehet, stehet, faellet, wandert, wachet, isset, trinket, leidet, stirbt ac.<sup>78</sup>

The only three places in which Christ's learning (or being taught, doceri) is referred to in the Christologies of the dogmaticians studied are Quenstedt, pages 252-53, and Chemnitz De Duabus, page 16, in both of which Hebrews 5:8 is used as a proof passage, and De Duabus, page 86.

Caro itaq; quae in Christo, ad summam post hac fiduciam hominis trasformabatur, docebatur mortem non pertimescere. Discente & incipiente nostra natura in primo Christo viriliter agere & praevidere contra incursus.<sup>79</sup> (Italics mine)

Perhaps one reason for the neglect of the question, "what did Christ learn?" with more attention to the question, "what could He learn?" is that the dogmaticians spend much more time on the person than on the work of Christ. Most of the Christological loci are tripartite: person, offices,

---

<sup>77</sup>Hunnius, op. cit., p. 26.

<sup>78</sup>Luther, Vermischte deutsche Schriften, p. 38.

<sup>79</sup>Chemnitz, De Duabus, p. 86.

states. The first of these three is usually the longest. As an extreme example of this, Hollaz devotes pages 650-764 to the person of Christ, and the entire locus extends only to page 790. Do the dogmaticians tend to view the person of Jesus Christ, make statements about His two natures and their relation to one another, and then draw a priori conclusions about the kind of things that could happen to Christ instead of viewing His work as limned in the New Testament and then draw a posteriori conclusions about what did happen? Concerning Hebrews 5:7-10 Manson says, "No theoretical reflection on the qualifications of priests or upon the dogma of Messiah's sinlessness," writes Dr. Moffatt, 'could have produced such passages as these.'<sup>80</sup> Spicq quotes the same statement of Moffatt, also with approval.<sup>81</sup>

That there was such an emphasis on the person of Christ, to the neglect of the work of Christ, is shown by Pelikan:

There are discernible in the Chalcedonian settlement, as in some of the earlier conciliar decisions, marks of a Greek preoccupation with the person of Christ rather than with the work of Christ. . . . The ancient Church has given us an interpretation of the person of Christ worked out in meticulous detail, but no interpretation of the work of Christ. . . .<sup>82</sup> (Italics mine)

Perhaps a similar evaluation of the Lutheran Christologies

---

<sup>80</sup>Manson, op. cit., p. 109.

<sup>81</sup>Spicq, op. cit., p. 113.

<sup>82</sup>Jaroslav Pelikan, "Chalcedon After Fifteen Centuries," Concordia Theological Monthly (December, 1951), pp. 931f.

would be true because

the major Christological controversy of Western theological history did not come until more than a millennium later. This was the controversy between the Lutheran and the Reformed, presaged in Luther's soteriological Christology as stated against Zwingli. Both sides saw parallels to their opponents' viewpoint in one or another ancient heresy. The Lutherans called the Reformed "Nestorians," and the Reformed called the Lutherans "Eutychians." As a result of this polemic, Lutheran theologians devoted much research to ancient Christology and to Chalcedon. . . .<sup>83</sup>

One of the major problems Baillie investigates in his book God Was in Christ is that of two opposite dangers, namely, making Christ too divine, at the expense of not making Him human enough, and making Him too human, at the peril of not regarding Him as divine enough. In treating the former danger, Baillie says:

The Ritschlian school generally was deeply suspicious of the intrusion of metaphysics into Christian theology, and this was closely connected with its emphasis on the historical Jesus as distinct from the Christ of dogma. To Harnack, the church historian of the school, the history of the early Christian centuries was a story of the gradual adulteration of the original Galilean Gospel through the infiltration of Greek philosophy, and thus the true hope of Christian theology must be in a movement back to the Jesus of history from the metaphysical dogmas about His Person. Similarly, to Herrmann, the greatest pure theologian of the school, the starting-point of Christian faith, and therefore of Christian theology, must never be in ready-made metaphysical dogmas about Christ, but in the historical Jesus with whom we are confronted in the Gospel story, and whose inner life becomes to the honest seeker the very revelation of God. . . . In 1922 a great Anglican bishop wrote: "Medieval theology allowed itself, by the misuse of dogmatic authority, to obscure the real meaning of our Lord's humanity. The truth came to us in such a book

---

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 933.

as Ecce Homo, and from countless other teachers, with a fresh thrill of delight.<sup>84</sup>

Perhaps a reason for the omission of a study and use of Hebrews 5:8 and an application of Christ's learning, with its potentially rich exegetical fruit, is contained in the summary of this period by Pelikan. "The exegetical and historical effort which sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutheranism expended on its Christology is perhaps its greatest achievement in the field of theological scholarship."<sup>85</sup> But, alas, in the dogmatical efforts, exegesis was left behind, and the Christology becomes more philosophical than Biblical.

In this controversy the Crypto-Kenotic as in other intramural controversies within Lutheranism, exegesis was left behind in favor of philosophy. By the seventeenth century the days of eminent Biblical scholarship were beginning to pass in the Lutheran Church. . . . The fact that the great seventeenth-century theologians were its dogmaticians rather than its exegetes means, . . . that in the press of controversy Lutheran theologians would have increasing recourse to the aid which philosophical speculation could give them in beating down their adversaries.<sup>86</sup>

When applied to the human nature of Christ, Aristotelian psychology was instrumental in formulating the listings and classifications of attributes in Lutheran discussions of the communicatio idiomatum. It produced long and learned speculations on the inner consciousness of Jesus before, during, and after His death. It was responsible for interesting interpretations of Jesus' saying: "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death."<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup>D. M. Baillie, God Was in Christ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), pp. 32-33.

<sup>85</sup>Jaroslav Pelikan, From Luther to Kierkegaard (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950).

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., pp. 57-58.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

Cf. Aegidius Hunnius, De persona Christi, eiusque ad dextram Dei sedentis divina maiestate (Franckfort, 1590), p. 27: "tristis est anima mea, eusque ad mortem: Quod de Divinitate explicari nequit, quippe quae nec tristitiae . . . capax est. . . . Proinde veram quoque animam assumpsit: neque vero eam vegetativam duntaxat et sensitivum, sed rationalem spiritum." The latter distinction of the vegetative, sensitive, and rational soul is taken from Aristotle.<sup>88</sup>

I would like to affirm decisively that I have not tried to create the impression that there is a tension or difference between the exegetical meaning of Hebrews 5:7-10 and the Christological formulations of the Lutheran dogmaticians. However, the real tensions of His double nature and single person which do exist could perhaps be seen more clearly with some assistance from Hebrews 5:7-10, which the dogmaticians have almost completely shunned but could have used as excellent, cogent proof to substantiate some of their theses.

Reference to the dogmaticians in this study and the hearing accorded them in no degree reflects the genuine worth (in some cases) of their Christological formulations. I have tried to glean the uses these men have made of Hebrews 5:7-10 but little more. Perhaps I have succumbed more often than necessary to discussing their Christological loci somewhat from a dogmatic and even philosophical standpoint, but even this was done with the intention of setting it up as a foil to their exegetical use or lack of use ("abuse" would be too strong) of Hebrews 5:7-10.

---

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 148, fn. 146.

## CHAPTER IV

### OTHER PASSAGES IN HEBREWS WHICH PUNCTUATE

#### CHRIST'S HUMANITY

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has an exalted estimate of the God-man Jesus Christ. He describes Him as the Son of God who is the very ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης (Heb. 1:3). But the author also is deeply concerned with portraying Christ's full humanity. He does this in the course of the entire epistle, and furthermore this portrayal of Christ's full humanity is reflected throughout much of the epistle. The following represents an effort to highlight those significant statements found here and there in the epistle which underscore the writer's understanding of the human nature of Christ.

God's utterance ἐν υἱῷ (the absence of the article adds to the qualitative force; compare supra, Chapter II, pages 9 and 10) was far superior to God's utterances in the Old Testament spoken through the prophets. This ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν υἱῷ in Hebrews 1:1-2 (= Λόγος of John 1:1ff.) occurred only after the Λόγος had become the Λόγος ἑνσάρκος, and it occurred with finality. The τελείωσις has been accomplished, with the result that God no longer speaks πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (Heb. 1:1). Having spoken with finality in a Son, He now confirmed the proclamation

of the Son through σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῦ (Heb. 2:4) and will continue to do so until the end of time.

Although He was the Son of God (cf. Heb. 1:8; 4:14; 6:6; 7:3 et al.), not merely a son, Jesus' common nature with humanity is never truncated in the Scriptures, but rather magnified. (Compare especially 2:5-10; 2:14ff.) "He was not ashamed to call them brethren" (Heb. 2:11). "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (John 20:17).

Yet, there is a distinction between Christ's filial relation with the Father and ours. The difference in the kinds of sonship is revealed by the fact that He was instructed al-  
though the Son, καίπερ ὢν υἱός, but we are instructed be-  
cause we are sons. Furthermore, He was instructed διὰ παθημάτων (2:9) and ἔπαθεν (5:8), but our instruc-  
tion is via παιδεία (12:5ff.).

Lenski observes that we have the interpretation of Hebrews 5:9 "in the interpretation of 2,10."<sup>1</sup> He says that the thought of 5:9-10 "is the same thought that was expressed in 2,10. . . ."

We have the same agent, namely God; the same means, namely suffering; the same verb τσάριουῦν, to bring

---

<sup>1</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle to James (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938), p. 165.



to a τέλος or goal, "to make complete"; the same object: "the Author of their salvation"--"the cause of eternal salvation"; finally, the same beneficiaries: many sons being brought to glory--all those obeying him. So also 2,10 ends with 2,17-18, the merciful and faithful High Priest who was tried and tempted.<sup>2</sup>

With regard to the verb τελειόω, Windisch observes: "τελειόων wird im Hebr. dreimal von Jesus ausgesagt, 2.10; 5.9; und 7.28."<sup>3</sup>

In Hebrews 2:6 the question is posed: "What is man?" This question had already been asked at a much earlier date. According to the Authorized Version, David asks the question in Psalm 8:4 (8:5 in Kittel's Biblia Hebraica וְיִשְׂרָאֵלִים יִשְׂרָאֵלִים). Part of Luther's answer to this question is in his commentary on Psalm 8:6, "Du hast ihn wenig niedriger gemacht, denn Gott, und mit Ehre und Schmuck hast du ihn gekroent."

Er redet nicht vom leiblichen Leiden Christi, welches auch gross und schwer ist; sondern von seinem hohen geistlichen Leiden, so er gefuehlt hat an seiner Seele, welches Leiden alles leibliche Leiden weit uebertrifft. Dasselbe hohe Leiden beschreibt er im hoechsten Grad und spricht: Du wirst ihn eine kleine Zeit lassen von Gott verlassen sein.<sup>4</sup>

Grant interprets Psalm 8 in a manner similar to that of Luther. "Stressing the phrases which point to Jesus' glorification and emphasizing transitoriness of His subjection

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Hans Windisch, "Der Hebraerbrief," Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1913), Vierter Band, Dritter Teil, p. 44.

<sup>4</sup>Martin Luther, Das Lutherwort zum Psalter (Leipzig: Verlag und Buecherstube der Maedchen-Bibel-Reise, 1930), p.37.

(Heb. 2:5-10)," the author of Hebrews uses Psalm 8 to show that Jesus is not inferior to the angels.<sup>5</sup> After quoting Psalm 8:6-8, Quenstedt says:

Confer. Hebr. II.6. I.Cor. XV.27. ex quorum locorum collatione evidentissimum sit, haec de Christo dici secundum hum. nat. secundum quam mortem pro nobis gustavit & paulo minoratus fuit infra angelos.<sup>6</sup>

I would like to submit two other answers to the question: "What is man?" The first is that of Bultmann, who defines the Christian concept of man as opposed to that of the Greek tradition.

It is clear that the early Christian doctrine of man is diametrically opposed to that which prevailed in the Greek tradition. Man is not regarded as an instance of universal human Being. . . . There is no attempt to escape from the questionableness of man's own individuality by concentrating on the universal law or the cosmic harmony. Christ had his own cup, John 18:11, which can be rendered: "That cup which the Father has given to Me shall not I drink it?" Like Gnosticism, primitive Christianity was totally uninterested in education or training. It had no use for the Greek dualistic anthropology, with its tension between spirit and sensuality, or the view of life which that implied, viz. the realization of the ideal of the "gentleman" as a "work of art." Man's essential being is not Logos, reason, or spirit. If we ask primitive Christianity where the essential being of man resides, there can only be one answer: in the will.<sup>7</sup> (*Italics mine*)

I would like to submit another answer to the same

---

<sup>5</sup>Robert M. Grant, The Bible in the Church (New York: Macmillan Company, 1954), p. 32.

<sup>6</sup>J. Quenstedt, Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologicum (Wittebergae, 1696), p. 202.

<sup>7</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, translated by R. H. Fuller (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), p. 180.

question, which I do not regard as essentially different from Bultmann's. I simply expand his answer "in the will" to "in the will, i.e., to obey God, in any and all circumstances." I arrived at this answer by the following sorites:

(a) hominem esse est creatari; (b) hominem creatari est A DEO creatari; (c) quia a Deo homo creatatur, sequitur quod homo oportet obtemperare Deo.

That Christ was a true man, i.e., a creature, is supported by Colossians 1:15,18. It is also Chemnitz's own view, in support of which he adduces Augustine, Leo, and Luther.

Multi timore trepidant, ne Christum esse creaturam dicere compellantur. Nos proclamamus, non esse periculum dicere, Christum esse creaturam. Augustinus in sermone Domini in monte: Qui ist creator, voluit esse creatura.

Leo de nativitate Domini: Deus, qui semper est, & qui semper erat, fit creatura. . . . Luther . . . dicit: . . . Humanitas Christi est Creatura.<sup>8</sup>

Gerhard answers the question: "Was Christ a creature?" in the following quotations: "Humana in Christo natura in sese considerata adorari non potest, cum sit creatura.

. . .<sup>9</sup>

An Christus secundum humanam naturam sit creatura. Ariani contendebant Logos secundum se, etiam non assumpta

---

<sup>8</sup>M. Chemnitz, Libellum De Duabus Naturis in Christo (Francfurti & Wittebergae, 1690), p. 70. Hereafter cited as De Duabus.

<sup>9</sup>J. Gerhard, Loci Theologici (Tomus primus; Berolini, 1863), p. 570. Hereafter cited as Gerhard, Loci.

humana natura, esse creaturam factam ex nihilo, Patri nequaquam homocousion, ideo veteres propter Arianorum insidias rejecerunt hanc propositionem: Christus est creatura. Sed propter Suenkfeldium, qui negavit Christum quoad humanam naturam esse creaturam, in conventu Schmalcaldico an 1537. haec phrasis de Christo secundum humanam naturam fuit usurpata. Improbamus (inquiunt) Suenkfeldii delirium et dicimus humanam naturam in Christo et manere et esse creaturam, ut Johannes inquit: Verbum caro factum est.<sup>10</sup>

In the section 3:1 to 4:13 Christ's superiority over two prototypes of Himself in the Old Testament is shown, that is, Moses and Joshua.

In 3:1 the one definite article with the two nouns shows that the one person, Jesus, is both the one commissioned by God, fully empowered and authorized by God ( $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ) and also the one capable of representing man in his approach to God ( $\alpha\epsilon\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ ). He has adequate credentials for moving in either direction with efficacy and authority: from God to man ( $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ) and from man to God ( $\alpha\epsilon\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ ). The former set of credentials is especially explicated in the Gospel of St. John in Christ's discourses in that book. The latter set is accredited in Hebrews 4:14-5:10, especially in 5:8. Actually the  $\alpha\epsilon\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  motif is not carried from 4:14-5:10 only, but all the way through 10:18. Thus 4:14-10:18 comprises the next section. The assurances ( $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\alpha\iota$ ) of Christ's sufficiency in 3:1-6 are succeeded by the parenthesis (3:7-4:13) not to lose these benefits of Christ as the

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 490.

Old Testament people of God failed to obtain the benefits God had designed for them.

In 4:14ff. we are reminded that we have become sharers with Him (3:14) because He has become a co-human, a sharer with us. Actually this theme had been stated already in 2:14ff., but now it is more fully explicated. With regard to the word *συνπαθέω* in 4:15, Dods says:

*Συνπαθέω* [to be distinguished from *συνπάσχω* which occurs in Rom. 8:17 and I Cor. 12:26, and means to suffer along with one, to suffer the same ills as another] means to feel for, or sympathize with, and occurs also in x.34, and is peculiar in N. T. to this writer but found in Aristotle, Isocrates and Plutarch.  
. . .<sup>11</sup>

The expression *ππειρασθῆναι δὲ κατὰ πάντα κατ'ὁμοιότητα* allows no belittling of Christ's temptations in comparison with ours nor diminution of their genuineness and integrity. The genuineness and extent of the temptations to which Jesus was subjected are insisted upon by Dods and Chemnitz.<sup>12</sup>

*κατ'ὁμοιότητα* may either mean "according to the likeness of our temptations," or, "in accordance with His likeness to us." The latter is preferable, being most in agreement with 11.17. . . . The writer wishes to preclude the common fancy that there was some peculiarity in Jesus which made His temptation wholly different from ours, that He was a mailed champion exposed to toy arrows. . . . The one difference between our temptations and those of Jesus is that His were *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*. Riehm thinks this expression is not exhausted by declaring the fact that in Christ's case temptation never resulted in sin. It means, he thinks, further, and rather, that temptation never in Christ's

<sup>11</sup>Marcus Dods, "The Epistle to the Hebrews," The Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), IV, 283.

<sup>12</sup>See Chemnitz, De Duabus, p. 87.

case sprang from any sinful desire in Himself. So also Delitzsch, Weiss, Westcott, etc.<sup>13</sup> (Italics mine)

By contrast with this human Jesus, who was without sin, we are constantly surrounded without and informed within by sin. It is this contrast between Jesus and ourselves which is precisely the intention, it seems to me, of 12:1. In that passage sin is described by its omnipresent characteristic, ἡ ἐντελειότητος ἀμαρτίας.

Jesus' disinclination to die was not sinful. It was χρεὶς ἀμαρτίας. If the upshot of this disinclination had been the perseverance in it and rejection of death, in opposition to the Father's will that He die, it would have been sinful.

We have now arrived (in our broad sketch of the entire letter, studied as the matrix from which 5:7-10 has emanated) at the immediate context. There is a general tendency to conceive verses 1-4 of Chapter 5 as a statement of the two requirements of priests, namely, the ability to sympathize and the validity of the call from God. The next section, verses 5-10, contains the validation of Christ's qualifications to be a high priest, in chiasmic arrangement.

Riggenbach's analysis differs in one respect from the preceding analysis. He regards verses 5-10 as answering to the second requirement only, that of a call from God. This differs from the analysis of the preceding paragraph which

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 284.

interprets verses 5-6 as showing the fulfillment of the call from God and verses 7-10 as demonstrating His sympathy with mankind.

Jesus besitzt ja die unentbehrlichen Erfordernisse jedes Hohenpriesters 5,1-10, naemlich  
 a. den Anteil an menschlicher Schwachheit 5,1-3,  
 b. die Berufung durch Gott 5,4-10, wie sie sich vollzieht durch das Verheiszungswort der Schrift 5,5f., durch die den Gehorsam Jesu kroenende Vollendung seiner Person und seines Heilandsberufs 5,7-10.<sup>14</sup>

Man irrt, wenn man . . . unter Berufung auf  $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\varsigma$  5,7 annimmt, die Parallele zu v.1-3 folge erst v.7-10. Von einem Opfer ist, wie sich zeigen wird, dort nicht die Rede, und die Schwachheit Jesu wird v.7-10 unter einen ganz anderen Gesichtspunkt gestellt als v.1-3. Nicht als Grund fuer das Mitgefuehl Jesu mit den Brueedern kommt sie dort in Betracht, sondern als Veranlassung zu williger Unterordnung unter Gott in demuetigem Gehorsam. So fuegt sich der Abschnitt 5,7ff. der andersgearteten Betrachtungsweise ein, zu welcher der Vf v.4 uebergeht.<sup>15</sup>

The section 5:11-6:20 is a digression. When he wrote 5:10, the author was on the verge of the extended Melchizedek discourse, for he had prepared the readers for it by twice mentioning Melchizedek, in 5:6,10. This discourse, which is contained in Chapter 7, was postponed until the writer had completed the urgent, monitory section, 5:11-6:8, which he palliates, or rather casts into its proper focus, in 6:9-12. This he does on the basis of God's reliability and faithfulness

<sup>14</sup> Edward Rigggenbach, Der Brief an die Hebraeer, in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1913), XIV, p. xxix.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 126.

which he demonstrates in 6:13-20. Then, recalling that the next topic was that of the comparison of Jesus' priesthood with Melchizedek's, he explains what it means that Jesus was a high priest *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ*. In 7:1 he resumes that which he had been prepared to say earlier, already in 5:10. The derailment which ensued perhaps became longer than he was himself aware that it would become when he began it in 5:11.

Or, perhaps the author fears that the subject just treated in 5:10 is so difficult (5:11 *δυσσεμνήν εὐτος λέγειν*) that it might be a stumbling block. Consequently, he quickly suggests some cautions and warnings. After these, he picks up the next major topic (7:1-10:18).

In the section 7:1-10:18 the high priesthood of Christ is treated intensively. By denominating Christ "a priest," the Epistle to the Hebrews is unique among the books of the New Testament. "The only formal discourse of the priestly work of Jesus Christ occurs in Hebrews."<sup>16</sup> "Dans le Nouveau Testament, les titres de pretre (1) et de grand Pretre (2) ne sont attribues au Christ que par l'epitre aux Hebreux."<sup>17</sup>

Luther provides an exalted estimate of the Epistle to the Hebrews because of the comfort it affords through its

---

<sup>16</sup>A. T. Robertson, Studies in the New Testament (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1915), p. 247.

<sup>17</sup>C. Spicq, L'Epitre Aux Hebreux (Deuxieme edition; Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1953), p. 119.



account of Christ's priestly acts.

In der heiligen Schrift ist kein Buch, in welchem so fein und eigentlich beschrieben ist das Priesterthum des Herr Christi, als die Epistel zun Hebraeern. Christi Priesterthum aber troestet ueberaus sehr die Gottfuerchtigen, dasz er ein Pfaff ist.<sup>18</sup>

St. Paul never speaks of Jesus as a priest. However, he does refer to the sacrificial offering in Ephesians 5:2

παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφοράν καὶ θυσίαν.

St. Paul suggests the same idea in Galatians 1:4 (though he here omits the sacerdotal terms *θυσία* and *προσφορά*)

"δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν" and in I Cor. 5:7 "τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη χριστός."

The unparalleled importance of Psalm 110 as the matrix of many of the thoughts of the Letter to the Hebrews is confirmed by much more than the explicit, or tacit, references to it in Hebrews 5:6; 7:21,28. The following quotations demonstrate how the thoughts of Psalm 110, which Jesus applied to Himself in all three Synoptics, permeate this epistle.<sup>19</sup> (Christ applies Psalm 110:4 to Himself in Matthew 22:44 and parallels. Commenting on the verse in Psalm 110

<sup>18</sup>Martin Luther, Vermischte deutsche Schriften, Vol. VI edited by Johann Konrad Irmischer in Saemtliche Werke (Erlangen: Heyder and Zimmer, 1853), LVIII, 22.

<sup>19</sup>A study of the index of Old Testament passages used in the New Testament, as found at the end of Nestle's edition of the Greek New Testament, reveals that there are more quotations and uses of Psalm 110:1 than of any other verse of the Old Testament.

("Der Herr hat geschworen und wird ihn nicht gereuen, Du bist ein Priester. . . ."), Luther says: "Das ist der schoenste, herrlichste Vers im ganzen Psalter. . . ."20

Diesz ist der rechte hohe Haeuptpsalm von unserm lieben Herrn Jesu Christo gemacht, darin beide, seine Person, . . . und seine Auferstehung, Himmelfahrt und ganzes Reich so klar und gewaltiglich beschriben wird, dasz deszgleich nirgend in der Schrift des Alten Testaments zu lesen ist.<sup>21</sup>

Concerning Psalm 110:8 ("Er wird trinken in seiner Wegfahrt von dem Wasserstrom"), Luther comments:

Dieser acht Vers thut Anzeigung von dem Leiden Christi, unsers Herrn, durch welches er ist zu beruhrter Ehre und Gewalt kommen, und durch das zeitlich Leiden worden ein Haupt aller Ding. . . . Wasser in der Schrift heiszt Leiden.<sup>22</sup>

Und in seiner Wegfahrt, das ist, in seinem Leben, das do ein Lauf oder Wegk ist, zu dem Tod; aber nach dem End dies Wegs wird er Nichts leiden, sondern sich ewig freuen. Compare Heb. 12:2

Er ist gehorsam worden bis an den Tod des Kreuz. Darumb hat ihm Gott erhoecht.<sup>23</sup> (*Italics mine*)

Manson discusses Psalm 110 at some length and concurs wholeheartedly with Luther in his exalted estimate of this Psalm:

The survey we have now concluded will have made plain the extent to which the Epistle to the Hebrews is

<sup>20</sup>Luther, Vermischte deutsche Schriften, p. 23.

<sup>21</sup>Martin Luther, Exegetische deutsche Schriften, Vol. VIII edited by Johann Konrad Irmischer in Saemtliche Werke (Erlangen: Carl Heyder, 1846), p. 39.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

dominated by one great Old Testament oracle--Psalm cx. Here, in verses 1 and 4 combined, we have, as far as Old Testament prophecy can provide it, the charter-document of the writer's Christology, and for him the provision is absolute. Here is the word of the Oath, which, pointing to the advent of the better hope through which we draw near to God (vii.19-22), announces the Eternal Order which supersedes the Law (vii.28). . . . In view of the frequency with which this Psalm appears and reappears in Hebrews, like the sun's light seen through trees, it is idle to put down the doctrine of Christ's eternal High-Priesthood to a "flash of inspiration" on the part of the writer, or to a "gnosis" to which he has come, an ingenious mental exercise of the order of Philo's speculations on the Logos, a Biblical student's lucubrations on the Old Testament hierarchy. The truth for him was written on the sky. The 110th Psalm exercised a great influence on the primitive Christian mind, and verse 4 was a part of that Psalm.<sup>24</sup>

Another contact between Manson and Luther in their regard for this Psalm is the value they attach to the oath. Just as, in the citation given from Manson, so in Luther's quotation which follows, real benefit for Christ's followers can be derived from the oath. In his commentary on the words "Gott hat geschworen, und wird ihn nimmer gereuen," Luther says:

Und ist hie zu merken, dasz zu dem Kunigreich Christi einzusetzen Gott nit schwuert, sondern schlecht sagt . . . : Gott hat gesagt zu meinem Herren. Aber einzusetzen das Priesterthumb Christi, thut Gott ein Schwur, und mit einem Eid bestaetiget er Christum zum Priester, und dann noch darzu: und wird ihn nit gereuen. Was ist das, oder was ist noth, dasz Gott schwuert, der nicht luegen kann?

Zum ersten darumb, zu unterscheiden all ander Priesterthumb, die do endlich aufhorn sollen. Wann ihn Aufhornen ist, dasz Gott in ihn nit meher gelustet, oder williget.

---

<sup>24</sup>William Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1951), pp. 117-18.

Und das heiszt, Gott reuen, als das Priesterthumb Aaron und Levi. Aber Christi Priesterthumb hat nimmer End in Ewigkeit, sonder er opfert sich und die Seinem dem Vater ewiglich.

Zum Andern, zu unsprechlichem suszen Trost uns armen sundigen Menschen, dasz wir dester kecklicher glauben und hoffen, dasz Christus ein Priester sei.<sup>25</sup>

Christ's priesthood has two phases, the propitiatory<sup>26</sup> and the intercessory. Mention of both phases abounds in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hebrews 5:7-10, it seems to me, is a good statement of both. Scherzer was the only Lutheran dogmatician studied who interpreted Hebrews 5:6-8 in this manner. "Considera etiam omnino, quod Apostolus sacrificum Christi proprie in expiatione & intercessione pro nobis Ebr. V, 6.7.8 . . . constituat."<sup>27</sup> Gerhard remarks that the one offering is complete, but the intercession is still in force.<sup>28</sup> "Duo sunt Sacerdotus munio, oblatio & intercessio."<sup>29</sup>

Duae ergo sunt hujus officii [i.e. sacerdotalis] partes: 1. Satisfactio, qua Christus (λύτρον ἰσορροπων)

<sup>25</sup>Luther, Exegetische deutsche Schriften, p. 26.

<sup>26</sup>For a comprehensive study of the concept of ἱλασκεσθαι (which occurs in Hebrews 2:17) see Leon Morris, The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross (London: The Tyndale Press, 1955), pp. 125ff. and passim.

<sup>27</sup>J. Scherzer, Systema Theologiae (Editio Tertia Auctior & Correctior; Lipsiae & Francofurti, 1691), p. 216.

<sup>28</sup>J. Gerhard, Commentarius Super Epistolam ad Hebraeos (Editio secunda; Jenae, 1561), p. 112.

<sup>29</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 329.

pro totius mundi peccatis Patri suo praestitit ac justitiam et vitam aeternam generi humano acquisivit. In hac satisfactione occurrit obedientia tam activa quam passiva. . . . 2. Intercessio est, qua Christus vi meriti et satisfactionis a se praestitae apud Patrem coelestem intercedit. . . .<sup>30</sup>

Officium Christi sacerdotale est, quo Christus mediator & sacerdos novi testamenti exactissima legis imple-  
tione, & sacrificio corporis sui, nostri caussa sic laesae iustitiae divinae satisfacit, & efficacissimas pro salute nostra preces Deo offert.<sup>31</sup>

Each of the two parts of the dual nature of His priest-  
hood can be found in Hebrews. The passage 1:3 καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιήσάμενος ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ combines the two functions of Christ's priesthood as well as any other passage in the letter.

Jesus moves with respect to the two priestly prototypes, Melchizedek and Aaron, both centripetally and centrifugally. He moves toward Melchizedek in many respects and away from Aaron in many. The only real identity of Christ's priesthood with that of the Aaronic (or Levitic) priesthood is that both involved an offering (9:16-22, especially verse 22 ἡμετέρας χυσιῶν ἀίματος οὗ γίνεσθαι ἀφ' ἑωυτοῦ). In verses 16-17 the necessity of a death in both the Old and New Testaments is accented. In verses 18-22 the word "blood" is used for death. The word αἷμα occurs in 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 (twice) in this sense. This is the rhetorical figure pars pro toto.

<sup>30</sup>Gerhard, Loc1, p. 603.

<sup>31</sup>D. Hollaz, Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum (Holmiae et Lipsiae, 1710), p. 731.

Among the many components of the resultant direction of the centrifugal motion of Christ from the Aaronic priesthood is the victim, or object of sacrifice. In 9:7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 (twice), and in 25 (ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτρίῳ) it is the blood of animals which is mentioned. In 9:12,14; 10:10,14,19,29 it is Christ's own blood, and in 7:27, 9:14, 25,28 the object (or subject of passive verb in 9:28) of the offering is <sup>ε</sup>ΕΑΥΤΟΝ (cf. also Eph. 5:2; I Peter 2:24; Gal. 1:4; I Cor. 5:7).

Another part of Christ's motion away from the Aaronic prototype is that each of the individual Levitic priests died (7:8,23) whereas Christ remains forever (5:6; 6:20; 7:8; 7:24,25).

Also Christ moved from the Aaronic, genealogical continuity to the ungenealogical Melchizedek (7:2). Compare the section 7:11-17, especially verse 14 <sup>ε</sup>Ἐξ Ἰουδα ἀναστράφηκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, εἰς ἣν φυλὴν περὶ ἱσραῆλ οὐδὲν Μωϋσῆος ἐλάλησεν.

The Aaronic offerings were repeated because none were effective for forgiving sins. Christ's offering was made only once because it accomplished the forgiveness of sins. This truth is stated many times in the Epistle to the Hebrews. These passages have been collated and will be arrayed below after two excerpts from the Apology in the Lutheran Symbols. The first is from the Apology (XXIV, 22-25) and the

second from the Apology (XXIV, 53-56):

There has been only one propitiatory sacrifice in the world, namely, the death of Christ, as the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches. . . . And Isaiah interprets the Law, in order that we may know that the death of Christ is truly a satisfaction for our sins, or expiation, and that the ceremonies of the Law are not; wherefore he says, 53.10: When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He will see His seed, etc. For the word employed here,  $\square \omega \nu$ , signifies a victim for transgression; which signified in the Law that a certain Victim was to come to make satisfaction for our sins. . . . The death of Christ alone is truly a propitiatory sacrifice. For the Levitical propitiatory sacrifices were so called only to signify a future expiation.

The preceding words [i.e., those before Hebrews 5:5] speak of the Levitical priesthood, and signify that the Levitical priesthood was an image of the priesthood of Christ. For the Levitical sacrifices for sins were only an image of the sacrifice of Christ, which was to be the one propitiatory sacrifice. . . . Therefore the Epistle [to the Hebrews] is occupied to a great extent with the topic that the ancient priesthood and the ancient sacrifices were instituted not for the purpose of meriting the remission of sins before God or reconciliation, but only to signify the future sacrifice of Christ alone. For in the Old Testament it was necessary for saints to be justified by faith derived from the promise of the remission of sins that was to be granted for Christ's sake, just as saints are also justified in the New Testament. From the beginning of the world it was necessary for all saints to believe that Christ would be the promised offering and satisfaction for sins, as Isaiah teaches, 53.10. . . . Christ is the only sacrifice applied on behalf of the sins of others.

The inadequacy of the offerings of the Levitical priests is shown by 7:11,19; 10:11. The adequacy of Christ's offering is affirmed in 10:11,14 and is possibly reflected in three passages in which the word  $\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota$  is present (7:27; 9:12; 10:10). Also in 12:24 Christ is called a  $\delta\epsilon\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\kappa\tau\iota$

νέας μεσίτης, a covenant made with blood that speaks better, αἵματι ἑαντισμοῦ κρείττον λαλοῦντι.

A beautiful, grammatical, balanced structure accents the theological truth. The first ten verses of Chapter 9 can be summarized, "On the one hand, the old tabernacle with all its accoutrements and rituals, was inefficacious," e.g., verse 9 μὴ δυνάμεναι . . . τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα . Verse 1 began εἶχε μὲν, i.e., "on the one hand," but verse 11 begins χριστὸς δὲ, i.e., "but, on the other hand, when Christ came, . . ." e.g., verse 12, "through His own blood He entered once into the holy place, αἰωνίαν ὑπερωσὶν εὐράμενος.

Similarly, even the grammatical structure of 10:1ff. points to the inability of the Old Covenant to perfect anything. The law had nothing but a shadow of the real image (verse 1, οὐδέποτε δύναται τὸν προσερχόμενον τελειῶσαι and verse 4 ἀδύνατον αἷμα ταύρων ἀφαιρῆν ἁμαρτίας). Therefore, in view of the great need which the previous arrangements (δικαιώματα σαρκὸς μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα 9:10 and ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις 10:1) were not able to fulfill, Christ came. The upshot is that we have been made holy by the offering of His body ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμεν διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος, 10:10.

Verses 11-14 conclude with a grand summary statement. The priests used to stand every day, repetitiously offering the same sacrifices (ταῖς αὐταῖς . . . θυσίαις verse 11)



which effected nothing οὐδέποτε δύνανται περισθεῖν ἁμαρτίας  
 However, He, by making one offering (μία . . . θυσίαν  
 verse 12) and by one sacrifice (μιᾶ . . . προσφορᾶ  
 verse 14) has perfected those who are holy forever

τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιασμένους, verse 14.

After the strong affirmation of the inadequacy of the Old Covenant in 10:1-4, there follows the monumental verse 5. Since the blood of animals was totally inadequate, the Father's Son was willing to do the Father's will, to satisfy the Father with a sacrifice, an offering, of Himself. This achieved the τελείωσις (cf. 7:28; 5:9; 10:14). All previous sacrifices had been unable to do this (cf. 7:11,19; 9:9 μὴ δύνασθαι . . . τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα 10:1 οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι ).

God does not want sacrifice and offering, as 10:5 states, θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας. Yet, these are what the Father received from His Son and He was well pleased therewith (10:10 διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 10:14 μιᾶ γὰρ προσφορᾶ τετελείωκεν ).

The Savior's sacrifice was voluntary and it was of Himself. These are the two features of it that enabled it to be enduring. It need not be repeated. It was sufficient.

Hebrews 10:5-7 is a quotation from the LXX of Psalm 40: 6ff. (LXX Psalm 39:7ff.). The phrase σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι renders the Hebrew  $\text{שָׁרַף} \quad \text{לְךָ} \quad \text{זָבַח} \quad \text{וְאָזְנוֹ} \quad \text{שָׁמַעְתָּ}$ , which, if rendered literally, means "You have pierced ears for me."

Does this mean that the Greek rendering of this Psalm passage is entirely erroneous? Quenstedt answers:

Ut ita haec aurium Messiae perfossio denotet promptam, constantem, atque perfectam obedientiam, quam Filius Dei assumpta servi forma Patri suo exhibuit ad mortem usque crucis Phil. II.7.<sup>32</sup>

A proposed reading in Kittel is  $\text{אֲנִי שָׁמַעְתִּי וְלֹא־סָגַמְתִּי אָזְנוֹתַי}$   
 "I have not closed my ears," i.e., I have listened to your demand for obedience and am willing to fulfill it. If adopted, this reading would still produce the same effect.

Calov has arrived at the same verdict as Quenstedt, to the effect that the Greek rendering of the Hebrew is not erroneous. In his commentary on Psalm 40, which Calov entitles "Christi obedientia nostra justitia," he observes regarding verse 7 that " $\text{אֲנִי שָׁמַעְתִּי}$  perfodere significat proprie" and notes that this is an allusion to Deuteronomy 15:16.<sup>33</sup> The fifteenth chapter of Deuteronomy refers to the hole in the ears, perforated by an aul (verse 17), among the Israelites as a sign of willingness to be a "servant for ever." "Verba illa  $\text{ὡμα δὲ κτητιῶν μοι}$ , magis  $\text{διὰ νοῦν}$  quam  $\text{ἰσῆν}$  textus Ebraei exprimere."<sup>34</sup>

Chemnitz lends philological support to the identity of the Greek rendering with the Hebrew. He even goes further

<sup>32</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 245.

<sup>33</sup>A. Calov, Biblia Novi Testamenti Illustrata (Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1719), I, 997.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

and makes of the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  the whole person, which is justifiable. In Deuteronomy 15 the whole person becomes a slave.

"Nam Graeci  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  dicunt, ut nos vulgo personam."<sup>35</sup> "Usitatissima enim in Scriptura est illa Synecdoche, nomine carnis significari totum hominem, ex anima rationali & carne constantem."<sup>36</sup>

The sacrifice of Christ was voluntary. "Christus non passus est coacte, sed voluntarie."<sup>37</sup> "Passus & mortuus est Dominus Jesus  $\epsilon\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omega\varsigma$ , voluntarie, sponte. . . ."<sup>38</sup>

"Modus passionis in eo consistit, quod Christus haec omnia passus est . . . nec coacte, sed voluntarie Ps XL, 9."<sup>39</sup>

"Car s'il y a un point où les Evangeles, les Epîtres de Paul et notre Epître sont absolument d'accord, c'est le caractère, volontarie de sa mort."<sup>40</sup>

Le Pontife de la Nouvelle Alliance n'est pas seulement le chef de la maison de Dieu. . . . L'originalité de son sacrifice consiste dans l'identité de l'offrant et de l'offrande. La victime c'est, lui-même; *Novi δὲ ἀγαθὸν ἐπὶ συντηρήσει τῶν αἰώνων, εἰς ἀθέρησιν τῆς ἀμαρτίας εἰς τῆς θουσίας αὐτοῦ πεφάνηται.* (IK, 26).<sup>41</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Chemnitz, Loc., p. 45.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 68.

<sup>37</sup> Gerhard, Loc., p. 540.

<sup>38</sup> Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 351.

<sup>39</sup> J. P. Koenig, Theologia Positiva Acroamatica (Editio Decima Quarta; Hostockii & Lipsiae, 1719), p. 164.

<sup>40</sup> Jean Hering, L'Epître aux Hebreux in Commentaire du nouveau testament (Neuchatel Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1954), XII, 54.

<sup>41</sup> Spicq, op. cit., p. 136.

Christ is not rejecting sacrifice but substituting a different kind of sacrifice, the sacrifice of Himself.<sup>42</sup>

Three times in Hebrews it is said that Christ offered Himself (7:27; 9:14,25). St. Paul says the same thing in Galatians 1:4  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  in Ephesians 5:2  $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ; and Titus 2:14  $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\ \eta\mu\omega\nu$ .

"Quas infirmitates assumsit volens propter nos, ut fieret victima."<sup>43</sup> "Materia Sacrificii ipse Christus est. . . ."<sup>44</sup>

"Est enim Christus ipsa hostia & victima propitiatoria, per & propter quam Deo irato nos placati & reconciliati sumus."<sup>45</sup>

In his commentary on Isaiah 53 Luther says:

Nulla sacrificia erant, quibus placari potuit Deus, nisi haec victima, quae poneret animam suam  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ . Immo omnia sacrificia veteris testamenti erant  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha$ , ut epistola ad Ebraeos loquitur, hujus sacrificii filii Dei.<sup>46</sup>

The remainder of the letter, 10:19-13:25, is a parenthesis, interspersed with assurances. For example, in 10:19 the readers are assured of their entrance into the real holy place, i.e., heaven, because of the blood of Jesus,  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \ι\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ .

<sup>42</sup>Cf. Manson, Chapter V, p. 99.

<sup>43</sup>Chemnitz, Loci, pp. 49,64,67.

<sup>44</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., p. 221.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 223.

<sup>46</sup>Martin Luther, Exegetica Opera Latina, curavit Henricus Schmidt (Erlangae et Francofurti: Sumtibus C. Heyderi et H. Zimmeri, 1841), XXIII, 513-14.

The readers can derive strength for fulfilling the injunctions of 10:34ff., even if their faith results in seizure of their goods (as it once had required, verse 34), by recalling that their better possession is a *πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς* Philippians 3:20. The deprivation of these (*τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων*, 10:34) is minor compared with the deprivation of the use (but not possession) of His divine prerogatives which Christ endured for a time, abstaining from seizure and full employment of that which was rightfully his (Phil. 2:6). To enable the readers to *συμπαθεῖν* with others, Christ affords the strength because of His experience in suffering (2:9 *διὰ τὸ πάθος τοῦ θανάτου*; 2:10 *διὰ παθημάτων*; 5:8 *ὅτι ὡν ἠπάθει*; 13:12 *ἐφ' ὧ τῆς πύλης ἠπάθει* ).

The theme of Chapter 11 has been rudely fragmented by dividing between 11:40 and 12:1 rather than continuing the thought through 12:11. Some rescue work has been done on the preservation of the unity of this theme by homileticians and others, however. Similar salvaging of the full force of the eleventh chapter by including with it 10:35-39 has escaped my notice. Before the lengthy catalogue of heroes of God's people, who placed and kept their faith in Him even when events urged contrariwise, is listed, Christians are encouraged to maintain their *παρηγορία* (v. 35), and their *ὑπομονή* (v. 36), which have the reward of *μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν* (v. 35) and *τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν* (v. 36).

In verse 39 the phrase εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς reflects probably the same notion as Christ's statement in Matthew 10:39; John 12:25; Luke 17:33 ὅς ἐάν τις ἑτάσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, i.e., whosoever strives to make the complete and full acquisition of his life with all its potential will lose it. The method given in Luke 21:19 for making the full acquisition of one's life is "by patience" (ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν Luke 21:19). Christ found that this eventuated, also for Himself, only through the complete abandonment of His ψυχῆ' to God's will (ἐμὴ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου John 10:17).

In 12:2b is perhaps as excellent a description of Christ's fiducia cordis (this fiducia cordis gave Him the strength to go all the way to the cross, for which crucifixion the experience in 5:7-8 was the prelude and enablement) as any other in this epistle, or in the New Testament for that matter. As he nears the end of the epistle, the author neatly brings together and summarizes by two mere words those two majestic sections 2:9-10 and 5:7-10 with the words ἀεχθός and τῆσιωτῆς. The readers have a reminder via both thought and lexical similarity. He expands beyond (1) ἀεχθός to γεύσεται θανάτου in 2:9 by saying ὑπέμεινεν σταυρόν in 12:2 (cf. also Acts 3:15) and beyond (2) τῆσιωτῆς in 5:9 to προσεχουθεῖν in 5:10 by saying ἐν δεξιῇ . . . κενάθεικεν (12:2).

In 12:4-11 the correlative of  $\mu\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  would be  $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega$  if it referred to one type of learning, but the correlative here is  $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\omega$  because a second type of knowledge is intended. Although there is no explicit reference in verses 4-11 to Christ's learning, it is present throughout by implication and lexical similarity, e.g., verse 8  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\chi\omicron\iota$ . Compare 2:14-17  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\omega\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \dots\ \acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\omega\nu\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ . He became a merciful high priest because he discovered what are all the experiences to which human beings are subject. We learn because we are sons, instructed by the Father, through  $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$ . He learned, although He was the Son, through His experience in Gethsemane which required that He consent to die.

In verse 11 is a reminder that just as the  $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}$  is not always near and apparent for us, but perhaps quite remote and obscured, also for Him (12:2) it lay ahead, i.e., it was temporarily veiled by His sufferings. In discussing the Gethsemane scene, Dr. Arndt says:

Can we ever fully remove the veil of mystery that hangs over this prayer? . . . We can merely say that Jesus here stands before us as a true human being and that the weight of the suffering which was approaching was so terrific that He saw nothing but this crushing burden, and prayed accordingly. A cloud passed over His mind, as it were, and hid from Him the resolve which He had voiced repeatedly--to lay down His life for the

salvation of the world.<sup>47</sup>

Further verses in this letter calling attention to Christ's human nature are 12:24 and 13:12,20.

---

<sup>47</sup>William F. Arndt, Bible Commentary The Gospel According to St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), p. 447.

I recall that on three occasions in the Gospel records on which the writer usually spoke more primarily for Christ's benefit, according to his human nature.

As his divine ministry, with its many rejections and humiliating passages, lay before him at his baptism, God gave him the assurance, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mt. 3:17 and parallels; Mark 1:11 and Luke 3:22; see also Mt. 21:9,11; Jn. 4:21 [Mt. 12:18]). It was in the wilderness of the Sea he offered himself, not in sacrificial water but his right hand offered apart from himself, that he dedicated (Heb. 10:5,8).

Christus veritate et in ignem est, cum patitur. In-  
 quiritur quod modum, quod sustinuit salvator nos-  
 trum a peccatis infantis, et in primis sub latuit  
 humilitati eius, in his terris gestis, tam in animis per  
 locum deserti in deserto Matta. IV. obrecta-  
 tiones et circumlocutiones, quae in corpore, per  
 terram, Matta. IV.2. pag. XXI.18. defatigationem et sit-  
 imum. Mt. III.2. purgationem baptis. VIII.28. periculis et  
 cruciacionibus. Mt. VII.30.22.

Christus veritate et in ignem est, cum patitur. In-  
 quiritur quod modum, quod sustinuit salvator nos-  
 trum a peccatis infantis, et in primis sub latuit  
 humilitati eius, in his terris gestis, tam in animis per  
 locum deserti in deserto Matta. IV. obrecta-  
 tiones et circumlocutiones, quae in corpore, per  
 terram, Matta. IV.2. pag. XXI.18. defatigationem et sit-  
 imum. Mt. III.2. purgationem baptis. VIII.28. periculis et  
 cruciacionibus. Mt. VII.30.22.



## CHAPTER V

### FINAL THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE STATEMENT:

#### HE LEARNED OBEDIENCE

##### Development in the Life of Jesus

##### According to the Gospels

I submit that the three occasions in the Gospel records on which the Father audibly spoke were primarily for Christ's benefit, according to His human nature.

As His entire public ministry, with its many rejections and culminating passion, lay before Him at His baptism, God gave Him the assurance, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mt. 3:17 and parallels; Mark 1:11 and Luke 3:22; see also Ps. 22:9,21; Is. 42:1 [Mt. 12:18]). It was in the readiness of the Son to offer Himself, not in sacrifices which the Son might have offered apart from Himself, that He delighted (Heb. 10:6,8).

Passio Christi alia inchoata est, alia extrema; Inchoata vocam passionem, quam sustinuit Salvator noster a prima statim infantia, & in primis sub initium Ministerii sui, in his terris gesti, tam in anima per tentationes Diaboli in deserto Matth. IV. obrectationes & calumnias adversariorum, quam in corpore, per famem, Matth. IV.2. cap. XXI.18. defatigationem & sitim Joh. IV.7. paupertatem Matth. VIII.20. pericula & persecutiones Joh. VII.30.44.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Quenstedt, Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologicum (Wittebergae, 1696), pp. 346-47.

Quenstedt continues to explain the Passio extrema as that which occurred on the last two days of his life, "partim in anima, partim in corpore, & haec Passio κατ' ἐξοχήν dicitur. . . ."2

In his discussion of the Gethsemane experience Dr. Arndt says virtually the same thing. He writes:

A. M. Hunter (The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 118), speaking of the prayer and struggle of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane, well says, "It was the old temptation--Messiahship without a cross, salvation without atonement--that met Him here with redoubled force." Satan now returned, having found a good opening for an attack after the initial encounter (4:12).3

Dr. Robertson makes a similar analysis of the benefit of Christ's baptism for the trials that awaited Him: "through all the coming days of strain the heart of Jesus had this great experience [i.e., baptism] to cheer him."4

Christ had made the first explicit announcement in Matthew 16:21 (barring John 3:14 ὕψω θ̄ ἡ̄ να, δ̄ ρ̄ ῑ ) of His impending glorification via the cross. Peter offered what must surely have been a temptation (Mt. 16:22), but soon after, Christ's fiducia cordis was bolstered by the Mount of Transfiguration experience. Regarding the fiducia cordis of Christ, Quenstedt says:

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 347.

<sup>3</sup>William F. Arndt, Bible Commentary The Gospel According to St. Luke (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1946), pp. 447-48.

<sup>4</sup>A. T. Robertson, Studies in the New Testament (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1915), p. 81.

Persona, quam Christus inelamat, . . . est Deus Pater, quem Deum vocat ratione humanitatis & quidem emphatice suum Deum, ut fiduciam cordis sui, quam in eo repositam habebat. . . . DEus meus, DEus meus; Plenum enim fiducia est ingeminatum pronomen possessivum MEUS.<sup>5</sup>

The Father assured Him of their relation. The appearance of Moses and Elias, coupled with the Father's bespeaking His satisfaction with the Son, was for the benefit of Christ rather than that of His disciples. How entirely the disciples missed the point of Moses' and Elias' appearance is marked by Peter's interpretation of it as a spectacle, to be commemorated by the erection of three memorials.

St. Luke tells us that they were speaking with Him (9:30). This is significant. They were speaking with Him "about the Exodus" which He was about to accomplish. Moses and Elias were bringing to bear upon Christ as a human being the divine necessity (Luke 24:26; οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν; cf. also Acts 3:18; 26:23; Mt. 16:21 and parallels) of His passion.

Perhaps Moses reminded Christ that he had once, as God's said to the archenemy of God's people of the Old Covenant, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my People Go" (Ex. 5:1) and that now He was to go to a greater archenemy and achieve a greater liberation (cf. frequent use of comparatives of adjectives and adverbs in Hebrews) for God's people of the New Testament by announcing to Satan, from the cross,

---

<sup>5</sup>Quenstedt, op. cit., pp. 355-56

"Let my people go." And the assurance, the strengthening of Christ's fiducia cordis, that He could fulfill the urgent imperatives and requests of Moses and Elijah came, "This is My Beloved Son, hear him" (Luke 9:35; Mark 9:7; Mt. 17:5). (Cf. also Deut. 18:19.)

Perhaps these spokesmen of God from the old eon reminded Jesus of His participation under other guises than His present, passible human body in that earlier dispensation of God, perhaps with the encouragement that He might apply a lesson of other Old Testament heroes besides themselves to Himself. "Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who hath sent his angel and delivered his servants" (Dan. 3:28). Of the servants it was said: "they yielded their bodies" (Dan. 3:28). (Cf. Heb. 9:14 ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ; 9:25 προσφέρει ἑαυτὸν ; 10:5 σῶμα . . . κατητίσω ; 10:10 διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος ; the "angel," the : ἄγγελος, [LXX, v. 95 ἀπέστειλε τὸν ἄγγελον.] Cf. with ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω throughout John's Gospel.)

The strength and assurance given to Christ on the Mount enabled Him to reaffirm His mission (first announced by Himself before the Transfiguration, Mt. 16:21; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22) shortly after His descent from the Mount of Transfiguration (Mt. 17:22-23; Mark 9:31; Luke 9:44). Then, having set His face toward Jerusalem for the last time, He preceded them (Mark 10:32) and announced (Mark 10:33) the purpose of

their journey (cf. Mt. 20:18 and Luke 18:31-33). Again, He clearly enunciated what was to befall Him, but two days before its occurrence (Mt. 26:2) and Luke 22:37 in the upper room: *τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί*. So much for the development of the Synoptics.

When we study the progression of Christ's awareness of the τέλος of His mission in John, we find that a few months prior to His death, He was able to say with as much personal detachment as possible--and far more than later, e.g., Tuesday of Holy Week (12:27) and even much less on Thursday night in the Garden (10:18)--"I have a command" (cf. δεῖ of the Synoptics and throughout John, "to do my Father's will") "to lay down my life." But the imminence and consequent shrinking from the fearful prospect of death required the Father's third assuring announcement, found in John 12:28:

The distinct and near prospect of the cross as the path of glory which these Greeks called up in His thoughts prompts Him to exclaim: *Νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τεταρακται*, "Now is my soul troubled." . . . A conflict of emotions disturbs His serenity. "Concurrebat horror mortis et ardor obedientiae." Bengel.

"There came, therefore, a voice out of heaven: I have both glorified it and will again glorify it." However Jesus might seem in the coming days to be tossed on the sea of human passions, the Father was steadily guiding all to the highest end. The assurance that His death would glorify God was, of course, that which nerved Jesus for its endurance. He was not throwing His life away.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Marcus Dods, The Gospel of St. John in The Expositor's

## Obedience and Sacrifice

"To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (I Sam. 15 :22). The heinousness of disobedience is highlighted by denominating it "rebellion" and equating it in seriousness with the sin of witchcraft, and designating it as "stubbornness," tantamount to iniquity and idolatry (v. 23). Stubbornness involves not letting one's will conform with God's, but rather remaining taut and unyielding.

The presentation of a sacrifice, unaccompanied by obedience, is repulsive to God. In such mere formality and external religion He has no delight (Is. 1:11-20). In fact, He hates such (v. 14). Verses 19 and 20 clearly enunciate what God accepts (v. 19, "willing," "obedient") and what He rejects (v. 20, "refuse," "rebel.") Compare Jer. 6:19-20: "because they have not hearkened unto my words . . . to what purpose . . . your burnt offerings are not acceptable . . ."; also Jer. 7 (passim, e.g., 22-24); Jer. 11 (passim, e.g., 4, 7); Hosea 6:6 (cf. the Apology XXIV, 29-30 ); Amos 5:21ff.; Micah 6:6-8; Eccl. 5:1: "Be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools"; Mt. 9:13 and 12:7 ἤκουσθε δὲ λέγω καὶ

---

Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), I, 810.

οὐ θυσίαν ; Mark 12:33 τὸ ἀγαπᾶν . . . περισσότερον  
 . . . πάντων τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν .

The thesis of the previous two paragraphs is: To obey is better than sacrifice. But this statement is also true: To obey is to sacrifice, i.e., sacrifice oneself. These two affirmations, the equality of two quantities and the statement that one of these two equal quantities is greater than the other, are mutually exclusive--logically, but not theologically.

To obey is better than sacrifice. This truth applies to God's covenant made at Mount Sinai and the one made via Moses just before his death (Deut. 29). This covenant was actually the second rather than the prior of God's two covenants of redemption with human beings (cf. Gal. 3:17). To obey is better than sacrifice means: (a) Obedience, the committing of one's will to God, must be anterior to sacrifice, which is merely the outgrowth of the former; (b) Sacrifice not motivated by obedience to God's desire for mercy, i.e., judgment, visiting the poor and fatherless, etc., is repellent to God.

To obey means to sacrifice, i.e., to sacrifice oneself. This is the New Covenant, which is actually the former of God's two covenants, made with with Abraham--a covenant of promise rather than of works (Heb. 6:13-20 and Galatians passim ). This does not mean the abolition of the principle of sacrifice, but merely the elevation of sacrifice to

the level of sacrifice of oneself.

The Christ of the Psalm 40:6-8 is not rejecting sacrifice and offering in favour of something else, but rejecting animal sacrifice in favour of that personal sacrifice which God has willed from Him, and for which He has prepared by appointing for Him the body of His Incarnation.

Here then, according to the writer, is the modus operandi of the divine grace in Christianity.<sup>7</sup>

This sacrifice of the New Covenant is not the outgrowth of the obedience which must precede and produce it, as the sacrifice in the Old Covenant is. This sacrifice is not of anything other than oneself, e.g., calves, etc. This sacrifice of oneself is the obedience. This sacrifice is the sacrifice of oneself of which Abraham was a type of Christ by sacrificing Isaac, who was his very self, his being, his seed, the only possible bearer and conveyer to posterity of the promises made unto Abraham himself. In the Apostolic Liturgy Field is excellent on Christ's obedience to the Father, citing John 15:10; 10:17-18; 14:28-31; "the command which Christ received from the Father was that he should make the sacrifice of Himself."<sup>8</sup>

By His own obedience Christ became to all those that obey Him the cause of eternal salvation, i.e., by sacrificing Himself for them He provided the wherewithal for their making

---

<sup>7</sup>William Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1951), pp. 144-45.

<sup>8</sup>John Edward Field, The Apostolic Liturgy and the Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Rivingtons, 1882), p. 134.



the commitment of self-sacrifice to Him and thereby being saved. That such is the nexus He explicates in John 12: 24-26 and had already adumbrated in Mark 8:34-35; Mt. 10: 38-39; Luke 9:23-24.

A sacrifice or offering it was not that you really wanted, but a self you presented me with, in order that I might present this self to you (Heb. 10:5). Here the *σῶμα* is the same as the *ψυχή* of which Christ frequently speaks elsewhere, i.e., the self. "Sicut vicissim Scriptura saepe animam vocat, ubi totum hominem intelligi necesse est."<sup>9</sup> "Nam Graeci *σῶμα* dicunt, ut nos vulgo personam."<sup>10</sup> It is that sacrifice by Christ of Himself, by offering which He is rendering the obedience par excellence, *τὴν ὑπακοήν*, which furnishes Him as the cause of eternal salvation to all who obey Him.

This equating of obedience with sacrifice is confirmed even grammatically in Ephesians 5:2 where the nearer and remoter object of the same verb *παρέδωκεν* are *ἑαυτὸν* and *προσδοξάν και δουλίαν* (Cf. Gal. 1:4; Heb. 7:27; 9:14,25; 10:10).

#### Two Wills in Christ: Human and Divine

One more figure is necessary, the congruence of two

---

<sup>9</sup>M. Chemnitz, Loci Theologici (Francofurti & Wittebergae, 1690), p. 45.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 68.

"I have come to do thy will" (Heb. 10:7,9); in Gethsemane, "not my will, but thy will" (Mt. 26:39,42,44; Mark 14:36,39; Luke 22:42; and according to John's words, "to do not my will but the will of Him who sent me" (passim, e.g., 1:43; 5:21; 5:30; 6:38; 10:11,15,17,18; 17:24). There were two wills in Christ.

quod Christo tribuuntur facultates animae rationalis, intellectus scilicet et voluntas a Patris voluntate distincta Luc. 2, v.52. c. 23, v.46. Matth. 26, v.39. Joh. 5, v.30. c. 6, v.38; 3. quod ad essentielles et constitutivas partes hominis pertineat non solum corpus, sed et anima rationalis.<sup>11</sup>

The divine will of Christ coincided exactly with that of the Father, was identical with it, just as He and the Father are one essence. The human will declined from the unpalatable dregs of the cup which the divine will proffered. The human and divine wills did not coincide. For, while the entire will bespoke the injunction, "Obey and drink," only part of the human will was willing to coincide with the divine will, not that part which must go even unto death. But even that much was learned in Gethsemane, namely, to submit every portion of the human will to the divine will which was superimposed upon the human will in such a way that the submissive human will beneath the divine disappeared from view entirely, having become entirely congruous with the divine will. The human will learned to say--in every respect, even up to

---

<sup>11</sup>J. Gerhard, Loci Theologici (Tomus primus; Berolini, 1863), p. 488.

death (Phil. 2:8)--to the divine will, "Thy will be done."  
 This is the decree of the Council of Constantinople, 681  
 A. D.

The council adopted the doctrine of the two wills and two energies, but decided that the human will must always be considered as subordinate to the divine.<sup>12</sup>

the controversy [monothelism] continued until 681 when the 6th ecumenical council met at Constantinople. . . . This council, in the 18th session, accepted a decree, acknowledging the teaching of two natural wills and two natural energies in Christ, by stating that the two natural wills are not opposed but that rather the human will follows and is subordinate to the divine will.<sup>13</sup>

Est enim obedientia, quando humana voluntas divinae subicitur.<sup>14</sup>

After Gethsemane, i.e., after He had learned obedience, did Christ have any more opportunities to turn back from the cross? Yes, several excellent opportunities. Opportunities which were excellent for Him because the cross is a *σταυρώσασον* (Mt. 16:23) not only to the wise Greeks and sign-seeking Jews (I Cor. 1:20ff.) but also to the Father's only Son.

The sword-wielding, Satan-assisting, temptation-offering Peter brought to Christ's mind His power to summon angels. But then what of the , that necessity (Mt. 26:54)? Not merely an enterprise of great pitch and moment, but this

<sup>12</sup>E. H. Klotsche, The History of Christian Doctrine (Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1945), p. 81.

<sup>13</sup>Lutheran Cyclopedia, edited by Erwin L. Lueker (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954), p. 714.

<sup>14</sup>Chemnitz, Loci, p. 169.

eternal, divine counsel would lose the name of action if Christ's ability of verse 53 be exercised. Christ did not calculate, "Because I am the Father's Son, I shall summon the angels. . . ." but rather "Although I am the Father's only Son, I shall not summon. . . ." He had learned the obedience in Gethsemane and did not shrink from putting this lesson into practice (John 18:11).

Christ's human Zuege<sup>15</sup> and motus<sup>16</sup> could hardly have been motionless when the passers-by challenged, "If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross" (Mt. 27:40). How the conjunctions waged war within Him! "They have no right to insinuate that I may not be the Son of God. If? No. Be-  
cause I am the Son of God, I shall descend? No. Although I am the Son of God. . . ." (Heb. 5:8).

He had learned the obedience. He had applied it on the cross. The counterpart of this *σκαύβαλον* for Him, which is the *σκαύβαλον* also for us, is this that we must believe Him although He did not come down from the cross, rather than be-  
cause He did not descend, and least of all because He did descend.

Quamvis esset Filius (Heb. 5:8)

Vere Filius Dei erat iste (Mt. 27:54).

---

<sup>15</sup>Supra, p. 51.

<sup>16</sup>Supra, p. 50.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

This study of Hebrews 5:7-10, buttressed by the rest of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the New Testament, and the Old Testament, led to the conclusion that the statement "He learned obedience" is not so enigmatic as it might appear. Rather, this brief statement is perhaps one of the most profound statements in the entire New Testament regarding the ultimate relation of the Creator to his creature, man. We, as His adopted children, not only benefit from the Father's only Son's yielding His will to the divine will, but by this we too are enabled to follow in His footsteps.

Christ learned to obey the Father's wish that He sacrifice Himself for us. The energy and dynamic poured into our lives as the result of this obedience and sacrifice give us the strength to obey and also furnish us the assurance that we can obey. This obedience consists in our sacrificing ourselves to Him, the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arndt, William F. Bible Commentary The Gospel According to St. Luke. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956.
- , and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.
- Baier, J. G. Compendium Theologiae Positivae. Denuo edendum curavit Walther. Editio auctior et emendatior. Vol. III, Pars Tertia, Sectio Prima. In urbe Sancti Ludovici, 1874.
- Baillie, D. M. God Was in Christ. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.
- Bengel, J. A. Gnomon Novi Testamenti. Secundum Editionem Tertiam (1773). Berolini, 1855.
- Braun, John. Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebraeos. Amstae-lodami, 1705.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Primitive Christianity. Translated by R. H. Fuller. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Burton, Ernest Dewitt. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1898.
- Calov, A. Biblia Novi Testamenti Illustrata. II, III, IV. Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1719.
- , Exegema Augustanae Confessionis. Editio Altera. Wittebergae, 1665.
- , Systema Locorum Theologicorum. Tomus Tertius. Wittebergae, 1559.
- Chemnitz, M. Libellum De Duabus Naturis in Christo. Francofurti & Wittebergae, 1690.
- , Loci Theologici. Francofurti & Wittebergae, 1690.
- Cotton, Harry J., and Alexander C. Purdy. "The Epistle to the Hebrews." Vol. 11 in The Interpreter's Bible. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1955.
- Debrunner, Albert. Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Fuenfte, durchgesehene Auflage. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.

- Delitzsch, Franz. Commentar ueber Das Buch Jesaie. Vierte durchaus neubearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig: Doerffling & Franke, 1889.
- Dods, Marcus. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," The Expositor's Greek Testament. IV. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- "The Gospel of St. John," The Expositor's Greek Testament. I. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- Edwards, Thomas Charles. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," The Expositor's Bible. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1898.
- Farrar, Frederick W. The Early Days of Christianity. New York: A. L. Burt, 1882.
- Field, John Edward. The Apostolic Liturgy and The Epistle to the Hebrews. London:ivingtons, 1882.
- Gerhard, J. Commentarius Super Epistolam ad Ebraeos. Editio secunda. Jenae, 1561.
- Loci Theologici. Tomus primus. Berolini, 1863.
- Grant, Robert M. The Bible in the Church. New York: Macmillan Company, 1954.
- Henry, Matthew. An Exposition of the Old and New Testament. V. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.
- Hering, Jean. L'Epitre aux Hebreux. Vol XII in Commentaire du nouveau testament. Neuchatel Paris VII<sup>e</sup>: Delachaux & Niestle S. A., 1954.
- "Hilary of Poitiers," Lutheran Cyclopedia. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954.
- Hollaz, D. Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum. Holmiae et Lipsiae, 1710.
- Moskier, H. C. A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus p<sup>46</sup> (circa 200 A. D.). London: W. Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., 1938.
- Hunnius, A. Libelli III De Persona Christi. Francofurti ad Moenum, 1590. Pp. 1-161.

- Hunter, Archibald M. The Work and Words of Jesus. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- Hutter, L. Loci Communes Theologici. Wittebergae, 1619.
- Jeremias, J. "Hbr 5.7-10," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche. XLIV. n.p., 1952/3. Pp. 107-11.
- Kittel, Rud., editor. Biblia Hebraica. Editio septima. Stuttgart: Privileg. Wuert. Bibelanstalt, 1951.
- Klotsche, E. H. The History of Christian Doctrine. Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1945.
- Koenig, J. P. Theologia Positiva Acoomatica. Editio Decima Quarta. Rostochii & Lipsiae, 1719.
- Kuebel, Robert. "Der Brief an die Hebraer," Kurzeffasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments. Herausgegeben von Hermann Strack und Otto Boeckler. B. Neues Testament. Vierte Abteilung. Nordling: Verlag der C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1888. Pp. 140-205.
- Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle of James. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938.
- Luther, Martin. "Divi Pauli apostoli ad Hebreos epistola," Nachschriften der Vorlesungen ueber Roemerbrief, Galaterbrief und Hebraeerbrief. LVII in Werke kritische Gesamtausgabe. Weimar: Hermann Boehlaus, 1939.
- . Exegetica Opera Latina. XXIII. Curavit Henricus Schmidt. Erlangae et Francofurti: Sumtibus C. Heyderi et H. Zimmeri, 1841. Pp. 513-14.
- . Exegetische deutsche Schriften. Vol. VIII edited by Johann Konrad Irmischer in Saemmtliche Werke, Vol. XL. Erlangen: Carl Heyder, 1846.
- . Das Lutherwort zum Psalter. Leipzig: Verlag und Buecherstube der Maedchen-Bibel-Kreise, 1930.
- . Vermischte deutsche Schriften. Vol. VI edited by Johann Konrad Irmischer in Saemmtliche Werke, Vol. LVIII. Erlangen: Heyder and Zimmer, 1853.



- Maclaren, Alexander. Second Timothy, Titus, Philippians and Hebrews. Vol. 15A of Expositions of Holy Scripture. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1938.
- Manson, William. The Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1951.
- Meyer, F. B. The Way into the Holiest. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1951.
- Michel, Otto. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar ueber das Neue Testament. Begruendet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. Dreizehnte Abteilung, 8. Auflage. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.
- Moffatt, James. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Vol. 39 of the International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- Moll, Carl B. A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. Edited by John Peter Lange and translated by A. C. Kendrick. Vol. VIII of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- "Monothelism," Lutheran Cyclopedia. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954. P. 714.
- Morris, Leon. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross. London: The Tyndale Press, 1955.
- Nairne, A. The Epistle to the Hebrews in the Cambridge Bible. Cambridge: University Press, 1921.
- Nestle, Eberhard. Greek New Testament. Revised by Erwin Nestle. 20th edition. New York: American Bible Society, n.d.
- . Novum Testamentum Latine. Editio tertia recognita. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1915.
- Osiander, Lucas. Sacrorum Bibliorum Pars III. Tuebingae, 1592.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. "Chalcedon After Fifteen Centuries," Concordia Theological Monthly (December, 1951), pp. 926-36.
- . From Luther to Kierkegaard. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950.

- Quenstedt, J. Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologicum. Wittebergae, 1696.
- Riggenbach, Edward. Der Brief an die Hebraeer. Vol XIV in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Herausgegeben von Theodor Zahn. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1913.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Studies in the New Testament. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1915.
- Scherzer, J. A. Systema Theologiae. Editio Tertia Auctior & Correctior. Lipsiae & Francofurti, 1691.
- Schille, Gottfried. "Erwaegungen zum Hohepriesterlehre des Hebraeerbriefes," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche. XLI. n.p., 1955. Pp. 81-109.
- Spicq, C. L'Epitre aux Hebreux--Commentaire. Deuxieme edition. II. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1953.
- Strobel, August. "Die Psalmengrundlage der Gethsemane-Parallele Hbr 5.7ff.," Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche. XLV. n.p., 1954. Pp. 252-66.
- Strathmann, Hermann. "Der Brief an die Hebraeer," Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Johannes Behm. Teilband 9. 5. Auflage. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.
- Tischendorf, Constantine. Novum Testamentum Graece. Editio Octava Critica Maior. Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872.
- Triplet Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Weiss, Bernhard. Der Hebraeerbrief in Zeitgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Epistle to the Hebrews. 3rd edition. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1909.

- , and Fenton John Anthony Hort. The New Testament in the Original Greek. Revised American edition with introduction by Philip Schaff. I. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1889.
- Windisch, Hans. "Der Hebraeerbrief," Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vierter Band, Dritter Teil. Tuebingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1913.
- Wuest, Kenneth S. Hebrews in the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947.