

APPENDIX J

The Meaning of *hupostasis* in Hebrews 1:3

<i>hupostasis</i> = (in Heb. 1:3)	Exegetical implications	Theological implications	Evaluation
A "person" of the triune godhead	Leads to highly complex technical assertion.	•Means that Heb. 1:3 would provide explicit evidence for Trinitarianism. >Means that Heb. 1:3 would provide explicit evidence against Transcendent Monotheism.	This is not likely since it would serve no purpose within the rhetorical intent of Paul in Hebrews.
The ontological essence of the divine being	The Son would be an "image" of the ontological essence of the divine being. What would this mean exactly: Jesus is ontologically a God-man who "images" in his being the ontological essence of God?	•Not clear whether this would provide evidence for Trinitarianism. Is it compatible with Trinitarian theology that Jesus only "images" the divine essence? > Not clear whether this is compatible with Transcendent Monotheism.	Possible (if Trinitarianism itself is possible), but difficult to even understand what it would be saying.
The particular, individual personal identity of God	The Son would be an "image" of the particular, individual, personal identity of God. Jesus is ontologically a human being who "images" the particular person of the transcendent God.	• Would be clearly incompatible with Trinitarianism. >Would be completely compatible with Transcendent Monotheism.	Possible. No particular difficulties with this reading.

APPENDIX J: The Meaning of *hypostasis* in Hebrews 1:3

<i>hypostasis</i> = (in Heb. 1:3)	Exegetical implications	Theological implications	Evaluation
The possessions of God (his divine attributes)	The Son would be an "image" of the divine attributes of God. What would this mean exactly: Jesus is ontologically a God-man who "images" God's divine attributes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doubtful that this would provide evidence for Trinitarianism. Is it compatible with Trinitarian theology that Jesus only "images" the divine attributes rather than contains them within his person? > Could be compatible with Transcendent Monotheism depending upon how one understands what it means. 	Possible. Takes <i>hypostasis</i> in a well-attested manner.
Some other vague, general reference to the being of God	The Son would be an "image" of God in some general, unspecified sense.	Completely compatible with both Trinitarianism and Transcendent Monotheism.	Entirely possible.