



<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study,
without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first
obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any
format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author,
title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

**THE USE OF
THE OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS
IN THE EPISTLE TO THE
HEBREWS 1 & 2**

Presented By

LEE YIP MUN

For the degree of

MASTER OF THEOLOGY

In the

Faculty of Divinity

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

1988

ProQuest Number: 10970879

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10970879

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

- "Situation du Christ. Epitre aux Hebreux 1 et 2" (Paris, 1969).
- "L'οικουμενη dans l'epitre aux Hebreux" Bib 45 (1964) pp.250-255.
- "L'epitre aux Ephesiens et l'epitre aux Hebreux" Bib 59 (1978) pp.198-230.
- Vermes, G "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting" ALUOS 6 (1966-68) p.95.
- Vis, A. "The Messianic Psalm Quotations in the New Testament" (Amsterdam, 1936)
- Waard, J.De. "A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament" (Leiden, 1966).
- Wallis, W.B. "The Use of Psalms 8 and 110 in I Cor 15:25-27 and in Heb 1 and 2" JETS 15 (1972) pp.25-29.
- Westermann, C. "The Praise of God in the Psalms" trans. K.R.Crim (Richmond, 1965).
- Williamson, R. "The Background of the Epistle to the Hebrews" ExpT 87 (1976) pp.232-237.
- "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Leiden, 1970).
- Wilson, R.McL "Hennecke: N.T. Apocrypha" (London, 1959, 1963).
- Wrede, W. "Das literarische Ratsel des Hebraerbrieffs" (Göttingen, 1906).
- Wuellner, W. "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" CBQ 49 (1987) pp.448-463.
- Yadin, Y. "A Midrash on 2 Sam vii and Ps i-ii" IEJ 9 (1959) pp.95-97.
- "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews" Scripta Hierosolymitana IV (Jerusalem, 1965). pp.36-53.
- "A note on Melchizedek and Qumran" IEJ 15 (1965) pp.152-154.
- Zimmermann, H. n/ "Das Bekenntnis der Hoffnung" Bonner Biblische Beitrage 47 (Köln, 1977).
- Zuntz, G. s/ "The Text of the Epistle" (London, 1953).



PREFACE

This is a master dissertation written over the period 1987-88 in the University of Glasgow.

The Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews has interested me since my undergraduate theological studies. More thoughts have developed in the last two years of teaching on Hebrews and thus persuaded me for further studies. For this opportunity, I like to acknowledge the following media for the completion of this short research work.

should First I like to thank my supervisor Reverend Professor Robert Davidson, the Professor of Old Testament and Literature of the Faculty of Divinity and the Principal of Trinity College in the University of Glasgow, for his wise and patient direction and painstaking corrections of my writings. *Language*

Secondly I am grateful to my many supporters; the Malaysia Bible Seminary, my employer who grants me the leave-of-absence; the Chinese Overseas Christian Mission in London; the Manchester Chinese Christian Church, and many friends and benefactors; in assisting part of my financial requirements in the research.

Thirdly thanks to the computers and *many* software; the IBM PC and its software, the Apple Macintosh and its software, and the Laser printer, which greatly help me to store, type, edit, and print on any part of the writings in any time I like. Thank to the "Dictionary" which enable me to avoid most of the misspell words. */s*

Finally my heartfelt gratitude and debt to my parents who have given most of their life-long savings for the sake of my nine years of tertiary education in Britain.

All the above named and unnamed persons have truly acted as the great cloud of supporters surrounded me so that I can work with perseverance the task that is set before me. More to Jesus the Archegos and Teleiotes of my Christian faith which I found fifteen years ago. To Him be the glory.

June 3, 1988.

Lee Yip-Mun

CONTENTS

	page
PREFACE	2
ABBREVIATIONS	5
PROLEGOMENA	7
I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE EPISTLE	19
Introduction : Structural-Rhetorical Criticism	20
A. The Structure of Hebrews	31
B. The Structure of Hebrews 1 & 2	42
II. The EXEGETICAL INVESTIGATIONS	53
Introduction: Exegesis in the Primitive Church	54
1. Heb. 1:5a (= Ps. 2:7b)	68
2. Heb. 1:5b (= 2 Sam. 7:14a)	74
3. Heb. 1:6b (= Ps. 97(LXX 96):7/ Deut. 32:43 (LXX)).	79
4. Heb. 1:7b (= Ps. 104(LXX 103): 4)	83
5. Heb. 1:8b-9 (= Ps. 45(LXX 44):7-8)	86
6. Heb. 1:10-12 (= Ps. 102(LXX 101):26-28)	93
7. Heb. 1:13b (= Ps. 110(LXX 109):1b)	98
8. Heb. 2:6b-8a (= Ps. 8:5-7)	103

9. Heb. 2:12 (= Ps. 22(LXX 21):23)	114
10. Heb. 2:13a (= Is 8:17)	118
11. Heb. 2:13b (= Is 8:18)	121
III. THE THEOLOGY OF Hebrews 1 and 2	124
CONCLUSION	132
Table I : The O.T. Quotations & Allusions in Hebrews	134
Cited Bibliography	139

Abbreviations

(Only the Journals and Lexicons are abbreviated here. Others; scriptural texts, short hands etc., are not listed and assumed as customary or self-explanatory.)

AJBA	Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology (Melbourne)
ALUOS	Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society (Leiden)
AnBib	Analecta Biblica Series
BA	Biblical Archaeologist (Denville,NJ)
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (Denville,NJ)
BDB	F.Brown, S.R.Driver, & C.A.Briggs, "Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament".
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Manchester)
Bib	Biblica (Rome)
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin (Rome)
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift (Poderborn)
BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly (Washington,DC)
CJT	Canadian Journal of Theology (Toronto)
EAJT	East Asia Journal of Theology (Singapore)
EQ	Evangelical Quarterly (Exeter)
EncJud	Encyclopedia Judaica vol. 1- 16. C.Roth ed. (Jerusalem, 1972)
ExpT	Expository Times (Edinburgh)
Exp&Rev	Exposition and Review (Louisville)
HeyJ	Heythrop Journal (London)
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTR	Harvard Theological Review (Cambridge,MA)
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual (Cincinnati,OH)
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal (Jerusalem)
INT	Interpretation (Richmond)
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature (Chicago)
JETS	Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society (Jackson,USA)
JSJ	Journal for the study of Judaism (Leiden)
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament (Sheffield)
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (Sheffield)
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies (Manchester)

JTS	Journal of Theological Studies (New Series) (Oxford)
NT	Novum Testamentum (Leiden)
NTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplement Series
NTS	New Testament Studies (Cambridge)
NTA	New Testament Abstracts
RB	Revue Biblique (Paris)
RQ	Revue de Qumran (Paris)
SemeiaSup	Semeia Supplement Series
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology (Edinburgh)
Str-Bill	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash (H.Strack and P.Billerbeck, 1922-56. vol. I - V)
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 9 vols.G.Kittel and G.Friedrich ed. 1932ff, trans. G.W.Bromiley 1964-74.
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. G.J.Botterweck & H.Ringgren ed 4 vols, 1970-72, J.T.Willis trans. vols. 1-5, 1977ff.
Them	Themelios (Leicester)
TLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung (Berlin)
TRu	Theologische Rundschau (Tubingen)
TZ	TheologischeZeitschrift (Basel)
TynBull	Tyndale Bulletin Cambridge)
VoxEv	Vox Evangelica (London)
VT	Vetus Testamentum (Leiden)
VTSup	Vetus Testament Supplements
ZAW	Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin)
ZNW	Zeitschrift fur die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin)
ZTK	Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche (Tubingen)

PROLEGOMENA

The study of the **Use of the Old Testament** (hereafter **OT**) **Quotations in the Epistle to the Hebrews** not only reflects the **exegetical principles** of the author but also helps the formation of the **structure** and **theology** in the Epistle. The extensive use of the OT¹ by the author has always been one of the perennial phenomena in the studies of Hebrews. Obviously the main theological themes in the Epistle are taken from it, and the chief arguments are based on the exegesis of it. Furthermore, the structure of the Epistle is "shaped" by the OT quotations. These are the three components; namely, the exegetical principles, the structure, and the theology, this dissertation sets on to work and attempts to discern their relationships. Due to the limited space of a master dissertation, my experimental scope only falls within Hebrews chapters 1 and 2, and I believe that these two chapters can act as a "microcosm" to the whole of the Epistle.

I have divided the contents of this writing into three main chapters. Chapter one (section I) is to deal first with the structure of Hebrews. Chapter two (section II) is the investigation of the Use of the OT quotations in the Epistle. Chapter three is the illustration of the theology in Hebrews; largely in the light of the discussions of the previous two chapters. In this introduction section, I wish to give a "prologue" to each of these chapter.

In recent years there has been an upsurge of interest among NT scholars on the reconstruction of the **structure** of Biblical documents. The Epistle of Hebrews is no exemption although it is not a popular piece of document for "experiment". This upsurge is probably due to two phenomena on Hebrews: (a) the rise of, and penetration of, Structural and Rhetorical criticism into biblical studies; (b) the re-appreciation of the excellent stylistic composition of Hebrews. Concerning these phenomena, I have spent the first chapter (section I) for discussion and investigation. I spend the introductory section discussing the

1. For the most recent statistics, the Third corrected edition of the Greek New Testament by the United Bible Societies (Stuttgart, 1983) gives 37 OT quotations in Hebrews. Also, G.L.Archer & G.C.Chirichigno, "Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey" (Chicago, 1983) listed 37 OT quotations in Hebrews as well. I have listed 42 in Table 1 (pp.180-185), and with the allusions of the OT in Hebrews, occupied approximately 18.5 % of the total wording of the Epistle.

Structural and Rhetorical criticism and attempt^{ing} to find out their relationships. Then I go on to reconstruct the structure of Hebrews, specifically on Hebrews 1 and 2. In the investigating of the structure, a short survey of the various theories of reconstruction is first discussed; I have named them as conceptual, literary, and form-content theories of reconstruction. Conceptual structure is the traditional structure, which follows the theological themes in the Epistle for divisions, and asserted by most of the commentators especially Thomas Aquinas,¹ B.F. Westcott,² C. Spicq,³ P.E. Hughes,⁴ only to name a few.

Literary structure is influenced by Structural and Rhetorical criticism and reconstructed the structure of Hebrews based on formal literary criteria. It appears first in F. Thein,⁵ later in R. Gyllenberg,⁶ L. Vaganay,⁷ A. Descamps,⁸ W. Nauck,⁹ A. Vanhoye,¹⁰ only to name some distinguish^{ed} ones. Vanhoye is the greatest supporter of this theory in the last twenty years.

The Form-Content theory of reconstruction is a challenge to the literary

1. Thomas Aquinas, "Super epistolam ad Hebraeos lectura". Cited from C. Spicq, Comm. I. p. 28.

2. B.F. Westcott, Comm. pp. xlviii-li, based on the "general progress of thought in the Epistle".

3. C. Spicq, Comm. I. pp.

4. P.E. Hughes, Comm. pp. 2-4, under the theme "The Supremacy of Christ" follows the logical theological arguments to reconstruct the structure.

5. F. Thein, "Analyse de l'Épître aux Hébreux" RB 11(1902) pp. 74-86, first introduces the inversion device from rhetorical study.

6. R. Gyllenberg, "Die Komposition des Hebraerbriefes" in Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 22-23 (1957-58) pp. 137-147, first to use symmetrism as criteria for reconstruction.

7. L. Vaganay, "Le Plan de l'Épître aux Hébreux" in Memorial Lagrange, L.H. Vincent ed (Paris, 1940) first introduced the use of "catch-words" in the reconstruction.

8. A. Descamps, "La Structure de l'Épître aux Hébreux" Rev. Dioc. Tournai 9 (1954) pp. 251-258 & 333-338, introduced the use of "repetition of the theme" as criteria.

9. W. Nauck, "Zum Aufbau des Hebraerbriefes" in "Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche" Festschrift zum Joachim Jeremias BZNW 26 (1964) pp. 199-206, calls for the use of Greek rhetoric in the reconstruction and against O. Michel and C. Spicq in the use of logical theological themes in the Epistle.

10. A. Vanhoye, "La Structure de l'Épître aux Hébreux" (Paris, 1963); "A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews" trans. J. Swetnam (Rome, 1964); "Situation du Christ: Épître aux Hébreux 1 et 2" (Paris, 1969); "Discussions sur la structure de l'épître aux Hébreux" Bib 55 (1974) pp. 349-380, conglomerates the above literary methods, especially emphasizes of Vaganay's "catch-words" ("hook-words" in Vanhoye), to construct a detail literary structure of Hebrews.

structure in recent years. J.Swetnam,¹ the translator of Vanhoye's book, first calls for the emphatic use of contents as criteria in reconstruction rather than purely building the structure on formal literary devices. Most recently, J.P.Meier² moved a step further to find the relationship between the structure and theology in Hebrews. I have tried to follow this theory, and in addition, by bringing in the OT quotations as an important factor in the forming of the criteria for reconstruction. Here I make some consideration of the literary form or the genre of the Epistle, since the proper identifying of the genre of Hebrews is of vital importance to the reconstruction of its structure. But the exact genre of Hebrews much has been disputed. At least five different opinions have been proposed.

(i) As essay or treatise. W.Wrede³ calls chapter 1-12 ~~as~~ "abhandlungsmässig" /δ in content and form. This term points to the serious, orderly, scholarly treatment of a theme. To some extent, Hebrews may fit this description. F.V.Filson⁴ criticises this view in two respects; (a) a treatise is a general discussion while Hebrews was directed to a definite group of Christians, (b) a treatise is content-centred, while Hebrews is marked by repeated and urgent hortatory exhortation. λs

(ii) An epistle or letter. This is the most frequently used term. Hebrews may be described as a letter since it reflects a living relationship between the author and his recipients and implies a specific situation of sufficient importance to move the writer to send his message as soon as possible. Nevertheless, this has been denied due to the omission of greetings at the beginning. H.Thylen,⁵ followed by G.W.Buchanan,⁶ argued that even the

1. J.Swetnam, "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6" Bib 53 (1972) pp.368-385; "Form and Content in Hebrews 7-13" Bib 55 (1974) pp.333-348, reconstructed the structure of Hebrews based on four independent factors as criteria: (i) the repetition of significant words; (ii) announcements of theme; (iii) basic genre (exposition and exhortation); (iv) length.

2. J.P.Meier, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14" Bib 66 (1985) pp.168-189; "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5-14" Bib 66 (1985) pp.504-533.

3. W.Wrede, "Das literarische Ratsel des Hebraerbriefs" (Gottingen, 1906).

4. F.V.Filson, "Yesterday: A Study of Hebrews in Light of Chapter 13" (London, 1967) pp.17.

5. H.Thylen, "Der Stil der judisch-hellenistischen Homilie" (Gottingen, 1955) p.17.

6. G.W. Buchanan, Comm. p.267.

end (chapter 13) is an addition. On the other hand, C.Spicq,¹ argued that the omission of greetings at the beginning was typical of the Near Eastern letter form. A more recent suggestion has been that Hebrews is a pseudigraphical letter whose beginning can be found in fragmentary fashion in Romans 16:25ff.²

(iii) A biblical exposition. Undeniably the whole work of Hebrews cites and applies OT passages in the exposition of its theological themes. This opinion is minimized by the argument that biblical exposition should not be the sole intention of the author since there are extensive sections given over to exhortation.

(iv) An exhortation. The author himself calls his writing "a word of exhortation"(Heb 13:22). Large portions of the material fit this description (examples, 2:1-4; 3:7-4:13; 6:1-19; 10:19-39; 12:1-28). F.F.Bruce³ criticises this view on the ground that in Acts 13:15 "word of exhortation" denotes a homily.

(V) A sermon or homily. This indicates that it is a biblically-based Christian message which has an assembled congregation in mind. Hebrews as homily is the most generally held opinion. H. Thyen⁴ has cogently defend of this position he argued that Hebrews was written in the style of the Jewish Hellenistic homily, a style also found in Philo's allegorical commentary on Genesis, I Clement, 4 Maccabees, Barnabas, Shepherd of Hermas etc. J. Swetnam has supplemented Thyen's book thoroughly but questioned Thyen's assertion of the Jewish-Hellenistic homily as opposed to that of the Jewish-Palestinian one.⁵

With these different proposals on the literary genre of Hebrews, we can only conclude that no one single word will clearly and accurately express what is the exact genre of Hebrews. But it is clear to any reader of Hebrews that it contains two obvious kinds of materials:

1. C.Spicq, Comm. I. p.24.

2. F.Renner, "An die Hebraer: ein pseudigraphischer Brief" (Munsterschwarzbach, 1970).

3. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.413, "in Acts 13:15, where the ruler of the synagogue at Prusidian Antioch sends a message to Paul and Barnabas inviting them to pass on any "word of exhortation" that they may have for the assembled company. The phrase clearly denotes a homily; it is thus very suitable description for this epistle, which is a homily in written form with some personal remarks at the end".

4. H.Thyen, "Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie" op. cit. p.71.

5. J.Swetnam, "On the Literary Genre of the "Epistle" to the Hebrews" NT 11 (1969) pp.261-269. While, G.W.Buchanan, Comm. p.246, thinks that Hebrews is a homiletic midrash on Psalm 110.

exposition and exhortation.¹ And I would claim that any of the suggestions above should not be abandoned and each of them is importance in the reconstruction of the structure of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The second chapter is dedicated to the investigation of the **use of the OT quotations in Hebrews 1 and 2**. Usually under two aspects scholars dealt with these OT quotations: the textual origin and the exegetical principles; the former must be clarified before the latter.

In this century scholarship, in the studies of the OT quotations in the NT, ^{/δ} has been able to claim that the NT writers quoted their texts not only from the Masoretic text but instead relied more on the Septuagint. But for the last thirty years, scholars on the Epistle to the Hebrews have been puzzled as to which manuscript of the LXX or any other Greek Vorlage was the author following. At least ^{s/} five general trends of opinions have been proposed.

(i) LXX A or B. F. Bleek, as the first to make a systematic textual study of the quotations, concluded that the author of Hebrews used a text similar to Codex Alexandrinus.² Later scholars like E. Riggerbach,³ A. Nairne,⁴ W. Leonard,⁵ ^{v/} J. van der Ploeg,⁶ consider LXX as the proven fact. S.G. Sowers⁷ even goes so far to state that the author knew and quoted only the LXX.

(ii) Pre-MT Hebrew text. Against the above trend in claiming LXX as the Vorlage, G. Howard, based on the discovery of the Qumran Literature and the impetus given by it to the study of the pre-Masoretic text, argues that the text used by the author of Hebrews is closer to a Hebrew recension more ancient than the Masoretic text.⁸

(iii) Multiple or Primitive Greek texts. This is an alternate way to explain the

1. J.C. Fenton, "The Argument in Hebrews" in "Studia Evangelica 7" (Berlin, 1982) pp.175-181 where he strongly claims for these two kinds of literary form in Hebrews

2. F. Bleek, Comm. I. p.374.

3. E. Riggerbach, Comm. p.6.

4. A. Nairne, Comm. p.273.

5. W. Leonard, "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Rome, 1939).p.316.

6. J. van der Ploeg, "L'Exegese de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Epitre aux Hebreux" RB 14 (1947) pp.187-228.

7. S.G. Sowers, "The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews" (Zurich, 1965) p.75. Cf. also, B.F. Westcott, Comm.p.478.

8. G. Howard, "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations" NT 10 (1968) p.208-216. Cf. also, M. Barth,

δ/ variant readings from LXX A or B. C.Spicq considered that the author used a manuscript which came from Family A (Alexandrinus), but also with certain readings from B, Lucianic recension, and Theodotion recension.¹ K.J.Thomas argued that the author was following a Codex which was more primitive than LXX A or B.² F.F.Bruce follows Thomas' argument and said, "the natural inference is that our author used a type of text earlier than either A-text or the B-text..."³ Recently, E. Ahlborn⁴ and J.C.McCullough⁵ have been able to gain insight from the recent Septuagintal researches in Gottingen and argue that the author of Hebrews made use of various recensions available to him.

(iv) Liturgy or Testimony hypothesis. S.Kistemaker argued that the author of Hebrews was familiar with the psalms and hymns used in the liturgies of the Early Church and thus he, naturally, borrowed various elements from the ritual and employed these in his Epistle.⁶ On the other hand, some scholars try to explain that the author made use of a common "Testimony" book of scriptural quotations.⁷

(v) The author's self-influence. Either that the author cited "verbatim" according to the Greek Texts,⁸ or he may have made some of the alterations himself for the sake of stylistic improvement.⁹

"The Old Testament in Hebrews-An essay in Biblical Hermeneutics" in "Current Issues in N.T. Hermeneutics" ed. Klassen.W. & Synder, G.F. (New York, 1962) pp.65-78.

1. C.Spicq, Comm. I. p.335. For similar older opinion cf. H.B.Swete, "An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek" (Cambridge, 1900) p.403.

2. K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959) p.321-322, & "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews" NTS (1965) p.303, Cf. also P.Katz, "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews" ZNW 49 (1958) pp.213-223, states that the proper question to be asked about the quotations in the NT is "does a quotation follow the primitive text or an 'edited' one?"

3. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.xlix.

4. E.Ahlborn, "Der Septuaginta Vorlage des Hebraerbriefs" unpub. thesis (Universitat Gottingen, 1966).

5.J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) & "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews" NTS 26 (1980) pp.363-379.

6. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961). Cf. also, O.Michel, Comm. p.7.

7. The first detailed working out of the theory was by R.Harris, "Testimonies" (Cambridge, I-1916, II-1920). He deals with Hebrews in vol. II pp.43-50. In recent years, F.C.Syngé, "Hebrews and Scriptures" (London, 1959) has been a strong supporter of the Testimony book hypothesis.

8. K.J.Thomas, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews" op. cit. p.303.

9. J.C.McCullough, "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews" op. cit. p.363.

Out of these divergent opinions, one general conclusion can be made. The textual Vorlage of many of the OT quotations in Hebrews is to be found not in one single codex or several well known codices but rather, probably, in the recensions; known or unknown. The LXX A or B or some major LXX codices are texts which just happen to have been preserved. More Septuagintal research remains to be done and is presently being carried out by the Göttingen Commission.¹ Any conclusion about the textual origin of the OT quotations in the Epistle to the Hebrews must be cautious and tentative.

In discussion of the author's **exegetical principles** two interdependent aspects have usually been considered. The first aspect concerns the formal exegetical rules which the author encounters or follows; the second concerns the underlying attitude which he displays toward the OT.

In the past fifty years more and more studies have been published concerning the formal exegetical rules existing in the milieu in the Primitive Church period. These formal exegetical rules I have discussed in the introductory section of chapter two (section II). All the possible exegetical rules covered by three schools; the Jewish-rabbinic school which includes Targum, Talmud, Septuagint, Midrash, apocalyptic writings; Philo of Alexandria, and the Qumran sectaries; and ~~the Judeo-Christian~~ school of exegesis, are briefly illustrated. The "Testimony Book" hypothesis is also included at the end of these discussions.

~~The~~ The more important exegetical principles issue is the **author's attitude to the OT**, or his "theology of the OT". This automatically brings in the issues of the author's religious background. Under five possible headings our discussion will cover here; Gnosticism, Eschatology, Philo, Qumran, ~~Mekabah~~ mysticism. Only matters strictly related to the Epistle to the Hebrews will be discussed, hopefully in a succinctly manner. The questions of authorship, recipients, purpose and place of writing will be lightly "touched" on.

(i) Although a **Gnostic background** for Hebrews had been presupposed

1. The main Septuagintal research has been carried out by the Göttingen Commission since 1908. The Cambridge centre also corroborated in this task. Cf. S. Jellicoe, "The Septuagint and Modern Study" (Oxford, 1968) for an account of the work done on LXX. Or cf. E. Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research" (Jerusalem, 1981). The following Septuagintal books have been published; Genesis, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, 1 Esdras, Esther, 1,2,3 Maccabees, Psalms and Odes, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Ben Sirach, 12 Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Thrones, Letter of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Susannah, Daniel, Bel and the Dragon.

by H.Windisch in 1931,¹ it is E.Kasemann² who first gave a thorough interpretation of the Epistle based on Gnostic motifs. Principal motifs such as Son and sons, katapausis, high priestly christology, pilgrimage of Hebrews are specially explained against the Gnostic background, and he concluded: "On the basis of the preceding investigation we may even assert that both the drafting of the entire theme and the Christology of the letter in particular were possible only on soil made ready by Gnosticism."³ After the Nag Hammadi discoveries, E.Grasser further supports Kasemann's interpretation by demonstrating that such concepts as "wandering," "pilgrimage," "rest," and "perfection" are attested in Nag Hammadi writings.⁴ While G.Theissen⁵ is more cautious in his support of Kasemann's interpretation by doubting whether Kasemann's principal motifs are Gnosticism. But Theissen claims that Hebrews view of creation as "Gemachte eo ipso nicht heilvoll" (cf. Heb 12:27) is closer to Gnosticism than to apocalyptic.⁶ On the other line of argument, G.Bornkamm⁷ and T.W.Manson⁸ argues that the danger which the author was combating was that of lapsing into the kind of syncretistic Gnostic-Judaism. All these accounts have not succeeded in making a lasting contributing to studies in Hebrews. Recently, Schmithals makes the remarks that some of the motifs illustrated by Kasemann might be derived from Jewish-hellenistic roots, without necessarily from Gnosticism.⁹ On the other hand, R.McL Wilson calls for a distinction between Gnosis in the broader sense (like the "gnostic myth" claims by Kasemann), and Gnosticism in the narrower sense referring to the developed systems of the second century.¹⁰ Thus B.A.Pearson suggests that Hebrews is one of the sources in the development of Gnosticism.¹¹ J.W.Thompson¹² comments

1. H.Windisch, Comm. He suggests the importance of the Mandaean literature for understanding Hebrews.

2. E.Kasemann, Comm.

3. Ibid. p.174.

4. E.Grasser, "Der Hebraerbrief 1938-1963" TRu 30 (1964) pp.185-186.

5. G.Theissen, "Untersuchungen zum Hebraerbrief" (Gutersloh, 1969) pp.115-130.

6. Ibid. p.121.

7. G.Bornkamm, "Das Bekenntnis im Hebraerbrief" in "Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum II" (Munich, 1959) pp.188-203.

8. T.W.Manson, "The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews" BJRL 32 (1949) pp.1-17.

9. W. Schmithal, "Neues Testament und Gnosis" (Darmstadt, 1984) pp.142-143.

10. R.McL Wilson, Comm. p.26.

11. B.A.Pearson, "Nag Hammadi Codices" IX & X (Leiden, 1981) p.34.

12. J.W.Thompson, "The Beginning of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews" CBQ series 13 (Washington, 1982) p.5.

that "the positive contribution of these [the above] interpreters has been in recognizing a pattern of argumentation which distinguishes Hebrews from other NT writers". What remains today is the concept of dualism. Again this must be carefully defined since one can describe dualism under Gnosticism, Platonism, and apocalypticism. Further research is needed in this area.

(ii) Recently scholars like C.K.Barrett,¹ B.Klappert,² and O.Hofius³ have emphasized on the **eschatological interpretation** in Hebrews. In contrast to Kasemann, Barrett interprets the theological motifs of "rest," "pilgrimage," and the "holy place above" as concepts shaped by eschatological consciousness. He claims that, by this eschatological consciousness, the author of Hebrews has been able to solve the tension posed by Paul to the Christian that Christ is the end of the Law. In three ways the author of Hebrews asserts his OT attitude: (a) What the prophets spoke to Israel of old or the words (of the Law) communicated through angels proved steadfast, (b) Parts of the OT prophecy have been fulfilled while others remain and await fulfillment in the future, (c) The truth in the OT not only pointed forward in time, but upward to the mind of God.⁴ O.Hofius claims that the concepts of "rest" and the "curtain" separating heaven and earth are not limited to Gnostic texts, but are more close to apocalyptic conceptual framework similar to Ezra.⁵ More recently, in the East, J.R.Sharp argues that the spatial dualism of Hebrews is to be found in apocalyptic idealism and primitive christian thought rather than in Platonic or Philonic idealism.⁶

(iii) That **Philo** is the key to Hebrews has been affirmed since C.Spicq⁷, following E.Menegoz's⁸ claims, that the author of Hebrews was "un philonien converti au christianisme". Spicq⁹ has brought together an extensive collection of parallels; Greek style, vocabulary, exegetical traditions, themes, between Philo and Hebrews.⁹ While R.Williamson¹⁰

1. C.K.Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" in "The Background of the NT and its Eschatology" (C.H.Dodd Festschrift) W.D.Davies & D.Daube ed (Cambridge, 1964) pp.363-393.

2. B.Klappert, "Die Eschatologie des Hebraerbriefs" (Munich, 1969).

3. O.Hofius, "Katapausis: Die Vorstellung von endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebraerbrief" (Tubingen, 1970). Also cf. "Der Vorhand vor dem Thron Gottes" (Tubingen, 1972).

4. C.K.Barrett, op. cit. p.391-392.

5. O. Hofius, "Katapausis" op. cit. p.181-182.

6. J.R.Sharp, "Philonism and the Eschatology of Hebrews" EAJT 2 (1984) pp.289-298.

7. C.Spicq, Comm. I. p.91.

8. E.Menegoz, "La Theologie de l'Epitre aux Hebreux" (Paris, 1894) p.198.

9. C.Spicq, Comm. I. pp.39-91.

10. R.Williamson, "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Leiden, 1970).

in his massive work "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews" challenges Spicq's thesis and argues that the similarity between Philo and Hebrews is only formal, not conceptual. He concludes that "there is no decisive proof that the author of Hebrews borrowed any of his terminology from Philo",¹ and agrees only that the author of Hebrews shared with Philo a common Alexandrian milieu. S.G.Sowers in his examination of the hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews agrees with this "common milieu" and says, "this plus the fact that Hebrews follows Codex Alexandrinus seems to indicate a geographical proximity of both writers".² But Sowers denies the use of allegory in Hebrews as it was defined and used by the allegorists.³ A more common view of scholars is that while Philo is allegorical, Hebrews is typological in approaching the OT.⁴ This immediately raises the issue as to how to differentiate the "typological" interpretation of the OT in Hebrews. S.G.Sowers formulates ^{ion of} typology as "the interpretation of earlier events, persons, and institutions in Biblical history which become proleptic entities, or "types," anticipating later events, persons, and institutions, which are their antitypes"⁵ is well accepted. But J.C.McCullough makes a further distinction, saying, "obviously this is very similar to the promise-fulfillment method of exegesis but its basis is very different. One is based on the assumption that God repeats acts in two ages, the other that God foretells what he is going to do in the future without reference to any doctrine of two ages."⁶ This is not the place to give a detailed discussion of allegory and typology.⁷ Recently R.W.Thurston has been able to claim that the author alludes to Philo because he is refuting a Christology based on Philo as the source.⁸

1. R.Williamson, op. cit. p.492. Cf. also p.276, 431.

2. S.G.Sowers, "The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews" (Zurich, 1965). Cf. also, F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes als ~~s~~chriftauslager" (Regensburg, 1966). ^{/S cap.}

3. Ibid. p.137. Cf. also G.B.Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews" CanJTheol 5 (1959) pp.44-51.

4. Cf. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.481; J.Moffatt, Comm. p.lxii; C.Spicq, Comm.l.p.346; O.Michel, Comm. p.188; F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.1; also L.Goppelt, "Typos. The Typological Interpretation of the OT in the New" (Grand Rapids, 1982) p.195. For details see R.Williamson, "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews" op. cit. pp.496-575.

5. S.G.Sowers, op. cit. p.89. Similar formulation can be found in R.P.C.Hanson, "Allegory and Event" (Richmond, 1959) p.7.

6. J.C.McCullough, "Some recent developments in Research on the Epistle to the Hebrews" II, Irish Biblical Studies 3 (1981) p.44.n.134.

7. For details, see D.L.Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament" SJT 29 (1976) pp.137-157; P.J.Cahill, "Hermeneutical Implications of Typology" CBQ 44 (1982) pp.266-281.

8. R.W.Thurston, "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews" EQ 48 (1986) pp.305-325.

(iv) The discovery and gradual publication of the **Dead Sea Scrolls** beginning in 1949 gave an impetus and deeper understanding to studies concerning the religious background of Hebrews. Y.Yadin first makes a study by comparing the concepts of prophets, angels, Moses, priestly Messiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls with those in Hebrews and concludes that "the 'addressees' themselves must have been a group of Jews originally belonging to the DSS Sect who were converted to Christianity, carrying with them some of their previous beliefs."¹ Yadin makes a similar ^{claim} again after he had examined the 11Q Melchizedek documents.² H.Kosmala³ takes one step further by arguing that the addressees were in fact an Essene congregation and that the purpose of the Epistle was to urge them to become Christians. In replying to the above claims, F.F.Bruce argues for a "common cultural milieu" shared by the author to the Hebrews and the Qumranites and concludes "it would be outstripping the evidence to call them Essenes or spiritual brethren to the men of Qumran."⁴ Bruce also argues that "the writer to the Hebrews, by every token, was a Hellenist," ^{writings} "to the Hellenistic readers."⁵ Later, scholars prefer to maintain that the common ideas the Qumranites and the Hebrews shared are simply Jewish and not peculiar to either of them.⁶ Quite different from these arguments, F.L.Horton argues that the author to the Hebrews chose Melchizedek because Melchizedek is the first priest mentioned in the OT.⁷

(v) More recently some scholars try to relate **Merkabah mysticism** found in Jewish Apocalyptic with Hebrews, especially the concept of "curtain" in the Epistle.⁸ This "narrow" assessment was criticised by R.Williamson. Merkabah

-
1. Y.Yadin, "The Dead sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews" Scripta Hierosolymitana IV (Jerusalem, 1965) pp.36-53. Quotation from p.38.
 2. Y.Yadin, "A note on Melchizedek and Qumran" IEJ 15 (1965) pp.152-154.
 3. H.Kosmala, "Hebraer-Essener-Christen" (Leiden, 1959).
 4. F.F.Bruce, "To the Hebrews or To the Essenes?" NTS 9 (1963) pp.217-232.
 5. Ibid. p.232.
 6. Cf. M.de Jonge & A.S.van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament" NTS 12 (1966) pp.301-326; J.A.Fitzmeyer, "Further light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11" JBL 86 (1967) pp.25-41. For details see H.Braun, "Qumran und das Neue Testament" (Tubingen, 1966) I.pp.241-274, II.p.183f.
 7. F.L.Horton, "The Melchizedek Tradition, a critical examination of the sources to the fifth century AD and in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Cambridge, 1976) p.161.
 8. Cf. O.Hofius, "Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Heb 6:19f und 10:19f" (Tubingen, 1972); H-M Schenke, "Erwagungen zum Ratsel des Hebraerbriefes" in "NT und Christliche Existenz" H.Braun Festschrift ed.H.D.Betz & L.Schottroff (Tubingen, 1973) pp.421-437.

mysticism can only represent one element in Judaism of the first century Hellenistic world, and the evidence is not strong enough to prove a link beyond all doubt.¹

All these possible "religious backgrounds" will continue to fascinate scholars and articles keep pouring out into the arena of the scholarship of Hebrews; not to mention many "old" studies finding a relationship between Hebrews and other NT figures like Paul, John, Ephesian,² Apollos,³ etc, or other groups and thoughts in Judaism like the Hasmoneans,⁴ Syriac documents⁵. More will be proposed in the future. Recently, J.W.Thompson argues for a "metaphysical" background and finally concludes that "Hebrews is thus distinguished from other early Christian literature by a consistent metaphysical that was commonly known in educated circles. While the author is not a philosopher, his work is a transition to Christian philosophy."⁶ R.McL Wilson in his most recent commentary, rightly says, "We may note parallels, but what do these parallels signify?". Three possibilities must always be in mind: a common background; or influence by the other writer; or serving as a source to or from the other writer.⁷ We may, at this juncture, following Wilson, make a tentative conclusion: "Apart from the OT, none of the areas passed under review can really be said to have exercised any direct or formative influence upon our author."⁸ Due to this certainty of the use of the OT, it is always safe to bring in OT quotations, and allusions, as the criteria in reconstructing the structure as well as in the illumination of the theology of the Epistle.

1. R.Williamson, "Background of the Epistle to the Hebrews" ExpT 87 (1976) pp.232-237.
2. A.Vanhoye, "L'epitre aux Ephesiens et l'epitre aux Hebreux" Bib 59 (1978) pp.198-130. He listed 258 common words between the two epistles and many other evidences.
3. C.Spicq, "L'epitre aux Hebreux, Apollos, Jean Baptiste, les Hellenistes et Qumran" RQ 1 (1959).
4. Cf. H.Kosmala, "Hebraer-Essener-Christen" op. cit. & Y.Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews" op. cit.
5. S.P.Brock, "Hebrews 2:9b in Syriac Tradition" NT 27 (1983) pp.236-244.
6. J.W.Thompson, "The Beginning of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews" op. cit. Cf. also P.Ellingworth, "Jesus and the Universe in Hebrews" EQ 4 (1986) pp.337-350 for a "cosmological" explanation of the "Universe" concept in Hebrews.
7. R.McL Wilson, Comm.p.18.
8. Ibid. p.27.

I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE EPISTLE

Introduction: Structural-Rhetorical Criticism	20
1. The Structure of the Epistle	30
2. The Structure of Hebrews 1 and 2	41

I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE EPISTLE.

Introduction: Structural-Rhetorical Criticism.

The argument of this dissertation points to the well ordered arrangement of the Old Testament quotations in the total structure of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and argues that these Old Testament quotations are cited in order to support the progressive theological themes in the Epistle. Before describing this structure we must clarify the formal literary methods that are used to help to create this structure.

Structuralism and **Rhetorical** criticism have been for the last few decades the prevailing disciplines in literary study and biblical exegesis. Their developments are so rapid that scholars described them as "an illusion"¹ or "a confusion of tongues"², and today they are still very much in flux. This is due to the many different backgrounds of Structuralism and Rhetorical criticism and the profusion of articles by various scholars before a proper definition of these disciplines. As Mary Savage puts it "There are as many structuralisms as the structuralists"³. Recently, Christopher Tuckett accuses the structuralists of presenting their work in a very confusing way by "using a great deal of technical jargon as well as plethora of diagrams and charts of ever-increasing complexity."⁴ In this introduction section we discuss, at least in a simplified level, ~~at~~ first Structuralism then Rhetorical criticism, and how far ~~can~~ these two "approaches"⁵ can contribute to the discovery of the structure of the Epistle to the Hebrews. / δ / δ

1. Robert C. Culley, "Structural Analysis: Is it Done with Mirrors?" Int. 28 (1974) p.165.
2. Martin Kessler, "A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism" in "Art and Meaning: Rhetorical Biblical Literature" ed. by D.J.A.Clines etc. JSOTSup. 19 (Sheffield, 1982) p.1.
3. Mary Savage, "Literary Criticism and Biblical Studies: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Joseph Narrative" in "Scripture in Context: Essays on the Comparative Method" ed. by C.D.Evans, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 34 (1980) p. 87.
4. C.Tuckett, "Reading the New Testament: Methods of Interpretation" (London, 1987) p.151.
5. Scholars have argued that Structuralism and Rhetorical criticism "is neither a science nor a distinctive methodology" cf. R.M.Polzin, "Biblical Structuralism" SemeiaSup. (Philadelphia: Fortress Pr., 1977), also D.J.A.Clines ed. op. cit. p. at preface.

To what shall we compare Structuralism? Like a musical score¹ one must read both horizontal (melody) and vertical (harmony) at the same time. The most fundamental method of a structuralist (and a rhetorical critic) is to read a piece of literature or biblical text "vertically" (synchronically: at the same time, or paradigmically) rather than "horizontally" (diachronically: through the time, or syntagmically). This shift of attitude in reading a piece of writing is totally due to the various influences in the western societies in this century. In the nineteenth century, questions of historical origin formed the primary arena for all streams of study. Darwin's theory of evolution had not only challenged the general sciences but even biblical studies. Historical-critical interpretation of the Bible was the prevailing method until the mid of twentieth century. In society, existentialism had made man as a "subject" and his "conscience" was exalted. "Liberty" and "decision" were key words of the language of philosophy. The "meaning" of life or of action was the ideal to be attained. "We were living in complete humanism"². But after the second world war, the intellectual climate in France has been profoundly modified. Increasingly questions, methods and systems from the social sciences were being brought to bear both on aspects of modern life and on Christian theology. New logical and objective methods were applied to man, his language, and his customs. From a subject, man has become an object - an insecure and provisional object. /2

In the last two decades, man speaks little about historicity but of codes, arrangements, and systems. Today the social sciences have pushed philosophy back against the wall, and most of the tertiary level students talk about "structure"³ in almost every field of studies; first from physics, mathematics to linguistics, anthropology, literary studies, history, psychoanalysis, sociology, economics, philosophy, and finally, biblical studies. /3

1. A popular illustration used by structuralists. Cf. C.Levi-Strauss, "Introduction to a Science of Mythology" I. trans. by J & D. Weightmann (New York: Harper & Row, 1969) p.26; E.R.Leach, "Levi-Strauss" (London: Fontana, 1970) p.52; Robert A. Spivey, "Structuralism and Biblical Studies: The Uninvited Guest" INT 28 (1974) p.135.

2. Francois Bovon, "French Structuralism and Biblical Exegesis" in "Structural Analysis & Biblical Exegesis" Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 3, trans. by A.M.Johnson (1974) p.4.

3. "Structure" here, at least, means "a system of transformations, which includes some laws in a systematic form (as opposed to the properties of the elements) and which conserves or enriches itself by the same action of transformations, without forcing it to go outside its limitations or make an appeal to external elements. In other words a structure is constituted of three characteristics of totality, transformations, and self-regulation" J.Piaget "Structuralism" trans. by C.Maschler (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) p.5. /H

Then what actually is Structuralism? "Structuralism is an extraordinarily hard moment to define"¹. This is because Structuralism is more a diverse collection of methods by different practitioners, and also it can be a discipline-crossing label which can be applied to various fields of studies. Nevertheless, Structuralism in a broad sense can be characterized by three principles² :

1. *Totalities are explained in terms of the relations of the parts*, and it is believed that all individual parts of a system are related in a law-like way which is discernable. In other words, "none of the parts of the system are insignificant and yet no single part is loaded with meaning by itself".³
2. Structure that is fundamental for understanding is *found "below" the surface*, that is the "deep structure", of empirical manifestation. The type of structure being sought is usually abstract, mechanical and impersonal - it is usually not obvious to the "naive" or careless observer.
3. *Synchronic* as opposed to diachronic analysis is central. Synchronic analysis examines the "cross-section" of a structure that exists at a fixed time.

These three principles mentioned above form a common canopy covering the various forms of Structuralism. We know that in the last decade, structuralism has applied to psychoanalysis (Jacques Lacan), to history (Michel Foucault), to sociology (Lucien Goldman), to Marxism (Louis Althusser) etc. Today, we can hear different terms like Russian Formalism, Anglo-American New Criticism, Psychoanalytic Criticism, Marxist Literary theories, Feminist literary criticism, Reader-response criticism, Deconstruction theories, text exegesis, and many new terms may arise in the coming years. In "Modern Literary Theory"⁴, all these are due to the influence of Structuralism.

Let us illustrate more fully the discipline of structuralism by concentrating upon two areas: anthropology with Claude Levi-Strauss and literary criticism with

1. V.S.Poythress, "Structuralism and Biblical Studies" JETS 21 (1978) p.221.

2. Cf. M.Lane ed., "Introduction to Structuralism" (New York: Basic books, 1970) pp.13-17

3. Corina Galland, "A Structural Reading Defined" in "Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics" ed. & trans. by A.M.Johnson, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 22 (1979) p.183.

4. For more modern structuralism consults, "Modern Literary Theory" A.Jefferson & D. Robey ed. (London, 2nd ed. 1986).

Ronald Barthes. This choice is justified because these two studies are related to biblical exegesis.

If the sociologist-linguist Claude Levi-Strauss¹ can be considered to be the father of French structuralism, the grandfather is surely the linguist of Geneva, Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913)². Saussure at the beginning of the century successfully distinguished the 'langue' (language) i.e. the sum of word-images stored in the minds of all individuals³, from the 'parole' (speech) i.e. the language as used by an individual speaker in order to convey a specific message⁴. In simple words, the 'langue' is the instrument; the 'parole' is the event. Saussure, and thus linguistics after him, concentrated his attention on the 'langue', leaving the 'parole' to the hands of hermeneutists. He showed, in contrast to the Nineteenth Century historical method which considered the 'langue' in its diachrony, an interpretation of the 'langue' which he called synchronic. He then proposed that languages ('langue') are "systems" (he does not yet use the term structure). Instead of studying the evolution of one language, he preferred to stop and considered the 'system' which constitutes that language. He then "deconstructed" language into its basic units, i.e. words, which he called these words of a language as 'signs'. 'Signs' are arbitrary and differential. A linguistic 'sign' consists in the union of two elements, a sound-image (called as 'signifier') and a concept (called as 'signified'). For instance, the sound 'tree' that I hear is signifier, to which there corresponds a signified tree in the sense of the concept that the sound evokes in my mind. So 'signifier' and 'signified' are arbitrary since these two 'signs' have different "natures", i.e. there is no inherent relation between them. Synchronic study considers how a language ('langue') functions as a system ('structure') at a given moment in time, analyzing the simultaneous relationships between its constituent parts ('signs').

1. Cf. C. Levi-Strauss, "Anthropologie Structurale" (Paris, 1958), or "Structural Anthropology" trans. by C. Jacobson & B.C. Schept (New York: Doubleday, 1967).
2. Cf. F. de Saussure, "Cours de linguistique generale" (Paris, 1916), or "Course in General Linguistics" trans. by W. Baskin (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966).
3. Daniel Patte, "What is Structural Exegesis?" (Philadelphia: Fortress Pr., 1976) p.27.
4. Ibid. p.27.

Between Saussure and Levi-Strauss there was an intermediary, the school of linguistics at Prague, which with men like Roman Jakobson and Troubetzkoy, unified Russian Formalism and Saussurean linguistics in a single theoretical programme, applied to phonology, to which they attached the label Structuralism. In the early twentieth century, the Russian Formalists have successfully made a distinction between form and content in literary study especially on poetic literature. Formalist theory reversed the priority of content over form and devoted its attention exclusively to form. "Form is a vessel into which content could be poured, the same vessel being theoretically capable of receiving a variety of different contents"¹. Content then becomes dependent on form and has no separate existence in literature. Thus Formalism has always been accused of "anti-history or a-history"². In the Prague school, phonology was regarded as a system of relations. These relations were primarily oppositions of binary features. Roman Jakobson³ later generalized the idea of binary opposition to cover all of language.

Levi-Strauss, who followed during the last war the path of Jakobson, who immigrated to the U.S.A., wished to apply the new structural method (Prague School's structural phonology) to his own specialty, anthropology. Levi-Strauss first attempted to interpret social phenomena. He discovered an elementary structure in which four types of relationships are linked: brother-sister, man-wife, father-son, and maternal uncle-nephew.⁴ These bonds form complex structures. With these bonds of kinship, later Structuralists have tried to apply Levi-Strauss' method to language and literature.

We come to A.J.Greimas⁵, Ronald Barthes⁶, who are structuralist

1. Ann Jefferson, "Russian Formalism" in "Modern Literary Theory" op. cit. p.36.

2. For a defence of the historicity of Structuralism, which is differentiated from Formalism, cf. A.M.Johnson, "Structuralism, Biblical Hermeneutics, and the Role of Structural analysis in Historical Research" in his "Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics" Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 22 (1979) pp.1-20.

3. R.Jakobson, "Two aspects of language and two types of aphasic disturbance" in his s) "Fundamentals of Language" (The Hague, 1956) pp.53-82.

4. Levi-Strauss, op. cit.

5. A.J.Greimas, "Semantique Structurale" (Paris, 1966).

6. R.Barthes, "Introduction a l'analyse structurale des recits" in Communications 8 (1966). Also "The Struggle with the Angel: Textual Analysis of Genesis 32:23-33" in "Structural Analysis and Biblical Exegesis" trans. A.M.Johnson, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 3 (1974) p.21ff.

semantists, who attempted to apply structural analysis to a narrative. Barthes proposes to distinguish a narrative story into several levels. (1) The level of functions by analyzing the 'correlations' of the functions of each character in the atmosphere of the story. (2) The level of 'actants' (the ones who act) by observing the actions of different characters in a narrative. (3) The level of narration, Barthes means everything that the text says about the author and about the reader. And finally, it is necessary to investigate the rules (or laws) which control the development of these different levels and to discover what one may call the 'grammar' (or system) of the story.

Eventually we may ask what benefits Structural analysis contributes to biblical exegesis? We know that contemporary exegesis, particularly in Germany, remains stamped by a double heritage: historicism and existentialism. For the past almost all exegetical movements are inscribed in a historical perspective: Form criticism, Tradition criticism, Redaction criticism etc. The internal structure or organizations are minimized. Not only the profound and invisible structure, but often even the visible literary structure are ignored.¹ Structuralism then appears to be a useful corrective to the traditional-historical methods of exegesis because it restores to the text a vertical reality, a synchronic rather than a diachronic truth. Meaning becomes something other than the reference to a past to the prehistory of the text.

Rhetorical criticism is also a new method of exegesis, and has had great influence in biblical studies in the last two decades. The definition and methodological setting for Rhetorical criticism have not been totally settled and are sometimes described as a "confusion of tongues"². For the English literary critics the term "rhetoric" may mean something different from that of the biblical Rhetorical critics. Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as "the art of

1. Some exceptions in the sixties, cf. A. Vanhoye, "La Structure litteraire de l'epitre aux Hebreux" (Paris, 1963); J. Bligh, "The Structure of Hebrews" *HeyJ* 5 (1964) pp.170-177.

2. Martin Kessler, *op. cit.* p.1.

discovering the best possible means of persuasion" and by Quintilian "the knowledge of how to speak well"¹ are still meaningful to most the English literary students today. In classical time, rhetorical study is divided into five parts.²

1. Invention which deals with the planning of a discourse, and the arguments to be used in it. Evidence is based on external or internal proofs. For example, in the New Testament there are three common forms of external proofs: quotations of scripture, the evidence of miracles, and the naming of witnesses. Internal argument involves three models of persuasion, "the first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker (ethos), the second on putting the audience in a certain frame of mind (pathos), the third on the proof or apparent proof provided by the speaker itself (logos)"³. Biblical Rhetorical critics have argued that many materials in the synoptic gospels are written in this persuasive model.⁴

2. Arrangement is the composition of the various parts into an effective whole. For instance, the Catena of Heb. 1:5-14, which arranges the seven Old Testament quotations is one of the best examples in the Bible.

3. Style which involves both choice of words and the composition of words into sentences, including the use of figures. Style as a whole is divided into two parts. First the 'lexis' (diction) which deals with choice of words. For instance, in John's gospel, the choice of "Logos" for the incarnate Word, "born from above (Hebrew)= born again (Greek)", Spirit = wind etc. The second part is 'synthesis', the study of how of words are put together to form phrases or sentences. The Beatitudes in Mt. 5:3-10 is a good illustration. To a larger passage, 'chiamus'

1. Aristotle, "The Art of Rhetoric" by J.H.Frøese (1926), and Quintilian, "Institutio Oratoria" by H.E.Butler, 4 vols (1920-22), as quoted by G.A.Kennedy, "New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism" (Chapel Hill: Uni. of North Carolina Pr., 1984), p.13.

2. Cf. G.A.Kennedy, op. cit. p.13-14, and Mastin Kesler, op. cit. p.2.

3. Aristotle, "The Rhetoric" trans. by R.Roberts (New York, 1954) I, p.2.

4. Cf. Mary Savage, "Literary Criticism & Biblical Studies: Essays on the Comparative Method" ed. by C.D.Evans, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Serie 34 (1980) p.87.

(crossing), with the parts arranged in a sequence A,B,C,C',B',A'. may occur in style.

4. Memory deals with mnemonic techniques in particular for delivery so that one could speak without notes.

5. Delivery is the rules for control of the voice and the use of gestures.

We know that rhetoric was a systematic academic discipline universally taught throughout the Roman empire. Before taking up rhetoric a student had often spent several years studying grammar. Rhetoric was taught as the main subject of secondary education. After completing their study of rhetoric some students went on to study philosophy, in which dialectic was regarded as the initial stage. Dialectic and rhetoric overlap in their use of logical argument. Many Bible passages reflect rhetorical approach. Today the legitimacy of approaching the New Testament in terms of Greek rhetoric is still in the process of vindication. Undoubtedly, the Fathers of the Church, especially Augustine's "On Christian Doctrine", used rhetoric.

Professor James Muilenburg in his presidential address delivered to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1968 entitled "Form Criticism and Beyond"¹ challenges and provokes biblical critics to use "Rhetorical Criticism". He defined "Rhetorical Criticism" as a special type of Form Criticism which is interested primarily "...in exhibiting the structural patterns that are employed for the fashioning of a literary unit, whether in poetry or in prose, and in discerning the many and various devices by which the predication¹ are formulated and ordered into a unified whole. Such an enterprise I should describe as rhetoric and the methodology as rhetorical criticism"².

B.W.Anderson defines "Rhetorical Criticism" as "the

1. J. Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond" JBL 88 (1969) pp.1-18.

2. Ibid. p.8.

isolation of a discrete literary unit, the analysis of its structure and balance, and the attention to key words and motifs"¹. Clearly, this "literary unit" corresponds to the pericope in Form Criticism, and thus Rhetorical Criticism builds upon Form Criticism. It is not difficult to see that James Muilenburg's Beyond-Form-Criticism-Rhetorical criticism is influenced by Gunkel's "Gattungsforschung" when he was a student at the University of Halle in 1930. Gunkel had long been in revolt against the "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule" over emphasis on diachronic study of a text, and thus he tried to shift to the synchronic study of each "Gattung" (or genre).²

Immediately after Muilenburg's address in 1968 there was an outpouring of articles applying Rhetorical criticism to biblical texts. Articles in the Journal of Biblical Literature and Interpretation between 1970 to 1980 reflected the phenomenon. In the mid seventies, Rhetorical criticism more and more overlaps with Structuralism. Many articles in the newly founded Journal, Semeia since 1974, hardly differentiate between what is Rhetorical criticism and Structural analysis. Later, B.W.Anderson prefers to use the term "synchronic study" and suggests that the trend toward synchronic study can be assisted by three kinds of literary study: (1) studies in oral literature, (2) stylistic and rhetorical criticism, (3) structuralism .³ Then Martin Kessler listed the methodology of Rhetorical Criticism as the studies of; 1. whole piece, 2. medium:Gattung, 3. stance, 4. Form:structure, 5.style, 6. metastyle, 7. ratio. He says, "Rhetorical criticism seems a more suitable term

1. Bernhard W.Anderson, "The New Frontier of Rhetorical Criticism: A Tribute to James Muilenburg" Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 1 (1974), p.xi.

2. H. Gunkel's (1862-1932) "Gattungsforschung" (genre criticism) is quite distinct from "Formgeschichte" which is more concern with the history of genre.

3. B.W. Anderson, "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1-11" JBL 91 (1978) p.23.

than structural analysis, not only because we are not limiting ourselves to the analysis of structure, but particularly because it may easily be confused with literary structuralism."¹

From these characteristics of Rhetorical criticism, we see that there is no difference from the three principles of structural analysis: totality, deep structure, synchronism. Because of these similarities I prefer to entitle my methodology as Structural-Rhetorical criticism.

Of course, there are differences between Structural and Rhetorical criticism. As Mary Savage puts it, "Perhaps the essential differences between the structuralist and the rhetoric models are difference of emphasis and orientation. Structuralism emphasizes a "STRUCTURE of meaning" and is oriented toward the process of reading, while rhetorical criticism emphasizes a "structure of MEANING" and is oriented toward the whole speech-act... A second essential difference is the orientation of each model. Given structuralism's reliance on the concept of 'langue' in the process of decoding the text...Rhetorical criticism, on the other hand, is oriented toward the whole speech-act as a function of its persuasiveness and looks to relation in the text itself."²

All the above discussed features of Structural-Rhetorical criticism will be taken into account, as guidelines in the construction of the structure of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

1. M.Kessler, op. cit. p.11.

2. Mary Savage, op. cit. p.88.

I. A. The Structure of the Epistle.

Hebrews was recognized at a very early date as a carefully structured document, although scholars differed in their reconstruction of its exact outline. Indeed James Moffatt held that it was impossible to reconstruct a definite plan for the document.¹ Nevertheless, scholars have tried to reconstruct the structure of Hebrews based on three main theories.

(a) Conceptual structure.

Conceptual structure is the traditional structure used by most of the commentaries to the Hebrews. It is based on the theological contents or themes of the Epistle. One of the earliest examples is by Thomas Aquinas². He simply divided the Epistle into two major parts.

- I. Superiority of Christ (1:1-10:39)
 - a) over angels (1:1ff)
 - b) over Moses (3:1ff)
 - c) over the sacrifices of the OT (5:1ff)
- II. Comments on the duty of the members to unite with the leaders. (11:1-13:25)
 - a) through faith (11:1-40)
 - b) through the work of faith (12:1-13:25)

Obviously, the divisions are according to the theological themes in the Epistle. We can also find a similar approach in most modern scholars e.g. E. Rignbach,³ B.F. Westcott⁴; We list P.E. Hughes⁵ and H. Braun's⁶ structures for comparison.

1. J. Moffatt, Comm. pp. xi-xiv.

2. St. Thomas, "Super epistolam ad Hebraeos lectura" cited from C. Spicq, Comm. I. p. 28.

3. E. Rignbach, Comm. pp. xxvi-xxviii, with a) 1:1-4:13; b) 4:14-12:29.

4. B.F. Westcott, Comm. p. lxxviii, with a) 1:5-2:18; b) 3 & 4; c) 5 to 7; d) 8:1-10:18 ; e) 10:19-12:29.

5. P.E. Hughes, Comm. pp. 2-4.

6. H. Braun, Comm. p. 19ff.

P.E.Hughes' structure

Theme: The Supremacy of Christ.

- I. Christ superior to the prophets (1:1-3)
- II. Christ superior to the angels (1:4-2:18)
- III. Christ superior to Moses (3:1-4:13)
- IV. Christ superior to Aaron (4:13-10:18)
- V. Christ superior as the new and living way (10:19-12:29)
- VI. Concluding exhortations, requests, greetings (13:1-25)

H.Braun's structure

- I. Jesus superior to the angels (1:1-14)
- 1st Paraenesis (2:1-4)
- II. Jesus, the author of salvation and high priest in becoming same like men (2:5-18)
- III. The true Jesus and the true Moses; two faithful Chargers in the house of God (3:1-6)
- IV. The warning example of the wandering Israelites in order to enter into Rest (3:7-4:13)
- V. Introduction: Jesus as heavenly high priest (4:14-16)
- VI. Jesus, the high priest in compar~~e~~ to the */ison* old order (5:1-10)
- VII. Introduction to the central theme of Hebrews: Melchizedek and the heavenly high priesthood of Jesus (5:11-6:12)
- VIII. The worthiness of the oath of God (6:13-20)
- IX. Melchizedek (7:1-28)
- X. The heavenly characteristic of Jesus cultus-service (8:1-10:18)
- XI. Request to remain in confession (10:19-26)
- XII. The apostate will wait for severe punishment (10:27-31)
- XIII. Reflection on the suffering that has gone through (10:32-39)
- XIV. The faithful witnesses of the men in the OT (11:1-40)
- XV. Looking upon Jesus (12:1-11)
The final paraenesis (12:12-19)
- XVI. The warning of forsak~~e~~n the faith */ing* (13:1-17)
- Conclusion (13:18-25)

Obviously, both P.E.Hughes and H.Braun reconstructed the structure according to the clear contents or teachings in the Epistle. Conceptual structure is the easiest and it is followed by most of the commentators to the Hebrews.

(b) Literary structure

The reconstruction of the structure of Hebrews based on literary devices was first introduced by F.Thien.¹ But until 1940, the French scholar L.Vaganay studied the literary structure of Hebrews most thoroughly, with inclusions(A,B,...C...B',A') and catch-words (examples, angels, high priest, faith etc.) as criteria. This gives a five section outline.²

- Introduction (1:1-4)
- I. Jesus, superior to **angels** (1:5-2:18) A
- II. Jesus, **compassionate and faithful high priest** (3:1-5:10) B
 - 1. Jesus, faithful high priest (3:1-4:16)
 - 2. Jesus, compassionate high priest (5:1-10)
- III. Jesus, **author of eternal salvation, perfect high priest** (5:11-10:39) C
 - [Hortatory admonitions (5:11-6:20)]
 - 1. Jesus, great priest according to the order of Melchizedek (7:1-28)
 - 2. Jesus, perfect high priest (8:1-9:28)
 - 3. Jesus, author of eternal salvation (10:1-39)
- IV. Perseverance in the **faith** (11:1-12:13) B'
 - 1. Faith (11:1-12:2)
 - 2. Perseverance (12:3-13)
- V. The great task of holiness and peace (12:14-13:21) A'
- Conclusion (13:22-25)

1. F.Thien, "Analyse de l'Epitre aux Hebreux" RB (1902) pp.74-86.

2. L.Vaganay, "Le Plan de L'Epitre aux Hebreux" in "Memorial Lagrange", ed. L.H.Vincent (Paris, 1940) pp.270-271.

The "literary structure" of Vaganay has turned away from traditional "conceptual structure" and sought a solution from rhetorical analysis. The further penetration of structuralism into the rhetorical study of biblical documents, especially in the French speaking world, later motivated Albert Vanhoye, the Professor of Biblical Studies in the Pontifical Biblical Institute, to make a much more extensive study of the "literary structure" of Hebrews than Vaganay had done. In his well known "La Structure Litteraire de L'Epitre aux Hebreux"¹ which, basically accepted Vaganay's method and outline, he dealt with both areas much more precisely. And with the presupposition "A systematic study of the Greek text of the Epistle to the Hebrews has led me to the conclusion that the author of the Epistle has structured his work with great care and has made use of fixed literary devices to indicate what he has done".² With symmetrism as method and six literary indications as criteria, Vanhoye elaborated on the outline already suggested by Vaganay and gave his own. By symmetrism, he means a) symmetrical parallelism (A, B,...A', B'), and b) symmetrical concentricism (A, B, ...B', A').³ The six literary indications are:⁴

1. *Announcement of the subject*: a brief formula before each part which presents the theme to be discussed and its principal divisions (cf. 1:4; 2:17-18; 5:9-10; 10:36-39; 12:11).

2. *Inclusion*: the use of the same word or words at the beginning and at the end of the development of a subject. (for example, the formula "for to which of the angels did he ever say?" (1:5) is resumed in 1:13 "to which of the angels has he ever said").

3. *Hook-words*: a word or words in the beginning of a paragraph repeated from the end of the preceding paragraph and thus designed to "hook" the two paragraphs together. (for example, the word ANGELS of 1:4 (end of exordium) is repeated in 1:5 (beginning of the First Part), and in 1:6 and 1:7 the same word is used for the transition between two subdivisions).

4. *Characteristic terms*: terms whose repetition within a section give to it a distinctive physiognomy (for example, ANGELS in the First Part (1:5-2:18), the word FAITH in section A of the Fourth Part (11:1-40)).

1. A.Vanhoye, "La Structure Litteraire de L'Epitre aux Hebreux" (Paris, 1963).

2. A.Vanhoye, "A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Rome, 1964) translated and summarised by James Swetnam from "La Structure Litteraire de L'Epitre aux Hebreux". op. cit. p.3.

3. A.Vanhoye, "La Structure..." op. cit p.63.

4. A. Vanhoye, "A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Rome, 1964) translated and summarised by James Swetnam from "La Structure Litteraire de L'Epitre aux Hebreux". op. cit. pp.3-4.

5. *Alternation in the use of literary genres*: the change from one type of discourse to another. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the author passes from the tone of doctrinal exposition to the tone of exhortation, and vice versa (for example, 1:5-14 and 2:5-18, separated by 2:1-4 as exhortation).

6. *Symmetrical arrangements*: patterns formed from correspondence in many details. [this is deduced from the symmetrism described above].

The above devices produce by Vanhoye are rhetorical devices which we have discussed in the Introduction section (pp.18-29).

The "literary" structure given by Vanhoye is as follow:

As

<u>Division</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Genre</u>	<u>Section</u>
a Exordium			
1:1-4		Introduction	
z			
I Eschatology			
1:5-2:18	A name so different from the name of the angels	doctrine	V
II Ecclesiology			
A. 3:1-4:14	Jesus, faithful	paraenesis	IV B
B. 4:15-5:10	Jesus, compassionate high-priest	doctrine	IV A
III Sacrifice			
p. 5:11-6:20	Preliminary exhortation		← paraenesis
III f			
A. 7:1-28	Jesus, high-priest according to the order of Melchizedek.		III C
B. 8:1-9:28	Come to fulfillment	doctrine	III B (centre)
C. 10:1-18	Cause of eternal salvation		← doctrine
III A			
f. 10:19-39	Final exhortation	paraenesis	III p
IV Ecclesiology			
A. 11:1-40	The faith of the men of old		doctrine
II B			
B. 12:1-13	The endurance required	paraenesis	II A
V Eschatology			
12:14-13:19	The peaceful fruit of justice	paraenesis	I
z Peroration			
13:20-21	Conclusion		a

With these five general sections, Vanhoye then examines each of these sections one by one and part by part in details. We can see, under "symmetrism", Vanhoye was able to display correspondences between I and V and between II and IV according to the scheme Eschatology-Eschatology and Ecclesiology-Ecclesiology with the central part being devoted to Sacrifice. And the centre portion of this central part being 8:1-9:28. Everything is well ordered, but the thought remains "Is this too artificial?"

Most scholars welcomed the book enthusiastically, but many, while agreeing with the main principles behind the work, expressed caution about accepting the "reconstruction" without doubt. The immediate criticism is by J. Bligh.¹ He disagreed with Vanhoye on two points. First, on the one hand he appreciated Vanhoye's making use of many "hook-words", but not all are convincing. Secondly, he criticised Vanhoye's reconstruction on pure literary criteria since it neglected the conceptual structure. Two years later, J. Bligh devoted a small volume² to the study of the structure of Hebrews with thirty-five sections based on the presupposition "perhaps the Epistle is the work of two hands, one of whom sketched out the argument, perhaps in poor Greek, and then gave his work to a stylist to be worked over and rewritten in good Greek".³ This thesis proved to be unpopular among scholars to the Hebrews.

A. Vanhoye continued to publish articles⁴ both for the purpose of spreading his view on the literary structure of Hebrews and to defend it against criticism. Few years later, he published another popular book just on the first two chapters of Hebrews.⁵

(C) Form-Content structure.

Eight years later, James Swetnam, the translator of Vanhoye's book, disagreed with Vanhoye's "literary structure" and in two articles, "Form and

1. J. Bligh, "The Structure of Hebrews" HeyJ 5 (1964) pp.170-177.

2. J. Bligh, "Chiastic Analysis of the Epistle to the Hebrews" Heythrop College, Oxon, 1966).

3. J. Bligh, "The Structure of Hebrews" op. cit. p.176.

4. A. Vanhoye, "Epître aux Hébreux: Texte grec structure" (Fano, 1966). "Les indices de la structure littéraire de l'Epître aux Hébreux" in "Studia Evangelica" II (19) pp.493-509. An article to defence his view is "Discussions sur la structure de l'Epître aux Hébreux" Bib 55 (1974) pp.349-380. More recent articles are, "Literarische Struktur und theologische Botschaft des Hebraerbriefts" in "Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt" 4 (1979) pp.119-147, and 5 (1980) pp.18-49.

5. A. Vanhoye, "Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1 et 2" (Paris, 1969).

and Content in Hebrews 1-6" , "Form and Content in Hebrews 7-13",¹ argues that "it would seem preferable to establish form on formal principles but in the light of content, just as content should be studied on the basis of content but in the light of form".² He criticised Vanhoye at least on two areas;

1. A. Vanhoye, also J. Bligh,³ have separated content from the form for reconstruction. Swetnam is probably right to say, "if form is too much divorced from content it can lead to a distortion of content, not a clarification".⁴
2. The six literary devices used by Vanhoye are "formal literary" devices and "are not a sufficient basis for analyzing structure".⁵

James Swetnam then goes on to isolate "several independent factors and indicate that they point to an intelligible pattern":⁶

1. *Significant conceptual word:* ὁμολογια occurs three times in Hebrews 3:1; 4:14; 10:23. Then by linking these three uses with the content of the ὁμολογια as well as the exhortations " ἐθεν ἀδελφοὶ ἀγιοὶ " of 3:1 and " ἔχοντες οὖν ἀδελφοὶ " of 10:19, the three basic sections of paraenesis in the epistle were set out.
2. *Announcements:* 1:4; 2:3a-4; 2:17-18; 4:13; 6:20; 7:29; 10:18; 10:39; 12:1-2; 12:28-29.
3. *Basic genre:*⁷ they were identified as exposition and exhortation : 1:5-2:18 (exposition), 3:1-6:20 (exhortation), 7:1-10:18 (exposition), 10:19-39 (exhortation) and 11-13 (exposition-exhortation).
4. *Length:* particular clear sections like 1:5-2:18 and 3:1-6:20.

il The above factors may be satisfactory claimed as the contents of Hebrews, although factors 1 and 2 are more or less formal literary devices and similar to Vanhoye's "hook-words" and "announcement of subjects" respectively. Anyhow, Swetnam has been able to balance form and content in the reconstruction.

1. J. Swetnam, "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6" Bib 53 (1972) pp.368-385, "Form and Content in Hebrews 7-13" Bib 55 (1974) pp.333-348.

2. J.Swetnam, "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6" op. cit. p.369.

3. For details of Swetnam criticism to J. Bligh see, "Review of J.Bligh "Chiastic Analysis" CBQ 29 (1967) p.134.

4. Ibid. p.369.

5 J.Swetnam, "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6" op. cit. p.385.

6 J. Swetnam, "Form and Content in Hebrews 7-13" op. cit. p.347.

7. For more of this see J.Swetnam, "On the literary genre of the Epistle to the Hebrews" NT 11 (1969) pp.261-269.

More recently, J.P.Meier in his two articles; "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14"¹ and "Structure and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5-14"², calls for the consideration of theology, especially the OT quotations, in the reconstruction of the structure of Hebrews. Unfortunately Meier's discussion is limited to the first chapter of Hebrews. In the first article, Meier has been able to show that there is a numerical symmetry between the seven Christological designations in Heb 1:2b-4 and the seven OT quotations in 1:5-14. This is sound. But in the second article, I think that he has gone too far in arguing that the seven OT quotations correspond to 1:2b-4 not only in number but also in general movement of thought.

I suggest reconstructing the structure of Hebrews based on the modification of the devices of J.Swetnam. I would agree, only on principle, with Swetnam's four devices which balance the form and content of Hebrews. I add a fifth; that is the direct OT quotations and allusions in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The OT in the Epistle to the Hebrews is cited in a well ordered fashion and appears in different sections to support the content or theology in each individual section. My criteria for reconstruction are as follows:

1. *Significant conceptual words*: These are not "hook-words" at the beginning and the end of a unit section, but rather theological conceptual words within different sections. They are significant because they are repeated in use and are prominent in the discussion in a particular context especially in the expository sections. These are Son (5 times)-angels(8 times) in 1:1-2:18; faithful(4 times) in 3:1-6; rest(10 times) in 3:7-4:16; priest(4 times) in 5:1-14; priest(17 times) in 7:1-28; covenant(15 times), offering(18 times), sacrifice(9 times) in 8:1-10:18; faith(20 times) in 11:1-40.

2. *Bridge passages*: These are similar to the "announcements" described by Vanhoye or Swetnam. These bridge passages appear, either explicitly or implicitly, at the end of each major section. There are 1:4; 2:17-18; 4:14-16; 6:20; 7:28; 10:39; 12:28-29.

1. J.P.Meier, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14" Bib 66 (1985) pp.168-189.

2. J.P.Meier, "Structure and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5-14" Bib 66 (1985) pp.504-533.

3. *Basic genre*: exposition and paraenesis. There are eight exposition sections; 1:5-14; 2:5-18; 3:1-6; 5:1-14; 7:1-28; 8:1-9:28; 10:1-18; 11:1-40, and five paranesis sections which begin with "therefore"¹ ; 2:1-4; 3:7-19; 6:1-20 ; 10:19-39; 12:1-29.

4. *Length*: There are clear sections in the discussion. I list six clear lengths; I. 1:5-2:18; II. 3:1-4:16; III. 5:1-6:20; IV. 7:1-28; V. 8:1-10:39; VI. 11:1-12:29.

5. *OT quotations and allusions*: There are clear OT quotations and allusions in each section of the Epistle, especially the expository sections. (See Table 1 for the clear lay out). In 1:5-14, seven OT quotations form a catena, starting with Ps 2 and ending with Ps 110. In 2:5-18, the author makes use of Ps 8 and Ps 22 to argue for the humanity of Jesus. In chapters 3 and 4, a meditation mostly based on Ps 95 about the true Rest, with also the "rest" passages from Gen 2 and Num 14. Chapter 5 is to underline the Sonship of Jesus from Ps 2. Chapter 7 is the argument on the high-priesthood of Melchizedek; all quotations and allusions are from Ps 110 and Gen 14. In Heb 8:1-10:18, the well known Jeremiah passage on New Covenant (Jer 31:31-34) is quoted and alluded to many times to support the view that Jesus is the mediator of the New Covenant by offering better sacrifices (Ps 40) with blood (Ex 24) and for all the sins (Is 53). In 10:19-39, exhortation is mainly based on Deut 32. All the OT in chapter 11 are from Genesis for the testimony of the men of Old, but conceptual influences from OT last throughout the whole chapter. All the above illustrations show that the author makes use of the OT in a clear pattern in a particular content.

1. There is one clear "therefore" at 3:1. This is why some scholars treated ^{the} whole of chapters 3-4 as exhortative. But I have treated 3:1-6 as expository since it gives a distinctive discussion.

The structure of the Epistle to the Hebrews is as follows ¹/₅

- 1:1-4 Introduction: an exordium
- 2b-3 With **seven** Christological designations; starting with **Ps 2** and ending in **Ps 110**, to illustrate the superior nature of the Son in hymnic form.
- 4 As the **bridge passage** to the next section.
- I. 1:5-2:18 The superior divine and human Son.
Son and **angels** are significant conceptual words
- 1:5-14 Exposition: Son superior to the angels.
With **seven** OT quotations, which is both numerical symmetry to the seven Christological designations above and started with **Ps 2** and ended in **Ps 110**.
- 2:1-4 First paraenesis.
- 2:5-18 Exposition: Jesus, the superior human.
With **Ps 8** and **Ps 22** to argue for the humanity of Jesus. As the brother of men, He is able to be the author of salvation.
vv.17-18 as the **bridge passage** to the next section.
- II. 3:1-4:16 The true Jesus and the true Rest.
Faithful and **Rest** are significant conceptual words.
- 3:1-6 Exposition: Jesus superior to Moses.
Jesus, as builder of and the faithful Son in the house of God, is superior to Moses as the faithful servant in the house of God.
With two allusions from **Num 12** to support the faithfulness of Moses.
- 3:7-4:16 Second paraenesis, together with exposition of the true Rest.
With **Ps 95** and **Num 14** and **Gen 2** as materials of exhortation and exposition.
vv.14-16 as **bridge passage** to the next section.
It can also act as an Introduction to Hebrews 5- 10.
- III. 5:1-6:20 The superior High-priesthood of Jesus.
Priest is the significant conceptual word.
- 5:1-14 Exposition: Jesus the superior high-priest.
With **Ps 110** as materials of argument; after the sonship of Jesus was first confirmed by **Ps 2**.
- 6:1-20 Third paraenesis.
v.20 as **bridge passage** to the next section.

- IV. 7:1-28 Exposition: The high-priesthood of Melchizedek.
Priest is the significant conceptual word.
 With evidences all from **Ps 110** and **Gen 14**.
 v.28 as **bridge passage** to the next section.
- V. 8:1-10:39 Better covenant and better sacrifice.
Covenant, offering, sacrifice are significant conceptual words.
- 8:1-9:28 Exposition: The better covenant.
 With the longest OT quotation from **Jer 31** as support of the argument.
- 10:1-18 Exposition: The better sacrifice.
 With materials especially from **Ps 40** and **Jer 31** for argument.
- 10:19-39 Fourth paraenesis.
 Exhortation mainly based on **Deut 32**.
 v.39 as **bridge passage** to the next section.
- VI. 11:1-12:29
- 11:1-40 Exposition: The faithful testimonies of the men of Old.
 With most of the OT evidences from Genesis, but conceptual influences from OT are obvious throughout the chapter. **"By faith"** occurs eighteen times, as the significant conceptual word.
- 12:1-29 Fifth paraenesis.
 vv.28-29 as **bridge passage** to the next section.
- 13:1-21 Conclusion: exhortation and prayer.

I. B. The Structure of Hebrews 1 and 2.

The purpose of this section is to investigate, in more detail, the structure of Hebrews 1 and 2. As in the previous section, I have reconstructed the structure of Hebrews based on the principles of Form-Content theory, by taking in the OT quotations and allusions as one of the main criteria for reconstruction. For easy investigation I would like to follow the divisions according to the previous suggested structure; 1:1-4; 1:5-14; 2:1-4; 2:5-18.

The proper understanding of the structures of these units is certainly a great help to the understanding of the use of the Old Testament in Hebrews 1 and 2. I agree that what E. Grasser has written about Heb 1:1-4 could be applied to Hebrews 1 and 2, or even to the whole of the Epistle; "for the exegesis [of Heb 1:1-4] , it is of the greatest importance that one understand that the careful stylistic design and the well composed structure are a factor in the author's theological intention. Therefore we are interested in the analysis of the literary structure not something alongside of exegesis, but precisely as exegesis".¹

Hebrews 1:1-4.

This unit clearly forms a structure of its own.² It acts as the prologue³ to the first main division 1:1-2:18, or perhaps to the whole Epistle. It possesses the most beautiful rhetorical-rhythm in the New Testament.⁴

Verses 1-2a show a well built *contrast of two dispensations*:

(God	spoke		has spoken)
	of old	these last days
	to the fathers	to us
	in the prophets	in [a] Son

1. E.Grasser, "Hebraer 1:1-4. Ein exegetischer Versuch" in "Text und Situation" (Gutersloh, 1973) p.183; translation mine.
 2. P. Hughes, Comm. detaches v.4 from vv.1-3 and place it with vv.5-14. ⁴⁵
 3. W.Wrede, "Das literarische Ratsel des Hebraerbriefs" (Gottingen, 1906) p.6, and E.Grasser, "Hebraer 1:1-4. Ein exegetischer Versuch" in "Text und Situation" op. cit. p.187, treated as "Exordium" just as in Jn 1:1-18 or I Jn 1:1-4.
 4. C. Spicq, "L'epitre aux Hebreux" (Paris, 1977, one volume work), "...une seule periode,

The first sentence starts, not as a letter with a self-introduction, but more as a homily¹ with a well thought phrase. Undoubtedly this is a rhetorical sentence of special design. It shows a comparison designed by the author purposely to illustrate the two dispensations; the Old and the New, and begins with *Πολυμερως* (various parts of the time) and *Πολυτροπως* (various ways). This part, 1-2a, begins with an accent letter "ΤΤ" which is a common rhetorical feature in Greek for easy memory.²

Verse 2a ends with the noun "Son", and v.2b begins with the relative pronoun *ὅν* which refers back to the "Son", and then in part vv.2b-3, there exists a structure of *seven*³ *Christological designations* about the "Son". Thus, immediately, the "Son" is being shown as the centre or the subject.⁴ These "seven Christological designations" look like a confessional hymn structure in the early Church.⁵ This is probably right. Moreover,

qui constitue sans doute la phrase grecque la plus parfaite du Nouveau Testament" p.56. For more rhetorical study in this section see F.Bliss, "Brief an die Hebraer: Text mit Augabe der Rhythmen" (Halle, 1903) pp.1-3. J.Moffatt, "Hebrews" (Edinburgh, 1924) ICC, pp.151-152. W.Leonard, "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Rome, 1939) p.129. /us

1. J. Swetnam, "On the Literary Genre of the "Epistle" to the Hebrews" NT 11 (1969) pp.261-269, agrees with H. Thyen, "Der Stil der Judisch-Hellenistischen Homilie" (Gottingen, 1955) that this is a common feature of Jewish-Hellenistic homilies in the first century A.D. For more details of discussion, see Prolegomena pp.8-9.

2.Cf. F.F.Bruce, "The Epistle to the Hebrews" New London Commentaries (London, 1964) p.1 n.1. Also, in verse 1 five words begin with π. C.Spicq, "Le philonisme de l'Epitre aux Hebreux" RB 56 (1949) pp.543-572, argues that this is a philonism feature in Hebrews.

3. E. Grasser, "Hebraer 1:1-4..." op. cit. p.189 argues that the author develops the theology of Hebrews 1:1-4 precisely as Christology.

4. F.F.Bruce, op. cit. counts seven "facts...about the Son of God" in vv.2b-3, p.3. While J.H.Davies, "A Letter to Hebrews" (Cambridge, 1967) counts only six in vv.2b-3 where he puts the whole of 3a ("being the ~~ep~~fulgence of his glory and the image of his substance") as one clause and designation. J.P.Meier, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14" Bib 66 (1985) has his special way of counting seven designations by taking vv.2b-4 together. He does this on the presupposition that that is a symmetry in theology between 1:1-4 and 1:5-14. /then

5. G.Bornkamm, "Das Bekenntnis im Hebraerbrief" in "Studien zu Antike und Christentum" II (Munich, 1959) p.198, G.Deichgraber, "Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der fruhen Christenheit" in "Studien zum Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 5" (Gottingen, 1969)p.137, R.P.Martin, "Carmen Christi" (Cambridge, 1962)p.19, and J.T.Sanders, "The New Testament Christological Hymns" (Cambridge, 1971) p.10 argued that Heb. 1:3 is a confessional hymn of early Christianity. But D.W.B.Robinson, "The Literary Structure of Hebrews 1:1-4" AJBA 2 (1972) pp.178-186 againsts R.P.Martin and J.T.Sanders who relied on G.Bornkamm, E.Lohmeyer and E.Kasemann that "...unlikely that verse 3 should be r/ ppsed off and treated as a putative hymn-fragment. If there is a hymn in the background, it should be at least begin with verse 2b"p.186.

as W. Nauck has claimed, that the author began his writing with a "Christus-Hymnus" (1:2b-3) and ended with a "Logos-Hymnus" (4:12-13) in the first larger section (Heb 1-4) before the exposition of the high-priest theme in the second larger section (Heb 5-10).¹ So the author has carefully made "Son" at the end of v.2a as a conceptual "pivot-point" or rhetorical "hook word".

"SON"

1. whom God appointed heir of all things. (cf. Ps 2:8)
2. through whom God created the worlds.
3. who being the effulgence of God's glory.
4. [who] being the image of God's substance.
5. [who] upholding all things by his word of power.
6. [who] (having) made purification for sins.
7. [who] sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high. (cf. Ps 110:1)

The first designation is an allusion to Ps 2:8 and the last (the seventh) alludes to Ps 110:1, where these two Psalms are also the first and last of the seven Old Testament quotations in the next part; Heb.1:5-14. On this feature, J.P.Meier concludes that "we can reasonably claim that there is a carefully worked-out numerical symmetry in Hebrews 1".² Furthermore he has tried to work out a theological symmetry between the two parts as well. He maintains that there is a general symmetry between the movement of thought in the seven Christological designations in Heb 1:2b-4 and the movement of thought in the seven OT quotations in Heb 1:5-14. It begins with Christ's exaltation (1:2b; 1:5-6), moves back to creation (1:2c; 1:7), moves farther back to pre-existence and eternal rule (1:3a; 1:8bc), moves forward again to creation (1:3b; 1:10-12), moves to exaltation again (1:3d; 1:13), and draws a final conclusion comparing Christ's exalted status to the angels' inferior role (1:4; 1:14), and then he claims "the ring closes where it opened".² All this may be sound neat, but it looks artificial in the reconstruction, and Meier himself

^a / 1. W. Nauck, "Der Aufbau des Hebraerbriefes" in "Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche" Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias, BZNW 26 (1964) pp.199-206.

2. J.P.Meier, "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5-14" Bib 66 (1985) p.523.

admits that the symmetry is not perfect in every detail and the reference to the Son's "purifying from sin" (1:3c) finds no correlation in the seven quotations.¹

Verse 4 ends in a comparison between the angels and the "Son" in response and parallel to verse 1 which draws a comparison between the prophets and the "Son".

v.1 prophets "Son"
v.4 angels "Son"

Both are comparisons of modes of revelation, in Old and New dispensations. The aim is to assert the superiority of the "Son" to other modes of revelation. But why angels? Various answers have been proposed.

(1) The "angels" stand for the Jewish tradition or revelation no less than do the "prophets" in Jewish theology, and v.4 thus rounds off the prologue with appropriate balance. The revelation in Jewish tradition can be characterized as either prophetic (with reference to the human messengers) or as angelic (with reference to the divine messengers). In the Hebrew Bible, an angel was portrayed as a "messenger of the Lord" to bring the divine word to the prophet, to be declared to the people. The principal instance of this in the Jewish scriptures was the angelic mediation of the law to Moses.² Heb 2:2 further shows that the author has this notion in mind.

(2) That the Son's superiority to the angels is simply the first in a series of 'a fortiori' (or *qal wahomer*) arguments, in the order Angel, Moses, Joshua (by the theme of 'rest'), and the High Priest.³

1. J.P.Meier, "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1:5-14" op. cit. p.523.

2. For "a fortiori" argument see section I. Introduction. pp. 26-27.

3. Cf. Deut 33:2(LXX). We can find traces in Gal 3:19, Acts 7:53, and Jub 1:29. The LXX of Deut 32:8, Dan 10:20f further indicate an angelic government of the nations. (Cf. G.Caird, "Principalities and Powers" (Oxford, 1956) p.5).

(3) That the community to whom the Epistle is written has been in danger of confusing Jesus as the Son of God with some angelic persona, and thus there is a "polemic of angel worship",¹ or the author is countering a veneration of angelic priests reflected in some of the Dead Sea documents,² or he is polemicizing against the idea of multiple intermediaries with interchangeable functions which was widespread in middle platonism and is seen in Philo.³

The first answer seems more probable.⁴ The second answer can be fitted into the first as well. Another factor is that the name "Son" has appeared in v.2a, and in Hebrew Bible and Septuagint angels are sometimes described as "sons of God" (Gn 6:2; Pss 29:1, 89:6; Job 1:6; Lxx Ps 8:6, Dan 3:25). So once the author has mentioned "Son" in v.2a, knowing that angels are also called "sons" of God, he quickly makes a comparison in v.4 by saying "*a name more excellent than [the angels]*". To support this argument, we can observe that the author himself, when quoting Deut 32:43 (LXX) in v.6 says, "Let all God's angels (ἄγγελοι θεου) worship him ("Son"), which in the longer version preserved in 4Q Dt 32 does not read ἄγγελοι θεου but υἱοι θεου . It seems that the author wished to avoid the title "sons of God" for angelic being.⁵

It is this concept of "name" that causes the author to proceed to argue for the superiority of the "Son" in the next unit of structure. A. Vanhoye has made v.4 the "*announcement of the theme*" to Heb 1:5-2:18.⁶ J. Swetnam disagrees with Vanhoye and argues that the announcement that Christ is superior (κρείττων) to the angels refers only to Heb 1:5-2:4 which speak of this superiority. The remainder of chapter 2

1. "...falsche Engelauffassungen polemisiere" in F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des als Schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1968) p.75, where also gives a list of references of those who argue for an angelic polemic. To name a few, H.Windish, Comm. p.17, O.Michel, Comm. p.31. C.Spicq, "L'Épître aux Hébreux, Apollon, Jean-Baptiste, les Hellenistes et Qumran" RQ 1 (1959) p.377. T.W.Manson, "The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews" BJRL 32 (1950) p.17 (= "Studies in the Gospels and Epistles" (Manchester, 1962) p.242).

2. H.M.Schenke, "Erwagungen zum Ratsel des Hebraerbriefes" in "Neues Testament und Christliche Existenz" (Tubingen, 1973) pp.421-437. P.Hughes, Comm. pp.52-53, suggests that the recipients have been influenced by teachings similar to those held by the Dead Sea Sect where both of the Messiahs would be subordinate to the Archangel Michael, hence the necessity to "demonstrate the supremacy of Christ over all angelic beings".

3. L.Dey, "The Intermediary World and Pattern of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews" (Missoula, 1975).pp.146-147.

u / 4. M.de Jonge & A.S.van der Waarde, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament" NTS 12 (1966) p.318. O.Kuss, Comm. p.47 note the absence of such a polemic in Hebrews.

u / 5. M.de Jonge & A.S.van der Waarde, op. cit. p.314-315.

6. A.Vanhoye, "La Structure littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux" (Paris, 1963) p.53.

²s / (2:5-18) speaks of Christ's inferiority and he makes 2:3a-4 as another "announcement of the theme". I would agree with Vanhoye taking v.4 as "announcement of the theme" to Heb 1:5-2:18, taking 2:1-4 as a short pause for exhortation. I have disagreed with his taking "angels" as "hook-word". Instead "Son" and "angels" are the conceptual significant words.

Heb 1:5-14

Scholars on the Epistle to the Hebrews have been in general agreement that the "catena" (chain of) of scripture quotations in Heb 1:5-14 is employed to provide support for the affirmation which is made in Heb 1:1-4, that Jesus Christ, who has a more excellent name and now sits at the God's right hand, has a dignity and status which make him "better than angels". As has been argued above, the determinative concept that links 1:1-4 to 1:5-14 is the "name" of Son, rather than totally relying on the "on high" concept as 'hook word' which was suggested by J.W.Thompson,¹ or "angels" as 'hook word' which suggested by A.Vanhoye.² In Heb 1:5-14 the author cited seven Old Testament passages as "proofs" of how the Son "become as much superior to angels as the name he obtained". In simple diagram,

v.2a

v.4

vv.5-14

"Son" -> "name" -> comparison of superiority -> proofs of "Son" superiority.
(concept)

So the statement in v.4 is due to the occurrence of the word "Son" in v.2a. I believe that the theological concept (name of Son) should be the governing factor to reconstruct the structure, at least for Heb 1:1-14, rather on pure literary "hook-word" ("angels" in v.4 hooks to "angels" in v.5) as proposed by Vanhoye.

1. J.W.Thompson, "The Structure and purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5-13" CBQ 38 (1976) argues that the two motifs (the new name and superiority to angels) develops the "exaltation of Christ" concept in 1:1-4 and then further develops into 1:5-13. p.354.

2. A.Vanhoye, "La Structure ..." op. cit. p.58.

Almost all scholars on Hebrews acknowledge that Heb 1:5-14, the first doctrinal portion of the Epistle, is made up of seven OT quotations. A. Vanhoye remains hesitant on whether the insertion of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in 1:8bc is meant to create a separation or a closer connection.¹ Probably the insertion is for the sake of rhetorical balance and emphasis.² Similar features may be found in 2:13; 10:27.

Scholars differ on how these seven OT quotations should be structured. A. Vanhoye sees an alternating pattern of contrast.³ I would like to list them in order for convenience in discussions.

First contrast (vv.5-6): Son (v.5) - angels (v.6).

v.5 For to what angels did he ever say ,

"Thou art my Son,

Today I have begotten thee"?

Or again

"I will be to him a father,

and he shall be to me a Son".

v.6 And again, when he brings the first-born into the world, he says,

"Let all God's angels worship him".

Second contrast (vv.7-12): angels(v.7) - Son(vv.8-12).

v.7 Of ($\mu\epsilon\nu$)the angels he says,

"Who makes his angels winds,

and his servants flames of fire".

vv.8 But of ($\delta\epsilon$) Son he says,

-12 "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,

(and) the righteous scepter is the scepter of thy kingdom.

Thou hast loved righteousness

and hated lawlessness;

1. A. Vanhoye, "Situation du Christ: Epître aux Hébreux 1 et 2" (Paris, 1969) p.175.

2. See J. Moffatt, Comm. p.13 n.1. J.P. Meier, "Structure and Theology in Hebrews 1:1-14" op. cit. p.175.

3. A. Vanhoye, "La Structure..." op. cit. pp.70-74, and "Situation du Christ" op. cit. pp.121-123.

therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee
with the oil of gladness beyond the comrades".

And,

"Thou, Lord, didst found the earth in the beginning
and the heavens are the work of thy hands;
they will perish, but thou remainest;
they will grow old like a garment,
like a mantle thou wilt roll them up,
and they will be changed.
But thou art the same,
and thy years will never end."

Third contrast (vv.13-14): Son(v.13) - angels(v.14).

8/

- v.13 But to what ~~angels~~ has he ever said,
"Sit at my right hand,
till I make thy enemies a stool for thy feet"?
- v.14 Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to serve,
for the sake of those who are to obtain salvation?

There are seven Old Testament quotations in this unit. The author himself seems intent on counting the number of quotations.¹ This number seven exactly corresponds to the seven designations in the first unit. This catena of seven OT quotations is clearly connected to the previous section by *γὰρ*, indicating that the OT texts somehow support or ground what is said before. The first quotation (1:5a) is introduced with the formula "to what angel did he ever said" which is repeated in the introduction of the last (seventh) quotation (1:13). The second quotation (1:5b) is a "supplement"² to the first by *καὶ πάλιν*, and presumably, using the same introductory formula as the first quotation. It is not difficult to see that the

1. Cf. J.P.Meier, "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14" Bib 66 (1985) p.175.
2. Ibid.p. 176. Meier uses the term "back-up" quotation.

third quotation (1:7) is a contrast to the first pair of quotations. Another introductory formula mentions the "Son"(the first-born), and angels appear in the quotation, which is in contrast to the angels, which appear in the previous introduction, and Son, which appears in the first two pairs of quotations. The second contrast is obvious as well. The fourth quotation (1:7), together with the fifth(1:8-9) and sixth(1:10-12), are introduced with formula and binded by *μεν ... δε*. The sixth quotation is connected to the fifth by *καὶ*. The seventh quotations starts, with an introductory formula, which is similar to the introduction of the first quotation, and the quotation illustrates something about the "Son". Verse 14 acts as contrast by noting something about the "angels", and as well acting as a conclusion to the seven OT quotations. It is understandable that the third contrast is not obvious. Thus at least four points can be claimed about the reconstruction of the structure of this section. / δ

(a) This is an expository section and exposition is mainly done on biblical texts. The quotations have formed the main content and acted as the best criteria for the reconstruction.

(b) "Son" and "angels" have acted as the significant conceptual words.

(c) The OT quotations are symmetrical; both in numerical "seven" ,and bounded by the use of Ps 2 and Ps 110. / δ by

(d) By the use of introductory formulae and the situation of the significant conceptual words, clear contrasts are obvious to these OT quotations.

Heb 2: 1-4

The argument by quoting seven Old Testament passages for the superiority of Son over angels in 1:5-14 serves as the presupposition for the paraenesis of 2:1-4. This can be based on two points: (a) The section clearly reflects an exhortatory tone, as in other paraenesis sections, for example, 3:7-4:13; 6:1-20; 10:19-39; 12:1-29, and all start with "therefore", (b) Exposition by using OT texts has disappeared in the paraenesis sections. "Therefore" in 2:1 connects the warning in 2:1-4 to the theological teaching in Heb 1, and because of this the author tries to persuade his recipients to take hold of this teaching steadfastly. He does so by 'a fortiori' (qal wahomer) argument.¹ / δ

1. A.Vonhoye, "Situation du Christ. Epitre aux Hebreux 1 et 2" (Paris, 1969) p.121.

- v.1 "We must pay attention to " (reason/ condition)
- v.2 "message declared by angels" is important (lesser: angels in the previous unit have been proved as lesser)
- v.3 "salvation declared by the Lord (Son)" is more important (stronger)
- v.4 "confirmed by God and Holy Spirit" (stronger: support to v.3)

A. Vanhoye¹ gives a symmetrical 'a fortiori' structure as follow:

.....ἐβεβαίωθῆ (2:3) / η

(2:1) ἡμᾶς εἰς ἡμᾶς (2:3)

(2:1) τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν τῶν ἀκουσάντων (2:3)

(2:2) δι' ἀγγέλων δια τοῦ κυρίου (2:3)

(2:2) λαλήθεις λαλήσθαι (2:3)

(2:2) λόγος σωτηρίας (2:3)

(2:2) βεβαίος

(2:2) παραβάσις ἀμελήσαντες (2:3)

(2:2) μὴ ἀποδοσῶν ἐκφουζουεθα (2:3)

πὼς ἡμεῖς (2:3)

This looks neat, but only in the sense of coincidence plus make-up. Later P.Auffret taking up this structure modified the "make-up" in a more complicated way.² Anyhow, Heb 2:1-4 is clear enough to be structured as an exhortative section, as against J.Swetnam who includes this section into Heb 1:5-2:4 as expository even though he claims to be reconstructing the structure of the Epistle based on Form-Content theory.³

1. A.Vanhoye, "La structure litteraire de l'Epitre aux Hebreux" (Paris, 1963) p.76.
 2. P.Auffret, "Note sur la Structure Litteraire D'HB 2:1-4" NTS 25 (1979) pp.166-179. There is no need to illustrate the details here.
 3. J.Swetnam, "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6" Bib 53 (1977) p.375.

Heb 2:5-18

In this unit the humanity of Jesus, the Son, is in focus. There are four Old Testament quotations as proofs for the superiority of Son's humanity to the angels. This is the second expository section after a short pause for exhortation. There exist two clear divisions: 2:5-9 and 2:10-16, with 2:17-18 acting as a conclusion, as well as bridge passage, to the next section.

"For it was not to angels ..." (v.5). It is obvious that this section ~~is~~ ^{is} connected to the previous expository section (1:5-14) rather than to 2:1-4. This continues the exposition on the superiority theme in the sense of the *humanity of the Son*, between "Son" and "angels", and thus 1:4 should be the "announcement of the theme" of 2:5-18 as well. We can see v.5 is responded in v.16.

The eighth quotation is introduced with simple formula. A clear contrast between the angels and the Son can be observed as well. After the quotation, then follows the paraphrases (vv.8b-9) of the quotation.

The next division (vv.10-16) is a further illustration of the humanity of the "Son" (here the author uses Son of man or Jesus), but with different focus, which A.Vanhoye, probably right, entitles "*the solidarity of redemption*".¹ This is confirmed by three OT quotation, the ninth, tenth and eleventh quotations in Heb 1-2, although the tenth and eleventh can be counted as one since they are from Is 8:17,18 and are separated by *καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ* (cf 1:8, 10:27). There follows explanation (vv.14-15), though not paraphrased. Verse 16 acts as a conclusion to Heb 2:5-16.

I continue to hold that "Son" and "angels" are significant conceptual words in this section where A.Vanhoye continues to take "angels" as the "hook-words".² Also the OT quotations should be treated as the main criteria in the reconstruction of the structure.

1. A.Vanhoye, "La Structure..." op. cit. p.85.

2. A.Vanhoye, "A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews" op. cit. pp.10-11, takes "subordinate" and "children" as "hook-words" as well.

The structure of Hebrews 1 and 2 is as follow:

- 1:1-4 Introduction: an exordium.
- 1-2a A contrast of two dispensations
- 2b-3 Seven Christological designations
- 4 Announcement of the theme

- 1:5-2:18 The superior divine and human Son.

- 1:5-14 Exposition: Jesus superior to the angels
 - 5-6 First contrast: Son - angels
 - 7-12 Second contrast: angels - Son
 - 13-14 Third contrast: Son - angels

- 2:1-4 Paraenesis: first exhortation

- 2:5-18 Jesus, the superior human
 - 5-9 Contrast: angels - Son (of man)
 - 10-16 The solidarity of redemption
 - 17-18 Bridge passage.

II. The EXEGETICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Introduction: Exegesis in the Primitive Church	54
1. Heb. 1:5a (= Ps. 2:7b)	68
2. Heb. 1:5b (= 2 Sam. 7:14a)	74
3. Heb. 1:6b (= Ps. 97(LXX 96):7/ Deut. 32:43 (LXX)).	79
4. Heb. 1:7b (= Ps. 104(LXX 103): 4)	83
5. Heb. 1:8b-9 (= Ps. 45(LXX 44):7-8)	86
6. Heb. 1:10-12 (= Ps. 102(LXX 101):26-28)	93
7. Heb. 1:13b (= Ps. 110(LXX 109):1b)	98
8. Heb. 2:6b-8a (= Ps. 8:5-7)	103
9. Heb. 2:12 (= Ps. 22(LXX 21):23)	114
10. Heb. 2:13a (= Is 8:17)	118
11. Heb. 2:13b (= Is 8:18)	121

Introduction: Exegesis in the Primitive Church.

What is meant by the "Primitive Church" is the period of the Christian Church within the first century A.D. I assume that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written in this period, either just before or after the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D.

This is the period when New Testament exegesis takes its roots, and the exegesis of the author to the Hebrews represents only one of the branches. But the soil where the tree (New Testament exegesis) is planted had already been there for long time. The fruits (where the use of the Old Testament in the Hebrews is one of them) are of course determined by the tree, but the "taste" of the fruits may, naturally, be influenced by the nutrition (different exegetical traditions in the first Christian century) absorbed from the roots. As Geza Vermes rightly said:

In inter-testamental Judaism there existed a fundamental unity of exegetical tradition. This tradition, the basis of religious faith and life, was adopted and modified by its constituent groups, the Pharisees, the Qumran sectaries and the Judeo-Christians. We have, as a result, three cognate schools of exegesis of the one message recorded in the Bible, and it is the duty of the historian to emphasize that none of them can properly be understood independently of the others.¹

Concerning the place of composition, I assume that it has no great effect on the exegesis of the author to the Hebrews. I agree with W.D.Davies² and M.Hengel³, where they have made a close analysis of Judaism and Hellenism in the first century A.D. and argued for the interpenetration of Hellenism and Judaism both in Palestine and in the Diaspora.

1. G.Vermes, "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical setting" ALUOS 6 (1966-68) p.95.

2. W.D.Davies, "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism" (London, 2nd ed. 1955) writes, "Palestine Judaism is not to be viewed as a watertight compartment closed against all Hellenistic influences: there was a Graeco-Jewish 'atmosphere' even at Jerusalem itself... There is thus no justification for making too rigid a separation between the Judaism of the Diaspora and that of Palestine." p.8.

3. M.Hengel, "Judaism and Hellenism" 2 vols (London, 1974) argues that Hellenism was a political and economic force which has penetrated to both the Palestine and the Diaspora Jews. p.31.

Our discussions will concentrate only on the three 'cognate schools of exegesis' and only on the fundamental characteristics of exegesis of each of these schools which hope to serve as a basis for our investigation.

The **Jewish-rabbinic school** of exegesis already has its strong tradition in the first century A.D. With this tradition the scribes, usually the interpreter of the Jewish scriptures, agreed at least on four basic points.¹

1. They held in common a belief in the divine inspiration of the scriptures.

and / 2. They were convinced that these scriptures (the Torah, whether the written Torah alone or both written ~~or~~ oral) contained the entire truth of God for the guidance of man.²

3. They viewed their task as being to explain the many meanings, either plain or deduced of the texts.

4. They considered the purpose of all biblical interpretation to be the making relevant for life the instruction of God.³

The earliest Jewish exegetical method can be found in the **Targums**.⁴ To the scribes, the Targums not only represent a literal translation of the Hebrews into vernacular Aramaic (thus arise the **literalistic exegesis**), but ~~as~~ the Levites

have intended

1. Cf. R.Longenecker, "Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period" (Grand Rapids, 1975). p.19.

2. D.Patte, "Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine" (Missoula, 1975) shows, particularly in relation to the targumim, that the Jews of the first century A.D. accepted scripture as 'canonical,' reckoned that everything in scripture was meaningful. pp.63-81. Also in his prefaces, Patte argues that for the early Jew there was no difference between exegesis and hermeneutic. Such is to say that the text presented itself to the early Jew as immediately relevant. pp.6-7.

3. Ibid. pp.63-81.

4. R. Le Deaut, "Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation" BTB 4 (1974) says, "...the Targum represents the first link between Scripture and interpretation..." p.244. Since the recent discovery of some Palestine Targum MSS, most are prepared to concede that the Targums contain some, perhaps much, pre-Christian material. (cf. A. Diez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship to the other Targums" VTSup 3 (1959) pp.226-236; P.E.Kahle, "The Cairo Geniza" (Oxford, 2nd ed 1959) p.208; Matthew Black, "An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts" (Oxford, 3rd ed 1967) pp.20-22; M.P.Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament" JSJ 2 (1971) p.36. Nevertheless, R. Le Deaut, "The Current State of Targumic Studies" BTB 4 (1974) pp.22-24, remarks about the difficulty of isolating pre-Christian traditions).

/cc

did / of Neh 8:8 put, "to give the sense and make the people understand the meaning" for the Jews who gathered in the Synagogue for worship and edification.¹ As interpretive paraphrases or explanatory translation, they frequently incorporated later theological concepts and their own haggadoth for purposes of clarification and edification.² This is most reflected in the Targum to Psalm 68 where verses 2-4 are word by word paralleled to the Masoretic text, while from verse 5 onwards both explanatory translations and theological haggadoth are introduced.³

Many scholars have tried to assess the method of exegesis of the targumists. According to R. Le Deaut⁴, supported by many scholars, the six tendencies of targumist's method of exegesis are:

1. The Bible is treated as a whole which is complete in itself and which can be clarified from the juxtaposition of Biblical texts ~~and~~ with another. / s
2. The Targum has a synthetic view of the whole of the unrolling of the history of salvation.
3. Everything in the text is of value and has significance.
4. The popular nature of the the Targum means that it employs correspondingly popular methods: "etiologies, histoires drolatiques, voire salaces; souci de preciser et determiner d'ajouter des details, de trouver un nom aux lieux, aux personages pour mieux concretiser un recit".
5. Occasionally texts are isolated from their contexts and treated more freely.
6. The overall aim of the targumist is to render the Hebrew text intelligible.

The second group of material in the Jewish-rabbinic tradition should be the **Septuagint**. In the second half of the twentieth century considerable attention has been devoted to this ancient translation of the Hebrew/Aramaic Scriptures into

1. J.Bowker, "The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to the Jewish Interpretation of Scripture" (Cambridge, 1969) claims that the Targums "...make an attempt to represent the text verse by verse but at the same time they introduce into it extensive and often far-ranging interpretations" p.9.

2. Cf. M.McNamara, "Targum and Testament" (Grand Rapids, 1972) pp.69-75.

3. In this area, I owe much to Rev. Prof Robert Davidson's lectures on the "History of Biblical Interpretation" in the Candlemas term, 1988, in the University of Glasgow.

4. R. Le Deaut, "La Nuit pascale" AnBib 22 (Rome, 1963) pp.58-62. I quoted from G.J.Broke, "Exegesis at Qumran" JSOTSup 29 (Sheffield, 1985) p.27. / s

Greek. Today scholars do not accept the "one book" theory described by and originated ^{ing} from Aristeas,¹ but rather take Septuagint(LXX) as a general concept referring to all Jewish-Greek biblical books. E. Tov in his recent study illustrates four stages in the development of the LXX,² and concludes that the "LXX" contains translations of different types; early and late, original and revised, official and private.³ Recent research in LXX has focussed on how to reconstruct the Vorlage of the translation (the text that was lying in front of them, variously termed as Urtext, Ur-Septuaginta, or Proto-Septuagint). New Testament scholars have also tried to find the Vorlage of each Old Testament quotation in different books.

How "literal" is translation from Hebrew to Greek; for every translation inevitably involves interpretation and reflects the translator's understanding of the text. E. Tov suggests that this may be divided into linguistic exegesis, which is interested only in the linguistic identification like Aquila's translation, or contextual exegesis, which uses words from prevailing theology in the translator's historical context.⁴ Thus the translator may add, omit, substitute, wrongly divided words, and later scribes may develop haplography, homoioteleuton, 'haggadic touches'⁵ and other errors.⁶ /δ

Two doctrines due to contextual exegesis were rising to prominence and

1. The "Letter of Aristeas" describes how the Egyptian King commissioned the royal librarian of Alexandria, Demetrius, to collect all the books in the world which also include a copy of the Jewish Law. Later Aristeas, a Jew in the court from Alexandria, was sent to the High priest in Jerusalem for translators (six elders from each tribe, thus come LXX) for the job of translation in Alexandria. Scholars sometimes rejects this "letter" on the reason that it was for propaganda among the Jews. For more of this transmission history of the LXX see S. Jellicoe, "The Septuagint and Modern Study" (Oxford, 1968) pp.39-70.

2. E. Tov, "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research" (Jerusalem, 1981). The four stages of development of the LXX:

(a) The original translation. (Two theories exist here; the 'one translation' Urtext theory (by P.de Largarde) and the 'multiple translations' theory (by P. Kahle)).

(b) A multitude of textual translations resulting from the insertion of corrections.

(c) Textual stabilization in the first and second century A.D.

(d) The creation of new textual groups and the corruption of existing ones through the influence of the revisions of Origen and Lucian in the third and fourth century A.D.

δ/ .pp.

3. Ibid. p.47.

4. Ibid. pp.82-83.

5. S. Jellicoe, op. cit. pp.321-322. Similar view is picked up by A.T.Hanson, "The Living Utterances of God: the NT Exegesis of the Old" (London, 1983) pp.10-14.

7/ 6. For illustrations of these errors, see E. Tov, op. cit. pp.83-93, S. Jellicoe, op. cit. pp.318-329.

find explicit expression in the LXX. These are the doctrines of resurrection and angelology. The addition to Job 42:17 in LXX say, "And it is written, he [Job] will rise again with those whom the Lord risen up" (also cf. Is 26:19; Dan 12:2). The translations of "the children of Israel," "the children of God," or "Gods" in Hebrew to "the angels (of God)" in the LXX are of special interest to the later readers of LXX; both Jews and Christians alike.

S. Jellicoe's comment is appropriate:

Style and method vary considerably, but this is no more than would be expected in a production which extended over some decades and which was the word of different hands. Liberties are taken at times, more so with the later Books, but here, literary rather than theological interests seem to be the governing principle.¹

The third group of Jewish literature is the rabbinic or **talmudic** materials. It is divided by subject matter into either halakah, being to do with the regulation of conduct, or haggadah, which concerns the illustration of biblical texts and edification. The Mishnah is the basic halakic document, containing sixty-three tractates (Massektoth) and codified by Rabbi Judah "the Prince" in the first century A.D. The Tosephta is the "supplement" to the Mishnah; while the Gemaras ("teachings") are built directly upon the Mishnah, ~~tries~~ ^{and} to relate the halakic teachings in Mishnah to scripture. The Midrashim, distinct from the Mishnah, are writings dealing principally with the exegesis of scripture. The name **Midrash**, derives from the verb שׂרַר which in the Bible means mainly "to search," "to seek," "to investigate," (cf. Lev 10:16; Deut 13:15; Is 55:6 etc), and in the Second Temple period the word has the sense of education and learning generally.² ^{It} was the central concept in rabbinic exegesis and presumably used by the Pharisees as well.

s/ What interest ^{is} us is the rules ("middoth") of Midrashic interpretation. The fundamental seven rules of midrash were attributed to Rabbi Hillel.³ The seven

1. S. Jellicoe, op. cit. p.316.

2. M.D.Herr, "Midrash" in "Encyclopedia Judaica" vol 11. p.1507.

3. Rabbi Hillel has been variously claimed as the father or grandfather of Gamaliel, who was the teacher of Saul of Tarsus (the apostle Paul). cf. H.L.Strack, "Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash" (Philadelphia, 1945) p.109.

middoth are:¹

- e/
1. *Qal Wa-homer*: Inference a minor/ ad maius, from the light (less important) to the heavy (more important) and vice versa. In Latin *a fortiori* argument.
 2. *Gezerah shawah*: Inference by analogy, where the same words occur in two different verses, it follows that the same considerations apply to both.
 3. *Binyan ad mikkathub 'ehad*: building up a family from a single text; when the same phrase is found in a number of passages, then a consideration found in one of them applies to all of them.
 4. *Binyan ad mishene kethubim*: building up a family from two texts; a principle is established by relating two texts together and this principle can then be applied to other passages.
 5. *Kelal upherat*: the General and the Particular; detailed determination of the General by means of the Particular, of the Particular by means of the General.
 6. *Keyoze bo bemaqom 'aher*: to which something similar in another passage; then exposition of a difficult text may be solved by comparing it with another similar passage.
 7. *Dabar ha-lamed me'inyano*: a meaning that is deduced from the context.

Obviously most of these middoth are a matter of common sense and sound judgement. It was with these middoth that the distinctive exegetical feature of Pharisaic Judaism come clearly into view. Later in the second century A.D., Rabbi Ishmael developed these middoth into thirteen rules. Much later, Rabbi Eliezer further developed into thirty-two rules of middoth. Most of the thirty-two rules of middoth are the expansion of the seven fundamental middoth. The last four are the most 'fanciful'. I quoted them from H.L.Strack's book:²

1. For the listing and discussion of these rules, up to 32 of them, see H.L.Strack, op. cit. pp.93-98.

2. Ibid. pp.97-98.

29. *Gematria*: (a) computation of the numeric value of letters; (b) secret alphabets or substitution of letters for other letters.

30. *Notrikon*: breaking up a word into two or more, exposition of the single word to stand for just as many words which commence with them.

31. *Mukdam shehu' me'uhar ba-'inyan*: something that precedes which is placed second.

32. *Mukdam u-me'uhar shehu' beparashioth*: many a biblical section refers to a later period than the one which precedes, and vice versa.

A word to add on this midrashic method of exegesis. Recent scholars like to characterise midrashic interpretation by a maxim: That is This.

The apocalyptic writings of Judaism that were composed in the century (or so) before Christ and the century immediately following have some bearing on the question of Jewish exegesis in the first century A.D. The apocalyptic writers were essentially students of prophecy who believed that they had been raised up by God to make known its meaning, particularly the predictive element in the prophecy or the unfulfilled prophecy to their people. The six general methods of interpretation given by D.S. Russell are:¹

1. They scrutinized the writings of the prophets for *reinterpretations and adaptations* to the future destiny both of Israel and of the Gentiles.

2. Through the device of *pseudonymity* they presented past history in the form of unfulfilled prophecies and then follow a further account of these prophecies relating to the writer's own day situation; *the time of the End*.

i / 3. This "*End time*" was *at hand (imminent eschaton)*; the things foretold by the prophets were about to take place.

4. They made free use of *imagery or symbolism*, sometimes from foreign mythology, to interpret prophecy.

s / 5. Sometimes the *actual is used to explain the traditional*. For example, the three and a half year in Dan 7:25 is referred to the duration of persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes. /are /v

6. *Forecasting by calculation the "time of the End"*; although this was discouraged and warned^{against} by many rabbis.

1. D.S. Russell, "The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200BC-100AD" (London, 1964) pp.184-187.

Out of the above Jewish groups, Philo of Alexandria, whose expositions of/ in scriptures were contemporary with the teachings of Jesus and the writings of the New Testament writers, should occupy a special place in our discussion. As a Jew, he was the inheritor of Stoic and Platonic ideas. His exegesis may be described as allegorical,¹ but would not totally deny his literal interpretation of scriptures.² Nevertheless, his "two-level view"³ of scripture needs to be considered. His method of exegesis has been described not as "Greek", or "rabbinic", or a mixture of both, but rather "Hellenistic",⁴ and one must take into view that even allegorical exegesis was widespread amongst Jews of the first century A.D.⁵ / 8

The second cognate school of exegesis which is of great significance for the history of interpretation in the first Christian century is the Qumran sectaries. What interest us here is the biblical texts, about one-fourth of the approximately six hundred identifiable Dead Sea Scrolls (a few relatively intact, though most fragmentary, by these "nonconformist Jews". I would like to list, briefly, only the thirteen exegetical "rules" distilled by W.H.Brownlee.⁶ These "rules" are not agreed by all scholars today, but I believe there are suffice/ to act as the basic guideline in our discussion. /ent

1. Cf. R. Williamson, "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Leiden, 1970) claims "The method of interpretation which Philo used to get beneath the superficial, literal level of meaning to the underlying truth of the Old Testament was the allegorical method". p.520.

2. Cf. R. Longenecker, op. cit. p.29 strongly claims this point.

3. The phrase is from S.G. Sowers, "The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews" (Richmond, 1965).

4. Cf. G.J. Brooke, "Exegesis at Qumran" op. cit. p.18. Also, B.J. Bamberger, "Philo and the Aggadah" HUCA 48 (1977) pp.153-185. R.G. Hammerton-Kelly, "Some Techniques of Composition in Philo's Allegorical Commentary with Special Reference to De Agricultura- A Study in the Hellenistic Midrash" in his (ed) "Jews, Greeks and Christians" (Leiden, 1976) pp.45-56.

5. Cf. R.Longenecker, op. cit. p.48, makes this claim and show examples even in the Dead Sea Scrolls; 1QpHab 12:3-4, 1QpMic 8-10, CD 6:2-11; 7:9-20.

6. W.H.Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dea Sea Scrolls" BA 14 (1951) pp.60-62. He is/ only concentrate/ on the commentary 1QpHab. /s

1. Everything the ancient prophet wrote has a *veiled, eschatological meaning*.
2. Since the ancient prophet wrote cryptically, his meaning is often to be ascertained through a *forced, or abnormal construction of the Biblical text*.
3. The prophet's meaning may be detected through the study of the *textual or orthographic peculiarities* in the transmitted text.
4. A *textual variant* may also assist interpretation.
5. The application of the features of a verse may be determined by *analogous circumstance*, or by
6. *Allegorical propriety*.
7. For the full meaning of the prophet, *more than one meaning* may be attached to his words.
8. In some cases the original prophet so completely veiled his meaning that he can be understood only by an *equation of synonyms*.
9. Sometimes the prophet veiled his message by writing one word instead of another, the interpreter being able to recover the prophet's meaning by a *rearrangement of the letters in a word*, or by
10. The *substitution of similar letters* for one or more of the letters in the word of the Biblical text.
11. Sometimes the prophet's meaning is to be derived by the *division of one word into two or more parts* and by expounding the parts.
12. At times the original prophet concealed his meaning beneath abbreviation, so the cryptic meaning of a word is through *interpretation of words, or parts of words as abbreviations*.
- s) 13. *Other passages of scripture* may illumine the meaning of the original prophet.

The first point clearly shows that the Qumran sectarians understand themselves as God's righteous remnant in the period of eschatological consummation and the words of the prophets relate only to them. This secret (raz) message from the prophets has now been given its interpretation (peshar) by the Teacher of Righteousness.¹ The second point is due to the fact that there are more than fifty

1. For a treatment of this whole subject see F.F. Bruce, "Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts" (Den Haag, 1969).

variations in 1QpHab either from the MT, LXX or Targums.¹ The remaining eleven "rules" are more or less similar to, or can be discovered in, midrash. Thus many² have followed Brownlee in labelling the exegetical method of the Qumran commentaries as a "midrash pesher", but one³ always bear in mind that "there are fundamental distinctions of *literary style* (italics mine) between Dead Sea Habakkuk and the Rabbinic midrashim".³ This is why scholars are not totally certain about the exact meaning of the term "pesher" (פֶּשֶׁר), an Aramaic word meaning "interpretation", used as introduction to each expository section in the commentaries from Qumran.⁴ G. Vermes, too, remarks on the variety of ways of using the scriptures at Qumran as, "...exegetical therefore, in the broader sense of the word".⁵ We can find direct citations, allusions and use of biblical imagery in 1QS, 1QSa, 1QM, CD, retelling of biblical narrative in 1QapGen, pieces of targums in 4QtgLev, 11QPssJosh, texts with midrash features in 1QSB, 4QPb, 4QFlor, 11QMelch, as well as other non-biblical texts in 4QTestim, 4QOrd.⁶ Nevertheless, a simple maxim is descriptive of the "pesher" method of exegesis: This is That.⁷

8/ The **Judeo-Christians** "school of exegesis" is our third school to access. It is impossible for us to investigate every distinct "stream" ; for example in the order of Jesus, Paul, the Evangelists, the author to the Hebrews,

1. For the variants of 1QpHab see W.H.Brownlee, "The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran" (Philadelphia, 1959) pp.108-113.

2. Cf. K.Stendahl, "School of St Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament" (Philadelphia, 1968) p.184. M.Black, "The Christological Use of the OT in the NT" NTS 18 (1971) p.1. L.H.Siberman, "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)" RQ 3 (1961-62) pp.323-364 reckons the similarity of pesherim and rabbinic midrash (p.327). A.Finkel, "The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures" RQ 4 (1963-64) pp.357-370. E.Slomovic, "Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls" RQ 7 (1969-71) pp.3-15. M.P.Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the O.T. in the N.T." JSJ 2 (1971) pp.49-55. Most recently, G.J.Brooke, "Exegesis at Qumran" op. cit.

3. W.H.Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls" op. cit. p.175. More recently in "The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk" (Missoula, 1979).

4. Yet in 4QFlor contains both the word "midrash" and the word "pesher" in relation one to the other.

5. G.Vermes, op. cit. p.86.

6. Cf. G.J.Brooke, op. cit. p.37.

7. R.Longenecker, op. cit. p.43.

James and so on,¹ within this school. I would like to outline what R. Longenecker² regards as the four presuppositions of Christian exegesis on how the New Testament writers interpret the Old. (Once again, it so happens in the New Testament that the *use of the Old Testament* by each writer is the best approach to understanding the exegesis of the New Testament).

1. *Corporate solidarity*: This of course was also claimed by both the Qunram³ sectaries and the rabbis. They all believed that their group was the true Israel of which scripture speaks. This may, inevitably, lead to the use of the existing scriptures (either Hebrew or LXX or other translations) to act as a "proof-text-fulfilment" in the claiming of the 'true inheritor' of the historical salvation by God.

2. *Correspondences in history*: Stemming in part from the concept of corporate solidarity, the early Christians were prepared to trace correspondences between God's activity of the past and his action in the present - between events then and event now, between persons then and persons now. A.T.Hanson³ is right to call this typology.

3. *Eschatological fulfilment*: "As with the covenanters of Qunram, early Jewish believers in Jesus understood their ancient Scriptures in an eschatological context"⁴, but to the Christians only, Messiahship had been realised in Jesus of Nazareth.

4. *Messianic Presence*: This leads, as summed up by Longenecker in his conclusion,⁵ to three ways in which New Testament writers interpret the Old Testament. (a) from a *Christocentric perspective*: Obviously the hermeneutical presupposition of all the New Testament writers and usually of their readers as well in either the explicit and implicit use of the "Jewish" scriptures is clearly the centrality of the figure of Jesus recognised

8 // 1. For detail ~~may refer~~ to R.Longenecker, "Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period" op. cit. and A.T.Hanson, "The Living Utterances of God" op. cit.

2. R.Longenecker, op. cit. pp.93-95.

3. A.T.Hanson, op. cit. p.41.

4. R.Longenecker, op. cit. p.95.

5. Ibid.pp.93-95.

through faith as the Christ. C.F.D.Moule is right to claim,¹

found /
The Christians began from Jesus- from his known character and mighty deeds and sayings, and his death and resurrection; and with these they went to the scriptures, and ~~find~~...new significance in the light of these recent happenings. Sooner or later this was to lead, through a definition of what God has done, to something like a definition of who Jesus was.

and /
(b) In *conformity with a Christian tradition*. It is difficult to define exactly what this Christian tradition is. It was there in the earliest Church. By "transformed the pre-messianic Torah into the messianic Torah"² there existed a distinct tradition and style in using the scriptures. This Christian tradition is said to be, or must be, started by Jesus, and then continued in the apostles in their ~~understood~~ of the resurrected Messiah.³ This does not mean that they dispense with traditional rabbinic influences. Many scholarly works have demonstrated how they, consciously or unconsciously, make use of the Jewish method of exegesis.⁴

(c) along Christological lines.

Finally I hope to deal specially with the "Testimony Book" hypothesis. It has always been associated with the name of Rendel Harris⁵ although the concept did not originate with him.⁶ But Harris claims for the existence of such a "Book" in at least four arguments:

1. There exist some 'key-texts' in various New Testament documents, for example, Ps 2:7 in Acts 13:23, Heb 1:5; 5:5, and Mk 1:11 and parallels.

1. C.F.D.Moule, "The Birth of the New Testament" (London, 1966) p.57.

2. B.Gerhardsson, "Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity" trans. E.J.Sharpe (Lund, 1961).

3. M.Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament" NTS 21 (1975) pp.353-379. also, "The Theological Appropriation of the Old Testament by the New Testament" SJT 39 (1986) pp.1-17 ~~claim of this Christian tradition.~~ / 8

4. E.g. K.Stendahl, "The School of St Matthew" op. cit., R.H.Gundry, "The Use of the O.T. in St Matthew" NTSup 18 (Leiden, 1967), M.Goulder, "Midrash and Lection in Matthew" (London, 1974) all illustrate how Matthew was influenced by the Jewish method of exegesis. Similarly on Pauline literatures, see W.D.Davies, "Paul's Use of the O.T." (Grand Rapids, 1957), A.T.Hanson, "Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology" (London, 1974).

5. J.R.Harris published his two slim volumes, "Testimonies" (Cambridge, 1916, 1920) and argued for the existence of such a "Book" in the earliest Church even though he did not have any support from the Qunram discoveries.

ing /
6. Cf. E.Hatch, "Essay in Biblical Greek" (Oxford, 1889) p.203 has claimed, though not directly mentioned the term "Testimony Book", but "a collection of excerpta" hypothesis. / 8

2. Some Old Testament quotations in the New Testament are not found in LXX or Hebrew Bible, thus it seems that they are from a 'common source'.

8/ 3. Some Old Testament quotations occur in 'group' in the New Testament and they usually link by certain key word or idea. / 9

are / 4. C. they usually link by a volume of "Testimonia" which was a collection of the / Messianic proof-texts from Hebrew Bible existed in the Early Church. / 8

Although the discoveries of the Cave 4 Testimonia (4QTestim) and Florilegium (4QFlor) have added more weight to the hypothesis, there has never been an early "Christian Testimonia" book found today and it remains as a hypothesis, although we cannot totally deny such a possibility. Later, C.H.Dodd took a further decisive step forward in modifying the hypothesis by proposing, instead, "a method of biblical study" by the earliest Christians which may have led to the formation, later on, of Testimony books.¹ Dodd's theory has been developed still further by B.Lindars² and he tries to trace the history of exegetical study which has produced the form in which quotations are used in the New Testament. In recent years biblical scholars have responded differently to this hypothesis.³ Concerning the hypothesis and the Hebrews, F.C.Synge⁴ offers three pieces of evidence for the ~~evidence~~ of Testimony Book underlying the epistle; the phenomenon of anonymous quotations, the splitting of quotations (cf Heb 2:13; 10:30), and the disregard of the context of a quotation by the author. H.Montefiori in his commentary adds to the above arguments by "an existing catena of Old Testament proof-texts"⁵. To quote from J.C.McCullough "On the one hand, it must be stated that there is evidence that the New Testament scholars did have a tendency to return to the same Old Testament passage, when drawing support from the Old Testament, when discussing the theological use which the author makes of the Old Testament, this must be borne in mind. On the other hand, there is no evidence to point to a written Testimony Book which was used by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. From the point of view of the text which

1. C.H.Dodd, "According to the Scripture" (London, 1952) p.126.

2. B.Lindars, "New Testament Apologetic" (London, 1961).

3. Rejected by K.Stendahl, "The School of St Matthew" op. cit. E.D.Freed, "Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John" (Leiden, 1965).

4. F.C.Synge, "Hebrews and the Scriptures" (London, 1959).

5. H.Montefiori, Comm. op. cit. p.43.

he is using, therefore, we must still reckon that he is quoting directly from some version of the Old Testament, and find that version, rather than look for a Testimony Book".¹

s/ 1. J.C.McCullough, "Hebrew and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.60.

1. Heb 1:5a (= Ps 2:7b)

For to what angel did God ever say,
 "Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee" ? (RSV)

Τι γὰρ εἶπεν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων·

Υἱὸς μου εἶ σὺ, ἔγωγ σημερον γεγεννηκα σε; (GK)

κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με·

Υἱὸς μου εἶ σὺ, ἔγωγ σημερον γεγεννηκέ σε: (LXX) / α

(MT), תָּבִיאִי: מִיָּד יְצָא נִפְלֵא יְצָא נִפְלֵא

From the above data, it is obvious that the first direct quotation is identical with the LXX and totally faithful to the MT.

Identical quotations from other parts of the NT occur in Heb 5:5 and Acts 13:33. But there are quite similar, partly or more extensive, quotations like:

Mk 1:11

Lk 3:22 (cf. Mt 3:17)

Lk 3:22 (D)

Ebio. Gosp.

σὺ

εἶ

ὁ υἱὸς

μου

ὁ ἀγαπητός

ἐν σοι

εὐδοκήσα

υἱὸς μου

εἶ

σὺ

-

-

-

-

ἔγωγ

σημερον

γεγεννηκα

σε

σὺ μου

εἶ

ὁ υἱὸς

-

ὁ ἀγαπητός

ἐν σοι

εὐδοκήσα (καὶ παλιν)

ἔγωγ

σημερον

γεγεννηκα

σε

From this, we observe that Mk 1:11 and Lk 3:22 render the first part of LXX Ps 2:7b, but the Western text (D a b c ff² Just. Dial.88;103 Clem.Alex.Paed. I 6.25) of Luke is identical with the LXX version as cited in Heb 1:5a. The Ebionite Gospel (cf. Epiph.Haer. 30.13) added *ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγεννηκα σε* after the full texts as given by the synoptists.

Once we compare the above data, we ought to ask ourselves what the relationship is of the quotation in Heb 1:5a to the other quotations, especially the quotations from the Western text of Luke and the Ebionite Gospel.

If we place the dates¹ of these texts in the order somewhat like Mk, Lk/Mt/Acts, Hebrews, D, Ebionite Gospel², we are faced with two questions: (i) Was the author of Hebrews citing directly from LXX? ; (ii) Was there an already existing reference source (let's say the "testimonia"³ book) ~~to~~ these quotations? */for*

It is arguable that even if the answer to (ii) is positive the answer to (i) might not be a negative one since the author of Hebrews might still compare the LXX with the existing reference source he possessed but cited directly from LXX. In the past most scholars of Hebrews have immediately concluded that the author cited directly from LXX.⁴ F.F.Bruce^{however} takes these evidences as a proof ~~to~~ */for* a "testimonia" book in the apostolic age.⁵ Conversely, C.H.Dodd argued that Luke (Western text) is the most correct form of citation as in Acts 13:33 or Heb 1:5a, and Mark assimilated it into his gospel.⁶ There is then the possibility that the author of Hebrews might

1. The dating of these texts are in order of year only. Detail in year is not necessary here.

2. R.McL.Wilson ed. "Hennecke- N.T. Apocrypha" (London, 1959/63) p.156 gives AD 130 ~~to~~ */as* the date of Ebionite Gospel, p.156.

3. For details see above (Introduction) pp.65-67.

4. J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.69

5. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.14. Also, B.Lindars, "New Testament Apologetics" (London: SCM, 1960) p.144.

6. C.H.Dodd, "According to the Scripture" (London, 1952) p.32

refer to Luke (Western text) or Acts 13:33 for citation.

At the moment it is difficult to make a conclusion until more evidence from other quotations has been considered.

Clearly, Psalm 2 is an enthronement Psalm.¹ The king himself, sometimes in first as well as the third person singular, tells how the kings of surrounding nations plotting in vain against the Lord and His anointed one (משיח). It is of this anointed king that the Lord (יהוה) said "Thou art my son, today I have begotten thee". This anointed king is called God's Son, in the sense of Son by adoption in the coronation liturgy. It is difficult to identify the kings in Ps 2 historically. Enthronement ceremonies were widely practiced throughout the Ancient Near East.² Some rabbinic sources understood this as a reference to the war of Gog and Magog.³ M.Dahood suggested that the El Amarna period in Syria-Palestine was the most suitable setting,⁴ and in Canaanite culture the king was believed to be an offspring of the gods and he cited evidence from Ugaritic textbook 125:10-11 to support this argument.⁵ Again we see an adoption formula exists in the background of this saying in Ps 2. Quite certainly, we can argue that Ps 2 has been used by the Israelites in the royal ritual of the enthronement or annual festival of the king of Jerusalem. Probably this is the Sitz-im-Leben of Ps 2, and the testimony in Ps 2:7b is to be understood as an act of adoption.⁶

In the OT, the most suitable historical event that matches this saying in Ps 2:7b is to be found in Nathan's oracle in 2 Sam 7:14a which was a promise to David. Probably, the author to the Hebrews understood this way and cited these two passages together in Heb 1:5.

1. Cf. M.Dahood "Psalm 1:1-50" Anchor Bible Series (New York, 1965) p.7. J.H.Eaton, "Kingship and the Psalms" (London, 1976) p.111. H.J.Kraus, "Theology of the Psalms" trans. K.Crim (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986) p.136.

2. For works of this investigation, cf. S.Mowinckel, "He That Cometh" (Oxford, 1956). J.H.Eaton, op. cit. H.J.Kraus, op.cit.

3. S.H.Levey, "The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation-the messianic exegesis of the Targum' Hebrew Union College Monographs 2 , 1974, shows evidences from Talmud Berkot 10a and Midrash Exodus Rabbah 1:1. p.105.

4. M.Dahood, op. cit. p.8

5. Ibid. p.12.

6. H.J.Kraus, "Theology of the Psalms" op. cit. p.180.

In Judaism, The Psalms of Solomon (PsSol 17:21ff), dated in the first century B.C.¹, testify that Ps 2 was understood messianically, but the Messiah was both a political as well as a spiritual figure.² In the later years, the Rabbis commented on Ps 2 differently and gave quite a different meaning to the term "anointed".³ Thus in the Targum, Ps 2 is of doubtful messianic interpretation. Verse 7b is translated as "You are as dear to me as a son is to a father; you are as meritorious as though I had created you this day"⁴ So the Targum on Ps 2:7 has weakened the meaning of Sonship. This may be due to the controversy between Christianity and Judaism which waxed hot in the later years.⁵

As we turn to the N.T., Ps 2 is one of the most popular psalms. All the quotations and references from Ps 2 reflect an messianic interpretation. Acts 4:25-27 which cited Ps 2:1-2 apply the term "anointed" to Jesus. The allusions to Ps 2:7 in Mk 1:11, Lk 3:22, Mt 3:17 all applied this verse to the time of Jesus' baptism. The allusion to Ps 2:7 in Mk 9:7; Lk 9:35; Mt 17:5 and in II Pet 1:18 applied to the time of transfiguration. While Paul cited Ps 2:7 directly in the preaching at Antioch (Acts 13:33) but applied it to the resurrection of Jesus. It is uncertain to which incident Heb 1:5a refers to. In other words, what did the author understand by the word "today" (*σημερον*) in this quotation?

H.J.Kraus states that ^{which} four possibilities can be discerned in the way in _a "today" was understood in the early Christian kerygma: (i) "Today" is the

1. J.H.Charlesworth ed. "The O.T. Pseudepigraphy" Vol.2 (London: Darton,Longman & Todd, 1985) gives "The widest limits for dating are between 125 B.C. and the early first century A.D. Narrow limits would be about 70 to 45 B.C... reached their final form before A.D. 70." p.641. /a

2. Idem. p.642-645.

3. Strack-Billerbeck, "Kommentar zum Neuen Testament" III (Munchen, 1926) p. 675, gives "Vermutlich hat auch der Targum Ps 2 messianisch gedeutet; denn die spätere Zeit hat bei dem "Gesalbten" Jahves kaum an etwas anders als an den messianischen König gedacht". /c

4. S.H.Levy, op cit., p.105. He too argues that the "anointed one" in Ps 2 should not be understood as the messiah but to any one chosen by God to be a king, and anointed as such. p.145.

5. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalms Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.17.

event of the baptism of ~~the~~ baptism of Jesus; (ii) In the miracle of the transfiguration Jesus was declared to be the "Son of God"; (iii) Jesus became the "Son of God" by his resurrection from the dead.; (iv) The ascension into God's heavenly ~~world~~ elevated the one who was humbled to be God's Son.¹ It is not difficult for us to envisage that Heb 1:5a belongs to category (4). In Heb 1:3, the author has cited Ps 110:1 and said that the Son "sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high". In Heb 1:4, the Son is compared to the angels, and naturally only the Son, who had ascended and sat down on the throne, is more excellent than the angels.² Also, Heb 5:5 combines quotations from Ps 2:7 and Ps 110:4 (Heb 5:6) where Christ is appointed a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. In Heb 7:28, the two psalms passages (Heb 7:21ff) are brought together once again where God appoints a Son as a priest for ever.

This / ~~These~~ combination of scriptures in one Epistle suggests strongly that the author perceives the same occasion in Heb 1:5a.

In examining the above texts, we may conclude that the decree on Ps 2:7b which declares the king as God's Son possesses the adoption formula just as in background usage in the surrounding nations of Israel. This adoptionistic concept continues to ^{be} reflect^{ed} in the Rabbinic and the Qumranite literatures, and even in the baptism of Jesus in NT. But the baptism of Jesus is not a terminus a quo for His "adopted" divine sonship. We see that the quotation of Ps 2:7b in Acts 13:33 states that Christ was enthroned as Son of God by the resurrection from the dead. This Christological statement might correspond to the passage in Rom 1:3-4 which Kasemann terms "a liturgical fragment from pre-Pauline times".³ So it is highly doubtful that it is justifiable to speak of an adoptionist Christology of primitive Christianity as Kasemann does.⁴ The use of Ps 2:7b in Heb 1:5a, as well as in Heb

1. H.J.Kraus, "Theology..." op. cit. p.181.

2. Cf. H.J.Kraus, "Theology. p.183. Also, F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.13. A.Vanhoye, "Situation du Christ" (Paris, 1969) p.141. H.Braun, Comm. p.35.

3. Kasemann, Comm. p.171.

4. Ibid. p.99.

5:5 and Heb 7:28, shows an exaltation formula with an eternal concept. Obviously, the "Son" in Heb 1:5a is tied up with the "Son" in Heb 1:2; a Son of pre-existence, creatorship, powerful and highly exalted. Undoubtedly the Son in Heb 1:5a should be understood in this context and within the structure of Heb 1. This is not to say that although the "today" in Heb 1:5a belongs to the ascension-exaltation formula it will totally dispense with the baptism, transfiguration, and resurrection concepts. Rather I would say all these occasions lead up to the exaltation of the Son. This is why the author cited Ps 2:7b with the introductory formula "God says" ("God spoke" in 5:5) as compared to "it is written in the second psalm" in Acts 13:33 which specifies the resurrection occasion.

Finally, we can conclude that (i) the quotation itself and the textual background are unable to give an immediate answer to the exact textual origin, either from LXX or from an existing reference source, of this quotation, (ii) the meaning of "today" is not totally restricted to one occasion but leading up to the ascension-exaltation concept, (iii) the author cited this verse from Ps 2:7b as the first quotation because it is demanded or shaped by the form-content structure of the Epistle, especially the structure of chapter 1.

2. Heb 1:5b (= 2 Sam 7:14a)

Or again,

"I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son" (RSV)

καὶ πάλιν· ἔγωγε ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα,
καὶ αὐτός ἐσται μοι εἰς υἱόν; (Gk)

ἔγωγε ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα,
καὶ αὐτός ἐσται μοι εἰς υἱόν . (LXX)

(MT) כִּי וְעַתָּה יִהְיֶה לִּי אֵלֹהִים וְהוּא יִהְיֶה לִּי בֶן

The second direct quotation in Hebrews is identical with the LXX and agrees with the MT.

The prefix *καὶ* is found in b, g, h, n, e₂, Sahidic and Ethiopic versions, Cyril, Theodoret, and Cyprian. The texts of A, B, and the rest of Septuagintal texts follow the MT text, which has no *καὶ*. No witnesses for Hebrews 1:5b have *καὶ*.

Two possibilities for this variant :

- (i) A reflection of the quotation of 2 Sam 7:14 in 2 Cor 6:18 where the *καὶ* is used to connect the quotation with the preceding one (cf 2 Cor 6:17).
- (ii) The introduction of a *καὶ* is a common practice.¹ Thus it found its way to some Greek texts due to the scribes.

Anyhow, the author of Hebrews had a text uncorrupted before him.²

1. E.E.Ellis, "Paul's Use of the OT" (Grand Rapids, 1957) p.49.

2. K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959) p.231.

2 Sam 7:14a occurs again in 1 Chron 17:13a with ^{the} same historical event which is a response of the Lord (יהוה) to king David from ~~prophet~~ ^{the} Nathan promised ^{the} /ing to establish David's house in perpetuity. Within the context of these two passages in the OT, the "Son" here refers to Solomon. 1 Chron 28:5 refers to the kingdom over which Solomon would rule as the kingdom of the Lord, and ^{he} /sat on the Lord's throne (cf. ^{he} / says he 1 Chron 29:23). The narratives in these two passages are closely associated with the poetic oracles of Pss 89:19-37, 132:11-18, and 2:7-9. These psalms portray that God will keep David's throne for ever, and a "Son" (Shoot/ horn) out of David will sit on his throne.

^s / David ^{the} / immediate successor Solomon did sit on the throne and build a temple for God, but the later parts of the OT did not regard God's promises made to David as exhausted. Jer 23:5 and 33:15 show that a shoot (יצחק : "the righteous Branch" being translated here), which is the Davidic Messiah, is to be raised up for David. Mic 5:2ff portrays this "Son of David" as perfect ruler, the prince of four names of Isa 9:6f and the Zion's king of Zech 9:9.

More hints of this "Son of David" can be found in the N.T. In Gabriel's words of annunciation to Mary (Lk 1:32f) and especially in Zechariah's thanksgiving "and has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David" (Lk 1:69). The allusion by Paul in Rom 1:3 "concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh" undoubtedly refers to 2 Sam 7:14 and probably the author of Hebrews knew about the above concepts while making his second quotation in Heb 1:5b.

The discovery of 4Q Florilegium which is made up of some 21 fragments of varying sizes representing most of one column of 19 lines is "mainly concerned with the re-establishment of the House of David in the last days"¹ has thrown more light to the interpretation of this verse. I quote two verses from 4Q Flor. col i: 10-11:

¹⁰ [And] the Lord [tel]ls you that he will build a house for you, and I shall set up your seed after you, and I shall establish his royal throne

¹¹ [for eve]r. I [will be] to him as a father, and he will be to me as a son. He is the shoot of David who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law, who [...] in Zi[on (?)] in the [l]ast days.

1. J.M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature" JBL 75 (1956) p.176.

It is clear that the author of 4Q Florilegium expected a messiah, a Davidic Messiah, from the "Son" (shoot) of David to fulfill the promise. Targum Jonathan of 2 Sam 7: 12ff uses "Son" which is consistent with the "Son" of MT 2 Sam 7:14.¹ Some commentators assumed that the author of Hebrews also expected a Davidic Messiah as the Qumranites.² On the other hand, it is difficult for us to argue that there is no ^{indication} connection, either in Heb 1 or other parts of the Epistle, that the author interpreted Jesus as having a relationship to David.³ Both the quotations in Heb 1:5a (= Ps 2:7b) and Heb 1:5b (2 Sam 7:14a) are clearly in the OT related to David. Probably, the author does not want to mention David because of the content structure where he has planned to portray a messiah who was a priest which David and his successors certainly were not.

Moreover, there are two messiahs, the messiah of Aaron (priestly) and Israel (kingly), described in the Manual of Discipline in Cave 1 (1QS), and the Samuel document discovered in Cave 1 (1QSa) envisages that the Messiah of Aaron stands above the Messiah of Israel.⁴ But these two Messiahs appeared together with a Prophet, "until the coming of a Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (1QS 9:11). Thus we can see three different heroes of redemption in the last days : (i) the new Prophet, (ii) the "Messiah of Aaron"⁵, the new high priest out of the tribe of

1. D.J.Harrington & A.J.Saldarini, "Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets" The Aramaic Bible 10 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987) p.175.

2. F.F.Bruce, " 'To the Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes?'" NTS 9, (1962-63) p.221. Also, F.C.Fensham, "Hebrews and Qumran" Neotestamentica 5 (1971) p.18.

3. G.W.Buchanan, Comm. p.15, insists that there is no connection at all.

4. For details see K.G.Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" pp.54-64 in "The Scrolls and the New Testament" ed. K.Stendahl (London: SCM, 1957). Also, Y.Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews" in Scripta Hierosolymitana IV (Jerusalem, 1965) pp.34-48.

5. "The Messiah of Aaron" has been variously claimed as "The Interpreter of the Law". Evidence is drawn from the Zadokite Document (CDC vii: 18-20) on the exposition on Num 24:17 where the "star out of Jacob" is the "Messiah from Aaron", the eschatological high priest, the "Interpreter of the Law", while the "sceptre out of Israel" is the Davidic ruler, the prince of all the congregation. Cf. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsdertam, 1961) p.70.

Levi, and (3) the "Messiah of Israel", the new king out of the tribe of Judah.¹

Now we need to ask what is the connection between the N.T. and the distinct form of messianic expectation of the Essenes? We may see a hint in the question asked by the Jews to John the Baptist (Jn 1:20f) or Jesus (Jn 7:40f; Mk 8:28f par.) whether they were "the Prophet" or "the Messianic king (Christ)". Obviously, there is no clear and direct evidence that the N.T. has an expectation of two Messiahs. But, to be sure, the N.T. speaks often enough of Jesus as the new Prophet (Lk 7:16; Jn 7:52, 9:17; Acts 3:22, 7:37), the messianic king (by the term "Christ") of Davidic origin (cf Rom 1:2-4). The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks at length of Jesus' high priestly office, not of Aaronic origin but a distinct order from Melchizedek.

^a Now we have a clearer view about the first two quotations, Heb 1:5a and Heb 1:5b, in Hebrews. The author quotes these two O.T. passages, Ps 2:7b and 2 Sam 7:14a, without mention or need to relate to David because of his total content structure. He used the Introductory formula "καὶ πάλιν", which is equal to the "God says" before. The author only wants to argue for a priestly Messiah which is in the order of Melchizedek and superior to the Messiah of Aaron. I am not denying that the author has no knowledge about the kingly Davidic Messiah in other parts of the N.T. or the two Messiahs in the Qumran community. These "Messiahs" are not of interest² or relevant to his argument in theology which has been planned and shaped by the content structure of the Epistle. That the author does so might be due to his recipients being only concerned with or troubled by the Aaronic Messiah which is portrayed by the Essenes.

Finally I want to argue that the author cited these two O.T. passages

1. K.G.Kuhn, op. cit. p.63.

2.. Y.Yadin, op. cit., claims that the author of Hebrews argues for both the kingly and priestly Messiahs. He does not show evidence how the kingly Messiah was argued by the author of the Hebrews' Epistle. p.42.

together not because of his "source" but because the structure demands these two scriptures. The pivot point is the existence of the word "Son" in Ps 2:7b and 2 Sam 7:14a. The term "Son" has been occurred in Heb 1:1, and the flow of the argument in Heb 1 is the comparison of the "Son" and the angels. The occurrence of these two passages together is not sufficient to support the claim for a "testimony book" in the patristic Church. /re

3. Heb 1:6b (Deut 32:43 LXX / Ps 97:7c)

And again, when he brings the first-born into the world, he says,

(ὅταν δε παλιν εισαγαγη τον πρωτοτοκον εις την οικουμενην, λεγει)

"Let all God's angels worship him" (RSV)

GK	Dt 32:43 (B)	Dt 32:43 (Odes B)	A, 55, Just., M.		Ps 96:7 (LXX)	Ps 97:7 (MT)
	line 2	line 4	line 2	line 4		
καὶ	καὶ	καὶ	καὶ	καὶ	—	—
προσκυνη-	προσκυνη-	ἐνισχυ-	προσκυνη-	ἐνισχυ-	προσκυνη-	ΤΙΠΛΩΠ
σατωσαν	σατωσαν	σατωσαν	σατωσαν	σατωσαν	σατε	
αὐτω	αὐτω	αὐτω	αὐτω	αὐτω	αὐτω	יף
παντες	(παντες	παντες A)	παντες	παντες	παντες	כ
αγγελου	υἱου	αγγελου	ου)αγγελου	υἱου	οι αγγελου	א'לך
θεου	θεου	θεου	θεου	θεου	αυτου	—

Concerning the Vorlage (fore or parent text) behind the quotation, three solutions have been suggested.

(1) That the quotation is cited from Ps 96:7 (LXX). Usually two reasons have been urged against this view. First, on grammatical grounds, *προσκυνησατε* in Ps 96:7 (LXX) is a second person plural aorist imperative, while in Deut 32:43 both *προσκυνησατωσαν* or *ἐνισχυσατωσαν* are third person plural aorist indicative. Secondly, *καὶ* has been retained, it is not in the Psalm. Not many scholars accept this view except G.L.Archer.¹

(2) From the above data, it is assumed that the author cited his quotation from line 2 of Deut 32:43 (Odes) in LXXB, or from line 2 of Deut 32:43 (Odes) in LXXA (except for the addition of the definite article under influence of Ps 96:7 LXX)². To support

1. G.L.Archer & G.Chirichigno, "Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament" (Chicago: Moody Pr, 1983) p.50, says, "Although it is a slight difference in that Heb 1:6... essentially it is the same thing. The inserted material of Deut 32:43 is not needed to serve as a basis for the quote in Heb 1:6, because it is there even in Ps 96:7".

2. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961)p.22.

this view, Deut 32:43 (Odes), a hymn of Moses, is said to be a popular hymn used not only in the service of the Temple and sung by the Jews of the Diaspora¹, and as S.Kistemaker argues this is also in the liturgy of the Church.² Thus the author of Hebrews cited his text from Deut 32:43 (Odes).³

(3) That the author cited his text from Deut 32:43 LXXA/B. There has been much discussion about the two lines, line 2 and line 4, in Deut 32:43 LXX, since neither of them are in the Masoretic text. This raises the question as to whether or not these lines are a later addition to the Septuagint. However, a Hebrew fragment recently found in Cave 4 at Khirbet Qumran testified the existence of line 2, but this can be explained probably by this line being taken from Ps 97:7 (MT) and added into the 'Song of Moses'⁴. On the other hand, Hebrews' scholars try to explain the variants in these two lines. (i) That the author cited line 2 or line 4 of Deut 32:43 LXX and changed *υιοι* to *αγγελου* or the less common *ενισχυσατωσαν* to *προσκυνησατωσαν* perhaps under the influence of Ps 97 (LXX 96):7.⁵ or (ii) That the author cited line 2 of Deut 32:43 LXX, where in some LXX manuscripts *αγγελου* had replaced *υιοι*.⁶ (iii) P.Katz⁷ claims that Hebrews 1:6 represents line 4, being the original, but with *προσκυνησατωσαν* of line 2 instead of the strange *ενισχυσατωσαν* of the LXX.

(3)(i) seems as the best explanation for the quotation. H.Windisch thinks it is "eine Mischung [marriage] von Ps 96:7 und Dt 32:43"⁸. Other advocates are, to list a few, E.Riggenbach⁹, J.Moffatt¹⁰, O.Kuss¹¹, C.Spicq¹². K.J.Thomas claims

-
- De/ 1. In IV Macc 18:6ff, and Philo calls it the "Great Song" of Moses, cf Leg Alleg III 34:105, The Plant 14:59.
2. Cf. H.Schneider, "Die biblischen Oden in christlichen Altertum" Bib 30 (1949) p.31.
3. S.Kistemaker, op cit, p.23.
- k/ 4. Cf. P.W.Sheehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut 32) from Qumran" BASOR 136 (1954) p.12. For more discussion about the relationship between 4QDeut 32:43, Ps 97:7(MT), and Deut 32:43 LXX see G.W.Buchanan, "To the Hebrews" Anchor Bible, (New York, 1972) p.15-18.
- ce/ 5. Some later Fathers evidently this change, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Hilary.
6. For example, F, the margin of M,N,O, V (*υιοι* in the margin), the Bohairic and Ethiopic versions, the margin of the Sahidic version, Justin, Origen, Eusebius, and Hilary.
7. P.Katz "The Quotation from Deuteronomy in Hebrews" ZNW 49 (1958) p.219.
8. H.Windisch, "Der Hebräerbrief" HNT (Tübingen, 1921) p.17.
- H/ 9. E.Riggenbach, "Der Brief an die Hebräer" (Leipzig, 1922) p.20.
10. J.Moffatt, "To the Hebrews" ICC (Edinburgh, 1924) claims "Our author probably changed it into *αγγελου θεου*, recollecting the similar phrase in Ps 97:7" p.11
11. O.Kuss, "Der Brief an die Hebräer" (Regensburg, 1953) claims that the quotation is taken from Deut 32:43 LXX and says, " a reproduction in Hebrews come from the influence of Ps 97(96):7"p.36.
12. C.Spicq, "L'Épître aux Hébreux" II (Paris, 1953) p.18

that this quotation in Hebrews "is the result of the author's intentional change. He used the quotation to demonstrate the superiority of Jesus over the angels. For this purpose, it was absolutely necessary that the subject of the quotation be ἀγγελοι instead of υἱοι ... Therefore, he combined the two [line 2 and 4] together, or revised one, to suit his purpose."¹ Quite differently, J.C.McCullough argues that the author cited line 2 but from a LXX manuscript of his own where ἀγγελοι had replaced υἱοι, therefore, he just "followed the text of the Vorlage before him."²

Perhaps, we should return to the content of Heb 1 & 2 and discuss the situation of this quotation. This quotation, Heb 1:6, is situated as the third quotation in the 'Catena' of the seven Old Testament quotations in Heb 1:5-14, the whole context arguing for the superiority of the Son of God in the light of the "Announcement of theme" in Heb 1:4 (See p. 35) about the contrast between the "Son" and the angels. This is why the author avoids using the term 'sons of God' in Deut 32:43 (LXX) line 2 and "intentionally" transfers the "angels of God" from line 4, although in the Old Testament angels were frequently called sons of God (Gen 6:4; Pss 29:1; 89:7; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7).

There exist three significant words; ὅταν, πρῶτοτοκος, and οἰκουμένη in the introduction to the quotation. The proper understanding of the meaning of these words is important for the use of the Old Testament quotation in Heb 1:6. In the LXX, "the orientation of the word πρῶτοτοκος is no longer to the presence of other sons [as in Hebrew Bible]. It expresses the fact that the people, the individual, or the king is especially dear to God. This nāunce, found already in the OT, is impressively expressed in the synonyms of the title..."(my) first-born, only one, elect and beloved (4 Ezra 6:58)".³ And in rabbinic commentary on Ex 4:22 the term "first-born" means Messiah-King, on the basis of

1. K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959)p.155.

2. J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.128.

3. W.Michaelis, " πρῶτοτοκος " in TDNT VI, p.874.

Ps 89:27 and Jer 31:9.¹ In the New Testament *πρωτοτοκος* always refers in the singular to Jesus Christ. To Jesus, in the birth narrative (Lk 2:7), as first-born among brethren (Rom 8:29), in the resurrection (Col 1:18, Rev 1:5), first among creation (in the sense of Mediator at creation, Col 1:15)², and in Heb 1:6, "both the context (1:3) and the content of the quotation (Deut 32:43; Ps 96:7)... it refers to the enthronement of the exalted Christ at the parousia."³ So the *δταν* should be understood as at the enthronement.

The Greek word rendered "world" is *οικουμενη*. It occurs only here (and in 2:5) in Hebrews. In the LXX, *οικουμενη* is commonly used to describe the world which God created (LXX Pss 23:1; 88:12; 89:2; 92:1; Jer 10:12; 28:15).⁴ While in Hebrews, various opinions have been suggested. G.Johnston puts it, "the word *οικουμενη* may refer in 1:6, as in 2:5, to the 'age to come', the world of eschatological salvation."⁵ In comparison with *κοσμος*, A.Vanhoye argues "Kosmos designates the visible, material world; *οικουμενη* evokes a spiritual realm - the world of relationships among persons."⁶ While, as G.W.Buchanan comments on Heb 1:6, "The 'world' which early Jews called *οικουμενη* seemed to have existed whenever the *kosmos* was under God's rule or administration. At such time, God's kingdom would have come, and he would establish a king on the throne of Zion."⁷ Or simply, as R. McL Wilson notes "the word for world is different from those used in verses 2 and 3, and means 'the inhabited universe'.⁸ If this is so we can be certain that the author 'intentionally' introduces the terms 'first-born', which represent the Son of God, together with *οικουμενη*, a world ruled by God, and thus he confidently say "Let all God's angels worship Him". In the original context it is God who is the object to be worshipped, but here, as we shall meet with other cases in Hebrews, the object has been transferred to Jesus.

1. Cf. Str-Bill III, p.677.

2. W.Michaelis, TDNT VI, op. cit., p.876-879.

3. Ibid. p.880.

4. Cf. G.W.Buchanan, "To the Hebrews" Anchor Bible (New York, 1972) p.17.

5. G.Johnston, "ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗ and ΚΟΣΜΟΣ in the New Testament" NTS 10 (1964) p.354.

6. A.Vanhoye, "L'οικουμενη dans l'επιτρε aux Hebreux" Bib 45 (1964) p.252.

7. G.W.Buchanan, op. cit. p.18.

8. R.McL Wilson, Comm. p.39.

4. Heb 1:7 (= Ps 104:4)

Of the angels he says, "Who makes his angels winds, and his servants flames of fire." (RSV)

και προς μεν τους αγγελους λεγει
ο ποιων τους αγγελους αυτου πνευματα,
και τους λειτουργους αυτου πυρος φλογα (GK)

ο ποιων τους αγγελους αυτου πνευματα
και τους αγγελους αυτου πυρ φλεγον. (LXX Ps 103:4)

(MT) שפף וס יתקטת . תיקת יכחזת תש

The author cited Ps 103:4 (LXX X, B)¹ with one variations; πυρος φλογα used instead of πυρ φλεγον . But there is a difference of objects between the LXX and the Masoretic texts. In MT, it is written, "Who makes winds his messengers, flames of fire his ministers" (Ps 104:4), where the natural elements fulfil the commissions of God. In LXX and Hebrews the angels are portrayed as executing the divine commands with the swiftness of wind and the power of fire. With the inter changing of the double objects in the Greek translation the conveyed meaning of the psalm verse has been altered.

Psalm 104 portrays God in his greatness.² He stretched out the heavens, laid the beams of his chambers on the waters, made the clouds his chariot, and rode on the wings of the wind (vv. 2-3). In this context it seems most

1. Also in Bohairic and Sahidic versions and thirty minuscules, but LXXA has πυρ φλεγον /
,"flaming of fire," which is probably an attempt to reproduce the text in Hebrews. Cf. P.Katz, " εν πυρι φλογος " ZNW 46 (1955) p.135 calls the variant in A a "backreading" of Heb 1:7.

2. H.Gunkel, "Die Psalmen" (Gottingen, 1926) places it in the category of a "Hymnus eines Einzelnen" which speaks of Jahweh's "Herrlichkeit in der Natur". p.447.

likely that Ps 104:4 means that God makes the winds his messengers. However, the problem arises because of the ambiguous use of the Hebrew verb $\pi\psi\upsilon$. Brown, Driver and Briggs¹ give two possible interpretations of $\pi\psi\upsilon$ with a double accusative. The main one is "make something out of". This is the interpretation in Ps 104:4 (MT). Another possible interpretation of $\pi\psi\upsilon$ is "to make something into something". This is the interpretation adopted by the LXX.

Several reasons have been suggested for the author altered *ing*
 $\pi\upsilon\rho \ \phi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu$ into $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$.

(i) Targum Jonathan (Targ Ps 104:4) already indicates that some difficulty prevailed in the correct understanding of the double objects in the Hebrew verb $\pi\psi\upsilon$, and has changed $\text{וַיִּשַׁע \ וַיִּשַׁע}$ into $\text{וַיִּשַׁע \ וַיִּשַׁע}$.²

(ii) $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ acts as a proper balance and rhythm with the preceding $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. A parallelism making both $\phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ and $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ in plural forms.

(iii) $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ is common in the New Testament scriptures. (Acts 7:30 $\phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota \ \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$; II Thess 1:8 $\pi\upsilon\rho\iota \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$; Rev 1:14 $\phi\lambda\omicron\Xi \ \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$; Rev 2:18 $\phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha \ \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$; Rev 19:12 $\phi\lambda\omicron\Xi \ \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$) but $\pi\upsilon\rho$ is never found alongside $\epsilon\iota \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu$ in New Testament scriptures. It has been suggested $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ may have been part of the liturgy of the Early Church.³ Moreover, it is not peculiar to the New Testament that angels are portrayed as wind and flame of fire. In Exodus 3:2, the LXX says that it was an angel in the form of a flame of fire which appeared to Moses from the bush: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma \ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \phi\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota \ \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \beta\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon$. In contemporary Jewish literature, Hagidah 14a in Mishnah says, "Every day ministering angels are created from the fiery stream..." IV Ezra 8:20-23 gives the most striking parallel to Heb 1:7, "O Lord that dwellest eternally... before whom (heaven's) hosts stand trembling, at thy word change to wind and fire."⁴

1. BDB, "Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT" (Oxford, 1952) p.

2. Cf. Str-Bill, III p.678.

3. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.24 argues "since the writer of Hebrews apparently has borrowed a quotation which was in vogue in the Early Church, it seems to accredit the proper wording of the text as known in that day to the liturgy of the Church."

4. J.H.Charlesworth ed. "OT Pseudepigraphy" vol.1 (London, 1983) p.520, claims the date of IV Ezra to be about A.D. 100. / a

The above reasons may suggest why the author changes his quotation. To quote from McCullough, "It is clear that the author is following the interpretation of the verse found in the LXX and among many rabbis."¹ And intentionally, "The author is changing the LXX translation or mistranslation of Ps 104 to mean that God can reduce angels to the elemental forces of wind and fire, so unstable is their nature, whereas the person and authority of the Son are above all change and decay."² So it is the total context that is the key to the author's intention. The change to *πυρος φλογα*, instead, emphasizes the loss of individuality on the part of the angels. This is in contrast to the "Son", who retains his individuality and remains the same forever.³ The angels are only messengers or ministers (*δουλευουσ*) responsible for carrying out orders or services (*δουλευη*). /ε This enables the author to make the concluding statement at Heb 1:14 that angels are only ministering spirits. In the first two chapters of Hebrews, the author is contrasting the "Son" with the angels. This quotation stresses the unchangeability or eternity of the Son's superior nature. This is also stressed in the two quotations which follow. Finally, as H. Montefiore puts it, "His primary intention, in making use of this verse, is to show that the angels are made and not begotten, and that they are as substantial and mutable as wind and fire, and that they do not give orders but carry them out."⁴

1. J.C. McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.230.

2. J. Moffatt, "To the Hebrews" ICC (Edinburgh, 1924) p.12.

3. Cf. K.J. Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis University of Manchester, 1959) p.86.

4. H. Montefiore, "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews" Black's NT Comm. (London, 1964) p.46. F. Schroger, "Der Verfasser Des Hebraerbriefes Als Schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1968) p.60, gives a list [most of the commentators] of commentators who claim the quotation is due to the author's alteration to suit the context.

5. Heb 1:8-9 (= Ps 45 (LXX 44) : 7-8)

But of the Son he says

(προς δε τον υιον)

8 " Thy throne, O God, Is for ever and ever, (and)
the righteousness scepter Is the scepter of thy kingdom.

9 Thou has loved righteousness and hated lawlessness;
therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee
with the oil of gladness beyond thy comrades." (RSV)

GK

Ps 44: 7-8 (LXX)

Ps 45:7-8 (MT)

v.8		v.9		v.7		v.8		v.7		v.8	
ο	θρονος	ηγατησας		ο	θρονος	ηγατησας		ךסכ		תבא	
	σου	δικαιοσυνην			σου	δικαιοσυνην				ךצ	
ο	θεος	και		ο	θεος	και		חלה		ו	
	εις	εμισησας			εις	εμισησας				אישת	
τον	αιωνα	ανομιαν/αδικιαν		τον	αιωνα	ανομιαν/αδικιαν		םש		עש	
του	αιωνος	δια τουτο		του	αιωνος	δια τουτο		דעו		ך-לע	
	και	εχρισεν		—	εχρισεν			—		ךשח	
η	ραβδος	σε		ραβδος	σε			שבש			
της	ευθυτητος	ο θεος		ευθυτητος	ο θεος			רשח		םלה	
	ραβδος	ο θεος		η	ραβδος	ο θεος		שבש		ךלה	
της	βασιλειας	σου		της	βασιλειας	σου		ךחכח			
χυτου/σου		:		σου		:					

There are five variants between Heb 1:8-9 and some of the manuscripts of the LXX.

1. In Hebrews a και is added between the first and the second lines of v.8.
2. The definite article η before ραβδος is placed differently; η is before the first ραβδος in Hebrews while η is before the second ραβδος in LXX.
3. In the LXX, B has εις αιωνα αιωνος, while in Hebrews most of the manuscripts have εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος but in B 33 Tert. have εις τον αιωνα alone. / δ
4. In the LXX, B R L 1219 is/ ανομιαν in v.8, while in A 2013 is/ αδικιαν. / it
In Hebrews αδικιαγ occurs in X A 33, while many others have ανομιαν.

5. In the LXX the last word of v.7 is τοῦ , while in Hebrews it is αὐτοῦ in P⁴⁶ X B.¹

Various explanations also have been given for these textual variants respectively.

1. The addition of καὶ before the second of v.8 in Hebrews was made by the author, probably, his pattern^{was} (cf Heb 2:13; 10:37) to add a καὶ to separate a quotation where two points are to be made from it.²

2. The difference in position of the definite article ἡ is connected with the addition of καὶ. The putting of the article ἡ between ῥαβδος in Hebrews / before stresses the parallelism with ὁ θρόνος σου , in order to emphasize both thoughts; the divine eternity of the Messiah's kingdom and the uprightness with which it is administered.³

3. Probably the author found and wrote εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸν αἰῶνος. The abbreviated form (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) in B of Hebrews is probably an adaptation of LXX B (εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος) Ps 44:7.⁴

4. Most probably, ἀδικίαν is the result of a later emendation to contrast better with δικαιοσύνη . If ἀδικίαν is original the author would not change to ἀνομίαν since ἀδικίαν would fit into the context far better. The author probably found ἀνομίαν in his source and "then simply reproduced his source accurately".⁵

1. τοῦ remains in Hebrews in A D K P Ψ 01216 33 81 88 104 181 326 330 436 451 614 629 630 1241 1739 1877 1881 1962 1984 1985 2127 2492 and many versions. cf. J.C. McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.86 n.1.

2. B.F. Westcott, Comm (1903) p.26, says "The kxi which is not found in the LXX is probably added by the apostle to mark the two thoughts of the divine eternity of Messiah's kingdom and of the essential uprightness with which it is administered". Also cf. E. Ahlborn, "Die Septuagint-Vorlage des Hebräerbriefes" unpub. thesis (Göttingen, 1966) p.13.

3. Cf. F. Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1968) p.62.

4. G. Zuntz, "The Text of the Epistle" (London, 1953) p.111., argues that the shorter reading in Hebrews is genuine, but would not deny that the author abbreviated the fuller form from the Septuagint.

5. J.C. McCullough, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.90.

5. The explanation of the changing of $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in the LXX to $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in some major NT manuscripts is a difficult and a disputable one. It all depend^h on how one interprets 'O $\Theta\text{EO}\Sigma$. Usually, it can be interpreted in two ways. The obvious way is to take 'O $\Theta\text{EO}\Sigma$ as a vocative and translates^h "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, and the righteousness scepter is the scepter of thy ($\tau\omicron\upsilon$) kingdom". The other way is to take 'O $\Theta\text{EO}\Sigma$ as nominative. Then the translation is " God is thy throne (God as subject) / Thy throne is God (God as predicate) is for ever and ever, and the righteousness scepter is the scepter of his ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$) kingdom".

Arguments have been given by many scholars and textual critics in favour of whether this verse ends with the second person or the third person singular pronoun. Full discussion recently has been given by M.J.Harris from Tyndale House.¹ Here I illustrate briefly the 'for' and 'against' views in the arguments for $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ or $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ before attempt^{ing} to make any conclusion.

(a) The $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ has proto-Alexandrian support in P⁴⁶ \times B, and K.J.Thomas gives more support for this argument.² In reply to this, J.C.McCullough and M.J.Harris say that external evidence supporting $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is both ancient and widely distributed geographically.³

(b) The insertion of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ already acts as an attempt to ease the ~~translation~~ ^{transition} from second ($\tau\omicron\upsilon$) to third ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$) person. This calls for the existence of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$.

Against this, the second person singular pronoun ($\tau\omicron\upsilon$ or $\tau\epsilon$) is said to agree with the LXX and accord with the other four instances in the quotation.

1. Murray J.Harris, "The Translation of 'Elohim' in Psalm 45:7-8" TynBull 35 (1984) pp.65-89, and "The Translation and significance of 'O $\Theta\text{EO}\Sigma$ ' in Hebrews 1:8-9" TynBull 36 (1985) pp.129-162.

2. K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959)p.17 n.1, gives another twelve passages from Heb 6:3,7,19; 7:6,9,10,21,23; 8:2,10,12; 9:10, and says, " In all twelve of these instances, the readings supported by this group are considered to be original". (p. 17)

3. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.86 n.1 (see p. 87 n.1 for list of mss), and M.J.Harris, "The Translation and significance of 'O $\Theta\text{EO}\Sigma$ " op cit. p.137 gives Cop^{sa,bo} as well.

ε/ (c) It is possible that the author alters σου of the LXX under the influence of 2 Sam 7:12-17; "12...I will establish his kingdom...13 I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. 14 I will be his father, and he shall be my son ..." , of which v.14 has already cited in Heb 1:5b. But, M.J.Harris, in return, argues that the σου occurs twelve times at end of a phrase in Ps 45:3-12.¹

(d) Advocates of the nominative interpretation of 'Ο ΘΕΟΣ claim that "God is thy throne..." is not strange in Old Testament. B.F.Westcott cited Ps 71:3, "[Lord] Be thou to me a rock of refuge, a strong fortress... for thou art my rock and my fortress" and other comparable passages.² This view is rejected by M.J.Harris,³ who says, "A distinctive must be drawn, however, between affirming that God is a person's rock... and that he is a person's throne... that "God is your stronghold" means "God protects you", but "God is your throne" means "God rules you"."³

(e) When we refer to the context of Ps 45, it belongs to a group of some ten 'royal psalms' in which the king is the central figure.⁴ Those who support αὐτοῦ and take 'Ο ΘΕΟΣ as nominative would argue that it is impossible to describe the earthly king as God.⁵ But recent study on Psalms has been able to conclude that this kingly figure can be portrayed as the royal Messiah.⁶ Although Jewish Rabbis designated this Psalm for the occasion of the marriage of a king of Israel, yet Targum Jonathan ascribes it to the Messiah, "Thy beauty. O king Messiah, is greater than that of the sons of men" (Targ Ps 45:3).⁷

Out of the above arguments, the strongest evidence for 'Ο ΘΕΟΣ as vocative is Ps 45:7 (MT)= 44:7 (LXX). " The traditional rendering, "Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever" is not simply readily defensible but remains the most satisfactory solution to the exegetical problem

1. M.J.Harris, " The Translation and significance of 'Ο ΘΕΟΣ..." op. cit. p.137.

δ/ 2. B.F.Westcott, Comm., op. cit. p.26. Other comparable passages are Deut 33:27; Pss 90:1; 91:1-2; Is 26:4.

3. M.J.Harris, "The Translation and significance of 'Ο ΘΕΟΣ..." op. cit. p.139 & p.139 n.33.

4. Viz Pss 2 (= Heb 1:5a), 18, 20, 21, 45 (=Heb 1:8-9), 72, 89, 101, 110 (= Heb 1:13; 5:6; 7:17; 7:21), 132, and some add 118 (=Heb 13:6), 144.

5. J.H.Eaton, "Kingship and the Psalms" 2nd ed. (Sheffield, 1986) pp.118-119, claims that this is strictly an enthronement psalm. While S.Mowinckel, "The Psalms in Israel's Worship" vol.1-2. trans. D.R.Ap-Thomas (Oxford, 1962), in vol.1 p.53, he argues that this king was described as "divine".

6. Cf. L.Sabourin, "The Psalms. Their Origin and Meaning" (New York, 1970) p.161f.

7. Cf. Str-Bill III, p.679. Delitzsch, Comm., p.33, who calls it "ein Messiaslied der Gemeinde."

posed by the verse."¹ Although there are five proposed translations of Ps 45:7a ², M.J.Harris finally concludes that, "the LXX text from which the author of Hebrews was quoting ὁ Θεος represents a vocative ὁ ἰηλᾶ".³

To list supporters from textual critics and commentators of each camp, there are; those who take αὐτοῦ and Ὁ Θεός as nominative: Moffatt NT4, B.M.Metzger⁵ and among commentators are J.Moffatt⁶, B.F.Westcott⁷, A.Nairne⁸, G.Milligan⁹, T.H.Robinson¹⁰, K.J.Thomas¹¹, and those who take τοῦ and Ὁ Θεός as vocative are;

translators: AV, RSV, NEB, NASB, NIV, NAB, and among

1. M.J.Harris, "... Elohim in Ps 45:7-8" (1985) op. cit. p.87.

2. Ibid. p.71-87, Harris gives five possible interpretations of Ὁ Θεός / ὁ ἰηλᾶ in Ps 45 (LXX 44) :7;

(i) "Your divine throne" (RSV). This views ὁ θεος as genitival, means "Your throne established and protected by God".

(ii) "God is your throne" or "Your throne is God" which makes ὁ θεος as subject or predicate and the sense is either that God himself is the creator and sustainer of the king's rule.

(iii) "Your throne is God's throne" (A.F.Kirkpatrick, "The Book of Psalms" (Cambridge, 1902)p.248; J.S.M.Mulder, "Studies on Ps 45" (Oslo, 1972) p.158; J.H.Eaton, "Kingship and the Psalms" (London, 1976)p.142) or "Your throne will be a divine throne" (W.Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the O.T. Scripture"(London, 1846)p.50; E.Konig, "Die Psalmen" (Gutersloh, 1927) p.474). In this case ἡδὲ has been made as ἡδὲ before ὁ ἰηλᾶ.

(iv) "Your throne is like God's throne" (NEB, G.R.Driver. "The Modern Study of the Hebrew Language" in "The People and the Book" ed. A.S.Peake (Oxford, 1925) p.115). This emphasizes and makes ὡς ("like") the preposition.

(v) "Your throne, O God" (AV, RV, NASB, NAB, JB, NIV, Knox etc). This renders ὁ θεος as vocative.

3. M.J.Harris, "The Translation and significance of Ὁ Θεός..." op. cit. p.143.

4. Also in the margins of ASV, RSV and NEB.

5. B.M.Metzger, "A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament" (London, UBS, 1971) p.663.

6. J.Moffatt, Comm. p.13.

7. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.24.

8. A. Nairne, Comm. p.31.

9. G.Milligan, "The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Edinburgh, 1899) pp.90-91.

10. T.H.Robinson, Comm. p.10.

11. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis, op. cit, p.305.

Commentators: J. Calvin¹ , Delitzsch² , E. Riggerback³ , H. Windisch⁴ , C. Spicq⁵ , / h
O. Kuss⁶ , J. Hering⁷ , O. Michel⁸ , T. Hewitt⁹ , H. Montefiore¹⁰ , F. F. Bruce¹¹ ,
P. E. Hughes¹² , D. Guthrie¹³.

Quite differently, S. Kistemaker argues that it is possible to take
αὐτοῦ yet take Ὁ ΘΕΟΣ as a vocative.¹⁴ Exceptionally in the 25th edition of the
Nestle-Aland (p. 549) text αὐτοῦ was preferred, but in the 26th (=UBS 3rd ed. / r
p. 564) τοῦ .

From the above list, most of the translators and commentators agreed
that Heb 1:8 should take τοῦ and ὁ θεός in vocative as original.

Furthermore, as Strack-Billibeck points out Ps 45 is referred in
rabbinic literature to the Sons of Korah, Moses, Aaron, and Solomon (especially in
the Midrashim), nevertheless it is also referred to the Messiah, especially in the
Targum.¹⁵ The Qumran sectarian interprets the psalm messianically as well; the
Testament of Judah 24:4ff alludes to Ps 45:6 in the passage: "Then will the sceptre of
my kingdom shine forth and from your root a stem will come and out of it will sprout
a rod of righteousness for the nations, to judge and save all who call upon the
Lord"¹⁶. It is against this background that the author quotes Ps 45 to prove once
again the superiority of the Son over the angels. This is why the author dares to apply

1. J. Calvin, Comm, p. 13-14.

2. F. Delitzsch, Comm, p. 76-77.

3. E. Riggerback, Comm, p. 21-22. / h

4. H. Windisch, Comm, p. 16-18.

5. C. Spicq, Comm I. p. 288, II. p. 19.

6. O. Kuss, Comm, p. 37, 45-46.

7. J. Hering, Comm, p. 10.

8. O. Michel, Comm, p. 118.

9. T. Hewitt, Comm, p. 56-57.

10. H. Montefiore, Comm, p. 47.

11. F. F. Bruce, Comm, p. 19-20.

12. P. E. Hughes, Comm, p. 64.

13. D. Guthrie, Comm, p. 76.

14. S. Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961)
p. 25-26, 98.

15. Str-Bill. IV p. 679.

16. F. F. Bruce, Comm. p. 19 n. 84.

ὁ Θεός , the only place in the New Testament, to Christ.¹

As we turn to the context or structure of Heb 1 & 2, we may be able to determine more clearly the use of Ps 45:7-8 (LXX) in Heb 1:8-9. From the structural analysis of Heb 1 & 2 (see pp.28-35) we have deduced that the first segment (1:1-2:18) focuses on the superiority of the Son. Heb 1:8-9 belongs to the fifth Old Testament quotation of the chain (Catena) of the seven Old Testament quotations of Heb 1:5-14, which makes contrasts between angels and the Son. In the first quotation (Heb 1:5a) the author argues for the "begotten" sonship of the Son. This is further confirmed by the second quotation (Heb 1:5b). In the third quotation (Heb 1:6), the author moves on to argue that this Son is worship_λ by all *ped* angels, and the fourth quotation (Heb 1:7) support this view by saying angels are only serving agents by orders. So in this second couplets_λ of quotation, two points */δ* have been confirmed; the 'equivalent' of the Son as 'God'(worship by the angels), and the 'unchangeability' of the Son (in contrast to the angels as winds and fire). Then the author_λ^{is} able to move on to the third couplets_λ of quotations (Heb 1:8-9, and Heb 1:10-12) which build on what has been argued, and in the fifth quotation he is able to *de /* ascribe the Son as God and his eternal kingdom. */δ*

1. Cf. H. Montefiore, Comm, p.4, "This is the only place in the N.T. where the Son is described simply as ὁ Θεός".

6. Heb 1:10-12 (= Ps 102 (LXX 101): 26-28)

And, ¹⁰Thou, Lord, didst found the earth in the beginning,
 and the heavens are the work of thy hands
¹¹they will perish, but thou remainest;
 they will all grow old like a garment,
 like a mantle thou wilt roll them up,
 and they will be changed.
¹²But thou art the same
 and thy years will never end." (RSV)

v.10	GK ¹	v.26	Ps 101:26-28(LXX)	Ps 102:26-28(MT)
σου	και ωσει	κατ' αρχας	και ωσει	כב' ש' פנ' פ
κατ' αρχας	περιβολαιον	σου	περιβολαιον	תהת' פ' חקך
κυριε	ελιξεις	κυριε	αλλαξεις	ד' ת
την γην	αυτους	την γην	αυτους	
θεμελιωσας	ως ιματιον	εθεμελιωσας	—	
και	και	και	και	והשמונה
εργα	αλλαγησονται	εργα	αλλαγησονται	ד' ת
των χειρων	ν.12	των χειρων	...	ש' מ' פ
σου	σου δε	σου	...	והא
εισιν	ο αυτος	εισιν	...	הו
οι ουρανοι	ει	οι ουρανοι	...	
ν.11	και			
αυτοι	τα ετη	αυτοι		והשמונה
απολουνται	σου	απολουνται		ש' ח
σου δε	ουκ	σου δε		והא
διαμενεεις	εκλειψουτιν	διαμενεεις		תמח
και		και		וכן
παντες		παντες		כבד
ως ιματιον		ως ιματιον		ב' פ
αλιωθονται		παλιωθονται		

There are at least three major variants where some manuscripts in Hebrews differ from some in the LXX. They concern:

1. In the Greek NT (UBS = 26th Nestle Aland) the division of verses is slightly different from the LXX and the MT. In the LXX and the MT, verse 11 extends and occupies the first two lines of verse 12 of Greek NT.

1. The word order of the first line in Heb 1:10 and Ps 101:26(LXX).

2. The LXX manuscripts X*142 S La Ga Ir Tert have ἀλλαξεις instead of ἐ(ι)ληξεις in B R L and in A (1219 ἰλιξεις , 55 εἰλιξεις). The main manuscripts in Hebrews have ἐλιξεις while X* D*arm^{la} Tert Or have ἀλλαξεις .

3. After ἐλιξεις αὐτους , Hebrews adds ὡς ἱματιον .

4. A minor variant occurs where LXX has διαμενεῖς (future) and Hebrews is διαμενεῖς (present).

Various explanations have been given for these variants.

1. The textual evidence for the first line is complicated. Three major LXX manuscripts give different readings.

κατ' ἀρχας συ κυριε την γην ἐθεμελιωσας (A)

κατ' ἀρχας την γην συ κυριε ἐθεμελιωσας (B)

κατ' ἀρχας - - την γην ἐθεμελιωσας (X)

Sinaiticus, agrees with the MT without συ κυριε , probably to make the text more literal to the Hebrew. Scholars agree that the adding of συ κυριε in the LXX is for the sake of emphasis, probably under the influence of verses 2 and 13 of the same psalm.¹ Obviously, it is the LXX A/B which has the addition of the emphatic pronoun συ and the vocative κυριε that makes the author to the Hebrews choose this specific verse in order to apply the quotation to the Son. The placing of συ as the first word in Hebrews gives συ more prominence. This then seems to be an example of a purposely stylistic change on the part of the author.² This συ immediately associated with the σου of the preceding quotation which referring to the Son. It is clear that the order of the rest of the line has no particular significance.³ So, "there is no question but that κυριε is

/δ

1. Cf. E. Ahlborn, "Die Septuagint-Vorlage des Hebräerbriefes" unpub. thesis (Göttingen, 1966) p.115. Anyhow, it is clear that the κυριε , as the object, runs through the whole psalm.

2. Cf J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.101.

3. Cf K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959) p.186.

addressed to the Son".¹ Once again, the creatorship and eternity of the Son is further illustrated (cf Heb 1:2; 1:8-9). Also it has been argued that there is no reason for the author to have rearranged the other words, and the order in Hebrews is the same as that in LXXA and thus LXXA is the Vorlage of this quotation.²

2. The Hebrew $\eta\gamma\eta$ is translated more accurately by $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\omega$ ("change" or "alter") than by $\epsilon\lambda\iota\phi\tau\omega$ ("roll" or "turn").³ It has been proposed that $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is a later corruption suggested by the similar passage in Isa 34:4 in the LXX version where the same verb is used "and the skies roll up like a scroll".⁴ It is more likely that $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ was the original reading both in LXX and Hebrews,⁵ and $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ was introduced, perhaps, under influence of the word $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ in the next line ($\eta\gamma\eta$ occurs twice) in the MT.⁶

3. This variant involves the addition of an extra $\omega\varsigma \iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ in verse 12. K.J.Thomas sees this as an deliberate change by the author to suit his context, which emphasises that contrast between the eternal nature of the Son and the ephemeral nature of the angels (cf Heb 1:9).⁷ In the two lines preceding the addition, the creation is likened to $\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ and $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$: it grows old as the one and is rolled up as the other. By the addition of $\omega\varsigma \iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota\omicron\nu$, the author illustrates that the creation will be changed even "as a garment".⁸ Against this view, G. Zuntz argues that if the author wanted to add something to the quotation to emphasise the contrast between the Son and the angels, he would have found different words from

1. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.186.

2. Cf F.Bleek, Comm. II, p.172. J.Moffatt, Comm. p.14.

3. Tengstrom, " $\eta\gamma\eta$ " TDOT IV, p.432-435.

4. Cf F.Bleek, Comm. II p.177. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.233. S. Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.27.

5. Cf. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.234, says, "the fact that $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is found in Hebrews is a strong witness to the fact that it was original in the Septuagint". But G.Zuntz, "The Text of the Epistles" (London, 1953) p.112, thinks that $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ was the original Septuagint, though $\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ was in the manuscript the author used, and he writes, "otherwise this reading could not even have come into being". / have

6. Cf T. Hering, Comm. p.27.

7. Cf K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.30.

8. Ibid. p.31.

those used in the previous line, and claims, "the writer of Hebrews found them in his copy of the psalms and kept them".¹ Some consider the words were added due to homoioteleuton.² J.C.McCullough suggests that "it seems best to view the words as a copyists addition at a very early date, though later on they were omitted by some manuscripts, either with the original text in mind, or, more likely, due to assimilation to the LXX".³ Most probably, as A.Vanhoye says, in view of the position of *ὡς ἰματίον* in the structure of the Epistle, "Le seul motif de cette addition semble bien être la recherche d'une symétrie plus parfaite".⁴

4. The change of future *διαμενεῖς* in LXX into present *διαμένευς* in Hebrews, probably, as B.F.Westcott puts it, "The present is more expressive".⁵ Anyhow, either future or present would not make much difference to the meaning of the quotation, and accents are of late origin as well. /ce

Ps 102:25-27 has been quoted in rabbinic writings, but the Jewish literature offers no instance of a messianic interpretation of the psalm.⁶ But why did the author cite this psalm? Several suggestions have been offered. O.Michel claims that the mention of 'angels' in Ps 102 gives rise to the author's choice where the context in Hebrews 1 is a comparison of the Son and the angels.⁷ Most of the Hebrews' scholars suggest that the occurrence of *κύριε* in the psalm facilitates the author's use of the quotation.⁸ More probably it is due to the context of Hebrews 1 where the creatorship⁹ and eternity form the basis of this quotation.

1. G. Zuntz, op. cit. p.173.

2. Cf J.Moffatt, Comm. p.14, while C. Spicq, Comm. I, p.418 says they were omitted by later copyists "sans doute par homoioteleuton".

3. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.103.

4. A.Vanhoye, "La Structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux" (Paris, 1963) p.72. Also see page 33 of this work for discussion.

5. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.28.

6. Cf Str-Bill III P.680.

7. O.Michel, Comm. p.120.

8. H.Windisch, Comm.p.16 . T.Hering, Comm. p. ad loc.

9. Agreed by J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.253. e/ i/

As we move to the 'structure' of this quotation (Heb 1:10-12), it is situated within the 'Catena' of seven Old Testament quotations in Heb 1:5-14, and introduced by *καὶ*. Clearly, this *καὶ* is referred back to the introduction of verses 8-9, "But of the Son, he says", where this sixth quotation and fifth quotation form the third couplet of the 'Catena' (see page 29-30). The "Lord" in Ps 102 (LXX 101) referred to God. Here, in this quotation, following verses 8-9, "Lord" is ascribed to the Son. This is the first quotation in Hebrews where the author claims *for* / the title "Lord" ~~to~~ the Son (others are 7:21; 8:8,9,10,11; 10:16,30; 12:5,6). On the other hand, the author does use the name "Lord" elsewhere when referring to the Son (2:3;7:14). All are due to the precedent use of "and" in this sixth quotation. Once again, we observe that the author is quoting an Old Testament passage out of context and attributing it to the Messiah, who is the Son. F.Schroger denotes the use of this OT text in Heb 1:10-12 as a midrash-pesher method of interpretation.¹

1. F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes als Schriftauslager" (Regensburg, 1966) p.71.

7. Heb 1:13 (= Ps 110 (LXX 109): 1)

But to what angel has he ever said,
" Sit at my right hand,
till I make thy enemies
a stool for thy feet"? (RSV)

προς τινα δε των αγγελων ειρηκεν ποτε,
καθου εκ δεξιων μου,
εως αν θω τους εχθρους σου
υποποδιον των ποδων σου; (GK/LXX)

שב לימיני
עד-אשית איבך הדם זרגליך (MT)

The Hebrews quotation is identical to the LXX. There are four other similar quotations in the New Testament; Mk 12:36, Mt 22:44, Lk 20:42-43, and Acts 2:34-35. In Mark and Matthew, ὑποκατω ("under") is used instead of ὑποποδιον ("footstool") in Luke, Acts and Hebrews. S.Kistemaker claims that this is an evidence that Luke reflects a textual tradition current within the Church.¹

It is clear that Ps 110 is an enthronement psalm, which belongs to the Gattung of the "Königslieder".² Within some rabbinic literature Ps 110:1 is

1. Cf. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.28, and he goes on to claim that the recipients of the Epistle to the Hebrews were "Hellenist".

2. Cf. H. Gunkel, "Einleitung in die Psalmen" (Göttingen, 1926) p.140-171.

is not necessarily a messianic psalm. The Hasmoneans use it to defend their claims for priestly and royal prerogatives (I Macc 14:41; Mos 6:1; Jub 32:1,16; T Levi 8:3).¹ The 11Q Melchizedek fragment makes no reference to Ps 110 or Gen 14:18-20 in its argument for Melchizedek, as a heavenly eschatological warrior and savior.² Of most importance is the Midrashic work on the Testament of Job 33:3 in the first century B.C. After Elihu mournfully asks Job eleven times "Where now is the glory of your throne?", Job responds, "Be silent. Now I will put out to you my throne, its glory and its splendor. My throne is in the heavenly world and its glory and splendor are at the right hand of God" (T Job 32:2-12). And in Enoch literature (Enoch 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:3-5; 69:27-29)³ the Chosen One is pictured as seated on the throne of God in the last days, where, obviously, Ps 110 is at the back of the language. In later Jewish literature, it is applied to Abraham in Bab.Talmud.Nedarim 32a; Midr.R.Lev. 25; Sanhedrin 108b; Jalkut i.71:1; ii.18:2;116:1;146:2; Midr.Tanch. 9a. It is also applied to David in the Targum: "A Psalm by the word of David. The Lord said by His Memra that He would make me the ruler of all Israel. However, He said to me: "Sit and wait until Saul, who is of the tribe of Benjamin, dies, ... after that I will make your enemies your footstool".⁴ However, in two sources Ps 110:1 is interpreted messianically. In Midrash Teh. on Ps 2, and on Ps 18, the words "Sit at my right hand" is applied to the Messiah.⁵ Justin Martyr Dialog.Trypho 33 and 83 applied the words to king Hezekiah. We may conclude with D.M.Hay, "On balance, it seems fair to suppose that in the NT era a messianic interpretation of Ps 110 was current in Judaism, although we cannot know how widely it was accepted"⁶, and "In all these

1. Hay, D.M. "Glory at the Right Hand:Ps 110 in Early Christianity" SBL Series 18 (Nashville, 1973) pp.24-25.

2. Cf. Jonge, J(de) & Woude, A.de "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament" NTS 12 (1966) pp.301-326. J.A.Sanders, "The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll" (Ithaca, 1967). But F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.96, n.35 suggests that the Qumran sectarians neglected Ps 110 out of the hatred for the Hasmoneans, who had used it in their propaganda.

3. S.H.Levey, "The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum" (New York, 1974) Monograph of the Hebrew Union College. p.122.

4. Cf. Str-Bill IV pp.452-465, and especially in p453 Billerbeck convincingly proves that this psalm was considered messianic in Jewish circles during the first century A.D.

5. Cf. O.Michel, Comm. p.122.

6. D.M.Hay, "Glory at the Right Hand", op. cit. p.30.

interpretations the psalm was construed as describing a person who enjoyed extraordinary favor with God".¹

Ps 110:1 is also alluded to in Mk 14:62 (Mt 26:64; Lk 22:69); Mk 16:19; Acts 7:55; Rom 8:34; I Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; I Pet 3:22; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:12,13; 12:2, where the exaltation of the Messiah at the right hand of God is in mind.^{In} all these instances the reference is to Jesus Christ. As C.H.Dodd puts, "it seems clear, therefore, that this particular verse was one of the fundamental texts of the *kerugma*, underlying almost all the various developments of it".² Ps 110 occurs here immediately before a citation of Ps 8:5-7 (cf Heb 2:6-8).^{It} is also alluded to in I Cor 15:25, Eph 1:20 and I Pet 3:22, just before an echo of Ps 8:7. S.G. Sowers notes "This citing of or allusion to Ps 8 immediately after Ps 110 in Hebrews, Paul and I Peter cannot be mere coincidence. It strongly suggests the two texts were lying side by side in some documents which all three writers consulted."³ In Rev 3:21, Ps 110:1 is referred messianically, though without mention of the right hand of God. In I Cor 15:25-27 the reference is to the second half of Ps 110:1 and again the interpretation is messianic. All the above references are clearly messianic. Some others are not so clear, like Mk 10:37, 40 (Mt 20:21,23); Acts 5:31, Rev 5:1. We may therefore conclude that Ps 110:1 was interpreted widely messianically among the Christians. It is safe to say that the author interpreted the psalm in this way in Heb 1:13, as well as in the rest of the Epistle.⁴ For him, what ever is said of the king of Israel, as in Ps 2:7 (=Heb 1:5a); 2 Sam 7:14 (=Heb 1:5b); Ps 45:6-7 (=Heb 1:8-9), seen in the context of the ideal king foreshadowed, is fulfilled better in the Son.⁵ As J.C.McCullough concludes in the investigation of

/ δ

1. D.M.Hay, "Glory at the Right Hand" op. cit. p.33.

2. C.H.Dodd, "According to the Scripture" (London, 1952) p.35.

3. S.S.Sowers, "The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews" (Zurich, 1965) p.85.

4. Cf. J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.265.

5. Cf E.Riggenbach, Comm. p.26 "In hoheren Sinn als irgendeinem Israelitischen konig ist die Zusage des indirekt messianischen Psalmes in der Person Jesu zur Verwirklichung gelangt, mit der Erhohung zur Rechten des gottlichen Thrones in Himmel".

5. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.265.

this quotation, "The Author, following his own exegetical principles, and at the same time following a common interpretation of his day, applied Ps 110:1 to the exaltation of Jesus Christ".¹

Recent scholars have been able to make a comparison between 1 Clem 36:1-6 and Heb 1:5-14.² In 1 Clem 36:1 Christ is styled "The high Priest of our offerings, the defender and helper of our weakness"³; then follows a set of affirmations with close verbal resemblances to Heb 1:3-4 and then quotations of Pss 104:4 and 2:7-8, in reverse order, of Heb 1:5 and 1:7, finally Ps 110:1 is cited. The majority of scholars suppose that Clement borrowed from Hebrews. But the dissimilarities in theology between the two documents suggest they are using a common source, and as D.M.Hay puts it, "probably one which existed in writing and was used in early church worship"⁴, a source containing or consisting in a catena of scriptural citations ["Testimonies"]⁵. Recently, G.L.Cockerill has claimed that, on the basis that both documents employ the Son-angel comparison, "1 Clement has paraphrased Hebrews" and "1 Clement is [thus] able to associate this traditional material with the high-priest title".⁶

1. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.265.

2. Cf. E.Kasemann, Comm. p.107, O.Michel, Comm. p.29, G.Theissen, "Untersuchungen zum Hebraerbrief" (Gutersloh, 1969) pp.34-37., D.M.Hay, "Glory at the Right Hand" op.cit.p.39. Most recently, G.L.Cockerill, "Heb 1:1-14, 1 Clem 36:1-6 and the High Priest Title" JBL 97 (1978) pp.437-440.

3. In 1 Clem 61:3, "though the High Priest and helper of our souls" and in 1 Clem 64 "though our High Priest and Helper".

4. E.Kasemann, Comm, p.107, G.Theissen, "Untersuchungen" op. cit. p.33-38, both argue that the quotations in 1 Clem 36:1-6 and Heb 1:5-14 are *drawn* from a common liturgy. / drawn

5. D.M.Hay, "Glory at the Right Hand" op. cit. p.39. He then gives a table (p.42) to illustrate the two documents come from a "collection of scriptural "Testimonies", but at the conclusion, he says, "The... diversity of early Christian interpretations of Ps 110 cannot be accounted for by the hypothesis of a widely used testimony book. Nor can it be explained by positing a school or distinctive method of exegesis".

6. G.L.Cockerill, "Heb 1:1-14, 1 Clem 36:1-6" op. cit.p.439.

8 | 6. So F.Bleek, Comm.I p.378. F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes als Schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1968) p.72.]

The author uses Ps 110:1 to close the 'Catena' of seven Old Testament quotations between Heb 1:5-14 just as he uses the same psalm and same verse to close the 'seven designations' in Heb 1:2b-3 (both structures with same Ps 2 as the beginning). So, the introduction, "he said" (εἶρηκεν) is referred to, and continued from, "God" (ὁ θεος) in verse 5.¹ In addition to this use of Ps 110:1 the author cites verse 4 of this psalm four times (Heb 5:6,10; 7:17, 21; and alludes to it in 6:20; 7:3, 8,11, 15, 24, 28) and applies all these quotations to the claim for the Highpriesthood (by the order of Melchizedek) of Jesus Christ.² Ps 110:4 only appears in New Testament in Hebrews.³

1. So F.Bleek, Comm.I p.378. F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes als Schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1968) p.72.

2. Cf. D.M.Hay, "Glory at the Right Hand" op.cit. p.46-47, pp.130-154 for detailed discussions of Ps 110:4 in Hebrews. *led*

3. Later, Church Fathers quoted Ps 110:4 for the discussions on Melchizedek are 1 Clem 36, 64:1; Ign Phid 9:1; Justin Dial 96:1; Epist of Apostles 51. Cf. G.Theissen, "Untersuchungen" op. cit. pp.32-52.

8. Heb 2:6-8 (= Ps 8:4-6 (LXX 8:5-7)).

It has been testified somewhere,

(διεμαρτυρατο δε που τις λεγων.)

What is man that thou art mindful of him,
or the son of man that thou carest for him?

Thou didst make him for a little while lower than the angels,
thou hast crowned him with glory and honor,
putting everything in subjection under his feet." (RSV)

(GK) ⁶ Τι ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὅτι μνησθήσεται αὐτοῦ, ⁵(LXX Ps 8:5-7)
ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι ἐπισκεπήσεται αὐτόν·
⁷ ἡλαττώσας αὐτόν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, ⁶
δοξὴν καὶ τιμὴν ἐστεφανώσας αὐτόν
(καὶ κατεστήσας αὐτόν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου).⁷
⁸ πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ

מִהֲאֲנוּשׁ כִּי־תִזְכְּרוּ וּבִן־אָדָם כִּי תִפְקְדוּן ⁵
וְתִתְּסַרְתְּוּ מֵעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים וּכְבוֹד וְהַדָּר תִּתְּסַרְתְּוּ ⁶
(MT) תִּתְּשִׁילֶהוּ בַמַּעַשׂ יְדִיָּה כֹל שֶׁתַּה תַּחַת־רַגְלָיו ⁷

There are three variants in this quotation.

1. The complete sentence *καὶ κατεστήσας αὐτόν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου* ("and didst set him over the works of thy hands" Ps 8:6a (LXX 8:7a)) is omitted from Hebrews in P⁴⁶ B D² K L 0142,¹ while added in Ξ A C D* M P Y Syr Vulg Boh Arm Eth 0121b.²

1. Other minuscules are 3 206 209 218 322 326 327 328 429 431 442 614 917 1175 1241 1944 2125 2495. Cf. H.Braun, Comm.p.55.

2. Other minuscules are 2 5 6 33 36 69 81 104 181 216 241 256 263 307 326 330 365 431 436 440 451 462 547 610 623 629 823 915 1739 1829 1836 1837 1852 1867 1874 1877 1881 1898 1912 1985 2127 2464 2492. Cf H.Braun, Comm. p.55.

2. The second variant concerns the word $\tau\iota$. $\tau\iota\varsigma$ found in the Septuagint in A L^{pau} and in Hebrews in P⁴⁶ C* P 81 104 917 1319 1834 1881 1891 2127 2495 d e Vulg^{tol} Boh. $\tau\iota$ is given in the main manuscripts both in Septuagint (including B) and in Hebrews in \aleph A B C^{cor} K L f Vulg SyrP^h Arm.

3. The third variant concerns $\delta\omicron\xi\eta$ και $\tau\iota\nu\eta$. In LXX, A has $\delta\omicron\xi\eta$ και $\tau\iota\nu\eta$, while R gives $\delta\omicron\xi\alpha\nu$ και $\tau\iota\nu\eta\nu$. Hebrews follows B and all the rest which have $\delta\omicron\xi\eta$ και $\tau\iota\nu\eta$.

Various explanations also have been given for these variants respectively.

1. Scholars are divided in their explanation concerning the omission of Ps 8:6a (LXX 8:7a) in Hebrews; either the short reading of P⁴⁶ B and others is to be preferred,¹ or the longer reading is the original one.² The arguments for the short reading as original are:

(i) the longer reading is due to assimilation, probably late, due to the LXX.³

(ii) a deliberate omission by the author because the phrase is not relevant to the context. K.J.Thomas argues that this phrase referred to the setting of man over the works of God's creation and this would only apply to man and not to Jesus. The author could not say "and set him (Jesus) over the works of thy (God) hands". This would deny Jesus was active in the creation as the author had already said in Heb 1:2 and Heb 1:10. So to avoid this difficulty, he left this phrase out of the quotation.⁴

G.Zuntz considers that our author omitted it because it contradicted the argument that we do not yet see all things put under his feet.⁵

1. Among them, F.Bleek, Comm.p.254, J.Moffatt, Comm.p.22, H.Windisch, Comm.p.306, T.Hewitt, Comm.p.67, C.Spicq, Comm I p.418, K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis, (University of Manchester, 1959) p.37, F.F.Bruce, Comm.p.31, n.13. G.N.Zuntz "The Text of the Epistles" (London, 1953) p.172. H.Braun, Comm.p.55.

2. Among them, E.Riggenbach, Comm.p.38, O.Michel, Comm.p.138.

3. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.31, n.13, in addition, he argues that the omission of the clause has any theological significance.

4. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis, op. cit. p.37. Also, J.Moffatt, Comm.p.22, "left it out as incompatible with 1:10...". C.Spicq, Comm.I. p.418.

5. G.N.Zuntz, op. cit. p.172.

J.H.Davies concludes that it was omitted because it emphasises man's rule over the material world whereas the intention was to apply the Psalm to Jesus' rule over the world to come, thus the author can emphasise the word " $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ " ("everything~~s~~", even angels).¹ / δ

Opponents to the above argument for the short reading include E.Ahlborn and J.C.McCullough. McCullough, on the one hand admits that we cannot judge with any certainty whether the author ^{was} found the phrase before him and omitted it, but on the other hand, says, "We incline to the view that the author had the longer reading, that is, he quoted the Old Testament text before him, and that the longer reading was shortened by an early copyist who noticed that the phrase in question was not commented on in the epistle."² / δ

2. We would say the manuscript evidence for $\tau\iota\varsigma$ in Hebrews is weak. P⁴⁶ and 104 are generally strong witnesses. Thus G.Zuntz considers $\tau\iota\varsigma$ as the original reading in Hebrews, and he believes that the author found in his sources $\tau\iota$ but changed it to $\tau\iota\varsigma$ for exegetical reasons, says "It is not the littleness of man which the author argues, but the unique prerogative of the 'son of Man', the Messiah. The author gains the scriptural basis for his argument by adding the one letter sigma to the first word of his Septuagint quotation"³. Long before G.Zuntz and the discovering of P⁴⁶, F.Bleek considers $\tau\iota\varsigma$ must be the correct reading on the basis of the interpretation of the citation in Hebrews.⁴ G.Zuntz's view was immediately challenged by R.V.Tasker who considers that " $\tau\iota\varsigma$ " is unlikely because the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews would "Have played havoc with the parallelism of the Psalmist in this way in the interests of a Son of Man Christology".⁵ Recently, J.C.McCullough insists that / δ

1. J.H.Davies, Comm.p.27.

2. J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971). p.72. E.Ahlborn, "Die Septuagint-Vorlage des Hebraerbriefes" unpub. thesis (Göttingen's University, 1966) p.117, for the same point, "Auch theologischer Gründe lassen sich nicht für die Auslassung anführen, und rhythmisch betrachtet, wird der Parallelismus membrorum durch das Fehlen der Wörter gestört. Die Passage kann auf Grund eines alten Fehlers ausgefallen sein". / δ

3. G.N.Zuntz, Op. cit. p.48. Also he gives a different translation, "Who is the man whom thou mindest? Truly the Son of Man, for Him thou visitest".

4. F.Bleek, Comm. II. p.246.

5. R.V.Tasker, "The Text of the Corpus Paulinum" NTS 1 (1954) p.185.

the author originally wrote τῆς since he would have had no reason to change a τῆς to a τῆ, although he had the main LXX reading τῆ before him.¹

Most scholars² considers τῆ to be the original reading. First, on the basis that the manuscripts on favour of τῆς are comparatively weak, and τῆ has δ/ the strongest manuscript support both from Septuagint and Hebrews. Secondly, δ/ ἴς τῆ ἴς correspond to the יְהוָה in the Masoretic text.³ The existence of τῆς has been explained as the work of an early copyist; the change may come about for one of the following reasons; either because of dittography⁴, or probably by a Christian scribe who was familiar with the application of the Psalm in the New Testament (cf I Cor 15:27, Eph 1:22), or to make the first line refer definitely to Jesus.

3. Concerning the third variant, LXX A obviously has a mistake in its use of both a dative and an accusative connected by καί. R probably represents an attempt to correct the mistake by making two accusatives.⁵ The phrase in B δοξῆ καὶ τιμῆ is apparently the original translation and is the Vorlage followed by the author of the Hebrews.⁶

In its original context of Ps 8, God is being praised because of the glory which he has given to mankind. B.F.Westcott argues "Ps 8 is not, and has never been accounted by the Jews to be, directly Messianic."⁷ A.Bentzen^{however} is probably right to say that this "son of man" has the "divine nature" similar to the concept in m/ the Mesopotamian usage.⁸ In some rabbinic writings the words of Ps 8:5 are put in the mouth of angels, but with a certain tone of scorn for mankind. In Sabb 88:1, / Sabb when Moses, the son of woman has ascended on high to Mt Sinai to receive the law, the angels address God on that occasion as "O Lord of the world, wilt thou give

1. J.C.McCullough, up. thesis. op. cit. p.74.

2. F.F.Bruce, Comm.p.31, n.12, J.Hering, Comm.p.30, T.Hewitt, Comm.p.66, O.Michel, Comm.p.133, J.Moffatt, Comm.p.22, E.Riggenbach, Comm.p.36, C.Spicq, Comm.l.p.418, B.F.Westcott, Comm.p.43, H.Windisch, Comm.p.22, K.J.Thomas, unpub.thesis, op.cit.p.219., E.Ahlborn, unpub.thesis, op.cit.p.116. /

3. Cf. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis, op.cit.p.215.

4. J.Moffatt, Comm.p.22. K.J.Thomas, unpub.thesis, op.cit.p.22.

5. Cf. K.J.Thomas, unpub.thesis, op. cit.p.220.

6. Most of the scholars accept this view. Cf. K.J.Thomas, unpub.thesis,op.cit.p.220, J.C.McCullough, unpub.thesis, op.cit.p.74.

7. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.42.

8. A.Bentzen, "King and Messiah' (Oxford, 1970) p.42.

to flesh and blood that precious thing which thou hast kept for 947 generations (Ps 8:5); give Thy glory rather to Heaven".¹ Strack-Billerbeck² gives illustrations that Ps 8 is also interpreted in Judaism as referring to various Old Testament personalities including Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, David.² We can be sure that there is no clear evidence of Ps 8 being interpreted in a direct messianic way.³

/K

The same is not, however, the case in the LXX translation and interpretation of Ps 8. It may be interpreted messianically and several significant words in the LXX may give rise to the Christian messianic interpretation.

(i) אלהים is translated by ἄγγελοι in the LXX. It is this word that attracted the author's attention to Ps 8. Dahood is probably correct in rendering the Hebrew אלהים ("the gods") rather than "God" in RSV Ps 8:5.⁴ In Heb 1:6, in the quotation from Deut 32:43 (LXX) or 4Q Dt, אלהים בני is used in the sense of 'angels'. אלהים alone is used for angels in Pss 29:1; 138:1 as well. We are quite certain that the author found this useful word, as one of his key word, since the whole context of Heb 1 and 2 is the comparison of the Son and the angels. The variant "gods" would not have been acceptable to the author, although it had been available to him.

(ii) The LXX seems to diverge from the original Hebrew in the translation of βραχυ τι ("a little while" in temporal sense) for the Hebrew וידע ("lower/little" in status). This temporal meaning was used by the Christians for whom it had special significance.

(iii) אדם-בן in Hebrew is translated by υἱος ἀνθρώπου in the LXX. The Hebrew expression simply means "man" just as אדם in the first line which is a parallel concept. υἱος ἀνθρώπου in LXX also has the similar meaning as the Hebrew. But for the Christians, especially in the early church, υἱος ἀνθρώπου is a profound expression in describing the Messiah.

1. Cf. J.C.McCullough, unpub,thesis, op.cit.p.268.

k / 2. Strack-Billerbeck, vol.iii, p.682.

3. B.F.Westcott, Comm.p.42, "It has not and has never been accounted by the Jews to be directly messianic". O.Michel, Comm.p.138, "Eine messianische Verwendung von Ps 8 ist im Rabbinat nicht nachweisbar, wohl aber in der Apokalyptik".

4. Dahood, M., "Psalms I:1-50" The Anchor Bible (New York, 1965) p.48.

Moreover, Ps 8, to the New Testament writers, provides clear evidence of a messianic interpretation. In I Cor 15:27, Eph 1:22; I Pet 3:22; Heb 10:13 it is used to refer to God subjecting all things to Christ. The first three passages are set in an exposition of the corporate nature of Christ.

Ps 8:6 is not only alluded to on its own, but it is often conflated with Ps 110:1 where the second half of the verse has a similar idea. In the LXX the same word ὑποτάσσεν is used. In I Cor 15:25, Eph 1:20 and I Pet 3:22 the words of Ps 110:1 are conflated with Ps 8, although some would disagree with B.Lindars in finding a use of Ps 110:1 in I Pet 3:22, 31. Ps 110:1 is also conflated with Dn 7:13, an important Son of Man text, in Mk 14:62 (par. Mt 26:64) and Acts 7:55. In I Cor 15:25, the addition of πάντα in the quotation from Ps 110:1 is due to the influence of Ps 8:6 which will be quoted two verses later.¹ And in Eph 1:22 and I Pet 3:22, where "only the first half of Ps 110:1 is alluded to, the second being exclusively expressed in terms derived from Ps 8:7".² In Hebrews 1 and 2, we have seen Ps 110:1 quoted (in Heb 1:13) just before Ps 8. On these phenomena J.C.McCullough claims, "It seems, therefore, probable that at least by the time of Saint Paul there was a common stock of exegetical material which centered round Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:6, and which was used as a basis for the teaching of the church concerning the subjection of all things by God to Christ. It is likely that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews knew that material, and that his interpretation of the Psalm begins with the common Christian interpretation of it".³ Although we may not totally agree with Lindars and McCullough, their proposal cannot be easily dismissed in this case.

The use of Ps 8:4-6 (LXX 8:5-7) in Hebrews 2:6-8 (or in other New Testament writings) has been subjected to a variety of views. Attention is *sed* normally focus on the presence or absence of a Son of Man Christology in Hebrews.

1. Cf. B.Lindars, "New Testament Apologetics" (London, 1960) p.50.

2. Ibid. op. cit. p.50.

3. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.270.

J.Moffatt,¹ H.Windisch,² later H.Montefiore³ denied that the author applied the Son of Man to Jesus at all. They say υἱος ἀνθρώπου is simply an accidental term that happened to be in Ps 8 in parallelism with "man". O.Cullmann,⁴ A.J.B.Higgins⁵ state, however, that our author applied Ps 8:4-6 to Jesus as the Son of Man. J.Hering says emphatically that "Though the Psalmist was thinking of man in general, in our Epistle it is a case of man with a capital M, that is, of Christ, regarded in His capacity as "Son of Man" in the technical and theological sense of the Gospels, or of the "heavenly Adam" in the Apostle Paul's terminology".⁶ F.F.Bruce points out that here there is "probably a tacit identification of "Son of Man" in Ps 8:4 with the "one like unto a son of man" in Dn 7:13, 15".⁷ Recently, P.Giles⁸ argues that although Son of Man is not used outside the gospels as title for Jesus, except in Heb 2:6-8, Acts 7:55-56, Rev 1:13; 14:14, that does not necessarily imply that it was unknown or unimportant. It appears in all the Gospel traditions, Q, Mark, M, L, and that underlying the Fourth Gospel, which seems to indicate that there was a wide knowledge of this tradition, "It would, therefore, appear almost inconceivable that they [the author and the readers] would fail to see in Ps 8 a reference to Jesus as the Son of Man or the Second Adam".⁹ G.W.Buchanan, after a long discussion in an excursus in his commentary on Hebrews, concludes that "the author identified the Son of God with the Son of man and Jesus as the gospels did. The political nature of the Son of man described in Hebrews was in agreement with that of

1. J.Moffatt, Comm. p.23.

2. H.Windisch, Comm. p.20.

3. H.Montefiore, Comm. p.57.

4. O.Cullmann, "The Christology of the New Testament" (London, 1959) p.188, says, "Hebrews applies the psalm [Ps 8] to Jesus as the Son of Man. The author's interpretation of the citation indicates that he apparently had quite precise information about the Son of Man doctrine."

5. A.J.B.Higgins, "The Son of Man in Myth and History" (London, 1967) p.237. He also suggests that the High Priestly Christology originated from a Son of Man Christology in the gospels in "The O.T. and some aspects of N.T. Christology" in "Promise and Fulfilment" ed. F.F.Bruce (Edinburgh, 1963) p.136. Also, I.H.Marshall argues that the Son of Man described in Heb 2:6 is consistent with the Son of man as representative or symbol of the saints of the Most High (Dn 7:18, 22, 27), cf. "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussions" NTS 12 (1965) P.347.

6. J.Hering, Comm. p.15.

7. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.35.

8. P.Giles, "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews" ExpT. 86 (1975) pp.328-332.

9. Ibid. p.329.

the figure described in Daniel, Enoch, and the gospels".¹ In the context of Heb 2:6-8, we know that this quotation was listed together with the other Old Testament passages that the author uses to describe the nature of the Son. Throughout the author argues that this Son is the Son of God (Heb 1:5a = Ps 2:7b; Heb 1:5b = 2 Sam 7:14a), the Son is superior to the angels (Heb 1:6b = Deut 32:43 (LXX); Heb 1:7b = Ps 104:4), the Son is for ever on the throne (Heb 1:8b-9 = Ps 45:6-7; Heb 1:10-12 = Ps 102:25-27), and just before this quotation, the author cited Ps 110:1 to illustrate that God "cares" for the Son and says, "Sit at my right hand till I make thy enemies a stool for thy feet", and we observe the phrases "mindful/cares of him" and "putting everything in subjection under his feet" in this quotation are clearly a continuation¹¹⁰ from the previous quotation. Naturally, the "Son of Man" here refers to and must be understood in the light of the previous "Son" of God in Hebrews 1.

Moreover, a study of the parallelism in this quotation strikingly corroborates the above observations. The first two lines are synonymously parallel. Here *ἄνθρωπος* and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* are equated. They are both terms for the "Son". The third and fourth lines are antithetically parallel: the humiliation is contrasted with the exaltation. K.J.Thomas further illustrates that the first and third lines are synthetically parallel ("Man" is equated with the idea of "humiliation") and so are the second and the fourth lines ("son of man" is equated with the traditional idea of "exaltation")².

Although "man" is paralleled to "son of man", the author has made possible a dual interpretation. In the Jewish scriptural text, it was strictly about man. Yet here the author seems to consider it capable of a dual application to both man and Jesus. As C.K.Barrett puts "The author of Hebrews, following the lead of Paul himself [I Cor 15:27; Eph 1:22], united the messianic and 'anthropological' interpretations of Ps 8 ... Not man but the Son of man, not man but Man, reigns already with God, awaiting the entire subjugation of his foes (cf Heb 10:13). The rest of the paragraph emphasizes the solidarity between Jesus and the rest of

1. G.W.Buchanan, Comm. p.51.

2. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.35.

mankind in him ..."1 We see in the next few verses immediately after this quotation, that Jesus died ὑπὲρ πάντων (verse 9). He was the ἀρχηγός of salvation (verse 10), and "he who sanctifies and those who are sanctified have all one origin" and thus they are brothers (verse 11). Only the two αὐτῷ ("to him") in verse 8 are left unspecified. K.J.Thomas claims that the αὐτῷ in verse 8 must refer to "the Son" in verse 5 where "the Son" is compared to the angels.² F.F.Bruce is probably correct in saying "So, while man is primarily indicated by αὐτῷ, the Son of Man cannot be totally excluded from its scope."³

Another significant word that contribute to the understanding of the use of this quotation is χαριτι θεου in verse 9. χαριτι θεου ("by the grace of God") appears in all the printed editions of Greek New Testament, in all modern translators, in vast majority of Greek manuscripts (P⁴⁶ X A B C D K P Y), as well as in versional (in all major Lat Syr Cop) and Patristic evidence. However, χωρις θεου ("apart from God" in NEB margin) is read by M₂ (= 0121b) 424² 1739* Vulg^G Syr^P Or(4/6) Theo^{mop} Ambr Anastasius-Abbot PsOec. λ s

Most commentators favour χαριτι θεου . F.F.Bruce, for example, says "Whatever may be said of the textual warrant for the phrase "by the grace of God" it is entirely appropriate in the context and makes for a smooth transition to the words which follow".⁴ This is a typical comment. But if we turn to the early fathers, it is not difficult to see, at least, two reasons why χωρις θεου is avoided. Origen uses this phrase to prove the subordination of the Word. In the Commentary on John, he argues that the Father alone can properly be said to live.⁵ And he

1. C.K.Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" p.391, in "The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology" ed. W.D.Davies & D.Daube (C.H.Dodd Festschrift) (Cambridge, 1964) pp.363-393. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.43 , J.Moffatt, Comm. p.23 argue that the reference is only to man. NEB thus translates "But in fact we do not yet see all things in subjection to man".

2. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.32.

3. F.F.Bruce, Comm.p.37. n.35.

4. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.40.

5. "For apart from God none of the being) who possess life have an immutable and unchangeable life. And why should we hesitate concerning the rest, since not even Christ possesses the immortality of the Father, for "he tasted death for all" (Origen, "Comm. John II 18:123" ed A.E.Brooke (Cambridge, 1896) p.289. λ s

interprets the verse to mean "he tasted death for all but God, including angels as well as men".¹ Theodore, adopted Origen's "apart from God", but argues in a different way by not emphasizing the phrase "for all", and claims that the "apart from God" is meant to show that none of this suffering and change is attributed to the Godhead. It is the Man alone exclusive of the indwelling Word who suffers and dies. Thus "the full humanity of Christ is greatly asserted, as is the role of the Man in bringing salvation...".² It is, as R.A.Greer correctly states, the fear in the Early Church caused by the "Antiochene exegesis" of Hebrews given by Origen, Arian, Theodore, Nestorius, that caused the use of $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in Heb 2:9³ to be avoided

Some recent scholars have been able to argue the meaning of $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in context in Heb 2:9. G.Zuntz⁴ argues that $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\iota \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is a dogmatic correction and that $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ fits the theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. J.C.O'Neill argues, "The preposition $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma$ has a common meaning, 'far from', ... The spatial distance from God represented by the position lower than the angels is perfectly expressed... the writer to the Hebrews understood the great distance between God and his Son on high and men below, with the angelic hierarchy between ... of his tasting death for all far from God".⁵ R.V.G.Tasker, following Ambrose (de Fide 5:106), says that Christ died to bring all ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$) under his power but that God is excepted from $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ as in I Cor 15:27. Then he attributes the reading not to the author but to scribes who changed the original $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ to $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\iota \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in order to exclude God from the inclusiveness implied by $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ".⁶ J.K.Elliott⁷ claims that $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is the original writing by the author to the Hebrews for three reasons:

1. R.A.Greer, "The Captain of Our Salvation: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews" (Tubingen, 1973) p.239.

b / 2. Ibid. p.239.

3. For details refer to R.A.Greer's book, op. cit. above.

4. G.Zuntz, "The Text of the Epistles" (London, 1953) p.34.

5. J.C.O'Neill, "Heb 2:9" JTS 17 (1966) p.82.

6. R.V.G.Tasker, "The Text of the Corpus Paulinum" NTS (1954) p.184.

7. J.K.Elliott, "When Jesus was Apart from God: an Examination of Hebrews 2:9" ExpT 83 (1972) pp.339-341.

(i) *χωρις* occurs 13 times in Hebrews (out of 28 times in the New Testament) always followed by an anarthrous noun, while *χαριτι* occurs 8 times in Hebrews and over 100 times in the New Testament but always followed by an arthrous noun (for example, *η χαρις του θεου/κυριου*). In Heb 2:9 *θεου* is anarthrous.

(ii) the author quotes the second half of Ps 22 (Ps 22:22) in verse 12. So it is likely that the first half of Ps 22 (Ps 22:1-21), which Ps 22:1 (=Mk 15:34 par a/ Mt 27:46) the cry of desolation from the cross, was in his mind when writing verse 9.

(iii) *χαριτι θεου* was an early variation made by scribes puzzled by the idea that Jesus was "without God". An easy orthographical change altered *ΧΩΡΙΣ* to *ΧΑΡΙΤΙ* replacing it with a common New Testament idea. Later *χαριτι θεου* gained in popularity due to Nestorianism which raised the fear that *χωρις θεου* would mean Christ's divine nature had no share in his death.

9. Heb 2:12 (= Ps 22 (LXX 21) : 23)

saying, "I will proclaim thy name to my brethren,
In the midst of the congregation I will praise thee" (RSV)

λεγων· ἀπαγγελω το ὄνομα σου τοις ἀδελφοις μου,
ἐν μεσῶ ἐκκληστιας ὑμνησω σε. (GK)

διηγησομαι το ὄνομα σου τοις ἀδελφοις μου.
ἐν μεσῶ ἐκκληστιας ὑμνησω σε (LXX)

(MT) תְּדַבֵּר אֵל בְּרֵיכָהּ יְהוָה בְּתוֹכָהּ תְּבַרְכֵהוּ

There is only one variant in this quotation, where LXX 21:23 renders MT Ps 22:22 תְּדַבֵּר ("I will tell") as διηγησομαι ("I will announce") and Heb 2:12 as ἀπαγγελω ("I will proclaim"). There is no parallel in all the direct quotations in Hebrews to this type of variant.

This is a difficult variant to deal with. Various explanations have been proposed.

(i) The variant is a mistake due to memory failure. The author, quoting from memory, substituted for one word its synonym.¹ διηγησομαι and ἀπαγγελω are used interchangeably and considered equivalent in the synonymous parallelism in LXX Ps 54:18. Recent textual critics of the OT in Hebrews object to this view, usually, on the basis that; (a) the author always cited his text quite accurately, and probably he has his Vorlage before him when he was citing.² (b) Secondly, it seems unlikely that the author would misquote the first word of this quotation.³

1. B.F.C. Atkinson, "The Textual Background of the Use of the O.T. by the New" Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute 129 (1947) p.41.

2. K.J. Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959) p.39. J.C. McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.75. Also, O. Michel, Comm. p.155. C. Spicq, Comm. I. p. 334. S. Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.57. F.F. Bruce, Comm. p. xlix.

3. K.J. Thomas, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.39.

(ii) If the author did not change the word due to memory failure, then he may have changed it deliberately, based on at least two reasons. (a) The verb *διηγεομαι* is not commonly found in the New Testament, being used only seven times in the Gospels and Acts and only once in the Epistles. While *ἀπαγγελω* is found thirty-six times in Gospels and Acts and five times in the Epistles. K.J.Thomas argues that *ἀπαγγελω* in the Gospels and Acts is used in the ordinary way. However, in the Epistles it has a specialized use meaning^{ng} "to proclaim" some aspect of the gospel, and likewise it is same in Heb 2:12 which refers back to the proclamation of "such a great salvation" in Heb 2:3.¹ Against this, J.C.McCullough argues that the main thrust of the verse is not on the term *ἀπαγγελω* but "brethren" and thus the change serves no immediate purpose to the author.² (b) O.Michel illustrated the relationship between the words *ἀπαγγελω* and *ἄγγελος* as follows. Jesus as "messenger" is emphasized by the author's use of *ἀπαγγελω* instead of *διηγεομαι*, since he has argued that Jesus is a "messenger" superior to the *ἄγγελοι* in Heb 1 and 2.³

(iii) A stylistic variant, perhaps found by the author in his source.⁴ This is based on the assumption that the author cited his quotations from various recensions of his "Vorlage".⁵ McCullough calls this a "Septuagintal translational variant", the Hebrew having the verb *גָּבַח* which the LXX in the Psalms translates either by *διηγεομαι* (Ps 21:23) or *ἀπαγγελω* (Ps 77:4,6). With this variety of translation it is probable that the author's Vorlage already had *ἀπαγγελω* and the author copied what was in front of him.⁶

Until further evidence is known, we are unable to make any definite conclusion about the Vorlage behind the quotation.

1. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis. op. cit. pp. 40-41.

2. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.77.

3. O.Michel, Comm. p.36. Also G.W.Buchanan, Comm. p.33.

4. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.79.

5. This is the thesis argument of J.C.McCullough's unpub. thesis in the year 1971, of which he follows E.Ahlborn's argument ("Der Septuaginta Vorlage des Hebräerbriefs" unpub. thesis. Universitat Göttingen, 1966).

6. J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.368.

Psalm 22 is a psalm of "lament and thanksgiving of the individual".¹ Most commentators now see Ps 22 as a unity, form critically as an individual lament (vv. 1-21), followed by an individual song of thanksgiving (vv. 22-31).² The psalm begins with its sharpest outcry of despair and forsakenness, and thus asking the question "Why hast thou forsaken me?" (v.1), but concludes with "O thou my help, hasten to my aid!" (v.19b). Then in the second part (vv. 22-31), praise is given to God in remembrance of the deliverance in verse 21. The 'pray-er' (in the MT this psalm is entitled a psalm of David) who begins the praise (v.22) is himself "in the midst of the congregation", but he exhorts the "brethren" who celebrate thanksgiving with him to join in (v.23). But praise cannot stop even with "all Israel" (v.23). In verses 27-28, the circle is expanded to "all the ends of the earth," and "the families of the nations," are to worship Yahweh the king.

In rabbinic literature, there was no sign of Ps 22 used of the person of the Messiah.³ And A.Vis, after going through all the instances of the occurrence of the psalm in rabbinic literature, concludes, "From the historical point of view this psalm is wrongly quoted [in the New Testament] as a testimony to the Messiah. The Christian writers find no support in Jewish messianic expectations of the psalm current in their time".⁴ Even though Ps 22 is not used messianically by the Jews, it is commonly used by pious Jews as they faced illness, oppression, or impending death.⁵ In Midr Teh 22:2 we are told how Esther, "at last prayed with a loud voice 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' and her prayer was at once answered".⁶

In spite of the lack of messianic interpretation of the psalm among the Jews, the New Testament gives ample evidence that it was thus interpreted among the Christians. F.F.Bruce points out, "Practically the whole of the lament to which the first part of the psalm is devoted is used in the Church from very early times as

1. J.H.Reumann, "Psalm 22 and the Cross; Lament and Thanksgiving for Jesus Christ" INT 28 (1974) pp.39-58.

2. C.Westermann, "The Praise of God in the Psalms" trans. K.R.Crim (Richmond, 1965) pp.64-81.

3. Str-Bill Vol.II. p.574.

4. A.Vis, "The Messianic Psalm Quotations in the New Testament" (Amsterdam, 1936). p.38.

5. Cf. H.D.Lange, "The Relationship Between Ps 22 and the Passion Narrative" Concor 43 (1972) pp.510-521.

6. Cf. J.H.Reumann, op. cit. p.48.

a testimonium of the crucifixion of Christ; not only is it expressly quoted, but its language has been worked into the very fabric of the New Testament passion narratives".¹ In the New Testament, no less than seven explicit quotations and eight allusions of Ps 22 are referred to.² H.J.Kraus concludes that "all these quotations and allusions were designed to make it clear that Jesus took on himself what was experienced in Israel as painful and was lamented in the presence of God".³ While S.Kistemaker argues, "the 22nd Psalm is par excellen^t messianic, and even Jesus uttered verses of this Psalm (Mt 27:46); it is understandable that the author to the Hebrews has put its words into the mouth of Jesus."⁴ On this occasion, F.Schroger claims this text is messianically interpreted, a "promise-fulfillment" in the person of Christ.⁵ Schroger's opinion is probably right if we see this eighth quotation in its context or structure. In the second exposition section (2:5-18)(see p.51), after the author has confirmed the humanity of the "Son" with the seventh quotation and "tied-up" the "son of man" with the suffering Jesus, the 'archegos'⁶ (vv.5-9), now he is able to move quickly to claim that this Jesus is not ashamed to call the "many sons" (v.10) and those "who are sanctified" as brethren.

1. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.45.

2. Quotations are: Ps 22:1 (= Mk 15:34/ Mt 27:46); Ps 22:5 (= Rom 5:5); Ps 22:7 (= Mk 15:29/ Mt 27:39/ Lk 23:35); Ps 22:9 (= Mt 27:43); Ps 22:16 (= Jn 19:28); Ps 22:19 (= Mk 15:24/ Mt 27:35/ Lk 23:34 or Jn 19:24); Ps 22:22 (= Heb 2:12); Ps 22:23 (= Rev 19:5). Allusions are: Ps 22:13b (= I Pet 5:8); Ps 22:15 (= Jn 19:28); Ps 22:21 (+ II Tim 4:17); Ps 22:24 (= Heb 5:7); Ps 22:28 (= Rev 11:15; 19:16); Ps 22:29c (= Mk 15:31/ Mt 27:42). Cf. J.H.Reumann, op. cit. pp. 41-42.

3. H.J.Kraus, "Theology of the Psalms" trans. K.H.Crim (Minneapolis, 1986) p.190.

4. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" op. cit. p.148.

5. F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes als schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1966) p.91.

6. G.Johnston, "Christ as Archegos" NTS 23 (1980) pp.381-385, argues, based on the use of the word 'archegos' in Acts 3:15; 5:31; Heb 2:10; 12:2, that archegos may have been an early title employed in the worship of the Hellenistic congregations among whom both Acts and Hebrews must have circulated at first.

10. Heb 2:13a (= Is 8:17/ 2 Sam 22:3/ Is 12:2).

And again, "I will put my trust in him" (RSV)

καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ ἐστομαὶ πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ (GK)

πεποιθὼς ἐστομαὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ (LXX)

(MT) וְיִתְקַדֵּשׁ

There are two variants in this quotation between Hebrews and the LXX.

- (i) ἐγὼ is added before ἐστομαὶ .
- (ii) ἐστομαὶ πεποιθὼς is used instead of πεποιθὼς ἐστομαὶ . Furthermore, πεποιθὼς ἐστομαὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ is found in Is 8:17, 2 Sam 22:3 and Is 12:2.

Various explanations have also been given respectively to these textual variants.

(i) The prefix ἐγὼ is said to be added for the purpose of emphasis.¹ Usually based on three arguments.

(a) To emphasise that the person speaking is the Messiah. K.J.Thomas argues that in the mind of the author, Jesus is the "ideal king".² He based his argument on Is 8:17, rather ^{than} on 2 Sam 22:3 which clearly indicates that the speaker is king David. G.W.Buchanan, probably correctly points out that the addition of καὶ ἔρει ("and he will say") at the beginning of Is 8:17 in LXX, which is not found in the Hebrew text, seems to put the words which follow into the mouth of a third person.³

1. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.52. J.Moffatt, Comm. p.33. C.Spicq, Comm. II. p.42. E.Riggenbach, Comm. p.52. n.29. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.32, rightly says, "The essential meaning of the text remains the same; there is only a shift of emphasis".

2. K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis. (University of Manchester, 1959) p.44. in agreement with E.Riggenbach.

3. G.W.Buchanan, Comm.p.33. F.Bleek, Comm. II. p.323, says that this seems to be a third person, but impossible to know what the translator of LXX had in mind. E.Riggenbach, Comm. p.52. n.30. says that the LXX adds the words in question.

(b) For the identification of Jesus with man.¹ To demonstrate that Jesus like man with a common origin (cf. Heb 2:11), puts his trust in God.

(c) To form a parallelism with ἐγώ in the following quotation (Heb 2:13b), so that Jesus is indicated as the same speaker throughout the two quotations.²

(ii) The exchange of ἐσομαι and πεπολιθως in the second variant is explained to be for the purpose of connecting πεπολιθως with ἐπ' αὐτῷ so that this shows directly that God is to be the object of Jesus' trust.³ Thus "the author has made the identity of the speaker evident and has accentuated the association between his trust and its object".⁴ J.C.McCullough against Thomas' explanation, says, "This seems to us to be a forced explanation",⁵ and suggests that "by putting πεπολιθως beside ἐπ' αὐτῷ there are three π's and the associated © and T. This helps the assonance of the sentence"⁶.

Here we are faced with the choice that either we accept^{that} the author changed his cited text due to theological motive (as argued by K.J.Thomas) or due to stylistic reason (as argued by J.C.McCullough). Until further evidence arises, it is difficult for us to draw out any conclusion at this juncture. /s

Concerning the original source of this quotation, there are three possibilities; Is 8:17, 2 Sam 22:3, and Is 12:2. Most of the scholars⁷ accept Is 8:17 as the author cited text, most probably from the LXX. This is mainly based on the reason that the next quotation is from Is 8:18. Also καὶ πεπολιθως ἐσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ (LXX Is 8:17) and ἐγώ ἐσομαι πεπολιθως ἐπ' αὐτῷ (Heb 2:13a) are proper translation of יָשָׁר יְהוָה of Is 8:17 (MT), rather than from the Hebrew of

1. C.Spicq, Comm. II. p.42.

2. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.52.

3. Cf. K.J.Thomas, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.45.

4. Ibid. p.45.

5. J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.137.

6. Ibid. P.137. n.2. He further concludes that the author felt free to paraphrase it to suit his particular purposes.

7. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.46. H.Montefiore, Comm. p.63. J.Moffatt, Comm. p.33. B.Lindars, "New Testament Apologetics" (London, 1960) p.176. B.F.Westcott, Comm. p.51. F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes als Schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1966) p.91. E.Riggenbach, Com. p.51. Except, G.Howard, "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations" NTS 10 (1968) p.210. O.Michel, Comm. p.81, prefer 2 Sam 22:3.

2 Sam 22:3, or from Is 12:2.¹ Some scholars² would suggest that the author separated the quotation by *καὶ πάλιν* because he was not aware that they came from the same passage, and he was citing, not from the Old Testament, but rather from a "florilegium". S.Kistemaker argues, based on the connecting formula *καὶ πάλιν* between the two quotations, that these two quotations in Heb 2:13 may stem from the liturgy of the early Church.³ F.C.Synge, suggests that "A Scribe took the first half to come from 2 Sam 22:3 ... Thinking that there were two citations, one from 2 Sam and the other from Isaiah, in a moment of misguided pedantry he separated the two with the words "and again".⁴ This is not a strong argument although J.Moffatt has pointed out that the word "and again" are used in precisely the same way to divide a quotation in Heb 10:30 (Heb 10:30a (= Dt 32:35); Heb 10:30b (= Dt 32:36)).⁵ However, LXX Is 8:17 seems to be the best choice, but we must remain uncertain, or "*A priori* the author would have used either passage".⁶

The discussion of the 'use' of this quotation in the context will ~~retain~~ until / be deferred the next quotation.

1. G.L.Archer, "O.T. Quotations in the N.T.: A Complete Survey" (Chicago, 1983) p.97.

2. C.Spicq, Comm. II. p.42. F.C.Synge, "Hebrews and the Scriptures" (London, 1959) p.17.

Opposed / Against by J.C.McCullough, unpub. thesis. op. cit. p.293.

3. S. Kistemaker, op. cit. p.34. He says the *καὶ πάλιν* presence between the two quotations may not be regarded as a possible slip on the part of an early scribe, and the author calls attention to a well known text [a liturgical text] which may be drawn from two sources (Is 8 and 2 Sam 22) and continues with a second quotation taken from one of them".

4. F.C.Synge, op. cit. p.17.

5. J.Moffatt, Comm. p.33.

6. G.W.Buchanan, Comm. p.33.

11. Heb 2:13b (= Is 8:18).

And again, "Here am I, and the children God has given me". (RSV)

καὶ πάλιν· ἴδου ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παῖδια ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός. (Gk)

(MT) הנה אנכי והילדים אשר נתן לי ה' הנה

There is only one variant in this quotation. The author follows the word order *μοι ἔδωκεν* as in LXX A, 26 236 538, but *ἔδωκεν μοι* occurs in LXX B, 87 91 228 309 490 Or Theo Syr^h.

K.J.Thomas says that this reversed word order (*ἔδωκεν μοι*) corresponds to the order in the Hebrew text (*יָֿתַן*) and thus the author attempts to reproduce literally the Hebrew word order.¹ While J.C.McCullough argues that the author found and wrote the readings of the main manuscripts.²

In Isaiah 6-9, prophet Isaiah has been speaking to the king and the people of the Southern kingdom and encouraging them to have faith in God in face of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition, rather than to turn to Assyria for help. His oracles, however, were not heeded. He therefore seals them up and hands them over to his disciples (Is 8:16), and says "I will wait for the Lord, who is hiding his face from the house of Jacob, and I will hope in him" (Is 8:17). But while he is waiting there are signs and portents from God. Then he says in in verse 18 "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord has given me are signs and portents in Israel...". Clearly in its Old Testament context, "I" refers to Isaiah himself, and his "children" are

1. K.J.Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959) p.235.

2. J.C.McCullough, "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971) p.136.

Shearjashub (Is 7:3) and Mahershalalhashbaz (Is 8:3), who were both given as signs with these prophetic names.

Is 8:17-18 is seldom cited either in Jewish literature or in the New Testament or among the Early Church Fathers. Only in Heb 2:13 are verses 17 and 18 of Is 8 ^{are} cited.¹ This is true only of Is 8:17-18, but the whole section of Is 6-9 is referred ^{to} by many of the writers of the New Testament.² C.H.Dodd puts ^{it} "... Is 6:1-9:7 may have formed, for early Christian students of the Old Testament, a single complex unit of prophecy, beginning with the vision of the glory of God ...".³ Moreover, this background may be known to the author of Hebrews. It is the LXX translation of Is 8:17-18 that fascinated him the most. It is in the context of Heb 2:10-18 that the author cited these two quotations separately, probably from the same passage of Is 8:17-18, in order that two distinct points are made, after the quotation of Ps 22:23. We see here how the author 'intelligently' cited the Old Testament passages for his argument. The subject in Is 8:17-18 was Isaiah, but with the LXX text, he changed the subject to Jesus and left the object the same, "a practice that was customary to the author of Hebrews and to other Christian and Jewish interpreters of that day".⁴ Thus F.Schroger claims this a "promise-fulfillment" method of interpretation.⁵ The one in whom both Isaiah and Jesus had confidence was God, whose name was to be announced to the "brethren, in the midst of the congregation" (Heb 2:12 = Ps 22 (LXX 21) :23). The main attraction of the Isaiah passage to Ps 22 (LXX 23): 23 is the word "children", which could be identified with

1. Str-Bill, III. p.683. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.32.

2. We have the list; Is 6:2-3 (= Rev 4:8); Is 6:9-10 (= Mt 13: 14, 15; Acts 28: 26,27); Is 7:14 (keyword "Immanuel") (= Mt 1:23; or perhaps Rom 8:31; Rev 21:3); Is 8:12f (= I Pet 3:14ff); Is 8:14 ("stone of stumbling") (= Rom 9:32,33; I Pet 2:8); Is 8:23 (= Mt 4:15-16).

3. C.H.Dodd, "According to the Scripture: The Substructure of New Testament Theology" (London, 1952) p.81.

4. G.W.Buchanan, Comm. p.34.

5. F.Schroger, "Der Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes als Schriftausleger" (Regensburg, 1966) p.95.

"brethren", as well as the "many sons" of Heb 2:10 and the "sanctified ones" of Heb 2:11.¹ Recently, P.S.Minear, from the structure of these three quotations in Heb 2:12-13, has been able to speak of the 'triangular conversation' in which God, Christ, and the redeemed are closely, and somewhat schematically, related to one another.²

1. G.W.Buchanan, Comm. p.34.

2. P.S.Minear, "An Early Christian Theopoetic?" Semeia 12 (1978) p.204.

III. THE THEOLOGY OF Hebrews 1 and 2 124

III. The Theology of Hebrews 1 and 2

This section is an "outgrowth" of what has been discussed in the previous two chapters. All the way we have argued that there are three distinguishable "components" in Hebrews; namely the OT quotations and allusions, the structure, the theology, and these components are inter-related together. By examining the placing of the OT quotations and allusions we can see a clear pattern of the structure in Hebrews, especially the expository sections. These OT quotations and allusions have formed the main criteria for reconstructing the structure of the Epistle. Moreover, with the well ordered structure we too can see a clear pattern of theological arguments. Consistently these theological arguments are due to and "shaped" by the use of the OT quotations and allusions in each particular section. The following discussion investigates the theology in each section and how the OT helps to furnish it.

Heb 1:1-4 Introduction: an exordium.

The author begins with a single well constructed rhetorical phrase. We first distinguish three elements of the OT (of old, to our father, by the prophets). *three* They are matched by *corresponding*, to some extent contrasting, *three* elements from the New (in these last days, to us, by a son). Then a series of seven Christological designations which begins by alluding to Ps 2 and closes with Ps 110. Generally, we can agree with C.Spicq that the prologue already contains the entire subject of the Epistle, according to the rule of the best ancient rhetoric; it presents the person and work of the son of God, king and priest, revealer and redeemer/object of faith for Christians.¹ / δ

Heb 1:5-2:18 The superior divine and human Christ

The argument of this section consists of a series of seven quotations in the first chapter (1:5-14). After a short paraenesis (2:1-4), the author continues to make the comparison between the Son and the angels (2:5-18).

1. C.Spicq, Comm.II. p.1.

Heb 1:5-14 Exposition: The Son is superior to the angels

The seven direct OT quotations are placed in order to prove the superiority of the divine son (Christ) to the angels. Christ's superiority to the angels can be seen in his inheritance of certain 'names' which are better than theirs: "Son" (v.5), "God" (v.8), and "Lord" (v.10). Clearly these names are drawn from OT texts, with no regard for their original significance. The texts, however, are largely royal psalms. Probably, as L.D. Hurst claims, "the author chose them because he believed that, in their original meaning, they spoke of the dignities of an ideal king."¹

Taken in this light, the author sets up a 'catena' of proof texts from the OT. The first two quotations of Ps 2:7 (1:5a) and 2 Sam 7:14 (1:5b) are straightforward; just to prove that Christ is rightly called Son and this title is never ascribed to any angel. But why angel? The author probably knew the Jewish scriptures and tradition well because "angel" was described as the spiritual law-giver and in the Hebrew angels are frequently called "sons of God" (see pp.44-45 for detail discussion). The proof here holds good because no single angel is ever described as "son of God". In these two quotations the "son" is a divine son of God. The idea of the Messiah as son of David or son of God is certainly widespread in Jewish circles and the fulfillment of the prophecy is in the NT seen in Jesus (cf. Lk 1:32, 68). Concerning "today" we have proposed four possibilities (see pp.71-72) and we concluded that, together with its use in Heb 5:5, it would refer to Christ's exaltation ^{is} and enthronement, but ^{is} not exhausted in this occasion.

The third quotation (Ps 97(LXX 96):7/Deut 32:43 LXX) in 1:6 introduces the motif of Christ's superiority to the angels. Angels are to worship Him; at the time when the 'first-born' was brought into the world (οἰκομενη). ^{is} Jesus is elsewhere described as the 'first-born' of a new creation (cf. Rom 8:29; Col 1:15,18; Rev 1:5), but here the word is used absolutely. In the light of the context, the point of time "is probably neither the incarnation nor the second advent of Christ: it is not so much a question of His being brought into the world as of His being introduced to it as the Son of God, and we may think rather of His exaltation and

1. L.D.Hurst, "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2" in "The Christology of the NT" (G.B.Caird Festschrift) (Oxford, 1987) pp.91-104. Citation from p.97.

enthronement as sovereign over the inhabited universe (*οικομενη*), including the realm of angels."¹

The fourth quotation (Ps 104 (LXX 103):4) in 1:7 and the fifth quotation (Ps 45(LXX 44):7-8) in 1:8-9 provide a contrast between the status of the angels and that of the son. The angels are changing but the son and His kingdom are the same for ever. The sixth quotation (Ps 102(LXX 101):26-28) in 1:10-12 reinforced the fifth. In the fifth quotation, we have argued that "O God" is probably vocative (see pp.88-90). The "Lord" in the sixth quotation is vocative as well. Scholars have disagreed as to why the author without hesitation transferred to Christ what the OT says about God. Most recently, L.D.Hurst,² agreeing with B.W.Bacon's³ and C.F.D.Moule's⁴ suggestions, thinks "it probable that behind Heb 1:10-12 lies a non-Christian, Hellenistic Jewish belief, built into the LXX, that in Ps 102 :24-29 God was addressing an appeal by the Messiah to shorten the appointed days." While T.F.Glasson, against the above argument, and probably rightly, claims that a 'plurality of divine persons' runs throughout chapter 1, and maintains that this was already in the early Christian tradition due to the peculiar inclusion of a second speaker in the LXX of Ps 102: 24-29 that presents a dialogue between the son (24-25) and the Father's reply (26-29).

The catena of texts closes at 1:13 with the second reference to Ps 110:1 (cf 1:3). Again here the figure in view is a divine being. J.A.Fitzmyer⁵ correctly stressed that in Ps 110:1 the being is "a religious figure who incorporates in himself" the kingdom of Israel and its hope for a future in which the kingship of Yahweh will become universally effective. The author has been able to ascribe this 'religious figure' to Christ. As F.F.Bruce⁶ notes, our author is not the only NT writer to ascribe to Christ the highest of divine names, or to apply to him OT scriptures which in their primary context refer to Yahweh (cf. Phil 2:10; I Pet 3:15).

1. F.F.Bruce, Comm. p.17.

2. L.D.Hurst, "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2" op. cit. p.100.

3. B.W.Bacon, "Heb 1:10-12 and the Septuagint Rendering of Ps 102:23" ZNW 3 (1902) pp.280-285.

4. C.F.D.Moule, "The Birth of the New Testament" (London, 1966) p.78.

7/ 5. J.A.Fitzmyer, "Now This Melchizedek: Heb 1:1; Ps 110:4; Gen 14:8ff" in "Essays on the Semitic background of the NT" (London, 1971) p.224.

6. F.F. Bruce NTS 9.

The author closes his discussion by reaffirming that the angels are only ministering spirits and not to be compared with the Son. The superiority of Christ over angels has thus been asserted and confirmed by the testimony of OT scriptures.

Heb 2:1-4 First paraenesis

Beginning with "therefore", the author urges his readers to "pay closer attention" to the greater message declared by the "Son" (Christ). No OT quotation appears in this exhortation.

Heb 2:5-18 Exposition: Jesus, the superior human

As A. Vanhoye notes "the third paragraph (2:5-18) is doctrinal in content and resumes the theme of Christ's eschatological rule, in which angels are merely ministering spirits."¹ G.W.Grogan argues that "the author will now show that our Lord's eschatological (and present) supremacy is human as well as divine."² However, the emphasis in this new section is on the fact that Christ assumes his dominion by fulfillment of Ps 8:4-6. Here we see the incarnation or humiliation of Christ. As D. Peterson appropriately puts it "the purpose of this paragraph, therefore, is to consider the necessity for Christ's temporary humiliation 'lower than the angels', particularly with respect to his suffering, and to show how he came to be 'crowned with glory and honour', as 'the heir of all things' and saviour of his people."³ The whole paragraph can be divided into two parts: 2:5-9 and 2:10-18.

In 2:5-9 we can begin our assessment of its theology by posing two questions⁴: (a) if Jesus Christ is 'the Son', as expanded in chapter 1, why is his rule not complete and apparent at all? (b) why did the Son have to suffer and die, as the apostolic tradition maintains that he did? It is in this context that the author quoted Ps 8:4-6 and made full use of this Psalm for the solution of the above two

1. A.Vanhoye, "La Structure de L'epître aux Hebreux" (Paris, 1963) p.77.

2. G.W.Grogan, "Christ and His People: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5-18" VoxEvan (1969) pp.56.

3. D. Peterson, "Hebrews and Perfection" SNTSMS 47 (Cambridge, 1982) p.51.

4. Ibid. p.51.

questions. In our previous investigation of the use of this quotation (see pp.103-113) we observed that it is the phrase 'son of man' that interested the author because the 'son of man' concept was significant to the early Christian tradition. Although Ps 8 in its original context and to the Jew was not messianic, to the NT writers it was. We find Ps 8 appears 'messianically' in I Cor 15:27; Eph 1:22; II Pet 3:22, and Ps 8 was used together with Ps 110, as in Hebrews. I quote from D.

e/ Paterson¹ :

"the author is not introducing a new contrast between Christ and the angels. This contrast was begun in chapter 1 and interrupted by the exhortation in 2:1-4. The assertion that it was not to angels that (God) subjected the world to come' (2:5) recalls the promise of absolute dominion to Christ in Psalm 110:1 (cf 1:13). It then provides the link to a second scriptural testimony to Christ, which explains how that promised is obtained by him. However, such an interpretation by no means supposes that the anthropological significance of Psalm 8 was ignored by the writer in his application of the words to Christ. On the contrary, mankind benefits from the achievement of Christ as representation Man."

The 'world to come', asserts the writer in 2:5, points to the authority of Christ, not to the angels. Christ is the one appointed 'heir of all things' (1:3), whom God has invited to sit at the right hand (1:13). However, the quotation of Ps 8:4-6 implies that Christ achieves this dominion as a man, made 'for a little while lower than the angels'. God is 'putting everything in subjection to him'. To reinforce this point, the author claims God left 'nothing outside his control'. However, the problem is that 'we do not yet see everything in subjection to him'. O.Michel argues²:

"now the revelation of Christ's world-dominion has still not happened. The eschatological οὐρανός has its parallel in Mk 13:7, I Jn 3:2, Rev 17:10,12. The primitive Christian tension between now and then is concealed in this 'not yet'. The contrast lies between the still not fulfilled world-dominion and the already occurring humiliation and exaltation."

e/ 1. D. Paterson, "Hebrews and Perfection" op. cit. p.52.
2. O. Michel, Comm. p.139.

Thus, as claimed by D.Peterson, to answer the questions above, the author reflects the frequent NT theme that the glorification of Christ is the result of his suffering and not something prior to it (Mk 8:31; Lk 24:26; Phil 2:8-11; I Pet 1:11,21); his resurrection, ascension and enthronement are his 'crowning with glory and honour'. We may note further that 'glory' is the final destination of believers (2:10), because Christ has already entered into that glory through suffering.¹ Whereas the words, as claimed by O. Michel, 'because of the suffering and death' point to Christ's death as the ground of his exaltation, the words 'so that by the grace of God he might taste death for every one' point to that death as the remedy for the human predicament.²

In the second part (2:10-18) the author asserts that it was 'fitting' for God to achieve the salvation of his people in the humiliation, death and exaltation of the Son. Indeed, it could be said that verses 11-18 explain this fittingness ; 11-15 in respect to those he is to save, and 16-18 in respect of the Saviour. The author also introduces a distinctive concept by 'bringing many sons to glory' that Christ is the " ἀρχηγός " of their salvation, but only 'perfect through suffering'. Scholars have noticed the importance of the title ἀρχηγός in the Christology of Hebrews.³ I agree with P.G.Muller⁴ who relates ἀρχηγός to OT theology that Israel is a people led by God and thus Christ is the new ἀρχηγός of the 'many sons' or 'those who are sanctified' through the suffering of Jesus. With this the author moves a step further to claim that they 'all share one origin' and 'not ashamed to call them ^{that he is} brethren'. Then the author cited three OT texts to support his claim. S.Kistemaker⁵ correctly summed up:

"It is the motif of glory and honour which has been the bridge between the last 6 / half of the Ps 8 and the second part of Ps 22. Yet the first part of the 22nd Psalm is not entirely lost out of sight. Once again the author seems to reach back to the

1. D. Peterson, "Hebrews and Perfection" op. cit. p.215 n.24.

2. O. Michel, Comm. p.139.

3. G.Johnson, "Christ as Archegos" NTS 27 (1980) pp.381-385, argues that Archegos may have been an early title employed in the worship of the Hellenistic congregation. E.K.Simpson, "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews" I EQ 18 (1946) pp.35-38, notes that the word means "Chieftain" or "Founder" in Greek literature. P.G.Muller, "Christ Archegos: Der religionsgeschichtliche und theologische Hintergrund einer neutestamentlicher Christus-pradikation" (Frankfurt, 1973) relates it to the fundamental theme of OT theology that Israel is a people uniquely led by God.

4. Ibid. p.57.

5. S.Kistemaker, "The Psalm citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Amsterdam, 1961) p.84.

agony of Christ on the cross, when he heard his scoffers say "He trusteth on God"; for the author quotes a verse found in Isa 8:17 and 2 Sam 22:3, "I will put my trust in him" The addition of this citation serves the purpose of affirming the intermediary work of the high priest in the person of Christ... Now all three citations contribute to the clarification of Heb 2:11a."

In the next five verses, the author makes more profound theological statements. The purpose of the incarnation is explained as the victory over the one who 'has the power of death', to deliver not the 'angels' but the 'descendants of Abraham'. To close his exposition of Hebrews 1 and 2, 'therefore', because Christ is 'like his brethren in every respect', 'he might become a merciful and faithful high priest' in order 'to make expiation for the sins of the people' and is 'able to help those who are tempted'. The concept of 'faithful' causes the author to comment on the 'faithful' of Moses and Jesus (Heb 3-4), while the concept of 'high priest' is thoroughly exposed in Heb 5-10. */expounded*

There is no NT writer who interprets Ps 8:4-6 like the author to the Hebrews. Until here, at least, we can claim that the OT quotations and allusions in Hebrews 1 and 2 have acted as the basis for the theology, or the basic materials for the theological arguments, in Hebrews 1 and 2.

Conclusion

Obviously, when reading through the dissertation, many "conclusions" have been drawn in the discussion of various issues. Here only the major conclusions or arguments are stated.

The overall "thesis" of this work is that the OT (quotations and allusions) in the Epistle have not only reflected the exegetical principles of the author but also helped the formation of the structure and theology in the Epistle.

1. Concerning the literary genre of Hebrews (pp.9-11) there is no one single word which λ will accurately express what is the exact genre of Hebrews, however, exposition and exhortation are the main forms of genre, although other forms like treatise, letter, homily should not be abandoned in the reconstruction of the structure of the Epistle.
2. Concerning the religious background of the author (pp.13-18), we are not certain of any except the OT.
3. In assessing the relationship between structural and rhetorical criticisms δ / δ (pp.20-29), we discover that there is no difference between the two methods of δ / criticisms δ on their three main principles (totality, deep structure, synchronism) except differences in emphasis and orientation.
4. In finding the criteria for reconstructing the structure of the Epistle (pp.30-38), we have argued for a form-content structure proposed by J.Swetnam, but added OT quotations and allusions as the main criterion.
5. Concerning the structure of Hebrews 1 (pp.42-49), We have agreed with J.P.Meier for a numerical symmetry between the seven Christological designations in Heb 1:2a-3 and the seven OT quotations in Heb 1:5-14 where they both begin with Ps 2 and close with Ps 110.
6. In the introductory section to the second chapter (pp.54-67), we have shown that the three 'cognate schools of exegesis' in the primitive Church period can be

the probable exegetical background to the author of Hebrews.

7. In investigating the textual origin of each OT quotation in Hebrews 1 and 2, we can only make tentative conclusions for each of them. Definite Vorlage is not certain at the present stage of Septuagintal research.

8. In the fifth quotation (Ps 45(LXX 44):7-8) in Heb 1:8b-9, we have accepted 'O God' as vocative, and this was due to the 'pluralistic divine person' concept in the early Church tradition.

9. In the last chapter, We have shown that the OT quotations and allusions have served as the basis to the formation of the theology in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

I have concentrated my investigation on Hebrews 1 and 2, but I believe ~~these~~ / that ~~this~~ two chapters can act as the 'microcosm' of the whole of the Epistle.

Table 1

Direct quotations^{of} and allusions to the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

	Direct Quotations	Allusions
Heb 1 : 2b		Ps 2 : 8 ὄν... παντων
Heb 1 : 3c		Ps 110 : 1 ἐκαθισεν... ὑψηλοῖς
Heb 1 : 5a	Ps 2 : 7 Υἱος... σε	
Heb 1 : 5b	2 Sam 7 : 14 Ἐγώ... υἱόν	
Heb 1 : 6	Deut 32 : 43 LXX / Ps 97(LXX 96) : 7 Καὶ... θεοῦ	
Heb 1 : 7	Ps 104(LXX 103) : 4 Ὁ ποιῶν... φλογα	
Heb 1 : 8-9	Ps 45(LXX 44) : 6-7 Ὁ θρονος... σου	
Heb 1 : 10-12	Ps 102(LXX 101) : 25-27 Σὺ... ἐκλειψουσιν	
Heb 1 : 13	Ps 110(LXX 109) : 1 Καθου... σου	
Heb 2 : 6-8	Ps 8 : 4-6 Τί... αὐτοῦ	
Heb 2 : 9		Ps 8 : 5 βραχυ... ἀγγελου
Heb 2 : 9		Ps 8 : 5 δοξη... ἐστε φανωμενον
Heb 2 : 12	Ps 22(LXX 21) : 22 Ἀπαγγελω... σε.	
Heb 2 : 13a	Is 8 : 17/ 2 Sam 22 : 3/ Is 12 : 2 (LXX) Ἐγώ... αὐτω	
Heb 2 : 13b	Is 8 : 18 Ἴδου... θεος	
	+ (198 words)	

	Direct Quotations	Allusions
Heb 2 : 16		Is 41 : 8-9 LXX σπερματος... ἐπιλαμβάνεται + (22)
Heb 3 : 2		Num 12 : 7 LXX Μωϋσης ... αὐτου
Heb 3 : 5		Num 12 : 7 LXX Μωϋσης ... θεραπων
Heb 3 : 7-11	Ps 95(LXX 94) : 7-11 Σήμερον...μου	
Heb 3 : 15	Ps 95(LXX 94) : 7-8 Σήμερον... παραπικρασμῶ	
Heb 3 : 17		Num 14 : 29, 32 ῶν... ἐρημῶ
Heb 3 : 18		Ps 95(LXX 94): 11/ Num 14 : 22-23 ῶμοσεν... αὐτου
Heb 4 : 3	Ps 95(LXX 94) : 11 Ὡς ...μου	
Heb 4 : 4	Gen 2 : 2 Και...αυτου	
Heb 4 : 5	Ps 95(LXX 94) : 11 Εἰ...μου	
Heb 4 : 7	Ps 95(LXX 94): 7-8 Σήμερον... ὕμων	
Heb 4 : 10		Ps 95(LXX 94) : 11 εἰσελθων ... αὐτου
Heb 4 : 10		Gen 2 : 2 κατεπαυσεν ... ἐργων
Heb 4 : 11		Ps 95(LXX 94) : 11 εἰσελθειν ... καταπαυσεν
Heb 5 : 5	Ps 2 : 7 Υἱος ...σε	
Heb 5 : 6	Ps 110 : 4 Συ...Μελχισεδεκ	
Heb 5 : 9		Is 45 : 17 αἴτιος... αἰωνιου
Heb 5 : 10		Ps 110 : 4 κατα ... Μελχισεδεκ
Heb 6 : 8		Gen 3 : 17 ἀκανθας ... τριβολουσ

	Direct Quotations	Allusions
Heb 6 : 13		Gen 22 : 16 ᾠμοσεν... ἑαυτου
Heb 6 : 14	Gen 22 : 17 Εἰ... πληθυνω	
Heb 6 : 19		Lev 16 : 2, 12, 15 εἰσερχομενην... καταπετασματος
Heb 6 : 20		Ps 110 : 4 κατα... αιωνα
Heb 7 : 1		Gen 14 : 17-20 ὁ Μελχισεδεκ... αὐτον
Heb 7 : 4		Gen 14 : 20 ὧ... ἔδωκεν
Heb 7 : 11		Ps 110 : 4 κατα... Μελχισεδεκ
Heb 7 : 11		Ps 110 : 4 κατα... ταξιεν
Heb 7 : 17	Ps 110 : 4 Συ... Μελχισεδεκ	
Heb 7 : 21	Ps 110 : 4 ᾠμοσεν... αιωνα	
Heb 8 : 1		Ps 110 : 1 ἐκαθισεν... οὐρανοις
Heb 8 : 5	Ex 25 : 40 ὄρα... ὄρει	
Heb 8 : 8-12	Jer 31 : 31-34 ἴδου... ἐτι	
Heb 9 : 19		Ex 24 : 3 ὑπο... λαω
Heb 9 : 20	Ex 24 : 8 το αιμα... θεος	
Heb 9 : 28		Is 53 : 12 παλτων... ἁμαρτιας
Heb 10 : 5-7	Ps 40(LXX 39) : 6-8 Θυσιαν... σου	
Heb 10 : 8	Ps 40 : 6 Θυσιαν... προσφορας	
Heb 10 : 8	Ps 40 : 6 ὀλοκαυτωματα... ευδοκησας	

	Direct Quotations	Allusions
Heb 10 : 9	Ps 40 : 7 Ίδου... σου	
Heb 10 : 12		Ps 110 : 1 ἐκαθίσεν... θεου
Heb 10 : 13		Ps 110 : 1 ἕως... αὐτου
Heb 10 : 16	Jer 31 : 33 Αὐτη... αὐτους	
Heb 10 : 17	Jer 31 : 34 των... ἔτι	
Heb 10 : 27		Is 26 : 11 πυρος... ὑπεναντιους
Heb 10 : 28		Deut 17 : 5 ἐπι... ἀποθνήσκει
Heb 10 : 29		Ex 24 : 8 το αίμα... διαθηκης
Heb 10 : 30a	Deut 32 : 35 Ἔμοι... ἀνταποδώσω	
Heb 10 : 30b	Deut 32 : 36/ Ps 135 : 14 Κρινει... αὐτου	
Heb 10 : 37-38	Hab 2 : 3-4 LXX μικρον... αὐτω	
Heb 11 : 4		Gen 4 : 4 ἐπι... θεου
Heb 11 : 5		Gen 5 : 24 LXX οὐχ... θεος
Heb 11 : 12		Gen 22 : 17 καθως... ἀναριθμητος
Heb 11 : 13		Gen 23 : 4 ξενoi... γης
Heb 11 : 18	Gen 21 : 12 Ἐν... σπέρμα	
Heb 11 : 21	Gen 47 : 31 LXX προσεκυνησεν... αὐτου	
Heb 12 : 2		Ps 110 : 1 ἐν... κεκαθικεν
Heb 12 : 5-6	Prov 3 : 11-12 LXX Υίε... παραδεχεται	

	Direct Quotations	Allusions
Heb 12 : 12		Is 35 : 3 τας... ἀνορθωσατε
Heb 12 : 13		Prov 4 : 26 LXX τροχίας... ὑμῶν
Heb 12 : 20	Ex 19 : 12-13 Καν... λιθοβοληθησεται	
Heb 12 : 21	Deut 9 : 19 Ἐκφοβος... ἐντρομος	
Heb 12 : 26	Hag 2 : 6 LXX Ἐτι... οὐρανῶν	
Heb 13 : 5	Deut 31 : 6, 8 Οὐ... ἐγκαταλιπω	
Heb 13 : 6	Ps 118 : 6 LXX Κυριος... ἀνθρωπος	
Heb 13 : 11		Lev 16 : 27 το αίμα... ἅγια
Heb 13 : 11		Lev 16 : 27 κατακαίεται... παρεμβολης
Heb 13 : 13		Lev 16 : 27 ἔξω... παρεμβολης
Heb 13 : 20		Is 63 : 11 τον... προβατων
Heb 13 : 20		Is 55 : 3/ Zech 9 : 11 αίματι... αἰωνίου

Total words : 632 281 = 913 words

Total words in Hebrews = 4948¹

Percentage of citations (Direct Quot. & Allusions) = $\frac{913}{4948} \times 100\% = 18.45\%$

Percentage of citations (Direct Quot. & Allusions) = $\frac{220}{569} \times 100\% = 38.3\%$
in Hebrews 1-2

1. J.D. Thompson & J.A. Baird, "The Computer Bible: A critical Concordance to the Letter to the Hebrews" (South Hamilton, 1988).

CITED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Commentaries

(At the footnotes, these commentaries only abbreviated as *Comm* ,after the authors' names).

- Bleek, F. "Der Brief an die Hebraer" I: Einleitung; II: Kap 1-4:13; III: Kap 4:14-13:25. (Berlin, I:1828; II:1836; III:1840).
- Braun, H. "An die Hebraer" HNT 14 (Tubingen, 1984).
- Bruce, F.F. "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (Grand Rapids, 1964).
- Buchanan, G.W. "To the Hebrews" Anchor Bible (New York, 1972).
- Calvin, J. "Commentary on the Hebrews" (Grand Rapids, 1949).
- Davies, J.H. "A Letter to Hebrews" (Cambridge, 1967).
- Delitzsch, F. "Commentar zum Brief an die Hebraer" (Leipzig, 1857).
- Haering, T. "Der Brief an die Hebraer" (Stuttgart, 1925).
- Hering, J. "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews" (London, 1970).
- Hewitt, T. "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (London, 1960).
- Hughes, P.E. "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Grand Rapids, 1977).
- Kasemann, E. "Das Wandernde Gottesvolk: Eine Untersuchung zum Hebraerbrief" (Gottingen, 2nd ed. 1957). "The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews"trans Harrisville, R.A. & Sandberg, J.L. (Minneapolis, 1984). I am using the translated commentary.
- Kuss, O. "Der Brief an die Hebraer" Das Neue T. 8. (Regensburg, 1966).
- Michel, O. "Der Brief an die Hebraer" Kritisch-exegetischer-Komm. NT(Meyer) 13, 14 Auflage (Gottingen, 1984).
- Moffatt, J. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews" ICC (Edinburgh, 1924).
- Montefiore, H. "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews" Black's NT Comm. (London, 1964).
- Nairne, A. "The Epistle of Priesthood" Torch Bible Comm. (Edinburgh, 1913).
- Riggenbach, E. "Der Brief an die Hebraer" Komm. zu.NT 14 (Leipzig, 3rd 1922).
- Robinson, T. H. "The Epistle to the Hebrews" Moffatt NT Comm. (London, 1953).

- Spicq, C. "L'Épître aux Hébreux" I: Introduction, II: Commentaire (Paris, I: 1952, II: 1953).
- Tholuck, A. "Kommentar zum Brief an die Hebräer" (Hamburg, 1850).
- Westcott, B.F. "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (London, 1892).
- Wilson, R. McL "Hebrews" New Century Bible (Grand Rapids, 1987)
- Windisch, H. "Der Hebräerbrief" HNT 14 (Tübingen, 1931).

Previous theses on OT in Hebrews

- Ahlborn, E. "Der Septuaginta Vorlage des Hebräerbriefs" unpub. thesis (Universität Göttingen, 1966).
- Kistemaker, S. "The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" Free University thesis, 1961 (Amsterdam, 1961).
- McCullough, J.C. "Hebrews and the Old Testament" unpub. thesis (Queen's University, 1971)
- Schroger, F. "Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger" Universität München thesis, 1966 (Regensburg, 1966).
- Thomas, K.J. "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews" unpub. thesis (University of Manchester, 1959).

Monographs and Articles

- Allegro, J.M. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature" JBL 75 (1956) pp.174-186.
- "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrasim" JBL 77 (1958) pp.350-354.
- Anderson, B.W. "The New Frontier of Rhetorical Criticism-A Tribute to James Muilenburg" in "Rhetorical Criticism-Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg" ed. Jackson, J.J. & Kessler, M. (Pittsburgh, 1974) pp.ix-xviii.
- "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1-11" JBL 97 (1978) pp.23-29.
- Anderson, H. "The OT in Mark's Gospel" in "The Use of the OT in the New and other Essays" ed. J.M. Eird (Durham: Duke Uni. Pr. 1972).
- Andriessen, P.C.B. "La Teneur Judeo-Chrétienne de He 1:6 et 2:14b-3:2" NT 18 (1976) pp.293-313.
- Archer, G.L. "O.T. Quotations in the N.T.: A Complete Survey" (Chicago, 1983).
- Aristotle "The Rhetoric" trans. R. Roberts (New York, 1954)

- Atkintson, B.F.C. "The Textual Background of the Use of the OT by the New" Journal of the Translations of the Victoria Institute 129 (1947).
- Auffret, P. "Note Sur La Structure Litteraire D'Hb 2:1-4" NTS 25 (1979) pp.166-179.
- Bacon, B.W. "Heb 1:10-12 and the Septuagint Rendering of Ps 102:23" ZNW 3 (1902) pp.280-285.
- Baker, D.L. "Typology and the Christian Use of the OT" SJT 29 (1976) pp.137-157.
- Bamberger, B.J. "Philo and the Aggadah" HUCA 48 (1977) pp.153-185.
- Barrett, C.K. "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" in "The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology" (C.H.Dodd Festschrift) ed. Davies, W.D. & Daube, D. (Cambridge,1964) pp.363-393.
- Barth, M. "The Old Testament in Hebrews - An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics" in "Current Issues in N.T. Hermeneutics" ed. Klassen,W. & Synder, G.F. (New York, 1962) pp.65-78.
- Barthes, R. "Introduction a l'analyse structurale des recits" in Communications 8 (1966).
- "The struggle with the angel; Textual Analysis of Genesis 32:23-33" in "Structural Analysis and Biblical Exegesis" trans Johnson, A.M. Pittsburgh Theo.Mono.Series 3 (1974).
- Beare, F.W. "The Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in P⁴⁶" JBL 66 (1944) pp.379-396.
- Betz, H.D. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians" NTS 21 (1975) pp.353-379.
- Black, M. "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament" NTS 18 (1972) pp.1-14.
- "The Theological Appropriation of the Old Testament by the New Testament" SJT 39 (1986) pp.1-17.
- "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament"
- Bligh, J. "The Structure of Hebrews" HeyJ 5 (1964) pp.170-177.
- "Chiastic Analysis of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Heythrop College, Oxon, 1966).
- Bliss, F. "Brief an die Hebraer: Text mit Ausgabe der Rhythmen" (Halle, 1903).

- Bowker, J. "The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to the Jewish Interpretation of Scripture" (Cambridge, 1969).
- Bornkamm, G. "Das Bekenntnis im Hebraerbrief" in "Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum II" (Munich, 1959) pp.188-203.
- Bock, D.L. "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New" I BibSac (1985) pp.209-223.
- "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New" II BibSac (1985) pp.306-319.
- Borchert, G.L.etc "Epistle to the Hebrews" Rev&Exp 82 (1985).
- n / Borges, P. "John's Use of the Old Testament and the Problem of Sources and Traditions" in "Logos Was the True Light" (Uni Trondheim, 1983)
- "The Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology" in "Logos Was the True Light" (Uni.Trondheim, 1983) pp.??
- Bovon, F. "French Structuralism and Biblical Exegesis" in "Structural Analysis & Biblical Exegesis" Pittsburgh Theo.Mono.Series 3 trans. Johnson, A.M. (1974).
- Braun, H. "Das Alte Testament in Neuen Testament" ZTK 109 (1962) pp.16-31.
- "Qumran und das Neue Testament" (Tubingen, 1966).
- Brooke, G.J. "Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish Context" JSOTSup 29 (Sheffield, 1985).
- "Qumran Peshar: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre" RQ 10 (1979) pp.483-503.
- Brock, S.P. "Hebrews 2:9b in Syriac Tradition" NT 23 (1983) pp.236-244.
- Brown,Driver & Briggs "Hebrew and English Lexicon of the O.T." (Oxford, 1952).
- Brownlee, W.H. l / "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls" BA 14 (1951) pp.54-76.
- "The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran" (Philadelphia, 1959).
- "The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk" (Missoula, 1979).
- Bruce, F.F. "Tradition Old & New" (Grand Rapids, 1970).
- "Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts" (London, 1960).
- "To The Hebrews' or 'To the Essenes'? NTS 9 (1963) pp.217-232.

- Buchanan, G..W. "The Present State of Scholarship on Hebrews" in "Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults" ed. Neusner, J. (Leiden, 1975) pp.299-330.
- Bue, F.Lo "The Historical background of the Epistle to the Hebrews" JBL 75 (1956) pp.52-57.
- Cahill, P.J. "Hermeneutical Implications of Typology" CBQ 44 (1982) pp.266-281.
- Caird, G.B. "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews" CanJTheol 5 (1959) pp.44-51.
- "Son By Appointment" in "The New Testament Age-Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke" I ed. Weinrich, W.C. (Macon, 1984) pp.73-82.
- "Principalities and Powers" (Oxford, 1956).
- Callan, T. "Psalm 110:1 and the Origin of the Expectation that Jesus will come again" CBQ 44 (1982) pp.622-636.
- Campbell, J.C. "In a Son" Int 10 (1956) pp.24-38.
- Carlston, C.E. "Eschatology and Repentance in the Epistle to the Hebrews" JBL 78 (1959) pp.296-302.
- Carr, G.L. "The Old Testament Love Songs and their use in the New Testament" JETS 8 (1981) p.97-105.
- Charlesworth, J.H.ed. "The O.T. Pseudepigraphy" I & II (London, 1985). /s
- Cockerill, G.L. "Heb 1:1-14, I Clem 36:1-6 and the High Priest title" JBL 97 (1978) pp.437-440.
- Combrink, H.J.B. "Some Thoughts on the Old Testament Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews" NeoT 5 (1971) pp.122-136.
- Culley, R.C. "Structural Analysis: Is it done with Mirrors?" Int 28 (1974) pp.165-181.
- Cullmann, O. "The Christology of the New Testament" (London, 1959).
- Dahood, M. "Psalms I:1-50" Anchor Bible (New York, 1965).
- Dahms, J.V. "The First Readers of Hebrews" JETS 4 (1977) pp.365-375.
- Davies, W.D. "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism" (London, 2nd ed. 1955).
- Deaut, R. Le "Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation" BTB 4 (1974).
- Deichgraber, R. "Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der fruhen Christenheit" in "Studien zum Umwelt des Neuen Testament" 5 (Gottingen, 1969).

- Descamps, A. "La Structure de l'epitre aux Hebreux" *Reveu diocesaine de T/ Journal* 9 (1954) pp.252-258.
- Dey, L.K.K. "The Intermediary World and Pattern of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews" (Missoula, 1975). λS
- Dodd, C.H. "Old Testament Testimonies and their Transmission" *ExpT* 87 (1976) pp.21-22.
- "According to the Scriptures; The Substructure of New Testament Theology" (London, 1952)
- Eaton, J.H. "Kingship and the Psalms" (London, 1976).
- Edgar, S.L. "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament" *NTS* 10 (1964) pp.55-62.
- Ellingworth, P. "Like the Son of God": Form and Content in Hebrews 7:1-10" *Bib* 64 (1983) pp.255-262.
- "Jesus and the Universe in Hebrews" *EQ* 4 (1986) pp.337-350.
- Elliott, J.K. "When Jesus was Apart from God: an Examination Hebrews 2:9" *ET* 83 (1972) pp.339-341.
- Ellis, E.E. "How the New Testament Uses the Old" in his "Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Early Christianity" (Grand Rapids, 1978) pp.147-171) or in "New Testament Interpretation" ed. Marshall, I.H. (Exeter, 1977) pp.199-219.
- "Midrash, Targum and the New Testament Quotation" in his "Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Early Christianity" (Grand Rapids, 1978) pp.187-197.
- "Paul's Use of the Old Testament" (Grand Rapids, 1957).
- Fensham, F.C. "Hebrews and Qumran" *NeoT* 15 (1971) pp.9-21.
- Fenton, J.C. "The Argument in Hebrews" in "Studia Evangelica 7" (Berlin, 1982) pp.175-181.
- Feuillet, A. "Le Commencement de l'economie chretienne d'apres Heb 2:3-4" *NTS* 24 (1977) pp.163-174.
- Filson, F.V. "Yesterday: A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13" (London, 1967).
- Fitzmyer, J.A. "4 Q Testimonia and the New Testament" *TheoStud* 18 (1957) pp.513-537.
- "The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament" *NTS* 7 (1961) pp.297-333.
- "Further light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11" *JBL* 86 (1967) pp.25-41.

- Flusser, D. "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam 7" IEJ 9 (1959) pp.99-107.
- Fyre, R.M. "A New Criticism" Int 31 (1977) pp.299-302.
- Galland, C. "A Structural Reading Defined" in "Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics" trans Johnson, A.M. Pittsburgh Theo.Mono.Series 22 (1979).
- Gaster, T.H. "Psalm 45" JBL 74 (1955) pp.23-51.
- Gerhardsson, B. "Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity" trns. E.J.Sharpe (Lund, 1961).
- Giles, P. "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews" ExpT 86 (1975) pp.327-331.
- Glasson, T.F. "Plurality of Divine Persons' and The Quotations in Hebrews 1:6ff" NTS 12 (1966) pp.270-272.
- Gourges, M. "Remarques sur la 'Structure Centrale' de L'Epître aux Hebreux" RB 84 (1977) pp.26-37.
- Goppelt, L. "Typos. The Typological Interpretation of the O.T. in the New" (Grand Rapids, 1982).
- Goulder, M. "Midrash and Lektion in Matthew" (London, 1974).
- Graßer, E. "Der Hebraerbrief 1938-1963" TRu 30 (1964) pp.138-226.
- "Hebraer 1:1-4. Ein exegetischer Versuch" in his "Text und Situation" (Gutersloh, 1973) pp.182-228.
- "Das Heil als Wort. Heb 2:1-4" in "Neues Testament und Geschichte" (O.Cullmann Festschrift) ed. Baltensweiler, H. & Reicke, B. (Tubingen, 1972). pp.261-274.
- "Zur Christologie des Hebraerbriefes" in "Neues Testament und Christliche Existenz (H.Braun Festschrift) ed. Betz, H.D. & Schottroff, L. (Tubingen, 1973) pp.195-206.
- "Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn in Heb 2:6" in "Jesus und der Menschensohn" (1975) pp.404-414.
- Grasser, G. m / "Der Glaube in Hebräerbrief" (Marburg, 1965).
- Grant, R.M. "The Old Testament in the New" in his "A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible" (Minneapolis, 2nd ed. 1984). pp.28-38.
- Greer, R.A. "The Captain of Our Salvation: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews" (Tubingen, 1973).
- Greimas, A.J. "Semantique Structurale" (Paris, 1966).
- Grogan, G.W. "The New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament; A Comparative Study" TynBull 18 (1967) pp.54-76.

- "Christ and His People : An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5-18" VoxEvang (1969) pp.54-71.
- Gundry, R.H. "The Use of the OT in St Matthew" NTSup 18 (Leiden, 1967).
- Gunkel, H. "Einleitung in die Psalmen" (Gottingen, 1926).
- Hagen, K. "Hebrews Commenting from Erasmus to Beze 1516-1598" (Tubingen, 1981)
- "The Problem of Testament in Luther's Lectures on Hebrews" HTR 63 (1970) pp.61-90.
- Hagner, D.A. "Interpreting the Epistle to the Hebrews" in "The Literature and Meaning of Scripture" ed Inch, M.A. & Bullock, C.H. (Grand Rapids, 1981) pp.217-242.
- Hammerton-Kelly, R.G. "Jews, Greeks and Christians" (Leiden, 1976).
- Hanson, A.T. "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Deutero-Paulines and the Epistle to the Hebrews" in "The Living Utterances of God" (London, 1983) pp.90-112.
- "Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology" (London, 1974).
- Harrington, D.J. "Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets" The Aramaic Bible 10 (Edinburgh, 1987).
- Harris, M.J. "The Translation of Elohim in Psalm 45:7-8" TynBull 35 (1984) pp.65-89.
- "The Translation and Significance of 'O OEOΣ in Hebrews 1:8-9" TynBull 36 (1985) pp.129-163.
- Harris, R. "Testimonies" I & II (Cambridge, I:1916; II:1920)
- Hay, D.M. "Glory at the Right Hand; Ps 110 in Early Christianity" SBL series 18 (Nachville, 1973).
- Hatch, E & Redpath, H.A. "A Concordance to the Septuagint" 2 vols. (Oxford, 1897, 1906).
- Hatch, E. "Essay in Biblical Greek" (Oxford, 1889).
- Hengel, M. "Judaism and Hellenism" 2 vols. (London, 1974).
- Hickling, C.J.A. "John and Hebrews: The Background of Hebrews 2:10-18" NTS 29 (1983) pp.112-116.
- J/ Higgins, A. E. B. "The Son of Man in Myth and History" (London, 1967).
 "The OT and some aspects of NT Christology" in "Promise and Fulfilment" ed F.F. Bruce (Edinburgh, 1963).
- Hofius, O. "Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes" (Tubingen, 1972) .
- "Katapausis: Die Vorstellung von endzeitlichen Ruheort im

- Hebraerbrief" (Tubingen, 1970).
- Horton, F.L. "The Melchizedek Tradition: a critical examination of the sources to the fifth century AD and the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Cambridge, 1976).
- Howard, G. "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations" NT 10 (1968) pp.208-216.
- Hughes, G. "Hebrews and Hermeneutics" Society of N.T.Studies Mono.Series 36 (Cambridge, 1979).
- Hurst, L.D. "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2" in "The Christology of the N.T." G.B.Caird Festschrift (Oxford, 1987) pp.91-104.
- Jacobson, R. "The Structuralists and the Bible" Int 28 (1974) pp.146-164.
- "Two aspects of language and two types of aphasic disturbance" in his "Fundamental of Language" (Hague, 1956).
- Jefferson, A. ed. "Modern Literary Theory" (London, 2nd ed 1986).
- Jellicoe, S. "The Septuagint and Modern Study" (Oxford, 1968)
- Jonge, M.de & *Van der Woude, A.S* "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament" NTS 12 (1966) pp.301-326.
- Johnson, S.L. "Hebrews 1:10-12. Indirect Predictive Messianic Prophecy" in his "The O.T. in the N.T." (Grand Rapids, 1980) pp.81-108.
- Johnson, A.M. ed. "Structuralism and Biblical Hermeneutics: A Collection of Essays" (Pittsburgh, 1979).
- Johnson, W.G. "The Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews" JBL 97 (1978) pp.239-251.
- Johnston, G. "ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗ and ΚΟΣΜΟΣ in the New Testament" NTS 10 (1964) pp.352-360.
- "Christ as Archegos" NTS 27 (1980) pp.381-385.
- Katz, P. "Ev *πυρί φλογος*" ZNW 46 (1955)pp.133-138.
- "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews" ZNW 49 (1958) pp.213-223.
- Kennedy, G.A. "New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism" (Chapel Hill, 1984)
- Kessler, M. "A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism" in "Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature" ed Clines, D.J.A. (Sheffield, 1982)pp. 1-19.
- Klappert, B. "Die Eschatologies des Hebraerbriefs" (Munich, 1969).
- Kosmala, H. "Hebraer-Essener-Christen" (Leiden, 1959).

- Kraus, H.J. "The Psalms in the New Testament" in his "Theology of the Psalms" trans. Crim, K. (Minneapolis, 1986).pp. 177-203.
- Kuhn, K.G. "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" in "The Scrolls and the N.T." ed Stendahl, K (London,1957) pp.54-64.
- Lane, M. "Introduction to Structuralism" (New York, 1970).
- Lange, H.D. "The Relationship Between Ps 22 and the Passion Narrative" Concordia 43 (1972)
- Leach, E.R. "Levi-Strauss" (London, 1970)
- Levi-Strauss, C. "Structural Anthropology" trans Jacobson, C. (New York, 1967).
- Leonard, W. "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Rome, 1939).
- Levey, S.H. "The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic exegesis of the Targum" Hebrews Union College Monographs 2 (1974).
- Lindars, B. "New Testament Apologetics" (London, 1960).
- "The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prelegomena" NTS 23 (1977) pp.59-66.
- Loader, W.R.G. "Sohn und Hoherpriester" (Dusseldorf, 1981).
- "Christ at the Right Hand" NTS 24 (1978) pp.199-217.
- Longenecker, R. "Can we reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament" TynBull 21 (1970) pp.3-38.
- "Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period" (Grand Rapids, 1975).
- Mackay, C. "The Argument of Hebrews" ChQRev ? pp.325-338.
- Man, R.E. "The Value of Chiasm for New Testament Interpretation" BibSac 1984 pp.146-157.
- Manson, T.W. "The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews" BJRL 32 (1949) pp.1-17.
- Martin, R.P. "Carmen Christi" (Cambridge, 1971).
- Marshall, I.H. "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussions" NTS 12 (1965).
- Mead, R.T. "A Dissenting opinion about respect for context in Old Testament Quotations" NTS 10 (1964) pp.279-289.
- McCullough, J.C "Some recent developments in Research on the Epistle to the Hebrews" Part I, Irish Biblical Studies 2 (1980) pp.141-165.
- "Some recent developments in Research on the Epistle to the Hebrews" Part II, Irish Biblical Studies 3 (1981) pp.28-45.
- "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews" NTS 26 (1980)

- pp.363-379.
- Meier, J.P. "Structure and Theology in Heb 1:1-14" Bib 66 (1985) pp.168-189.
- "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Hebrews 1:5-14" Bib 66 (1985) pp.504-533.
- Menegoz, E. "La Theologie de l'Epitre aux Hebreux" (Paris, 1894).
- Menken, M.J.J. "Numerical Literary Techniques in John" NTSup 55 (Leiden, 1985).
- Metzger, B.M. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah" JBL 70 (1951) pp.297-307.
- Michaelis, W. "πρωτοτοκος" in TDNT VI pp.876-879.
- Michel, O. "Zur Auslegung des Hebraerbriefes" NT 6 (1963) pp.189-191.
- Mickelsen, A.B. "Methods of Interpretation in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Chicago, 1959).
- Miller, M.R. "What is the Literary form of Hebrews 11?" JETS 29 (1986) pp.411-417.
- Milligan, G. "The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Edinburgh, 1891).
- Miner, P.S. e/ "An Early Christian Theopoetic?" Semeia 12 (1978)
- Moloney, F.J. "The Reinterpretation of Psalm 8 and the Son of Man debate" NTS 27 (1980) pp.656-672.
- Moule, C.F.D. "The Birth of the New Testament" (London, 1966).
- Mowinckel, S. "He That Cometh" (Oxford, 1956).
- Muilenburg, J. "Form Criticism and Beyond" JBL 88 (1969) pp.1-44.
- Namara, M.Mc "Targum and Testament" (Grand Rapids, 1972).
- Nauck, W. "Der Aufbau des Hebraerbriefes" in "Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche" Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias BZNW 26 (1964) pp.199-206.
- Nash, R.H. "The Book of Hebrews: A test case in his 'Christianity and the Hellenistic World'" (Grand Rapids, 1984) pp.89-112.
- O'Neill, J.C. "Hebrews 2:9" JTS 17 (1966) pp.79-82.
- Pearson, B.A. "Nag Hammadi Codices" IX & X (Leiden, 1981).
- Peterson, D. "Hebrews and Perfection" Society of NT Studies Mono.Series 47 (Cambridge, 1982).

- a/ Pette, D. "What is Structural Exegesis" (Philadelphia, 1976).
- "Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine" (Misgola, 1975). 15
- Perry, M. "Method and Model in the Epistle to the Hebrews" Th 77 (1974) pp.66-74.
- Piaget, J. "Structuralism" trans. C.Maschler (New York, 1971)
- Ploeg, J. van der "L'Exegese de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Epitre aux Hebreux" RB 14 (1947) pp.187-228.
- Polzin, R.M. "Biblical Structuralism: Method & Subjectivity in the study of ancient texts" SemeiaSup (Philadelphia, 1977).
- Poythress, V.S. "Structuralism and Biblical Studies" JETS 21 (1978) pp.221-237.
- Rendall, R. "The Method of the Writer to the Hebrews in using Old Testament Quotations" EQ 27 (1955) pp.214-220.
- Renner, F. "An die Hebraer- ein pseudipigraphischer Brief" (Munsterschwarzbach, 1970).
- Reumann, J.H. "Psalm 22 and the Cross: Lament and Thanksgiving for Jesus Christ" INT 28 (1974)
- Rissi, M. "Die Theologie des Hebraerbriefes" (Tubingen, 1987).
- Robinson, D.W. "The Literary Structure of Hebrews 1:1-4" AusJBA 2 (1972) pp.178-186.
- Russell, D.S. "The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200BC-100AD" (London, 1964).
- Sabourin, L. "The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning" (New York, 1970).
- Sandegren, C. "The Addressees of the Epistle to the Hebrews" EQ 27 (1955) pp.221-224.
- Sanders, J.A. "The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll" (Ithaca, 1967).
- Sanders, J.T. "The New Testament Christological Hymns" (Cambridge, 1971).
- Saussure, F.de "Course in General Linguistics" trans Baskin, W. (New York, 1966).
- Savage, M. "Literary Criticism and Biblical Studies: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Joseph Narrative" in "Scripture in Context" ed. Evans, C.D. etc. (Pittsburgh, 1980) pp.79-91.
- Schenke, H-M. "Erwagungen zum Ratsel des Hebraerbriefes" in "Neues Testament und Christliche Existenz" Festschrift fur H.Braun, ed. H.D.Betz & L.Schottroff (Tubingen, 1973) pp.421-437.
- Schille, G. "Die Basis des Hebraerbriefes" ZNW 48 (1957) pp.274-276.

- s/ Schmithal, W. "Neues Testament und Gnosis" (Darmstadt, 1984).
- Scott, J.J. "ARCHEGOS in the Salvation History of the Epistle to the Hebrews" JETS 29 (1986) pp.47-54.
- Sharp, J. "Philo's Method of Allegorical Interpretation" EAJT 2 (1984) pp.94-102.
- "Philonism and the Eschatology of Hebrews: Another Look" EAJT 2 (1984) pp.289-298.
- "Typology and the Message of Hebrews" EAJT 4 (1986) pp.95-102.
- Simpson, E.K. "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews" I, EQ 18 (1946) pp.35-38.
- "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews" II, EQ 18 (1946) 187-190.
- Skehan, P.W. "A Fragment of the Song of Moses (Deut 32) from Qumran" BASOR 136 (1954) pp.12-15.
- Slomovic, E. "Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls" RQ 7 (1969) pp.3-15.
- Smalley, S.S. "The Atonement in the Epistle to the Hebrews" EQ 33 (1961) pp.36-43.
- Smith, D.M. "The Use of the OT in the New" in "The Use of the OT in the New and other essays" ed. J.M.Efird (Durham: Duke Uni Pr. 1972) pp.3-65.
- Sowers, S.G. "The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews" (Zurich, 1965).
- Spicq, C. δ/ "L'epitre aux Hebreux, Apolos, Jean Baptiste, les Hellenistes et hē Qumran" RQ 1 (1959).
- "Le philonisme de l'Epitre aux Hebreux" RB 56 (1949) pp.543-572.
- Spivey, R.A. "Structuralism and Biblical Studies; The Uninvited Guest" Int 28 (1974) pp.133-145.
- t/ Steward, R.A. "Creation and Matter in the Epistle to the Hebrews" NTS 12 (1966) pp.284-293.
- Stendahl, K. "The School of St Matthew" (Philadelphia, 1968).
- Strack-Billerbeck "Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash" (Munich, 1965).
- Strack, H.L. "Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash" (Philadelphia, 1945).
- Swete, H.B. "An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek" (Cambridge, 1900).

- Swetnam, J. "On the Literary Genre of the Epistle to the Hebrews" NT 11 (1969) pp.261-269.
- "Jesus as Logos in Hebrews 4:12-13" Bib 62 (1981) pp.214-224.
- "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6" Bib 53 (1972) pp.368-385.
- "Form and Content in Hebrews 7-13" Bib 55 (1974) pp.333-348.
- "Jesus and Isaac: Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah" Analecta Biblica 94 (Rome, 1981).
- Synge, F.C. "Hebrews and the Scriptures" (London, 1959).
- Tasker, R.V.G. "The Text of the Corpus Paulinum" NTS 1 (1954)
- Tengstrom " η/τ " TDOT IV
- Theissen, G. "Untersuchungen zum Hebraerbrief" (Gutersloh, 1969).
- Thien, F. "Analyse de l'Épître aux Hébreux" RB 11 (1902) pp.74-86.
- Thompson, J.D. "The Computer Bible: A Critical Concordance to the Letter to the Hebrews" (South Hamilton, 1988).
- Thompson, J.W. "The Structure and Purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5-13" CBQ 38 (1976) pp.352-363.
- "The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews" CBQ Series 13 (Washington, 1982).
- Thomas, K.J. "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews" NTS 11 (1965) pp.303-325.
- Thurston, R.W. "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews" EQ 48 (1986) pp.133-143.
- Thyen, H. "Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie" Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament 47 (Gottingen, 1955).
- Tov, E. "The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research" (Jerusalem, 1981).
- Vaganay, L. "Le Plan de l'épître aux Hébreux" in Memorial Lagrange. L.H.Vincent ed (Paris, 1940).
- Vanhoye, A. "La structure de l'épître aux Hébreux" (Paris, 1963).
- "A Structured Translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews" trans. J.Swetnam (Rome, 1964).
- "Discussions sur la structure de l'épître aux Hébreux" Bib 55 (1974) pp.349-380.