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1. Introduction

Although Matthew, Romans and Revelation are well known for their citations from and allusions to the Old Testament, it is especially the epistle to the Hebrews which attracts attention by its direct and indirect use of the O.T. — and not only by its citations, but also by the manner in which persons and institutions of the O.T. are woven into its argument. Thus most commentaries on Hebrews pay some attention to the question of citation as well as to the relation between the two Testaments. Besides the treatment in commentaries quite a number of articles and monographs have been published on the topic of OT citations in Hebrews1.

To understand the message of Hebrews it is necessary to have a good idea of the manner in which (and to what purpose) the writer of Hebrews uses explicit and implicit citations from the OT. It is significant that most of the well-known and characteristic concepts of Hebrews — e.g. huios, katapausis, archiereus, kaine diatheke — are taken from OT citations2. And whereas G. Bornkamm sees the purpose of the letter as follows: "Man wird das eigentliche Anliegen des Briefes darin finden dürfen, dem Bekenntnis der Gemeinde eine neue Auslegung zu geben"3, one may observe that this confession is the archiereus-confession of the congregation, a confession which is to be interpreted as a Christological exegesis of Ps. 110:1, 44. It is for this reason that for example van der Ploeg can say that we cannot understand this letter if we do not understand the writer’s conception of the OT5.

The way in which Hebrews cites the OT is quite remarkable and it differs in this respect from the other NT writings6. Instead of the exact source of a citation being given, the citation is introduced in a rather vague way — e.g. Heb. 2:6 (RSV):

“It has been testified somewhere . . .” Often the citations are simply put into the mouth of God (1:4; 3:7, 21; 8:5, 8; 10:30), of Christ (2:12; 5:5, 6; 10:5), and of the Holy Spirit (3:7; 9:8; 10:15). Another exceptional feature is that the citations are also very often used in combination with and in support of one another, e.g. Ps. 2 and Ps. 110 in ch. 1, Gen. 14 and Ps. 110 in ch. 7. But this striking
way of quoting the Old Testament reveals above all a particular view of Scripture. In this respect Spicq calls attention to the pregnant verse 4:12; Ἰωάννης ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. Here the writer is not interested in a mere written word, but in the Word spoken by the Son (1:2). In this way the OT is seen definitely through the eyes of a Christian but no interest is shown in the human authors of the OT.

Another reason why these OT citations form such an interesting terrain of study is the fact that they pose certain important problems with significant hermeneutical implications. In this connection one may recall the citations from the OT according to the LXX, even when the LXX differs from the Masoretic Text (MT). Berkouwer shows in this respect that the freedom with which the NT cites the OT gives rise to the question as to whether there is not a measure of arbitrariness, anachronism, and non-normative use of Scripture in these citations. He then remarks: "we blijven in deze citering van een geconditioneerde vertaling staan voor een speelruimte, die hermeneutisch niet geheel doorzichtig te maken valt". Much has already been written on this subject, and many scholars are still occupied in this field. It is therefore worth while to pay attention to this important and interesting topic — although I can only draw attention to some of the most significant phenomena, without shedding any new light or uttering the last word in this connection.

2. Textual form of the citations

Apparently it is not easy to determine the number of citations in Hebrews. According to Kistemaker Dittmar counts 34, Spicq 36, Padua 29, Michel 32, Venard 29/30 and Westcott 29, while he himself counts 32—26 citations introduced by introductory formula, and 6 obvious citations without any introductory formula. Thomas starts from 29 direct citations in his article, whereas Howard works on 35.

It is generally accepted that Hebrews usually cites according to the LXX (and not the MT), with approximately two-thirds of the readings from LXX and one third from LXX. Also, as is known, Hebrews often follows the LXX, even where the LXX differs from the MT — but in this respect problems arise because there is not always exact textual correspondence between the citation and the LXX text. Sometimes the citation corresponds with the Masoretic Text against the LXX, as in 12:5 and 10:30. From his statistics Howard makes the following statement: "It appears from the preceding statistics that it is incorrect to characterize the quotations in Hebrews as always Septuagintal. A great many of them do not correspond exactly to any Septuagint, and some agree with a known Hebrew text, either whole or in part, against the Septuagint". In his summary he distinguishes 8 citations which are identical with the
LXX and the MT, 24 differing from both, 6 identical with the MT against the LXX, while in 18 instances he accepts possible LXX influence and in 10 instances possible MT influence. However, in spite of these deviations from LXXA or LXXB, Thomas takes as starting-point the "obvious relationship to LXXA and LXXB" of the citations in Hebrews, for which reason these deviations from the LXX gain a special significance.

It is further important to note the now well-known fact that there were probably in New Testament times Greek texts of the OT available with readings not attested in the later LXX text, but also Hebrew manuscripts with readings corresponding to the LXX, notably when differing from the MT. De Waard draws attention to a correspondence in the textual form of the citations in Hebrews and the literature of Qumrân.

In view of these facts, it is not easy to decide whether it is the writer who is responsible for altering the LXX reading, or whether he follows an existing reading unknown to us. It is therefore of the utmost importance to pay attention to the context citations of Ps. 40:6-8 in Heb. 10:8-10 and Jer. 31:33, 34 in Heb. 10:16, 17, because here it becomes evident that the author could deliberately modify his citations to suit his argumentation. Kistemaker rightly objects to the conclusion that these modifications indicate that the author cites from memory — "First, it would be rather disparaging of the literary abilities of the author to expect that after having quoted a passage at length, his memory would fail when he tried to reproduce parts again, while, so to speak, his own written work was lying before him. Second, the author applies the context quotations in a slightly modified form in order to substantiate his arguments better."

Before leaving the textual form of the citations, it is necessary to draw attention to the nature of these texts. Katz draws a distinction between citations following a primitive and those following an edited text. Edited readings are for him readings which tend to more literal translations of the MT, show traces of grammatical and stylistic improvements, and even modifications in the text to elucidate certain opinions.

In his article Thomas compares the readings in Hebrews with the existing variants, i.e. where LXXA and LXXB differ from each other, but also variants from LXXA/B which do not appear in Hebrews. He arrives at the following interesting conclusions: where LXXA and LXXB differ, the text used by Hebrews on the whole follows a primitive reading, except in two instances of stylistic changes to avoid hiatus. Apparently this was the first type of change effected.
It is quite interesting to see that nearly half of the variants which are not used in Hebrews are more literal renderings of the Hebrew, while another 3 stylistic/grammatical refinements and 2 variants for interpretational purposes are not found in Hebrews. "These facts give evidence as to the primitive nature of the LXX text used by the author of Hebrews". This conclusion is then further confirmed by the observation that a comparison of LXX\textsuperscript{A/B} readings with variants of LXX\textsuperscript{A/B} which are not found in Hebrews yields the result that in all these instances the readings of Hebrews are primitive readings. From this Thomas deduces that — for the Prophets and Writings — LXX\textsuperscript{A} and LXX\textsuperscript{B} are apparently two traditions of the same translation, and that the author of Hebrews used an early form of it.  

3. Contemporary hermeneutical methods

Attention has already been drawn to the manner in which the author could manipulate the OT quotation in the case of Jer. 31:33, 34. It is therefore worth while to take note of the communis opinio that the way in which the NT used the OT was definitely influenced by the hermeneutical principles which were current at that time. Van der Ploeg thinks that Justin, especially in his dialogue with Trypho, can shed some light on the manner in which the OT is cited in Hebrews — although he does not ignore the differences, e.g. the fact that the author is neither philosopher nor apologist and is writing to believers. The point of contact is for him the fact that both distinguish between prophecies which are clear and lucid, and those which are not and therefore require detailed explanation. Justin also presupposes the harmony between OT and NT, on the basis of beginning and teleiōsis.

Special attention has already been paid to the relation of Philo and Hebrews to each other. And while the author of Hebrews is often associated with the Hellenistic Judaism of Alexandria, and especially while certain affinities in language and thought can be demonstrated, it is striking that allegory — so characteristic of Philo — is conspicuously absent. "Because allegory was the outstanding exegetical principle practised in Alexandrian circles, its omission in Heb. also means that the writer has excluded Alexandrian hermeneutics par excellence". There are, however, some similarities between Philo and Hebrews in connection with certain exegetical principles, but in reality these are also typical Rabbinical principles, so that not too much can be deduced from Philo.

Much has already been written concerning contemporary Jewish exegesis. In brief it can be said that exegetical activity was known as midrāj. In the course of time certain rules were developed. Rabbi
Hillel († 20 B.C.) formulated 7 rules. Later Rabbi Ishmael extended these 7 to 13, and Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose ha-Galili extended them to 32. This does not mean that NT writers made use of these exegetical principles in all respects in exactly the same way, but that these principles were part of the hermeneutical climate of the times.

Of utmost importance in connection with contemporary exegetical methods is the use of Scripture in *Qumrân*\(^{36}\). One of the most characteristic features is the so-called *pešer* commentaries, e.g. the commentary on Habakkuk (1QpH) with its running commentary, verse by verse. The exegetical methods of this group were furthermore flexible — an author could choose between variant readings, and there is a strong suspicion that he could even alter the text in order to make his application more effective\(^{37}\). However, this freedom appears to be limited to the exposition of the Writings and the Prophets, and is wanting in the exposition of the Law\(^{38}\). I. H. Eybers also notes that although the expositional methods in the commentaries and some of the other writings are exceptionally flexible, it is reasonable to suppose that certain hermeneutical principles could develop and be handed down in a group which paid so much attention to the study of the Scriptures\(^{39}\). On the basis of the 12 principles of Brownlee\(^{40}\), he then elucidates this further. We cannot dwell on this now in detail but while discussing various citations attention will be drawn to certain points of contact. It is, however, important to state already at this stage that not only is it possible to note a similar use of Scripture in Qumrân and in the Gospel of Matthew\(^{41}\), but also that several scholars believe that especially Hebrews gives evidence of a similar use of Scripture to that of the community of Qumrân\(^{42}\). S. Kistemaker distinguishes 3 important characteristics of the *midraš* *pešer*, viz. the substitution of words, long citations from Scripture followed directly by the interpretation, and the repetition of words, phrases and sentences of the citation with accompanying interpretative remarks. He then comes to the following conclusion: "Nearly every chapter of Hebrews reveals the peculiar features of the *Midrash pesher*"\(^{43}\).

From the above it should be clear that the NT writers, and particularly the author of Hebrews, were definitely not unacquainted with contemporary hermeneutical principles. But it is just as important to realize that the first Christians also had other principles than those of their contemporaries in citing the OT\(^{44}\). We shall return to this later.

4. Some Citations

The series of citations in ch. 1 gives Scriptural support to the statement of 1:4 concerning the superiority of the Son over the angels.
It can rightly be said that we have here in ch. 1 displayed before us the method of our author in handling OT citations\textsuperscript{45}. It is also noteworthy that there are allusions to Ps. 2 and Ps. 110 in the introductory verses (1:1-4) — and the series of citations is introduced and closed by quotations from these very two Psalms\textsuperscript{46}.

4.1. Heb. 1:5 — Ps. 2:7; 2 Sam. 7:14

The quotation from Ps. 2:7 corresponds to the LXX and the MT. Ps. Salom. 17:26 from the first half of the first century B.C., as well as Mk. 1:11 and Acts 13:33 give evidence that Ps. 2 was interpreted Messianically. The second quotation is from 2 Sam. 7:14. Although it is true that Nathan's words refer without doubt to Solomon, it is also true that all the promises made to David were not completely fulfilled in Solomon. One of Hillel's rules, gezerah shewah (similar expressions), could have been the reason for joining these quotations\textsuperscript{47}. However, it is now also known that 2 Sam. 7:14 is interpreted Messianically also in 4 Q Florilegium\textsuperscript{48}. The remarkable thing is that both Hebrews and Qumran combine Ps. 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14.


By mentioning the angels, this text actually links the 3 citations as delineating a common thought. The NT quotation differs from the LXX\textsuperscript{A/B} in reading “angels of God” instead of “sons of God”\textsuperscript{49}. In the MT this part of the reading is absent in Deut. 22:43, but in Ps. 97:7 it is also part of the MT. However, the quotation in Hebrews corresponds exactly to Deut. 22:43 in the hymn of Moses, which can be found in the LXX as one of the Odes just after the Psalms. There is now also a Hebrew text available, viz. 4 Q Dt. 32:43, which gives evidence to the longer LXX reading; but now correctly in Hebrew\textsuperscript{50}. As Deut. 32 was used liturgically in the temple and church, Thomas assumes that “this form of the text was probably familiar at the time of the writing of Hebrews and used intentionally by the author to fit his purpose”\textsuperscript{51}.

It is noteworthy that what has originally been said of God, is now said of the Son. It is also important that the concept prôtôtôkos can be connected with Ps. 89:28 — which is also closely related to 2 Sam. 7:14 and Ps. 2:75\textsuperscript{52}.

4.3. Heb. 1:7 — Ps. 104:4

The interesting feature of this citation is that the LXX and Heb. have switched the objects — MT: “who makest the winds thy messengers, fire and flame thy ministers”; LXX and Heb: “who makes his angels winds and his servants flames of fire” — but that
Targum Jonathan has done the same thing. According to the MT the natural elements fulfil the instructions of God. Heb. (and the LXX) has a different meaning — “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.” This quotation serves to emphasize the superiority of Jesus above the angels, while his eternity is stressed in the two following citations. In passing it may also be observed that the reading purôs phlôga, differing from the LXX reading: pûr phlêgon, was a current phrase in NT times.

4.4. Heb. 1: 10-12 — Ps. 102: 25-27

Moule emphasizes the problem that Ps. 102, addressed to God, the Creator, is being used as Scriptural proof in connection with the status of Christ — “here in Heb. i.10ff., apparently in the course of an argument from scripture intended to strengthen the Christian convictions of readers who know Judaism from the inside, and to arm them with arguments against non-Christian Jews, is the application to Christ of words which a Jew, one might have assumed, would simply claim to be irrelevant to Christ.” But, here again, it seems to be the LXX which opens the door for a Christological exegesis of the part concerned. In the MT the afflicted is the speaker throughout the Psalm, but in the LXX v.23ff. is the answer of Yahweh to his Messiah — note especially the sū and kūrie in Heb. 1: 10. The way in which v.10ff. is joined to the previous quotation also indicates that the citation is seen as a pronouncement by God. Kistemaker considers the use of these specific verses an example of the midraś pešer where the changes in the text are functional for the writer’s own interpretation. This quotation also emphasizes Christ’s superiority over the angels — the Son was present and working at the creation, and while the angels can be made into wind and fire, the Son’s nature is stable and immutable.

4.5. Heb. 1: 13 — Ps. 110: 1

In this case the quotation corresponds to the LXX as well as the MT. The introductory formula is the same as in the case of 1: 5, and in this way Ps. 2: 7 and Ps. 110: 1 are bound together as the introductory and concluding citations of this series of OT citations. It has already been stated that in the introductory verses of ch. 1 there is a reference to Ps. 2: 8 and an allusion to Ps. 110: 1. The series of OT quotations is therefore used by the author to expound and to confirm what has already been said in the introduction concerning the Glorified Christ. In Ps. 2 and Ps. 110, pertinently interpreted Messianist...
cally in the early Church, the Son is addressed in a way which elevates Him above all angels — angels who should pay homage to Him as the Lord. It is also interesting to note that the emphasis on the service of the angels in v.14 (leitourgikà pneûmata) is actually also an allusion to Ps. 104:4, quoted in Heb. 1:7.

4.6. Heb. 2:6-8 — Ps. 8:5-7

The author is still occupied with the contrast between the angels and the Son. Attention has been drawn to the fact that in 1 Cor. 15:25, 27 and Ephes. 1:20, 22, the same sequence of quotations, viz., first Ps. 110:1 and then Ps. 8:6, occurs as in Heb. 1:13 and 2:8. As a result of the combination of Dan. 7:13 and Ps. 110:1 in Luk. 22:69, apparently attested by the tradition (cf. Acts 7:56), Kistemaker thinks that the train of thought could have moved from Ps. 110:1 via Dan. 7:13 to Ps. 8:5. And it is significant that, whereas Dan. 7:13 is wanting in Heb., huîdos anthrôpou occurs in Dan. 7:13 and Ps. 8:5 (LXX) without the usual definite article.

The quotation diverges from the LXX by omitting: kai katêstîsas autôn epî tà érga tôn cheirôn sou. The reason for this is probably because the autô in v.8 refers to man, but also to the Son, and as it has been stated already in 1:10 that the Son was also active at the creation, this line could not be included.

The LXX already gives evidence of certain variations from the MT, e.g. aggélous for ëlohim, with the Targum in line with the LXX, viz., malîkayyâ. These and other similar alterations fit in with the author's argumentation. By changing the word order of 2:7a, brachû ti is strongly emphasized in 2:9. In this way it becomes apparent that the meaning here is not “little less” as in Ps. 8, but “a little while”. Textual changes such as these, together with the citing of a whole portion of Scripture which is then further explicated, and the repetition of certain words and phrases of the quotation (e.g. Heb. 2:8-9), provide convincing evidence that this citation also displays the characteristics of the midraš pe'er.

4.7. Heb. 2:12-13 — Ps. 22:23; Is. 8:17b, 18a

Having emphasized the humanity of Christ by means of Ps. 8, the author now wishes to stress Jesus' identification with man (with his brothers) in 2:12, 13. In 2:12 the reading diégësomai of the LXX is substituted by apaggelô in a position of emphasis. In this way the superiority of Christ above the angels is again implicated quite effectively, in view of the association that can be discerned between apaggelô, ággelos and euaggélion.
It is not all that evident that these citations from Is. 8 are to the point in this context. It is therefore illuminating to see that the LXX, by the insertion of καὶ ἐρεῖ before v.17, has already created the impression that it is in this case the Messiah who is waiting for the Lord who is hiding his face from Israel. In this connection Bruce makes the following important statement: "This is a good example of C. H. Dodd’s thesis that the principal Old Testament quotations in the New Testament are not isolated proof-texts, but carry their contexts with them by implication." He then sees in the hiding of the face of the Lord the connection with Ps. 22 where God’s face is hidden from the suffering righteous one. After the suffering, the second part of Ps. 22 is full of praise to the Lord. Even though the people are not seeking God, Isaiah with his children will be a sign amongst them of the grace and the wrath of the Lord. It is therefore clear that the author of Hebrews justly combined and used these two citations.

4.8. Heb. 3:7-11 — Ps. 95:7-11

In this lengthy quotation there are again certain divergences from the LXX, probably functional for the author’s argumentation. The insertion of διό in 3:10 has the effect that the tesserákonta ἕτε is connected with the preceding sentence, whereas in 3:17 the prosōchthisen is connected with it as in the original text — this change having as result that the "day of testing" (3:8) is then parallel to the "forty years". This is further confirmed by the fact that edokimasan has been changed to en dokimasia, signifying the testing of man by God, instead of the tempting of God by man (as in Ps. 95).

In addition to these alterations, the exposition in 3:12-4:11 is a good example of the exegetical methods of the author. After a few general statements, important concepts are explained and finally a concluding remark sums up the whole.

4.9 Heb. 8:8-12; 10:16-17 — Jer. 31-34.

Here we have again an obvious example of the freedom with which the author used his text. In four instances he deviates from LXX in 10:16-17, even though in 8:8-12 he has followed the LXX readings! Concerning the use of suntelēsō instead of diethēmēn, Thomas draws attention to the interesting fact that suntelēsō and epoīēsa occur in Jer. only in 41:8, 15, 18 (LXX) together with diathēkē, and then in a passage close to the one from which the citation is taken (LXX: 38:33, 34). "The striking fact is that suntelēsō is used in Jer. xlii.8 and 15 in instances in which the covenant is kept or accomplished and poiēō is used in Jer. xliii.18 in an instance in which the covenant is spoken of as broken." In Is. 28:15 we find the only other occurrence of one of these words with diathēkē in the LXX, and in this case
poieō is used in the same way as in Jer. 41:18. In Heb. 8 the use of these words can therefore indicate that the New Covenant will be kept, whereas the Old Covenant was broken. In 10:16 the author substitutes tō olkō Israēl by pros autoús. In this way the quotation is applied directly to readers and author, and it is directly linked to the hēmin in v.15. The insertion of kai tōn anomiōn autōn in 10:17 — however that may be interpreted — again points to the author’s use of Scripture according to which such free insertions are permissible.

5. Allusions to the OT

In addition to the use of explicit citations, one should note the important role played in Hebrews by implicit citations and allusions to the OT. The author is in fact almost always using this material to expound his thoughts. See e.g. ch. 11 where no specific texts are quoted, but where a whole cloud of witnesses are summoned from the OT. ‘De schrijver ziet blijkbaar in oud-testamentische zaken en in het historisch beschrevene een betekenis die in zekere zin, als negatief vergelijkingsmateriaal, een juistere kijk geeft op de tegenwoordige heils- goederen’73. Throughout the letter it is not only the explicit quotations that are taken from the OT, but the author’s language is actually ‘Biblical’ language, viz., very often he uses phrases and words adopted from the LXX.

6. Some concluding remarks

Although there has been neither time nor space to cover in this paper all the relevant quotations from the OT in Hebrews, it is clear that OT quotations constitute the framework of this letter. Kistemaker e.g. sees 4 citations from the Psalms (Ps. 8:4-6; 95:7-11; 110:4 and 40:6-8) as the basis for the construction of Hebrews74. In this scheme he even links the seven quotations in ch. 1 to the first pivotal quotation in ch. 2, viz., from Ps. 8. It remains an open question whether or not the author really took these four citations as an outline. But there can be absolutely no doubt about the cardinal importance of these four Psalm quotations and their exegesis. Often the writer of Hebrews begins with a Psalm quotation, but further on uses other OT evidence to support his argument.

As regards the text of the citations, it seems justifiable to take as basis the text of the LXX, and then a rather primitive text of which both LXXa and LXXb may be descendants75.

It is furthermore obvious that the author diverged from this text, and with good reason. We see some pertinent examples of this free usage of his text in the manner in which the quotations from Jer. 31 and Ps. 40 have been handled in Heb. 10:16, 17 and 10:8-10.
It is also clear that contemporary hermeneutical principles have influenced our author. In this respect his rejection of Alexandrian hermeneutical principles, viz., the allegory, is quite remarkable. There are, however, without doubt some parallels to certain rabbinical methods, but especially with the midrash peser as practised in the community of Qumran. The way in which he uses especially those textual variants suitable to his interpretation — insertions into quotations, a play upon words, combinations of citations, but above all the fact that he sees the OT as Holy Scripture and emphasizes revelations in the recent past — gives evidence of important similarities to Qumran. "Dog daar is reeds hier ook 'n belangrike verskil, want terwyl dit by die Sekte gaan om Skrifstudie as 'n bestaansrede vir die Sekte, is die Skrifverklaring in die Nuwe Testament bloot 'n middel om die boodskap van Jesus as Messias kragtig te verkondig".

The fundamental difference is without doubt situated in the person and work of Jesus Christ who — unlike the Teacher of Righteousness who received the key for the understanding of the Scriptures — is in His own person the living Key. See in this connection also Michel's word: "Hebr zitiert nicht nur alttestamentliche Sätze, sondern versteht jedes Wort des Zitates aus seiner Situation heraus, und zwar aus der Situation des Christusereignisses." Eybers further indicates in his article that the person of Christ makes in the first place a difference to the contents of the exegesis. He then asks if Heb. does not also indicate differences with respect to exegetical method, though it may for the most part be the same. In this connection it may be worth while to note an important point of difference. Although both Qumran and the NT see the OT as fulfilled, and both interpret the last of days as already at hand, yet there is a basic difference in their vision of history. Qumran sees Scripture (OT) as enshrouded in mystery, with practically no meaning for the time of the OT itself — the meaning remains obscure until the time of fulfilment dawns. The author of Heb. on the other hand, sees in the OT a wealthy source of historical detail illuminating the time of the OT. "His interpretation of the psalm citations has been joined to the historical value of the words quoted." To this can be added that one of the functions of the citations in Hebrews was precisely to represent the historical context. It can furthermore be said that each quotation was chosen with a view to the theological motive of the author, and that it is precisely the introductory formulae of the citations that give evidence of the author's specific theological vision of his OT quotations. It is clear that it is God, Christ and the Holy Spirit who are addressing the congregation in this manner. That is the reason why our author is able to substantiate his arguments with such freedom but also with such apt quotation from the Old Testament.
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