

The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint*

Martin Karrer

1. Introduction

The author of Hebrews creates a more literary Christian work than any other New Testament author. He adopts rhetorical elements in a superior style, beginning with the famous alliteration in 1:1 (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως κτλ., “in many and various ways ...”).¹ He broadens the early Christian vocabulary with about 150 New Testament *hapax legomena*.² He likes metaphoric language (education in 5:12–14; navigation in 6:19; sports in 12:1; etc.). And, most important for us, he forms an intertextual network.

Such a network is typical for literature. But our author shapes it in a unique way. Though writing in sophisticated Greek, he never alludes to or quotes any work of non-Jewish Greek or Roman literature. Instead, he casts his literary net exclusively over the words of God that he finds recorded in the Scriptures of Israel in Greek translation.

This decision is based on a theological program revealed in the *prooemium* 1:1–4, where our author’s identity and place within the history of early Christianity are not disclosed. He pushes God alone to the fore: “God spoke to the fathers” (1:1), and “spoke to us in the end” (1:2). “We,” the author and his readers, become listeners. Our author subsumes his own person as well as his addressees under the first person plural pronoun.³ Consequently, details of the authorship, situation, and historical background of Hebrews remain a mystery

* In memoriam Jürgen Roloff (1930–2004).

¹ Cf. Lauri Thurén, “The General New Testament Writings,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. S. E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

² The *hapax legomena* are listed in Ceslas Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, 1 (3d ed.; EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1952), 157.

³ The first person singular remains an exception throughout Hebrews. The only example, 11:32, is part of a rhetorical question and is a stylistic feature of the diatribe, not a personal statement.

for scholarship.⁴ Yet at the same time, the impersonal beginning indicates the theological intention: the author wishes to listen, together with his readers, only to words attributed to God.

Urged on by this theology of the word, the author of Hebrews quotes about twenty-nine different texts of Scripture; if we count every single quotation, up to thirty-five (and one may add approximately twenty-four relevant allusions).⁵ The number and the length of the quotations are outstanding in the New Testament. Thus, Hebrews presents the climax of New Testament citing, and additionally gives significant insights into the history of the Hellenistic-Jewish transmission of Scripture, the Septuagint.

Because of this double importance, much work has been done on Scripture and hermeneutics in Hebrews since Katz in 1958 and Ahlborn in 1967 (Schröger, Howard, Hughes, etc.), with new points of view since McCullough in 1980 (Hübner, Leschert, Jobs and Silva, Rösen-Weinhold, and others).⁶ We will try

⁴In the famous words of Franz Overbeck (*Zur Geschichte des Kanons: Zwei Abhandlungen* [Chemnitz: E. Schmeitzner, 1880; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965], 1–70, here, 1) “lacking a genealogy, Hebrews is itself a melkisedekian kind of being,” etc. On the present state of the discussion concerning introductory matters see Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (ed. H. Koester; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 1–13; Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 36; New York: Doubleday, 2001); Erich Gräßer, *An die Hebräer* (EKKNT 17; Zurich: Benziger, 1990–1997), 1:14–25; Martin Karrer, *Der Hebräerbrief: Kapitel 1:1–5:10* (ÖTK 20.1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 2002), 91–101; and Gerd Schunack, *Der Hebräerbrief* (ZBK:NT 14; Theologischer Verlag: Zürich, 2002), 9–12.

⁵The quotations are listed in Friedrich Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger* (BU 4; Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1968), 251–56; the most important allusions at pp. 201–7.

⁶Peter Katz, “The Quotations From Deuteronomy in Hebrews,” *ZNW* 49 (1958): 213–23; Erko Ahlborn, “Die Septuaginta-Vorlage des Hebräerbriefes.” (PhD, University of Göttingen, 1967); Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger*; George D. Howard, “Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations,” *NovT* 10 (1968): 208–16; Graham Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics: The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament Example of Biblical Interpretation* (SNTSMS 36; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); John C. McCullough, “The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews,” *NTS* 26 (1980): 363–79; Hans Hübner, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990–1995), 1:15–63; Dale F. Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of the Epistle’s Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms* (National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion Dissertation Series 10; Lewiston: Mellen, 1994); Karen H. Jobs and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), esp. 195–99; Ulrich Rösen-Weinhold, “*Der Septuaginta-Psalter im Neuen Testament: Eine Textgeschichtliche Untersuchung*.” (PhD, Wuppertal, 2002). See in addition for the

to sketch an overall picture in the following section. We begin with general observations (including the connection between quotations and theology of the word). Then we give a review on the Septuagint text in Hebrews, and finally we show an example for the correlation between textual history and theology. As far as possible, we will neglect the allusions, which cause special difficulties for examination.

2. General Observations

2.1 The quotations

The quotations of Hebrews are usually marked by introductory formulae. Therefore they are easily discernible.

Table 24. Quotations in the Book of Hebrews⁷

1:5a	Ps 2:7	3:7–11 (and on to 4:7)	Ps 94:7–11	10:16–17	Jer 38:33– 34
1:5b	1 Chr 17:13 / 2 Kgdms 7:14	4:4	Gen 2:2b	10:30a	Deut 32:35 / Odes 2:35
1:6	Deut 32:43 / Odes 2:43; cf. Ps 96:7	5:5	Ps 2:7	10:30b	Deut 32:36 / Odes 2:36
1:7	Ps 103:4	5:6	Ps 109:4	11:18	Gen 21:12
1:8–9	Ps 44:7–8	6:13–14	Gen 22:16– 17	11:21	Gen 47:31
1:10–12	Ps 101:26–28	7:17	Ps 109:4	12:5–6	Prov 3:11– 12
1:13	Ps 109:1	7:21	Ps 109:4	12:20	Exod 19:13
2:6–8	Ps 8:5–7	8:5	Exod 25:40–39	12:26	Hag 2:6, 21

older discussion, Günther Harder, “Die Septuagintazitate des Hebräerbriefs: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Auslegung des AT,” in *Theologia Viatorum: Theologische Aufsätze* (ed. Martin Albertz; Munich: Kaiser, 1939); and for the last decades Otfried Hofius, “Biblische Theologie im Lichte des Hebräerbriefs,” in *New Directions in Biblical Theology: Papers of the Aarhus Conference, 16–19 September 1992* (ed. S. Pedersen; NovTSup 76; Leiden: Brill, 1994); Richard T. France, “The Writer of Hebrews As a Biblical Expositor,” *TynBul* 47 (1996): 245–76; and James W. Thompson, “The Hermeneutics of the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *ResQ* 38 (1996): 229–37.

⁷ The texts are quoted according to LXX. In MT, ch. 31 is LXX Jer 38, and the numbering of the Psalms often differs too.

2:12	Ps 21:23	8:8–12	Jer 38:31– 34	13:5	Deut 31:6
2:13a	Isa 8:17	9:20	Exod 24:8	13:6	Ps 117:6
2:13b	Isa 8:18	10:5–10	Ps 39:7–9		

Most commentators add:

3:2, 5	Num 12:7	7:1–2	Gen 14:17– 20	10:37–38	Isa 26:20; Hab 2:3–4
--------	----------	-------	------------------	----------	-------------------------

Introductory formulae are missing in the last passages, and the use of the LXX text is not as clear as in the quotations with introductions; e.g., in 3:1–6, the alluded passage, LXX 1 Kgdms 2:(30–)35 is not less important for the understanding than Num 12:7.⁸ So our author indicates a greater poetic license where he abstains from introductory formulae. The dividing line between quotations and allusions becomes blurred. Hence one should modestly weigh such quotations.

2.2 *Origin and distribution*

The origin and distribution of the quotations is worthy of attention. Hebrews prefers the Pentateuch (thirteen instances), the Psalms (fourteen instances), and the Prophets (major prophets five instances, minor prophets two instances). That does not seem surprising in literature of the first century C.E. If we compare the Torah and Psalms, however, the latter gain in prevalence. They dominate in their number, length, and placement. Unmistakably, they form the central line of argument early in the decisive first chapter (from LXX Ps 2:7 in v. 5, to LXX Ps 109:1 in v. 13). The Law is there quoted after Psalms and a prophetic motif (Nathan's oracle in 1:5). Moreover the single quotation from the Torah (1:6) is taken from the Song of Moses (Deut 2 / *Odes* 2), which is a psalm within a narrative.⁹ By so using the Psalms, the author of Hebrews turns upside down the normal assessment of Scripture, according to which the Law would determine exegesis.¹⁰ In addition, the only quotation out of the historical books, LXX 1 Chr 17:13 / 2 Kgdms 7:14 in 1:5b, is part of a prophetic word (the oracle of Nathan), and also the noted allusion to LXX 1 Kgdms 2:35 in 2:17 and 3:2, 6 refers to a

⁸ Cf. Martin Karrer, "Der Weltkreis und Christus, der Hohepriester: Blicke auf die Schriftrezeption des Hebräerbriefs," in *Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr; WUNT 162, Tübingen 2003), 151–79.

⁹ Cf. the Song of Moses in Rev 15:3 (ὁδῆ). The next strong allusions or quotations from the Torah in Hebrews are 3:2, 5 (cf. Num 12:7), and 4:4 (cf. Gen 2:2b).

¹⁰ See, particularly, Philo, whose writings are devoted to the exegesis of the Law alone, although he mentions Psalms in his writings. For the Psalms in Philo cf. Jutta Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria* (TS 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

prophecy (God's word through Samuel). Evidently, the author is not interested in history as history of external facts. Besides Torah and Psalms he picks up especially prophetic materials.

Regarding language, our author consistently chooses Greek traditions, as noted. We do not find a single Hebrew or Aramaic relic in the quotations or elsewhere in Hebrews.¹¹ Moreover, no quotation presents us with undisputable evidence of a correction by our author toward the Hebrew (Proto-MT) text. The author abstains from checking Hebrew traditions, even in the Pentateuch (Torah), as 11:21 shows. There the writer overlooks how LXX Gen 47:31 misunderstands the Hebrew text by reading הַמַּטֵּה (staff) instead of הַמִּטָּה (bed), and follows the LXX and combines it with Gen 48:15–16.¹² So, there is no proof of a knowledge of Hebrew. In any case, the Qumranic or proto-rabbinic tendency to return to the Hebrew text of Scriptures is not found in this book. There is a clear conviction that the Greek language was appropriate to the speaking of God.

Nevertheless, the author shares the impact of the Jewish formation of Scriptures. Wisdom literature has less weight; we find just one quotation, the exhortation in 12:5–6 (following Prov 3:11–12). No quotation comes from literature beyond the later canon of the Hebrew Bible.¹³ Even Esther, still disputed at the time of Hebrews, is not mentioned. Thus in spite of the peculiarities, Hebrews runs parallel to the development of the Jewish canon.¹⁴

¹¹ One may compare Philo, who praises the Greek translation of his LXX corpus, the Pentateuch (*Moses* 2.25–44), and reflects Hebrew motifs only within onomastics. Folker Siegert, *Zwischen hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (MJSt 9; Münster: LIT, 2001), 104–5; idem, *Register zur "Einführung in die Septuaginta": Mit einem Kapitel zur Wirkungsgeschichte* (MJSt 13; Münster: LIT, 2003), 343. In addition, the onomastic explanation of "Melchizedek, king of Salem" as "king of righteousness" and "king of peace" in Heb 7:1–2 is fully conventional (cf. Philo, *Alleg. Interpr.* 3.79–81; Josephus, *J.W.* 6.438; *Ant.* 1.180). We cannot draw any conclusion about knowledge of Hebrew by the author of Hebrews.

¹² The difference at LXX Gen 47:31 results in the translation "Israel [Jacob] was bowing in reverence over the top of his staff," instead of "Israel bowed himself on the head of his bed."

¹³ Although Hebrews touches upon motifs known from some other Greek Scriptures: cf. Heb 1:3 and Wis 7:25–26; Heb 11:25 and 2 Macc 6–7; 4 Macc 15:2, 8; and Heb 12:7 and *Pss. Sol.* 10:2; 14:1. See H. Anderson, "The Jewish Antecedents of the Christology in Hebrews," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 530–35; and Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 38–39.

¹⁴ That development takes the Hebrew Scriptures of Israel as its point of reference as can be seen in Hellenistic-Jewish authors of the first century C.E.; see especially Josephus,

In sum, the choice and the priorities in the treatment of quotations may be unusual. But fundamentally, Hebrews bears witness to the option of its author to develop Christian theology on a Jewish basis. Let us say it more generally: despite the parting of the ways between early Christianity and ancient Judaism, the formation of the Hebrew canon affected the extent of respect and the quotation out of Septuagint manuscripts in Christianity in the time of our author. The use of Scripture united Judaism and Christianity more than it separated them.

2.3 Introductory formulae and speakers

Hebrews's theological concept of the word affected the imbedding of quotes in a context, and especially the introductory formulae. Our author avoids the most frequent quotation formula of the first century, *ἔγραπται*, "it is written."¹⁵ Since the quoted word of God is spoken word, there is a favoring of "it is said" or other forms of *λέγειν*, "say," *φάναι*, "speak," and *μαρτυρεῖν*, *διαμαρτυρέομαι*, "testify".¹⁶ All emphasis lies on the actual, performative word.

This word is primarily word from above. God, the Spirit, and Christ speak it in, and from, the "heights" (*ὕψηλοί*, first mentioned in 1:3). Only in Heb 9:20 and 13:6 do words of Scripture (LXX Exod 24:8 and Ps 117:6) remain fully human words (the first time a word of Moses, the second time a word of the community).¹⁷ In the other cases human speakers recede behind God.¹⁸

In consequence, our author often changes the speaker. Thus, the Song of Moses in 1:6 (cf. 10:30) against Deut 32 and *Odes* 2 (superscription) is referred to as a word of God, not of Moses. In a similar way God or the Spirit speaks the

Ag. Ap. 1.38–46. On this topic see Christine Gerber, "Die Heiligen Schriften des Judentums nach Flavius Josephus," in *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum* (ed. M. Hengel and H. Löhr; WUNT 73; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 91–113.

¹⁵ The only exception, Heb 10:7, has *ἔγραπται* inside the quotation of LXX Ps 39:8, and was therefore not arranged by our author. *Ἐγράπται* was used from as early as LXX 4 Kgdms 14:6.

¹⁶ 1:5, etc.; 10:5, 8, etc.; 2:6; 7:17, etc.

¹⁷ But also in the latter case, the community answers to a word of God: Deut 31:6, etc. in Heb 13:5.

¹⁸ Sometimes into abstraction (e.g., 7:17). Therefore it is difficult to count the speakers. Michael Theobald finds God as speaker 22x, the Son 4x, the Spirit 2x, and others 5x (mostly abstract formulae) ("Vom Text zum 'Lebendigen Wort' [Hebr 4:12]," in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums: Festschrift Otfried Hofius* [ed. C. Landmesser, H.-J. Eckstein, H. Lichtenberger, BZNW 86; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997], 764).

Psalms from 1:5 onwards. The contemporary view of the Davidic origin of the Psalms is almost completely ignored (though our author knows about it).¹⁹

The tradition that the Spirit spoke through David (LXX 2 Kgdms 23:2) helps us to understand this position. Nevertheless, from an outward perspective and in retrospect, it provokes serious criticism. Modern hermeneutics must come to terms with the phenomenon that, due to our author's theology, even words that were not originally words of God in the Scripture are regarded as coming from God and the Spirit.

2.4 Word of God, quotations and christology

Hebrews is not the only book of the New Testament that focuses on words of God. An interesting comparison can be made with the Revelation. This book also claims to give a testimony to the word of God (λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, 1:2). But it updates the word in another way. It starts with unveiling / revelation (ἀποκάλυψις, 1:1) and seeing (1:2, 12 etc.). Consequently, it forms new words out of Scripture. Characteristically, it uses the name "Song of Moses," e.g., in 15:3, following the LXX (*Odes* 1 and 2 *superscription*; cf. Exod 15:1; Deut 31:22; 32:44), but then it combines different parts of Scripture and new motifs for the song itself (15:3–4).²⁰ So in early Christianity, the reception of Scripture did not necessarily mean the reception of a particular form of the quotations.

Hebrews however leaves every new unveiling (ἀποκάλυψις) aside and has a mistrust in seeing.²¹ Moreover, the author finds his criticism of seeing confirmed already in the Scriptures. As 3:12–4:11 unfolds, the fathers saw (εἶδον) and did not obey (3:7–11 after LXX Ps 94:7–11). That underlines the notion that the major way is to hear (sketched in a history of hearing 2:3). And what is to be heard are known words. Therefore contrary to the Revelation of John, God, Spirit and Christ in Hebrews do not say any new words. Only the framework may be free; the words of God are fixed. The performative act of speaking supports the accuracy in citation in Hebrews; the conviction that God speaks needs quoted words as a strong basis.

A secondary effect is problematic. Not only God and the Spirit speak in the words of Israel's Scriptures, even Christ does. In fact, all of Jesus' statements are scriptural quotations (2:12–13; 10:5–7; cf. LXX Ps 21:23, etc.); the author of

¹⁹ "In David" (Heb 4:7) refers explicitly to LXX Ps 94 (MT 95), where v. 1 (differently from MT Ps 95) says that the Psalm was authored by David. But Hebrews moves this note far from the first quotation of the Psalm in 3:7–11; there it names the Spirit as speaker.

²⁰ See Klaus-Peter Jörens, *Das hymnische Evangelium: Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Funktion und Herkunft der hymnischen Stücke in der Johannesoffenbarung* (SNT 5; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971), 126–32 and the commentaries.

²¹ In Hebrews we find no instance of ἀποκάλυψις, "unveiling, revelation," and very rarely Revelation's favorite expression (καὶ) ἰδοῦ. Cf. also 11:1.

Hebrews abstains from quoting any word of the historical Jesus (despite 5:7 and his focus on the historical Jesus). Thus, the theology of the word of Scripture reaches its peak in the author's Christology. Christ becomes not a Christ of new revelation, but in general the Christ of Scripture. Some research in the last decade has discovered such a Christology of word and Scripture intended to overcome ontological Christology.²² Others wrestle with the lack of Jesus' words. Yet that is not our main concern here.

3. Hebrews and the Text of the Septuagint

3.1 *The Vorlagen of Hebrews*

There is good evidence that our author appreciates written *Vorlagen* where he has them. Above all the quotations from his favorite books, Psalms, the Pentateuch, and Jeremiah are not only frequent, but also very extensive. Jer 38 (MT 31):31–34 in Heb 8:8–12 provides the longest quotation in the Christian literature of the first century on the whole.²³ Heb 3:7–11 (LXX Ps 94:7–11) stands out in length when compared to citations of Psalms in other writings of early Christianity.²⁴ So the conclusion is almost certain that the author possessed and used scrolls of the Psalms and Jeremiah.

Regarding the Pentateuch, the facts are more complex. Our author prefers Genesis (the Melchizedek passage Gen 14:17–20, etc.), Exodus, and Deuteronomy, and probably had access to manuscripts of these books (for peculiarities regarding the text-forms, see below).²⁵ But there is no quotation from Leviticus (including ch. 16), even though our author is very interested in the book and

²² Cf. David Wider, *Theozentrik und Bekenntnis: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Redens Gottes im Hebräerbrief* (BZNW 87; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997); and this author's review in *TLZ* 30 (1999): 166–67.

²³ Cf. Knut Backhaus, *Der Neue Bund und das Werden der Kirche: Die Diatheke-Deutung des Hebräerbriefs im Rahmen der frühchristlichen Theologiegeschichte* (NTAbh n.F. 29; Münster: Aschendorff, 1996), 167–80; and Jörg Frey, "Die Alte und die Neue διαθήκη nach dem Hebräerbrief," in *Bund und Tora: Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition* (ed. F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 263–310.

²⁴ In addition Ps 94:11 brings into Heb 3:11 and 4:3, 5 a special element of LXX grammar, the unusual negation using εἰ; cf. *Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf* §454.6.

²⁵ On Gen 14:17–20, see Heb 7:1–3, etc. We have already considered the most interesting passage in textual reception against MT, i.e., LXX Gen 47:31 in Heb 11:21 (see above §2.2). A third passage, Gen 21:12 in Heb 11:18, allows us to study ancient translation technique: The LXX translates the Hebrew text word for word (ⲙ= ὅτι, ⲛ = ἐν, etc.), and Hebrews takes that over (ὅτι in 11:18, line 1, may be quotation, *contra* NA²⁷).

especially in the day of atonement traditions.²⁶ We must take into account theological reasons to explain this: our author hesitates to quote cultic laws, for in his opinion the (cultic) law is no more than a shadow (σκία) of the things to come (cf. 10:1). The question of whether there was a manuscript of Leviticus cannot, therefore, be decided.

Perhaps we can explain a second surprising gap in a similar way. Hebrews does not offer a single quotation from Ezekiel, even though we would expect a preference for this book with its cultic interests (cf. esp. Ezek 40–48). But the problem surpasses that associated with Leviticus, because we also miss any significant allusions to Ezekiel.²⁷ Therefore, the easiest explanation seems to be here that our author could have both had theological reservations and lacked a manuscript.

Surprisingly, we must be cautious also with Isaiah. Our author loves this prophet; in addition to 2:13 (Isa 8:17–18) and 10:37 (Isa 26:20) we find six allusions.²⁸ But the quotations are short, in 2:13a slightly altered, and in 10:37 disputed (see above).²⁹ Therefore it may be that the author quoted from Isaiah from memory.

Even clearer is the issue with the Minor Prophets. The quotation of (or dense allusion to) Hab 2:3–4 in Heb 10:37–38 contains important peculiarities against all our LXX manuscripts, and also the second quotation, Hag 2:6 in Heb 12:26, differs from the LXX.³⁰ The differences are not necessitated by the context in Hebrews; therefore they are hardly due to redaction. It is just as problematic to explain them as secondary adaptations to the MT (following, for example, a *kaige*-tradition).³¹ Thus, it is nearly certain, that our author lacked a manuscript of the Dodekapropheton and so quoted it from memory.

A last specific feature may be found in the background of Heb 1. The chapter is formed out of a catena containing LXX Ps 2:7(f.), 103:4, 109:1, and other passages (see above). This catena has an important parallel in *1 Clem.* 36. It inverts the order of the Psalms (first LXX Ps 103:4, then Ps 2:7) and leaves out some quotations of Heb 1 (Deut 32:43 / *Odes* 2:43; Pss 44:7–8; 101:26–28; etc.). There are, however, some variants readings in common between them: in

²⁶ See the list of allusions in NA²⁷, 775–76.

²⁷ The eight allusions noted in NA²⁷, 795–96, are of limited importance.

²⁸ Heb 2:16; 5:9; 9:28; 10:27; 12:12; and 13:20.

²⁹ At 2:13a against all known LXX manuscripts of Isa 8:17, ἐγώ is added and the word order is altered. Perhaps the author did so for the embedding into the context of Hebrews.

³⁰ For details see Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger*, 182–87, 190–94 and the commentaries.

³¹ Our passage is missing in the scroll from Naḥal Hever (see Emanuel Tov, Robert A. Kraft, and P. J. Parsons, eds., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever [8HevXIIgr]* [DJD 8; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990]).

Ps 103:4 they have πυρὸς φλόγα, “fire flame,” against the main LXX manuscripts, and in 109:1 they both have ὑποπόδιον, “footstool,” in the sense of ὑποκάτω, “under,” with LXX, but against the usual reception of the Psalm in early Christianity.³² So it is possible that our author in that chapter does not quote directly from a Psalms scroll but used an early Christian testimonium.³³ The loyalty of our author to manuscripts is then broadened; to the older manuscripts we must add later collections of Christological proofs taken from Israel’s Scriptures. However, we should not build too much on a testimonium thesis; the proof for it is not without difficulties (all testimonia of the first century are controversial), and we can write a history of the text without recourse to such a concept.

All in all, Hebrews gives indirect, but informative insight into the distribution of LXX manuscripts: even an author who is orientated strictly to the Scriptures of Israel—as is the case with the author of Hebrews—possessed, at the end of the first century, at most Psalms scrolls and one or two great prophets and in addition, had access to manuscripts of the Torah (the most widespread text of Israel and available in the synagogues). Our concept of “Septuagint” in that time, therefore, must be one of a loose, emerging sampling of texts.

3.2 *Quotations and textual variants of Septuagint*

If we look into the texts, we often find small variants against the critical Septuagint editions (Septuaginta Göttingensis and Rahlfs). Only six (respectively seven) quotations agree with all the main manuscripts of the critical edition (A, B, and S).³⁴ In many cases Hebrews goes with A against B, in others with B against A, in a third set of cases with lesser manuscripts, and about fifteen times it differs from virtually all known LXX manuscripts.³⁵

Numerous variants are more distant from the Hebrew text than the main manuscripts of Septuagint (which are later than Hebrews). In the past, scholars tried to attribute almost all of them to the redaction of the author of Hebrews. But by-and-large, the variants are not necessary for the context and the theology

³² Mark 12:36; Matt 22:44.

³³ Cf. especially, Martin C. Albl, *And Scripture Cannot be Broken: The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections* (NovTSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 201–7.

³⁴ Ps 2:7 in Heb 1:5a and 5:5; 2 Kgdms 7:14 in Heb 1:5b; Ps 109:1 in Heb 1:13; Isa 8:18 in Heb 2:13b (but cf. n. 29 regarding 2:13a); Gen 21:12 in Heb 11:18; and, with vagueness regarding the extra καί, Ps 117:6 in Heb 13:6.

³⁵ See the lists in Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger*, 247–50. Particular variants of Hebrews are found at 1:6, 10, 12; 2:12, 13a; 3:9, 10; 8:8, 9, 10–11; 10:30^{2x}; 12:15, 26; and 13:5.

of Hebrews, and their vocabulary differs from our author's preferred stock of words.

The difficulty of proving redaction is exemplified by the citation of Jer 38:31–34 in Heb 8:8b–12. There we have many variants against the critical, reconstructed Jeremiah text (Septuaginta Göttingensis Ziegler). But a portion of them go with A, a portion with collateral manuscripts, and the remaining are stylistic without being definitely explicable by redaction. As it stands today it is probable that our author took over a *Vorlage* without alteration (but alters the quotation when it is repeated in 10:16 and 17).³⁶

We can broaden the evidence for this conclusion. In the last twenty years, it has been recognized that differences from the MT in manuscripts and quotations often are unaffected by the LXX-redactions that took place around the turn of our era (beginning in the end of the second century B.C.E.³⁷ and continuing till the second century C.E., especially the *kaige*-recension).³⁸ If we draw the conclusion for Hebrews, our author found most of his variants in the manuscripts, and these manuscripts witness collateral, sometimes older lines of the Septuagint.

The argument accords well with the observation made above, that our author did not endeavor to participate in the Proto-MT revisions of his day. Opting to use the Greek text made it easy for the author to employ manuscripts that were at hand, even when they were only revised to a small extent.

A last topic will round off the matter. Jobes has observed phonetic assonance in six of the (as she says) “misquotes” of Heb: 1:7 πνεύματα – φλόγα; 2:12 ἀπαγγελῶ – ἐν μέσῳ; 3:10 ζῆτη – ταύτη; 8:5 πάντα – δειχθέντα; 10:5–7 οὐκ ἠέλησας – οὐκ εὐδόκησας and περὶ ἐμοῦ – θέλημα σου; 13:5 ἀνῶ – ἐγκαταλίπω.³⁹

³⁶ Variants against all or almost all LXX manuscripts are ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον instead of τῷ οἴκῳ in 8:8, ἐποίησα instead of διεθέμην in 8:9, and the omission of αὐτῶν καὶ in 8:11. *Ibid.*, 249, added λέγει instead of φησὶν in v. 9 (and 10). For the state of research see Backhaus, *Der Neue Bund und das Werden der Kirche*, 170–72. He also discusses συντελέσω instead of διαθήσομαι in v. 8 without clear results and gives literature.

³⁷ Cf. *Let. Aris.* 310; and Rösen-Weinhold, “Der Septuaginta-Psalter im Neuen Testament,” 26–28.

³⁸ For more information, see Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich, *La Bible Grecque des Septante: Du Judaïsme Hellénistique au Christianisme Ancien* (2d ed.; Initiations au Christianisme Ancien; Paris: Cerf, 1994), 142–43, 150–61; Emanuel Tov, “The Septuagint,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. J. Mulder; CRINT 2.1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 182–86; Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 142–54; and Siegert, *Zwischen hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament*, 84ff.

³⁹ Karen H. Jobes, “Rhetorical Achievement in the Hebrews 10 ‘Misquote’ of Psalm 40,” *Bib* 72 (1991): 390–92; cf. *idem*, “The Function of Paronomasia in Hebrews 10:5–7,” *TJ ns* 13 (1992): 184 and *passim*.

They affect the Pentateuch (Exod 25:40; Deut 31:6) as well as Psalms (Pss 21:23; 39:7–9; 94:10; 103:4). Three are (fully or partially) supported by other texts that make use of them: Ps 103:4 by 1 Clement, see above §3.1; and Exod 25:40 and Deut 31:6 by Philo, see below §3.4). Elsewhere we cannot find Hebrews's favorite vocabulary.⁴⁰ So again, redaction by our author is unlikely.⁴¹ This phenomenon, rather, highlights a marginal but appealing characteristic of textual transmission: ancient texts were read and dictated aloud. In that way, rhetoric influenced orality and writing. Of course one should check more references in manuscripts to prove the issue finally.

3.3 Quotations and localization of Hebrews

It would be nice if we could learn from the variants something about the textual location of the author Hebrews and the LXX manuscripts that were used. But we have contradictory evidence where Hebrews uses texts of the first century:

Like Philo, Hebrews has an additional πάντα in Exod 25:40, against the MT and the main Septuagint manuscripts.

Exod 25:40	Exod 25:40	Philo, <i>Alleg. Interp.</i> 3.102	Heb 8:5
ועשה בחבניתם אשר־אחה מראה בהר	Ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει	κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει πάντα ποιήσεις	ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει

At first glance one may think of an Alexandrian origin for Hebrews, the more so as some features of the theology of Hebrews are similar to Philo's.⁴² But the differences with Philo are great, even in our verse, and the rest of Hebrews does not confirm the agreement with Philo. Therefore no commentary places Hebrews in Alexandria with certainty.⁴³

⁴⁰ Regarding 2:12, ἀπαγγελῶ is a *hapax legomenon* in Hebrews whereas διηγέισθαι (which the LXX prefers) occurs at 11:32.

⁴¹ *Contra* Jobes in "Rhetorical achievement" and "Function of paronomasia in Hebrews 10:5–7," who assumes that our author has a specific "rhetoric skill" ("Function of paronomasia in Hebrews 10:5–7," 191).

⁴² Regarding textual history some add Gen 2:2 in Heb 4:4 and Philo, *Posterity* 64. Both times we have an additional ὁ θεός. But it stands at different places and is not significant; cf. the criticism by Katz, "Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews," 220. Of more interest is Num 12:7 in Heb 3:5 and Philo, *Leg.* 3.204, 228; both times, against the main LXX manuscripts, πιστός stands at the beginning of the phrase.

⁴³ Only Schunack, *Der Hebräerbrief*, 11 considers it, at all.

This is confirmed by a second textual variant. Here we have a special agreement with Paul, who did not write in Egypt: Heb 10:30 quotes v. 35 of the Song of Moses Deut 32 / *Odes* 2 with the same syntax as Rom 12:19 against the main Septuagint manuscripts; maybe the variant influenced the MT, or maybe it is, unusually for Hebrews, partially Proto-MT:

Deut 32:35	Deut 32:35= <i>Odes</i> 2:35	Rom 12:19 and Heb 10:30
יְהוָה יִשְׁפֹּט וְיִשְׁפֹּט	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω	ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω

There is a hint of Paulinism in Heb 13:23, and in the greetings to some persons from Italy in 13:24. So it is possible that our author wrote near Rome. We cannot decide. But it is clear that Hebrews witnesses to the spreading of textual variants in the Mediterranean region between Alexandria and Rome.

3.4 Hebrews and the reconstruction of Septuagint passages

New Testament quotations are seldom used in the reconstruction of Septuagint passages, because the good transmission of New Testament texts is to a large extent balanced out by the problems of quoting (e.g., incorrect memory, mistakes in the received LXX manuscripts).⁴⁴ Yet with regard to the observations we have made, Hebrews not only gains relevance for our understanding of the transmission of the Septuagint, but sometimes also it may be helpful as a witness to LXX textual traditions. We will offer two examples.

In *Conf.* 166 Philo cites the λόγιον, “word,” of God οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ’ οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω, “I will never leave and never forsake you.” In Heb 13:5 we find exactly the same text.⁴⁵ Yet we lack an exact parallel in our Septuagint traditions. The quotation seems to combine three texts: Deut 31:6, Gen 28:15, and Josh 1:5, with greatest affinity to Deuteronomy.⁴⁶

Philo, <i>Conf.</i> 166 = Heb 13:5	Deut 31:6	Gen 28:15	Josh 1:5
Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ’ οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω	κύριος ὁ θεός [...] οὐ μή σε ἀνή οὐτε μή σε ἐγκαταλίπη	οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω ἕως τοῦ ποιῆσαί με πάντα ὅσα ἐλάλησά σοι	ἔσομαι καὶ μετὰ σοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὐδὲ ὑπερψομαί σε

But is it plausible that Philo and Hebrews developed a combination of three texts in parallel? More likely they both used the same textual form of their

⁴⁴ Cf. Siegert, *Zwischen hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament*, 106–7.

⁴⁵ There introduced by εἶρηκεν, and thus again marked as a quotation of Scripture.

⁴⁶ There the phrase is in addition repeated with small variations in 31:8.

Greek Scripture, a non extant text of probably Deuteronomy (less likely Joshua or Genesis). Since the Hebrew Deuteronomy is rather correctly translated in the main Septuagint text, the variant in Philo and Hebrews shows a collateral text, not the OG.

Psalms 39:7 provides the second example. At this verse, all relevant Greek manuscripts (including Pap. Bodmer 24 [Rahlfs 2110]) render “a body (σῶμα) have you [i.e., God] prepared me (κατηρτίσω μου),” whereas the MT (Ps 40:7) reads “ears (אזניים) have you dug for me.” The text of Heb 10:5 has the same as the major LXX manuscripts (σῶμα κ.τ.λ.). No witness to Hebrews or the LXX has a word for word translation “ears have you dug.”

If we put this issue into the context of the cultures of antiquity, it is easy to explain the new rendering in the LXX and Hebrews: “You (God) dug ears” contradicted the Hellenistic way of thinking (as it does modern thought). The translators evidently bore in mind the target audience, and chose a metonymy that made good sense. They dared to render a new text, even though they were on the whole interested in a faithful translation.

The explanation fits with our knowledge of ancient translators.⁴⁷ However the Rahlfs text contradicts what we know. It gives the priority to the Latin daughter-translation and minor witnesses and reads ὠτία, “ears,” against Hebrews and the main manuscripts of the Septuagint.

Ps 40:7	LXX Ps 39:7, main manuscripts = Heb 10:5	LXX Göttingensis (Rahlfs; La ^G Ga Hex)
זבח ומנחה לא־הפצח אזניים כרית לִי	Θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἤθέλησας, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μου	θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἤθέλησας ὠτία δὲ κατηρτίσω μου

These witnesses alone are not weighty enough to justify adopting ὠτία as original. Thus far unspoken, the common opinion is that Hebrews cites the text in a form altered according to fit its Christology (Christ speaks the Psalm), and then that text influenced the main Septuagint text. Some researchers add that ΣΩΜΑ could be a misreading for ΩΤΙΑ (with Σ from the previous word).⁴⁸ Yet the misreading is too complicated (also the Σ must be doubled), and it is unlikely that Hebrews influenced the Old Testament texts to a great extent; Hebrews was

⁴⁷ Most psalms are translated very precisely, but there are more examples of free renderings, on which see Holger Gzella, *Lebenszeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Eschatologie und Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalter* (BBB 134; Berlin: Philo Verlagsgesellschaft, 2002), 26–29 and passim regarding LXX Pss 15; 16; and 89.

⁴⁸ Masséo Caloz, *Étude sur la LXX Origénienne du Psautier, les Relations entre les Leçons des Psaumes du Manuscrit Coislin 44, les Fragments des Hexaples et le Texte du Psautier Gallican* (OBO 19; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1978).

not wide-spread till the fourth century. Moreover, Hebrews uses σάρξ, “flesh,” (and αἷμα) for the earthly life of Jesus beginning at 2:14 (cf. 5:7), and does so also in our chapter (in the famous v. 20). If the author had corrected the text, we would expect σάρξ.

All in all, a redactional σῶμα in Heb 10:5 is very improbable, even if we cannot solve all problems of the quotation here.⁴⁹ Therefore, we would propose to correct the Psalms text in the coming revision of the Septuaginta Göttingensis according to the main manuscripts (and Hebrews) and to explain the weaker ὠτία as a secondary adaptation to the Proto-MT; that fits with the general process of secondary LXX revisions.

4. An Example for Textual History and Theology: Deuteronomy 32 / Odes 2:43 in Hebrews 1:6

Let us finally take a look at the interdependence of textual history and theology. Hebrews offers some famous examples, such as its treatment of Melchizedek. We will choose an unknown one, however. It concerns Hebrews’s approach to a theology of religions: though the work is addressed predominantly to Gentile Christians (see 6:1; 13:23–25, etc.), it ignores their religious traditions and even avoids using the term ἔθνη, “Gentiles.” How did Hebrews come to this position? The question is worth asking, because the Scriptures of Israel also allowed other options. A considerable openness is perceived by contemporary scholars especially in the Song of Moses, Deut 32, a text used in Hebrews. We will begin with an outline of its history.

4.1 *The Hebrew text of Deuteronomy 32*

In Deut 32:8, 4QDeut¹ (4Q37) reads “children / sons of God” instead of “children of Israel” of the MT. If this reflects—as many contemporary scholars assume—the earliest form of the Song of Moses, we can assume a Hebrew stage of development that acknowledged divine beings as protectors of the Gentile nations.⁵⁰ Schenker has concluded that in that passage, God was described as

⁴⁹ We cannot discuss here the other variants of Heb 10:5–7. Recently, Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 195ff. cogently argue for an original ὠτία. But see the review by James Barr, *RBL*, n.p. [cited 16 January 2003]. Online: <http://www.-bookreviews.org.>; and Rösen-Weinhold, “Der Septuaginta-Psalter im Neuen Testament,” 208–10, against it.

⁵⁰ Cf. Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene C. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible* (San Francisco: Harper, 1999), 191.

“Founder of the world’s Religions,” and granted them something “divine”; the text allowed an open theology of religions.⁵¹

Yet we must be aware of a problem. The interpretation presupposes a parting of the ways in the text’s transmission between v. 8 and v. 43. Verse 43 is lost in 4QDeut¹ but preserved in 4QDeut⁹ (4Q44), which demands that the gods fall down before the one God (instead of “praise, nations, his people,” in the MT). Thus the gods, whose divine status seemed to be acknowledged in v. 8, lose their status in v. 43.

Consequently the version of the text that is open to other religions is confined to one fragment, 4QDeut¹. A correction is provable elsewhere in early Judaism, before the Common Era. There was a tendency to put the divine children of God in charge of the authority of the God of Israel. The MT becomes the last stage of that development. It ignores any gods or divine beings in v. 8 and regards “the bounds of the people” as set “according to the number of the children of Israel” (not divine beings).

4.2 The Greek text

Hellenistic Judaism highly appreciated the Song of Moses and probably handed it down separately (beside Deuteronomy), for we find it also in the *Odes*.⁵² We cannot solve here the problems concerning the double transmission, but be that as it may, in Deuteronomy, as in the *Odes*, the Greek Song of Moses includes two important alterations.⁵³ First, in all extant versions of v. 8, the first reference to “sons of God” becomes “angels of the nations,” installed by the one God.⁵⁴ This was a typical approach to such ideas in early Judaism.⁵⁵ Secondly, v. 39

⁵¹ Adrian Schenker, “Gott als Stifter der Religionen der Welt: Unerwartete Früchte der textgeschichtlichen Forschung,” in *La Double Transmission du Texte Biblique: Études d’histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman and C. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 99 (quotation) and 102.

⁵² For Philo, it is the “great” song in Scripture; cf. especially det. 114 and post. 121.

⁵³ For a fuller discussion of the double transmission of the song, see Karrer, “Der Weltkreis und Christus, der Hohepriester.”

⁵⁴ According to Hanhart, in v. 8 the OG (LXX) reads ἄγγελοι θεου (Robert Hanhart, “Die Söhne Israels, die Söhne Gottes und die Engel in der Masora, in Qumran und in der Septuaginta,” in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik: Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* [ed. C. Bultmann et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002], 171–73, with Rahlfs, against John W. Wevers, *Deuteronomium* [Septuaginta 3.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977]). For angels of the nations, cf. Dan 10:13, 20–21; 12:1; and maybe Sir 17:17. Later sources are mentioned in Michael Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 257–62.

⁵⁵ Which no longer sees the transcendental “sons of God” as gods, but as angels: Cf. Ps 82:6; Job 1:6–12; 2:1–6; 38:7 and the sons of heaven in texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls,

shows in all Greek manuscripts an absolute divine self-predication (clarifying the Hebrew text): “I am He, and there is no God apart from me.”

Verse 43 follows the Hebrew precisely. We read (according to the *Odes* that are nearer to Hebrews): “Rejoice, heavens, with him, and let all the angels (!) of God worship him (the one God of v. 39).”

Deut 32:43 (abridged)	<i>Odes</i> 2:43 (abridged) (underlined: difference over against Deut 32)	Deut 32 / <i>Odes</i> 2:43 in Heb 1:6
εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ Rejoice, ye heavens, with him [God], ⁵⁶	εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ Rejoice, ye heavens, with him [God],	
καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ and let all <u>sons</u> of God worship him;	καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ and let all the <u>angels</u> of God worship him;	καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ and let all <u>angels</u> of God worship him.
εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people,	εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people,	
καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ and let all <u>angels</u> of God strengthen it ⁵⁷	καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ and let all <u>sons</u> of God strengthen it	

The result is as simple as clear. Those who stand above the nations cannot be regarded as gods, but only as guardian angels, subordinated to the one God who assigned them to the nations. Therefore, they need to fall down worshipping before the one God. Indeed, there emerges an interaction with the nations, but it lacks openness towards their religions. The one God does not tolerate belief in

esp. 1QS XI, 20 (=4Q264 XI, 8). On this see further Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 166ff., 192–93.

⁵⁶ There is a change of speaker between vv. 42 and 43 (LXX and *Odes*). Previously, God was speaking, now it is Moses.

⁵⁷ The construction of ἐνισχύειν with a dative is unusual, but possible (cf. Hos 10:11). Thus, αὐτῷ, “it,” in our line is best understood as referring to τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, “his [God’s] people” (with Hanhart, “Die Söhne Israels, die Söhne Gottes und die Engel,” 175 n. 7). The alternative translation, “and let all angels of God strengthen themselves in him,” is less probable.

other gods or divine beings. The nations have reason to rejoice, but only in the one God, who gives strength to the angels so that they are able to invigorate his people (this is the most probable interpretation of Deut 32 LXX).⁵⁸ Or the nations may even have to rejoice in the strength that the one God gives to his people through the children of Israel, who are his own children (thus v. 43 in the *Odes*, if a difference is made there between angels and children of God; otherwise we have the same meaning as in LXX Deuteronomy). In summary, the Hellenistic Jewish Diaspora does not use the Song of Moses to increase openness towards religions, but modifies it in order to invalidate them.

Other examples of early Jewish reception confirm this picture, especially *Jub.* 15:31–32 and LXX Ps 96:6. In the latter we find the short and sharp contrast: where gods worshipped in the MT, now the angels worship, and any permission to venerate idols and images vanishes.

LXX Ps 96:7 (parallels to the Song of Moses underlined) (cf. the underlined text and Heb 1:6)

<p>αἰσχυνθήτωσαν πάντες οἱ προσκυνούντες τοῖς γλυπτοῖς οἱ ἐγκαυχώμενοι ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν <u>προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι</u> <u>αὐτοῦ</u></p>	<p>Let all worshipers of carved images be put to shame, those who make their boast in their idols. <u>All his</u> <u>angels worship him!</u> [the Lord: see v. 1:5].</p>
---	--

4.3 The reception in Hebrews

The author of Hebrews takes up this line and connects it with Christology.⁵⁹ In 1:6 we read:

Heb 1:6

<p>ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει· Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.</p>	<p>and again, when he [God] brings the firstborn into the inhabited world,⁶⁰ he says: And let all the angels of God worship him.</p>
---	---

⁵⁸ If one prefers the alternative translation, “and let all angels of God strengthen themselves in him,” another possible meaning emerges: The nations have reason to rejoice, but only in the one God, who gives strength to the angels so that they are able to protect them.

⁵⁹ Perhaps imparted by an early Christian *testimonium* (see above §3.1).

⁶⁰ Another possible translation, preferred by many exegetes, but less likely, is: “but when he [God] brings the firstborn into the world again.”

Other Gods are ignored. Instead, angels of the one God are responsible for the nations of the world. Thus our author opts for a kind of religious exclusivism without developing it anew or giving a reason for it. The position is—as he sees it—already included in the quoted text of Scripture.

The main interest moves to Christology: the Son is so great when he is brought into the inhabited world (the οἰκουμένη) that even the angels of the nations must fall down on their knees before him.⁶¹ Nevertheless, the exclusivist position does not moderate, as becomes clear at 12:15, which contains an allusion to Deut 29:17 LXX. According to that verse devotion to foreign gods would be like the shooting up of a bitter root. Hebrews implicitly gives the old religions of his readers a negative critique.

The problems in this development are obvious. In the textual history of the Song of Moses the once open perspective narrows, and Hebrews fails to widen the horizon in its Christological use. Modern hermeneutics, therefore, must look for a correction to that perspective through other texts and traditions. But that charge goes beyond our task here.

5. Conclusion

We could give only a rough sketch of the many aspects regarding the Septuagint reception in Hebrews, and some of the considerations surely remain matters for dispute. Yet, some insights seem to be relevant not only for understanding Hebrews, but also exemplify a change in our understanding of scriptural quotations in general. Until recently, it might not have been considered adequate to take seriously the New Testament quotations in the inquiry of the Septuagint, and vice versa to examine the details of text history and the original contexts of scriptural quotations in New Testament studies. However, we are in a process of recognizing anew the history of manuscripts and texts; the New Testament quotations make their contribution to it. Parallel to this development, we detect evidence of the history of theology behind the textual history, and again the New Testament plays a role in that. All in all the complexity of quotations calls for close attention, because it helps us to understand the textual and the theological history of early Judaism and the beginnings of New Testament theology.

⁶¹ Οἰκουμένη refers to οἶκος, “house,” and is of special importance to political ideologies beginning in Ptolemaic times. (PSI 5, 541,7; for first century C.E. texts [Claudius, Nero, etc.] see Otto Michel, “ἡ οἰκουμένη,” *TWNT* 5:159–61). Thus Heb indirectly criticizes not only pagan religions, but also contradicts the worship of ruler cults.