

Some observations about the *Vorlage* of Ps 8:5-7 in Heb 2:6-8¹

G J Steyn
(University of Pretoria)

ABSTRACT

Some observations about the *Vorlage* of Ps 8:5-7 in Heb 2:6-8

The following observations relate only to one of the approximately 30 explicit quotations to be found in Hebrews and is part of a broader project on the nature of the Vorlage of these quotations. The focus in this investigation is more of a text critical than a hermeneutical nature. It is rather on establishing the origin and text form of the text used by the unknown author of Hebrews than on the interpretation of the quotation itself within the broader context. Regarding the origin of the quotation from Ps 8:5-7 in Heb 2:6-8, it is clear from the investigation that the author of Hebrews probably knew the quotation already via the tradition, but that he quoted a longer section and that some conscious changes were made during the process of his application and re-interpretation of the quotation in its new context. The link with Ps 110(109):1 was already made prior to Hebrews. The author did not share a testimony book with Paul for this combination, but knew the combination either via Paul or independently from Paul via the tradition. Regarding the text form of the quotation, it becomes clear that it closely resembles the reading of our reconstructed LXX.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The problem

The late first century AD document, *Ad Hebraeos*, is the book in the New Testament which quotes the most from what we know today as the Old Testament. However, the *Vorlage* of these approximately 30 explicit quotations is to date an unresolved matter. This relates especially to the particular *version* being used (LXX, Hebrew, or neither). But it also relates to the *origin* and the *selection* of

1 This is a revised form of a paper read at the Doktoranden- und Habilitandenkolloquium at the Humboldt Universität in Berlin on 10 January 2003, and at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität in Münster on 16 January 2003.

passages, as well as to the *interpretation* of the quotations in Hebrews.

1.1.1 Previous studies are dated

The few specialized and in-depth studies which were conducted on the quotations in Hebrews, although very thorough and in many ways still valid, are now dated, e.g. those of Kistemaker (1961) and Schröger (1968). Not only has more research been done in the mean time and been published in journal articles and commentaries relating to the quotations in Hebrews (cf, for instance, the text-critical contribution of Cadwallader 1992:257-292), but also newer text-critical editions on both the New Testament text as well as the LXX (Göttingen edition) have become available. This becomes clear when one compares the analysis of Schröger on Heb 4:4 - where Gn 2:2 is quoted - with the later LXX text-critical edition of Genesis regarding the presence of $\epsilon\eta$ in the LXX. It also becomes clear when one compares the analysis of Kistemaker on Heb 11:18 – where Gn 21:12 is quoted – with the presence of $\omicron\tau\iota$ in the LXX.

1.1.2 Importance of Dead Sea Scrolls

The texts that were found amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls must also be taken into account – particularly regarding the Psalter, from which about one third of the explicit quotations in Hebrews were taken (Kistemaker 1961:14; Kistemaker 1984:9; Koch 1999:465). Some of them, such as 11QPs, is of little use here as none of the Psalms quoted in Hebrews preserved amongst the 41 canonical Psalms is found there. However, the relation between the text readings found amongst the Dead Sea scrolls and that of the quotations in Hebrews needs much more attention. (For an overview of studies in this regard, see Gräßer 1964:171-176; Bruce 1962/3:217-232; Batdorf 1972:16-35; Wilcox 1988:647-656). How do we explain, for instance, the fact that the subject matter of Heb 1:1-5 agrees closely with that of 4QFlorilegia (now known as 4QMidrEschat), that three of the seven texts quoted there overlap with Hebrews (2 Sam 7:10-14; Is 8:11 and Ps 2:7) and that Ps 45:1-2 is also quoted in the Dead Sea Scrolls? But apart from the Psalter, what do we do with the striking prominence of the Melchizedek motif between 11QMelch and Hebrews? Although one might differ on the detail of some similarities as briefly pointed out by De Waard, one ought to take note of the special affinity to the Dead Sea Scrolls that is shown by Hebrews (De Waard 1965:81-82. Cf. also Attridge 1989:28-29;

Bruce 1985:li; Weiss 1991:381). Add to all this the fact that amongst all the known early rabbinical literature (such as the Mishnah), the Hebrew equivalents of the introductory formulae in the NT are found in greater abundance in the Qumran literature (Fitzmyer 1968:253; Terry 1975:504; Metzger 1951:297-307) and that Hebrews shows close affinities in methodology with the *midrash-pesher* method of commentary on his quotations.

1.2 The focus

What is presented here, is one small step in the quest for the *Vorlage* of the explicit quotations in Hebrews. As the author of Hebrews quotes from the Psalms, the Torah and the Prophets, it would make sense to start the journey focusing on the quotations within those collections themselves, rather than to follow the author's order slavishly – particularly if a reconstruction of the *Vorlage* is the goal of this investigation. Only later in the journey will the next steps follow when the particular combinations, the interpretation within the broader context and the author's own explanations of his quotations are discussed. Given the fact that about half of all the quotations were taken from the Psalter, as well as the fact that *Ad Hebraeos* opens (1:5) and ends (13:6) with quotations from the Psalms, it also seems logical to begin the first steps on our journey within the Book of the Psalms.

1.3 Grouping the quotations

In a preliminary survey of the explicit quotations encountered in Hebrews, it became clear that the quotations can be grouped in three ways. The *first group* consists of quotations that the author found already in use by his tradition. He uses the same quotations, but sometimes quotes longer and comments on the quotations presented (eg Ps 8:5-7 in Heb 2:6-9). The *second group* represents possible knowledge of a quotation used in the tradition, but the author himself chose to quote from another part or section of the same passage (eg Ps 2:7 in Heb 1:5). The *third group* represents quotations which are not to be found anywhere in the existing Jewish or early Christian literature which pre-dates Hebrews (eg Ps 40:7-9 in Heb 10:5b-7). Many of these are long quotations including the longest in the NT, that of Jeremiah 31 in Hebrews 8. It can be assumed, fairly safely, that the selection and origin of these quotations can be attributed to the author of Hebrews.

2 PSALM 8

2.1 Background regarding Psalm 8

Ps 8 was probably compiled in the late first half of the second century BC (Kaiser 1994:215). It has as heading in the LXX: Eij- to; telo~, upe~r tw~n lhnw~n: yalmo~ tw/ Daid. It belongs to the group of Pss which prefers speaking of “the Lord” (*Yahweh*) rather than of “God” (*Elohim*). (Similar also Soggin (1971:570): “im sonst jahwistischen Psalm kann Elohim nicht ‘Gott’ heissen, wie ‘A, S, Q es möchten“). The LXX, though, translated *Elohim* as “angels”. Siegert confirmed this: “Überall, wo *elohim* eine Mehrzahl meint, ändert die Septuaginta interpretierend ab entweder in uibi; Qeou oder in abgeloi: so Ps 8,6; 89(88),7; 138(137),1“ (2001:172). This is the same reading that is used in Heb 2:7. West lists Ps 8 as one of those sacred (cultic) songs, one which he describes as a “hymn”, of which the object was simply to sing praise to God (West 1981:35,442; Dalglish 1984:34). It praises the Lord’s glory and his creation. Seybold sees Ps 8 as the third most important statement in the OT on the position of humanity within the created order, after the *Imago-Dei* text of Gn 1:26ff and the Yahwistic cornerstone in Gn 2:7 (Seybold 1990:153). In fact, interesting intertextual connections are to be found between Ps 8:5, Ps 144:3 (143:4 LXX) and Job 7:17-18 which all have similar readings. The same applies to Ps 8:6a when it is compared with Gn 1:26ff (as an exposition of the priestly anthropology by the poet). In the words of Kaiser (1994:208): “Der Mensch ist gewiß gottähnlich, aber damit eben nicht gottgleich”. It also applies to Ps 8:7 in comparison with Gn 1:26b,28b. Kaiser says of this: “Dem Menschen ist das *dominium terrae* übergeben” (1994:209; see also Görg 1986:125-148). Hawthorne even sees a possible “blending” of Gn 3:15 with Ps 8:6 and/or Ps 110(109):1 in Rm 16:20 (Hawthorne 1993:866).

2.2 Psalm 8 in the early Jewish and early Christian pre-Hebrews tradition

There are no explicit quotations from Ps 8:5-7 to be found in the early Jewish literature. However, allusions to Ps 8:5 and 8:7 occur in 1QS3,17-18 and 11:20 (McLean 1992:67). Turning to early christianity, it is clear that Ps 8 was known and used in early christianity. The following occurrences serve as evidence:

A possible conflation is suggested in Mk 12:36 between Ps 8:7 and Ps 110(109):1 with the presence of $\omega\text{pok}\alpha\text{t}\omega$ in the Markan reading being taken as evidence for this possibility (Luz 1968:344-5; Breytenbach 1997:197-222).

Paul quotes Ps 8:7 explicitly in 1 Cor 15:27, and so does the author of Eph 1:22. Both readings are identical and no textual variations amongst the witnesses are to be found in either of these readings. It is specifically quoted in an *eschatological* manner (Koch 1986:287; Gräßer 1992b:164) with a christological application or interpretation in both instances (Schröger 1968:82; Hawthorne 1993:12). Both are also preceded and combined with Ps 110(109):1, and both are followed by a short exegetical commentary. After the failure of the first Adam, all things are subjected to the second Adam “who triumphs through obedience, and fulfils the destiny of race” (Kirkpatrick 1906:36; Van den Brink 1993b:212; Girdwood 1997).

Apart from the explicit quotations in the NT, the only possible reference (according to NA27) referring to verse 4 of Ps 8, is to be found in Rm 1:20.

Ps 8:3 is also explicitly quoted in Mt 21:16 by Jesus in connection with himself with no textual variations amongst the witnesses.

Hengel found an underlying christological template which corresponds with the early christological hymns (Hengel 1980:9).

A papyrus-fragment was found (Papyrus Wien Nr. 180) containing Ps 8:2 as a writing exercise of a pupil, probably from the Christian era. It indicates how the Psalter took over the same function as Homer had in the past for such exercises (Siegert 2001:97).

Hebrews’ use and application of Ps 8 builds on this early Christian tradition in the sense that (a) it is used again by the author, (b) it is again linked with Ps 110(109):1, and (c) it is again briefly commented upon. Koch pointed out that it is less likely that both Paul and the author of Hebrews independently found the quotation from Ps 8:7. (The same also applies to Hab 2:4). Neither can literary dependency on Paul by Hebrews be proved (Kistemaker 1961:29), nor pre-Pauline christian usage of both quotations (Kistemaker 1961:29; contra Dodd 1953:33). It was usually assumed in the past that Ps 8:7 had already acquired a traditional christological interpretation. However, according to Koch, one should rather assume that Ps 8:7 (and Hab 2:4) found an established place *through Paul* in the chris-

tian tradition, and that the author of Hebrews took this up and reworked it independently. This is supported by the fact that Hebrews quotes every time a larger section than Paul (Koch 1986: 244-5).

Ps 8 is a song which probably was compiled from two tradition elements, the first is found in verses 2-3, the second in verses 4-9 (Kaiser 1994:207; Beyerlin 1976:1-22). This would mean that the quotation from Ps 8:3 in Mt 21:16 comes from the first element whilst the other NT writers (Paul and the authors of Ephesians and Hebrews) quoted from the second tradition element of Ps 8. The author of Hebrews quotes almost the whole of the second element, i.e. verses 5-7. Schematically, the situation could be presented as follows:

Ps 8:3	Ps 8:5	Ps 8:6	Ps 8:7
			[+ Ps 110(109):1 = Mk 12:36 ??]
			+ Ps 110(109):1 = 1 Cor 15:27
			+ Ps 110(109):1 = Eph 1:22
Mt 21:16			
	Heb 2:6	Heb 2:7	Heb 2:8

2.3 The combination of Ps 110(109):1 and Ps 8:7

The motif of everything which is submitted under the feet (Heb 2:8), reminds immediately of Ps 110(109):1 where the enemies become a footstool for the king (Pryor 1981:45; Lane 1998). This might actually have been the link which was made between the two passages and might explain why they were combined in the tradition so that Ps 110(109):1 and Ps 8:7 were quoted in close connection with each other in the early Christian tradition. Going back to Paul, it was pointed out that his quotation from Ps 8:7 in 1 Cor 15:27 was preceded by Ps 110(109):1 in 15:25. A similar phenomenon occurred in Eph 1:20-22 where Ps 110(109):1 is alluded to before the actual quotation from Ps 8:7 follows in Eph 1:22. Also here in Hebrews the last quotation cited before the quotation from Ps 8:5-7 in Heb 2:6-8, was the quotation from Ps 110(109):1 in Heb 1:13 (Kistemaker 1961:29; Lindars 1961:50-1, 168-9; Loader 1977/8:209-213; Attridge 1989:72; Weiss 1991:194; Gräber 1990:117; Gräber 1992a:192; Fensham 1998). According to Erich Gräber, Hebrews

stands with its demolishing of the *diabolos* doubtlessly in the tradition of old liturgical material, supported by the application of Ps 110 (109):1 and Ps 8:7 that acknowledge the submission of powers to the exalted Christ in the sense of the hellenistic acclamation (1992a:192). This combination of Ps 110(109):1 and Ps 8:7 which already existed in the tradition (Weiss 1991:194; Gräßer 1990:117), supports the link between Heb 1:13 and 2:6ff (Luz 1968:343; Brandenburger 1962:235; Gräßer 1992a:192).

Some also see this combination being alluded to in passages such as Phil 3:21 and 1 Pt 3:22 (Gräßer 1992a:192; Lane 1998; Weiss 1991:194). The former of these is then similar to the declaration made in 1 Cor 15:27 and is built upon Ps 8:7 (Hawthorne 1993:264). Moving to 1 Clement, one finds the same recurring phenomenon with the combination of Ps 110(109):1 and Ps 8:7 (1 Clem 36:4-5).

This raises again the question about the existence of a possible list of quotations, some sort of testimonia, similar to the list encountered in 4Q174. Evidence for the existence and use of such a written list of proof texts does not convince (Karrer 2002:169). The least that one could say, though, is that we are dealing here with “a common exegetical tradition upon which Christian writers drew” (Lane 1998).

3 PSALM 8:5-7 IN HEBREWS 2:6-8

Ps 2:7 served to substantiate the *exalted* position of the divine Son (“Son of God”) in Heb 1:5 and 5:5. The quotation from Ps 8:5-7, however, is used to show how the earthly Jesus was made *inferior* to the angels (“Son of Man”) for a short while in Heb 2:6-8. The author of Hebrews shifts in his argumentation from proving that Jesus is far above the angels, to a position where he explains now how “it came about that he had appeared as a man, and was known as a human being” (Clements 1985:39). Barth already pointed to the fact that, except for John’s Gospel, no other book of the New Testament “puts the real deity and true humanity of Jesus Christ so clearly side by side” (Barth 1962:58). Ps 8, which expresses the exalted position of man in relation to the angels, is now almost ironically used to point to the inferior position of Jesus in relation to the angels. The “Son” who is now the reflection of the glory of God (Heb 1:3), was demoted to the state of a human being.

The quotation from Ps 8:5-7 is the first quotation encountered in Hebrews where the author presents a brief explanation, an exegetical exposition or commentary, on the passage that he quoted. More cases of similar expositions of the Scripture quoted by him, would be encountered later in his work, eg when he quotes Ps 96(95) and comments on it in Heb 3:7-4,11 and when he quotes Ps 40 in Heb 10:5-10. This methodology shows some resemblances with the *pesher* method as found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Weiss 1991:194; Schröger 1968:25, 258, 260). As the question posed here is primarily a tradition historical one, this study will concentrate only on the explicit quotation from Ps 8 itself in Heb 2:6-8a and not on the author of Hebrew's commentary in Heb 2:8b-9.

3.1 Adaptation of the quotation in Hebrews

The author starts his quotation with the opening words of a rhetorical question: *tiv eĵtin* (2:6). This surely appealed to him given his stylistic abilities and preferences – also towards rhetorical questions in his argumentation. This is the way in which he opened his catena of seven quotations in 1:5 (*tini gar – kai; palin*) and this is the way in which he ended it in 1:13 (*pro; tina ...*).

3.1.1 Introductory formula

Heb 2:6 is one of two places in Hebrews (the other being Heb 4:4) where a vague reference to Scripture with *pouw* is given in the introductory formula (*diemarturato deŵ pouw ti" legwn*). Apart from these two vague references with *pouw* and a third similar one without *pouw* in Heb 7:17, are similar indefinite references not to be found elsewhere in the NT (Westcott 1974:96; Metzger 1975:301; Gräber 1990:115; Schröger 1968:253, 273). However, this was a well-known manner in which quotations were introduced in hellenistic Judaism (Weiss 1991:279). Although the phenomenon is well-represented by Philo (*Deus*. 16.1, 74; *Profug.* 36.1; *Congr.* 31.1, 176; *Ebr.* 61; *Plant.* 90, 138; *Agr.* 51; *Conf.* 39; *Somn.* 1,150. See also Clement of Rome's *ad Cor.* 1.15; *Epist.* 15,2; 21,2; 26,2; 28,2; 42,5), is it not the rule but rather the exception (Gräber 1990:115), and the occurrences are taken as Alexandrianisms (Schröger 1968:273). Also the Mishna made use of this indefinite formula in Nazir 9:5 (“*But was it not once said...?*”) and Sotah 6:3 (“*and elsewhere it says...*”) (Metzger 1951:301; Schröger 1968:273). Instead of translating the particle *pouw* in Heb 4:4 in a local sense with “*somewhere*”, a better translation would probably be to rather translate it in a

general sense with “*as we know*” or “*to quote familiar words*” (Westcott 1974:96; Bruce 1985:75).

Neither the specific place of the reference in Scripture, nor the human author of it is important for the author of Hebrews. The speaker’s identity therefore remains here indefinite (Attridge 1989: 70). The Word is spoken word, i.e. living word, and the authority of the quoted words are contained rather in the words themselves (Müller 1986:238). In the words of Lane: “Precisely because it is God who speaks in the OT, the identity of the person through whom he uttered his word is relatively unimportant. A vague allusion is sufficient” (Lane 1998). This is a typical characteristic of the author of Hebrews. All the quotations are connected to God, to the Holy Spirit, or to the Son. Human authors do not feature here. The exception is 4:7 which has David as author of Ps 95, but even in this instance Ps 95 was quoted already before and connected to the Holy Spirit (3:7). No wonder that the author himself made no effort to ensure that future readers would know who he is. Simultaneously, though, exactly this feature reveals a fundamental aspect of the author’s character.

3.1.2 Comparision of the text readings of Ps 8:5-7 with Heb 2:6-8

The text of Ps 8:3-9 survived, amongst others, in the third century AD papyrus P.Mich. inv.22 (1588, or earlier P.Mich. III.133; 101 by Van Haelst 1976:101-2; AT 48 by Aland 1976:113; 2067 by Rahlfs). A comparison between the available Hebrew and Greek texts of Ps 8:5-7 with that of Heb 2:6-8 looks as follows:

Ps 8:5-7 (MT)	Ps 8:5-7 (LXX)	Ps 8:5-7 (P.Mich.III.133)	Heb 2:6-8
v/na0 Ahm; 5 Wnr;Kz0ti AyKi yKi µda; A=bW . Wndq0]ti Wnr0j] Tj" 6 f [M] µyhil 00ne d/bkw0 rdhw0 . Wnr0F] [T] Whl 0v0m]T' 7 yca[mB] 0ydy; hT;v' I K0 . wyl g00' Atj 't'	5 tiv e]stin a]qrwpo", o]ti mimnh]skh/auj]tou, h]uib;" a]qrwpou, o]ti episkepth/auj]toy 6 h]l ait]wsa" au]ton bracu]ti par]f aj]ggelou", do]xh/ kai; tim]h/ e]stefan]wsa" au]ton, 7 kai; kate]st]hsa" au]ton e]pi; ta; e]rga tw]n ceirw]n sou, panta up]et]axa" up]okatw tw]n podw]n au]toy,	ti es[tin an][qrwpo]c oti [mim]nh[skh] autou h ui[o-] [anqrwp]ou [oti] episkepth aut[o]n [hl at][tws]a[- au]t[on] bracu ti par ag[g]elou~ [do]xh kai] t[im]h e[s]tefan]wsa~ auto[n] [kai katest]h[s]a~ auton epi ta erga tw]n [ceirw]n so]u panta upetaxa~ [upokatw tw]n [p]odwn autou	tiv e]stin a]qrwpo" o]ti mimnh]skh/auj]tou, h]uib;" a]qrwpou o]ti episkepth/auj]ton0 7 h]l ait]wsa" au]ton bracu]ti par]f aj]ggelou", do]xh/ kai; tim]h/ e]stefan]wsa" au]ton, 8 panta up]et]axa" up]okatw tw]n podw]n au]toy.

There is not enough evidence to accept any of the following minor changes present amongst the LXX witnesses and none of them are confirmed by the reading of P.Mich III 133 (see Winter 1936:4-6 for the text): V.6: A reads do]xh/ kai; tim]hn (*sic*); R reads do]xan kai; tim]hn and La^G reads *gloriam et honorem*. V.7: The article ta] is placed before panta] by Sa Sy. The article tw]n is omitted before ceirw]n by B.

3.1.3 The choice between tiv or tiv-

Some witnesses to the LXX (A and 12 minuscles) read at the beginning of Ps 8:5 the initial interrogative not as tiv (“*what*”), but as tiv- (“*who*”). The former is the correct translation of the Hebrew and attested by B (Thomas 1964/5:323; Attridge 1989:71; Gräber

1990:116). This change in the LXX was probably done later due to a christological understanding of the Psalm (1990:116).

In Heb 2:6 the text as in NA27 with $\tau\iota\nu$ is supported by a A B D. Other witnesses read here $\tau\iota\upsilon$: \mathfrak{P}^{46} C* P 81. 104. 1881. 2495 *pc d* *vg^{mss} bo*. Zuntz suggested a reading where $\alpha\eta\eta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\sim$ is read as $\alpha\eta\eta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\sim$ and $\eta\lambda$ (“*or*”) as $\eta\lambda$ (“*indeed*”). This would allow for a meaningful reading which starts with $\tau\iota\upsilon$ instead of $\tau\iota\nu$ (Zuntz 1953:71, summarised by Attridge 1989:71). This proposed reading is, however, weak. Ellingworth has convincingly argued against this viewpoint (2000:148). It is also rejected by Kistemaker (1961:29) and Attridge (1989:71). Thomas reckoned that this latter reading “originated by a Christian scribe to emphasize the messianic interpretation and application to Jesus” (Thomas 1964/5:323). Weiss is of the opinion that the change from $\tau\iota\nu$ to $\tau\iota\upsilon$ can be explained from the LXX text tradition itself, which is the reading of Ps 8:5a in Codex A (LXX) (1991:194). Attridge holds a similar viewpoint and sees the change to be due to “a scribal correction to bring the verse into conformity to the LXX text-type represented in A (Attridge 1989:71). Rösen-Weinhold, in turn, suspects that the *epsilon* of the following $\epsilon\lambda\tau\iota\nu$ could have been easily confused with a *sigma* which could have resulted in either the inclusion or exclusion of *sigma* (2002:197).

During a personal discussion on this matter (March 2003), Barbara Aland was of the opinion that the change in \mathfrak{P}^{46} should not be taken too seriously. The papyrus represents a hand which wrote fairly quickly and not always with mechanical correctness. Interesting is, though, that \mathfrak{P}^{46} originally also read $\tau\iota\upsilon$ instead of $\tau\iota\nu$ between $\beta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon$ and $\rho\alpha\rho\eta$. It was, however, shortly afterwards corrected – probably even by the same hand as the one that wrote \mathfrak{P}^{46} .

The choice could thus rather be made towards $\tau\iota\nu$, which is well supported by the strong external evidence of a A and B.

3.1.4 Omission of $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\sim\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\alpha\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\tau\omega\nu\kappa\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu\varsigma\omicron\upsilon$

None of the LXX witnesses testify to the possible omission of the phrase $\kappa\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\sim\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\alpha\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\tau\omega\nu\kappa\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu\varsigma\omicron\upsilon$ and all the available texts include it. The same applies to Eusebius (*Commentaria in Psalmos* 23:37 and 23:48), John Chrysostom (*Scr. Eccl. Prooemia in Psalmos* (fragmenta) 55:3), John Philoponus (*De opi-*

ficio mundi 25) and Theodoret (*Scr.Eccl., Theol: Interpretatio in Psalmos* 80:28) who all included it in their discussions on the Psalms - which means that it had been included in their texts. Some NT witnesses too *include* it: (a A C D* P Y 0121b. 0243. 0278. 6. 33. 81. 104. 181. 330. 365. 629. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464. *al* lat (sy^{p.h**}) co arm eth) (Cadwalader 1992:263). Origen (who first quotes Heb 2:9), included the phrase as if his version of the text of Hebrews contained it: *Dokh/ kai; timh/ eġstefanwsa~ auġton kai; kateġthsa~ auġton epi; ta; eġga twġ ceirwġ sou* (*Selecta in Psalmos* 12:25). The same applies to John Chrysostom (*Scr.Eccl. In epistulam ad Hebraeos, Homiliae* 1-34. 63:40) and Theodoret (*Scr.Eccl., Theol: Interpretationin xiv epistulas sancti Pauli* 82:1) who repeat the complete quotation from Ps 8:5-7 in their expositions on Hebrews, by including the phrase under discussion. The external evidence thus prefer the inclusion, which was probably made afterwards due to scribal enlargement and in order to agree with the LXX reading (Metzger 1975:663; Weiss 1991:194; Schröger 1968:80; Attridge 1989:69). The later Coptic translation, which did the same, is a case in point. Ahlborn is of the opinion that the phrase belonged to the original reading in Hebrews. He lists three arguments for his assumption: (a) the fact that it is not a common feature of the author's style to omit parts of a quotation, (b) there are no clear theological reasons for its omission, and (c) the *parallelismus membrorum* would be broken by the omission (1966:117). Ellingworth pointed out, however, that the argument of breaking the parallelism in the Psalm is not convincing as the author of Hebrews does this in anyway in other places, as in Heb 10:7 where he quotes Ps 40:8a and in Heb 10:17 where he quotes Jer 31:34 (Ellingworth 2000:148).

The *omission* of this phrase, though, is supported by a few other important witnesses too (P⁴⁶ (Chester Beatty, folio 22) B D² M¹ vg^{mss}). Text critics quite rightly prefer the omission of the phrase in their reconstruction of the Hebrews text, including NA27. Especially the weight of the second century Chester Beatty papyrus (P⁴⁶) and the fact that it is the shorter textual reading, are important text-critical considerations here. The internal evidence also supports the omission. A closer look at the author's commentary (2:8b-9) reveals that the last three phrases of the quotation are commented upon, without any reference to the phrase under debate here. The question is then: why did the author of Hebrews omit this phrase? It could

have been a conscious omission based on the content and meaning of the phrase. Or it might have been a non-conscious omission due to the reading of his *Vorlage*, or to a parablepsis made by the author.

Looking at the possibilities for a *non-conscious* exclusion of the phrase, it is important to consider the following: according to the surviving evidence at our disposal, it is highly unlikely that the author's *Vorlage* had already contained the omission of this phrase. There are no textual witnesses to Ps 8 that testify to its exclusion. It is thus fairly certain that all the OT versions included the phrase and that the *Vorlage* at the disposal of the author to the Hebrews contained the phrase as well. The only possibility that is left, is therefore, that the author might have left the phrase out due to a possible parablepsis. However, the linguistic criteria to argue in favour of a parablepsis do not apply here, as the omission does not start and end with the same (or a similar) word which could have resulted in the jump of the eye.

This leaves us then – in good company - with the option of a *conscious* omission of the phrase by the author of Hebrews himself (Pryor 1981:45; Attridge 1989:69, 71; Weiss 1991:194; Van den Brink 1993a:206; Rösen-Weinhold 2002:197; Schunack 2002:33). But why would he do it? The principle of the author quoting shorter is possibly not foreign to the author of Hebrews. Possible examples might be his condensed versions of OT passages in Heb 7:1f., 10:6f., and the omission of three lines from the quotation of Dt 32:35f. in Heb 10:30 (Ellingworth 2000:148). It is clear that the omitted phrase here in Hebrews 2 describes human reign and man's dominion status in God's creation (Görg 1986:125-148; Steck 1982:221-231). The phrase would then stand against the author of Hebrews' overall argument which he actually made here, namely that Jesus was made lower than the angels. Because the argument then runs along the lines of Jesus' inferiority, the omitted phrase does not fit in the broader argument and is thus left out. Attridge argued along similar lines when he stated that the omission "was probably made because the clause refers quite clearly to the mastery of humanity over the present world and would make more difficult the interpretation in terms of Christ, his temporary subjection, and his eschatological reign" (1989:71; similar also Zuntz 1953:172; Vanhoye 1969:264; Laub 1980:64). Ellingworth sees the author's main concern to be "with human beings and their place in the 'world to come' not with creation as a whole (2000:149). If the omitted phrase is compared

with the very similar line found in the quotation from Ps 102(101), 26ff in Heb 1:10, the pieces of the puzzle start to fall into place - although for a different reason as suggested by scholars in the past (Schröger 1968:82; Ellingworth 2000:149). It was assumed that the phrase was left out because Heb 1:10 had already stated that the Son participated in the creation (Thomas 1964/5:306; Karrer 2002:168). But the emphasis is probably different. Heb 1:10 mentions that “*the heavens are the works of the Lord’s hands*” (kai; eřga twñ ceirwn sou eijsin oil ouřranoi). The omitted phrase under discussion states that the “(son of) man” ... “was appointed over the works of God’s hands”. If the “works of your hands” (ta; eřga ceirwn sou) was understood to be “the heavens” (oil ouřranoi- as in the quotation in Heb 1:10), then it certainly would not make sense in the author’s argument that Jesus, who was now made lower than the angels, could have been appointed over the heavens during his inferior state. The heavens are, after all, the dwelling place of these angels! One could, however, struggle with the presence of the very next line (2:8) which provides a parallel thought (Bruce 1985:31). But there is a difference here. The omitted phrase would have appointed Jesus in his inferior state above the heavens as the work of God’s hands and the dwelling place of the angels. The phrase in 2:8 probably allows for submission under his feet of “the world to come” (upetaxen thñ oikoumenhn thñ mellousan, 2:5), i.e. of “his enemies” (tou; eřqrou; sou upopodion twñ podwn sou - quoted from Ps 110 (109):1 in Heb 1:13). Even though it is a similar motif, the object of what is submitted is the difference between heaven and earth – “the world to come” (not yet now). Furthermore, the author would explain how he interprets the concept of “submission” here in his brief commentary that follows the explicit quotation.

Another position, taken here by Kistemaker, does not convince. According to him, “the author does not seem to be interested in retranslating the Hebrew, if he had any knowledge of this language; for Ps. 8 is known to his readers in its Greek translation of the LXX” (Kistemaker 1961:30). With all the textual witnesses to the LXX which include this line, the readers of Hebrews would no doubt know that this line is part of Ps 8. And why would the author anyway only exclude this particular phrase and nothing else?

3.1.5 Interpretation of *bracuwti*

bracuwti is a degree of indefinite approximation and may be translated with “*somewhat*” or “*about*”, according to Louw and Nida (1988:domain 78.43). It is used as translation by the LXX for $\text{f}[M]$. So also at 2 Ki 16:1 and Is 57:17. *bracuwt* itself is exclusively used as translation equivalent for $\text{f}[M]$, except once in Exodus. The Hebrew $\text{f}[M]$ usually only expresses the qualitative meaning (“*a little*”), whereas the LXX translation *bracuwti* is taken by the majority of scholars in a temporal sense (“*a short while*”) (Harder 1939: 35; Kistemaker 1961:30; Schröger 1968:82-3; Van den Brink 1993a: 206; Moyise 2001:101; Schunack 2002:33). There is a case to be made, though, for the fact that *bracuwt* could be taken in both the LXX and in Heb 2:7 also in a qualitative sense, as in the Hebrew, so that man was made “*a little lower than the angels*” and not “*a little while*”. Louw and Nida supports this interpretation in saying that the expression *bracuwti* as a lexical unit in Heb 2:7 refers to rank (Louw & Nida 1988:domain 78.43). Pryor also takes both the MT and the LXX to refer to degree rather than to time as “there is no hint of eschatological progression”. The change from a qualitative to a temporal meaning was then made by the author of Hebrews (Kistemaker 1961:30). He found several indications “that the author has chosen to give this phrase a temporal meaning which it may not have had originally” (Pryor 1981:44-5). This viewpoint is confirmed by Louw and Nida who reckons that Heb 2:8-9 “...suggests that the writer of Hebrews probably interpreted $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\upsilon$ as meaning a small quantity and as referring to time in the sense of a ‘little (while)’” (Louw & Nida 1988:domain78.43). The author comes back in his discussion on the quotation to this phrase, and it is especially in the light of his comments in 2:9 that it seems as if he intends the phrase to be taken in a temporal sense. He uses the word again in Heb 13: 22, saying that he wrote only “a few” words or “briefly”.

3.1.6 *Par jaggelou~* as translation for $\mu\upsilon\eta\eta\iota\lambda\ \alpha\theta\eta$

The LXX uses *aggeloi* as a translation for *'elohim*, i.e. “*a little lower than angels*”. It is also attested by the Psaltererium Gallicanum (G) of Hieronymus and Codex a. “Hieronymus hat G entsprechend mit *angelis*, seine hebräische Vorlage aber mit *a Deo* übersetzt” (Kaiser 1994:208). The Coptic version also has “*angels*” here. The Hebrew, on the other hand, reads “*a little lower than God / heavenly beings*”. The later versions of Aquila, Symmachus and

Theodotion, again translated *elohim* with θεοι. The possible ambiguity in meaning (either “*God*” or “*heavenly beings*”/“*gods*”) swayed the LXX translators to the latter. The translators of the Greek LXX clearly made their choice here on theological grounds in order to differentiate between the God of Israel und subordinate divine beings (Schenker 2001:191, 193). This interpretation is also to be found in *Targum Jonathan* (Kistemaker 1961:30; Lane 1998; Van den Brink 1993b:206). The “heavenly beings” were probably understood to be the members of the heavenly court, based on a Canaanite background (Attridge 1989:71; Cooke 1964:22-47). Schröger summarises the situation appropriately by saying:

Es kommt aber dabei so heraus, daß der griechische Text von einer Erniedrigung im Vergleich zu den Engeln spricht, während im Urtext von einer sachlich geringfügigen ‘Erniedrigung’ im Vergleich mit Gott die Rede war; aber gerade das paßt dem Verfasser in sein Konzept (1968:83).

4 SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE *VORLAGE* OF THE QUOTATION

The following conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the analysis and discussion above:

- This quotation was known to the early Christian tradition. It is quoted by Paul in 1 Cor 15:27. It is also quoted in Eph 1:22 and in Mt 21:16. There is a possibility that it was Paul who established its place in the early Christian tradition. The author of Hebrews got it somehow from this early Christian tradition. The readings of the quotation from Ps 8:7b in 1 Cor 15:27 and Eph 1:22 correspond with each other. Both have the same reading with the same differences in comparison with that of the LXX. Both only quote Ps 8:7b, starting and ending at the same place. Hebrews, however, shows three major differences here: (i) He starts the quotation much earlier (Ps 8:5), but also ends with the quotation at the same place. This longer version is probably an indication that he independently reworked Ps 8:7 from the early Christian (Pauline?) tradition from which he received it (Koch 1986:245). (ii) The reading of the section from Ps 8:7b in Heb 2:8 corresponds closely with the reading of the LXX (υπεταξα~; υποκατω + gen.pl), against the readings of 1 Cor 15:27 and Eph 1:22 (υπεταxen; υπο + acc.pl). It should be noted, however, that although there might have been

pre-Pauline text readings with $\text{u}\rho\omega\text{v}$ that it is more likely that Paul changed it as it "...fügt sich glatt in den paulinischen Sprachgebrauch ein" (Koch 1986:140) and that the choice of $\text{u}\rho\epsilon\text{t}\alpha\text{x}\epsilon\text{n}$ in stead of $\text{u}\rho\epsilon\text{t}\alpha\text{x}\alpha\text{-}$ could similarly be explained on stylistic grounds, as Koch has indicated: "...eine Abänderung der direkten Anredeform des Psalmtextes (war) erforderlich, da Paulus die Zitate jeweils ohne Einleitungswendung anführt und sie so übergangslos in seine eigene Darstellung einbezieht" (Koch 1986:111). (iii) It lacks the section from Ps 8:7a LXX, which is also present in the Hebrew (Ps 8:6a MT). The latter, though, should be considered carefully in the light of the text critical evidence.

- This quotation from Ps 8 had already been linked with Ps 110 (109):1 in the tradition. Traces of it can still be seen here in Hebrews where Ps 110(109):1 precedes the quotation from Ps 8:5-7. It should rather be assumed that the author of Hebrews knew this combination from the early Christian pre-Hebrews literature and / or from an oral tradition, than from a written common list of proof texts which was available to himself and to the authors who quoted this combination before.
- The reading represented in the quotation in Hebrews is closer to that of the LXX than to the Hebrew (Kistemaker 1961:29; Howard 1968:211; Müller 1986:238; Schröger 1968:82; Moyise 2001:101). When the OT Hebrew and Greek readings are compared with that of the quotation in Heb 2:6-8, it is clear that the author of Hebrews followed the Greek reading of Ps 8:5-7, rather than the Hebrew as represented in the MT. Particularly the phrase, $\text{h}\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\text{"}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\text{n}\ \beta\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\ \rho\alpha\rho\kappa\ \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\ \omicron\upsilon\text{"}$ - which is the LXX translators' version of the Hebrew $\mu\upsilon\eta\iota\lambda\ \alpha\theta\eta\ \epsilon\text{ [M]}\ \omega\eta\rho\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\iota\upsilon\text{"}$ - fits the argument of the author of Hebrews much better. The author of Hebrews thus follows (a form of) the LXX text (Girdwood 1997; Fensham 1998; Dalglish 1984:26; Smits 1963:558) and represents one of a few quotations in Hebrews which agree verbally, or almost verbally, with the LXX. The others are Heb 1:5,13; 5:6 and 11:18. Gräßer says: "Diese völlig unveränderte und auch ganz und gar unvermittelte Übernahme des LXX-Zitates besagt, daß der Verfasser des Hebr den Text zunächst einmal in seinem ursprünglichen Sinn zu Worte kommen lassen will..." (1992b:158). All of this depends, of course, whether one includes or excludes the

phrase of Ps 8:7a. In this investigation, it was argued that its exclusion should rather be preferred, based on the external evidence of Papyrus 45 and the internal evidence of the author's commentary on the Psalm quotation that excludes a discussion of this particular phrase.

- The author of Hebrews thus reworked and interpreted the quotation that he had found from his tradition in order to fit within its newly given context. He (i) starts earlier with the quotation, (ii) omits a phrase from the known LXX readings and (iii) presents a short commentary (Heb 2:9ff). Karrer clearly pointed out how the author also masterly interpreted the quotation both anthropologically (according to its LXX context), as well as christologically (according to its early christian context) (Karrer 2002:169).

Consulted Literature

- Ahlborn, E 1966. *Die Septuaginta-Vorlage des Hebräerbriefes* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Göttingen: Georg-August-Universität.
- Aland, K 1976. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri. I. Biblische Papyri*. Berlin/New York.
- Attridge, H W 1989. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press (Hermeneia).
- Barth, M 1962. The Old Testament in Hebrews. An essay in Biblical hermeneutics, in Klassen, W, & Snyder, G F (eds), *Current issues in New Testament interpretation. Essays in honor of Otto A. Piper*. London: SCM Press, 53-78.
- Batdorf, I W 1972. Hebrews and Qumran: old methods and new directions, in Barth, E H & Cocroft, R E (eds), *Festschrift to honor F. Wilbur Gingrich*. Leiden: Brill, 16-35.
- Beyerlin, W 1976. Psalm 8. Chancen der Überlieferungskritik *ZThK* 73, 1-22.
- Brandenburger, E 1962. *Adam und Christus. Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm 5,12-21; 1 Cor 15*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag (WMANT 7).
- Breytenbach, C J 1997. Das Markusevangelium, Psalm 110,1 und 118,22f. Folgetext und Prätext, in Tuckett, C M (ed), *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Leuven: University Press, 197-222 (BETHL CXXXI).
- Bruce, F F 1962/63. 'To the Hebrews' or 'to the Essenes'?, *NTS* 9, 217-232.
- , (1964) 1985. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans (NICNT).

- Cadwallader, A H 1992. The correction of the text of Hebrews towards the LXX, *NT* 34, 257-292.
- Clements, R E 1985. The use of the Old Testament in Hebrews, *SWJT* 28, 36-45.
- Cooke, G 1964. The sons of (the) God(s), *ZAW* 76, 22-47.
- Dalglis, E R 1984. The Use of the Book of Psalms in the New Testament, *SWJT* 27, 25-39.
- De Waard, J 1965. *A comparative study of the Old Testament text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dodd, C H 1953. *According to the Scriptures*. New York: Scribner's Sons.
- Ellingworth, P (1993) 2000. *The Epistle to the Hebrews* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans (NIGTC).
- Fensham, F C (1981) 1998. *Die brief aan die Hebreërs*. Cape Town: NG Kerk Uitgewers (electronic edition).
- Fitzmyer, J A 1968. Jewish Christianity in Acts in light of the Qumran Scrolls, in: Keck, L E & Martyn, J L (eds), *Studies in Luke-Acts: essays presented in honour of Paul Schubert*. Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 233-257.
- Girdwood, J 1997. *Hebrews*. Joplin, Mo.: College Press (The College Press NIV commentary).
- Görg, M 1986. Alles hast Du gelegt unter seiner Füße. Beobachtungen zu Ps 8,7b im Vergleich mit Gen 1,28, in Haag, E & Hossfeld, F-L (Hrsg), *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn. Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Groß*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 125-148 (SBB 13).
- Gräßer, E 1964. Der Hebräerbrief 1938-1963, *ThR* 30, 138-226.
- , 1990. *An die Hebräer. 1. Teilband. Hebr 1-6*. Zürich: Benziger Verlag (EKK XVII/1).
- , 1992a. Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesu in Hebr 2,14-18, in Evang, M & Merk, O (Hrsg), *Erich Gräßer: Aufbruch Und Verheissung. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Hebräerbrief*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 181-200 (BZNW 65).
- , 1992b. Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn in Hebr 2,6, in Evang, M & Merk, O (Hrsg), *Erich Gräßer: Aufbruch Und Verheissung. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Hebräerbrief* (BZNW 65). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 155-165.
- Harder, G 1939. Die Septuagintazitate des Hebräerbriefs. *Theologia Viatorum*. München: Kaiser Verlag.
- Hawthorne, G F 1993. *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

- Hengel, M 1980. Hymnus und Christologie, in Haubeck, W & Bachmann, M (Hrsg), *Wort in der Zeit. Neutestamentliche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 75. Geburtstag*, Leiden: Brill, 1-23.
- Howard, G 1968. Hebrews and the Old Testament quotations, *NT* 10, 208-216.
- Kaiser, O 1994. Erwägungen zu Psalm 8, in Seybold, K & Zenger, E (Hrsg), *Neue Wege der Psalmenforschung. Für Walter Beyerlin* Freiburg: Herder, 207-222 (HBS 1).
- Karrer, M 2002. *Der Brief an die Hebräer. Kapitel 1,1 – 5,10*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus (ÖTKzNT 20/1).
- Kirkpatrick, A F (ed) 1906. *The Book of Psalms*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Kistemaker, S 1961. *The Psalm citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: G. van Soest.
- Kistemaker, S J 1984. *Hebrews. New Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Koch, D.-A. 1986. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (BzHTh 69).
- , 1999. Schriftauslegung II, *TRE* XXX 2/3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 457-471.
- Lane, W L 1998. *Hebrews 1-8*. Dallas: Word, Incorporated (electronic ed.) (Word Biblical Commentary 47A).
- Lindars, B 1961. *New Testament apologetic. The doctrinal significance of the Old Testament quotations*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Loader, W R G 1977/78. Christ at the right hand – Ps CX.1 in the New Testament, *NTS* 24, 199-217.
- Louw, J P & Nida, E A 1988. *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: based on semantic domains*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Luz, U 1968. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*. München: Kaiser Verlag (BETH 49).
- McLean, B H 1992. *Citations and allusions to Jewish Scripture in early Christian and Jewish writings through 180 C E* Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Metzger, B M 1951. The formulas introducing quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah, *JBL* 70, 297-307.
- Metzger, B M 1975. *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London/New York: United Bible Societies.
- Moyise, S 2001. *The Old Testament in the New. An Introduction*. London: Continuum.

- Müller, P.-G. 1986. Die Funktion der Psalmzitate im Hebräerbrief, in Haag, E & Hossfeld, F.-L. (Hrsg), *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn. Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Groß*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 223-242.
- Pryor, J W 1981. Hebrews and incarnational Christology, *Reformed Theological Review* 40/2, 44-50.
- Rüsen-Weinhold, U 2002. *Der Septuagintapsalter im Neuen Testament. Eine textgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Unpublished Dissertation). Wuppertal: Kirchliche Hochschule.
- Schenker, A 2001. Götter und Engel im Septuaginta-Psalter. Text- und religionsgeschichtliche Ergebnisse aus drei textkritischen Untersuchungen, in: Zenger, E (Hrsg). *Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und Theologische Aspekte*. Freiburg: Herder, 185-195.
- Schröger, F 1968. *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger* Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet (BU 4).
- Schunack, G 2002. *Der Hebräerbrief*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich (Zürcher Bibelkommentare).
- Seybold, K 1990. *Introducing the Psalms* (Translated by R Graeme Dunphy). Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Siebert, F 2001. *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*. Münster: Lit Verlag (MJSt 9).
- Smits, C 1963. *Oud-Testamentische citaten in het Nieuwe Testament. Deel IV: de Brief aan de Hebreëën*. 's-Hertogenbosch: Malmberg.
- Soggin, J A 1971. Textkritische Untersuchung von Ps. 8 VV.2-3 und 6, *VT* 21, 565-571.
- Steck, O H 1982. Beobachtungen zu Psalm 8, in Steck, O H (ed), *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im Alten Testament*. München: Kaiser Verlag, 221-231 (ThB 70). (Also in *BN* 14 [1981], 54-64).
- Terry, M S 1975. *Biblical hermeneutics. A treatise on the interpretation of the Old and New Testaments*. Michigan: Grand Rapids.
- Thomas, K J 1964-5. The Old Testament citations in Hebrews, *NTS* 11, 303-325.
- Van den Brink, G 1993a. De schrift zegt of de schrift fantaseerd? (1) De tekst van oudtestamentische citaten in Hebreëën, in Knevel, A G, et.al. (eds). *Bijbel en Exegese. Verkenningen in de katholieke brieven en Hebreëën*. Kampen: Kok Voorhoeve, 203-210 (Theologische Verkenningen 7).
- , 1993b. De schrift zegt of de schrift fantaseerd? (2) Het gebruik van het Oude Testament in Hebreëën, in: Knevel, A G, et.al. (eds). *Bijbel en Exegese. Verkenningen in de katholieke brieven en Hebreëën*. Kampen: Kok Voorhoeve, 211-217 (Theologische Verkenningen 7).

- Van Haelst, J 1976. *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Vanhoye, A 1969. *Situation du Christ: épître aux Hébreux 1-2*. Paris: Cerf (Lectio Divina 58).
- Weiss, H.-F. 1991. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (KEK 13).
- West, J K 1981. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Westcott, B F 1974. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wilcox, M 1988. "According to the pattern (TBNYT)...": Exodus 25,40 in the New Testament and early Jewish thought, *Revue de Qumran* 13/49-52, 647-656.
- Winter, J G (ed) 1936. Papyri in the University of Michigan collection: miscellaneous papyri. Michigan, (University of Michigan Studies Humanistic Series, XI).
- Zuntz, G 1953. *The text of the Epistles: A disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. London: Oxford University (The Schweiz Lectures of the British Academy, 1946).

Internet

- Papyrus Oxyrynchus Online. Accessed on 14.11.2002 and 16.12.2002 from <http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk/POxy/frame1.htm>
- Papyrus Michigan. APIS (Advanced Papyrological Information System). Accessed on 14.11.2002 and 16.12.2002 from <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/projects/digital/apis/search/>