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This thesis is principally an examination of modern research concerning the author of Hebrews' use of Scripture. It focuses on how recent interpreters of this letter have supported their theories. The paper's intent is to show that modern research in a variety of fields is making it increasingly more difficult for the interpreter to arrive at conclusions that can be confidently backed.

This study covers the areas that are considered to be important for understanding Hebrews' use of Scripture. Chapter two examines the attempts made to determine the precise Biblical text(s) that the author of Hebrews used as a basis for his exegesis. The evidence indicates that it is becoming more and more difficult to determine what the original text(s) could have been. We do not even know whether the author of Hebrews had before him a version of the Bible—be it Greek or Hebrew—or a collection of pre-arranged Biblical texts—be it a set of testimonia or a list of liturgical passages.

Chapter three reviews the exegetical practices of Hebrews' contemporaries, insofar as they bear on Hebrews, as well as the terms now used to describe some of these practices. The conclusion is that Hebrews' contemporaries, represented in part by the rabbinic and targumic works, as well as by the Apocryphal literature and the writings of Philo and the Qumran sectaries, appear to help us very little in better understanding his use of Scripture. Furthermore, we see that under close scrutiny the seemingly simple terms "midrash," "allegory," and "typology" become difficult to accurately delimit. The interpreter of Hebrews who wishes to use these terms must then either define them precisely, or refrain from using them altogether.
The lack of available data about Hebrews' exegetical method must force the interpreter of this letter to redirect his aims. The time for all-encompassing theories is past; scholars must now assess precisely how much we do not know.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The New Testament writers used Biblical passages to support many of their views, and a great deal of scholarly ink has since flowed in an attempt to determine the hermeneutical principles involved in their use of Scripture. Almost every NT book has now been analyzed, and the wealth of material is fast becoming as burdensome as it is helpful. The letter to the Hebrews especially is far from lacking detailed interpretations. This paper is concerned with sifting the ever-growing mass of scholarly data and isolating a sound starting point for critically examining the use of Scripture by the author of Hebrews. A careful definition of my purpose will, I

\[1\]

I use the term "Scripture" instead of the more common designation "OT" for two reasons. First, "OT" used of the mid-first century A.D. text is anachronistic: "OT" implies (1) a "NT" which was formed much later; and (2) a fixed Jewish canon which was not promulgated until a generation after the destruction of the Temple (although the canon was actually set by the mid-first century). More important, the author of Hebrews, though seeing Jesus as introducing a new covenant (9:15), has no desire to set up a new corpus of writings against the old. Rather, he believes that the traditional selection of writings accurately relates what Jesus said (cf. Rom. 15:4).

\[2\]

Important secondary literature includes:


hope, represent my inquiry as helpful to the community of scholars concerned with this issue.


4 By "letter" I imply no hidden or suggestive meaning. For a discussion of the many nuances attached to this term, see Prof. C.P. Anderson, The Setting of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Columbia Univ. diss., 1969), pp. 15ff.

5 Important literature includes:

6 I shall deal with all of Hebrews. The integrity of some parts of the letter—especially in the last chapter—has been and is being questioned. See Anderson, pp. 15-35. These studies do not affect a study of Hebrews' use of Scripture. For example, there are only two clear instances of deliberate quotations in chapter 13 (in vv. 586) and both exhibit no marked difference from the preceding citations.
The aim of this paper is not to offer another interpretation of Hebrews' use of Scripture, but rather to determine what evidence the modern interpreter of this letter is able to bring forth to substantiate his theories and presuppositions. How far is it possible for the NT scholar to present a verifiable historical aperçu of Hebrews' particular exegetical method? In other words, the emphasis will lie less on questions asked within history than on questions asked about it. No study of Hebrews has systematically taken into account the implications of the rapidly evolving scholarly views of the past generation on the textual and exegetical areas important for an understanding of this letter's use of Scripture. This work does not profess to present a thorough examination of all the data, but is concerned with delimiting some issues of method and logic raised by modern research.

The critical problems in Scriptural interpretation can be divided into two parts, the first dealing with textual and the second with exegetical matters. That is, in order to understand how the author of Hebrews uses Scripture it is necessary to try to determine what text(s) he had recourse to and whether the use of Scripture by his contemporaries can shed some light on his method. The importance of the first task should not be underestimated. To understand clearly how anyone worked with Scripture requires knowing the version of Scripture that he used. Rabbinic works have long shown us the importance of paying close attention to minute changes of words and even consonants in order to appreciate the text's exegetical intricacies. It is also

Following the majority of NT scholars, I am assuming that the author was not Paul. This view is not without weaknesses. See Leonard, Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In this paper, as in most studies, "use of Scripture" is narrowed down to places where there is a seemingly purposeful (usually formally introduced) use of a Biblical passage. To do a complete study it would, of course, be necessary to "conclude that the whole of Hebrews, not only the texts found in bold type in Nestle, offers material apposite to the present inquiry."--Barth, p. 54. It is very important to realize that allusive use of Scripture was often a conscious literary practice. Cf. Gundry, pp. xif.

"Necessary" only for those doing a traditio-critical study of the text. But there are other ways of understanding the letter.
essential to examine closely, wherever possible, the milieu from which the author of Hebrews may have adopted and adapted his way of perceiving and analyzing Scripture. The critical task is to try to appreciate the use of Scripture in its first century A.D. Weltbild and yet to avoid converting parallels into influences and influences into sources.

Chapter two examines areas pertinent to a study of the textual background of the quotations in Hebrews. It includes a discussion of modern inquiries into the nature of the first century Greek and Hebrew Biblical texts and explores alternative sources for Hebrews' use of a particular passage, i.e. testimony books and liturgical collections. Chapter three examines (1) the nature of the terms allegory and typology, which are commonly used to describe first century exegetical practices, and (2) the first century practices themselves, represented in part by the rabbinic works and the targum traditions, as well as by the Apocryphal literature and the writings of Philo and the Qumran sectaries.

For textual sources in this essay, I have used Kittel (14th ed.) for the Massoretic Text, Rahlfs (8th ed.) for the LXX, and Aland (2nd ed.) for the NT. When an English translation is used, I have followed the Revised Standard Version unless otherwise noted.

---

10 I use the terms A.D. and B.C. instead of C.E. and B.C.E. because this notation is probably more faithful to the author of Hebrews' strong conviction that the "old" had been superseded by the "new" with the coming of Jesus Christ.


CHAPTER II

TEXTUAL PROBLEMS

To understand how the author of Hebrews exegeted Scripture, it is necessary to establish, as far as possible, the particular text type(s) that he used for his quotations.¹ This entails choosing the best reading for the first century Greek and Hebrew Biblical texts, as well as the most likely reading for the quotations in Hebrews itself,² determining what alternative textual sources might have also been available, and suggesting what first century text(s) (Biblical or otherwise) could have provided the author of Hebrews with his quotations.³

The textual critics have usually concluded that Hebrews shows no dependence on the Hebrew text, but relies instead on some form of the Greek Biblical text, one most similar to the extant codices Alexandrinus(A) and Vaticanus(B). Some minor variances from these codices are explained either by assuming the author's use of a slightly different Greek source, or by supposing that he altered his available text intentionally (for theological reasons) or unintentionally (through slips of memory).

¹I am assuming that the author of Hebrews is responsible for the extant form of the letter. The textual history of Hebrews is not well enough established to be sure that present peculiarities can be ascribed to the author and not to some later hand. Furthermore, Scriptural quotations would seem to be the least stable part of any NT textual tradition, as they are more apt to suffer scribal harmonistic corruption. See B.M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), pp. 197-98.


³The dating of Hebrews is an important consideration for the textual critic. This is a much disputed question. However, an upper limit can be set at the end of the first century A.D., and a maximum lower one three generations earlier with the death of Jesus. See Spicq, I, pp. 253-65 and Anderson, pp. 109-16.
A quasi-stability has been achieved by assuming uniform (for the Hebrew) and assessable (for the Greek) first century Biblical texts, and by minimizing the difficulties involved in discussing some non-Biblical sources which could have also provided the author of Hebrews with his citations. Textual discoveries at Qumrân, recent transformations in the LXX field, and continuing research in such areas as liturgiology and testimonia have reminded us of how elusive the quest for Hebrews' Scriptural source must be. The purpose of this chapter is to point out the results of some recent developments in the textual area of Biblical interpretation and to suggest their implications for an analysis of Hebrews' use of Scripture.

First Century Text

The diversity of both the Hebrew and Greek first century A.D. Biblical texts is now solidly supported. The early Greek text has, for many years, been considered diverse and the main issue of discussion has revolved around the origin and evolution of the various Greek traditions. In a different manner, the first century Hebrew text has almost invariably been considered to be fixed. However, as more and more of the Dead Sea material is deciphered and published, it is becoming increasingly evident that, though the text of some of the Biblical sections found there is remarkably similar to the Massoretic Text (thereby lending support to the traditional claim of the MT's antiquity), "the most striking feature of the biblical manuscripts

---

4 Of the many theories, those put forth by P.A. de Lagarde and P. Kahle are pivotal. The first posits an archetypal LXX lying beneath the three recensions of Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen; the second considers an homogeneous LXX text to be the end result of a long process of Greek targums. Important books in this area include: S. Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (London: Oxford University Press, 1968); H.B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (N.Y.: KTAV, 1968); and S.P. Brock, C.T. Fritsch, and S. Jellicoe, A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973).

found in the vicinity of Qumran is the diversity of their textual traditions...the plurality of the distinct text types preserved...." There may now be differences of opinion concerning the number of Hebrew recensions circulating in first century Palestine, but one thing is firmly established: the pre-A.D. 70 Hebrew text--like its Greek sister--was not uniform.

In practice, how does this changed conception of the Hebrew text affect the textual critic? Certainly the practice of looking almost exclusively to the Greek texts for source material will not be altered, since the only extant Hebrew text available in substantial quantity is the MT. However, what must change are the presuppositions held concerning the stability of the Hebrew text. For example, "MT" should be substituted for "Hebrew text" in statements such as "Il suit les LXX, et jamais l'hébreu...." But a new conception of the Hebrew text can also lead to a more basic redirection of scholarship. This can be exemplified by analyzing S. Kistemaker's position.

6 Prompting B.J. Roberts to exclaim, "the Biblical texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls do indicate the existence of a pre-Massoretic Hebrew text which, to all intents and purposes, agrees with the present MT...." In "The Dead Sea Scrolls and OT Scriptures," BJRL 36(1953/54): 96. Roberts based his conclusions on the limited data of those hectic years following the Qumran finds. Subsequent expansion of evidence has led to a very different assessment.


9 Nevertheless, isolated instances of texts discovered at Qumran have proved illuminating. One example offers a possible source for Heb. 1:6: the Hebrew text of 4 Q Dt. 32: 43 which reproduces the same lines previously found only in the MT of Ps. 97:7.

10Spicq, I, p. 335. Similarly, Westcott, pp. 478f.; Smits, vol. 4, p. 598; Pavda (throughout); Thomas, pp. 7-9; and Kistemaker, p. 88. Others are more cautious, indicating that though the author of Hebrews seems to have definitely used the LXX for direct quotations, allusions would seem to hint at a knowledge of the Hebrew text. E.g. Stendahl, p. 160; and Leonard, pp. 315-16.
Kistemaker, hinting throughout, states outrightly (p. 88) that the author of Hebrews knew no Hebrew, and that he only used a LXX version. His method of reasoning can be shown in his description of Ps. 102:25 in Heb. 1:10-12: "But if the author had the ability to employ the Hebrew, why did he not show it in this quotation? If he were acquainted with the Hebrew tongue he could have corrected the LXX at several places." This assumes two disputable presuppositions: (1) that the Hebrew version available to the author of Hebrews was identical to the one now found in the MT; and (2) that had the author known Hebrew, he would have automatically corrected the "inferior" LXX. The second lies more in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century need to determine how accurate a translation the LXX is, than in the first century Hellenistic Jewish thought which saw the LXX as being as valid--and at times more so--as the Hebrew text. The first presupposition is simply untenable in light of the discoveries at Qumran.

The author of Hebrews, more explicitly than any other NT author, probably used a Greek source very similar to our LXX text. G. Howard is the only scholar to have persuasively suggested a probable Hebrew MT source for Hebrews. Based on raw statistics--and very little textual exegesis--Howard's argument, though important for showing the problems involved in trying to posit no other influence but the LXX, does not bring forth enough evidence to argue a case for probable Hebrew influence. His reasoning can also be misleading. For example, the statement (and it is not followed up) that 24 quotations are unlike either the Hebrew or the LXX, 8 are identical to both, and 6 are identical to the Hebrew against the LXX both misses the point and

---


12 F. Johnson is a good representative of this nineteenth century mode of reasoning. He tries to show (pp. 1-28) that the author of Hebrews, though using the LXX, "corrected it by the Hebrew original whenever necessary." In The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old (Phl.: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896).

13 See Spicq, I, pp. 334ff.

is deceiving. The suggestive question is: of the 24 differing quotations, what degree of difference do we have? Besides, how can a quotation, in Greek, ever be considered identical to the Hebrew text?

However, to say that the LXX represents the most likely Biblical source for the critic dealing with Hebrews is not to simplify the matter by much. It is far from certain what first century Greek texts were available to the author of Hebrews. The LXX manuscripts which have come down to us are not the work of one man or group of men. Rather, they indicate layers of translation and editing which, like the Hebrew Bible, represent the outcome of a long and diversified textual tradition. To distinguish between the various sources and to separate the "primitive" sections from the "edited" ones are the present concerns of the LXX critic. P. Katz, the man most responsible for initiating this perspective, states:

In the LXX no manuscript is homogeneous throughout...In fact, the question to be asked is: does the quotation follow the primitive text or an "edited" one? And that answer can only be given on the basis of an expert knowledge of the evidence of the several books of the LXX.15

The practice of comparing Hebrews' quotations with a few manuscripts loses purpose. What is gained by saying: "...les accords de Hébr. avec A contre B sont nombreux...Mais, par ailleurs, Hébr. est plusieurs fois d'accord avec B contre A...?"16

K.J. Thomas is alone in applying Katz' theory to Hebrews.17 He concludes that the author of Hebrews had before him a primitive LXX text underlying both A and B. The reasoning is as follows: it is highly likely that the author used an earlier version of the LXX (1) since most of Hebrews' variations from A/B are intentional (and proving this takes up much of his paper), (2) since in the 23 readings where A differed from B there could be found no interpretational reasons, and

---

16Spicq, I, p. 335.
17The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Univ. of
(3) since textual analysis itself supports the author's use of a "primitive" rather than an "edited" text. Thomas' conclusions are debatable but his orientation is indicative of the direction that must be followed.

Since A and B first became available in the nineteenth century as key witnesses to the LXX, it has often been noted that the quotations in Hebrews, although remarkably similar to both manuscripts, correspond wholly to neither. In fact, over half of them are not exact replicas of our reconstructed LXX. The differences can be seen as stemming not from the text used but from the author's stylistic or exegetical concerns. For example, one might picture him altering a particular word or phrase for stylistic reasons or to convey a desired theological perspective. These questions will be considered in the following chapter. What concerns the textual critic is the possibility that the author of Hebrews used a different source (Biblical or otherwise).

A number of alternatives can be postulated to explain the divergencies between A/B and the citations in Hebrews. They include


18 For example, Westcott (pp. 478f.) sees 15 quotations out 29 differing from A/B.


20 Stendahl points to a school of interpreters doing this for the Gospel of Matthew. Working with Hebrews, the two scholars most representative of this approach are Thomas and Kistemaker. The important texts are Heb. 1:8f., 10-12; 2:6f.; 9:20; 10:16f., 37f.; and 12:5. The classic representative of the viewpoint that NT authors modified Scripture for apologetic reasons (i.e., the application of Scripture to the kerygma) is B. Lindars' New Testament Apologetic. Lindars examines the shift in application of texts from one key issue (of the early Church) to another, and studies the complexity which slowly develops in the interpretation of Scripture. He posits four basic events which dramatically altered the consciousness of the early Church and so forced it to adapt Scripture in a peculiar way: Jesus' resurrection, his suffering and shameful death, his messianic ministry, and his birth.

21 Moreover, it must be remembered that a supposed "non-variation" may in fact have been a variation for the author of Hebrews. Aside from the hypothetical notion that a variation may have been accidentally paralleled then or later by some Greek or Hebrew text, there exists the
the following: the author of Hebrews\textsuperscript{22} may have chosen a reading from a now non-existent Greek\textsuperscript{23} or Hebrew\textsuperscript{24} text; he may have translated independently from the Hebrew;\textsuperscript{25} or (more probably) tried to reconcile the Greek to a Hebrew text which is no longer available.\textsuperscript{26} Nor can we ignore the following possibilities: that there could have been errors in the transmission of the text of Hebrews; that the author may have been following a now-lost set of proof-texts,\textsuperscript{27} or making use of a liturgical tradition.\textsuperscript{28}

The last two alternatives can be profitably expanded, especially since they are mentioned time and again in every study dealing with Hebrews' use of Scripture. But first a note on one of the most used and abused explanations of Hebrews' minor variations from the LXX: the author's fallible memory. I include this section now because one often meets this type of reasoning from those wishing to prove that it is not necessary to posit an extra-Biblical source for Hebrews. These scholars assume that the author's use of the LXX, with minor errors of memory that he is bound to make, adequately explains the situation.

\textsuperscript{22}Or a "school" responsible for Hebrews' particular method. This theory has not yet been tested for the letter, but it has been fruitfully applied to other NT books by Stendahl (Matthew) and E.D. Freed (John).


\textsuperscript{24}G. Howard, "Hebrews and Old Testament Quotations."


\textsuperscript{26}E.g. M. Barth who sees (p. 55) Heb. 12:5-6 and 13:6 more literally translating the Hebrew.

\textsuperscript{27}Below, pp. 13f.

\textsuperscript{28}Below, pp. 21f.
Memory

Often the NT critic, confronted with a Scripture-like citation that is not exactly represented in older extant literature, will appeal to the formula: "citation from memory" in order to resolve the problem. In other words, he will see the NT writer's faulty memory as being the cause of the inaccuracy. This notion is applied to Hebrews in a more potential than actual sense. That is, the author's quotations are believed to be accurate because he depended on some written text, not on his memory: "It is clear that the author to the Hebrews does not rely on memory while citing the OT, for his quotations are too much in harmony with the written text." Apart from the more basic problem of applying the cause and effect syndrome to historical narrative, there are many difficulties with such an appeal. For one thing, alternatives may better explain the situation, e.g. the author's use of testimonia, midrashic rewriting of Scripture, or liturgical alterations. For another, the ancients' memory may not have been as faulty as we like to imagine. The first suggestion is an obvious note of caution; the second can be profitably expanded.

Today it is not uncommon to meet people who can accurately recite long portions of the Bible, and this is done in a society that is much less oriented towards learning through memory than was the early Jewish one. B. Gerhardsson's fascinatingly detailed Memory and Manuscript clearly shows how memorizing the tradition formed the basis of education for the early Jews. Although it is evident that Gerhardsson's evidence, coming as it does from anywhere in the rabbinic corpus, cannot be safely assumed for pre-70 Jewish practice, it is certain that the use of memory for the first century Jew--and for classical man in

29 Kistemaker, p. 57. Concerning the long quotation from Jeremiah (Heb. 8:8-12) he adds: "Since it is the longest quotation in the entire NT, it is a bit out of place to expect memory work at this point." (p. 42) Similarly, Spicq, I, p. 334; Mickelsen, p. 169; Swete, p. 402; Dodd, p. 50; and Reid, pp. 55f:


31 Concerning this issue, the heated debate between B. Gerhardsson
general--was more integrally incorporated into the educational system than it is today. To deny any lapses of memory among the first century Jews would be foolish, but to assume that we can easily resolve or redirect textual problems in Hebrews by recourse to the author's memory can be even more tenuous.

Testimonia

We have no reason to believe that he [the author of Hebrews] was acquainted with a sort of theological enchiridion in which texts were already gathered.33 Hebrews...pays no attention to contexts: he is not quoting the Bible; he is quoting from a Testimony Book.34

The Epistle to the Hebrews stands far removed from any dependence on a Testimony Book.35

Il est vraisemblable que Hébr. utilise ici [1:5-13] un florilège scripturaire destiné à prouver l'excellence de Jésus.36 L'auteur a manifestement utilisé un recueil de Testimonia tel qu'il en existait à Qumrân.37

Testimonia is a current name38 for systematic collections of Scriptural passages, usually of messianic import, which were used by

and M. Smith (later followed up by J. Neusner) is instructive. The key issues are clearly exposed by Gerhardsson in his Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity (Uppsala: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1964), p. 12. They are (1) whether one can read into Pharisaic teachings Rabbinic principles of pedagogics, (2) to what extent one can regard Pharisaic teachers as representative of "normal" Judaism, and (3) whether the early Church followed "the principles of practical pedagogics which were common to their milieu." Important works (in order of publication) are Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript; Smith, "A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition," JBL 82(1963): 169-76; Gerhardsson, Tradition and Transmission; and J. Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70, vol. 3 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971), pp. 143-79.


33 Leonard, p. 352.

34 Synge, p. 17.

35 Kistemaker, p. 92.
some Jews and Christians perhaps as far back as the first century. That such collections served the NT writers as sources for their quotations is the debated notion called the testimonia hypothesis. Sparked by E. Hatch (1889), expressed in its extreme form by R. Harris (1920-21), and revised and modified extensively by C.H. Dodd (1952), the hypothesis—in any of its forms—has not gained general scholarly acceptance. Since interpreters of Hebrews usually take an extremely strong stand either for or against such a theory, and since their position can have important repercussions on their other hypotheses, it is worthwhile to examine the problem in some detail.

36 Spicq, II, p. 333.
39 E.g., 4 Q Testimonia in the Qumrân community; Cyprian (see preceding note); and Papias' attribution of the logia to Matthew in Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., III, xxxix, 16(LCL, I, 296-97).
40 E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford: Univ. Press, 1889). He believed that there may have existed Scriptural collections ("manuals of extracts from the Old Testament") put together by Greek-speaking Jews, and perhaps used by NT writers (e.g., Paul in Rom. 3:10-18). Following this suggestion, S.H. Vollmer in Die Alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus (Freiburg: Univ. Press, 1895) suggested that the compilations probably also existed in Hebrew and could be used fruitfully to explain some citations in Paul's letters. Burkitt expanded the theory with his study of Matthew and suggested that the logia of Papias should be understood as a collection of Scriptural proof-texts.
42 His theory is detailed in According to the Scriptures.
43 Opposed are: Stendahl, pp. 207-17 (and the preface to his second edition); Freed, p. xi; Lindars, pp. 23f.; Hagner, p. 95; and Gundry, pp. 163-66.
The testimonia hypothesis in classic expression was put forth by Harris in order to explain certain peculiarities of NT usage. He


46. This can be most clearly seen in the works of Sowers and Bruce. The first considers the discovery of 4 Q Testimonia to have wiped away all objections to the theory, and sees a "strong probability" that the author of Hebrews used isolated fragments of a book of testimonies. He then uses this "fact" to prove his main point: the author of Hebrews could be accused of allegorical interpretation (reading into a passage a meaning not intended by the original author) were it not for the fact that Hebrews does not use the original passages, but relies on testimonia. Thus, Hebrews' method of exegesis is ratified, and disturbing relations with Philo are rendered even less likely. Bruce, while discussing the author of Hebrews' use of Hab. 2:4 (pp. 274-75), though pointing out that this text is twice quoted by Paul, that it "might well be regarded as the 'text' of the Epistle to the Romans," and that it is used by the two authors with "no fundamental difference," concludes (by placing undue weight on the testimonia hypothesis): "It is plain that our author does not take this quotation from Paul."


48. Six in particular: (1) composite citations (e.g., Heb. 1:5-13; 2:12-13; 5:5-6; Matt. 21:13; Rom. 15:9-12; 2 Cor 6:16-18); (2) attribution of citation to a wrong author (e.g., Mk. 1:2-3; Mt. 27:9-10)--this cannot be applied to the author of Hebrews since he is not concerned with naming the human source of the revelation; (3) peculiar formal quotations in Matthew (e.g. 1:22-23; 2:15-23; 4:15-16); (4) divergence of many NT citations from any known LXX text, sometimes agreeing with parallel NT and Patristic citations and other times with a Hebrew version (e.g., the "λεγεται γραφει" citations: Heb. 8:8-12; 10:16f., 30 [See Ellis, pp. 102-12]); (5) the preference for certain portions of Scripture among early Christians; and (6) "to this should be added that the testimonies...might fit well into the picture of early Christian preaching." (Stendahl, p. 208.)
believed the testimonia to be a single collection of Scriptural texts, predating the NT writings, and used in Christian polemic against the Jews. Furthermore, he thought that Matthew the Apostle put the collection together, and considered a sixteenth century anti-Jewish document found on Mt. Athos to be a late edition of this work. Concerning Hebrews he clearly stated his position: "We can readily deduce that the Book of Testimonies is the book of Origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews." However intriguing Harris' theory was, no evidence could be found that such a testimony book, aimed at the Jews, preceded the NT, or that it was a single book--nor, for that matter, a book at all. Also, there was no reason to suppose that this testimony book was polemical rather than liturgical or catechetical in purpose. And what grounds did Harris have for equating the logia with this collection? The theory remained the focus of attention for thirty years, Nevertheless, it suffered many transformations under the next generation of scholars who were fascinated by the theory's usefulness, but were intent on staying clear of its methodological pitfalls.

In the Stone Lectures given at Princeton in 1950, C.H. Dodd put forth an alternative theory. His motive was to underline the creativity and unity of the early Christians while still acknowledging their use of some form of testimonia. Dodd thought that the early Church used collections of Scriptural quotations, but in oral not written form. He also believed that they originated within the creative tradition of the Church searching Scripture for an understanding of Jesus, not with one or two people intent on writing a polemical work. "I am not thinking of a book at all, but rather something belonging to the body of instructions imparted orally in the main." The impression...is that

49 Based on Papias' statement. See Footnote 39.

50 Harris, II, p. 44.

51 Cf. T.W. Manson's statement: "...the earliest form of the 'Testimony Book' was determined by the form of the primitive preaching and the book itself was written on the 'fleshy tablets' of the preacher's heart." "The Argument from Prophecy," JTS XLVI(1945): 132.

52 See Fitzmyer (pp. 522f.) and Pringent (pp. 20f.) for masterful discussions of the reactions to Harris' theory.
they are working upon certain accepted assumptions, and that they have behind them a good deal of fundamental work upon the subject which must have gone on in very early days. Dodd also did not suppose that the early Christians mechanically linked together selections available in an anthology of single isolated proof texts. Rather, following Jesus' example they meditated on certain parts of Scripture, acknowledged by others as being useful, and considered each section in its proper Scriptural context. "These sections were understood as wholes, and particular verses or sentences were quoted from them rather as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves."

Dodd's theory received an overwhelmingly favorable reception from the scholarly world, no doubt due in part to his view of the early Christians.

---

53. These lectures were later collected and published under the title According to the Scriptures. A summary is available in The Old Testament in the New (Phil.: Fortress Press, 1952).

54. Dodd, The Old Testament in the New, p. 12. In According to the Scriptures, p. 126 he adds: "The composition of 'testimony books' was the result, not the presupposition of the work of early Christian scholars."

55. According to the Scriptures, pp. 22-23. Among his examples, he notes Hebrews' use of Ps. 8 and 110, where the content is applied to Christ without argument, thereby suggesting previous work.

56. Dodd considers fifteen passages to represent the core of the Scriptural tradition of the early Christians, their "Bible": Ps. 2:7; 8:4-6, 110:1, 118:22-23; Is. 6:9-10, 53:1, 40:3-5, 28:16, 61:1-2; Gen. 12:3; Jer. 31:31-34; Job 2:28-32; Za. 9:9; Hab. 2:3-4; and Dt. 18:15,19.

57. According to the Scriptures, p. 126. This practice of using brief phrases designed to bring to mind the longer passages from which they are taken was a common one in antiquity (cf. Johnson, pp. 67-73). We can apply it to the author of Hebrews' use of Is. 8:17-18 (a rarely quoted text in the NT). If we assume that Is. 6:1-9:7 formed a single unit of prophecy, as Professor Dodd argues (Acc. to the Scrip., p. 81), then the quotation falls more readily into a common NT mold.

58. Cf. Lindars' (New Testament Apologetic, p. 14): "The importance of Professor Dodd's work can hardly be over-estimated." On the other hand, Sundberg's critique has become the clarion call for those few feeling as uneasy about Dodd's proposals as they were with Harris'. Unfortunately, Sundberg's argument is not well defended. Three reasons can be given. First, using the list of quotations printed at the end
They became leaders critically and emotionally involved in following and understanding the tradition initiated by Jesus, rather than followers passively selecting isolated passages from a ready-made collection. After Dodd's proposal three events occurred which left a significant impression upon the testimonia hypothesis: the finds at Qumran, the renewed interest in Jewish exegesis, and the mounting importance attributed to lectionaries for understanding first century thought. Most startling of all was the find of testimonia at Qumran.

Before the mid-twentieth century one of the main stumbling blocks to the entire testimonia hypothesis had been the lack of evidence for the existence of such collections as early as the first century. This dearth had plagued Harris' theory, and Dodd had concluded that such an absence must lead us to believe that testimonia must have been the result and not the presupposition of early Christian Biblical study. However, the publication of some Qumran Cave 4 fragments, entitled "4 Q Testimonia" and "4 Q Florilegium," has altered the picture. In R.A. Kraft's words:

> It is no longer possible to deny the early use of collected scriptural excerpts, nor is it easy to maintain the Christian origin of the testimony literature... there should be, therefore, no a priori objection to the suggestion that early Christian authors, perhaps even some N.T. authors themselves, may have used testimony literature.

of Nestle's NT text, Sundberg attempts to show that Dodd erred when calculating the concentration of Scriptural references. He forgets to state that Nestle's list lumps together direct and indirect quotations as well as allusions and reminiscences. Second, when Dodd says that some Scriptural passages were more basic to NT writers than others he implies both a qualitative and quantitative importance. Sundberg has tried to show, by quantitative analysis alone, that Dodd's chosen citations were not the most basic. And third, Dodd's mention that there seemed to be a traditional method of exegesis among early Christians brings on Sundberg's unfounded statement: "this can only mean that the same Scriptural passage received the same interpretation."

It is interesting to note that while Dodd was advancing his hypothesis, J.W. Doeve, working with Jewish sources, was independently suggesting that isolated testimonia, without reference to context, were of secondary importance to the early Jewish mind. See Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Leiden: Van Gorcum and Co., 1954), pp. 116f.
Meanwhile other feasible theories have emerged which positively explain textual divergencies without recourse to testimonia. K. Stendahl, working on Matthew's citations, believes the Jewish hermeneutical methods—properly assessed—to account more naturally for the NT peculiarities that Harris wanted to explain—even in the light of the Qumran finds of testimonia. In addition, one shoot from the growing interest in Jewish exegesis has been the fascination found in liturgy and the realization that perhaps lectionaries had a notable influence over the form of certain NT texts.

The early stages of some relatively fixed sequence of messianic texts...may not go back to a single written source nor be combined through exegetical reflexion, but may rather be compositions created by prophetic figures for use in liturgy.

B.F. Westcott may have anticipated this point when he stated:

The large proportion of passages taken verbally from the Greek Psalter points to the familiar use of the Book both by the writer and the readers. Under this aspect, the absence of verbal coincidence with the Psalms apart from the quotations from them is remarkable.

Would it be so remarkable if the author had followed a non-Biblical (liturgical) source? The following section looks more closely at this point.

---

60 The texts can be found in J.M. Allegro, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan. V: Qumrân Cave 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 53-60. They are discussed in Fitzmyer's article (pp. 532-37). 4 Q Testimonia is a combination of Nb. 24:15-17; Dt. 5:28-29, 18:18-19, 33:8-11 (none found in Hebrews), strung together with no additional comments.


62 To be discussed in the following chapter.

However, one last point needs to be made. The quotations which opened this section disagreed forcefully concerning Hebrews' use of testimonia. They did so mainly for two reasons. First, as already mentioned, the available evidence is sufficiently sparse to warrant disharmony. Second, and more important, each critic hypothesizes a different kind of testimonia collection available to the author of Hebrews. The most frequent assumption is that Harris' theory represents the only testimonia hypothesis. S. Kistemaker is a good example of one who believes that once Harris' position is refuted, the entire theory falls. According to him, the author of Hebrews cannot be said to follow testimonia for two reasons: one, he could not have used but a single collection due to the textual variations found in the letter's quotations; and two, the use of a testimonia collection necessarily implies an ignorance of the larger totality of Scripture, an ignorance which is not otherwise shown by the author of Hebrews.

Kistemaker's position is not valid. Few scholars since Harris have believed in the existence of one testimonia collection. Furthermore, why suppose either the author's total dependence on written testimonia (as Dodd also does) or a resulting lack of appreciation for context? Surely one can imagine the opposite. The testimonia hypothesis should no longer be equated with Harris' theory; rather, the last fifty years of research must be considered. First century Jews used written and (no doubt) oral testimonia and florilegia as apologetic and study aids. It is quite possible (albeit still impossible to show) that the author of Hebrews had recourse to such aids. The

64 Stendahl, pp. 216f. Concerning Matthew, he sees the quotations reflecting more the pesher type of exegesis found at Qumrân than a dependence on testimonia.
65 Miller, p. 55.
66 Westcott, p. 475.
67 This lack of accepted definition and the assumption that the term is self-evident bring about a problem which we shall encounter again in dealing with midrash, typology, and allegory.
68 Reid (pp. 66f.) is another.
testimonia hypothesis has to be considered a valid option for the
textual critic intent on determining Hebrews' Scriptural source.

**Lectionaries**

"For some time criticism has been concerned to understand the
documents of the New Testament not only in the light of their setting
in life conceived in a broad sense, but also especially in the light
of the worship of the Church from which they emerged." The study of
early Jewish lectionaries, especially with a view to seeing what
importance they may have on elucidating some NT passages, is now a
blossoming field of research. Many scholars of the Bible and
related fields have tried to show how readings from the Synagogue
services often provide the foundation for other writings.

Concerning Hebrews, almost a century ago, Westcott prophetically
inquired: "It would be of great interest to determine, if there
were adequate evidence, how far the quotations are connected with
Lessons or Psalms of particular days." The hint was picked up by
V. Burch (1936) who was the first to suggest publicly that "our
writer fundamentally goes to a non-biblical authority for his material.
The lectionary of the Synagogue is that authority." More recently,
C. Spicq (1950) and M. Barth (1962) have elaborated various aspects
of this theory. S. Kistemaker (1964) has based his entire work on it.

---

69 Testimonia and florilegia, though not normally differentiated,
do have slightly different implications. The first suggests an ulterior
(apologetic) reason for making a collection; the second is a more neutral
term.

70 W. D. Davies, "Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's The Primitive
Christian Calendar," in *Christian Origins and Judaism* (London: Darton,

71 Examples include: P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar*
(Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1952); A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish

72 E.g., R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique* (Rome:
Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1966).

73 Westcott, p. 474. The Psalms play a very important role in Hebrews.
According to Bishop Westcott's calculation, 11 out of 29 quotations in
Hebrews are taken from this collection.
Believing that the Psalms dominate Hebrews, four of them in particular (Pss. 8,40,95,110) laying the structure and thought of the entire letter, Kistemaker postulates that the source of most of Hebrews' quotations was the liturgy familiar to him and his readers. The purpose of this section is to determine how valid an option the lectionary theory is for a textual understanding of Hebrews.

A representative example of how this theory can be applied to Hebrews is A. Guilding's exegesis of Heb. 4:14-7:28. Assuming a triennial cycle in Palestine (i.e., the reading through of the Pentateuch on consecutive sabbaths over a period of three years) she determined that the passages read from the Pentateuch for the Pentecost each year would be Gen. 14 (year 1), Ex. 19 (year 2), and Nb. 17-18 (year 3)—with Psalm 110 being read yearly. Remarkably, all these passages can be tied

74 p. 58.
75 Spicq (I, p. 336) sees the quotations from Deuteronomy originating in the liturgy, but does not elaborate.
76 One of the main thrusts is: "The author is far from seeking for his Old Testament interpretation a climate devoted to abstract thought and detached from contact with what the people of God actually receive or fail to receive." (p. 75) To lend partial credence to this, he suggests that "in Hebrews the clusters of quotations and allusions appearing in chapters 1-2; 3-4; 5-10; 11; 12-13 may each have to do with a specific festival or feature of Israel's worship." (p. 71) As a suggestion, his theory is provocative; as a forceful proposition it lacks support and must even muster a hypothetical "King's festival" in order to explain the quotations in chapters 1-3.
77 Reid narrows it down to one, attempting to prove that Ps. 8 "is really the key to the whole epistle." (p. 127)
78 He bases his theory on a detailed analysis of six quotations: 1:6,7; 3:7-11; 4:4; 8:8-12; and 13:5. I should add that the most comprehensive treatment of the use of liturgy in Hebrews would seem to lie in an unpublished M.A. thesis (Univ. of Nottingham, 1960) by C.H. Cave: The Influence of the Lectionary of the Synagogue on the Formation of the Epistle to the Hebrews. I have not been able to obtain a copy of this work. Cave's more recent article takes for granted an early triennial cycle: "The Parables and the Scriptures," NTS 11(1965): 374-87.
79 "Some Obscured Rubrics and Lectionary Allusions in the Psalter," JTS 3(1952): 48-55. The purpose of this article is to show "that the arrangement of the Psalter was determined by the cycle of the ecclesiastical year and the needs of public worship...." (p. 41)
in with a section of Hebrews, implying that the letter could have been grounded in liturgy and, more particularly, in the Pentecostal readings. The analysis goes as follows.

After mentioning the ascension and high priesthood of Christ, the author of Hebrews dwells on the high priesthood of Aaron, especially the fact that Aaron was called by God and did not take the honour himself (Nb. 17). A quotation from Ps. 110 (which alludes to Gen. 14) then reveals that Jesus, likewise, was chosen by God for the high priesthood, but that his priesthood is after the order of Melchizedek. There is then a rebuke to his readers for their dullness, a reference to the gift of the Holy Spirit (the Pentecostal theme), and an indication of the oath made to Abraham which, like the Psalm, stresses the immutability of the Promise. Chapter seven then proves the superiority of Jesus' high priesthood by using terms drawn from the first and third years (the giving of tithes in Nb. 18:21 and Gen. 14), with a reference to the giving of the Laws mentioned in Ex. 19 (the reading from the second year).

However appealing Guilding's theory may be, we have to ask what kind of backing it has. The crucial issue in the study of early Jewish liturgy revolves around whether there is any evidence to support the notion of a fixed lectionary at such an early date. A subsidiary point concerning Hebrews, which is a letter of unknown origin and destination, is whether any evidence also exists for the presence of early fixed lectionaries outside of Palestine. For example, much about the letter suggests an Alexandrian rather than a Palestinian provenance, but it is debatable what lectionary system—if any—was followed in that major center.

H. St. John Thackeray's Schweich Lectures of 1920 exemplify the earlier view concerning Jewish liturgy: "The Pentateuch was divided

80 R. Marcus (in his introduction to Philo Supplement of the LCL pp. xii-xiv) finds much similarity between Philonic thought and the Babylonian annual lectionary system. However, he stresses the hypothetical nature of these thoughts.

81 These views are based on the pioneering efforts of A. Büchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," JQR 5(1893): 420-68; 6(1894): 1-73. This work was carried further by his pupil J. Mann in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, vols. I-II (N.Y.: KTAV, 1940-66). Büchler dramatically illustrated,
into some 150 sections and was read through once in three years. On this system, which was in vogue in New Testament times and was generally superseded by an annual cycle about A.D. 200, I need not dwell.\(^{82}\) Actually, he could not dwell on this point because there is no support for it. Westcott’s word of caution, "if there were adequate evidence," points to the Achilles heel of this and other lectionary theories.

There is no first century evidence whatsoever for postulating the existence of a developed *lectio continua* of the Pentateuch and the Prophets in NT times, and a great deal of information—from both Christian and Jewish sources—casting doubt upon it. Justin Martyr’s description of an early church service (First Apology 1:67), in which Scripture was to be read as long as time permitted (μὴ ἔχῃς ἐγγύωρείς) lessens the probability that the early church had a fixed lectionary. A similar interpretation can be deduced from 1 Clement 40:1.\(^{83}\) Furthermore, the Mishnaic passage Meg. 4:4 suggests that even in later times there appears to have been no continuous reading of the Prophets.

In addition, the fact that the Jewish scholars at Yavneh had to regulate the calendar\(^{84}\) makes the idea of a fixed Jewish calendar before this time highly improbable.

Critics would now invariably agree\(^{85}\) with L. Morris when he states:

> Wherever we look there are conjectures and uncertainties. We do not know when systematic reading began or what form it first took. When the triennial cycle evolved we do not know at what time of year it began and whether there may not have been several different triennial cycles. We do not know the relation of the triennial to the annual cycles, nor the precise connection of the LXX with the cycles.\(^{86}\)

---

with the publication of a Geniza fragment, that the list of Prophetic readings in early Jewish liturgy differed from the ones now used. He set out to determine exactly what were the early readings.

\(^{82}\) The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, p. 45.

\(^{83}\) This is noted by W.D. Davies, p. 73.


\(^{85}\) Crockett's discussion of this problem (in a lengthy excursus)
The textual critic cannot determine precisely what texts, if any at all, were systematically read in the first century liturgy. This is true even though there seems to have been some sort of tradition of readings, both of the Law and of the Prophets, in the early Church (e.g., Lk. 4:16-19; and Acts 13-15), and though it seems probably that some of the ordered readings from the Pentateuch mentioned in the Mishnah (e.g., Meg. 3:4-6) reflect, in part, a first century situation.

Summary

It is at present impossible to convincingly determine the source(s) of the author of Hebrews' quotations. This is especially true if divergencies are not lightly dismissed as "errors of memory." Whether he took his texts from a version of the Bible—either Greek or Hebrew—or from a collection of pre-selected Biblical texts—be it a collection of testimonia or a list of liturgical passages—is unknown. In addition, recent research is making the situation more complex.

The Qumrân finds have revealed diverse Hebrew textual traditions, as well as early collections of testimonia. One can no longer neglect the possibility that the author of Hebrews used (if only in part) Hebrew texts or pre-set collections of citations. Meanwhile, work in the Septuagintal field has begun to detect a textual situation as complex as that of the Hebrew Bible. Although a text quite similar or even identical to our LXX still represents, for the critic, the most

is perhaps the most systematic rebuttal of the lectionary theory. B.Z. Wacholder's learned prolegomenon to Mann's book is perhaps the most brilliant. Also helpful are McNamara's comments in Targum and Testament (pp. 46f.) and in The New Testament and Palestinian Targums (pp. 42f.).


87 We have to speak of "probabilities" when using these later texts. Kistemaker often forgets this. For example, when speaking of the canticles and hymns now collected in the LXX (following the Psalter), he states (p. 47): "Although the list was not drawn up immediately at the dawn of the Christian era, we may be certain that the hymns circulated among the early Christians....and that many...were sung in the church near the end of the first century A.D. already."
likely source for Hebrews' citations, it is no longer a matter of comparing the citations with A and B. Perhaps the liturgical area is the only one that recent studies have simplified: however intriguingly this theory can be applied to Hebrews, the uncertain origin and destination of the letter, coupled with the lack of evidence favoring such a theory, renders this option more hypothetical than ever.

The incertitudes of this area must be appreciated by anyone attempting to analyze Hebrews' exegetical practices. The conception that one has about the source of the quotations greatly determines how one then explains the author's use of Scripture.
CHAPTER III

FIRST CENTURY EXEGETICAL PRACTICES

Said R. Simon: "Alas for the man who regards the Torah as a book of mere tales and everyday matters!"...The Torah...contains in all its words supernatural truths and sublime mysteries. Observe the perfect balancing of the upper and lower worlds. Israel here below is balanced by the angels on high, of whom it says: "Who makest thy angels into winds" (Ps. civ. 4). For the angels in descending on earth put on themselves earthly garments, as otherwise they could not stay in this world, nor could the world endure them. Now, if thus it is with the angels, how much more so must it be with the Torah...The stories of the Torah are thus only her outer garments, and whoever looks upon that garment as being the Torah itself, woe to that man.

Once the author of Hebrews has stripped away Scripture's "outer garments," once he has reinterpreted the "mere tales and everyday matters," what does he see? Since he begins with a pre-understanding of Jesus as the Christ, and of the Bible as divinely inspired (1:5f.; 5:5; 8:8f.), what do the Scriptures mean to him? In answering these questions, the critics go to the author's contemporaries for guidance. They do so for three main reasons. Understanding these motives will help us to appreciate much of the research in this area.

First, and most obvious, the modern historian tries to see everyman as a child of his age. He is intent on gaining an entry into the author's different mode of reasoning by studying his particular world view. Second, many studies dealing with Hebrews have a distinct apologetic tone. The critic's purpose is often one of showing how Hebrews' exegetical method is different from or better than that of his contemporaries. Third,

---
2. E.g., Ps. 102:26-28 in Heb. 1:10-12. The text originally clearly speaks of God the Father, the Creator, but by transferring the name kyrios to Jesus, the author of Hebrews is able to address him with the words of the Psalm, and to call him the creator of heaven and earth.
much of Hebrews' method can perhaps only be grasped by understanding how his contemporaries viewed Scripture. This is so because, as we have seen in the previous chapter, it is impossible to determine the exact text which the author of Hebrews used. Some aspects of the author's method may be understandable only through comparison with the techniques of his contemporaries, to the degree that they can be understood.

Recent work concerning the exegetical procedures of Hebrews' contemporaries raises serious problems for the NT scholar. The debatable areas can be reduced to two. The first concerns matters of definition. That is, are the key terms such as "midrash," "allegory," and "typology" precisely defined in a commonly accepted manner? The second area involves the viability of using the author of Hebrews' contemporaries in order to better understand him. Do they really help us to more clearly grasp the author's particular method? The purpose of this chapter is to outline some of the potentially troublesome research concerning Philo and the Qumran sectaries, as well as the rabbinic, targumic, and Apocryphal traditions, insofar as they bear on Hebrews. 3

Hebrews' exegetical method is often called "midrashic," which equates it to some degree with a type of Scriptural interpretation usually associated with the rabbis. This chapter opens with a discussion of the elusively simple term "midrash." It stresses, as the previous chapter did with textual matters, the innate complexity of such an inquiry.

---

3 A discussion of Pseudo-Philo was not included because so little is known about it, and so little of what is known applies to Hebrews. The basic text is M.R. James' English translation (1917) now republished with a very extensive and erudite prolegomenon by L.H. Feldman (including a comprehensive bibliography):The Biblical Antiquities of Philo (N.Y.: KTAV, 1971).
Rabbinic Exegesis

The task of the first century Jewish thinker—and indeed his very life force—was to discover and to apply the Scriptural word, that divinely inspired message containing all of God's teaching and guidance for man. The two essential and subtle poles were then "le rattachement et la référence constante à l'Écriture et l'adaptation au présent." The term used to describe this process is "midrash," coming from the root וְרָשׁ (vrš) meaning "to examine," "to search," "to explicate." "May God us keep, From Single Vision and Newton's sleep" might well express the first century Jewish view, with the effort being placed on setting some rules of interpretation rather than putting a single meaning on a text.

4 "Les Maîtres en Israël devaient concilier deux obligations, en apparence contradictoires: d'une part l'interdiction soit d'ajouter à la Loi qui contient tout, soit d'en rien retrancher puisqu'elle est sacrée; d'autre part, la nécessité d'adapter cette Loi aux circonstances, d'édicter la Loi orale, dont quelques prescriptions éliminent pratiquement tels commandements anciens:..." J. Bonsirven, Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse Paulinienne (Paris: Bibliothèque de théologie historique, 1939), p. 13.


8 Called "middot," or "norms" and "measures," developed and collected classically for halakhic texts by Hillel, and later expanded by his successors. J. Bowker gives one of the clearest descriptions of these rules in The Targums and Rabbinic Literature (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1969), p. 315. I have avoided using the terms "peshat" and "derash" for literal and applied exegesis, respectively. There is now some controversy over whether "peshat" really means "literal" or if it should rather be taken as the authoritative and generally accepted text. See R. Loewe, "The 'Plain' Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Midrash," Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies, ed. J.G. Weiss, vol. I (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1964), pp. 140-85.
Hebrews 3:7-19 is usually taken as a good example of a midrash. After the presentation of the text, Ps. 95:7-11 [vv. 7-11], comes an explanation ("Who were they that heard and yet were rebellious? Was it not all those who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses?") and adaptation ("For we share in Christ.") [vv. 12-19] using relevant parts of the text, as well as other Scriptural sections (Nb. 14:29) to bolster the argument. And, if one wishes, the whole section can be seen within the frequently used rabbinic technique of inclusion, from ἀπίστευκας [v. 12] to ἀπίστευκεν [v. 19].

The area of midrashic studies is now in flux. There are two driving forces behind the contemporary discussion of Jewish exegesis: (1) Can the term midrash be precisely defined?; (2) How valid is it to take rabbinic midrash as the standard by which the first century midrashic genre is to be strictly understood? This section examines these questions and seeks to determine what repercussions the answers have on the interpretation of Hebrews. Wright and Bloch introduce us to the first query. Is "midrash at present...an equivocal term...used to describe a mass of disparate material...and approaching the point where it is no longer meaningful...?" Can a true understanding of the term be had only through "une sérieuse étude critique, historique et littéraire de cette tradition et des écrits qui la véhiculent...?" G.W. Buchanan begins his commentary on Hebrews with the statement, "The document entitled 'To the Hebrews' is a homiletical midrash based on Ps. 110." While it is debatable that the entire letter is "based on Ps. 110," that the document itself is a midrash is also questionable in the light of modern scholarship. According to A.G. Wright, a text cannot be called a midrash unless it is grounded completely upon the Scriptural quotation and is not mediated by another concept. Since Christians no longer preserve Scripture as the basic point of reference, using Jesus instead, their use cannot be called "midrashic." While Wright's thought clarifies one side of the argument, Le Déaut's lights

---

up the other: "Midrash may be described but not defined, for it is
a way of thinking and reasoning...which refuses to be conceptualized,
where it is first of all the response to the question: what does
Scripture want to say for the life of today?" Does midrash exist
for the sake of the text or does the text exist for the sake of the
contemporizing argument? Each NT scholar will have to decide how
narrowly or broadly he wishes to define the term.

The effort to situate the problem of midrash—both halakhic and
haggadic—within historical perspective began with R. Bloch, was
extended by G. Vermes, and is most systematically being carried out
by J. Neusner. If a true understanding of midrash can only come
through a study of its roots and growth, great care must be taken to
trace the evolution of this form. Such a concern inevitably leads to
the attempt to place the rabbinic works into some sort of chronological
order. Neusner is concerned with applying the results of form criticism
to rabbinic works, and has made an attempt at classifying rabbinic
material into "forms" and then tracing their evolution.

The theories of Neusner and his predecessors are not unanimously
accepted, especially their attempt to date the rabbinic works by using
internal and external evidence. Many continue to place much trust
in the tradition, satisfied to follow it in placing the rabbis and
their sayings in traditional chronological order. This position is
most cogently and cautiously expressed by R.N. Longenecker:

12 Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash."

13 Introduction, pp. 269-70. On this matter he is following Bloch.

14 Her two important articles are "Midrash" in VDBS and "Note
méthodologique," presenting a new synthesis in the first, and elaborating
her method in the second. Wright (p. 109) gives a complete bibliography
of Bloch's works. G. Vermes (pp. 7-9) presents an excellent summary
of her work in Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Leiden: E.J. Brill,
1961). Bloch greatly utilized A. Robert's work. He had postulated that
the roots of the midrashic genre could be traced in post-exilic Scripture,
calling this midrashic use "anthological style,\""qui consiste à réemployer,
littéralement ou équivalente, les mots ou formules des écritures antérieures."
("Genres littéraires," VDBS, 5(1957): col. 411.)

15 He adamantly believes that NT interpretation of Scripture can only
be understood within the context of midrashic development as a whole. See
Scripture and Tradition, pp. 227f.
A major problem in the use of rabbinic materials for the elucidation of first-century practice is, of course, the lateness of the codifications. Yet we are dealing with a religious mentality that took great pride in the preservation of the traditional; and while changes due to development or differing circumstances cannot be denied, this desire to preserve the traditional—barring other considerations—minimizes the severity of the problem.\textsuperscript{18}

The importance lies in appreciating the tradition-preserving essence of this culture while still taking account of the natural tendency for change. Extravagant claims in the area of rabbinic dating are not difficult to find. Following are two revealing examples of an extreme, though quite representative, position concerning Hebrews.

S. Kistemaker gives strong indication that he believes rabbinic sources purporting to deal with first century material to be trustworthy. For example, when looking at Hebrews' use of Ps. 110:1, he finds "convincing" Strack-Billerbeck's excursus that postulates a progression of Jewish thought in the understanding of this psalm, from messianic interpretation in the first century to a revision of this concept ca. 150 with R. ben Elisha. Kistemaker considers this argument, founded on traditional rabbinic dating of material, "unequivocal" proof of messianic interpretation of this psalm among first century Jews.\textsuperscript{19} A.B. Mickelsen also reasons in this manner.\textsuperscript{20} Basing himself on a quotation from R. Marcus, he finds it "perfectly proper" to compare Hebrews with all rabbinic material, assuming the second and third century doctrines to be exact representations of first century practice.\textsuperscript{21} "Unequivocal proof" and "perfectly proper"

\textsuperscript{16} Especially in \textit{The Rabbinic Traditions}, vol. 3.

\textsuperscript{17} Notably Doeve who (pp. 177f.), aware of form criticism and its possible uses for dating rabbinic sources, nevertheless does not consider Jewish tradition to have worked in that manner. G.F. Moore summarizes: "But the task of Johanan ben Zakkai and his followers was one of conservation, not of reformation." (I, p. 331.)

\textsuperscript{18} Longenecker, pp. 24-25.

\textsuperscript{19} Kistemaker, pp. 27f.

\textsuperscript{20} Mickelsen, pp. 20f. Similarly, Reid, pp. 96f.
are misleading qualifiers in these cases since they fail to indicate the scope of the problem.

This attempt to place midrash in proper historical context implies questioning whether rabbinic midrash should be viewed as representative of first century Jewish exegesis. Three factors have to be considered in this light. First, ever since Goodenough's major study pointing out that many Jews living in Palestine and in the Diaspora were not part of the rabbinic tradition, the existence of many "types" of Jews in the first century has become firmly established. Goodenough confirmed what others had long supposed (but without evidence). Rabbinic literature cannot be regarded as the total content of Jewish thought—event in Palestine—or even as faithfully representing the Pharisaic tradition.

Second, research is increasingly coming to support the position that there were varieties of exegetical methods within each "sect" of first century Judaism. The rabbinic exegetical method itself has always been difficult to categorize clearly and distinctly. Daube's thesis that

---

21R. Marcus, "Wolfson's Reevaluation of Philo," RevRel xiii(1949): 373. I also object to yet another aspect of Mickelsen's methodology. His support for this belief—a belief that deeply colors later judgments in his work—is a quotation from one authority, Marcus, whose discussion is in fact simply a listing of other "authorities" who reason in a similar fashion. In effect then, because L. Ginzberg and L. Finkelstein and V. Aptowitzer have used this method, Marcus uses it; and since Marcus uses it, then Mickelsen does likewise. Nowhere are we told why it is used and what the arguments for and against it might be.

22E.R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols, vols. 1-13 (N.Y.: Pantheon Books, 1953-69). E.g., "...the writings of the rabbis can similarly not be assumed to represent the Judaism of all Jews even in Palestine." (vol. 12, p. 185.) Even M. Smith's excellent review (of reviews) of Goodenough's work, arriving at a quite negative evaluation of the whole ("He was trying to make a point, and he failed") readily admits that "one of the major results of Goodenough's work" has been to clearly show the existence of varieties of expressions differing from the rabbinic mold. See "Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in Retrospect," JBL 86(1967): 53-68.

23E.g., Bowker (pp. 36-37) takes this as an axiom.


25E.g., Doeve: "...the liberty obtained in haggadic exegesis is often so great and the method of going to work so dependent on the ingenuity of the exegetist, that it is out of the question to attempt to give a consistent system of norms for this exegesis." (p. 64)
rabbinic exegesis was based on Hellenistic models has more specifically (although indirectly) shown the problems arising when trying to classify exegetical practices into certain geographical camps, e.g., Alexandrian or Palestinian.\textsuperscript{27} Third, it is only reasonable to suppose that whatever has been recorded in the particular traditions themselves cannot automatically be taken as representative of that particular stream of consciousness. Were rabbinic practices noted due to their normal presence or their innovative nature? Indeed, what place rabbinic theology had in rabbinism and what place rabbinism maintained on the lives of all Jews are questions still very much under debate.\textsuperscript{28}

It is useful to review the main points. The rabbinic tradition represents the outcome (not the equivalent) of only one (albeit, probably the most prevalent) first century Jewish stream. We cannot even be certain of the precise character of mainstream rabbinic exegetical practice, either by examining its own tradition or by trying to differentiate it from others. The uncertain basis for defining the term midrash can be linked, in great part, with the contemporary effort to view midrash in historical perspective. Given these factors, it is only natural that there should be a reassessment of principles and a shift away from rabbinic midrash as the standard by which the genre is to be strictly understood and used for NT studies.

To try to classify a particular NT book's exegetical practice as "Palestinian" or "Alexandrian," to equate "rabbinic" with "Palestinian," and "rabbinic midrash" with "first century midrash" now seems more tenuous than ever. In short, one should no longer ask: Does Hebrews

\textsuperscript{26}D. Daube, "Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis," Festschrift Hans Lewald (Basel: Verlag Helbing, 1953), pp. 27-44.

\textsuperscript{27}Quite recently, Lowy has divided midrashic works not into geographical camps, but into methodological ones: (1) normative, (2) literalist, and (3) allegorical. See "Some Aspects of Normative and Sectarian Interpretation of the Scriptures," ALUOS vi(1966-68): 98-163.

use Palestinian exegetical practices? The origin of Hebrews' exegetical practices cannot at present be determined. The question should be: Can the rabbinic mode of reasoning be of any use in better understanding Hebrews' exegetical method? Coupled with the modern attempt to "really understand and appreciate" the wealth, variety, and importance of Jewish thought, this change of emphasis is an important consideration.

NT scholars' use of rabbinic material has greatly changed over the past century. From F. Johnson's description of rabbinic exegesis in the late nineteenth century, "the obscurities, the superstitions, the cabalisms, the puerilities, the absurdities, the insanities..." to I. Abraham (1909) who apologetically goes to great lengths to cautiously suggest than an appreciation and understanding of rabbinic material might be an aid to the study of NT exegesis, there is now a tremendous interest by NT scholars in understanding Jewish exegetical practices.

This feeling was prophesied nearly forty years ago by Bonsirven (Exégèse, p. 5): "C'est à l'intention des exégètes et des théologiens chrétiens que nous avons entrepris cet ouvrage: ils se réfèrent volontiers à l'herméneutique rabbinique...Presqu'invariablement ils répètent les mêmes lieux communs: les rabbins se servaient dans l'explication de la Bible des sept règles d'Hillel, qui se sont ensuite dilatées dans les treize d'Ismaël; leurs méthodes herméneutiques comprenaient quatre genres indiqués par les quatre lettres PRDS...Nous avons le sentiment que la réalité est moins simple..."

Johnson, p. 34.


Prof. Ellis' career illustrates this point. His early book, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, astutely summarizes and presents the early and mid twentieth century viewpoint that though an understanding of Jewish midrash is helpful in understanding Paul's exegetical method, it is more important to realize how much the early Christian tradition and Jesus himself have influenced him. However, in two recent articles, Ellis has begun to believe that an understanding of the midrashic mode of thought can be the critical factor in discerning the meaning of some NT segments. See "Midrash, Targum, and New Testament Quotations," Neotestamentica et Semitica, ed. E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (Edinburgh: T.T. Clark, 1969); "Midrashic Features in the Speeches in Acts," Mélanges Bibliques (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1970). Prof. Ellis has informed me that his forthcoming articles will pursue this area of research.
 Granted that the interest is related in part to the general fascination in Biblical hermeneutics, and the spectacular archaeological finds at Qumrân, there seems to be a fervent desire to deal with Jewish material on a more direct level.

Many scholars are now concerned with determining how Jewish techniques can illuminate certain NT passages. There is a movement away from finding material parallels between rabbinic and NT texts, towards discovering formal similarities, i.e. the use by Christians of rabbinic techniques to arrive at particular Christian interpretations. For example, the realization that the key Scriptural text for structuring and understanding a rabbinic passage was often not clearly cited, or not cited at all--intentionally or due to loss during revision--has led to some recent exciting interpretations of some NT passages.

How does this apply more specifically to Hebrews? Unfortunately, this letter has not been included in the recent work done by NT scholars in the field of Jewish exegesis, and my attempts to apply the methodology of various recent studies to Hebrews have been in vain. Nevertheless, the rabbinic mode of exegesis is always useful in understanding some of Hebrews' basic peculiarities. For example, the use of the rabbinic gezerah shawah (i.e. whenever the same word occurs in two Scriptural passages, it is possible to use one of those passages to shed light on the other) is clearly exemplified in Heb. 4: the words κατέπαυσέν of Ps. 95 used in Heb. 3 and κατέπαυσέν of Gen. 2:2 used in Heb. 4 enable a particular exegesis to unfold concerning "the rest." Also, the typically rabbinic method of stringing together various parts of Scripture--haraz--is revealed in a series of quotations in Heb. 1:5-13. The argument from silence, familiar to Philo and used in

---


34 E.g., M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (N.Y.: Scribners,
Heb. 7:3, was also known to some of the rabbis. Lastly, the use of a *fortiori* reasoning is common to the rabbis and is evident in Heb. 3:3 and Heb. 6:7f.

**Targum Traditions**

Etymologically, targum (although of uncertain origin) means "a translation"; practically, it signifies a translation of a book or books of Scripture into Aramaic, with commentary being of secondary importance. The targum tradition was the process of expounding, explaining, and contemporizing (in the vernacular Aramaic) the meaning of Scripture (in traditional Hebrew) during the weekly synagogue meetings. Potentially, the targums have always been a valuable source of information for the NT scholar. Many reasons can be adduced for this. Originating in popular liturgy, targums were likely to be well known by grass-roots Judaism, and consequently by a considerable portion of the early Christians. Also, for the most part being haggadic, these collections probably suffered fewer changes over the years than did the more legal corpus of material. Moreover, since the first century Bible

---

35 Crockett's thesis pinpoints this.


37 Bonsirven, p. 336.

38 Spicq, I, pp. 59f.


40 "...le T. P. appartient a un genre litteraire...beaucoup plus proche du midrash proprement dit que de la version." (Bloch, "Note," p. 211.) However, Wright's note of caution is important: "Certainly the sections of expansions in these targums are midrash, but that the whole targum should be called a midrash is open to question...The purpose of the targum is to give a translation plus incidental material; the purpose of the midrash is to give homiletic material with incidental connection to the text." (pp. 422-23.)
was handed down to the early Christians as an interpreted book, any indication of how other first century groups and writings interpreted it is always a valuable addition.

The big stumbling block has always been the lateness of our extant targums. However, recent studies have led to a reassessment of the dating of the available targumic collections, and a realization that some of them, though obviously written much later than the letter to the Hebrews, might quite accurately represent first century thought and tradition. The Palestinian Targums have become especially important, due to three mid-twentieth century finds. In 1930, P. Kahle discovered various fragments of the Palestinian Targums in the Cairo Geniza, dating as early as the seventh century, suggesting no one recension (i.e. the fragments disagreed among themselves), and acknowledged as better representing the first century Aramaic language than Targum Onkelos.


The origin of oral targums is traced to Ezra (Neh. 8:8), but it would now seem impossible to critically verify any such date. The synagogue practice is at least as old as the first century B.C., and is probably much older. See G.F. Moöre, I, pp. 283f.

This is especially important for Hebrews, a writing regarded by many as influenced by its choicest and most coherent Scripture.

The latter-day Judaism as well as Christianity did not evolve from the religion of Israel in the OT, but from the Jewish religiosity that flourished during the intertestamental period."H. Flusser, HTR 61(1968): 109.

McNamara (T.&T., p. 15) sees enough similarity between these groups of various Palestinian exegetical traditions to want to group them under a single Palestinian Targum. I prefer the term "Palestinian Targums."

Before 1930 there was a basic set of known targums which had frozen the oral tradition at one point or another. Onkelos (0), the officially recognized Babylonian version of the Pentateuch, was deemed the oldest (second century A.D.). Two versions of the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch were known: Pseudo-Jonathan (TJI)--or, as it is also called,
Twenty years later, Prof. A. Díez Macho, perusing manuscripts in the Vatican Library, found a complete version of the Palestinian Targum that had been misclassified under Onkelos. It differed from existing versions. Finally, materials from the caves of Qumrân slowly began to reveal the presence of written targums from at least the first century, targums strikingly similar to that of the Palestinian Targums to the Pentateuch. The trend seems to be—though not without valid opposition—towards placing an early date on the bulk of the Palestinian Targums. A great deal of work is now being done to see how targumic passages can illuminate particular NT texts. Could the author of Hebrews have been using (in part or in whole) a targumic text for his quotations?

Though targums appear to clarify scores of NT passages (or at least, to shed new light on them), remarkably little is applicable to Hebrews. It is a puzzle why Hebrews exhibits so few parallels. However, a few

Yerushalmi I (TY I)—and The Fragmentary Targum (Tj II)—or, Yerushalmi II (TY II). There were also various Targums of the Prophets and the Hagiographa which were considered to have been written much later and, aside from Targum Jonathan of the Prophets, did not attain official recognition. For a more detailed analysis, see Le Déaut, "Les études targumiques," ETL 44(1968): 5-14; and M. McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1966), pp. 5-37.

Later published in London under the title The Cairo Geniza (1947).

First published in 1956, this text is now appearing under the editorship of Macho. His related article is "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," VT 7(1959): 222-45. For critical editions of TO and TJ of the Prophets we have the first three volumes of A. Sperber's work, The Bible in Aramaic. Volume four (1973) presents in a less critical fashion the targums on the Hagiographa.

E.g., 11 Q Targ Job, 4 Q Targ Job, and 4 Q Targ Lev.

McNamara tries to prove throughout his work that the Pal. Targ. as a whole was early.

Sperber (IV, B, p.2) clearly represents the opposing viewpoint, which bases its criticism on dating and contextual evidence. In fact, the earliest possible dating of actual written targums comes from the seventh century. Many late elements are found within the targums themselves, e.g. the reference to the orders of the Mishna in Tj I, Ex. 26:9; and naming the two wives of Ishmael Khadijah and Fatima (the wife and daughter of Muhammad) in Gen. 21:21. Bowker (p. 14) also forcefully
leads have emerged. Targum Neofiti's description of Abel as a confessor of faith seems to fit in more closely with Hebrews' account than does the Biblical rendition which makes no mention of Abel's faith.\textsuperscript{54} The targumic reverential manner of speaking of God, coupled with the frequent targumic expression "good pleasure before the Lord" might explain some of the author of Hebrews' particular phrases (e.g., Heb. 10:6).\textsuperscript{55} Also, Le Déaut presents targumic evidence for the antiquity of the title High Priest for Melchizedek.\textsuperscript{56} This figure might have been very familiar in the first century, suggesting why the author of Hebrews would have built his case around the otherwise vague Biblical character.

Any rapprochement of the targumic texts to Hebrews must appreciate the fact that there is simply not enough evidence to posit Hebrews' dependence on the targumic tradition. Any individual targumic text can stresses the limitations: "There seems no doubt at all that their attempts in the second and third centuries to move towards a standard rendering drew on existing and far older traditions, but at present the evidence is lacking through which a direct connection might be established...between the existing written Targums and the targum as it might have been rendered in the synagogue in the earliest days."

\textsuperscript{52} The standard works are: M. McNamara, \textit{NT and Pal. Targ.} (1966) and \textit{Targum and Testament} (1972); Le Déaut, "Les études targumiques" (1968) and \textit{Introduction à la littérature targumique} (1966). A very useful bibliography has been compiled by P. Nickels, a student of Le Déaut: \textit{Targum and the New Testament} (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1967). One less valuable for the NT area is B.A. Grossfeld's \textit{Bibliography of Targumic Literature} (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1972).

\textsuperscript{53} For example, Le Déaut, in giving a long and fascinating list of examples where targums shed light on some NT passages (e.g., Rom. 10:6-8; 2 Cor. 3:17-4:5; and Mk. 13:22) does not deal at all with Hebrews. "Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation," \textit{Biblical Theology Bulletin} 4(1974): 243-89.

\textsuperscript{54} McNamara, \textit{NT and Pal. Targ.}, pp. 157f.

\textsuperscript{55} McNamara, \textit{T.&T.}, pp. 93-97.

\textsuperscript{56} Le Déaut, "Le titre de Summus Sacerdoce et l'exégèse juive," \textit{RechScR} 50(1962): 222-29. Neofiti reads on Gen. 14:18: "And Melchizedek, king of Jerusalem—he is Shem the Great—brought out bread and wine, for he was the priest who ministered in the High Priesthood before the Most High God."
be later than the first century, and even though the particular texts might come to be meticulously studied using both internal and external evidence, nothing but a tentative conclusion can ever be brought forth concerning their date and subsequent relation to Hebrews. Practically, this means that targumic texts will have very little force in arguments concerning Hebrews' use of Scripture. The coming section which discusses Philo and the Qumran sectaries arrives at similar conclusions. However, it is important to first discuss the nature of two terms which are often confused yet frequently used when discussing Hebrews' exegetical method: allegory and typology.

Allegory and Typology

This exegetical concept [typology] is basic to Hebrews' interpretation of the OT.57

His typology is very close to allegory.58

Its [Allegory's] greatest development in the NT is found in Heb. 7-10.59

In allegory the interpreter attaches a meaning to the narrative which he wants it to convey. His reasons for doing so are entirely subjective...60

Allegory and typology are two prominent yet deceptively simple terms used in the on-going attempt to categorize certain non-literal exegetical practices. Were they clearly defined and applied, there would be no need for discussion. However, as the preceding quotations begin to show, this area of scholarship is confused and charged with emotion. The situation demands further analysis.61

57 Sowers, p. 91. See also Hanson, p. 96; van der Ploeg, p. 228; and R. Williamson, Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970), p. 54.


60 Mickelsen, pp. 13-22.

61 The following studies are basic: (1) H. de Lubac's historical
It is important to realize that modern interpreters do not approach this area as detached observers. Many feel charged to justify the "typological method" because it is frequently used by NT writers. This method (to be discussed below) reflects a view of history in which the world is divided into two ages, and it fits very well into the early Christian impression of Christ being the inaugurator of a new divine Heilsgeschichte. Ellis adds: "This typological view of OT history is a rare, if not unknown, element in contemporary Jewish exegesis." 62

Mickelsen's discussion of typology and allegory carries this apologetic line of reasoning to its extreme position. 63 He is obviously intent on showing that typology (used by the author of Hebrews) was much superior to allegory (used by non-Christians at the time). Must we read "a courageous endeavor...an outstanding accomplishment?" Or be told that though typology "did not measure up to modern standard...it pointed the way to the future day?" (p. 21) And why does he have to blur whatever fine distinctions may exist: "Allegory...only seeks to put across some particular idea under the sponsorship or protection of a meandering piece of literature?" (p. 20) Again, "His reasons [the allegorist's] are entirely subjective." (p. 20) Although broad biases are at work in any discussion of typology and allegory, the main problem centers on how broad a definition one wants to give these terms.

The lack of a commonly accepted definition causes most of the confusion. The problem is a persistent one, because the search for any usable definition invariably skirts two precipices. A fall-off of one results in a definition too broad to be of use, and an overly restricted definition awaits the tottering seeker on the other side. An examination of the term "allegory" clearly reveals this.

---

62 Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, p. 54.

63 Mickelsen, pp. 13-22.
The word ἀλληγορία, a very late and infrequent term in classical Greek culture, etymologically means "to say something" (ὑποψεύω) in "another (ἀλλα) fashion," and so has as its primary meaning "figurative language." A derived meaning becomes "to say" "other" than the obvious sense, or to interpret a text in terms of something else. H.A. Wolfson bases his definition of the term on its etymological roots, and thinks it a mistake to make over-subtle distinctions between what is genuine allegory and what is not. "The allegorical method essentially means the interpretation of a text in terms of something else, irrespective of what that something else is." If one accepts this stance (and Wolfson does not elaborate) all interpretation—including "typological" and "literal"—can rightfully be termed allegorical because one always views a text in terms of something else. This extreme perspective is helpful in realizing that the degree of difference, not of principle, must then become the determining factor in delimiting these exegetical terms.

However, the term allegory is more often used in a much more restricted manner. It becomes a method of decoding Scripture which takes each term, in a passage to be expounded, as a symbol or cryptogram.

---

64 It is probably Hellenistic. The common word before this time was ὑποψεύω (=the real, the underlying meaning). de Lubac suggests (pp. 180f.) that the word ἀλληγορία, in its exegetical sense, might have first been coined by Paul in Gal. 4:21-24. Similarly, Woolcombe, pp. 50f.

65 What we call allegorical interpretation seems to have arisen with the early Greek philosophers (most rigorously with the Stoics from the fourth century) in their attempt to understand the works of Homer and Hesiod. Philo of Alexandria became the master of this art, applying it to the Bible. It is uncertain how early the Jewish tradition began making use of this method. See J. Gutmann, "Aristobulus of Paneas," EJ, vol. 3, pp. 444-45.

66 Wolfson, I, p. 34.


68 P. Büchsel also arrives at this conclusion in studying the terms allegory and typology in "ἀλληγορία," TDNT, ed. G. Kittel, vol. 1, p. 262.
Paul clearly employs this method in Gal. 4:22f.: 

For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave and one by a free woman. But the son of the slave was born according to the flesh, the son of the free woman through promise. Now this is an allegory: these women are two covenants. One is from Mount Sinai in Arabia; she corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother... Now we, brethren, like Isaac, are children of promise.

Typological interpretation, as a look at its etymology will begin to suggest, is also not self-explanatory. The word τύπος, a noun formed from the stem of τύπειν (which basically means "to strike") was very common and had a variety of meaning in classical literature, including the NT. It was the context which gave the word its meaning, and to say that somebody used a "typological" method of interpretation meant very little unless "typological" was defined in more depth. Four of its basic uses can be found in the NT: (1) τύπος is sometimes employed in its more "classical" sense of "mark" (Jn. 20:25) or "idol" (Acts 7:43), and at times (2) as an "example" or "model" to follow (Rom. 6:17). It can also signify (3) an earlier event or person or place that corresponds to a later (post-Christ) one (Rom. 5:14), or (4) points to the heavenly original or model, whereby the earthly one becomes the ἀντίτυπος (Heb. 8:5).

---


71 de Lubac suggests that there was no clear-cut division between typology and allegory even in Paul's time. Grant (p. 134) also concludes: "All terminology in the first century is fluid."


As in the case of allegory, typology has currently taken on a more specific sense. "Typology now means the interpretation of earlier events, persons, and institutions in Biblical history which become proleptic entities, or 'types', anticipating later events, persons, and institutions which are their antitypes." This method has also come to imply an appreciation for history, one where the literal sense of the Scriptural passage is not precluded. Thus, Adam becomes a type of the "coming one" (τύπος τοῦ μεταποίηματος) in Rom. 5:12-21, and one has only to remember the allegorical use of "women" in Gal. 4:22f. to see the different appreciation of the primary sense of Scripture. In Hebrews, the various ways that God has spoken to the fathers becomes a type for which his revelation through the Son was an antitype. The levitical priesthood also becomes a type for which Melchizedek (and consequently Jesus, who belonged to his order) was the antitype.

What does the above discussion suggest? Clearly, the disagreement concerning how one should name Hebrews' exegetical method reflects a more basic lack of consensus about what the terms allegory and typology really mean. The problem is not made simpler by those who feel compelled to defend the typological method because they think it represents the early Christian way and is also closer to the modern attitude of respecting the literal meaning of the Bible. What is to be done? Without a doubt, each person who uses these terms must now define them very specifically, and the definition has to be both narrow enough to limit the area to a workable size, and broad enough to adequately describe


Cf. Williamson: "Typology does not say that the text of the OT means something other than it says;" (p. 530) and Buchanan: "Typology is not designed to give a hidden meaning to the type or to change the meaning originally intended by it." (p. xxv) Also, France, p. 40. Woolcombe's statement summarizes well: "Typological exegesis is the search for linkages between events, persons, or things within the historical framework of revelation, whereas allegorizing is the search for a secondary hidden meaning underlying the primary and obvious meaning of the narrative." (p. 40)

Barth believes that "Exegesis is for the author of Hebrews the hearing participation in the dialogue that goes on within God...."
a way of thinking found in many authors. However, I would advocate
going one step further and not use the terms at all.

Exegetical terms should be aids to a better understanding of a
comp lex situation, and "typology" and "allegory" no longer seem to
serve this purpose. I can see no movement towards a common base by
scholars who use these terms. The disagreements seem to have nestled
into various camps.

If one is to use a specific term, perhaps a different one, such as
Barth's "dialogical interpretation" or Spicq's "parabolisme christologique"
might force a closer examination of the author of Hebrews' particular
method. Another valid alternative is to describe the author's method
without attempting to reduce it to a graspable expression. Westcott
does this well, and part of his description of Hebrews goes accordingly:
"It follows that the historical truth of the Scriptural records is
everywhere guarded, but the recorded facts are treated as "signs", and
the believer is led to see in them a fuller meaning, as the course of
life is unfolded. The records are not changed, but men are changed by
gaining deeper insight into nature and history." In short, I am
suggesting that the careful definition of the terms allegory and typology,
though very much needed, may not be as helpful as using or coining a
different term or describing the situation without recourse to a formula.

**Philo, Qumrân, and Hebrews**

The extant writings of Philo and the Qumrân sectaries, more datable
than the rabbinic material, offer us a clear opportunity to examine the
author of Hebrews' contemporaries. Unfortunately, the legitimate quest
to see whether Philo and the Qumrân sectaries can be of use, in particular
cases, for better understanding and precisely situating Hebrews' exegetical
method, is often intertwined with the vain attempt to show Hebrews' total

(p. 64) Spicq (I, p. 347) thinks that the term παραλλαγή (Heb. 9:9; 11:19)
would have been the one most favored by the author himself.

Westcott, p. 480.

I stress here "exegetical" (and not "textual" or "contextual")
similarity. It does not further our cause to inquire whether both authors
used a similar LXX version, introduced the quotations in a like manner, or
dependence on, or independence of, Philo or the Qumran sectaries. This endeavor to delineate the general relationship and parallels between them is based on three major presuppositions, all of them weak, yet all of them taken up again and again. They warrant further discussion.

First, and most important, many believe that the author of Hebrews can rightfully be considered somebody's disciple if enough similarities can be found between the two. The flaw in this line of reasoning is that discipleship calls for more than subservience and similarity of thought, non-discipleship for more than contradictory views and techniques. In other words, unless we come across a reliable early document stating that the author of Hebrews was definitely a disciple of, let us say, Philo, no amount of long and detailed lists of similarities can ever forcefully prove such a dependence. Some degree of doubt will always remain.

Second, it is often assumed that Greek and Hebrew ways of thought can be clearly differentiated. This is Reid's basic assumption, and the one behind many other scholars' attempts to set out Hebrews' relationship with Philo. The trend today is to see that the two modes of reasoning were not as antithetical as one might think, be it in their exegetical even quoted from similar parts of Scripture. These are questions asked by those concerned with proving or disproving Hebrews' dependence on Philo or the Qumran community.

---


79 If this were not true, it might be difficult to see the later Schelling as Hegel's pupil; or (to use a more contemporary analogy) to realize that P. Goodman and W. Buckley, now so close in thought, were originally in anything but a master-disciple relationship.

80 Reid calls this concern to delineate Philo's relationship to the author of Hebrews "the central issue." (p. 5) There have been in modern times, strong arguments brought forth to show both enough similarities between Philo and Hebrews to warrant calling the author of Hebrews Philo's disciple (especially Spicq, I, pp. 39-91.); and enough striking differences to deter any positive conclusions (Sowers, Williamson, and Hanson). Thomas has even attempted to prove that the author of Hebrews' obvious theological and methodological differences from Philo are simply reflections and conscious adaptations of their shared past. See The Use of the Septuagint, pp. 248-311; and "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," p. 308.
methods, thought patterns as a whole, or more particularly in their concept of time. Lastly, there is the assumption that Qumranic exegesis is perfectly definable, peculiar (i.e. different from rabbinic exegesis), and perhaps comparable to Hebrews. "Midrash pesher" is the term that has been coined to describe the seemingly peculiar type of exegesis practised by the Qumran sectaries, an interpretation said to be related to the Qumran sect.
to (on the basis of type of exegesis) and distinguished from (on the basis of style and content) the previously known rabbinic midrashim. That this type of exegesis is surely definable is perhaps misleading because it is uncertain what Hebrew texts were used by these members; that it is peculiar enough to warrant a separation from rabbinic exegetical practices is highly problematic, at best. The question to ask is: Can the use of a particular text by Philo or the Qumran sectaries clarify a hitherto confusing passage in Hebrews?

The attempt to use Qumranic methods of exegesis to better understand some NT works is not new. Certain features of the Gospel of Matthew, especially the "formula quotations," led Stendahl to conclude that the Gospel might have been written by a "school," a community of scholars studying Scripture and trying to relate it to Jesus's life. Mainly due to the seemingly very free use of the text in the citations (including alteration of the consonantal text at times), Stendahl states: "The main object of our study...will be to prove clear affinity between the type of OT interpretation to be found in a certain group of Matthew's quotations and the way in which this sect of Qumran treats the book of Habakkuk." (p. 31) Kistemaker has tried to show that the interpretative method of Hebrews (as viewed through a close analysis of eleven Psalm citations) is also very similar to that found at Qumran.


88 Gundry forcefully criticized his view.

89 However, the Achilles heel of Kistemaker's argument is his surprising failure to describe rabbinic interpretative methods which account just as well for the similarities he wishes to make between Qumran and Hebrews.
eschatological perspective, and their habit of relating a text to a contemporary event. Believing all the words of the prophets to enigmatically refer to the end of time, the end of time to be at hand, and to be in the presence of an interpreter who had received from God the key—the *pesher*—to unlock the real significance underlying the prophetic oracles, the Qumrán sectaries evolved an exegetical system that was bound to be reminiscent of Hebrews' method. But, apart from a few not-too-surprising similar uses of some basic texts, I have not found my readings of the Scrolls to be particularly useful in illuminating individual citations in Hebrews. The only significant lead seems to be the interpretation of Melchizedek in 11 Q Melch. "Dans le Midrash de Qumrán (11 Q. Melk), basé sur le dérash de Gen. 14, du Ps. 110, d'Is. 52, 7, et du Ps. 81, Melchisédeq devient un personnage humano-divin, Messie sacerdotal et Juge eschatologique...."91 The linking of Gen. 14 and Ps. 110, and the importance placed on Melchizedek perhaps represent the basic tradition from which the author of Hebrews developed his singular conception of Melchizedek in chapter 7.

The attempt to compare Hebrews with Philo is a common one, but a mere survey of Philo's works immediately reveals a very different general exegetical method from Hebrews.92 I was able to find only three clear instances of exegetical similarities93: Nb. 12:7 in Heb. 3:2, 5 and "Noah's Work as a Planter," 68;94 Gen. 14:17-20 in Heb. 7:1-10 and "Allegorical Interpretation," III, 78-82;95 and Gen. 22:16-17 in Heb. 6:14 and "Allegorical Interpretation," III, 203.96 None of the similarities adds new light on

---

90 E.g. Hab. 2:3-4 in Heb. 10:39 and I Qp. Hab; 2 Sam. in Heb. 1:5 and 4 Q Fl.


92 A peculiarity noted by many. See Williamson, pp. 576f. Sowers' work arrives at the same conclusion. Also, "...their basic hermeneutical principles are quite distinct." (Bruce, p. 1) Even Spicq, who considers the author of Hebrews to be a true (Christianized) disciple of Philo, states (I, pp. 63-64): "On voit combien l'exégèse de Hébr. est loin de celle de Philon...." However, Mickelsen finds the author of Hebrews' exegetical method to be very close to that of Philo.

93 Using for my ground work the Loeb Scripture Index to Philo's works (X, pp. 189-268). Thomas found five similar interpretations, but four were based on indirect quotations in Hebrews.

94 LCL, III, 246-47.
Hebrews' usage, since all the passages in the letter are understandable without Philo's aid.

In this section, I have tried to show what happens when the question of Hebrews' dependence on either Philo or Qumran is left aside, and when we try to ascertain how helpful Philo and the Qumran sectaries are in shedding light on Hebrews' use of Scripture. I have suggested that apart from the interpretation of Melchizedek in 11 Q Melch, little seems to be gained by perusing the works of Philo and the Qumran sectaries. 

The Apocryphal Literature

Another potentially valuable but practically veiled source of information concerning the use of Scripture in Hebrews is the Apocryphal (and Pseudepigraphal, for those still wishing to make that distinction) tradition. By setting forth some of the diverse first century thought of both Palestinian and Alexandrian provenance, it is essential for a fuller understanding of first century Judaism. Unfortunately, there are serious handicaps which the textual critic must consider. Dating, origin, destination, and provenance are—as in Hebrews—for the most part uncertain in the Apocryphal tradition, but more important our present versions are generally Greek translations of Hebrew and Aramaic originals. Precisely determining the Scriptural text used and the minute exegetical practices performed on it are then impossible. Nevertheless, some valuable information can be obtained from these sources.

J.K. Zink's work, the only systematic endeavor to study the Apocryphal tradition's use of Scripture, clearly brings out its possible use for the NT scholar. Part of the process of determining an author's 

95LCL, I, 353-55.
96LCL, I, 439.
97By "Apocryphal" I mean the various Jewish literary works (apart from those at Qumran, for the present discussion) written during the first two centuries before and after the Common Era, that failed to enter the Jewish canon, and were not included or mentioned (apart from Sirach) in the rabbinic tradition.
hermeneutical method lies in examining what parts of Scripture he used and how he introduced these quotations into his text. Zink has made a good beginning at amassing such material, material that is suggestive in light of Hebrews' method. Introductory formulae, frequent and unique in Hebrews, are rare and different in the Apocryphal books studied. Similarly, the favorite areas of Scripture for the author of Hebrews are ignored by the Apocryphal writers.

98. The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha. D. Hartmann also has begun to deal with the importance of Scripture for the Apocryphal writers, preferring to concentrate on only four passages rather than to attempt a more sweeping survey of the entire tradition. It is a suggestive study. However, Zink's work is the only one that enables the student to get an overview.

99. He limits his study to ten books: 4 Ezra, Tobit, Judith, The Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Ben Sira, Baruch, Additions to Daniel, the Prayer of Manasseh, and I and II Maccabees. The presuppositions behind much of his study are questionable. He assumes relatively fixed LXX and Hebrew traditions, and then attempts to find the sources for the citations--either in the Greek or Hebrew texts that we now have--in order to use this "fact" to help determine the original language of the particular text.

100. Unlike other NT works, there is no reference in Hebrews to a particular Scriptural section or to a human author (unless one takes "in David" of 4:7 to refer to a specific person or book). There is no use of the characteristic word denoting fulfilment (τὸ πληρῶς and its derivatives). See B. M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and Mishnah," JBL 70(1951): 297-307. Furthermore, there is no denoting Scripture as "something written" (γέγραπτός), the favorite rabbinic way of introducing a citation (Metzger, p. 305). Instead, the author of Hebrews uses a verb of saying (εἰθαυματε) without combining it (as commonly done) with the name of a prophet or with "Scripture."


101. Of 83 passages, 17 have introductory formulae.

102. Zink's Appendix A (pp. 191-93) at first glance points out five possible similarities, three of them using the same verse and two using nearby verses--related if one takes the entire context into account. Same verse: Gen. 14:19-20 in Judith 13:18-20 and Heb. 7:1-2; Gen. 22:17 in The Add. to Daniel, Prayer of Azariah 13 (LXX=Dan. 3:36) and Heb. 6:13-14; Dt. 32:36 in 2 Macc. 7:6 and Heb. 10:30.
Interesting as these details may be, they are not of much use in better understanding Hebrews. Analyzing minute exegetical practices in the Apocryphal tradition (e.g., How does the author view his text? How does he work with it and mold it?) becomes a matter of guesswork. Modern textual research is greatly complicating the issue by revealing the diverse nature of the first century Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. This trend, when applied to the Apocryphal (translated) works, clearly indicates the uncertainty that must face the modern scholar when he attempts to determine precisely how the author of a particular Apocryphal work made use of Scripture. Zink's tentative conclusions, based on a more secure but now outdated vision of the first century text, must be viewed as even more hypothetical.

Summary

To summarize, "midrash," "allegory," and "typology" are all variously defined, and perhaps undefinable, terms used by the majority of scholars to explain a variety of different phenomena. Precision of definition is required. There seems to be a shift away from supposing that the author of Hebrews depended on one of his contemporaries towards determining how useful the rabbinic and targumic works, Philo, Qumrân and the Apocryphal tradition are for the NT scholar. A redirection of purpose is in order. What does this imply for a study of Hebrews?

If midrash is a term at present describing a mass of disparate material (Wright), if a meaningful understanding of it can only come through a study of its genesis and evolution (Bloch), it is surely only through a diligent examination of recent literature concerning Jewish exegesis that the student of Hebrews can attempt to define and to apply this term—and only provisionally. Moreover, rabbinic midrash can no longer automatically be considered the standard by which first century Jewish exegesis is to be understood. A similar note of caution applies as well to the terms "allegory" and "typology." I have suggested that

Same context: 2 Sam. 7:13 in 4 Ez. 3:24 and Heb. 1:5; Gen. 47:29 in I Macc. 2:49 and Heb. 11:21. However, a closer examination of the specific Greek texts in question reveals that the three similarities of verse are all superficial, since they use different sections of the verse. Five close contexts remain, and a detailed look soon reveals a great difference in every case.
these two terms are used in such a variety of ways and with such
underlying emotion that it might be advantageous to categorize Hebrews'
exegetical method in a different way or by a different term.

I have hinted throughout this chapter that a shift in purpose is
necessary. It is misleading to try to show that the author of Hebrews
depended on any of his contemporaries. Theoretically, it is deceptive
to assume that finding similarities between two people or groups
of people warrants our calling one the disciple of the other. Practically,
that the author of Hebrews depended on rabbinic midrashim is impossible
to determine. Two reasons have been given: (1) the rabbinic texts
were written after the first century, and one cannot judge with any
degree of accuracy how far back the traditions go; and (2) what importance
rabbinism had on first century thought cannot be ascertained. That
the author depended on Philo is also difficult to determine, for Greek
and Hebrew thought cannot be divided as neatly as hitherto imagined.
That he depended on the Qumran sectaries is unknown because it is very
difficult to categorize the particular type of exegesis practised
at Qumran. And even though recent evidence tends to support the idea
that the greater part of the Palestinian Targums accurately reflects
first century thought, that the author of Hebrews depended on the
targumic tradition can also not be determined because any targumic
text can reflect a thought later than the first century.

The redirected question is then: Can the author of Hebrews'
method be illuminated by the works of his contemporaries? The answer
seems disappointingly negative. The rabbinic techniques can facilitate
the understanding of similar ways found in Hebrews, e.g. *gezerah*
*shawah*, *haraz*, and *a fortiori* reasoning. And the targums (e.g.,
Neofiti, Gen. 14:18) and the Qumranic material (e.g., 11 Q Melch)
suggestively offer an understanding of Melchizedek similar to that of
Hebrews. But very little in the letter seems to be made clearer by
perusing the works of Philo and the Qumran sectaries, or of the rabbis,
the targums, and the Apocryphal traditions. The author of Hebrews'
method of interpreting Scripture is quite independent of any that we
know.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

When a man finishes
he is only beginning,
and when he stops,
he is as puzzled as ever.

(Eccles. 18:6[Jer.Bible])

The survey of areas important for a critical interpretation of Hebrews' use of Scripture is completed. We must now ask how this inquiry has contributed to an understanding of a sound starting point for further study.

There are three interrelated areas of summary and recommendation. The first is concerned with the increasing difficulty of determining the particular form of Scripture that the author of Hebrews used. Although our present LXX compilation still represents the text which is closest to that used by Hebrews, we have seen how modern textual studies have underlined the fragility of such a theory. The finds at Qumran have clearly revealed the possible variety of first century Hebrew texts of the Bible, and P. Katz has pointed to the composite nature of our LXX versions. The discovery of testimonia at Qumran, coupled with a more sophisticated way of examining possible collections of such proof-texts, raises the possibility that some NT writings reflect this influence. Furthermore, although the likelihood that the author of Hebrews relied on some liturgical collection(s) seems quite remote, it cannot be discarded altogether. Textual analysis of Hebrews now runs its course between the Scylla of traditional exegetes who are content with comparing Hebrews' quotations with the LXX, and the Charybdis of radical interpreters who are skeptical about the possibility of isolating Hebrews' textual source.
The second area of discussion focuses on the difficulty of isolating the exegetical methods of Hebrews' contemporaries and the feasibility of applying these methods to Hebrews in order to better understand the letter. The rabbinic material now must be broken down into pericopae that are individually analyzed and at least tentatively dated before they can be applied to the first century. The same stricture applies to the use of the targums, many of which probably reflect first century thought. Important introductory work in the Apocryphal field also reveals many textual problems and questions about the texts' Sitz im Leben. Concerning the Qumrān sectaries and Philo, the material must be sorted out and then questioned in different terms. That is, instead of asking if Hebrews is dependent on Philo and/or the Qumrān sectaries, one must ask if they are of use in reaching a better understanding of Hebrews. The same point made in relation to Hebrews' other contemporaries as well, to the extent that they can be isolated, yields a surprisingly negative conclusion. The author of Hebrews' contemporaries seem to help us very little in better understanding his use of Scripture.

And finally, the student must realize that general terms like "midrash," "allegory," and "typology" are not self-explanatory. If they are to be used at all in characterizing Hebrews' exegetical method it must be done with careful precision.

The foregoing analysis may appear to be largely annihilating in its insistence that the "facts" are few. But the emphasis on how little evidence the historian of Hebrews has to work with is therapeutic and has far-reaching implications. It challenges the conventional attitude of historians to ignore the problem of lost data and to organize existing information into as seamless a web as possible, assuming the novelist's role of omniscient narrator.
When one is not constantly aware of this dearth of information, much scholarly literature on Hebrews resembles a lipogram, a piece of writing in which the author rejects all words containing a certain letter. The psychological reaction of an unwarned reader who encounters such a lipogram is a vague uneasiness, the sense that something inexplicable is wrong; it is the same kind of feeling that Kafka's "K" had in The Trial. Scholarly work on Hebrews must now determine precisely what evidence is available, and especially what evidence is not. In isolating what we know, as well as what has gone wrong and why, the road to further research is cleared. Future historians will then have to decide what direction this road should take.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts


Reference Works


Commentaries


Books


Mann, Jacob. The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue: A Study in the Cycles of the Readings from the Torah and the Prophets, as well as from Psalms, and in the Structure of Midrashic Homilies. Prolegomenon by B.Z. Wacholder. Vol. I. New York: KTAV, 1971 (1940 orig.).


Articles and Essays


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATIONS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJPhilol</td>
<td>The American Journal of Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUOS</td>
<td>The Annual of the Oriental Society of Leeds University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
<td>Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td>John Rylands Library Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHB</td>
<td>The Cambridge History of the Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQR</td>
<td>The Church Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia Judaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL</td>
<td>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpT</td>
<td>Expository Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>History of Religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUCA</td>
<td>The Hebrew Union College Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>Israel Exploration Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Judaism Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSJ</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of Judaism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>Loeb Classical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Patrologia Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RechScR</td>
<td>Recherches de Science Religieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Journal Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Revue de Qumrân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevRel</td>
<td>Review of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevScR</td>
<td>Revue des Sciences Religieuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBibFr</td>
<td>Studium Biblicum Franciscum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDNT</td>
<td>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThSt</td>
<td>Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDBS</td>
<td>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZFNW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>