DAVID M. ALLEN

Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 238

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

238

David M. Allen

Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews

A Study in Narrative Re-presentation

Mohr Siebeck

David M. Allen, born 1972; 2007 PhD at the University of Edinburgh; currently Tutor in New Testament Studies at the Queen's Foundation in Birmingham, U. K.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151581-1
ISBN 978-3-16-149566-3
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This study is a reworking of my doctoral dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Divinity at the University of Edinburgh. I am grateful to the Faculty for their generous fees scholarship over the three years of study and for the attention and interest of its staff and broader academic community over that time. My primary supervisor, Prof. Timothy Lim, showed considerable interest in the research project and I am indebted both to his close attention to the thesis' finer detail and for his encouragement to pursue the topic in the first instance. He has been a model *Doktorvater*. The thesis was examined by Prof. Steve Moyise and Dr. Helen Bond and I am appreciative of their suggestions and comments during the review process.

I would also like to thank other individuals who have contributed to the thesis reaching publication stage. Dr. George Guthrie helped give the topic some initial shape, whilst Prof. Friedrich Avemarie offered important critical insights to the text's finer form. I am grateful to the the editor of the WUNT II series, Prof. Jörg Frey, for accepting the work into this prestigious series, and to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and his staff at Mohr Siebeck for their patient assistance in preparing the manuscript for publication.

It was a scholarly pleasure and spiritual blessing to be surrounded by other doctoral students whilst in the process of my doing my research and I have been gladdened by their ongoing friendship and patience as I shared with them my reading of this "word of exhortation." To the following I offer my particular thanks: Holly Carey, Jeff Brannon, Chris Keith, Judy Diehl, David McCabe, Dieter Roth, Michael Leary, Will Rutherford and Jeromey Martini.

The project was also conducted with the support of a large cloud of witnesses, who gave of their time, self and resources to bring it to fruition. Their friendship remains a great blessing to our family: Chad and Heidi Blair, Matthew and Cathy Dalton, Richard George, Kay Morrow, Wendy Harrison, Graham and Chris Batchelor, John and Sarah Murton, Scott McGuiness, Libby Ballard, Cindy Bennett and Rev. Gareth and Michelle McFadden. Michelle also offered expert proofreading skills and improved the language of the thesis no end. I would also like to thank the Livingston house group hosted by Rev. David and Jean Liddle, for their support and encouragement along the way.

Our families have been a constant source of encouragement and support, and to both Brian and Susan Allen, and Dorothy and Peter Linnett, I offer our love and thanks. But final, and special, thanks must go to my wonderful wife Beccy and our son Seth, who make the time away from research that much more pleasurable.

Birmingham, November 2007 David Mark Allen

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

The Relationship between Hebrews & Deuteronomy

1.1 Introduction & History

The letter to the Hebrews[1] has been described as "one of the earliest and most successful attempts to define the relation between the Old and New Testaments"[2] and its author similarly portrayed as "more than anyone else, the Old Testament theologian of the New."[3] Any serious analysis of the letter must take account of its exposition and application of the Greek Jewish Scriptures. Whilst its ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ ἀγενεαλόγητος production has generated widespread debate as to its milieu and conceptual background,[4] such speculation has always had to engage with the letter's core Old Testament (OT) material[5] to justify any position adopted. Hebrews' use of the

---

[1] Hebrews' genre has engaged scholars for many years. Whilst we will make much of its oral and sermonic character, we receive it in epistolary form, with customary personalised valedictions (13:22–25). Hence we will refer to it primarily as a letter or epistle, not judging Deissman's distinction between the two expressions (cf. Gustav Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910), 227–30), but recognising, in modern parlance at least, the terms' synonymy. Using both labels avoids unnecessary and stylistically awkward repetition.

[2] George B. Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *CJT* 5 (1959): 45.

[3] D. Moody Smith, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays; Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring* (ed. James M. Efird; Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972), 61.

[4] The best recent assessment of such issues remains L. D. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought* (SNTSMS 65; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

[5] Scholarly opinion varies as to the appropriate terminology for identifying the Scriptural imagery – 'Hebrew Bible,' 'Old Testament,' 'Israel's Scriptures' etc. In the interests of consistency, and because Hebrews itself describes a πρώτη διαθήκη as παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον (8:13), we will henceforth use 'Old Testament' terminology.

A further terminological clarification is also requisite. Whilst the use of gender-specific language will generally be avoided, the textual witness of 11:32 (the masculine participle διηγούμενον) makes the case for male authorship strong. We will therefore use masculine terminology for the author when absolutely necessary.

OT is intrinsic to the prevailing worldview in which its readers are invited to participate:

> Through its multiple citations from the Greek text of Scripture, its mode of introducing those citations that treat Scripture as a living and spoken word, and its intricate interpretations of Scripture in light of a contemporary experience, Hebrews constructs a world for its hearers that is entirely and profoundly scriptural.[6]

Research on the function of the OT in Hebrews has consequently been relatively abundant and space precludes an exhaustive discussion of the material produced.[7] Whilst such categorisation can be somewhat artificial, the dominant drive of OT/Hebrews research has tended towards text-critical and *Vorlage* analysis of the letter's quotations,[8] along with related issues such as the author's exegetical technique[9] and hermeneutical assumptions.[10] More

---

[6] Luke Timothy Johnson, "The Scriptural World of Hebrews," *Int* 57 (2003): 247.

[7] For a comprehensive review of recent scholarship see Radu Gheorgita, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews* (WUNT 2/160; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003), 7–25; George H. Guthrie, "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research," *Currents in Biblical Research* 1 (2003): 271–94.

[8] Kenneth J. Thomas, "Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," *NTS* 11 (1965): 303–25; Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2001), 98–108; Simon Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Soest, 1961), 17–60; George E. Howard, "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations," *NovT* 10 (1968): 208–16; John C. McCullough, "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews," *NTS* 26 (1980): 363–79; Alan H. Cadwallader, "The Correction of the Text of Hebrews towards the LXX," *NovT* 34 (1992): 257–92; Peter Katz, "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews," *ZNW* 49 (1958): 213–23; William Leonard, *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Critical Problem and Use of the Old Testament* (London: Vatican Polyglot, 1939); Gert Jacobus Steyn, "A Quest for the Vorlage of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut 32) Quotations in Hebrews," *Neot* 34 (2000): 263–72.

[9] Friedrich Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger* (Biblische Untersuchungen 4; Regensburg: Pustet, 1968); Herbert W. Bateman IV, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5–13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage* (American University Studies: Series VII Theology and Religion 193; New York: Peter Lang, 1997); Caird, "Exegetical," 44–51; R. T. France, "The Writer of Hebrews as a Biblical Expositor," *TynBul* 47 (1996): 245–76; Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (trans. Donald H. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 161–78; Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 94–133; Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 158–85.

[10] Graham Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics* (SNTSMS 36; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Markus Barth, "The Old Testament in Hebrews: An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics," in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper* (ed. W. Klassen and G. W. Snyder; London: SCM, 1962), 53–78; Dale F. Leschert, *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms* (NABPR dissertation series 10; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1994); Stephen Motyer, "The Psalm Quotations of Hebrews

recently, the research scope has extended to the specific influence of the LXX,[11] the rhetorical function of the OT,[12] use of familiar OT narratives,[13] and analyses focused upon the letter's (non-divine) OT protagonists.[14]

1: A Hermeneutic-Free Zone?" *TynBul* 50 (1999): 3–22; A. T. Hanson, "Hebrews," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 292–302; Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 61–94; Kiwoong Son, *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews: Hebrews 12:18–24 as a Hermeneutical Key to the Epistle* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005); Sidney G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Richmond: John Knox, 1965); Steve Stanley, "A New Covenant Hermeneutic: The Use of Scripture in Hebrews 8–10," *TynBul* 46 (1995): 204–06; Francis Charles Synge, *Hebrews and the Scriptures.* (London: SPCK, 1959); James W. Thompson, *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (CBQMS 13; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982); Ronald Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

[11] Gheorgita, *Role*, 32–231; Martin Karrer, "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 335–53.

[12] On Hebrews' general rhetorical qualities, see Michael R. Cosby, *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11 in Light of Example Lists in Antiquity* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988); David A. deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); Barnabas Lindars, "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews," *NTS* 35 (1989): 382–406; Thomas H. Olbricht, "Hebrews as Amplification," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; JSNTSup 90; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 375–87; Duane F. Watson, "Rhetorical Criticism of Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles since 1978," *CurBS* 5 (1997): 175–207.

[13] Martin Emmrich, "Hebrews 6:4–6 – Again! (A Pneumatological Inquiry)," *WTJ* 65 (2003): 83–95; Peter Enns, "Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1–4:13," *WTJ* 55 (1993): 255–80; Philip F. Esler, "Collective Memory and Hebrews 11: Outlining a New Investigative Framework," in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity* (ed. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher; SemeiaSt 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005); Randall C. Gleason, "The Old Testament Background of the Warning in Hebrews 6:4–8," *BSac* 155 (1998): 62–91; Randall C. Gleason, "The Old Testament Background of Rest in Hebrews 3:7–4:11," *BSac* 157 (2000): 281–303; Jon Laansma, *I Will Give You Rest: The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3–4* (WUNT 2/98; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1997); Hermut Löhr, "'Heute, wenn ihr seine Stimme hört.' Zur Kunst der Schriftanwendung im Hebräerbrief und in 1 Kor 10," in *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum* (ed. Martin Hengel and Hermut Löhr; WUNT 73; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994), 226–48; Dave Mathewson, "Reading Heb 6:4–6 in Light of the Old Testament," *WTJ* 61 (1999): 209–25; Verlyn D. Verbrugge, "Towards a New Interpretation of Hebrews 6:4–6," *CTJ* 15 (1980): 61–73; Noel Weeks, "Admonition and Error in Hebrews," *WTJ* 39 (1976): 72–80.

One potential avenue of inquiry for Hebrews' research is the way in which an individual OT book functions corporately within the letter. The recent publications in the *New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel* series pursue this book-based approach,[15] and build upon other intertextual studies on Hebrews' use of particular OT books, especially the Psalms corpus.[16] Our study sits within this stream of inquiry, though, as we shall suggest below, goes beyond its predecessors in terms of working out the nature of the interrelationship. We will examine the use of Deuteronomy in the letter to the Hebrews, attempting to discern how the latter's various OT motifs might contribute to a 'Deuteronomic' reading of the letter.

Such a book-based approach might appear anachronistic, as Hebrews itself appears initially uninterested in the precise textual provenance or human 'author' of the cited material. God, Son and the Holy Spirit are rather the dominant Scriptural orators; David is subsequently accredited the quotation of Ps 95:7 in Heb 4:7, but he is only an instrument (ἐν Δαυὶδ λέγων – 4:7) of the Spirit's prior voicing (cf. 3:7). Likewise, the human author of Ps 8 remains anonymous, being merely "someone somewhere" who penned the psalm's testimony (Heb 2:6; cf. the similar disinterest in 5:6). The absence, however, of a specified origin does not necessarily require that the citation's source is not contingent upon or in service of the prevailing argument. It seems imperative, for example, that Ps 110:1 and 110:4 co-exist in the same parent text, as this permits Hebrews to interpret Melchizedeck as a genuine king-priest.[17] It is perfectly possible that the author's choice of OT materials (quotations, allusions, echoes, characters, themes *et al*) are not merely apologetic or coincidental proof texts, but rather corporately reconstruct a familiar OT narrative that serves the author's hortatory purpose.

At first glance, Hebrews and Deuteronomy might seem to make unlikely conversation partners. Hebrews announces the demise of the 'former' or 'old' covenant (Heb 8:13; 10:9) which Deuteronomy, on initial reading perhaps, appears to establish as the rule for life in the land (Deut 4:40; 5:1; 12:1; 29:9). Hebrews' widely acknowledged linguistic excellence is in stark contrast to

---

[14] Pamela M. Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (SBLDS 156; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Mary Rose D'Angelo, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* (SBLDS 42; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

[15] Thus far in the series: Harold W. Attridge, "The Psalms in Hebrews," in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 197–212; J. Cecil McCullough, "Isaiah in Hebrews," in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 159–73.

[16] For example, Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 96–133.

[17] Cf. Son, *Zion*, 149: "(I)t is not only the priestly oracle of verse 4 of Psalm 110 but also the kingly oracle of verse 1 of the Psalm that contribute to the superior nature of Jesus' high priesthood in Hebrews."

LXX Deuteronomy's rather unwieldy and harsh Greek rendering, occasioned by its desire to faithfully replicate its Hebrew *Vorlage*.[18] The NT letter is dominated by priestly and sacrificial language, much of which is drawn from Leviticus rather than Deuteronomy, a text for which priestly discourse and praxis are, at best, only minor elements. However, intertextual treatment of two apparently 'foreign' narratives can nonetheless open up profitable lines of inquiry in previously unexpected ways[19] and a number of surface similarities between Hebrews and Deuteronomy invite further comparative analysis. Qumranic expectation of a priestly messiah drew its substance from a Deuteronomic testimonium (Deut 33:8–11 – cf. 4Q175), whilst Hebrews' paradigmatic prologue portrays the Son in terms of the prophet-priest-king trinity of Deut 17:14–18:22 (prophet – 1:1–2; priest – 1:3; king – 1:3).[20] Both texts appeal to past events/history as grounds for action in the present. Both invest the land motif with a soteriological character, and define apostasy in terms of the failure to enter that land. Both are sermonic or homiletic in character and appeal for attention to the spoken word. Both climax in discourses focused around two mountains, with cursing and blessing motifs prominent in each montage. Likewise, each one explicates a covenant that marks the end of the Mosaic era and a consequent change in leadership to a figure named Ἰησοῦς.

It is our contention that such surface similarities are actually symptoms of, or signposts to, a Deuteronomic reading of Hebrews. Even a cursory glance at the letter suggests that the Song of Moses (Deut 32) has a particular attraction for Hebrews, as three of its Deuteronomic quotations are sourced from this particular chapter (1:6, 10:30a, 10:30b; cf. Deut 32:43, 35, 36). More detailed exegesis will also reveal echoes of Deut 32 in Heb 2:1 (32:46), 2:5 (32:8–9 LXX), 3:12–19 (32:15; 32:20; 32 *passim*), 4:12 (32:46–47), 6:7 (32:2, especially in rabbinic discourse), 10:23 (32:4) and 10:25 (32:35).

The letter's use of Deuteronomy remains fairly uncharted territory in terms of Hebrews' scholarship. Whilst there has been some analysis of the actual

---

[18] Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie. 5, Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 33 note that parts of the text are "rude pour des oreilles grecques." J. W. Wevers, "The Attitude of the Greek Translator Towards His Parent Text," in *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walter Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Herbert Donner, et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 500–501 observes: "Deut is … obsessed by faithfulness to the parent text sometimes to the point of obscurity."

[19] Cf. Seán Freyne, "Reading Hebrews and Revelation Intertextually," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (ed. Sipke Draisma; Kampen, Netherlands: J H Kok, 1989), 83–93, whose comparison of two remarkably different texts yields interesting and fruitful results.

[20] On Deut 18:18–19 within prophet-priest-king messianic thought, see William Horbury, "Monarchy and Messianism in the Greek Pentateuch," in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Michael A. Knibb; BETL 195; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006), 110–15.

quotations of Deuteronomy within Hebrews,[21] these have attempted primarily to ascertain their *Vorlage*, rather than to construct an overarching Deuteronomic reading of the letter. Works have occasionally dealt with Hebrews' assessment of issues pertinent to Deuteronomy, such as the wilderness wanderings,[22] the role of the new covenant[23] or the letter's depiction of Moses,[24] but none do so through particularly Deuteronomic lenses.

Several scholars have, however, made guarded remarks about the affinity between the two texts or touched upon their interrelationship. A broad application of Deuteronomic ideology to Hebrews, for example, is made by Robin Nixon:

> (T)he author sees the situation of his readers as being parallel to that of the people of the first Exodus. … (T)he forty years are running out as AD 70 approaches; the people of Israel are to bring upon themselves the curses threatened in an Exodus context in the book of Deuteronomy and they will be dispossessed of their inheritance as the heathen were; the new people of God will then be led by the new Joshua, Jesus, into their spiritual inheritance.[25]

Of Heb 12:15, Peter Rhea Jones opines that "the vivid picture, 'root of bitterness,' is taken directly from Deuteronomy 29, along with much else relevant to the concerns of Hebrews," whilst of 13:5, he notes how "with great pastoral sensitivity and mastery of Deuteronomy the author confirmed God's promise of his constant presence."[26] John Proctor likewise avers that "Deuteronomy as a whole is a quarry where Hebrews digs a good deal of information," and tentatively suggests that both texts exhibit contextual and situational parallels in terms of journeying and apostasy.[27] P. C. B. Andriessen notes how Hebrews "s'inspire souvent de LXXDt, soit par des citations, soit par des allusions" and finds such Deuteronomic influence outworked in Hebrews' use of the land motif.[28] In an essay on Deuteronomy's contemporary promise/fulfilment relevance, Gerhard von Rad remarks: "we

---

[21] Katz, "Quotations," 213–23; Steyn, "Quest," 263–72. Forthcoming in the 'New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel' series is Steyn's chapter on Deuteronomy in Hebrews.

[22] Ernst Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk: eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief* (FRLANT 55; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), 5–58.

[23] Susanne Lehne, *The New Covenant in Hebrews* (JSNTSup 44; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

[24] D'Angelo, *Moses*.

[25] Robin Ernest Nixon, *The Exodus in the New Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1963), 27.

[26] Peter Rhea Jones, "A Superior Life: Hebrews 12:3–13:25," *RevExp* 82 (1985): 394, 400.

[27] John Proctor, "Judgement or Vindication? Deuteronomy 32 in Hebrews 10:30," *TynBul* 55 (2004): 68, 74–75.

[28] P. C. B. Andriessen, "La Teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de Hé 1:6 et 2:14b-3:2," *NovT* 18 (1976): 295n3.

are astonished how similar Israel's situation before God is to that in which the New Testament church found itself.… (W)ith respect to what we have said about the history of salvation between election and fulfilment, just think of the Letter to the Hebrews!"[29] Dieter Georgi also observes how "(u)nder heavy influence of Deuteronomy, Hebrews understands law most of all as paraenesis."[30]

Probably the most significant examination of the relationship between Deuteronomy and Hebrews is contained within John Dunnill's avowedly structuralist assessment of the epistle.[31] Dunnill remarks upon a number of common symbolic affinities between the two texts (including covenant renewal, sacred time/place, divine encounter) and it will become clear that our thesis benefits from many of his astute observations on their intertextual exchange. He finds a common vision within them, concluding:

> (t)he relation between Hebrews and Deuteronomy is ... in each case an attempt to articulate God's call and challenge to his people, not only in an authoritative preaching but through the re-presentation of an event, in the celebration of a divine personal presence and the possibilities which that presence opens up: the renewal of history.[32]

Despite Dunnill's commendable sensitivity to the texts' shared themes, however, his monograph is not a comprehensive assessment on their interrelationship (and never intends to be so). To paraphrase Heb 4:1, it still remains for someone to enter into a full analysis of the function of Deuteronomy in Hebrews.[33]

1.2 Deuteronomy as Text

Deuteronomy purports to be the farewell address of Moses, a retelling of the Horeb theophany and its associated stipulations, whilst at the same time expounding further statutes and regulations that compose its central law code. The discourse culminates in a covenant renewal ceremony on the plains of

---

[29] Gerhard von Rad, "Ancient Word and Living Word: The Preaching of Deuteronomy and Our Preaching," *Int* 15 (1961): 8–9.

[30] Dieter Georgi, "Hebrews and the Heritage of Paul," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights* (ed. Gabriella Gelardini; Biblical Interpretation Series 75; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 244.

[31] John Dunnill, *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS 75; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[32] Dunnill, *Covenant*, 134.

[33] Guy Prentiss Waters, *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul* (WUNT 2/221; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2006), 250 arrives independently at this conclusion, and ponders whether "there is a discernible pattern to the engagement of Deut 29, 31, and 32 in Hebrews." Our study seeks to address his question.

Moab that marks the handover of leadership from Moses to Joshua under the auspices of torah and Song. Its status as a pre-eminent text within Second Temple Judaism has been well established[34] and aspects of its significance will be explicated in the following chapter. Lim remarks: "On virtually every page and column of Second Temple Jewish literature, one is able to detect a verbatim citation, *oratio obliqua* or allusion to a Deuteronomic source."[35] Despite such contemporary prominence, or perhaps because of it, some clarification is necessary regarding the parameters and content of what we shall henceforth identify as 'Deuteronomy.' What would a Greek reader like Hebrews' author have understood by it and what text would have been available to him?[36]

Deuteronomy is attested in several major textual streams ((proto-)MT, LXX, (proto-)SamP), and manifests further development and interpretation within targumic and rabbinic traditions. Modern OT scholarship also divides on what is genuinely 'Deuteronomic,' variously restricting core Deuteronomy to chapters 12–26[37] or 4:44–30:20.[38] It cannot, therefore, be merely *assumed* that the LXX composed all 34 chapters, and to speak of a precise 'final' or 'canonical' form is both unduly simplistic and contrary to the contrasting

---

[34] Most recently, see Sidnie White Crawford, "Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 140: "Deut was an authoritative text in and of itself, an important book in the creation of texts for study purposes and/or liturgical use, and was used as a base text in the exegetical creation of Rewritten Bible works with claims to their own authority. Deuteronomy may be termed the 'second law' but clearly has attained the first place in Second Temple Judaism." Twenty-nine manuscripts of Deuteronomy have been unearthed in the Judean Desert (26 at Qumran), a volume second in abundance only to the Psalms (numbering 40) – Julie A. Duncan, "Deuteronomy, Book Of," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 198–99.

[35] Timothy H. Lim, "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period," in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark International, 2007), 20.

[36] The primary works on Greek Deuteronomy remain Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*; John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995). See also John William Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (MSU 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978); John William Wevers, "The LXX Translator of Deuteronomy," in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 57–89. Our discussion of LXX Deuteronomy is heavily indebted to these works.

[37] Stephen B. Chapman, "'The Law and the Words' as a Canonical Formula within the Old Testament," in *Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 37n64.

[38] Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. 1, Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1943), 16.

textual evidence found within Alexandrinus and Vaticanus. Caution is particularly requisite when discussing Deuteronomy's usage in Hebrews, as several apparently Deuteronomic citations depart from the LXX text evidenced in both A and B traditions.[39] With the book's repetitive and formulaic style, Wevers notes an expansionistic tendency within its transmission process and hence his critical edition generally favours shorter readings.[40]

One may, however, still speak confidently about the broad contours of Greek Deuteronomy, even if uncertainties remain regarding finer points of textual precision. The Qumran evidence, for example, attests all 34 chapters, albeit across a number of scrolls,[41] and, as we shall see, the Qumranic readings support several LXX variant (i.e. non-MT) readings.[42] More significantly, the 1st century BCE Greek MS P. Fouad 848 attests chapters 17–33 in their received canonical order, suggesting that putatively non-Deuteronomic material, especially chs. 31–33, would have formed part of Hebrews' *textus receptus*.[43] Our working text will be Wevers' Göttingen edition, whose content comprises all 34 chapters,[44] and we will view Deut 1–34 as complete entity, not in negation of its transmission history, but rather recognising that this was the textual form likely available to the NT writers.[45]

The effects of Deuteronomy's transmission history, though, are not irrelevant to our inquiry. In both the Greek and MT traditions, the redactional process is not seamless; differing voices continue to speak within the discourse, and are not silenced for the attentive reader, testifying instead to a

---

[39] See Katz, "Quotations," 213–23.

[40] See Wevers' summation of the characteristically shorter P. Fouad 848 – Wevers, *History*, 64–85. Duncan, "Deuteronomy," 199–200 observes the same expansionistic trend in the Qumran Deuteronomic material, venturing that the phenomenon is more marked in the LXX/Qumran texts than in the proto-Masoretic and proto-Samaritan traditions. Crawford, "Reading," 130 notes that most variants derive from scribal error: "Deuteronomy does not exist in two variant literary traditions, as does, for example, Jeremiah."

[41] Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 145.

[42] Several fragments of Greek Deuteronomy were also found at Qumran (4QLXXDeut) – see Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4. 4, Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 195–97. The fragments contribute little text-critically (Deut 11:4 is the only identified text), but nonetheless attest the existence and usage of LXX Deuteronomy in the 2nd century BCE. Duncan, "Deuteronomy," 199–200 observes that 4QDeut^{h}, 4QDeut^{j} and 4QDeut^{q} also reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek tradition.

[43] Wevers, *History*, 64.

[44] John William Wevers, *Deuterionomium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977). We will use his versification of the text, notably in Deut 29, where he follows English versification against MT and Rahlfs.

[45] Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 19 locate its date to the 3rd century BCE.

history of reflection and retrospection. Lim observes that the location of the discourse as *across* the Jordan (1:5; also 1:1) implies a west Jordan perspective to the account; from the outset, the eastern pre-conquest context, however dominant narrative-wise, is not the only lens through which the events are to be comprehended. This will be of interest to us in discussing Deuteronomy's own (muted) assessment of life in the land. Post-exilic spectacles are similarly evidenced by the LXX's specific reference to the punishment of the Diaspora (ἐν διασπορᾷ – 28:25; cf. 30:4). Whilst LXX Deuteronomy's implied readers are situated on the Moabite plain, its actual audience hears the text from a post-exilic perspective of Hellenistic dispersion.

Yet recognition of the text's various redactional and perspectival layers should not detract from the narrative's dominant pre-entry perspective, however 'fictitious' this might be. The text is primarily a "temps d'ârret" for Israel in her exodus narrative, a time of reflecting on the past, giving new laws and passing leadership onto Joshua against the celebration of the Moab covenant.[46] Although they detail a number of interesting qualitative and quantitative distinctions between the LXX and the Hebrew text, Dogniez and Harl concur that "le traducteur recevait le texte sous la forme d'un livre en son édition finale, enchaîné de façon continue et logique; pour lui tout prenait sens dans cette unité littéraire."[47] Hence when we speak of the 'Deuteronomic posture,' the position adopted is the Moab, pre-entry handover moment of the discourse; the implied audience stand at the threshold of entry into the land and await the prophesied blessing or curse which would subsequently accompany life within it.[48]

LXX Deuteronomy remains a translation, and therefore an interpretation of the Hebrew original.[49] It is a 'text' in its own right. Although the translator was generally conservative in regards to his Hebrew *Vorlage*,[50] preserving a somewhat 'un-Greek' word order, there are inevitably ways in which the

---

[46] Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 19–20.

[47] Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 21. They also propose that the translator knew of, and sought to preserve, the eminent sacral role Deuteronomy held in contemporary Judaism (20). See also Wevers, *Notes*, x–xii.

[48] In using the term *Deuteronomic*, we are scoping out reference to '*Deuteronomistic,*' and the potential connotations of Martin Noth's Deuteronomistic History (Noth, *Überlieferungs-geschichtliche Studien*). By 'Deuteronomist,' we mean the person(s) responsible for the form of (LXX) Deuteronomy available to Hebrews – and no more. We will restrict our investigation solely to Deuteronomy, without recourse to the Joshua-Kings discourse, since LXX Deuteronomy does not link itself to the former prophets; rather, the translator views the text as closing the Pentateuch – cf. Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 75.

[49] Lim, "Deuteronomy," 18-20.

[50] Wevers, "Attitude," 498–505; Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 29–30. The latter use the term "decalqué" to describe its attention to detail.

Greek text exhibits characteristic nuance. It furnishes its own narrative which, whilst fundamentally still the familiar Jewish story, permits interpretation not available from the Hebrew text.[51] The text's title – δευτερονόμιον as opposed to the Hebrew דברים – is the case in point. Although derivative from a particular translation of Deut 17:18,[52] it does seem to have been one label by which the book was identified in its Greek form. The δευτερονόμιον that Joshua wrote (Josh 8:32(9:2)) on Mount Ebal is the lawcode received from Moses (νόμον Μωυσῆ) and although not his sole appellation for the text,[53] Philo also refers to it as δευτερονόμιον (*Leg* 3.174, *Deus* 50).

The naming of the book within the Greek tradition opens further possibilities for its reception and interpretation, and, for the LXX at least, "devient ainsi la clé du livre."[54] Rather than being דברים delivered by Moses on the Moab plain, Δευτερονόμιον becomes a second law,[55] distinct from, or even counter to, its Exodus-Numbers predecessor.[56] This secondariness is subsequently exploited in early Christianity for apologetic reasons,[57] but the translational deecision still befits the overall disposition of the text.[58] Deuteronomy opens with Horeb left behind (1:6) and marks a new stage in Israel's journey towards the promised land; a Moab covenant law code is

---

[51] Cf. Gheorgita, *Role*, esp. 225–31.

[52] The MT reads משנה התורה הזאת, literally and contextually 'the copy of this law', i.e. the law code commencing in Deut 12. The meaning of משנה is ambiguous and may be rendered as both 'copy' and 'second'; the translator understands the latter rather than the former and coins a neologism – δευτερονόμιον. The sense of the demonstrative pronoun also changes: 'a copy of this law' becomes 'this second law.'

[53] Alternative titles include νομοθεσίας (*Migr.* 182), παραινέσεσι (*Spec.* 4.131), προτρεπτικοῖς *(Agr.* 78, 172; possibly *Fug.* 170) and Ἐπινομίδι (*Her.* 162, 250; cf. *Spec.* 4.160). Such appellatory differences demonstrate both the diversity of material within Deutronomy (legal and paraenetic) and the different conceptions of the book as denoted by the respective titles. Ἐπινομίς implies an "addition to a law, or appendix" (LSJ), a different, more supplementary, slant than that conveyed by δευτερονόμιον.

[54] Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 22.

[55] LSJ *loc. cit.*: "second or repeated law."

[56] Wevers, *Notes*, 289–90.

[57] This is briefly discussed in Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 27–28. Irenaeus recounts Moses giving a "second law" to his people, along with a "new legislation" (*Epid.* 28), and Origen likewise proposes that the giving of the "second legislation" to Joshua brought an end to the first law, thereby prefiguring the "second" brought in by Christ (*Princ.* 4.1.24).

[58] Deuteronomy "is an apt designation of the character, if not also genre, of the book as the second law that God covenanted with Israel on the plains of Moab" – Lim, "Deuteronomy," 7. Similarly S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902), i: "Although based upon a grammatical error, the name is not an inappropriate one; for Deuteronomy ... does embody the terms of a second legislative covenant."

given 'in addition' to the Horeb disposition (29:1).[59] The label 'second' also opens up the possibility of intertextual connection with Hebrews' own discussion of the requisite 'secondness' of the new covenant in relation to the former dispensation (8:7; 8:13; 9:1; 9:15; 9:18; 10:9).

1.3 Methodology/Intertextuality

Our approach follows George Guthrie's text-linguistic analysis of Hebrews' structure, which takes account of the letter's two distinctive strands of thought, doctrinal and hortatory.[60] Whilst the strands are intertwined to fulfil the author's overall communicatory purposes, Guthrie's proposal justifies treating both sections as distinct elements with their own trajectory through the letter.[61] The OT background of the doctrinal passages has been well researched and understood predominantly in terms of exegesis of the Psalms,[62] coupled with the Jeremiah new covenant. The hortatory passages, however, have received less attention; although studies of individual paraenetic passages do exist,[63] particularly absent has been any attempt to unearth a broader Scriptural narrative operating throughout the letter's hortatory strand.[64] If Scriptural exposition is intrinsic to the author's understanding of the Son's high priestly sacrifice, then it seems at least possible that a similarly Scriptural perspective underpins his paraenetic approach. It is this broader interpretative task that forms the context for our present study, as we seek to establish the nature of any Deuteronomic backdrop to the letter. Reference to the doctrinal sections of the letter will be

---

[59] See 4.1.3.

[60] George H. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (NovTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1994), *passim*, esp. 139–45. Guthrie was scarcely the first to distinguish the two streams, but his analysis gives them an internal cohesion and progression.

[61] Cynthia Long Westfall, *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning* (LNTS 297; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 18–20 criticizes Guthrie for overstating the distinction and jeopardising the letter's unity. Our concern, however, is less the manner of their connection, but rather to recognize the independent integrity of the paraenetic discourse.

[62] B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950), 473; Longenecker, *Biblical*, 167. See also Kistemaker, *Psalm*, 95–133.

[63] *Inter alia* N. Clayton Croy, *Endurance in Suffering: Hebrews 12:1–13 in its Rhetorical, Religious, and Philosophical Context* (SNTSMS 98; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Laansma, *Rest*; Juliana Casey, "Eschatology in Heb. 12:14–29: An Exegetical Study" (PhD diss., Catholic University of Leuven, 1977).

[64] Käsemann, *Gottesvolk* remains an important contribution, but its emphasis upon the letter's Gnostic backdrop has coloured its reception among scholars.

sporadically necessary, but our study will focus primarily upon the hortatory sections, treating them as a self-standing, distinct entity in their own right.[65]

Our attention will likewise concentrate upon the paraenetic elements of Deuteronomy (chs. 1–11, 27–34), with correspondingly less attention paid to the law code itself. Anticipating somewhat the outcome of the research, the vast majority of connections between the two texts are found within their respective hortatory material, with little appeal to the Deuteronomic legal discourse. Any putative association is paraenetic, not doctrinal. Furthermore, Hebrews' insistence on a new covenant, and the demise of its predecessor, immediately draws some disjuncture between the two texts, implicitly envisaging a 'legal' framework ontologically different from that of Deut 12–26. Rather than being 'done' or 'taught' (Heb 8:13), laws will be written on human minds and hearts (Heb 8:10; 10:16; cf. Deut 30:6).

Isolating the Deuteronomic paraenesis from the legal corpus might be justified on modern source critical grounds, but it receives similar warrant from contemporary literature. The Qumranic excerpted texts of Deuteronomy consistently omit legislative material, but still apparently possessed an important didactic or liturgical function within the community.[66] The Testament of Moses functions against the backdrop of Deut 31–34, and likewise has little concern for the precise content of the law code. 4QMMT utilises covenantal paraenesis drawn from Deut 30:1–2, 4:29–30, but applies it to halakhic legislation drawn predominantly from Leviticus, and only minimally from Deut 12–26. It appears that Deuteronomic paraenetic material has a life of its own distinct from the legal corpus, and may be engaged without recourse to the latter.

Some comment must also be made on our broader methodology. OT in the NT has expanded as a discourse in recent years, and our thesis will engage some of the questions raised by that discourse (for example: faithfulness to original authorial intent, respect for context, application of non-cited passages).[67] One methodological aspect that does require some initial

---

[65] This is particularly pertinent if, as William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8: Hebrews 9–13* (WBC 47A-47B; 2 vols.; Dallas: Word, 1991), ci ventures, "parenesis holds the various sections of discourse together as a unified whole. The dominant motif in Hebrews is paraenetic." If exhortation is primary in the letter, and if the OT is seminal to its argument, some attempt to unearth an OT backdrop to the paraenesis would seem a worthwhile exercise. Timothy A. Lenchak, *"Choose Life!" A Rhetorical-Critical Investigation of Deuteronomy 28,69 – 30,20* (AnBib 129; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1993), 5–6 also proposes that paraenesis is the most important element within Deuteronomy.

[66] Cf. Julie A. Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 43–62.

[67] For an introduction to the divergent views on such issues, see the collection of essays in G. K. Beale, *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994).

clarification, however, is our use of intertextuality, as the term tends to be used with some imprecision and disregard for the literary critical circles in which it was coined.[68] Its entry into biblical studies has expanded the term's scope and, in recognition of this, Moyise ascribes it a broad definition: it "is best used as an 'umbrella' term for the complex interactions that exist between 'texts.'"[69] He identifies three types of intertextual methodology evidenced within the discipline ("echo," "dialogical" and "postmodern"),[70] the first two of which are germane to our approach. "Echo" incorporates the familiar OT in the NT categories of quotation and allusion, how the NT text utilises motifs, language or material ostensibly borrowed from the antecedent OT text. Such citation of Deuteronomy in Hebrews will form the backbone of our inquiry. "Dialogical" intertextuality reflects on how the semantic sense of the OT lemma changes through participation in the NT text; it is not just about importing the original meaning into the new text, but also viewing how/if the original is changed in the process. Again, this will be of concern to us; does Hebrews' use of Deuteronomy reflect or even inculcate a fresh or altered understanding of its source text?[71]

Gail O'Day identifies similar plurality within biblical studies' adoption of intertextual methodology. She differentiates between historical-critical approaches produced in the first half of the twentieth century that attended to OT usage in relation to authorial intent, and more recent approaches that focus upon the reinterpretation of texts along a continuum within a tradition. Whereas the former focused upon "prophecy/fulfilment and apologetic motives," the latter "starts with a received text and moves forward to subsequent interpretations of it."[72] Our approach will attempt to embrace both aspects, suggesting that, for Hebrews at least, there is good reason to see them as complementary rather than antithetical. It is difficult to ignore the typological fulfilment discourse that pervades Hebrews' argument, and we will consider how its author uses Deuteronomy to source, sustain and

---

[68] Cf. Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 80–88.

[69] Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J.L. North* (ed. Steve Moyise; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 41.

[70] Moyise, "Intertextuality," 14–41.

[71] Hebrews 3:7–4:11 would appear to be a case in point. The heavenly κατάπαυσις is viewed in similar terms to the Canaan rest but is shown to be greater or more extensive than Canaan. In so doing, Heb 4:8 reinterprets the Deuteronomic perspective on Canaan and opens up the possibility that Deuteronomic rest should be read in a different light.

[72] Gail O'Day, "Intertextuality," in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. John Haralson Hayes; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 546–48.

construct its paraenesis. It will also be shown, however, particularly in the final chapter, that the engagement is genuinely intertextual; Hebrews' interface with Deuteronomy participates in a broader debate within Jewish tradition on the nature and outworking of Israel's story.

In summary, our approach is intertextual in a broad, though not unlimited, sense. We will not engage the "postmodern" issues that (rightly) stress the ideological perspectives which impose upon any reading of the text. Our scope is limited only to that exchange between the textual worlds created by Deuteronomy and Hebrews. We are nonetheless concerned to analyse the exchange in as wide a fashion as possible, using the definition proposed by Watson *et al,* that intertextuality denotes "a text's representation of, reference to and use of phenomena in the world outside the text being interpreted."[73] The 'phenomena' under discussion will include familiar categories of quotations and allusions, but will extend to Hebrews' engagement with themes, motifs, rhetoric and situations borrowed from the antecedent text.

Furthermore, we are interested in Deuteronomy for its own sake, rather than just Hebrews' usage of it as a mine of convenient proof texts. The interplay between the two books is genuinely reciprocal; although, for heuristic purposes, we will start with the Hebrews text and work backwards, we will also have in view how Deuteronomy's narrative (and especially chs. 28–34) proves receptive to engagement over Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* and continues to work forward within the NT text.[74] Such a forward-orientated approach to the OT seems commensurate with Hebrews itself, as the author attempts to make sense of the Scriptures in the light of the new revelation.[75] Hebrews 11, for example, exhibits a progressive dynamic as it rehearses elements of Israel's history; it climaxes in 11:39–40, but in a conclusion now shared with the new covenant faithful. Vos observes of Heb 4:2, that it reads 'we as well as they', not 'they as well as we';[76] apropos of his observation, and in agreement with him, Hebrews appears to theorize upon the OT situation first and then try to make sense of it in terms of the new covenant revelation.

---

[73] Duane Frederick Watson, *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 2.

[74] Hence our methodology differs from the work of, for example, C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 1–27 and Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961), 251–86. The former worked backward from the kerygma, whilst the latter espouses an apologetic approach to the OT text.

[75] This seems broadly conversant with the assessment of Hebrews' OT exegesis in Caird, "Exegetical," 44–51.

[76] Geerhardus Vos, "Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke," *Princeton Theological Review* xiv (1916): 19.

1.4 Thesis Outline

Chapter 2 anticipates the material covered in subsequent chapters by focusing upon the Song of Moses. In view of Hebrews' frequent appeal to the Song, we will examine the text's context, message and usage in the Second Temple era.

Chapter 3 turns attention to Hebrews itself, and focuses upon its textual affinities with Deuteronomy. Four types of interface will be analysed: quotations, strong allusions, echoes and narrative affiliations. The first three types, although familiar criteria from other OT in the NT works,[77] require some further definition. The fourth, though less common, is more straightforward; for our purposes, narrative affiliations are those instances in which Hebrews recalls features of the Deuteronomic narrative, conveying familiarity with an episode but without formal lexical reproduction.

Distinguishing between quotations, allusions and echoes can be a difficult and somewhat subjective exercise, as the criteria by which to categorize the respective elements lacks substantial consensus.[78] Quotations are normally recognized by the presence of an introductory formula (IF) that demarks or separates the cited text from the author's own words. Hebrews characteristically introduces quotations with variant forms of λέγω, and frequently interprets the citation as direct divine speech.[79] Despite this accepted IF criterion, however, the different quotation counts evinced by commentators testifies to a lack of clarity in determining the existence (or otherwise) of a quotation.[80] Several grey areas emerge: Heb 10:37–38 is a lengthy citation whose subsequent explication makes it sound like a quotation, yet it lacks the typical IF preface. Conversely, Heb 8:5 and 12:21 possess the λέγω IF and therefore qualify as quotations, but their 'spokenness' is essentially narratival and humanly-voiced, and neither quotation receives further exposition. Our definition of quotation requires the IF, but broadens its scope to include any phrase that introduces the antecedent text more or less

---

[77] Cf. Moyise, *Old*, 5–6.

[78] So Porter, "Use," 80–88.

[79] On the hermeneutical differences between Hebrews' use of quotations and allusions, see Eisenbaum, *Heroes*, 90–133.

[80] Total quotations cited include 36 – George Guthrie, "Old Testament in Hebrews," *DLNT* 841–850; Ceslas Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris: Gabalda, 1953), 1.331. 29 – Thomas, "Citations," 303; Westcott, *Hebrews*, 469–70. 35 – Howard, "Hebrews," 211; Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 37; Lane, *Hebrews*, cxvi-cxvii; Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 116. 38 – Longenecker, *Biblical*, 165–66. 37 – UBS[4]; Robert Galveston Bratcher, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (3; London: 1967), 57–67. Variations occur according to, for example, whether 10:30 is counted as one or two citations.

verbatim from its original form; ἔτι γὰρ (10:37) and καὶ γὰρ (12:29) thus qualify as IFs introducing formal quotations.

Allusions lack the directive IF, and possess some flexibility in word order compared to the source lemma. Because of their often-impressive verbal similarity with the source text, and in order to emphasize the distinction from mere 'echoes,' we will speak of 'strong allusions' rather than just allusions *per se*. Guthrie's definition of a (strong) allusion is apposite for our purposes: "an overt weaving of at least a phrase from the antecedent text into the author's own language, without a formal marking of that language as set apart from the author's own words."[81]

Defining echoes is more complex and some element of subjectivity is inevitable in their identification. Hays lists seven criteria for assessing an echo's presence (availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation and satisfaction)[82] and his categories provide a useful framework for our analysis. We will not formulaicly apply each individual test to the respective echoes (and neither, in the interests of avoiding monotony, does Hays);[83] moreover, because our attention is focused solely on Deuteronomy, any justification premised upon the first three criteria would be somewhat self-fulfilling. Instead, we will assess each echo upon the latter four tests, paying particular attention to the echo's explanatory power; that is, does the echo fit within the broader context of the letter's argument (thematic coherence) in a contextually appropriate manner (historical plausibility) acknowledged by others (history of interpretation) that enriches the argument being made (satisfaction)? In so doing, we will seek to demonstrate that the respective texts exhibit at least some of the following criteria: "common vocabulary, common word order, common theme(s), similar imagery, similar structure, (and) similar circumstance(s)."[84]

Most intertextual studies on Hebrews are driven by analysis of textual links, but in terms of Deuteronomy at least, attention solely to verbal affiliation somewhat impoverishes our understanding of the texts' inter-relationship. We concur with Lim's assertion that "the study of quotations is a useful and illuminating exercise, but it hardly exhausts the influence of Deuteronomy on the New Testament and other Jewish writers of the Second

---

[81] Guthrie, "Recent," 273.

[82] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–32. For recent discussion on identifying Scriptural allusions and/or echoes, see Dale C. Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 9–14; Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 41–55.

[83] Hays, *Echoes*, 32.

[84] Allison, *Intertextual*, 11.

Temple Period."[85] The next two chapters engage further, non-citational links between the two texts. Chapter 4 examines those themes (covenant, blessing/curse, land) that have a common significance for both texts, and assesses how they connect the two discourses. We will identify motifs which might otherwise be labelled as echoes or allusions and therefore be discussed in the previous chapter. However, for cumulative and heuristic effect, we will group them together under these three specified themes.

Chapter 5 examines how the texts can be profitably compared for their rhetorical effect and investigates the extent to which Hebrews echoes Deuteronomy's narrative posture. Hebrews' in-depth use of the LXX suggests that the author did indeed anticipate an informed audience,[86] and our analysis of echoes reflects this, but critics of intertextual studies have occasionally mused as to whether subtle textual echoes would necessarily have been comprehended by an audience unversed in the nuances of the OT.[87] This chapter will therefore be as much inter*narratival* as inter*textual,* focusing on high-level, symbolic affinities, rather than particular lexical correspondences. It assumes that an appeal to the broad land/eisodus ideology of Deuteronomy would have been perceptible even for a moderately informed audience.[88]

Chapter 6 shifts intertextual tack. Rather than treating the Hebrews-Deuteronomy relationship in isolation, it considers the broader milieu in which their exchange might function and the degree to which a Deuteronomic intertextual discourse would have contemporary pertinence. It also considers how Hebrews might be said to 're-present' Deuteronomy, or at least be a candidate for re-presentation in its own right.

With introductory and methodological remarks made, our attention in the next chapter now turns to Deuteronomy and its use within Second Temple society.

---

[85] Lim, "Deuteronomy," 6.

[86] Johnson, "Scriptural," 239: "The author's liberal use of citation and allusion suggests a confidence that the composition's readers share some degree of that competence."

[87] Cf. Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 39–60.

[88] Christopher M. Tuckett, "Paul, Scripture and Ethics: Some Reflections," *NTS* 46 (2000): 403–24 expresses reservations over the detailed textual awareness demanded by Hays' intertextual methodology. Yet he concedes: "the events associated with the Exodus, including the giving of the Law at Sinai as well as the events of the wilderness wanderings as recounted in the Pentateuch, would be easily recalled and evoked in different contexts" (405).