SEPTUAGINT TERMINOLOGY AS CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS IN HEBREWS

GERT J. STEYN

INTRODUCTION

The term *Praeparatio Evangelica* is known for some of the theological issues dealt with by Eusebius of Caesarea in his work with this name. The term, however, can also be taken from the well-known essay of Georg Bertram, *Praeparatio Evangelica in der Septuaginta*.[1] According to Bertram, one can identify a threefold meaning of the Septuagint for the religion of the Hellenistic world: "1. Die Septuaginta bewirkt und vollzieht die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus. 2. Die Septuaginta ermöglicht die Umprägung der alttestamentlichen Überlieferung zur universalen Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und 3. gestaltet sie sich unbewusst und ungewollt zur Praeparatio Evangelica."[2] It is especially its role regarding the latter which is important here for our study.

The Greek versions of the Old Testament, "usually lumped together"[3] as the "Septuagint" (LXX), represent a merger between the religious and sociological worlds of the Hebrew- and Aramaic-speaking Jews, on the one hand, and Greek-speaking Jews on the other hand. It provided a translation of Hebrew terms and theological concepts into Greek – often with a transition in meaning from the original Hebrew. This made it a convenient hinge or link between the Hebrew biblical texts and the Greek-speaking world in which early Christianity developed. It would, in this sense, not be out of order to refer to the LXX as "*praeparatio evangelica*". The role and function of the Greek Old Testament in the New Testament can therefore hardly be overestimated. Its traces can be seen, not only in the numerous quotations, allusions, references, echoes and paraphrases taken from it, but also in the use of some of its terminology that

---

[1] Bertram (1957:225-249).
[2] Bertram (1967:250).
[3] De Silva (2004:807).

formed the theological building blocks of early Christian concepts. This relationship between the LXX and the NT vocabularies ought to be defined more clearly[4] if Girdlestone was correct that "the Christian revelation must be regarded as Hebrew thought in Greek clothing", and that "the main value of the LXX lies in this, that it represents in a great measure the Greek religious language of many of the Jews of our Lord's time, and by its pages the Greek of the N.T. may be illustrated at every turn",[5] or that the "LXX may thus be regarded as a linguistic bridge spanning the gulf which separated Moses from Christ".[6]

The late first century C.E. document by an unknown author to the Hebrews is an exemplary case in this regard.[7] Macquarrie defines Hebrews as "an impressive composition with a sustained train of thought, and though it does not make any significant addition to our knowledge of the history of Jesus, it opens up a new theological interpretation of his person and work by applying to him the imagery of sacrifice and priesthood".[8] There is little doubt that the unknown author of Hebrews found the witnesses to the "phases in the Son's career" in the Old Testament Scriptures.[9] A large number of quotations are provided by the author, carefully selected to contain key Christian concepts which are elaborated upon and skilfully interwoven into the author's argument. This paper intends to identify some of these concepts, particularly in the quotations found in Hebrews 1, and to briefly survey their adaptation and function within the broader context of Hebrews as Christian theological concepts.

The author of Hebrews' use of Scripture forms the backbone of, and frame for, his document. If the quotations are thus stripped from the rest of Hebrews, we can filter to the surface fragments of the author's text that he used to identify, expand and develop his theological concepts in his masterfully

---

4   See Silva (1983:57).
5   Girdlestone (1948:8-9).
6   Girdlestone (1948:11).
7   Cf., e.g., "Heiligungstheologie", "Sühneterminologie" and "Reinheitsterminologie" in Hebrews, as described by Gäbel (2006).
8   Macquarrie (1990:123).
9   De Silva (2004:806).

composed work. There is enough reason to assume that the text of these quotations represent some form of LXX text.[10] This was certainly not "the" LXX as reconstructed by Cambridge, Rahlfs, or Göttingen, or even any one of our extant textual codices for that matter. There is enough evidence, though, that the author utilized a Greek *Vorlage*, perhaps based on a Hebrew text that was closer to that as found in some of the fragments of the Dead Sea scrolls. Scholars reckon in general that the text of the quotations in Hebrews is closer to the Alexandrian text form.[11]

> According to Bleek, Hebrews gives evidence of its author's partiality to a text similar to Codex Alexandrinus. However, scholars such as P. Katz have questioned Bleek's observations, and discussions in this century have dealt with how the author's text relates to one or both of these major codices. J. C. McCullough has emphasized the need to focus research on recensions of the Greek text on a book-by-book basis rather than on one or two extant manuscripts. McCullough concluded that for several books of the OT, such as Jeremiah and Psalms, the recension from which the text quoted is taken is fairly clear, whereas a great deal of uncertainty surrounds other OT books. It seems the author of Hebrews used and reproduced faithfully the local text of various OT books available to him.[12]

Others, as Barth, defined it more plausibly: "The text of the Old Testament used by the author agrees partly with the LXX version found in the Codex Vaticanus, partly with that of the Alexandrinus, and again partly with neither of them."[13]

Based on the assumption, then, that these quotations were taken from, or via, a form of the LXX, the terminology contained in them are thus important for an understanding of the author of Hebrews' theological concepts. The focus is only on these Christian theological concepts within Hebrews and to situate

---

[10]   So also, for instance, Attridge (1989:50).
[11]   So, amongst others, Beare (1944:379-396); Carson, Moo & Morris (1992:404); Harris (1992:209).
[12]   Guthrie (1997).
[13]   Barth (1962:55).

the concepts within the viewpoint of the author. A broader NT theology on these concepts is not intended here.

CHRISTOLOGY

Attridge quite rightly pointed out that the Christology of Hebrews "is developed largely through exposition of scripture".[14] There are possibly seven underlying (mainly christological) "titles" used in the quotations of Heb 1:5-13 which coincides with that as listed in Justin Martyr. Only six of these, however, are applied to Christ. The remaining one, "angel", is not applied to Christ.[15]

LXX Quotation	Qualities in Hebr	Title
Ps 2:7	Son - Father generates	υἱός
II Sam 7:14	Father - Son	
Deut 32 / Ode 2	Angels must worship	ἄγγελος
Ps 103:4	Angels = winds, flames	
Ps 44:6-7	Eternal throne	βασιλεύς
Ps 44:6-7	Justice/righteousness	ἱερεύς
Ps 101:25-27	Creator: heaven, earth	λόγος
Ps 101:25-27	External existence	
Ps 109:1	Exaltation & rule, submission of enemies	θεός
		κύριος

Attention will be paid particularly to the first five of these Christological titles. Although the latter two will not be discussed explicitly, they will be integrated into the discussion of the former.

JESUS AS "SON" (υἱός)

The author of Hebrews begins his book with the fact that "God spoke in these last days to us through the Son" (Heb 1:2). Apart from the fact that the phrase ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων is a Septuagintalism,[16] also the "idea of

---

[14] Attridge (1989:23).
[15] Cf. Steyn (2003a:1107-1128).
[16] Bruce (1985:3); Ellingworth (2000:93); Weiß (1991:139); Lane (1991:5); Karrer (2002:113).

God speaking doubtless refers to the very frequent LXX λέγει κύριος".[17] The term υἱός occurs frequently as a *Leitmotif* in Hebrews and is also found in the LXX quotations from Ps 2:7 (Heb 1:5; 5:5); II Sam(Kings) 7:14 (Heb 1:5); Ps 8:5-7 (Heb 2:6-7); Prov 3:11-12 (Heb 12:5-6) and in the introductory formula to Ps 45(44):7-8 (Heb 1:8-9). Only in the case of Proverbs 3 does it not refer to Jesus, but to the believers. The case of Psalm 8 is a doubtful one, although according to the author's exposition of this quotation in Heb 2:8-9, there is a strong possibility that even the reference υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου refers here to Jesus.[18] Lee[19] is of a similar opinion when quoting Giles in this regard: "Although the phrase υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου is not part of the author's own vocabulary, the use of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the Gospels is so frequent, and so closely associated with Jesus, that it may well have led the author of Hebrews to read Ps 8 in a christological sense".[20] In all these cases, the LXX translated the Hebrew בן with υἱός. Hahn pointed out that "Im Hebräerbrief ist die Eigenständigkeit (von Sohn, GJS) vornehmlich noch im Sprachgebrauch bewahrt, die Relation zum Vater ist nur an einer einzigen Stelle und dies innerhalb eines alttestamentlichen Zitats erhalten geblieben" (i.e. IIKi 7,14 LXX). "Sonst erfolgte durchweg eine Gleichsetzung mit 'Sohn Gottes', was der Wechsel in die Terminologie ebenso wie die Anwendung der messianischen Zitate auf den 'Sohn' zeigt".[21]

The very first quotation in Hebrews (1:5), though, is taken from Ps 2:7. The author uses it later again in Heb 5:5. Early Christianity applied this text to Jesus, "alluding to it in the accounts of his baptism and citing it explicitly in the context of his exaltation".[22] According to Westcott, "Son" as title is always anarthrous in Hebrews, except in 1:8. That is, the writer "fixes the attention of his readers upon the nature implied by it".[23] Psalm 2 from which he quotes (with

---

[17]   Ellingworth (2000:91-92).
[18]   Cf. Steyn (2003c:493-514).
[19]   Lee (2005:221, 223).
[20]   Giles (1973:3-10).
[21]   Hahn (1974:331).
[22]   Attridge (1989:53).
[23]   Westcott (1974:34)

Ps 45, 72 and 110), belongs to the group of "Royal Psalms"[24] – i.e. those Psalms written about or by the king, which in some instances might refer to the specific occasion of the king's coronation or its annual commemoration. The author of Hebrews quotes from all these Royal Psalms, except Ps 72.[25] Striking in the broader context of LXX Ps 2 is a number of terms that were taken as important theological concepts by early Christianity. Firstly, the occurrence of the phrase κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ (v. 2), containing both the terms κύριος and χριστός that were applied to Jesus of Nazareth.[26] Secondly, the appointment of God's king on Zion, his holy mountain (ἐπὶ Σιων ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ, v. 6). Thirdly, one may add, also Ps 2:9 where the formulation of the LXX translator contributed to the "Christusbild", or the apocalyptic "Messiasvorstellung".[27] By applying Ps 2 to Jesus, he is now identified as the messianic king.[28] Furthermore, the broader context of Ps 102(101):26-28, which is quoted in Heb 1:10-12, is also closely linked with the role of Zion: the Lord will have compassion on Zion (Ps 102:14); the Lord will rebuild Zion (Ps 102:16); the Name of the Lord will be declared in Zion and his praise in Jerusalem (Ps 102:22). The author of Hebrews would also later arrive with his readers at Mount Zion, at the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem (Σιὼν ὄρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ιερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ – Heb 12:22).[29] In Heb 1:5, the author introduces his second quotation: ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν (II Sam/IIKi 7:14 LXX). These were the words that the prophet Nathan had to convey to King David. Lane pointed out that "in a narrow sense the oracle of Nathan (II Sam 7:14-I Chr 17:13) had

---

[24]   See, for instance, West (1981:35); Vriezen & Van der Woude (1980:265); Schröger (1968:35); Rösel (1999:99); Schaper (1995:72).

[25]   Steyn (2003b:262-282).

[26]   Cf., for instance, Acts 2:36; John 20:28.

[27]   Bertram (1957:240-241). Also Black confirms that "There seems little doubt that ποιμαίνειν at Rev 2:27=LXX Ps 2:9 is a mistranslation of the Hebrew word, taken over by the writer of the Apocalypse …" (1976:137).

[28]   Lee (2005:271) points out that "the messianic application of Ps 2:7 to Jesus was not a radical break with Jewish exegetical tradition, but rather a natural continuation of a process which had already begun in pre-Christian Judaism."

[29]   Cf. Son (2005).

reference to Solomon, but in the LXX a messianic interpretation had been encouraged by a phrase in v. 12 that precedes the promise of sonship, ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα, "I will raise up seed".[30] The immediate context of the words that are quoted in Hebrews was that God would make one of King David's descendents, "your own son", a king and that God would give him a stable kingship (τὴν βασιλείαν) (II Ki 7:12 LXX). It is to that descendent, the son of King David, that God would be a Father and it is that son who would be a son to God. This law of adoption is the direct speech of God which Nathan had to quote to David. These were the words of יהוה צבאות (II Sam 7:8 MT), translated as κύριος παντοκράτωρ (II Ki 7:8 LXX) – who identified himself as the "Father" in II Ki 7:14 LXX. The Father-son relationship referred to in II Ki 7 LXX is a metaphor for that of God and the king of Israel. The phrase יהוה צבאות "is a designation for the divine king sitting on the throne of the cherubim"[31] (cf. I Sam 4:4; II Sam 6:2). According to Langkammer, by translating the term צבאות with παντοκράτωρ, the LXX translators introduced "a Greek term that appeared around the third century B.C. and could actually be derived from an older (Stoic) model, παγκρατής, with the primary sense of 'almighty'".[32] The Χριστός παντοκράτωρ presentation would later in Christianity become prominent in the Byzantine art and theology.[33]

   The author of Hebrews now uses the two quoted texts from Ps 2:7 and II Ki 7:14 LXX,[34] and presents them as a single quotation. In a masterly manner in this two-line quotation, the author starts the first word of the first quoted line with the word υἱός and ends the second line with the last word being υἱόν,[35] thus forming an *inclusio* and with the two lines standing in a perfect chiastic

---

[30] Lane (1991:25).
[31] Langkammer (1993:11).
[32] Langkammer (1993:11).
[33] For the use of the παντοκράτωρ concept in LXX Amos 4:13, see Dafni (2006:443-454).
[34] Cf. my discussion on the combination of Ps 2:7 and II Sam 7:14 (2003:262-282).
[35] This is also the case with the quotation from Prov 3 (Heb 12:5-6) where the beginning and end of the author's quotation is the keyword υἱός. Similar is the quotation from Ps 95 (Heb 3) where the first (σήμερον) and last words (κατάπαυσίν μου) are the key concepts upon which the author elaborates.

structure. He uses the messianic adoption formula ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν within the context of Heb 1:5 as if these are the direct words of God (ὁ θεός, Heb 1:1) to his son, "Jesus" (Heb 2:9). The quotation, which expresses the relationship between God and the king within the metaphor of a father and a son, sets the scene for the ultimate royal position of Jesus who is instituted as Son of God, i.e. as King. In this sense, the author of Hebrews adapts the already extended meaning of υἱός as "one who is accepted or adopted as a son".[36] Although the metaphor is an important one and affirms close relation to God, it does not imply deification.[37] "We need not be surprised", says Macquarrie, "that Jesus was called 'Son of God' but we need not suppose that this title originally had the decisive meaning that it acquired later".[38]

The formulation that Jesus is the "Son of God" is only explicitly mentioned by the author later in his book (Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, 4:14; also 6:6; 7:3; 10:29).[39] "Son of God" was "not a frequently-used honorary title for the Messiah" in Judaism[40] which "in pre-Christian times obviously avoided employing the title 'Son of God' in order to ward off misunderstanding of the term in the non-Jewish world. This Jewish reservation naturally became all the stronger when Christians began to apply the title 'Son of God' to Jesus of Nazareth".[41] Nonetheless, "the origin of the 'son of God' concept lies in ancient oriental religions, in which above all kings were thought to be begotten of Gods".[42] "In the pagan world, on the other hand, sons of the gods in a special sense are not only known to myth and legend, but definite historical personalities are also designated as such".[43] It, therefore, has an "inevitably

---

[36] Arndt & Gingrich (1979:833).
[37] Macquarrie (1990:42).
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] It is a typical feature of the author to introduce a key term but only expands on it later on in his work.
[40] Arndt & Gingrich (1979:834).
[41] Kittel & Friedrich (1964:362 electronic ed.).
[42] Cullmann (1963:271).
[43] Arndt & Gingrich (1979:834).

mythological ring about it",[44] on the one hand, and was not limited to rulers, on the other hand. "Anyone who was believed to possess some kind of divine power was called 'son of God' by others, or gave himself the title. All miracle workers were 'sons of God'".[45] However, the idea of *divine* Sonship outside Judaism "was not so widespread as is often supposed, and the actual term is used comparatively infrequently".[46] It was used at the turn of the Christian era, though, as a patronymic of Augustus,[47] who became known with later Roman emperors, as *divi filius*.

Apart from using the concept as a metaphor, the author also uses it as a simile in Heb 3:6 where "Christ is *like* a son over his house".

According to Hahn, the titles "Son" and "Son of God" as Christological titles involve three fundamental conceptions: "1) Jesus' sonship is established in his relationship to God as the Father; 2) the position of the Son of God is, in the messianic sense, the appointment to the office of Savior; 3) divine sonship is a statement concerning the supernatural divine essence. These three conceptions cannot always be distinguished, and particularly the third increasingly predominates over the other two".[48] Louw & Nida classify this meaning under the semantic domain of "Nature, Class, Example" and the subdomain of "Class, Kind", with the entry as "a kind or class of persons, with the implication of possessing certain derived characteristics".[49]

JESUS IS SUPERIOR TO THE ANGELS (ἄγγελοι)

An important issue in the author of Hebrews' opening argument is the fact that the Son and his name are superior to the angels (Heb 1:4). This leads into the introductory formula of the first two quotations that is introduced with the rhetorical question about whom of the angels these words were said (1:5). The

---

[44]   Macquarrie (1990:42).
[45]   Cullmann (1963:272).
[46]   Marshall (1976:113-114).
[47]   Cf. B.G.U. 545.3 (27 B.C.); PTeb 382.21 (1st cent B.C.); IG1 2(3).174.2 (Epist.ad Cnidios, 5 A.D.) (Liddell & Scott 1847).
[48]   Hahn (1993, Vol 3:383).
[49]   Louw & Nida (1988, Vol. 1:588).

catena of quotations is concluded again with a similar rhetorical question which forms the introductory formula of the last of the seven quoted texts, i.e. the one on Ps 110(109):1. As in the previous case about the υἱός, the author of Hebrews again uses two quotations on the same theme, this time on the term ἄγγελοι in Heb 1:6-7. The introductory formula in 1:6 refers to πάλιν. Schunack has drawn attention to the fact that "das Adverb wie im Kontext ein weiteres Schriftzitat anzeigt und in der Aufnahme von LXX-Sprache ausgesagt wird, dass Gott den Sohn als den Erstgeborenen in die als Erbe verheißene Welt Gottes hineinführt, d.h. dessen irdischen und himmlischen Einwohnern präsentiert".[50] The first quotation that follows hereafter is from the Song of Moses. The quoted line is absent in the MT, but present in 4QDeut and the LXX. There is exact agreement, however, with the version of Ode 2 in LXXA. In the context of Moses' Song, all the "angels of God" (Ode 2:43), or "sons of God"[51] (Deut 32:43 LXX)[52] should worship "him", i.e. the only God, the One who Is (ἴδετε ἴδετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς πλὴν ἐμοῦ, Ode 2:39; Deut 32:39 LXX). The quotation is interpreted christologically by the author of Hebrews and now applied to the Son who should be worshipped by the angels.

Turning to the next quotation, namely Ps 104(103) in Heb 1:7, the Psalm is ascribed "to David" only in the LXX. The quotation is closer to a LXX form than to the Hebrew.[53] Westcott already pointed to the fact that "the LXX rendering is adopted by the writer of the Epistle (*sic*! GJS), and this is quite unambiguous. The Greek words describe the mutability, the materiality, and transitoriness of angelic service".[54] The author praises the Lord (את־יהוה

---

[50]   Schunack (2002:27).

[51]   The term implied "inheritors of the nature of God" or "participants in the glory of God" (Liddell & Scott 1847).

[52]   The terms ἄγγελοι and υἱοί are interchanged in the two versions. Deuteronomy 32:43 LXX reads: καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ ... καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, whereas Ode 2:43 reads: καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ ... καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ. Hebrews 1:6 follows the reading of the Odes version. The Deut 32 LXX version agrees with 4QDeut. Cf. Steyn (2000:263-272).

[53]   Similarly Grässer (1990:81); Schunack (2002:27).

[54]   Westcott (1974:25).

translated by the LXX as τὸν κύριον), whom he addresses as "Lord, my God" (יהוה אלהי translated as κύριε ὁ θεός μου in Ps 103:1 LXX). The substantively used participle (ὁ ποιῶν), as well as the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ that occurs twice in the quoted v. 4 of Ps 103 LXX, thus refer to יהוה – the κύριος of the LXX. In Ps 103:1 LXX, both the terms κύριος and θεός occur as reference to the same Entity. This thought complements the Christian author's concept that the Son, the κύριος, is also God.[55] Furthermore, Ps 104 (MT) is not yet talking about angels, but about the winds that are God's messengers and flames that are his servants. Karrer is thus right in pointing out: "Erst in der LXX kam es – für den Hebr wesentlich – über die Wahl des Wortes *aggeloi* für 'Boten' zu 'Engeln' (da Engel Botenaufgaben wahrnehmen)".[56]

In using these two quotations (Ode 2 and Ps 103 LXX) regarding the subordinate role of the angels to God, the author of Hebrews applies them in terms of the Son. This transition in meaning becomes clear by means of the introductory formula which presents the quotations as the direct speech of God in relation to the Son: "when God brings the firstborn (τὸν πρωτότοκον) into the world, he says" (Heb 1:6; cf. also 12:23). The translation of יהוה with κύριος in the LXX resulted in the fact that the author of Hebrews could also transfer the divine identity of the κύριος in the context of Ps 103 LXX to Jesus in the development of his argument. By the time that Hebrews was written, this "Verschmelzung des Christusbildes mit dem Gottesbild in der christlichen Theologie"[57] was already well established in early Christianity and was made possible by the translation of both אדני and יהוה with the term κύριος.

The author's concept of the angels that are subordinate to the Son does not end here, though, with the catena of quotations. It surfaces again in Heb 2:5 where the author states that it is not to angels that God has subjected the world to come. He quotes then from Ps 8:5-7, which states that God made the "son of

---

[55] Cf. Weiß (1991:164): "Nur in dieser LXX-Gestalt ist das Zitat für den Autor des Heb in seinem Kontext brauchbar".

[56] Karrer (2002:136). Similarly Kistemaker (1992:41): "…in the Septuagint, the word angels is predominant because it is the first of two direct objects (that is, the word angels comes before the term winds, not vice versa)."

[57] Bertram (1957:243).

man" for a little while lower than angels, crowning him with honour and glory and submitting everything under his feet (Heb 2:7-8a). Apart from the quotations from Ode 2/Deut 32 and Ps 104(103), this is the third quotation that contains the *Stichwort* ἄγγελοι. The author presents his commentary on the quoted verses from Ps 8, explaining that Jesus was crowned with honour and glory and that he was made lower than the angels for a little while in order to die for everyone through the grace of God (Heb 2:9). That the author operates with the term ἄγγελοι via the LXX is clear. The quoted line in Heb 1:6 is not only absent in the Hebrew of the MT, but also reads "sons" and not "angels" in the versions of Deut 32:43 LXX and in 4QDeut. In Ps 104:4 the term מלאכיו was translated with τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ by the LXX, whereas in Ps 8:6 the term מאלהים was used for angels[58] – a translation which contributed here to the interpretation regarding the incarnation.[59]

The concept of Jesus' relation to the angels surfaces also in Heb 2:16 where the author explains the fact that Jesus took the "flesh and blood" form of humans (cf. 2:14) and that it is therefore clear that at issue were not the angels, but the descendents of Abraham. Two things were most probably at issue in this regard for this early Christian community. Firstly, the fact that Jesus is "son of God" might have equalled him to the angels who were also known as "sons of God".[60] Strobel wrote in this regard: "Wenn auch das Alte Testament mehrmals die Engel als 'Göttersöhne' aufführt (1. Mose 6,2.4; Ps. 58,1 LXX; s. 89,7; Hiob. 1,6; 2,1; 38,7), so hat dies doch das Denken der späteren Übersetzer, vor allem der Septuaginta, der sich der Hebr. anschließt, um eines ausgeprägten Monotheismus willen nicht billigen können".[61] Secondly, the fact that the Son of God was "flesh and blood" clearly put him in a lower rank to these believers than the angels were. In selecting these quotations from the LXX which contain

---

[58] The translators of the LXX sometimes translated the name Jahweh with "angel" (Ps 8:5; 97:7; 138:1). The quotation from Ps 8 in Heb 2:7 and 2:9 also reads "angel" according to the LXX translation of Jahweh!

[59] Hanson (1989:22).

[60] Cf. Steyn (2003a:1107-1128). Similar views are held by Spicq (1952:50-61) and Harris (1992:207).

[61] Strobel (1991:22-23).

the key term ἄγγελος, the author applies them now with regard to Jesus.

The last time that reference is made to the angels is in Heb 12:22 where the believers are seen to be gathered at Zion, at the heavenly Jerusalem, with its thousands of angels.

JESUS AS KING (βασιλεύς)

The relationship between God and the Son takes an interesting turn in Heb 1:8 when the author of Hebrews writes that God himself addresses the Son also as "*God*"! By using a fairly long quotation from Ps 45(44) LXX[62] – a poem addressed to a king (Ps 45[44]:2) – all the appropriate elements associated with a king, can now be transferred to Jesus, who as Son of God, is *the* King. According to Hahn κύριος was only used in the East during the second and first centuries B.C.E.: "Im 2. Jh. v. Chr. in Übersetzung alter Pharaonentitel: κύριος βασιλειῶν u.ä., dann im 1. Jh. v. Chr. κύριος βασιλεύς, κύριος θεός".[63] "Die LXX übertrug das in Berührung zur divinisierenden Herrsherideologie des Hellenismus".[64] In the quoted section (vv. 7-8), the poem addresses the king as ὁ θεός[65] (אלהים), although he himself was anointed by "God, his God" (משחך אלהים אליך translated as ἔχρισεν σε ὁ θεός ὁ θεός σου in the LXX). Still in line of designating particular titles to Jesus, the author of Hebrews also uses θεός – which "is not actually a name of God but rather a title".[66] The first two quoted texts stressed the fact that the relationship between Jesus and God is that of a Father and a Son, thereby acknowledging that Jesus is instituted as King by God himself. This quotation builds further on the Son's kingship and is now able to link the unique title of "*God*" for the king of Ps 45(44) directly to Jesus.[67] The result of this interpretation is that all the second person personal

---

[62] For a comprehensive discussion on the similarities and differences between Ps 45 (MT) and Ps 44 (LXX), see Harris (1992:187-227). Cf. also Grässer (1990:83).
[63] Hahn (1974:69).
[64] Karrer (2002:142).
[65] The nominative form in Greek is used here as a vocative.
[66] Betz (1993, Vol. 2:140).
[67] Harris (1992:227) states in this regard that "although some slight degree of uncertainty remains as to whether אלהים in Psalm 45:7 (MT) is a vocative, there

pronouns are now direct references to Jesus. The introductory formula to this quotation from Ps 45(44) presents it as direct speech of God, addressing the Son-king also as "God".

A similar situation is found in the opening line of Ps 110(109):1 – a psalm that was well known in early Christianity[68] and is quoted by our author in Heb 1:13 – "The Lord said to my Lord" (εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου). The second κύριος might refer here to either the king or the messiah. Cullmann[69] explains the situation as follows:

> According to the original intention of the Psalmist, the kyrios in the nominative case designates God; the *Kyrios* in the dative, the king – 'my Lord'. Thus the psalm originally meant, 'God spoke to my king: sit at my right hand…" The meaning of the psalm changes, however, as soon as one is convinced that it was not written in honour of the king, but was composed by him, by David himself. The *Kyrios* in the nominative remains God, but the *Kyrios* in the dative can no longer be the king, since he himself is speaking. The words 'my Lord' then come to mean the Messiah.

But apart from the (a) name of this Son-king, a series of other royal elements are applied to him via the quotation from Ps 45(44); (b) the throne; (c) the sceptre (rod) of his kingdom and (d) his role as judge; (e) also his anointment. Two more elements are added by quoting Ps 110(109):1 in Heb 1:13, namely (f) his position at the right hand of God and (g) the submission of his enemies under his feet. Also the quotation from Ps 8:5-7 confirms the element of subjecting everything under his feet, and adds the additional element of (h)

---

can be little doubt that the LXX translator construed it so … and that the author of Hebrews, whose quotations of the OT generally follow the LXX, assumed that the Septuagintal ὁ θεός in Psalm 44:7 was a vocative and incorporated it in this sense into his argument in chapter 1, an argument that was designed to establish the superiority of the Son over the angels."

[68]   Attridge (1989:61-62): "Although in Jewish tradition attestations of a messianic interpretation of the text are weak, the passage became in early Christianity one of the most common vehicles for expressing christological convictions."

[69]   Cullman (1963:131).

being crowned with honour and glory (Heb 2:7). By referring to most of these elements through the mouth of God, the acknowledgement and status of the Son as an instituted king by God himself, confirms his exalted position at the right hand of God (Heb 1:3-4).

- The term, βασιλεύς, takes a key position in Heb 7 where Jesus is compared to Melchizedek, the king of Salem. Melchizedek was the one who conquered the other kings (7:1). In an etymological exposition, the author explains that Melchizedek means in the first instance "king of righteousness". But he was also the king of Salem, which means "king of peace" (7:2). Melchizedek is compared to the "Son of God" (Heb 7:3). In his exposition, the author refers to the only two places where Melchizedek occurs in the OT: Gen 14 and Ps 110(109). He paraphrases the first and quotes from the second.[70]

- The term, θρόνος, that appears in the quotation from Ps 45(44):7 as an eternal throne, surfaces again in relation to it being a "*throne* of grace" (τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, Heb 4:16), and with regard to Jesus, the High Priest's, position at the right hand of the *throne* of the Majesty in heaven/of God (Heb 8:1 and 12:2). In terms of the ultimate position of honour that the Son took at sitting (not standing) at the right hand of God himself in heaven, the author opened his book with this exalted status of the Son in Heb 1:3. The invitation to take the seat at God's right hand was given as an instruction by God self according to the introductory formula and the quotation from Ps 110(109):1 in Heb 1:13. But his office in that position is not only that of King, but also that of High Priest who presented himself as the sacrifice (Heb 8:1; 10:12; 12:2).

- The ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας of the Ps 45(44) quotation is clearly a royal item and different from the staff (ῥάβδος) that appears in Heb 9:4 with regard to Aaron and in Heb 11:21 with regard to Jacob. Its function is that of judgement (Heb 1:8-9). In this role, the son-king "loves righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) but hates lawlessness". This relates closely to the author's link with Gen 14 and his exposition of the name of Melchizedek, who is the

---

[70]   Cf. Steyn (2002:207-223).

"king of righteousness" – and thus the "son of God", after whom Melchizedek takes. (Note: it is Melchizedek who is like the "son of God", not *vice versa*). Apart from the occurrences in the quotation from Ps 45(44) and the reference to Melchizedek from Gen 14, an important quotation in which the term δικαιοσύνη surfaces again, is that of Hab 2:3-4 (Heb 10:38). Here it is those who have been justified by God (not the Son) who will live. This is seen not only in the exemplary lives of Abel who was righteous (Heb 11:4) and Noah who, by his faith, "became heir of the righteousness that comes by faith" (11:7), but also those of the judges, kings and prophets who "administered justice" (11:33). The spiritually immature believers, though, those still "living on milk", are not acquainted with the teaching about righteousness (5:13), but those who are disciplined receive "a harvest of righteousness and peace" (12:11). The book closes with the believers who arrived at Zion, where God is, the Judge of all, and where the spirits are of the righteous (δικαίων, 12:23).

- The concept of Jesus as the "*anointed*" king is closely connected with the title "Christ" that was attributed to him by early Christianity. The term is presented by means of the verb ἔχρισεν in the quotation from Ps 45(44) in Heb 1:9. The first time that the title itself is used, occurs in Heb 3:6 where it is stated that "Christ is like a son" (Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱός). Not only does this connect the two titles υἱός and Χριστός with Jesus, but also merges into the concept of him as divinely anointed king.[71] The term Χριστός is used as an independent name for Jesus in Heb 3:14; 5:5; 6:1; 9:11, 14, 24, 28; 11:26 and also in 10:10; 13:8 and 13:21 (the only three places where it is explicitly combined with the name "Jesus").

- The submission of his enemies and of everything is an element of the Son's royal rule that arises mainly from the quotations from Ps 110(109) and Ps 8. In both cases, it is God who submits the enemies under his feet (τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου, Ps 109:1 in Heb 1:13) as well as everything under his feet (πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν

---

[71] For a brief discussion on the Jewish expectation of a royal messiah, cf. Dunn (2003:619-622).

αὐτοῦ, Ps 8:7 in Heb2:8a). Also in this sense the Son is different from the angels as it was not to them that God subjected the world to come (2:5). In the author's exposition of the quotation from Ps 8, he makes it clear that everything was subjected to him and that nothing was left out, although we do not see at present everything subject to him (2:8). Later, in Heb 10:13, the author sheds clarity on this remark. According to his understanding there, Jesus Christ brought his sacrifice, took his position at the right hand of God, and now waits there until his enemies are subjected to him (οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ), which is a reference to the quotation from Ps 110(109):1, and a reference to the *parousia*.[72]

- Yet another element which testifies to the royal position of the Son, and one that is brought in via the quotation from Ps 8:5-7 is the fact that he is "crowned with honour and glory" (δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας, Heb 2:7) – which is an allusion to the resurrection-ascension.[73] It is in these terms that the son was pictured at the opening of the book when the author mentioned that the "Son radiates God's glory" (ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, Heb 1:3). In his exposition of the quotation from Ps 8, the author relates Jesus with being crowned with *honour* and *glory* (2:9). He, however, did not *glorify* himself, but God gave it to him (5:5), because nobody takes this *honour* upon himself (5:4). Jesus' *glory* was greater than that of Moses, just as the one who builds the house has greater *honour* than the house itself (3:3). The book is concluded with a confessional statement that the glory belongs to Jesus Christ forever (13:21). Cherubim represented God's glory on top of the Ark of the Covenant (9:5). It is understood that God wanted to lead many as his children into glory (2:10).

JESUS AS "HIGH PRIEST" (ἀρχιερεύς)

The concept of Jesus as Son of God is often obscured in Hebrews by the metaphor of Jesus as high priest (Heb 3:1; 4:14). The latter finds its basis in the quotation from Ps 110(109):4 which occurs in Heb 5:6, 7:17 and 7:21 (σὺ

---

72   Hanson (1989:22).
73   Hanson (1989:22).

ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ). Cullmann pointed out that "when Jesus quotes Ps 110 in Mark 12.35ff. to show that the Messiah's Davidic sonship is problematical, he clearly presupposes that the king addressed in the psalm (the king who is at the same time a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek) is to be understood as the Messiah. The Septuagint also interprets the psalm in this way".[74]

The author to the Hebrews already introduces the metaphor of Jesus as high priest when he states that Jesus had to become equal to his brothers in order to be a merciful and faithful high priest (ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύ) before God for the reconciliation of the people's sins (Heb 2:17).[75] He already went through the heavens and is therefore able to have compassion (4:14-15). He took his place at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven in the office as high priest (8:1). The introduction to the quoted texts from Ps 2:7 and Ps 110(109):4 make it clear that God gave Jesus this honour to be high priest as no one takes this upon himself (5:4-5). It was God who declared him high priest according to the order of Melchizedek (5:10; cf. also 6:20).

Having stated his high priesthood according to the order of Melchizedek, the author now focuses on some other qualities of Melchizedek, the "priest of God" (7:1), in Heb 7. Philo also identified the Logos with Melchizedek and called him the "Priest of God".[76] For Hebrews, one of the qualities of Melchizedek is the fact that this priesthood is an eternal one (7:3).[77] The Levite priests were mortal but Melchizedek lives (7:8). Furthermore, those priests received the Law of Moses through the Levitical priesthood. By means of a rhetorical question, the author asks that, if perfection could have been attained through this Levitical priesthood, why would there be a need for another priest according to the order of Melchizedek? And when the priesthood changes, so

---

[74] Cullmann (1963:84).
[75] Weiß (1989:245): "Hier liegt im Rahmen der schrifgelehrten Argumentation des Autors des Hebr offenbar eine Kontamination verschiedener Schriftstellen vor, bei der es darum geht, das Thema der 'Treue' des Hohenpriesters von 2,17 exemplarisch darzustellen…"
[76] Weiß (1989:85). Cf. Philo, *LegAll* III, 79; *Congr* 99.
[77] Hebrews 7:1-3 is a paraphrase of Gen 14:17-20 LXX. See Steyn (2002:207-223).

does the law as well (7:11-12). The Law of Moses said nothing about priesthood with regard to the tribe of Juda – from which "our Lord" (ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν) descends. This "other priest" (ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος), though, who resembles Melchizedek, became priest not through the law of human descendency but on the basis of the power of an indestructible life (7:14-16). The Levite priests did not enter priesthood through an oath, but "Jesus" became priest "with an oath by God" who declared to him the words of Ps 110(109):4, confirming that God would not recall his oath and that Jesus will be priest forever (7:20-21). One major difference between these priesthoods is then that the priesthood of Jesus is the guarantee of a better covenant (7:22). Another difference for our author is the fact that because of the descendency of the Levite priesthood, they remained temporarily in that office whilst Jesus' priesthood is an eternal one and cannot be transferred to another (7:23-24). The author summarizes the status of Jesus' high priesthood and contrasts it again with that of the Levites in Heb 7:26-28 and Heb 10:11-12. He concluded that God's oath appointed the Son as an *eternal* and *perfect* high priest (7:28). He is the great priest over the house of God (10:21). The concept of "perfection" plays an important role in Hebrews with τέλειος and cognates as *Stichwörter*. It "refers both to that which is perfect and to that which is complete".[78] Its cultic-sacral character is found in the language of the mystery religions, "and the Septuagint actually gives it the meaning of 'dedication'".[79]

As a high priest, he also had to have something to sacrifice (8:3-4, cf. 5:1). In this sense, one could indeed say that here "the concept of the High Priest is closely related to that of the Suffering Servant of God".[80] The author expands hereafter on the layout of the temple, the service of the priests and the holy of holies where the high priest would enter once a year (9:6-7). This cultic scene is drawn upon according to the pattern or example (8:5) of that in heaven. It is in the latter where Christ serves in his office as high priest (9:11). It is here where he entered the most holy place only once with his own blood, and not with that

---

[78] Cullmann (1963:92).
[79] Cullmann (1963:92).
[80] Cullmann (1963:83, 91).

of goats and calves, bringing eternal redemption (9:12). He did not enter repeatedly as the Levite priests did in order to sacrifice himself, otherwise he had to suffer repeatedly (9:25-26). A last comparison is made in Heb 13:11-12 between the high priest who burnt the bodies of the sacrificial animals outside the camp and Jesus' suffering outside the city gates.

JESUS AS "LOGOS"?

Acknowledgment of the pre-existence and eternity of the Son became an increasingly important issue during the development of early Christianity. Already in the opening lines of the book, the author of Hebrews identifies the Son as "the one through whom God made the universe" (δι᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, Heb 1:2). Apart from implying the pre-existence of the Son, also the concept of the Son as the instrument through whom God created everything is important here. Although Hebrews does not call the Son explicitly the "Logos", there are similarities in this regard with Jesus as the Logos in John's Gospel[81] and also in Philo. Interestingly, Philo also thought of the Logos not only as "the high priest which sets the soul before God",[82] but also as the "Son of God", or the "first born" (πρωτόγονος),[83] the "mediator" between God and man, the ὄργανον or instrument in the creation of the world, "the impress" (χαρακτήρ) of God's seal",[84] or as an angel[85] or archangel.[86] As in SapSal 18:14ff., the Logos became "kein blutleerer philosophischer Begriff, sondern es ist der personifizierte Gotteswille, Stellvertreter und Hypostase Gottes".[87]

According to Macquarrie, "the idea that the Word or Logos is a kind of hypostasis or distinct entity within the being of the Godhead might indicate a development beyond the Hebrew understanding of the Word of God." "One could say that the expression 'Son' has the advantage of being personal; on the

---

[81]   So also Macquarrie (1991:124).
[82]   Barclay (1958:116).
[83]   *Agr* 51; *Conf* 63, 146.
[84]   Taylor (1958:90); Lee (2005:69).
[85]   *LegAll* 3.177; *Deus* 182; *Mut* 87; *Som* 1.239-40.
[86]   *Conf* 146; *Her* 205.
[87]   Bertram (1957:240).

other hand, 'Word' is more universal and breaks out of the specifically Jewish associations of 'Son of God', which might also acquire the unwanted pagan associations that were common in the Hellenistic world."[88]

By quoting particularly Ps 102(101):26-28 in Heb 1:10-12, the author introduces the pre-existence of the Son. Schunack is correct in saying that "In V. 10-12 wird durch Ps. 101,26-28 LXX auf den Sohn übertragen, Mit-Schöpfer zu sein, und belegt, dass er Schöpfungsmittler (V. 2) ist".[89] The quotation is introduced with the statement that God said these words about the Son (v. 1, 8, 10). The Son is addressed in the vocative, through the words of the quotation, as κύριε – which is in itself an insertion in the LXX.[90] The laying of the foundations of the earth in the beginning is ascribed to him, and the heavens are seen as the work of his hands. All these will end and be rolled up like a garment, but the κύριος will remain. There is no end to his years. Kistemaker pointed to the fact that "The author of Hebrews, who relied on the Greek translation of the Old Testament, understandably applied this section of Ps 102 to the Christ, because the title *Lord* appeared in the Greek text".[91]

CONCLUSION

"By the end of the first century the Christian Church was faced with an acute problem in communication. The Church had been cradled in Judaism, but now she had to present her message to a Greek world, to which the categories of Judaism were quite alien".[92] The LXX translations provided an important platform from which Christian theological concepts were developed. Müller formulates this aptly: "For the New Testament authors this translation had tremendous impact. It influences their perception of the wording of the Bible text decisively, and, to a varying degree, left its stamp on their language."[93]

---

[88] Macquarrie (1991:43).
[89] Schunack (2002:28).
[90] Similarly, Wilson (1987:42).
[91] Kistemaker (1992:46).
[92] Barclay (1958:114-115).
[93] Müller (1996:129).

Some interesting suggestions were made regarding the structure of Hebrews. Some suggested that Heb 1:5-13 is programmatic for the rest of the book. Others suggested that Ps 110 actually formed the basis, or plan, according to which the book was written and that it provides the key theological concepts that are discussed in the book. Without rejecting these suggestions, it is clear that the quotations form the backbone of this masterful work. It is a carefully planned work, based on a number of quoted texts from mainly the LXX, which provided the necessary terminology, expanded upon by the author and developed further as Christian theological concepts. A number of these concepts were not directly deduced from the LXX by the author of Hebrews himself, but the concepts were already built via the LXX by the early Christian tradition prior to Hebrews. Here, though, we can see them as well-established and well-developed Christian concepts that found their way originally via the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. The LXX terminology was thus taken either directly from the LXX by the author himself, or in many cases arrived at his desk via the early Christian tradition – sometimes by means of the liturgical use of these texts.

There is a clear "determinedly christocentric interpretation of scripture" which is running through most of the quoted passages in Hebrews.[94] "Promises once given to David and his heirs are now applied to Jesus, who is 'Son' to God and 'heir of all things' (see Ps 2:7-8), who, after his ascension, took his seat at God's right hand (an inference drawn from applying Ps 110,1 to Jesus)."[95]

A shift in the meaning of words between the Hebrew *Vorlage* and the translation of the LXX, or from the LXX to the NT is not the only prerequisite to determine whether LXX terminology contributed to the NT's understanding of particular Christian theological, and in particular christological, concepts. Fact is, the LXX played an important lexicographical role by providing the NT writer with existing translation equivalents for Hebrew words. Purely Jewish ideas and concepts were thus already coloured with the socio-religious paint of a predominantly Greek-speaking world. Early Christianity picked up on this

---

[94]   Hanson (1989:22).
[95]   De Silva (2004:808).

ready-at-hand terminology in its selection of a number of key passages which they quoted, or referred to, and from which they developed a new branch of interpretation.

Bertram's conclusion still holds: "Auch da, wo die Septuaginta nicht erst das alttestamentliche Bild gedeutet oder die im Neuen Testament verwendete Formulierung oder Darstellung geschaffen hat, wo also der Septuagintatext dem der Masora entspricht, wird von Praeparatio evangelica zu reden sein."[96]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arndt, W F & Gingrich, F W 1979. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature.* Chicago: UCP.

Attridge, H W 1989. The Epistle to the Hebrews. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Balz, H & Schneider, G (eds.) 1990-1993. *Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament.* 3 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Barclay, W 1958. *More New Testament wor*ds. London: SCM Press.

Barth, M 1962. The Old Testament in Hebrews: an essay in biblical hermeneutics, in Klassen & Snyder 1962: 53-78.

Beare, F W 1944. The text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in P46, *JBL* 63:379-396.

Bertram, G. 1957. *Praeparatio Evangelica* in der Septuaginta, *VT* VII:225-249.

_____ 1967. Zur Bedeutung der Religion der Septuaginta in der hellenistischen Welt, *ThLZ* 92:246-250.

Betz, H D s.v. θεός, in Betz & Schneider 1990-1993.

Black, M 1976. Some Greek words with 'Hebrew' meanings in the Epistles and Apocalypse, in McKay & Miller 1976:135-146.

Bruce, F F 1985. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Carson, D A, Moo, D J, & Morris, L 1992. *An introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Cullmann, O 1963. *The Christology of the New Testament*. London: SCM Press.

Dafni, G 2006. Παντοκράτωρ in Septuaginta-Amos 4,13. Zur Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta, in Knibb (2006:443-454).

De Silva, D A 2004. *An introduction to the New Testament*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Dunn, J D G 2003. *Jesus remembered*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ellingworth, P 2000. *The Epistle to the Hebrews. A commentary on the Greek text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gäbel, G 2006. *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes*. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Giles, P 1973. Jesus the high priest in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the fourth

---

[96]   Bertram (1957:249).

gospel, MA Thesis, Manchester.

Girdlestone, R B 1948. *Synonyms of the Old Testament: their bearing on Christian doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Grässer, E 1990. *An die Hebräer*. EKK. Zurich: Benziger.

Guthrie, G H 1997. The Old Testament in Hebrews, in Martin & Davids 1997:PAGES.

F. Hahn, F 1974. *Christologische Hoheitstitel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

_____ 1993. s.v. υἱός, in Balz and Schneider 1993, Vol. 3:383.

Hanson, R P C & A T 1989. *The Bible without illusions*. London: SCMP.

Harris, M J 1992. J*esus as God. The New Testament use of theos in reference to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Karrer, M 2002. *Der Brief an die Hebräer: Kapitel 1,1-5,10*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn.

Kistemaker, S J 1992. *New Testament commentary, exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House

Kittel, G & Friedrich G (eds.), 1964. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 8 (electronic ed.).

Klassen, W & Snyder, G F (eds.) 1962. *Current issues in New Testament interpretation. Essays in honor of Otto A. Piper*. New York: Harper.

Knibb, M A (ed.) 2006. *The Septuagint and messianism*. Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense LIII, July 27-29, 2004, BETL. Leuven: Peeters.

Langkammer, H 1993.s.v. παντοκράτωρ, in Balz & Schneider 1993:11.

Lane, W L 1991. *Hebrews 1-8*. WBC 47A. Dallas: Word Book Publishers.

Lee, A H I 2005. *From messiah to pre-existent son*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Macquarrie, J 1990. *Jesus Christ in modern thought*. London: SCMP.

Martin, R P & Davids, P H (eds.) 1997. *Dictionary of the later New Testament and its developments*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Marshall, H 1976. *The origins of New Testament Christology*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

McKay, J R & Miller, J F (eds.) 1976. Biblical studies: essays in honour of William Barclay. London: Collins.

Müller, M 1996. *The first Bible of the Church. A plea for the Septuagint*. JSOT SS 206. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.

Rösel, C 1999. *Die messianische Redaktion des Psalters. Studien zu Entstehung und Theologie der Sammlung Psalm 2-89*. CTM 19. Stuttgart: Calwer.

Schaper, J 1995. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. WUNT 76. Tübingen: Mohr.

Schröger, F 1968. *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger*. Regensburg, F. Pustet.

Schunack, G 2002. *Der Hebräerbrief*. ZB. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Silva, M 1983. Biblical words and their meaning: an introduction to lexical semantics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Son, K 2005. *Zion symbolism in Hebrews. Hebrews 12:18-24 as a hermeneutical key to the epistle*. Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster Press.

Spicq, C 1952. *L'Epître aux Hébreux*. Paris: Gabalda.

Steyn, G J 2000. A quest for the *Vorlage* of the Song of Moses (Dt 32) quotations in Hebrews, *Neotestamentica* 34/2:263-272.

_____ 2002. The *Vorlage* of the Melchizedek phrases in Heb 7:1-4, *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 13:207-223.

_____ 2003a. Addressing an angelomorphic christological myth in Hebrews? *HTS* 59/4:1107-1128.

_____ 2003b. Psalm 2 in Hebrews, *Neotestamentica* 37/:262-282.

_____ 2003c. Some observations about the *Vorlage* of Ps 8:5-7 in Heb 2:6-8, *Verbum et Ecclesia* 24/2:493-514.

Strobel, A 1975. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. NTD 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Taylor, V 1958. *The person of Christ in New Testament teaching*. London: Macmillan.

Vriezen, C & Van der Woude, A S 1980. *De Literatuur van Oud-Israel*. Wassenaar: Servire.

Weiss H-F 1991. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

West, J K 1981. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Westcott, B F 1974. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wilson, R McL 1987. *Hebrews*. NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gert Steyn

Department of New Testament

University of Pretoria

Pretoria 0002

South Africa

E-mail: Gert.Steyn@up.ac.za