

TWO FIRST-CENTURY MESSIANIC USES OF THE OT: HEB 1:5-13 AND 4QFLOR 1.1-19

HERBERT W. BATEMAN, IV*

Since the unprecedented finds of the Qumran scrolls between 1947 and 1956, scholars have either overemphasized or undervalued their importance for NT studies.¹ Nevertheless Julius Scott identifies their value as well as that of other Jewish literature for NT studies when he says that "such intertestamental books as those in the apocrypha, pseudepigrapha and QL remain, individually and collectively, windows through which we may catch glimpses of various aspects of that bygone world and culture into which God sent his Son, 'when the fulness of time came' (Gal 4:4)."² The Qumran text entitled *Florilegium* (4QFlor)³ provides one such window. In fact an examination of the structural, exegetical and conceptual use of the OT in 4QFlor 1.1-19 will provide historical insight into how the OT is used in Heb 1:5-13 as well as understanding of a first-century Christian messianic use of the OT.

I. STRUCTURAL USE

Artfully framed between two rhetorical questions, the group of OT passages (catena) in Heb 1:5-13 has three structural parallels with 4QFlor 1.1-19. First, both string OT passages of Scripture together. *Florilegium*

* Herbert Bateman is a New Testament adjunct faculty member at Dallas Theological Seminary, 3909 Swiss Avenue, Dallas, TX 75204.

¹ S. Sandmel has labeled the overemphasized use of the QL as "literary parallelomania" and defined it as an exaggeration concerning literary parallels and literary influence that may or may not exist between the NT and other literature ("Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 [1962] 1-13). I contend that those who undervalue the QL seem to suffer from "literary paranoia"—that is, they have an excessive resistance to the use of external Jewish sources or downplay the significance of the QL and other Jewish literature for NT studies (H. W. Bateman, *Jewish and Apostolic Hermeneutics: How the Old Testament Is Used in Hebrews 1:5-13* [dissertation; Dallas Theological Seminary, 1993] 5).

² J. J. Scott, Jr. "On the Value of Intertestamental Jewish Literature for New Testament Theology," *JETS* 23 (1980) 317-318.

³ Dated c. 37 BC to AD 70, *Florilegium* was one of over eight hundred fragments discovered in 1952 in Cave 4 at Qumran. For texts and critical notes see J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4*, DJD 5, plate 174; E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch, mit masoretischer Punctuation* (Munich: Köel, 1971) 255-259; G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985) 86-88; J. Carmignac, "Florilege," *Les textes de Qumran: traduits et annotés* (ed. J. Carmignac, E. Cothenet and H. Lignéd, Paris: Éditions Letouzey, 1962) 2.279-284.

1.1–19 strings together Deut 23:3–4; Exod 15:17c–18; 2 Sam 7:10b–14a; Pss 1:1a; 2:1–2; Isa 8:11; Ezek 37:23a; Amos 9:11. Hebrews 1:5–13 strings together Deut 32:43;⁴ 2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:7; 45:6–7; 102:25–27; 104:4; 110:1. Although 4QFlor 1.1–19 draws its passages from the HB and Heb 1:5–13 from the LXX,⁵ neither reproduces its respective OT passages verbatim. In fact both occasionally alter their OT passages to substantiate their argument. Thus a second structural parallel is that 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 exercise a degree of freedom when reproducing an OT passage.

For instance, though 4QFlor 1.1–19 selectively quotes from 2 Sam 7:10–14; Amos 9:11 almost verbatim, it makes several alterations. In 2 Sam 7:10a “sons” is changed to “son” and “his enemies” is added (4QFlor 1.1).⁶ In 2 Sam 7:11 “the Lord will make for you” is changed to “he will build for you” (4QFlor 1.11). The first example appears to be a text-critical issue,⁷ but the addition of “his enemies” and the change from “he will make” to “he will build” are not. The latter changes appear to create a stronger contextual connection in *Florilegium* as a whole. “His enemies” verbally joins 4QFlor 1.1 (2 Sam 7:10) with 1.7 (2 Sam 7:11), and “he will build” in 1.10 (2 Sam 7:11b) verbally joins interpretations in 1.2 and 1.6. The changes do not distort the OT passage since they are contextually and conceptually accurate changes, but they serve to better substantiate *Florilegium*’s argument. God will not only establish the eschatological sanctuary⁸ and the Davidic King-Messiah’s house but also eliminate the communities’ and Messiah’s enemies (i.e. the sons of Belial). In addition, phrases and words are combined in Ezek 37:23; Deut 23:3–4 to eliminate redundancy and create compactness in style. In fact the combination of words and phrases in *Florilegium* reflects a form of telescoping common in targumic texts.⁹ Thus

⁴ Since Deut 32:43 as it is quoted in Heb 1:6b does not exist in the MT, a debate exists as to whether Deut 32:43 or Ps 96:7 is quoted in Heb 1:6b. The quote, however, does exist in 4QDeut⁴, LXX Codex A, Odes 2:32 and Justin Martyr. It is my contention that Hebrews used a text of the LXX similar to or equivalent to Codex A. For a more detailed discussion of the debate cf. Bateman, *Jewish* 251–253.

⁵ Although G. Howard suggests that Hebrews uses the MT (“Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations,” *NovT* 10 [1968] 208–216), H. W. Attridge argues that Howard’s view is “unwarranted speculation” (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989] 23). In addition B. F. Westcott (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [MacMillan; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, reprint 1984] 469–480) and C. Spicq (*L’Épître aux Hébreux* [Paris: J. Gabalda, 1962] 1.331–336) offer significant evidence to the contrary. Thus Heb 1:5–13 reflects a contemporary LXX text.

⁶ Brooke provides several reasons why “his enemies” is a “direct or indirect quotation” of 2 Sam 7:10 from unknown textual tradition (*Exegesis* 97–99). But since *Florilegium* is very similar to the traditional Hebrew text, perhaps another reason exists other than that “his enemies” is part of an unknown textual tradition. Perhaps the change was an intentional exegetical change to better substantiate *Florilegium*’s argument. See n. 25 *infra*.

⁷ The singular “son” in 4QFlor 1.1 agrees with *Septuaginta* (ed. A. Rahlfs; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935; reprint 1979) 578.

⁸ Since “sanctuary” is mentioned three times in *Florilegium* (“the sanctuary of the Lord” [1.3], “the sanctuary of Israel” [1.6a], “a sanctuary of men” [1.6b]), a debate exists as to whether *Florilegium*’s eschatological sanctuary is limited to one made of stone and whether it speaks of two or three sanctuaries. For a fine summation of the various views cf. M. O. Wise, “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam,” *RevQ* 15 (1991) 103–132.

⁹ Coined by M. Sokoloff, “telescoping” is a characteristic that the targumist frequently uses to combine phrases or words into a unit for compactness in style (*The Targum to Job from Qumran*

the selectively quoted and telescoped Scripture in *Florilegium* is virtually verbatim. Nevertheless the alterations reflect the OT text’s contextual and conceptual sense to substantiate *Florilegium*’s argument.

Several passages quoted from the LXX in Heb 1:5–13 are also altered.¹⁰ Although 2 Kgdms 7:14; Pss 2:7; 109:1 are verbatim, Deut 32:43 (A); Pss 103:4; 44:7–8; 101:26–28 evidence minor changes. For instance “a flaming fire” (Ps 103:4) is cited in Heb 1:7 as “a flame of fire.” In Heb 1:8 the implied “and” is added to Ps 44:7–8, perhaps to balance two independent clauses. This addition of the conjunction “and” opens the door for other adjustments in the subsequent clause. For instance “you” is changed to “his” (*autou*, genitive of possession)¹¹ to emphasize that the Son presently possesses the kingdom: It is “his” kingdom. Articles added to the first occurrence of “rod” and “righteousness” draw attention to what was initially an abstract description of the Son’s present rule. In fact the alteration echoes 2 Kgdms 7:12: “I will establish his kingdom.” It thereby serves as a conceptual connection with 2 Samuel 7, a connection that is made in 4QFlor 1.10–11. This is not to say, however, that there is no earthly kingdom yet to come. Hebrews 1 does not address this issue. It merely identifies the fact that some form of the Davidic kingdom presently exists (cf. Col 1:12) that is ruled over by the Son. Nevertheless Hebrews 1 does identify a future aspect of the Son’s rule with Ps 110:1. The details of 110:1, however, are discussed below. Finally, the article eliminated from the second occurrence of “rod” emphasizes the fact that “the righteous scepter” describes the quality of the king’s rule.¹² Thus the textual adjustments in this one clause emphasize the Son’s present rule over “his kingdom.” In fact the Son’s active authority is clearly evident over all creation in Heb 1:10–12. In addition the Son’s active authority is clearly evident over the Church (a spiritual recreated order) and all creation (the existing created order) in Col 1:15–20. Finally, the Son’s rule over his kingdom is unmistakably one of righteousness. Although three alterations exist in this clause, the rest of Ps 44:7–8 is verbatim.

Finally, Ps 101:26–27 as quoted in Heb 1:10–12 also reflects several alterations. The word order is changed from “in the beginning, you” (*kata archas sy*) to “you, in the beginning” (*sy kata archas*). Such an alteration emphasizes three things about the Son: (1) He existed before creation; (2) he

Cave XI [Jerusalem: Ahava, 1974] 8). Sokoloff says that “the translator [often] combined the parallel words or phrases into one unit, thus destroying the poetic character of the original, but gaining compactness in style” (cf. 11QtgJob 31.3–4 with Job 38:26).

¹⁰ It is beyond the scope of this article to address differences between the LXX and Hebrew text. For a discussion of those sorts of textual comparisons cf. Bateman, *Jewish* 235–253.

¹¹ Contrary to the Nestle-Aland²⁶ or *UBSGNT*³ reading of the text, I suggest that Hebrews deliberately changes the LXX’s “your kingdom” to “his kingdom.” Internal evidence (i.e. difficulty in explaining the change; the similar changes for emphasis that occur in this clause) and external evidence (i.e. p⁴⁶ B) rule against scribal error (Bateman, *Jewish* 241–244).

¹² The “rod” or “scepter” was a common symbol of the king’s authority and rule in the ancient Near East. It symbolized protection of subjects, prosperity, and relationship to the gods and was regarded as a source of life. It also symbolized the king’s function as judge and administrator of his people. For a more detailed discussion cf. J. P. J. Olivier, “The Scepter of Justice and Psalm 45:7b,” *JNSL* 7 (1979) 45–54, esp. 47–49. For how scepter and throne are understood in Psalm 45 cf. n. 58 *infra*.

was involved in creation; (3) he is Lord over creation (cf. Col 1:15–20).¹³ In addition the future “you will remain” is changed to the present “you remain,” the phrase “you will change them” is changed to “you will roll them up,” and “like a garment” is added. The changes once again emphasize a particular truth about the Son. Whereas creation is transitory, the Son is not. The Son remains the same. What was true in the past about the Son is true now and will be true in the future (cf. Heb 13:8).

Thus alterations or changes to passages quoted from either the HB or the LXX in 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 reveal that neither first-century author is enslaved to the Biblical text. In fact Kistemaker has also argued that the author of Hebrews deviates from his LXX text from time to time throughout the book of Hebrews so as “to substantiate his arguments better.”¹⁴

The third structural parallel between 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 is the use of introductory formulae to introduce Scripture. On the one hand *Florilegium* introduces Exod 15:17c–18 (1.12); Amos 9:11 (1.12) with “as it is written.” “He said to David” introduces 2 Sam 7:11b (1.7), and “concerning whom it is written” introduces Isa 8:11 (1.15); Ezek 37:23 (1.16). On the other hand Hebrews introduces Ps 2:7; 2 Kgdms 7:14 with “he said” (1.5). “He says” (1:6–7) introduces Deut 32:43 (A); Pss 44:7–8; 101:26–27. “He has said” (1:7) introduces Ps 109:1. Although Hebrews never refers to the OT as something written,¹⁵ Hebrews introduces Scripture as God’s spoken word as in *Florilegium*: “He said to David” (4QFlor 1.7); “he said” (Heb 1:5), “he says” (1:6–7), “he has said” (1:7). Introductory formulae, however, are not a unique or uncommon first-century Jewish practice.¹⁶ Nevertheless their use in 4QFlor 1.1–19; Heb 1:5–13 remains a significant parallel since they both reflect a common first-century cultural phenomenon. Consequently 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 share similar structural uses of the OT: (1) They string OT passages together, (2) they quote their respective OT texts

¹³ The vocative “O Lord” was added to Ps 102:26 in the LXX to explicitly identify Yahweh as the one being addressed as both King and Creator. The psalm begins with a petition to Yahweh. Hence the LXX translates “Yahweh” (102:1) as a vocative, “O Lord” (101:1). Yahweh is later addressed as one who sits enthroned. Thus the LXX once again translates “Yahweh” (102:12) as a vocative, “O Lord” (101:12). Attention then shifts from Yahweh’s enthronement to his creative activities (102:26). At this point the LXX translator adds the vocative “O Lord.” The LXX’s addition does not distort the contextual or conceptual sense of the psalm. It does, however, explicitly identify that the subject whom the psalmist addresses is Yahweh, who is Creator. Thus Heb 1:10–12 recontextualizes and applies the LXX’s translation of the psalm to the Son.

¹⁴ S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Van Soest, 1961) 57.

¹⁵ There is no use of “I write” with an OT citation in Hebrews. Scriptural quotations are introduced with “he said” (1:5); “he says” (1:6, 7; 2:12; 5:6; 6:14; 8:8; 9:20; 10:5); “he has said” (1:7; 4:3; 13:5); “solemnly witnessed somewhere . . . saying” (2:6); “the Holy Spirit says” (3:7); “while it is said” (3:15); “as he has previously said” (4:7); “the one speaking to him” (5:5); “it is witnessed” (7:17); “the one saying to him” (7:21); “to have said” (10:15); “the one having said” (10:30); “as to whom it was spoken” (11:18); “the exhortation” (12:5); “he has promised, saying” (12:26).

¹⁶ Pre-Christian Jewish literature also introduces Scripture as something God spoke or something written: “He said” (1QpHab 3.14; 5.6; 4Q252 1.1); “God said” (4Q252 1.1); “And as for what he says” (1QpHab 6.2; 7.3; 9.3–4; 10.2; 12.6; 11QMelch 2.2, 10, 15, 18); “as it is written” (1QS 5.17; 8.14; 4Q252 3.1); “as he spoke” (4Q252 4.2).

verbatim but occasionally alter a passage to substantiate their arguments better, and (3) they use similar introductory formulae to introduce their respective OT passages. But on what basis are the OT passages connected? One basis for connecting Scripture together is exegetical.

II. EXEGETICAL USE

Bowker identifies thirteen rules of interpretation that were particularly respected by Jewish interpreters: the seven rules of Hillel (60 BC–AD 20?) and the expanded thirteen rules of Ishmael (AD 110–130).¹⁷ Of particular interest to this study are Hillel’s rules of exegesis since they existed prior to the first century BC.¹⁸ Although the sophisticated use of Hillel’s rules is generally denied to exist in the NT or prerabbinic literature,¹⁹ do rudiments of Hillel’s seven rules ever occur in 4QFlor 1.1–19? And if they exist in *Florilegium*, do they exist in Heb 1:5–13? More importantly, however, is whether any identified rules provide a reason for connecting OT passages together and whether the rules help in understanding the meaning of these first-century texts.

Hillel’s exegetical rule *gēzērā šāwā* frequently applies in 4QFlor 1.1–19.²⁰ In fact several easily distinguishable verbal analogies serve as the basis for connecting one verse of Scripture to another: (1) “Enemy” connects 2 Sam 7:10a (4QFlor 1.1) to 2 Sam 7:11a (4QFlor 1.7); (2) “I will raise up” connects Amos 9:11 to 2 Sam 7:12; (3) “walk” connects Isa 8:11 to Ps 1:1; and (4) “forever” connects Exod 15:17c to Deut 23:4.²¹ Thus for the first-century Jewish culture, where the same words are applied to two separate cases, it follows that the same considerations apply to both. For instance Amos 9:11

¹⁷ J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (New York: Cambridge, 1969; reprint 1979) 315, and H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (Munich: C. H. Beck’sche, 1982) 28–30, list and define Hillel’s and Ishmael’s rules.

¹⁸ Although Jewish tradition clearly attributes Hillel’s rules to the eminent Jewish scholar Hillel (*m. Abot* 1:12), Bowker (*Targums* 315–316), Strack and Stemberger (*Einleitung* 27), J. Neusner, *Midrash in Context* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983] 1–20, and others are of the opinion that they did not originate with Hillel.

¹⁹ W. S. Towner, “Hermeneutical Systems of Hillel and the Tannaim: A Fresh Look,” *HUCA* 53 (1982) 133–134; P. S. Alexander, “Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament,” *ZNW* 74 (1983) 237–246, esp. 244; W. C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1986) 255; R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale, 1989) 12–13.

²⁰ Bowker defines *gēzērā šāwā* as “a verbal analogy from one verse to another; where the same words are applied to two separated cases it follows that the same consideration found in one of them applies to all of them” (*Targums* 315).

²¹ E. Slomovic (“Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *RevQ* 7 [1969] 3–15, esp. 7–8), Brooke (*Exegesis* 133–141, 147–148, 166) and M. Fishbane (“Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* [ed. M. J. Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988] 374) identify two other less distinguishable verbal analogies as (1) *nāf*, which connects Exod 15:17c–18 to 2 Sam 7:10b–11a, and (2) *mwšb*, which connects Ezek 37:23 to Ps 1:1. The verbal analogy “enemy” is debatable (see n. 6 *supra*; n. 25 *infra*).

and 2 Sam 7:12 both use "I will raise up" and thereby serve as a verbal link in 4QFlor 1.10–13. Although both passages speak of different historical situations, they deserve the same consideration because of "I will raise up." This verbal connection is strengthened through another one of Hillel's rules, *kayyôṣē' bô bēmāqôm 'aḥēr*,²² which links as well as equates "your seed" of 2 Sam 7:13b with "the booth of David" in Amos 9:11. Thus God's unconditional covenant made with David concerning his seed (i.e. Solomon)²³ is equated with the fallen booth of David and thereby recontextualized in *Florilegium* to refer to someone yet to come.

Florilegium 1.10–13 first quotes portions of God's promise made to David concerning his son Solomon (i.e. 2 Sam 7:12b, 13b, 14a) and then a portion from Amos 9:11:

¹⁰"And the Lord declares to you that he will build you a house. And *I will raise up your seed* after you, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom ¹¹forever. I will be to him as a father, and he will be to me as a son": He is the shoot of David who will stand with the Interpreter of the Law, who ¹²[will rule] in Zion in the latter days, as it is written, "And *I will raise up the booth of David* which is fallen": He is the booth (or branch) of ¹³David which was fallen, who will take office to save Israel.²⁴

The phrase "I will raise up your seed" from 2 Sam 7:12b is first interpreted to be "the shoot of David . . . who [will rule] in Zion in the latter days." The interpretation is then validated with Amos 9:11. "Your seed" in 2 Sam 7:12b parallels and has points of similarity (though not necessarily verbal) with the "booth of David" in Amos 9:11.²⁵ Thus according to Hillel's rules 2 Sam 7:12b and Amos 9:11 can legitimately be linked together. *Florilegium* 1.10–13 concludes with another interpretation of "I will raise up the booth of David," which parallels the previous one for 2 Sam 7:12b: "He is the booth of David which was fallen, who will take office to save Israel." Thus 4QFlor 1.10–13 reflects one sectarian's expectation of a future Davidic King-Messiah based upon first-century exegesis of Scripture. God will place over Israel a Davidic King-Messiah as his ruler, and he will save Israel.

²² Bowker defines *kayyôṣē' bô bēmāqôm 'aḥēr* to mean "as is found in another place; a difficulty in one text may be solved by comparing it with another which has points of general (though not necessarily verbal) similarity" (*Targums* 315). The difficulty of 2 Sam 7:14 is the absence of a Davidic king on the throne at the time *Florilegium* was written and because of the nature of God's unconditional covenant with David. Amos 9 explains that absence and is used to support the expectation of a future Davidic Messiah.

²³ M. Weinfeld notes that similar promissory grants existed among the Hittites. Hittite promissory grants protected the property or the establishment of a house (dynasty) from generation to generation. Regardless of what a son, grandson, great-grandson, etc., might do, the property or the establishment of a dynasty could never be taken away. The grant could not be broken ("The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," *JAOS* 90 [1970] 184–203).

²⁴ The translation is taken from Brooke, *Exegesis* 92.

²⁵ The use of two exegetical rules simultaneously to substantiate an argument is not unusual. In fact the use of *dēbar hallammēd mē'inyānō* (i.e. a meaning may be established or clarified by its context) and/or *binyan 'āb* (i.e. relating two similar texts together whose interpretation is applicable to both) best explains the addition of "enemy" in 2 Sam 7:10. For a more detailed discussion see Bateman, *Jewish* 152 n. 47.

Hebrews 1:5–13 also evidences Hillel's rules. In fact, Hillel's *qal wāḥōmer* is used in Heb 1:5–13 to address the first-century Christian issue about the Son's relationship to the angels.²⁶ Scripture is applied to the less important (i.e. angels) and then compared and contrasted with Scripture applied to the more important (i.e. the Son).²⁷ Thus Heb 1:5–13 builds a *qal wāḥōmer* argument to explain why the Son is superior over the angels. In addition Heb 1:5–13 also uses Hillel's *gēzērā šāwā* and *kayyôṣē' bô bēmāqôm 'aḥēr* rules as a basis for linking Scripture together.²⁸

Gēzērā šāwā is evidenced twice in Heb 1:5–13: (1) "Son" connects 2 Kgdms 7:14 to Ps 2:7 (LXX), and (2) "God" connects Ps 44:7–8 (LXX) to Deut 32:43 (A).²⁹ In the latter case the verbal connection is strengthened through *kayyôṣē' bô bēmāqôm 'aḥēr* since "O God" in Ps 44:7 and "God's angels" in Deut 32:43 parallel and have points of similarity (though not necessarily verbal) with "O Lord" in Ps 101:26 (LXX). In fact, the Son's description as Creator of all things from 101:26 and its connection with 44:7 identifies the Son as Divine Wisdom and validates Heb 1:2c.

Hebrews 1:2c describes the Son as the agent (*di' hou*) through whom God created "the universe" (cf. 11:3).³⁰ This creative activity conceptually ties Jesus to Divine Wisdom through whom Yahweh created the universe (Wis 9:2, 9; Prov 8:27–31). Thus Ps 101:26 (LXX) offers one reason why the Son's inherited name is superior to the angels: As Divine Wisdom he created all things (cf. Col 1:15–17). In addition the Son's description as the (1) "radiance

²⁶ Bowker defines *qal wāḥōmer* to mean that "what applies in a less important case will certainly apply in a more important case" (*Targums* 315).

²⁷ Attridge, *Hebrews* 25 n. 196; 47 n. 152; Kistemaker, *Psalm Citations* 73; G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983) xxiii–xxiv; and W. L. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8* (WBC; Waco: Word, 1991) cxxi, all point out that Hebrews frequently uses *qal wāḥōmer* to make other minor-to-major comparisons: Moses to Jesus (3:3); old covenant to new covenant (8:6); blood of bulls and goats to blood of Jesus (9:13–14); earthly father to heavenly Father (12:9–11). Even Towner, who tends to deny the developed existence of Hillel's exegetical rules in the NT, suggests that *qal wāḥōmer* may be exemplified in Heb 12:9 ("Hermeneutical Systems" 134 n. 67).

²⁸ See nn. 20, 22 *supra* for the definition of *gēzērā šāwā* and *kayyôṣē' bô bēmāqôm 'aḥēr*. With regard to the latter, the difficulty with Deut 32:43 (A) and LXX Ps 44:7 is the description of the Son as God. LXX Ps 101:26, however, clarifies Hebrews' application of Deut 32:43 (A) and LXX Ps 44:7 to the Son.

²⁹ R. N. Longenecker notes that *gēzērā šāwā* is also used in Heb 4:3–4; 5:6–7:10. He also notes that although it is at work in Heb 4:3–10, the major exegetical principle employed is *dēbar hallammēd mē'inyānō* since it explains why "they shall never enter my rest" in Ps 95:11 by appealing to "today" in 95:7 (Heb 4:7). Thus both exegetical principles are used to recontextualize Psalm 95 in Heb 4:8–11 and give an eschatological emphasis (*Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975] 181–182, esp. 182). Lane (*Hebrews 1–8* cxxi) and Attridge (*Hebrews* 24–25) note that *gēzērā šāwā* also occurs in (1) Heb 5:5–6 when Pss 2:7 and 110:4 are linked together by "you," which identifies Jesus as the true Davidic King-Priest, and (2) Heb 5:6, 10; 6:20 where the phrase "according to the order of Melchizedek" in Ps 110:4 is explained by appealing to Gen 14:17–20 in Heb 7:10. In the latter cases, however, the author shifts to a *qal wāḥōmer* argument, since what was true of Melchizedek (the less important) certainly is true and will be true for Jesus Christ (the more important). Thus two exegetical principles serve to recontextualize Pss 2:7 and 110:4. Jesus is the true Davidic King-Priest who is greater than Melchizedek. In fact if the initial referent of these royal psalms is Solomon (see n. 35 *infra*) the author's use of these passages also supports Jesus' teaching that he was greater than Solomon (Luke 11:31; Matt 12:42).

³⁰ See H. Sasse, "aion," *TDNT* 1.197–209, esp. 203–204.

of God's glory" (*apaugasma tēs doxēs*) and (2) "the exact representation of his being" (*charaktēr tēs hypostaseōs autou*) in Heb 1:3 also links the Son with Wisdom. The term "radiance" (*apaugasma*) verbally links the Son with Wisdom (Wis 7:26), and *charaktēr* conceptually parallels the description of Jesus as the "image" (*eikōn*) of God in 2 Cor 4:4; Rom 8:29; Col 1:15. Finally Wisdom, described as sitting by the throne of God in Wis 9:4, 10–11, conceptually parallels Heb 1:8 via Ps 44:7 (LXX). The first-century Jew familiar with wisdom literature would recognize the verbal and conceptual links made with Divine Wisdom in Heb 1:5–13. Thus Lane rightly identifies the Son of Hebrews 1 as Divine Wisdom.³¹

Therefore, LXX Ps 101:26's "O Lord" linked with LXX Ps 44:7's "O God" provides an added dimension in understanding Psalm 45 in God's progressive revelation (Heb 1:1–2a). Whereas Psalm 45's historical Davidic-king referent (i.e. Solomon)³² was merely to reflect divine characteristics,³³ the Son as Divine Wisdom not only reflects divine righteousness but also is righteous.³⁴ Psalm 45's Davidic king-messiah was merely a prototype of the

³¹ See Lane, *Hebrews 1–8* 5–19, 30. In addition, J. D. G. Dunn identifies several NT passages that have been influenced by wisdom terminology. Compare Matt 11:27–30 with Sir 51:23–27; John 1:1 with Wis 9:9; John 1:11, 14 with 1 Enoch 42:2; 1 Cor 8:6 with Prov 3:19 and Wis 8:4–6; Col 1:15 with Prov 8:22, 25, and Wis 7:26; Col 1:17 with Sir 24:9; Heb 1:3 with Prov 8:27–30 and Wis 7:26 (*Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980] chap. 6).

³² Psalm 45 is a royal psalm designed to praise a Davidic king for all his splendor, majesty and righteousness (45:2–8), to counsel his bride before she is brought before him (45:9–15), and to predict the king's eternal remembrance through his children (45:16–17). Since Solomon (1) built ivory palaces (cf. Ps 45:8 with 1 Kgs 10:18; 2 Chron 9:17), (2) had friendly relations with the king of Tyre (cf. Ps 45:12 with 1 Kgs 5:1–12; 9:10–11; 10:11–12), (3) was recognized as a king who was just and righteous (cf. Ps 45:7 with 1 Kgs 10:1–10), and (4) married many foreign women (Ps 45:10 with 1 Kgs 11:1–3; 3:1), perhaps Psalm 45 is a love song composed for one of Solomon's weddings. The king certainly was a Judahite king because of allusions to the Davidic covenant (2 Samuel 7): He is blessed forever (45:2), guaranteed a throne as long as he lives (45:6), anointed by God (45:7), promised heirs (45:16), and his enemies are killed (45:5). In fact they all could easily point to Solomon since he was the immediate referent in 2 Samuel. Similar Davidic covenant allusions also occur in Psalms 72, 89 and 132.

³³ Although the vocative "O God" is problematic for those who view Psalm 45 to be spoken to an historical king, similar addresses occur in the OT. Yahweh said to Moses: "See! I made you God to Pharaoh." The witch of Endor said of Samuel's spirit: "I see God coming up from the ground." Neither statement means that Moses or Samuel is God. Nor is the king of Psalm 45 God. The statement means that the king reflects the divine, he is the divine agent of Yahweh. In fact M. J. Harris exemplifies how the king reflects the divine in Psalm 45: "Glory and majesty" are ascribed to the king (45:4–5a), as they are to God (96:6); the king is a defender and lover of truth and right (45:5b–8a), as God is (33:5; 99:4; Isa 61:8); the king judges with equity (Ps 45:7b), as God does (67:4; 99:4); just as God's rule is eternal (10:16; 93:2; 145:13), so will be the king's dynasty (45:7a) ("The Translation of Elohim in Psalm 45:7–8," *TynBul* 35 [1984] 65–89, esp. 84). In addition C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs argue that "this is not strange in ancient poetry. The great kings reflect the divine majesty, and in a sense partake of the divine nature" (Pss 8:5; 82:6; John 10:35) (*The Book of Psalms* [ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906, reprint 1981] 1.141). Finally J. I. Durham argues that such expressions reveal respect for royalty as either divine or divinely authorized and were common in the ancient Near East ("The King as 'Messiah' in the Psalms," *RevExp* 3 [1984] 425–435). For ancient Near Eastern examples see Code of Hammurapi i.24–38; iv.33–35; v.1–20 (*ANET*).

³⁴ The OT identifies righteousness as a dimension of God's moral purity (Jer 9:24), a quality that is possessed by the Son (Heb 4:15–16; 2 Cor 5:21).

greater and ultimate Davidic King-Messiah, the Son.³⁵ In fact Jesus said of himself, "Now one greater than Solomon is here" (cf. Matt 12:42; Luke 11:31). The Son is not only Yahweh's vicegerent but also the expression and manifestation of God (i.e. Divine Wisdom). He created the entire universe (Heb 1:10 via Ps 101:26 LXX; cf. Col 1:15–17), including the angels who presently worship him (Heb 1:6b via Deut 32:43 [A]) and serve him (Heb 1:7 via Ps 103:4 LXX; cf. Heb 1:14). There is no other Davidic King-Messiah like the Son since he is also Divine Wisdom. Thus "O Lord" in Ps 101:26 heightens the original sense of meaning for "O God" in 44:7 as well as adds another dimension for understanding how Deut 32:43 is used in Heb 1:6b.

Although the designation "God"³⁶ in Deuteronomy 32:43 (A) is a bit ambiguous early on in Heb 1:6b, as the catena unfolds the first-century exegetical connection with Ps 44:7 (LXX) and Ps 101:26 (LXX) clarifies Deuteronomy's recontextualized sense. Thus "all God's angels" and "to him" in Deut 32:43 clearly refer to the Son in Heb 1:6b. The Son as Davidic King-Messiah is above the angels (i.e. "companions" in Heb 1:9 via Ps 44:8 LXX; Heb 1:14), and as Divine Wisdom he is their Creator (Heb 1:10 via Ps 101:26 LXX). Thus angels serve the Son (Heb 1:7, 14). The point of Heb 1:6b, however, is that the Son as Divine Wisdom (i.e. God) is superior to angels because the angels belong to the Son and thereby worship him.³⁷

Consequently 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 use similar first-century exegetical principles to connect OT passages together. In fact the use of Hillel's exegetical rules in both *Florilegium* and Hebrews provides a first-century reason for connecting their respective OT passages. It also provides an historical basis for understanding the first-century texts themselves. Although *Florilegium* uses the OT to point to a future Davidic King-Messiah, Hebrews uses the OT to declare that the Davidic King-Messiah has come (Heb 1:5, 8–9, 13). In addition LXX Psalm 44's exegetical connection with LXX Ps 101:26 and Deut 32:43 (A) describes the Son as not only Davidic King-Messiah but also Divine Wisdom. It is for this reason that the Son is superior to the angels. But 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 are not limited to Hillel's rules for

³⁵ Psalm 45:6–7 is one of four OT passages used in Heb 1:5–13 whose historical referent was perhaps Solomon. The others are 2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:7; 110:1. More will be said about 2 Sam 7:14 later in this article. For a discussion of Ps 2:7 see Bateman, *Jewish* 262–264; for Ps 110:1 see Bateman, "Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament," *BSac* 149 (1992) 438–453. But regardless of the historical referent, Psalms 2, 45 and 110 all have elements of Yahweh's covenant to David (2 Samuel 7) concerning his heir Solomon. All are royal psalms. (1) Psalm 2 references to "king" (2:6), "his anointed one" (2:2), "scepter" (2:9), and Father-son imagery (2:7, 12) support a royal psalm motif. (2) Psalm 45 references to a "king" (45:1, 5, 9, 11, 14, 15), "your throne" (45:7), "royal bride" (45:9), "princess" (45:13) and future sons being made "princes" (45:16) support a royal psalm motif. (3) Psalm 110 references to "my Lord" (110:1) and the imagery "sit at my right hand" (110:1, 5), "a footstool for your feet" and "scepter" (110:2) support a royal psalm motif. Thus the royal psalms provide an historical pattern for the Davidic king, but the prophetic aspects of the psalm emerge when the ultimate application of the psalm is made to the Son in Heb 1:5–13. The Son is the ultimate and anticipated Davidic King-Messiah.

³⁶ The designation "God" is not necessarily an ontological statement. Rather, it serves as a link and a reference to the Son's divine activities as Divine Wisdom, mentioned in Heb 1:2c, 3b and supported in 1:7, 10–12.

³⁷ Early and later Jewish tradition recognizes that when the Messiah comes angels will worship him (1 Enoch 48:4–6; 51:1–3; 52:4; 62:1–9; Talmud: *Abod. Zar.* 7).

linking Scripture together. OT passages are linked together based upon similar first-century theological concepts.

III. CONCEPTUAL USE

First-century concepts about the "latter days" and a "Davidic king-messiah" are two additional reasons for connecting OT Scripture together in 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13. In fact the reappearance of these two concepts in the Qumran sectarian literature and Christian Biblical literature reflects their importance in their respective communities. For instance *Florilegium* recontextualizes the OT prophetic promise of a Davidic king-messiah in the OT (2 Sam 7:10–14; Amos 9:11) to refer to an eschatological "Davidic King-Messiah." The Davidic king of the OT nation of Israel serves as a prototype for the eschatological "King-Messiah" that typically occurs in other Qumran sectarian scrolls (1QSb 5.20–24, 27–28; 1QM 5.1; 11.5–7). Although two messiahs are expected in Qumran's sectarian literature, a priestly and a kingly messiah (CD 7.18–20; 13.20–23; 14.19; 1QS 9.11; 1QSa 2.11–12), *Florilegium* focuses on the "Davidic king-messiah." In fact recontextualizing Nathan's prophetic promise in 2 Sam 7:14 to a future Davidic king-messiah also occurs in nonsectarian QL and second-temple literature.

For instance, while commenting on Jacob's blessing in Gen 49:10, the seven-line fragment *Patriarchal Blessings* (4QP Bless)³⁸ and another Qumran fragment 4Q252³⁹ reveal the hope of a future ruling Davidic messiah based upon Yahweh's covenant with David (2 Sam 7:11b–16).⁴⁰ *Patriarchal Blessings* 1–3 reads:

A monarch will not be wanting to the tribe of Judah when Israel rules, and a (descendant) seated on the throne will not be wanting to David. For the (commander's) staff is the Covenant of kingship, and the feet are the Thousands of Israel. Until the Messiah of Righteousness comes, the Branch of David; for to him and to his seed has been given the Covenant of the kingship of his people for everlasting generations.⁴¹

4Q252 5.1–6 reads:

"The sceptre shall not depart from the tribe of Judah" [Gen 49:10a]. When Israel rules [there will not] be cut off one who occupies the throne for David [Jer 33:17]. For "the staff" [Gen 49:10a] is the covenant of the kingship; the thou-

³⁸ In J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956) 174–187, esp. 174–176, the text is initially referred to as 4QpGn 49. Allegro, however, identifies it as 4Q Patriarchal Blessings (4QP Bless), which is the accepted designation.

³⁹ G. J. Brook, "From Poetry to Peshet: The Genre of 4Q252" (SBL paper, November 1993).

⁴⁰ D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik contend: "L'attente d'un Messie davidique est confirmée par deux textes de 4Q: des l'un, commentaire de Gen 49 [i.e. 4QP Bless], la bénédiction de Juda (v. 10) est appliquée au Messie fils de David; dans l'autre, commentaire d'un Psaume" (DJD 128–130). As of yet, however, the text does not appear in DJD.

⁴¹ Translation is from A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Gloucester: Smith, 1973) 314–315. For a Hebrew text see Lohse, *Texte* 50; Allegro, "Further" 172–175; Y. Yadin, "Commentaries on Genesis xlix and Isaiah, from Qumran Cave 4," *IEJ* 7 (1957) 66–68, esp. 66–67.

sands of Israel are "the feet" [Gen 49:10a], until the coming of an anointed one (messiah), the righteous one, the shoot of David. For to him and his seed has been given a covenant of the kingship of his people for everlasting generations, which he kept.⁴²

Both texts equate the staff of Gen 49:10 with "covenant of the kingship."⁴³ In fact the "shoot of David" or the "branch of David" and his seed are the recipients of the covenant of kingship.

A similar expression, "covenant of kings," occurs in Sir 47:11 (c. 180 BC). Sirach recollects the "covenant of kings" given to David, selectively recounts the reigns of several Davidic kings (Solomon, 47:12; Rehoboam, 47:23; Hezekiah, 47:17; Josiah, 48:25), and points out that Yahweh "will never blot out the descendants of his chosen one, nor destroy the posterity of him who loved him" (Sir 47:22). Thus the "covenant of kings" in 47:11 and the "covenant of the kingship" in *Patriarchal Blessings* and 4Q252 refer to Yahweh's unbreakable promissory grant to David.⁴⁴ Solomon was the first to fulfill God's promise in 2 Samuel 7. Solomon was specifically chosen "to sit on the throne of the kingdom of the Lord" (1 Chron 28:5–7; cf. 1 Kgs 9:4–5; 2 Chron 13:8). Nevertheless the passage was applicable to every succeeding Davidic king as one who ruled as Yahweh's vicegerent over Israel. In fact, aspects of 2 Samuel 7 are reflected in many royal psalms (Psalms 2; 45; 72; 89; 110). Throughout Israel's history and especially during the second temple period the unbreakable covenant of kingship gave hope for a future Davidic King-Messiah of Righteousness, a "Branch of David" (Jer 23:5; 33:15; Isa 11:1–5; Zech 3:8; 6:12; 4QP Bless 2; 4QFlor 1.11; 4Q252 5.5; 4QpIsa^a fragments C and D).

In fact, sometime around Pompey's invasion of Palestine a Jewish author pleads for Yahweh's intervention based upon Yahweh's covenant with David.⁴⁵ *Psalms of Solomon* 17:4 says, "Lord, you chose David to be king over Israel, and you yourself swore to him about his descendants forever, that his kingdom should not fail before you." The phrase "you yourself swore" not only emphasizes the fact that it was God who swore but also identifies the belief that God made a promise to David that his kingdom

⁴² Translation by Brook, "Poetry."

⁴³ The term "staff" may also be an allusion to Ps 2:9, a point *Gen. Rab.* 97 also makes. In fact, E. Lovestamm connects "what has been decreed" with Ps 2:7: "I will tell of the decree of the Lord," which is followed by "You are my son; today I have become your Father." The statement is obviously from the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:14a). There may be a double allusion here because of this possible paranomasia (*Son and Saviour* [ConNT 18; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1961] 65). For another perspective cf. L. C. Allen, "The Old Testament Background of (ΠΡΟ) ΟΡΙΖΕΙΝ in the NT," *NTS* 17 (1987) 104–108.

⁴⁴ See n. 23 *supra*.

⁴⁵ The historical descriptions in *Pss. Sol.* 2, 8, 17 parallel Josephus *J.W.* 1.6.1–7.7 §120–158 concerning Pompey's attack on Jerusalem. For more complete discussions cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1986) 3.193–194; W. B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," *OTP* 2.640–641; "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes," *1972 Proceedings* (ed. R. A. Kraft; International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 1972) 136; *APOT* 2.629–630. Wright labels the *Psalms of Solomon* a "literature of crisis" (*OTP* 2.645).

should not fail.⁴⁶ This allusion to 2 Sam 7:11b–16 is also reiterated in a similar manner in Ps 89:3–4 (LXX 88:4–5): “I swore to David my servant, I will establish your seed forever and build your throne to all generations.” David and his descendants are guaranteed a perpetual kingdom (cf. *Sib. Or.* 7:29–32; 1 Macc 2:57). In the progress of Israel’s history the promise of 2 Samuel 7 to David has not changed and will not change. Thus *Ps. Sol.* 17:4 portrays God’s sworn oath as a guarantee that Yahweh will fulfill his covenantal promise and therefore pleads: “See, Lord, and raise up for them their king, the son of David, to rule over your servant Israel in the time known to you, O God” (17:21).

Consequently in the progress of Israelite history Yahweh’s covenant to David was perceived to be a perpetual covenant (e.g. 4QFlor 1.1–13; Sir 47:11, 22; 4QPBless 1–5; 4Q252 5.1–6; *Ps. Sol.* 17:4, 21). In particular *Ps. Sol.* 17:4 speaks of God’s oath to David as a guaranteed promise and is the basis for the expectant hope of a future Davidic King-Messiah. And though “sonship” is mentioned only once (4QFlor 1.11), the phrases “covenant of kingship” and “branch of David” or “shoot of David” in 4QPBless 3–4 and 4Q252 5.1–6 are conceptually tied to *Florilegium*’s use of “branch of David” with the “son” (4QFlor 1.11–12). In fact *Florilegium* conceptually links 2 Sam 7:11a–14a, Amos 9:11 and Ps 2:1–2 together because they all speak of David’s seed, God’s anointed. Hence “son” and “branch of David” are one and the same person who is yet to come.

Therefore if the first-century Jew believed the original covenant applied to Davidic descendants like Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, and so forth, how much more reasonable it would be for Heb 1:5–13 to use and recontextualize 2 Sam 7:14, Ps 2:7, Ps 45:6–7 and Ps 110:1 to the great, expected Davidic King-Messiah, the Son. In fact the Christian community traditionally used Ps 2:7; 110:1 to speak of Jesus Christ as the Son of David, the ultimate Davidic King-Messiah (Acts 2:14–40; 13:32–37).⁴⁷ There is no one greater. There is no other Davidic King-Messiah. The Davidic King-Messiah has come, and his name is Jesus.

In addition 4QFlor 1.1–19 recognizes that its OT passages were applicable to the “latter days” (4QFlor 1.2, 12, 15, 19). The concern over *ʾahārīt hayyāmīm* frequently manifests itself in Qumran sectarian texts.⁴⁸ In fact it may be better translated as “at the end of days” (Kosmala)⁴⁹ or “la suite

⁴⁶ J. Schneider also points out that “God takes an oath by Himself to vouch for it that the will expressed in the promise will remain unchanged” (*omnyō*, *TDNT* 5.176–185, esp. 184). In addition M. de Jonge points out that *Ps. Sol.* 17:4 refers to the prophecy in 2 Samuel 7 “in which the continuity in the covenantal relationship between the Lord and the house of David is underlined” (*Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* [Leiden: Brill, 1991] 10).

⁴⁷ See D. L. Bock, “The Reign of the Lord Christ,” *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church* (ed. C. A. Blaising and D. L. Bock; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992) 37–67.

⁴⁸ For instance *lʾʾahārīt hayyāmīm* occurs in 1QpHab 2.5–6; 9.6; 4QpNah 2.2; 4QpIsa^a 2.26; 4QpIsa^b 2.1; 4QpIsa^c 10; 4QFlor 1.15; *bēʾahārīt hayyāmīm* occurs in 1QpMic 6.2; 1QSa 1.1; 4QpIsa^a 3.22; 4QpNah 3.3; 4QFlor 1.2, 12, 19; 4Q252 4.2; CD 4.4; 6.11. For other similar and frequently used phrases cf. 1QpHab 2.7; 7.2; 1QpMic 17–18.5; CD 1.12.

⁴⁹ H. Kosmala, “At the End of the Days,” *ASTI* 2 (1962) 27–37, esp. 33–34.

des jours” (Carmignac),⁵⁰ especially since 4QFlor 1.19–2.1 identifies *ʾahārīt hayyāmīm* to be at hand (i.e. if the Kittim are Rome) while at the same time 4QFlor 1.1–13 speaks of things yet to come (i.e. the sanctuary and Davidic king-messiah). Although Brooke agrees with Carmignac he says that “the translation ‘the latter days’ allows for this sense of futurity whilst embracing something of the eschatological and historical self-understanding of the community. This future time, this time before the end, is already being experienced.”⁵¹ Thus *Florilegium*’s use of “latter days” suggests an “already—not yet” perspective of the *eschaton*—that is, the Qumran community viewed the *eschaton* as though it were upon them (i.e. Roman bondage, 1.19–2.1) with aspects of the *eschaton* yet to come (i.e. the Davidic king-messiah ruling over the sanctuary, 1.1–13).

Hebrews 1 also concerns itself with the “last days” and speaks of the “last days” in an “already—not yet” perspective, just like *Florilegium*. Hebrews 1:1–2 says, “In these last days (God) has spoken to us by his Son.” So Hebrews concerns itself with last-day events. Some of them are already upon us. For instance in Heb 1:5–13 God declares that the Son has entered into kingship (Heb 1:5a via Ps 2:7) and that the Son’s Davidic kingship is permanent (Heb 1:5b via 2 Sam 7:14). Although “Son” used in connection with Ps 2:7 may refer to Jesus’ preexistence,⁵² baptism,⁵³ or exaltation, the use of Ps 2:7 with 2 Sam 7:14 in Heb 1:5 shows that the Son’s unique regal relationship began at his exaltation for two reasons.⁵⁴ (1) Similar imagery exists in Acts 13:33. Yahweh announces that Jesus is his Davidic vicegerent and has entered into a special regal relationship after the resurrection. And (2) Phil 2:6–11 mentions that Jesus inherited his name after his death on the cross (i.e. at his exaltation). In fact Heb 1:4 also speaks of Christ inheriting a name superior to the angels, and Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14 are used to identify that name to be “Son.” Thus Ps 2:7 used in connection with

⁵⁰ In Carmignac, “Florilège” 281; “Notes sur les Pešārīm,” *RevQ* 3 (1961–1962) 505–538, esp. 527–529; and “La notion d’eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumrān,” *RevQ* 7 (1969) 17–30, esp. 22–27, *lʾʾahārīt hayyāmīm* (1QpHab 2.5–6; 9.6; 4QpNah 2.2; 4QpIsa^b 2.1; 4QpIsa^c 10; 4QFlor 1.15) and *bēʾahārīt hayyāmīm* (1QSa 1.1; 4QpNah 3.3; 4QFlor 1.2, 12, 19; CD 6.11) are translated as “la suite des jours.”

⁵¹ Brooke, *Exegesis* 176.

⁵² Some speculate that the text supports a preexistence view—that is, the Christian doctrine of a “divinely begotten Messiah.” Attridge suggests the catena is used to support the prologue’s description of the Son as preexistent (*Hebrews* 54, esp. n. 54). Thus “today” of Ps 2:7 is used allegorically for the eternal generation of the Son, which he supports from Philo *De fuga et inventione* 57. R. Gordis even suggests that “begotten” in 1QSa 2.11–17 supports preexistence (“The ‘Begotten’ Messiah in the Qumran Scrolls,” *VT* 7 [1957] 191–194, esp. 194). However, Lovestamm insists that nothing exists in the text to support the interpretation. In fact later Christian theology seems to be read into early Jewish usage of the term “begotten” (*Son* 19 n. 4). See also D. L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987) 299 n. 53, for a similar conclusion.

⁵³ Psalm 2:7 may allude to and be associated with Jesus’ baptism. God introduces his Davidic vicegerent at Jesus’ baptism, the beginning of his ministry. The psalm is quoted: “This is my Son whom I love; with him I am well pleased” (Matt 3:16–17; cf. Mark 1:10–11; Luke 3:21–22).

⁵⁴ Since Ps 2:7 says “today I have become your Father,” which is the same day that “I [Yahweh] installed” the king in 2:6—that is, the One who is “his anointed” in 2:2—it would seem that

Heb 1:4–5 and in light of other apostolic teachings describes the Son's unique regal relationship with Yahweh, which began at his exaltation.⁵⁵ The Son is Yahweh's Davidic vicegerent. Hebrews 1:5a then moves from the Son's entrance into this special regal relationship at his exaltation to the permanence of that kingship.

Hebrews 1:5b continues (*kai palin*) to build its argument with 2 Sam 7:14 in order to identify the permanence of the Son's sonship. As already mentioned above, first-century Jewish usage of 2 Sam 7:14 understood that David's dynasty was permanently established.⁵⁶ In addition Lane notes how Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14 form a chiasm that reinforces the Son's entrance and permanence of kingship.

- A You are my son;
 B today I have become your Father.
 B I will be his Father,
 A and he will be my Son.⁵⁷

Thus according to the use of Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14 in Heb 1:5 the Son has entered into a permanent Davidic King-Messiah relationship. In addition the use of Ps 45:6–7 in Heb 1:7–8 identifies the reality of the Son's rule as Davidic King. "Your throne" and "scepter of righteousness" symbolize the Son's rule.⁵⁸ They symbolize the Davidic Son's present authority to function as a righteous administrator and just judge over "his kingdom." There is, however, a future element of the Son's authority and rule yet to be realized.

Although Heb 1:13 via Ps 110:1 identifies the Son to be presently ruling as Davidic Messiah-King ("sit at my right hand"),⁵⁹ at least one aspect of the Davidic King-Messiah's rule has not been realized. The future reign of the

some form of a coronation event or entrance into kingship may be in view here. For similar discussions cf. P. C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC; Waco: Word, 1983) 64–68; R. B. Chisholm, "A Theology of the Psalms," *A Biblical Theology of the Old Testament* (ed. R. B. Zuck; Chicago: Moody, 1991) 269. In addition, "I have become your Father" in Ps 2:7 is a figure where the initiation of a special or unique relationship between Yahweh and his anointed is compared to the initiation of the father-son relationship (cf. Deut 32:18–19; see Exod 4:22; Hos 11:1; BDB 408c 2b). For the father, the initiation of this relationship with his son begins at birth. For Yahweh, the initiation of this relationship with the Davidic king began at the coronation. Thus Hebrews' usage of the psalm could refer to the Son's exaltation.

⁵⁵ The Christian community frequently applied Psalm 2 to Jesus Christ. Psalm 2 introduces Jesus as Davidic King (baptism, gospels), entrance into his Davidic role (exaltation, Acts 13:33; Heb 1:5a), and consummation of his Davidic rule—that is, Jesus' eschatological role as Yahweh's vicegerent (second advent, Rev 12:5; 19:15).

⁵⁶ See previous discussion concerning first-century Jewish usage of 2 Sam 7:14 and n. 23 *supra* concerning the Hittite promissory grants.

⁵⁷ Lane, *Hebrews 1–8* 25.

⁵⁸ "Your throne" and "scepter of justice" are metonymy of subject, symbols of royalty and authority. "Your throne" stands for the king's authority to rule (2 Sam 7:16; 1 Chron 17:12; 22:10; 2 Chron 7:18; 1 Kgs 9:5) that will be perpetuated by the promise of children through his marriage (Ps 45:17). "Scepter of justice" stands for his act of judging. The thrones of the house of David are considered thrones to judge (Ps 122:5; cf. Prov 20:8) established by Yahweh to maintain justice (1 Kgs 10:9; 2 Chron 9:8). Just as God judges the people justly (Ps 67:5; cf. Isa 11:4), the king also judges justly. See n. 12 *supra*.

⁵⁹ "Sit at my right hand" does not mean that the Son's rule is passive as suggested by M. Saucy, "Exaltation Christology in Hebrews: What Kind of Reign?", *Trinity Journal* (1993)

Son occurs in the latter half of the citation from Ps 110:1b: "until (*heōs*)⁶⁰ I make your enemies a footstool for your feet."⁶¹ Yahweh's promise to the Son concerning authority over his enemies is future. In fact Heb 2:5–8 also notes that not all things are subjected to the Son. Future subjection of the Son's enemies and other things are yet to come. Therefore the Son has entered into his Davidic inheritance, but certain aspects of the Son's reign are still future. Not all things have been subjected to him (cf. Phil 2:6–11). The victory has been won by the Son (Heb 2:14–18; cf. 1 Cor 15:54–57), but the Son still has enemies.⁶² It is for this reason (*gar*, Heb 1:5) that the Son is described as "appointed heir of all things" in the prologue (1:2b).⁶³ The Son has entered into his kingship, but future aspects of his kingship are yet to come. Thus another reason why the Son is superior to the angels is that he presently rules as Davidic Messiah-King with a future consummation of that rule yet to come.

Consequently 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 share similar first-century theological concepts to present a theological treatise to their respective communities. In fact the use of the theological concept about the future Davidic King-Messiah based upon 2 Samuel 7 reflects the fact that neither community, Qumran or Christian, operated in an historical vacuum. An air of expectancy concerning the coming of a future Davidic King-Messiah existed among first-century Jews and reinforced the belief with passages from the royal psalms. In addition the first-century conceptual use of "last days" in 4QFlor 1.1–19 and Heb 1:5–13 is the same. Thus the phrase "the last days" was perceived to be in process with a sense of something more yet to come.

41–62. I point out in *Jewish* 389–390 and "Psalm 110:1" 451 n. 58 that "sit at my right hand" is an OT concept symbolizing a king's active authority over his subjects. Christ's present acts of authority as Davidic King-Messiah are over creation (Heb 1:10–11; Col 1:15–17; 1 Cor 11:3), the Church (Col 1:18), and his giving of gifts (Eph 4:11–13).

⁶⁰ A. T. Robertson notes that "until" (*heōs*) may be used either as a conjunction (Matt 2:9; 14:22; 5:25) or a preposition (Matt 11:23; Acts 8:40); cf. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament* 975, 643). In Heb 1:13 it is used as a conjunction. With simple *heōs* it is quite common to have an (Matt 5:26) as it appears here in Heb 1:13. In fact Robertson points out that "most examples of *heōs* deal with the future." For a similar discussion see C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1953, reprint 1984). For a similar expression but with a different Greek term (*achri*) see 1 Cor 15:25: "until he has put all his enemies under his feet."

⁶¹ I point out in "Psalm 110:1" 450 n. 57 and *Jewish* 268–269 nn. 29–30 that "a footstool for your feet" (Heb 1:13) in Psalm 110 is holy-war language that symbolizes complete subjugation of a conquered people (Isa 51:23; Josh 10:24). Similar holy-war language occurs throughout the psalm.

⁶² Unlike Solomon's enemies who were limited to earthly opponents, the enemies are recontextualized in Hebrews to refer to demonic forces (Heb 2:14), death (2:15) and human opponents to the Son (10:26–31). See Rev 20:10–15. 1 Corinthians also specifies death as an enemy, the last enemy, to be subjected to the Son (15:26). 1 Corinthians, however, qualifies what "all things" does not include—that is, the Father is not subject to the Son (15:27–28). In addition Clement, while commenting on much of Hebrews 1, states: "And again he says to him, 'Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies a footstool for thy feet.' Who then are the enemies? Those who are wicked and oppose his will" (1 *Clem.* 36:5–6).

⁶³ The ingressive aorist "appointed" (*ethēken*) indicates the beginning of a condition. That condition began when the Son inherited his name (Heb 1:4). Psalms 2:7; 110:1 identify that the Son's Davidic inheritance has been inaugurated (Heb 1:3; 5; 13), but a future consummation of that inheritance is yet to come (1:13; 2:5–8; cf. Phil 2:6–11).

IV. CONCLUSION

Glimpses of the first-century world concerning how the OT is used in 4QFlor 1.1–19 are extremely helpful in understanding how the OT is used in Heb 1:5–13. In fact the comparison of 4QFlor 1.1–19 with Heb 1:5–13 provides valuable “historical” information of the first-century bygone world and culture concerning the structural (i.e. stringing OT passages together, introductory formulae), exegetical (*gēzērâ šāwâ, kayyôṣē’ bô bēmāqôm ʿahēr*), and conceptual (Davidic king-messiah, “latter days”) use of the OT. In addition it helps in understanding and interpreting how the OT is used in Heb 1:5–13.

Understanding and interpretation of Heb 1:5–13 are enhanced in that, like 4QFlor 1.1–19, Heb 1:5–13 interweaves Scripture and concepts together to present a theological treatise. In *Florilegium*, Scripture and concepts about the sanctuary and the Davidic king are interwoven together. Thus the Qumran community looked forward to a future Davidic king-messiah who would rule over the future sanctuary. In Hebrews, Scripture and first-century concepts are interwoven to present the Son as Divine Wisdom and Davidic King who presently reigns even though future aspects of that reign are yet to come. In fact the OT citations in Heb 1:5–13 form a conceptual chiasm about the Son.

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------|
| A | The Son's status as royal King (Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14) | (Heb 1:5) |
| B | The Son's status as Divine Wisdom (Deut 32:43; Ps 104:4) | (Heb 1:6–7) |
| C | The Son's status as royal King and Divine Wisdom
(Ps 45:6–7) | (Heb 1:8–9) |
| B' | The Son's status as Divine Wisdom (Ps 102:26–28) | (Heb 1:10–12) |
| A' | The Son's status as royal King (Ps 110:1) | (Heb 1:13) |

Verses 5 and 13 present one conceptual image to explain why the Son is unequalled among the angels: The Son is Israel's ultimate Davidic King. The use of Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14; Ps 110:1 reflects first-century progressive Jewish tradition in that all are applied to a future Messiah (1QSa 2.1–10; 4QFlor 1.1–13; *Patriarchal Blessing*; Sir 47:11; 11QMelch 9–10; *Ps. Sol.* 17:14, 23b–24; *T. Judah* 22:2–3; 24:1–6).⁶⁴ Verses 6–7 and 10–12 present the other reason: The Son is Divine Wisdom. Deuteronomy 32:43, Ps 104:4 and Ps 102:25–27 all have verbal and conceptual links with another first-century concept, Divine Wisdom (Prov 8:27–31; Wis 7:24–27; 8:1; 9:2, 4, 9–11). Both concepts are united into one in verses 8 and 9. Thus the royal psalm, Ps 45:6–7 with its eloquent praise for a Davidic king at his wedding, serves to unite two first-century Jewish concepts together: Davidic Sonship (Pss 2:7; 110:1; 2 Sam 7:14) and Divine Wisdom (Deut 32:43; Pss 104:4; 102:25–26). And thus in the progress of Israel's history and in the progress of divine revelation two first-century Jewish concepts about a future Davidic King and Divine Wisdom are

⁶⁴ 2 Samuel 7 is used in 4QFlor 1.1–13, *Patriarchal Blessings*, Sir 47:11 and *Pss. Sol.* 17:14; Psalm 2 is used in 1QSa 2.10–11, 4QFlor 1.18–19 and *Ps. Sol.* 17:23b–24; Psalm 45 is used in *T. Judah* 24:1–6; and Psalm 110 is used in 11QMelch 16–24. For a more detailed discussion see Bateman, *Jewish* 271–294.

hermeneutically and exegetically merged together and find their fulfillment in one person, the Son.

Hebrews 1 does not arbitrarily select OT passages. Rather, it uses passages that are exegetically and conceptually linked together to support a major theological point in keeping with the Christian community's understanding of the teachings of Jesus and the apostles as well as the leading of the Holy Spirit. Based upon Scripture, the development of Jewish history, and God's progress of revelation, Heb 1:5–13 points out that the Son is declared by God to be Divine Wisdom and Davidic King-Messiah. In fact Hebrews' first-century structural use, exegetical use and conceptual use of the OT in God's progress of revelation unites two first-century concepts about a Davidic King-Messiah and Divine Wisdom into one person, the Son. He is both God and Davidic King who exercises authority to rule but with future aspects of his rule yet to come. It is for this reason that the Son (specifically his name) is superior to the angels.

HENDRICKSON PUBLISHERS

PARABLES AS POETIC FICTIONS



The Creative Voice of Jesus
CHARLES W. HEDRICK

PARABLES AS POETIC FICTIONS

The Creative Voice of Jesus

CHARLES W. HEDRICK

Contending that Jesus' narrative parables are more poetic than metaphoric, Charles Hedrick argues that parables should be heard solely on their own terms and not on the terms of the Gospel writers' contexts into which they have been placed or on the terms of the agendas of the later church. "... *provocative, insightful. . . . An important contribution.*" —Dan Via
Cloth • \$24.95

JESUS THE EXORCIST

*A Contribution to
the Study of
the Historical Jesus*

GRAHAM H. TWELFTREE

JESUS THE EXORCIST

A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus

GRAHAM H. TWELFTREE

Only scant scholarly attention has been focused on Jesus' role as exorcist. In a provocative and insightful study, Graham Twelftree helps New Testament scholars move beyond such myopia. Twelftree examines exorcists and exorcisms in first-century Palestine, assesses the New Testament accounts of demons and their demise, and explores the implications and significance of the fact that Jesus was indeed an exorcist. *Paper • \$19.95*

THE JEW OF ANCIENT ROME

Updated Edition



HARRY J. LEON

THE JEWS OF ANCIENT ROME

HARRY J. LEON

The updated edition of this standard reference work on the catacomb inscriptions in Rome is the single best entree to the archaeological materials on Judaism in ancient Rome. A new introduction by Carolyn Osiek, of Catholic Theological Union, brings together the new inscriptional discoveries and assesses the scholarly import of Leon's original work. *Paper • \$19.95*

The Old Testament Roots of Our Faith

Paul J. Achtemeier
Elizabeth Achtemeier

THE OLD TESTAMENT ROOTS OF OUR FAITH

Revised Edition

PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER AND ELIZABETH ACHTEMEIER

In this revised edition of a now classic work, the Achtemeiers clearly outline the relationship between the Old and New Testaments with respect to salvation's drama. Since the Lordship of Jesus is firmly rooted in the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament, knowing Jesus more fully entails knowing the story of God's salvation that was planned before the foundation of the world. *Paper • \$9.95*

Available at your bookstore, or call toll-free 800-358-3111

Hendrickson Publishers • P.O. Box 3473, Peabody, MA 01961 • 508-532-6546