

COMMENTARII PERIODICI PONTIFICII INSTITUTI BIBLICI

BIBLICA

VOLUMEN 72



1991

BUSWELL MEMORIAL LIBRARY

BIBLICA

COMMENTARIUM TRIMESTRES
A PONTIFICIO INSTITUTO BIBLICO IN LUCEM EDITI
IN URBE

Redactor generalis et redactor pro Veteri Testamento: HORACIO SIMIAN-
YOFRE

Redactor pro Novo Testamento: JOHN KILGALLEN

Redactor recensionum: JEAN LOUIS SKA

Secretarius redactionis: STEPHEN PISANO

Adjutor secretario redactionis: LEO ARNOLD

Comitatus redactionis: JEAN-NOËL ALETTI - LUIS ALONSO SCHÖKEL -
PIETRO BOCCACCIO - PIETRO BOVATI - FREDERICK BRENK - MAURICE
GILBERT - ROGER LE DÉAUTI - FRITZLEO LENTZEN-DEIS - JESÚS
LUZARRAGA - REINHARD NEUDECKER - ROBERT NORTH - JOSÉ
O'CALLAGHAN - ÉDOUARD DES PLACES - IGNACE DE LA POTIERIE -
PIERRE PROULX - KLEMENS STOCK - JAMES SWETNAM - ALBERT
VANHOYE - JOHN WELCH

Administrator: PASQUALE PUCA

Sedes Directionis: Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta 25
00187 Roma
Italia

Sedes Administrationis: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Piazza della Pilotta 35
00187 Roma
Italia

INDEX GENERALIS VOLUMINIS LXXII

1991

Commentationes - Animadversiones - Res bibliographicae

BARRÉ M. L., Jonah 2,9 and the Structure of Jonah's Prayer	237-248
BERLINERBLAU J., The Israelite Vow: Distress or Daily Life?	548-555
BLENKINSOPP J., The Social Context of the "Outsider Woman" in Proverbs 1-9	457-473
CARRIÈRE J.-M., Le Ps 72 est-il un psaume messianique?	49-69
DE LA SERNA E., Los orígenes de 1 Corintios	192-216
DUPONT J., Un important commentaire du troisième évangile	397-403
FISCHER G., Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche: Unterschiede zwischen hebräischem und griechischem Text	474-499
FREVEL C., Vom Schreiben Gottes. Literarkritik, Komposition und Auslegung von 2 Kön 17,34-40	23-48
GALIL G., The Babylonian Calendar and the Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah	367-378
GARSIEL M., Puns upon Names as a Literary Device in 1 Kings 1-2	379-386
HAMM D., Zacchaeus Revisited Once More: A Study of Vindication or Conversion?	249-252
HAYES J. H. - KUAN J. K., The Final Years of Samaria (730-720 BC)	153-181
HEIL J. P., The Story of Jesus and the Adulteress (John 7,53-8,11)	182-191
—, The Narrative Roles of the Women in Matthew's Gospel	538-545
JOBES K. H., Rhetorical Achievement in the Hebrews 10 'Misquote' of Psalm 40	387-396

impressive way. There is no escape from the conclusion that punning upon names in this biblical story (as well as in many others) functions as a significant literary device to enrich and intensify the plot through a correspondence between names and themes.

This correspondence does not necessarily mean that the names in this and other biblical stories should be regarded as "charactonyms", that is to say, as symbolic names invented for the purpose of punning, since among the puns one finds many that pertain to known place names like Anathoth or Jordan, or personal names that are well attested elsewhere in the Bible. On the other hand, it is also highly improbable that the author should have invented the story, or most of it, only in order to make use of the puns inherent in the historical names. We suggest that one should adopt the explanation that this phenomenon is, in most instances, an outcome of a punning technique widely used by the biblical authors, who had the artistry to fit the connotative senses of names into the stories⁽³¹⁾

By creating a correspondence between names and plot materials, the biblical author evokes an atmosphere of order and coherence which occasions a sense of predestination — as if everything had been planned beforehand by the Lord and was explicitly or implicitly fitted into the names of characters and places; and the later historical events indeed move and develop along the lines of this plan.

Bar-Ilan University
Ramat Gan, Israel

Moshe GARSIEL

Rhetorical Achievement in the Hebrews 10 'Misquote' of Psalm 40

The author of the NT book of Hebrews structures his epistle on citations of four Psalms (Pss 8,4-6; 95,7-11; 110,4; 40,6-8)⁽¹⁾. In Heb 10,5-7, a Greek translation of Ps 40,7-9⁽²⁾ is quoted but with four minor changes to the wording of those verses compared to the extant Greek texts of the OT. When trying to understand how the author of Hebrews was using this OT passage, these variations raise several questions. Were these minor variations already present in the Greek *Vorlage* used by the author of Hebrews? Could these variations even attest to a Hebrew text which varies from the Masoretic? Or did the author of Hebrews introduce these variations for a particular reason? Do they contribute to the author's purpose in Hebrews 10? Or are these variations from the LXX rendering a merely incidental lapse of the author's memory?

The passage being discussed reads as follows in the English (*NIV*) translation, starting at Heb 10,5⁽³⁾:

Therefore, when Christ came into the world, he said:

"Sacrifice and offering you did not desire,
but a body you prepared for me;
with burnt offerings and sin offerings
you were not pleased.
Then I said, 'Here I am — it is written
about me in the scroll —
I have come to do your will, O God'".

When the Masoretic (MT), Rahlfs' Septuagint (LXX) and the Heb 10 texts of Ps 40,7-9 are placed side by side, comparisons of the text can be readily made. See Chart, p. 395.

The LXX translates the MT of Ps 40 very closely. The only variations between the Greek and Hebrew texts are the use of the verb *κατηρτίσω* ("you prepared") to translate *kārītā* ("you dug") and the phrase *ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλίας μου* ("in the middle of my belly") to translate *b'itōkē mē'ay*. These lexical choices appear to be what one would expect of a close but

⁽³¹⁾ For a full discussion of the various hypothetical explanations of how the puns upon names in the Bible came into being, see GARSIEL, *Midrashic Name Derivations*, Chapter 7.

⁽¹⁾ S. KISTEMAKER, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam 1961) 130.

⁽²⁾ According to the *NIV* versification the verses are 6-8.

⁽³⁾ All Scripture is quoted from the *NIV* unless otherwise noted.

transcultural translation. The translator does not seem to be attempting to introduce semantic variance into the translation.

However, when Ps 40 is quoted in Heb 10 the four variations do introduce, at least formally, a semantic difference: 1) σώμα ("body") is found in v. 5c instead of ὠτία ("ears"); 2) ὀλοκαυτώματα ("burnt offerings", plural) is substituted in v. 6 for the singular form ὀλοκαύτωμα in the LXX; 3) εὐδόκησας ("you were pleased") is substituted for ἤτησας ("you demanded") in v. 6; 4) ὁ θεός and τὸ θελημα σου are transposed in v. 7c and the remainder of the verse as it appears in the LXX is omitted. This final omission in v. 7 makes the infinitive ποιῆσαι the purpose for the coming ("I have come to do...") in contrast to its function in the LXX as the object of ἐβουλήθην ("I desire to do...").

Although Rahlfs' LXX text of Ps 40 reads ὠτία ("ears") in v. 7b, all extant Greek manuscripts, the oldest of which is Sinaiticus (4th century AD), attest σώμα ("body") instead. Rahlfs' choice of ὠτία is a retroversion based on the evidence of the MT and the Gallican Psalter.

In *Étude sur la LXX Origénienne du Psautier*, M. Caloz offers two hypotheses to account for this discrepancy⁽⁴⁾: 1) the Greek translator used ὠτία to translate 'oznayim, but at an early date ὠτία was corrupted to σώμα, 2) σώμα was the original translation of 'oznayim. Caloz finds it difficult to decide definitively between the two, but finds the first hypothesis the most reasonable.

However, for the purpose of understanding the use of Ps 40 in Heb 10, the question is whether or not σώμα was the reading of Ps 40 in the Greek translation used by the author of Hebrews in the first century. Most commentators believe that Heb 10:5-7 reflects its author's dependence on a Greek translation of Ps 40 which already contained σώμα. This opinion was held by J. Calvin ("The apostle followed the Greek translators when he said..."), J. Moffat ("Our author found σώμα in his LXX text and seized upon it;"), H. Attridge ("In the citation of Ps 40(39),7-9 dependence on the LXX is quite clear") and C. Spicq (the author of Hebrews uses "Ps 40, cité avec de légères variantes d'après les Septante")⁽⁵⁾.

In this paper I argue based on principles of first-century rhetoric that all four of the variations found in Heb 10 were intentionally introduced by the author of Hebrews and were not already in the Greek translation of the OT in the first century. If this is true, the appearance of σώμα in Ps 40:7 in all extant Greek manuscripts implies that Christian scribes 'corrected' the text of Ps 40 in subsequent manuscripts to agree with its quotation by the author of Hebrews.

⁽⁴⁾ M. CALOZ, *Étude sur la LXX Origénienne du Psautier* (Göttingen 1978) 383.

⁽⁵⁾ J. CALVIN, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids) 227; J. MOFFATT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (ICC; New York 1924) 138; H. ATTRIDGE, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia 1989) 274; C. SPICQ, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris 1977) 165.

Commentators who believe these variations were present in the first-century Greek text of Ps 40 must explain them as either the original translation of the Hebrew or the result of scribal error during the transmission of the Greek OT text. Some would suggest that these differences are evidence of variant Hebrew exemplars from which the Greek translation was made⁽⁶⁾.

When explanations of NT 'misquotes' of the OT are first attempted from this perspective, two questionable methodological assumptions are introduced. Firstly, it is assumed that the variations in a given citation have no relationship to one another because presumably they were introduced independently at various times and in various ways. Each variation in the quotation is most often examined independently of any others. This means that if two or more variations are functionally related to each other their relationship, and its possible semantic significance, will be overlooked.

Secondly, assuming that the variations were already in the first-century Greek text of the OT implies that the NT author did not introduce the variations, but was merely quoting the Greek text at hand. Attributing variations in OT citations to translation or transmission errors of the Greek OT further implies that the NT author used an 'erroneous' text of the OT. Consequently, commentators attempt to absolve the NT author by emptying the variation from the Hebrew text of any semantic difference. By using the 'original' Hebrew reading as the standard, a text critical approach to 'misquotes' of the OT implies that the NT author should have used, or would have used were it available to him, the original, and hence superior, OT reading. This assumption pressures the interpreter to make the meaning of the quotation in the NT conform to the meaning of the Hebrew text in its original context as intended by the OT author. Legitimate interpretation of the NT use of the OT citation proceeds only after it has been demonstrated that the variations are not semantically significant and, therefore, that the NT author is not misusing the OT text by violating the original purposes and intentions of the OT author. This pressure is evident in Moffatt's attempt to justify the apostle's use in Heb 10 of what he considers to be an erroneous Greek mistranslation of Ps 40: "Though the LXX mistranslated the psalm, however, it did not alter its general sense. The Greek text meant practically what the original had meant, and it made this interpretation or application [by the author of Hebrews] possible,..."⁽⁷⁾.

These methodological assumptions have precluded interpreters from considering that the four variations in the Ps 40 citation in Heb 10 are the intentional and creative rhetorical product of the author.

Even when a variation in an OT citation is thought to be introduced by the NT author himself, the assumption is often made that the NT author must intend the citation to mean, in its new context, exactly what the original OT text meant in its original context. Consequently, an attempt is

⁽⁶⁾ For instance, S.L. JOHNSON, *The Old Testament in the New. An Argument for Biblical Inspiration* (Grand Rapids 1980) 62.

⁽⁷⁾ MOFFATT, *Commentary*, 138.

made to absolve the NT author of misusing the OT quotation by explaining the variations as semantically insignificant. This approach can be seen, for instance, in W Kaiser's handling of Heb 10,5-7. In his book *The Use of the Old Testament in the New* (8), Kaiser identifies and explains each of the four variations found in Heb 10,5-7. He understands the substitution of σώμα, "body" instead of "ears", to be the whole being used for the part as a "culturally meaningful dynamic equivalent" when the Hebrew was translated into Greek. Kaiser dismisses the second variation, the substitution of the plural for the singular form, as "hardly worth noticing except as it sheds light on the lines of textual dependence". Variation number three, the substitution of "you did not desire" for "you did not demand", is made by the author, according to Kaiser, to avoid appearing to contradict himself, since in Heb 9 he had just said that the law had commanded animal sacrifice. Kaiser explains the fourth variation as the author simply truncating the quotation in such a way that does not affect the overall meaning of the psalmist. Having duly noted and explained how the variations do not violate the authorial intention of the psalmist, Kaiser dismisses them as exegetically insignificant.

A careful examination, however, of the character of the variations found in Heb 10,5-7 suggests that they are neither the results of translation nor the errors of transmission. Neither are they the result of a lapse of memory. The four variations are functionally related and effect semantically significant changes introduced by the author of Hebrews. With each variation the author has achieved a phonetic assonance between the variant word and another element of the quotation. This phonetic assonance functions to denote linguistic highlighting, or marked prominence, for that pairing. I argue that the semantic pairing thus produced contributes eloquently to the author's argument and is therefore exegetically significant.

A syllabic representation of the quotation of Ps 40,7 as it stands in Heb 10 will aid our discussion:

- 5b: θυ-σί-αν-καί-πρὸς-φο-ράν-οὐκ-ἠ-θέ-λη-σας
5c: σῶ-μα-δὲ-κα-τηρ-τί-σω-μου
6: δ-λο-κav-τῶ-μα-τα-καί-πε-ρι-
ἄ-μαρ-τί-ας-οὐκ-εὖ-δὸ-κη-σας

Consider variations 1) and 2) together, for reasons which will soon become apparent. In Heb 10,5c σώμα is substituted for ὠτία and in v 6 the plural ὀλοκαυτώματα is likewise substituted for the singular form ὀλοκαύτωμα. The alignment of the above syllabic representation shows that by effecting these two changes concurrently, the author of Hebrews achieves assonance between σώμα δὲ and ὀλοκαυτώματα. In both variations, a long-o accented syllable is followed by two short syllables (cf.

(8) W. C. KAISER, JR., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago 1985) 137-138

-τώματα, σώμα δὲ). This creates a pairing of phonetically similar syllables between the two variations. The long-o syllables (σῶ-/τῶ-) are followed by the identical syllables (μα/μα), then by (δέ/τα) which are phonetically similar. (δ and τ are both alveolar stops, voiced and unvoiced, respectively (9).) If only one of these variations had been effected, that is, if either ὠτία or ὀλοκαύτωμα had been allowed to stand, there would be no phonetic assonance produced.

Now consider variation 3), where the author of Hebrews substitutes εὐδόκησας for ἠτήσας in the LXX. This variation forms assonance with ἠθέλησας in the final clause of Heb 10,5b by phonetically pairing syllables: οὐκ/οὐκ, followed by a long unstressed syllable pair (ἠ-/εὐ-), then a pair of short stressed syllables (θέ-/δό), followed by (λη-/κη) and (σας/σας):

θυ-σί-αν-καί-πρὸς-φο-ράν-οὐκ-ἠ-θέ-λη-σας
" " " "
" " "
" " "
καί-πε-ρι-ἄ-μαρ-τί-ας-οὐκ-εὐ-δὸ-κη-σας

By effecting this variation, a phonetic "inclusio", so to speak, is achieved that sets off verses 5b-6 as one unit of thought. This effect would not be achieved if οὐκ ἠτήσας were allowed to stand, since ἠτήσας, though ending in -τήσας, is too short, being only three syllables long, and therefore the long and stressed syllables would not pair with those in ἠθέλησας.

Variation 4), the transposition of phrases in Heb 10,7c, does not so obviously involve phonetic manipulation:

ἐν-κε-φα-λί-δι-βίβ-λί-ου-γέ-γραπ-ται-πε-ρι-ἐ-μοῦ
τοῦ-ποι-ἠ-σαι-ὁ-θε-ὸς-τὸ-θέ-λη-μά-σου

The phonetic correspondence achieved is the assonance ending the clauses: μου and σου. The transposition of ὁ θεός and τὸ θελημα σου and truncation cannot be explained as phonetic manipulation.

When examined, all of the 'misquotes' of Ps 40 in Heb 10, with the possible exception of variation 4), are found to involve some sort of phonetic manipulation that creates a certain assonance when pronounced aloud. Is this apparently intentional phonetic manipulation evidence that the author of Hebrews fancifully trifled with the LXX text merely to pull off a clever turn of phrase in this isolated instance?

Examination of other 'misquotes' of the OT in the book of Hebrews reveals that in at least five other instances, the misquote also achieves phonetic assonance (10):

(9) D. A. BLACK, *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek* (Grand Rapids 1988) 32

(10) The work of G. I. ARCHER and G. C. CHIRICHIGNO in *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament. A Complete Survey* (Chicago 1983) was extremely helpful in identifying these instances.

1. Heb 1,7 quoting LXX Ps 103,12:
ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα
καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα
(substituting πῦρος φλόγα for πῦρ φλέγον)
2. Heb 2,12 quoting LXX Ps 21,23:
ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομα σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου,
ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὕμνησω σε
(substituting ἀπαγγελῶ for διηγῆσομαι)
3. Heb 3,10 quoting LXX Ps 94,10:
τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη διὸ προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ
(substituting ταύτῃ for ἐκείνη)
4. Heb 8,5 quoting LXX Exod 25,40:
ὄρα ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει
(inserting πάντα and substituting δειχθέντα for δεδειγμένον)
5. Heb 13,5 quoting LXX Deut 31,6 8:
οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω
(substituting ἀνῶ for ἀνῆ and ἐγκαταλίπω for ἐγκαταλίπη.
Notice the LXX rendering had a phonetic assonance of its own).

If the author of Hebrews is misquoting the LXX in such a way as to achieve phonetic assonance, these lexical choices which produce assonance must also contribute semantic sense, for no competent author intending to communicate would sacrifice meaning for mere euphony. Although he overlooks the phonetic assonance of these 'misquotes' of the OT, K. Thomas examines these OT citations in Hebrews and concludes that in Heb 2,12; 3,10; 8,5 and 10,5-7 the variations were introduced by the author to strengthen the argument of the epistle⁽¹¹⁾. The author's intended semantic sense was apparently communicated while simultaneously achieving assonance.

What could possibly motivate an author, and a divinely inspired author at that, to such phonetic manipulation? To our modern tastes, such rhyme and assonance may seem best reserved for television advertising jingles: "Winston tastes good, like a cigarette should!" But what effect would such phonetic techniques have on the first-century Hellenistic ear? Since the achievement of phonetic assonance would be best displayed if read aloud, could it be that the epistle to the Hebrews was written to be read aloud, and therefore the author took care to use a compositional style that would conform to the principles of good oral delivery?

⁽¹¹⁾ K. J. THOMAS, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews", *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (ed. S. JELlicoe) (New York 1974) 507-529

George Kennedy argues that

We need to keep in mind that the Bible in early Christian times was more often heard when read aloud to a group than read privately; very few early Christians owned copies of the Bible and some did not know how to read. To a greater extent than any modern text, the Bible retained an oral and linear quality for its audience⁽¹²⁾.

He therefore exhorts NT exegetes to read the Bible as a speech.

There is some debate about whether Hebrews found its origin as a sermon or as an epistle. If it originated as a sermon, then the use of phonetic ornamentation is particularly apt.

But even if it was originally composed as an epistle, it still has a claim to oral delivery. When a letter was delivered in the first century, it was usually read aloud and its audience perceived the contents of the letter as following the pattern of a speech⁽¹³⁾. Is there any evidence that the phonetic manipulation observed in the "misquoting" of Ps 40 may have been motivated by principles of oration?

The *Institutio Oratoria* of Quintilian⁽¹⁴⁾ preserves for us the best of the first-century's rhetorical principles⁽¹⁵⁾. Whether or not the book of Hebrews was intended to be read aloud, even literary works, according to Quintilian, adhered to principles of good first-century oration. Admonishing that the pen must be "slow yet sure", he exhorts that every thought must be first criticized and then, once approved, arranged with care:

For we must select both thoughts and words and weigh them one by one. This done, we must consider the order in which they should be placed, and must examine all the possible *varieties of rhythm*, refusing necessarily to place each word in the order in which it occurs to us. In order to do this with the utmost care, we must frequently revise what we have just *written*⁽¹⁶⁾ (emphasis mine)

Given that the NT writings were written with the intent to be read aloud, it would not be surprising to find that the style of its composition was influenced accordingly by standard rhetorical practices of that day.

Quintilian cites many rhetorical techniques of rhythmic arrangement and ornamentation of style. Most relevant to the phenomenon found in the

⁽¹²⁾ G. A. KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, NC 1984) 5

⁽¹³⁾ *Ibid.*, 87

⁽¹⁴⁾ Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria* (LCL; Cambridge 1958).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Quintilian was born c. AD 35 in Spain. At the age of sixteen he traveled to Rome where he received his education and spent most of his life as a teacher of rhetoric and as a pleader. One of his better known cases was a trial of the Jewish Queen Bernice, the same Bernice before whom the apostle Paul appeared in Caesarea. Pliny the Younger was one of Quintilian's famous pupils. In AD 90 Quintilian retired from teaching and over the next nine years produced a twelve-book series on the principles of rhetorical oration

⁽¹⁶⁾ Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.3.5, (LCL 4,94-95)

'misquotes' of Heb 10, is his long list of phonetic techniques which were practiced as good oratorical style in the first century

One of the many techniques Quintilian recommends for ornamentation of style is paronomasia, "the [phonetic] resemblance, equality or contrast of words" (17). There are, according to Quintilian, four different forms of play upon phonetic resemblance (18). One form is when the words selected will achieve assonance of equal length and have similar terminations, a technique he calls parison. The term parison describes the nature of the variations which form the $\sigma\tilde{\omega}$ - $\mu\alpha$ - $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ / $\tau\acute{\omega}$ - $\mu\alpha$ - $\tau\alpha$ pairing in Heb 10,5,6. A second form of phonetic play is when clauses conclude with like syllables, as is found in Heb 10,5b,6 and in 10,7c,d. When two or more sentences end in this way it is called homoeoteleuton (19). Furthermore, Quintilian teaches that the highest achievement of this phonetic play is when both the beginnings and endings of two or more clauses correspond "in such a way that there is close resemblance between the words, with cadence and termination virtually identical" (20).

Though the results of paronomasia may sound contrived to our modern ears, various forms of this rhetorical technique were apparently highly prized in the first century. The very type of phenomenon observable in the variations of Heb 10 as it 'misquotes' the LXX is therefore found to be recommended by Quintilian as highly regarded ornamentation of style.

Could it be that the value placed upon the euphony produced by these techniques of oration took precedence over the "literal" quotation of sources in the first century? It is well known that quotations in the first century were freely rendered with little concern for the precision that we so highly value today. Josephus admits the influence of rhetorical principles when he explains some of the variations and omissions from the sources in his writing as motivated by concern for how his work would *sound* to the Greek ear (21).

Our modern society, with its advanced printing technology and its copyright laws, values precision in quotations above all else. The highest form of quotation is achieved with exacting precision, even to the point of misspelling what was misspelled in the source. Because of the high value we place on exact literal quotations, the handling of the OI sources by the NT authors may seem to some to be careless at best and culpable at worst. But perhaps the author of Hebrews, and his co-authors of the NT, in 'misquoting' the OI were in fact reaching for the highest first-century

(17) Ibid., 9.3.66, (LCL 3, 485)

(18) Ibid., 491.

(19) This same term is used in textual criticism to describe the inadvertent omission of text during copying due to the similarity of sentence endings.

(20) Ibid., 493

(21) L. H. FELDMAN, "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus", *Mikra Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. J. MULDER) (CRINT; Philadelphia 1988) 479.

Psalm 40, 7-9 in Translation and Quotation

<i>zebah uminhāh lō' hāpasā</i>	MT 40, 7a	Sacrifice and offering you do not desire
θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας	LXX 39, 7a	Sacrifice and offering you did not desire
θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας	Heb 10, 5b	Sacrifice and offering you did not desire
<i>*oznāyim kārtā lī</i>	MT 40, 7b	Ears were dug for me
<i>*ōtia dē katērtisō moi</i>	LXX 39, 7b	Ears you prepared for me
<i>*σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι</i>	Heb 10, 5b	but a body you prepared for me
<i>*olāh wahātā ah lō' sālēlā</i>	MT 40, 7	Burnt offering and sin offering you did not demand
<i>*ōlokaūtōmia kai peri āmartias oūk *ḥētas</i>	LXX 39, 7c	Burnt offering and sin offering you did not demand
<i>*ōlokaūtōmia kai peri āmartias oūk *ēddōktas</i>	Heb 10, 6	[with] Burnt offerings and sin offering you were not pleased
<i>*āz 'āmartī himēh-bā' lī</i>	MT 40, 8a	Thereupon I said, "Behold! I come
τότε ἔπον Ἰδού ἤκω,	LXX 39, 8a	Then I said, "Behold! I have come
τότε ἔπον Ἰδού ἤκω,	Heb 10, 7a	Then I said, "Behold! I have come
<i>bingūllat-sēper kātib 'ālāy</i>	MT 40, 8b	in the scroll of the book it is written about me
ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ	LXX 39, 8b	in the scroll of the book it is written about me
ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ	Heb 10, 7b	in the scroll of the book it is written about me
<i>lā 'āsōl-r'sōrēkā 'ēlōhay hāpāsif</i>	MT 40, 9a	to do your will, my God, I desire
<i>*τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θελημα σου, ὁ θεός μου, ἐβουλήθη</i>	LXX 39, 8b	to do you will, my God, I desire
<i>*τοῦ ποιῆσαι ὁ θεός τὸ θέλημά σου</i>	Heb 10, 7c	to do, O God, your will
<i>*lōrārēkā θ'ētāk mē'āy</i>	MT 40, 9b	and your law is within me
καὶ τὸν νόμον σου ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλίας μου.	LXX 39, 9b	and your law is in the middle of my belly

* The asterisk marks the variants.

standards of composition based, not on the value of precision, but on the value of rhetorical ornamentation⁽²²⁾.

I suggest that the author of Hebrews was expressing his argument in Heb 10 in his best rhetorical style and that what has been misunderstood by modern standards as 'misquoting' the OT added the very quality that made his argument very attractive to the ear of his Hellenistic audience⁽²³⁾.

According to Quintilian, one of the functions of paronomasia is to attract the ear of the audience and to excite their attention for that element of the argument⁽²⁴⁾. To put it in modern linguistic terms, the phonetic assonance of paronomasia effects marked prominence of certain elements of the paragraph, highlighting and emphasizing those particular thoughts. In ancient Greek, marked prominence was achieved by unusual word order, repetition, use of particles, intensifying verbs, and shift in verbal tense⁽²⁵⁾. Based on Quintilian's description of the function of paronomasia, I suggest that phonetic assonance was another highly stylized, rhetorical method of marking semantic prominence.

A catchy phrase sticks in the mind. Television commercials use phonetic techniques to advertise a product because the consumer is likely to remember the product advertised. A similar goal was attained by using phonetic techniques in persuasive argument. Those elements of the argument that the rhetor wished to have stick in the minds of his audience, he ornamented with phonetic word play. By quoting Ps 40, but with selective variations which achieved paronomasia, the author of Hebrews was highlighting these variations in the ear, and the mind, of his audience. The prominence of these elements would cause them to stand out in the argument being put forth, thus enhancing the audience's memory of the argument.

In conclusion, the four variations which comprise the "misquote" are systematically related by the rhetorical technique of paronomasia. This indicates that they are the deliberate result of the creative mind of the author of Hebrews, and were, therefore, not found in the first-century Greek text of Psalm 40.

Westminster Theological Seminary
P.O. Box 27009
Philadelphia, PA 19118 USA

Karen H. JOBES

⁽²²⁾ Such rhetorical principles as Quintilian documents were practiced from the classical period in Athens onward, as Aristotle's *Art of Rhetoric* shows. Aristotle (c. 330 BC) and Quintilian (c. AD 90) bracket the period of time in which both the Old Testament was translated into Greek and the New Testament was written. Principles of oration may account for other Old Testament "misquotes" found in the New Testament. They may also account for some of the variations between the Greek translations of the Old Testament and the Hebrew text.

⁽²³⁾ The rhetorical skill of the author of Hebrews has also been explored by M. COSBY in his published doctoral dissertation, *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11* (Macon, GA 1988).

⁽²⁴⁾ Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.66, (I.L.C. 3, 485)

⁽²⁵⁾ K. CALLOW, *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids 1974) 52.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Un important commentaire du troisième évangile⁽¹⁾

Voici le premier des trois volumes qui, dans la série scientifique EKK de haut niveau, doivent commenter l'évangile de Luc. Le commentateur n'est pas un inconnu. Rappelons surtout l'important état des questions, raisonné et critique, qu'en 1978 (21988) il a consacré à *Luc le Théologien*⁽²⁾.

L'introduction au commentaire peut donc prendre une forme extrêmement ramassée (13-26). La manière dont l'auteur y définit ses positions mérite l'attention. Sept points sont pris en considération:

1. Le texte pose des problèmes excessivement difficiles pour un certain nombre de versets; cela n'empêche pas que, dans l'ensemble, il nous est bien transmis.

2. Construction et style. Après les étapes préparatoires de 1,5-2,52 et 3,1-4,13, le récit évangélique est divisé en trois grandes sections: 4,14-9,50; 9,51-19,27; 19,28-24,53. La division entre 19,27 et 19,28 se réclame d'une curieuse considération logique: le voyage à Jérusalem, que la section centrale représente, se termine «logiquement» avec l'arrivée à Jérusalem. Ce n'est pas précisément ce dont parle 19,28, où se poursuit une approche qui, précisément, ne se terminera pas par une arrivée à Jérusalem, mais par une entrée dans le Temple (19,45), d'où l'on ne sortira plus avant 21,37-38. Curieusement aussi, F.B. dit et répète que le mot *exodos* désignant le but de la montée de Jésus à Jérusalem (9,31) est un euphémisme pour sa mort (15 et 496), quitte à ajouter qu'il n'y a pas seulement cela (497). L'auteur avait été mieux inspiré lorsqu'il écrivait: «Lors de la Transfiguration, Luc évite la trivialité du langage univoque: c'est sur l'*exodos* de Jésus et non sur la croix que porte l'entretien...»⁽³⁾. Certains détails peuvent donc être discutés. Peu de chose à côté des excellentes remarques sur l'art avec lequel Luc compose son récit, varie son style, sait faire voir concrètement les choses: ce n'est pas pour rien que la tradition a fait de lui un peintre.

⁽¹⁾ François BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. I. Teilband: Lk 1,1-9,50 (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament III/1). Zürich, Benziger Verlag - Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1989. VIII-524 p. 16,5 x 24. DM 128.

⁽²⁾ Voir *Bib* 63 (1982) 266-267. Ses principaux articles ont été groupés dans deux recueils: *Lukas in neuer Sicht*. Gesammelte Aufsätze (Bibisch-theologische Studien 8; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985); *L'œuvre de Luc*. Études d'exégèse et de théologie (LD 130; Paris 1987). Il nous paraît indispensable d'ajouter la présentation d'ensemble que F.B. a faite de «Luc-Actes» dans l'ouvrage collectif *Évangiles synoptiques et Actes des apôtres* (Petite bibliothèque des sciences bibliques, Nouveau Testament 4; Paris 1981) 195-283. Cet exposé n'est pas mentionné dans le commentaire, dont cependant il pourrait utilement éclairer l'introduction.

⁽³⁾ «Effet de réel et flou prophétique dans l'œuvre de Luc», *A cause de l'Évangile*. Mélanges J. Dupont (LD 123; Paris 1985) 356.