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In the course of work on the text of Hbs 11, I was struck by the frequency of correction of the text of Hbs towards the LXX text that was being paraphrased or alluded to. Some well-rehearsed textual decisions of commentators raised the possibility that, in a book with so many Old Testament connections, the occasional recognized assimilation may be just the tip of an iceberg. And so it proved to be.

The first task was simply to collect as many instances as could be found. This meant a scouring of the apparatuses of the various editions of the Greek New Testament, relying primarily on N25, N26-UBS and Tischendorf, supplemented by Old Latin and

---

1 See my “In Defence of the Scarlet Lady” (forthcoming).
2 Thus Moffatt accredits the με of 3:9 in 01c, Dc, K, L, vg, syr, arm, eth etc to assimilation (J. Moffatt, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1924) 45 n. 5). Similarly Bruce on the addition of χαί κατέστησε αυτῶν ἐπὶ τά ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου in 2:7 (F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1964) 31 n. 13 and see H. Braun, An die Hebräer (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984) 55); and, in the same quotation of Ps 8, the replacement of τί by τίς in 2:6 (G. Zuntz, The Text of the Pauline Epistles (London: O.U.P., 1953) 48f. R.V.G. Tasker, “The Text of the Corpus Paulinum”, NTS 1 (1954-5) 185 and Bruce 31 n. 12); Braun notes the assimilation to Ps 44(45):7 in the και of 1:8 (39). James Swetnam noted the two-way traffic of LXX-Hebrews text assimilations in the Jeremiah quotation: “A Suggested Interpretation of Hebrews 9, 15-18”, CBQ 27 (1965) 376 n. 15.
Vulgate editions, informed by commentaries and cross-referenced, via Hatch-Redpath’s concordance, to editions of the Septuagint. Where possible and invited, reference was made to facsimile editions of manuscripts.

There are variables in this simple approach: Firstly, instances (and manuscripts for citation) of variants may be overlooked where a more rigorous survey and correlation would more thoroughly extract evidence. Computer-assisted research has yet to deliver easy correlations of material found in a textual apparatus. Secondly, no attempt initially, has been made to discern any connection between a particular New Testament manuscript and a particular LXX-manuscript/text-type. Such a task, whilst outside the limits of this

---

4 In addition to the Latin texts above, the following were also consulted: H.J. Frede, *Vetus Latina* (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1987, Vol 25.2.4 (Hbr 1:2-2:16)); J. Wordsworth and H.J. White H.J. (Eds.), *Novum Testamentum Latine* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911, Editio Minor).


6 Endeavouring to be circumspect in the use of this great tool. See E. Tov, "The Use of Concordances in the Reconstruction of The Vorlage of the LXX", *CBQ* 40 (1978) 29-36.

7 Namely, the Göttingen edition, Rahlfs’ Editio Minor, Swete’s *Old Testament in Greek* and Brooke-McLean’s *Octateuch*. For the Psalter, cross-reference was made to R. Kasser & M. Testuz (Eds.), *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV: Psamares XVII-CXVIII* (Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1967).


9 This is the atomizing of Aland’s brief observation so much at the heart of this study: “Quotations from the Old Testament which differ from the text of the Septuagint popular in the Church were often corrected to agree with it.” H. & B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, 2nd Ed. Trans E.F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989) 290. The classic instance is the use of κατανοηθήναι for κατανοηθήναι in Hbs 11:29 by ms 104, 1912 following Ex 15:4 LXX A cf. Hbs 1:9 διδομαι for δυναται in A for both Hbs and Ps 44:8 τι for τι in 2:6 in some New Testament manuscripts cf. Ps 8:5 A. One further suspects that some singular readings, and readings supported by few and “related” manuscripts are influenced by the LXX manuscript familiar to the scribe (where an allusion or quotation is apparent).