

THE USE OF
THE OLD TESTAMENT
IN THE NEW AND
OTHER ESSAYS

STUDIES IN HONOR OF
WILLIAM FRANKLIN STINESPRING

Edited by
JAMES M. EFIRD

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham, N. C. 1972

© 1972, Duke University Press
L.C.C. card no. 70-185463
I.S.B.N. 0-8223-0288-8

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Composition by Maurice Jacobs, Inc.

THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW

D. MOODY SMITH, JR.

Professor William F. Stinespring's career has been an expression of his commitment both to biblical scholarship and to the Christian faith. It has been his steady conviction that the study of the Old Testament and of Semitic languages is directly important for, and ultimately indispensable to, the right understanding of the New Testament and hence of Christianity. Therefore, the question of the Old Testament in the New goes to the heart of Professor Stinespring's own interests and concerns. This article, in tribute to him, is an attempt to reopen and review that important question in the light of recent research. Our purpose cannot be to bring forth in detail or on a large scale the results of recent scholarly effort. Concentrating primarily upon explicit usage or citation, we shall attempt to sketch the main lines of development since the publication of Tasker's general book on this subject in 1946, and especially since its revision in 1954.¹

The phrase "the Old Testament in the New" is, of course, an anachronism on two counts. First, and most importantly, the concept of an "Old Testament" depends upon the existence of a "New

1. R. V. G. Tasker, *The Old Testament in the New*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1954). Hopefully this book will also serve as a guide to recent literature in this field. Other bibliographical data may be found in the preface to Krister Stendahl's *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (1954; reprinted, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968) pp. i-xiv. Note also the article by Gottlieb Schrenk, "γράφω . . ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. G. W. Bromiley and ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids, 1964-69), 1, 742 ff. Principal items of the earlier literature are cited by L. Venard, "Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans le Nouveau Testament," *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*, ed. L. Pirot (Paris: Librarie Letouzey, 1934), 2, 23-51, esp. 50-51.

Only after the completion of my article was I able to see C. K. Barrett's essay, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. I, *From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 377-411. Important also is the even more recent article by Merrill P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 2 (1971), 29-82, containing extensive bibliographical information. Note also P. Nickels, *Targum and the New Testament: A Bibliography together with a New Testament Index* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967).

Testament." Therefore, we should not expect any reference to the Hebrew Scriptures as Old Testament until the formation of the New Testament canon was well under way.² Nevertheless, Paul already speaks of the reading of the Old Covenant (II Cor. 3:14), by which he certainly means part, if not all, of the Scriptures, and thus prepares the way for the adoption of the term *Old Testament*. In the second place, the canon of the Old Testament was not officially closed on the Jewish side at the time many New Testament books were being written; thus it is incorrect to imply that it was completely fixed at the time of Christian origins. Moreover, some fluidity in Christian usage continued well past the official establishment of the Jewish canon in A.D. 90 or 100. Nevertheless, the authority of the Law and the Prophets (Matt. 5:17; 7:12; Luke 16:16; John 1:45; Rom. 3:21) or the Scriptures (plural, Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:24; Acts 17:2; or sing., Acts 8:32; John 20:9; Rom. 4:3) had long been acknowledged within Judaism when Christianity appeared upon the scene. Such fluidity as there was pertained only to the Hagiographa, but even there usage had established the authority of a number of books. Luke refers to the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms (Luke 24:44), and New Testament usage generally confirms the existence of a threefold canon. The prologue to the wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach, almost two centuries older than any New Testament book, confirms the general use of a threefold canon in early Christian times as does the usage of Philo, who quotes from the Law, Prophets and Writings, and Josephus (cf. *Against Apion* I:8), whose use of apocryphal material may be significant.³

THE OLD TESTAMENT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA

The problem of the Old Testament canon

The preceding observations are sufficient to justify speaking of the Old Testament in relation to the New. The term refers to a

2. Perhaps the earliest reference to the Hebrew scriptures as "Old Testament" is to be found in Melito of Sardis (ca. A.D. 180), who sets forth a list of books τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. Cf. W. G. Kümmel *Introduction to the New Testament*, founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm and trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr., 14th ed. rev. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), p. 344.

3. Cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941), pp. 67 f.

body of canonical Scriptures whose existence, if not its exact delimitation, was scarcely in doubt. Yet the question of the exact delimitation of the Old Testament in the New Testament period is real and should not simply be bypassed. Because of the predominance of septuagintal quotations, as opposed to quotations which reflect the Hebrew in distinction from the Septuagint, it has been widely assumed that the Septuagint was the Bible of the primitive church. This is by no means an erroneous assumption. On the other hand, the corollary that the Christian church adopted an Alexandrian canon consisting of the books of the Hebrew Old Testament finally accepted at Jamnia (c. A.D. 90) plus the Apocrypha (included in one form or another in extant Septuagint manuscripts) has recently been opposed by A. C. Sundberg.⁴ Sundberg argues that such a Hellenistic-Jewish canon never existed at all. The Christian canon, based upon pre-Jamnian Jewish usage, consists of the Law, the Prophets and a more broadly based collection of Hagiographa than was finally admitted by the rabbis at Jamnia. But this canon does not represent an earlier, official Alexandrian canon, as opposed to a narrower Palestinian one. Rather, the septuagintal canon reflects a pre-Jamnian Jewish situation fully as common to Palestine as to the Hellenistic environment of Alexandria. This earlier period in Palestine is reflected also in the Qumran scrolls, where canonical and extracanonical materials existed together with little indication that the Qumraners respected the bounds of canonicity as they were to be later defined. Moreover, the usage of the New Testament, as reflected in Nestle's marginal notes, shows that these earliest Christian writers did not

4. *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, Harvard Theological Studies, no. 20 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964). Sundberg discusses the development of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis on pp. 7-24 and its general acceptance on pp. 25-40. A reserved proponent of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis is R. H. Pfeiffer; see his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 65-70, and his article "Canon of the Old Testament," *IDB*, 1:510 f. On the other hand, no less an authority than H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1914), rejected the Alexandrian canon hypothesis quite emphatically (pp. 156, 180).

Sundberg, "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon," *Studia Evangelica* (Oxford Congress, 1965), vol. 4, which is *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin, 1968), 102:452-61, has recently argued that the frequent identification of "canon" and "scripture" is misleading, since in the New Testament *γραφὴ* is not the equivalent of "canon." Rather, all the instances of *γραφὴ* which are usually cited as carrying the meaning of "canon" can be shown to carry instead the meanings of "specific writing" or "book." The plural *γραφαί*, moreover, refers to the sacred writings taken together, but not necessarily to the canon.

confine themselves to the Jamnian canon.⁵ Earliest Old Testament canonical lists of the church fathers show considerable variation, an unlikely phenomenon if there had been a Hellenistic-Jewish Alexandrian canon of recognized status. The probability that there never was such a canon is further strengthened by the unlikelihood of such a canon's being established independently of Palestinian Judaism.

While Sundberg's case for a certain fluidity in the Hagiographa of Palestine as well as Alexandria seems to be well made, the impression he leaves concerning the early Christian use of extra-canonical (by Jamnian standards) books is not entirely felicitous.⁶ Robert A. Kraft has raised some pertinent issues about Sundberg's procedures. He questions "his appeal to the passages from 'non-canonical' Jewish literature listed in the margins of Nestle's 22nd edition of the New Testament (!) as evidence for 'the canon' received by 'the church' from Judaism." Moreover, he asks: "Do alleged parallels in wording and thought indicate actual use? Does actual use indicate canonical status. . . ? Does canonical status for Jude necessarily indicate the same for Paul, or for the whole of early Christianity?"⁷ It seems to be a fact that although a few passages from outside the Hebrew or Jamnian canon are cited as scripture in the New Testament, none of these is from the Apocrypha. The New Testament gives the impression that the Old Testament acknowledged by its writers was virtually the same as that adopted by Judaism in the early years of our era.⁸ Neverthe-

5. The precise role and importance of Jamnia is a matter of dispute. Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, pp. 113 ff., takes the more-or-less orthodox critical view that the council meeting there ca. A.D. 90 set the bounds of the Hagiographa, confirming some books (e. g., Ecclesiastes, Esther, Song of Songs) and eliminating Sirach and those books known to have been of recent origin. On the other hand, Jack P. Lewis, "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, 32 (1964), 125-32, points out that the traditional view of Jamnia is largely inference and conjecture. While this may be so, "Jamnia" apparently does point to an actual stabilization of the canon which took place at the end of the first century or shortly thereafter. The second-century proscription of the Septuagint and the Jewish adoption of the Greek version of Aquila (whose limitations correspond to the Jamnian canon) would seem to indicate that such a stabilization had taken place.

6. *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, pp. 53 ff., 81-103.

7. Review of Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, in *JBL*, 85 (1966), 259.

8. In a 1965 Ph.D. dissertation written under the direction of Professor Stinespring, I. H. Eybers has argued forcefully that the books regarded as canonical in Palestine in 100 or even 150 B.C. were virtually the same as those approved at Jamnia at the end of the first Christian century ("Historical Evidence on the Canon of the Old

less, the apparent absence of apocryphal citations as such in the New Testament does not necessarily mean that the New Testament writers did not acknowledge the apocryphal books as canonical. In point of fact, a number of Old Testament books are not cited as scripture in the New Testament, especially those from the Hagiographa, which was precisely the part of the canon still in a fluid state during the early Christian period.⁹ The situation with respect to those books is no different from that of the Apocrypha. There are similarities of language and allusions in the New Testament, but no explicit quotations as scripture. If citation as scripture in the New Testament were made the touchstone of canonicity of the Old, the latter would be significantly smaller.¹⁰ Still, the only certain indication that a book was regarded as canonical is its citation as scripture. (Although one will scarcely doubt that I Samuel and II Kings, neither of which is cited explicitly as scripture, were regarded by the early Christians as a part of their Bible.)

The only safe generalization, then, would go something like this: the Law, the Prophets and a number of the Writings—the exact number being a matter of dispute—were regarded as canonical by the Christians (and Jews) of the New Testament period, but from

Testament with Special Reference to the Qumran Sect"). Josephus, Philo, the New Testament, IV Ezra, and especially Qumran are cited in support of this contention. Eybers maintains that the Septuagint can scarcely be adduced as evidence of a broader canon in Hellenistic Judaism, since the manuscripts and lists show its contents to have been very uncertain (pp. 53, 59). Moreover, almost all the important evidence for the Septuagint comes from Christian sources (pp. 61 f.). Nevertheless, Eybers must admit that several documents such as Jubilees, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Enoch, and Sirach may have been regarded as canonical, or at least authoritative, at Qumran.

While his argument for the prevalence of the Palestinian canon in Greek-speaking Judaism is impressive, Eybers never fully explains why the Christian church, which did not widely use the Apocrypha in the New Testament, would have introduced it into its Old Testament unless it were in use by Hellenistic Jews already.

9. According to the Nestle *index locorum*, Proverbs is cited only four times as Scripture, Job once, and Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs not at all. Psalms on the other hand is cited fifty-five times, or more than any other book in the Old Testament. Thus the casual reference in Luke 24:44 to "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms" seems to be very close to an accurate description of the canon of the New Testament writers. Of course, Kraft's point (above) that the limits of the canon may have differed for individual New Testament writers is well taken.

10. By my count about seventeen Old Testament books are not explicitly cited as Scripture in the New Testament, although only four are not represented at least once in bold-face type in the Nestle text (Ruth, Ezra, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs).

among those writings the New Testament authors tended to quote mostly from the Pentateuch, certain of the Prophets, especially Isaiah, and the Psalms. Moreover, they afford no sure evidence for the canonicity of the books of the Apocrypha.

Principal texts and versions

That the Hebrew text existed in a form not too different from the Masoretic text during the New Testament era has now been shown by the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls. Yet the scrolls also attest the existence of near prototypes of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint. B. J. Roberts observes that the Qumraners were little disturbed by the existence of competing textual traditions; in fact, they made the most of them.¹¹ More conservative treatment of the textual tradition is attested by the manuscript finds at Wadi Murabba'at. These manuscripts belong to the period of the Bar Cocheba Revolt (A.D. 132-135), and the association of the eminent Rabbi Akiba with that uprising would lead us to expect a closer conformity with the emerging textual "orthodoxy." Roberts believes that the text-form of the Torah was fairly well established, with some variation, in pre-Christian times, but that there were major divergences in other parts of the Old Testament.¹² But no unified textual tradition at the beginning of the Christian era can be posited as the beginning point for work upon the problem of the Old Testament in the New. The divergences of the Septuagint from the Masoretic text already invite such a conclusion.

The Septuagint. The Septuagint is, of course, the immediate source for most of the Old Testament quotations in the New. According to R. H. Pfeiffer, eighty percent of the Old Testament quotations in the New are drawn from the Septuagint.¹³ This figure, presumably based upon agreement or near agreement with some known septuagintal text-form, may be a bit high, but it is probably not misleading. In many or even most of these instances there is little or no disagreement between the Septuagint and the

11. "Text: Old Testament," *IDB*, 4, 583; cf. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, esp. pp. 183 ff.

12. Roberts, 4: 583. On the text of the Old Testament compare his earlier work, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951).

13. Pfeiffer, 1: 511.

Masoretic text. This does not, of course, mean that the quotation could have just as well been made from the Hebrew, for no two translators are likely to render the same sentence in exactly the same way. Moreover, there are numerous instances in which a New Testament writer obviously follows the Septuagint in distinction from the Hebrew.¹⁴ The dictum that the Septuagint was the Bible of the early Christian community and of the New Testament writers is not false. To repeat this, however, does not solve every problem, for the state of the septuagintal text in early Christian times is itself a far-reaching, highly complex, and important question. Moreover, it is quite clear that not only the Septuagint, but also the Hebrew text and the Targums have had some influence upon the writings of the New Testament.

The question of the nature of the Greek translation we know as the Septuagint has been much debated in the last few decades. Perhaps the chief impetus for this debate has been the theory of Paul Kahle, according to which the Septuagint arose out of a welter of Greek Targums to the various parts of the Old Testament.¹⁵ In Kahle's view, the Letter of Aristeas was intended to propagandize for a standard Jewish translation of the Torah (Pentateuch) into Greek at about the end of the first century B.C. The claims which it makes for the Pentateuch were later extended to the entire Greek translation and the name derived from it applied to the entire body of scriptures by Christians. In point of fact, the Septuagint Old Testament is a creation of second-century Christians out of various Jewish translations of portions of the Old Testament, none of which had previously attained undisputed authoritative status, except perhaps the pentateuchal translation promoted by Aristeas. Evidence for this view is adduced from a number of sources and considerations: the existence of various textual traditions of the Septuagint designated by Jerome (Hesy-

14. For a very convenient and useful assembly of the New Testament, septuagintal, and Masoretic materials see W. Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo: Die alttestamentlichen Parallelen des Neuen Testaments im Wortlaut der Urtexte und der Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903). C. H. Toy's older work, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1884) gives English translations as well as the original New Testament, Hebrew, and septuagintal texts.

15. See *The Cairo Geniza*, The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1941 (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 132-79, esp. 157 f., 165, 174 ff. Kahle published a second edition of this book a decade later (Oxford: Blackwell, 1959), in which see esp. pp. 235 ff.

chius, Lucian, and Origen); the likelihood that earlier translation work underlies the three second-century Greek versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus (not to mention the anonymous translations cited in Origen's Hexapla); and the numerous New Testament quotations which do not correspond to the text of the Septuagint.¹⁶ Kahle also maintains that in dealing with a translation it is fallacious to assume a single *Urtext* as one does when dealing with an original text. It is rather *prima facie* possible that translations of such a work as the Old Testament would spring up quite independently. Kahle cites the growth of the Targums and of the Latin and Syriac versions of the Bible as evidence of his contention that in the case of translations, standardization of the text follows upon a period of freedom and even confusion in its transmission.¹⁷

Although Kahle's position seems plausible, the prevailing tide of contemporary scholarship is against it.¹⁸ Major objections are raised on several counts. First, the recently discovered Greek Old Testament fragments from Qumran and elsewhere seem to confirm the existence of a standardized Greek text in the pre-Christian period, although Kahle has not conceded this.¹⁹ Secondly, evidence is lacking for the process of standardization in the second-century Christian church. Moreover, the second-century B.C. prologue to the Wisdom of Sirach speaks of the translation of the threefold canon in such a way as to imply something more than a collection of more or less unofficial Targums, and there is some doubt that the evidence of Philo and Josephus can be disposed of in such a way as to accommodate Kahle's theory.²⁰ As for the New Testa-

16. Note especially Alexander Sperber, "New Testament and Septuagint," *JBL*, 59 (1940), 193-293; cf. his earlier article "The New Testament and the Septuagint," in the Hebrew quarterly *Tarbiz*, 6 (1934), 1-29 (*non vid.*).

17. *Cairo Geniza*, 1st ed., p. 175.

18. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions*, pp. 111-15; Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 59-63, catalogues older and more recent opposition to Kahle (H. M. Orlinsky, Peter Walters (Katz), D. Barthélemy, F. L. Cross, and H. H. Rowley).

19. F. L. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," *Harvard Theological Review*, 57 (1964), 281-99, esp. 281-84. Cf. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, 2nd ed., pp. 246 f.

20. *Cairo Geniza*, 1st ed., pp. 141 ff., 150 ff.; 2nd ed., 229 ff., 247 ff. Cf. Peter Katz, *Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950), who believes the variations in Philo's Old Testament texts have been introduced from later translations.

ment quotations, most do not differ materially from the Septuagint,²¹ and there are a number of possible explanations for those that do: quotation from memory, influence of Masoretic or other Hebrew traditions or of the Aramaic Targums. But such reservations regarding Kahle's denial of the existence of a non-Christian Septuagint do not necessarily rule out other aspects of his hypothesis. In his criticism of the predominant theory identified with Paul de Lagarde, Kahle rightly objects to the assumption that a translated text must, like an original text, have a single *Urtext* or *autographon*. Independent translations could arise, and apparently did.²² Certainly it is reasonable to suppose that traces of variant readings arising from such processes may be found in the New Testament.

The implications of the present state of Septuagint studies for New Testament exegesis generally are thus difficult to assess. Even if Kahle's thesis is rejected, a certain fluidity in the Greek text of the Old Testament, if not distinct traditions of translation, remains a certainty. Accordingly, variations in New Testament quotations from the principal Septuagint manuscripts may in any instance simply indicate reliance upon a variant Greek translation. Needless to say, each such instance is to be judged on its own merits.

The Targums. While the importance of the Septuagint for the investigation of the use of the Old Testament in the New has long been recognized, the question of the bearing of the Aramaic Targums upon this problem is still in relatively early stages of exploration. There is, first of all, the matter of which Targums are most useful in New Testament study. (Of course, the Targums of the Hagiographa are generally rather late.) Gustaf Hermann Dalman threw his prestige behind the value of the official Pentateuchal Targum of Onkelos and the Prophetic Targum of Jonathan, which

21. Sperber, "New Testament and Septuagint," p. 204, cites Turpie, *The Old Testament in the New* (London, 1868) to the effect that the New Testament departs from the Septuagint in 185 instances, but he also cites Grinfeld, *Apology for the Septuagint* (1841), who finds only about fifty quotations that differ materially from the Septuagint.

22. Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II-IV Centuries C.E.* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942), pp. 47 ff., adduces evidence of the use of Greek translation(s) of the Scriptures by Palestinian rabbis. W. D. Davies, "Law in First-Century Judaism," *IDB*, 3: 90, refers to a statement on translating the law by Rabban Simeon Gamaliel, who is reported to have said that such a translation could be written only in Greek.

he regarded as representative of the early Targumic tradition of Palestine, despite the fact that he was well aware of their immediate Babylonian provenance. More recent research, especially that of Paul Kahle, has emphasized the scholastic and standardizing tendencies at work in Onkelos especially, and has turned to the Palestinian Targum as a better representative of the speech and thought of first-century Palestine.²³ With the further support afforded by the discovery of the Neofiti Codex of the Palestinian Targum, Kahle's views have in this case won wide acceptance. The recent monograph of Martin S. McNamara seeks to vindicate the early date of the Palestinian Targum and its importance for early Christianity by examining certain texts and motifs of the New Testament against that background.²⁴

I am unable to offer the critical evaluation which McNamara's significant work deserves. Obviously, however, he has shown that there are affinities of various sorts between the New Testament and the Palestinian Targum, and thus he has reason to think that he has vindicated the statement of Kahle which he quotes toward the beginning and end of his work:

"We can learn many more details from them [the PT texts] than from the material collected by Billerbeck and Bonsirven. . . . In the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch we have in the main material coming down from pre-Christian times which must be studied by everyone who wishes to understand the state of Judaism at the time of the birth of Christianity. And we possess this material in a language of which we can say that it was similar to that spoken by the earliest Christians. It is material, the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated."²⁵

Needless to say, the value of the Targums for New Testament investigation is not limited to what light they may shed upon the

23. *Cairo Geniza*, 1st ed., pp. 117 ff.; 2nd ed., 191 ff. Nevertheless, discussion continues among the experts as to the antiquity of this Targum. See the articles by Malcolm C. Doubles, "Toward the Publication of the Extant Texts of the Palestinian Targum(s)," *Vetus Testamentum*, 15 (1965), 16-26, and "Indications of Antiquity in the Orthography and Morphology of the Fragment Targum," *In Memoriam Paul Kahle*, ed. Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 79-89.

24. *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, *Analecta Biblica*, no. 27 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), pp. 33 ff.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 253; *The Cairo Geniza*, 2nd ed., p. 208.

use of the Old Testament in the New. They afford a rich resource of material relating to the language, conceptuality, and religion of the Judaism of New Testament times. With the publication of critical texts of Onkelos and Jonathan,²⁶ as well as the forthcoming Madrid edition of the Palestinian Targum, elicited by the discovery of its complete text in the Neofiti Codex,²⁷ the Targums are now more than ever before becoming accessible for New Testament and cognate research.

The use of the Old Testament in late Judaism

The consideration of the questions of the canon, text, and versions of the Old Testament in the first Christian century provides the necessary framework for any discussion of the use of the Scriptures of Judaism in the books of the New Testament. Yet it does not supply the key to understanding the motives, methods, and purposes that govern their use. Such a key is perhaps to be found in the investigation of the use of the Old Testament in contemporary Judaism. Yet to gain access to such a key is no simple task. For one thing, it is perhaps easier to ascertain the typical uses of the Old Testament in first-century Christianity than in first-century Judaism. For example, the New Testament affords a fairly comprehensive picture of the use of the Old Testament in the theology and practice of the early church. On the other hand, the rabbinic literature is organized around interests and perspectives of post-Jamnian Judaism, which was predominantly Pharisaic. While Philo utilizes exegetical methods and perhaps traditions common also to the rabbis, he is apparently an original if not an entirely isolated figure. Josephus' interests in Old Testament texts are primarily those of a historian, albeit a first-century historian with apologetic motivation. The Qumran literature probably furnishes the most fruitful parallels to the New Testament and

26. Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1959-62). See also J. W. Etheridge, trans., *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum from the Chaldee*, 2 vols. in 1 (1862, 1865; reprint ed., New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971).

27. A. D. Macho, ed. *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense, Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana*, *Textos y Estudios*, nos. 7 ff. (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968-). The first two volumes have appeared, but I was able to see them only after the completion of this article.

early Christian usage.²⁸ True, the Essenes or Qumraners do not represent a main line of Jewish piety, but a sect. Yet precisely their sectarian character affords an analogy with earliest Christianity, which was also, if in a somewhat different way, a sect of Judaism.

In addition to these frequently cited representatives of first-century Judaism, a consideration of the use of the Old Testament in the so-called Apocrypha, or even the use or reappropriation of the earlier books or traditions of the Old Testament in later books or recensions, might be relevant and worthwhile. It is arguable, however, that such instances are qualitatively different from those previously mentioned, since many of the apocryphal books, as well as the later Old Testament books, were very likely written before the Old Testament canon was closed. Of course, a number of the writings of the New Testament, Qumran, and Philo were composed before the Old Testament canon (particularly the contents of the Hagiographa) was firmly fixed, so any such distinction is less than absolute. Nonetheless, the Apocrypha differs from the New Testament, Philo, the rabbinic sources, and Qumran, not only in being for the most part somewhat earlier, but also in lacking any clear differentia from the later Old Testament books themselves—witness their inclusion in the Septuagint.²⁹ The apocryphal writers are not so clearly concerned with coming to terms with or expounding a body of accepted scripture. Neither do they feel the need to reinterpret the scriptures in the light of a new historical situation (Qumran, the New Testament) or a new perspective or insight (Philo). Therefore, the relative scarcity of explicit Old Testament citations, in comparison to numerous references and allusions, is not surprising.

The most important witnesses to the use of the Old Testament in Jewish religious literature contemporary with the New Testament (i. e. the rabbis, Philo, and Qumran) all manifest some similarities to the New Testament. Needless to say, they also display

28. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS*, 7 (1961), 297 f.

29. Cf. J. L. Zink, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1963). In an otherwise careful study Zink pays too little attention to the implications of the obvious but important fact that the apocryphal writers could not know that they were writing "apocryphal" rather than "Old Testament" books.

some important differences, inasmuch as the appropriation of the Old Testament in the New presupposes Jesus Christ as its central organizing point. These similarities and differences have been studied with respect to various documents of early Christianity and late Judaism.³⁰ Sweeping generalizations regarding the use of the Old Testament in, let us say, the rabbis and the New Testament are probably not very helpful, and, while unnecessary for the scholar, may prove misleading to the novice. More profitable are comparisons of specific authors or documents and the use of contemporary and cognate materials, for instance, from Philo or Qumran, to illuminate specific instances of the use of the Old Testament in the New. With this caveat in mind and with appropriate disclaimers to completeness, it may nevertheless be useful to record a few observations about the use of the Old Testament in Judaism.

The use of the Old Testament in rabbinic materials in comparison to its use by Paul has been extensively treated by Joseph Bonsirven, whose work is useful for obtaining a grasp of rabbinic exegesis generally.³¹ Bonsirven is able to show many affinities between Paul and the rabbis, especially in exegetical method and technique, introductory formulas, and the like. What is true for Paul, moreover, holds good for much of the remainder of the New Testament. With good reason Géza Vermès sees in the New Testament material for the reconstruction of methods and traditions of Jewish exegesis in the first century of our era.³² Moreover, the relationships in exegetical method among the documents of this period are complex. For example, there are remarkable affinities not only between the rabbis and the New Testament, but also between the

30. See, for example, the recent monographs of S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Basel Studies of Theology, no. 1 (Zurich: EVZ Verlag, 1965) and Peder Borgen, *Bread From Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, no. 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1965). J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1954), has provided an introduction to the use of Jewish materials for understanding Old Testament exegesis in the narrative books of the New Testament. See also B. M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah," *JBL*, 70 (1951), 297-307.

31. *Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne*, Bibliothèque de Théologie historique (Paris, Beauchesne, 1938).

32. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, Studia Post-Biblica, vol. 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1961), p. 8.

rabbinic literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls.³³ Since the hallmarks of rabbinic exegesis have been set forth in great detail by Bonsirven³⁴ and summarized by others,³⁵ there is no need to rehearse them here. Suffice it to say that despite many points of contact, one receives rather divergent impressions of the Old Testament from Paul and the rabbis.³⁶ The disparity between them doubtless has something to do with Paul's Christocentrism and the centrality of the Torah in the rabbis. For Paul the Old Testament is no longer primarily law, in the sense of commandment, although it certainly was and remains, that. It is primarily promise and the prefiguration of the salvation event of the coming of Christ. Its prophetic and eschatological potentialities are utilized to the fullest. While Paul can and does use the Old Testament commandments in a prescriptive sense (e. g. Rom. 12:20; cf. also I Cor. 9:9 where the Old Testament is used in precisely this way, even though Paul insists it now applies to Christians), this is not the style most characteristic of him (cf. Rom. 10:6 ff., where Paul takes a word about the law from Deut. 30:12 ff. and applies it to Christ). For the rabbis, on the other hand, the Old Testament is above all God's commandments; their energies are tirelessly devoted to the exegesis of the commandments for prescriptive application to specific situations. Perhaps it is not misleading to say that while the rabbis tend to read the Old Testament as law,³⁷ Paul (and with him the other New Testament writers) reads the Old Testament as prophecy and even transforms specific commandments and narrations into prophetic words (e. g. I Cor. 9:9 and 10:1 ff., which although taken in something like their original sense are thought to point forward to the Christian community).

Possibly Philo's use of the Old Testament ought to be studied as an instance of highly creative Hellenistic rabbinic exegesis. Yet because Philo seems so distinctive in comparison to the rabbis whom we know through the Mishnah and Talmud there is good

33. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations," pp. 304 f.

34. Pt. 1, esp. 252 ff.

35. E. g., E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1957), pp. 45 ff., 54 ff.

36. Noted also by Bonsirven, pp. 324, 348 ff.

37. Cf. Bonsirven, p. 252: "Le Judaïsme est la Religion de la Tora, comportant pour la Loi divine un culte savant et pieux: de cette propriété fondamentale dérivent tous les caractères de l'exégèse juive."

reason for considering him as a special instance. Since the precise delineation of Philo's whole orientation and purpose has been a matter of dispute, unanimity over his exegetical method ought not to be expected. Be that as it may, there is little inclination to deny to Philo the title of the leading exponent of allegorical exegesis in first-century Judaism. His methods or those of his school were later taken up by Christian exegetes and became common currency in the church for centuries. The kind of allegorical exegesis we find in Philo is not utterly without representation in the New Testament (see Gal. 4:21-31), and there are weighty reasons for seeing a certain positive relation between his biblical exegesis and what we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet the total impression conveyed by Philo's exegetical procedure is very different from that obtained from the New Testament, and indeed from the main line of rabbinic exegesis. While the New Testament and the rabbis may differ in emphasizing the prophetic and legal aspects of the scriptures respectively, they lack the Philonic penchant for using the facts, figures, words, and whole passages of scripture as ciphers or symbols designating some less obvious reality to be grasped by either mystical or philosophical insight. Both Paul and the rabbis appear confident that the scriptures have some rather clear and direct message, while for Philo their meaning is of a more recondite character and requires a unique insight or inspiration as the prerequisite of interpretation. Still, in just this fact there is a point of contact between Philo and the New Testament. For both, a proper perspective is required before the scriptures can be understood. In the New Testament, of course, this perspective is given in the central, saving event. In Philo it is less concrete, but nonetheless real. Whoever does not read the Old Testament by the light of that mystical and divine revelation which Philo associates with *λόγος*, *νοῦς*, or *φῶς* will not find its more important meaning. Like the rabbinic literature, however, Philo's writings lack the New Testament's emphasis upon the prophetic and eschatological dimensions of the Hebrew Scriptures.³⁸ For Philo the necessary perspective on the Old Testament is not so integrally related to eschatology and historical revelation.

38. Thus C. F. D. Moule in his important article, "Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse," *NTS*, 14 (1967/68), 311, points out that there is in Philo virtually no use of the *πληροῦν*-words so common in the New Testament.

The most striking similarities to the New Testament's use of the Old are probably to be found in the Qumran Scrolls. The affinity between the use of the Old Testament in the scrolls and in the New Testament doubtless hinges upon the fact that both the Qumran community and the primitive church saw in their own times and among themselves the fulfillment of biblical prophecy.³⁹ One might characterize both the New Testament and the Qumran use of the scriptures as historical, prophetic, or eschatological. It is historical in the sense that the historical and revelatory situation in which the community finds itself is the indispensable ingredient of the hermeneutical process; prophetic in that the scriptures are seen as written about or directed toward the events transpiring in and around the community;⁴⁰ eschatological in that these events are understood as the culmination, or the anticipation of the culmination, of God's sovereign activity as Lord of history. It is no

39. Cf. Herbert Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966), 2: 306. For a summary of the literature on the use and exposition of the Scriptures at Qumran, see pp. 301-25. A brief, but illuminating discussion of Qumran biblical interpretation is to be found in Géza Vermès, "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting," *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society*, 6 (1966-68; *Dead Sea Scroll Studies 1969*), 84-97. Cf. also the substantial work of O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, no. 6 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960), and L. H. Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher," *Revue de Qumran*, 3 (1961), 323-64.

With good reason Moule, "Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament," p. 311, speaks of a greater sense of completeness in the New Testament than in the Qumran sources, a situation doubtless indicative of the difference between Qumran and New Testament eschatology.

40. In this connection F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959), pp. 67 f., compares I Pet. 1:10-12 and 1 Qp Hab. vii. 1-5.

According to I Pet. 1:10-12a, "The prophets who prophesied of the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired about this salvation; they inquired what person or time was indicated by the Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glory. It was revealed to them that they were not serving themselves, but you. . ."

The Qumran community (1 Qp Hab. vii. 1-5) had a similar view: "God commanded Habakkuk to write the things that were coming upon the last generation, but the fulfillment of the epoch he did not make known to him. And as for the words, 'so he may run may read,' their interpretation concerns the teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets."

In the latter text Vermès, "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture," p. 91, sees the following assumptions or principles of Qumran prophetic exegesis at work: the mysterious character of the prophetic word; its reference to end-events; the imminence of those events for the contemporary generation; the revelation of the mysteries in question to the Teacher of Righteousness.

coincidence that both the Qumran community and the primitive church saw in Isa. 40:3 a direct command or prophecy relating to their own times (1QS viii, 13-16; cf. Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4-6; John 1:23). Nor is it a matter of chance that both the Qumran commentator and the apostle Paul saw in Hab. 2:4 a reference to faith in their own founder or Lord (1Qp Hab. viii, 1-3; cf. Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11). Moreover, similar patterns in the use of the Old Testament emerge in both the scrolls and the New Testament, despite the differences in literary genre. (There are, for example, no biblical commentaries, strictly speaking, in the New Testament.) Joseph Fitzmyer has classified the non-*pesher* scroll quotations into four basic types: the literal or historical class, in which the original sense of the text is preserved; the modernized texts, which are applied to new situations in the life of the community (Hab. 2:4 in 1Qp Hab. viii, 1-3 would presumably fit this category also); the accommodated texts, which are taken out of context or essentially modified; and the eschatological texts, in which an original promise or threat is applied to the yet outstanding culmination of history toward which the community is pointing. Fitzmyer⁴¹ sees these same basic types occurring frequently in the New Testament, although he wisely hesitates to claim that these categories exhaust the full range of the use of the Old Testament by New Testament writers.⁴² Nevertheless, in view of the similarities in eschatology and historical situation, it is not surprising that a related similarity in the ways of adopting and adapting the Scriptures can also be perceived.

In a more technical vein, recent research has also uncovered some striking similarities between the text-form of the New Testament quotations and those of Qumran.⁴³ The investigation and comparison of these text-forms may prove to be an interesting and significant aspect of the study of the Old Testament text in Qumran. The intriguing question stimulating—or plaguing—such investigation will be whether affinities in such text-forms between

41. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations," pp. 297-333.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 330, esp. n. 2.

43. J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, no. 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), discerns evidence of a relationship between the Qumran text and Old Testament quotations in the New, particularly in the speeches of Acts; see pp. 17-26, 41 ff., 78 ff.

the New Testament and Qumran mean that the New Testament writers or speakers knew the Hebrew text in forms similar to those known at Qumran or that the Qumran text-form or something similar underlies the Greek translations employed by the New Testament writers. Already de Waard has attacked the well-known view that the speeches of Acts are Luke's composition with the argument that affinities with Qumran text-forms indicate that an Aramaic tradition at least stands as the basis of the speeches.⁴⁴

Although the early Christian appropriation of the Old Testament cannot be explained solely on the basis of documents of contemporary Judaism, indispensable light is shed upon the New Testament by them. Clearly they show that the ways in which the New Testament writers put the Old Testament to use are not at all unprecedented. While this usage may seem at places arbitrary enough, it is by and large neither more nor less arbitrary than the contemporary use of the Old Testament among Jews. Against this background it is to be understood and appreciated.⁴⁵

THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

The use of the Old Testament by Jesus

Is the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament grounded upon its prior use in the primitive church? Most critics would surely answer affirmatively, regardless of how many reservations they might hold regarding some recent theories of its use. Is the primitive church's use of the Old Testament grounded upon Jesus' own understanding and interpretation of the Old Testament? On this question there is not even the most general kind of consensus. Only sheer temerity would deny that Jesus was familiar

44. Pp. 78 ff.

45 A rapidly developing interest in Jewish exegetical techniques in the period of Christian origins is strongly reflected in recent research and publication. Along with the earlier work of Doeve, Vermès and Borgen mentioned elsewhere, the following recent articles exemplify this interest: R. Le Déaut's review of A. G. Wright's *The Literary Genre of Midrash* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1967), translated and published as "Apropos of a Definition of Midrash" in *Interpretation*, 25 (1971), 259-82; J. W. Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yellammedenu Form," *NTS*, 14 (1967/68), 96-111; E. Earle Ellis, "Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations," *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, ed. Ellis and M. Wilcox (Edinburgh: Clark, 1969), pp. 61-69; *idem*, "Midraschartige Züge in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte," *ZNTW*, 62 (1971), 94-104.

with the Old Testament, regarded it as God's word, and reflected upon his own mission in the light of a religious perspective fundamentally informed by it. On the other hand, there is a real problem as to the extent to which the use of the Old Testament in the New—even in the Gospels—reflects directly or indirectly Jesus' own meditation over, and interpretation of, the Scriptures.

To attempt to adjudicate this question is too great a task for a general essay such as this. But since the question cannot ultimately be skirted, it is therefore incumbent upon us at least to describe the present state of affairs and to venture an opinion concerning it. While there may be a great variety of viewpoints on this question, there seem to have developed two basic positions around which, or between which, others take their place. For convenience we may call these the conservative and the radical views, recognizing the lack of precision inherent in such a characterization. According to the conservative view, represented particularly by such luminaries as Dodd, the two Mansons, and Hoskyns, Jesus very carefully thought out his mission and message in reflection upon the Old Testament, and his line of thought can be recovered from the New Testament (and the Old). This view has had considerable popularity also in America. According to the more radical position current in the Bultmann school and espoused by a number of other scholars, including some in the English-speaking world, the Old Testament quotations in the Gospels are largely the result of the interpretative work of the early Christian church, which used the Old Testament to prove the messiahship of Jesus and to make other points in controversy with Judaism. Bultmann's view that Jesus was a first-century Palestinian rabbi as well as an apocalyptic prophet would seem to imply that Jesus was an interpreter of the will of God found in the Scriptures. Bultmann does not deny this, but maintains a profound skepticism as to the possibility of recovering Jesus' own interpretations of the Scriptures from the New Testament, which is "Christian" in a sense in which Jesus was not.⁴⁶

46. Bultmann's own position on Jesus' use of the Old Testament is implicit in his *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten Testaments*, n.s. 12; 4th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), although he does not set it forth in a comprehensive statement. On pp. 51 f., however, he indicates how in the context of *Streitgespräche* Old Testament words are attributed to Jesus, without denying that some may actually go back to him (see also pp. 272 ff.,

These two positions are closely but not inextricably bound to the question of whether Jesus understood his earthly ministry as messianic. The synoptic Gospels, beginning with Mark, certainly interpret this ministry in that way in accord with their Christian faith. Yet the problems of taking the Gospels', particularly Mark's portrayal, as historical fact have often been pointed out.⁴⁷ Certainly they bear the imprint of faith's later interpretation, whatever the facts may have been. If one accepts the Gospels' portrayal as basically historical, one is likely also to take seriously the several hints and indications that Jesus performed his messianic role in fulfillment of the Scriptures, especially insofar as he took it upon himself to suffer and die. Thus those who accept the Gospel picture of a deliberately messianic ministry are inclined also to believe that Jesus thought of his suffering as a fulfillment of Scripture, and particularly a fulfillment or representation of the Suffering Servant motif of Isaiah. Those who are skeptical of Jesus' explicitly messianic consciousness—or at least skeptical of recovering it—tend to regard the Scripture fulfillment motif as a theologoumenon of the earliest church and to question the view that Jesus thought of himself as Suffering Servant.

In this connection, it is remarkable that there has lately been some breaking of ranks, especially on the conservative side. Two British scholars who have come to maturation in America have in recent years gone over to the more radical (or Bultmannian) posi-

302 ff., and 329). On Bultmann's view of Jesus as rabbi see *Jesus and the Word*, trans. L. P. Smith and E. H. Lantero (New York: Scribner's, 1934), pp. 57 ff.; for his understanding of the relation between the historical Jesus and the Christian kerygma consult his *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Scribner's, 1951), 1: 3-52.

47. Perhaps most memorable is Albert Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, trans. William Montgomery (New York: Macmillan, 1954), pp. 330 ff., essentially agreeing with W. Wrede's *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), esp. pp. 9-22. The most thoroughgoing critique of the Marcan framework is K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1919). The difficulties of taking the Marcan framework as historical have been reiterated by D. E. Nineham, "The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel—An Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis," in his *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), and J. M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, no. 25 (London: SCM, 1959), pp. 35 ff. For a brief summary of a wide consensus of opinion concerning the nature of the Marcan framework by a "conservative" scholar, see Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. Norman Perrin (New York: Scribner's, 1966), pp. 91 f., esp. p. 92, n. 1.

tion, namely, R. H. Fuller and Norman Perrin.⁴⁸ Moreover, the view once common among English scholars that Jesus thought of himself in terms of the Isaianic Suffering Servant has been subjected to searching scrutiny by the Englishwoman M. D. Hooker, who has pronounced a negative judgment upon it.⁴⁹ Moreover, Miss Hooker's negative conclusions are now reflected in the work of the distinguished British scholar, C. K. Barrett.⁵⁰ Also, the Anglican Barnabas Lindars, whose stimulating monograph on the use of the Old Testament in the New generally takes up and affirms the earlier work of Dodd, discreetly demurs at accepting the latter's suggestion that Jesus is the originator of the exegetical methodology of the New Testament writers.⁵¹

The present state of affairs admits of few unexceptionable generalizations on the question of Jesus' use of the Old Testament beyond the acknowledgment that he in fact interpreted it. Thus scholars of diverse perspectives such as W. D. Davies and Rudolf Bultmann can agree in describing Jesus as a rabbi.⁵² While recent

48. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Scribner's, 1965), *passim*, but especially pp. 108 f. and pp. 18 f., where Fuller adumbrates his tendency to ascribe scripture fulfillment to the early church. Perrin's most recent statement of his position is to be found in *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967). He does not deny that Jesus used the Old Testament (p. 66) but, like Fuller, tends to ascribe Old Testament exegetical work to the traditions of the early church (pp. 27 f., 176 f., 185). Both Fuller and Perrin have departed from the predominant Anglo-Saxon affirmation of the explicitly messianic consciousness of Jesus.

49. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament* (London: S.P.C.K., 1959). Miss Hooker therefore brings into question the view of the distinguished Göttingen New Testament scholar Joachim Jeremias that Jesus identified with the Servant; cf. Jeremias and Walther Zimmerli, *The Servant of God*, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, no. 20 (London: SCM, 1957). Jeremias has replied in a review of Hooker, *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 11 (1960), 140-44, and the continuation of the discussion scarcely permits us to treat the matter as settled.

50. *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition* (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), pp. 39 f.

51. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), p. 30.

52. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, esp. pp. 57 ff., and W. D. Davies, *The Sermon on the Mount* (New York: Oxford, 1966), pp. 129 ff. and 154 ff. A helpful inventory and initial discussion of the Old Testament in the sayings of Jesus has been made by T. W. Manson, "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 34 (1951/52), 312-32. Two more recent works, Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, (see above, n. 48) and L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par*, *Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series*, no. 1 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), in rather different ways undertake investigations of Old Testament material attributed to Jesus. While Perrin's work follows well-established form- and redaction-critical lines, Hartman concentrates on the relation of the material in question to Jewish

criticism manifests a discernible trend toward greater recognition of the role of the early church in the development of Christology generally, as well as in the christological use of the Old Testament, it scarcely justifies the assumption that Jesus did not reflect upon his own mission in light of the Scriptures. At least his authoritative interpretation of Scripture implies a uniquely authoritative, if not an explicitly messianic, self-consciousness. The problem of Jesus' use of the Old Testament, particularly in connection with his own self-understanding, is difficult for almost the same reason that the problem of his messianic self-consciousness is difficult. For at points in the Gospel where Jesus speaks in terms later employed by the Christian community it is often hard to decide what, if anything, goes back to the historical Jesus. This is especially true if the critic eschews both the orthodox and the critically orthodox ways of cutting the Gordian knot, that is, either, to maintain that the Gospels accurately portray Jesus' own mind or, alternatively, to regard all explicit—and some implicit—expressions of Christology (or messianology) as the work of the later church. In this connection Jesus' use of the Old Testament might profitably be made the subject of further investigation, since it represents an important instance in which an external criterion, i. e. the textual traditions of the Old Testament, can serve as a check and a guide for the judgments of the critic. (For example, an Old Testament reference reflecting the Hebrew text or the Targums will presumably have a higher claim to authenticity than one reproducing the Septuagint.) Naturally, the investigator would do well to begin with those citations which do not relate directly to the questions of Jesus' messianic consciousness and his death and thereby attempt to establish a basis for further, more difficult, judgments.

For our present purposes the obvious impossibility of adjudicating the questions and issues surrounding Jesus' use of the Old Testament is not an insurmountable obstacle. Although this is an important area for research and theological reflection, it is nevertheless possible and legitimate to circumvent it in order to deal

exegetical or midrashic techniques. In a similar fashion Birger Gerhardsson has investigated the temptation narratives in *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1-11 & Par): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash* (Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series, no. 2; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966).

with the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament books. For most of what can be said on that subject will stand whatever may be decided about historical origins, whether with Jesus or the early church.

The use of the Old Testament in the primitive church

The use of the Old Testament in the earliest preaching is amply attested in the Books of Acts. While the role of Luke in the composition of the speeches was certainly considerable, recent research tends to confirm the judgment of Martin Dibelius, as well as Dodd, that they are based on earlier tradition.⁵³ That this should be the case may also be inferred from I Cor. 15:3 f., where Paul recites the basic elements of the kerygmatic tradition, which are affirmed to be—doubtless in the tradition as well as in Paul's own view—"according to the scriptures." The way in which not only direct scripture quotations but also implicit ones and allusions are imbedded in the narratives of the Gospels, especially the Passion narratives, also attests the widespread and primitive use of the Old Testament in the early church. The fact of this extensive use of the Old Testament is relatively easy to confirm. All one really has to do is read the New Testament. The purpose, manner, and origin of this usage are another matter.

Whoever addresses himself to this series of problems has eventually to deal with the matter of the exact source of the Old Testament material in the New. Since the invention of printing in relatively modern times the availability, transport, and storage of the Bible has not been a significant difficulty for Christians, Jews, and biblical scholars. But prior to the printing press books were relatively scarce and literally weighty, so that carrying around the Old Testament would have been a considerable job. This consideration alone might have prompted itinerant Christian mis-

53. Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. B. L. Woolf (New York: Scribner's, 1935), pp. 15 ff., and C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (New York: Harper & Row, 1936), pp. 17 ff. More recently de Waard has argued for primitive tradition in the speeches on the basis of affinities with the Qumran Old Testament textual tradition (see above, n. 42). Lindars, pp. 38-45, shows the traditional character of the Old Testament quotations, particularly in the Pentecost speech of Peter. Cf. also Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), especially pp. 49, 180-86.

sionaries to make notes on the Old Testament texts most useful in proclaiming and proving the truth of the Gospel. On grounds of other and more scholarly evidence Rendel Harris several decades ago suggested that they did just that. On the basis of evidence adduced from the New Testament, patristic, and later documents, he propounded his theory of a "testimony book" of Old Testament quotations widely used in the early church.⁵⁴ Harris began from the fact that there exists a third-century collection of testimonies attributed to Cyprian. On the basis of such criteria as recurring peculiar texts, sequences of texts, erroneous ascriptions of authorship, editorial prefaces, comments or conclusions, especially polemical ones—the testimony book was originally directed against the Jews—Harris discerned traces of the testimony book in Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Justin, not to mention Bar Salibi and Matthew the Monk! Turning to the New Testament he found there similar evidences of a testimony book: the same passage is frequently quoted by New Testament writers; sometimes it appears in an identical or similar form differing from the Septuagint; certain passages appear in combination in more than one New Testament text (notably Isa. 28:16 and 8:14, in I Pet. 2:8 ff. and Rom. 9:32 f.); sometimes passages are ascribed to the wrong Old Testament book (the famous instance of the Malachi passage ascribed to Isaiah in Mark 1:2, 3; there is also the problem of the Zechariah quotation attributed to Jeremiah in Matt. 27:9); occasionally passages seem to have been brought together on the basis of some key word (e. g. the passages governed by the term *stone* in I Pet. 2:6–8; Rom. 9:32 f.; Mark 12:10–11 ff.; Acts 4:11).

Harris argued his case with great deftness and erudition. His proposal was taken very seriously in almost all quarters and accepted in some.⁵⁵ For most, however, it remained in the kind of

54. J. Rendel Harris, with the assistance of Vacher Burch, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916). Harris's book is not easily available, but a brief summary is to be found in C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), pp. 23 ff.

55. It should be noted, however, that Harris's proposal was not without its forerunners; for example, A. Freiherr von Ungern-Sternberg, *Der traditionelle alttestamentliche Schriftbeweis "de Christo" und "de evangelio" in der alten Kirche bis zur Zeit Eusebs von Caesarea* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1913), argues for the existence of a testimony tradition with roots in the New Testament community, but not for a pre-New Testament testimony book. Earlier Edwin Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press,

limbo to which the proposals of very learned men are often relegated for lack of a competent critic, until the publication in 1957 of C. H. Dodd's slim but important volume *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology*. Dodd acknowledged the significance of the hypothesis set forth by Harris insofar as it underlined the evidence for the primitive and traditional character of the use of the Old Testament in the New, as well as the widespread agreement among early Christians as to the importance and application of certain scriptures. For Dodd the most primitive Christian tradition was the kerygma,⁵⁶ the generally uniform announcement of the grace of God in Christ. But this aboriginal proclamation was, according to Dodd, given its original significance and exposition through the Old Testament scriptures. By the time of the earliest New Testament authors much of the fundamental exegesis and interpretation of the Scriptures had already been done and could be presupposed as agreed upon. Dodd points to the fact that the Lo-Ammi passage from Hosea (2:23) and the Isaiah passages concerning the remnant (10:22 f.; cf. 1:9), the foundation stone of Zion (28:16), and the stone of stumbling (8:14) are in Romans (9–11) all assumed to apply to the situation brought about by the coming of Christ. Moreover, all these passages save one are used, under the same assumption, in I Peter.⁵⁷

Despite his recognition of the significance of Harris's proposal, Dodd nevertheless rejected the testimony book hypothesis. While in his view the same Old Testament passages occur in different, and apparently unrelated, New Testament books with significant frequency, the recurrence of common textual variations, the same combinations of passages and the like are not so frequent as to

1889), p. 203, suggested that Greek-speaking Jews probably produced propaganda manuals consisting of extracts from the Old Testament.

Harris's proposal of a Testimony Book has been accepted more or less completely by D. Plooi, *Studies in the Testimony Book* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1932), and by B. P. W. Stather Hunt, *Primitive Gospel Sources* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1951), who makes it the basis of his research into the Gospels. Robert A. Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and the 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis," *JBL*, 79 (1960), 336–50, does not find support for Harris's theory in the Epistle of Barnabas, but rather discovers evidence for the existence of a variety of briefer "testimony note sheets" (cf. 4Q Test).

56. *The Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 7 ff.; cf. *According to the Scriptures*, p. 12, n. 1.

57. *According to the Scriptures*, p. 23.

justify the testimony book hypothesis. In other words, the kind of evidence that scarcely admits of any other explanation than a common, written source is too sparse to support the hypothesis of an extensive testimony book. Aside from this important fact, the lack of concrete evidence for the existence of such a book in the first two centuries makes the hypothesis questionable. So widely-known a book would surely have been widely and explicitly cited.⁵⁸ One could even imagine that it would have been incorporated into the New Testament.

Dodd seeks, however, to incorporate the valid aspects of Harris's testimony book theory into his own counter-proposal. Not a fixed book of Old Testament quotations, but a nonetheless real, if largely oral, consensus concerning the important Old Testament texts lies behind the New Testament, and is reflected in the repeated use of the same and neighboring texts in the various books.⁵⁹ Dodd adduces about fifteen important texts which are used more than once in the New Testament. He then shows how these and related or contiguous texts fall into three groupings (apocalyptic-eschatological scriptures, scriptures of the New Israel, scriptures of the Servant of the Lord and Righteous Sufferer) which taken together form the Bible of the early church. He also relates the use of the Old Testament to the principle doctrines of early Christian theology (the church, the messianic titles, the death of Christ).⁶⁰ Further, Dodd maintains that there was agreement not only on the choice and extent of scriptural texts, but also on the methods of exegesis and other uses of those texts. Isolated quotations are generally not intended as proof-texts, but as pointers to whole Old Testament contexts, knowledge of which is assumed. This consistent usage of the Old Testament, which at bottom was intended to manifest the ground of the Christian message in "the determinate counsel of God," is common to all the major portions of the New Testament. As the basic interpretative mode of the early Christian kerygma, it is the substructure of New Testament theology.⁶¹

In opposition to much modern critical opinion concerning the

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 26 f.

59. *Ibid.*, pp. 28 ff.

60. *Ibid.*, chap. 4, "Fundamentals of Christian Theology."

61. *Ibid.*, pp. 126 f.

use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers, Dodd contends that it was not fundamentally arbitrary: "In general . . . the writers of the New Testament, in making use of passages from the Old Testament, remain true to the main intention of their writers."⁶²

Dodd's work received a favorable reception, especially in the English-speaking world,⁶³ and stimulated renewed interest in this aspect of biblical study. Nevertheless, some doubt remains as to whether all his major contentions have been equally well established. Since the discovery of relatively brief collections of Testimonia at Qumran (4Q Test; cf. 4Q Flor), Dodd's arguments against Harris's testimony book hypothesis may stand in need of some qualification.⁶⁴ Whether Dodd's own proposal of a consensus or established tradition is less vulnerable to criticism is a matter of debate. Over a decade ago A. C. Sundberg registered a strong demurrer, pointing out that 42 percent of the Old Testament chapters cited in the New are cited by more than one author, including 71 percent of the 56 chapters of Isaiah that are cited and one-third of the Psalms.⁶⁵ Against such a statistical background, instances of the use of the same or proximate Old Testament texts in different New Testament books seem less impressive as evidence of a common tradition. Moreover, Sundberg maintained on the basis of another statistical reckoning that those books which on Dodd's accounting comprise the Bible of the early church do not actually predominate in the entire New Testament.⁶⁶ While Sundberg's statistics seem at first to be devastating to Dodd's theory, one must bear in mind that the latter's proposal was not based primarily on a statistical survey of individual instances, but involved judgments about the ways in which portions of the Old Testament were used repeatedly to confirm certain central doctrines of primitive Christianity. Additionally, however, Sundberg has questioned Dodd's contention that most Old Testament quotations in the New are dependent on

62. *Ibid.*, p. 130.

63. Cf. Lindars, p. 14; Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, p. 68.

64. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "4Q Testimonia and the New Testament," *Theological Studies*, 15 (1957), 513-37.

65. "On Testimonies," *Novum Testamentum*, 3 (1959), 268-81. Cf. the negative comments of Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1965), pp. 32 f.

66. These statistical phenomena are displayed in two tables; Suhl, pp. 272 f.

their Old Testament context for proper understanding⁶⁷ and denied that it is possible to discern an agreed-upon or uniform method of exegesis. Divergent uses of the same text argue against the theory of a widespread and primitive common exegetical method. Concerning these matters it is difficult to make an overall judgment, but Sundberg at least points to aspects of Dodd's position which have not as yet been clearly established.

The function of the Old Testament in early Christian preaching and teaching

The question of the exact source of most, or even a great many, of the Old Testament quotations in the New may not be amenable to solution by any comprehensive theory. Dodd's approach is not so neat as Harris's, for example, in view of its exclusion of the testimony book hypothesis, and really leaves undecided the exact nature of the sources upon which the New Testament writers drew. Interest has actually been moving in the direction of Dodd's own principal focus upon the manner and purpose of the appropriation of the Old Testament. Not surprisingly, Dodd contended that the primal function of the Old Testament in primitive Christianity was to support the assertions of the kerygma—originally, of course, in a Jewish context—to show that they were in accord with the determinate council of God. Allowing for legitimate debate over the content and possible variety of the kerygma, one must at the same time acknowledge the fundamental rightness of Dodd's proposal. Beyond this, however, much remains to be clarified concerning the manner and motivations of the use of the Old Testament in the developing church, which had many needs and functions other than the promulgation and demonstration of its missionary preaching, important as that remained.

Two subsequent and rather more technical works have elaborated or modified Dodd's position. Krister Stendahl analyzed a special class of Old Testament quotations in Matthew with a view to recovering their function and *Sitz im Leben* there and in the pre-

67. On the question of "respect for context" in the use of the Old Testament in the synoptics, see R. T. Mead, "A Dissenting Opinion about Respect for Context in Old Testament Quotations," *NTS* 10 (1963/64); 279-89, who takes issue with S. L. Edgar, "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament," *NTS*, 9 (1962/63), 55-62, and denies that such respect characterizes instances of Old Testament citation attributed to Jesus.

Matthean tradition, and Barnabas Lindars refined Dodd's position in attempting to account for the fact (pointed out by Sundberg) that the same Old Testament quotations are often put to different uses in the New Testament. Since Stendahl's work is much more circumscribed in focus, we shall consider it in connection with the use of the Old Testament in the Gospel according to Matthew. Lindars's work, however, takes up and develops the proposals of Dodd directly and comprehensively.

Accepting Dodd's repudiation of Harris's hypothesis, Lindars undertook to refine Dodd's rather general proposals concerning the use of the Old Testament in primitive Christianity. It is hardly possible to do justice to Lindars's work apart from a consideration of the detail and nuances of his arguments. Nevertheless, the main thrust of his investigation is clear enough. Beginning from Dodd's insights that early Christians used the Old Testament to support and defend the kerygma and that the blocks of material from which the specific quotations are drawn are of very great importance for the understanding of their appropriation and function, Lindars moved forward along lines suggested by the Qumran scrolls and particularly Stendahl's work *The School of St. Matthew* to formulate an initial conception of early Christian exegesis.⁶⁸ Qumran *peshet* exegesis, in which texts and textual traditions were chosen and even modified to fit the theological needs and historical situation of the community, provides a fruitful model for understanding the development of Old Testament exegesis within the primitive church. (The relevance of Qumran to Matthew has been suggested by Stendahl, who proposed that similar exegesis is to be found also in John,⁶⁹ and Ellis adduced evidence for the same phenomenon in or behind Paul's use of the Old Testament.⁷⁰) The analogy of Qumran provides historical precedent for the kind of development which Lindars projected for primitive Christianity, a development which involves modification of the Old Testament text, but more importantly, a shift in application of those texts in accord with the changing situation of the church.⁷¹ This shift in

68. Cf. Lindars, pp. 13 ff.

69. Pp. 162 f.

70. Pp. 139 ff.

71. On modification of the text, see Lindars, pp. 17, 24 ff.; on shift of application see pp. 17 ff. Lindars recognizes the difficulty of moving too quickly from the Qumran *peshet* model to New Testament exegesis of the Old.

application is generally a departure from an earlier evidenced or putative use of the Old Testament to support or defend the kerygma. The presumptive occasion for such a shift is the need for a relevant apologetic to meet new situations.⁷² For example, Isaiah 53 was almost surely used at a very early time in connection with Jesus' Passion. But explicit citations of it in the New Testament and other early literature have to do with his miracles (Matt. 8:17) or with the lesson of humility that may be drawn from his silent suffering (I Clement 16).⁷³

As will be apparent, Lindars's view of the early Christian use of the Old Testament is more complex than C. H. Dodd's, for developments in the use of texts are described in great detail. Indeed, he sees a development within the primitive kerygma concomitant with, and related to, the use of the Old Testament. Fundamental in his view is the proclamation that Jesus has been raised from the dead and its corollary, deduced with the help of Old Testament texts, that he is the Messiah. How this inference was drawn is explained by Lindars with particular reference to the use of Ps. 16:8-11 in the Pentecostal speech of Peter (Acts 2:22-36).⁷⁴ Although the Resurrection itself was proclaimed as the literal fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, this most primitive use of the Old Testament is often submerged in the New. For example, Hos. 6:2, which was likely used as the scripture proof of the tradition of Jesus' Resurrection on the third day, is not explicitly cited in the New Testament.⁷⁵ No sooner was Jesus proclaimed as raised from the dead and as the Messiah than it became necessary to explain his ignominious death. Within a Jewish context the idea of a crucified Messiah rejected by his own people was, as Paul recognized (I Cor. 1:23), an offense. The early Christians' response to the objection elicited by this state of affairs was the development of a Passion apologetic, by which they sought to show that the

72. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

73. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-22.

74. *Ibid.*, pp. 36 ff. Recently, H. W. Boers has sought to discern in Psalm 16 the scriptural basis for the disciples' reflection upon Jesus' death, which in turn created the psychological state of expectation leading to the resurrection experiences: see "Psalm 16 and the Historical Origin of the Christian Faith," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 60 (1969), 105-10.

75. Lindars, pp. 59 ff.

suffering of the Messiah was anticipated, and therefore vindicated, by Scripture. In this Passion apologetic such passages as Isaiah 53; Psalms 22, 31, 34, 41, 69, and 109; and the book of Zechariah played a prominent role. Lindars endeavors to show through close examination of quotations in the New Testament how these passages were used in the Passion apologetic. In some cases this usage must be inferred from such subtle matters as interpretative variations in the text, especially when the New Testament contains no instances of the use of a given quotation in direct connection with the Passion. This Passion apologetic was in no sense an afterthought, presupposing the developed *theologia crucis*. Rather, it was the seed-bed in which the doctrine of the atonement, already stated in the tradition behind I Cor. 15:3, grew.⁷⁶

Only after the application of the Old Testament to the Resurrection and death of Jesus did attention turn to his earthly ministry. Then the Old Testament (Ps. 2:7; Isa. 42:1) was first used in connection with Jesus' baptism (cf. Mark 1:11) to help demonstrate the messianic character of his entire ministry.⁷⁷ A similar motivation helps explain the conflation of these same texts in the transfiguration scene (Mark 9:7). What Lindars calls the "apologetic of response" grew up in direct relation to the portrayal of the earthly ministry as the arena of messianic revelation, for the latter naturally raises the question of the culpability of those who fail to recognize the messianic character of Jesus' work.⁷⁸ This question tends ultimately to be resolved in the direction of the theory of a deliberate policy of self-reservation or concealment on the part of Jesus, the messianic secret.⁷⁹ In the process, however, the Scriptures (e. g. Isa. 6:9; 28:16) are adduced to show that the rejection of Jesus by the greater part of his people in no wise affects adversely his messianic claim, but is rather the fulfillment of Scripture.

The final chapters of Lindars's book are devoted to a consideration of the Old Testament in the development of the tradition concerning Jesus' birthplace (chap. 5), quotations in Paul (chap. 6),

76. *Ibid.*, p. 134: "Atonement theology and Passion apologetic are worked out together, and naturally the same scriptures are useful for both."

77. *Ibid.*, pp. 138 ff.

78. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 155, 187 f.

79. *Ibid.*, pp. 158 f.

and in the early church generally, especially in Matthew and John (chap. 7). He finds that the tradition of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem has actually replaced an older tradition of his origin in Nazareth. Although Paul's use of the Old Testament has its place in the line of the church's exegetical work, Lindars finds that "he does not reproduce the christological texts nor argue that Jesus is the Messiah. This is simply taken for granted as an assured fact."⁸⁰ Strikingly, he maintains that the use of the Old Testament quotations in John represents more nearly the older apologetic tradition than in Matthew, and that the latter really does not understand the *peshet* quotations which Stendahl ascribed to the Matthean school.⁸¹

The most notable aspect of this important book is Lindars's effort comprehensively to grasp the Old Testament quotations in the New in the light of their *Sitz im Leben* in the development of early Christian preaching and theology. Whether the picture which Lindars has drawn, admittedly in a hypothetical way,⁸² will stand the test of further investigation remains to be seen. Many of his individual exegetical insights are extremely perceptive and suggestive, while others are somewhat conjectural. But the attempt to probe into and behind the New Testament in order to trace the development of primitive Christian reflection in and through the Old Testament quotations is an exceedingly stimulating exercise and one that should prove quite fruitful. The reader familiar with form criticism will doubtless notice how Lindars's work seems to confirm the perspectives and insights of that discipline. To what extent this is an independent corroboration of the basic insights of form criticism is, however, difficult to say, since Lindars to some extent shares its basic presuppositions and methods. The idea that the use of the Old Testament in the New is fundamentally apologetic will doubtless bear further scrutiny, although there is little doubt of the importance of the apologetic factor, especially in the original Jewish milieu. That further work remains to be done in this obscure but important area scarcely needs to be said, but the

80. *Ibid.*, p. 247.

81. *Ibid.*, pp. 259 ff.

82. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

contributions of Harris, Dodd, and Lindars certainly provide a basis and stimulus for future investigations.

THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT BY THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS

In the preceding section we have surveyed the problem of the use of the Old Testament in primitive Christianity, focusing attention particularly on the works of Dodd and Lindars. The use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers is a distinguishable, if finally an inseparable, question, for the history of the use and exegesis of the Old Testament by the early church antedates its appropriation in the earliest New Testament documents by at least two decades.⁸³ Therefore the texts of the Old Testament as appropriated by the New Testament writers may well have been understood, interpreted, and even altered, along lines already laid down by traditional exegesis. As we have already noted, Dodd pointed to this phenomenon, Lindars made it the basis for his study, and Stendahl showed its peculiar relevance to Matthew. Recently Edwin Freed has investigated the use of the Old Testament in John to ascertain its relation to an earlier textual and exegetical tradition,⁸⁴ while E. Earle Ellis has made proposals along these lines with respect to Paul.⁸⁵ Although the use of the Old Testament in the New must always be seen against this background, it is also clear that various New Testament writers understand and make use of the Old Testament in distinctive ways. Our purpose here is not to engage in the kind of thoroughgoing consideration or exegetical study that might be expected to advance our knowledge, but rather to point to the more salient, and perhaps in some instances obvious, features of the use of the Old Testament by the major New Testament authors or traditions in the light of recent research.

83. I and II Thessalonians which may be earlier scarcely come into consideration, since, with the exception of II Thessalonians 2, Paul makes little use of the Old Testament in them.

84. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, no. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1965).

85. Pp. 139 ff.

Paul

The ground-breaking work on Paul's use of the Old Testament is Otto Michel's *Paulus und seine Bibel* (1929).⁸⁶ It was followed a decade later by Bonsirven's exhaustive comparison of Pauline usage with rabbinic exegesis. More recently Ellis has brought matters up to date with his very useful book, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (1957).

There is little question of the importance of the Old Testament in the development of Paul's thought. Despite the absence of Old Testament quotations from I Thessalonians, Philippians, and much of I and II Corinthians, Harnack's view that Paul valued the Old Testament only for polemical use against Jews or Jewish-Christian opponents is no longer widely held.⁸⁷ Moreover, one may be quite certain that Paul's exegesis finds its place in his own world, with real and obvious connections with his contemporaries, within the church and outside. While he differs from the rabbis in his total perspective on the Old Testament,⁸⁸ this is rather because of his different eschatological and christological perspective than on account of a deliberately different method of dealing with scripture. Victor P. Furnish, who is disinclined to view Paul as a rabbi,⁸⁹ concedes Paul's kinship with the rabbinic style of biblical exegesis.⁹⁰ In all probability, however, Paul's peculiar slant on scripture is more closely paralleled in the Qumran community. Not only the *pesher* exegesis,⁹¹ but the conviction that the Old Testament finds its fulfillment in a new event or series of events which have occurred

86. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, no. 18 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929). Although Bultmann's review in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 58 (1933), 157-59, was scarcely friendly, he at least granted the value of the volume as a summation of scholarship.

87. "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Sitzung der philosophisch-historischen Klasse, 1928, pp. 124-41. Yet Harnack himself did not doubt the importance of the scriptures in Paul's own thought. His theory applied only to Paul's missionary churches.

88. Cf., in addition to Bonsirven, Victor P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), pp. 33 f.

89. Contrast W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 2nd ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1955).

90. Pp. 33, 40; cf. Furnish's brief but useful treatment of the Old Testament as a source of Paul's ethical teaching (pp. 28-34, 42 f.).

91. Ellis, pp. 139 ff. Such exegesis probably indicates Paul's connection with earlier exegetical tradition.

or are about to occur, is a common factor binding Qumran exegesis to that of Paul and much of the New Testament. But despite the similarities, which are related to their prophetic-eschatological viewpoint, Paul's Christology gives to his exegesis an emphasis on present eschatological fulfillment absent from Qumran.

At the acceptable time I have listened to you,
and helped you on the day of salvation.

So writes Second Isaiah (49:8), and Paul (II Cor. 6:2) comments, "Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation."⁹²

Paul's use of the Old Testament may be summarized under four heads. First, and most important, there is his general prophetic and kerygmatic understanding of the Old Testament as the precursor, prefiguration, and promise of the Gospel. Thus the Gospel was "promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scriptures" (Rom. 1:2) and "the law and the prophets bear witness to it" (Rom. 3:21). As we have already noted in the case of the quotation from II Cor. 6:1 f., the Gospel can be announced in the language of the Old Testament. Moreover, Adam is said to be a *τύπος* of the one who was to come (Rom. 5:14), and Abraham, as the type or model of the man of faith, prefigures the Gospel (Romans 4; Galatians 3).⁹³ The Scripture is said to preach the Gospel to him, saying (in the words of Gen. 12:3), "In you shall

92. Despite points of contact (Michel, pp. 107 f.), Paul's approach to the Old Testament is rather different from Philo's, for the latter largely lacks appreciation for the historical and eschatological dimensions of the Old Testament. Probably Philo is not altogether typical of Hellenistic Judaism. Yet the Wisdom of Solomon also shows relatively little of Paul's prophetic eschatological viewpoint, despite its well-known similarities to Paul's diagnosis of man's sinfulness.

93. This use of the Old Testament may be distinguished from the purely prophetic as "typological." Yet typology seems to be based on the premise of prophecy and fulfillment, particularly in Paul. Probably L. Goppelt, *Typus: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments in Neuen*, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, no. 43 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939), goes too far in seeing typology as the dominant form of the use of the Old Testament in the New (p. 239). Nevertheless, typology may well be the distinctly Christian form of the appropriation of the Old Testament. Cf. G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology*, Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 22 (London: SCM, 1957): "While it is indisputably convenient to use one word to embrace the study of all such linkages [between the Old Testament and the New], it is open to question whether typology is the right word" (p. 39). "The methods of handling the Old Testament which were already practised in Judaism were allegorism and the study of the fulfillment of prophecy. Historical typology, as defined above, came into existence with Christendom" (p. 42).

all the nations be blessed" (Gal. 3:8). In somewhat less explicit or emphatic ways, Paul also uses the language of the Old Testament to characterize the eschatological consummation (Phil. 2:10 f.; cf. Isa. 45:23; I Cor. 15:27; and Ps. 8:7) and to interpret Jesus' ministry (Rom. 15:3; cf. Ps. 69:9).

A second typical Pauline usage might be called ecclesiastical-parenetic. Paul uses the Old Testament as a source for the ethical instruction and edification of the church.⁹⁴ He may do this in a variety of ways. Most simply Paul continues to apply individual commandments of the law to specific problems (cf. II Cor. 13:1), although he may shift the application of the law in the light of his new situation (I Cor. 9:8-10). Of course, it is not the case that the law simply remains in force. In light of the demonstration of God's love in Christ's cross (cf. Rom. 5:8), the man of faith has a new perspective from which to view even the law (Rom. 13:8-10; Gal. 5:13-15). Its entire meaning is love of neighbor; love is the fulfillment of the law. Paul can also use the Exodus traditions in haggadic fashion to admonish the church (I Cor. 10:1-13), as he can use the Old Testament to express exhortations or warnings (Rom. 12:19 f.; I Cor. 5:15; II Cor. 6:16-18) or to support them (II Cor. 8:15; 9:9; Rom. 14:11).

A third distinguishable use of the Old Testament is found in Paul's interpretation of the historical or historical-eschatological situation in which he finds himself. Although it is not always possible clearly to distinguish this usage from the christological or kerygmatic one, since the historical-eschatological situation is fundamentally conditioned by the coming of Christ, the appropriation of the Old Testament as the key to the unfolding course of events is a clear feature of several Pauline passages, particularly Romans 9-11 (cf. also Rom. 15:8 ff.; Gal. 4:21 ff.; Phil. 2:10 ff.). Here Paul's conception of the interplay between Israel and the Gentiles in the history of salvation is based upon his exegetically grounded discussion of the present state of affairs between Israel and the church. Moreover, his last word concerning the mystery of God's working in history is taken from the Old Testament (Rom. 11:34 f., quoting Isa. 40:13 and Job 35:7).

A fourth and final category of Paul's use of the Scriptures is

94. Cf. Furnish, pp. 25 ff.

probably best left unlabelled. It comprises a variety of instances in which Paul uses the Old Testament to prove a point, on the assumption that Scripture is God's word. Particularly interesting subcategories are Paul's use of the Old Testament in connection with wisdom (I Cor. 1:19, 31; 2:9, 16; 3:19 f.) and in his description of the human situation (see esp. Rom. 3:9-20). Otherwise, Paul can make use of the Old Testament to uphold Christian freedom (I Cor. 10:26); to give guidance concerning tongues (I Cor. 14:21); to expound his eschatology (I Cor. 10:27, 54 f.); or to illuminate the relation of Christ and Adam (15:45). This category naturally shades over into Paul's ethical and parenetic use of the Old Testament, where he often quotes the Old Testament in order to add force to his argument.

There are, moreover, several passages in which Paul becomes rather explicit in stating the role and status of the Old Testament in the light of the Gospel. To say that he regards the Old Testament as a Christian book would be anachronistic. Yet Paul evidently felt peculiarly empowered to apply the Old Testament to Christ and to the church (see I Cor. 9:8-10; 10:11), and he makes this fact quite explicit. As far as Paul was concerned, the Old Testament could not be rightly read apart from Christ and his spirit (II Cor. 3:12-18). For the earlier preaching and exegetical tradition the Old Testament was the key to Christ in that it provided both a framework for understanding him and the promises and other adumbrations of his coming. Already for Paul, however, a subtle shift is taking place.⁹⁵ For he can claim that the ancient scriptures themselves are not rightly understood apart from Christ, a claim that was to be reiterated in the early church (cf. John 5:38 ff.). For Paul, as a Jew, Christ still gained intelligibility from the Old Testament; but a generation later, when most Christians were not Jews, the shoe would be on the other foot.⁹⁶

The form of Paul's Old Testament quotations is predominantly septuagintal, although there are a significant number which depart

95. Lindars, pp. 17 f., sees the recognition of a shift in the application of Old Testament quotations as basic to a right understanding of their history in early Christianity.

96. Rom. 16:25-27 is intentionally omitted from this discussion because it is usually regarded as secondary and non-Pauline. Cf., for example, C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans*, Harper's New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), pp. 10-13, 286 f.

from any known Septuagint textual tradition.⁹⁷ Agreement with the Masoretic text against the Septuagint is not frequent, although a number of Paul's *peshet* quotations may have been influenced by a form of the Hebrew text. Ellis finds that Paul's conflated or combined quotations show a much higher than normal degree of deviation from the Septuagint,⁹⁸ a fact which suggests their origin and transmission in the exegetical tradition of primitive Christianity.

Mark

Mark's use of the Old Testament is hard to isolate and characterize.⁹⁹ Apparently he and the church standing behind him regard the Old Testament as holy Scripture, divine revelation; yet even this is not undisputed,¹⁰⁰ for he at least represents Jesus as taking a position in seeming opposition to some parts of scripture (7:14 ff.), albeit sometimes on the basis of scripture (10:5 ff.).

Similarly, Mark apparently relies on a Christian tradition of Old Testament interpretation. The combination of Malachi and Isaiah in a probable *peshet* quotation and Mark's ignorance of its exact origin both point in that direction. Moreover, the use of the Old Testament in Mark's passion narrative is in all probability of

97. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, p. 12, gives the number of these as thirty-eight.

98. *Ibid.*, p. 12 (see esp. n. 5).

99. Since we are concerned primarily with the explicit use of the Old Testament in the New, we shall not go into the question of the more subtle influence of the Old Testament upon Mark, as important as that may be for the understanding of the whole Gospel and for the question of the historical Jesus. Quite thoroughgoing in interpreting Mark in terms of Old Testament typology is Austin Farrer, *A Study in St. Mark* (London: Dacre, 1951). His approach has not, however, gained wide acceptance. Ulrich Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, no. 39 (London: SCM, 1963), develops the theme of the wilderness in Mark's theology. His theses, however, have also met some opposition; cf. Ernest Edwin Best, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Marcan Soteriology*, *Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series*, no. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), pp. 25 ff. On Mark's use of the Old Testament see further Best, pp. 134-59 and the literature cited there.

Regrettably, Manfred Kärntzki's Tübingen dissertation, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate in der synoptischen Tradition" (1955) has not been published. Apparently he has undertaken to trace the history of the Old Testament material in the synoptic Gospels on form-critical grounds. See Joachim Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, trans. D. M. Barton (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), p. 27, n. 96.

100. Cf. the position of Samuel Schultz, "Markus und das Alte Testament," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 58 (1961), 184-97, who thinks that Mark has a canon within the canon of the Old Testament and does not regard the corpus of scriptures *per se* as authoritative.

pre-Markan origin.¹⁰¹ Here the frequency of Old Testament allusions and quotations in comparison to the rest of the Gospel increases markedly. Strangely enough, however, most of these references are not in any way noticed or marked as such. Likely they belong in large measure to the very early tradition of the passion, which was deeply influenced by the Old Testament. The earliest disciples and their contemporaries doubtless searched the Scriptures in order to unlock the secrets of Jesus' suffering and death. Also rather striking is the absence in Mark of any reference to the Scriptures in the Resurrection narrative (16:1-8; cf. Luke 24:25-27; John 20:9; I Cor. 15:4; Acts 2:25-28), an absence, however, which is paralleled in Matthew.

Mark's Old Testament quotations are taken primarily from the Septuagint, although there are variations.¹⁰² In several instances Jesus seems to quote the Old Testament in its septuagintal form.¹⁰³ At first glance this would seem to indicate that these quotations had been placed on Jesus' lips by the evangelist or by the Hellenistic church. Yet this conclusion is inevitable only in instances in which the argument of a pericope is based upon the Septuagint.¹⁰⁴ Otherwise, it is quite possible that such quotations have been assimilated to the Septuagint, a procedure with ample precedent. Josephus, whose native language was Aramaic, generally chose to quote the Bible according to the Septuagint in his works, which were published in Greek.

The question of Mark's purpose in quoting the Old Testament has recently become the subject of discussion.¹⁰⁵ It has ordinarily been assumed that the New Testament writers see the Old Testament standing in a relation of prophecy and fulfillment to the coming of Christ, the growth of the church, and so on. Alfred Suhl,

101. For a discussion of this question with citation of relevant literature, see Suhl, pp. 45-56. Admittedly, there is a difference of opinion as to when the Old Testament quotations and allusions entered into the formation of the tradition.

102. Cf. R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, *Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, no. 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), pp. 5, 9, 28, 147 ff.; also Henry Barclay Swete, *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1898), pp. lxx-lxxiv. On variations in the direction of the Hebrew and the targumim in the words of Jesus, see T. W. Manson, "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus," esp. pp. 314 ff.

103. E. g. Mark 7:6 f.; 7:10; 10:6 f.

104. As seems to be the case in Mark 7:6 f.

105. Suhl's work is fundamentally concerned with this question. Cf. Hugh Anderson's essay on Mark's use of the Old Testament in this volume.

however, has sought to show that Mark's intention in appropriating the Scriptures is only to show the *Schriftgemässheit* of events in Jesus' ministry and that it is therefore wrong to impute to him a view of salvation history and a scheme of prophecy and fulfillment that is really derived from Matthew and Luke. Suhl's position is well taken in so far as he seeks to differentiate Mark from the much more pointed use of the Old Testament and Old Testament themes in the other Gospels. Nevertheless, his case is somewhat distorted by dependence on Willi Marxsen's view of Mark's Gospel as evangelical proclamation decisively conditioned by the expectation of the imminent Parousia of Jesus in Galilee.¹⁰⁶ The denial that Mark is interested in prophecy and fulfillment is tied to a denial that Mark is interested in salvation history. Perhaps Mark does not have the historical sensibilities of Luke. Yet it is scarcely possible that his work does not embody the more primitive Christian idea that the kerygma as presently announced fulfills the past prophetic Scriptures (I Cor. 15:3 ff.), and scarcely credible that the primitive references to the Scriptures (e. g. in I Cor. 15:3 ff.) have no specific Scripture prophecies in view, but express only the community's faith in the *Schriftgemässheit* of the salvation events. Mark's Gospel begins with an Old Testament quotation whose most obvious significance is to indicate the fulfillment of prophecy, a motif which occurs relatively seldom, but nevertheless explicitly (9:11-13; cf. 12:10 ff.). Suhl's position must be regarded as an overstatement of a valid insight, namely, that Mark's view of the Old Testament is much less refined and programmatically formulated than that of his successors.

Although Mark (through his introductory quotation and his appropriation of a traditional passion narrative replete with Old Testament references or allusions) reflects the primitive Christian idea that the event of Jesus' coming is the fulfillment of Scripture and portrays Jesus as debating about the bearing of Scripture (especially the Law), he does not generally use the Old Testament to embellish and interpret the events of Jesus' Galilean ministry as extensively as does Matthew. This relative omission is perhaps of a piece with his omission of the teaching tradition we know from

106. *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*, trans. James Boyce et al. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969). (The English translation is based upon the 1959 German edition.)

the other Gospels. Furthermore, it is consonant with the kerygmatic character of Mark's Gospel, which concentrates on the saving event and person, eschewing any broader historical interest, in essential correspondence with the primitive kerygma. In emphasizing the kerygmatic character of Mark as compared with Matthew and Luke, Suhl is surely right, whether one refers "kerygma" here to the primitive kerygma of the apostolic preaching (Dodds) or to the Hellenistic kerygma of the Gentile-oriented church. Mark's total theological interest appears to be in accord with his use of the Old Testament.

To what extent Mark preserves an accurate picture of Jesus' attitude toward, and use of, the Old Testament is a good question. Long-standing conceptions of Jesus' most fundamental insights into the will of God rest largely upon the assumption that Jesus actually spoke as Mark reports him to have spoken, for example, in chapters 7 and 10. Some recent research has made this assumption appear invalid, however, precisely insofar as it has emphasized Mark's kerygmatic interest in contradistinction to any historical interest.¹⁰⁷ Such a state of affairs is at least superficially supported by the septuagintal flavor of Mark's Old Testament. Yet on the other hand one may cite the affinity of Jesus' free use and interpretation of the Old Testament in Mark with what appears to be a similar stance in the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed, the authoritative posture of the Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount is even more pronounced than in Mark's Gospel. So even if the kerygmatic, and Hellenistic or Gentile character of Mark's Gospel is emphasized and his historical interests minimized, it is still not too much to think that he conveys the spirit of the historical Jesus, particularly his attitude toward the Old Testament law.¹⁰⁸

Matthew

Matthew¹⁰⁹ generally reproduces Mark's explicit Old Testament quotations. There are four formal Old Testament quotations pe-

107. This position is characteristic of the work of Suhl and, to a lesser degree, of Schulz.

108. This much, at least, is granted by Schulz, p. 197.

109. There has recently been published extensive work on Matthew's use of the Old Testament, much of it stimulated by Stendahl's monograph. Aside from Gundry (n. 102 above), see R. S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Au-*

cular to Matthew and Luke and twenty peculiar to Matthew. These last represent a variety and mixture of text types.¹¹⁰ Among these eleven (or twelve) are of particular interest. They are introduced by special fulfillment formulas, indicating that the events relating to Jesus' life or ministry fulfill Old Testament prophecy, and represent unique textual traditions.¹¹¹ In *The School of St. Matthew* Stendahl paid particular attention to these formula quotations, which he likened to the *peshet* quotations of the Habakkuk Commentary of Qumran, in developing his thesis regarding the origin of the First Gospel. Stendahl believes that Matthew originated in a school or circle of early Christian Old Testament interpretation analogous to that of Qumran. The interpretation of the special formula quotations in Matthew's school accounts for their special form, just as the Qumran *peshet* activity accounts for aberrant Old Testament text-forms. Moreover, the formula quotations in Matthew show Semitic influence, whereas the other Old Testament quotations in Matthew are predominantly septuagintal.¹¹²

Stendahl's thesis has proved stimulating, not only for Matthean studies, but also for attempts to understand the use of the Old Testament in primitive Christianity. For example, Lindars's work on the apologetic use of the Old Testament in the early church was inspired largely by Stendahl's research. Nevertheless, his position has met with criticism as well as assent.¹¹³ Lindars, although finding his research stimulating, does not believe that the evan-

thority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew, Theologische Dissertationen, no. 2 (Basel: Reinhardt, 1969), and W. Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*, Beiträge zum Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, ser. 5, no. 8 (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1969); also earlier G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946), *passim*.

110. *Ibid.*, pp. 148 f.

111. The formula quotations are 1:23; 2:6, 15, 18, 23; 4:14 f.; 8:17; 12:18-21; 13:35; 21:5; 27:9 f. by Stendahl's accounting, pp. 97-127. Matt. 3:3 is also introduced by the peculiar formula, but has synoptic parallels.

112. Gundry, however, criticizes Stendahl for ignoring the nonseptuagintal elements in other Matthew quotations (pp. 157 f.). In his view only the parallels to Mark's formal quotations should be characterized as septuagintal.

113. Lindars, pp. 259 ff. Note also Bertil Gärtner's far-reaching criticisms, particularly of Stendahl's attempt to explain the Matthean quotations on the basis of Qumran, in "The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew," *S. T.*, 8 (1954), 1-24. Stendahl opens the preface of the Fortress edition of his work with a candid acknowledgment of the weight of such criticisms, indicates some reservation of his own about the Matthean school hypothesis, and avers that the principal justification of the study was and is the analysis of the Old Testament text in the Gospel.

gelist himself appreciated the exegetical work lying behind the formula quotations, but rather understood them pictorially, that is, as depicting in advance events to be fulfilled in Jesus' life and ministry. Thus, in his view Matthew the evangelist does not really belong to the school of that name! At least he ignores it in the use of these Old Testament quotations. In a more negative vein, Gundry rejects Stendahl's whole thesis (along with Lindars's) on the principal ground that he fails to note the pervasiveness of non-septuagintal influence on all Matthew's quotations except those in which he is simply following Mark. Gundry takes the position that the apostle Matthew is responsible for the present text-forms.¹¹⁴ In the new preface (Fortress edition, pp. vi-ix) of his work, however, Stendahl guardedly reiterates his view that the formula quotations are the ambiance of the evangelist and in their present text-form provide a key to understanding Matthew's Gospel. Stendahl is, in fact, responding specifically to Strecker,¹¹⁵ yet in effect he responds also to the criticism of Lindars. Although Stendahl has not yet replied to Gundry's attack, he promises a detailed analysis of the latter's book in a forthcoming issue of *Biblica*. So the debate over Matthew's special quotations continues. That it is not a merely technical matter is clear enough, for at stake is the problem of Matthean origins and therefore Matthean interpretation.

In view of the unsettled state of research, is it possible to characterize Matthew's use of the Old Testament with any felicity? Probably so, for despite debated issues, major aspects of his use of the Old Testament stand out clearly. Moreover, even scholars who, for example, deny that Matthew is a "Jewish gospel" agree that it at least embodies elements of a Jewish-Christian tradition, while those who regard it as Jewish-Christian often grant that it was composed in a Hellenistic environment.¹¹⁶

114. See pp. 181 ff. While Gundry's labors in collecting and sorting out the Old Testament textual materials relating to Matthew have won critical approval, the same cannot be said for his own position. See, for example, the review by Lindars, *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 20 (1969), 282-84. It has been observed that Gundry's consideration of Old Testament allusions as well as quotations has given rise to the theory of pervasive mixed text-forms, but that the nature of the possible allusions scarcely admits of inference about text-forms.

115. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, no. 82; 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

116. Note Stendahl's preface to the new Fortress edition of his work, pp. viii, n. 3; xii, n. 1; xiii. Stendahl has sympathy with Davies's position that Matthew is a response

Matthew's use of the Old Testament is a problem with at least two foci. First, and more generally, how does Matthew relate the Old Testament to his account of Jesus' ministry? Second, what is the Matthean position toward the Law? The second question is not really separable from the first, but since we are primarily interested in the use and functioning of the Old Testament we shall concentrate upon the first and deal with the second only insofar as it impinges upon it. As was the case with Paul, a thorough pursuit of the question of the Law would entail a treatment of the total theological perspective of the author.¹¹⁷

Matthew takes up most of the Marcan Old Testament quotations and thus apparently endorses them. Over and beyond this he has about two dozen formal quotations, four of which he shares with Luke and ten or eleven of which fall into the category of the Matthean formula quotations. Whatever their origins, these last seem most typical of Matthew. The occurrence of five of these special quotations in Matthew's distinctive birth narrative, where they follow hard on the heels of the Matthean genealogy, tends to confirm this judgment. Where Matthew constructs his own narrative episodes in relative independence (although he probably knew an earlier tradition) his historical narration stands in closest relation to Old Testament testimonies.¹¹⁸

The events are portrayed as the fulfillment of the prophetic words of Scripture. Naturally, not every detail of the narrative is

to Jamnian Judaism. Yet he doubts that "the influence of Palestinian Judaism on the Gospel of Matthew can . . . be as direct as Davies's study [*The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*] presupposes" (p. xii, n. 1). On the other hand, scholars such as Strecker and Wolfgang Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments, no. 10; 3rd ed. (Munich: Kösel, 1964), who regard Matthew as the product of a church fully separated from Judaism, grant the Jewishness of much of Matthew's tradition. In fact, the distinction between the viewpoint of this tradition and that of the final redaction is the basis of their positions.

117. H. Freiherr von Campenhausen discusses the use of the Old Testament in Paul and Matthew in relation to the question of Law and Gospel: *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, no. 39 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1968), pp. 16 ff., 32 ff.

118. On the Matthean infancy narratives and particularly their use of the Old Testament, see Stendahl, "Quis et unde? An Analysis of Mt 1-2," *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, no. 26; 2nd ed. (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), pp. 94-105; Strecker, pp. 51-63; and especially W. Barnes Tatum, "The Matthean Infancy Stories: Their Form, Structure, and Relation to the Theology of the Evangelist" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1966), esp. pp. 83-85 ff., 99.

supported by Scripture, but the Scripture quotation seems to lift out and underline principal points of each pericope: "A virgin shall conceive . . ."; Christ is to be born in Bethlehem; the Son of God is called out of Egypt; and so on. That all of these events happen according to prophecy and not fortuitously means, of course, that they are ordained of God and, moreover, that they constitute an extension of the holy history into the period of Jesus' life and ministry. That this last is not a purely Lucan idea (Conzelmann) would seem to be indicated by the opening genealogy, through which the continuity of the New with the Old is assured.

When Matthew passes from the birth narrative to the account of Jesus' ministry, he picks up and rearranges the Marcan quotation of Malachi and Isaiah which introduces the Baptist narrative, correcting Mark's erroneous ascription of the whole passage to Isaiah. There follows the Q narrative of the temptation of Jesus, already replete with Old Testament themes and allusions (4:1-11). Then begins Jesus' public ministry in Galilee, introduced by Mark (1:21) with a simple transitional statement of place, but by Matthew with an extensive formula quotation (4:15-17), which establishes the Galilean locus of Jesus' ministry as the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy. One hesitates to attribute to Matthew's deliberate intention what may be merely the result of chance, but the remainder of the formula quotations are distributed among various important phases or aspects of Jesus' ministry: his healings (8:17); his self-concealment (12:18-21); his parables (13:35); the preparation for his entry into Jerusalem (21:5); Judas' fate (27:9 f.). The formula also occurs to introduce the famous Isaiah passage (40:3) used in connection with the appearance of the Baptist (3:3), although in this instance there is a Marcan parallel. Rather striking, however, is the relative scarcity of distinctly Matthean quotations with the fulfillment formula in the passion narrative (cf. 27:9 f.), where it might have been expected to appear more often in connection with Jesus' death.

Matthew very deliberately introduces his Gospel narrative with extensive references to the Old Testament. In general these Old Testament references extend and refine the common early Christian idea that the Gospel is the fulfillment of the Scriptures, but in the precise sense that the events of Jesus' life and ministry—particularly its beginnings—are prophesied therein. Thus he extends the

familiar motif of Jesus as the one announced by Scripture, a motif already present in Mark, but, interestingly enough, absent from Q.¹¹⁹

The high regard for the Old Testament which Matthew manifests in his portrayal of Jesus is reflected also in his attitude toward the law.¹²⁰ Probably Matthew's handling of this issue places him in a Jewish-Christian milieu.¹²¹ But Matthew's exact attitude toward the Old Testament, and particularly the Law, is not always easy to deduce, since he appropriates traditions embodying varying viewpoints. Yet it may be inferred from the content and structure of the Sermon on the Mount that Jesus stands over and above the Law, the Old Testament Torah per se, not just its traditional interpretation. This is particularly clear from the antitheses.¹²² Moreover, Matthew keeps the Marcan instances in which Jesus breaks the sabbath or purification commandments, although he tends to soften them.¹²³ While he also transmits the strict or conservative line, attributed to Jesus, on the keeping of the Law (5:17-20; see also 23:3), he tempers this position with the repeated quotation of Hos. 6:6, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice" (Matt. 9:13; 12:7), and sharply distinguishes between the trivial and the weightier matters of the Law (23:23). Yet in the same breath in which he makes that distinction he also insists upon observance. The whole Law, however, "hangs" upon the double commandment of love of God and love of neighbor (22:40), which provides the hermeneutical fulcrum for the interpretation of the individual commandments. Yet the allegiance which Matthew commends is

119. Trilling sees as the peculiarly Matthean contribution in the appropriation of the Old Testament the evangelist's interpretation of the Christian church, rather than the synagogue, as the true continuation of the Old Testament people of God, "The True Israel." On the absence of christological proof from prophecy from Q, see von Campenhausen, p. 13, n. 32; but Matt. 11:4-6 / Luke 7:22 f., with obvious references to Isaiah (29:18 f.; 35:5 f.; 61:1), seems to constitute an exception.

120. Note especially Gerhard Barth, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law," in Günther Bornkamm, Barth, and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, trans. P. Scott (London: SCM, 1963), pp. 58, 164: "The Law of Moses is for him unquestionably the law of God, and also for the church" (p. 158). Cf. also Trilling, pp. 165-224, and Reinhart Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Matthäusevangelium*, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, no. 33; 2nd ed. (Munich: Kaiser, 1966), pp. 34-75.

121. So von Campenhausen, p. 22.

122. *Ibid.*, pp. 18 f.

123. *Ibid.*, pp. 20 f. Cf. Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, pp. 24 f., on Matthew's strict interpretation of the law.

not to the Law, but to Christ. One can certainly not hide behind any legalism in order to protect himself from the hard demands of God's will (cf. 3:7-10) promulgated definitively by Jesus. Matthew teaches a Christianity that is discipleship, following Christ, the way of righteousness (Strecker), to a community with deep roots in its Jewish past (Stendahl, Davies, von Campenhausen, *et al.*), probably one in which these roots have not been completely broken. Yet in principle Matthew's position makes such a break inevitable, for in his view adherence to the commandment as commandment is no longer the fundamental organizing principle and ground of inspiration or exhortation, but loyalty and obedience to Christ (7:24-27; 11:25-30; 28:18-20). On the other hand, this loyalty is itself defined by an understanding of obedience or righteousness which is intelligible only against an Old Testament and Jewish background.

Luke

The Old Testament quotations, references, and allusions in Luke's Gospel are concentrated largely in the introduction (the nativity and Jesus' preaching in Nazareth), and in the Passion and Resurrection accounts. In Acts they are most frequent in the initial section dealing with the Jerusalem church (chaps. 1-7) and at the end (28:23 ff.). Moreover, they tend to fall in the speeches. The similar tendency in the Gospel for Old Testament quotations to appear on Jesus' lips is due mainly to the precedents established by Mark and Q. Nevertheless, it is significant that in his initial sermon at Nazareth (cf. 4:18 f.) and in his final utterance on the cross (23:46) Jesus quotes the Old Testament, since both instances are unique with Luke. Surely it is also not a happenstance that the Risen Jesus interprets the Scriptures to his disciples in Luke alone (24:27, 32, 44 ff.).

It is usually said that Luke's Bible is the Septuagint, and the predominance of quotations from the Septuagint is real. Luke's imitation of the style of the Septuagint has also been noted.¹²⁴ Recently, however, Traugott Holtz has advanced the thesis that only Luke's quotations from Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and the Psalms are taken directly from the Septuagint; and that his other Old Testa-

124. Kümmel, pp. 95, 98, 123.

ment quotations, if not simply drawn from Mark, follow the text-forms of primitive Christian testimonia.¹²⁵ While Holtz's theory will bear further critical scrutiny, its correspondence with the textual evidence of Luke-Acts is striking. Already Lindars and de Waard have drawn attention to the primitive, traditional character of the Old Testament testimonia in some of the Acts speeches. Moreover, it is a real question whether at this stage in the development of early Christianity (the latter part of the first century) authors would have had easy access to the entire Old Testament—a considerable library—particularly if they belonged to churches which had already separated from the synagogue.

As a Gentile Christian in the Pauline sphere of influence, Luke doubtless belonged to such a separated Christian church. Luke looks back on the period of most intense struggle with (and within) Judaism over the new Christian Gospel and its interpretation. For him the controversy over the law within Christianity—Luke adumbrates the term in referring to *χριστιανοί*—was a matter of historical interest except insofar as it had left wounds which still needed to be healed. Yet his feeling for the continuity between Israel and the church was real and deep. Although he was scarcely the originator of the concept of salvation-history,¹²⁶ he brought it to clear articulation in his two-part narrative which is so explicitly and consciously rooted in the Scriptures of Israel. The discussion of the finer points of Conzelmann's comprehensive portrayal of Lucan theology does not need to be taken up here. While we may reserve judgment on the precise periodization of salvation-history in Luke's own intention, the main lines of Conzelmann's Lucan interpretation surely point us in the right direction. This is particularly so in regard to the place and importance of Israel, and concomitantly of Israel's Scriptures, in Luke's overall conception.

The prominence of the Old Testament at two crucial points in Luke's work is obvious. First of all, the Acts speeches emphasize

125. *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, Texte und Untersuchungen, no. 104 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968). I have not been able to see the Bonn dissertation of M. Resc, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie Lukas* (Bonn, 1965); cf. the brief summary in Rohde, pp. 217–19.

126. Cf. Ulrich Wilckens, "Interpreting Luke-Acts in a Period of Existentialist Theology," *Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), pp. 60–83, esp. 72 ff.

that Christ's coming and the coming of the Spirit in the church are the fulfillment of prophetic Scripture (see, for example, Acts 2). Probably these speeches embody primitive tradition, but to the degree that they are Luke's own composition they attest his conviction that God's ancient word has found its fulfillment in Christ and his church. In the second place, there are the initial chapters of the Gospel, including the birth narratives and Jesus' preaching in Nazareth, which are full of Old Testament allusions and quotations. It will be instructive to look briefly at these opening chapters, since they afford an interesting comparison with Matthew's.¹²⁷

Anyone who reads the Lucan birth narrative is immediately struck by its style and tone, which is deliberately contrived to evoke the narratives of the Old Testament. Also the great hymns or canticles uttered by the angel Gabriel, Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon are reminiscent of hymns and Psalms of the Old Testament. These similarities have, of course, often been noted by commentators. The whole narration is clearly designed to anchor the birth of Jesus the Christ in the faith and piety of Israel, in the Hebrew Scriptures, and thus in the plan and purpose of God. Generally its function is not unlike that of the Matthean birth narrative. On the other hand, the formal contrast is considerable. Whereas Matthew accomplishes his purpose by punctuating his narrative with Old Testament testimonies—indeed, they may provide the framework of his account—Luke has not a single formal Old Testament quotation. The difference is rather typical of the Gospels, for Matthew continues to introduce such Old Testament testimony on a much larger scale than Luke.

But surely Luke is just as much interested in portraying Jesus as fulfilling the Scriptures.¹²⁸ This intention becomes quite explicit in the famous scene in the Nazareth synagogue (4:16–30) where Jesus begins his public ministry. Luke has apparently taken the

127. On Luke's birth narratives, see W. Barnes Tatum, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke i–ii and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," *NTS*, 13 (1966–1967), 184–95, who cites the recent literature fully. Tatum argues persuasively that "St. Luke uses the birth stories to characterize that period in salvation-history before the ministry of Jesus as the Epoch of Israel" (pp. 190–93 f.).

128. Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, no. 21; 2nd ed. (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957), pp. 165–86, has underlined the central place of Old Testament (but not only Old Testament) proof from prophecy in Luke's theology.

Marcan account of Jesus' preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth (Mark 6:1-6), modified it and enlarged it greatly to suit his own ends, and introduced it at the opening of the ministry. Since Luke has acted so deliberately, we are justified in assuming that he thereby reveals his own outlook and viewpoint. Thus it would seem he takes this occasion to have Jesus announce the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy (61:1-2) in his own public activity (Luke 4:18-21). The words of Isaiah in the mouth of Jesus answer to the fulfilled expectation which is expressed in the joyous hymns of the infancy narrative. These hymns reveal the fervid expectancy which for Luke characterizes the time of Israel, the first epoch in the history of salvation.

Yet the account does not simply end with Jesus' own proclamation of himself as the fulfillment of prophecy. Another characteristic Lucan motif finds expression as in response to Jesus' sharp retort (vv. 23 ff.), anticipating his rejection by Israel and acceptance by Gentiles—a retort which is really unjustified in the context¹²⁹—his fellow townsmen turn violently against him (vv. 28-30). At this point Jesus simply departs to Capernaum (and Luke takes up the Marcan account). This account may make little sense historically, but it is a perfect expression of Luke's own view that the Gospel is offered first to Jews, preserving the continuity of salvation history, and, when rejected by them, to Gentiles. This pattern emerges again and again in Acts and provides the note on which the entire narrative concludes (28:23-28).

Thus Luke 4:16-30 affords an excellent illustration of Luke's attitude both toward the Scriptures and toward Judaism. Jesus' coming is the fulfillment of Scripture. At the same time, his rejection by Israel—a historical fact in Luke's own time—is anticipated at the very beginning of Jesus' ministry. Thus the continuity of redemptive history is maintained both in the appropriation of the Scriptures and in the conviction that the rupture between synagogue and church is the result of the peculiar hostility of a particular generation of Jews.¹³⁰

129. By mentioning Capernaum (v. 23) Luke implies that Jesus' public ministry had already previously commenced. Probably this incongruity is Luke's own, revealing his awareness of having transposed the whole incident (cf. vv. 31 ff.), and not an indication of reliance upon an earlier source (whose mention of Jesus' activity at Capernaum Luke would have then suppressed).

130. Yet this obduracy is not without precedent, but in Luke's view has a signifi-

John

For John the question of the Old Testament as Law is a dead issue, reflected only occasionally in passages such as 1:17, where the author seems to be pointing to successive epochs if not setting up a deliberate antithesis. References to "your law" in Jesus' debate with the Jews (8:17; 10:34) indicate that for John's church, and in John's theological perspective, the Law belongs to the Jews. And while salvation may be "of the Jews" (4:22), it is actually "of them" and no longer "in them." For the Jews in John's Gospel represent the world's rejection of Jesus.¹³¹

The disciples' obedience is no longer defined, even in concrete or practical instances, in terms of the Old Testament law. Rather they are given a new commandment, the love commandment, by Jesus (13:34 f.). Yet in some sense the validity of the law is acknowledged in just those instances in which it is referred to as "your law," and Nicodemus' appeal to the law in 7:51 is clearly set in a positive light by the evangelist. Moreover, John holds that Moses himself wrote about Jesus in the law (1:45; 5:46). Very likely this ambiguity toward the law reflects the history of the Johannine Christianity's conflict with the synagogue, in which it has been alienated from Judaism, all the while appealing to the Jewish Law in its own defense.¹³²

Paradoxically, John evinces a more positive attitude to the Scriptures than to the Law per se (or to the Scriptures considered as Law). This comes about in two ways, which we shall examine briefly. First, John appropriates the Old Testament testimony tradition of primitive Christianity reflected elsewhere in the New

cant history which he rehearses in Acts 7 (see esp. 7:51-53). While Luke obviously employs traditional material, D. C. Arichea, "A Critical Analysis of the Stephen Speech in the Acts of the Apostles" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1965), is doubtless correct in maintaining that the most fruitful approach to the speech relates it to Luke's purpose (pp. 237 ff.).

131. Cf. von Campenhausen, p. 62, and especially the discussion of Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Scribner's, 1953), 2: 26-32.

132. For an analysis of crucial aspects of the Fourth Gospel as the direct or indirect expression of this conflict, see J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968). On the ambivalence of the relationship of the law to Jesus in John, see Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, no. 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), pp. 288 ff.

Testament.¹³³ Second, John sets his Gospel against the background of Old Testament Judaism. Old Testament figures, Old Testament places, Old Testament symbols and institutions are woven into its very fabric, sometimes as the antitypes of John's Jesus, but not always so.¹³⁴

The variety of text-forms in John's Old Testament¹³⁵ testimonia probably means that they have been derived from traditional sources. Particularly noteworthy are the Passion testimonies of John. In several instances John has an explicit testimony that is only suggested in Mark (cf. Mark 15:24; 15:36; and John 19:24;

133. M. Dibelius, "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der Leidensgeschichte des Petrus- und des Johannes-Evangelium," in *Botschaft und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953), 1: 221-47, drew attention to the traditional character of the Johannine Old Testament quotations in the Passion narrative. Cf. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, pp. 265-72, on the traditional character of the formula quotations related to the Passion, as well as their apologetic tendency. Very recently Rothfuchs has observed that these quotations deal with and interpret the enemies of Jesus and their actions (pp. 170 ff.).

John's explicit quotations are predominantly from the Prophets (cf. 12:15, 38, 40; 19:37 f.) and the Psalms (2:17; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28 f., 36).

134. The Old Testament matrix of Johannine thought is frequently pointed out by E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. N. Davey (London: Faber and Faber, 1947). A good summary treatment of this phenomenon has been set forth by C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 48 (1947), 155-69. Much more extensive is François Marie Braun, *Jean le Théologien: Les grandes traditions d'Israël et l'accord des Écritures selon le Quatrième Évangile*, Etudes Bibliques (Paris: Gabalda, 1964), the second volume of Braun's trilogy on the Fourth Gospel. Borgen, p. 27, n. 1, cites major contributions to the question of John's use of the Old Testament, of which he is generally critical for their failure to take account of contemporary Jewish midrashic exposition.

Aileen Guilding in an elaborate and erudite study, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), attempts to account for John's Old Testament substructure by understanding the Gospel as a series of meditations upon a triennial cycle of Old Testament lections. Her conclusions have not, however, been widely accepted; cf. Ernst Haenchen, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 86 (1961), 670-72; Leon Morris, *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries* (London: Tyndale, 1964); and D. Moody Smith, Jr., *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory*, Yale Publications in Religion, no. 10 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), pp. 102-5.

135. Pointed out by Charles Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?," *JBL*, 73 (1954), 61-75, who suggests that John may cite from memory (p. 73). More recent research such as Lindars's and Edwin D. Freed's has, however, made this originally plausible suggestion appear less likely. Freed proposes a background of the Old Testament quotations analogous to Stendahl's school of St. Matthew (p. 130). Thus his conclusion that John probably did not use written testimonia (p. 128) does not deny John's dependence on tradition in the broader sense. Freed's research suggests that at points John's use of the Old Testament is in contact with the Hebrew original or the Targums, although his literal agreements are mostly with the Septuagint. A Semitic background for some of John's Old Testament quotations is also proposed by Borgen, esp. pp. 64 f.

19:28 f.), and John makes very clear the Christian conviction that the Scriptures point to Christ (1:45; 5:39; 5:46 f.). Major events of Jesus' career are said to have occurred in fulfillment of Scripture. Usually the specific Scripture is cited (e.g. 2:17; cf. vs. 22; 12:14-16), but in the case of the Resurrection it is not (20:9). The apologetic of response, a major motif of the early Christian testimony tradition, occurs also in John (12:39 f.).¹³⁶ Moreover, the Johannine use of these and other testimonies may reflect an intimate acquaintance with their traditional use.¹³⁷ Major Old Testament figures are said to have written about Jesus (Moses in 5:46 f.) and to have seen his day (Abraham in 8:56) or his glory (Isaiah in 12:38). Although the Scripture passages cited may be drawn largely from the testimony tradition of early Christianity, probably the explicit statements regarding the remembering of the Scriptures (e.g. 2:17, 22) and the references to Moses, Abraham and Isaiah are to be ascribed to the fertile and creative mind of the author.

Significant as such instances of the use of the Old Testament as cited above may be, both in showing John's debt to tradition and his originality, they are of secondary importance in comparison with the way in which the movement and framework of the Gospel are set against a Jewish and Old Testament background. The prologue's (1:1-18) depiction of the role of the Logos (Word) in creation—note the light-darkness motif—is reminiscent of the Genesis creation story, where also "in the beginning" God speaks and separates light from darkness. The subsequent account of John the Baptist and the calling of the disciples (1:19-51) is replete with Old Testament references and allusions. The very purpose of John's baptism is the revelation of Jesus (as the Christ) to Israel (v. 32). In this episode a whole series of Old Testament or traditional Jewish titles are ascribed to Jesus: Lamb of God (vv. 29-36), Son of God (v. 34), Rabbi (v. 38), Messiah (v. 41), the one "of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote," the King of Israel (v. 49), and the Son of man (v. 51). The positive relation of Jesus to the Old Testament tradition is affirmed, despite—or perhaps because of—the polarity between Jesus and Moses described in 1:17.

Following this lengthy introduction Jesus proceeds to turn the

136. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, pp. 18, 159-61.

137. *Ibid.*, pp. 265 ff.

water intended for use in Jewish rites of purification into the wine symbolic of his own divine revelation (2:1-11). After this he cleanses the temple (2:13-22), but indicates that he will ultimately replace it (2:19 ff.; cf. 4:21 ff.)! There follows an encounter with Nicodemus, the representative of main-line Judaism (3:1-21), after which Jesus confronts the Samaritan woman (4:1-42), who epitomizes Jewish apostasy. The miracle at Bethzatha Pool (5:1-9) becomes the occasion for Jews to persecute Jesus for working on the Sabbath and thus violating Old Testament law. This in turn leads to a christological discussion in which Jesus' work is compared with the Father's. Chapter 6, which finds Jesus suddenly in Galilee, continues much the same level of christological discussion, although in a different theological as well as geographical setting. Here the Exodus tradition is invoked as Jesus and his interlocutors discuss the real meaning of Exod. 16:4 (cf. Ps. 78:24, etc.): Who or what is the true bread from heaven?¹³⁸ After the withdrawal of many of his disciples at the end of this episode, Jesus goes again to Jerusalem, where a crucial conflict with the Jewish officialdom takes place (chaps. 7, 8). And one could trace this thread through the remainder of Jesus' public ministry, for it is a major motif of the Johannine framework.

This framework itself is marked by repeated appearances of Jesus in Jerusalem for the Jewish feasts (2:13, 23; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2, 37, etc.). There are also other instances in which events or symbols from the Old Testament are used by Jesus in a way that might be described as typological, for example, the comparison of Jesus' crucifixion to Moses' lifting up the serpent in the wilderness (3:14 f.).¹³⁹ Further, it may be possible to trace the influence of

138. *Bread From Heaven* by Borgen is the most thorough recent discussion of John 6. It is, of course, especially valuable for the way in which John's method of dealing with the Old Testament is placed over against contemporary Jewish homiletical practice.

139. The possibility that the signs of John's Gospel stand in an intentional typological relation to the "signs" or "signs and wonders" of Moses in the exodus tradition of the Old Testament has been put forward by Robert H. Smith, "Exodus Typology in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL*, 81 (1962), 329-42. He reviews and criticizes the earlier proposals of J. J. Enz, B. P. W. Stather Hunt, and Harold Sahlin. Whether his own theory is a plausible one is a question that deserves more extended treatment than can be given here. While I do not find it convincing in detail, a typological relation between Jesus and Moses certainly cannot be dismissed. (See John 1:17; 6:32 f. and 9:25 f. as well as 3:14). On the figure of Moses in the Fourth Gospel see also Martyn, pp. 88, 91 ff.; T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, no. 40 (London: SCM, 1963) and especially now the important work of Meeks, *The Prophet-King*.

the language and thought of certain Old Testament traditions or books, particularly Isaiah, through John's Gospel.¹⁴⁰

In a variety of ways John seems the most *alttestamentlich* of New Testament books. This is not, however, the result of a simple idea of continuity between the Old Testament, the Judaism of Jesus' or John's day, and the Gospel. In fact, John sets up the sharpest antithesis between the Old and the New that is to be found in the New Testament. One has the impression that the New—Jesus Christ as God's word, as Light, Truth and Life—is not in fact rightly known on the basis of a prior understanding of the Old Testament or the institutions of Judaism. Rather, faith in Jesus, which is the one indispensable thing in John's view, opens up the possibility for a proper understanding of the Scriptures as pointing to him, and of the institutions of Judaism as finding fulfillment in him. Such an understanding ought perhaps to have been present in Jesus' own contemporaries, but in fact it was not (5:39 f.; 5:46 f.). On the contrary, a whole series of "testimonies" is brought forth by the Jews in order to disprove Jesus' claims (e. g. 7:42, 52; 12:34). These, however, represent the unenlightened reading of the Scriptures that is bound to err because it does not recognize and acknowledge in Jesus the source of true light and life. Thus even Nicodemus seems farther from the truth initially than the Samaritan woman, despite his rabbinic learning, and those who reject Jesus most vehemently are the learned representatives of Jewish officialdom (7:45-52; 11:45-53).

In light of this state of affairs, Jesus' turning away from "the Jews" to "his own," already adumbrated in 1:11 f., becomes intelligible. Yet after Jesus turns from the Jews, who have become the representatives of a hostile world, to his own disciples (esp. chaps. 13-17, 21), he turns again with them toward the world, sending them into the world as he was sent (3:13; 17:20 ff.; 20:21). The destiny of Jesus' disciples is a mission to and for the world. It is, however, a real question whether for Johannine Christianity the explicit use of the Old Testament is any longer a necessity for missionary preaching and the ordering of church life. The answer depends in part on whether one sees the Fourth Gospel as representative of a church still in some positive contact with Judaism or

140. F. W. Young, "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 46 (1955), 215-33.

as the product of a dialogue that has resulted in alienation, without, however, producing the thoroughgoing rejection of the Old Testament and of creation as divinely ordered that is found in Gnosticism. In my view the latter alternative is more probable. If so, it may be that Johannine Christianity could come to expression apart from its Old Testament basis, as in fact seems to have happened in the Johannine Epistles, as well as the farewell discourses of the Gospel. While the Gospel is built upon a foundation of Old Testament allusion and imagery, especially in chapters 1-12, the Epistles, likely the work of another author or authors, may represent a stage of development in which this Jewish, Old Testament matrix has been attenuated. It is noteworthy that in the Pastorals, documents of comparable date and *Sitz im Leben*, there is a similar dearth of Old Testament references. Conversely, however, other later New Testament documents such as Hebrews, Revelation, and James, not to mention the Apostolic Fathers (see esp. I Clement and Barnabas), attest that the separation of the church from Judaism did not result in the downgrading of the Old Testament. Instead, in many ways it paved the way for the adoption of the Old Testament as a Christian book. In a certain sense it is already that for the Fourth Evangelist, and as such indispensable to the presentation of Jesus which he gives us.

Hebrews and Revelation

This survey of the use of the Old Testament in the New may at best be suggestive of the main lines and results of relevant research, and hopefully also of areas needing further study. As such it is necessarily incomplete. We cannot, however, conclude without mentioning two other New Testament books. Much significant research has recently been done on the one; the other has lately been overlooked. These are, respectively, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Revelation to John.¹⁴¹ Each makes as much or more use of the Old Testament as any New Testament document, yet in very different ways. Hebrews contains a great number of rather explicit verbatim scriptural quotations, most of which are attributed directly to God, Christ, or the Holy Spirit. Thus Hebrews'

141. One might also find it fruitful to investigate I Peter in this connection, since the use of the Old Testament in that document appears to bear traces of an earlier tradition (e. g., compare the use of Isaiah in I Pet. 2:6 and Rom. 9:33).

introductory formulas indicate that the author regards the text as God's own speaking. Revelation contains not a single formal citation, but it is just as full of Old Testament language, phraseology, and allusions as Hebrews.¹⁴²

Since so much of Hebrews is biblical exegesis, or at least application, and since we have rather copious Jewish exegetical materials dating from the contemporary period, much recent interest has focused upon locating its precise background. While rabbinic methods of exegesis find extensive parallels in Hebrews,¹⁴³ much recent investigation has focused upon Philo¹⁴⁴ or Qumran.¹⁴⁵ Yet neither Qumran nor Philo provides the key to understanding the complex patterns of exegetical discussion in Hebrews, for the author was an original thinker and writer, and a Christian as well. Although he obviously owes something to the exegetical traditions of early Christianity, the attempt to make Hebrews dependent upon the hypothetical primitive testimony book (Harris) scarcely succeeds.¹⁴⁶ Actually, it seems that the author of Hebrews was not greatly dependent upon his Christian predecessors. He appears to have used a form of the Septuagint for most, if not all, of his thirty-odd Old Testament quotations.¹⁴⁷ Probably the key to Hebrews does not lie outside the book itself, but is to be found in an analysis of the author's use of the Scriptures in the context of his total work.

Despite certain affinities with Philonic exegesis, the basic form of the appropriation of the Old Testament in Hebrews is not alle-

142. For the following discussion I am largely indebted to excellent seminar papers (spring semester, 1969) of two graduate students in New Testament at Duke: C. Denny White, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews," and James S. Aull, "The Use of the Book of Jeremiah in the Apocalypse of John."

143. Richard Reid, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Th.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., 1964), pp. 72-97, esp. 73, 80-97.

144. See Sowers (above, n. 30).

145. For example, Hans Kosmala, *Hebräer-Essener-Christen: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung*, *Studia Post-Biblica*, no. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1959), esp., pp. 1-43; cf. S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Wed. G. van Soest, 1961), pp. 64-70 *et passim*; also George Howard, "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations," *Novum Testamentum*, 10 (1968): 208-16, who attempts to make the textual evidence of Qumran profitable for the determination of the Old Testament text-form of Hebrews (but cf. n. 147 below).

146. F. C. Synge, *Hebrews and the Scriptures* (London: S.P.C.K., 1959); Reid, pp. 66-71, also Kistemaker, pp. 91 f.

147. A recent and very full treatment of the use of the Old Testament in Hebrews, Friedrich Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger*, *Biblische Untersuchungen*, no. 4 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1968), confirms the generally held view that the author relies upon the Septuagint (see pp. 248 ff., 262-65).

gory, but typology. Although Hebrews has a forerunner in Paul (cf. Romans 4; Galatians 3), the author is certainly the master of typology among New Testament writers. There are several important typologies in Hebrews: the Moses-Christ typology (3:2 ff.); the Israel-Church typology (3:7-4:11); the Melchizedek-Christ typology (chap. 7). They all, however, seem to revolve about the basic typology of the Old and New Covenants.¹⁴⁸ This typology is not only implicit in the entire argument of Hebrews, but becomes quite explicit in 8:8-13, for there the author quotes the famous new covenant passage of Jer. 31:31-34 in its entirety. Within this overall typology, the exegesis of several Psalms plays an important role. In 2:6-8 Ps. 8:4-6 is adduced to make the point that Christ identifies with humanity. In 3:7-11 Ps. 95:7-11 is adduced to warn the church by means of the example of Israel's apostasy. In 1:13 and 5:6 Ps. 110:1,4 is used to underline Jesus' exaltation. Finally, in 10:5-7 (Ps. 40:6-8) the exact means of transition from the Old Covenant into the realm of holiness of the New is specified: "through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."¹⁴⁹ The themes of these Psalm quotations are summarized in 2:17.

If one speaks of the purpose of the author of Hebrews in using the Old Testament, he must distinguish two levels. There was the practical and overall purpose of the letter to encourage and warn Christians wavering in their faith, perhaps in danger of persecution, perhaps in greater danger of falling, or falling back, into Judaism because of their general lassitude and disappointment over the delay in the Parousia. To this end the Old Testament is sometimes applied directly (e. g. 3:7-11; chap. 11). More often, however, the Old Testament is used to develop the theological argument concerning the superiority of Jesus, the high priestly mediator of the New Covenant, over the sacrificial system of the Old. (The messiahship of Jesus is simply assumed. What is demonstrated is his high priestly function.) The faith conviction that underlies this argument is the grounds upon which the author of Hebrews can comfort, exhort, and warn the wavering community which he addresses. The Old Testament provides not only the framework

148. Cf. Sowers, pp. 91 ff.

149. This is the discovery of Kistemaker, pp. 96-133, who thinks that the exegesis of these Psalms determines the structure of Hebrews.

and structure for this argument, but legitimates and guarantees it. For the author of Hebrews regards the Scriptures as nothing less than God's word. This is probably why the scriptural quotations are so often attributed to God's own speaking, either directly or through Christ and the Spirit. Remarkable by their absence from the introductory formulas of Hebrews are the terms *γράφω* and *γραφή*, which appear so often in connection with Old Testament quotations elsewhere in the New Testament. For him the Old Testament, while God's word and therefore valid, along with the Jewish institutions it establishes, is nevertheless anticipatory, demanding completion. Yet its prophecies may continue to point to the future, even for the Christian, and even its anticipatory and incomplete aspects serve to illumine the perfect revelation that has come in Christ.¹⁵⁰ Perhaps more than any other figure the unknown author of Hebrews deserves the title of the Old Testament theologian of the New.

The Old Testament language of the Revelation to John is indicated by the bold face type in the Nestle text and even more fully by the marginal notes. Swete counts 278 verses with allusions to the Old Testament or some dependence upon it out of the 404 verses of the book.¹⁵¹ Yet John never quotes extensively. Not even a full verse from the Old Testament is quoted in its entirety. Never does he give any indication that he is quoting, and therefore he has no introductory formulas. Not surprisingly, in view of the allusive character of the author's use of the Scriptures, the Old Testament text of Revelation presents a difficult problem. J. A. Montgomery is probably correct in thinking that the Old Testament material in Revelation comes out of the rich storehouse of the author's memory rather than from a single textual tradition or combination of traditions.¹⁵² Yet recent research has turned up

150. See the excellent statement by C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd*, ed. W. D. Davies and David Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), p. 392.

151. Henry Barclay Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices*, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1911), p. cxl. His count is actually based on the "quotations from the Old Testament" given in the appendix of B. F. Wescott and F. J. A. Hort, eds., *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Cambridge and London: Macmillan, 1881).

152. "The Education of the Seer of the Apocalypse," *JBL*, 45 (1926), 70-80, esp. 71 f.

some rather striking affinities between the Old Testament references in Revelation and the Aramaic Targums.¹⁵³ The semitizing character of John's Greek suggests the likelihood of his knowledge of targumic tradition. That such tradition might turn up in material drawn from his memory is not at all unlikely. John's method of using the Old Testament may also explain why he shows relatively little contact with the primitive church's tradition of scriptural proof or apologetic.¹⁵⁴ His mind moves independently along new paths, producing only occasional testimonies from the common tradition (or memory) of the church (see for example Zech. 12:10 f., found in Rev. 1:7 and John 19:37).

Naturally John's reminiscences of the Old Testament are heavily weighted toward the prophetic side of the canon. References to Isaiah are fairly numerous as one might well expect, since Isaiah is the prophetic book most frequently quoted in the New Testament. On the other hand there are numerous allusions to Ezekiel, Daniel, and Jeremiah—more in Revelation than in other New Testament books.

It is virtually impossible to discover any purpose behind John's use of the Old Testament distinguishable from his purpose in the entire work. This is exactly what his way of employing the Old Testament would lead us to expect. The author's language and thought world is the Old Testament, as he understands it, particularly the prophetic writings. Without them he could not have written at all. Thus the document itself is, literally, quite inconceivable apart from the Old Testament. While Revelation is unique among New Testament books generally, as well as unique in its appropriation of the Old Testament, in two respects it is strikingly typical. First, the prophetic-eschatological dimension of the Old Testament is dominant in Revelation. Actually, the predominance of allusions to prophetic books is disproportionate. Nevertheless, the New Testament is marked by its tendency to read the Old Testament as prophecy rather than law (the rabbis) or reli-

153. L. P. Trudinger, "Some Observations concerning the Text of the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 17 (1966), 82-88; McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, pp. 97-125.

154. Cf. the judgment of Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, p. 29: "The Epistle to the Hebrews . . . is a highly individual study in its own right, so that its scriptural interpretation witnesses more to the outlook of the author than to a previous apologetic tradition. The Book of Revelation, which also contains a wealth of scriptural quotations, is so poetical in its approach . . . that it could be used only rarely for confirmatory evidence of conclusions drawn from other parts of the New Testament."

gious philosophy (Philo). (Perhaps Revelation shares with Qumran an emphasis on the future rather than the past or present fulfillment of prophecy, whereas the New Testament generally places greater weight upon the latter aspect.) Second, the author of Revelation expresses himself in a vocabulary and phraseology drawn from the Old Testament. Here again he represents a kind of exaggeration of a phenomenon found elsewhere in the New Testament, for it is well known that the Old Testament scriptures, particularly in their septuagintal form, served as a rich mine of theological (and other) vocabulary and conceptuality for the early Christian writers.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE NEW

The principal importance of the Old Testament for the New inheres precisely in the two points just mentioned above. When due account is taken of the historic novelty or uniqueness of the New Testament message and the extent of its orientation toward the Hellenistic world, one must still reckon with its deep indebtedness to Judaism and the Old Testament, both with respect to its theological language and conceptuality and with respect to its prophetic-historical consciousness.¹⁵⁵

Because of this rootage, which is intrinsic to the Christian message and not merely its historically conditioned husk, the Old Testament is the indispensable theological-historical background for reading and understanding the New. This does not mean that

155. The importance of the Old Testament for the New, and for the Christian faith, has in recent years been the subject of considerable scholarly theological discussion. Note especially B. W. Anderson, ed., *The Old Testament and Christian Faith: A Theological Discussion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963); Claus Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, trans. J. L. Mays (Richmond: John Knox, 1963); James Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); John Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1967); Daniel Lys, *The Meaning of the Old Testament: An Essay on Hermeneutics* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1967); K. H. Miskotte, *When The Gods are Silent*, trans. J. W. Doberstein (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); F. F. Bruce, *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1968); Claus Westermann, *The Old Testament and Jesus Christ*, trans. O. Kaste (German ed., 1968; Minneapolis: Augsburg, n.d.); Norbert Lohfink, *The Christian Meaning of the Old Testament*, trans. R. A. Wilson (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1968); and, especially, Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), an important programmatic statement. See also the summation of earlier literature by Roland E. Murphy, "The Relationship Between the Testaments," *CBQ*, 26 (1964), 349-59, and his "Christian Understanding of the Old Testament," *Theology Digest*, 18 (1970), 321-32.

the contemporary Jewish and Hellenistic milieu can be left out of account, however, because it is only in and through that milieu that the Old Testament was read by the early Christians, including the New Testament writers. It does mean that those who first brought the Christian message to theological articulation—even in most primitive form—saw that message as the culmination of the saga of Israel's history and faith, and therefore of Scripture. Furthermore, New Testament writers and theologians from Paul to Luke, John, and the author of Hebrews carried out their work in conscious continuation of this perspective, in different ways elaborating it or enlarging upon it. Thus Luke sees the relationship between Old and New primarily in terms of continuity. John sees it in terms of polarity, but not a polarity in which the Old has a purely negative function. Rather the Old must be seen completely in light of the New, and the failure to do so constitutes the ground for condemnation whereby "Israel" becomes "the Jews," and the latter, in their obduracy, "the world." In Hebrews we see a point of view closer to John than to Luke, but without the visible animus toward the representatives of an old dispensation that will not change. Nevertheless, "He abolishes the first in order to establish the second" (10:9); thus the Old is fulfilled and displaced by the New no less thoroughly in Hebrews than in John.

In a very helpful way von Rad has shown that the reinterpretation of the old sagas and traditions in the light of a new salvation-event, either anticipated or accomplished, is a phenomenon quite common in the Old Testament from the Exodus onward.¹⁵⁶ In principle, or formally considered, the New Testament represents a continuation or extension of this process, although the reinterpretation is carried through in a quite radical way. Again, the closest historically contemporary analogy to this reinterpretation is probably to be found in Qumran. Although Qumran has no "New Testament" in the proper sense of the word, the impetus and the initial stages of another canonical corpus, or at least the extension of the inherited scriptures in consequence of the sect's unique experience and consciousness, can already be seen in the surviving documents.¹⁵⁷

156. *Old Testament Theology*, vol. II: *The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pt. 3, esp. pp. 319-35.

157. Eybers may be right in contending that, strictly speaking, the canon of Qumran

Perhaps even more important than this traditional-historical connection of the Old Testament and the New, with all its theological implications, is their common language and conceptuality. By this is not meant merely common vocabulary and a common treasury of ideas, although those are present and significant. Rather, there exists a common way of talking and thinking about Man and God in their confrontation and interaction. Man can only be understood and defined over against God. Conversely God and talk about God can only have significance in so far as they bear upon man; not man in the abstract, but man as a concrete historical being whose life is characterized by decision-making, dependency, and dying. In this respect, Rudolf Bultmann, whose views on the Old Testament have been much criticized,¹⁵⁸ has quite rightly affirmed the indispensability of the Old Testament for the New. In his characteristic way of putting the matter, the Old Testament as law provides the indispensable existential presupposition for understanding the New. Man in Old Testament terms is the man to whom the Gospel is addressed, because that man understands himself as responsible for disposing of himself before God. Only such a man can receive grace, for apart from such a self-understanding grace is a meaningless concept. Whatever may be said by way of criticizing or questioning the adequacy of this view of the Old Testament's relevance, it can scarcely be gainsaid as far as it goes. For the irrelevance and impotence of the church is the inevitable result of failure to understand man as a creature responsible before God, whose creatureliness and responsibility are neither resolved nor negated, but redeemed, by the Gospel message of the New Testament. Where the Old Testament is ignored, such an understanding of man as creature, indeed as historical and societal creature, usually disappears, and the New Testament is wrongly regarded as only a handbook of personal piety and religion.

was very close to the Jamnian canon. But the criterion of use is also an important factor in establishing canonicity, and by this criterion Qumran would seem to have been in the process of expanding its canon. See, for example, the War Scroll, the Manual of Discipline, and the Damascus Document.

158. See especially the B. W. Anderson volume which consists of an interesting and important series of critical responses to Bultmann's opening essay, "The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith" (first published in 1933).