

Jewish communities in Palestine, Rome and Alexandria agreed in identifying their sacred writings with a definite number of books, ordered sequentially into three (or four) divisions: Laws, Prophecies or Oracles, Hymns and the rest. A tripartite division of Scripture, not unlike that of **Josephus** and **Philo**, is also attributed to Jesus in Luke 24:44: 'the law of Moses and the prophets and psalms'.³¹

BEN SIRA. This tripartite division of the Bible was not the creation of first-century Judaism, for it has a precedent in the prologue attached in Alexandria to the Greek translation (c. 132 BC) of **Ben Sira**, a Hebrew work originating in Palestine in the early second century B.C.E. The translator observes that

My grandfather Jesus (devoted himself) to the Law and the Prophets and the other ancestral books (τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρῶν βιβλίων) . . . (In Greek translation) not only this work but even the Law itself and the Prophecies and the rest of the books (αὐτός ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων) differ not a little (from the original).

As the prologue shows, already in the late second century B.C.E., and probably two generations earlier, certain sacred books had a canonical status. That is, they constituted a definite and identifiable collection with a continuing, normative authority distinguished from that of other religious writings. They had already been translated into Greek and, like the Holy Scriptures known to **Philo** and **Josephus**, they were divided into three parts: the Law, the Prophets and the other books. It is possible that, since the individual books are not named, those in the canon of one writer were not identical with those of the others. However, they are designated by very similar expressions and are apparently well-known works requiring no enumeration. In the absence of contrary historical evidence the twenty-two books mentioned by **Josephus** and perhaps earlier in Jub 2:23 may, with some probability, be presumed to be the sacred books of **Philo** and **Ben Sira** as well. Only in the second century C.E., when uncertainty existed about their number or order, are the books of the OT listed by name. We may now turn to these later testimonies.

WITNESSES: THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES

MELITO. The two principal witnesses to the state of the OT canon in the second century are the Babylonian Talmud tractate Bava Batra and Melito, bishop of Sardis. Melito, answering an inquiry concerning the 'number' and the 'order' of

³¹ Since the Psalms stand at the beginning of the Hagiographa in some Hebrew manuscripts and are a part of the title (ὑμνους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα) of the Hagiographa in **Philo**, they may represent the third division of the OT canon in Luke. Cf. also Luke 24:27. For a somewhat similar division in a Jewish writing cf. 2 Macc 2:13.

'the old books' (τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων), writes the following words (c. 170 C.E.):

. . . when I came to the East and reached the place where these things were preached and done, and learned accurately the books of the Old Testament (τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία), I set down the facts . . . These are their names: Of Moses five, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy; Joshua son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, four of Kingdoms, two of Chronicles, the Psalms of David, Solomon's Proverbs or Wisdom (ἡ καὶ σοφία), Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; of the Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve (Minor Prophets) in one book, Daniel, Ezekiel, **Esdras**.³²

It is apparent in the light of some subsequent catalogues given below, that this enumeration includes Samuel within Kings, Lamentations under Jeremiah and identifies Ezra-Nehemiah as Esdras; Solomon's 'Wisdom' is in all likelihood an alternate designation for Proverbs.³³ If so, this list conforms to the present OT with the exception of Esther, which was apparently omitted, either by accident or by design.³⁴

Melito's canon represents the OT as it was received in certain Palestinian Jewish and/or Jewish-Christian circles in the second century. Apart from Esther it presumably contained the same books as the canon of **Josephus**. It also has three divisions, with the first and third designated 'Of Moses' and 'Of the prophets'. However, it differs in the numbering since Samuel and Kings are counted as four, Judges-Ruth as two, to give a canon of twenty-five books; in this respect, in the books within each division and in sequence it conforms more closely than **Josephus** to Codex B of the Septuagint: Law (5), Histories (9) and Poetry (5), Prophets (6). It is also closer to the Septuagint in the titles of the books.

Since both the Septuagint (Greek) version of the OT and a Hebrew recension with a Septuagint text-form were already in use in first-century Palestine, the divisions and sequence represented by later codices of the Septuagint may also have been known. At least, Melito's canon, chronologically speaking, has as good a claim to represent an accepted Jewish order as does the rabbinic

³² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:26.13f. If Melito's reference to a trip was literary convention, as **Nock** ('Apocryphal Gospels', 63f.) thought, he in any case identifies Palestine as the source of his information.

³³ According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 4:22, 9) this designation for Proverbs was common in the second century.

³⁴ Cf. **Ryle**, *Canon*, 214-18, 229ff. In other lists 'Εσθή follows 'Εσδρας and, if this was the case in Melito's catalogue, it may have been omitted by a scribe inadvertently or because of a confusion of names. A parallel for this is offered by Origen's list of OT books which omits the Twelve Minor Prophets. However, of the twenty-two OT books only Esther is lacking at Qumran, and the biblical status of Esther was questioned by some rabbis (cf. Leiman, *Canonization*, 200 n. 634) and by a few Christian writers. Therefore, it is possible if not probable that the book was not recognized as Scripture by Melito's informants. Cf. *B.T. Sanhedrin* 100a.

arrangement that one first encounters also in a second century document, a baraita of the Babylonian Talmud. It is reasonable to suppose that the canonical lists of both the rabbis and of Melito represent revisions of an older order or orders to which Josephus, Philo and Ben Sira bear witness.³⁵

BAVA BATRA. A tradition in the Babylonian Talmud tractate Bava Batra (14b) reads:

Our rabbis taught that the order of the Prophets is Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, the Twelve (Minor Prophets). . . . The order of the Hagiographa is Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, **Chronicles**.³⁶

The section is introduced by the formula, 'our rabbis taught', which identifies it as a baraita and thereby probably dates it before 200 C.E.³⁷ It appears to represent the accepted limits and divisions of the Sacred Scriptures among (some) second-century rabbinic schools. With some variations in the divisions of the canon and in the sequence of certain books, i.e. Isaiah, Ruth, Song of Songs, Esther, it agrees with the subsequent form of the Hebrew (masoretic) Bible received and used in Judaism. Since the Pentateuch is presupposed, it reflects a canon of twenty-four books:³⁸ Law or **Tora** (5), Prophets or **Neviim** (8), Writings or **Kefuvim** (11).

It is significant that the baraita is concerned not with the **identity** of the canonical books but with their **order**. That is, it suggests no controversy about the **limits** of the canon, but it may reflect a situation in which there were uncertainties or divergent traditions among the Jews about the sequence and divisions of the canon, e.g. which books belonged among the Prophets and which among the Writings. Just these kinds of variations **from** the rabbinic order given in the baraita occur in the canons of **Josephus** and Melito and in the Hebrew Bible known to later Christian writers.

³⁵ On the background of the text-types underlying the Septuagint and masoretic texts cf. Leiman, *Canon and Masorah*, 327-33 (= Albright, 'New Light'), 334-48 (= Cross, 'Contribution'), 833-69 (= Orlinisky, 'Prolegomenon').

³⁶ The order of the Hagiographa is meant to be chronological with the possible exception of Job. Ruth is attributed to Samuel; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs to Solomon; Lamentations to Jeremiah; Daniel is from the Exile; Esther, Ezra and Chronicles are post-Exilic. Cf. Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 1-8; Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar* 4, 415-34.

³⁷ For the most part the **beraitot** of the Talmuds originated in the Tannaic period (i.e. pre-200 C.E.) but were not included in the Mishna. Cf. De Vries, 'Baraita, Beraitot'.

³⁸ Cf. The Gospel of **Thomas** 52: 'Twenty-four prophets spoke in Israel and all of them spoke in you'. Some manuscripts of 4 **Ezra** 14:44-46 (c. 100 C.E.) may imply a canon of twenty-four books (and seventy apocryphal books), but others give a different numbering. Some manuscripts of the **masoretic** Bible have four divisions: Pentateuch, Megillot (Ruth, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Prophets, Hagiographa. Cf. Ryle, *Canon*, 250-61; Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 3. On the possible origins of an 'ordering' of the individual canonical books cf. Leiman, *Canonization*, 162 n. 258, 202 n. 644, and Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 181-234.

ORIGEN. While still at Alexandria, and therefore before 231 C.E., the eminent biblical scholar Origen (c. 185-254 C.E.) wrote an exposition of Psalm 1 in which he included 'a catalogue of the sacred scriptures of the Old Testament' (τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης καταλόγου). He comments that 'there are twenty-two canonical books (ἐνδιαθήκους βιβλούς) as the Hebrews tradition them, the same as the number of the letters of their alphabet'. He proceeds to give the titles in Greek, followed by a transliteration of the Hebrew names:

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, **Judges-Ruth**, Kingdoms (1,2) [= Samuel], Kingdoms (3,4), Chronicles (1,2), Esdras (1,2) [= Ezra], Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah-Lamentations-Letter, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, Esther.

In conclusion Origen states, 'And outside of these are the Maccabees, which are entitled **Sarbethsabaniel**'.³⁹

The account, also preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 6:24, 2; 6:25, 1f.), gives only twenty-one books, and it is evident that the Twelve (Minor Prophets) has been accidentally omitted by a scribe. Like Melito, Origen employs Septuagint titles and roughly follows the Septuagint sequence of Law, Histories, Poetry and Prophecies. However, he goes beyond Melito in several important respects: He (1) sets the Septuagint titles beside those of the Hebrew books and gives a more specific listing. (2) He considers (elsewhere) the problem of differences between the Hebrew and Septuagint texts and (3) introduces a (?Jewish) practice whereby religious books 'outside of these' canonical writings, but nevertheless useful to the people of God, may be regarded as a kind of appendix to the canon.

1. Origen transcribes the Hebrew names and details those books, usually separated in the Septuagint, that appear 'in one [book]' in the Hebrew canon known to him. Of the six combined books – Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Judges-Ruth, Jeremiah-Lamentations-Letter, Ezra – the last three are of special interest.

a. As Jerome later states explicitly, "the combined and separate disposition of Ruth and Lamentations accounts not only for their different classification, respectively, among the Prophets (**Neviim**) or among the Hagiographa (**Ketuvim**) but also for the different number of books in the Hebrew canon of Josephus, Origen, Epiphanius and Jerome (twenty-two books) and in the list of

³⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:25, 1f. Perhaps, 'the book (**sefer**) of the house (**beir**) of **Sabaniel**, i.e. of the **Maccabees**. On the problem cf. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées*, IVf.; Alon, *Jews, Judaism*, 8f.; Leiman, *Canonization*, 159 n. 229; Attridge, 'Historiography', 171 n. 39.

⁴⁰ In *Prologus Galeatus* ('the Helmeted Prologue'), which was the preface to Jerome's Latin translation of the OT. It stands before Samuel and Kings, the first books that Jerome translated, and notes that, while the Jewish canon ordinarily had twenty-two books, some (**nonnulli**) Jews count Ruth and Lamentations separately, giving a canon of twenty-four books. For the text cf. Fischer, *Biblia Sacra* 1, 364ff.; for the ET cf. Schaff-Wace, *Nicene Fathers* 6, 489f. For rabbinic witnesses to a canon of 24 books cf. Leiman, *Canonization*, 53-56.

Bava Batra 14b, other rabbinic traditions and the masoretic Bible (twenty-four books).

b. The 'Letter' attached to Jeremiah in Origen's list refers either to **Baruch**⁴¹ or to the Letter **of Jeremiah**. While the latter was originally written in Greek, Baruch may have existed in Hebrew and may therefore be the 'Letter' referred to here. In support of this supposition the Greek text of (parts of) Baruch manifests signs of a Hebrew original" and, according to the fourth-century **Apostolic Constitutions** (5:20), certain Jews read Baruch on the Day of Atonement. Furthermore a reference to the Letter of Jeremiah is virtually excluded by the following considerations: Origen has the Hebrew Scriptures in his possession and presupposes a knowledge of them in his commentaries and his **Hexapla**. Even though he defends some Septuagint additions, e.g. to Daniel, he is quite aware of the different readings 'in their [Hebrew] copies' (**ἀντιγράφοις**) and 'in our [Septuagint] books'.⁴² It is, therefore, difficult to suppose that Origen has here added a **Septuagint** appendix, whether Baruch or the Letter of Jeremiah, and has then explicitly identified the whole with the Hebrew book Jeremiah. Either 'the Letter' is a Baruch appendix to Jeremiah in the Hebrew Bible known and used by Origen, or it is a scribal gloss on Origen's list.

Several items of evidence favour the latter alternative, that is, a scribal gloss as the most satisfactory resolution of the problem. (1) Jerome states that the Hebrews 'neither read nor possess' (*nec legitur, nec habetur*) Baruch, and Epiphanius excludes both Baruch and the **Letter of Jeremiah** from the canon of the **Hebrews**⁴³ as does rabbinic tradition. Thus, the isolated comment that certain Jews read Baruch (**Apostolic Constitutions** 5:20) applies at most to a local phenomenon, if it is not completely without historical worth. (2) When other fourth century lists combine either the **Letter of Jeremiah**⁴⁴ or both the Letter and Baruch with the book of Jeremiah, they apparently reflect the content of Greek and Latin Bibles currently in use. This usage might have given occasion for a scribe to alter Origen's list accordingly. (3) Scribal 'mending' of texts to conform them to current usage is not unknown elsewhere, and it may well account for the addition of the Letter to Jeremiah-Lamentations.

c. Septuagint manuscripts now extant, all considerably later than Origen, place the Hebrew 'double' book Ezra-Nehemiah in one book under the title 2 Esdras and precede it with a book entitled 1 Esdras, a Greek paraphrase or

⁴¹ So Ryle, Canon, 218f.; Wildeboer, **Canon**, 79. Both Baruch and the Letter are referred to as 'epistles' in Epiphanius, **Panarion** 1:1, 5; De **Mens. et Pond.** 5. Cf. the discussion in Sundberg, **Old Testament**, 74-77. See note 67.

⁴² Cf. Swete, **Introduction**, 275f. So for Baruch 1:1-3:8, Tov, **Septuagint Translation**, 170.

⁴³ **Ad Africanum** 5; on different readings cf. **Ad Afr.** 2; 5 (in Daniel); 3f. (in Genesis, Esther, Job, Jeremiah). See note 49. On Origen's possession of Hebrew scriptures cf. Eusebius, **Hist. Eccl.** 6:16, 1.

⁴⁴ Jerome's prologue to Jeremiah in his Vulgate; Epiphanius, De **Mens. et Pond.** 5.

⁴⁵ Hilary, **Prol. in Libr. Pss.** See note 83.

midrash of parts of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. & In Origen's canon the two Greek books called Esdras are said to be 'in one' book, viz. Ezra, in his Hebrew Bible. For reasons given above in the matter of the Letter, Origen's two books of Esdras refer in all likelihood not to the two Septuagint books of those names but to the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, books that were 'one' in the Hebrew Bible but were separated in some Septuagint **codices** of that period.⁴⁷ Readers whose Septuagint copies contained 1 Esdras (alongside Ezra-Nehemiah) may have misunderstood Origen's statement and supposed that 1 Esdras was part of the Hebrew canon. Indeed, this apparent **terminological** confusion may have promoted the canonical status later accorded 1 Esdras although the major influence to that end seems to have been the inclusion of the work in some early Septuagint **codices** (e.g. Vaticanus, Alexandrinus). In any case the misunderstanding can hardly be charged to Origen.⁴⁸

2. If the above reasoning is correct, Origen's canon agrees in content with that of **B. T. Bava Batra** (14b) and, with the exception of Esther, of **Melito**. His defense of the Septuagint additions to Daniel, i.e. **Susanna**,⁴⁹ does not represent a different judgement about **the books** that belong in the canon. Rather, as the context makes evident, it concerns **variant readings and diverse content** within a commonly received book of the Hebrew canon. Like Justin (**Dial.** 71-73), Origen suspects that the texts of the rabbis may have been tampered with. Of course he could not know, as we today know from the library at Qumran, that the Septuagint text-type does have a Hebrew **Vorlage** that in some respects is superior to the masoretic text.⁵⁰ He was influenced substantially by a natural preference for the traditional 'Christian' Septuagint Bible. But for him it was a textual and doctrinal rather than a canonical

⁴⁶ The two books are apparently parallel translations of (Chronicles and) the Hebrew Ezra, Greek 1 Esdras more paraphrastic or midrashic and Ezra-Nehemiah more literal, somewhat analogous to the **Septuagintal** and Theodotianic translation of Daniel. Cf. Swete, **Introduction**, 265ff.; Jellicoe, **Septuagint and Modern Study**, 290-94. An apocalyptic book, 4 **Esdras** = 4 **Ezra**, is also sometimes called 2 **Esdras**.

⁴⁷ Jerome, **Prologus in Libro Regum** (= **Prologus Galeatus**). Cf. Fischer, **Biblia Sacra**, 1, 365: . . . 'Ezra is itself similarly divided into two books in the Greek and Latin (Bibles)'.

⁴⁸ **Puce Zahn, Geschichte** 2,331.

⁴⁹ Origen, **Ad Africanum** 9: The Hebrew copies lack the Septuagint readings because the elders 'hid from the knowledge of the people' passages that might bring discredit on them, e.g. the story of Susanna. Some of the passages 'have been preserved in their non-canonical writings' (**ἀποκρύφους**). For an ET of **Ad Africanum** cf. Roberts-Donaldson, **Ante-Nicene Fathers** 4, 386-92.

⁵⁰ Cf. Tov, **Septuagint Translation**, 168; Cross, 'Contribution': The biblical manuscripts from Qumran reflect a plurality of text-types including that of the Septuagint. In some instances 'the Septuagint faithfully reflects a conservative Hebrew textual family. On the contrary, the Proto-Massoretic and Massoretic family is marked by editorial reworking and conflation . . .' (82). The (traditional) view that the masoretic text was 'standard' and all others 'vulgar' cannot explain the data (91ff.).

preference and, as his compilation of the Hexapla shows, it was not maintained uncritically.”

The canonical list of Origen, which presents the books ‘as the Hebrews tradition them’, is not inconsistent with his defense of Septuagint text-forms, and it is a most significant witness to the church’s canon in the early third century. A hundred years later it is recorded by Eusebius because he, at least, views it as Origen’s own conviction about the books that the church should acknowledge. Since Origen’s translator and admirer Rufinus endorses a similar list, we may consider it very probable that Eusebius has represented the matter correctly.

3. Like other patristic writers, Origen cites writings outside his ‘canonical books’ with formulas that also introduce quotations from the canon.” He appears to be the first, however, to enunciate a principle to distinguish, in their employment and in their authority, writings that are canonical from writings that are useful for the church. In his commentary on Matthew he states,

It is of great virtue to hear and fulfill that which is said, ‘Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good’ (1 Thess 5:21). Nevertheless, for the sake of those who... cannot discern... and guard themselves carefully so as to hold that which is true and yet ‘avoid every kind of evil’ (1 Thess 5:22) no one ought to use for the confirmation of doctrine any books that are outside the canonical Scriptures (*canonizatas scripturas*).⁵¹

This distinction, which is elaborated in the following century by a number of Christian writers, is similar to and appears to rest upon earlier Jewish practice.” It is implicitly ascribed to the Jews by Origen himself when, in his catalogue, the

⁵¹ Cf. Swete, *Introduction*, 480f. for Origen’s criticism of certain Septuagint readings. Cf. de Lange, *Origen* 50f.

⁵² E.g. I Enoch in *De Principiis* 4:35 (‘he says’). In the context Origen, like Jude, views I *Enoch* as a prophecy. However, in *Contra Celsum* 5:54 he states that *Enoch* does not generally circulate at all (οὐ πάνυ) in the churches as divine (θεία). In *Ad Africanum* 13 Origen comments that ‘since the churches use *Tobit*’, he can adduce it to rebut an argument of Africanus. But the qualification is hardly an affirmation of the canonicity of *Tobit*, and it may indicate the opposite. Wiles’ conclusion that Origen’s usage ‘is a case of having it both ways’ and of citing the apocryphal writings used by the church ‘as authoritatively as any other part of the Old Testament’ seems doubtful to me. Cf. Wiles, ‘Origen’, 456.

⁵³ Origen, Comm. in *Mart.* 28 (on Matt 23:37-39), extant only in the Latin translation of Rufinus. The reference may be primarily to NT apocrypha, but it is equally applicable to the Old; cf. Westcott, *Survey*, 136f. The Latin *canonizatus* probably translates ἐνδιαθήκος (‘covenantal’), a term that Origen uses elsewhere for ‘canonical’ books. In 117 (on Matt 27:3-10) Origen distinguishes quotations found in a ‘standard book’ (*regulari libro*) or ‘public books’ (*publicis libris*) from those in a ‘secret book’ (*libro secreto*), i.e. the *Apocalypse of Elijah* and the Book of *Jannes and Jambres*.

⁵⁴ When in *Ad Africanum* 13 Origen states that the Jews neither use *Tobit* and Judith nor have them in the Hebrew apocrypha (ἀποκρύφους ἑβραϊστί), he implies that the Jews had a twofold classification (at least) of religious writings. This seems to be confirmed by the ‘kind of intermediate holiness’ that is ascribed in rabbinic literature to Ben Sira and, at the same time, the condemnation upon the (?public) reading of ‘outside books’; cf. Haran, ‘Problems of Canonization’, 245; 4 Ezra 14:45f. See also Gilbert, ‘Wisdom Literature’, 300-01; *M. Sanhedrin* 10:1.

Maccabees are mentioned along with but ‘outside of’ the canonical books of the Hebrews. It also seems to be presupposed by Josephus, who excluded from the canon writings after Ezra as not ‘worthy of equal credit’ but nevertheless employed them in constructing his *Antiquities* of the Jews.⁵⁵ The distinction is present, moreover, in Philo’s comment, given above, on the Holy Scriptures and the sectarian writings of the Therapeutae.

Somewhat different but perhaps not without similarity to Origen’s conception are the Qumran writings, Ben Sira and the rabbinic literature. In his prologue the translator of Ben Sira sets his volume apart from writings that had normative authority in Judaism, and yet he clearly regards it as a useful supplement, i.e. ‘a further help’. On a different level the rabbis contrast the ‘oral law’ (B. *T. Shabbat* 31a) or ‘traditions of the elders’ (cf. Matt 15:2) with the written Tora. But they consider the oral law as embodied in the Talmud to be the authoritative interpretation of the Tora and also cite Ben Sira, a book never received as canonical, with formulas ordinarily used for canonical writings.⁵⁶ As we hope to show below, the conception that *Holy Scripture can be supplemented* is significant not only for understanding the patristic church’s authoritative use of approved Jewish apocrypha and of post-apostolic Christian writings but also for the process of canonization itself.

THE FOURTH CENTURY: CUSTOM VERSUS JUDGMENT

In the fourth century the canon of the *or* posed an increasing problem for the church. Divided by a conscious and widening gap were the scholarly judgments on the canon and the popular usage of the church. The scholarly attitude was often expressed in explicit catalogues and was most clearly defined in the writings of Jerome. The popular conception was reflected in the (greater number of) books contained in many Greek and Latin Bibles and by the quotations of various writers.

There was, moreover, a different perception of the canon in the East and in the West. Especially in Africa, the church appears to have used indiscriminately the additional books of the Old Latin *codices* that were taken over from the Septuagint. The church in the East was more influenced by leaders who knew the Hebrew Bible (e.g. Origen, Jerome) or at least knew of a Hebrew canon to which their own should be subject.

⁵⁵ See note 26. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 12 and 13 *passim* (1 Macc).

⁵⁶ In *B. T. Berakhot* 48a, Sir 11:1 is combined with Prov 4:8 and introduced with the formula, ‘as it is written’; in *B. T. Bava Kamma* 92b, Sir 13:15 is introduced with the formula, ‘as written in the Hagiographa’. But cf. *T. Yadayim* 2:13 ‘Ben Sira and all the books written from that time on do not defile the hands’, i.e. are not canonical. On the status of Ben Sira in the Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition, see Beckwith, above, pp. 68-73.

CANONICAL LISTS IN THE EASTERN CHURCH. As was true earlier, the compilers of fourth-century canonical lists⁵⁷ are for the most part writers of the Eastern church. Early in the century⁵⁸ Eusebius (died c. 339 c.E.), bishop of Caesarea, included in his *Church History* the canonical statement of **Josephus** and the catalogues of Melito and Origen. He thus conveyed his own conviction that the OT to be received by the church was the twenty-two books of the Hebrew Bible. Other fourth-century fathers imply or expressly mention a second order of useful books outside the canonical twenty-two, but they are chiefly concerned to make known the limits of the canon in order to protect the believers from the dangerous influence of heretical writings. Cyril bishop of Jerusalem, writing his *Catechetical Lectures*⁵⁹ about the middle of the century, exhorts the **catechumens** to

read the divine Scriptures (**θείας γραφάς**), these twenty-two books of the Old Testament (**παλαιάς διαθήκης**) that were translated by the seventy-two translators (33) . . . (For) the translation of the divine Scriptures that were spoken in the holy Spirit was accomplished through the holy Spirit. Read their twenty-two books but have nothing to do with the apocryphal writings (**ἀπόκρυφα**). Study diligently only these that we also read with confident authority (**μετὰ παρρησίας**) in the church. (For) much wiser and holier than you were the apostles and ancient bishops who led the church and handed down these books (34f.).

Cyril proceeds to tabulate the books in three divisions, twelve historical, five poetic and five prophetic.⁶⁰ It is not certain whether 1-2 Esdras, 'reckoned [by the Hebrews] as one', refers to Ezra-Nehemiah, as seems probable, or includes 1 Esdras. 'Baruch and Lamentations and Epistle', appended to Jeremiah, clearly represent an accommodation to the contents of (Cyril's) Septuagint; and other books may implicitly comprehend the Septuagint additions. After enumerating the NT books, Cyril concludes:

Let all the rest be placed outside (the canon) in a second **rank**⁶¹ (**ἐν δευτέρῳ**). And whatever books are not read in churches, neither should you read them in private . . . (36).

⁵⁷ Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 172-259, gives most of the texts. The lists are conveniently tabulated by Swete, Introduction, 203-14, and Sundberg, 'Old Testament', 58f.

⁵⁸ The tenth book of his *History*, added in the third edition and dedicated to Paulinus of Tyre (*Hist. Eccl.* 10: 1, 2) upon the consecration of the basilica there, can be dated to 317 c.E. Cf. Lake, *Eusebius* 1, xx.

⁵⁹ Cyril, *Catech.* 4:33-36, a section with the title, 'Concerning the Divine Scriptures'. For the ET cf. Schaff-Wace, *Nicene Fathers* 7, 26ff.; Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 172 dates it 348 c.E.

⁶⁰ Cyril, *Catech.* 4:35: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges-Ruth, Kingdoms (1, 2), Kingdoms (3, 4), Chronicles (1, 2), Esdras (1, 2), Esther; Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs; Twelve (Minor Prophets), Isaiah, **Jeremiah-Baruch-Lamentations**-Epistle, Ezekiel, Daniel.

⁶¹ Cf. Schaff-Wace, *Nicene Fathers*; Westcott, Survey, 169.

Cyril makes his strict injunction against reading apocryphal books in the context of opposing the heretical Manicheans.⁶² Yet, addressing the same hearers, he himself cites works that he excludes from the canon in a manner somewhat similar to his citations of Scripture.⁶³ It is probable, then, that in the conclusion quoted above, Cyril has in view three classes of writings, the canonical books, the books of 'second rank' (that also may be read or cited in churches) and the heretical **apocrypha**.

In his Easter *Letter* (367 c.E.) Athanasius bishop of Alexandria makes this threefold classification explicit: canonical books, books read in church (especially) to catechumens, rejected heretical writings. Like Cyril, Athanasius also writes in the context of opposing the 'apocrypha' that some heretics sought 'to mix . . . with the inspired Scripture' (**θεοπνεύστῳ γραφῇ**). With respect to approved but non-canonical books, he writes?

But for the sake of greater exactness I add this also, writing under obligation, as it were. There are other books besides these, indeed not received as canonical but having been appointed (**τετυπωμένα**) by the Fathers to be read to those just approaching (the faith) and wishing to be instructed in the word of godliness: Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Ben **Sira**, Esther, Judith, **Tobit**, the **Didache** and the Shepherd (of Hermas) Nevertheless, my brothers, neither among those that are received as canonical nor among those that are read is there mention of any of the apocryphal books; they rather are the imagination (**ἐπίνοια**) of heretics, who indeed write them whenever they wish . . .

⁶² In *Catech.* 4:36; 6:31 Cyril ascribes the 'pseudepigraphal' Gospel of **Thomas** to the Manicheans; 4:34 appears to have the Marcionites also in view.

⁶³ Cyril, *Catech.* 9:2; 9:16 (Wisdom of Solomon) and 6:4; 11:19; 22:8 (Ben Sira). However, they are not cited as Scripture or, for the most part, with introductory formulas used to introduce canonical Scripture.

⁶⁴ Athanasius, *Easter Letter* 39; ET: Schaff-Wace, *Nicene . . . Fathers* 4, 551f.: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms (1, 2), Kingdoms (3, 4). Chronicles (1, 2), Esra (1, 2), Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, **Twelve** (Minor Prophets), Isaiah, Jeremiah-Baruch-Lamentations-Epistle, Ezekiel, Daniel. Esther is omitted. but by a separation of Judges and Ruth a twenty-two book total is maintained.

Canonical catalogues from Asia Minor during the mid-fourth century⁶⁵ show a similar concern to guard the readers from the dangers of 'strange books', and they have virtually the same content as the canons of Cyril and Athanasius.

Epiphanius (d. 404) bishop of Salamis (= Constantia) does not at first impression appear to be a very reliable witness. He is obsessed with number analogies,⁶⁶ is incessantly repetitious and rather absent-minded and gives three canonical catalogues that do not entirely agree.⁶⁷ However, the differences in the lists are more apparent than real; and the writer's wooden, repetitious style and candid 'after-thought' qualifications suggest a severely honest, if dogmatic temperament. Moreover, Epiphanius has a knowledge of Hebrew and has independent Jewish traditions, i.e. a catalogue of canonical books, that he carefully transliterates for his readers.⁶⁹ His comment on the list in *Panarion* (376 c.E.) is, therefore, of considerable importance:

⁶⁵ (1) Gregory Nazianzus (Carmen 1:12) bishop of Constantinople who, like Cyril, follows an arrangement of 12 historical, 5 poetic and 5 prophetic books; he counts Judges and Ruth separately and omits Esther. (2) Amphilochius, cited by Gregory (Carmen 2:8, 264-88), indicates no double books and employs no number analogies; he concludes that 'some add Esther'. Both lists, given in verse, are intended to guard the reader from the danger of heretical books. Gregory draws an analogy with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Neither mentions any books appended to Jeremiah. (3) The synod of Laodicea (c. 360 c.E.), which in its canon 59 restricted readings in church to 'the canonical books of the New and Old Testament', was apparently the first *ecclesiastical* action giving the canonical books a special and exclusive authority. The list of books itself (canon 60), agreeing with Cyril except for the position of Esther and Job, is a later appendage. Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 193-202; Swete, *Introduction*, 209.

⁶⁶ Epiphanius, *De Mens. et Pond.* 22f. E.g. there are twenty-two generations from Adam to the twelve patriarchs, therefore there are twenty-two Hebrew letters 'from Aleph to Tau'. The Jews have twenty-two canonical books- 'there being twenty-seven but counted as twenty-two'- with five double books, just as there are twenty-two Hebrew letters with five double letters. There are twenty-two works of God in creation and twenty-two sextaria (pints) in a modius (peck), just as there are twenty-two letters and twenty-two sacred books. In *De Mens. et Pond.* 4 he arranges the OT into four pentateuchs - Law, Poets, Holy Writings, Prophets - plus two other books (Ezra, Esther).

⁶⁷ In the *Panarion*, i.e. *Haer.* 8:6 (= 1:1, 9[6]) Epiphanius agrees with Cyril in the content though not in the sequence of books. In *De Mens. et Pond.* 4f. and 22-24, written some fifteen years later, he gives a different sequence and does not mention the additions to Jeremiah. However, Epiphanius (*De Mens. et Pond.* 5) explains that he includes the additions with the book Jeremiah 'though the Epistles (of Baruch and the Letter) are not included by the Hebrews: they join to Jeremiah only the book of Lamentations'.

⁶⁸ Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 222, 224 is certainly mistaken in supposing that Epiphanius wants to 'smuggle in' the Septuagint (apocryphal) books while professing to adhere to the twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon. For Epiphanius is at pains to single out the 'useful and beneficial' apocryphal books of Wisdom and Ben Sira from the canonical twenty-two and to explain that he includes the 'Letters' appended to Jeremiah while the Hebrews do not.

⁶⁹ Epiphanius, *De Mens. et Pond.* 23. It is not derived from Origen; Audet, 'Hebrew-Aramaic List', relates it to the list in the Bryennios manuscript (photograph in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* I/1, 474) whose source he dates to the first or early second century. The 27 books of the Bryennios canon are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Joshua, Deuteronomy, Numbers, Ruth, Job, Judges, Psalms, Kings, (1, 2, 3, 4), Chronicles (1, 2), Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Jeremiah, Twelve (Minor Prophets), Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Esdras (1, 2), Esther.

These are the twenty-seven books given by God to the Jews. But they are to be counted as twenty-two, the number of the Hebrew letters, since ten books are doubled and reckoned as five ...⁷⁰ There are also two other books near to them in substance (*ἀμφιλέκτω*), the Wisdom of Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon, besides some other apocryphal (*ἐν-αποκρύφω*) books. All these holy books (*ἱερὰ βιβλία*) also taught Judaism the things kept by the law until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

His distinction between the canonical (*ῥητά, ἐνδιόθετα*) and the apocryphal books is stated more precisely in *De Mensuris et Ponderibus* 4.

In these passages Epiphanius, a disciple of Athanasius, agrees with the Alexandrian in identifying two classes of books that are read in the church. Unlike Athanasius, he names the second class 'apocrypha' and, similar to Augustine (*De Doct. Christ.* 2:12f.), can regard both as 'holy books' or 'divine writings' (*Haer.* 76:1). That the 'apocrypha' have no special connection with his OT is evident also from the fact that he (again like Athanasius) can mention them, viz. Wisdom and Ben Sira, after the NT books.

In conclusion, among the fourth-century writers of Asia Minor, Palestine and Egypt⁷¹ the scholarly judgment of the Eastern church is intelligible and relatively consistent, and it rests upon appeal to ancient Christian tradition. It is divided only on the sequence and numbering of the books and on the inclusion of Esther, points at issue already in Judaism. It departs from the rabbinic determinations only with respect to the Septuagint additions to Jeremiah and (apparently) other books, seemingly content to follow the conviction of earlier Christian scholars, e.g. Justin and Origen, that the masoretic rather than the Septuagint text was defective.

At the same time these writers were quite prepared to recognize certain extra-canonical works as a second rank of holy books, to cite them author-

⁷⁰ From *De Mens. et Pond.* 4 it becomes clear that the double books are Judges-Ruth, 1-2 Chronicles, 1-2 Kingdoms (= Samuel), 3-4 Kingdoms, and 1-2 Esdras which 'also is counted as one'. Jeremiah-Lamentations-Letter-Baruch is counted as one among the twenty-seven and therefore, is not a double book. In *De Mens. et Pond.* 23 Epiphanius is not embarrassed to admit that, beyond the five double books, 'there is also another little book called Kinot' (= Lamentations) joined to Jeremiah. This shows that he is not a prisoner to his number analogies.

⁷¹ The judgement of the fourth-century Syrian church is less clear. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (2:57, 2), extant in Syriac, gives the groupings of OT books without naming them all individually. The Syriac OT, the Peshitta, which may be Jewish in origin (cf. the article of Dirksen, above), apparently contained only the books of the masoretic canon at the beginning. But by the fourth century it, like the Septuagint, had added apocryphal books, books that also were being cited as 'Scripture'. Cf. Jellicoe, *Septuagint and Modern Study*, 246-49; van Puyvelde, 'Versions Syriaques', 836; Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 227ff.

itatively⁷² and to include them in the same volume with canonical scripture.” In this matter also they followed ancient practice. However, while they were able to differentiate the two kinds of holy books, the popular mind of the church increasingly mixed and confused them. The popular attitude posed a danger not only for the integrity of the canon received from Judaism **but** also for the canonical principle itself. It was challenged and resisted by one man above all, who in spite of many faults was ‘the great representative of Western learning, its true head and glory, and the rich source from which almost all critical knowledge of Holy Scripture in the Latin Churches was drawn for almost ten **centuries**’.⁷⁴ In his historical knowledge, his scholarship and industry he can be compared in the ancient church only with Origen, and in his judgment on the canon he was unsurpassed. The man was Jerome. He can be best understood in the light of the general situation in the Western church of his time.

THE WESTERN CHURCH: **HILARY AND RUFINUS**. The church in the West produced no list of OT canonical books before the fourth century. As its Bible it had the Old Latin version(s) and the Septuagint from which it was translated,” both of which mixed together rather indiscriminately canonical and other ancient Jewish religious books. The Latin church, which by the fourth century was the church throughout the West, was separated by language and custom, even more than the Greek Church, from its Jewish origins. In its popular expression, at least, it regarded its version of the **OT** as ‘the Bible’ and resisted or accepted only reluctantly and gradually even the new Latin translation of **Jerome**.⁷⁶

⁷² E.g. Gregory Nazianzus, *Orat.* 29:16f.: ‘from the divine oracles’, followed by a score of biblical passages and one apocryphal saying (Wisdom 7:26); 45:15: ‘the Scripture’, referring to phrases from Judith 5:6 and Ps 138:9. Among earlier writers cf. Burn. 4:3: ‘concerning which it is written, as Enoch says’ (1 Enoch?); 16:5: ‘the Scripture says’ (1 Enoch 89:56?); Hermas, *Vis.* 2:3, 4: ‘as it is written in Eldad and Modad’; Clement Alexandrinus, *Strom.* 1:21: ‘for it is written in Esdras’ (1 Esdras 6-7?); Origen, Luke: *Homily* 3: ‘the Scripture promised’ (Wisdom 1:2); Cyprian, *Epistulae* 73(74), 9: ‘as it is written’ (1 Esdras 4:38-40); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4:20, 2: ‘Well did the Scripture say’ (Hermas, *Mand.* 1:1). See notes 63, 100.

⁷³ The fourth-century Septuagint **codices**, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, both contain the apocryphal books of Wisdom, Ben Sira, Tobit and Judith. Vaticanus also has Greek 1 Esdras; Sinaiticus, 1 and 4 Maccabees. The Septuagint apparently had this inclusive character from the beginning of its **codex** form, i.e. in the second or early third century. Cf. Swete, *Introduction*, 265-88.

⁷⁴ Westcott, Survey, 180f.

⁷⁵ But see Jellicoe, *Septuagint and Modern Study*, 251. Sparks, ‘Latin Bible’, 102f. calls attention to Jewish (Christian) influences in the ‘haphazard and gradual’ process of translation, and Cantera, ‘Puntos de contacto’, 223-40, finds that the Old Latin has points of contact with the **targum** and with the Peshitta, and that it probably has a targumic origin. See Kedar, above, pp. 308-11.

⁷⁶ For Augustine’s reservations cf. De *Civ. Dei* 18:43. See also Augustine, *Epistulae* 71:5 (cf. *DCB* 3, 45), where it is related that a north African congregation loudly corrected its bishop when he reading Jerome’s translation, differed from the traditional wording.

This state of affairs is reflected by the **Mommsen Catalogue**, which was probably composed in north Africa in 359 c.e.⁷⁷ In its OT list it numbers the apocryphal books of 1 and 2 Maccabees, Tobit, Judith, and perhaps (under the title ‘Solomon’) Ben Sira and Wisdom. At the conclusion it compares the twenty-four ‘canonical books’ with the twenty-four elders of Revelation (4:4). However, the total can be squared with the enumerated books only by arbitrary combinations and appears to be a number, traditional in some circles of the Western church,⁷⁸ that has been gratuitously appended to a list with which it has no essential connection. Like certain Greek and Latin biblical **codices**, the Mommsen Catalogue appears to represent not a critical opinion but a popular usage with which the traditional twenty-four books were then identified. It indicates a changed situation from the early third-century African church where Tertullian (De *Cult. Faem.* 1:3; cf. Epiphanius, De *Mens. et Pond.* 4), in deference to the Hebrew Bible, qualified his use of 1 Enoch with the comment that it was ‘not admitted into the Jewish ark’.

Two other sources, that at first look promising, prove to be of little help in determining the canon used in the West. Philaster (d. 397) bishop of Brescia, Italy, states with reference to the OT that ‘nothing else ought to be read in the catholic church but the law and the prophets’ ...⁷⁹ But he does not identify the books. Equally unhelpful is the **Decretum Gelasianum**,⁸⁰ which is usually attributed to Gelasius, bishop of Rome from 492-496 c.e., but in some manuscripts is credited to the Roman bishop Damasus (d. 384). Its second section contains an OT catalogue including apocryphal books that, in the opinion of some scholars, represents a canon promulgated by Damasus at the council of Rome in ad 382. However, Epiphanius, who participated in the council, had only a few years before endorsed a canon limited to the twenty-two books of the Hebrew Bible, and he would not likely have joined in commending as divine Scripture ‘which the universal catholic church receives’* books that he had earlier set apart as **apocrypha**. More significantly, the **Decretum** is extant only in a later compilation of mixed vintage, and it is impossible to say what the list may have

⁷⁷ On the provenance cf. Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 154f. It is also known as the Cheltenham List from the place where one of the two extant manuscripts was found. It is reproduced and evaluated by Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 143-56, 1007-12. Cf. also Sanday, ‘Cheltenham List’, 217-303.

⁷⁸ A total of twenty-four books is mentioned also by Hilary (*Prol. in Libr. Pss.*), who compares it to the twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet; by Victorinus of Pettau (d. 304, *Comm. on Apcl.* 4:6, 8 cited in Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 338); and by Ps-Tertullian (= ?Commodian, c. 250 c.e.), *Poem against Marcion* 4:251-65 (Roberts-Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 4, 160). Jerome, *Prologus Galeatus*, states that some Jews count twenty-four books in their canon; the twenty-four count in the West also probably has its origin in Jewish tradition or usage.

⁷⁹ Philaster, *Treatise on Heresies* 88 (c. 385 c.e.). Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 237.

⁸⁰ Cf. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum*, who gives the text (24-26) and concludes (348-51) that it is a private work, compiled in Italy in the sixth century.

⁸¹ *Decretum Gelasianum* 2, Title: ‘*quid universalis catholica recipiat ecclesia*’. Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 261n.; von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum*, 24. Apocryphal books included in the list are Wisdom, Ben Sira, Tobit, 1 Greek Esdras, Judith, 1-2 Maccabees.

looked like in an original fourth-century document if, in fact, such a document ever existed. The list cannot, therefore, be regarded as a reliable witness to the canon received in the West in the fourth century.⁸²

At about the time that the Mommsen Catalogue appeared in north Africa, Hilary (d. 367), bishop of Poitiers in Gaul, published a canon of the *OT* in the prologue to his commentary on the Psalms.⁸³ It consists of the twenty-two books of the Hebrew Bible and of our present *OT* although some books, like Jeremiah, may represent the longer Septuagint text-forms. Apparently influenced by the catalogues of the Greek church, it represents the canon also accepted by some churches and/or teachers in the West. For it concludes with the comment that some 'by adding **Tobit** and Judith count twenty-four books'. This alludes to a tendency in the West, observable in the Mommsen Catalogue, to accommodate a traditional twenty-four book count to the popular use of apocryphal writings.

Rufinus (d. 410), presbyter of Aquileia in northeast Italy, who had long known Hilary's *views*,⁸⁴ set forth the same canonical standard in that country that Hilary had published in France.⁸⁵ He presents a list that in two respects is remarkable. Like the Greek Fathers generally, it limits the *OT* books to the twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon. But unlike any known Christian catalogue, it follows a sequence like that of **Josephus** three centuries before: Law (5) + Prophets (13) + Hymns and precepts (4).⁸⁶ In this respect he does not follow Origen but, since he appeals to the 'records of the fathers' (*ex patrum monumentis*), he presumably received the sequence from a Christian tradition. Possibly he deduced it from the account of **Josephus** found in Eusebius, but more likely he found it elsewhere.

Like several Eastern writers, Rufinus distinguishes three classes of 'scriptures': canonical, ecclesiastical and apocryphal. He places the ecclesiastical writ-

⁸² Otherwise: **Schwarz**, 'Zum Decretum Gelasianum' 168; Turner, 'Latin Lists', 554f.; Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 259-67. The supposition of **Howorth** 'Influence', followed by **Sundberg**, *Old Testament*, 148f., that Jerome accepted the canonicity of the apocrypha at the Council and later changed his opinion, only adds conjecture to conjecture.

⁸³ Hilary, *Comm. in Pss.*, Preface 15: Moses (5), Joshua, Judges-Ruth, Kingdoms (1, 2), Kingdoms (3, 4), Chronicles (1, 2), Ezra (= Ezra-Nehemiah), Psalms; Solomon: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs; Twelve (Minor) Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah-Lamentations-Letter, **Daniel**, Ezekiel, Job, Esther.

⁸⁴ Jerome, *Epistulae* 5:2: '(Send) me Hilary's commentary on the Psalms ... which I copied for (Rufinus) at Trèves ...'

⁸⁵ Rufinus, *Expositio Symboli* 34 (36). Rufinus can elsewhere defend the Septuagint additions, e.g. to Daniel (*Apof.* 2:35). But this is more a textual than a canonical question, as it was also for Origen and for Cyril.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 35f. (37f.): Five of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Joshua, Judges-Ruth, Kingdoms (4) 'which the Hebrew count as two', Chronicles, Esdras (2) 'which (the Hebrews) count as one', Esther; of the Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, **Daniel**, Twelve (Minor) Prophets, Job; Psalms, Three of Solomon: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs. Unlike Josephus, there is no demarcation between a second and third division of the canon. For the text cf. Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 24044; for an **ET**, **Kelly**, *Rufinus' Commentary*.

ings – Wisdom, Ben Sira, Tobit, Judith, Maccabees – after the list of *OT* and *NT* books, thereby avoiding any implication that they belong to his canonical *OT* and states that they are not to be used as authority 'for the confirmation of doctrine' (ex *his fidei confirmandam*). He designates as apocrypha those books that are explicitly excluded from the churches' corporate life and worship. His repeated references to 'the fathers' or 'the ancients' as the transmitters of the canon show that he derives his understanding of the matter not from popular usage but from traditional authorities such as Cyril (whom he must have met in Jerusalem), Origen and other Fathers whose writings he had read. Rufinus gives the impression that he is not so much opposing a different canon currently advocated in Italy as he is clarifying uncertain distinctions between canonical and uncanonical books, distinctions that had been preserved among the Greek theologians but were less clearly perceived among the churches of the West.

AUGUSTINE. Of the three Western witnesses to the *OT* canon discussed above – the Mommsen Catalogue from north Africa, Hilary in Gaul and Rufinus in Italy – only the first identifies apocryphal writings as canonical. These testimonies probably reflect in substantial measure the differing regional attitudes of the Latin church in the latter half of the fourth century. The churches of Italy and Gaul, which had been served by prominent Greek-speaking writers until the beginning of the third century, remained undecided or, at least, of two minds on the question of the canon. On the other hand the churches in north Africa, which from the beginning of the third century exercised an increasingly important role in Western Christianity, had apparently reached a settled acceptance of apocryphal writings and received them at full parity with the other Scriptures.

The north African attitude received an official standing in the canon promulgated at the council of Hippo 393 c.e. and was reaffirmed by two councils at Carthage (397, 419 c.e.).⁸⁷ These resolutions, which rested on no appeal to ancient patristic authority and which apparently reflected only the consensus of contemporary usage in Africa, drew no distinction between canonical and ecclesiastical, i.e. apocryphal writings. Both were equated under the dictum 'Nothing shall be read in church under the name of divine Scriptures except canonical Scriptures'.

At these provincial assemblies Augustine bishop of Hippo (d. 430) exercised an influential role, and his name is largely responsible for the far-reaching

⁸⁷ For the text and the problem of interpolation cf. Zahn, *Geschichte* 2, 246-59. For the *OT* the councils approved the following 'canonical scriptures': Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms (4), Chronicles (2), Job, Psalter, Solomon (5). Twelve (Minor) Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, **Tobit**, Judith, Esther, Esdras (2). A concluding instruction of the Council of 397 c.e. that the transpontine (Roman) church be consulted for a confirmation of the approved canon apparently did not achieve its desired end, for in the renewed affirmation in 419 c.e. the confirmation of Boniface bishop of Rome 'and other bishops of those parts' is again requested.

influence of their decisions.⁸⁸ Yet, unlike the councils, the bishop himself did not make an unqualified equation of canonical and apocryphal books. Before his conversion Augustine was for some years an adherent of Manicheism, a sect that was then active in north Africa and that made use of heretical apocrypha to promote its teachings among the Christians. This context best explains both Augustine's concern to circumscribe the writings used in the churches and, at the same time, his relative lack of interest in distinguishing among them the books 'accepted by all catholic churches' from those 'not accepted by all'.⁸⁹ In the first half of his treatise *On Christian Doctrine*, written soon after the council of Hippo, he draws this distinction⁹⁰ and proceeds to list the 'whole canon of scriptures'. Within the OT section he names a number of apocryphal books with the concluding comment, 'The authority of the Old Testament is restricted (*terminatur*) to these forty-four books'.⁹¹

Like Epiphanius, Augustine uses the term 'divine scriptures' of a broad category of religious writings of which the 'canonical scriptures' form only a part and, among the canonical, he distinguishes between universally accepted and disputed books.⁹² Thus, he appears to recognize a three-fold classification of religious writings common in the East and sometimes known there as canonical, ecclesiastical and apocryphal. But he termed the first two classes 'canonical', apparently held the distinction between them rather lightly and, in any case, failed to impress it upon his readers and upon the north African councils. Furthermore, apparently reluctant to offend popular piety,⁹³ Augustine preferred to rely on the traditional usage of the churches and on patristic citations to establish the limits of the canon. He shows little knowledge of the Fathers' express canonical statements. For a more acute perception of the issues involved, one must turn to Jerome who, though he lacked the theological creativity of Augustine, was in matters of church history better informed and in spite of a certain narrowness was on this issue gifted with a more critical faculty.

⁸⁸ As the survey by Westcott (Survey, 191-291) shows, even in the Middle Ages the canonical parity of the apocrypha was by no means universally acknowledged.

⁸⁹ Cf. Westcott, Survey, 185.

⁹⁰ Augustine, *De Doct. Chris.* 2:12.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 2:13: Five of Moses: ., Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms (4), Chronicles (2), Job, Tobit, Esther, Judith, Maccabees (2), Esdras (2); the Prophets: Psalms, Three of Solomon: Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes; Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus (= Ben Sira); Twelve (Minor) Prophets: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; Four Major Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel.

⁹² Cf. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*: Although 'some writings left by Enoch . . . were divinely inspired . . . (they) were omitted from the canon of scripture of the Hebrew people' (15:23). 'Three books (of Solomon) are received as of canonical authority, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs'; two others, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, 'are not his but the church of old, especially the Western received them into authority . . .' (17:20). The books of Maccabees are not recognized by the Jews as canonical, but 'the church accepts (them) as canonical because they record the great and heroic sufferings of certain martyrs' (18:36). Cf. Augustine, *On the Soul* 3:2: 'Scripture has spoken' (Wis 1:5).

⁹³ Cf. Augustine, *Epistulae* 82:35 (end); *De Civ. Dei* 18:43.

JEROME. Jerome of Bethlehem (c. 331-420 C.E.)⁹⁴ was born in Dalmatia (= Yugoslavia) near Aquileia in northeast Italy. After his conversion as a student in Rome, he mastered Greek, travelled in Gaul and returned to Aquileia (c. 370 C.E.). In 374 he journeyed to Syria where he adopted a monastic lifestyle, learned Hebrew⁹⁵ and was ordained a presbyter. After a brief return to Rome in 382 in the service of the Roman bishop Damasus, he went back to the East and in 386 settled in Bethlehem where until his death he lived in a cell, taught the Scriptures and continually devoted himself to study and to writing.

Jerome began his great work of biblical translation with a Latin rendering from the Septuagint but became convinced, largely by the use of Origen's Hexapla and his own knowledge of Hebrew, that the extant Greek version, no less than the Latin, suffered from many inaccuracies. Like Cyril, he still viewed the original work of the Septuagint as inspired but decided soon after his return to the East to start afresh with a translation directly from the Hebrew text, whose reliability he apparently did not question.

The relationship between Jerome's preference for the Hebrew text and his commitment to the Jewish canon is not entirely clear. The Jewish canon of twenty-two or twenty-four books was observed by some in the West and was known to Jerome very early in his Christian life if not from the beginning:

- (1) While in Gaul he copied for Rufinus Hilary's commentary on the Psalms with its canonical catalogue.
- (2) He began the study of Hebrew during his first sojourn in the East, some years before his interest in biblical translation.

This indicates an implicit recognition of the priority of the Hebrew Bible, and his translation of certain works of Eusebius and Origen at this time shows the impression that the Greek writers had made upon him. Probably his textual studies, especially his disillusionment with the Septuagint and his use of the Hebrew, sharpened his opinion about the canon but were not the origin of it.

Jerome began his new Latin Bible about 390. In the prologue to the first books translated, Samuel and Kings, and intended as a preface to the whole, he wrote as follows:

This prologue to the Scriptures may serve as a kind of helmeted preface for all the books that we have rendered from Hebrew into Latin in order that we (all) may know that whatever is outside these is to be set apart among the apocrypha. Accordingly, (the book of) Wisdom, commonly

⁹⁴ Following Kelly, Jerome, 337ff.

⁹⁵ Jerome, *Epistulae* 18:10; 125:12. According to Rufinus (*Apol.* 2:9) Jerome also did not know Greek before his conversion.

⁹⁶ Cf. the preface to his translation of Chronicles from the Hexaplaric Septuagint (cited by Swete, *Introduction*, 101f.). However, citing Josephus, Jerome appears to restrict the original Septuagint to the Pentateuch (Preface to the *Book on Hebrew Questions*; cf. *Comm.* in *Ezek.* 2:5, 12). Cyril restricted it to the twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon. Later (*Apol.* 2:25) Jerome rejected the inspiration of the Seventy.

ascribed to Solomon, and the book of Jesus son of Sirach and Judith and Tobit and the Shepherd are not in the canon.

Apart from the restriction of the OT canon to the Hebrew Bible, the prologue is noteworthy in other respects.

- (1) It lists the books of the OT, often with the Hebrew names followed by the Latin, in the masoretic sequence of the Law (5), the Prophets (8) and the Hagiographa (9).⁹⁷
- (2) It not only shows an acquaintance with a Hebrew canon of twenty-two books but also explains the origin of the masoretic canon of twenty-four books: some (*nonnulli*) Jews placed Ruth and Lamentations among the Hagiographa, counted them separately and thus obtained a canon corresponding to 'the twenty-four elders of the Apocalypse of John' (cf. Rev. 4:4).⁹⁸ The problem of the two different enumerations of the OT books thus appears to be resolved.
- (3) The reference to the helmeted *preface*, incorporated into the later title of the prologue, *Prologus Galeatus*, apparently anticipates opposition both to a translation from the Hebrew (rather than from the Septuagint) and to the exclusion from the canon of Septuagint additions. Such opposition was not long in coming, especially from the African church.⁹⁹
- (4) The classification 'apocrypha' for non-biblical books used in the church agrees with the terminology of Epiphanius, whom Jerome had known for a decade or more. It also accords with the general attitude of the Greek church although the term 'ecclesiastical' was more often preferred. Like other Christian writers, Jerome introduces apocryphal and canonical citations with similar formulas.¹⁰⁰ But he distinguishes the two kinds of books, in terms reminiscent of Origen and Rufinus, with respect to their authority:

As the church reads the books of Tobit and Judith and the Maccabees but does not receive them among the canonical scriptures, so also it reads

⁹⁷ Jerome, *Prol. in Libr. Regum*: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Joshua, Judges-Ruth, Kingdoms (1, 2), Kingdoms (3, 4), Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Twelve (Minor Prophets); Job, David; Psalms, Solomon: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs; Daniel, Chronicles (1, 2), Ezra, Esther. 'Ezra' = Ezra-Nehemiah, as the list in his letter to Paulinus shows (see note 98).

⁹⁸ A slightly different enumeration is given in a second, annotated catalogue found in Jerome's *Epistulae* 53:8: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Job, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings (1, 2), Twelve Prophets: , Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, David, Solomon, Esther, Chronicles (1, 2), Ezra-Nehemiah 'in a single book'. The order follows the general sequence of the Hebrew Bible but without the precise sequence or divisions of the Masoretic Text.

⁹⁹ Even from Augustine (*Epistulae* 82:35), who was sympathetic to Jerome's intentions. As Swete (Introduction, 264-77) rightly observes, the issue was more than translation: much patristic exegesis had been built upon the Septuagint renderings.

¹⁰⁰ E.g. Jerome, *Against the Pelagians* 1:33 (Wis 3:21); Letters 58.1 (Wis 4:9, 'Solomon says'); 75:2 (Wis 4:11-14, 'as it is written in the book of Wisdom') 66:5 (Sir 3:30, 'it is written'); 77:4 (Bar 5:5, cited as a prophet); *Against Jovianus* 2:3 (Sir 27:5, 'in another place it is written').

these two volumes [of Ben Sira and Wisdom] for the edification of the people [but] not as authority for the confirmation of doctrine."¹⁰¹

This would perhaps not have been opposed in principle even by Augustine. But Jerome was single-minded and he did not temporize. He never tired of reminding his readers that the Septuagint additions were not part of the canon. Apart from a hasty version of Tobit and Judith, made at the request of friends, and perhaps the additions to Daniel and Esther he declined even to make a translation of books not in the Hebrew canon. He applied the principle in such thoroughgoing fashion probably because he wished to make 'the distinction between the Hebrew canon and the apocrypha as clear in the Latin as it was in the Greek churches'.¹⁰²

CONCLUSIONS

To determine the OT of the early church the above presentation has given priority to explicit canonical affirmations and has interpreted the usage of the writers in the light of them. The opposite approach would infer the canon of the writer from the books that he cites or from the contents of the Septuagint codex that he uses. This not only is a questionable method but also sometimes involves the patristic writer in self-contradictions since he would affirm one canon in his catalogue and reflect another in his citations.

If the approach taken in this essay is correct early Christianity, as it is represented by its writers, received as its OT a collection of twenty-two or, in the later masoretic count, twenty-four books.¹⁰³ At the same time many writers quoted authoritatively and occasionally as 'Scripture' documents that they elsewhere explicitly excluded from their canonical catalogues; furthermore, they used a Septuagint that differed in content from their professed canon. How are these discrepancies to be explained?

As we have seen, formulas such as 'Scripture says' or 'it is written' may introduce both express citations of canonical writings and 'rewritten' interpretive renderings of these texts.¹⁰⁴ Equally, they may introduce citations of

¹⁰¹ Jerome, *Prol. in Libr. Sal.*: ... 'Non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam' (cf. Fischer, *Biblia Sacra* 2,957).

¹⁰² Westcott, Survey, 182.

¹⁰³ On the priority of the twenty-two book arrangement cf. Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2, 336ff.; Hölischer, *Kanonisch und Apokryph*, 25-28; Audet, 'Hebrew-Aramaic List', 145; Katz, 'Old Testament Canon', 199-203. The numerical variation was originally of no consequence for the content of the canon since, as Jerome informs us, it reflects only the arrangement and not the content of the Hebrew Bible. Similarly, Epiphanius, *Panarion* 8:6. Curiously, Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 256-62, thinks that an earlier 24-book enumeration was literally lessened (by merging) to 22 books in order to conform the number of canonical books to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. The earliest reference to a 22-book enumeration appears to be in the first or second century B.C.E.: Jubilees 2:23 (cf. Charles, *Jubilees*, XXXIX-XL, 17f.; Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 235-40).

¹⁰⁴ E.g. 1 Cor 2:9; 2 Cor 6:16-18.

non-canonical documents that are regarded as correct commentary (midrash) on canonical books¹⁰⁵ or as authoritative in some way.¹⁰⁶ Even when they are employed in their technical reference to holy or religious writing, they sometimes have a broader connotation than canonical or covenantal **writing**.¹⁰⁷ Ordinarily, then, introductory formulas do not in themselves constitute evidence for the canonical authority of the book cited.

The Septuagint originally referred to a Greek version of the Pentateuch translated in Alexandria in the third century **B.C.E.** and, according to legend, the inspired work of seventy Jewish elders. However, the same name and origin came to be ascribed to the Greek version of the rest of the Hebrew canonical books that by 132 **B.C.** also existed on Greek **scrolls**,¹⁰⁸ sometimes with a quite different text-form from the masoretic **Bible**.¹⁰⁹ Later the name was applied to certain other Jewish religious writings that originated or were translated in Greek.

When the Septuagint was put into codex form, apparently sometime after the mid-second century **C.E.**, it became even more a *corpus mixtum*. In some manuscripts it included two, partially overlapping translations of parts of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah (i.e. 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras) as well as a collection of excerpts from the **OT**, the **Apocrypha** and Luke 1-2 (i.e. the Odes). Furthermore, it placed Jewish apocrypha not only among the **OT** books but also, in one codex, at the end of the **NT** (the Psalms of Solomon). No two Septuagint **codices** contain the same apocrypha, and no uniform Septuagint 'Bible' was ever the subject of discussion in the patristic church. In view of these facts the Septuagint **codices** appear to have been originally intended more as service books than as a defined and normative canon of **scripture**.¹¹⁰

There is no evidence that elements of Diaspora or Palestinian Judaism had an expanded Septuagint canon distinct from the twenty-two book Hebrew canon, and the historical probabilities weigh heavily against such a supposition. There is also no evidence that the ante-Nicene church received or adopted a **Septuagint** canon although it did apparently consider the Septuagint to be inspired and

¹⁰⁵ Jude 14f.; cf. Ellis, Prophecy, 225.

¹⁰⁶ E.g. Josh 10:13; 2 Sam 1:18; Eph 5:14; Jas 4:5. See note 52.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. the usage of Gregory, Cyril, Jerome and Augustine noted above, which hardly sprang forth full-grown in the fourth century. For earlier examples cf. Jas 4:5; John 7:38 and probably **Barn. 16:5** since **I Enoch** was not in any Septuagint manuscript and, according to Origen, did not circulate in the churches as a 'divine' writing. Beckwith, **Old Testament Canon**, 69-79, 387ff., seems to put too much weight on introductory formulas as an invariable indicator of a reference to canonical authority.

¹⁰⁸ Ben Sira, prologue.

¹⁰⁹ E.g. in Daniel and Esther, which contain considerable additional matter not in the Hebrew text. On the origin of the Septuagint cf. Swete, **Introduction**, 1-28 and Jellicoe, **Septuagint and Modern Study**, 29-73.

¹¹⁰ The codex gradually replaced the scroll in the early centuries of the Christian era. No **codices** were found at Qumran (pre-70 **C.E.**), or Pompeii (pre-79 **C.E.**). Jerome (d. 420) is said to have been the first scholar to have a library consisting entirely of **codices**. Cf. Birt, **Buchwesen**, 115; Roberts-Skeat, **Codex**, 61; Paoli, Rome, 177f., who dates the first reference to the codex form to 84 **C.E.**: Martial, **Epigram** 1:2, 2f. (*libellis*). See Bar-Ilan, above, pp. 24-25.

its text-forms to be superior to those of the masoretic Bible.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, **unknowledgeable** persons tended to give equal authority to all books used in the church, books that varied from time to time and place to place and that included both apocryphal and other, sometimes heretical books. They were probably confirmed in this attitude by the inclusion of various writings used in church within one or a few **codices** and tended to equate the resulting volumes with the canonical Bible.

In the face of this situation the fourth century church was compelled to define more clearly the **OT** canon of the church. The bishops and other writers of the Greek church and, one must assume, the council of Laodicea affirmed on the basis of testimony reaching back to **Josephus** (96 **C.E.**) that the twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon and, thus, of the apostles constituted the church's **OT**. Augustine and the councils of Carthage affirmed as canonical, on the basis of current usage and of citations by the Fathers, an additional number of Jewish apocryphal writings. Even if the north African churches had the theological right to define their canon, the churches of the East, and Jerome as he sharpens and mediates their convictions, had the stronger historical claim to represent the **OT** canon of Jesus and his apostles. For although the apostolic church left no canonical lists, in all likelihood it agreed with the mainstream of Judaism in this regard. Not without significance for the question is the fact that no explicit quotation from the Septuagintal apocrypha appears in the **NT**, in **Philo** or in the literature from Qumran. In its conception of the **OT** the messianic community of Jesus differed from the mainstream of Judaism not in the content of its Bible but in the interpretive key that it used to open the Bible. Since this key was molded in part by theological conceptions implicit in the process of canonization, it is necessary to consider more closely this aspect of the subject.

The Canon as a Hermeneutical Process

INTRODUCTION

The evidence offered in the preceding section argues that in the first Christian century (**Philo**, **Josephus**) and even two centuries earlier (**Ben Sira**) Judaism possessed a defined and identifiable canon, twenty-two books arranged in three divisions and regarded as an inspired and normative authority for the community. As the church's librarian it preserved and passed on these sacred writings to the Christian community. How the canon of Judaism developed the form and

¹¹¹ Alexandrian Judaism remained a loyal daughter of Jerusalem even though cultural differences had developed (cf. Feldman, 'Orthodoxy'; **Borgen**, 'Philo of Alexandria', 257-59). According to **Philo**, its major spokesman in the first century, it sent tribute (De **Monat.** 2:3) and pilgrims (in Eusebius, **Praep. Evang.** 8:14, 64; cf. Acts 2:10) to Jerusalem. On the status of the apocryphal books in Hellenistic Judaism, see Beckwith, above, pp. 81-84. For a critique of the theory of an Alexandrian canon, Beckwith, **Old Testament Canon**, 382-86.

content in which the apostolic church received and used it requires a further word. First of all, the criteria used in Judaism to set apart the canon from other religious literature are not unimportant for the early church's conception of 'Scripture'. Also, there are scholarly disagreements that need to be evaluated. Finally, the growth of the OT canon involves an interpretive process that continues in the biblical interpretation of Jesus and his apostles and prophets.

THE TRIPARTITE DIVISION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE FAILURE OF THE THREE-STAGE CANONIZATION THEORY. The theory that the three divisions of the Hebrew OT represented three successive acts or stages of canonization was increasingly attractive to nineteenth-century scholars.¹¹² In its most popular form it postulated the canonization of the Law at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh 8-10; c. 400 B.C.E.), the Prophets about 200 B.C.E. and the Hagiographa by the rabbinic academy of Yavne (Jamnia) (c. 90 C.E.).¹¹³ In spite of reservations¹¹⁴ and opposition¹¹⁵ it rapidly gained and continues to have a widespread acceptance.¹¹⁶

The theory was not unrelated to earlier Roman Catholic hypotheses that, consequent upon the decision of the Council of Trent,¹¹⁷ sought to show that the

¹¹² E.g. Westcott, Survey, 297-301: 'At the return (from the Exile) a collection of the Prophets was probably made by Ezra and added to the sacred Law. Afterwards the collection of the Hagiographa was completed during the period of Persian supremacy' (297).

¹¹³ Graetz (*Kohélet*, 147-73) apparently was the first to attribute to Yavne the role of 'closing' the canon: Both the Law and the Prophets were established by the assembly of Nehemiah since the departure of the Samaritans was occasioned in part by the introduction of readings from the Prophets. The majority of the Hagiographa were confirmed by a rabbinic assembly in c. 65 C.E. and the final two books, Ecclesiastes and Song of songs, by the school at Yavne. Cf. Beckwith, above, pp. 58-61 (The Date of the Closing of the Canon).

¹¹⁴ Cf. Smith, *Old Testament: The* work of Graetz is 'a model of confused reasoning' (169). But 'the third collection (of Hagiographa) was formed after the second had been closed' by a sifting process not easily explained (179).

¹¹⁵ E.g. Beecher, 'Alleged Triple Canon'; Green, General Introduction, 19-118, who makes some telling points and shows a commendable caution: 'We have no positive evidence when or by whom the sacred books were collected and arranged' (111). But he offers little evidence for his own hypothesis that the second division of the canon grew with each prophet adding his book until Malachi completed the collection.

¹¹⁶ Wildeboer, Canon 144; Buhl *Canon and Text*, 9-12, 25ff.; Ryle, Canon, 105, 119: The Tora received its final recognition by the fifth century B.C.E. and the Prophets by 200 B.C.E.; for the Writings 100 C.E. marks an official confirmation that 'had long before been decided by popular use' (133). Cf. Kaiser, *Introduction*, 405-13; Schafer, 'Die Sogenannte Synode', 54-64, 116-24.

¹¹⁷ The fourth session (8 April 1546) declared certain apocrypha to be canonical, viz. the additions to Esther and Daniel, Ben Sira, Wisdom, Tobit, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees. The north African councils were influential but were not followed precisely. For example, they accepted 1 Esdras (= 3 Esdras) and apparently rejected 2 Maccabees.

Apocrypha had canonical status in first-century Judaism.¹¹⁸ And it was later adapted to this end.¹¹⁹ Its popular reception, however, may be largely attributed to the Maccabean (c. 150 B.C.E.) and later dating of certain of the Hagiographa by many scholars of the day. Such dating was incompatible with the older tradition that ascribed the formation of the canon to Ezra and 'the men of the great synagogue' (c. 400-200 B.C.E.),¹²⁰ and it produced a pressing need for a new explanation.

The three-stage theory was thought to fill this need, but on several counts it has proved to be unsatisfactory.

- (1) It is based not on concrete historical evidence but on inferences, none of which are necessary and some of which are clearly mistaken. Specifically to be faulted is its estimate of the evidence of Josephus, Ben Sira and the academy of Yavne.
- (2) For certain books it presupposes a late dating that can no longer be entertained.

a. The testimony of Josephus in c. 96 C.E. to a universal, clearly defined and long settled canon¹²¹ contradicts any theory of an undetermined canon in first-century Judaism. And it cannot easily be set aside. As Thackeray has pointed out, Josephus was writing a closely reasoned polemic against *inter alia* the work of an erudite Alexandrian grammarian,¹²² and he could not afford to indulge in careless misstatements that could be thrown back at him. Also, he wrote as a representative of his people and does not transmit only the views peculiar to his own (Pharisaic) religious party or to the Pharisaic-rabbinic traditions:¹²³

- (1) His canon follows a substantially different arrangement from the rabbis.
- (2) He reflects anti-Pharisaic traits elsewhere,¹²⁴ and his writings found no apparent acceptance among the rabbis and eventually had to be preserved

¹¹⁸ Genebrard, *Chronographia*, 2, 190 (cited in Cosin, *Scholastic History*, 14): The Hebrew canon was received at the time of Ezra, certain Apocrypha at the translation of the Septuagint (c. 250 B.C.E.) and 1 and 2 Maccabees in the first century C.E. Movers, *Loci Quidam Historiae Canonis*, 20-22: Books peculiar to the Septuagint were at first canonical also in Palestine but were excluded in the second century C.E. in deference to the rabbinic opinion that inspiration ceased with Malachi (*T. Sota* 13:2).

¹¹⁹ E.g. by Sundberg, *Old Testament*, 108, 126, 129.

¹²⁰ Cf. Ryle, *Canon*, 261-83; Graetz, *Kohélet*. Shimon the Just, the last member of the great synagogue according to rabbinic tradition (*M. Avot* 1:2f.), is identified by some with the son of Onias I (c. 300 B.C.E.) and by others with the son of Onias II (c. 200 B.C.E.). See note 149.

¹²¹ Barr, *Holy Scripture*, 49-74, 51, viewing 'canonization' as explicit acts of choosing and listing some books and excluding others, concludes that early Judaism had no 'canon'. He seems to confuse the concept with a particular terminology and process.

¹²² Thackeray, *Josephus*, 122f.

¹²³ Pace Meyer, 'Bemerkungen', 298.

¹²⁴ Cf. Thackeray, in Thackeray et al., *Josephus* 4, VIII: In the proem to the *Antiquities* Josephus alludes to the legitimacy of paraphrasing the scriptures. In this 'the author is doubtless controverting the views of the contemporary rabbinical schools'.

by the Christians.

Similar to Josephus, and two centuries earlier, the book of Ben Sira also speaks of a tripartite canon of 'the law and the prophets and the rest of the books'. According to the three-stage theory this statement indicates that the law and the prophets were completed collections and 'the rest' or 'the other' books were a less defined miscellany. Apparently the only reason for this odd conclusion is the differing terminology used for the third division. It is scarcely acceptable since even in the first century C.E. the terminology for all three divisions was still flexible: the Psalms could be called 'the law' (John 15:25), 'the law' could be designated 'the writings' (γραφαί, Matt 22:29; cf. Rom 4:3) and 'the law and the prophets' described variously as 'Moses and the prophets' or simply as 'the prophets' (Luke 24:27; Acts 13:27). The statement in Ben Sira mentions each of the three divisions with the same degree of preciseness and, to be meaningful to the reader, it must refer to definite, identifiable books. It could be interpreted otherwise only if one were already convinced that the tripartite canon could not have existed as a subsistent entity at that time.

The rabbinic academy of Yavne affirmed, after discussion, that the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes 'defiled the hands', that is, were **canonical**.¹²⁵ Such pronouncements were not peculiar to Yavne, resolved nothing and continued into the following centuries.¹²⁶ Misunderstanding the proceeding at Yavne as an act of canonization and associating it with other Talmudic discussions addressing quite different questions, advocates of the three-stage theory concluded that the third division of the canon was officially 'closed' at this time. Most likely the questions at Yavne about the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes had no more to do with the canonization of the OT than the questions of Luther about the letter of James had to do with the canonization of the NT. In so far as they were not discussions of theoretical possibilities, they apparently expressed only a reaffirmation of books long received and now disputed by some.

b. The Qumran library contained all twenty-two books of the Hebrew Bible with the exception of Esther. These books must therefore be dated before 70 C.E. when the community was destroyed, and probably before the accession of Jonathan as high priest in 152 B.C.E., when, apparently, the community separated from the mainstream of Judaism.¹²⁷ For books after that time, if written by the other sects, would not likely have found acceptance at Qumran or, if produced by the Qumran sect, would not have been received by the rest of Judaism. Moreover, the textual history of the **manuscripts**,¹²⁸ the dates of

¹²⁵ *M. Eduyot* 5:3; *T. Eduyot* 2:7; *M. Yadayim* 3:5. Cf. Lewis, 'What Do We Mean'; Newman, 'Council of Jamnia': 'The rabbis seem to be testing a *status quo* which has existed beyond memory' (349); Schäfer, 'Die sogenannte Synode'.

¹²⁶ Jerome, *Comm. in Eccl.* 12:13f. (c. 390 C.E.); cf. *E.T. Megilla* 7a (R. Meir, c. 150 C.E.). Cf. Childs, *Introduction*, 53.

¹²⁷ Cf. Beckwith, above, pp. 76-81 (Esther and the Pseudepigrapha in Essenism and the Dead Sea Community).

¹²⁸ Cf. Cross, 'Contribution'.

specific scripts and other considerations led W.F. Albright to conclude that, with the exception of Ecclesiastes and Daniel, all of the OT books were written before the end of the Persian period, that is, before 330 B.C.E..¹²⁹

What of Ecclesiastes and Daniel? In the light of Qumran and of other evidence Ecclesiastes cannot have been composed later than the third century B.C.E. and may be considerably earlier.¹³⁰ Even Daniel, which in its present form has for the past century usually been assigned to the Maccabean period, viz. 165 B.C.E., must almost certainly have originated before that time.¹³¹ Six manuscript fragments of Daniel reflecting different textual families, one in a script from the second century B.C.E., were found at Qumran.¹³² There is also a quotation from Daniel 12:10; 11:32, introduced by the formula, 'As it is written in the book of Daniel the prophet' (4QFlor 2:3). As was shown above, introductory formulas are no guarantee of a canonical citation. However, this formula is identical with an earlier one introducing a citation of Isaiah (4QFlor 1:15), identifies Daniel as one book (and not a cycle of traditions), and accords with an older division of the Hebrew canon in which Daniel was placed among the Prophets. Customarily today it is supposed that Daniel, originally among the Writings (*Ketuvim*), was only later placed among the Prophets (*Neviim*). But the historical evidence, on balance, does not support this view of the matter. The first century witnesses place Daniel among the Prophets. Matthew (24:15) reflects this perspective by its designation of Daniel as 'the prophet'. Josephus (note 25) and the *Bryennios list* (note 69), which J.P. Audet and P. Katz on rather firm grounds date to the late first or early second century, clearly do so.¹³³ The same is true of the lists of Melito and Origen which illustrate the canon used by certain Palestinian Jews and/or Jewish Christians in the second and early third centuries. Of the early evidence Daniel is counted among the

¹²⁹ Albright, *Recent Discoveries*, 129; cf. Cross, *Ancient Library*, 165: Qumran supports a dating of the latest canonical Psalms from the Persian period and a *terminus ad quem* for Ecclesiastes in the third century B.C.E.; Williamson, *Israel*, 83-86: the evidence points to the Persian period, i.e. pre-330 B.C.E., for the date of Chronicles.

¹³⁰ Cross, 'Contribution'.

¹³¹ For other evidence cf. the form of the Aramaic in Dan 2:4b-7:28, which on balance favours a third-century B.C.E. or earlier date (Albright, 'Date and Personality', 117; Kitchen, 'Aramaic of Daniel', 76, 79); Bate, *Sibylline Oracles*, 64f.: the whole passage (c. 150 B.C.E.) is partly based on Dan 7-9 (65n.). Cf. 1 Macc 1:54; 2:60 with Daniel 11:31; 6:22. Josephus, *An.* 11:337, relates a story that Alexander the Great was shown the prophecy of Daniel (8:21) predicting his conquest. Since Josephus (cf. *Ag. Ap.* 1:183-95) used the historian Hecataeus of Abdera (c. 300 B.C.E.) who wrote a book on the relationship of the Jews to Alexander, he presumably found the story there. While he may have elaborated it and perhaps supplied the (obvious) name Daniel, there are no historical reasons to dismiss it as a fiction. Otherwise: Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 42-46.

¹³² Cf. Cross, *Ancient Library*, 43, 164n; DiLella, *Daniel*, 72f.

¹³³ Audet, 'Hebrew-Aramaic List', 145; Katz, 'Old Testament Canon', 196. Otherwise: Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 188, who thinks that the Bryennios list cannot be Jewish 'since it mixes the Prophets and Hagiographa indiscriminately'. But see Orlinsky, 'Prolegomenon', XIX (= Lciman, *Canon and Masorah*, 852): It 'may well be that the Christian, essentially fourfold division of the Bible . (is) actually Jewish in origin'.

writings only in *B.T. Bava Batra* 14b, which probably dates (at least) from before the end of the second century. Although *B.T. Bava Batra* 14b may represent an older tradition, it must be judged secondary to the earlier-witnessed and more widely attested order. Qumran, with its reference to 'Daniel the prophet' (*4QFlor* 2:3), lends further weight to this judgment. Given the deep influence of Daniel on the Qumran sect and its known and undisputed canonical standing throughout first-century Judaism, it is altogether likely that at the time the Qumran community became distinct from mainstream Judaism the book was received among them in the canonical collection known in Ben Sira as 'the prophets'.¹³⁴

A Maccabean origin of the Daniel narratives (Dan 1-6) has increasingly given way to the view that they were formed and in use well before the Maccabean period.¹³⁵ For a number of reasons the Maccabean origin of the visions (Dan 7-12) is also open to doubt. First of all, (1) it is intrinsically improbable that visions composed as *vaticinia ex eventu* in c. 165 B.C.E. could, within a few decades and without a trace of opposition, be widely and authoritatively received as the revealed word of a sixth century prophet. Also, (2) the theory of the specifically Maccabean origin apparently arose less from historical considerations than from the philosophical assumption that this kind of explicit predictive prophecy was impossible.¹³⁶ Furthermore, (3) the theory does not take into account the 'contemporizing' alterations characteristic of the periodic rewriting of biblical books.

To whatever degree the language of Dan 7-12 reflects an origin in the second century B.C.E., it is best explained as a contemporization of an earlier prophecy:¹³⁷ (1) The recopying of many OT books was a necessity after the widespread

¹³⁴ The absence of Daniel in Ben Sira's (48-50) annotations on famous men is no more significant for his canon than is the absence of Ezra or the presence of Enoch. It can also hardly indicate that Ben Sira classified Daniel among the Writings rather than the Prophets since David and Nehemiah, both of whose works were among the Writings, are included.

¹³⁵ E.g. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* 1, 113, 29f. ('current. . . in the third century B.C.'). Jepsen, 'Bemerkungen': Apparently there was 'a collection of Daniel narratives and visions already in the time of Alexander' (?chapters 4, 5, 6, 10, 12) supplemented by chapters 2, 7, 8; in the Maccabean period, perhaps, chapters 1, 3 and 4 were added and 7 and 8 elaborated. For an instructive discussion of the date of Daniel cf. Baldwin, *Daniel*, 13-74.

¹³⁶ Apparently first made by Porphyry (d. 303). Cf. Archer, Jerome (407), 15 Prologue: Porphyry alleged that 'whatever (pseudo-Daniel) spoke of up to the time of Antiochus (Epiphanus) contained authentic history whereas anything that he may have conjectured beyond that point was false, inasmuch as he would not have foreknown the future'.

¹³⁷ Cf. Wright, *Daniel*, XIX, 242.; Noth, *Gesammelte Studien*, 11-28. Otherwise: Archer, 'Hebrew of Daniel'.

destruction of the Scriptures by Antiochus Epiphanes in c. 169 B.C.E.¹³⁸ and such activity, like scribal transmission generally, inevitably included some alterations and also incorporated in greater or lesser degree an 'up-dating' of orthography and terminology along with other explanatory elaboration (*midrash*). (2) Such elaboration appears earlier in manuscript-transmission and in the translation (as in the Septuagint), revision (as in Esther and Jeremiah) and rewriting (as in Chronicles) of biblical books.¹³⁹ (3) Both the Qumran library and the NT make evident that such elaboration was not precluded by the fact that the texts were regarded as canonical scripture and that, on the above analogies, (4) it would very likely have been employed in the transmission of the book of Daniel.

THE CANON AND THE CULT. With the failure of the three-stage canonization theory, at least in its traditional form, the origin and meaning of the tripartite division of the Hebrew Bible remain very open questions.¹⁴⁰ The following suggestions may, it is hoped, contribute to a more satisfactory answer. The tripartite arrangement was, of course, not the only one known in Judaism. The Septuagint preserves a fourfold division – Pentateuch, Historical Writings, Poetic (Wisdom) Literature, Prophets – that is probably pre-Christian,¹⁴¹ and other sources indicate that a tripartite pattern was not a fixed or necessary conception.¹⁴² The later masoretic Bible in a number of ancient manuscripts shifts to a fourfold division: Pentateuch, Megillot, Prophets, *Hagiographa*.¹⁴³ However, the tripartite scheme, attested by Ben Sira, Josephus and the rabbinic tradition and perhaps by the NT and Philo, was apparently the prevailing usage in first century Judaism. It seems to have arisen from the role of Scripture

¹³⁸ Cf. 1 Macc 1:56f.; 2 Macc 2:14f.; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1:35f.; Segal, 'Promulgation', 39-45, Cross, 'Contribution', 91. Whether such activity created a standard text (Segal) or one of its forerunners (cf. Cross) need not be discussed here. Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 80-86, 153 argues with some cogency that the standard for canonicity was whether a book was laid up in the Temple and that Judas Maccabaeus was instrumental in regathering the Temple Scriptures after the liberation of Jerusalem in 165 B.C.E. (cf. 2 Macc 2:14), but he is less convincing in his view that Judas also classified and ordered the sacred books in the arrangement later found in *B.T. Bava Batra* 14b.

¹³⁹ Cf. Talmon, 'Textual Study'. On the orthographic modernization of transmitted texts cf. Kitchen, 'Aramaic of Daniel', 60-65; Kutscher in 'Current Trends', 399-403.

¹⁴⁰ For an attempt to reconstruct the beginnings of it cf. Freedman, 'Law and Prophets': The Law and Former Prophets (Genesis-2 Kings) were published as one literary unit by 550 B.C.E. and supplemented by the Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Twelve) before 450 B.C.E.

¹⁴¹ So, Orlinsky, 'Prolegomenon' XIX-XX. Cf. Swete, *Introduction*, 217ff. It may possibly be reflected by Philo (see note 29).

¹⁴² 'The Law and the Prophets', often used for the whole of Scripture (e.g. in Matt 5:17; 7:12), expresses a twofold division. Cf. 2 Macc 2:13 (c. 100 B.C.E.): Nehemiah 'collected the books about the kings (= ?Samuel-Kings) and the Prophets, the works of David and the letters of Kings concerning sacred offerings' (= ?Ezra 6-7). Although probably traditional idiom, such passages show that the divisions of scripture were not always perceived within a tripartite framework.

¹⁴³ Cf. Ryle, Canon, 292. The five Megillot together with the Pentateuch also were sometimes transmitted separately.

in the cultus, if the synagogue readings and the activity and traditional picture of Ezra are accurate guides in the matter.

At least from the first century and probably much earlier the Law and the Prophets were read in the synagogue every sabbath on a systematic basis;¹⁴⁴ the Hagiographa, on the other hand, were used only on special occasions or, in the case of the Psalms, for different parts of the service. Certain rabbis rearranged the masoretic Bible into four divisions 'for liturgical or ritual purposes',¹⁴⁵ and others, who at an earlier time transferred two of the Megillot (Ruth, Lamentations) and the book of Daniel from the Prophets to the Hagiographa, may have been motivated by similar considerations.¹⁴⁶ That is, if Ruth, Lamentations and Daniel were excluded from the cycle of weekly readings or were designated for reading only on special occasions, this would on the above analogy have resulted in their transferral to the Hagiographa.

Jewish tradition associates Ezra the priest both with the establishment of the public reading of Scripture and with the ordering of the **canon**.¹⁴⁷ If it in part represents a later idealized picture, it supports nonetheless an early and close connection between the canon and the **cultic usage**.¹⁴⁸ It also supports the supposition that between the time of Ezra (c. 400 B.C.E.) and the prologue of Ben Sira (c. 132 B.C.E.), when the tripartite canon is first attested, priestly circles or another body or bodies related to **them**¹⁴⁹ classified the biblical books to accord with their use in worship. When the use varied, these circles apparently reclassified the affected book within the canonical divisions, a relatively simple procedure before the advent of the **codex**. They thereby maintained the relationship established by Ezra between the canonical structure and the **hermeneutical** context.

THE GROWTH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

TYPOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCE. The OT displays a hermeneutical progression in

¹⁴⁴ Acts 13:15, 27; 15:21; Luke 4:16; cf. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2:175; Philo, *De Somn.* 2:127; *M. Megilla* 3:4. Cf. Perrot, above, pp. 149-59.

¹⁴⁵ Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 3.

¹⁴⁶ This was first suggested to me in a lecture of A.A. MacRae, who apparently was following his teacher, R.D. Wilson, *Studies*, 59ff., 64. Cf. also Wilson, 'Book of Daniel', 404 f., 408. Anti-apocalyptic tendencies in post-70 rabbinic Judaism could have occasioned the transfer of Daniel to the Hagiographa and, consequently, its removal from the **Haftara** readings.

¹⁴⁷ Re the canon cf. 4 *Ezra* 14:38-48; *B. T. Bava Batra* 15a; *B. T. Sanhedrin* 21b-22a; *Ezra* 7:6. Re public reading cf. *Neh* 8-10; *B. T. Bava kamma* 82a; Perrot, above, pp. 149-50; Elbogen, *Gottesdienst*, 157f. On the problem of dating Ezra's ministry cf. Klein, 'Ezra and Nehemiah', 370ff.; Talmon, 'Ezra and Nehemiah'; Wright, *The Date*.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Östborn, *Cult and Canon*, 15ff., %f.

¹⁴⁹ Kuenen, 'Groote Synagoge', showed that most rabbinic references to a 'great synagogue' between Ezra and Shimon the Just are late and confused. But his conclusion (149) that they are based on a fiction created out of *Neh* 8-10 is doubtful. *M. Avot* 1:1f. and, perhaps, *B. T. Bava Batra* 15a probably preserve traditions of the role (though not the name) of some such body or bodies in the reception and transmission of the canon. See note 120; cf. Bacher, 'Synagogue, The Great'.

which, on the one hand, sacred accounts of God's acts in the past provided models for later accounts of his present and future activity and, on the other hand, the received sacred literature was from time to time conformed to its contemporary or future application and fulfillment. The first aspect of the process is evident in the way in which the prophets 'placed the new historical acts of God ... in exactly the same category as the old basic events of the canonical history':¹⁵⁰ a new creation,¹⁵¹ a new Exodus,¹⁵² a new covenant,¹⁵³ a new Davidic kingdom,¹⁵⁴ a new Zion or temple.¹⁵⁵ It also is present in those Psalms (e.g. 8, 68, 106, 136) in which the appeal or praise for God's present and future help is keyed to his past acts of redemption. It represents a typological correspondence that is not a mere cyclical repetition but rather a progression in which the new surpasses the old. The process appears to embody a canonical principle as well. That is, inspired prophetic writings are received as normative for the faith and worship of the community as they are recognized to be valid contemporary expressions of and abiding supplements to the ancient election and covenantal traditions. As we hope to show in the following essay, the early Christians' understanding of the OT and its actualization in their own time and community stands within the same perspective.

REWRITING. A second aspect of the hermeneutical process, also to be found later in the NT, likewise involves a contemporization of God's ancient word and work. However, it carries this out in a different way, by a rewriting of the ancient accounts. The process takes several forms: (1) It appears in Deuteronomy (a 'second law') as a reworking and reapplication of Exodus traditions and in Chronicles as a reinterpretation of (mainly) Samuel-Kings. The same procedure is carried further in the non-canonical 1 Esdras, a Greek rewriting of parts of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.¹⁵⁶ (2) A kind of rewriting also occurs within a book's own manuscript transmission. This has been suggested above in the case of Daniel. On a broader scale it appears to be supported by the textual

¹⁵⁰ Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* 2, 113, cf. 112-19, 272; cf. Goppelt, 'τύπος', 254.

¹⁵¹ Isa 11:6-9; 51:3; 65:17; 66:22; Ezek 36:35; 47:7-12; cf. Dan 7:13f. with Ps 8:4ff. and Gen 1:26 ('dominion'); Hooker, *Son of Man*, 11-32; Ellis, *Prophecy*, 167.

¹⁵² Jer 16:14f.; Isa 11:15f.; 43:16-21; 48:20f.; 51:9ff.; cf. Ezek 36:8 with 47:13.

¹⁵³ Hos 2:18 (20); Jer 31:31f.; Isa 54:10.

¹⁵⁴ Hos 3:5; Amos 9:11; Mic 5:2 (1); Isa 11:1; Ezek 37:24; cf. 2 Sam 7:6-16; Ps 2:7; Ellis, *Prophecy*, 199f.

¹⁵⁵ Isa 2:2ff.; 54:11f.; Ezek 40-48; Amos 9:11.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. the examples in Driver, *Deuteronomy*, VIII-LX; XXXVII-XXXIX; Willi, *Die Chronik*, 48-198; Childs, 'Midrash', 53ff. and the literature cited; Ackroyd, 'The Chronicler'.

history of other biblical books in both their 'creative' and 'recensional' stages."¹⁵⁷ That is, the kind of interpretive alteration usually associated with later scribal activity was in all likelihood made from time to time from the inception of a book. The circles that 'reproduced' the work (with variations) even as they transmitted it thus contributed to its final canonical form. Among other things the alterations involved a reordering and contemporizing of the text, as is evident in the Septuagint and may be inferred at least in some cases for the Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint.¹⁵⁸ (3) Finally, the older writings were likewise brought into the present by the exposition and application of the later canonical writers. For example, Ezek 16 is an allegory built upon themes drawn from earlier books and Ps 132 apparently a 'midrashic reflection' on 2 Sam 7.¹⁵⁹

The hermeneutical process seen to be unfolding within the OT continued beyond the canonical boundaries. In some circles, for example, Jeremiah, Daniel and Esther were supplemented with material not received as canonical by messianic (i.e. Christian) and rabbinic Judaism and their predecessors. The book of Jubilees provided a rewriting of Genesis, 1 Esdras of Chronicles-Ezra; and in a somewhat different way Qumran's *Temple Scroll* reworked and supplemented parts of the Pentateuch and Ben Sira, along the lines of Proverbs, extended further the re-understanding of the Law in terms of Wisdom. Yet none were received as canonical. And, of course, at some point literary alterations and supplements in the manuscript-transmission were no longer regarded as part and parcel of a canonical book's essential form but as departures from it.

THE LIMITS OF THE CANON. What caused the hermeneutical process characteristic of the canonical progression to cease providing the valid form and continuation of the canon? Our sources provide no clear answer, but they do permit certain

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Talmon 'Textual Study': 'It appears that the extant text types must be viewed as the remains of a yet more variegated transmission of the Bible text in the preceding centuries' (325). An 'undetermined percentage of these *variae lectiones* (in biblical manuscripts at Qumran) derive from the ongoing literary processes of an intra-biblical nature.' (380). Cf. Gooding, 'Recent Popularization' 130f.; Gordon, 'Septuagint account'. Admittedly, this view of the matter complicates the problem of dating OT books since some internal evidence may reflect the time of a 'revision' and not of the origin of the work.

¹⁵⁸ E.g. Isa 9:11 (LXX: Greeks; MT: Philistines). Cf. Gooding, *Relics; idem*, 'Text-sequence'; *idem*, 'Problems of Text and Midrash', 28: The Septuagint 3 Kingdoms 'is quite obviously a commentary on I Kings'. Further cf. Sanders, Canon and Community, 22f., 30ff., whose views are both similar to and critiqued by Childs, *Introduction*, 56f., 171ff., 367-70, 434ff. Neither Sanders nor Childs gives sufficient attention to the specific (prophetic disciple-circle) context for the creative rewriting and up-dating of received prophetic books. To my mind a recognized inspired status of the traditioning circles best explains how the 'community', who are the recipients not the makers of books, could accept the rewritten material on a par and in continuity with the prophetic *Vorlage*. Cf. Blenkinsopp, Prophecy and Canon, 134-37; Sturdy, 'Authorship', 149f.; Carroll, 'Canonical Criticism'; Foul, 'Canonical Approach'.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Bloch, 'Midrash', 1271, 1274. For a somewhat different re-use of biblical traditions cf. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection* 82-92.

inferences to be drawn. They do not speak of a 'closing' of the canon, which is apparently a modern conception, but rather of a time after which no subsequent writings were placed on a par with canonical books. Josephus marks this time at the death of Artaxerxes; the rabbis refer to the same general period or, alternatively, to the time of Ben Sira. More significantly, however, both sources also associate the cessation of the growth of the canon with the cessation of a particular kind of prophetic inspiration or *succession*.¹⁶⁰ That is, the chronological limits of the canon were inextricably combined with convictions about the activity of the prophetic Spirit in the community as well as in the individual writing.

The communities of Qumran and of Jesus, in which prophetic manifestations continue to be quite evident,¹⁶¹ do not follow the judgement of Josephus and rabbinic Judaism. In their respective ways they continue a canonical progression that resulted *inter alia* in a supplement to the twenty-two book canon received in pre-Maccabean Judaism. They do so not by an undefined 'openness' with regard to the canon but by the recognition of the prophetic inspiration and normative authority of certain of their own books. Although it is difficult to document explicitly, Qumran adherents very probably gave such recognition to the works of their Teacher. The Christian community clearly did so for certain of its writings, not only the NT as it was finally defined but also – from a very early time – individual books and traditions.

The community of Jesus, then, did not differ from other groups in Judaism in the OT canon that it received, but it continued a hermeneutical process that inevitably brought into being a further supplement to the ancient canon. That hermeneutical process also brought about a radically new perception of the OT itself. But this must be considered in a separate essay.

Bibliography

A brief but very useful survey of the canonical lists and the discussions and decisions about the canon in the early church is WESTCOTT's *The Bible in the Church* (1864). Among the older Protestant writings a three-stage canonization theory was championed in the English-speaking world by RYLE's *The Canon* (1892), in the Netherlands by WILDEBOER's *Origin of the Canon* (1889) and in Germany by BUHL's *Canon and Text* (1891). While it was opposed, for example, by GREEN's *General Introduction* (1898), it nevertheless became a dominant

¹⁶⁰ Cf. B. T. Sanhedrin 11a (= T. Sota 13:2); *Seder Olam Rabba* 30, cf. Leiman, *Canonization*, 66.

¹⁶¹ 1 Thess 2:13; 2 Thess 2:15; Rom 16:26; Eph 3:3-5; Col 4:16; Acts 15:28f.; 2 Pet 3:15f. On prophetic manifestations at Qumran and in the NT cf. Ellis, 'Weisheit' (= Ellis, *Prophecy*, 45-62). Cf. also Yadin, *Temple Scroll* 1, 73-82; 390ff., where *inter alia* YHWH passages in the third person in the OT are shifted to the first person. This suggests a prophetic consciousness on the part of the author and, in Yadin's words, 'the belief that the author construed the Pentateuchal laws correctly' (390). Otherwise: Wacholder, Dawn of Qumran 4, 30f., 229, who supposes that the Scroll presents a new and superior Tora to replace the Mosaic Tora.

viewpoint and, with variations, was accepted by some Jewish scholars, for example, MARGOLIS, *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making*, and ZEITLIN, *An Historical Study*.

Among recent works of significance one may mention SUNDBERG, *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (1964); LEIMAN, *Canonization* (1976); and BECKWITH, *Old Testament Canon* (1985). It was the merit of Sundberg to show the fallacy of the theory that Alexandrian Judaism had a wider canon than that accepted in Palestine. Both Leiman and Beckwith give devastating criticisms of the three-stage canonization theory. Leiman also provides a valuable collection of early Jewish witnesses together with an evaluation of their significance for the canon. Beckwith's book offers the most comprehensive treatment of the subject in this generation and promises to become the standard work from which future discussions will proceed.

Chapter Nineteen

Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church

E. Earle Ellis

Introduction

In its interpretation of scripture the community of Jesus is rooted in and remains in continuity with the larger community of religious Judaism. It follows exegetical methods very similar to other groups and is distinguished primarily in the emphasis given to some procedures and in the boldness with which they are applied. In its general conceptual frame of reference it is closest to apocalyptic Judaism and thus, in some respects, to the Qumran community, but here also it is not without **affinities** with the Pharisaic-rabbinic and Sadducean parties. Jesus and his apostles and prophets, as they are represented by the NT, make their unique contribution to first-century Jewish exposition by their thoroughgoing **reinterpretation of the biblical writings to the person, ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah**.

This messianic interpretation of scripture could be understood as a break with Judaism since it involves a new covenant of God (Luke 22:20; Heb 8:8-13) that depicts Israel's preceding institutions and scriptures as an old covenant, i.e. Old Testament, now superceded. However, Jesus and the NT writers present the new covenant as a 'fulfilment' that was prophesied by the OT (Jer 31:31) and that remains in a typological relationship to it (1 Cor 10:1-11). In this way the messianic hermeneutic continues, admittedly in a highly climactic manner, earlier prophetic interpretations of Israel's scriptures in terms of the current acts of God within the nation. And it is employed not only in matters of specific interest to the Christian community, but also in issues of general importance for contemporary Judaism: the Kingdom of God, the Messiah, the role of ritual and the place of the temple, the way to righteousness and to eternal life.

Jesus and the NT church give a prominent place to the OT in the formulation of their teachings. Like other Jewish groups, they concentrate their biblical quotations on certain portions of the Bible, especially the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and the Psalms; and they employ them more in some NT books than in others. In all

likelihood this reflects the writers' selected themes, traditions, and interests, and not their limited acquaintance with' or regard for the OT.²

In their textual form the citations accord with the audience addressed and the argument pursued. They frequently follow the Septuagint, both because this Greek version was used in Palestine and the Diaspora and, at times, because the Septuagint rendering fits the writer's **viewpoint**.³ For the same reasons some citations, on occasion against the Septuagint, agree with the Hebrew text (Matt 2:15) or the **targum** (cf. Eph 4:8). *Ad hoc* renderings usually serve an interpretative **interest**.⁴

The Bible was the touchstone not only of the NT writers' religious teachings but also of their total life and culture. As might be expected, it was used occasionally for an analogy or illustration or for an expressive **idiom**.⁵ But even in this literary usage it continued to carry theological implications. Similarly, as will be shown below, biblical citations containing widespread variations from the OT text-forms were more often intentional alterations than unintentional lapses.

Exegetical Methods

GENERAL FORM AND USAGE

In many respects NT citations of scripture display methods that are common to all literary quotations: paraphrase, combined citations, alterations in sense and **reference**.⁶ Even when they have special affinity with wider Jewish practice, they often reflect adapted forms of the common usage of the Greco-Roman world.' However, some citations display features that, although not unique, do

¹ On Jesus' use of selected portions of Scripture cf. France, Jesus, 172-226; Grimm, *Die Verkündigung*.

² **Pace v.** Hamack, 'Das Alte Testament' 124-41, who thinks that Paul used the OT only as a matter of convenience. Cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 30-33; *idem*, intr. to the ET of Goppelt, *TYPOS*, IXf.

³ E.g. in Gen. 12:3; 18:18 the Hebrew may be passive or reflexive ('bless themselves'); the Septuagint is passive and accords with Paul's understanding of the verses (Gal 3:8). On the use of the LXX cf. Swete, *Introduction*, 381-405; Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 11-20.

⁴ Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 173-87.

⁵ 1 Cor 15:32; Heb 12:14f. (expressive idiom); Rom 10:6-8; Jas 5:11 (illustration); Rom 2:24; Jas 5:17f. (analogy).

⁶ For comparisons with secular literature cf. Johnson, *Quotations*. For comparisons with Judaism cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 45ff.; Le Déaut, 'Traditions targumiques'.

⁷ Re Hillel's rules cf. Daube, 'Rabbinic Methods'; Kasher, above, pp. 584-85. Certain aspects of the *Yelammedenu* midrash, e.g. the dialogic structure, also may have their background in Hellenistic rhetoric, e.g. Socratic interrogation or the diatribe style; cf. Daube, *New Testament*, 151-57, 161; Bultmann, *Der Stil*, 67, 73f. More generally, Daube, 'Alexandrian Methods': '(The) whole Rabbinic system of exegesis initiated by Hillel about 30 B.C.E. and elaborated by the following generations was essentially Hellenistic.' (44).

set forth distinctively Christian conceptions. These features include certain introductory formulas, merged citations and **testimonia**.

(1) **Introductory formulas** often serve to specify the authority of a citation and, for the most part, they are widely used in Judaism.⁸ They also may point to the particular context within the Christian movement in which a citation was originally employed. For example, the formula 'have you not read', found in the NT only on the lips of Jesus, usually occurs in debates between Jesus and his religious opposition:

Have you not read this scripture: 'The stone that the builders rejected, this one has become the head of the **corner**.'⁹

Two other formulas, 'in order that it might be fulfilled' (ἵνα πληρωθῇ) and 'says the Lord' (λέγει κύριος), apparently were utilized, respectively, by prophetic circles of the Hebraist and of the Hellenist missions. And both introduce quotations whose creatively altered text-forms adapt them to an eschatological, messianic **interpretation**.¹⁰

As a formula introducing a biblical citation, ἵνα πληρωθῇ appears only in the Gospels of Matthew and John.¹¹ Along with other 'fulfilment' formulas, it is favoured by the Hebraist missionaries to underscore their perception of salvation history as it is consummated in Jesus:

⁸ For parallels with formulas in **Philo**, rabbinic literature and especially at Qumran, e.g. 'as it is written', 'Moses says', 'God said', 'Scripture says' cf. Ryle, *Philo*, XLV; Metzger, 'The Formulas' 297-307; Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 48f.; Fitzmyer, 'Explicit OT Quotations', 299-305.

⁹ Mark 12:10. Cf. Matt 12:3, 5; 19:4; 21:16, 42; 22:31. Cf. Luke 10:26. It may imply that the opponent has read but has not understood the passage cited (cf. Daube, *New Testament*, 433). Cf. Justin, *Dial.* 11:3; 29:2; 113:1. On the connection between the Pharisaic opponents of Jesus and the rabbinic circles of Mishna and Talmud, a question which is highly debatable, cf. Bowker, Jesus *and the Pharisees*; Gafni, 'Historical Background', 7-8; Luz, 'Jesus und die Pharisäer'; Sanders, *Palestinian Judaism*, 60-62; Sigal, *Halakhah*, 195ff.

¹⁰ Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 182-87; Freed, *Old Testament Quotations*, 129; Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, 89-122; Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 97-120. Of quotations employing these formulas only Matt 2:15 has a text-form in agreement with the Masoretic Text; only John 12:38 and 19:24 agree with the LXX. On the two-fold mission of the Jewish-Christian church cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 101-28, 246: in NT usage (e.g., Acts 6: 1) it appears that Hebraists designated those Jews with a strict, ritualistic viewpoint; and Hellenists those with a freer attitude toward the Jewish Law and **cultus** (Ellis, '"Those of the Circumcision"' 392). It is usually supposed that the terms reflect only a difference in language, Hebrew/Aramaic speakers and Greek speakers, but as Schmithals and Ellis have shown, this view cannot explain the NT or wider usage. Cf. Schmithals, *Paul and James*, 16-27.

¹¹ Matt 1:22; 2:15; 4:14; 12:17; 21:4; cf. 2:23; 8:17; 13:35; John 12:38; 13:18; 15:25 (17:12); 19:24, 36. The formula introduces words of Jesus in John 18:9, 32. It apparently does not occur at Qumran or in rabbinic writings. But see, Fitzmyer, 'Explicit OT Quotations', 303. In the early patristic writings the phrase occurs once (Ignatius, *Ad Smyr.* 1:1) but with a different connotation.

This happened in order to fulfill the word through the prophet saying, 'Say to the daughter of Zion: Behold your king is coming to you ...'¹²

The λέγει κύριος formula, as an addition to the OT text, appears only in a quotation attributed to Stephen and in the Pauline letters:

For it is written, 'Vengeance is mine,
says the Lord, I will repay'.¹³

Elsewhere the phrase is substituted where the OT has φησι κύριος.¹⁴ The formula is characteristic of OT prophetic proclamation and it, or its equivalent, occasionally appears in the oracles of Christian prophets.¹⁵ For these and other reasons¹⁶ it is probable that the idiom reflects the activity of the prophets, especially those within the Hellenist mission.

The more commonly used formulas, no less than those discussed above, also locate the 'Word of God' character of scripture in the proper interpretation and application of its teaching. Thus, a messianically interpreted summary of OT passages can be introduced with the formula 'God said' (2 Cor 6: 16) and those persons who have a wrong understanding of the OT are regarded as 'not knowing the scriptures' (γραφάς, Matt 22:29) or as 'making void the Word of God' (Mark 7:13 = Matt 15:6). What 'is written', i.e. of divine authority, is not the biblical text in the abstract but the text in its meaningfulness for the current situation. The introductory formulas show, in the words of B.B. Warfield, that 'scripture is thought of as the living voice of God speaking in all its parts directly to the reader'.¹⁷ However, to this statement one should add, 'to the reader who has ears to hear' (cf. Matt 11:15). The formulas, then, reveal not only a method of citation but also something of the theological convictions of the NT writers.

(2) **Other exegetical terminology** is also associated with the use of the OT in the New, a small part peculiar to the NT writers and the rest the common property of Jewish exposition.

¹² Matt 21:4f. The verb is also used occasionally in the literature of the Hellenist mission as a formula (e.g. Gal 5: 14) or otherwise (e.g. Mark 14:49), but not in the same way. The traditional piece in Acts 1:16 is not an exception although Peter may be later associated with the Hellenist mission (cf. 1 Cor 3:22; Gal 2:12; 1 Pet 1:1).

¹³ Rom 12:19. Also, Acts 7:49; Rom 14:11; 1 Cor 14:21; 2 Cor 6:17, 18 (Heb 10:30A). Cf. Acts 2:17; 7:7 ('says God', 'God said'). At Isa 66:1f. (= Acts 7:49) and 2 Sam 7:14, 8 (= 2 Cor 6:18) the formula does appear in the immediate context. In Acts 15:16f. it reproduces the OT text. On a few occasions in patristic writings it also occurs within a citation as an addition to the OT text. Cf. Barn. 3: 1, 6; 8, 14; 9:1; Justin, Dial. 136:2.

¹⁴ Heb 8:8-10; 10:16.

¹⁵ Rev 1:8; cf. 2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7; Luke 11:49; Acts 21:11.

¹⁶ Detailed in Ellis, Prophecy, 186.

¹⁷ Warfield, *Inspiration*, 148; cf. Bloch, 'Midrash', 1266 (ET 33): Scripture 'always concerns a living word addressed personally to the people of God and to each of its members.' Cf. Matt 4:4-10; Acts 15:15; Rom 15:4.

(a) One idiom that apparently occurs only in the NT is the formula 'faithful is the word' (πιστὸς ὁ λόγος).¹⁸ Found in the Pastoral letters, it appears to be a favourite idiom of Paul and/or his amanuensis or co-workers at a later stage of his mission. Broadly speaking, it is used to refer to a traditioned teaching-piece of prophets or inspired teachers.¹⁹ But it is also used in connection with their exposition of the OT. For example, in 1 Tim 3:1a the formula appears to conclude the preceding interpretation of Gen 3 that forbids a wife 'to practice teaching' or 'to domineer' over her husband (1 Tim 2:11-15). In Titus 1:9, 14 'the faithful word' is contrasted to the false biblical interpretations of Paul's opponents, and in Titus 3:5f., 8 it appears to refer to a Pentecostal interpretation of Joel 3:1:

When the goodness and loving kindness of God our Saviour appeared . . ., he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us ... Faithful is the Word.

A more explicit connection with prophecy occurs in a similar formula in Rev 22:6:

Faithful are these words and true (οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί), seeing that (καὶ) the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets sent his angel to show his servants what things must shortly come to pass.

The Qumran *Book of Mysteries*, which uses a similar expression with reference to a prophecy, probably represents the Jewish apocalyptic antecedent of the NT idiom.²⁰

Certain is the word to come to pass (נכון הדבר לבוא) and true (אמת) the oracle.

(b) More common is the exegetical usage of such terms as 'this is' (οὗτος ἐστιν), 'learn' (μανθάνειν), 'hear' (ἀκούειν), 'but' (ἀλλά, 66). In the Greek OT οὗτός ἐστιν translates terms that introduce the explanation of divine revelation through a divine oracle (Isa 9: 14f.), parable (Ezek 5:5), vision (Zech 1:10, 19; 5:3, 6), dream (Dan 4:24, [21]) and strange writing (Dan 5:25f.). For example,

The Lord will cut off from Israel head and tail:
The elder and the honoured man, this is (הוא) the head,

¹⁸ E.g. 1 Tim 1:15; 4:9; 2 Tim 2:11; cf. 1 Cor 1:9; 2 Thess 3:3; see Knight, *Faithful Sayings*. The idiom apparently does not occur elsewhere although similar phrases appear in 2 Clem 11:6 (citing Heb 10:23) and Ignatius, *Tral.* 13:3 and in the Qumran Book of Mysteries (see note 20).

¹⁹ Cf. 1 Tim 4:1 ('the Spirit says') with 4:6 ('by the words of the faith'). See also Rev 19:9; 21:5; Ellis, 'Pastoral Epistles'.

²⁰ IQ27 1:8. This work, according to Rabinowitz, 'Authorship' 29, concerns 'the fulfilment of the words of Israel's prophets'. It has another significant parallel with the Pauline literature in the phrase 'mysteries of iniquity' (IQ27 1:2 פשע ררי). Cf. 2 Thess 2:7; Dimant, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature' 536 n. 256.

And the prophet who teaches lies, this is (הוא) the tail.

Isa 9:14f.

Again I lifted up my eyes and saw ... a flying scroll ...

And [the angel] said to me, 'This is (זאת) the curse ...'

Zech 5:1,3

In Daniel and at Qumran these terms are used in a similar way in conjunction with or as an equivalent of *peshet* (פֶּשֶׁת):²¹

'Because of bloodshed in the city and violence in the land ...' (Hab 2:17).

It's interpretation (פֶּשֶׁת): 'The city', that is (היא) Jerusalem ...

1QpHab 12:6f.; cf. 12:3ff.

The books of the law, they are (הם) the tabernacle of the King, as he said: 'I will raise up the fallen tabernacle of David that is fallen' (Amos 9:11).

CD 7:15f.

'I will be to him a father and he will be to me a son' (2 Sam 7:14). This is (הואה) the branch of David ... As it is written, 'I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen' (Amos 9:11). This is (היאה) the fallen tabernacle of David who will arise to save Israel. Exposition (מדרש) of: 'Blessed is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the ungodly' (Ps 1:1). The interpretation (פֶּשֶׁת) concerns the backsliders from the way ...

4QFlor 1:11-14

In the NT οὗτος (ἐστιν) is also employed with the same eschatological orientation and exegetical framework that is found at Qumran. This formula is an equivalent of the Qumran *peshet* and may introduce either an explanation following cited biblical texts or a biblical citation used to explain the described event:"

'In Isaac shall your seed be called' (Gen 21:12).

That is (τοῦτ' ἐστιν), not the children of the flesh ... but the children of the promise ... For this is (οὗτος) the word of promise, 'About this season I will return and Sarah will have a son' (Gen 18:10).

Rom 9:7-9

²¹ Cf. also 4QpIsa^a 2:6f., 10; 4QpNah 1:11. The Qumran usage is not restricted to revelations through dreams or visions, as some scholars have supposed, for it is used in the explanation of 'Words of Moses' (1Q22 1:3f.) to whom God spoke not in vision but 'mouth to mouth' (Num 12:6-8). For the use of these exegetical formulas in rabbinic writings cf. Silberman, 'Unriddling the Riddle', 326-30; Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique* 42-46; in Gnosticism cf. *Pistis Sophia* 65-67 (131-47); Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 6:14(9).

²² Cf. also John 6:31, 50; Rom 10:6-8; Heb 7:5; 1 Pet 1:25 and, introducing the citation, Matt 3:3; 11:10; Acts 4:11.

But this is (τοῦτό ἐστιν) that which was spoken by the prophet Joel 'And it shall be in the last days, says God, ..' (Joel 3:1).

Acts 2:16f.

(c) The use of the adversative 'but' (ἀλλά, 66) in the exposition of scripture also displays a Jewish ancestry. In the NT (1) it may follow a biblical citation or allusion in order to correct, qualify or underscore a particular understanding of it²³ or (2) it may introduce a citation to correct, qualify or underscore a preceding statement" or citation?

You have heard (ἤκούσατε) that it was said ... ,

'You shall not kill' (Exod 20:13)...

But (δέ) I say to you that everyone who is angry ...

Matt 5:21f.

I know whom I have chosen.

But (ἀλλά) that the scriptures might be fulfilled:

'He who ate my bread lifted his heel against me' (Ps 41:10)

John 13:18

The usage represents an exegetical technique, a dialectical procedure by which apparent contradictions are resolved and the meaning of scripture is drawn out or more precisely specified. A similar contrast between scripture and scripture or scripture and commentary is observable in rabbinic exposition even though an adversative conjunction may not be used:²⁶

'And if he smite out his bondsman's tooth' (Exod 21:27) I might understand (שומע אני) this to mean ... milk tooth.

But it also says (תלמוד לומר), 'Eye' (Exod 21:26)...

Just as the eye ... the tooth must be such as cannot grow back ...

Mekhilta Nezikin 9 (p. 279) on Exod 21:26f.

When Scripture says, 'And David ... wept as he went up' (2 Sam 15:30), one might suppose [he lamented].

But ... he was composing a Psalm, as it is said,

'A Psalm of David, when he fled from Absalom' (Ps 3:1).

Midrash Tehillim 119, 26 (p. 496) on Ps 119:75.

All shofars are valid save of that of a cow, since it is a horn.

But are not (והלא) all shofars called ... 'horn'? For it is written,

²³ Cf. also Matt 19:8; Mark 11:17; 14:28f.; Luke 20:37f.; John 6:31f.; Rom 10:15f.; 1 Cor 2:10A, 16; 15:45f.; Gal 4:22f.; Heb 10:37ff.; 12:26f.

²⁴ Cf. also Acts 2:15f.; Rom 9:7; 15:21; 1 Cor 2:8f.; 10:4f.; Gal 4:30; 3:12; Heb 2:16; 2 Pet 3:12f.

²⁵ Cf. Acts 7:48f.; Rom 8:37; 10:18f.; 11:2ff.; 12:20; Jude 8ff.

²⁶ Whether the NT usage is, like the rabbinic, concerned with resolving apparent contradictions in scripture is less certain to me. But see Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 159-77.

'When they .. blast with the ram's horn' (Josh 6:5)...
 'When Moses held up his hand, Israel prevailed' (Exod 17:11).
 But (וכי) could the hands of Moses promote the battle? ...

M. Rosh Hashana 3:2,8

(d) The terms 'hear' (ἀκούειν) and 'learn' (μανθάνειν), appear occasionally in the NT with reference to 'understanding' scripture:

Go learn what it means,
 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice' (Hos 6:6).²⁷

Matt 9:13

... Then 'all the tribes of the land **will** lament' (cf. **Zech 12:12**)
 And 'shall see the **Son** of man coming on the clouds of heaven' ... (Dan 7:13)
 And his elect ... 'from one end of heaven to the other' (Deut 30:4).
 From the fig tree learn the mystery (παραβολή)...²⁸

Matt 24:30ff.

In Matt 21:33 the words, 'Hear another mystery' (παραβολή), like the apparently equivalent phrase, 'Learn the mystery' (Matt 24:32), refer to an exposition of **scripture**.²⁹ Also, a biblical exposition may be opened with the words, 'Hear the law', or concluded with the expression, 'He who has ears, let him hear'.³⁰

In rabbinic literature the terms 'learn' (למד) and 'hear' (שמע) are similarly employed in formulas coupling biblical texts to commentary upon **them**.³¹

Behold we have thus learned [from the preceding exposition] that work is forbidden during the intervening days of the festival.

Mekhilta Pisha 9 (p. 30) on Exod 12:16

²⁷ Cf. also Matt 11:27, 29: '... Take my yoke upon you and learn from me'. The 'yoke' implies a 'Law of Christ' that, when followed, brings a knowledge of God. Specifically it is a knowledge of 'the mysteries of the Kingdom of the Heavens' (Matt 13:11 *parr*) that, along the lines of the book of Daniel, Jesus unveils *exempli gratia* in his exposition of scripture. Cf. Sir 51:23, 26; M. *Avot* 3:5; M. *Berakhot* 2:2; Davies, *The Setting* 94,214; Cerfaux, 'La connaissance' 244f.

²⁸ That is, the παραβολή apparently is not only the story of the fig tree (Luke 21:29) but also the 'mystery' (ῥ) in the scriptures that Jesus has 'interpreted' (ῥ) (ῥ). Cf. 1QpHab 7:1-8; Ellis, *Prophecy*, 160ff. For this meaning of παραβολή cf. *Jeremias, Parables*, 16; E. Schweizer, *Das Evangelium*, 51 (ET 92f.). Cf. Matt 13:35 = Ps 78:2; Mark 4:11f.; 7:17f. (cf. ἀσύνετοι); Heb 9:9; John 10:6; 16:25, 29. On the expository, i.e. midrashic origin of Matt 24 = Mark 13 see below. Unlike those of 1 Enoch (e.g. 1:2f.; 37:5; 43:4), Jesus' parables of the kingdom are drawn mostly from daily life (but cf. Matt 25:31-46; Luke 16:19D). However, like the parables of Enoch and other apocalyptic literature (4 Ezra 4: 12-22; 7:3-14; 8:41) and unlike those of the rabbis, his are not merely illustrations but are truly 'mysteries', i.e. a **hidden** eschatological word of revelation, clothed in the form of a story. But see the remark of Gilbert, 'Wisdom Literature' 319.

²⁹ I.e. Matt 21:33-46.

³⁰ I.e. Gal 4:21-5:1; Matt 11:7-15. Cf. Rev 1:3; 13:9.

³¹ Cf. Bacher, *Exegetische Terminologie* 1, 75, 94f., 189; 2, 220. Le Déaut, 'La tradition juive ancienne' 37. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar* 1,499, 604.

'She shall go out for nothing'. I might understand (שמה) 'for nothing' to mean without a bill of divorce.

Mekhilta Nezikin 3 (p. 259) on Exod 21:11

(3) **The seven exegetical rules** that, according to later rabbinic tradition, were expounded by the great teacher Hillel represent general hermeneutical principles of inference, analogy and context that were probably in use before that time.³² They may be derived, as Daube argues, from rules of Hellenistic rhetoric **current** in Alexandria in the first century B.C.³³ As attributed to Hillel, they were as follows:

1. An inference drawn from a minor premise to a major and vice versa (**Kal wa-homer** = 'light and heavy').
2. An inference drawn from analogy of expressions, that is from similar words and phrases elsewhere (**Gezera Shawa** = 'an equivalent regulation').
3. A general principle established on the basis of a teaching contained in one verse (**Binyan Av mi-katuv 'ehad** - 'constructing a leading rule from one passage').
4. A general principle established on the basis of a teaching contained in two verses (**Binyan Av mi-shenei ketuvim** - 'constructing a leading rule from two passages').
5. An inference drawn from a general principle in the text to a specific example and vice versa (**Kelal u-ferat** = 'general and particular' and **Perat u-khelal**).
6. An inference drawn from an analogous passage elsewhere (**Kayotse bo mi-makom aher** = 'something similar in another passage').
7. An interpretation of a word or passage from its context (**Davar halamed me-inyano** = 'explanation from the context').

For example, a negligent man whose animal kills someone is liable to death, but he may be delivered by the payment of money (Exod 21:29f.); **a fortiori** (**rule 1**) a man who maims another, a non-capital case, may also compensate by the payment of money and not literally 'eye for eye' (Exod 21:24). It is true that scripture says, 'If a man maims his neighbour ..., so shall it be done to him' (Lev 24:19); but this **genera/principle** cannot include more than the following **specific example**, 'eye for eye' (Lev 24:20), which allows monetary compensation (**rule 5**).³⁴ A master must free a slave whose eye or tooth he has knocked out (Exod 21:26f.); these two examples establish the general principle (**rule 4**) that a

³² E.g. Prov 11:31; cf. 1 Pet 4:17f. On Hillel see **T. Sanhedrin** 7:11; **Avot de-R. Natan A37** (p. 110). Danby, *Tractate Sanhedrin*, 76f. See Kasher, above, pp. 584-85.

³³ Daube, 'Rabbinic Methods' 239-64; cf. Hamerton-Kelly, 'Some Techniques'. 47-53.

³⁴ **Mekhilta, Nezikin 8** (p. 277) on Exod 21:24.

slave must be freed for such an injury to any important, visible and irreplaceable member of his body.³⁵

Daily sacrifice 'in its due season' is offered on the sabbath (Num 28:2, 10); by a Gezeru *Shawa* analogy (*rule 2*) the Passover sacrifice (Num 9:2) should also be offered on the Sabbath since the same expression, 'due season', is **used**.³⁶ One might understand 'Honour your father and your mother' (Exod 20: 12) to signify that the father should be given precedence since he is mentioned first; but in a similar passage 'mother' precedes 'father' (Lev 19:3) and, by **analogy** (*rule 6*), shows that both are to be honoured **equally**.³⁷ The commandment, 'you **shall** not steal', refers to stealing a man and not money; for in the context (*rule 7*) the prohibitions against murder and adultery concern capital crimes and so must this **one**.³⁸

The use of a number of these principles may be observed in the **NT**.³⁹

Rule 1

The ravens neither sow nor reap, and God feeds them (Ps 147:9); of how much more value are you (Luke 12%). If the scripture calls 'gods' those whom God addressed (Ps 82:6), how much more may he whom God sent into the world be called 'son of God' (John 10:34ff.). If the covenant at Sinai came with glory (Exod 34:30), how much more does the new covenant (Jer 31:31ff.) abound in glory (2 Cor 3:6-11). If in the old covenant the blood of animals could effect a **cermonial**, external cleansing (Lev 16; Num 19), how much more shall the blood of (the sacrificed) Messiah cleanse our conscience (Heb 9:13f.).⁴⁰

Rule 2

David, who received the kingdom from God, was blameless when he and those with him violated the Law in eating the showbread (1 Sam 21:6; cf. 15:28); the Son of Man, who also received a kingdom from God (Dan 7:13f.), is equally blameless when those with him violate the sabbath law in similar circumstances (Luke 6:1-5).⁴¹ The righteousness 'reckoned' to Abraham (Gen 15:6) may be explained in terms of forgiveness of sins in

³⁵ *Mekhilra, Nezikin 9* (p. 279) on Exod 21:27. Or one might regard Exod 21:26f. as one passage and take this to be an application of rule three.

³⁶ *T. Pesahim* 4:lf.; *P. T. Pesahim* 6:1 (33a); *B.T. Pesahim* 66a.

³⁷ *Mekhilra, Pisha 1* (p. 2) on Exod 12:1.

³⁸ *Mekhilra, Bahodesh 8* (p. 232-33) on Exod 20:15; cf. *B.T. Sanh. 86a*. For other examples cf. Bacher, *Exegetische Terminologie*, 1, 9ff., 13-16, 75f., 80ff., 172ff.; Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique*, 77-113; Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, 52-90; Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 41f.; Mielziner, *Introduction*, 130-87; Strack, *Introduction*, 93ff., 285-89.

³⁹ Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, 91-118; Gerhardtsson, 'Hermeneutic Program'; Jeremias, 'Paulus als Hillelit', 92ff. For a critique of Hübner's ('Gal 3, 10', 222-29) view that Paul was, contra Jeremias, a Shammaite, see Sanders, *Palestinian Judaism*, 138n. Further cf. Cohn-Sherbok, 'Paul', 12631.

⁴⁰ See further Luke 6:3-5; Rom 5:15, 17; 9:24; 11:12; 1 Cor 6:2f.; 9:9; Heb 2:2ff.; 10:28f.; 12:24f.

⁴¹ The grounds on which this analogy can be drawn are considered by Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, 165.

Ps 32:lf. since the word 'reckoned' is also employed there (Rom 4:3, 7). Gen 14:17-20 may be interpreted in the light of Ps 110:4 where alone in the OT the name 'Melchizedek' again appears (Heb 7:1-28). Gen 15:5f. may be interpreted by Gen 22:9-19 and Isa 41:8 since the texts contain a common reference to Abraham's seed (Jas 2:21ff.).

Rule 3

God is not the God of the dead, and yet in Exod 3:14f. he affirmed a continuing covenant relationship with dead Abraham. Therefore, he must intend to raise Abraham out of death, and from this conclusion one may infer the resurrection of all the dead who had a similar covenantal relationship (Mark 12:26 parr). Cf. Jas 5:16ff.

Rule 4

The uncircumcised Abraham (Gen 15:6) and the circumcised David (Ps 32:lf.) establish the general principle that the righteousness of God is graciously given to the **circumised** Jew and to the uncircumcised Gentile apart from works (Rom 4:1-25). From the commands to unmuzzle the working ox (Deut 25:4) and to give the temple priests a share of the sacrifices (Deut 18:1-8) one may infer the general right of ministers of the gospel to a living (1 Cor 9:9, 13). The examples of Abraham (Gen 22:9-19) and Rahab (Josh 2:1-16) establish the general principle that genuine faith is manifested by works (Jas 2:22-26).

Rule 5

'The [particular] commandments, "you shall not commit adultery, ... commit murder, ... steal, ... covet" (Exod 20:13-17; cf. Lev 18:20; 19:11) and any other commandment are summed up in this [general] sentence, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself" (Lev 19:18) . . . Therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law' (Rom 13:9f.). That is, the particular commandments are apparently regarded as illustrative examples of the general."

Rule 6

The prophecy in Gen 12:3 that all nations shall be blessed in Abraham may, in the light of the analogous passage in Gen 22:18, be understood of Abraham's offspring and thus of Messiah (Gal 3:8, 16). One might understand the 'rest' promised to God's people to have been fulfilled by Joshua (Num 14:21-30; Josh 1:13-15; 22:4), but the analogous and much later passage in Ps 95:7-11 shows that the prophecy is still outstanding (Heb 4:7-9). The covenant at Sinai (Exod 19:5f.; Lev 26:9-12) is shown to

⁴² Cf. Daube, *New Testament*, 63-66.

be inadequate and temporary by a subsequent and similar passage (Jer 31:31-34) in which God speaks of a new covenant (Heb 8:7-13).

Rule 7

Indissoluble marriage was established at creation (Gen 1:27, 2:24), a context that takes priority over later (Deut 24: 1) provisions for divorce (Matt 19:4-8). That righteousness was reckoned to Abraham (Gen 15:6) before he was circumcised (Gen 17:10f.) enables him to be the father of both Jewish and (uncircumcised) Gentile believers (Rom 4:10f.). Equally, because the covenant promise was established with Abraham (Gen 22:18) 430 years before the Mosaic Law (Exod 12:40), it has validity independent of that law (Gal 3:17). That God rested after the completion of the present creation, i.e. on the seventh or sabbath day (Gen 2:2), implies that those who enter God's future sabbath rest (Ps 95:7-11) will do so only when their and his present work is completed, i.e. at the resurrection (Heb 4:9f.; cf. 11:13-16, 35-40).

Some of the above NT passages are clearer than others, and since no 'rules' are mentioned, one cannot prove that the writer or the speaker cited by him had a specific exegetical rule consciously in mind. Nevertheless, a number of these texts almost certainly reflect the use of an exegetical principle or combination of principles. As a whole the examples show that the principles attributed to Hillel were also used by the messianic Judaism represented by Jesus and the NT writers. Certain of the principles, especially the association of biblical texts containing similar ideas (rule 6) or common words and phrases (rule 2), are important for the formation of larger commentary patterns in the NT. They are also evident in other techniques such as a string (חרוז) of quotations⁴³ and merged or composite quotations⁴⁴ that often have appended to one text a snippet from another.⁴⁵ The latter practice appears to be infrequent in other Jewish literature.

MIDRASH

The Hebrew verb *darash* (דרש) and its substantive form *midrash* (מדרש) were used in pre-Christian Judaism for the interpretation of scripture" or for commentary on scripture.⁴⁷ For example, the 'house of midrash' in Ben Sira 51:23

⁴³ E.g. Rom 11:8-10; 15:9-12; 1 Cor 3:19f.; Heb 1:5-13; 1 Pet 2:7f. Some of these combinations from the Law, the Prophets and the Writings. Cf. Bacher, *Proömien*, 9-14; Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 3, 314; B. T. *Pesahim* 76-8a.

⁴⁴ Rom 3:10-18; 2 Cor 6:16ff.; 1 Cor 2:9. Cf. *Mekhila*, *Pisha* 1 (p. 3) on Exod 12:1.

⁴⁵ Matt 21:5 (Isa 62:11 + Zech 9:9); Mark 1:2 (Mal 3:1 + Isa 40:3) etc. Cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 186.

⁴⁶ Perhaps as early as Ezra 7: 10 'Ezra had set his heart to interpret (דרש) the law of the Lord'.

⁴⁷ Perhaps as early as 2 Chron 13:22 ('Midrash of the prophet Iddo'); 24:27 ('Midrash on the Book of Kings').

refers to the place of instruction in the Law of God.⁴⁸ Similarly, at Qumran 'midrash' can mean the 'study' of Tora.⁴⁹ This study; i.e. interpretation of scripture, was an established practice in first-century Judaism in the synagogue service?" as well as in the academic schools.⁵¹

As an *interpretive activity* the midrashic procedure (1) is oriented to scripture, (2) adapting it to the present (3) for the purpose of instructing or edifying the current reader or hearer.⁵² It may take the form either of a simple clarification or of a *specific* application of the texts.

As a *literary expression* midrash has traditionally been identified with certain rabbinic commentaries on the OT. However, in accordance with its use in Ben Sira and at Qumran, the term is now employed more broadly to designate interpretive renderings of the biblical text (= implicit *midrash*) and of various kinds of 'text + exposition' patterns (= explicit *midrash*).⁵³

(1) *Implicit midrash* first appears, as has been observed above, as a process of rewriting that occurs within the Hebrew OT itself. It may also involve the transposition of a biblical text to a different application. For example, the prophecy in Isa 19:19-22 transposes the words and motif of Israel's redemption from Egypt (Exod 1-12) to God's future redemption of Egypt."

Implicit *midrash* is present also in biblical translations, that is, the Greek Septuagint and the Aramaic *targums*, where interpretive adaptation to a current understanding, interest, or application is interwoven into the translation process.⁵⁵ For example, in Lev 18:21 the prohibition of child-sacrifice 'to the god Molech' becomes in *Targum Neofiti* 'to an idol'. In the Septuagint it is a simple prohibition on idolatry, i.e. to serve or worship (λατρεύειν) a ruler. In Num 24:17 a 'star' and a 'scepter' become in *Targum Neofiti* a 'king' and a 'redeemer', in the Septuagint a 'star' and a 'man'. In Isa 9:11 (12) the Philistines become in the Septuagint 'the Greeks'. In Isa 52:13 'my servant' becomes in *Targum Yonatan* 'my servant the Messiah'.

Similarly, at Qumran rewritings of Genesis, the Genesis Apocryphon (1QGenAp) and Jubilees (1Q17, 18; etc.) may properly be designated implicit

⁴⁸ The 'house of midrash' (*beit ha-midrash*) may already here be a technical term and certainly becomes so in later rabbinic usage. Cf. Safrai, 'Education', 960ff.

⁴⁹ 1QS 8:15, 26; CD 20:6.

⁵⁰ Cf. Luke 4:16-30; Acts 13:16-41. Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* 2, 60-64; *Hypothetica* 7, 11-13. Cf. P.T. *Megilla* 3:1 (73d): There were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem, each of which had a 'house of reading' and a 'house of learning' (*beit talmud*).

⁵¹ Paul's study 'at the feet of Gamaliel' (Acts 22:3) is one example. Cf. van Unnik, *Tarsus*; Neusner, *Rabbinic Traditions*, 3, 248-319.

⁵² Bloch, 'Midrash' 1263-67; ET 29-34. Vermes, 'Bible and Midrash', *CHB* 1, 223ff.

⁵³ Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 188-97.

⁵⁴ Isa 19:20 ('cry', 'send', 'oppressors', cf. Exod 3:9f.), 20ff. ('sign', 'know', 'sacrifice', 'smite', cf. Exod 7:27; 8:4, 18-25 = 8:2, 8. 22-29). Cf. Fishbane 'Torah and Tradition', 277.

⁵⁵ Le Déaut, 'Une phénomène spontané' 525, distinguishes *midrash* proper from 'targumism', in which the interpretive factor is spontaneous and unconditioned by hermeneutical rules and techniques.

midrash. The same may be said of interpretive alterations of OT texts, often based on word-play, in certain Qumran commentaries.⁵⁶

These various forms of implicit **midrash** are also present in the NT. **Word-play** in Matt 2:23 connects Jesus' residence in Nazareth to an OT messianic text such as Isa 11:1 (נצר = 'branch') or Isa 49:6 (נצירי = 'preserved?', 'branch?', 'Nazorean?'). Luke 1-2 offers examples of the **transposition** of OT texts. The prophecy of Gabriel (Luke 1:30-35) is given literary expression via allusion to 2 Sam 7, Isa 7 and other passages. The song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1-10), supplemented by other passages, is transposed to form the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55). Other OT texts are used in the same way in the Benedictus (Luke 1:68-79) and in the Nunc Dimittis (Luke 2:29-32).

Events in Jesus' life that are described by the use of biblical allusions are also a form of implicit **midrash**. In this way the event can be clearly associated with or presented as a fulfilment of the OT. Thus, the angelic annunciation to Mary (Luke 1:26-38) is virtually a pastiche of biblical allusions (Isa 7:14, 13; Gen 16:11; Isa 9:6f.; 2 Sam 7: 12-16; Dan 7:14). Somewhat differently, the visit of the wise men and the sequel (Matt 2:1-23) is structured upon both explicit quotations (Mic 5:1, 3[2, 4] + 2 Sam 5:2; Hos 11:1; Jer 31:15; Isa 11:1; Jer 23:5 or Judg 13:5) and implicit **allusions** to scripture (Num 24:17; Exod 2:15; 4:19). The feeding of the Five Thousand (Matt 14:13-21 parr) is described with clear allusions to the Exodus (Exod 16:12-15; 18:21; Deut 18:15; cf. IQS 2:21f.; IQSa 1:14f.; 2:1). The **raising** of the widow's son (Luke 7:11-17, 16) highlights the people's misunderstanding of who Jesus is by plain allusions to a similar miracle by Elijah (1 Kgs 17:10, 23). The Triumphal Entry (Mark 11:1-10) is a messianic act based upon Isa 62:11 and Zech 9:9, as the crowd recognizes and Matthew (21:4f.) and John (12:15) make explicit, and the Cleansing of the Temple (Matt 21:10-17; cf. John 2:17) and the Last Supper (Matt 26:20-29 parr) are presented in a similar manner.

This kind of narrative **midrash** is in several respects different from certain rabbinic midrashim that elaborate, usually via wordplay, a biblical word or verse into a fictional **story**.⁵⁷

- (1) While the rabbinic **midrash** seeks to discover some hidden element within the OT text itself, the NT **midrash** with its eschatological orientation applies the text theologically to some aspect of Jesus' life and ministry.
- (2) While for the rabbis the text is primary, the NT writers give primacy to Jesus and to the surrounding messianic events, or tradition of events, and only then use OT texts to explain or illuminate them.

While they may describe the events in biblical language and may on occasion allude to a prior fictional **midrash** (e.g. 1 Cor 10:4), they never seem to reverse their priorities so as to make the OT text the locus for creating stories about

⁵⁶ E.g. 4QTest1:22 (Josh 6:26, omitting 'Jericho'); IQpHab X:3 (Hah 2:5, changing 'wine' יין, to 'wealth'. דון). Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 175ff., 190, 201f.

⁵⁷ For examples, cf. Weingreen, *From Bible to Mishna*, 18; Ellis, *Prophecy*, 209-12.

Jesus. This holds true also for the Infancy Narratives where, even on the unlikely assumption of the writers' total loss of a salvation-history perspective, the wide-ranging **mélange** of citations and allusions could only have coalesced around preexisting traditions and, in any case, could not have produced the stories in the **Gospels**.⁵⁸ For example, only because Matthew (2:6, 23; 4:15) had a tradition that Jesus was born in Bethlehem and raised in Galilee does he use Mic 5:2 (1) of Jesus' birth and Jer 23:5; Isa 11:1; 9:2f. (8:23f.) of his youth and ministry and not vice versa. The texts themselves could be applied to either eventuality.

More subtly, certain of Jesus' parables are based upon OT passages; but this may be so because they are biblical expositions, excerpted from earlier explicit midrashim (see below). The Revelation of St. John represents a comprehensive adaptation of OT images and motifs, using midrashic techniques, to verbalize the eschatological visions of the Seer. In 1 Tim 1:9f. the fifth to the ninth commands of the Decalogue are transposed to accord with a current interpretation of the violation of these commandments:

Exodus 20:12-16

Honour your father and your mother

You shall not commit murder

You shall not commit adultery

You shall not steal

You shall not bear false witness

1 Timothy 1:9f.

Murderers of fathers and ... mothers

Manslayers

Immoral persons, sodomites

Kidnappers

Liars, perjurers

Interpretive alterations within OT quotations are a third and more common form of implicit **midrash**. They are characteristic of certain classes of NT citations and, as will be seen below, are frequent in quotations used within explicit **midrash** patterns. Sometimes they simply contemporize the citation to the current audience. For example, 'Damascus' in Amos 5:27 becomes 'Babylon' in Acts 7:43. More generally, such alterations appear to serve the writer's purpose by accenting a particular interpretation or application of the citation. They may involve either elaborate alterations of the OT text⁵⁹ or the simple but significant change of one or two words, as in the following examples:

Behold, I am sending my messenger **before your face**.

Matt 11: 10 (Mal 3: 10)

... you shall not steal, you shall not bear false witness, you shall not **defraud**.

⁵⁸ Otherwise: Gundry, *Matthew*, 26-41; Brodie, 'Unravelling' 263; Hanson, *Living Utterances*, 76, qualifying his better judgment in *Studies*, 207: 'We are never led to think that (the New Testament writers) are themselves inventing *Haggadah*, a narrative midrash'.

⁵⁹ These are often found in merged or composite citations of several OT texts, e.g. Kom 3:10-18; 1 Cor 2:9; 2 Cor 6:16ff. Cf. also the running summary of the Patriarchal and Exodus story in Acts 7.

Mark 10: 19f. (Exod 20: 12-16)

The stone set at naught by you builders ..

Acts 4:11 (Ps 118:22)

Everyone who believes on him shall not be put to shame.

Rom 10:11 (Isa 28:16)

In burt offerings and sin offerings you did not **have pleasure**.

Heb 10:6 (Ps 40:6)

The textual alterations in the last two examples are designed to create verbal links within a larger exposition of scripture, i.e. a pattern of explicit **midrash**.⁶⁰ We may now turn to a closer examination of that phenomenon.

(2) **Explicit midrash** in the NT takes various forms. It may appear as a cluster of texts and commentary on a particular theme, similar to **the florilegia** found at Qumran⁶¹ or as a special pattern.⁶² More frequently, it occurs in literary forms found in rabbinic expositions, the '**proem**' and '**yelammedenu rabbenu**' ('let our master teach us') midrashim. While in the rabbinic collections these forms date from several centuries after the NT,⁶³ they were hardly borrowed from the Christians. Also, similar patterns are present in the first-century Jewish writer, Philo.⁶⁴ One may infer then, with some confidence, that their presence in the NT reflects a common, rather widespread Jewish usage. The rabbinic **proem midrash** generally had the following **form**.⁶⁵

The (Pentateuchal) text for the day.

A second text, the **proem** or 'opening' for the discourse.

Exposition, including supplementary quotations, parables and other commentary with verbal links to the initial and final texts.

A final text, usually repeating or alluding to the text for the day, and sometimes adding a concluding **application**.⁶⁶

The **yelammedenu midrash** has the same general structure except for an interrogative opening in which there is posed a question or problem that the exposition serves to answer.

As might be expected, the NT exegetical patterns display a number of differences from those of the rabbis. They represent an earlier stage in the development of the art as well as a divergent theological orientation. In addition,

⁶⁰ Cf. Rom 10:12f, 16, 18; Heb 10:38.

⁶¹ **4QFlor**. Cf. Heb 1:1-14; Jude 4-23; Ellis, Prophecy, 221-26.

⁶² E.g. John 1:1-18; Matt 4:1-11; cf. Borgen, 'Observations'; Gerhardsson, **Testing**. Perhaps Heb 1:1-2:18, Luke 4: 16-30 and Mark 13:5-29 appear to reflect expository patterns that have been partly dissipated in transmission.

⁶³ See Bowker, **Targums**, 74-77.

⁶⁴ E.g. Philo, **De Sacrif. Abel. 76-87**; Lev 2:14 + Commentary with verbal links and supplementary texts + Concluding allusion to the opening text + Final texts (Exod 6:7; Lev 26:12).

⁶⁵ E.g. **Pesikta Rabbati** 34:1; Zech 9:9 + Isa 61:9 + Commentary, with verbal links and illustrative stories + Isa 62:2 + Final reference to Isa 61:Y.

⁶⁶ Cf. Stein, 'Homiletische Peroratio'.

they apparently have been frequently abbreviated and otherwise altered before their incorporation into the present NT context. Among the more notable differences, the NT midrashim (1) do not appear to be related to a (Pentateuchal) lectionary cycle, (2) often lack a second, **proem** text and (3) use a final text that does not correspond or allude to the initial text. Occasionally, (4) they have lost their catchword **connections**.⁶⁷ More importantly, (5) they consistently have an eschatological orientation. Nevertheless, the NT patterns show an unmistakable resemblance to rabbinic **midrash** that cannot be coincidental and that permits a qualified label of '**proem**' and '**yelammedenu**'.

In the expositions attributed to Jesus by the Evangelists@ the **yelammedenu** form is usually found in discussions about the **halakha**⁶⁸ or other questions⁷⁰ between Jesus and other Jewish theologians. Compare Matt 12:1-8 on what is permitted on the Sabbath:"

- 1-2 – Theme and question raised by the initial texts (cf. Exod 20: 10; 34:21)
- 3-5 – Counter question and exposition via supplementary texts (1 Sam 21:7; Num 28:9; θυσία), verbally linked to the theme and the initial texts (ποιεῖν; ἐσθίειν).
- 6f. – Eschatological application via an **a fortiori** argument and a final text (Hos 6:6, θυσία).

In the teachings of Jesus given in the Gospels the **proem** form appears only infrequently. A striking example, dealing with God's judgement on the nation's leaders for their rejection of the Messiah occurs in Matt 21:33-46 and parallels:"

- 33 – Initial text (Isa 5:1f.).
- 34-41 – Exposition via a parable, verbally linked to the initial and/or

⁶⁷ E.g. Matt 11:7-15: Theme and initial text (7-10; Mal3:1) + Exposition (11-13) + Final text (14; allusion to Mal3:23 = 4:5).

⁶⁸ While **they were** somewhat altered in transmission, less so in Matthew than elsewhere **apparently**, these expositions belong to the bedrock of the Gospel traditions and originate in the **prcrsurrection** mission of Jesus. Cf. Ellis, Prophecy, 154-59, 247-53.

⁶⁹ Cf. further on ritual defilement, Matt 15: 1-9: Question and initial texts (1-4; Exod 20: 12; 21: 17) + Exposition/application (5-6) + Concluding text (7-9; Isa 29:13). On divorce, Matt 19:3-8. On the meaning of a commandment, Luke 10:25-37. Cf. Ellis, Prophecy, 158f.

⁷⁰ On messianic themes e.g. Matt 21:15f.: Theme and initial text (Ps 118:25) + Objection + Counter question with concluding text (Ps 8:3). On resurrection, cf. Matt 22:23-33.

⁷¹ It is similar to the **yelammedenu** pattern even though, like other midrashim of Jesus, it is an adversary rather than a teacher/disciple context. Daube, **New Testament**, 170-75 identifies the form as 'revolutionary action, protest, silencing of remonstrants'. However, the action usually involves a violation of an accepted halakha, and on that basis is objected to and the objection answered. It may be, then, that this represents a biblical dispute even when express biblical references are partial or absent, perhaps having disappeared in transmission (cf. Matt 9:9-13; 12:22-30; Luke 13:10-17).

⁷² Cf. Ellis, Prophecy, 251f. Another **proem-like** pattern, somewhat reworked, appears in John 6:31-58: Initial texts (31; Exod 16:4) + Exposition with dialogue (32-44) + Supporting texts (45; Isa 54:13) + Exposition and concluding reference to the initial text (58). Cf. Borgen, **Bread From Heaven**. 37-43.

final texts (ἄμπελών, 33, 39; λίθος, 42, 44, cf. 35: Isa 5:2, ἕρπ; cf. οἰκοδομεῖν, 33, 42).

- 42-44 – Concluding texts (Ps 118:22f.; Dan 2:34f., 44f.) and application.

In Acts and the Epistles the **proem midrash** is much more frequent, the **yelummedenu** relatively less so.⁷³ Gal 4:21-5:1 offers an instructive example:

- 21f. – Introduction and initial text (cf. Gen 21).
 23-29 – A supplementary citation (27: Isa 54:1) and exposition, verbally linked to the initial and final text (ἐλευθέρα, 22f., 26, 30; παιδίσκη, 22f., 30f.; ἱβ/υῖός = τέκνον, 22, 25, 27f., 30f.).
 30ff. – Final texts and application, referring to the initial text (cf. Gen. 21:10).

It is noteworthy that the initial and final texts are, in fact, implicit **midrash**, the first a selective summary of Gen 21 and the last an interpolated citation shaped to underscore the key term ἐλευθέρα.⁷⁴ This kind of usage alerts one to recognize the presence of implicit (Rom 3:10-18) and explicit (Rom 4:1-25) midrashim as 'texts' in a more elaborate commentary pattern. in Rom 1:17-4:25:⁷⁵

- 1:17 – Initial texts (Hab 2:4, δίκαιος, πίστις).
 1:18-3:3 – Exposition, verbally linked to the initial and/or subsequent texts (κρίνειν, 2:1, 3, 12, 16; δίκαιος, 2:13; πίστος, 3:3).
 3:4 – Supplementary texts (Ps 51:6, δικαιοῦν, κρίνειν).
 3:5-9 – Exposition (δικαιοσύνη, 5; κρίνειν, 6f.).
 3:10-18 – Supplementary texts (Eccl 7:20; Ps 14:1-3; 5:10 (9); Isa 59:7f.; etc.; cf. δίκαιος, 10).
 3:19-31 – Exposition (δικαιοῦν, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; δικαιοσύνη 21f., 25.; δίκαιος, 26; πίστις 22, 25f., 27f., 30f.).

⁷³ But see Ellis, *Prophecy*, 137n, 218ff. and (for illustrations of proem-type expositions) 155ff. Cf. Rom 4:1-25; 9:6-29; 1 Cor 1: 18-31; 2:6-16; Gal 3:6-14; Heb 10:5-39. It may be, as Bowker, 'Speeches in Acts' has suggested, that Acts 15:14-21 contains the remnant of a **yelummedenu midrash** on perhaps the last decisive halakhic question that engaged the Christian community as a whole: 'Must proselytes – and by inference any believer in Jesus as Messiah – be circumcised and keep the Mosaic regulations?'

⁷⁴ Cf. also 1 Cor 10:1-31: Initial 'texts' (1-5; Exod 13-17; Num 14:29) + Application (6) + Supplementary text (7; Exod 32:6) + Exposition/application (8-13) + Extended application (14-30) and concluding allusion to the initial 'texts' (31). Similar patterns are to be found in 2 Pet 3:5-13 and Heb 5:1-7:28. Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 157.

⁷⁵ See Ellis, *Prophecy*. 217f. Cf. also 1 Cor 1:18-3:20: Initial 'text' (1:18-31) + Exposition (2:1-5) + Supplementary 'text' (2:6-16) + Exposition (3:1-17) + Final texts (3:18-20; Job 5:13; Ps 94:11).

- 4: 1-25 – Final 'text'⁷⁶ (δικαιοῦν, 2, 5; δικαιοσύνη 3, 5f., 9, 11, 13, 22; πίστις, 5, 9, 11ff., 14, 16, 19f.).

The above examples indicate the way in which explicit **midrash** was employed, both by Jesus and by the early Christian prophets and teachers, to establish and justify their new understanding of the scriptures. There is some evidence that this usage represented only the first stage of a process that soon developed into an independent employment of the texts and of the expositions.

(3) **From midrash to testimonia.** Several scholars have argued that in rabbinic literature the mishna-form, that is, independent commentary that is topically arranged, developed in part from detaching the commentary from an earlier **explicit midrash**-form, that is, biblical texts + commentary.⁷⁷ Something similar seems to have occurred in the NT church. Explicit **midrash** was a means to establish a particular interpretation of scripture while isolated proof-texts did not, apparently, have that function or that **effectiveness**.⁷⁸ It is likely, then, that a **midrash** of a given text preceded its use as an isolated 'testimony' in which a Christian **understanding** of the text was assumed. The use of the same texts both in midrashim and as **testimonia** supports this supposition even if the particular NT **midrash** is not the direct antecedent of the 'testimony' text. For example, midrashim in Acts 2 and Heb 5-7 and (underlying) in Mark 13 establish, respectively, that Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:13 applied to Jesus; the independent use of the verses in Mark 14:62, summarizing Jesus' response at his trial, presupposes that **understanding**.⁷⁹

On the same analogy certain clustered parables of Jesus, like those in Matt 13 or Luke 15, may have been excerpted from earlier commentary formats like those of Luke 10:25-37 or Matt 21:33-44. This is suggested especially for those parables that themselves echo **or passages**⁸⁰ or utilize formulas customary in **midrash**.⁸¹

⁷⁶ Note the commentary pattern of **Rom 4:1-25**: Theme and initial text (1-3; Gen 15:6) + Exposition (4ff.) + Supplementary text (7f.; Ps 32:1f.) + Exposition (9-16) + Supplementary text with exposition (17; Gen 17:5) + ?**Supplementary** text (18; Gen 15:5) + Exposition (19-21) + Concluding allusion to the initial text and application (22-25). Cf. **Borgen, Bread From Heaven**, 47-52.

⁷⁷ Lauterbach, 'Midrash and Mishnah'; Halivni, *Midrash*; Otherwise, Safrai, 'Halakha', 148, 153-55. For a similar process in the targums cf. Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 202.

⁷⁸ **Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics**, 116: 'Words lifted from their scriptural context can never be a testimonium to the Jewish mind. The word becomes a testimonium after one has brought out its meaning with the aid of other parts of scripture'.

⁷⁹ Cf. Acts 2:14-36: Theme and initial text (14-21; Joel 2:28-32 = 3:1-5) + Exposition (22-24) + Supplementary text (25-28; Ps 16:8-11) + Exposition (29-34) + Final text and application (34ff.; Ps 110:1). See Ellis, *Prophecy*, 199-205. Cf. also Heb 2:6-9 with 1 Cor 15:27 and Eph 1:20, 22 (Ps 8); Acts 13:16-41 with Luke 3:22D, Heb 1:5 and 2 Cor 6:18 (2 Sam 7:6-16; Ps 2:7).

⁸⁰ E.g. cf. Luke 15:3-7 with Zech 10-11; 13:7; Ezek 34:11f. Cf. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 208f.

⁸¹ E.g. οὗτός ἐστιν. Cf. Matt 13:20, 22f., 38.

Perspective and Presuppositions

It has been argued above that, in terms of method, the early Christian use of the OT was thoroughly Jewish and had much in common with other Jewish groups. Much more significant than method, however, was the interpretation of scripture offered by Jesus and his followers. In some respects this also agrees with previous Jewish interpretation, but in others it displays an innovative and unique departure. Sometimes the NT writers (to whom we shall limit this survey), and Jesus as he is represented by them, set forth their distinctive views in a biblical exegesis; sometimes they appear, at least to us, simply to presuppose a 'Christian' exegetical conclusion. They apparently derive their particular understanding of scripture both from Jesus' teaching and from implications drawn from his resurrection from the dead. Their perspective on the OT is especially shaped by presuppositions in at least four areas: (1) eschatology, (2) typology, (3) a corporate understanding of man and of Messiah, (4) a conception of scripture as a hidden Word of God. In the following survey their OT citations and commentary (i.e. midrash), illustrative of the early Christian perspective on these issues, will be indicated in the footnotes.

ESCHATOLOGY

The OT prophets predicted the coming of the 'last days' (אחרית הימים), and/or 'the day of the Lord' that would bring the 'kingdom of God', together with a final judgement and a redemption of God's people.⁸² Apocalyptic Judaism, which was in important respects the midwife of first-century messianic Judaism, interpreted the coming kingdom in terms of a catastrophic and cosmic judgement of God followed by a renewed creation.⁸³ Two immediate antecedents of the Christian movement, the communities of Qumran and of John the Baptist, reflect this point of view and consider the kingdom of God to be 'at hand'. The Baptist points to Jesus as the one through whom God will accomplish the final redemption and judgement.⁸⁴ Jesus and the NT apostles and prophets are at one with apocalyptic Judaism in several respects.

- (1) They conceive of history within the framework of *two ages*, this world or age and the age to come,⁸⁵ and they identify the kingdom of God with the

⁸² Num 24:14; Isa 2:2-4; Dan 10:14; Hos 3:4f.; Amos 5:18-27 (cf. Acts 7:42f.); Mic 4:1ff.; Zech 14 (cf. Matt 25:31; Rev 21:6, 25; 22:1, 17). See von der Osten-Sacken, *Die Apokalypitik*, 39-43.

⁸³ Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 150f. (in Isa 56-66), 371f. (Zech 14); Russell, *Method and Message*, 280-84; Ringgren, *Faith*, 155-66; Rowland, *Open Heaven*.

⁸⁴ Matt 3:2; cf. *IQpHab* 2:7; 7:2 where the Qumran writer identifies the community with 'the last generation' (הדור האחרון). Further, cf. Matt 3:1-12; 11:2-15; Mark 1:4-7; Luke 3:1-20; 7:18-28.

⁸⁵ I.e. αἰών (Matt 12:32; 2 Cor 4:4; Gal 1:4f.; Eph 1:21; Heb 6:5); αἰσχος (John 16:11; 18:36; 1 Cor 7:29ff.; Eph 2:2; Jas 2:5; 2 Pet 3:6f.); οἰκουμένη (Acts 17:31; Heb 1:6; 2:5).

coming age.⁸⁶

- (2) They view themselves to be living in *the lust* (ἐσχάτος) days preceding the consummation.⁸⁷
- (3) They proclaim God's final redemption to be a *salvation in history*,** that is, a redemption of matter in *time*.⁸⁹

Equally important, however, they modify apocalyptic ideas in significant ways.

(1) The two-fold consummation of redemption and judgement becomes a *two-stage consummation*. As 'redemption' the kingdom of God is regarded as already present in certain respects, that is, in the work of Jesus the Messiah,⁹⁰ and 'coming in power' within the lifetime of his hearers, that is, at the Transfiguration of Jesus and/or at the Christian Pentecost.⁹¹ As 'judgement' and final redemption the kingdom will come only at the end of this age in the second and glorious appearing of the Messiah⁹² which, as in the OT prophets, is represented to be just over the horizon, existentially 'near' but chronologically indefinite.⁹³

(2) The two-age, horizontal perspective of apocalyptic Judaism is also modified by a 'vertical', *heaven/earth dimension*. A vertical perspective is already at hand, of course, in that the kingdom of God is 'the kingdom of the heavens' (ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν).⁹⁴ Thus, the believers' 'treasure', 'reward'⁹⁵ and 'names' are 'in heaven', or 'in God', that is, where God's rule is now manifested

⁸⁶ Cf. Matt 13:40-43; Luke 21:31; Acts 1:6ff.; 1 Cor 15:50; Heb 12:26ff.; 2 Pet 1:10f.; Rev 11:15-18.

⁸⁷ E.g. Acts 2:17 in a commentary; Heb 1:2, introducing a *florilegium* of OT texts with commentary (?1:1-2:18); 2 Pet 3:3, introducing a commentary; Jude 18f. in an elaborate commentary on the theme of judgment (cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 221-36). Cf. also 2 Tim 3:1; 1 John 2:18.

⁸⁸ Cullmann, *Salvation*.

⁸⁹ This stands in contrast to conceptions dominant in current Platonic thought, which by the first century was also influential not only among the Stoics and Pythagoreans but also in some Jewish circles and which postulated a deliverance of the 'soul' from matter and out of time. See Perlman, 'Greek Philosophy' 126-29; Brehier, *History of Philosophy*, 137, 168-72. On body/soul dualism in rabbinic and intertestamental Jewish literature cf. Meyer, *Hellenistisches*; Russell, *Method and Message*, 353-90. See also Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul*; id., *Christ and Time*, 139-43.

⁹⁰ E.g. Luke 10:9, 11:20; Col 1:12f.; John 11:24f. Kümmel, *Theology*, 36-39 Ellis, *Eschatology*, 11-14, 16f.

⁹¹ Acts 2:16f. in a commentary. Cf. Mark 9:1f.; John 14:12; Acts 1:8; Rom 14:17; 15:18f. The *eschatological* power (δύναμις) of the Holy Spirit that was manifested in Jesus' ministry was, after Pentecost, experienced in the wider Christian community. Cf. Ellis, 'Present and Future Eschatology'. Otherwise: Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 19-87.

⁹² Luke 21:31, applying a re-worked commentary (21:8-28 = Mark 13:5-27 = Matt 24:4-31) on Daniel 7-12 (cf. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*). Cf. Matt 25:31f.; Luke 22:18, 28ff.; John 5:25-29; 2 Thess 1:5-10; 2:8; Heb 9:27f.; 12:26ff. Note the omission of Isa 61:2b in Jesus' exposition of the passage at Luke 4:18-21. This accords with his conception elsewhere (e.g. Luke 9:54f.; Matt 11:4f.; 26:52ff.) of his present mission and is not to be regarded as a Lukan (or pre-Lukan) editorial even though it also serves a Lukan interest (cf. Luke 22:50f. with Mark 14:47).

⁹³ Mark 13:32, applying are-worked commentary; 2 Thess 2:1-7, with allusions to Dan 11:36, Ezek 28:2 and Isa 11:4; Heb 10:37, concluding a commentary; 2 Pet 3:8-13 in a commentary. Cf. Isa 13:6; Joel 1:15; Luke 12:39f.; 1 Thess 5:10; Jas 5:7f.

⁹⁴ Matt 4:17 *et passim*. But see Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar* 1, 172-84.

⁹⁵ Matt 5:12; 6:19f.; 19:21; Luke 12:33f., which may have been extracted from a commentary on Zech 11 and 13; Bruce, 'Book of Zechariah', 342-49; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 208.

and from which it shall be revealed.⁹⁶ This vertical element is given a specifically Christian understanding in terms of the Messiah who has been exalted into heaven.” For in the resurrected body of the Messiah the world to come has been brought into being and, pending its public revelation to earth on the last day,⁹⁸ is now manifested ‘in heaven’.⁹⁹

(3) Furthermore, the NT teachers regard this age and the age to come as standing in a **relationship of both discontinuity and continuity**, of novum and fulfilment. In contrast to some other Jewish views they consider resurrection life to be radically different from that of the present age.¹⁰⁰ They represent it, however, not as a ‘non-material’ life but rather as a modification of a strictly ‘materialist’ conception reflected in some sectors of Judaism.¹⁰¹ In Paul’s words the life of the age to come involves a ‘Spirit-empowered body’ (1 Cor 15:44), that is, the present body ‘transformed’ to be like Messiah’s ‘glorious body’.¹⁰² One observes, here and elsewhere, that early Christianity defined the life of the age to come in terms of the testimony to Christ’s resurrection in which the risen Messiah was seen to be both ‘glory’ and ‘flesh’, both a new creation and the physical body of the crucified Messiah redeemed from the tomb.¹⁰³ Thus, the age to come is regarded neither as a mere extension of the present age nor as isolated from it. The future age is considered to be rather a transformation and transfiguration of the present world that is brought about by a mighty act of God.

(4) Finally, unlike other Jewish groups, the first followers of Jesus teach that the age to come, the age of resurrection, would begin not at the end of the present age, as Judaism had usually believed, but in the midst of it. Already, in the resurrected Messiah, the first to rise from the dead and the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep in death, the age to come has broken into the present age and now determines its ultimate course.¹⁰⁴ Again, they attribute

⁹⁶ Cf. Luke 10:20; Rom 1:18 and 2:5f.; 1 Cor 3:13; 1 Pet 1:4f.; 4:13; Rev 20:15.

⁹⁷ E.g. Acts 2:34 (cf. 3:21) in a commentary; Rom 10:6 in a commentary (? 10:4-11:12) on Deut 30:12f., etc.; Heb 1:13 in a *florilegium* (1:5-2:5) including Ps 110:1; Heb 8:1 in a commentary; cf. Acts 7:55; 1 Pet 3:22. Somewhat different is the commentary on Exod 16 in John 6:31-58 concerning the pre-existent Son, who has come down from heaven.

⁹⁸ E.g. Matt 24:30 in a re-worked commentary; Heb 9:27f. and 10:37 in a commentary; 2 Pet 3:5-13 in a commentary. Cf. Acts 3:21; 1 Cor 15:22f.; Phil 3:21; 1 John 2:28.

⁹⁹ E.g. Gal 4:26 in a commentary; Heb 2:9 (cf. 4:14) in a commentary (? 1:1-2:18) on Ps 8 etc. Cf. Luke 24:25-27; Rev 21:1f.

¹⁰⁰ Matt 22:30f. in a commentary; 1 Cor 15:44-49, commenting on Gen 2:7. Cf. Ellis, ‘Life’.

¹⁰¹ E.g. in Matt 22:28 (presupposed); 2 Macc 7:7-29; 2 Bar 50:2-51:3; Sib. Or. 4:181-92.

¹⁰² 1 Cor 15:44; Phil 3:21. Cf. 1 Cor 15:12-18.

¹⁰³ Matt 28:8f.; Luke 24:26, 36-40; John 20:26f.; 1 Cor 15:4. The tendency to assign greater historical worth to traditions concerning the ‘glory’ than to those concerning the ‘physical’ character of the Messiah’s resurrection does not appear to be justified. Cf. Alsop, *Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories*, 55-61, 266-74.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Acts 26:23; 1 Cor 15:20; Cullmann, *Salvation*, 166-85. For the thesis that Qumran also regarded the salvation of the age to come as already present cf. Kuhn, *Enderwartung*.

their convictions to their experience of the resurrected Jesus who becomes the model by which their views are shaped.¹⁰⁵

TYPOLGY

Typological interpretation had been employed earlier in Judaism¹⁰⁶ and became, in early Christianity, a basic key by which the scriptures were understood.¹⁰⁷ In NT usage it rested upon the conviction of a correspondence between God’s acts in the present age and those in the person and work of Jesus that inaugurated the age to come. From past OT events and institutions it drew out the meaning of the present time of salvation and, in turn, interpreted present events as a typological prophecy of the future consummation.

(1) NT typological interpretation is to be distinguished from certain other approaches.¹⁰⁸ Unlike allegory, it regards the scriptures not as verbal metaphors hiding a deeper meaning (ὕπονοια) but as historical accounts from whose literal sense the meaning of the text arises. Unlike the ‘history of religions’ hermeneutic, it seeks the meaning of current, NT events not from general religious history but from the salvation-history of Israel. Unlike the use of ‘type’ (τύπος) in pagan and some patristic literature, which assumes a cyclical-repetitive historical process, it relates the past to the present in terms of a historical correspondence and escalation in which the divinely ordered prefigurement finds a complement in the subsequent and greater event. Like rabbinic midrash, it applies the OT to contemporary situations, but it does so with historical distinctions different from those of the rabbis. Like Qumran exegesis, it gives to the OT a present-time, eschatological application, but it does so with an eschatological and messianic orientation different from that at Qumran.

(2) In the NT typology appears, broadly speaking, as **creation typology** and **covenant typology**. In the former case Adam ‘is a type of the one to come’, (Rom 5:14), that is, of Jesus the Messiah. A similar typological correspondence is implied in the designation of Adam, like Jesus, as ‘son of God’ and in the description of the age to come in terms of Paradise¹⁰⁹ or of a new creation.¹¹⁰ Apparently, Jesus’ teaching on divorce reflects the same perspective: the messianic age is to fulfill the intended order of creation in which both divorce

¹⁰⁵ John 11:25f.; Acts 4:2; 1 Cor 15:12-22; Heb 2:10.

¹⁰⁶ The Exodus provided the model or ‘type’ by which the OT prophets understood God’s subsequent acts of redemption of Israel (Isa 40-66) and of Gentiles. Cf. Daube, *The Exodus Pattern*; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 170ff.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Ellis, Paul’s Use, 126-35; Kümmel, ‘Schriftauslegung’; Goppelt, *TYPOS: Luz, Geschichtsverständnis*, 53-56.

¹⁰⁸ Largely following Goppelt, *TYPOS*, 18f., 31-34, 235-48 (ET 17f., 29-32, 194-205). Cf. Luz, *Geschichtsverständnis*.

¹⁰⁹ Luke 3:22, 38; cf. 23:43; 1 Cor 15:21f., 45-46; Rev 2:7; 22:2.

¹¹⁰ Rom 8:21f.; 2 Cor 5:17; 1 Pet 3:20f.; 2 Pet 3:13 concluding a commentary.

and polygamy are excluded.¹¹¹ In a word the Messiah and his people stand at the head of a new creation in which, with a change of key, the original purposes of God are to be fulfilled.

In covenant **typology** various or persons, events and institutions are viewed as prophetic prefigurements of NT realities. The Exodus events, Paul writes, were intended as ‘types for us’ and ‘were written down for our admonition upon whom the ends of the ages have come’¹¹² or, more negatively, the ritual laws from Sinai were ‘only a shadow (σκιά) of the good things to come.’¹¹³ In a typological correspondence oriented more specifically to Jesus, the royal and the servant psalms are applied to the Messiah who represents or incorporates in himself God’s servant people and who is the heir to David’s **throne**.¹¹⁴ Similarly, Jesus can be described as the ‘Passover **Lamb**’¹¹⁵ who in his sacrificial death brings the covenant of Sinai to its proper goal and **end**¹¹⁶ and establishes a new covenant.¹¹⁷

Since the new covenant associated with Jesus’ death issues in the new creation associated with his resurrection, the two typologies may be closely intertwined. For example, the ‘son of man’ title given to Jesus is probably derived from typological interpretations of Dan 7:13 and of Ps 8:4-8 in which both covenant and Adamic motifs occur. The latter passage, apparently used in Israel’s worship for the (messianic-ideal) king, also alludes to **Adam**.¹¹⁸ In 1 Cor 15 and Heb 2 it is applied to Jesus, primarily as the **resurrected** head of a new

¹¹¹ Matt 19:8f. in a commentary. The phrase ‘and marries another’ (19:9) encompasses polygamy. The exception clause (19:9; contrast Mark 10: 11) appears to be a postresurrection addition in which, if one accepts Matthew’s prophetic credentials, the exalted Lord qualifies the principle in somewhat the same manner as God’s command in Deut 24:1-4 qualifies Gen 1:27. A similar prohibition of polygamy and, probably, divorce with an appeal to Gen 1:27 is made also at Qumran (CD 4:20f.).

¹¹² 1 Cor 10:6, 11 in a commentary. Cf. Rom 15:4.

¹¹³ Col 2:16f. (calendrical and food laws); Heb 8:5;10:1 (Levitical system).

¹¹⁴ E.g. Luke 4:18 (Isa 61:1f.; 58:6) in a synagogue exposition; Acts 13:33 (Ps 2:7) in a synagogue exposition, 13:16-41: Theme and initial texts (16-19; cf. Deut 4:34-38; 7:1) + Exposition (20ff.) + Supplementary text (22f. cf. 1 Sam 13:14; 2 Sam 7:6-16; Ps 89:21 (20)) + Exposition (23-33) + Supplementary texts (33-35; Ps 2:7; Isa 55:3; Ps 16:10) + Exposition (36-40) + Final text (41; Hab 1:5). Cf. Ellis, Prophecy, 199.

¹¹⁵ 1 Cor 5:7; cf. John 1:29; Acts 8:32; 1 Pet 1:19; Rev 5:12.

¹¹⁶ Rom 10:4. So, also, Heb 10:9f., which stands in a commentary covering Heb 10:5-39: Initial text (5-7; Ps 40:7-9) + Exposition with supplementary texts (16f., 30) and verbally linked to the initial text (8-36) + Final texts and application, verbally linked to the initial text (37-39; Isa 26:20; Hab 2:3f.). See Ellis, Prophecy, 155.

¹¹⁷ Luke 22:20, 29. So, also, Heb 9:15, which stands in a commentary covering 8:1-10:39. Theme and initial text (8:1-13; Jer 31:31-34) + Exposition, incorporating allusions to various texts and verbally linked to the initial text (9:1-10:4) + Final ‘text’ (10:5-39), verbally linked to the initial text (διαθήκη, καινή, ἀληθινός).

¹¹⁸ The terms ‘glory’ (כבוד) and ‘honour’ (הדר) elsewhere express the king’s royal dignity (Ps 21:6[5]; 45:4f.[3f.]; Isa 22:18) and the affinities with Gen 1:26 are present in the references to dominion over the animal world. Cf. Bentzen, King and Messiah, 41-44; Wifall, ‘Protevangeliem?’, 365 thinks that Gen 1-3 reflects a ‘messianic’ framework. But see also Kim, ‘“Son of Man”’, 31-37: with the term, Son of Man (Dan 7: 13), ‘Jesus intended to reveal himself as the divine figure who was the inclusive representative (or the head) of the eschatological people of God’ (36).

creation, but also as ‘Messiah’ and ‘High Priest’ and ‘Seed of Abraham’, terms with covenantal and national connotations.¹¹⁹ Dan 7: 13, ‘in imagery similar to Ps 8, seems to identify ‘one like a son of man’ both with ‘the people of the saints of the Most High’ (7:27) and with the rightful ruler of creation, who is heir to the promises given to Adam.¹²⁰ In the synoptic apocalypse Jesus identifies his ‘son of man’ with his own future, glorious manifestation as Messiah.¹²¹

(3) An OT type may stand in a positive correspondence to the new-age reality or in contrast to it. This ‘synthetic’ and ‘antithetic’ **typology**¹²² may be illustrated by two examples. Adam is like the ‘eschatological Adam’ in being the ‘son of God’ and the head of the race. But, in contrast, he brings mortality and sin while Jesus delivers man from these maladies.¹²³ Similarly, the law of Sinai in its ethical requirements reflects the character of God and is to be ‘fulfilled’ in the messianic **age**,¹²⁴ but in its ritual structures and obligations it served only as a ‘custodian’ (παιδαγωγός), to watch over us until the Messiah came, and contained only a ‘shadow’ of the new-age realities.¹²⁵

(4) A **judgement typology**, in which God’s earlier acts of destruction are understood as ‘types’ or ‘examples’ of eschatological judgements, also appears

¹¹⁹ 1 Cor 15:20-28; Eph 1:20-22; Heb 2:6ff. in a commentary.

¹²⁰ Cf. Hooker, Son of Man, 11-32, 71f. For the view that identifies the ‘son of man’ in Dan 7 with a divine or an angelic figure cf. the discussion in Kim, Origin, 246-52.

¹²¹ Mark 13:26f. concluding a commentary. Cf. also Mark 14:62; Rev. 1:7;14:14ff. Betz, Jesus, 73-102.

¹²² Cf. Luz *Geschichtsverständnis*, 59f.; Hanson, *Studies*, 151ff. Abraham represents only a positive correspondence (i.e. his faith) and not an antithetic (e.g. his circumcision); Moses (Heb 3:2-6), Jerusalem (Gal 4:25; Rev 11:8;21:2) and the Exodus (1 Cor 10:1-4; 2 Cor 3:7-11) may represent both.

¹²³ 1 Cor 15:21f., 45-49, commenting on Gen 2:7;5:3; cf. Rom 5:12-21; Heb 2:6-9 in a commentary (1:1-2:18) with an unusual pattern.

¹²⁴ Specifically, ‘love’ (Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18) is the command on which the whole law depends (Matt 22:40) and by which it is to be ‘fulfilled’ (Rom 13:8; Gal 5: 14) and without which it is transgressed. Cf. Matt 5:17-48, where the ‘fulfilment’ (17) of the law is related to being ‘perfect as your heavenly father is perfect’ (48). Cf. the commentary in Luke 10:25-37.

¹²⁵ In the NT the law is viewed from the perspective that ‘Messiah is the end (τέλος) of the law’ (Rom 10:4). However, as Cranfield, ‘St. Paul’, Davies, ‘Law in the NT’, 100 and Michel, *Brief*, 326f. have rightly observed, τέλος here does not mean simply ‘termination’ but carries connotations of ‘completion’, ‘goal’ and ‘fulfilment’. Even legal observances that stand in contrast to the new-age realities, in spite of the dangers posed by them (cf. Heb 9:9f.;10:1;13:9) and the prohibition of them to Gentile Christians (e.g. Gal 5:2; Col 2:13, 16f.), were not forbidden to Jewish Christians when they were practiced in the right spirit (Matt 5:23f.; 6:2ff.; Acts 2:46; 3:1;16:3;18:18;20:16;21:20-26; Rom 14; 1 Cor 9:19-23). When not literally observed, they continued in their antitype, transposed into a new key: **Passover** continued in the removal of unethical leaven (1 Cor 5:7f.) and in the observance of Messiah’s ‘Passover’ sacrifice of the new covenant (Luke 22:19f.; cf. 1 Cor 11:23-26); **circumcision** in the identification of the believer with Messiah’s spilt covenant blood (Col 2: 11; cf. Phil 3:3); an altar in the appropriation of Messiah’s sacrificial offering (Heb 13: 10; cf. John 6:53f.); **sacrifices of praise and gifts** (Phil 4:18; Heb 13:15; 1 Pet 2:5) and **one’s own life** (Rom 12:1; 2Tim 4:6) by which the afflictions of Messiah are ‘completed’ (ἀντανάλησθαι, Col 1:24; cf. Rev 6: 11). In the words of J.A. Sanders (‘Torah and Paul’, 137), the Tora was not eradicated in early Christianity but ‘was caught up in Christ’.

in the $\pi\tau$. The flood and Sodom, for example, are used in this way.¹²⁶ Likewise, the faithless Israelite is a type of the faithless Christian;¹²⁷ the enemies of Israel a type of the (religious) enemies of the eschatological Israel, that is, the church.¹²⁸

CORPORATE PERSONALITY

In the $\sigma\tau$ the individual person may be viewed as extending beyond himself to include those who 'belong' to him. Thus, the husband (at the family level) and the king (at the national level) both have an individual and a corporate existence encompassing, respectively, the household and the **nation**.¹²⁹ Corporate personality also characterizes the nature of God. It is not a metaphor, as modern Western man is tempted to perceive it, but an ontological affirmation from which the biblical writers' view of reality proceeds.

(1) For Jesus and the $\pi\tau$ writers this perception of *man* as a corporate being is determinative for the proper understanding of scripture. It is exemplified, at its most basic level, in the interpretation of the sexual union in terms of Gen 2:24: 'The two shall be one ($\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$) flesh'.¹³⁰ At the national or **covenant** level it is reflected in such idioms as existence 'in Abraham' and as the nation's baptism 'into Moses'¹³¹ or its existence as Moses' house or David's **tabernacle**.¹³² More broadly, corporate personality of the whole of mankind appears as existence 'in Adam'.¹³³

¹²⁶ 2 Pet 2:5f.; 3:5-7 in a commentary; Jude 7 in a commentary. The prospect of a final divine destruction of the wicked by fire (1 Cor 3:13ff.; 2 Thess 1:7-10; Heb 12:29; Rev 20:9-15; cf. 1 Pet 1:7) and even a cosmic conflagration (2 Pet 3:7, 10f.) has a part of its background in a 'Sodom' typology (Jude 7). Cf. Gen 19:24; Zeph 1:18; 3:8; Mal 4:1 = 3:19; 1 Enoch 1:3-6; Jubil. 16:5f.; 1QH 3:28-36; Thiede, 'Pagan Reader'.

¹²⁷ 1 Cor 10:6 in a commentary; Heb 4:11 in a commentary covering Heb 3:7-4:16: Initial text (3:7-11; Ps 95) + Exposition/application (3:12-15) + Supplementary text (3:16-18; allusion to Num 14:22f., 29) + Exposition (3:19-4:3) + Supplementary text (4:4; Gen 2:2) + Exposition with allusions to the initial and supplementary texts (4:5-10) + Concluding application and exhortation (4:11-16).

¹²⁸ Rev 11:8; Gal 4:28 in a commentary. Similarly, OT passages originally referring to Gentiles can be applied to Jews who persecute Christians (Rom 8:36 = Ps 44:22) or who indulge in sin (Rom 2:24 = Isa 52:5). Otherwise: Richardson, Israel; Jervell, Luke, 41-74. Cf. Ellis, Paul's Use, 136-39. Qumran similarly views its own community as Israel (Cross) or as the forerunner of eschatological Israel (Sanders) and the current Temple authorities as Gentiles. Cf. 1QpHab 12:1-3 (on Hab 2:17); CD 3:18-4:4; 19:33f.; Cross, *Ancient Library*, 127ff. But see Sanders, *Palestinian Judaism*, 245-50.

¹²⁹ Johnson, *The One and the Many* 1-13; *Sacral Kingship*, 2f.; Pedersen, *Israel*, 62f., 263-71, 474-79; Robinson, *Corporate Personality*; Shedd, *Man in Community*, 29-41; Daube, *Studies*, 154-89.

¹³⁰ Matt 19:5 in a commentary; 1 Cor 6:16f.; Eph 5:31.

¹³¹ 1 Cor 10:2 and Heb 7:9f. both within expository contexts.

¹³² Heb 3:3-6, commenting on OT texts; Acts 15:16 in a commentary. Strictly speaking, in Heb 3 it is apparently God's house of the old covenant headed up by Moses in contrast to God's eschatological house headed up by the Messiah.

¹³³ 1 Cor 15:22; cf. Rom 5:12, 19.

Each level of corporeity is given a Christological application. As the two in sexual union become 'one flesh', so the believers in faith-union are 'one spirit' with Messiah or 'members of his body'.¹³⁴ In the 'new covenant' corporeity diverse images are used. At the Last Supper and, according to John, in a synagogue exposition at Capernaum Jesus identifies himself with the new-covenant Passover Lamb¹³⁵ and with the manna of the Exodus¹³⁶ that his followers are given to eat. In a similar typology Paul relates the Exodus baptism 'into Moses' and its manna and spring of water to the Lord's Supper understood as a participation ($\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$) in Messiah's death. This participation makes manifest that believers are 'one body', that is, the body of Christ.¹³⁷

In imagery closely related to 'the body of Christ', the 'temple' ($\nu\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$) or 'house' ($\sigma\acute{o}\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$, *et al.*) or 'tent' ($\sigma\kappa\eta\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma$, *et al.*) similarly reflects an interplay between the individual and corporate dimension of Messiah's person.¹³⁸ In the Gospels Jesus, that is, his individual body, is identified as God's (new) temple¹³⁹ or as the key-stone in that temple.¹⁴⁰ In Acts and the Epistles, as in the Qumran writings,¹⁴¹ the community is God's temple or house.¹⁴² But it is not the community abstracted from the Messiah but rather as the corporate dimension or extension of his person. Like the 'body' imagery, these expressions sometimes go beyond a covenant corporeity to express a contrast between two creations, 'in Adam' and 'in Christ'.¹⁴³ The conception of a corporate Adam and a corporate Christ underlie such Pauline expressions as 'the old (or outer) man' and 'the new (or inner) man',¹⁴⁴ 'the natural body' and 'the spiritual body'.¹⁴⁵

This corporate view of man illumines the $\pi\tau$ interpretation of a number of $\sigma\tau$ texts. For example, within this frame of reference the promise given to King Solomon can be understood to be fulfilled not only in the messianic king but also in his followers.¹⁴⁶ The 'seed of Abraham' has a similar individual and

¹³⁴ 1 Cor 6:16f.; Eph 5:30 referring to Gen 2:24.

¹³⁵ Matt 26:27f.; Luke 22:15, 19; cf. 1 Cor 5:7; 1 Pet 1:19.

¹³⁶ John 6:35, 49-56 in a commentary.

¹³⁷ 1 Cor 10:16f. in a commentary; cf. 1 Cor 12:12f.: here 'Christ' refers to the corporate body who 'unites the members and makes them an organic whole' (Robertson-Plummer, *First Epistle*, 271). Cf. Robinson, *The Body*; Moule, *Origin*, 47-96. 'The body of Christ' is a frequently used Pauline idiom for the church.

¹³⁸ Cf. John 2:19ff.; 2 Cor 5:1, 6ff.; 1 Cor 6:15-20; McKelvey, *The New Temple*; Ellis, 'II Corinthians V.1-10'; Cole, *The New Temple*. See also Ellis, '1 Corinthians'.

¹³⁹ Mark 14:58; 15:29; John 2:19ff.

¹⁴⁰ Matt 21:42 (= Ps 118:22) in a commentary; cf. Acts 4:11; Rom 9:32f.; Eph 2:20ff.; 1 Pet 2:5, 6-8 (= Isa 8:14f.; 28:16; Ps 118:22).

¹⁴¹ 1QS 8:4-10. For other passages indicating that the Qumran community regarded itself as the true Israel cf. Ringgren, *Faith*, 163, 188, 201-04; Fishbane, above, pp. 364-66.

¹⁴² 1 Cor 3:9, 16; 2 Cor 5:1; Heb 3:6; 1 Pet 2:5; cf. Acts 7:49f.; 15:16.

¹⁴³ Heb 9:11 in a commentary; 2 Pet 1:13f.; 2 Cor 5:1; cf. Ellis, 'II Corinthians V.1-10'.

¹⁴⁴ Rom 6:6; 7:22; 2 Cor 4:16; Eph 3:16; 4:22, 24; Col 3:9f.

¹⁴⁵ 1 Cor 15:44; cf. Rom 6:6; 7:24; 2 Cor 5:6, 8, 10; Col 2:11.

¹⁴⁶ Heb 1:5 in a commentary; cf. 2 Cor 6:18 in a *florilegium*.

corporate reference.¹⁴⁷ Also, since Israel's Messiah-king incorporates the nation, those who belong to him-Jews and Gentiles-constitute the true Israel.¹⁴⁸

(2) The NT writers' conception of corporate personality also extends to an understanding of **God himself as a corporate being**, a perspective which underlies their conviction that Jesus the Messiah has a unique unity with God and which later comes into definitive formulation in the doctrine of the Trinity. The origin of this conviction, which in some measure goes back to the earthly ministry of Jesus,¹⁴⁹ is complex, disputed and not easy to assess.¹⁵⁰ One can here only briefly survey the way in which the early Christian understanding and use of the OT may have reflected or contributed to this perspective on the relationship of the being of God to the person of the Messiah.

Already in the OT and pre-Christian Judaism the one God was understood to have 'plural' manifestations. In ancient Israel he was (in some sense) identified with and (in some sense) distinct from his Spirit or his Angel. Apparently, YHWH was believed to have 'an indefinable extension of the personality', by which he was present 'in person' in his agents.¹⁵¹ Even the king as the Lord's anointed (= 'messiah') represented 'a potent extension of the divine personality'.¹⁵²

In later strata of the OT and in intertestamental Judaism certain attributes of God – such as his Word (ר֑בֶרֶךְ/λόγος)¹⁵³ or his Wisdom (חֵכֶמָה/σοφία)¹⁵⁴ – were viewed and used in a similar manner. In some instances the usage is only a

poetic personification, a description of God's action under the name of the particular divine attribute that he employs. In others, however, it appears to represent a divine hypostasis, the essence of God's own being that is at the same time distinguished from God.

From this background, together with a messianic hope that included the expectation that YHWH himself would come to deliver Israel,¹⁵⁵ the followers of Jesus would have been prepared, wholly within a Jewish monotheistic and 'salvation history' perspective, to see in the Messiah a manifestation of God. In the event they were brought to this conclusion by their experience of Jesus' works and teachings, particularly as it came to a crescendo in his resurrection appearances and commands. Although during his earthly ministry they had, according to the Gospel accounts, occasionally been made aware of a strange otherness about Jesus,¹⁵⁶ only after his resurrection do they identify him as God. Paul, the first literary witness to do this,¹⁵⁷ probably expresses a conviction initially formed at his Damascus Christophany.¹⁵⁸ John the Evangelist, who wrote later but who either saw the risen Lord or was a bearer of early traditions about that event, also describes the confession of Jesus as God as a reaction to the resurrection appearances.¹⁵⁹ Yet, such direct assertions of Jesus' deity are exceptional in the NT¹⁶⁰ and could hardly have been sustained among Jewish believers apart from a perspective on the OT that affirmed and/or confirmed a manifestation of YHWH in and as Messiah.

¹⁴⁷ Gal 3:16, 29 in a midrash covering Gal 3:6-29.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 136-39; Goppelt, *TYPOS*, 140-51; Luke 19:9; Acts 3:22f.; 15:14-17; Rom 9:6f.; Gal 6:16; Phil 3:3; Heb 4:9; Rev 2:9, 3:9. Otherwise: Richardson, Israel; Jervell, Luke, 41-69.

¹⁴⁹ E.g. the impact of certain miracles in which Jesus by a word controlled nature (Mark 4:35-41 + Q; Matt 14:22-33 parr), created matter (Mark 6:32-44 + Q + John 6:1-15) and life (Mark 5:21-42 + Q). These miracles are in the earliest traditions and can hardly be regarded, a *la* classical form criticism, as 'mythological' accretions. Cf. Stuhlmacher, *Das Evangelium, passim*; Ellis, *Prophecy*, 43f., 239-47; Josephus, *Ant.* 18:63f. (παράδοξων ἔργων). However, they were attributed by Jesus' opponents (Mark 3:22 + Q) and later rabbinic tradition (*B. T. Sanhedrin* 43a, cf. 107b) to demonic power, by rationalists to misapprehensions or trickery (cf. Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law*; Smith, *Jesus the Magician*). Significant also were Jesus' sovereign 'I' sayings (Matt 5:22 etc.) and his claim to forgive sins (Mark 2:5 + Q), to have a unique and reciprocal knowledge of God (Matt 11:27 par; Mark 14:36) and (implicitly) to raise himself from the dead (Mark 14:58, ἀγχιροποίητος cf. John 2:19f.). See Jeremias, Abba, 15-67 (= *Prayers*, 11-65); but see Harvey, Jesus, 168f.

¹⁵⁰ Dunn, *Christology*; Hengel, *Son of God*; Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 250-311; de Jonge, Jesus, 141-68; Kim, Origin; Marshall, Origins; Moule, *Origin*; Turner, *Jesus the Christ*, 7-28.

¹⁵¹ Johnson, *The One and the Many*, 16; cf. Gen 18-19; Judg 6:11-23; Johnson, *Cultic Prophet*, 10f., 176f., 248ff., 318f.

¹⁵² Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, 14, 122f.; Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, 19.

¹⁵³ E.g. Isa 9:8; 55:10f.; cf. Wis 18:15; Schmidt 'Davar'. Quite different from the NT thought is the Greek (Stoic) philosophical conception of the Logos as the divine reason, which probably lies behind Philo's identification of the wisdom (σοφία) of God with the word (λόγος) of God and his designation of the latter as 'a second God' (*L.A.* 1:65; 2:86; *Q.G.* 2:62 on Gen 9:6). Cf. Brthier, *Les idées philosophiques*, 83-86; Kleinknecht, 'Der Logos'. Otherwise: Wolfson, *Philo* 1, 289-94.

¹⁵⁴ Especially Wis 7:21-27, in which Wisdom is the omniscient and omnipotent creator and is identified with the Spirit of God; cf. Sir 24:3. Cf. Prov 8:22f.

¹⁵⁵ Mal 3:1; cf. Zech 4:10 with Zech 4:14; 6:5. On this expectation in first-century Judaism cf. *Ps Sol* 17:36; *Test Simeon* 6:5; *Test Levi* 2:11; 5:2; *Test Judah* 22:2; *Test Naph* 8:3; *Test Asher* 7:3. Similarly, Matt 11:3 = Luke 7:19 (John the Baptist's disciples); cf. Luke 1:16f. with 2:11 (σωτήρ χριστός κύριος = משיח יְהוָה . מורשע . מרשע). Mark 1:2, a testimony which is probably an excerpt from an antecedent midrash (cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 150f., 161f.) expounding Mal 3:1 in terms of Isa 40:3 and applying the text to Jesus the Messiah.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Mark 4:41 + Q; Mark 9:2f. + Q; Lk 5:8.

¹⁵⁷ Rom 9:5f.; cf. Cranfield, *The Epistle*, 2, 464-70; Tit 2:13. The argument of the 'history of religions' school that Jesus was perceived in the earliest Palestinian church solely as a human figure and was given the status of deity only later in the Diaspora is a somewhat artificial construct and is not supported by the sources. Cf. Hengel, *Son of God*, 3-6, 17ff., 77-83.

¹⁵⁸ 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8; Gal 1:12, 16; Acts 9:3ff., 20; 22:14; 26:19; cf. Ezek 1:26ff.; Kim, *Origin*, 193-268; Thrall, 'Origin' 311-15.

¹⁵⁹ John 20:28f.; cf. 1:1, 14, 18; 1 John 5:20.

¹⁶⁰ χριστός κύριος in Luke 2:11 may also represent 'Messiah YHWH' and refer to Jesus' birth as an epiphany of Yahweh. Cf. *Ps Sol* 17:36 (32); Sahlin, *Der Messias*, 217f., 383ff.

The NT writers usually set forth Messiah's unity with God by identifying him with God's Son¹⁶¹ or Spirit¹⁶² or image or wisdom¹⁶³ or by applying to him biblical passages that in their original context referred to YHWH.¹⁶⁴ They often do this within an implicit or explicit commentary (midrash) on the OT and thereby reveal their conviction that the 'supernatural' dimension of Jesus' person is not merely that of an angelic messenger¹⁶⁵ but is the being of God himself.

The use of the OT in first and second century Judaism, then, marked a watershed in the biblical doctrine of God. At that time the imprecise monotheism of the OT and early Judaism moved in two irreversible directions. On the one hand Jewish-Christian apostles and prophets, via 'corporate personality' conceptions and Christological exposition, set a course that led to the trinitarian monotheism of later Christianity. On the other hand the rabbinic writers, with their exegetical emphasis on God's unity, brought into final definition the Unitarian monotheism of talmudic Judaism.¹⁶⁶

CHARISMATIC EXEGESIS

Some NT writers, particularly the Evangelists and Paul, represent the OT as a hidden word of God, a divine mystery whose interpretation is itself a divine gift (χάρισμα) and act of revelation. For this viewpoint they appear to be dependent in the first instance on Jesus and, more generally, on prior Jewish apocalyptic conceptions. Jesus argues against the Sadducees that they 'do not know (εἰδέναι) the scriptures'¹⁶⁷ and against other religious opponents that by their

¹⁶¹ Matt 11:27; Mark 1:2; Luke 1:35; Rom 8:3; Heb 1:2; Kim, Origin, 109-36; Cullmann, *Christology*, 270-305.

¹⁶² 2 Cor 3:16 (= Exod 34:34) in a commentary (3:7-18) on Ezek 34. 'The Lord', who is the Spirit, refers to Jesus as (the messianic manifestation of) YHWH: Paul makes no distinction between the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ (Rom 8:9) and the Holy Spirit. See especially Kim, *Origin*, llf., 231-39. Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 63, 67f.; but see Moule, 'II Cor 3:18b'.

¹⁶³ On 'image': 2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15 (εἰκόν); Heb 1:3 (χαράκτῃ); cf. Kim, Origin, 137-41, 229-68; Wilckens, 'χαράκτῃ' 421f. On 'wisdom': 1 Cor 1:24; cf. Luke 11:49 with Matt 23:34. Cf. Bumey, 'Christ as the APXH', 160-77 (on Col 1:15-18); Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse*. Otherwise: Aletti, *Colossiens* 1, 15-20, 148-76.

¹⁶⁴ E.g. Rom 10:13 (= Joel 3:5); 2 Cor 3:16ff. (= Exod 34:34); Eph 4:8 (= Ps 68:19); Heb 1:6 (= Ps 97:7); 1:10 (= Ps 102:25); probably 1 Cor 10:26 (= Ps 24:1).

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Johnston *Spirit-Paraclete*, 119-22; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 99-141.

¹⁶⁶ For rabbinic references to disputes with heretics over the unity of God cf. Strack, *Jesus*, 70*-74*. More generally, Segal, *Two Powers*, 33-155. However, even into the second century some mystical Jewish writings apparently continued to identify YHWH in some sense with other beings. Cf. Odeberg, 3 Enoch, 82 (Introduction), 32f. (Text): Metatron, the exalted Enoch, has divine glory, conferred on him and is called 'the lesser YHWH' (3 Enoch 12:5). See now Alexander, in Charlesworth, *OTP*, 1, 243, 265 n. Cf. also Strouma, 'Form(s) of God'; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1, 153-62; Oesterley-Box, *Religion and Worship*, 195-221. But see Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, 293, 466; Urbach, *Sages* 1, 19-36, 135-38, 207f.

¹⁶⁷ Mark 12:24, in a yelammedenu-type commentary (Mark 12:18-27 + Q); cf. Matt 12:7.

traditional interpretations they 'make void the word of God.'¹⁶⁸ Since he used methods of interpretation similar to theirs, his criticisms give rise to a question: How does one 'know' the true meaning of a biblical passage, that is, its 'word of God' import? Jesus gives no direct answer to this question, but he appears to connect it with his role as a prophet, a role that others ascribe to him¹⁶⁹ and that he himself affirms.¹⁷⁰ Unlike the professionally trained scripture-teachers of his day, the scribes (γραμματεῖς), Jesus is said to expound the OT with an authority (ἐξουσία)¹⁷¹ that in the Gospels is related to his claim to possess the prophetic Spirit.¹⁷² Likewise, he attributes the response to his 'kingdom of God' message and to his messianic signs, both of which are rooted in the interpretation of OT promises, to the fact that God revealed (ἀποκαλύπτειν) it to some and hid (ἀποκρύπτειν) it from others.¹⁷³ This is evident, for example, in his response to the Baptist as well as in his sermon at Nazareth.¹⁷⁴

In similar imagery Jesus describes his parables as a veiling of his message from 'those outside' but an aid to understanding for his disciples because 'to you it is given [by God] to know the mysteries (γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια) of the kingdom of God'.¹⁷⁵ As has been observed above, Jesus uses 'parable' in the sense of 'mystery' or 'dark saying', the meaning that the term carries in some other Jewish literature.¹⁷⁶ He also employs such veiled meanings in his exposition of scripture.¹⁷⁷

There is then a paradox about Jesus' biblical exposition. He follows exegetical methods that were current in Judaism and regards them as a useful means to expound the biblical passages. Nevertheless, he recognizes that the meaning of scripture — even his exposition of it — remains hidden from many and, at least in the latter part of his ministry, he seems deliberately to veil the presentation of

¹⁶⁸ Matt 15:6, in a yelammedenu-type commentary (15:1-9 par). Perhaps the pericope extends to Matt 15:1-20; cf. Daube, *New Testament*, 143.

¹⁶⁹ Mark 6:15 par; 8:28 par; cf. 14:65 par; 8:11 + Q; Luke 7:39.

¹⁷⁰ Mark 6:4 par; Luke 13:33; John 4:44. His disclosure of visions in Luke 10:18; cf. Matt 4:2-11 (Q) falls into the same category. Cf. Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 63-71.

¹⁷¹ Mark 1:22 par, in the context of synagogue teaching, i.e. biblical exposition. Cf. Matt 7:29. On the definition of γραμματεῖς and the distinction between the scribes and the Pharisees see Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 233-45, 252-59; Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, 66f.; Safrai, 'Halakha', 149-50.

¹⁷² Cf. Luke 4:18, 21, 24, in a commentary.

¹⁷³ Matt 11:25, as a sequel to the identification of his message (11:5) and of the role of the Baptist (11:10-14) with the fulfilment of OT promises; similarly, in Luke 10:21f. the same saying is placed after the preaching of the seventy that the kingdom of God promised in the scriptures has come in Jesus (10:5f., 9). Cf. Matt 16:16f.; Luke 9:45; 19:42; 22:32, 45.

¹⁷⁴ Luke 7:22f. (Q); 7:35; 4:18f., 21, 25f.; cf. Isa 29:18f.; 61:1f.; cf. Ellis, *Gospel*, 120.

¹⁷⁵ Matt 13:11 (Q); cf. Mark 4:11. The passive form veils a reference to deity; cf. Blass-dc Brunner-Funk, *A Greek Grammar*, 72, 164f., 176.

¹⁷⁶ Jeremias, *Parables*, 16. Cf. Ezek 17:2; Hab 2:6; Ps 49:5; 78:2; 1 Enoch 68:1; Sir 47:17; Barn 6:10; 17:2.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Matt 15:12, 15-20, explaining an exposition (15:1-9); Mark 12:1-12 + Q, in a commentary. Cf. Mark 12:12 with 12:36f.; John 7:38f. Certain assertions about his relationship to God, his messiahship and other matters also have this veiled character. Cf. Mark 4:33f. par.; 8:15-18 par.; 14:58 with John 2:19f.; Luke 9:45; John 4:13f.; 12:32f.; 16:25.

his message. The acceptance of his exposition, and of his teaching generally, depends in his view on a divine opening of the minds of the hearers:

He who has ears to hear let him hear ...
Blessed are your ears because they hear.¹⁷⁸

In the writings of Paul and of **Peter**¹⁷⁹ there is the same conception of the **οτ** as a hidden wisdom that was long concealed but is now revealed. In Paul it often concerns the particular task of his ministry 'to make known the mystery (**γνωρί-οat τὸ μυστήριον**) of the gospel', namely, the inclusion of the Gentiles in eschatological Israel.¹⁸⁰ This purpose of God is a divine mystery or wisdom (**σοφία**) that was not made known (**οὐκ γνωρισθῆναι**) and indeed was hidden (**σιγᾶν, ἀποκρύπτεσθαι**) for ages but is now (**νῦν**) revealed (**ἀποκαλύπ-τεσθαι**), made known (**γνωρισθῆναι**) and manifest (**φανερωθῆναι**), especially in the writings of Paul and other **pneumatics**,¹⁸¹ in his preaching 'by the Spirit'¹⁸² and in his **messianic/eschatological** exposition of scripture.

In 1-2 Corinthians and in the **Pastorals**¹⁸³ Paul describes the broader gospel message in a similar way. In 2 Cor 3 he likens the hiddenness of the word of God to a veil on the mind of (Jewish) unbelievers that keeps them from understanding the meaning of the scriptures read in the synagogue, a veil that is taken away when they turn to the Lord, i.e. to the **Messiah**.¹⁸⁴ More often he represents the unveiling as a revelatory understanding of scripture gifted to the pneumatics (**πνευματικοί**) who, in turn, disclose its meaning by inspired exposition to the Christian community and to interested outsiders.

In 1 Cor 2:6-16, a proem-type **midrash**,¹⁸⁵ and in 1 Cor 12-14 he discloses his rationale for this view of God's revelation.¹⁸⁶ He argues that certain believers are given a gift of divine wisdom (12:8), a prophetic endowment that enables them to speak 'the wisdom that has been hidden in a mystery' (2:7) and, indeed, 'to know (**εἰδέναι**) all mysteries' (13:2; cf. 2:12) because 'God has revealed (**ἀποκαλύψει**) them to us through the Spirit' (2:10). They are called pneumatics (2:13, 15; 12:1ff.), a term that is probably equivalent to 'man of the Spirit' in Hos 9:7, that is, a prophet (14:37). As recipients and transmitters of divine mysteries and of wisdom, they are the 'mature' (**τέλειοι**) believers who 'have the mind of Christ' (2:16) and who rightly interpret (**συγκρίνειν**) the things of

¹⁷⁸ Matt 13:9, 16; cf. Mark 4:9, 12 + Q; Matt 11:15; 13:43; Luke 24:32.

¹⁷⁹ 1 Pet 1:1ff., 20.

¹⁸⁰ Rom 16:25f.; Eph 3:2f., 5f., 9f.; Col 1:25ff. The theme is present also in the cited (**εἰδότες ὅτι**) hymn in 1 Pet 1:18-21 if, as is probable, 1 Pet 1:18 identifies the audience as Gentiles, i.e. God-fearers. So, van Unnik, *Sparsa Collecta* 2, 3-82, 32f., 81.

¹⁸¹ Rom 16:26.

¹⁸² Eph 3:3, 5; cf. Col 1:28 ('in wisdom').

¹⁸³ 2 Tim 1:9f., 11, in a (preformed) hymn; Tit 1:2f. Cf. Ellis, 'Pastoral Epistles'.

¹⁸⁴ 2 Cor 3:14ff., in a commentary embracing 2 Cor 3:7-18; cf. 2 Cor 4:3.

¹⁸⁵ 1 Cor 2:6-16: Theme and initial texts (6-9; Isa 64:4; 65:16) + Exposition (10-15) + Concluding text and application (16; Isa 40:13). Cf. Eph 3:3ff. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 213ff.

¹⁸⁶ For the detailed argument cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 45-62.

the Spirit to others (2:6, 13), expounding the scripture and affirming or testing (**διακρίνειν**) the exposition of other prophets (14:29, 37).¹⁸⁷ Such a pneumatic interpreter of the word of God is best exemplified by Paul himself. What is the background of his perception of scripture as a hidden wisdom requiring a charismatic, revelatory exposition?

Various parts of the **οτ**¹⁸⁸ as well as some rabbinic writings¹⁸⁹ speak of divine wisdom and knowledge as God's secret and his gift to selected individuals. However, it is the teaching of Jesus and conceptions current in the contemporary Qumran community which provide the more immediate and significant antecedents for Paul's thought. Traditions of Jesus' teaching were certainly known to Paul and to his **churches**,¹⁹⁰ and they may have included some on this theme. But the Dead Sea Scrolls, which have affinities with Pauline thought and hermeneutic in a number of areas,¹⁹¹ display a greater number of parallels with the Apostle's writing on this subject.

The wise teachers or **maskilim** (**משכילים**) at Qumran, including the Teacher of righteousness, understand their role to be like 'the wise' in Dan 12:9f. Indeed, they may take as their paradigm Daniel himself, whose gifts of wisdom (**שכל, חכמה/σοφία**) and knowledge enable him to understand sacred writings and interpret (**שרר/συγκρίνειν**) them, i.e. to reveal the mystery (**למגלה/ἀποκαλύψει τὸ μυστήριον**).¹⁹² The same gifts of wisdom enable him to understand and expound the prophecy of Jeremiah and, by implication, they will also give understanding to the 'wise teachers' (**משכילים**) at the time of the end.¹⁹³

The **maskilim** at Qumran consider themselves to have this role. They confess to God that 'by your Holy Spirit' you opened knowledge 'in the mystery (**רז**) of your wisdom' (**שכל**).¹⁹⁴ They are 'to test' (**לבחן**; cf. LXX **διακρίνειν**) those in the community¹⁹⁵ and guide them with knowledge and wisdom (**שכל**) in the mysteries (**רזי**)... so that they may walk maturely (**תמיה**; cf. LXX **τέλειοι**) with one another in all that has been revealed (**גלה**) to them. '% The **maskilim** probably regard the Teacher of righteousness, 'to whom God has revealed all the mysteries of his servants the prophets',¹⁹⁷ as the leading representative of

¹⁸⁷ 1 Cor 14:37 concludes a section concerned with *inter alia* the regulation of the conduct of wives (14:33b-36) that is partly based on an interpretation of Gen 3:16. Cf. Ellis, 'Silenced Wives'.

¹⁸⁸ E.g. Gen 41:38f. (Joseph); Num 24:15f. (Balaam); Deut 34:9 (Joshua); Dan 1:17; 2:21f. (Daniel); Von Rad, *Wisdom*, 55-68.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 235-42 re esoteric traditions. Cf. *M. Megilla* 4:10; *M. Hagiga* 2:1; *T. Hagiga* 2:1, 7; *B.T. Pesahim* 119a; *B.T. Sanhedrin* 21b. Further, 4 *Ezra* 14:45f.

¹⁹⁰ 1 Cor 7:10; 9:14; 11:23; 15:3; 1 Tim 5:18; Dungan, *Sayings of Jesus*; Ellis, 'Gospels Criticism' 46; Ellis, '1 Corinthians'.

¹⁹¹ E.g. Murphey-O'Connor, *Paul and Qumran*; Ellis, *Prophecy*, 33f., 173-81, 188-97; Brown, *Semitic Background*, 24-27.

¹⁹² Dan 1:17; 5:12; 2:47. Cf. Bruce, 'Book of Daniel', 255ff.; Betz, *Offenbarung*, 73-98, 110-42.

¹⁹³ Dan 9:2, 22f.

¹⁹⁴ *IQH* 12:12f.

¹⁹⁵ *IQH* 2:13f.

¹⁹⁶ *IQS* 9:12, 17ff.

¹⁹⁷ *IQpHab* 7:4f.

their own ministry.¹⁹⁸ If so, they would also have emulated his exposition of scripture. Both in their gifts and in their ministry the *maskilim* bear a striking resemblance to the pneumatics in the Pauline churches, and they shed considerable light on the background of the charismatic exegesis of the early church.

Conclusion

Biblical interpretation in the NT church shows in a remarkable way the Jewishness of earliest Christianity. It followed exegetical methods common to Judaism and drew its perspective and presuppositions from Jewish backgrounds. However, in one fundamental respect it differed from other religious parties and theologies in Judaism, that is, in the christological exposition of the OT totally focused upon Jesus as the Messiah. This decisively influences both the perspective from which they expound the OT and the way in which their presuppositions are brought to bear upon the specific biblical texts. Their perspective and presuppositions provide, in turn, the theological framework for the development of their exegetical themes and for the whole of NT theology.

First-century Judaism was a highly diverse phenomenon, as becomes apparent from a comparison of the writings of Philo, Josephus, Qumran, the (traditions of the) rabbis and the NT. The NT, which as far as I can see was written altogether by Jews,¹⁹⁹ is a part of that diversity but also a part of that Judaism. Its writers were Jews, but Jews who differed from the majority of the nation and who in time found the greater number of their company of faith not among their own people but among the Gentiles. And still today, apart from a continuing Judeo-Christian minority, the church remains a community of Gentiles, but Gentiles with a difference. For as long as Gentile Christians give attention to their charter documents, they can never forget that as those who are joined to a Jewish Messiah they are in a manner of speaking 'adopted Jews' or, in Paul's imagery, branches engrafted into the ancient tree of Israel and a people who have their hope in the promise given to Abraham. The centrality of the OT in the message of Jesus and his apostles and prophets underscores that fact.

Bibliography

A convenient listing of OT quotations and allusions in the NT may be found in NESTLE-ALAND, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, (cf. pp. 739-75) and the texts of the quotations, together with the corresponding Septuagint and Hebrew OT passages, in ARCHER-CHIRICHIGNO, *Old Testament Quotations*, and DITTMAR, *The*

¹⁹⁸ This follows if the Teacher is the author of (some of) the Hymns, as is argued by Jeremias, *Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 176f., 264. But see Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns, 45-49*; Dimant, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', 523 and n. 199.

¹⁹⁹ Luke is the only NT author whom many scholars identify as a Gentile. But see Ellis, *Gospel*, 51ff.; *ibid.*, 'St. Luke'.

Old Testament in the New. For the history of research into the NT quotations compare ELLIS, 'Quotations'.

On exegetical methods the following are particularly instructive: BONSIRVEN, *Exégèse rabbinique*; DAUBE, *New Testament* and DOEVE, *Jewish Hermeneutics*. More generally, compare also ELLIS, *Paul's Use; ibid., Prophecy*; LONGENECKER, *Biblical Exegesis*; MICHEL, *Paulus*.

The conceptual background and thematic emphases of NT biblical interpretation are treated by BETZ-GRIMM, *Jesus und das Danielbuch*; DODD, *According to the Scriptures*; Goppelt, *TYPOS*; GRIMM, *Die Verkündigung*; and, more popularly, by BRUCE, *New Testament Development*.

Chapter Twenty

Old Testament Interpretation in the Writings of the Church Fathers

William Horbury

I met with certain barbarian writings, older by comparison with the doctrines of the Greeks, more divine by comparison with their errors; and it came about that I was persuaded by these, because of the unpretending cast of the language, the unaffected character of the speakers, the readily comprehensible account of the making of all that is, the foreknowledge of things to come, the extraordinary quality of the precepts, and the doctrine of a single ruler of the universe.

TATIAN, *Ad Graecos xxix* (circa A.D. 165),
on his conversion to Christianity.

Introduction

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES INTO THE CHRISTIAN OLD TESTAMENT

The biblical writings of the Jews formed the holy book of the early Christians ('the scriptures', 1 Cor 15:3f.). The Pentateuch, Prophets and Psalms constituted the core to which reference was most frequently made in the second century (and later), but the Wisdom literature was also valued.¹ This mainly fixed but partly variable **corpus**,² read normally in Greek rather than Hebrew, was indeed supplemented by some writings of Christian authorship. In the second century 'the memoirs of the apostles', as Justin Martyr calls gospels, were read

¹ Junod, 'Formation', p. 109, on the basis of citations and allusions noted by Allenbach et al., *Biblia Patristica*, 1-3; and p. 114, where the view that the Wisdom books first gain high significance in Clement of Alexandria should perhaps be complemented by reference to their earlier importance for Christology (Prov 8:21-5 quoted from 'Wisdom' as testimony to Christ's pre-existence by Justin, *Dial.* 139; cf. Col 1:15-18) and the tradition of the Exodus (Wis 17:2, 18:12 at Melito, *De Pascha 140, 186*) as well as morality (Prov 1:23-33 quoted at length from 'all-virtuous Wisdom', 1 Clement 57; cf. Rom 12:20 [Prov 25:21f.], Heb 12:5f. [Prov 3:11f.]). On Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon in early Christianity see Gilbert, 'Wisdom Literature', 300f., 312f.

² The number and order of the books, still the subject of discussion by Jews, were investigated by Melito and Origen (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:26, 6:25), Jerome and others; see Swete, *Introduction*, 197-230; de Lange, *Origen*, 49-55 and Junod, 'Formation' (variations of Jewish practice reflected in Christianity); contrast Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 182-98 (Christians varied a substantially unified Jewish practice) and Barton, *Oracles*, 13-95. See also Beckwith, above, pp. 51ff.; Ellis, above, 655-79.