

HOLY BOOK  
AND  
HOLY TRADITION

INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM  
HELD IN THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

*edited by*

F. F. BRUCE *and* E. G. RUPP

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 1968 MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Published by the University of Manchester  
at THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
316-324 Oxford Road, Manchester 13

G.B. SBN 7190 0303 2

## V

### *Scripture and Tradition in the New Testament*

F. F. BRUCE

#### I

In the Editor's Foreword to the recently published English version of *The Jerusalem Bible*, Fr Alexander Jones speaks of 'Christianity's adopted child, which is the Old Testament, and her natural child, which is the New'.<sup>1</sup> Without commenting on the aptness or otherwise of the epithet 'natural', one may ask what the situation was with regard to these two children in the earliest days of Christianity.

Early Christianity possessed many strands of tradition. We may think of preaching,<sup>2</sup> ethical catechesis,<sup>3</sup> confession of faith,<sup>4</sup> liturgical practice,<sup>5</sup> hymns and spiritual songs,<sup>6</sup> and so on. There are the early layers of 'tradition' which can be traced behind our written Gospels, even behind the earlier documentary sources which Gospel criticism has uncovered.<sup>7</sup> There are those forms of oral tradition whose familiarity to the original readers of the several writings (especially the epistles) which came in due course to constitute the New Testament is presupposed by the writers. The knowledge of these forms of oral tradition is not so immediately accessible to us as it was to them, and must be reconstructed by inference and careful comparative study; this raises questions (not necessarily unanswerable questions) for those who adhere to the theological principle of *sola scriptura*.<sup>8</sup> So far as the New Testament is concerned, here is tradition that precedes scripture;<sup>9</sup> so far as the Old Testament is concerned, it is a tradition that follows scripture, a tradition by means of which the Old Testament is so reinterpreted as to become a new book.

For the church of the apostolic age inherited a holy book, the Jewish Bible in its Hebrew or Greek form, which Christians call the Old Testament. It also quickly acquired a holy tradition—or rather several strands of holy tradition—one of the

uses of which was to enable them to read their holy book aright. The church shared its holy book with the commonwealth of Israel, but because the main lines of its interpretative tradition were so different from those of Jewish tradition, it was almost as if the two communities read two different holy books. When asked how their understanding of the holy book was so different from that of the synagogue, the early Christians were wont to reply that the mind of the synagogue was blinded, that between its face and the sacred text was interposed a veil which could be removed only when it turned to Christ;<sup>10</sup> then it would read and understand clearly in all the scriptures the things concerning Jesus as the Christ.

Of the various kinds of tradition mentioned in the New Testament, some are approved and some disapproved. Among the latter are the 'tradition of the elders'—the growing accumulation of oral law—by which Jesus said the scribes had nullified the plain sense of the Word of God,<sup>11</sup> and the 'tradition of men'<sup>12</sup> attacked in the Epistle to the Colossians, an incipient gnosticism which threatened to transform apostolic Christianity into something of a different order. To this 'tradition of men' is opposed the true tradition of Christ: 'as therefore you received (*παρελάβετε*) Christ Jesus the Lord, so live in him, rooted and built up in him and established in the faith, just as you were taught'.<sup>13</sup> The verb *παραλαμβάνειν*, 'to receive by tradition', is the correlative of *παραδιδόναι*, 'to deliver, transmit' (the two correlative verbs corresponding to Heb. *qibbēl* and *māsar*).

When Paul uses the verb *παραδιδόναι* or its cognate noun *παράδοσις*, he sometimes makes it plain that what he is transmitting to others was similarly delivered to himself. Thus in 1 Corinthians 11:23 ff. and 1 Corinthians 15:3 ff. the account of the institution of the Eucharist and the skeleton of the kerygma which he delivered (*παρέδωκα*) to the Corinthians are things which he claims in the first instance to have 'received' (*παρέλαβον*) himself.<sup>14</sup> But on other occasions, as when he charges the church of Thessalonica to hold fast the traditions (*παραδόσεις*) which, he says, 'you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter',<sup>15</sup> it is not necessary to confine them to things which he himself first learned from those who were in Christ before him.<sup>16</sup> Tradition must start somewhere, and while the bulk of apostolic tradition stemmed, like the words

of institution, 'from the Lord' (*ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου*),<sup>17</sup> it does not follow that Christian tradition in the New Testament is invariably a synonym for *κύριος*.<sup>18</sup>

The possession of a common holy book, as has been said, does not guarantee religious unity. The interpretation of the holy book—and this will at first take the form of tradition—is important;<sup>19</sup> and divergent interpretations tend to produce religious divisions. In the period with which this paper is concerned this tendency is particularly prominent where the divergent traditions have to do with the observance of the law and religious practice in general—pre-eminently where those who embrace one line of interpretation band themselves together in *h<sup>a</sup> b<sup>u</sup> rōt*, like the Pharisees, or in covenant-communities, like the men of Qumran. It is in complete accordance with this general pattern that the first really serious external threat to the life of the Christian church should be bound up with the charge that Stephen understood Christianity to involve changing 'the customs which Moses delivered (*παρέδωκεν*) to us',<sup>20</sup> and that the first internal threat to the unity of the church should be posed by sharply divergent views on the necessity for Gentile converts to be 'circumcised according to the custom of Moses' and so undertake an obligation to keep the Jewish law.<sup>21</sup>

As against those who took the latter line ('believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees') the narrative of Acts represents Paul and the Jerusalem leaders as sharing substantially the same tradition.<sup>22</sup> But a hint is given of another tradition, perhaps as far to the 'left' as the Pharisaic believers were to the 'right', represented by Apollos of Alexandria, who was an expert in biblical exegesis, well versed in the story of Jesus, so that he could argue powerfully from the Old Testament that Jesus was the Messiah—yet his understanding of the Way deviated so much from the tradition which Acts presents as the main stream that by the standard of the latter it was positively defective.<sup>23</sup>

In one of his 'Father Brown' stories (*The Sign of the Broken Sword*), G. K. Chesterton describes one General Sir Arthur St Clare as 'a man who read his Bible'. 'That', remarks Father Brown, 'was what was the matter with *him*. When will people understand that it is useless for a man to read his Bible unless he also reads everybody else's Bible?' The point—a character-

istically propagandist point—is that when a man reads ‘his’ Bible he tends to find there what he is looking for, and what he is looking for will be determined by a wide background of pre-supposition, temperament, interest, motive and the like.<sup>24</sup> Through General St Clare’s reading of ‘his’ Bible, the story goes on, he was able to justify many a dubious activity by saying ‘that he did it to the glory of the Lord’. ‘My own theology’, comments Father Brown, ‘is sufficiently expressed by asking which Lord?’<sup>25</sup>

Chesterton’s lesson receives copious illustration in the period of our present concern.

## II

Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries shared the same sacred scriptures, the same divinely-given law, the same written sabbath commandment.

On the sabbath day, the Israelite was enjoined in that commandment, ‘thou shalt not do any work’.<sup>26</sup> But what was the precise meaning of ‘work’? Which activities counted as work, and which did not? In a simple agricultural community the answer was relatively easy: ‘work’ consisted of those activities which made up the daily routine of labour. But in the Pentateuchal legislation itself we have evidence of rulings on the question whether this or that more occasional activity constituted work within the meaning of the commandment. What of those special agricultural activities which recurred season by season, and not day by day? The ruling was plain: even ‘in ploughing time and in harvest you shall rest’.<sup>27</sup> What of lighting a fire? Was that permissible or not? The answer was ‘No’.<sup>28</sup> What about gathering fuel to light a fire? Again the answer is ‘No’—and in this case we have the ruling embodied in a narrative: a man who was found gathering sticks on the sabbath was kept in custody until a divine response was secured.<sup>29</sup> In the time of Nehemiah the importation of wares into Jerusalem on the sabbath, already forbidden under the monarchy in terms of a ban on commercial transactions and the carrying of burdens on that day,<sup>30</sup> was effectually prevented by the governor’s order that the city gates be closed and guarded by Levites from sundown on Friday till after sundown on Saturday<sup>31</sup>—but

those Levites, be it noted, were not deemed to violate the sabbath by standing on guard over the gates.

The thirty-nine categories of work defined in the traditional sabbath regulation of the rabbis<sup>32</sup> no doubt reflect an interpretation current in the school of Hillel. The school of Shammai, we may surmise, had an even stricter interpretation. Yet both of these schools would probably have agreed that a domestic animal might be rescued from a pit on the sabbath without detriment to the sanctity of the day—a situation which must have called for a ruling quite early in a pastoral or agricultural community. Jesus assumes that no objection to an action of this kind will be raised by any of his Pharisaic hearers.<sup>33</sup> But the community of Qumran, to judge by the sabbath *halakhah* of the Zadokite work, would apparently have disagreed: 'Let no one help an animal in birth on the sabbath. Even if she drops [her young] into a cistern or a pit, let him not lift it out on the sabbath.'<sup>34</sup>

It was evidently accepted from early times that the ban on sabbath work did not apply to the sacrificial services in the sanctuary or to certain other ceremonial obligations. Jesus in debate appeals to this fact. 'The priests in the temple "profane" the sabbath with impunity',<sup>35</sup> he says—that is, by doing their regular work on it (in fact, probably by doing more work on it than on other days). The implication is: if one form of serving God is permissible on the sabbath, why not others (which from certain points of view might be considered more important, such as healing)? Again, if the eighth day from a Jewish boy's birth coincided with the sabbath, he must be circumcised on that day, sabbath or no. Hence the argument in John 7:23, 'If on the sabbath a man receives circumcision [undergoes an operation affecting but one small part of his body], so that the law of Moses may not be broken, are you angry with me because on the sabbath I made a man's whole body well?'<sup>36</sup>

But Jesus' basic principle of interpretation of the sabbath law appears not so much in these *ad hominem* arguments with doctors of the law as in those Synoptic passages where he appeals to the primary intention of the sabbath institution. 'The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath'<sup>37</sup>—more particularly, the sabbath was instituted for men's rest and relief, not to be a burden to them. Therefore, any action

which promoted the divine intention in instituting the sabbath was appropriate for that day. The satisfaction of normal human need, he held, takes precedence over ceremonial requirements or the rulings of the schools. The bread before the altar in the sanctuary might be reserved by sacral law for the priests alone, but the scriptures do not censure David and his company for eating it when he was hungry.<sup>38</sup> As for the sabbath law, others might concede that in a case of extreme urgency, a matter of life and death, remedial measures might be applied on the sacred day—but as an exception to the general rule. If there was no great urgency, then, in the words of a synagogue official who was annoyed by an act of healing in his synagogue on the sabbath, ‘there are six days on which work ought to be done; come on those days and be healed, and not on the sabbath day’.<sup>39</sup> A woman who had suffered from *spondylitis deformans*<sup>40</sup> (if that is what it was) for eighteen years could easily wait another day, he reckoned. But Jesus in effect said ‘No; she has waited long enough, and the sabbath is the most fitting day for her to be released from her trouble. If on the sabbath you untie your ox or ass as a matter of course and take it off to be watered, how much more should this daughter of Abraham be relieved on the sabbath?’<sup>41</sup>

If we turn from the sabbath law to the law of divorce, a comparable situation meets us. Jesus, together with the Qumran community, the schools of Hillel and Shammai and the Jews in general, read the same wording in the Deuteronomic legislation where it is recognized that a man is entitled to divorce his wife if, after marrying her, he finds in her ‘some unseemliness’ (*erwaṭ dāḥār*).<sup>42</sup>

But here too the question of definition arose. What constitutes *erwaṭ dāḥār*? The school of Shammai, as we know, limited it to unchastity: if a man found that his bride was not a virgin, as he might reasonably expect her to be, he was entitled to dismiss her. The school of Hillel, commonly credited with milder interpretations than the school of Shammai, manifested its ‘mildness’ here in the husband’s interest: he might divorce her (so its leaders expounded the law) for practically any feature or practice which he found displeasing.<sup>43</sup> But when Jesus was asked to say whether a man might put away his wife for any cause, he did not deal with the exegesis of Deuteronomy 24:1–4; however



'*erwaṭ dābār* might be interpreted, that whole provision, he said, was a modification of the original principle, introduced later because of the hardness of men's hearts.<sup>44</sup> The original principle was disclosed by the Creator's intention in instituting marriage, as laid down in Genesis: 'From the beginning of creation he "made them male and female"; this is why a man will leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, so that the two become one flesh.'<sup>45</sup> From this Jesus deduced that in the original institution man and woman were made for each other, being joined together by God, and divorce was not contemplated; divorce, in fact, was an attempt to undo the work of God. The practical implication of this ruling—although it is not explicitly attributed to Jesus—would have been a redressing of the unequal balance in favour of the wife, who under Jewish law could not take the initiative in divorcing her husband and who had little opportunity of defending herself against such initiative on his part.<sup>46</sup>

Paul underlines the tradition of Jesus in this matter not only in Ephesians 5:22 ff., where the marriage relationship, expounded in the light of Genesis 2:24, is treated as a 'mystery' setting forth the relationship between Christ and the church, but in 1 Corinthians 6:15 f., where he uses the Genesis language about 'one flesh' to insist that even a man's casual intercourse with a harlot establishes a vital bond between the two, and thus 'displays a psychological insight into human sexuality which is altogether exceptional by first-century standards'.<sup>47</sup>

But such is the hardness of men's hearts that before the gospel tradition was stereotyped Jesus' ruling was modified by the reintroduction of the '*erwaṭ dābār*'. The two exceptive clauses in the First Gospel<sup>48</sup> may indeed represent an adaptation of his ruling to the conditions of the Gentile mission, in which a couple might before their conversion have cohabited within forbidden degrees of affinity, so that their union constituted a form of *πορνεία*.<sup>49</sup> But the history of canon law shows how the kind of approach which Jesus was careful to avoid has tended to obscure the spirit of his liberating pronouncement by treating it woodenly as a piece of legislation.<sup>50</sup>

Yet this principle of legal interpretation, rejecting an existing tradition and establishing a new one, is not the most distinctive form of the Christian interpretative tradition. For this we find

the readiest analogy not in rabbinical jurisprudence but in the literature of the Qumran community.

### III

The community of Qumran read for the most part the same sacred scriptures, so far as we can judge, as many of their fellow-Jews; but they read them through spectacles of quite a different sort and therefore understood them quite differently. Their interpretation of the Torah, if we may make an inference from the Zadokite work, was different in a number of respects from that of the Pharisees (although the Pharisees were not in themselves entirely agreed on the application of many of the laws).

It is in the interpretation of the Prophets and Psalms, and of prophetic oracles and hymnic passages found *passim* in other Old Testament books, that we find the really distinctive 'tradition' by which the scriptures were understood at Qumran. This 'tradition', by the testimony of the Qumran texts themselves, was established by the Teacher of Righteousness, whom God raised up to lead the faithful remnant 'in the way of his heart, and to make known to the last generations what he was about to do to the last generation—the congregation of deceivers'.<sup>51</sup> This man taught his followers how to interpret the prophetic writings, and enabled them to see their own duty and prospects written clearly there. To the prophets much had been revealed, but not everything. One thing in particular had been withheld from them—the *time* at which their oracles would be fulfilled—and the withholding of this meant that their oracles remained mysteries, both to the prophets themselves and (even more so) to their readers. But when the time of their fulfilment was at last revealed, the mystery was a mystery no longer: with this further revelation its solution was imparted. The man chosen by God to be the recipient of this further revelation was the Teacher of Righteousness. Of the oracle of Habakkuk, for example, the Qumran commentator on that prophet says: 'God commanded Habakkuk to write the things that were coming on the last generation, but the fulfilment of the epoch (*g<sup>e</sup>mar haqqēš*) he did not make known to him. And as for the expression, "that he may run who reads it", its interpretation

concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries (*rāzē*) of the words of his servants the prophets.<sup>52</sup>

There are, of course, exceptions to the rule that the prophets were not told when their predictions would be fulfilled. We may recall passages in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel where periods of between forty and seventy years from the prophet's time are prescribed for the accomplishment of certain events, such as Jeremiah's fixing of seventy years as the epoch of the desolations of Jerusalem.<sup>53</sup> But the 'epoch' (*qēṣ*) which the Qumran interpreters had in mind was that which marked the end of the current age. In this respect they had only one canonical predecessor, Daniel. When Daniel reinterprets Jeremiah's seventy years as seventy sevens of years, the terminus of the period is not now a return from exile but the inauguration of the age to come, with the putting an end to sin and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness.<sup>54</sup> Josephus remarks that Daniel alone among the prophets of old was able to state the *time* of the fulfilment of his oracles;<sup>55</sup> in Qumran terminology, which is in essence that of the book of Daniel, his visions embrace both mystery (*rāz*) and interpretation (*pēšer*). Indeed, there is probably a closer relation between Daniel and the Teacher of Righteousness than can be established thus far by detailed evidence; it is somewhat surprising that, so far as I know, no one has thought of identifying the two (not that I myself have any idea of doing so).

At any rate, instructed by the Teacher of Righteousness and the men who learned from him their principles of biblical exegesis, the members of the Qumran community found the sacred scriptures an open book. The interpretative 'tradition' which they 'received'—a 'tradition' which to their minds was as fully the product of divine revelation as were the written oracles themselves—embodied a few simple principles.

1. God revealed his purpose to the prophets, but the relevance of his purpose could not be understood until the *time* of its fulfilment was revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness.
2. All the words of the prophets referred to the time of the end.
3. The time of the end is at hand.

It was in the eschatological situation which the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness showed to be imminent that the true

context of any oracle was sought; the text was atomized, regardless of what *we* call context, so as to fit here or there into the eschatological situation. Variant readings were selected so as best to serve the interpreter's purpose. Where a relation could not otherwise be established between the text and the eschatological situation, allegorization was employed.<sup>56</sup>

The men of Qumran, properly instructed in these principles, had no difficulty in understanding passages like Psalm 37:32, 'the wicked watches the righteous and seeks to slay him',<sup>57</sup> or Habakkuk 1:4, 'the wicked surrounds the righteous'.<sup>58</sup> Language like this infallibly points to the attacks made on the Teacher of Righteousness by his inveterate enemy, the Wicked Priest. References to the overthrow of Israel's enemies—the 'sons of Sheth' in Balaam's oracles,<sup>59</sup> the Assyrians in Isaiah,<sup>60</sup> the Chaldaeans in Habakkuk<sup>61</sup> and Gog in Ezekiel<sup>62</sup>—were understood not of nations contemporary with these prophets but of the last Gentile oppressors of the people of God, the 'Kittim' of the commentaries and of the War scroll.

Again, references to the building of a wall or a city were understood of the building either of the righteous community or of some rival enterprise, political or religious, according as the building was spoken of in terms of approval, promising success, or in terms of reprobation, portending destruction. 'Samaria' in Micah 1:5 is interpreted of the 'Spouter of falsehood, who led the simple astray' (perhaps some early leader of the group that developed into the party of the Pharisees), while 'Jerusalem' is related to 'the Teacher of Righteousness, who expounded the law to his council, to all who voluntarily pledged themselves to join the elect of God'.<sup>63</sup> The builders of the unstable wall in Ezekiel 13:10 ff. are similarly the 'Spouter of falsehood' and his associates;<sup>64</sup> on the other hand, the wall of Micah 7:11 is the fence (the rule of life) which keeps the righteous community insulated from the contamination of evil.<sup>65</sup>

The members of the righteous community are not only the builders of the well-founded wall; they are also the diggers of the well of Numbers 21:17 f.: 'the nobles of the people are those who have come to dig the well with the staves which the law-giver (*m<sup>e</sup>hōqēq*) appointed for them to walk withal during the whole epoch of wickedness'.<sup>66</sup>

And so on. Grasp the basic principles of the interpretative tradition, and the sacred text becomes luminous.

## IV

We revert now to the parallel situation in the Church. 'One of the extraordinary features of the early Church', it has been said, 'is the number of men who were converted by reading the Old Testament'<sup>67</sup>—converted, that is to say, from paganism to Christianity. It does not appear that these men had any antecedent conviction of the authority of the Old Testament, but as they read it, it 'found' them (in Coleridge's sense of the word).<sup>68</sup> One wonders, however, if they were completely ignorant of a 'tradition' which helped them to read the Christian gospel in those pre-Christian scriptures.

A good example is provided by Tatian in an autobiographical section of his *Address to the Greeks*. After unsatisfying experience of Greek philosophical and legal literature and of mystery religions, he says:

I withdrew by myself and sought how best to discover the truth. While I was giving earnest attention to this, I happened to light upon certain barbaric writings, too old to be compared with the opinions of the Greeks and too divine to be compared with their error. I found myself convinced by these writings, because of the unpretentious cast of the language, the unstudied character of the writers, the ready comprehension of the making of the universe, the foreknowledge of things to come, the excellence of the precepts and the placing of all things under the rule of one principle. My soul being thus taught by God, I understood that the pagan writings led to condemnation, whereas these put an end to the slavery that is in the world, rescuing us from many rulers (*ἄρχοντες*), yes, from ten thousand tyrants. These writings do not indeed give us something that we had not received before, but rather something which we had indeed received but were prevented by error from making our own.<sup>69</sup>

These last words suggest that Tatian's reading of the Old Testament books was preceded or accompanied by some awareness of the kind of 'tradition' which enabled him to understand them in a Christian sense.

What can be said of such a 'tradition'?

That the Old Testament prophecies were 'mysteries' whose interpretation was concealed from the prophets themselves is a theme common to Qumran and the early church. The prophets, according to one New Testament writer, foretold the advent of the Christian salvation, but they did not grasp the full purport of their own predictions; they 'searched and inquired diligently' in order to discover who was the person and what the time pointed to by the Spirit of messianic prophecy within them when bearing witness in advance to 'the sufferings of the Messiah and the glories that were to follow'.<sup>70</sup> But the writer and his readers had no need to search and inquire diligently; they knew that the person was Jesus and the time was now. 'This is that which was spoken through the prophet'<sup>71</sup>—Peter's message on the day of Pentecost—is writ large over the New Testament writings; it is plainly affirmed in the gospel tradition itself. Jesus congratulates his disciples because they see and hear things to which prophets and righteous men had looked forward with longing expectation, but which they did not live to witness.<sup>72</sup>

Occasionally the very word 'mystery', in the same sense as *rāz* in Daniel and the Qumran texts, is used in this regard. 'To you', says Jesus to his disciples, 'the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given, but to outsiders all these things come as riddles; they see without perceiving, and hear without understanding, otherwise they would turn back and receive forgiveness'.<sup>73</sup> And one aspect of the gospel—the manner and purpose of its communication to the Gentile world—is treated in the Pauline corpus as a mystery 'which was not made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed to Christ's holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit'.<sup>74</sup> That the Gentiles would place their hope on the Davidic Messiah and rejoice in Israel's God was foretold in the Old Testament, as Paul emphasizes in a catena of quotations in Romans 15:9–12, but the implications of this hope were not appreciated until the time of its fulfilment.

This interpretative tradition pervades all the strata of the New Testament. We find it in the Synoptic records and in the Fourth Gospel, in Paul and Peter, in the Alexandrian Epistle to the Hebrews and the Hebraic book of the Revelation. The various writers have their distinctive hermeneutical principles

and methods, it is true. Matthew records how this or that incident in the life of Jesus 'took place in order that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophet'.<sup>75</sup> Paul sees the temporary and partial setting aside of Israel as clearly in the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, as he finds the ingathering of the Gentiles adumbrated there.<sup>76</sup> He is careful withal to distinguish his Old Testament authors—Moses, David, Hosea, Isaiah<sup>77</sup>—unlike the writer to the Hebrews who, true to his Alexandrian heritage, ignores such details for the most part, since to him all scripture is oracular in character.<sup>78</sup> John the Evangelist portrays Jesus as the fulfiller of a number of Old Testament motifs, such as the *dāḥār*, the *kāḥōd* and the *miškān*;<sup>79</sup> the bread of life, the water of life, the light of life;<sup>80</sup> while the Apocalypse, in Austin Farrer's words, is 'a rebirth of images' from the Old Testament and other ancient lore<sup>81</sup>—some of them remarkably recalcitrant to a Christian purpose,<sup>82</sup> yet all pressed into service to depict the triumph of Christ. But, however variously the interpretative tradition be treated by the different New Testament writers, the core of the tradition is common property: the central subject of the Old Testament writings is Jesus; he is the one to whom they all bear witness.

The analogy of Qumran would lead us to the conclusion which is in any case the plain testimony of the gospel record: that the main lines of this tradition were laid down by Jesus himself. It is not necessary here to repeat the arguments to this effect so cogently deployed by my distinguished predecessors C. H. Dodd and T. W. Manson.<sup>83</sup> The insistence that 'so it is written' is too deeply imbedded in all the gospel strata to be reasonably suspected of being an accretion, due to reflection in the post-Easter church on the events of the ministry and passion of Jesus. I have elsewhere<sup>84</sup> drawn attention to the way in which the visions and oracles of Zechariah 9-14 have influenced the passion narratives, and this, I believe, stems from Jesus himself—from his deliberate choice of 'a colt, the foal of an ass'<sup>85</sup> to ride into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, and his reference, an hour or two before his arrest, to the words of Zechariah 13:7, 'Smite the shepherd and scatter the sheep.'<sup>86</sup>

This reference to Zechariah 9-14 reminds us of a feature of New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament which to a large degree distinguishes it from the *pēser* interpretation of

Qumran: the New Testament interpretation of a few words or sentences from the Old Testament which are actually quoted very often implies the context in which these words or sentences occur—we may think of such contexts as Zechariah 9-14; Isaiah 40-66, Psalm 69 and so forth. Moreover, different New Testament writers will quote different words or sentences from the same context in a manner which suggests that the complete context had received a Christian interpretation before these writers quoted from it. For example, C. H. Dodd points out that from Psalm 69:9 ('zeal for thy house has consumed me, and the insults of those who insult thee have fallen on me') the former part is applied to Christ in John 2:17 and the latter part in Romans 15:3. While no one is likely to maintain that the one writer has influenced the other, 'it would be too much of a coincidence if the two writers independently happened to cite the two halves of a single verse, unless they were both aware that at least this whole verse, if not any more of the Psalm, formed part of a scheme of scriptural passages generally held to be especially significant'.<sup>87</sup> This implies something more substantial in the way of primitive Christian exegesis of the Old Testament than a catena of more isolated proof-texts or 'testimonies' such as J. R. Harris envisaged.<sup>88</sup>

Alongside this contextual element in the interpretative tradition there is another, which (unlike the former) does have an analogue in the Qumran literature (as also in rabbinical literature). This is the bringing together and giving a unified exegesis to widely separated scriptures which have a significant term in common.<sup>89</sup> Perhaps the most prominent example in the New Testament is the widespread evidence for an integrated messianic interpretation of various 'stone' passages in the Old Testament—the stone which the builders rejected in Psalm 118:22, the stone in Nebuchadnezzar's dream which pulverized the great image (Daniel 2:34 f.), the tested corner stone of sure foundation in Isaiah 28:16 and the rock of refuge amid the flood waters in Isaiah 8:14 which proves a stone of stumbling to those who refuse to take refuge upon it.<sup>90</sup> Again, we find the 'one like a son of man' of Daniel 7:13 brought into close relation with the 'son of man' of Psalm 8:4 beneath whose feet all things have been placed and possibly also with the 'son of man' of Psalm 80:17 whom God makes strong for himself;<sup>91</sup> or we find



the deliverance from death of God's *hāsīd* (δοσιος) in Psalm 16:10 linked in Acts 13:34 f. with the promise of the *hasdē* (δοσια) of David in Isaiah 55:3 to provide a joint *testimonium* of the resurrection of Christ.

It is not surprising that the Psalter as well as the Prophets should be expounded thus. In addition to those royal psalms which were commonly acknowledged in the first century A.D. as 'messianic',<sup>92</sup> and whose fulfilment Christians naturally recognized in Jesus, there are many psalms in which a righteous sufferer raises his plaint to God, and which were equally naturally interpreted of Jesus. Indeed, had not Jesus confirmed this interpretation by making the language of one of these psalms his own in the bitterness of dereliction on the cross?<sup>93</sup>

But if the righteous sufferer was recognized as Jesus, the persecutors of the righteous sufferer were identified with Jesus' enemies,<sup>94</sup> and with none more freely than with Judas Iscariot. Here again the cue appears to have been given by Jesus himself; there is no good reason for doubting that at the Last Supper he used the words of Psalm 41:9, 'he who ate of my bread has lifted his heel against me', to indicate to his companions that he knew there was a traitor in the camp.<sup>95</sup> It was no difficult matter to find other passages in the Psalter which could be similarly applied to Judas; the quotation in this connection of Psalms 69:25 and 109:8 in Acts 1:20 is a case in point. The tradition still flourishes vigorously in circles less severely academic than ours; I have known it to be seriously argued that since Psalm 109:8 (applied by Peter to Judas in the form, 'his office let another take') is followed immediately by the words, 'May his children be fatherless and his wife a widow' (Psalm 109:9), Judas was therefore a married man with a family.

With such dominical and apostolic precedent, the Christian church was able so to read the Old Testament writings that they supplied not only an increasing store of christological *testimonia* but additional factual evidence about New Testament events. This tendency we find well established in Justin and the Cypriatic *Testimonia adversus Iudaeos*; it was carried to excess in the Middle Ages. The passion narrative in particular was embellished by mediaeval piety by the liberal importation of Old Testament *motifs* divorced from their context as well as elements from other sources; striking examples are provided in the

fourteenth-century German mystical treatise now called *Christi Leiden in einer Vision geschaut*<sup>96</sup> or in the fifteenth-century poem quoted by G. L. Prestige where the words of Canticles 2:5, *quia amore langueo*,<sup>97</sup> are pressed into service as a passion theme. Even today this tendency is strong enough in much traditional Christian piety to be the cause of some uneasiness when it is found that several modern versions of the Old Testament exhibit readings and renderings which do not lend themselves so readily to this kind of traditional interpretation as older versions did.<sup>98</sup>

## v

One important phase of the early Christian interpretative tradition is the tracing of a recurrent pattern in the story of God's dealing with his people. For instance, New Testament writers view the history of Israel in the Old Testament, with special emphasis on the course of events from Egypt to Canaan, as recapitulated either in the personal experience of the Messiah or in the corporate experience of the church.<sup>99</sup>

Recapitulation in the Messiah's personal experience (perhaps by way of applying Isaiah 63:9, 'In all their affliction he was afflicted'),<sup>100</sup> appears especially in the Old Testament quotations in Matthew's nativity narrative where, for example, the reference to the Exodus in Hosea 11:1, 'out of Egypt I called my son', is said to be fulfilled in the Holy Family's flight into Egypt and return thence to Judaea.<sup>101</sup> It is not that the Evangelist arbitrarily detaches a sentence from its context in order to apply it to an event with which it has nothing to do; it is rather that he sees the fortunes of the messianic people as re-enacted by the Messiah himself. Something of the same sort may be implicit in the parallel between Jesus' forty days in the wilderness and Israel's forty years of wilderness wandering (cf. Deuteronomy 8:2 f.), both periods of 'testing' coming as the sequel to a 'baptismal' experience.<sup>102</sup>

As for the recapitulation of the Egypt-to-Canaan sequence in the life of the church, this pervades the major epistles of the New Testament, Pauline and non-Pauline alike, and must be an extremely primitive Christian tradition.

Israel had the paschal lamb; 'Christ our passover was sacrificed for us', says Paul<sup>103</sup>—'a lamb without blemish and with-

out spot', says Peter.<sup>104</sup> Israel passed through the Red Sea, says Paul, being thus 'baptized unto Moses'<sup>105</sup> (baptized without being immersed, as a Scots divine once pointed out, whereas the Egyptians were immersed without being baptized);<sup>106</sup> Christians for their part are baptized *εἰς Χριστόν*.<sup>107</sup> Israel had manna from heaven and water from the rock to sustain and refresh them in the wilderness;<sup>108</sup> Christians too have their supernatural food and drink.<sup>109</sup> But for all these privileges, the generation that left Egypt died in the wilderness because of rebellion against Israel's God; Christians should take due warning lest disobedience on their part brings them into comparable disaster.<sup>110</sup> And here the writer to the Hebrews takes over from Paul: the Israelites in the wilderness had a promised rest before them, but failed to enter into it because of unbelief; so Christians may miss the rest that remains for the people of God if they in their turn cherish 'an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God'.<sup>111</sup>

Then there is the interpretative principle which A. T. Hanson has called the 'real presence' of Christ in Old Testament history.<sup>112</sup> He sees it in places where it is not properly to be found, to the point where it becomes the central principle of Old Testament interpretation in the New Testament, but in certain forms it is plain enough.

In a Pauline passage already alluded to, it is stated that the 'rock' which accompanied Israel in the wilderness was Christ<sup>113</sup>—that it was from Christ that they drew their 'spiritual' refreshment, just as Christians do. But a clearer instance still is provided by the *lectio difficilior* in Jude 5: 'I desire to remind you, though you were once for all fully informed, that Jesus, who delivered a people from the land of Egypt, later destroyed those who did not believe.' In place of 'Jesus' various authorities for the text have 'the Lord' or 'God' or the Greek definite article. But on the principle *praestat lectio ardua* 'Jesus' is the preferable reading.<sup>114</sup> What, then, can 'Jesus' mean in this context? It does not mean the Old Testament leader Joshua, as it does in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8. Joshua led Israel into the promised land (thus providing the basis for a rich Joshua-Jesus messianology),<sup>115</sup> but he did not deliver them from the land of Egypt. No; Jude's point is that it was Jesus the Son of God who, centuries before his incarnation, delivered Israel from Egypt. The

fact that Yahweh was commonly rendered *κύριος* in the Septuagint, and that Jesus was called *κύριος* in the church, made it the easier to identify Jesus with 'the Lord' who went before Israel in a pillar of cloud and fire,<sup>116</sup> who rescued them from the hand of the Egyptians,<sup>117</sup> who healed them in the wilderness.<sup>118</sup> It was even easier to identify Jesus with the covenant-messenger, Yahweh's 'angel' or 'presence', who led them under Moses towards the land of rest.<sup>119</sup>

This goes farther than either Paul or the writer to the Hebrews goes; it is, however, adumbrated in Stephen's speech in Acts, where—by implication, though not expressly—Jesus is 'the angel' who appeared to Moses 'in a flame of fire in a bush'<sup>120</sup> and later on the day of the assembly at Mount Sinai;<sup>121</sup> it appears in full development in the second century, not least in Justin's *Apology*<sup>122</sup> and *Dialogue with Trypho*.<sup>123</sup> Justin criticizes the Jewish belief that the one who said to Moses in the bush, 'I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob', was 'the Father and Creator of the universe'.<sup>124</sup> No, says Justin, they are wrong (as the spirit of prophecy says, 'Israel does not know me, my people have not understood me');<sup>125</sup> it was the Son of God who spoke those words. Here the exegesis does not depend on the ambiguity of *κύριος* (it is not *κύριος* but *θεός* who calls to Moses out of the bush); it depends on the statement that 'the angel of the Lord' (*ἄγγελος κυρίου*) appeared to Moses in the burning bush, and it is the Son of God, says Justin, 'who is called both angel and apostle'.<sup>126</sup> Justin was manifestly acquainted with the Synoptic incident in which these words from Exodus 3:6 are quoted by Jesus himself with unambiguous reference to 'the Father and Creator of the universe'.<sup>127</sup> But that could not outweigh in his mind the force of the interpretative principle that where *ἄγγελος κυρίου* appears in the Old Testament narrative—especially in passages where the phrase alternates with *θεός* or *κύριος*—the pre-incarnate Christ is indicated. In fact, Trypho's exegesis of Exodus 3:6 is more in line with that of Jesus than Justin's is: 'This is not what we understand from the words quoted', says Trypho in reply to Justin, 'but we understand that, while it was an *angel* that appeared in a flame of fire, it was *God* who spoke to Moses'.<sup>128</sup> Justin and Trypho read (substantially)<sup>129</sup> the same Bible, so far as the Old Testament books are concerned, but in another

sense they read different Bibles, because their respective 'traditions' were so different.

By the same process Justin argues that it was Christ who announced the birth of Isaac to Abraham and Sarah,<sup>130</sup> who overthrew the cities of the plain,<sup>131</sup> who spoke to Jacob in his dreams at Bethel and Padan-aram and wrestled with him at Peniel,<sup>132</sup> who appeared to Joshua as captain of the Lord's host,<sup>133</sup> and so forth. This line of interpretation has passed into traditional Christian theology; in its main features, however, it is post-apostolic and goes far beyond the interpretative tradition of the New Testament.

Quite apart from the differences between the Septuagint and Massoretic texts, Jews and Christians could no longer be said to read the same scriptures in a material sense, in view of the divergent 'traditions' by which they understood them. The accepted Christian tradition became more sharply anti-Judaic, and the Jewish tradition in turn became increasingly careful to exclude those renderings or interpretations, previously quite acceptable, which now proved to lend themselves all too readily to Christian use.<sup>134</sup> So, despite the common heritage of the holy book, the two opposed traditions hardened. Only in more recent times, with the acceptance on both sides of the principle of grammatico-historical exegesis, have their hard outlines softened, so that today Jews and Christians of varying traditions can collaborate happily in the common task of translating and interpreting the Bible.<sup>135</sup>

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *The Jerusalem Bible* (London, October 21, 1966), p.v.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (London, 1936).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (Leipzig, 1903); G. Klein, *Der älteste christliche Katechismus* (Berlin, 1909); P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (Cambridge, 1940); E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter* (London, 1946), pp. 363 ff.; C. H. Dodd, *Gospel and Law* (Cambridge, 1951).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (London, 1949); R. P. Martin, *An Early Christian Confession* (London, 1960); *Carmen Christi* (Cambridge, 1967).

<sup>5</sup> Liturgical practice is one of the most important elements in the development of religious tradition. In the New Testament we may think especially

of baptism and its accompanying words, τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι (Ephesians 5:26), and the Eucharist with its accompanying words (1 Corinthians 11:24 f.). Cf. O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Eng. trans., London, 1950) and *Early Christian Worship* (Eng. trans., London, 1953); A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (London, 1952); R. P. Martin, *Worship in the Early Church* (London, 1964).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Colossians 3:16 and Ephesians 5:19; these found an early place in the context of sacrament (cf. ἔγειρε δὲ καθεύδων . . . in Ephesians 5:14) and liturgy (cf. the canticles of Revelation).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the recurrence of the word 'tradition' in the titles of works on Gospel criticism, especially form criticism; e.g. R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen, 1921; Eng. trans. of 3rd edition, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* [Oxford, 1963]); M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (London, 1934, Eng. trans. of *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* [Tübingen, 1919, 1959]); V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London, 1933); H. Riesefeld, *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings* (London, 1957); J. W. Doeve, 'Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la composition des Évangiles Synoptiques', in J. Cambier *et al.*, *La formation des Évangiles* (Bruges, 1957), pp. 70 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Thus proponents of *sola scriptura* may well ask what elements of tradition have been preserved from the apostolic age to our day apart from those which have been recorded in extant writings. See pp. 129, 163.

<sup>9</sup> See pp. 3, 99 f., 160. On the relation of the New Testament canon to the tradition which preceded it, cf. pp. 183, 189, below; also E. Flesseman-van Leer, 'Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons', *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, lxi (1964), pp. 404 ff. See too on the general theme her *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church* (Assen, 1955).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the sculptured portrayal of the church and the synagogue in Strasbourg and Rochester Cathedrals. The *motif* goes back to Paul's application of Exodus 34:29 ff. in 2 Corinthians 3:12 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Mark 7:1 ff. and Matthew 15:1 ff.

<sup>12</sup> Colossians 2:8.

<sup>13</sup> Colossians 2:6 f.; cf. Philippians 4:9.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. 1 Thessalonians 2:13, discussed by R. Schippers, 'The Pre-Synoptic Tradition in I Thessalonians II 13-16', *Novum Testamentum*, viii (1966), pp. 223 ff. One occasion on which Paul could have 'received' these things is indicated in Galatians 1:18 ff. On the sense in which he asserts that he did not 'receive' (οὐδὲ . . . παρέλαβον) his gospel from any human source (Galatians 1:11 f.) as contrasted with the sense in which he did so receive it, see H. Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament: An die Korinther I-II<sup>a</sup>* (Tübingen, 1923), p. 58 (*ad* 1 Corinthians 11:23), quoted p. 97 below.

<sup>15</sup> 2 Thessalonians 2:15. Here *παράδοσις* covers both spoken and written instruction. Compare the evidence of Papias (*apud* Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 39. 3 f.) for the availability of both oral and written tradition in his day; he himself regarded the former as the more valuable, 'for I did not suppose that what I could get from books would help me so much as what came from a living and abiding voice' (cf. H. D. Lockett, 'The Growth of Creeds', in

*Inaugural Lectures delivered by Members of the Faculty of Theology*, ed. A. S. Peake [Manchester, 1905], pp. 235 ff., especially p. 251). The gnostics also appealed to oral and written tradition; hence arose the question which Irenaeus set himself to answer, how to distinguish true from false tradition.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. G. Widengren, 'Tradition and Literature in Early Judaism and in the Early Church', *Numen*, x (1963), pp. 42 ff., especially pp. 79 f.

<sup>17</sup> 1 Corinthians 11:23. See p. 95.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. O. Cullmann, 'Kyrios as Designation for the Oral Tradition concerning Jesus (*Paradosis* and *Kyrios*)', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, iii (1950), pp. 180 ff.; 'Scripture and Tradition', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vi (1953), pp. 113 ff. (with reply by J. Daniélou, 'Réponse à Oscar Cullmann', *Dieu vivant*, no. 24 [1953], pp. 107 ff.); 'The Tradition', Eng. trans. in *The Early Church* (London, 1956), pp. 55 ff.

<sup>19</sup> So important, indeed, that it may become an integral part of the holy revelation; cf. the rabbinical dictum in TB *Qiddušin* 49b, 'mā'ī tōrāh? midraš tōrāh' (quoted by J. Weingreen, 'Old Testament and Rabbinical Exposition' in *Promise and Fulfilment* [ed. F. F. Bruce, Edinburgh, 1963], p. 192).

<sup>20</sup> Acts 6:14.

<sup>21</sup> Acts 15:1, 5.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Acts 15:22 ff.; 21:17 ff.

<sup>23</sup> Acts 18:24 ff.; cf. G. Widengren, *Numen*, x (1963), p. 78 (art. cit., n. 16 above).

<sup>24</sup> I recall a Scots lady, member of a church which confined its hymnody to the Old Testament Psalter and which eschewed the use of any musical instrument, who on being asked how she could intelligently sing words about praising God on a ten-stringed instrument (e.g. Psalm 33:2) replied that this, of course, was a reference to the Ten Commandments and showed surprise that anyone should be ignorant of so elementary a truth. Here church practice controlled the interpretative tradition.

<sup>25</sup> G. K. Chesterton, *The Father Brown Stories* (London, 1929), pp. 266 f.

<sup>26</sup> Exodus 20:10; Deuteronomy 5:14.

<sup>27</sup> Exodus 34:21.

<sup>28</sup> Exodus 35:3.

<sup>29</sup> Numbers 15:32 ff. Thus we trace the growth of case-law (see p. 61).

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Amos 8:5; Jeremiah 17:22 ff. (see p. 63).

<sup>31</sup> Nehemiah 13:19 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Mishnah *Shabbath* vii. 1 ff. (see p. 67, n. 12).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Matthew 12:11; Luke 14:5.

<sup>34</sup> CD xi. 13 f. Compare Josephus's statement that the Essenes 'are stricter than all Jews in abstaining from work on the seventh day' (*BJ*, ii. 147).

<sup>35</sup> Matthew 12:5.

<sup>36</sup> On such characteristic samples of rabbinical argument in the Fourth Gospel cf. I. Abrahams, 'Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis', in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, ed. H. B. Swete (Cambridge, 1909), pp. 159 ff., especially p. 181; *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, i (Cambridge, 1917), p. 12.

<sup>37</sup> Mark 2:27.

<sup>38</sup> Mark 2:25 f., referring to 1 Samuel 21:1 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Luke 13:14. Cf. TB 'Abodah *Zārāh*, 27b-28a.

<sup>40</sup> Luke 13:11; cf. A. R. Short, *Modern Discovery and the Bible* (London, 1943), p. 91.

<sup>41</sup> Luke 13:15 f.

<sup>42</sup> Deuteronomy 24:1. The provision for divorce is assumed, not laid down *de novo*; the whole sentence consists of Deuteronomy 24:1-4 (cf. RSV) and the substantive provision is laid down in verse 4.

<sup>43</sup> Mishnah *Gittin*, ix. 10; TB *Gittin*, 90a. 'If she spoils his dinner', said the school of Hillel; 'if he sees a woman fairer than she', said Aqiba.

<sup>44</sup> Mark 10:2 ff.

<sup>45</sup> Genesis 1:27 with 2:24. Genesis 1:27 is quoted with a similar rubric (*ʾsōd habbeʾrīʾāh*; cf. *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτισθεως* in Mark 10:6) in CD iv. 21, but there not to forbid divorce but to forbid bigamy. Genesis 2:24 is quoted as a divine utterance in Matthew 19:5.

<sup>46</sup> Mark 10:12 seems to contemplate the wife's initiation of divorce proceedings, but this may refer to Herodias, who as a Roman citizen could do so under Roman law (Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii. 136); cf. her grand-aunt Salome (Josephus, *Ant.*, xv. 259 ff.).

<sup>47</sup> D. S. Bailey, *The Man-Woman Relation in Christian Thought* (London, 1959), p. 10.

<sup>48</sup> *παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας* (Matthew 5:32); *μη ἐπι πορνεία* (Matthew 19:9).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. the force of *πορνεία* in the Jerusalem decree (Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25) and in 1 Corinthians 5:1, and the force of the corresponding Hebrew *z'nut* in CD iv. 20 (similarly the rabbis understood the *zōnāh* of Leviticus 21:7 of a woman who had contracted a union within forbidden degrees; cf. C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*<sup>2</sup> [Oxford, 1958], p. 17).

<sup>50</sup> On Jesus' procedure in delivering 'tradition' to his disciples for preservation and transmission see B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript* (Lund and Copenhagen, 1961); *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (Lund and Copenhagen, 1964). Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 237 ff., for the view that Jesus would have called one of his disciples *š'wilyi* ('my apprentice') rather than (like a rabbi) *talmīdī*.

<sup>51</sup> CD i. 11 f.

<sup>52</sup> 1QpHab. vii. 1-5, on Habakkuk 2:1 f.

<sup>53</sup> Jeremiah 25:11 f.; 29:10. Cf. the sixty-five years of Isaiah 7:8; the seventy years of Isaiah 23:15 ff.; the forty years of Ezekiel 29:11 ff.

<sup>54</sup> Daniel 9:2, 24 ff.

<sup>55</sup> Josephus, *Ant.*, x. 267.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen, 1953); O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen, 1960); F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (London, 1960).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. 4QpPs. 37, frag. 2, lines 1-4.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. 1QpHab. i. 12 f.

<sup>59</sup> Numbers 24:17, quoted in CD vii. 20; 1QM xi. 6; 4Q *Testimonia* 13.

<sup>60</sup> Isaiah 31:8, quoted in 1QM xi. 11 f.

<sup>61</sup> Habakkuk 1:6 ff., quoted in 1QpHab. ii. 11 ff.



- <sup>62</sup> Ezekiel 38:2 ff., mentioned in 1QM xi. 16.
- <sup>63</sup> 1QpMic., frags. 8-10.
- <sup>64</sup> CD iv. 19, viii. 12 f.
- <sup>65</sup> CD iv. 12. Compare the rabbinical depiction of teachers and scribes as builders in passages quoted by Strack-Billerbeck i, p. 876 (on Matthew 21:42).
- <sup>66</sup> CD vi. 3 ff.
- <sup>67</sup> W. Barclay, *The Making of the Bible* (London, 1961), p. 41.
- <sup>68</sup> S. T. Coleridge, *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*<sup>2</sup> (London, 1849), pp. 11, 13.
- <sup>69</sup> Tatian, *Address to the Greeks*, 29. Cf. Justin, *Dialogue* 8:1; Theophilus, *To Autolytus* i. 14. See E. Flesseman-van Leer, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, lxi (1964), p. 407 with n. 14 (art. cit. p. 88, n. 9 above).
- <sup>70</sup> 1 Peter 1:10 f.
- <sup>71</sup> Acts 2:16, introducing the quotation from Joel 2:28 ff. about the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit.
- <sup>72</sup> Matthew 13:16 f. and Luke 10:23 f.
- <sup>73</sup> Mark 4:11 f., quoting Isaiah 6:9 f.
- <sup>74</sup> Ephesians 3:4 f.; cf. Colossians 1:26 f.; Romans 16:25 f.
- <sup>75</sup> Matthew 1:23, etc.
- <sup>76</sup> Romans 9-11, *passim*; cf. 2 Corinthians 3:14 f.
- <sup>77</sup> E.g. Romans 10:5, 19; 11:9; 9:27; 9:25.
- <sup>78</sup> Cf. Philo, *passim*. An exception is Hebrews 3:7, 'saying through David', where it is of the essence of the argument that the words of Psalms 95:7 ff. were spoken 'so long after' the entry into Canaan under Joshua.
- <sup>79</sup> All three motifs are combined in John 1:14.
- <sup>80</sup> John 6:35 (cf. Psalm 78:24 f.); 4:10 ff. and 7:37 ff. (cf. Psalm 78:15 f., 20; 105:41; Ezekiel 47:1 ff.; Zechariah 14:8); 8:12 (cf. Psalm 56:13; 1QS iii. 7). These motifs, of course, were widespread in antiquity beyond the Old Testament. Cf. R. A. Henderson, *The Gospel of Fulfilment* (London, 1936); J. G. H. Hoffman, 'Le quatrième Évangile', *La Revue Réformée*, iii (1952), pp. 1 ff.; and pre-eminently C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge, 1953).
- <sup>81</sup> A. M. Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images* (London, 1949). The motif of the heavenly book, familiar in other settings (cf. G. Widengren, p. 211 below; also *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book* [Uppsala, 1950]), has its New Testament representation not surprisingly in the Apocalypse. This work is introduced by the words, 'the apocalypse of Jesus Christ which God gave to him' (Revelation 1:1), and we actually see God giving it to him in Revelation 5:7, in the form of the seven-sealed scroll of destiny. The fulfilment of the divine purpose written down there in advance (cf. the 'writing of truth' in Daniel 10:21) is launched by the unsealing of the scroll and divulging of its contents. Yet the rich pre-history of the Apocalypse is plain to read even on its surface.
- <sup>82</sup> E.g. the use of Isaiah 63:1 ff. in Revelation 19:11 ff.
- <sup>83</sup> C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London, 1952); T. W. Manson, 'The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus', *BjRL*, xxxiv (1951-2), pp. 312 ff. Manson finds that 'our Lord's treatment of the Old Testament

is based on two things: a profound understanding of the essential teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures and a sure judgment of his own contemporary situation,' thus providing 'the standard and pattern for our own exegesis of the Old Testament and the New' (p. 332).

<sup>84</sup> F. F. Bruce, 'The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative', *BjRL*, xliii (1960-1), pp. 336 ff.

<sup>85</sup> Zechariah 9:9, quoted Matthew 21:5; John 12:15; cf. Mark 11:1 ff.; Luke 19:29 ff.

<sup>86</sup> Mark 14:27.

<sup>87</sup> C. H. Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New* (London, 1952), p. 8; cf. *According to the Scriptures*, p. 57 ('it is more probable that both writers were guided by a tradition in which this psalm was already referred to Christ'). Cf. further quotations from Psalm 69 in Matthew 27:34; Mark 15:36 (with John 19:28); John 15:25; Acts 1:20.

<sup>88</sup> J. R. Harris, *Testimonies*, i (Cambridge, 1916), ii (Cambridge, 1920). On this subject see also B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London, 1961).

<sup>89</sup> The rabbinical principle of *g<sup>e</sup>zērah sāwāh*.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Mark 12:10 f. and more particularly its parallel Luke 20:17 f.; Acts 4:11; Romans 9:32 f.; 1 Peter 2:6 ff.

<sup>91</sup> E.g. in Hebrews 2:5 ff.; also in 1 Corinthians 15:25 ff.; Ephesians 1:22; 1 Peter 3:22.

<sup>92</sup> E.g. Psalms 2 (Luke 3:22 D; Acts 13:33; Hebrews 1:5; 5:5, and, in an extended application, Revelation 2:26 f., etc.) and 110 (Mark 12:35 ff.; 14:62; Acts 2:34 f.; Hebrews 1:13; 5:6, etc.).

<sup>93</sup> Psalms 22:1, quoted in Mark 15:34; cf. an extended application of the psalm in Hebrews 2:12.

<sup>94</sup> So too in a 'messianic' psalm the enemies of Yahweh and his Anointed are interpreted as the enemies of Jesus; cf. Acts 4:25 ff., where the nations, the peoples, the kings and the rulers of Psalms 2:1 are identified with 'Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel' (cf. also Tertullian, *de resurr. carn.* 20).

<sup>95</sup> John 13:18 (cf. John 17:12, 'that the scripture might be fulfilled'; and Matthew 27:9 f. for Zechariah 11:12 f. as a *Judas testimonium*).

<sup>96</sup> Cf. editions by R. Priebsch (Heidelberg, 1936) and F. P. Pickering (Manchester, 1952). An example is the expansion as a historical incident in Jesus' arrest of Isaiah 50:6, 'I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to those who pulled out the beard' (ed. Pickering, pp. 65 f.); this passage in the third Isaianic Servant Song, incidentally, may have provided scriptural support for the figure of the bearded Christ discussed in Professor Brandon's article, p. 10 above. See also F. P. Pickering, *Literatur und darstellende Kunst im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1966), especially the section on 'Christi Kreuzigung' (pp. 146 ff.).

<sup>97</sup> G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics* (London, 1954), p. 195 ('its whole contents', says Prestige, 'are permeated with the spirit and language of Bernard's exposition of the Song of Songs'). Chapter 1 of Prestige's book, entitled 'Tradition: or, The Scriptural Basis of Theology', is germane to our general theme.

<sup>98</sup> E.g., although the last clause of Psalm 22:16, which RSV (following

LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate, and the earlier English versions) translates 'they have pierced my hands and feet', is not quoted in the New Testament as a *testimonium* of the crucifixion of Christ, this rendering lends itself so compellingly to such use that any deviation from it (as in *The Jerusalem Bible*, 'they tie me hand and foot') is bound to arouse misgivings.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. J. R. Harris, 'Jesus and the Exodus', *Testimonies*, ii (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 51 ff.; E. Käsemann, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk* (Göttingen, 1938); H. Sahlin, 'The New Exodus of Salvation according to S. Paul', in A. Fridrichsen *et al.*, *The Root of the Vine* (London, 1953), pp. 81 ff.; J. Daniélou, *From Shadow to Reality* (Eng. trans., London, 1960); S. H. Hooke, *Alpha and Omega* (London, 1961), *passim*; R. E. Nixon, *The Exodus in the New Testament* (London, 1963); D. Daube, *The Exodus Pattern in the Bible* (London, 1963); H. H. Rowley, 'The Authority of the Bible', *From Moses to Qumran* (London, 1963), pp. 3 ff. The Exodus pattern had been used already in the history of Israel as a mode of portraying the return from the Babylonian exile, especially in Isaiah 40-55.

<sup>100</sup> So MT; LXX renders differently, 'Not an ambassador, nor a messenger, but he himself saved them' (this wording has echoes in later Jewish literature as also in the language of Christian confession; see p. 196 below). The LXX reading presupposes Hebrew *lô šîr* ('not a messenger') as against MT *lô šar* (lit. 'to him affliction').

<sup>101</sup> Matthew 2:15.

<sup>102</sup> Or we may compare the reference to Jesus' death as his 'exodus' in Luke 9:31.

<sup>103</sup> I Corinthians 5:7.

<sup>104</sup> I Peter 1:19. Cf. Melito, *Paschal Homily*, especially § 69.

<sup>105</sup> I Corinthians 10:2.

<sup>106</sup> Neil Macmichael, *apud* J. Macleod, *Scottish Theology* (Edinburgh, 1945), pp. 253 f.

<sup>107</sup> Galatians 3:27, etc.

<sup>108</sup> I Corinthians 10:3 f.

<sup>109</sup> I Corinthians 10:16.

<sup>110</sup> I Corinthians 10:5 ff.

<sup>111</sup> Hebrews 3:12 in the context of 3:7-4:11, where the words of Psalm 95:7-11 are applied to the current situation.

<sup>112</sup> A. T. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament* (London, 1965), p. 7 *et passim*.

<sup>113</sup> I Corinthians 10:4. A halfway stage towards Paul's statement that 'the Rock was Christ' may have been the identification of the rock with divine wisdom, attested in Philo, *The Worse attacks the Better*, 115 (cf. Wisdom 11:4).

<sup>114</sup> The latest edition of *The Greek New Testament*, edited by K. Aland, M. Black, B. M. Metzger and A. Wikgren (Stuttgart, 1966), commendably prints 'Ἰησοῦς' in the text. But see M. Black, 'Critical and Exegetical Notes on Three New Testament Texts', in *Aphophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* (Berlin, 1964), pp. 39 ff., especially pp. 44 f.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Barnabas 6:8 f.; Justin, *Dialogue*, 113, 132; see J. R. Harris, *Testimonies*, ii (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 51 ff.

<sup>116</sup> Exodus 13:21.

<sup>117</sup> Exodus 14:30.

<sup>118</sup> Exodus 15:26 (for the use of 'The LORD thy healer' in Judaism cf. Mishnah *Sanhedrin* x. 1).

<sup>119</sup> Exodus 14:19; 23:20 ff.; 32:34; 33:2, 14 ff. Cf. Justin's exegesis of 'my name is in him' (Exodus 23:21) in *Dialogue* 75.

<sup>120</sup> Acts 7:30.

<sup>121</sup> Acts 7:38.

<sup>122</sup> *First Apology* 63.

<sup>123</sup> *Dialogue* 59 f.

<sup>124</sup> *First Apology* 63:11; *Dialogue* 60:2, 3.

<sup>125</sup> *First Apology* 63:12.

<sup>126</sup> *First Apology* 63:5.

<sup>127</sup> Mark 12:26; Matthew 22:32; Luke 20:37. Justin quotes Luke 20:35 f. in *Dialogue* 81:4.

<sup>128</sup> *Dialogue* 60:1.

<sup>129</sup> Where their received texts of Scripture diverged, as in the famous question of the insertion or omission of ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου in Psalm 96:10 (LXX 95:10), Trypho's was the more accurate (*Dialogue* 41:73).

<sup>130</sup> *Dialogue* 56:6 ff. (on Genesis 18:9 ff.).

<sup>131</sup> *Dialogue* 56:18 ff. (on Genesis 19:1 ff.).

<sup>132</sup> *Dialogue* 58 (on Genesis 31:10 ff.; 32:22 ff.; 35:6 ff.; 28:10 ff.).

<sup>133</sup> *Dialogue* 62:4 f. (on Joshua 5:14).

<sup>134</sup> See Professor Simon's reference to the removal of the Decalogue from the daily liturgy (p. 110). We may instance also the Jewish rejection of the Septuagint (e.g. *Sopherim*, i. 8 f.) or the shocked surprise of Aqiba's hearers when he appeared still to accept the messianic identification of the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7:13 (TB *Hagigah* 14a, *Sanhedrin* 38b).

<sup>135</sup> A good example of this cooperation is *The Anchor Bible*, edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Doubleday, New York). The validity of the christological *sensus plenior* in the church is something which elsewhere I have already defended and hope to defend more fully, but to be valid it must be based on grammatico-historical exegesis of the text. Cf. p. 181 below; also H. Cunliffe-Jones, *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation* (London, 1945), pp. 93 f.