

E

EARLY CHURCH INTERPRETATION

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Jesus
- 3 The earliest believers
- 4 Paul
- 5 The evangelists
- 6 Hebrews
- 7 General Epistles and Apocalypse

1 Introduction

The study of the interpretation of the Bible in the New Testament is a vitally important one. Historically, differences between Judaism and Christianity can, in large measure, be traced back to and understood in light of their differing exegetical presuppositions and practices. And personally, it is of great importance to appreciate something of how the Bible was interpreted during the apostolic period of the church, and to ask regarding the significance of these interpretations and understandings for one's own convictions, exegesis, and life today.

The study is complicated by a paucity of primary materials in certain areas of importance and frustrated by uncertainties as to the exact nature of the biblical text in its various recensions during the early Christian centuries. It is also, sadly, often bedeviled by (a) the imposition of modern categories and expectations on the ancient texts, (b) desires to work out a monolithic understanding of early Christian interpretation, such as would minimize or discount variations in our sources, and (c) attempts to develop a strictly inner-biblical type of exegesis, such as would ignore or discredit comparisons with the exegetical conventions and practices of the Graeco-Roman world generally and Second Temple Judaism in particular.

2 Jesus

The New Testament reflects an original and highly creative treatment of the Jewish scriptures. It is an approach that bases itself on a Jewish understanding of God, builds on a Jewish appreciation of God's desire for the redemption of humanity, and parallels in many ways

the exegetical principles and procedures of Second Temple Judaism. But it is also an approach that evidences a distinctive outlook, a different selection of passages, a creative exegesis, and a unique interpretation. Dodd concluded in words that cannot be improved on: 'To account for the beginning of this most original and fruitful process of rethinking the Old Testament we found need to postulate a creative mind. The Gospels offer us one [i.e., Jesus of Nazareth]. Are we compelled to reject the offer?' (Dodd 1963: 110). It is necessary, therefore, to begin our study of the interpretation of the Bible in the New Testament with Jesus' use of scripture.

2.1 Literal and midrash interpretation

A number of times Jesus is portrayed in the Gospels as interpreting scripture in a quite straightforward, literal manner, particularly when dealing with matters related to basic religious and moral values. For example, in answer to a scribe who asked regarding the greatest of the commandments he quoted Deuteronomy 6:4-5 (the first words of the *Shema*): 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And you shall love the Lord your God with your whole heart, and with your whole soul, and with your whole mind, and with your whole strength' (Mark 12:29-30; Matt. 22:37; Luke 10:27). Then, lest it be thought that God's commandments apply only to a person's vertical relationship and not also to his or her attitudes and actions on the horizontal level, he went on to quote Leviticus 19:18: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself' (Mark 12:31; Matt. 22:39; Luke 10:27).

Likewise in his teachings on human relationships, Jesus is represented as using scripture in a straightforward manner, with only minor variations in the texts cited. For example, on settling disputes between brothers, he advised that the wronged party confront the other in the presence of one or two others, for, quoting Deuteronomy 19:15, 'by the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established' (Matt. 18:16).

2.2 Peshet interpretation

But while the evangelists record a number of rather literal treatments of scripture on the part of Jesus (as well, it must be noted, as the use of then current midrash syllogisms in outclassing his opponents on their own

grounds) his most characteristic is portrayed in the Gospels as 'Peshet' interpretation. Peshet interprets the current situation in a 'this' departure is the present situation, relates to and finds justification in that text ('that') — (in contrast to midrash which starts with the biblical text and spells out that text's relevance to the present situation ('this')). Peshet interpretation of scripture with a present midrash exegesis ('that approach') is a revelatory stance and is evident in showing how the current situation is supported by the ancient scriptures.

According to Luke's Gospel, Jesus interpreted the scriptures in terms of his ministry. In Luke 4:16-20, Jesus reads the scroll of Isaiah at Nazareth and is told to sit down. He unrolls the scroll, hands it to the attendant, and then proclaims, 'This is fulfilled in your ears.' In John 8:12-18, Jesus' filial relationship with the Pharisees in John 8:12-18 is with a rebuke of his opponents who proceed to give an unfavorable interpretation and interpretations, and you believed Moses you do not believe me? If we believe he wrote of me.' If we believe he would be possible to believe who inaugurated for his first standing scripture in terms of peshet type of hermeneutic.

The following instances of the peshet theme and a peshet however, should also be noted.

(1) Mark 12:10-11; where Jesus concludes his parable of the vineyard (12:1-11) with a rebuke of the people's quotation of Psalm 118:22-23.

(2) Mark 14:27; Mark 14:27-29; Last Supper he quotes Zechariah 13:7 and approaching death and then the citation is introduced by 'as it is written,' and its use by Jesus and his disciples in Matthew 27:46.

(3) Matthew 11:10; where Jesus applies the prophecy of Isaiah 40:3 to John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel to the texts, 'This is the one typical peshet introduction.

(4) Matthew 13:14-15; 6:9-10 in explanation of the Lord's Prayer.

(5) Matthew 15:8-9.

grounds) his most characteristic use of scripture is portrayed in the Gospels as being a 'pesher' type of interpretation. Pesher interpretation applies scripture to the current situation in a 'this is that' manner. Its point of departure is the present situation ('this'), which it then relates to and finds justification for in a particular biblical text ('that') — (in contrast to 'midrash' interpretation, which starts with the biblical text ('that') and seeks to spell out that text's relevance for the present situation ('this')). Pesher interpretation is not just a commentary on scripture with a present-day application, as found in midrash exegesis ('that applies to this'). Rather, it assumes a revelatory stance and highlights eschatological fulfilment in showing how the present situation is foretold and supported by the ancient biblical text ('this is that').

According to Luke's Gospel, Jesus began to expound the scriptures in terms of a fulfilment theme very early in his ministry. In Luke 4:16–21 he enters the synagogue at Nazareth and is called on to read the lesson from the prophet Isaiah. He reads Isaiah 61:1–2, rolls up the scroll, hands it to the attendant, sits down to speak, and then proclaims: 'Today this scripture is fulfilled in your ears.' In John's Gospel the theme of fulfilment is just as explicitly stated in Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees in John 5:39–47. The passage begins with a rebuke of his opponents' false confidence, proceeds to give an unfavorable verdict on their attitudes and interpretations, and climaxes in the assertion: 'If you believed Moses you would have believed me, for he wrote of me.' If we had only these two passages, it would be possible to claim that it was Jesus himself who inaugurated for his followers the impetus for understanding scripture in terms of a fulfilment theme and a pesher type of hermeneutic.

The following instances of Jesus' use of the fulfilment theme and a pesher approach to scripture, however, should also be noted:

(1) Mark 12:10–11; Matthew 21:42; Luke 20:17, where Jesus concludes his allusion to the well-known parable of the vineyard (Isa. 5:1–7) and his not-so-veiled rebuke of the people's rejection of the son with the quotation of Psalm 118:22–23.

(2) Mark 14:27; Matthew 26:31, where after the Last Supper he quotes Zechariah 13:7 in regard to his approaching death and the disciples' reactions. The citation is introduced by Jesus with the formula 'it is written,' and its use by him with reference to the desertion of his disciples invokes a 'this is that' pesher motif.

(3) Matthew 11:10; Luke 7:27 (cf. Mark 1:2–3), where Jesus applies the conflated texts of Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3 to John the Baptist. The formula used in Matthew's Gospel to introduce these Old Testament texts, 'This is the one about whom it is written,' is a typical pesher introductory formula.

(4) Matthew 13:14–15, where Jesus quotes Isaiah 69:9–10 in explanation of his use of parables.

(5) Matthew 15:8–9, where he paraphrases Isaiah

29:13 (possibly also collating Psalm 78:36–37) in rebuke of the scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem.

(6) Luke 22:3, where Jesus applies the clause 'he was numbered among the transgressors' from Isaiah 53:12 directly to himself.

(7) John 6:45, where he alludes to the message of Isaiah 54:13 and Jeremiah 31:33, making the point that the words 'and they shall be taught of God,' as the prophets' message may be rather freely rendered, apply to his teaching and his ministry in particular.

(8) John 13:18, where he applies the lament of David in Psalm 41:9 (LXX 40:10) to his betrayal by Judas.

(9) John 15:25, where the lament of Psalms 35:19 and 69:4, 'hated without a cause,' is applied by Jesus to his own person and introduced by the statement 'in order that the word that is written in their law might be fulfilled.'

Jesus is also recorded as pointing out typological correspondences between earlier events in redemptive history and various circumstances connected with his own person and ministry. We have already referred to his application of the laments of Psalms 35:19, 41:9, and 69:4 to his own situation. In three other instances, as well, he is portrayed as invoking a typological or correspondence-in-history theme and applying the incident to himself in pesher fashion: (a) in Matthew 12:40, paralleling the experience of Jonah and that of his own approaching death and entombment; (b) in Matthew 24:37, drawing a relationship between the days of Noah and the days of 'the coming of the Son of man'; and (c) in John 3:14, connecting the 'lifting up' of the brass serpent in the wilderness to his own approaching crucifixion. Jesus seems to have viewed these Old Testament events not just as analogies that could be used for purposes of illustration, but as typological occurrences that pointed forward to their fulfilment in his own person and ministry.

3 The earliest believers

Luke 24:27 recounts that in appearing to two from Emmaus, Jesus 'interpreted to them in all the Scriptures, beginning from Moses and the prophets, the things concerning himself.' Luke 24:45 says that he later met with his disciples and 'opened their minds that they might understand the Scriptures.' And Acts 1:3 tells of Jesus teaching his disciples 'things concerning the kingdom of God' during a forty-day postresurrection ministry. These verses, of course, together with a postresurrection ministry generally, are highly suspect in contemporary studies, due to modern theology's denial of Jesus' physical resurrection and therefore a denial of his postresurrection ministry. At the very least, however, it must be said that in these passages Luke is relating what he believed to be the rationale for the distinctive use of scripture by the earliest believers in Jesus, whether it originated in this specific period or not.

The analogy of the exegetical practices at Qumran is probably pertinent here. For, it seems, the members of the Dead Sea community both passively retained their teacher's interpretations of certain biblical portions and actively continued to study the Old Testament along lines stemming from him — either as directly laid out by him or as deduced from his practice. Likewise, the earliest believers in Jesus continued their study of the scriptures not only under the guidance of the Holy Spirit but also according to the paradigm set by Jesus in his own interpretations and exegetical practices.

3.1 Literal and midrash interpretation

A literal mode of biblical interpretation appears in the accounts of the earliest believers' use of scripture in the Acts of the Apostles. Peter, for example, is portrayed in Acts 3:15 as citing the covenant promise to Abraham quite literally, acknowledging that his hearers gathered in the temple precincts were 'children of the prophets and of the covenant that God made with our fathers' (cf. Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 22:18). All the citations and allusions of Stephen in his detailed tracing of Israel's history in Acts 7 — specifically in verses 3 (cf. Gen. 12:1), 6–7a (cf. 15:13–14), 7b (cf. Exod. 3:12), 27–28 (cf. Exod. 2:14), 32 (cf. Exod. 3:6), 33–34 (Exod. 3:5, 7–10), 42–43 (Amos 5:25–27), and 49–50 (Isa. 66:1) — adhere closely to the plain meaning of the biblical text. Even Stephen's use in Acts 7:37 of Deuteronomy 18:15 ('The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me [Moses] from among your own brothers. You must listen to him!'), which by implication is applied to Jesus, is a straightforward treatment of a prophecy that was widely seen within Second Temple Judaism to have direct reference to the coming Messiah.

Likewise, a midrash treatment of scripture by the earliest believers is depicted at many places in the Acts of the Apostles. The exegetical rule *qal wa-homer* ('light to heavy'), for example, underlies the use of Psalms 69:25 [MT = 69:26] and 109:8, thereby allowing Peter in Acts 1:20 to assert that what has been said of false companions and wicked men generally applies, *a minore ad maiorem*, specifically to Judas, the one who proved himself uniquely false and evil. Similarly, in Peter's Pentecost sermon Psalms 16:8–11 and 110:1 are brought together in Acts 2:25–28 and 34–35 in support of the resurrection on the hermeneutical principle *gezera shava* ('analogy'), since both passages contain the expression 'at my right hand' and so are to be treated together.

3.2 Peshet interpretation

But what appears to be most characteristic in the preaching of the earliest Jewish believers in Jesus are their peshet interpretations of scripture. Addressing those gathered in the temple courts, Peter is portrayed in Acts 3:24 as affirming that 'all the prophets from Samuel on, as many as have spoken, have foretold these days.' Such a view of prophetic activity, particularly when coupled

with concepts of corporate solidarity and typological correspondences in history, opens up all of the biblical message and all of biblical history to a Christocentric interpretation. Taking such a stance, all that remained for the earliest believers in Jesus was to identify those biblical portions considered pertinent to the messianic age (at least as they understood it) and to explicate them in accordance with the tradition and principles of Christ.

In the majority of the cases of Peter's preaching recorded in Acts, a 'this is that' peshet motif and a fulfilment theme come to the fore, as can be seen in the following examples:

(1) The application of Joel 2:28–32 (MT = 3:1–5) to the Pentecost outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2:17–21, stating explicitly that 'this is that spoken by the prophet Joel.' The feature of fulfilment is heightened by Peter's alteration of 'afterwards,' as found in both the MT and LXX, to 'in the last days, says God,' and by his breaking into the quotation to emphasize the fact of the restoration of prophecy with the statement 'and they shall prophesy.'

(2) The 'stone' citation of Acts 4:11, quoting Psalm 118:22 and introducing the passage in Acts by the words 'this is the stone.' The midrashic bringing together in 1 Peter 2:6–8 of Isaiah 28:16, Psalm 118:22, and Isaiah 8:14 — all of which passages have to do with a prophesied 'stone' — appears to be a later development.

(3) The statements applied to Judas in Acts 1:20, which are taken from Psalms 69:25 (MT = 69:26) and 109:8. While there is here the use of Hillel's first exegetical rule *qal wa-homer* ('what applies in a less important case will certainly apply in a more important case'), thereby applying what is said in the Psalms about the unrighteous generally to the betrayer of the Messiah specifically, the aspect of fulfilment, as based on typological correspondences in history, gives the treatment a peshet flavor as well.

(4) The application of Psalms 16:8–11 and 110:1 to the resurrection and ascension of Jesus in Acts 2:25–36. While a midrashic understanding has brought the two passages together, it is a peshet understanding that evokes such an introduction as 'David said concerning him [the Christ]' and applies the passages directly to Jesus.

3.3 Summation

Many other examples could be cited of the earliest believers' use of scripture, as drawn from their preaching (cf. Longenecker 1975, 1999a: chs 3 and 7) and their confessions (cf. Longenecker 1999b: chs 2–5). But from these few examples it seems evident that (a) the earliest believers blended and interwove literal, midrash, and peshet modes of treatment into their interpretations of scripture, together with the application of then generally accepted prophecy, and (b) they interpreted the scriptures from a Christocentric perspective, in conformity with the exegetical teaching and example of Jesus,

and along Christological lines the interplay of Jewish pre- on the one hand, and Christ- spectives, on the other, with interpretation of the Old Test

4 Paul

Having been trained as a Pharisee in Judaism of his day many of the traditional conventions and procedures fronted by the risen Christ. Paul he came to share with the other and believers in Jesus their understanding of the Old Testament. Paul worked exegetically with Old Testament passages as did Dodd (1952: esp. 23). Yet with agreement between Paul and there also appear discernible differences in matters of exegetical approach.

The earliest believers, following exegetical procedures of their day placed the revelation of God in their *idem Text*, so that both stood in a treatment of the Old Testament not quite such a simple juxtaposition more nuanced exposition of the text in a larger context of Christology than both the earliest believers in Jesus and newly formed Christian thinkers. Their conviction about the Messiah and exegesis of the Old Testament was somewhat different. For when he began with the proclamation of Nazareth and then to relate to understanding in peshet fashion. In fact, Paul in his major letters used biblical text itself and then sought explication to demonstrate Christ.

As C.H. Dodd long ago pointed out, the main tries to start from an understanding of the text just as it stands in its own right. Likewise, as W.F. Albright once noted, rabbinic hermeneutics with their contrast and applying that contrast to Paul vis-à-vis what appears in the use of scripture and at many points in the interpretation of the Old Testament hermeneutics of the Mishnah. A different type of interpretative commentaries on the books of the Old Testament (51). So while the exegesis of the earliest believers and teachers — even Paul — had its closest parallels in Jewish exegetical conventions of the cove-

and along Christological lines. In their exegesis there is the interplay of Jewish presuppositions and practices, on the one hand, and Christian commitments and perspectives, on the other, which produced a distinctive interpretation of the Old Testament.

4 Paul

Having been trained as a Pharisee, Paul shared with the Judaism of his day many of the then current hermeneutical conventions and procedures. But having been confronted by the risen Christ on his way to Damascus, he came to share with the earliest Christian apostles and believers in Jesus their distinctive Christocentric understanding of the Old Testament. Furthermore, Paul worked exegetically from many of the same Old Testament passages as did the earliest believers (cf. Dodd 1952: esp. 23). Yet while there are broad areas of agreement between Paul and other believers in Jesus, there also appear discernible differences between them in matters of exegetical approach and practice.

The earliest believers, following the teaching and exegetical procedures of their Master, seem to have placed the revelation of God in Jesus the Messiah '*neben dem Text*,' so that both stood starkly side-by-side. Paul's treatment of the Old Testament, however, evidences not quite such a simple juxtaposition, but, rather, a more nuanced exposition of the Jewish scriptures within a larger context of Christological awareness. Of course, both the earliest believers in Jesus and Paul began their newly formed Christian thinking with a deep-seated conviction about the Messiahship of Jesus. But in their exegesis of the Old Testament they seem to have been somewhat different. For whereas the earliest believers began with the proclamation of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth and then to relate this new Christological understanding in pesher fashion to their traditional scriptures, Paul in his major letters usually begins with the biblical text itself and then seeks by means of a midrashic explication to demonstrate Christological significance.

As C.H. Dodd long ago pointed out: 'Paul in the main tries to start from an understanding of the biblical text just as it stands in its context' (Dodd 1952: 23). Likewise, as W.F. Albright once observed — contrasting rabbinic hermeneutics with that of the Qumran covenanters and applying that contrast to the hermeneutics of Paul vis-à-vis what appears in the portrayals of Jesus' use of scripture and at many places elsewhere in writings of other New Testament authors: 'St. Paul's interpretation of the Old Testament follows the Greek hermeneutics of the Mishnah rather than the quite different type of interpretation found in the *Essenes* commentaries on the books of the Bible' (Albright 1966: 31). So while the exegesis of the earliest Christian believers and teachers — even, indeed, of Jesus himself — had its closest parallels known to date with the exegetical conventions of the covenanters at Qumran, as found

in the Dead Sea Scrolls, it needs to be noted that Paul's treatment of the biblical texts is more closely related to the hermeneutics of early Pharisaism, as later incorporated into the Jewish Talmud in more codified form.

4.1 Frequency and distribution of the quotations

At least eighty-three biblical quotations appear in Paul's letters — with that number growing to approximately 100 if one disengages conflated texts and possible dual sources, treating each separately. Allusive use of biblical language is also found in all Paul's letters, except Philemon. The Old Testament, as Earle Ellis observes, was for the apostle 'not only the Word of God but also his mode of thought and speech' (Ellis 1957: 10), and so parallels of language are inevitable.

What particularly needs to be noted with respect to the distribution of Paul's biblical quotations, however, is that they are limited to only certain letters — (that is, they appear in Romans (45 times), 1 Corinthians (15 times), 2 Corinthians (7 times), and Galatians (10 times), with six other appearances in Ephesians (4 times), 1 Timothy (once), and 2 Timothy (once), but not in 1 & 2 Thessalonians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, or Titus. This phenomenon of distribution, as Adolf Harnack long ago observed, should probably be understood circumstantially (cf. Harnack 1928: 124–41). For the letters to believers at Rome, Corinth, and Galatia may be understood to involve, in one way or another, addressees who had some type of Jewish heritage or were influenced by some type of Jewish teaching. Even 1 & 2 Timothy, if 'Timothy' is the young man of Lystra referred to in Acts 16:1–3, and Ephesians, if it can be postulated that 'Ephesians' was originally intended for a wider audience than believers at Ephesus, could be so considered. But the letters written to the churches at Thessalonica, Philippi, and Colosse, as well as those to Philemon and Titus, were addressed, as far as we know, to believers who were relatively uninformed regarding the Old Testament and relatively unaffected by Jewish teaching or a Judaistic polemic. And in his pastoral correspondence with these latter churches and individuals, Paul, it seems, attempted to meet them on their own ideological grounds, without buttressing his arguments by appeals to scripture.

4.2 Literal and midrash interpretation

There is in Paul's use of scripture a great many rather straightforward, even literalistic, treatments of the ancient biblical texts, such as would be common to any reverential or respectful treatment of the Bible, whether Jewish or Christian, and such as would require comment only if they were absent or spoken against. He agrees, for example, with the psalmist that God is true, just, and prevailing in his judgments (Rom. 3:4, citing Ps. 51:4). He quotes the fifth through the tenth commandments as applying to various ethical situations

EARLY CHURCH INTERPRETATION

(Rom. 7:7; 13:9; Eph. 6:2–3, citing Exod. 20:12–17; Deut. 5:16–21), and asserts that whatever has been left untouched in the sphere of human relations by these divine principles is covered by the précis of Leviticus 19:18: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself' (Rom. 13:9; Gal. 5:14). For further examples see Romans 4:17–18; 9:7–9; 1 Corinthians 6:16; 2 Corinthians 13:1; Galatians 3:8, 16; and Ephesians 5:31.

More particularly, the seven exegetical rules (*middot*) attributed by tradition to Hillel, which seem to have been widely practiced by first-century rabbis, underlie Paul's use of scripture at a number of places in his letters. Rule one, *qal wa-homer*, is expressed, for example, in the argument of Romans 5:15–21: If death is universal through one man's disobedience and sin has reigned as a result of that one man's act of transgression (citing the Genesis story of Adam), 'much more' will God's grace and the gift of grace 'supremely abound' and 'reign to life eternal' by Jesus Christ.

It also undergirds Paul's contrasts between the fall and the fullness of Israel in Romans 11:12 and between 'the ministry of death and condemnation' and 'the ministry of the Spirit and righteousness' in 2 Corinthians 3:7–18. The apostle can even reverse the procedure and – in demonstration of his thorough familiarity with this first exegetical principle – argue *a maiori ad minus* in such passages as Romans 5:6–9, 5:10, 8:32, 11:24, and 1 Corinthians 6:2–3.

Hillel's second rule, *gezera shawa* ('analogy'), is abundantly illustrated by Paul's frequently recurring practice of 'pearl stringing' – that is, of bringing to bear on one point of an argument passages from various parts of the Bible in support of the argument. This is most obviously done in Romans 3:10–18, 9:12–29, 10:18–21, 11:8–10, 15:9–12, and Galatians 3:10–13, but it appears as well in Romans 4:1–8, 9:33, 12:19–20, 1 Corinthians 15:54–55, and 2 Corinthians 6:16–18. Hillel's fifth rule, *kelaq upherat* ('general and particular'), can be seen in the apostle's discussion of love in action in Romans 13:8–10. For after itemizing the last five of the ten commandments, he goes on to say: 'If there is any other commandment, it is summed up in this word: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself"' (v. 9, citing Lev. 19:18; cf. Gal. 5:14).

Rule six, *kayyoga bo bemaqom 'alzer* ('as found in another place'), expresses itself in Paul's argument of Galatians 3:8–9 regarding the nature of God's promise to Abraham. Quoting Genesis 12:3, he speaks of Abraham as the immediate recipient of God's promise and of 'all nations' as the ultimate beneficiaries. But by bringing Genesis 22:18 into the discussion, a passage generally similar to the first, he is able to highlight the point that both Abraham and his 'seed' were in view in the divine promise. Rule seven, *dabar halamed me'inyano* ('context'), is probably most aptly illustrated by Paul's observations in Romans 4:10–11 that Abraham was accounted righteous before he was circumcised. It appears also in Galatians

3:17, where Paul lays stress on the fact that the promise made to Abraham was confirmed by God 430 years before the giving of the Mosaic law.

Midrash exegesis characterizes the apostle's hermeneutical procedures more than any other. Indeed, when he speaks to a Judaizing problem or to issues having Jewish nuances, he sometimes uses midrashic exegesis in an *ad hominem* fashion, as he does particularly in Galatians 3:6–14. But even apart from the catalyst of Jewish polemics, Paul's basic thought patterns and interpretive procedures were those of first-century Pharisaism. The dictum of Joachim Jeremias regarding the apostle's biblical interpretation is, it seems, fully justified: 'Paulus Hillelit war' (Jeremias 1969: 89).

4.3 Allegorical and peshet interpretation

In two passages, however, Paul goes beyond both literal and midrashic exegesis and interprets the Old Testament allegorically – that is, elaborating a secondary and hidden meaning that is claimed to underlie the primary and obvious meaning of a historical narrative. In 1 Corinthians 9:9–10 he goes beyond the primary meaning of the injunction in Deuteronomy 25:4, 'You shall not muzzle the ox that thrashes,' to insist that these words were written for a reason not obvious in the passage itself: 'Is it about oxen that God is concerned? Surely he says this for us, doesn't he? Yes, this was written for us!' And in Galatians 4:21–31 he goes beyond the account of relations between Hagar and Sarah in Genesis 21:8–21 when he argues that 'these things may be taken allegorically, for the women represent two covenants,' (v. 24), and so goes on to spell out symbolic meanings that are seen to be contained in the historical account.

But allegorical exegesis, while prominent in the writings of Philo of Alexandria, was also present in milder forms in all the known branches of Judaism during the first Christian century (cf. Longenecker 1975: 45–8; 1999a: 30–3). And in 1 Corinthians 9:9–10 and Galatians 4:21–31 Paul reflects something of this general Jewish background. More particularly, however, it needs to be noted that while 1 Corinthians 9:9–10 displays an allegorical exegesis such as was undoubtedly part-and-parcel of Paul's own exegetical equipment, Galatians 4:21–31 is probably to be seen as an extreme form of allegorical interpretation that was triggered by polemical debate with the teaching of the Judaizers in Paul's Galatian churches – and so is largely *ad hominem* in nature.

But is there any evidence of a peshet treatment of the Old Testament by Paul? Some have argued that textual deviations in Paul's biblical quotations signal a peshet treatment. But peshet interpretation is wrongly understood if it is defined only on the basis of its textual variations, for rabbinic midrash differs only quantitatively and not qualitatively from peshet at this point.

Others have suggested that the 'this is that' fulfilment motif, which is a feature of peshet interpretation,

can readily be found in Paul's writing. In 2 Corinthians 6:2, where he speaks of 'the time of our salvation' and 'the day of salvation' (v. 2), and in 1 Corinthians 10:4, where he speaks of 'the fullness of time' (v. 4), are present with us 'now' (v. 2). In Galatians 4:4, where he speaks of 'the fullness of time' (v. 4), and in God's sending of his Son. But in addressing those gathered in the city of Pisidia, is Paul represented as the fulfilment theme. And that is to a Jewish audience. Paul's habit, it seems, was not to attempt to fulfilment in any explicit way, perhaps, when such a theme was present in his quotation of an early Christian text. To have been the case in Galatians 4:4, a procedure carried little weight. Paul is accustomed to thinking in terms of fulfilment, unschooled in the Old Testament.

What is significant with respect to Paul's interpretation, however, is his use of a feature of the prophetic message that has been made known by the 'understanding' – or, to use the phrase from the Dead Sea Scrolls, 'the revelation' (v. 4) – become known through a 'peshet' (v. 4). Paul uses 'mystery' (v. 4) twenty times in his letters, and in Galatians 1:11–12, but in three instances in his letters it is to be definitely involving him in the understanding of the unfolding of revelation.

(1) In the doxology of Romans 16:25–27, he identifies 'my gospel' as being 'hidden' (v. 25). Christ according to the revelation was kept secret for long ages, but now, through the prophetic writings, is revealed to the nations.

(2) In Colossians 1:26–27, 'mystery hidden for ages and now made manifest to his saints.'

(3) And in Ephesians 3:3–6, 'the mystery' that was 'made manifest to his saints,' but 'which was not made manifest to other generations as it has now been made manifest to the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, who have hidden for ages in God what he planned for his church.'

Paul could not claim the 'this is that' fulfilment motif as expressed in John 15:17. His understanding of the Old Testament is to be directly related to the teaching of historic Jesus, as was that of many of the earliest believers dependent on the early church tradition, as his letters frankly indicate. He is confronted by the exalted Lord, an apostle by Jesus himself, and has been given the key to the pattern of the present age – that is, the

the fact that the promise
ed by God 430 years
aw.

the apostle's hermeneu-
y other. Indeed, when
m or to issues having
ises midrashic exegesis
e does particularly in
t from the catalyst of
thought patterns and
those of first-century
im Jeremias regarding
ion is, it seems, fully
eremias 1969: 89).

Interpretation

oes beyond both literal
rprets the Old Testa-
rating a secondary and
o underlie the primary
ical narrative. In 1
eyond the primary
uteronomy 25:4, "You
hrashes," to insist that
reason not obvious in
en that God is com-
s, doesn't he? Yes, this
ians 4:21-31 he goes
s between Hagar and
he argues that "these
for the women repre-
ed so goes on to spell
seen to be contained

moment in the writ-
also present in midrash
of Judaism during the
enecker 1977/5: 45-8);
is 9:9-10) and Galatians
of this general Jewish
wever, it needs to be
9-10 displays an alle-
bly part-and-parcel
nt, Galatians 4:21-31
me form of allegor-
ed by polemical debate
ars in Paul's Galatian
animum in nature.

a pesher treatment of
me have argued that
al quotations signal a
rpretation is wrongly
the basis of its textual
differs only quantita-
pesher at this point.
e 'this is that' fulfill-
peshier interpretation,

can readily be found in Paul's writings – as, for example, in 2 Corinthians 6:2, where he asserts that 'the acceptable time' and 'the day of salvation' spoken of in Isaiah 49:8 are present with us 'now,' and in Galatians 4:4, where he speaks of 'the fullness of time' taking place in God's sending of his Son. But only in Acts 13:16-41, in addressing those gathered in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, is Paul represented as making explicit use of the fulfilment theme. And that, of course, is directed to a Jewish audience. Paul's habit in his Gentile mission, it seems, was not to attempt to demonstrate eschatological fulfilment in any explicit manner – except, perhaps, when such a theme was incorporated within his quotation of an early Christian confession, as seems to have been the case in Galatians 4:4-5. Evidently such a procedure carried little weight with those unaccustomed to thinking in terms of historical continuity and unschooled in the Old Testament.

What is significant with respect to Paul's use of pesher interpretation, however, is his understanding of one feature of the prophetic message in terms of a 'mystery' that has been made known by means of a 'revelational understanding' – or, to use the nomenclature derived from the Dead Sea Scrolls, a *raz* ('mystery') that has become known through a *pesher* ('revelational interpretation'). Paul uses 'mystery' (Greek: *mysterion*) some twenty times in his letters, and in a number of ways. But in three instances in his use of the term he seems to be definitely involving himself in a *raz-pesher* understanding of the unfolding of redemptive history:

(1) In the doxology of Romans 16:25-27, where he identifies 'my gospel' as being 'the preaching of Jesus Christ according to the revelation of the mystery that was kept secret for long ages, but now is disclosed and through the prophetic writings is made known to all nations.'

(2) In Colossians 1:26-27, where he mentions 'the mystery hidden for ages and generation, but is now made manifest to his saints.'

(3) And in Ephesians 3:1-11, where he speaks of 'the mystery' that was 'made known to me by revelation,' but 'which was not made known to people in other generations as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, . . . the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things.'

Paul could not claim the usual apostolic qualifications, as expressed in John 15:27 and Acts 1:21-22. His understanding of the Old Testament could not be directly related to the teaching and example of the historic Jesus, as was that of the Jerusalem apostles and many of the earliest believers in Jesus. Rather, he was dependent on the early church for much in the Christian tradition, as his letters frankly indicate. But Paul had been confronted by the exalted Lord, directly commissioned an apostle by Jesus himself, and considered that he had been given the key to the pattern of redemptive history in the present age – that is, that he had been given the

'mystery' to the outworking of divine redemption in this present day by means of a 'revelational understanding.' The Jerusalem apostles had the key to many of the prophetic mysteries; but he had been entrusted with a pesher that was uniquely his. Together, they combined to enhance the fullness of the Gospel.

5 The evangelists

The interpretation of the Bible by the four canonical evangelists in their editorial comments (as distinguished from that of Jesus in their portrayals of him) – especially the editorial comments of Matthew and John – represents a particularly distinctive use of biblical material. While there are definite lines of continuity with both Jewish exegetical conventions and Jewish Christian presuppositions and practices, the Gospels of Matthew and John, in particular, exhibit a unique strand of exegesis among early Christian writings. Furthermore, they evidence a development in Jewish Christian interpretation over what we have seen so far in the apostolic period.

The evangelists' own use of scripture is reflected, at least to some extent, in the arrangement of their respective narratives where they parallel certain biblical features, in their emphases where they highlight certain biblical themes, and in their use of Old Testament language. But it is most aptly seen in their editorial comments where they quote biblical material. One such editorial quotation appears in Mark's Gospel (1:23), eleven in Matthew's Gospel (1:23; 2:15, 18, 23; 4:15-16; 8:17; 12:18-21; 13:35; 21:5; 3:3; 27:9-10, with ten of these being explicitly introduced by a fulfilment formula), three in Luke's Gospel (2:23, 24; 3:4-6), and seven in John's Gospel (2:17; 12:15, 38, 40; 19:24, 36, 37, with four of these being explicitly introduced by a fulfilment formula).

5.1 Editorial quotations in Mark's and Luke's Gospels

The use of the Old Testament in Mark's Gospel has proven difficult to isolate and characterize. Some have interpreted the Gospel as built on biblical typology throughout, and others have argued for the wilderness theme as undergirding the entire presentation. On the other hand, there are those who deny any promise-fulfilment schema or any use of biblical themes in the Second Gospel. But both the attempt to make Mark's Gospel something of a Jewish Christian midrash and the denial to the evangelist of any interest in scripture are extreme positions, which have rightly been widely discounted today.

In his editorial comments, as distinguished from his portrayals of Jesus in the narrative material common to all three Synoptic writers, Mark is very reserved with respect to an explicit use of the Old Testament. Such a use appears only in Mark 1:2-3 where the evangelist cites the conflated texts of Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah

EARLY CHURCH INTERPRETATION

40:3. In Matthew 11:10 and Luke 7:27, of course, Malachi 3:1 is attributed to Jesus' teaching. But Mark cites both Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3 at the very beginning of his narrative – probably, it may be presumed, in continuity with a developing practice within the early church. Beyond this one conflated citation of scripture, however, there are no further explicit quotations in the editorial material of Mark's Gospel.

A number of features in Luke's Gospel deserve mention with regard to the evangelist's own use of scripture. In the first place, the Lukan birth narrative of 1:5–2:52 clearly anchors the birth of Jesus in the faith and piety of Israel, in the Jewish scriptures, and in the plan and purpose of God. Furthermore, it serves to highlight the fact of the renewal of prophecy at the dawn of the messianic age. Thus, while there are no explicit fulfilment quotations in the evangelist's editorial comments, the biblical allusions and prophetic tone of these first two chapters clearly indicate the author's understanding of the gospel's continuity with and fulfilment of the prophetic message to Israel of old. And the emphasis on the activity of the Spirit – both in the conception of Jesus and in the prophetic responses of Mary, Zechariah, Simeon, and Anna – seems to be Luke's way of saying to his Gentile audience that the time of fulfilment has been inaugurated.

To be noted, however, are two quotations from the Pentateuch – first from Exodus 13:2, 12 and then from Leviticus 12:8 – that appear in Luke 2:23–24. But these quotations are not used in any fulfilment manner; rather, only to explain certain features of Jewish ritual law to a non-Jewish audience. Where the note of fulfilment comes into Luke's editorial use of scripture is at the beginning of his 'common narrative,' where in 3:4–6 the evangelist quotes Isaiah 40:3–5 as having been fulfilled in the ministry of John the Baptist – much, of course, like Mark 1:2–3 quotes Isaiah 40:3, though without reference to Malachi 3:1 and with an extension of the quotation to include the very relevant material for Luke's purposes of Isaiah 40:4–5. But beyond these two explanations of Jewish ritual law and the one inclusion of a traditional prophetic portion, there is a decided lack of explicit biblical material in the editorial comments of Luke's Gospel.

5.2 Editorial quotations in Matthew's Gospel

While Mark and Luke are quite reserved in their editorial use of biblical material, the use of scripture in the editorial comments of Matthew's Gospel goes much beyond what has been called *historico-grammatical exegesis* – even beyond what was practiced by the earliest believers in Jesus or by Paul. Who would have suspected, for example, apart from a knowledge of Matthew's Gospel, that anything of messianic significance could be derived from God's calling Israel's children out of Egypt (cf. 2:15), Jeremiah's reference to Rachel weeping for her children in Rama (cf. 2:17–18),

a statement regarding the lands of Zebulun and Naphtali (cf. 4:14–16), or the payment to Zechariah of thirty pieces of silver and his subsequent action of giving them to the potter (cf. 27:9–10). All these references might resound in quite a familiar fashion to those reared on the New Testament. But they would never have been guessed apart from Matthew's treatment. And any similar treatment of scripture today would be considered by most Christians to be quite shocking. Such biblical quotations within the editorial comments of Matthew's Gospel, in fact, are quite distinctive in their introductory formulae, their textual variations, and their oftentimes surprising applications. For want of space, the first two of these matters must be left for treatment elsewhere (see Longenecker 1975:140–52; 1999a: 124–35). The third, however, needs to be dealt with here, even though briefly.

In seeking to understand the evangelist's own use of the Old Testament, it is well to remind ourselves of a phenomenon that has been frequently noted and variously explained: that many parallels between the life of Jesus and the experiences of the nation Israel seem to underlie the presentation of the First Gospel – especially in the first half (approximately) of Matthew's Gospel, where the order of material varies noticeably from that of either Mark's or Luke's Gospels. Indeed, Matthew seems to be following a thematic arrangement of material in his portrayal of the life and ministry of Jesus that is guided by and incorporates various reminiscences of Israel's earlier experiences.

Scholars have given various explanations for Matthew's thematic arrangement of material in his Gospel. What can be said with confidence, however, is that (a) behind the evangelist's presentation stand the Jewish concepts of *corporate solidarity* and *typological correspondences in history*, (b) the phenomenon of historical parallelism seen in the First Gospel is a reflection of such conceptualization, and (c) this background is important for understanding Matthew's treatment of specific Old Testament statements and events. For by the use of such concepts, Jesus is portrayed in Matthew's Gospel as the embodiment of ancient Israel and the antitype of earlier divine redemption.

Thus in setting out ten explicit 'fulfilment formula' quotations and one direct use of a widely accepted messianic prophecy in his editorial comments, Matthew expresses both the Jewish concepts of *corporate solidarity* and *typological correspondences in history*, on the one hand, and the Christian convictions of *eschatological fulfilment* and *messianic presence*, on the other. Therefore he quotes in application to the ministry and person of Jesus: (a) Isaiah 7:14 (the Immanuel passage) in 1:23; (b) Hosea 11:1 ('Out of Egypt I called my son') in 2:15; (c) Jeremiah 31:15 (Rachel weeping for her children) in 2:18; (d) probably Judges 13:5–7 and 16:17 (Samson a Nazarite), together with an allusion to Jesus' hometown (Nazareth), in 2:23; (e) Isaiah 9:1–2 (Zebulun and

Naphtali) in 4:15–16; (f) sicknesses and bore our sorrows (cf. 42:1–4 (the servant's work and ultimate success) in Isaiah 49:1–6 (Asaph's words regarding the servant) in 62:11 and Zechariah 9:9 (the servant on a donkey) in 21:5; and (g) allusions to Jeremiah 18:1–4 (the potter) of silver given to purchase

In addition, the evangelist's use of a messianic prophecy of Isaiah 40:3–5 (the servant in the wilderness') in 3:3, 11, and 23, and eleven editorial quotation formulae (the fulfilment formula and whose name is in the text of the LXX. Here, for example, in Luke, Matthew is taking the text, which was common to the early church, to have messianic relevance in a fashion to the ministry of Jesus. The assertion that 'this is the prophet,' he is invoking a

In surveying Matthew's Gospel, one gets the impression that the evangelist himself to be working from the scriptures as given by the apostles. The common apostolic hermeneutic is not carrying further the theme of the text under the guidance of the Spirit, but to whether he acted legiti- mately. It is more than a strictly historical approach to the commitments regarding the di- vine activity of the Spirit, or 'apostolic person.' Suffice it to say that here. Suffice it to say that the approach to scripture in Matthew's Gospel is that bears the name of

5.3 Editorial quotations

Whereas Matthew's Gospel has been developed along the lines of the embodiment of the nation Israel in its typological history, the Gospel of Jesus more as centre of the fulfilment of its features in support of the apparent in the Fourth Gospel, variously explained as

Most obvious in this is to the festivals of Judaism, the way in which the Gospel as the fulfilment of Israel's ritual stance of Israel's ritual 7:2; 10:22; 11:55; 12:1 into this festal pattern true temple (2:18–22), (3:14–15), the true n

Naphtali) in 4:15-16; (f) Isaiah 53:3 ('he took our sicknesses and bore our diseases') in 8:17; (g) Isaiah 42:1-4 (the servant's works, withdrawal from conflict, and ultimate success) in 12:18-21; (h) Psalm 78:2 (Asaph's words regarding dark sayings) in 13:35; (i) Isaiah 62:11 and Zechariah 9:9 (Israel's king comes riding on a donkey) in 21:5; and (j) Zechariah 11:12-13, with allusions to Jeremiah 18:1-2 and 32:6-9 (thirty pieces of silver given to purchase a potter's field) in 27:9-10.

In addition, the evangelist quotes the explicit messianic prophecy of Isaiah 40:3 ('the voice of one crying in the wilderness') in 3:3, which is the only one of his eleven editorial quotations not introduced by a fulfilment formula and whose text form is almost identical to the text of the LXX. Here, in concert with Mark and Luke, Matthew is taking a widely used Old Testament text, which was commonly considered within Judaism to have messianic relevance, and applying it in Christian fashion to the ministry of John the Baptist. And in his assertion that 'this is the one spoken of by Isaiah the prophet,' he is invoking a peshet type of interpretation.

In surveying Matthew's use of the Old Testament, one gets the impression that this evangelist believed himself to be working from a revelational insight into the scriptures as given by Jesus himself, following out common apostolic hermeneutical procedures, and explicating further the theme of eschatological fulfilment under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The question as to whether he acted legitimately or not is, of course, more than a strictly historical issue. It involves faith commitments regarding the distinctiveness of Jesus, the reality and activity of the Spirit, and the authority of an apostle or 'apostolic person.' Such matters cannot be settled here. Suffice it to say that it is Matthew's Gospel, and not Mark's or Luke's Gospels, that develops the peshet approach to scripture in such a distinctive fashion and that bears the name of one of Jesus' chosen disciples.

5.3 Editorial quotations in John's Gospel

Whereas Matthew's portrayal of Jesus seems to have been developed along the lines of the Messiah as the embodiment of the nation Israel and the fulfilment of its typological history, John appears to have thought of Jesus more as central in the life of the nation and the fulfilment of its festal observances. A number of features in support of such a hypothesis are readily apparent in the Fourth Gospel, though they may be variously explained as to their details.

Most obvious in this regard is the prominence given to the festivals of Judaism, particularly the Passover, and the way in which the fourth evangelist portrays Jesus as the fulfilment of Israel's messianic hope and the substance of Israel's ritual symbolism (cf. 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2; 10:22; 11:55; 12:1; 13:1; 18:28; 19:14). Interwoven into this festal pattern is the presentation of Jesus as the true temple (2:18-22), the antitype of the brazen serpent (3:14-15), the true manna (6:30-58), the true water-

giving rock (7:37-39), the true fiery pillar (8:12), the eschatological Moses (6:1-15, 25-71; cf. 1:17; 5:39-47; 14:6), the new Torah (1:1-18; cf. 5:39-47; 14:6), and the true paschal sacrifice (1:29, 36; 19:14, 31-37).

In addition, the fourth evangelist builds his narrative around Jesus' visits to Jerusalem. At Passover he purifies the temple (2:13-17), at 'a feast of the Jews' he comes to Jerusalem as a pilgrim and teaches (5:1ff.), at Tabernacles he presents himself as the substance of the festival's symbolism (7:2-52; 8:12-59), and at another Passover he finalizes his redemptive mission (12:1ff.). The imagery, of course, varies from that of Matthew's Gospel. But the presuppositions are the same and the stress on fulfilment is strikingly similar.

Likewise, the seven biblical quotations of John's editorial material closely parallel in their applications and purpose the eleven editorial quotations of Matthew's Gospel. Underlying the use of the Old Testament in the writings of both evangelists are the Jewish presuppositions of *corporate solidarity* and *typological correspondences in history* and the Christian convictions of *eschatological fulfilment* and *messianic presence*. Furthermore, in John's Gospel, as well as in Matthew's Gospel, a peshet type of interpretation is involved in the demonstration of prophetic fulfilment. Thus in application to the ministry and person of Jesus, John in his editorial comments quotes: (a) Psalm 69:9 ('the zeal of your house has eaten me up') in 2:17; (b) Zechariah 9:9 (Israel's king comes riding on a donkey, with a possible allusion to the 'fear not' of Isaiah 40:9) in 12:15; (c) Isaiah 53:1 ('Lord, who has believed our report?') in 12:38; (d) Isaiah 6:9-10 (blinded eyes and hardened hearts) in 12:40; (e) Psalm 22:18 ('they parted my garments among them and cast lots') in 19:24; (f) Psalm 34:20, with possibly also in mind Exodus 12:46 and Numbers 9:12 ('a bone of him shall not be broken'); and (g) Zechariah 12:10 ('they shall look on him whom they pierced') in 19:37.

From the perspective of the completed ministry of Jesus, as validated by his resurrection and interpreted by the Spirit, the fourth evangelist was able to move back into the Old Testament and to explicate a Christocentric fulfilment theme that involved both direct messianic prophecies and corporate-typological relationships. In so doing, he treated his Old Testament scriptures in continuity with the exegetical practices of Jesus and the earliest believers in Jesus. Yet the degree to which he used peshet exegesis and his development of corporate-typological relationships went somewhat beyond what seems to have been common among early Christian exegetes - perhaps not as extensively as in Matthew's Gospel, but a development in peshet interpretation nonetheless. And as was observed with regard to Matthew's Gospel, it is pertinent here to note that it is John's Gospel (in concert with Matthew's), and not Mark's or Luke's, that develops peshet interpretation of Scripture in such a distinctive fashion and that bears the name of one of Jesus' chosen disciples.

6 Hebrews

Hebrews represents in many ways a hybrid blending of traditional Christian theology, the ideological perspectives and concerns of a particular Jewish Christian community, and an anonymous author's own highly individualized exegesis of the Old Testament. Historically, while its author was a Jewish Christian, he takes his stance outside the Jewish Christian mission and urges his readers to be prepared, if need be, to move beyond their former Jewish allegiances. Theologically, while the thought of the writing is compatible with the proclamation of the gospel within the large Graeco-Roman world, its argument is framed according to the interests of a particular Jewish Christian audience. And exegetically, while it uses a number of distinctly Jewish conventions and expresses a distinctly Christian outlook, it is, as Barnabas Lindars has rightly observed, 'a highly individual biblical study in its own right, so that its scriptural interpretation witnesses more to the outlook of the author than to a previous apologetic tradition' (Lindars 1961: 29).

6.1 Selection, text forms, and introductory formulae

The writer of Hebrews obviously felt himself quite at home in the Old Testament. This is particularly so with regard to the Pentateuch and the Psalms – which were among all Jews 'the fundamental Law and the Book of common devotion' (Westcott 1889: 475). From the Pentateuch he drew the basic structure of his thought regarding redemptive history, quoting some eleven times from ten different passages and alluding to forty-one others. From the Psalms he derived primary support of his Christology, quoting some eighteen times from eleven different passages and alluding to two others. With the exceptions of 2 Samuel 7:14, Deuteronomy 32:43 (LXX), and Isaiah 8:17–18, all of which are taken to be direct messianic prophecies, the biblical portions used to explicate the nature of the person of Christ are drawn entirely from the Psalms. On the other hand, with the single exception of 2 Samuel 7:14, no use is made by the writer of the historical books. And with the exception of Isaiah, only minimal use is made of the prophetic books.

Compared with other New Testament authors in their selection of Old Testament portions, the writer of Hebrews exhibits certain similarities and certain differences. Some of the passages he uses appear elsewhere in the New Testament, and are in those instances elsewhere used rather uniquely – for example, Psalm 110:1 (Mark 12:36 par.; Acts 2:34–35); Habakkuk 2:4 (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11); Psalm 2:7 (Acts 13:33); 2 Samuel 7:14 (2 Corinthians 6:18, possibly); Genesis 21:12 (Rom. 9:7), and Deuteronomy 32:35 (Rom. 12:19). On the other hand, nineteen or twenty of the passages quoted in Hebrews are not cited elsewhere in the New Testament. In addition, even where the writer

agrees with other New Testament authors in his selection of texts, he varies at times from them in the text form he uses or in his application of the passage – for example, most prominently, in his variant wording of Habakkuk 2:4 in Hebrews 10:38 (cf. Rom. 1:17 and Gal. 3:11) and his different application of Psalm 8:6b in Hebrews 2:8 (cf. 1 Cor. 15:27 and Eph. 1:22).

Also significant in Hebrews is the distinctive manner in which the biblical portions are introduced. In the majority of cases, it is God himself who is the speaker (cf. 1:5 [twice], 6, 7, 8–9, 10–12, 13; 4:3, 4, 5, 7; 5:5, 6; 6:14; 7:17, 21; 8:5, 8–12; 10:30 [twice]; 12:26; 13:5). In four quotations drawn from three Old Testament passages the psalmist's or prophet's words are attributed to Christ (cf. 2:12–13 [three times]; 10:5–7) and in three quotations drawn from two passages the Holy Spirit is credited as speaking (cf. 3:7–11; 10:16–17 [twice]) – though it needs also to be noted that these three citations credited to the Spirit appear elsewhere in Hebrews credited to God (cf. 4:7; 8:8–12). In many cases the words quoted are introduced as being spoken in the present, whether cited as words of God (cf. 1:6, 7; 5:6; 7:17; 8:8–12), of Christ (cf. 10:5–7), of the Spirit (cf. 3:7–11; 10:16–17 [twice]), or attributed more generally to 'the exhortation that addresses you' (cf. 12:5–6). The rationale for this phenomenon seems to be, as B.F. Westcott expressed it, that 'the record is the voice of God; and as a necessary consequence the record is itself living. It is not a book merely. It has a vital connexion with our circumstances and must be considered in connexion with them' (Westcott 1889: 477). In only two instances are words credited to a human speaker, in both cases to Moses (cf. 9:20; 12:21). And in two or three instances the material is introduced with a comment so general as to be unparalleled by any other introductory formula in the New Testament: in 2:6–8 (quoting Ps. 8:4–6), 'somewhere someone testified, saying,' and in 4:4 (quoting Gen. 2:2), 'somewhere he has said' – which are echoed to some extent by the introduction in 5:6 (quoting Ps. 110:4), 'in another passage he says.'

6.2 Presuppositions, structures, and procedures

From the perspective of the Messiah's presence among his people in 'these last days' (1:2), Israel's life and worship are viewed by the author of Hebrews as preparatory for the coming of the Lord's Christ. A more profound significance is seen in the prophetic words and redemptive experiences recorded in scripture, and all these biblical words and events are understood to be looking forward to the consummation of God's salvific programme in the person and work of Jesus. For the author of Hebrews, as Westcott has pointed out,

the O.T. does not simply contain prophecies, but . . . it is one vast prophecy, in the record of national fortunes, in the ordinances of a national Law, in the

expression of a nation's ritual, in its deeds, in the lives of its peoples of the world, in the complete solution. (Westcott 1889: 478)

In spelling out this argument, the author builds his argument; a catena of verses drawn from the Old Testament and Deuteronomy 1:3–2:4 is based; (b) 2:5–18 is based; Hebrews 3:1–4:13 is based; Hebrews 4:14–7:28 is based; on which Hebrews 8:1–10:18 is based; Hebrews 10:19–12:2 is based; on the exposition of 12:1–2; other verses quoted in 12:2–13.

These five biblical quotations are used because (a) they speak of God's redemption and/or God's redemption; (b) they are traditionally accepted within the early church; (c) they emphasize the incompleteness of the present and looked forward to the future; (d) they come. The writer uses a number of procedures in his day – for example, *dabar halamed me'inyan* – a hermeneutical treatment of the text which included correspondences in history; (e) they are biblical endeavors; (f) they do the scriptures mean; (g) they are centered perspective?

The author of Hebrews is using a peshet approach; he appears to be only using the Old Testament; (h) interpretations that had been in Jesus. Nor is he using exegesis *per se*, though he uses of rather common; (i) attempting to develop the Old Testament, the names in a mildly allegorical; (j) seems to be doing is exegetical tradition with; (k) ition that both he and; (l) rather straightforwardly; (m) contained within that tradition; (n) addressees in light of; (o) he probably saw himself; (p) ceded him in Christ; (q) comparing his interpretations; (r) predecessors, he must; (s) unique in spelling out; (t) Old and New Testament; (u) implications drawn from

ament authors in his selections from them in the text of the passage – for example, in his variant wording of 10:38 (cf. Rom. 1:17 and application of Psalm 8:6b 15:27 and Eph. 1:22).

ways is the distinctive manner in which these quotations are introduced. In the case of James, it is himself who is the speaker (cf. 1:10–12, 13; 4:3, 4, 5, 7; 5:5, 10:30 [twice]; 12:26; 13:5). In the case of the other three Old Testament prophets, their words are attributed to the prophet (cf. 1:22 [three times]; 10:5–7) and in the case of the other two passages the Holy Spirit is the speaker (cf. 3:7–11; 10:16–17). It should also be noted that these quotations of the Spirit appear elsewhere in the New Testament (cf. 4:7; 8:8–12). In many cases, the quotations are introduced as being spoken by the prophet or as words of God (cf. 1:6, 12:17 [twice]), or attributed to the Spirit (cf. 10:16–17 [twice]), or attributed to the prophet (cf. 10:5–7). For this phenomenon seems to have been expressed in the record is a necessary consequence the text is not a book merely. It has a distinctive character and circumstances and must be read in connection with them' (Westcott 1889: 189). These are words credited to a prophet (cf. 9:20; 12:21). In many instances the material is introduced in a general as to be unparalleled formula in the New Testament (cf. Ps. 8:4–6), 'somewhere and in 4:4 (quoting Gen. 1:1) – which are echoed in the introduction in 5:6 (quoting Gen. 1:1) as he says.'

Figures, and procedures
The presence of the Messiah among the 'days' (1:2), Israel's life and the author of Hebrews as of the Lord's Christ. A more important feature in the prophetic words and recorded in scripture, and all events are understood to be the summation of God's salvific work and work of Jesus. For the author has pointed out,

They contain prophecies, but they, in the record of national events of a national Law, in the

expression of a national hope. Israel in its history, in its ritual, in its ideal, is a unique enigma among the peoples of the world, of which the Christ is the complete solution. (Westcott 1889: 493)

In spelling out this consummation theme, the author builds his argument around five biblical portions: (a) a catena of verses drawn from the Psalms, 2 Samuel 7, and Deuteronomy 32 (LXX) on which Hebrews 1:3–2:4 is based; (b) Psalm 8:4–6 on which Hebrews 2:5–18 is based; (c) Psalm 95:7–11 on which Hebrews 3:1–4:13 is based; (d) Psalm 110:4 on which Hebrews 4:14–7:28 is based; and (e) Jeremiah 31:31–34 on which Hebrews 8:1–10:39 is based (cf. Caird 1959). All of the exhortations of chapters 11–13 depend on the exposition of these five biblical portions, and all other verses quoted in the letter are ancillary to these.

These five biblical portions were selected, it seems, because (a) they spoke of the eschatological Messiah and/or God's redemption in the Last Days, either as traditionally accepted within Judaism or as understood within the early church, or both, and (b) they set forth the incompleteness of the old economy under Moses and looked forward to a consummation that was to come. The writer uses in the process of his exegesis a number of procedures and practices that were common in his day – for example, *gezera shawa* ('analogy') and *dabar halamed me'innyano* ('context'), an allegorical-etymological treatment of names, and a concept of fulfillment that included *corporate solidarity* and *typological correspondences in history*. But at the heart of his exegetical endeavors is the quite straightforward query: what do the scriptures mean when viewed from a christocentric perspective?

The author of Hebrews is probably not himself originating a pesher approach to scripture, for in chapter 1 he appears to be only repeating certain pesher interpretations that had been used by the earliest believers in Jesus. Nor is he principally engaged in midrashic exegesis *per se*, though at a number of places he makes use of rather common midrashic techniques. Nor is he attempting to develop an allegorical understanding of the Old Testament, though in chapter 7 he treats two names in a mildly allegorical fashion. Rather, what he seems to be doing is basing himself on an accepted exegetical tradition within the early church – a tradition that both he and his addressees accepted – and rather straightforwardly explicating relationships contained within that tradition and implications for his addressees in light of their circumstances. In so doing, he probably saw himself in continuity with what preceded him in Christian hermeneutics. Nonetheless, comparing his interpretation of the Bible to that of his predecessors, he must be judged as having been rather unique in spelling out certain relationships between the Old and New Testaments and highlighting particular implications drawn from early Christian tradition.

7 General Epistles and Apocalypse

James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 John, and Jude, together with the Johannine Apocalypse, make up a group of writings that have many features in common. This is particularly the case with regard to the Semitic cast of their expressions and form of their presentations. In their use of the Old Testament, however, while evidencing continuity with earlier Christian exegesis and a degree of agreement among themselves, there are also significant differences between them.

7.1 Phenomena of biblical usage

The writings in the latter part of the New Testament have a somewhat confusing mixture of biblical quotations, biblical allusions, noncanonical materials, and unidentifiable proverbial maxims. The lines of demarcation between biblical and nonbiblical materials is in some of these writings not as clearly drawn as elsewhere in the New Testament, and the interplay between explicit quotations and more indirect allusions is in some cases heightened. All of this makes any listing of biblical materials for these writings extremely difficult, though probably six explicit biblical quotations are to be identified in James (2:8, 11 [two passages], 23; 4:5, 6), eight in 1 Peter (1:16, 24–25; 2:6–8 [three passages]; 3:10–12; 4:18; 5:5), and one in 2 Peter (2:22).

Biblical quotations in these writings occur almost exclusively in James and 1 Peter. Quoted material is used only once in 2 Peter and once in Jude: in 2 Peter 2:22, citing Proverbs 26:11 in conjunction with an unidentifiable maxim, and in Jude 14–15, quoting 1 Enoch 1:9 as a prophecy – with both quotations being rather strange when compared with the rest of the New Testament. The Apocalypse is replete with biblical expressions and allusions, but it lacks any clear biblical quotation, while the Johannine Epistles are devoid of either quotations or allusions. A number of problems, of course, come to the fore here – particularly with regard to the use of quoted material in 2 Peter and Jude, as well as the lack of biblical quotations in the Johannine Epistles – for which there are no ready answers. It may be that such phenomena are indicative of pseudonymity. Or it may be that a somewhat larger Old Testament canon was used among some Jewish Christian writers of the first century. Or it may only suggest certain personal idiosyncracies or certain uncharted exegetical developments. In any case, this type of data in such short letters is hardly conclusive in support of any current theory.

7.2 Literal and pesher treatments

The Epistle of James is unique among the writings of the New Testament in its selection of biblical quotations from only the Pentateuch and Proverbs. This is, however, hardly surprising, for James is composed of a series of ethical exhortations and so could be expected

to highlight the ethical portions of scripture. Furthermore, the author's treatment of passages from the Pentateuch and Proverbs is consistently literal throughout. Allusions to Isaiah and Psalm 103 also appear in 1:10–11 (Isa. 40:6–7), 2:23 (Isa. 41:8), 5:4 (Isa. 5:9), and 5:11 (Ps. 103:8), but always with an ethical rather than a prophetic thrust.

Examples of literal exegesis in 1 Peter are relatively abundant. In 1:16 there is the reminder: 'It is written, "You shall be holy, for I [God] am holy"' (quoting a conflation of Lev. 11:44; 19:2; 20:7). In 3:10–12 the psalmist's words regarding 'whoever would love life and see good days' (Ps. 34:12–16) are cited, laying out a pattern of proper behavior and giving a God-oriented rationale for such conduct. In 4:18 the words of Proverbs 11:31 regarding the righteous being judged in this life are cited in support of the exhortation to rejoice when one suffers for Christ; while in 5:5 the teaching of Proverbs 3:34, 'God resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble,' is used to buttress the author's teaching on humility.

But while there are many points of similarity between James and 1 Peter in their literal treatments of scripture, the Petrine Epistles and Jude – particularly 1 Peter, though to an extent also 2 Peter and Jude – stand apart from James, the Johannine Epistles, and the Johannine Apocalypse in their use of a pesher type of approach to the Old Testament. This is immediately apparent in 1 Peter 1:10–12, where, after the salutation, a doxology, and the setting of the theme of the writing, the author enunciates a clear-cut pesher attitude toward the nature of biblical prophecy:

The prophets who spoke of the grace that was to come to you searched intently and with the greatest care concerning this salvation, trying to find out the time and circumstances to which the Spirit of Christ in them was pointing when he predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glories that would follow. It was revealed to them that they were not serving themselves but you, when they spoke of the things that have now been told you by those who have preached the gospel to you by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven – things that even angels long to look into.

Though the terms 'mystery' and 'interpretation' are not used, the thought here is strikingly parallel to the *naz-pesher* motif found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Furthermore, it is in continuity with the use of scripture by Jesus, the earliest believers in Jesus, Paul in speaking about his Gentile ministry, and the evangelists of the First and Fourth Gospels.

And it is such a pesher understanding that underlies at least three of the Old Testament quotations in 1 and 2 Peter: (a) 1 Peter 1:24–25, quoting Isaiah 40:6–8 ('Everyone is like grass and everyone's glory is like the wild flower'), which applies the passage using the typ-

ically pesher phrase 'this is the word' (cf. Acts 4:11) and explicates a fuller meaning in the text from the perspective of eschatological fulfilment; (b) 1 Peter 2:6–8, quoting Isaiah 28:16, Psalm 118:22, and Isaiah 8:14 (the 'stone' passages), which applies these three passages directly to Jesus Christ; and (c) 2 Peter 2:22, quoting Proverbs 26:11 ('A dog returns to its vomit') and another proverb of undetermined origin ('A sow that is washed goes back to her wallowing in the mud'), which declares in good pesher fashion that these proverbs have their fullest application to apostates from Christ. Among the latter writings of the New Testament, only Jude 14–15 contains anything similar in its application of 1 *Enoch* 1:9 to apostate teachers: 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied about these men, saying . . .'

Aside from these two instances in 1 Peter, one in 2 Peter, and one in Jude, however, the rest of the General Epistles and the Johannine Apocalypse do not use a pesher type of biblical interpretation. James uses scripture in quite a literal manner throughout; John's letters are devoid of either biblical quotations or allusions. And the Apocalypse, while permeated with biblical expressions and allusions, neither directly quotes the scriptures nor enters into a pesher type of exegesis. Some of these differences, of course, may be due to differing circumstances and a different literary genre. Nonetheless, they are interesting and suggest a somewhat different pattern of biblical interpretation than found elsewhere in the New Testament.

References and further reading

- Albright, W.F. (1966) *New Horizons in Biblical Research*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Caird, G.B. (1959) 'The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews,' *Canadian Journal of Theology* 5: 44–51.
- Dodd, C.H. (1952) *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*, London: Nisbet.
- (1963) *The Old Testament in the New*, London: Athlone/Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Ellis, E.E. (1957) *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- (1977) 'How the New Testament Uses the Old,' pp. 199–219 in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, I.H. Marshall (ed.), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- (1978) *Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Early Christianity*, Tübingen: Mohr/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- (1991) *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*, Tübingen: Mohr/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- (1993) 'Jesus' Use of the Old Testament and the Genesis of New Testament Theology,' *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3: 59–75.
- Harnack, A. (1928) 'Das alte Testament in den paulinischen Briefen und in den paulinischen Gemeinden,'

- in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*.
- Hay, D.M. (1973) *Jesus Christ in the Gospels*, London: SCM.
- Jeremias, J. (1969) *Neotestamentica ebraica* (eds.), Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lindars, B. (1969) *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, London: SCM.
- Longenecker, R.N. (1999) *The Apostolic Period*, London: SCM.
- (1987a) 'The Relationship between the Testaments,' pp. 22–30 in *Tradition and Testament: Essays in the History of the Bible*, 60th Birthday, C. G. Frey (ed.), Tübingen: Mohr.
- (1987b) 'The "Word" in the New Testament: Some Reflections on the Old,' *Theological Studies* 48: 1–15.
- (1997) 'Prophets in Romans,' *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 7: 1–15.
- (1999b) *New Testament Contextualizing*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Moule, C.F.D. (1966) *The Use of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament*, London: Duckworth.
- (1968) 'Fulfillment and Use and Abuse,' pp. 53–85 in *The Bible in the World*, Row, pp. 53–85.
- (1968) 'Fulfillment and Use and Abuse,' pp. 53–85 in *The Bible in the World*, Row, pp. 53–85.
- Vermes, G. (1980) 'The Interpretation of Jewish Scripture,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 33: 1–15.
- (1982) 'Jewish Exegesis: Reflections on the Jewish Studies 33: 1–15.'
- Westcott, B.F. (1886) *The New Testament in the Original Languages*, London: Cambridge University Press.

EBELING, GERHARD

German theologian and minister, since 1950 professor of New Testament at Tübingen and Zürich. Bultmann, author of the most important *und Glaube/Word* in his field was systematic and hermeneutics. Together with Bultmann stressed the existence

word' (cf. Acts 4:11) and the text from the permanent; (b) 1 Peter 2:6–8, 22, and Isaiah 8:14 (the es these three passages 2 Peter 2:22, quoting to its vomit) and another (A sow that is washed be mud'), which declares these proverbs have their from Christ. Among the ment, only Jude 14–15 application of 1 Enoch the seventh from Adam, ying
ces in 1 Peter, one in 2 r, the rest of the General ocalypse do not use a ation. James uses scrip- oughout; John's letters ations or allusions. And ed with biblical expres- irectly quotes the scrip- type of exegesis. Some may be due to differing rary genre. Nonetheless, st a somewhat different n than found elsewhere

g
izons in Biblical Research, ity Press.
ical Method of the Epistle mal of *Theology* 5: 44–51.
a the Scriptures: *The Sub- heology*, London: Nisbet.
nt in the New, London: ss Press.
of the Old Testament, and Rapids: Eerdmans.
estament Uses the Old,' ment Interpretation: *Essays* A. Marshall (ed.), Grand
menetics in *Early Chris-* and Rapids: Eerdmans.
nt in *Early Christianity: Light of Modern Research*, pids: Eerdmans.
Old Testament and the 'Theology,' *Bulletin for*
estament in den paulin- ulinischen Gemeinden,

- in *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissen- schaften zu Berlin*, pp. 124–41.
- Hay, D.M. (1973) *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Jeremias, J. (1969) 'Paulus als Hillelit,' pp. 88–94 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica*, E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
- Lindars, B. (1961) *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*, London: SCM Press.
- Longenecker, R.N. (1975/1999a) *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans (2nd edn. 1999).
- (1987a) 'Three Ways of Understanding Relations between the Testaments: Historically and Today,' pp. 22–30 in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His 60th Birthday*, G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), Tübingen: Mohr/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- (1987b) "'Who Is the Prophet Talking About?'" Some Reflections on the New Testament's Use of the Old,' *Themelios* 24: 3–16.
- (1997) 'Prolegomena to Paul's Use of Scripture in Romans,' *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 7: 145–68.
- (1999b) *New Wine into Fresh Wineskins: Contextualizing the Early Christian Confessions*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Moule, C.F.D. (1962) 'The Church Explains Itself: The Use of the Jewish Scriptures,' in *The Birth of the New Testament*, London: Black/New York: Harper & Row, pp. 53–85 (2nd edn. 1966).
- (1968) 'Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse,' *New Testament Studies* 14: 293–320.
- Vermes, G. (1980) 'Jewish Studies and New Testament Interpretation,' *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31: 1–17.
- (1982) 'Jewish Literature and New Testament Exegesis: Reflections on Methodology,' *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33: 362–76.
- Westcott, B.F. (1889) 'On the Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle,' pp. 471–97 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: Macmillan.

RICHARD N. LONGENECKER

EBELING, GERHARD (1912–2001)

German theologian, originally Protestant (Lutheran) minister, since 1946 taught at the universities in Tübingen and Zürich, student and friend of Rudolf Bultmann, author of studies inspiring biblical exegesis (the most important are included in the volume *Word and Glaube/Word and Faith*, 1960, ET 1963), however, his field was systematic theology, ecclesiastical history, and hermeneutics.

Together with Bultmann and 'dialectic theology,' he stressed the existential engagement in interpreting the

Bible and he analyzed the role of 'preliminary know- ledge' (*Vorverständnis*) in interpretation of ancient texts including the New Testament. The present impact of Jesus Christ through a living proclamation is the deci- sive level for understanding the biblical text. The earthly and crucified Jesus is immediately important as the 'that' (*daß*), stressing as contrast the 'impossible possibility' of his new presence.

However, in the 1950s, Ebeling dared a second step. In his opinion the most legitimate approach to biblical texts is on the level of language. His hermeneutic strategy was to ask what the text was saying. In other words, how are the texts that deal with Jesus chal- lenging us as texts, as language? This concept broad- ened the first, existing level. Ebeling investigated the language of the Jesus tradition and discovered the crucial role played by the term 'faith' or 'believe' (Gr. *pistis*, *pisteuein*), which has often been used absolutely, without indicating any object (e.g., Matt. 17:20 or Luke 18:8). According to him, faith is a technical term for the general life orientation, the dimension of life corre- sponding to God's call and challenge – the foundation of authentic humanity. The analysis of the language level of the kerygma opened for Ebeling the way toward the 'historical Jesus.' This was the turning point in development of the Bultmann school, which marked the beginning of the new quest of the historical Jesus (E. Fuchs, J.M. Robinson, and others). Discovering the specific role of faith in the Jesus tradition opened the way toward analysis of this phenomenon also in a diachronic, historical way: e.g., the special term 'little faith' (*oligopistos*, *oligopistia*) from the Synoptic tradition has no analogy in classical Greek. Ebeling concluded that it was most probably created in order that Greek- speaking Christians might understand some Aramaic or Hebrew expression typical from the most ancient Jesus tradition (*Jesus und Glaube/Jesus and Faith*, 1958, reprinted in Ebeling 1963). Faith is the common denominator of the 'historical Jesus' and the post-Easter church, and therefore interpreting faith was the main topic of Ebeling's works in systematic theology.

Faith is being evoked by the present proclamation, but the interpretation and orientation of faith has always to be derived from the tradition of the historical Jesus: 'The problem of the historical Jesus is the problem of the hermeneutical key to christology' (1962: 52). Ebeling considers Jesus research as providing feedback for Christian proclamation, protecting it from enthusi- astic distortion or misuse.

References and further reading

- Ebeling, Gerhard (1961) *The Nature of Faith*, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith, London: Collins.
- (1963) *Word and Faith*, trans. James W. Leitch, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- (1966) *Theology and Proclamation: Dialogue with*