



From Prophecy to Testament: An Introduction

Craig A. Evans

Half a century ago the great Cambridge scholar C. H. Dodd published a small but very influential book on the function of Old Testament (OT) Scripture in the New Testament (NT).¹ The subtitle of the book reflected an important thesis of his work: *The Substructure of New Testament Theology*. About a decade later Barnabas Lindars published a book on the same subject, in which he too underscored the significance of the contribution that the OT made to the theology of the NT writers.² Most of the numerous books and studies that have appeared in the last forty years have driven home this point: The theology of the NT is fundamentally indebted to, and a reflection of, major OT themes, images, and language.³ There is simply no significant element in NT theology that is not in some way a development of a tradition or theology expressed in the sacred writings that eventually

¹C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952).

²B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961).

³Many studies could be mentioned, e.g., F. F. Bruce, *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968); idem, *The Time Is Fulfilled: Five Aspects of Fulfillment of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); H. M. Shires, *Finding the Old Testament in the New* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974); D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1986); J. A. Sanders, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It Is Written—Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); R. Liebers, “Wie geschrieben steht”: *Studien zu einer besonderen Art frühchristlichen Schriftbezuges* (New York: de Gruyter, 1993); D. Marguerate and A. Curtis, eds., *Intertextualités: La Bible en échos* (Le monde de la Bible 40; Paris: Labor et Fides, 2000); S. Moyise, ed., *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North* (JSNTSup 189; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

came to be what Christians call the Old Testament (OT), Jews call the Tanakh, and scholars call the Hebrew Bible (HB).⁴

Not surprisingly, in recent years scholars have investigated the approaches and methods of biblical exegesis in late antiquity. The hermeneutical principles of Philo, Josephus, the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, NT writers, the various recensions and translations of Scripture, and early rabbinic and ecclesiastical literature have been investigated and continue to be studied.⁵ Building upon this work, several detailed studies have appeared that investigate specific scriptural passages or themes.⁶

The function of the OT in the NT often revolves around the theme of fulfillment, a theme driven by the conviction of early Christians that the prophecies of the First Testament have been fulfilled in the events described in the Second Testament. Hence the title of the present collection of studies: *From Prophecy to Testament*. We do not mean to imply that prophecy was the only impulse that led to interpretation and resignification of the older revelation, but it was a major impulse. Nor do we mean to imply that prophecy has as its primary refer-

⁴It is important to remark also that much of the Scripture that makes up the Old, or First, Testament is itself a product of interpretation of older sacred tradition. In other words, it was not *after* the completion of the OT that interpretation began; it was *during*. See J. A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972); idem, *From Sacred Story*.

⁵For representative studies, see J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954); J. Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments* (London: SCM Press, 1966); R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (SBLDS 22; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975); E. E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978); L. Goppelt, *Typos, The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); J. L. Kugel and R. Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986); D. Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 C.E.* (TSAJ 30; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992); J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; SSEJC 2; Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1993). For an excellent bibliographical summary of the most important older work, see M. P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash, and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSJ* 2 (1971): 29–82.

⁶For representative studies, see D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBLMS 18; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973); M. C. Callaway, *Sing, O Barren One: A Study in Comparative Midrash* (SBLDS 91; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); D. H. Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); C. A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9–10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (JSOTSup 64; Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1989); C. R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (CBQMS 22; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1989); K. E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); P. E. Enns, *Exodus Retold: Ancient Exegesis of the Departure from Egypt in Wis 15–21 and 19:1–9* (HSM 57; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

ence *prediction* or *foretelling* this event or that. Rather, we understand it in its classical sense of *making known* the word of God. The older revelation is probed and pondered, and out of it comes forth new meaning and new application. The word of God speaks afresh. The primary goal of the interpreter, translator, and paraphraser in late antiquity was to allow the sacred text to speak to the new situation, to address the new problems, to answer the new questions.

The Task

Study of the function of the OT in the NT requires consideration of many versions, texts, and traditions and of the contexts and communities of faith from which they emerged. These traditions functioned, more or less, as the raw materials out of which new texts could be fashioned, texts that gave expression to the faith and beliefs of the new community that sprang from Jewish roots. Surveying these materials and citing some of the most important bibliography will be helpful for beginning students.

The Contents of Scripture

When most students consider the question of how the OT functions in the NT, they usually assume a particular set of writings. But when the NT authors were at work (not knowing, by the way, that what they were writing would ever become a “New Testament”), there was no finalized canon of Scripture. Consequently, it was not always clear what could be quoted and interpreted as authoritative and what could not be. Was *Enoch* Scripture? Was *Sirach*? Evidently in the first century some Jews did recognize these writings as authoritative; so did many in the early church (and in the church today).

It is sometimes assumed that the three divisions of the HB were established and recognized in the first century, when most of the books of the NT were written. But this is far from evident. The Torah, or Law of Moses, was recognized several centuries before the NT era. The Prophets were also recognized, though the place of Daniel was uncertain.⁷ The Writings, however, were far from settled. That there were authoritative writings outside the Law and the Prophets seems clear enough. But how many and which ones were questions that would not be settled until well into the Christian era itself (cf. *m. Yad.* 3:5).⁸

⁷Christians eventually recognized the book of Daniel as part of the prophetic corpus. But in the Jewish Bible Daniel is placed with the Writings.

⁸The most pertinent texts from late antiquity include the prologue to the Wisdom of Sirach; Sir 39:1; 4Q397 14–21 ii 10–12; 2 Macc 2:13; and Philo, *Contempl. Life* 25. In the gospel tradition, Jesus regularly refers to “the Law and the Prophets” (e.g., Matt 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; Luke 16:29, 31). Some scholars point to the words of the risen Jesus in Luke 24:44 as evidence of a recognized tripartite canon of Scripture in the first century. For example, the RSV translates (with numbers inserted in square brackets): “in [1] the Law of Moses and [2] the Prophets and [3] the Psalms.” But in the Greek the definite article occurs only

Consequently, when speaking of the function of the “Old Testament” in the New, we must not assume that everything quoted was necessarily viewed as authoritative Scripture. One of the factors that guided early Christians in deciding which writings were authoritative, and which ones were not, was inspiration. That is, did a given writing speak with a prophetic voice, conveying the will and mind of God? Writings believed to reveal the mind of God were studied in hopes of finding new inspiration and insight. Writings widely believed to reveal the mind of God eventually were recognized as authoritative Scripture. Writings believed by relatively few to be inspired did not gain such recognition but eventually found themselves classified as part of the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, or Apostolic Fathers (see pp. 11–20, “Cognate Literatures,” below). Some of these writings survive only in brief quotations in later writings (e.g., *Eldad and Modad*) or are lost altogether.

Versions of Scripture

Appreciation of the function of the OT in the NT must also take into account the text type and language of the former. The writings that make up the OT were originally composed and handed down in Hebrew and Aramaic.⁹ But in NT times portions of the OT circulated in Greek, Latin, and Aramaic. The NT writers quote the Greek more than any other version, though sometimes they appear to have been acquainted with the Hebrew and the Aramaic.

But the picture is even more complicated, for there were several versions of the Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, and Latin texts of Scripture. Qumran attests at least four versions of Hebrew Scripture (viz., proto-Masoretic, Samaritan, Septuagintal, and a fourth, previously unknown).¹⁰ The Dead Sea region has also given us the *Greek Minor Prophets Scroll* of Naḥal Ḥever, which at many points differs

twice, not three times; this suggests that we translate the text this way: “in [1] the Law of Moses and [2] the Prophets and Psalms.” The syntax suggests that the Psalms are in some sense part of the Prophets. Thus, the words of the risen Jesus imply that the Psalms are prophetic. The eschatological commentaries found at Qumran (i.e., the pesharim), which interpret the Prophets and the Psalms, support this understanding of Luke 24:44. For further discussion of the development of canon, see L. M. McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon: Revised and Expanded Edition* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995); L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002).

⁹Most of the OT was originally composed in Hebrew. Aramaic is limited to Gen 31:47 (two words), Jer 10:11 (one sentence), Dan 2:4–7:28 (five stories and a vision), and Ezra 4:8–6:18 and 7:12–26 (mostly concerning the rebuilding of the Jewish temple).

¹⁰See the helpful synthesis in E. Ulrich, “Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; New York: E. J. Brill, 1991), 23–41; and E. Tov, “Scriptures: Texts,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:832–36.

from the LXX, the better-known Greek translation.¹¹ Qumran has also yielded two small fragments of Targumim to Leviticus and Job, and a large fragmentary scroll of Aramaic Job.¹² These texts differ significantly from the fully preserved Targumim of the later rabbinic period. Even the Old Latin (which predates the late-fourth-century Vulgate) probably circulated in more than one version.¹³

The multiformity of the biblical text must be taken into account when studying OT quotations and allusions in the NT and in other writings of late antiquity. What at first may appear to be an inaccurate quotation, or a quotation of the LXX, itself thought to be an inaccurate translation of the underlying Hebrew, may in fact be a quotation of a different textual tradition.¹⁴

Let us briefly review the principal versions of Scripture, along with basic bibliography:

Hebrew. Prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947–1956, the oldest copies of the HB dated to the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh century (viz., the Aleppo Codex, ca. tenth century; and the Leningrad Codex, 1008 C.E.). The region of the Dead Sea has yielded more than two hundred scrolls (mostly fragmentary) of Hebrew Scripture. Only the book of Esther is unattested. The best-preserved scroll is the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a), found in the first cave, which may date to the second century B.C.E. Amazingly, the Dead Sea Bible scrolls push back the date of the extant Hebrew text more than one thousand years. The official Hebrew Bible of Judaism and the Christian OT is the Masoretic Text (MT; named after the sixth- to ninth-century Jewish scholars who vocalized and annotated the text). The Hebrew scrolls of Qumran antedate the MT by several centuries.

Bibliography. For the text of the (Masoretic) Hebrew Bible, see K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983). For discussion, see L. Goldschmidt, *The Earliest Editions of the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Aldus, 1950); and E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992). Eugene Ulrich and others are preparing a Hebrew Bible based on the Dead Sea Scrolls. For an English translation of the Bible as preserved at Qumran and at other locations in the Dead Sea region, see M. G. Abegg, P. W. Flint, and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: Harper-Collins, 1999).

¹¹ See E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (Seiyāl Collection 1; DJD 8; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

¹² M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan, 1974).

¹³ E. Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 87–95.

¹⁴ Recognition of the multiformity of the biblical text in late antiquity, especially before 70 C.E., renders obsolete the older notions of accuracy in quotation, as seen in studies such as C. Goodwin, “How Did John Treat His Sources?” *JBL* 73 (1954): 61–75; and S. V. McCasland, “Matthew Twists the Scriptures,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 143–48.

Aramaic. The Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Scriptures developed in the synagogue. How old this practice was and how far back the Aramaic tradition can be dated are complicated questions. Fragments of Targumim to Leviticus and Job found at Qumran make it clear that the practice antedates Jesus and the early church, but how much of the later, fully extant targumic tradition reaches back to this early period is uncertain and disputed. Several studies show convincingly that at least some elements of this tradition were, in one form or another, in circulation in the first century.

Bibliography. For texts of the Targumim, see A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (4 vols. in 5; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959–1973); A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Targum palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (5 vols.; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968–1978); and E. G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* (Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav, 1984). For introductory studies and studies that explore the relevance of the targumic tradition for NT interpretation, see J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969); P. Grelot, *What Are the Targums? Selected Texts* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992); M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (2d ed.; AnBib 27A; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978); idem, *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972); and B. D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time* (GNS 8; Wilmington, Del.: Glazier, 1984). For an English translation of the Targum, see the multivolume series *The Aramaic Bible*, launched by Michael Glazier and continued by Liturgical Press. This series is nearly complete.

Syriac. Another Semitic version of Scripture is the Syriac; it is known as the Peshitta (“simple”). Like the Targumim, the antiquity of this version as well as its provenance are disputed. The Syriac gives evidence of being influenced by both the Aramaic and the Greek. Both Testaments of the Syriac version, the Old and the New, may potentially make important contributions to questions of textual development.

Bibliography. For the Syriac text, see *Ktabe Qadishe* [Holy Bible] (London: United Bible Societies, 1979), and *Ktabe Qadishe* (Beirut: Bible Society in Lebanon, 1995). E. J. Brill is publishing a critical edition of the Syriac text (the OT in Syriac according to the Peshitta version), sponsored by the Peshitta Institute of the University of Leiden. See also A. Kiraz, ed., *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels* (4 vols.; New York: E. J. Brill, 1996). For a critical study, see M. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). For an English translation, see G. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts* (Nashville: Holman, 1933).

Greek. Beginning in the third century B.C.E. and probably beginning with the books of Moses, the Hebrew and Aramaic Scriptures were translated into Greek. Much of this translation was probably done in Egypt, especially Alexandria, but some of it may have taken place in other locations, including Israel itself. By the first century C.E. the Law and the Prophets were probably widely circulated in Greek. The NT writers quoted the Greek version more often than any other version. Not surprisingly, the Greek version of the Bible became the standard text in the Christian church (though Jewish Christians, or Ebionites, continued to make use of the Hebrew version).

Bibliography. The standard text has been A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935; repr., 1971). This edition, with its limited critical apparatus, is being replaced, however, by the Göttingen Septuagint, which for many years was edited by the late Joseph Ziegler. For critical studies and an introduction, see H. M. Orlinsky, *The Septuagint: The Oldest Translation of the Bible* (Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1949); K. Hanhart, "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta in neutestamentlicher Zeit," ZTK 81 (1984) 395–416; S. Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (ConBOT 30; Stockholm: Almqvist, 1990); E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2d ed.; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997); K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000); R. T. McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

The Göttingen Septuagint project is not yet complete, but a great many volumes have been published. See R. Hanhart and J. W. Wevers, eds., *Das Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen: Joseph Ziegler zum 75. Geburtstag, 15. 3. 1977* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977). Mention also should be made of A. E. Brooke, N. McLean, and H. St. J. Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906–1940). The textual notes of these editions are rich. There are two English translations of the LXX: Charles Thomson, *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and the New Covenant, Commonly Called the Old and the New Testament* (4 vols.; Philadelphia: Jane Aitken, 1808); and Lancelot C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, according to the Vatican Text* (2 vols.; London: S. Bagster & Sons, 1844; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986). A New English translation of the LXX (NETS) has been launched by the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS). The first fascicle to appear is by Albert Pietersma, *The Psalms: A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Members of the IOSCS are also preparing a commentary on the LXX. Their work will take into account the manner in which the Greek translators rendered the underlying Hebrew. Taking a different approach, a team of scholars assembled by Stanley Porter is preparing a commentary on the LXX that emphasizes the LXX as Greek literature read by Greek speakers.

Latin. When Pompey entered Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E., Israel became part of the Roman Empire. It was inevitable that the sacred scriptures of Israel would eventually be translated into Latin, though exactly when and where this took place are not known. North Africa is a good candidate. This Latin version of Scripture, usually called the Old Latin version (OL), is attested by Latin-speaking church fathers, such as Tertullian (b. ca. 160) and Cyprian (d. ca. 258). In the latter part of the fourth century, Pope Damasus I (366–384) commissioned Jerome to prepare a Latin translation of the Christian Bible. Eventually this version became known as the Vulgate (i.e., “common”). Although influential persons such as the great church father Augustine urged Jerome to translate the Greek OT, Jerome based his translation on the Hebrew.

Bibliography. For the Latin text, see R. Weber, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (2 vols.; 3d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1985). For critical studies, see F. Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1928); H. J. Vogels, *Vulgatastudien: Die Evangelien der Vulgata untersucht auf ihre lateinische und griechische Vorlage* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1928); J. Barr, “St. Jerome’s Appreciation of Hebrew,” *BJRL* 49 (1966/1967): 281–302; B. Kedar-Kopfstein, “The Vulgate as a Translation: Some Semantic and Syntactical Aspects” (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1968).

General Bibliography. For comprehensive studies pertinent to all of the versions of Scripture that have been mentioned, see M. J. Mulder, ed., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT 2.1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); and especially D. Barthélemy et al., *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament* (3 vols.; OBO 50; Fribourg: Presses Universitaires, 1982–).

Interpretive Approaches

The interpretation of Scripture in late antiquity took many forms. One such form—translation and paraphrase—was implicit and often unconscious. But other forms were explicit. These include midrash, pesher, allegory, and typology. These interpretive approaches were not always consciously recognized or distinguished. In fact, elements of allegory and typology often appear in midrash and pesher, and the latter often overlap. Nevertheless, there are distinctive features, the recognition of which will aid the modern interpreter.

Midrash. Midrashic exegesis is usually associated with rabbinic Judaism, though it has roots that reach back into the intertestamental period and into biblical literature itself.¹⁵ Midrash is religious, literary, academic, and collegial, often taking

¹⁵See S. Sandmel, “The Haggada within Scripture,” *JBL* 80 (1961): 105–22. For other studies on midrash, see S. Zeitlin, “Midrash: A Historical Study,” *JQR* 44 (1953):

form in didactic settings and collegial debate. The principal objective of midrash (from Heb. *darash*, “to search”) is, as its name implies, the searching of Scripture for clarification and further teaching. The Johannine Jesus alludes to this approach when he says, “You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life” (John 5:39; cf. 7:52: “Search and you will see that no prophet is to rise from Galilee” RSV). Searching the Scriptures for life (cf. Luke 10:28, “Do this and you will live” RSV; *Tg. Onq.* Lev 18:5, “which if a man does, he will live by them in eternal life”) is the whole point of biblical interpretation.

Scripture had to be searched, for it was believed that it contained all that really mattered (cf. *m. ʿAbot* 5:22: “for everything is in it . . . you cannot have a better guide than it”). Tradition holds that the great sage Hillel formulated seven rules, or *middoth*, for searching the Scripture (*ʿAbot R. Nat.* 37; *t. Sanh.* 7.11). Whether he in fact did so is not known and does not matter. What is significant is that we find evidence of several of these rules in practice in many of the NT writings themselves.

Pesher. At Qumran, Scripture was viewed as containing mysteries that needed explanation (or the covenanters of Qumran needed scriptural clarification of their own bewildering and painful experience). The *pesher* was the explanation of the mystery: “the *pesher* of this [passage of Scripture] concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the prophets” (1QpHab 7:4–5).

It was assumed that the text spoke of and to the Qumran community and of eschatological events about to unfold. As in NT exegesis (cf. Mark 12:10–11 [citing Ps 118:22–23]; 14:27 [citing Zech 13:7]; Acts 2:17–21 [citing Joel 2:28–32]; 15:16–17 [citing Amos 9:11–12]), *pesher* exegesis understands specific biblical passages as fulfilled in specific historical events and experiences.¹⁶

Allegory. Allegorical interpretation entails extracting a symbolic meaning from the text. It assumes that a deeper, more sophisticated interpretation is to be found beneath the obvious letter of the passage. The allegorist does not, however, necessarily assume that the text is unhistorical or without literal meaning. His exegesis

21–36; A. G. Wright, *The Literary Genre Midrash* (Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba, 1967); G. G. Porton, “Midrash: Palestinian Jews and the Hebrew Bible in the Greco-Roman Period,” *ANRW* 2.19.1:103–38; idem, “Defining Midrash,” in *Study of Ancient Judaism* (ed. J. Neusner; New York: Ktav, 1981), 55–94; J. Neusner, *What Is Midrash?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); G. G. Porton, “Rabbinic Literature: Midrashim,” *DNTB* 889–93.

¹⁶See J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–333; M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979); G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1985); D. Dimant, “Pesharim, Qumran,” *ABD* 5:244–51; M. Bernstein, “Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 30–70; G. J. Brooke, “Pesharim,” *DNTB* 778–82.

is simply not concerned with this aspect of the biblical passage. The best-known first-century allegorist was Philo of Alexandria, whose many books afford a wealth of examples of the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, primarily the books of Moses.¹⁷ There is some allegory in the NT—in a few places in Paul, in Hebrews, and in some of Jesus' parables.¹⁸ (See more on Philo below.)

Typology. Typology is not so much a method of exegesis as a presupposition underlying the Jewish and Christian understanding of Scripture, particularly its historical portions. Typology is based upon the belief that the biblical story of the past has some bearing on the present or, to turn it around, that the present is foreshadowed in the biblical story. Unlike allegory, typology is closely tied to history, for the events of history exemplify the very patterns of divine activity and, accordingly, adumbrate the plans of God yet to unfold. Typology therefore enables interpreters to weld the past together with the present and the future, thus providing a reassuring continuity between sacred story and present experience.¹⁹

¹⁷See J. Z. Lauterbach, "The Ancient Jewish Allegorists," *JQR* 1 (1911): 291–333; G. L. Bruns, "Midrash and Allegory: The Beginnings of Scriptural Interpretation," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (ed. R. Alter and F. Kermode; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), 625–46; R. Boer, "National Allegory in the Hebrew Bible," *JSOT* 74 (1997): 95–116; R. Kasher, "Metaphor and Allegory in the Aramaic Translation of the Bible," *Journal of the Aramaic Bible* 1 (1999): 53–77; E. M. Menn, "Targum of the Song of Songs and the Dynamics of Historical Allegory," in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (ed. C. A. Evans; JSPSup 33; SSEJC 7; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 423–45.

¹⁸S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (BST 1; Richmond: John Knox, 1965); C. K. Barrett, "The Allegory of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar in the Argument of Galatians," in *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann* (ed. J. Friedrich; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1976), 1–16; repr. in *Essays on Paul* (London: SPCK, 1982), 154–70; C. E. Carlston, "Parable and Allegory Revisited: An Interpretative Review," *CBQ* 43 (1981): 228–42; S. Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story? Allegory and Interpretive Power in Galatians," *JSNT* 55 (1994): 77–95; T. Löfstedt, "The Allegory of Hagar and Sarah: Gal 4.21–31," *EstBib* 58 (2000): 475–94.

¹⁹See J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum Futuri* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1950); G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology* (SBT 22; London: SCM Press, 1957); G. von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," in *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics* (ed. C. Westermann; Richmond: John Knox, 1963), 17–39; M. D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964); P. J. Cahill, "Hermeneutical Implications of Typology," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 266–81; L. Goppelt, *Typos, The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); C. K. Barrett, "The Significance of the Adam-Christ Typology for the Resurrection of the Dead: 1 Co 15, 20–22, 45–49," in *Résurrection du Christ et des chrétiens* (1 Co 15) (ed. L. de Lorenzi; Série monographique de "Benedictina": Section biblico-oecuménique 8; Rome: Abbaye de S. Paul, 1985), 99–126; repr. in *Jesus and the Word and Other Essays* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 163–84; F. Foulkes, "The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1994), 342–71; F. Young, "Typology," in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder* (ed. S. E. Porter et al.; BIS 8; New York: E. J. Brill, 1994), 29–48; J. W.

Cognate Literatures

One of the most challenging aspects of serious biblical exegesis for the beginning student is the myriad of cognate literatures. Identifying the pertinent materials, rightly assessing their relevance and potential contributions, and gaining critical control of the materials are daunting tasks. These literatures are diverse, spanning centuries and emanating from various geographical and cultural settings, and, of course, they are extant in several languages. Moreover, their origins are sometimes obscure, often because they represent (exegetically) reworked traditions, usually moving from Jewish to Christian circles (*4 Ezra* / *2 Esdras* an illustrative case in point).²⁰

What is listed and briefly summarized below represents only the minimum of the literatures that exegetes must take into account. Other materials, including papyri, inscriptions, coins, and artifacts must also be considered but are not discussed here. Once again basic bibliography is provided.²¹

Apocrypha. The most important intertestamental corpus is the OT Apocrypha, or deuterocanonical books (called such because they are viewed as a second group of books to be recognized as canonical). Fifteen books make up this corpus if we count the Epistle of Jeremiah separately and do not include 3–4 Maccabees, and Psalm 151. The latter are usually included with the OT Pseudepigrapha.

The Apocrypha include several types of writings. Among them, some are historical (1 Esdras, 1–2 Maccabees), some are romantic (Tobit, Judith, Susanna), some are moralistic (Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, Bel and the Dragon, Sirach [or Ecclesiasticus]), and some devotional (Prayer of Azariah, Song of the Three Young Men, Prayer of Manasseh). One is apocalyptic (2 Esdras). Most of the books of the OT Apocrypha were written in Greek.

Aageson, "Typology, Correspondence, and the Application of Scripture in Romans 9–11," JSNT 31 (1987): 51–72; repr. in *The Pauline Writings: A Sheffield Reader* (ed. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; Biblical Seminar 34; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 76–97; G. M. Stevenson, "Communal Imagery and the Individual Lament: Exodus Typology in Psalm 77," *ResQ* 39 (1997): 215–29.

²⁰ *Fourth Ezra* is extant as 2 Esdras 3–14. *Fourth Ezra* was composed, in either Aramaic or Hebrew, by a Palestinian Jew near the end of the first century C.E. A generation later a Christian added two chapters at the beginning of the composition (i.e., 2 Esdras 1–2 = 5 Ezra), and a century later another Christian added two more chapters at the end of the composition (i.e., 2 Esdras 15–16 = 6 Ezra). These additions were originally in Greek, but only fragments are extant. The document as a whole survives in Latin, and large portions survive in other languages. See T. A. Bergren, *Fifth Ezra: The Text, Origin, and Early History* (SBLSCS 25; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), idem, *Sixth Ezra: The Text and Origin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); and M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

²¹ For a general introductory survey, see C. A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992).

Bibliography. The text of the Greek Apocrypha is found in the LXX (see above). For an English translation, see E. J. Goodspeed, *The Apocrypha: An American Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938); and for the RSV, B. M. Metzger, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977 [for the NRSV, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989]). For a concordance of the Apocrypha in English, see B. M. Metzger, ed., *A Concordance to the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books of the Revised Standard Version* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983). For introductions and surveys, see W. O. E. Oesterley, *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha* (London: SPCK, 1953); B. M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957); D. J. Harrington, *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); D. A. DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002). For commentaries on the individual books of the Apocrypha, see the Anchor Bible series (Doubleday).

Pseudepigrapha. The writings of the OT Pseudepigrapha are numerous and diverse. Several literary genres are represented in this amorphous collection. Their dates of composition also cover a broad period of time, with *Ahiqar* the oldest, at about the seventh or sixth century B.C.E., and *Apocalypse of Daniel* the most recent, at about the ninth century C.E. Many of these books were among those to which *4 Ezra* refers: “Ninety-four books were written. And . . . the Most High spoke to me, saying, ‘Make public the twenty-four books that you wrote first and let the worthy and unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people. For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the river of knowledge’” (14:44–47).²² The “twenty-four” books are the books that make up the Jewish Bible, or what Christians call the Old Testament. The “seventy” books are the books of the OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The author of *4 Ezra* was probably very close to the truth.

The word *pseudepigrapha* is a Greek word meaning “falsely superscribed,” or what we moderns might call writing under a pen name. The classification “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha” is a label that scholars have given to these writings. Although some of the writings have been grouped together or associated in one way or another, most never had any connection to one another. Most of the writings are Jewish or Christian, most are attributed to an OT worthy (e.g., Adam, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Ezra), and most build on OT stories or themes. Many of them were written before the Christian era or at least contain traditions that antedate the NT writings. Accordingly, these writings often shed light on ideas found in the NT.

Bibliography. For an introduction and English translation, see R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Oxford: Claren-

²²Bruce M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; 2 vols., N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 516–59.

don, 1913); J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985). For a bibliography, see J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, with a Supplement* (2d ed.; SBLSCS 7; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981); and L. DiTommaso, *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research, 1850–1999* (JSPSup 39; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). The latter work is massive, comprising more than 1000 pages, and invaluable for research in the OT Pseudepigrapha. For an assessment of the value of the Pseudepigrapha for NT study, see J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); repr. as *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998).

Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls probably constitute the single most important biblically related literary discovery of the twentieth century. The Scrolls have made important contributions to biblical scholarship in several fields: (1) the study of the ancient writing and making of books/scrolls; (2) textual criticism of the OT; (3) linguistic studies in Hebrew and Aramaic; (4) apocryphal and pseudepigraphal studies; (5) the study of sects and groups, particularly the Essenes, within Palestinian Jewry; (6) ancient methods of biblical interpretation; (7) intertestamental history; (8) first-century doctrines and religious ideas; and (9) NT background studies.

Bibliography. The official editions of the Scrolls, which are now nearly complete, have appeared in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series (Oxford University Press). More than sixty scholars have participated in publishing these texts. There is also a convenient edition, with Hebrew- and Aramaic-English facing pages, by F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; vol. 1, New York: Brill, 1997; vol. 2, Boston: Brill, 1998). A multivolume series, the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, edited by James Charlesworth (Mohr [Siebeck] and Westminster John Knox), is about half complete. For an introduction to the Scrolls, see J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994). See also L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam, eds., *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

There are also English editions by G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (4th ed.; New York: Penguin, 1995); and M. O. Wise, M. G. Abegg Jr., and E. M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: Harper-Collins, 1996). Perhaps the most important scholarly assessments are those by L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Israel Antiquities Authority, 2000); and P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A*

Comprehensive Assessment (2 vols.; Boston: Brill, 1998–1999).²³ For a recent assessment of the value of the Scrolls for NT interpretation, see J. C. VanderKam and P. W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: Harper-Collins, 2002).

Philo. Philo Judaeus of Alexandria (ca. 20 B.C.E.–50 C.E.) was a prolific writer. Although he was Jewish, his language was Greek, the principal language of his city. Most of his writings are extant, but scholars dispute whether they represent exegesis, philosophy, apologetics, or even psychology. Philo's writings probably reflect all of these interests. But his principal purpose, in my judgment, was to show that Judaism, particularly as seen in the scriptures of Judaism, constitutes a superior worldview. His allegorical exegesis should be understood in this light. Philo was not interested in what actually happened but in how the biblical story could speak to thinking persons of the Greco-Roman world. Philo carried out this purpose by interpreting the biblical stories (mostly those of the Pentateuch) in terms of neoplatonism (i.e., the view that what the physical senses perceive on earth below is but an imperfect reflection of the true and perfect reality of heaven above). Like Stoic philosophers who allegorized Homer's epics, Philo read allegorical meanings into the biblical narratives. For example, Cain is to be understood as "foolish opinion," which is to be replaced by Abel, to be understood as "good conviction" (*Sacrifices* 2 §5). Or again, when Abram was commanded to depart from his home country, the patriarch was thereby commanded to escape the prison house of his physical body and turn his thoughts God-ward (*Migration* 1–2 §1–12).

Of special interest is the relationship of Philo's exegesis to the targumic traditions of the synagogue and to the midrashic traditions of the rabbinic academies. Some scholars have attempted to relate Philo's legal interpretations (halakah) to those of the rabbis, concluding that Philo's halakic interpretation is distinctive to Alexandria.²⁴ Others disagree, thinking that it is in basic continuity

²³A few other learned collections should be mentioned: D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; New York: E. J. Brill, 1992); E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam, eds., *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (CJAS 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994); M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins, and D. G. Pardee, eds., *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994); S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans, eds., *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich, eds., *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

²⁴See E. R. Goodenough, *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts of Egypt* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929; repr., Amsterdam: Philo, 1968); Isaak Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1932; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1962).

with Palestinian halakah.²⁵ Yet others think Philo and early Palestinian rabbis had very different interpretive intentions;²⁶ this may be so, but the similarities nevertheless call for explanation.

Philo's allegorical interpretation of Scripture has shed some light on the NT. Peder Borgen has shown that the use of manna tradition in John 6 coheres at many points with Philonic and early rabbinic interpretation.²⁷ Wayne Meeks found additional points of coherence between John and Philo (and other early Jewish materials) in their respective interpretations of Moses.²⁸ Hebrews is another NT writing that has often been compared to Philonic principles of interpretation.²⁹ Its writer's comparisons between the earthly priesthood and the heavenly, the earthly tabernacle and the heavenly, and the earthly sacrifice and the eternal are very much in step with the neoplatonic approach taken by Philo.

Bibliography. The standard critical edition of Philo's works is L. Cohn and P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* (7 vols.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1896–1930; repr. 1962). For the Greek text and English facing pages, see F. H. Colson et al., *Philo* (12 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1953). For a concordance, see P. Borgen, K. Fuglseth, and R. Skarsten, *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria* (Boston: Brill, 2000). For critical studies, see T. H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (CBQMS 14; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1983); D. T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature* (CRINT 3.3; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); D. M. Hay, "Defining Allegory in Philo's Exegetical World," in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1994* (ed. E. H. Lovering;

²⁵ See E. Stein, *Philo und Midrasch* (BZAW 57; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1931); Samuel Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940).

²⁶ S. Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1971). For an assessment, see the studies by R. D. Hecht, "The Exegetical Contexts of Philo's Interpretation of Circumcision," in *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel* (ed. F. E. Greenspahn et al.; Scholars Press Homage Series 9; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984) 51–79; idem, "Preliminary Issues in the Analysis of Philo's *De specialibus legibus*," *SPhilo* 5 (1979): 1–56.

²⁷ P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (NovTSup 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965; repr., 1981).

²⁸ W. A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King, Moses Traditions, and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967). See also A. W. Argyle, "Philo and the Fourth Gospel," *ExpTim* 63 (1951–52): 385–86; R. McL. Wilson, "Philo and the Fourth Gospel," *ExpTim* 65 (1953–54): 47–49; H. Chadwick, "St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria," *BJRL* 48 (1966): 286–307; P. Borgen, "Observations on the Targumic Character of the Prologue of John," *NTS* 16 (1970): 288–95; D. A. Hagner, "The Vision of God in Philo and John: A Comparative Study," *JETS* 14 (1971): 81–93; T. H. Tobin, "The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation," *CBQ* 52 (1999): 252–69.

²⁹ See L. K. K. Dey, *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews* (SBLDS 25; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1975); S. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1965); R. Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (ALGHJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

SBLSP 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 55–68; A. A. Long, “Allegory in Philo and Etymology in Stoicism: A Plea for Drawing Distinctions,” *SPhilo* 9 (1997): 198–210.

Josephus. The writings of Josephus provide us with invaluable information touching history, politics, religious ideas, Jewish sects, and biblical interpretation. Born in the year of Gaius Caligula’s accession (37/38 C.E.), young Joseph ben Matthias studied Jewish law, contemplated which sect he would join (Pharisees, Sadducees, or Essenes), and visited the Roman capital. When the first war with Rome broke out (66 C.E.), Josephus (as he later calls himself) assumed command of part (or all) of Galilee. Besieged at Jotapata for forty-seven days, he surrendered to the Romans and prophesied that Vespasian, the commander of the Roman forces in Israel, would someday become the Roman emperor. When his prophecy came to pass in 69 C.E., Josephus was released from custody and was made part of the advisory council of Vespasian’s son Titus. Shortly after the war ended in 70, Josephus went to Rome, where he was granted Roman citizenship. He took the name Flavius from the family name of Vespasian and Titus. In the late 70s he wrote the *Jewish War* (seven books). (An earlier version of this work, written in Aramaic, was sent to Jews of Mesopotamia to discourage them from revolt.) In the mid-90s he completed the *Jewish Antiquities* (twenty books). Shortly after 100 C.E. he published his *Life* (an appendix to the *Antiquities*) and *Against Apion* (two books). (From *Ant.* 20.12.1 §267 one may infer that much of the *Life* had been written by 93–94 C.E., although it would not be published for about another seven years.) Josephus died in the early years of the second century. All of his writings, with the exception of the earlier draft of the *Jewish War*, were originally published in Greek. Greek was not Josephus’s mother tongue, but he had studied it and could with some difficulty write and speak it. He had assistance with the Greek in composing his books, as he himself explains (*Ag. Ap.* 1.9 §50).

Several topics treated in the writings of Josephus are especially relevant to NT study. His description of the religious/political sects (Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and the so-called Fourth Philosophy) is of great importance (cf. *Life* 2 §10–12; *J.W.* 2.8.2–14 §§119–166; *Ant.* 18.1.2–6 §§11–23). His account of the Samaritan-Jewish hostility (*J.W.* 2.12.3 §§232–244; *Ant.* 18.2.2 §30; 20.6.1–3 §§118–136) helps us understand what the NT presupposes (Matt 10:5; Luke 9:52; 10:30–39; John 4:9; 8:48). His portrait of Pontius Pilate as insensitive and brutal is illuminating, if not somewhat gratuitous (*Ant.* 18.3.1–3 §§55–62; *J.W.* 2.9.2–4 §§169–177; cf. Philo, *Embassy* 38 §§299–305), and coheres with the NT (Luke 13:1–2; Acts 4:27). Josephus’s portrait of the high priesthood reveals corruption, avarice, collaboration with Rome, and, on occasion, violence (*Ant.* 20.8.8 §181; 20.9.2 §§206–207)—details that certainly cohere with the portrait found in the Gospels and Acts (Mark 14:1, 43, 53–65; 15:1–15, 31–32; Acts 4:1–3; 5:17–18; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1–2; 23:2; 24:1). Jesus’ critical stance toward the ruling priests is thus clarified (Mark 11:15–17, 27–33; 12:1–12, 38–40, 41–44). Josephus’s personal prophecies (*J.W.* 3.8.3 §§351–352; 6.2.1 §109; 6.4.5 §250; 6.5.4 §311) and the prophecies of others (*J.W.* 6.5.3 §§301–309) that he records regarding the de-

struction of Jerusalem and the temple are instructive for comparison with Jesus' similar prophecies (Mark 13:1–2; Luke 19:41–44; 23:27–31). Finally, his description of would-be kings and prophets, his retelling of the biblical narratives, and his references to John the Baptist and Jesus provide us with useful data.

Bibliography. There are two critical editions of the writings of Josephus, one by S. A. Naber, *Flavii Josephi Opera omnia* (6 vols.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1888–1896), and another by B. Niese, *Flavii Josephi Opera* (7 vols.; Berlin: Weidmann, 1885–1895). The Greek text and an English translation are presented in H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren, and L. H. Feldman, trans., *Josephus* (9 vols., LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965). The standard concordance is K. H. Rengstorff, ed., *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus* (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1973–1983). For critical studies, see H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures 1; New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929); S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeon Politics* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 18; New York: E. J. Brill, 1990); L. H. Feldman and G. Hata, eds., *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987); L. H. Feldman and G. Hata, eds., *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989); R. Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); L. H. Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); idem, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (New York: Brill, 1998). For recent introductory works, see T. Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and His Society* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1988); S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (2d ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003). Mason is giving editorial direction to a new translation and commentary on Josephus (E. J. Brill).

Rabbinic Writings. Rabbinic writings that have relevance for the study of early Christianity fall into three categories: Targum, Talmud, and midrash. The first category was mentioned under “Aramaic,” above. The writings that fall into the category of Talmud constitute the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the Jerusalem (or Palestinian) Talmud (Heb. Talmud Yerushalmi), and the Babylonian Talmud (Heb. Talmud Babli) along with its several minor tractates. The remaining writings, from *Mekilta* to *ʿAggadat Esther*, fall into the category of midrash.

These rabbinic writings also fall into two broad periods of time: Tannaitic (or Tannaic) and Amoraic. The Tannaitic period was roughly from 50 B.C.E. to 200 C.E., that is, from the establishment of the early academies, Bet Shammai (“House of Shammai”) and Bet Hillel (“House of Hillel”), to the compiling and editing of the Mishnah under Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi (“the Prince” or “the Patriarch”; 135–217 C.E.) in about the first decade of the third century C.E. The teachers or sages of this period are called the Tannaim (“teachers,” from the Aramaic word *tana*, which literally means “to repeat”). Midway through this period, probably following Yavneh (or Jamnia; late first century C.E.), ordained sages were

given the title “rabbi,” which literally means “my master.” Informal use of “rabbi,” of course, was earlier, as seen in the NT gospels. Babylonian scholars were called “Rab.” The achievement of the Tannaitic period was the production of the Mishnah. Tannaitic sayings found in later writings outside the Mishnah are called *baraitoth* (an Aramaic word literally meaning “standing outside”; sg. *baraita*). The Amoraic period was from 220 C.E. to 500 C.E. Its rabbis are called the Amoraim (“expounders” or “spokesmen,” from the Aramaic word *amar*, “to say”). The achievement of the Amoraic period was the production of the two Talmuds and several of the midrashim.

The principal dangers in making use of rabbinic literature are anachronism and misleading generalization. Scholars and students must critically assess the traditions relating to events and customs said to have taken place or to have been observed during Second Temple times. At least partial corroboration is required before accepting these traditions as historically sound. Moreover, one must exercise caution regarding the attributions of sayings and teachings to various rabbinic authorities. The work of Jacob Neusner and others has made important contributions to recognizing and dealing with this problem.

Bibliography. For texts and translations of the Mishnah, see P. Blackman, *Mishnayot* (6 vols.; New York: Judaica, 1977); J. Rabbinowitz, *Mishnah Megillah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931); H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933); and J. Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988). For texts and translations of the Tosefta, see S. Lieberman, *Tosefot Rishonim* (4 vols.; Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1936–1939); M. S. Zuckerman, *Tosefta: Based on the Erfurt and Vienna Codices* (2d ed.; Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1937); and J. Neusner, ed., *The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew* (6 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1977–1986; repr. 2 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002). For the text and a translation of the Babylonian Talmud, in the format of English-Hebrew facing pages, see I. Epstein, ed., *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (30 vols.; London: Soncino, 1960; repr., 1990). For introductions to the rabbinic literature, see S. Safrai, ed., *The Literature of the Sages* (CRINT 2.3/1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992); and J. Neusner, *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994). For liturgy and the synagogue, see I. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1993).

New Testament Apocrypha and Early Patristic Writings. The so-called NT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is a misnomer, seeming to imply that these are writings of the NT itself. In reality these are post-NT Christian apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings, some of them dating from the Middle Ages. The earliest patristic writings are mostly found in the collection of so-called Apostolic Fathers; some are genuinely ascribed (e.g., the letters of Ignatius and *1 Clement*), whereas others

are either anonymous or pseudonymous (e.g., *Barnabas*). *First Clement* may date to the end of the first century, but the others range across the second century.

The most important writings of the NT Apocrypha are the gospels, such as the Jewish gospels (esp. the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* and the *Gospel of the Ebionites*) and gospels whose fragments have been discovered in more recent times (e.g., the Egerton Papyrus, the *Gospel of Peter*, and the *Gospel of Thomas*). Scholars hotly dispute the antiquity, independence, and value of these writings. If they are early and perhaps even independent of the NT gospels (and this is highly doubtful), they could make important contributions to our understanding of the meaning and development of the canonical gospels.

The dangers of making use of early patristic and extracanonical writings are analogous to those in the case of the rabbinic literature. Some of the earliest material may contain traditions that reach back to the NT and that may be independent from the writings of the NT themselves. Accordingly, they may clarify the meaning of certain passages and themes and therefore should be taken into account.

Bibliography. For Greek texts and translations of the Apostolic Fathers, see K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* (2 vols.; LCL 24–25; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912–1913); also see J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp* (5 vols.; 1889–1890; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989); J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (ed. J. R. Harmer; New York: Macmillan, 1891). There is also an English translation, with some commentary, edited by R. M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers* (6 vols.; New York and Camden, N.J.: Thomas Nelson, 1964–1968); and a new edition of Lightfoot's English translation, *The Apostolic Fathers* (ed. M. W. Holmes; rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989). The Hermeneia commentary series (Fortress) is producing critical commentaries on these writings. See W. R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); K. Niederwimmer, *The Didache* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998); C. Osiek, *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999).

For collections, introductions, notes, and bibliography of the NT Apocrypha, see W. Wright, *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament: Collected and Edited from Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, with an English Translation and Notes* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1865); M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924; corrected ed., 1953); W. Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha* (2 vols.; rev. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991–1992); J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation Based on M. R. James* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993). For works that tend to accept the antiquity and independence of one or more of the extracanonical gospels (esp. the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Gospel of Peter*, the *Secret Gospel of Mark*, and the *Egerton Papyrus*), see R. Cameron, ed., *The Other Gospels: Non-canonical Gospel Texts* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982); J. D. Crossan, *Four Other Gospels: Shadows on the Contours of Canon* (New York: Harper & Row, 1985; repr.,

Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1992); H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990); R. J. Miller, ed., *The Complete Gospels* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1992).

The Present Work

The essays that have been collected in this volume illustrate the principles and tasks that have been outlined above. They illustrate in various ways the nature of the work that is required, the texts that must be taken into account, and the problems that must be addressed.

The first two studies explore the ways in which the Aramaic version of Scripture assists in NT interpretation. Bruce Chilton examines how the paraphrasing and interpretive tendencies in the Aramaic (i.e., the Targumim) clarify similar tendencies in the NT. Chilton defines “Targum” and then cites several examples of dictional and thematic coherence between various NT passages and the Aramaic version of the Bible. Chilton rightly argues that these examples are not instances of dependence upon the Targum (or of the Targum upon the NT) but evidence of common interpretive traditions and locutions that appear in two independent streams of literature.

Craig Evans also treats the Targum but narrows the discussion to the Aramaic Psalter and its relevance for NT interpretation. Consistent with the observations and conclusions of Chilton, Evans finds interpretive tradition common to the Aramaic and the major components of the NT, including the Gospels and the Pauline Letters. In several instances it is the Aramaic version of Scripture that clarifies the point being made in the NT, especially as it concerns the messianism of Jesus himself and the subsequent Christology articulated by others, not least the Apostle Paul.

The next two studies probe the function of OT Scripture in the infancy narratives. Rikk Watts takes into account the wider Isaianic context of Isa 7:14, the Immanuel passage, which is cited by the Matthean evangelist. He concludes that this passage, fulfilled in the birth of Jesus, conveys a warning of judgment as much as it offers a promise of salvation. Israel must repent and receive its anointed deliverer lest, as in the days of the feckless and faithless king of Judah, the nation be divided and buffeted by a series of judgments.

Robert Shedinger examines the quotation and interpretation of Mic 5:1 in Matt 2:6. The focus, however, is primarily textual and linguistic. His study turns an old issue on its head. It used to be assumed that discrepancies between NT quotations of the OT were indications of either misquotation (accidental or deliberate) or use of a faulty Greek translation of the Hebrew. But now, thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls and other old versions, Shedinger rightly wonders if the discrepant quotations of the OT in the NT might not be witnesses to early, pre-Christian textual variants. He finds that the NT itself, in its various versions, including Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, may in fact aid the task of OT textual criticism.

The next two studies probe the function of the OT in the Gospel of Luke. Simon Gathercole investigates the use and interpretation of Lev 18:5 in early Judaism and clarifies its importance for understanding the allusions to it in several NT passages. He concludes that Lev 18:5 in late antiquity was a text of major significance, informing significant beliefs about righteousness and salvation, beliefs at issue in NT passages such as Luke 10, Romans 10, and Galatians 3. Gathercole makes creative use of Philo, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Pseudepigrapha, and rabbinic literature.

Michael Labahn explores the meaning of Isaiah 61 for Luke 7, especially in the light of the *Messianic Apocalypse* (4Q521). He calls into question the oft-heard notion that in Q there was little interest in eschatology and apocalyptic. Labahn rightly concludes that Jesus points to what is happening in his ministry as evidence of the arrival of the kingdom of God and that Jesus is saying that he is himself the tool through which God is bringing about this eschatological reality. The remarkable parallels found in the *Messianic Apocalypse*, drawn from the same Isaianic passages to which Jesus himself alludes, clarify the meaning of Jesus' reply to the imprisoned John the Baptist, pointing unmistakably to the eschatological significance of his ministry. Whereas the eschatological drama foreseen in the *Messianic Apocalypse* (and in other Qumran scrolls) is still awaited, in Jesus' ministry the drama has begun to unfold in the present time.

A. J. Droge provides our only study of the Fourth Gospel. Making interesting comparisons with Philo, he probes the link between the tradition of the unseen and unseeable God and the Fourth Evangelist's presentation of the eternal Word of God. Despite OT traditions that speak of a host of individuals who are said to have seen God (patriarchs, prophets, and others), the Fourth Evangelist declares that "no one has seen God." Droge wonders if this apparent contradiction may tell us something about the evangelist's view of Scripture—of what is authoritative Scripture and what is not or, put in another way, tells us something about the difference between the living word versus the written word. Thus, Droge's provocative study is not limited to a specific text but plunges into the larger and more complicated picture of Johannine hermeneutics and understanding of canon. If his conclusions are valid, our views of the Fourth Evangelist's assumptions about Scripture will have to be revised.

James VanderKam and James Kugel explore aspects of the OT in the book of Acts. VanderKam unpacks the OT background of the Festival of Weeks and its relevance for understanding the context and meaning of Peter's Pentecost sermon. He finds several points of agreement between Jewish traditions of the giving of the Law at Sinai and details in Acts 2. Kugel probes the exegetical context of Stephen's speech in Acts 7, in which the history of Israel is midrashically presented. He observes several points at which the summary of Israel's history is at variance with the history as recorded in either the Hebrew Bible or the Greek Bible. These departures, which at times cohere with Samaritan traditions, are often part of a midrash on Israel's sacred story.

The final two studies focus on the Pauline tradition. Brigitte Kahl offers an intriguing study of Paul's understanding of the Hagar story and its implications

for membership in the Christian church, a membership composed of Jews and Gentiles. She concludes that Paul's command in Galatians to "drive out the slave" means ending the hierarchical division of humanity into superior and inferior, an idea sharply at variance with the political philosophy regnant in the Roman Empire (as is so well illustrated in Josephus's version of a speech by Agrippa).

Gary Anderson tackles the difficult passage in 1 Timothy that assigns culpability to Eve. On what grounds does the Pauline author develop this charge? The reasoning of the author cannot be understood apart from careful consideration of the Jewish traditions presupposed, especially in the pseudepigraphal *Life of Adam and Eve*. Anderson believes that the key to the argument in 1 Timothy 2 lies in this pseudepigraphon, in which Eve's culpability is emphasized.

The collection of essays is brought to a close in an epilogue by veteran scholar James Sanders, who ponders why the theme of the present book and the approaches taken by the several authors matter. Sanders reminds us that early Judaism was an expression of faith in God, in which the revelation of God, the Scriptures, were "searched" (the root meaning of *midrash*) out of the conviction that everything of importance was in them. Sanders rightly points out that, by its very authoritative nature, sacred scripture was understood to speak to the end time in a dynamic, adaptable way, all the time declaring the unity and integrity of God. In this sense it is right to say that all of Scripture is prophetic and that both Testaments, in their own ways, attempt to affirm that God is truly One.

The essays that make up this volume illuminate important aspects of NT theology and the ways in which its authors appropriated and interpreted older Scripture. May the essays also serve a heuristic purpose, suggesting approaches and methods for further fruitful study.