

book and author on its own terms, one risks misinterpreting Scripture and not discerning what God intended to say to his people at any given point in their history. Theologically, the unity of Scripture marks out clear limits of thought and behaviour beyond which individuals or 'churches' may not legitimately be called Christian. On the other hand, the diversity of Scripture demonstrates how no one sect or ecclesiastical tradition has a monopoly of the truth. One can become heretical by being either too broad-minded or too narrow-minded!

See also: CHALLENGES TO BIBLICAL THEOLOGY; RELATIONSHIP OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT.

Bibliography

P. Balla, *Challenges to New Testament Theology* (Tubingen, 1997); C. L. Blomberg, 'The legitimacy and limits of harmonization', in D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (Grand Rapids and Carlisle, repr. 1995), pp. 135-174; R. B. Dillard, 'Harmonization: A help and a hindrance?' in H. Conn (ed.), *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic* (Grand Rapids, 1988), pp. 151-164; C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (London, 1936); J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London and Philadelphia, 1977); R. T. France, 'Development in New Testament Christology', *Them*, 18.1, 1992, pp. 4-8; D. N. Freedman, *The Unity of the Hebrew*

Bible (Ann Arbor, 1991); D. P. Fuller, 'The Importance of the Unity of the Bible', in R. L. Hubbard, Jr., et al. (eds.), *Studies in Old Testament Theology* (Dallas and London, 1992), pp. 63-75; J. Goldingay, 'Diversity and Unity in Old Testament Theology', *VT* 34, 1984, pp. 153-168; G. F. Hasel, *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids, 1978); *idem*, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids, 1991); A. J. Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis, 1994); E. E. Lemcio, 'The unifying kerygma of the New Testament', *JSNT* 33, 1988, pp. 3-17; 38, 1990, pp. 3-11; J. G. McConville, 'Using Scripture for theology: Unity and diversity in Old Testament theology', *SBET* 5, 1987, pp. 35-57; J. Reumann, *Variety and Unity in New Testament Thought* (Oxford, 1991); H. G. Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia, 1986); D. Rhoads, *The Challenge of Diversity: The Witness of Paul and the Gospels* (Minneapolis, 1996); H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (London and Philadelphia, 1953); W. VanGemeren, *The Progress of Redemption* (Grand Rapids and Carlisle, 1988, 1995); D. Wenham, 'Appendix: Unity and diversity in the New Testament', in G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, 1993, 1994), pp. 684-719.

C. L. BLOMBERG

Evans, Craig A. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." In

New Testament Use of the Old Testament

Introduction

It is difficult to overemphasize the importance of the function and influence of the OT in the NT. There are quotations of or allusions to the OT in every NT writing except Philemon and 2 and 3 John. It is quoted with introductory formulas ('it is written') and without.

Paraphrases and allusions appear; sometimes the allusions comprise no more than a word or two. In other places the NT reflects OT themes, structures and theology. The NT writers appeal to the OT for apologetic, moral, doctrinal and liturgical reasons. The evangelists seek in various ways to show how Jesus understood Scripture, fulfilled Scripture,

and was clarified by Scripture. The OT is represented even more prominently in the writings of Paul and in Hebrews.

Of more importance than its use in the NT is the theology of the OT. The OT's view of God, of humanity, of covenant, of the election of Israel and of judgment forms the presupposition that underlies the theology of Jesus, his disciples, and the writings of the NT. Apart from the OT the NT would make little sense. Explicit quotations of the OT, as well as the numerous allusions, provide only a partial indication of the foundational function the OT plays in the theology of the NT. Careful consideration of the function of the OT clarifies at many significant points the foundational doctrines of the NT.

Functions of the OT

The OT is quoted with introductory formulas (e.g. 'in order that it be fulfilled'), and sometimes without; many paraphrases and allusions are made through the use of a few key words or phrases. With regard to exegetical style, scholars have pointed to possible parallels with *pesher* as practised at Qumran (esp. in Matthew, Paul and Hebrews) and parallels with rabbinic midrash (esp. in John and Paul). The OT seems to have three principal functions: 1. legal, 2. prophetic and 3. analogical. *Legal* interpretation has to do with determining what is required of the one who has faith in God (or in Jesus). *Prophetic* interpretation has to do with what has been fulfilled in Jesus' advent and what is expected to be fulfilled in the future. *Analogical* interpretation has to do with comparisons. Typology is a familiar form of analogical interpretation. Several examples of these principal functions are considered in the following sections.

Jesus and the Gospels

Jesus' use of the Scripture is at points similar to its use by the rabbis of his day. Therefore much of his teaching and use of the OT is familiar to his hearers. However, the eschatological orientation of Jesus' interpretation of Scripture parallels more closely scriptural interpretation at Qumran, while its pneumatic emphasis reflects Jesus' own experience of the Spirit in his life and ministry. Thus Jesus' understanding of the OT often struck familiar chords, which attracted hearers, and yet his understanding was at points distinctive and

unexpected, which challenged his hearers, including his closest followers.

Citations of the OT in the Gospels reflect the Hebrew (Matt. 11:10, 29; Mark 10:19; 12:30; Luke 22:37), the Greek (Matt. 18:16; 21:16; Mark 7:6-7; 10:8; Luke 4:18; 23:46; John 12:38), and the Aramaic (Matt. 4:10; Mark 4:12; 9:48) versions. Given the nature and origin of the material, the respective contexts of the evangelists, and the fact that they wrote their Gospels in Greek, such diversity is hardly surprising. But citations attributed to Jesus also reflect the same diversity. Since Jesus probably did not speak Greek, he probably did not quote the Greek version (Lxx). But the Greek citations are not necessarily inauthentic, that is, deriving from the Greek-speaking Church after the time of Jesus. In many cases Jesus' citations of Scripture have been assimilated to the wording of the Greek, especially when the point that he makes is not lost in such assimilation.

Legal interpretation of Scripture

In most respects Jesus' view of the legal portions of Scripture was essentially that of his Palestinian contemporaries. When tempted by the devil (Matt. 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-13), Jesus responded with appropriate citations from Deuteronomy 8:3 ('Man shall not live by bread alone'), 6:16 ('You shall not tempt the Lord your God'), and 6:13 ('You shall worship the Lord your God', RSV). When asked what the greatest commandment was, Jesus cited Deuteronomy 6:4-5 ('Hear O Israel ... love the Lord your God with your whole heart ...'; cf. Mark 12:29-30) and Leviticus 19:18 ('You shall love your neighbour as yourself'; cf. Mark 12:31). Deuteronomy 6:4-5 was part of the Shema that an observant Jew was to recite twice daily (cf. *Mishnah Berakot* 1:1-4). The idea of loving one's neighbour as oneself and so fulfilling the whole law is found in Jewish sources: 'This [Lev. 19:18] is a great principle in the Torah' (*Sipra Leviticus* on Lev. 19:18; cf. *Genesis Rabbah* 24.7 [on Gen. 5:1]). There is probably an allusion to the two commandments in combination in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: 'Each of you speaks the truth clearly to his neighbour ... Throughout all your life love the Lord and one another with a true heart' (*Testament of Dan* 5:2-3); 'Love the Lord and the neighbour' (*Testament of Issachar* 7:6); they are also

linked by Philo: 'Among the great number of particular propositions and principles, two, as it were, stand as preeminent topics: one of duty toward God in piety and holiness, one of duty toward people in generosity and justice' (On *Special Laws* 2.15 §63). When the young man asked Jesus what he must do to inherit eternal life, Jesus responded, 'You know the commandments ...', and then cited approximately half the Decalogue (Mark 10:19; cf. Exod. 20:12-16 [Deut. 5:16-20]). In condemning legalism and hypocrisy (Mark 7:1-23), Jesus argued that the Pharisaic *korban* tradition (cf. *Mishnah Baba Qamma* 9:10; *Mishnah Nedarim* 1:1; 9:1) controverted God's commands: "Honour your father and mother"; and "He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die" (Mark 7:10; cf. Exod. 20:12 [Deut. 5:16] + LXX Exod. 21:17). Herein we find an important difference between Jesus and the Pharisees. On another occasion Jesus cites Hosea 6:6, 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice' (Matt. 9:13; 12:7), to defend his habit of having fellowship with 'tax collectors and sinners' (Matt. 9:10). According to the rabbis, one was to avoid the company of sinners (*Tosefta Demai* 3:6-7; *Babylonian Talmud Berakot* 43b). But the citation of Hosea did not imply that Jesus was opposed to the cultus; he urges his followers to be reconciled before offering something upon the altar (Matt. 5:23-24). Moreover, implicit in Jesus' command not to take oaths is a profound respect for Jerusalem and the temple (Matt. 5:34-35; cf. Is. 66:1). Indeed, Jesus' action in the temple (Mark 11:15-17) was probably a call for greater respect for the cultus.

The Gospels, however, do recount several episodes where the activity of Jesus and his disciples was thought to break the law. Perhaps best known was the frequent charge that Jesus violated sabbath laws, even when he healed someone (cf. Mark 2:23-28; 3:1-6; Luke 13:10-17; 14:1-6; John 5:1-18; 9:1-34). To be sure, the rabbis taught that the 'saving of life overrides the sabbath' (*Mekilta* on Exod. 31:13), after all, 'the sabbath was given to [people], not [people] to the sabbath' (*Mekilta* on Exod. 31:14). This reasoning obviously parallels Jesus' claim that 'the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath' (Mark 2:27). (It is possible, of course, that the tradition in *Mekilta* is dependent upon Jesus.) But in cases where a person's life was not in

immediate danger, some rabbis felt that healing activity was unnecessary and so constituted a violation of the sabbath. Indeed, the Essenes were even more strict in their interpretation of **Sabbath laws** (*Damascus Document* 11:13-14: 'If a [beast] fall into a cistern or into a pit, let it not be lifted out on the sabbath'; cf. Matt. 12:11: 'What man of you, if he has one sheep and it falls into a pit on the sabbath, will not lay hold of it and lift it out?'). Obviously the difference between Jesus and his opponents lay in the interpretation and application of the sabbath laws; they did not dispute their validity.

Jesus applied Mosaic law to disputes among his disciples, enjoining that 'every word be confirmed by the evidence of two or three witnesses' (Matt. 18:16; cf. LXX Deut. 19:15). On the permanence of the marriage union, Jesus cited texts from Genesis: 'God made them male and female' (Mark 10:6; cf. LXX Gen. 1:27; 5:2); and 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh' (Mark 10:7-8; cf. LXX Gen. 2:24). Jesus' legislation is clearly at variance with some of the more permissive interpretations of Deuteronomy 24:1: 'The School of Hillel says, "[Divorce is permitted] if she spoil the cooking"... Rabbi Aqiba says, "[Divorce is permitted] if he has found another more beautiful than she, as it is said..."' (cf. *Mishnah Gittin* 9:10). In this case the Essenes apparently adopted a position similar to that of Jesus (cf. *Temple Scroll* 57:17-18: 'And he must not select in addition to her another woman because she, and she alone, will remain with him all the days of her life'; cf. *Damascus Document* 4:20-21, where Gen. 1:27 is cited).

It is clear from his interpretation of the legal portions of Scripture that Jesus was committed to the essentials of the Jewish faith, even if some of his interpretations were apparently at variance with, at times even stricter than, those of his contemporaries. The chief difference between Jesus' interpretation of Scripture and that of many of his contemporaries is seen in his view of the relationship between the law and people. When it came to morals (e.g. divorce) Jesus' interpretation was stricter than that of most of his contemporaries. When it came to cultic laws (e.g. the sabbath and certain aspects of purity) Jesus' interpretation was comparatively lenient.

Prophetic interpretation of Scripture

Jesus cites Isaiah 61:1-2 as fulfilled in, and perhaps the occasion for, his public ministry: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor' (Luke 4:18-19; cf. Luke 7:22 = Matt. 11:5). Jesus' interpretation of Micah 7:6 (Tor I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother... [Matt. 10:35-36]) is similar to the messianic interpretation of this text in Jewish sources (cf. *Jubilees* 23:16, 19; *Mishnah Sota* 9:15; *Babylonian Talmud Sota* 49b; *Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin* 97a). Apparently the rabbis also believed that division within families would take place in the time of the Messiah. The theme of division is reflected in the allusion to Psalm 6:8 ('Depart from me, you evildoers') in the sayings concerning false prophets (Matt. 7:23). The early Christian understanding of John the Baptist as the fulfilment of Malachi 3:1 apparently derives from Jesus ('See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way before you', Matt. 11:10, NRSV). Jesus explains the incomprehension and unbelief of his contemporaries in terms of Isaiah's strange commission from God: 'in order that they may indeed see but not perceive, and may indeed hear but not understand; lest they should turn again, and be forgiven' (Mark 4:12, alluding to *Targum of Isaiah* 6:9-10; cf. Matt. 13:14-15, which cites LXX Is. 6:9-10). But even Jesus' disciples are rebuked in similar terms: 'Having eyes do you not see, and having ears do you not hear?' (Mark 8:18; cf. Jer. 5:21; Ezek. 12:2; Is. 6:9-10). Jesus castigates Israel's religious leaders: 'This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; in vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men' (Mark 7:6-7, citing LXX Is. 29:13).

Many of Jesus' prophetic statements looked forward to fulfilment in the future. In alluding to Isaiah's oracle against Babylon ('will you be exalted to heaven? You shall be brought down to Hades' [Is. 14:13, 15]) Jesus offered the cities that rejected him a grim warning of coming judgment (Matt. 11:23). Jerusalem herself received a warning no less foreboding in language borrowed from Jeremiah 22:5 ('Behold, your house is forsaken and desolate' [cf. Matt. 23:38]). The thought is completed in the reference to Psalm

118:26: 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord' (Matt. 23:39). The prophetic implication is that Jerusalem will be in a state of spiritual desolation until Jesus returns at the Parousia and is properly received. Jesus predicted Jerusalem's impending fate in terms of Daniel's 'abomination of desolation' (Mark 13:14; cf. Dan. 11:31; 12:11). The eschatological day will approach ... suddenly like a snare; for it will come upon all who dwell upon the face of the whole earth' (Luke 21:34-35; cf. Is. 24:17). When these things happen, 'they will begin to say to the mountains, "Fall on us"; and to the hills, "Cover us"' (Luke 23:30; cf. Hos. 10:8).

Jesus described his impending arrest and crucifixion in the words of Zechariah 13:7: "I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered" (Mark 14:27). He told his troubled disciples: 'And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory' (Mark 13:26; cf. Dan. 7:13). Before the high priest, Jesus similarly predicted: 'you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven' (Mark 14:62; cf. Ps. 110:1 + Dan. 7:13). Jesus apparently understood himself in terms of Daniel's 'son of man', to whom the kingdom would be given (cf. Dan. 7:14; *1 Enoch* 69:29; *Psalms of Solomon* 17:44), and his disciples as the 'saints' to whom judgment would some day be given (cf. Dan. 7:22). This is probably what lies behind Jesus' saying, 'Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Matt 19:28; cf. Luke 22:28-30: I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, that you may ... sit on thrones judging ...'). It is likely that Psalm 122:3-5 ('Jerusalem ... to which the tribes go up ... There thrones for judgment were set, the thrones of the house of David') has also contributed to this eschatological saying; both passages, Daniel 7 and Psalm 122, are cited side by side in a rabbinic exegesis that anticipates the day when God and Israel's elders will sit in judgment upon the peoples of the world (cf. *Tanhuma, Qedoshim* 1.1). Elsewhere Rabbi Aqiba interpreted the plural 'thrones' of Daniel 7:9 as implying that the Messiah would take his seat next to God himself (*Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin* 38b; *Babylonian Talmud Hagiga*

14a). Finally, Jesus warns his followers of the judgment of Gehenna: 'where their worm does not die, and the fire is not quenched' (Mark 9:48; *cf. Targum of Isaiah* 66:24). According to Jesus, when the Son of man comes, 'he will repay every person for what he has done' (Matt. 16:27; *cf. LXX Ps.* 61:13).

Analogical interpretation of Scripture

This category includes typology and other points of comparison. Jesus explicitly compared his ministry to those of Elijah and Elisha (Luke 4:25-27; *cf. 1 Kgs.* 17:1-16; 2 Kgs. 5:1-14). Later deeds resemble the exploits of these prophets of old (compare Luke 7:11-17 with 1 Kgs. 17-24 and 2 Kgs. 4:32-37; Luke 9:51-56 with 2 Kgs. 1:9-16; Luke 9:61-62 with 1 Kgs. 19:19-21). The kingdom is compared to the crop that grows of its own accord and then is harvested (Mark 4:29; *cf. LXX Joel* 3:13). Jesus enjoined his listeners to take his yoke upon them and 'find rest for [their] souls' (Matt. 11:29; *cf. Jer.* 6:16). He may have presented himself here as the personification of Wisdom (*cf. Eccus.* 51:23-27; *cf. Matt.* 11:19, where Jesus apparently did identify himself with Wisdom). The rabbis spoke variously of taking upon oneself the yoke of the kingdom, the law, or repentance (*Babylonian Talmud Berakot* 10b; *Mishnah 'Abot* 3:5; *Babylonian Talmud 'Aboda Zara Sa*).

The comparison with Jonah is one of the most significant and one of the most debated: 'For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth' (Matt. 12:40; *cf. Jonah* 1:17). In Matthew (12:38-39) the 'sign of Jonah' has something to do with Jesus' resurrection (*cf. 3 Macc.* 6:8). In Luke (11:31-32) it appears to be no more than Jesus' preaching. In a late rabbinic work Jonah's remarkable deliverance is described as a sign to the heathen (*Pirque Rabbi Eliezer* §10). Not only is Jesus greater than Jonah, he is also greater than Solomon, who was visited by the 'queen of the South' (Matt 12:41-42; *cf. 1 Kgs.* 10:1-10).

When he took action in the temple, Jesus said: '"My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations." But you have made it a den of robbers' (Mark 11:17; *cf. Is.* 56:7 + *Jer.* 7:11). Isaiah 56 anticipates the day when all peoples will gather at Jerusalem to

worship the Lord. By crowding the temple's court of the gentiles with sacrificial animals, the ruling priests made it difficult to pray and so showed callous disregard for gentile worshippers. Jeremiah 7 is a prophetic indictment of a violent and avaricious priesthood, one destined to come under divine judgment. In alluding to this passage Jesus implied that the ruling priests were corrupt and possibly violent. Other Jewish sources reflecting upon the pre-70 AD ruling priesthood paint a similar picture (*cf. Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews* 20.8.8 §181; 20.9.2 §206-207; 2 *Baruch* 10:18; *Mishnah Keritot* 1.7; *Tosefta Yoma* 1.6-7; *Tosefta Menahot* 13.18-22; *Babylonian Talmud Pesahim* 57a). As a rejoinder to the chief priests' indignation over the children's shouts of acclamation (which recall the triumphal entry and the citation of Ps. 118:26, *cf. Matt.* 21:9), Jesus replied: 'Out of the mouth of infants and nursing babies you have prepared praise for yourself' (Matt. 21:16, NRSV; *cf. LXX Ps.* 8:3, one of the *Hallel* psalms that small children were taught; *Tosefta Sofa* 6.2-3).

Jesus' parable of the wicked vineyard tenants begins with an important allusion to Isaiah's song of the vineyard: 'A man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge around it, and dug a pit for the wine press, and built a tower' (Mark 12:1; *cf. Is.* 5:1-2). Whereas Isaiah's original song indicted all of Judah (*cf. Is.* 5:3, 7), Jesus' parable limits the indictment to the Jewish religious leaders (*cf. Mark* 12:12). His application probably reflects exegetical traditions current in his time (*cf. Vineyard Text*; for later, but fuller explanations, see *Targum of Isaiah* 5:1-7; *Tosefta Me'ila* 1.16; *Tosefta Sukka* 3.15, where the song's 'tower' is explicitly identified as the temple, and the 'wine vat' the altar). At the conclusion of the parable Jesus quotes Psalm 118:22-23: 'The very stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner; this was the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes' (Mark 12:10-11). The rejected stone of Psalm 118 is to be understood as further explanation of the significance of the rejected son of the parable. The targum's paraphrase, 'the son which the builders rejected' (based upon a play on the words son [*ben*] and stone [*eben*]), and the rabbis' custom of referring to themselves as the 'builders' (*cf. Babylonian Talmud Shabbat* 114a; *Babylonian Talmud Berakot* 64a [in a

positive sense]; *Damascus Document* 4:19; 8:12, 18 [in a negative sense]; *cf. 1 Cor.* 3:10), probably facilitated Jesus' comparison. With the citation, 'The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet' (Mark 12:36, NRSV; *cf. LXX Ps.* 110:1), Jesus startled his hearers by suggesting that the son of David (i.e. the Messiah) is in fact greater than King David (not lesser as might be implied by his identification as the son of David). Jesus' interpretation of this verse provides important evidence that he understood his messiahship in terms very different from those of his contemporaries.

An apparently distinctive feature of Jesus' understanding of OT Scripture was that it was fulfilled: not soon to be fulfilled, as at Qumran, but actually fulfilled in his ministry. The casting out of demons was tangible evidence that the kingdom of God had come upon those in his presence (Luke 11:20). This proclamation of the kingdom ('The kingdom of God is at hand!') is drawn from passages in Isaiah (e.g. 40:9; 52:7; 61:1), through the interpretive lens of the Aramaic synagogue: 'The kingdom of your God is revealed!' (*Targum of Isaiah* 40:9; 52:7). Jesus' proclamation of the fulfilment of Scripture thus established the hermeneutical matrix, in the light of which the NT interprets and utilizes the OT.

Distinctive emphases in the four Gospels

Although the four Gospels cite and allude to many common Scriptures, their respective uses of the OT are distinctive and clearly serve their respective interests and purposes.

Mark. Mark apparently defines the 'good news' of Jesus Messiah in terms of the fulfilment of Isaiah's oracle of salvation and deliverance: 'See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way; the voice of one crying out in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight' (1:2-3, NRSV; *cf. Mal.* 3:1 + *LXX Is.* 40:3). In other words, the good news of the Christian message is the fulfilment of that for which Israel had for many years longed. Qumran (*Rule of the Community* 8:12-14; 9:19-20), as well as others (*Baruch* 5:7; *Testament of Moses* 10:1-5), also understood Isaiah 40:3 as a prophetic text that spoke of restoration. At his baptism the heavenly voice echoed the words of Psalm 2:7: 'You are my

Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased' (1:11, NRSV; *cf. Gen.* 22:2; *Exod.* 4:22-23; *Is.* 42:1). With this utterance Jesus' identity is made clear. Such recognition will not come forth from a human being until Jesus' death on the cross (*cf. Mark* 15:39). At the mountain of transfiguration, where Jesus conversed with Moses, the heavenly voice once again spoke, only this time addressing the disciples: 'This is my beloved Son; listen to him' (9:7; *cf. Ps.* 2:7; *Gen.* 22:2; *Deut.* 18:15). The injunction to listen is probably an allusion to Deuteronomy 18:15 ('The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me [Moses] ... listen to him', NW). These citations and allusions strongly suggest that Mark understood Jesus as the fulfilment of Jewish messianic expectation. As God's beloved Son and as the prophet who was to come (see 8:28), Jesus was the long-awaited Messiah of Israel.

Matthew. The extensive use of the OT in the Gospel of Matthew is well known. The Matthean evangelist was keenly interested in showing how Jesus fulfilled every aspect of the scriptures. All three components of the Bible, legal, prophetic, and wisdom/praise, have been fulfilled in Jesus. He not only has personally fulfilled the requirements of the law, but also is the law's master interpreter. He not only fulfilled messianic prophecies, but is also Israel's greatest prophet. Finally, he is the incarnation of Wisdom itself, an unparalleled master teacher. The evangelist's practice of finding new meaning in old tradition (whether OT or Christian tradition), which parallels that of Qumran, may very well be reflected in a verse found only in his Gospel: 'Every scribe who has been trained for [or by] the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old' (13:52).

Luke/Acts. The OT functions in the writings of the Lukan evangelist in ways that are clearly distinct from its functions in the other three Gospels. He does not punctuate the tradition with proof texts as do Matthew and John; rather, he punctuates his narrative with speeches that are full of OT words and phrases (esp. the speeches in the birth narratives). Another distinctive feature is Luke's dependence upon the LXX. Indeed, the evangelist deliberately imitates the style of the Greek OT. But this imitation does not involve only style; it involves substance too. It is

probable that the Lukan evangelist understood the story of Jesus (the Gospel) and the early church (the book of Acts) as the continuation of the biblical story. This is probably part of the meaning of the risen Jesus' statement to his disciples that 'everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled' (24:44-47; cf. 24:26-27).

John. At first glance John's use of the OT appears to be very much the same as Matthew's. Like Matthew, the fourth evangelist formally quotes the OT several times, many times with reference to the 'fulfilment' of something. But in other important ways the OT functions in John quite differently. Even in the case of the quotation formulas, John's purpose is very different. Unlike Matthew's, John's formulas appear to make up a pattern, a pattern that accentuates the theological development of the gospel narrative. In the first half of his Gospel, the evangelist introduces Scripture in a variety of ways, though usually using the word 'written' (1:23; 2:17; 6:31, 45; 7:38, 42; 8:17; 10:34; 12:14). In the second half he invariably introduces Scripture with 'in order that it be fulfilled' (12:38, 39-40; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28, 36, 37). What is the meaning of this pattern? The answer may be deduced from the summary in 12:37 and the citation that follows in verse 38: 'Though he had done so many signs before them, yet they did not believe in him; it was that the word spoken by Isaiah might be fulfilled'. The 'signs' to which reference is made are those of the first half of the Gospel. The scriptural citations in the first half of the Gospel demonstrate that Jesus conducted his ministry in keeping with scriptural expectation ('as it is written'). For example, Jesus' zeal for the temple is related to Psalm 69:9; the feeding of the five thousand is related to Psalm 78:24; his appeal to the testimony of two witnesses is related to Deuteronomy 17:6 (or 19:15); his claim to be God's Son is related to Psalm 82:6; and his riding the donkey is related to Zechariah 9:9. In some of these instances the evangelist could have introduced the OT citation with reference to fulfilment (compare the citation of Zech. 9:9 in Matt. 21:4-5), but he did not. It is not until Jesus is rejected, despite his signs, that the Scriptures are said to be 'fulfilled'. It is in Jesus' rejection and crucifixion that the Scriptures find their ultimate fulfilment. Far from proving that Jesus did

not fulfil the Scriptures, and so could not be Israel's Messiah, Jewish unbelief and obduracy specifically fulfilled Isaiah 53:1 (lord, who believed ... ?) and Isaiah 6:10 (they blinded their eyes ...). In each action taken against Jesus, including the treachery of Judas, Scripture is fulfilled. It is apparent that the fourth evangelist wishes to show that it is in his passion, Jesus' 'hour of glorification' (17:1), that the Scriptures are truly fulfilled.

Paul

Paul cites the OT some one hundred times (slightly more, if the disputed letters are included). More than sixty of these quotations agree with the LXX, though many of these agree with both the LXX and the MT (some forty in all; e.g. Rom. 2:6; 3:4, 13, 18; 4:17, 18; etc.). Several quotations agree with the LXX, but not with the MT (some sixteen in all; e.g. Rom. 2:24; 3:14; 4:3, 7-8; 9:29; etc.). A small number agree with the MT and against the LXX (e.g. Rom. 1:17; 11:4, 35; 12:19; 1 Cor. 3:19; Gal. 3:11). A larger number of others disagree with both the LXX and the MT (e.g. Rom. 3:10-12, 15-17; 9:9, 17, 25, 27-28, 33; 10:6-8; etc.). Ten others are debatable (e.g. Rom. 3:20; 9:20; 11:1-2; 12:16-17; 1 Cor. 2:9; etc.). Paul's allusions to Scripture are as important for his theology as his formal citations, as will be seen in the following example.

One of the most intriguing instances of Paul's use of the OT is seen in the allusion to Deuteronomy 30:12-14 (and 9:4a) in Romans 10:6-8. Whereas Moses spoke of God's 'commandment' not being too far off (either up in heaven or beyond the sea), so that failure to obey it cannot be excused, Paul speaks of Christ. As unusual as Paul's exegesis appears, it is not entirely novel. The author of Baruch has alluded to this passage from Deuteronomy, and has applied it to Wisdom: 'Who has gone up into heaven, and taken her, and brought her down from the clouds? Who has gone over the sea, and found her ...?' (Baruch 3:29-30). As already noted, comparisons between Christ and wisdom were sometimes made. But Baruch's parallel usage leaves some components of Paul's exegesis unclear. Scholars have called attention to the paraphrase of Deuteronomy 30:12-13 in the *Fragmentary Targum*, which reads (with italics showing departures from the Hebrew): 'The Law is not in heaven that one may say:

"Would that we had one like the prophet Moses who would ascend to heaven and fetch it for us and make us hear the commandments that we might do them." Neither is the Law beyond the Great Sea that one may say: "Would that we had one like the prophet Jonah who would descend into the depths of the Great Sea and bring it up for us and make us hear the commandments that we might do them." The point of the Hebrew is that the law has been given once and for all. There is no need for a prophet to ascend to heaven or to traverse the sea to obtain it. The Aramaic paraphrase illustrates this point with two biblical characters whose experiences roughly match the language of the passage. Moses, it was believed, had ascended to heaven when he received the law from God. For example, in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* Deuteronomy 34:5 we are told that Moses 'brought it [the law] from heaven'; and in *Pesiqta Rabbati* 4:2: 'Moses went up to heaven' (see also *Biblical Antiquities* 15:6; 2 Esdras 3:1-8). These traditions are based on Exodus 19:3, 20, where God summons Moses to meet him on the mountain. The reference to the sea, of course, provides the link to Jonah. In fact, the Targum's 'descend into the depths' draws the OT passage into closer alignment with Jonah's experience, for the prophet did not go across the sea; he went down into it (see the reference to 'abyss' in Jonah 2:3; cf. v. 6). In the NT, of course, both Moses and Jonah are compared to Christ, at points that are relevant to the traditions just reviewed. Like Moses, Jesus brings a new law from heaven (Mark 9:2-8; John 3:13-14; 1:17); like Jonah, Jesus descends into the abyss (Matt. 12:39-40; 16:4; Luke 11:29-30). Paul presupposes these Jewish and Christian traditions (cf. Eph. 4:8-10), and has combined them in his own way. His point in Romans 10:4-13 is that Christ has accomplished salvation. All that is now required is faith. No one needs to ascend to heaven to bring Christ down, for he has already descended. No one needs to descend into the abyss to raise him up, for he has already been resurrected. Redemption has been accomplished. All that remains is the confession of faith (Rom. 10:8-10, citing and interpreting Deut. 30:14). By faith in what God has accomplished through Christ, God's righteousness may be obtained.

Hebrews and the general epistles

The author of Hebrews explicitly cites the OT some thirty-six times, alludes to it another thirty-five times, and summarizes OT passages or stories another eighteen times. The author makes use of the LXX, but it is not clear exactly which version of it is used. Use of the OT in Hebrews is distinctly un-Pauline. Never is Scripture introduced with *gegraptai* ('it is written'). While several studies have looked to Philo or Qumran as the background against which Hebrews might be understood, the exegesis of its author is neither allegory nor *pesher*. He has developed his own style of typological exegesis, in which he compares Christ and the church against OT figures and institutions (figures such as Moses, angels and especially Melchizedek; institutions such as the priesthood and the sin offering). Unlike midrash, *pesher*, or even allegory, typology is primarily interested in biblical events and not in the biblical text.

Revelation

In the book of Revelation Scripture is never cited. No introductory formula appears (such as 'as it is written'), nor is Scripture (*graphe*) even mentioned. Yet Revelation is full of echoes and allusions to words and phrases drawn from the Bible. The seer envisages conflict with representative beasts (drawing upon Ezekiel and Daniel), a new Jerusalem, a new temple, and a new covenant (drawing on Ezekiel and Isaiah), and a return to the bliss of Paradise (drawing upon Genesis and the 'tree of life'). This expectation returns the end to the beginning, as earthly and heavenly history comes full circle and human and cosmic redemption is completed.

Continuity between the Testaments

One of the most important assumptions underlying the NT's use of the OT is that of fulfilment and continuity. NT usage of the OT cannot be reduced to mere proof-texting and apologetic. The purpose, structure and content of OT theology lie behind the major theological themes of the NT. Beliefs in and about the only God and Creator, who establishes a covenant with a chosen people and who promises redemption and salvation, are the beliefs presupposed in NT theology and its exegesis of specific OT passages.

The advent of Jesus not only fulfils pro-

phetic and messianic expectations of the Scriptures of Israel; it also continues the story of Israel. Recognition of this important fact should warn Christians against neglect of the OT and failure to appreciate the inherently Jewish nature of Christianity. This means that Christian biblical theology must take fully into account the theology of the OT and never develop NT theology apart from it.

See also: RELATIONSHIP OF OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT.

Bibliography

D. L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lukan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield, 1987); D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge, 1988); B. D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible* (Wilmington, 1984); D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1956); C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology* (New York, 1952); E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1981); C. A. Evans, 'The function of the Old Testament in the New', in S. McKnight (ed.), *Introducing New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, 1989); J. Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield, 1994); J. A. Fitzmyer, 'The use of explicit Old Testament quotations in Qumran literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7, 1960-61, pp. 297-333; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (London, 1971); E. D. Freed, *Old*

Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John (Leiden, 1965); L. Goppelt, *Typos – The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids, 1982); R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden, 1967); A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1974); *idem*, *Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old* (London, 1983); R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven and London, 1989); G. Howard, 'Hebrews and the Old Testament quotations', *NovT* 10, 1968, pp. 208-216; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia, 1961); R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids and Carlisle, 1975, 1995); S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield, 1995); B. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7* (Leiden and Grand Rapids, 1994, 1999); D. M. Smith, 'The use of the Old Testament in the New', in J. M. Efird (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays* (Durham, 1972); K. R. Snodgrass, 'The use of the Old Testament in the New', in D. A. Black and D. S. Dockery (eds.), *New Testament Criticism and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, 1991); S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews* (Richmond, 1965); K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, 1968).

C. A. EVANS

Relationship of Old Testament and New Testament

The nature of the problem

'Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son' (Heb. 1:1-2, NRSV). Thus the biblical author poses the question of the relationship of the Testaments: how does the word of Christ relate to that of the prophets, and in broader terms, is the NT continuous or discontinuous with the OT? The history of biblical theology as a modern discipline, not to mention the history of its antecedents, shows that the question of the relationship between the two Testaments is of enduring importance and concern. H. G. Reventlow, in *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century*, p. 11, sees it as one of the key problems in 20th-century "biblical theology, and quotes N. H. Ridderbos as saying, 'The relationship between Old and New Testaments: that is just about the whole story; the whole of theology is involved in that.' The problem is manifested in a number of theoretical and practical ways: the use of the OT by Jesus and by the authors of the NT; the history of the Christian interpretation of the OT, and its effects on Christian doctrine; and the application of the OT to the Christian life, are but a few examples.

Biblical theology as a discipline presupposes that the Bible, notwithstanding its great diversity, has some kind of perceptible unity. However, the modern pursuit of a biblical theology has (almost inadvertently) created a problem. The overwhelming majority of biblical theologies written in the last century and a half have been theologies of either the OT or the NT. Some would argue that this is simply due to the necessary specialization demanded by the sheer volume of biblical literature. Whatever the reason, the result has been a tendency to treat the two Testaments as if they were independent of each other. This is more true in OT theologies than in NT, since the latter have to take into account the conviction common to all the NT authors that their message has its roots in the OT. All the

books of the NT, with the possible exception of 2 John and 3 John, contain direct references and allusions to the OT, presupposing some continuity between the Testaments.

A number of OT theologians have attempted to address the problem in a theoretical way. For example, G. von Rad includes a lengthy section at the end of volume 2 of his *Old Testament Theology* (ET, Edinburgh, 1965, pp. 319-429), dealing with the OT and the NT. It gives a detailed exposition of a typological understanding of the unity of the Bible. Th. C. Vriezen, in his volume, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* (ET, Oxford, 1958), devotes the first two chapters to his view of the OT as Christian Scripture, but it is not altogether obvious how this presupposition has affected his treatment of the OT itself. W. Eichrodt, in the opening chapter of his *Theology of the Old Testament* (ET, London, 1961, p. 27), states that OT religion must be seen as completed in Christ, but in the two volumes of this work there is little that displays an overt application of this principle. G. A. F. Knight wrote *A Christian Theology of the Old Testament* (London, 1957), and stated that his purpose was to 'seek to discover what the Old Testament has to say to the twentieth century in the light of the Christian revelation as a whole' (p. 10). Despite the title, one of the crucial issues concerning the continuity between the Testaments, that of Israel and the church, is relegated to a short appendix.

Some see the OT as providing authentic revelation and theology independently of the NT. For Christian writers this means that the OT reveals God as truly as does the New. But resistance to a Christological, and thus to a NT-based, interpretation of the OT can be seen in more extreme approaches to the diversity within it. Postmodernist trends not only follow modernism in denying transcendence, but refuse to allow any concept of a metanarrative, a comprehensive story and picture of reality in a word from God, which can unite the two Testaments into one meaningful canon of revelation. The notion that there is