

THE THEOLOGICAL APPROPRIATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT BY THE NEW TESTAMENT*

by THE REV. PROFESSOR MATTHEW BLACK

To speak, in general terms, of trends in modern biblical study is often to over-simplify; and certainly to claim that there has been, in recent years, a trend away from the traditional classicist or 'hellenist' approach to New Testament problems towards a more Hebraic or semitic-centred approach would be to be guilty of the same exaggeration as E. C. Hoskyns in 1930: '(There are) grounds for supposing no further progress in the understanding of . . . Christianity to be possible unless the ark of New Testament exegesis be recovered from its wanderings in the land of the Philistines (sic) and be led back not merely to Jerusalem, for that might mean contemporary Judaism, but to its home in the midst of the classical Old Testament Scriptures — to the Law and the Prophets.'¹ There is, nevertheless, some truth in A. M. Hunter's later statement:² 'After ransacking all sorts of sources, Jewish and Greek (and, we may add, starting all sorts of "hares", some of which have not run very well), (scholars) are discovering the truth of Augustine's dictum, "The New Testament lies hidden in the Old, and the Old is made plain in the New"' (*Novum Testamentum in vetere latet, vetus in novo patet*).

* This article, and the two which follow, by Professor Charlesworth and Professor Davies respectively, were originally read as contributions to a *Festtag* held at New College, Edinburgh, on 8th May 1985, to mark the retirement of Hugh Anderson as Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology. The event was made possible by the generosity of the Senate of New College, and of some friends of Professor Anderson in the U.S.A. Hugh Anderson occupied the New Testament Chair at the University of Edinburgh from 1966, having previously been Professor of Biblical Criticism at Duke University, North Carolina. His contribution to New Testament studies and teaching is well known on both sides of the Atlantic, not least for his books *Jesus and Christian Origins* (1964) and *Jesus* (1968), and his *Commentary on Mark* (1976). A one-time colleague of William Barclay in Glasgow, and the successor in Edinburgh to James S. Stewart, Hugh Anderson has done as much as anyone to maintain the high standard of biblical scholarship in Scotland; and in printing these papers delivered in his honour, the *Scottish Journal of Theology* is happily associated with the gratitude and good wishes expressed to him on his *Festtag*.

¹ *Mysterium Christi*, ed. G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann (London, 1930), p. 70.

² *The Work and Words of Jesus* (London, 1950), p. 71.

Certainly in recent years there has been a revival of interest in the use, in particular the theological use, or, as I prefer to describe it, the theological appropriation — in some cases a complete 'take-over bid' — of the Old Testament by the New — studies which have received a fresh impetus by the Qumrân discoveries and the recognition that, hermeneutically, the New Testament stands in the same tradition.

In his Currie Lectures, delivered in Austin Presbyterian Seminary, on *Old and New in Interpretation: a Study of the Two Testaments* (SCM, 1966), James Barr quotes a question which had been asked by an Old Testament colleague, Claus Westermann: 'Is the relationship of the Old Testament to the New Testament essentially simple or is it complex?' 'The answer must surely be', Barr goes on to say, 'extremely complex'. Old Testament typology and allegory, e.g., in the New Testament, are 'a very complex phenomenon' (*op. cit.*, p. 134). The main reasons for the 'multiplex' character of the use of the Old Testament by the New are now all too familiar; they are (1) the difficulties of translating from one language Hebrew into another, Greek, where we have to do with two, in many respects alien, cultures; but, above all, (2) the application of principles of interpretation, mostly taken from the Jewish hermeneutics of the period. These could at times produce, to use an expression of B. H. Streeter, 'interpretative transformations' with often little more than a verbal or formal connection with the intention or meaning of the Old Testament writer — 'interpretative transformations' which become increasingly important when they have to do with credenda, with basic articles of Christian belief.

Problems of translation, interpretation and text are inextricably inter-connected: there is no translation that is not an interpretation and questions of text are basic to all hermeneutic. Here, however, I am especially concerned with the principles of scriptural interpretation which gave us our New Testament theology, and particularly with those shared by the New Testament with contemporary Qumrân exegesis.

But first, it is important to realise, as our Old Testament colleagues remind us, that this reinterpretation of Scripture is a process of growth, as it were, which has been going on within the Old Testament itself. Thus the Chronicler reinterprets the Books of Kings; and the fascinating suggestion has been made

that the link between the two 'Isaiahs', first and second, may have to be explained along similar lines, i.e., Second Isaiah follows First Isaiah because of passages in the later work which are reinterpretations of passages in the earlier.³ As Barr points out, while traditions of this kind after Scripture (as in the New Testament or at Qumrân) have a formally different character from the growth of such hermeneutical traditions within Scripture, 'the dynamics with which it operates are not essentially different . . .' (p. 29). This process of growth has continued, not only into the intertestamental period in the apocalypses, but through the New Testament, into the patristic, the mediaeval and the modern period, i.e., within periods which have undergone massive cultural changes from the age of the original documents.

Since Qumrân a new word has entered the vocabulary of the New Testament scholar; *peshet* or *midrash-peshet*, i.e., quite simply, 'interpretation', and frequently both 'interpretation and application'. Three salient hermeneutical principles put into our hands the key to a fuller understanding of the use of the Old Testament in the New: (1) In addition to the *peshet* (or *pesharim*), a running commentary (or commentaries) on Old Testament texts (usually a text is cited followed by 'its *peshet* is'), *midrash-peshet* can influence the form of the Hebrew Old Testament quotation itself, including explicit formula quotations introduced by 'as it is written/said' etc. The result is what we would regard as a 'free quotation', but, in fact, this can be misleading, since this intruding *peshet* into the sacred text to yield a desired result is always carried out, even by Qumrân standards, with almost pedantic caution; e.g., the meaning may be extracted from a variant understanding or even a variant reading of the text.⁴ At the same time such 'quotations' enjoy the full authority of the basic Old Testament text. (2) No less important is the use or application of the text and its *peshet* in the Qumrân scrolls, generally to the actual historical circumstances or destiny of the sect. These have been described as 'modernising' *pesharim*, but a more accurate description is 'applied' *midrash-peshet*

³ Cf. M. Fishbane, 'Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis', in *J.B.L.*, Vol. 99 3, 1980, pp. 343-361 (on Isaiah, p. 355).

⁴ See the detailed discussion of the use of the Hebrew text of Habakkuk in K. Stendahl, *The School of Matthew* (Uppsala, 1954), p. 185f.

or *actualisation midrashique*, since the reference is usually to present circumstances in the life of the sect which are now seen to be 'actualised' or 'fulfilled'. (3) The historical situation of the Qumrân sect was conceived as an eschatological situation, exactly as in the New Testament. Like the primitive church, the Qumrân Essenes believed they were living in the End-Time, so that many pesharim or pesharised texts are apocalyptic and eschatological.

Two examples will illustrate. (1) The 'peshering' of Hos. 3.4 at C.D. XX 15-17 illustrates all three principles: 'And during that period (the 40 years after the "ingathering" of the Teacher) the wrath of God will be kindled against Israel; as He said: "There shall be no king, no prince, *no judge, no man to rebuke with justice* (cf. Hos. 3.4)"' (translation after Vermes). The italicised words are no part of the original Hebrew text, although cited as such. The A.V. reads: '(For the children of Israel shall abide many days) without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an Ephod, and without teraphim.' 'There shall be . . . no judge, no man to rebuke/reprove with justice' is a targum-type expansion or explication of 'There shall be no king (to exercise judgement), no prince (to rebuke/reprove/correct/instruct)', with justice, the rôle of the prince (s a r) in the scroll of the Benedictions (IQS^b 5.22; it is also the rôle of the maskil IQS 9.17). But the Hebrew expansion as well as the actual words cited from the Old Testament are quoted as holy scripture. Hosea 3.4 as here targumised is an applied 'pesharised' eschatological text. (2) A second example of an applied targum or paraphrase occurs at IQM 10.1-2, quoting Deut. 7.21-22: 'Moses taught us: "Thou art in the midst of us, a mighty God and terrible, causing all our enemies to flee before us . . ."' The A.V. reads: '. . . the Lord thy God is in the midst of you, a mighty God and terrible. And the Lord thy God will drive out those nations before you. . .'. The quotation occurs in the discourse of the High Priest before the eschatological battle.⁵

So far as the theological use of the Old Testament by the New is concerned, and in spite of its multiplex character, there is, as

⁵ For a discussion of both passages, see J. A. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumrân Literature and in the New Testament', in *NTS*, Vol. VII (1960-1961), p. 327.

C. H. Dodd (followed by James Barr) pointed out,⁶ an important limiting or circumscribing factor; the New Testament has, by and large, a central focus or main objective in its use of the Old. As Barr puts it: ‘. . . it shows a heavy concentration on events, the centre being the coming of Christ, the fact of his doing good, the events of his death and resurrection, and so on’ (*op. cit.*, p. 109). To use Dodd’s term, the use of the Old Testament in the New centres on the Kerygma, the ‘salvation history’ (*Heilsgeschichte*) which constitutes what we know as the Gospel. There is, i.e., a core tradition of Old Testament testimony texts by which the Kerygma is expressed and communicated as their fulfilment. There are exceptions, as Barr notes, such as the Sarah-Hagar allegory at Gal. 3, or Paul’s typology of the ‘muzzled ox’ (I Cor. 9.9), but these are a minority of cases (Barr, p. 110). In general, the New Testament use of the Old is kerygmatic or Christocentric, and its kernel or core the Passion and Resurrection with their sequel.

Thus Dodd concludes: ‘This whole body of material — the passages of Old Testament Scripture with their application to the Gospel facts — is common to all the main portions of the New Testament, and in particular it provided the starting point for the theological constructions of Paul, the author of the Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist. It is the substructure of all Christian theology and contains already its chief regulative ideas . . .’ (*According to the Scriptures*, p. 127). ‘He (Paul) expressly bases his theology upon the kerygma as illuminated by the prophets of the Old Testament; or, in other words, on the historical facts which he had received . . . from competent witnesses, set in the larger historical framework witnessed, both as fact and as meaning, by the prophetic writers.’ (*ibid.*, p. 135.)

Since Dodd the field has been widened through the work of Stendahl, Hanson, Moule, Lindars, Wilcox (not to mention Old Testament and Targumic scholars, like Díez Macho, Renée Bloch, Martin McNamara, etc.). Thus Harris’s claim that it was in controversy with Jewish opponents that the Old Testament

⁶ In his two seminal studies, *The Old Testament in the New*, Ethel M. Wood Lecture, London, Athlone Press, 1952, and *According to the Scriptures: the Substructure of New Testament Theology* (also London, 1952), work largely inspired by Rendel Harris’s equally important studies in his two slim volumes entitled *Testimonia* (I, Cambridge, 1916, II, Cambridge, 1920).

was so used has been further developed; a whole Christian apologetic arose out of the continuing debate with the Synagogue, a debate probably sponsored by exegetical schools, a School of Matthew, perhaps an Alexandrine-type School behind the Epistle to the Hebrews. These Old Testament interpretations could at times seem arbitrary and perplexing to the modern reader⁷, but, as James Barr insisted ' . . . one has to balance the actual (arbitrary) handling of particular texts against the importance of religious newness and creativity'⁸. Certainly the hermeneutic of these early Christian teachers and prophets (and the important rôle played by the latter is being increasingly realised), endowed as these missionary apostles believed themselves to be by the Holy Spirit, which had been silent so long, is creatively new; and the creative, intellectual factor which has been at work is the continuing witness of the early Church to the Kerygma, expressed, in conceptual terms, in the use of 'pesherised' Old Testament texts. Thus Moule sums up: 'The Christians . . . found themselves pushed by the pressure of events into a new way of selecting, relating, grouping, and interpreting what we call "Old Testament" passages; and while the scriptures of the Jews undoubtedly exercised a great influence upon the form in which they presented their material . . . this influence was evidently subordinate both to the influence of the apostolic witness to Jesus and to the living inspiration of Christian prophets in the Church'⁹.

Most scholars since Dodd accept his basic premise on the primacy of the Kerygma: the Kerygma came first, the proclamation of the 'facts' or 'events' of the life, death, resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, the latter attested by many eye-witnesses (I Cor. 15.4f.) — 'facts' or 'events' to which the Apostles bore witness and saw as fulfilled in ancient prophecy. Thus, again, C. F. D. Moule: 'The Christians began from Jesus — from his known character and mighty deeds and sayings, and his death and resurrection; and with these they went to the scriptures, and found that God's dealings with his People and his intentions for them there reflected, did, in fact, leap into new significance in the light of these recent happenings' (*op. cit.*, p. 57).

⁷ C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, p. 79f, cf. p. 77 on Heb. 1.8f.

⁸ *op. cit.*, p. 142; cf. Moule, *op. cit.*, pp. 53f.

⁹ *op. cit.*, p. 85.

So far as I am aware, the only New Testament scholar who has seriously applied himself to these problems, and challenged Dodd's basic assumption of the primacy of the Kerygma, is Professor Max Wilcox of University College, Bangor, in his article 'On Investigating the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament.'¹⁰ He writes (p. 235): 'Dodd sets out from the view that the Church began with the *kerygma* and then went to the Old Testament to marshal evidence to show that the events of that kerygma had happened "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts ii.23); that is, . . . that enterprise was aimed from the start at finding support for the confessional statement which he identified as the *kerygma*. Such considerations . . . may have affected the relative concentration of emphasis on certain particular texts, but we should be highly doubtful if they were the actual starting points of the procedure. For even if the church's aim in using Old Testament material was in fact apologetic, as Harris, Dodd and others have claimed, that would only reinforce the case that its starting point would have had to be what was already common ground between Jew and Christian. But this does not mean merely the Old Testament, but rather the Old Testament understood in the light of the then accepted exegetical traditions. . . . That is, far from scouring the Old Testament in search of texts to bolster up the statements of the *kerygma*, the early church would have needed to start with the exegetical traditions of contemporary Jewish thought concerning the Messiah and the end events, and then argue that these had found their proper interpretation (and hence 'realization') in the person and rôle of Jesus of Nazareth. In this way the scripture would have been seen to speak (anew) to the situation now called forth in and by the 'Christ event'. On this analysis the elements of the so-called *kerygma* would appear as an end product rather than a starting point. That such a procedure was not without contemporary models we may see from the Qumrân literature.'

This view of the evidence seems to me to contain an important fresh insight: Wilcox is not denying that the proclamation of the Kerygma influenced the concentration of emphasis on certain

¹⁰ In *Text and Interpretation, Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black*, edited by E. Best and R. McL. Wilson, Cambridge, 1979, pp. 231-250.

particular texts. What he is emphasising is that it was in debates within the context of current messianic Judaism, the Judaism of the end-time like that of Qumrân, that the hermeneutical principles of contemporary Judaism came to be applied by Christian believers to the person and rôle of Jesus of Nazareth; and it was out of this exegetical tradition that the Kerygma emerged. ' . . . the starting point of the debate will have been laid down in advance in passages of scripture already viewed within current streams of Jewish exegetical tradition as in some sense "messianic" . . . if so, we are warned against proceeding from Kerygma to scripture' (*op. cit.*, p. 236).

What were these passages in the Old Testament, or wherever, where the debate started, and which, if I may so put it, set the Christian theological or rather Christological ball rolling? To put the question in another form: Was there any *praeparatio evangelica*, also based on the use of the Old Testament, out of which the full Kerygma developed?

We must turn again to C. H. Dodd for an answer: 'What forgotten geniuses may lurk in the shadows of those first twenty years of Church history about which we are scantily informed, it is impossible for us to say. But the New Testament itself avers that it was Jesus Christ Himself who first directed the minds of His followers to certain parts of the scriptures in which they might find illumination upon the meaning of His mission and His destiny . . . , that He pointed to Psalm cx as a better guide to the truth about His mission than the popular beliefs about the Son of David, or that He made that connexion about the "Lord" at God's right hand with the Son of Man in Daniel which proved so momentous for Christian thought; or that he associated with the Son of Man language which had been used for the Servant of the Lord, and employed it to hint at the meaning, and the issue, of His approaching death. To account for the beginning of this original and most fruitful process of rethinking of the Old Testament we found need to postulate a creative mind. The Gospels offer us one. Are we compelled to reject the offer?' (*According to the Scriptures*, p. 110).

This is the last question that now concerns us. To quote Dodd's words seems like a statement of the obvious, but it is by no means so for some of the most recent critical discussion of these foundation Jesus' Son of Man sayings-traditions.

Two of the passages to which Dodd refers represent fundamental aspects of the Kerygma, viz., the post-Transfiguration Elijah pericope at Mark 9.9-13 (= Matt. 17.9-13, omitted in Luke) containing the question of Peter, James and John '... and how is it written of the Son of man that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt?'; and the Jesus prediction at Mark 14.62 parr. about the exaltation of the Son of Man, 'seated at the right hand of God'. The first, I shall argue, is a didactic peshar on Mal. 4.5-6 and Is. 53.3, with significant translation semitisms, the second a prophetic-apocalyptic peshar on Ps. 110.1, Dan. 7.13 (cf. En. 104.1-6, 46.1-2, etc.), again with at least one distinctively Aramaic feature. Both are genuine dominical sayings.

The Elijah pericope forms 'a problematic and seemingly confused segment, the unity of which appears to be broken by the question: "How is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt?" Several theories of the dislocation of the text have consequently been brought forward, among them the proposal that verse 12b originally came immediately after verse 10' (C. H. Turner, p. 61).¹¹ The most widely accepted of these theories of textual dislocation is undoubtedly that of Turner, who wrote, in his short commentary on Mark (first published in Gore's *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*): 'As it stands, this paragraph (Mark 9.9-13) consists of two verses that are straightforward enough (vv. 9-10), followed by three that are unintelligible (11-13)'. Among others, A. M. Hunter agrees (without mentioning Turner): 'These verses are difficult until one sees that there has been a little displacement. If we put 12b after 10 it all becomes clear. What the disciples discussed was (1) what rising from the dead meant, and (2) how it could be written in scripture that the Son of Man must suffer many things (i.e., they were wrestling with the problem of a Suffering Messiah)'.¹²

Turner's arguments, in particular for a primitive pre-Marcian scribal displacement of v. 12b, seem to me also to be convincing, thus bringing v. 10 + 12b into line (in chiasmic form) with the solemn prediction of the imminent Passion and Resurrection of

¹¹ Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, New Century Bible (Oliphants, 1976), p. 227.

¹² *The Gospel according to St Mark* (SCM, 1948), p. 93f.

the Son of Man uttered at 8.31. To this I would add my agreement with Turner's recognition (with the AV and RSV) that Mark's $\delta\tau\iota$ must be translated 'Why say the scribes', where the $\delta\tau\iota$ is a semitised (Hebrew or Aramaic) direct interrogative.¹³ To this last observation I would further add that $\pi\omega\varsigma$ at v. 12b, 'how is it written', seems to me another semitism, in this case a mistranslation of Aramaic, where the original was *hékħ* and should have been rendered by $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ 'where is it written'.¹⁴ Moreover, the expression 'they did to him whatsoever they pleased' ('they worked their will on him') at v. 13, is another glaring semitic locution.¹⁵ Mark continues: '(They did to him whatsoever they pleased) as it is written of him (i.e., Elijah)'. Exegetes have searched the scriptures for a prediction of Elijah's sufferings: the account of his persecution at I Kings 19.2-10 has been suggested but found limited acceptance. The proposal of C. C. Torrey,¹⁶ on the other hand, looking at the text from the point of view of an Aramaic original, does deserve the same close attention as that of C. H. Turner for v. 10, viz., that Matt. 17.12 provides the missing parallel clause, in characteristic synonymous parallelism familiar in the Jesus logia tradition, to 13a, 'so also the Son of Man will suffer at their hands, (13b) as it is written of him'.

We are now in a position to discuss the Marcan pesher at v. 11f. Modern editors of the Greek text at v. 12 place 'Elijah' and 'restore' in heavy type (or italics) to indicate the Old Testament source at Mal. 4.5-6. Commentators usually refer to an allusion to the Micah verse, but it is in fact a full pesher, and so carrying the authority of the original. 'To restore all things', the rôle attributed to Elijah, is a pesher on the verb *šub* at Mal. 4.6; Matt: '. . . he (Elijah) will restore (NEB, reconcile) fathers to sons and sons to fathers . . .'. Moreover, it is a pesher which encapsulates a current belief common to Greeks, Jews and Christians, 'the restoration of the Kosmos', 'of Israel', or 'of all things' (the *ἀποκατάστασις πάντων*, the classic Christian expres-

¹³ See my *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*,³ p. 119f.

¹⁴ See Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, Bd I, p. 197.

¹⁵ Expressing 'irresponsible or arbitrary action' (Swete), e.g., 3 Kgs 9.1, 10.13, Ps. 113.11, Dan. 8.4 (Theod.), 2 Macc. 7.16.

¹⁶ *The Four Gospels: A New Translation* (London: Hodder & Stoughton) 88, 301, and *Our Translated Gospels* (London: Hodder & Stoughton) 123 esp. 162.

sion at Acts 3.21). The Matthaean pesher takes a further step of 'applied exegesis' or *actualisation midrashique*, by explicitly identifying the Baptist with Elijah (cf. Mark 9.13).

If we are prepared to accept the Torrey Matthaean supplement to the Marcan text: ' . . . so also the Son of man will suffer at their hands, 13b as it is written of him', the question then arises (cf. 8.31), to which scripture does the saying refer? The scholarly debate on this problem has been most recently discussed in the careful study of Douglas Moo in his monograph on *The Old Testament in the Passion Narratives* (The Almond Press, 1983), who concludes: 'If ἐξουδενθηθή ("is treated with contempt") and πολλά παθεῖν ("suffer many things") are to be taken closely together, Is. 53.3 would be decisively favored because the list of the servant's afflictions in vv. 3-7 may be admirably described as "suffering many things"' (p. 91).¹⁷ The verbal connection of the Marcan didactic pesher with Is. 53.3 is as explicit as the earlier pesher with Mal. 4.6: ' . . . he was . . . humbled by suffering . . . we held him of no account . . .' (NEB); we have to do again with a pesher which had the full authority of scripture, 'as it is written'. Even more striking as an *actualisation midrashique* is the implicit assumption that, just as the speaker was referring to the rôle of John the Baptist as the returning Elijah in his application of Mal. 4.6, so here the speaker is prophetically referring to the actualisation of his rôle as Son of Man fulfilling the destiny of the Isaianic Servant as set forth in Is. 53.3.

Rudolf Otto went so far as to describe the clause at 12b, that the Son of Man 'must suffer much and be set at naught' (his translation) as not only an indubitably genuine saying of Jesus, but as an actual quotation of Is. 53.3: 'In this original saying we have also the proof that Jesus was concretely aware of himself as the expiatory suffering Servant of God in Is. liii. His words do not say that he will suffer in general, but that the Son of Man is the Servant of God. They are a quotation. Only so are they intelligible.'¹⁸ The words can hardly be described as a literal quotation as we understand quotation nowadays; but as a pesher 'quotation' in the period when it was 'cited', it did have the full

¹⁷ Is πολλά, adverbial like Aramaic *sagi* = πολύ ?

¹⁸ *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (London, 1938), p. 250.

force and authority of a text of scripture. More explicit quotations and references elsewhere in the Gospels to the Son of Man's expiatory rôle (Matt. 8.17, 12.18, Mark 10.45), are not necessarily to be set aside as post-kerygmatic prophetic sayings. Mark 9.9-13, however, contains striking features of semitic provenance, and seems to me to include at v. 12b and Matt. 17.12 pre-kerygmatic *peshet* tradition. The latter passage *μέλλει πάσχειν* corresponds to Mark 8.31 *δεῖ πολλά παθεῖν* where *μέλλει* and *δεῖ* look like translation variants of an original dominical *peshet* on Is. 53.3 'atid barnaša' lameḥōš sagi'.¹⁹

Comparison of Mark 14.62 with the parallels at Matt. 26.64 and Luke 22.69 shows that, while Matthew is closely following Mark, and all three evangelists include the clause from Ps. 110, Luke omits the clause from Dan. 7.13. (Other variations are comparatively minor, e.g., Matthew's agreement with Luke against Mark in adding 'from now on' could be primitive. Matthew's *ἀπ' ἄρτι* and Luke's *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* look like translation variants. Luke drops the visionary formula 'you shall see' (*ὄψεσθε*), but has it at Acts 7.56, the Son of Man vision of Stephen — it was quite certainly original and Luke's text an edited abridgement.)

Scholarly opinion on the whole has tended to favour the longer Markan text as the original form of this apocalyptic prophecy, and a widely popular modern view has been to interpret the Dan. 7.13 component as envisioning the Son of Man ascending to the presence of God (the clear intention of the original Old Testament text), rather than as containing a reference, as the Church and most probably Mark himself understood it, to his coming again in his Parousia.²⁰ If this had been, however, the intention of the original composer of this *peshet*, the order would surely

¹⁹ Here it seems appropriate to add a note on the Resurrection predictions in the Synoptic Gospels, coming mostly from Mark, at 8.31, 9.31, 10.33f., and all linking Resurrection, as at Mark 9.9f., with the Passion. (R. H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of Mark*, Oxford, 1950, p. 11, once compared them to the solemn tolling of a minute bell as the party made its way from the slopes of Hermon to Jerusalem.) These passages also include Old Testament *peshet* (the Resurrection 'on the third day' draws on the Targum to Hos. 6.2), but in literary form and content they seem to be later kerygmatic expansions. See my 'The Son of Man Passions Sayings in the Gospel Tradition' in *ZNW* Bd. 60, 1969, p. 4f. I have suggested that an Aramaic *peshet* tradition may lie behind John 3.14, 12.34 in 'From Schweitzer to Bultmann: the Modern Quest of the Historical Jesus' in the *McCormick Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. 4, May 1967, p. 279f.

²⁰ See especially T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent*¹ (London, 1963), p. 60, and J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming: the Emergence of a Doctrine* (SCM, 1957), p. 57f.

have been ' . . . you shall see the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven and sitting at the right hand of the Power (God)'.²¹ More recently, the shorter Lukan text, omitting the Daniel quotation, a text similar to the Lukan vision of Stephen at Acts 5.56, has been favoured as the more primitive formulation of the vision, one uninfluenced by the christological schema of Ascension followed by Parousia.²² It seems, on the whole, more likely, however, that Luke is abbreviating the saying; and, in any case, even in his shorter formulation of this Son of Man theophany he is assuming an allusion to Dan. 7.13. Moreover, the Markan Son of Man Parousia apocalypse at 13.26 anchors the Daniel parousia *pesher* as securely in the earliest Gospel traditions as Mark 14.62 does the Ascension *pesher*.²³

In his recent book, *Jesus Son of Man* (SPCK 1983) Professor Barnabas Lindars attributes the authorship of Mark 14.62 to Mark himself, since it fits nicely into the series, beginning with 8.38 (the coming of the Son of man 'in the glory of his Father with the holy angels') and 13.26 ('and then they will see the Son of man coming on clouds with great power and glory'), in both of which identification with the Daniel figure is complete. It must also be regarded as at least possible that Mark's choice of 'Power' as a periphrasis for God is derived from 13.26. (*op. cit.*, p. 110.) It is also possible that Mark derives 14.61b-62 from another source, but this suggestion 'does not overcome the obstacles which stand in the way of accepting the saying as authentic' (p. 112).

The ineluctable conclusion we must draw from this is that Mark 14.62 is not a pre-kerygmatic dominical saying, but a post-kerygmatic creation of Mark himself. Along similar lines, in his earlier *New Testament Apologetic* (SCM 1961), an attempt is made to trace the use of Ps. 110.1 in the dominical saying at

²¹ Cf. H. K. McArthur, 'Mark xiv.62' in *NTS*, Vol. IV, 1957-58, p. 157.

²² See J. Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie* (Gütersloh, 1973), p. 260.

²³ How much weight is to be given to the citation of Mark 14.62 in Hegesippus's account of the martyrdom of James (Eusebius, H.E. 23.8-18) it is difficult to say; the story could have Palestinian roots, but the quotation from the LXX of Is. 3.10 in the same passage rather suggests that it is a free quotation from the Greek Mark. If the origin was Aramaic (cf. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (Göttingen, 1936), p. 68, n. 4) could Jesus as the 'Gate' reflect an Aramaic *'abbula*, a rare term used once in Syriac for the 'Entrance' or 'Portico' of heaven. See Payne Smith, *The. Syr.*, I, p. 11.

Mark 12.36, 'The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand . . .', to the Resurrection pericope at Acts 2.34 (*op. cit.*, p. 45f.).

It is not necessary to posit 'sources' behind Mark 14.62, or in the other two passages, to be able to recognise that Mark is patently drawing here on earlier apocalyptic traditions on the Parousia. The Parousia concept in these passages owes as much, if not more, to I En. 1.9 and 1.4 as they do to Dan. 7. These Enoch verses portray the classic apocalypse of the Last Judgement, the advent of deity in judgement with myriads of angels, a coming 'in the power of his might from the highest heaven' (1.4). (It is extremely unlikely that the use of 'Power' in Mark as a surrogate for God owes anything to Mark 13.26.) Mark, in all these three Son of Man passages, is the transmitter of the tradition, not its creator; that he was the genius behind their classic composition (which he himself attributes to Jesus of Nazareth) carries little conviction.

Lindars prefers to explain the use of "Power" (if it does not come from 13.26) as a doxological term rather than as a substitute for the divine name (p. 212, n. 16). The term, however, must be explained in the light of its use elsewhere, where it is almost always a divine name or rather a surrogate for the divine name. In addition to its use in the quotation of Mark 14.62 in Hegesippus fragment,²⁴ Ernst Lohmeyer noted its occurrence in the Pseudo-Clementines, the apocryphal Gospel to the Hebrews and in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter; it may even be traceable in the designation of Simon Magus at Acts 8.10 as 'the Great Power'. In my *Scrolls and Christian Origins*,²⁵ I drew attention to this Aramaic usage in Samaritan sources where 'the Mighty One' and 'the Power' (ḥayl) are exceedingly frequent terms for deity. Its presence in the apocalyptic prophecy at Mark 14.62 points to an Aramaic, even a Galilaeian Aramaic, origin for this Exaltation-Advent peshet.

Finally, I come now to the theological appropriation of Dan. 7.13 and Ps. 110.1 (cf. En. 104.1-6, 46.2f. etc.) at Mark 14.62 parr.

²⁴ Above, p. 13, n. 23.

²⁵ Edinburgh and New York, 1962, reprinted in *Brown Judaic Studies* 48, 1984, p. 64.

As I have maintained for some years now,²⁶ what the Daniel and Enoch apocalypses were predicting was nothing less than the apotheosis of Israel after the Last Judgement, the 'deification' of the Son of man, i.e. the 'saints of the Most High', an apocalyptic vision, not of a terrestrial but of a celestial Israel; not of the national or ethnic Israel, but of the Remnant, the purified and redeemed 'saints', the 'wise' (the *maskélim*) who had endured the afflictions of the refiner's furnace (Dan. 12.10); the 'Servant of the Lord' who 'justifies the many' (Dan. 12.3, cf. Isa. 53.12) and who will include those shining spirits who sleep in the dust, but will be awakened to 'everlasting life' in a Kingdom which is 'not of this world'. The best commentary on this 'Son of man' is En. 104.1-6, verses, like En. 108.11-15, inspired by Dan. 12:

'(1) I swear unto you (righteous), that in heaven the angels remember you for good before the glory of the Great One, and your names are written before the glory of the Great One. (2) Be of good courage, for aforesime you were worn down by evils and afflictions, but now you shall shine and appear as the lights of heaven, and the portals of heaven shall be opened unto you. (3) And your cry will be heard, and your judgement for which you cry will also appear. . . . (4) Be of good courage, and do not abandon your hope; for you shall have great joy as the angels of heaven. . . . (6) But now fear not, you righteous, when you see the sinners growing and prospering: be not companions with them, but keep afar from all their evil-doings; for you shall become companions of the angels of heaven.'²⁷

Can we take the background argument a stage further? Was

²⁶ See my article in *Jesus und der Menschensohn*, Für Anton Vögle, Herausgegeben von Rudolph Pesch und Rudolph Schnackenburg in Zusammenarbeit mit Odelo A. Kaiser, Freiburg, 1975, 'Die Apotheose Israels: eine neue Interpretation des danielischen Menschensohnes', pp. 57-73. Cf. now J. Coppens, *Le Fils d'Homme Vétéro- et Intertestamentaire*, Leuven, 1983, for the identification of the 'saints of the Most High' with angelic beings as well as 'faithful Israelites' (p. 112).

²⁷ Cf. Luke 20.35f. and my *Scrolls and Christian Origins*, p. 139f. Cf. also *Assumption of Moses*, ch. 10:

'And then his Kingdom shall appear throughout all his creation . . .
For the Most High shall arise, the eternal God alone;
And thou Israel shalt be blessed,
And God will exalt thee,
And he will cause thee to approach the heaven of the stars. . . .'

As Charles comments 'Here . . . is no metaphor, but a description of Israel transfigured and glorified after the final judgement'. (*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1913, Vol. II, p. 422.)

there any common ground in contemporary Judaism, beyond Dan. 7 and I En. 1.4, 9, 104.1-6, etc. with the Gospel Son of Man traditions? Does the Gospel apocalyptic Son of Man owe anything, e.g. at Mark 14.62, to the Son of Man figure in I En. 46.2f. etc., the famous *Parables of Enoch*? The recent work of Coppens dates the Parables before A.D. 70²⁸ and follows Theisohn²⁹ in recognising a composite Elect-Son of Man in his supreme rôle as Judge of mankind, a messianic figure inspired by Dan. 7 and Second Isaiah's Elect One, in at least one pre-Christian recension (the attribution to the figure of the epithet 'Anointed One' at 49.10, 52.4 is a later recension, and the identification with Enoch himself later still). My own view is not dissimilar: there is ancient, pre-Christian apocalyptic source material, Hebrew and/or Aramaic, in the Son of Man visions in the Parables. 'The two titles "Elect One" and "Son of Man" are deliberately brought together by the final author/editor of the Parables. The first is the more common of the two, but both belong to the thought of the author from whose hand the book finally came, about the central figure, next to the "the Lord of Spirits", of his apocalypse. . . . The term "Elect One" points us unequivocally to the elect Servant of Second Isaiah as does the term Son of Man to Dan. 7. Moreover, Chh. 49.3 and 62.2 apply the prophecy of Isa. 11.1f., about the "root of Jesse", the Davidide, to the Elect One; and 48.10, 52.4 use the term "anointed" of him. The "messianism" of the Parables thus unites these three strands of biblical tradition about its central figure; he is the Elect One, the Isaianic Servant of the Lord, the anointed royal "son of David", and the Danielic "son of man".'³⁰

James Barr tells us that ' . . . The Christian Message, while it had certainly come from the Hebraic heritage, had at certain parts burst the moulds within which that heritage had found expression. The centre of this conflict or explosion is the incarnation. Incarnation makes sense only on Jewish soil. . . .

²⁸ *op. cit.*, p. 154.

²⁹ Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*. Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch (Göttingen, 1975).

³⁰ *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch*, A New English Edition, with Commentary and Textual Notes by Matthew Black in consultation with James C. VanderKam, Brill, Leiden, 1985, p. 189.

Yet the Old Testament background provides no adequate terms for incarnation, no “conceptuality” for it . . .’ (*op. cit.*, p. 57). But apocalyptic Judaism in Daniel and Enoch, appropriated as a peshet in the dominical logion at Mark 14.62 does. For (1) Mark 14.62 is a ‘pesharised’ scripture predicting the coming of the Kingdom of God, ‘a Kingdom’, in words attributed by St John to Jesus himself (John 18.36), ‘not of this world’, and (2) the apocalyptic Judaism of Daniel and the Parables of Enoch furnish a symbolic terminology, ‘Son of Man’, whether corporately or (as in the parables) also individually conceived, or, more probably, both in one, as corporate Personality, a King/Kingdom (in Origen’s phrase *αὐτοβασιλεία*, the Kingdom in a Person) ‘not of this world’ — yet a Kingdom inaugurated and realised in flesh and blood in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Moreover, the apocalyptic Judaism of the Parables does provide a figure in its Elect Son of Man, fulfilling the rôle of David’s Anointed Son, which may well have provided the *praeparatio evangelica* on which New Testament theology rests. What is, in my opinion, irrefragably certain is that the symbolic figure of the Son of Man, interpreted in terms of both Is. 53, Dan. 7 and I En. *loc. cit.* — the lowly Servant and the heavenly Lord — has entered into the life-story of Jesus of Nazareth; and that is the Kerygma.

MATTHEW BLACK
 40 Buchanan Gardens
 St Andrews
 Fife KY16 9LX

License and Permissible Use Notice

These materials are provided to you by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) in accordance with the terms of ATLA's agreements with the copyright holder or authorized distributor of the materials, as applicable. In some cases, ATLA may be the copyright holder of these materials.

You may download, print, and share these materials for your individual use as may be permitted by the applicable agreements among the copyright holder, distributors, licensors, licensees, and users of these materials (including, for example, any agreements entered into by the institution or other organization from which you obtained these materials) and in accordance with the fair use principles of United States and international copyright and other applicable laws. You may not, for example, copy or email these materials to multiple web sites or publicly post, distribute for commercial purposes, modify, or create derivative works of these materials without the copyright holder's express prior written permission.

Please contact the copyright holder if you would like to request permission to use these materials, or any part of these materials, in any manner or for any use not permitted by the agreements described above or the fair use provisions of United States and international copyright and other applicable laws. For information regarding the identity of the copyright holder, refer to the copyright information in these materials, if available, or contact ATLA at products@atla.com.

Except as otherwise specified, Copyright © 2016 American Theological Library Association.