

JEWISH PROCEDURES OF BIBLE INTERPRETATION IN THE
GOSPELS.
A PROPOSAL FOR A SYSTEMATIC CLASSIFICATION¹

AGUSTÍN DEL AGUA
MADRID

INTRODUCTION

In its interpretation of the Scriptures, the community of Jesus is deeply rooted in the wider ongoing community of religious Judaism. It follows an exegetic method very similar to other Jewish groups and stands out above all for the stress laid on some procedures and the daring with which they are applied. In terms of method, therefore, the early Christian use of the OT was completely Jewish and bore a lot in common with other Jewish groups. The method and procedures, however, are subordinated to the original interpretation of the Scriptures offered by Jesus and his followers. In certain aspects this ties in with previous Jewish interpretation², but there are always signs of a new, unique starting point. The aforementioned exegetic procedures are not applied mechanically in the NT but rather in terms of new assumptions that characterise the originality of the Christian approach to the Scriptures.

The Christian perspective on the OT is indeed determined by assumptions affecting at least four areas³: *eschatology* which implies having now entered

¹ This proposal of a systematic classification on NT midrash/derash will be added to the new edition of my former book: *El método midrásico y la exégesis del Nuevo Testamento* (Biblioteca midrásica 4; Valencia 1985).

² The phenomenon of Bible interpretation goes back to the period of the formation of the Bible itself. See M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985).

³ See A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 84-87; see also E. E. ELLIS, "Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church", in: M. J. MULDER (ed.), *Mikra. Text*,

the messianic era [= the future aeon of the apocalypse] by means of the message of Jesus Christ and his work of salvation (the redemption of God is carried out in history); *typology* as the key to reading the Scriptures, whereby OT persons, events and institutions are considered to be prophetic prefiguration of NT events (thus they are applied to Jesus, among others figures, the messianic type of the king and the affliction of the righteous man, both present in the Book of Psalms); the *corporate personality* in his perception of man and the Messiah (in the OT an individual figure can embody all those related thereto); and the *Christ-centred*⁴ approach whereby Jesus interprets (and even criticises) the Scriptures in terms of his own doctrine and person (see Mt 5.21-48; 19.7-9); thus, although the messianic interpretation of the Scriptures can also be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls⁵, the new feature of the proclamation of Jesus is that the Kingdom of God is present in his own person and mission (see Lu 4.43)⁶. Jesus and his apostles and prophets, as represented in the NT, made a unique contribution to C1st Judaism in their profound interpretation of biblical writings in terms of the person, ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah. This Christ-centred approach set the course for the whole of Christian exegesis thereafter.

Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (CRINT II/1; Assen/Maastricht-Minneapolis 1990) 691-725, 710-19.

⁴ Among the most recent exegetical literature see F. C. HOLMGREN, *The Old Testament and the Significance of Jesus: Embracing Change—Maintaining Christian Identity* (Grand Rapids 1999); P. M. VAN BUREN, *According to the Scriptures: The Origins of the Gospel and of the Church's Old Testament* (Grand Rapids 1999).

⁵ Thus 4Q174 [4QFlorilegium]; 4Q175 [4QTestimonia]; 4Q246 [4QSon of God]; 11Q13 [11QMelch]. On biblical exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see M. FISHBANE, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran", in: M. J. MULDER, o. c., 339-77; D. PATTE, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (SBL Monograph Series 22; Missoula, Montana 1975); G. J. BROOKE, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSS 29; Sheffield 1985); F. F. BRUCE, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Den Haag 1959); H. GABRION, *L'Interprétation de l'Écriture dans la littérature de Qumran* (Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt [Haase-Temporini] II.19.1; Berlin 1979) 749-848; M. P. HORGAN, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington 1979).

⁶ A. DEL AGUA, "The Lucan Narrative of the 'Evangelization of the Kingdom of God'", in: J. VERHEYDEN (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL 142; Leuven 1999) 639-61; *Id.*, "El cumplimiento del Reino de Dios en la misión de Jesús: programa del evangelio de Lucas (Lc 4,14-44)": *EstBib* 38 (1979-80) 269-294; A. PRIEUR, *Die Verkündigung der Gottesherrschaft. Exegetische Studien zum lukanischen Verständnis von basileia tou/ qeou/* (WUNT 2/89; Tübingen 1996).

The method by which the Christians reinterpreted the Scriptures –and its exegetic traditions– was the *midrash*, whose hermeneutic principles and exegetic procedures were handed down to them through Judaism. This noun, stemming from the root *drsh* (“search”, “deal with”, “study”, “look into”, etc.) had already been unequivocally used as an interpretation or explication of a biblical text before Christianity (e. g. 4Q 174: “interpretation [*midrash*] of ‘Blessed is the man that walks not in the counsel of the wicked [Ps 1.1]”). For the modern mentality *midrash* could be said to be equivalent to *hermeneutics*, the latter being understood as the principles governing interpretation of the Scriptures, and *exegesis*, in terms of the application of specific procedures in the interests of understanding the text.

In light of the above postulates, the midrashic/derashic method, by means of the procedures outlined below, was applied by Jesus and the writers of the NT not as an amplification of or commentary on the biblical text, as with the Jewish *midrash*, but rather in service of the event of Jesus Christ, who had carried out the “fulfilment” of what had been announced in the Scriptures (1 Co 15.3f; Lu 24.27; Jn 19.28...). For the *midrash* or *derash* of the NT, therefore, the *meaning* of the OT is Jesus Christ, and its *function* is that of unveiling his mystery as corroborated by the word of God. Unlike the Jewish *midrash*, therefore, which centred on the study of the Torah, the Christian *midrash* is Christ centred. Moreover, the NT *midrash* sought not so much to find proof texts in the OT but rather to search the Scriptures in an attempt to understand what God was doing in Christ and the early Church.

The NT exegesis of the OT makes use of all the *interpretation procedures* known in the Judaism of the time and makes a selective reading of the OT, both in terms of subject matter and passages quoted. Like other Jewish groups (e.g., Qumran), the Christians concentrated their biblical quotes on certain passages of the Scriptures, especially the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms, and used them more in some NT books than in others. The classification of these biblical ‘interpretation procedures’ –centring here on examples taken from the gospels, but applicable to the NT as a whole– has to respond to the twofold *interpretative activity* they represent, namely, the *narrative form of interpretation* and the *exegetic form of interpretation*. As I have dealt with in previous articles⁷, this division responds to the double hermeneutic aspect of *midrash/derash*, that is, the exegetical one and the theological one; both hermeneutic aspects make that the gospel account

⁷ A. DEL AGUA, “Die ‘Erzählung’ des Evangeliums im Lichte der Derasch-Methode”: *Judaica* 47 (1991) 140-54, 140-42.

functions as an interpretative narrative, namely “that the juncture between exegesis and theology, before being a work of interpretation applied *to* the text, already functions *in* the text if this text is a narrative with an interpretative function”⁸, as it is the case of the canonical gospels. From these forms of interpretation, indeed, derive the *narrative procedures* and the *exegetic procedures* of interpretation of the Scriptures in the whole NT. Moreover, only in this way is the NT midrash tackled from its true hermeneutic dimension, eschewing the frequent exegetic attitude that filters what is hermeneutic in favour of what is purely literary as is demonstrated by a certain classification of the “literary forms” of the NT midrash. In the world of the midrash, literary aspects always play second role to hermeneutic aspects. In any case, neither Early Judaism nor Rabbinical Judaism distinguished between hermeneutic and literary categories of writing; they even read the Scriptures first and foremost as a hermeneutic text, i.e., as works of interpretation as well as scripture⁹. Hence the fact that the particular hermeneutics of the midrashic method is the key factor at times in resolving questions as fundamental as the historicity of some passages¹⁰ or in explaining the semantic peculiarity of the gospel narration in general or of a ‘narrated speech’ of Jesus in particular on the basis of the part played therein by the Scriptures. This does not imply

⁸ P. RICOEUR, “Interpretative narrative”, in: R. SCHWARTZ (ed.), *The Book and the Text. The Bible and Literary Theory* (Cambridge, Mass.-Oxford, UK. 1990) 237-257, 237.

⁹ G. L. BRUNS, “The Hermeneutics of Midrash”, in: R. SCHWARTZ, *o. c.*, 189-208, 195.

¹⁰ The significance of midrash for the historical criticism of the Bible goes back to A. ROBERT, “Littéraires (genres)”, in: DBS V (Paris 1950) kol. 405-21; A. TRICOT and A. ROBERT, *Initiation biblique. Introduction à l'étude des saintes écritures* (Paris 1954); R. BLOCH, “Midrash”, in: DBS V, kol. 1263-80; G. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden 1961 = 1982 2cd ed.) spec. 1-10; *Id.* (ed.), *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden 1975) 59-91; A. DíEZ MACHO, “Derás y exégesis del Nuevo Testamento”: *Sef* 35 (1975) 37-89. All this pioneer work on midrash has been criticized recently by L. TEUGELS, “Midrash in the Bible or Midrash on the Bible? Critical remarks about the Uncritical Use of a Term”, in: G. BODENDORFER und M. MILLARD (eds.), *Bibel und Midrasch. Zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für die Bibelwissenschaft* (Tübingen 1998) 43-63, 51: “The pioneer advocates of the importance of midrash for the historical criticism of the Bible, André Robert, René Bloch and Geza Vermes, have greatly influenced both Old Testament and New Testament scholars. It is their merit to have treated midrash for the first time in an historical-critical way – an exception even in the Jewish Studies of their time. Furthermore, they have brought midrash to the attention of biblical scholars by locating its roots in the Hebrew Bible and by pointing to similar literary forms in the New Testament. However, the same authors actually encouraged a rather superficial use of the term “midrash” in biblical exegesis”. Dealing with the NT midrashic exegesis, however, the discussion about the notion of midrash to be applied in it should be an “a posteriori” question, i.e., a result of the research of the OT in the NT and not vice versa.

overlooking the distinct *literary expression* enshrining the specific application of the midrashic hermeneutics. Finally, in terms of the *content*, the procedures apply both to *halakic* questions, related to rules of conduct, and *haggadic* questions, referring to all non-*halakah* matters.

In its conception of the Scriptures, therefore, the messianic community of Jesus differed from the main current of Judaism not in terms of the content of the Bible but rather in the interpretative key it used to 'open' the Bible (see Lu 24.16-31), albeit using the same procedures. It was indeed the existing Jewish Scriptures – called 'Old Testament' only from the C2nd onwards – that allowed the first Christians to *tell* the event of Jesus Christ – particularly his death and resurrection – as a *kerygma* of salvation¹¹. The midrashic resources of interpretation used for that purpose (without being tied down to the hermeneutic rules or *middot*) include procedures of Christian 'creative historiography' and 'creative philology'. This does not necessarily imply a contradiction between theological truth and the historical truth of the life of Jesus¹²; quite on the contrary, *kerygma* and history both act as two inseparable functions of the gospel story. The *kerygmatic* aspects, in whose service the aforementioned interpretation procedures act, should not therefore be understood as a formal notion of the gospels, as the latter aim to be first and foremost "narratives" of the eschatological work of God in the life of Jesus of Nazareth, in perfect keeping with the ongoing biblical narrative tradition. The two proposed types of Christian interpretation of the Scriptures are subordinate to the hermeneutic dimension of the gospels as stories.

The above can now serve as preamble and background to our presentation of the hermeneutic procedures used by Christian writers both in their recourse to the OT¹³ and in their updating of the "sayings" (*logia*) of Jesus. Given that the developments of the early *kerygma* were carried out by means of new (compositional) resources to the OT, it is not acceptable to speak of an inner NT midrash in general, but rather of midrashic procedures in the reinterpretation of the sayings of Jesus. Moreover, as in any systematisation, it might prove impossible to pigeon-hole some examples in just one category.

¹¹ See, e.g. C. ROWLAND, *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism* (Cambridge 1985) 50-55, 53s: "Jewish Scriptures provided the Christians with the determinative framework for the establishment of their own identity".

¹² See M. HENGEL, "Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft": NTS 40 (1994) 321-57.

¹³ See esp. C. A. EVANS and W. R. STEGNER (eds.), *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (Sheffield 1994) *passim*.

I. NARRATIVE FORM OF INTERPRETATION OF THE OT IN THE NEW CHRISTIAN CREATIVE HISTORIOGRAPHY AS A HERMENEUTIC PROCEDURE

New Testament Christian identity finds its major hermeneutic mode in the narrative. The method of “narrative analysis” (*narrative criticism*) seeks to interpret the biblical stories today with the help of old and new literary theory; i.e., it is concerned with the narrative as a literary text that can be analysed in literary categories (narrator, plot, characters, point of view, setting, events...). Nevertheless, the narrative theological model proper to the New Testament as a whole tells (and retells) the story of Jesus and the story of the early Church in the key of fulfilment of the Scriptures [the storyteller tries to understand what God was doing in Christ and in the early Church by searching Scripture rather than looking for proof-texting]. This means that each one of the aforementioned literary categories function in the narrative as semantic categories, since it is they that give theological meaning to the narrative. So, bearing in mind that the NT is written in a tradition (OT) rather than in a literary form, we need to relate each of these categories to the OT, since each refers the understanding of the event of Christ and the early Church to several ‘patterns’ in the OT tradition. This is what we generally understand by the term ‘typology’ (*tu,poj*) and the hermeneutic aspect to which it is associated, which sees in persons, events, or places the prototype, pattern, or figure of historical persons, events, or places that follow it in time. This kind of hermeneutic procedure is particularly associated with the Christian exegesis of the OT in the NT, and also with classical Christian exegesis¹⁴.

So the *plot*, programme or sequential argument of the story of a Gospel, focused on Jesus’ own actions, is in the end a ‘narrative of events and words’ interpreted narratively as ‘fulfilment’ in the light of the promise of salvation made by God to the fathers in the old covenant (see Lu 1.1; Mk 1.1; Mt 1.1). The *Characters* are the actors in the story, acting as such characters through typological recourse to the OT [there is a narrative understanding of characters]. *The point of view* particular to each of the Gospel stories is worked out by means of narrative elaboration of the sources in the light of new recourse to the OT tradition. The *events* are the content of a narrative, but the events and words of Jesus must equally be distinguished from the

¹⁴ A. DEL AGUA, “La interpretación del “relato” en la doble obra lucana”: *EE* 71 (1996) 169-214; *Id.*, “Interpretación del Nuevo Testamento y métodos”: *EE* 73 (1998) 3-42, *Id.*, “Identidad narrativa de los cristianos según el Nuevo Testamento”: *Concilium* 36 (2000) 113-21.

typological interpretation given them in the narrative. The *setting*, be it spatial, temporal or social, can also be a reference to the Old Testament, giving a particular theological character to a narrative (e.g. the mount in Mt 5.1; 8.1).

For all these reasons, the narrative form of biblical interpretation in the canonical gospels in itself calls for the complete study of each gospel as a 'story', for only in this way can the narration reveal its full recourse to the OT patterns (tu,poi) that act as mediation between the narrated event of Jesus and the reader. In fact the reader would be hard put to understand the Christological path of Jesus without taking this hermeneutic mediation of the OT into account¹⁵. Herein lies the task of the immediate future, but the narrative study can also be applied to sections and passages of a narrative whole. Such is the case of the examples put forward below. The *setting*, therefore, is here –in the following examples- to be understood as a synecdoche of the part for the whole. Its treatment as narrative 'procedure' of interpretation aims to be only a demonstration of how the narrative form of interpretation in question in fact works.

The use of the hermeneutic expression "creative historiography" requires once more an explanation in order to avoid any misunderstanding about it. In this context, it is applied exclusively to the underlying hermeneutics on the developments of the kerygma as one function of the gospel narratives, without diminishing for nothing the historical dimension of themselves. Moreover, the kerygma as a whole is proclaimed about the historical Jesus in christological continuity with the preaching of Jesus himself [Jesus on the origins of Christology]. Thus, the historical aspect of the gospel narratives remains untouchable, insofar as it is the purpose of another parallel study (compatible with the present one). In addition to all that it seems preferable to use this hermeneutical terminology better than the terminology of fiction stemming from the modern novel. Thus, the plot which Mark establishes is the connecting thread of purpose which links the different isolated episodes into a unified, narrative Christology. Mark is therefore best described as narrative, though the narrative is not put forward as fiction. It is not fictional narrative, because the narrator did not feel free to alter or create as he liked. There is positive evidence that he had a real respect for the tradition and preserved much of its detail faithfully. Likewise, the sophistications of gospel

¹⁵ See J. LIEU, "Narrative Analysis and Scripture in John", in: S. MOYISE (ed.), *The Old Testament in the New Testament. Essays in Honour of J. L. North* (Sheffield 2000) 144-63, 145 n. 4: "Narrative studies of the Fourth Gospel tend to ignore issues such as the use of Scripture, and see Jesus' journey and that of the believer as available to the reader without mediation".

narrative are quite different from the subtleties of modern novels. Gospel narrative shares in the subtleties of ancient Hebrew narratives, not in the more self-conscious subtleties of modern novels¹⁶.

Consequently, instead of fiction I prefer to talk about “creative historiography”¹⁷ as the proper hermeneutics of midrash. The NT writers seem to have composed scenarios based on OT patterns having in mind a theological purpose as a narrative form of interpretation of the OT in the NT.

The evangelists, following formal patterns (*typoi*) of the OT tradition, set the birth of Jesus, narratively speaking, with a clear theological intent in mind. They also composed *stories* comprehending a profession of the Christian faith in various forms, and *discourses*, which retold the words of Jesus in various ways (narration [*diegesis*] or imitation [*mimesis*] to update them to new theological and pastoral needs (narrated discourses). This is what NT scholars have called a ‘history-like’ narrative¹⁸ or described as ‘christologische Aussagen als Geschichte erzählt [werden]’¹⁹.

1. OT narrative setting as interpretation of the ‘events’ of the life of Jesús

One of the most notable examples of this type of interpretation is Matthew’s narration of the birth and childhood of Christ (Mt 1-2)²⁰. Good scribe that he was, Matthew was also well aware of the developments in the Jewish tradition haggadah. Except for the midrashic procedure of the *gematry* with which he structures his initial genealogy (Mt 1.1-17), Matthew based the various sequences of his account of the childhood of Jesus on the OT *narrative pattern of a biographical nature*: the biblical (Ex) and haggadic infancy narratives of Moses (see F. Josephus, *Ant.* II, 9.1-4; *Targumic* traditions, etc.). Jesus thus recapitulates the exodus as the founding event of Israel’s identity; after undergoing similar vicissitudes to those of Moses, he

¹⁶ See J. L. SKA, “La “nouvelle critique” et l’exégèse anglo-saxonne”: RechSR 80 (1992) 29-53.

¹⁷ This is the exegetical terminology introduced by I. HEINEMANN, *Darkhei ha-Aggada* (Jerusalem 1942, 3rd ed. 1970) 15-95.

¹⁸ See H. W. FREI, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative. A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven-London 1974) *passim*.

¹⁹ U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus I. Mt 1-7* (EKKNT 1/1; Zürich-Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985) 85.

²⁰ See A. DEL AGUA, “Los evangelios de la infancia: ¿verdad histórica o verdad teológica?”, in: *RF* 230 (1994) 381-400, 388-95; M. MAYORDOMO MARÍN, *Den Anfang hören. Leserorientierte Evangelien exegese am Beispiel von Matthäus 1-2* (FRLANT 180; Göttingen 1998) 203-365.

ushers in the messianic people. Together with these exodus motifs, the narrator rounds off the scene with messianic motifs: the 'star' in the story of the wise men (ma,goi avpo. avnatolw/n: Mt 2.1-12) [application to Jesus of the tradition of royal messianism that dates back to Balaam's prophesy in Nu 24.17 where a 'star' and a 'sceptre' become a 'king' and a 'saviour' in the Targum Neophyti, a 'star' and a 'man' in the Septuagint = Messiah], the 'east' that alludes to the 'branch' of David (*semah*: Jer 23.5; Zech 3.8, Zech 6.12 – ajnatolhv: east: LXX – Messiah: Tg), plus the event of the virgin birth (1.18-25) which, set in this narrative context and corroborated with the quote from Isa. 7.14 (LXX), also shows Jesus' messianic identity with king David. To this must be added the universal motifs alluded to by the narrator: 1 Ki. 10.1-13 (visit of the Queen of Sheba) and Isa. 60.6 ("a multitude of camels shall cover you [...], all they from Sheba shall come; they shall bring gold and incense"). This narrative confession of the faith in Jesus as the Messiah, son of David would seem to be linked to the conclusive phrase of the childhood stories: "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets: He shall be called a Nazarene (Nazwrai/oj)" (Mt 2.23) which designation, whether or not it comes from the place name "Nazareth", becomes one of the titles of Jesus (Mt 26.71; Jn 19.19), tantamount to that of "Christ" or "Messiah", and it was also applied to those who recognised Jesus as Christ or Messiah (Ac 24,5: th/j tw/n Nazwrai,on ai`re,sewj), equally with the term "Christians" (Ac 11.26: evge,neto de. [...] crhmati,sai te prw,twj evn vAntiocci,a| tou,j maqhta,j Cristianou,j). Finally, within this whole set of parallels and in keeping with the typology of the exodus, Herod acts (*character*) as a new "Pharaoh" plotting the massacre of the innocents.

- Likewise, the account of the *interpretative vision* that follows the baptism of Jesus (Mk 1.9-11par; Jn 1.29-34) would seem to be the setting of a confession of Christian faith based on motifs taken from the apocalyptic tradition. This would seem to be borne out by the heavenly voice that, in its interpretation of the *peshet* type scene²¹, identifies Jesus with the messianic and redemptive traditions of the OT: Ps 2.7; Isa 42.7 with an allusion to the 'Aqedah' of Isaac. This confession of faith is linked to the baptism because it represents the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus (see Ac 1.21-22).

²¹ See A. DEL AGUA, "El procedimiento derásico que configura el relato del Bautismo de Jesús (Mc 1,9-11)", in: D. MUÑOZ LEÓN (ed.), *Salvación en la Palabra. Targum, Derash, Berith. En memoria de A. Díez Macho* (Madrid 1986) 593-609.

- The passage dealing with the *temptation* in the desert, in the version of 'Q' (Mt 4.1-11; Lu 4.1-13) is a setting of Jesus in terms of the narrative pattern of the three temptations with which Israel –according to the tradition of Deuteronomy– was tested by God in the desert. There, Jesus the Messiah, acting as a corporate personality, is tempted as the head of the new people of God. In antithetic parallelism with Israel, however, Jesus comes down on the side of God in each trial, by virtue of being the Son of God.

- The account of the *transfiguration* (Mk 9.2-13 par), composed of various OT motifs [possibly reflecting also the tradition of a midrash of the glory of Moses according to Ex 34.29-35, cf. 2 Co 3.7-4.6] is perhaps an attempt to set in proleptic form the glory of the future resurrection of Jesus on the basis of apocalyptic images (see Dan 12). Be that as it may, it would seem to be a setting of the profession of faith in Jesus Christ and the mystery of his death and resurrection. Thus, the voice coming from the cloud interprets the scene in *pesher* mode, *identifying* Jesus with messianic and redemptive traditions of the OT: Ps 2.7; Isa 42.1; allusion to the '*Aqedah*' of Isaac [without excluding Isa 44.2] and also the messianic tradition of Deu 18.15²².

- The setting as a narrative procedure of interpretation appears in John's account of the Passion in the theological dimension of his chronology. The typology of the Passover lamb, already traditionally applied to Christ (1 Co 5.7), is interpreted as chronology by making the time of Jesus' sacrifice coincide with the time when lambs were slaughtered for the Passover²³; hence the insistence on the fact that the Passover followed directly upon the crucifixion, with the affirmation "because it was the preparation" (Jn 19.31). This implied that the last supper took place before the Passover, contrasting with the chronology of Mark: "And on the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the passover lamb, his disciples said to him, 'Where will you have us go and prepare for you to eat the passover?'" (Mk 14.12 par).

- As for the money paid to Judas for his betrayal, apparently used after his death for buying a field (see Ac 1.18f) – which in Mt 27.3-10 is identified with

²² See A. DEL AGUA, "The Narrative of the Transfiguration as a Derashic Scenification of a Faith Confession (Marc 9,2-8par)": *NTS* 39 (1993) 340-54; *Id.*, "La transfiguración como preludio del 'éxodo' de Jesús en Lc 9,28-36. Estudio derásico y teológico": *Salmanticensis* 40 (1993) 5-19; see also M. GOULDER, *Luke. A New Paradigm, I* (JSNT SS 20., Sheffield 1989) 441; B. E. REID, *The Transfiguration. A Source- and Redaction-Critical Study of Lk 9,28-36* (Cahiers RB 32; Paris 1993) 103; B. J. KOET, "Divine communication in Luke-Acts", in: J. VERHEYDEN (ed.), *o. c.*, 745-57.

²³ See, e. g., F. KERMODE, *The Genesis of Secrecy. On the Interpretation of Narrative* (Cambridge, Ma.-London 1979) 93s.

the 'potter's field' (v. 7; cf. v.10) – Matthew based *his* interpretation of the episode on the messianic oracle of the prophetic figure of the shepherd from the Second Zechariah (11.12-13) – who receives from the Lord the order to cast the thirty pieces of silver of his wretched price unto the potter in the house of the Lord – and on the oracle of Jeremiah in which God orders him to buy a field (Jer 32. 6-9), probably related by the evangelist to other texts of the prophet (Jer. 18.1-12; 19.1-13). With this interpretation of the episode of the so-called 'Field of Blood' (*Hakeldama*: Mt 27.7; Ac 1.19), Matthew thus carries out his midrashic (theological) interpretation of a *place name/toponym* (of Christian or Jewish origin), by virtue of which he 'explains' the name the place has taken on (perhaps a cemetery) in terms of the *blood* price for betraying the innocent Christ ["Wherefore that field was called, The Field of Blood, unto this day", Mt 27.8; dif. Ac 1.19], seeking biblical support therefor in prophecy. This serves to bear out the 'fulfilment quote' whereby Matthew considers the purchase of the field to have 'fulfilled' the aforementioned prophecies of Zechariah and Jeremiah (Mt 27.9-10)²⁴.

- For his setting of the theological interpretation of the death of Christ, Matthew also resorts to apocalyptic figures in Mt 27. 51-53. Given that the accusations against Jesus in the Sanhedrin and the insults received on the cross had referred to his claims to be able to destroy and build the temple of God in three days (26.61; 27.40) and to be the Son of God (26.63f; 27.40-43), the signs following his death were God's response to both challenges. The abolition of the temple [the curtain of the temple was torn in two] expresses, as a judgement on Israel, the end of the old economy (Mt 27.51a), and the resurrection of the dead [the tombs were opened, and many bodies of the saints... were raised] represents, in light of the exegetic tradition on the resurrection of TgEzek 37, the start of the new life granted by Jesus, as Son of God and Saviour (Mt 27.51b-53)²⁵, as is borne out by the confession of the centurion in Mt 27.54. Jesus thus exercises both functions [judge and saviour] in the final judgement (Mt 25.31-46).

2. OT interpretative setting in the narrative of Jesus' words or speeches

In the set of gospel narratives the speeches of Jesus function as 'accounts of words' or narrated speeches; just like the events, therefore, the words of

²⁴ So A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 144-49.

²⁵ See R. AGUIRRE MONASTERIO, *Exégesis de Mateo 27,51b-53*. Para una teología de la muerte de Jesús en el evangelio de Mateo (Vitoria 1980) *passim*.

Jesus are also interpreted –in being told (or retold)– as a ‘verbal episode/event’ by dint of the settings based on narrative patterns from the OT tradition. The most typical examples are the five great discursive compositions (*Redekompositionen*) with which the evangelist Matthew has elaborated, by means of different settings, the words of the Lord Jesus stemming from the synoptic tradition (Mt 5-7; 10; 13; 18; 24-25).

- The opening speech (Mt 5-7) narrates the teaching of Jesus as ‘fulfilment’ of the revelation given on Sinai (“spatial scene of the mountain”: Mt 5.1; 8.1). By means of the typological recourse to the Sinai revelation, indeed, the narrator presents the halakic interpretation of Jesus and his moral teaching as the programmatic and eschatological revelation of the Torah of God. This revelation, however, is not set against the first revelation but rather presented as its final *fulfilment* (5.17): righteousness (*dikaïosu,nh*) exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees (5.20)²⁶. The narrator had already told the reader that Jesus “fulfils all righteousness” (Mt 3.15), fulfilling in himself the demands of mercy made by the prophets (e. g., Hos 6.6). The typological interpretation, however, goes even further. The “it was said [by God] (*evrre,qh*)”, which recalls the locution of God in the Scriptures, is counterpoised by the “But I (*evgw,*) say to you” which, together with its importance for defining the self-understanding of Jesus, vindicates something that “für jüdisches Empfinden ein Eingriff in göttliche Prärogative war”²⁷. Jesus in fact acts invested with divine authority itself and not alone like Moses. The typology therefore is not only Mosaic but also embraces the theological aspects of Christology [it is in fact a clear example of the *christological transposition* of the divine predicates to the specific acts of Jesus²⁸]. Jesus is thus presented as inaugurator [ein neuer Gesetzgeber] of a new moral order based on his divine authority. Matthew dedicates his whole retelling to this.

- Likewise, the words of Jesus – proceeding from the stories of the mission and other passages of synoptic tradition – are set by Matthew as a speech of Jesus on the *ecclesiology of the mission* in the discursive composition of 9.35-11.1. To this end the narrator has undoubtedly made use of ‘patterns’ of the OT tradition to elaborate his narrative ecclesiology²⁹. On the one hand he

²⁶ See H. FRANKEMÖLLE, *Matthäus kommentar I* (Düsseldorf 1994) 70, 98, 205ss.

²⁷ G. DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu I* (Leipzig 1898) 258.

²⁸ See A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 235-38.

²⁹ See H. FRANKEMÖLLE, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi*. Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des “Evangeliums” nach Matthäus (Münster 1973) 138-43.

has resorted to particularist messianic traditions that predicted a Messiah for Israel alone, whose representations he sees to have been fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus and in the –for Matthew– current mission of the disciples vis-à-vis Israel (Mt 10.5b-6; cf. 15.24)³⁰; on the other, Matthew has borne in mind the universal promises that the covenant with Abraham contained for ‘all peoples’ (see, e.g., 1 Chron 16.28-30; 2 Chron 6.33), and also the prophecies that announced the messianic salvation for pagans (e.g., Is 49.6), as borne out by Mt 28.18-20³¹. For this reason Matthew can speak at the same time of ‘the twelve apostles’ (10.2), whose historic mission is now the guarantee and prototype of the permanent *mission to Israel* on the part of the community, and of ‘the twelve disciples’ (10.1; 11.1), an expression by means of which, by the midrashic procedure of ‘updating by substitution’, Matthew also applies that first mission to the current *universal mission* of the community³². There is therefore no contradiction between the two projections, the universal and the particular, but rather two constituent aspects of the missionary identity of the disciple. The apparent discord of the text is due to Matthew’s introduction of his own theological perspective into pre-existing texts.

- The same hermeneutic procedure of the setting is found in Jesus’ speech by parables of Mt 13.1-53. In his discursive composition Matthew tackles the question of the incredulity of Israel and its historic redemptive consequences by means of the midrashic recourse to the OT *testimonium* of Is 6.9-10, from which text he takes the theme of *understanding* (*su,nesij*) that runs through the whole discourse in its positive and negative form. The discourse thus takes the form of a theological *reasoning* of the forfeiture by Israel – because it failed to understand – of its status of being the historico salvific bearer of the ‘People’ and of the ‘Kingdom [of God]’ caused by its incredulity. At the same time, the evangelist explains the continuity of the ‘People’ and ‘Kingdom’ in the Christian Church – because the latter did understand. But the latter must however learn the lesson from the poor behaviour of Israel. It is not enough for the disciples to enter the Church; as well as listening to the ‘word of the kingdom,’ they need to take it on board to avoid being excluded from salvation on the day of judgement to be carried out by the Son of Man³³.

³⁰ H. FRANKEMÖLLE, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi*, 123-37.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 108-19.

³² See U. LUZ, “Die Jünger im Matthäusevangelium”: *ZNW* 62 (1971) 141-71.

³³ A. DEL AGUA, “Eclesiología como discurso narrado: Mt 13.2-52. Teoría y práctica del análisis de discursos narrados en los evangelios”: *EE* 72 (1997) 217-69.

- Another discursive composition of Matthew is to be found in Mt 18.1-35, now set as a *halakic* speech of Jesus on the internal order of the community/ekklesia (vv. 15-20). In this case the OT pattern is the function of *binding* and *loosing*, taken by Matthew from the Jewish halakic tradition and set in the discourse by means of a halakic deduction from a saying of Jesus. Indeed, the introduction on humility as the true greatness in the kingdom of heaven is followed by the words of the Lord of v. 15: "If your brother sins against you, go and tell him his fault between you and him alone. If he listens to you, you have gained your brother" (cf. Lk 17.3), from which the narrator seems to deduce in halakah fashion other rules of community conduct: vv. 16-17. Then the power of *binding* and *loosing* within the community is declared (v. 18; cf. 16.19); images used by the scribes in the Jewish halakah tradition for declaring what is banned or permitted. The halakic decisions of the community therefore have the authority of heaven itself. The speech finally ends with a declaration that serves as *gemara* (complement) in the form of a parable on forgiving your brother his trespasses (vv. 22-35)³⁴.

- Mathew completes his narrated speeches with an eschatological instruction on the fundamental attitudes that the believer has to abide by in view of the end of the world and of history (Mt 24-25); its narrative setting, replete with apocalyptic recourses, includes, together with the eschatological discourse of Mk 13, various teachings of Jesus on vigilance, rounding them off with his original setting of the final judgement (25.31-46). Thus, the destruction of the temple and the city of 70 AD, as an event of the recent past, seems to have been used by the narrator for theologically tackling the intermediate time running from the first to the second coming of Jesus (see Mt 28.18-20), and also as the prototype for describing the end of the world. The narrative setting of the final judgement of history, based on the apocalyptic tradition of the Son of Man (Dan 7; 1 En 37-71; 4 Ezra), presents Jesus exercising as judge and universal sovereign king, a function corresponding to him as the Son of Man. Before this trial stand both Israel and the Christian Church; hence the need for 'vigilance' as the attitude for appearing before this court with confidence³⁵.

- The serious problems of interpretation that have always characterized the well-known apocalyptic speech of Mk 13 could perhaps be cleared up

³⁴ See W. D. DAVIES and D. C. ALLISON, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew II* (Edinburgh 1991) 781ss.

³⁵ See D. MARGUERAT, *Le jugement dans l'évangile de Matthieu* (Genève 1981).

somewhat by being analysed from this viewpoint of the *narrated speech*³⁶. It seems to be quite on the cards that the narrator of Mk 13 has merged in his composition traditions of Jesus that originally run in an independent way: firstly, Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the temple, and secondly the references of Jesus to the apocalyptic tradition of the Son of Man and his return for the consummation of history (cf. the parables of the return: Mt 24.45-51; 25.1-13.14-30; Lk 19.11-27). Once Jesus had been identified as the Son of Man (without excluding this self-understanding of Jesus), together with the apocalyptic conviction of the imminent end of the world (which took root in some groups of nascent Christianity, see 1 Th), the narrator then saw himself in a suitable *Sitz im Leben* for composing a narrated speech, in mimetic mode, with which, based on the aforementioned patterns of the apocalyptic tradition, he wished to instruct the Christian community on the coming end (cf., e.g., 1Q War Scroll – 1QM).

- Although John's account of the last supper makes no reference to the Eucharist institution by Jesus, the long speeches of Jn 13-17 are in fact the staged development by John's school of all the ecclesiological themes bound up with the Eucharist (which John's school knew through the synoptic tradition). This school put in the lips of Jesus an elaborate *narrated discourse* in mimetic mode based on the OT prototype of the *farewell speech*³⁷ or *testament* – very widely used in the biblical and apocryphal tradition of the OT – by which the great biblical figures make their last will known (Gen 49; Deut 33; 1 Mac 2.49-70; Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs).

3. Narrative setting by the procedure of parallelism or imitation of the OT texts

- Unlike Matthew, who composes scenes in the way of Jewish creative haggadah tradition (Christologische Aussage als Geschichte erzählt), Luke tells his 'story' of the childhood of Jesus (Lk 1-2) according to the parallelism technique ('history by parallels') or the imitation technique ('imitative historiography'), based on *formal patterns* of a biographical nature taken from

³⁶ Regards the approach of Mk 13 as "narrated speech", see W. S. VORSTER, "Literary reflections on Mk 13,5-37: A narrated speech of Jesus": *Neotestamentica* 21 (1987) 203-24; from the point of view of the midrash/derash, see L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted. The formation of some Jewish apocalyptic texts and of the eschatological discourse Mark 13 par.* (Uppsala 1966), 226-52.

³⁷ See esp. E. CORTÉS, *Los discursos de adiós de Gn 49 a Jn 13-17* (Barcelona 1976).

the accounts of the childhood of the great biblical figures³⁸. Pride of place here goes to the *hymns* (*Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, *Nunc dimittis*) which abide by the *anthological procedure* or *mosaic style* (*musivstil*), but with the same purpose of showing the messianic fulfilment in Jesus³⁹. The account of Lk 1-2 is broken down into seven episodes arranged around two diptychs: the annunciations of John and Jesus, concluding with the visitation and the Magnificat (1.5-56), and the births, which conclude with the presentation of Jesus and the finding of him in the temple (1.57-2.52). The previous announcements of the birth of John and Jesus conform to a narrative pattern from the parallel annunciations of the OT (Isaac: Gen 17-18; Samuel: 1 Sa 1-2; Moses: Ex 3-4; Gidion: Judg 6.11ff...). The account of the birth of John is based on the parallelism between the married couple Abraham-Sarah and Zacharias-Elizabeth. The birth of Jesus is set among the shepherds abiding in the fields (2.8-20). This would seem to have been based on the messianic tradition of *Migdal 'Eder* (*tower of the flock*: TgMic 4.8; PsJGen 35.21). The entrance of Jesus into the temple is described in the light of Mal 3.1-2. Finally, the account of finding the child Jesus among the doctors of the temple mimics the Jewish darashic tradition of Moses and Samuel (F. Josephus, *Ant.* II.9.6 and V.10.4).

- Luke's account of the *ascension* of Jesus (Lk 24.50-52; Ac 1.6-11; cf. Mk 16.19) is also the narrative setting, in the manner of a historical account, of the glorification of Jesus after his death and resurrection. The narrative pattern *imitated* by Luke is that of the ascension to heaven of some great figures of biblical tradition (Enoch: Gen 5.24; Elijah: 2 Ki 2.11; Sir 48.9.12) as apocrypha of the OT (*Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah...*)⁴⁰.

- The account of the coming of the Holy Spirit in Ac. 2.1-13 (cf. Jn 20.22), to which is inextricably linked the interpretative speech of Peter (Ac 2.14-41), contains the narrative setting of the return of the spirit of prophecy as a sign of the arrival of messianic times, as is borne out by the speech of Peter quoting Joel 2.28-32 in *peshet* form in Ac 2.16-21. The biblical readings of the Jewish feast of Pentecost (*pentêkostê*: the *fiftieth* [day]) or *Feast of the Weeks* (*Shabu'ot*), when is was commemorated the gift of the Law given by

³⁸ See A. DEL AGUA, "Los evangelios de la infancia: ¿Verdad histórica o verdad teológica?": *RF* 230 (1994) 381-400, 395-98.

³⁹ See M. COLERIDGE, *The Birth of the Lukan narrative*. Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2 (Sheffield 1993) *passim*.

⁴⁰ See esp. G. LOHFINK, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts-und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas* (München 1971).

God to Israel on Sinai, are the narrative pattern imitated by Luke's whole setting of the gift of the Holy Spirit⁴¹. That is why the account sets the episode on the same day of Pentecost (Ac 2.1).

II. THE EXEGETIC FORM OF INTERPRETATION OF THE OT IN THE NEW CHRISTIAN CREATIVE PHILOLOGY AS A HERMENEUTIC PROCEDURE

The gospels belong to a category of narratives we could call interpretative narratives. This means that they exercise their interpretative function as narratives. This is why theology and exegesis, rather than being a work of applied interpretation to the text, function in the text itself, since the text is a narrative with an interpretative function⁴². Hence the fact that, together with the narrative form of interpretation, there is also the exegetic form of interpreting the Scriptures. This is manifested in the text by means of the recourse to the many midrashic procedures of interpretation, as well as the well-known hermeneutic rules or *middôt*. This hermeneutic approach to the Bible traditions has been designated –already in Jewish haggadah– as *creative philology*⁴³. As a specific procedure of interpretation, creative philology includes all those techniques that allow the Christian narrator to obtain deductions from the Scriptures and unearth a hidden meaning. This kind of interpretation is more specific in its procedures than creative historiography, since it is more exacting to deduce with precision than to develop, amplify and embellish. Likewise, this approach to the Scriptures is based on two principles: firstly, all the details of the biblical text need to be interpreted and, secondly, all parts of the Bible can be interpreted both in context and in isolation therefrom.

⁴¹ See J. POTIN, *La Fête juive de la Pentecôte. Étude des Textes liturgiques*, I-II (Paris 1971).

⁴² P. RICOEUR, "Interpretative Narrative", in: R. SCHWARTZ (ed.), *The Book and the Text* (Cambridge; Mass.-Oxford, UK 1990) 237-57.

⁴³ See I. HEINEMANN, *Darkhei ha-Aggadah*, 96-164.

1. Exegetic procedures in the ways of quoting the Scripture

In the framework of the Christian interpretation of the OT in the canonical gospels, citations of scriptures⁴⁴ display methods that are common to all literary quotations: paraphrase, combined quotes, changes in sense and reference. Despite a wide-ranging affinity with Jewish practice, they often reflect forms adapted from the Greco-Roman world. To learn about the characteristics of Christian OT exegesis, however, we need to concentrate on the formulae⁴⁵ with which the NT introduces the OT quotes⁴⁶ on the selection of the OT passages (*testimonia*), and also on the peculiar merging of quotes, without forgetting the cases and principles we have already dealt with above⁴⁷.

Among the NT citations of the Scripture, stands out the different exegetic terminology associated with the formulae introducing a biblical quotation. Thus, we find the formula “*have you not read... (Οὐκ ἄνεγνωτε...)?*” (Mt 12.3) only to be met with on the lips of Jesus and habitually appearing in the debates between Jesus and his religious adversaries. Likewise, the gospels of Matthew⁴⁸ (1.22; 2.15...) and John⁴⁹ (12.38; 13.18...), and only these two,

⁴⁴ For a Sketch of the History of the research on Old Testament Quotations in the New, see: E. E. ELLIS, “Old Testament Quotations in the New: A Brief History of the Research”, in: *ID.*, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Tübingen 1991) 51-74.

⁴⁵ Without entering into the current debate about Form and Function in the Explicit OT Citations in the NT, see for this survey E. E. ELLIS, *Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church*, 692-99.

⁴⁶ For the OT quotations in the NT as a whole, see D. A. CARSON and H. G. M. WILLIAMSON (eds.), *It is written: Scripture citing Scripture*. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars (Cambridge 1988) 1-21.

⁴⁷ On quotations in Mark see A. SUHL, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh 1965); in Luke see D. L. BOCK, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*. Lucan Old Testament Christology (Sheffield 1987); M. RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloh 1969); T. HOLTZ *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104; Berlin 1968).

⁴⁸ Mt 1,22; 2,15; 4,14; 12,17; 21,4; cf. 2,23; 8,17; 13,35; K. STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (Uppsala 1954; Ramsey, NY. 1991); R. H. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden 1967); J. MILLER, *Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'évangile de Matthieu*. Quand Dieu se rend présent en toute humanité (AnBib 140; Rome 1999); M. J. J. MENKEN, “The Quotation from Jeremiah 31(38).15 in Matthew 2.18: A Study of Matthew's Scriptural Text”, in: S. MOYISE (ed.), *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, 106-25.

⁴⁹ Jn 12,38; 13,18; 15,25 (17,12); 19,24.36; the formula introduces words of Jesus in John 18,9.32; B. G. SCHUCHARD, *Scripture within Scripture. The Interrelationship of Form and Function*

use the formula “*that the scripture might be fulfilled*” (i[na h` grafh. plhrwqh/|), whose use is characteristic of the Christians coming from Judaism. The formula “*says the Lord*” (le,gei ku,rioj), added to an OT text, appears only in a citation attributed to Stephen (Ac 7.49) and in the epistles of Paul (Ro 12.19...). The formula is characteristic of the prophetic proclamation of the OT and it or its equivalent occasionally appears in the oracles of the Christian prophets (Rev 1.8; cf. 2.1...; Lk11.49; Ac 21.11). It is therefore probable that the phrase reflects the deeds of the Christian prophets in the Pagan Hellenic world. All these formulae locate the ‘Word of God’ character of the scripture in the very interpretation and application of its teaching. Thus, when mention is made of what “is written”, i.e. of divine authority, is not the biblical text in the abstract to be understood but rather the text in its meaningfulness for the current situation.

Commoner than formulae such as “*faithful is the word*” (pisto,j o` lo,goj), is the exegetic use of the formula “*this is*” (ou-toj evstin), (Mt 3.3; 11.10; 13.37-43; Jn 6.31-50; Ac 2.16f; 4.11; Ro 9.7-9...; cf. Lk 4.21), which is used with the eschatological orientation and exegetic framework that is found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This formula is in effect an equivalent of the Qumran *peshet* and might introduce either an explanation of the quoted text or a text put forward to explain the episode or event described.

The use of the adversative “but” (avlla,(de,) in the NT might follow a biblical quote or allusion in order to correct, qualify or underline a particular understanding of it (Mt 5.21f...; Jn 6.31f...), or it might introduce a quote to correct, qualify or underline a prior declaration or quote (Jn 13.18...). It represents an exegetic technique whereby the meaning of the Scriptures is drawn out or more precisely specified.

The terms “*hear*” (avkou,ein) and “*learn*” (manqa,nein) appear at times in the NT with reference to the ‘understanding’ or interpretation of the scripture. Thus, “*learn*” in Mt 9.13 and 24.30ff, and “*hear*” in Mt 21.33 and 24.32.

The *Testimonia* juxtapose OT passages dealing with a common theme without appending any commentary thereto, e.g., Mt 21.42; Ac 4.11; Eph 2.20; 1 Pe 2.6 merge the texts of Isa 28.16; Ps 118.22 and Isa 8.14 to develop the theme “Christ-Son-Rock”. Also Isa 6.9-10 as *testimonium* of the incredulity of Israel in Mk 4.12 par; Mt 13.14-15; Jn 12.37-41; Ac 28.26-27.

in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John (Atlanta, Georgia 1992); M. J. J. MENKEN, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel. Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen 1996).

It should be pointed out in this context that the textualist of today is more aware of the fact that the Greek or Aramaic textual variations represent not so much errors of scribes or different types of text but rather more significant interpretations of the text deliberately made with a theological purpose⁵⁰. This also holds true of the OT quotes in the NT e.g. Mt 11.10 contains an interpretative alteration of Mal 3.10; Mk 10.19f of Ex 20.12-16; Ac 4.11 of Ps 118.22; Ro 10.11 of Isa 28.16; He 10.6 of Ps 40.6; Jn 12.41 seems to contain a 'Christological' alteration of TgIsa. 6.1.5.

2. Application of exegetic rules or middôt and other techniques

a) The seven rules traditionally attributed to Hillel⁵¹ (there are also the sets of R. Yismael and R. Eliezer).

The argument *a fortiori*. "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? *How much* then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days" (Mt 12.11f). "If then God so clothe the grass [Gen 1.11f], which is today in the field, and tomorrow is cast into the oven: *how much more* will he clothe you, O ye of little faith!" (Lu 12.28). "Is it not written in your law, I said, You are gods? [Ps 82.6] If he called them gods to whom the word of God came [...], do you say of him, *whom the Father has consecrated and sent into the world*, 'You are blaspheming', because I said, 'I am the Son of God'?" (Jn 10.34-36).

Deduction by *analogy*. If David and his companions took and ate the holy bread [of the Presence], which should be eaten only by priests [1 Sa 21.6], it is then lawful for the Son of Man and those who are with him to break the *halakah* of the sabbath in similar circumstances (Lu 6.1-5).

General principle *drawn from one passage*. God is not a God of dead men, since it was an unbroken covenant that was established with Abraham in Ex 3.14f. God therefore has to resurrect him from among the dead. From this conclusion could in turn be deduced the resurrection of all dead men who have a similar covenant with God (Mk 12.26f par).

⁵⁰ See esp. the approach made by M. J. J. MENKEN, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, *passim*.

⁵¹ See examples of application of all these rules in A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, *passim*. For a summary of the seven Hillel's rules with examples taken from the NT, see E. E. ELLIS, *Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church*, 699-702.

General principle *drawn from two passages*. The uncircumcised Abraham [Gen 15.6] and the circumcised David [Ps 32.1] laid down the general principle that for them the justice of God is freely conceded to the circumcised Jew and the uncircumcised pagan regardless of their works (Ro 4.1-25). Likewise, the prohibition of muzzling the ox while it treads out the corn (Deu 25.4), and the custom of giving priests a temple for part of the offered sacrifices (Deu 18,1-18) could serve as the basis for deducing the general right of all ministers of the gospels to their subsistence (1 Co 9.9-13). Similarly, the examples of Abraham (Gen 22.9-19) and Rahab (Jos 2.1-16) establish the general principle that genuine faith is manifested in works (Jas 2.22-26).

Use of *generalisation and specification*. The [specific] commandments, “you shall not commit adultery, you shall not kill, you shall not steal ...” (Ex 20.13-17; cf. Lev 18.20; 19.11), and any other commandment are summed up in this [general] sentence, “you shall love your neighbour as yourself” (Lev 19.18). From this it follows that love is fulfilment of the Law (Ro 13,9f); i.e., the specific commandments are seen as illustrative examples of the general rule. Deduction made from *something similar in another passage*. The prophecy of Gen 12.3, affirming that all nations will be blessed in Abraham can be understood, in light of the analogous passage of Gen 22.18, as applying to all his seed and hence to the Messiah (Ga 3.8.16).

The *contextual sense*. At the start of the creation God founded the indissoluble marriage (Gen 1.27; 2.24); this precedent is understood to override subsequent (Deu 24.1) divorce provisions (Mt 19.4-8).

b) Other exegetic techniques in the interpretation of the Scriptures.

Gemetry, which involves interpretation of words by the numerical value of their consonants. Thus, on the basis of the numerical value [of the defective scripture] of the Hebrew name for David: *dwd*, 4+6+4=14, Matthew divides the ascendant genealogy of Jesus into three groups of fourteen generations each one (Mt 1.17), thereby giving to understand that Jesus is three times over the “son of David”, the Messiah⁵².

The *notarikon*, which takes the letters of a word as acrostics or abbreviations of another word. Thus the “testimony” of the refused *stone* (*'eben*) of Ps 118.22f finds lexical support by this procedure in the parable of the vineyard tenants who killed the *son* (*ben*) in Mk 12.1-12 par⁵³.

⁵² A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 104s.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 182-84.

Exegetic technique *'al tiqrey*, “not to be read thus... but rather”, i.e., the same Hebrew consonants read with different vowels. In the quote from Mi 5.2 given in Mt 2.6 there is an example of midrashic exegesis by this very procedure. The text of the prophet: “But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little to be among the *clans* (*'alfey-*) of Judah...”, is read by Matthew in the following way: “and you, O Bethlehem, ...are by no means least among the *princes* (*'al.lufey*) [the great cities] of Judah”. Matthew thus affirms that Bethlehem, as the cradle of the Messiah, is great among the great cities⁵⁴.

The double-entendre technique (*tartey mishma'*). Jn 3.14 says: “And as Moses lifted up (kai. kaqw,j Mwú?sh/j u]ywsen to.n o;fin) the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up (u`ywqh/nai)”. The evangelist, basing himself on the double-entendre technique, makes use of the word “lift up” (u`yo,w) to indicate, on the one hand, the form of death by crucifixion and, on the other, his theological interpretation as exaltation (see Isa 52.13) by reference to the typology of the bronze serpent exegetical tradition (Num 21)⁵⁵.

The *parable* as exegetic procedure. Thus, the text of Mt 21.33-46 is in reality a parable-based exposition of God's judgement on Israel, after its rejection of the Messiah causes it to forfeit the privilege of being the history of salvation bearers. The recourse to the symbol of the vineyard (Isa 5.1-7) illustrates the poor conduct shown by Israel in rejecting the 'Son' of the vineyard owner, and the consequences thereof for the former chosen people. As in other texts, the exegete Matthew does not rest content with simply reporting the judgement of God but affirms that the People and the Kingdom of God will be given to 'another people' which will bring forth the fruits thereof, in due course, for the Christian community (Mt 21.43)⁵⁶.

Midrashic exegesis by *etymology*. Procedures of popular etymology. Thus, the interpretation of the name of Jesus in Matthew 1.21c: “for he shall save his people from their sins”, is in fact a midrashic allusion to Ps 130.7-8 [“for with the Lord there is mercy..., And he shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities”], whereby Jesus Christ is granted the divine attribute of forgiving sins. Likewise, in Mt 1.23c, and as part of the quote from Isa 7.14, Jesus Christ is granted the name *Emmanuel* (“MeqV h`mw/n o` qeo,j”: Isa 8.8

⁵⁴ A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 109.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 136-42.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 224s.

LXX), which in its original sense is a formula of covenant to indicate the protecting presence of God with his People⁵⁷.

The interpretation of the name of Peter in Mt 16.18 also involves an etymological procedure, which exegetically explains Peter's apostolic guarantee [function] in relation to the originally proclaimed kerygma [the truth of the Christian Tradition], by means of the midrashic recourse to images of "building" (see 1 Co 3.5ff) which OT applied to Israel in its condition of being the bearer of the history of salvation⁵⁸.

The name of Melchizedek is also given a midrashic etymology in Paul's letter to the Hebrews 7.2, as "king of righteousness" (basileu.j dikaios,nehj) and "king of peace" (basileu.j eivrh,nehj).

3. *Typological exegesis as Christian midrash of the Scriptures*

'[The] Scripture are not a text-book teaching conceptual truths but rather a document of a historical process...'⁵⁹. This historical process is that of the revelation or salvation. Typological exegesis, therefore, based on the notion of salvation as history, regards persons, events or places as the prototype, pattern or figure of historical persons, events or places that follow in time⁶⁰. Unlike the 'history of religions school', therefore, which interpreted the NT in terms of parallels taken from several religions, typological exegesis tries to understand NT situations through the history of the salvation of Israel, as it is presented in the OT. Thus, the writers of the NT considered their own time as an intermediate segment in the ongoing development of God's plan, begun in the OT. On the basis of such events they discovered the meaning of the present time of salvation, their prime interest. They likewise considered current redemptive events as typological prophecies of future development and consummation of the salvation history.

Typological exegesis updates the biblical text, but it does not do so by means of symbolic or homiletic explanations, but rather by appropriating the

⁵⁷ For this kind of approach see also C. J. DAVIS, *The Name and Way of the Lord. Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology* (Sheffield 1996).

⁵⁸ For the "status questionis" of the recent exegetical studies on Mt 16, see J. I. GONZÁLEZ FAUS, "Algunos libros últimos sobre el ministerio de Pedro": *Actualidad Bibliográfica* 34 (1997) 5-21, 165-83.

⁵⁹ J. C. K. VON HOFMANN, *Interpreting the Bible* (Minneapolis 1972) 204.

⁶⁰ See esp. L. GOPPELT, *TYPOS. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (Gütersloh 1939 = Darmstadt 1981) 4-22, *et passim*.

prophetic and representative character of OT persons, events and institutions. Furthermore, as the predominant procedure of NT biblical interpretation, typology appears not only in the OT quotes but also in the Christian community's total representation of itself and of its mission. Each typology has two constituent characteristics, historical correspondence and escalation or 'heightening', by which the divinely ordered prefigurement finds its complement in a greater and later event – it is not mere cyclical repetition. A 'figure' or type of the OT may stand in positive correspondence to the new era reality or in contrast to it. This 'synthetic' or 'antithetic' typology can be illustrated with two examples. Adam is like the 'eschatological' Adam in being the 'son of God' and the head of the human race. But, in contrast, he brings mortality and sin, while Jesus frees man from these maladies (1 Co 15.21f. 45-49, commenting on Gen 2.7; 5.3; cf. Ro 5.12-21). Likewise, in contrast with the first Israel which failed the tests God submitted it to in the wilderness, Jesus successfully came through the triple temptation (Mt 4.1-11; Lu 4.1-13). And as has already been seen, Matthew makes use of the typological contrast between the teaching of Jesus, presented by the evangelist as a programmatic fulfilment of the full revelation of Sinai, and the demands of the old Torah, reduced to legal precepts and perfunctory compliance by the Pharisees and Scribes of the time (Mt 5.21-48).

Within the field of typological exegesis, *Christology* bulks large. This was developed from application to Jesus of the traditions on the figure of the Messiah King, together with other figures of the eschatological saviour, albeit not messianic in the strict sense. Thus, the following are applied to Jesus: 2 Sa 7; Ps 2; 110; Isa 7-11; Zech 9-14...; messianic traditions of the targum, e.g., TgN Nu 24.17; the poems of the Servant of the Lord of the second Isaiah; the exegetic tradition of the prophet such as Moses of Deu 18.15-18; the tradition of the Herald (*mebasser*) of the Kingdom of God in TgIsa. 52.7...; the prophecy of the return of Elijah (Mal 3.1.4), etc⁶¹.

Another important aspect of Christological typology is the Christological transposition whereby Jesus is granted attributes, prerogatives and divine names of the OT⁶². This part of Christology builds up from Mark, through Matthew and Luke and comes into its own in John (without forgetting the rest of the NT). Thus, the first biblical quote of the gospel according to St. Mark (Mk 1.2-3) already introduces an interpretative alteration by transposing to Jesus Christ the original divine reference of the text of Mal 3.1 and Isa 40.3.

⁶¹ A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 154ss.

⁶² See above Footnote n. 57.

Matthew likewise presents Jesus Christ with a formula of divine covenant taken from the book of Isaiah: "God with us" (*Emmanuel* of Isa 8.8 LXX) in Mt. 1.23; cf. Mt 28.20⁶³. Throughout the whole of Luke's gospel Jesus is said to be the personification of the Kingdom of God [αυτοβασίλει,α]⁶⁴, that is, *Regnum Dei, Deus est*. The prologue of the Gospel according to St. John (1.1-18) identifies Jesus with the divine attribute *Logos*, elaborated then by the attributes of Wisdom and Shekinah. Jesus also receives the 'Name above all names': *Kyrios*, in Phil 2.9 [translation in LXX of 'Adōnay, not so much in the written text (*ketiv*) as in the pronunciation (*qerē*), i.e., the reading of the Tetragrammaton *Yhwh*], etc... But here the typology spills over from the strictly messianic into the theological aspect of Christology.

In the account of the passion and resurrection the figure of the suffering and afflicted righteous man from Ps 22 and 69 is applied to Jesus. In this context the cry of the abandoned Jesus in Mk 15.34 par, taken from Ps 22.2 should be understood in light of the complete psalm⁶⁵. Likewise, the abandonment of Jesus by part of his disciples receives a messianic interpretation from Zech 13.7: "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered" in Mk 14.27 par. Furthermore, the young man with a loin cloth cast about his body who fled after casting it aside, according to Mk 14.51f, could be a prototype taken from Am 2.16. Likewise the transposition of Zech 12.10 into Jn 19.37. The exegetic tradition of the bronze serpent, from Nu 21.4-9 is the type of the death of Jesus hoisted on the cross in Jn 3.14-15; 8.28; 12.32-34; 19,37. The presentation of the resurrection of Jesus among a series of redemptive actions carried out by God "on the third day" (1 Co 15.3-5...) refers to a type of redemptive actions of the OT (GenR 56.1). Noteworthy in this same context is the *sign of Jonah* as prototype of the resurrection of Jesus "on the third day" in Mt 12.38-42; 16.1-4; Lu 11.29-32⁶⁶.

The institution of the Eucharist itself, carried out by Jesus in the last supper, reflects the OT prototype of Passover supper tradition (Mk 14.12-24; Lu 22.7-23...). Thus, Jesus, declaring himself eschatological lamb, establish the "new covenant" (Jer 31.31-34) with the messianic people through his sacrificial death. This is what Jesus declares in his words over the bread and wine. The Passover lamb of the exodus (Ex 12,21) – united to the 'Aqedah of Isaac in the Passover night–, conceived as 'redemptive' in the Jewish

⁶³ This was the main Thesis by H. FRANKEMÖLLE, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi, passim*.

⁶⁴ See Origen, *Comm. In Mattheum XIV,7* (ad Mt 18,23).

⁶⁵ A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 133s.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 149-54.

tradition of the Passover⁶⁷, is therefore the ‘type’ of Jesus Redemption in a important part of NT Christology (e.g., 1 Co 5.7; cf. Jn 1.29; Rev. *passim*...). Typological imitation (mī,mesij) has already been dealt with in the infancy narratives of Jesus in Lu 1-2. Worth adding here is Luke’s account of the resurrection of the widow’s son in Lu 7.11-17, as typological imitation of 1 Ki 17.17-24 LXX, while the messianic entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem according to Lu. 19. 35-40 is typological imitation of 1 Ki 1.33-40 LXX. Similarly, the death of Stephen is described in Ac 7.54-60 by means of a typological comparison (su,nkrisij) with the death of Jesus in Lu 23.34.44-49.

4. *Exegesis of Jesus sayings*

Once arrived to this chapter of Jewish interpretation procedures in the NT, it no longer seems valid to speak – as we did at the beginning – of inner-new-testament midrash, since no layer of the NT is entirely free of recourse to the OT. Moreover, the developments of kerygma, as has already been shown, were effected by means of new recourses to the OT. In this section, therefore, we concentrate on the *sayings* (lo,gĩa) that are traditionally attributed to Jesus and which the evangelists interpreted – reapplying them to new situations – with the same procedures as were used for dealing with the OT. This is a sign that the tradition of Jesus was considered right from the start as a sacred tradition. There follow some of the most important examples⁶⁸.

The gospels contain predictions or prophecies of Jesus that were reinterpreted by the evangelists in terms of ‘fulfilment’, reapplying them to new situations. To the episode of the *empty tomb* Luke applies Jesus’ first announcement over his Passion: “He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spoke to you while he was yet in Galilee, Saying: the Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men and be crucified, and the third day rise again (Lu 9.22). And they *remembered* his words” (Lu 24,6-8)⁶⁹.

⁶⁷ See esp. R. LE DÉAUT, *La Nuit Pascale*. Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d’Exode XII,42 (Rome 1963) *passim*.

⁶⁸ A. DEL AGUA, *El método midrásico y la exégesis del NT*, 265-72.

⁶⁹ See F. NEIRYNCK, “Le récit du tombeau vide dans l’évangile de Luc (Lc 24,1-12)”, in: *Id.*, *Evangelica* (BETL 60; Leuven 1982) 297-328; see also J. KREMER, “Die dreifache Wiedergabe des Damaskuserlebnisses Pauli in der Apostelgeschichte. Eine Hilfe für das rechte Verständnis der lukanischen osterevangelien”, in: J. VERHEYDEN, *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, 329-55, 345-51.

Lu 21.5-36 is also a 'retelling' (narrated speech) of Mk 13, the eschatological discourse⁷⁰. Luke's account has dissociated Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the temple from the Parousia of the Son of Man at the end of history. By way of fulfilment, therefore, Luke identifies Jesus' temple-destruction prediction with the ruin that befell it in 70 AD. In the same way, Lk 19.41-44 is the fulfilment-based interpretation of Jesus' threat against Jerusalem in Lu 13.34-35 (par Mt 23.37-39).

The prophetic saying of Mk 9.1: "Verily I say to you, That there be some of you that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power", is retold by Luke in terms of his new eschatological conception of time and history and, consequently, of the Kingdom of God: "But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God" (Lu 9.27). In Luke's theology of time, the Kingdom of God is made "visible" – its redemptive efficacy is experimented – in the death and resurrection of Jesus. The same goes for Mk 14.62 with respect to Lu 22.69.

Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the temple in Mt 26.61 is interpreted by John in fulfilment terms, by applying it to the resurrected body of Jesus as a new temple, in Jn 2.19-21.

The sayings of Jesus, as handed down from previous tradition, are also used for clearing up possible misunderstandings, as also occurs in the world of the midrash. Thus, the *logion* of Lu 12.8: "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God", in which there seems to be a distinction between Jesus (first person) and the Son of Man (third person), is cleared up in Mt 10.32: "Whosoever therefore shall confess *me* before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven".

The gospel according to St. Matthew contains interesting halakic developments based on a word /precept of Jesus. Thus, the words of Jesus in Mt 18.15: "if your brother shall trespass against you, go and tell him his fault between you and him alone: if he shall hear you, you have gained your brother" are developed into a sequence of halakah rules in the following verses 16-17, to which is added the *gemara* or complement in parable form of Mt 18.23-35. Other examples: Mt 5.22b; 5.34-36; 19.12; 23.8-10; 23.20-22.

⁷⁰ A. DEL AGUA, "Derás lucano de Mc 13 a la luz de su 'teología del Reino': Lc 21,5-36": *EstBib* 39 (1981) 285-313.

5. Homiletical exegesis

The 'proem' (petihta) homily and the 'our master teaches us' (yellammedenu rabbenu) homily as procedures of interpretation

The category of 'homiletical exegesis', which corresponds to the Jewish synagogue model, was also a midrashic procedure inherited by Christians from Judaism in the interpretation of the Scriptures. Its presence in the NT reflects a fairly widespread use thereof in the NT era, even though the Rabbinic collections of homilies appeared somewhat later.

As is well known, Jewish homilies generally respond to two basic types. In the *introduction (petihtah)* or *proem* the preacher starts with a quote from the 'Writings' or from the 'Prophets', which he then imaginatively links up with the texts of the Pentateuch and Prophets of the liturgy of the day; he follows this with an exposition and then ends up with an exhortative and consolatory peroration. Homilies of the "*our master teaches us*" (*yellammedenu rabbenu*) type start from a halakah question and end up by finding a response and wide-ranging teaching in the texts of the Pentateuch and Prophets of the liturgy of the day. There are many models bearing a great deal of similarity to both types of homily in the Christian Church. The synoptic gospels in fact show exegetic patterns that bear an undoubted similarity with the rabbinic homiletic midrash. This similarity cannot be a coincidence; moreover it allows us to classify them as *introductory* homilies and *our master teaches us* homilies⁷¹.

The *introductory* homiletic form appears rarely in the teachings of Jesus given us by the gospels. One striking case is the treatment of God's judgement on Israel after it had rejected the Messiah, in Mt 21.33-46 par: v. 33 contains the initial text of the historic salvific symbol of the vineyard (Isa 5.1f.); vv. 34-41 represent the exposition thereof by means of a parable, verbally united to the initial and/or final texts (avmpelw,n, 33.39; li,qoj, 42.44; cf. 35: Isa 5,2; cf. oivkodome,w, 33.42); vv. 42-44 contain the conclusive texts (Ps 118.22f; Dan 2.34f.44f) and the application.

Another example of the *introductory* homily is Lu 4.16-30. See also Ac 13.17-41; Gal 4.21-5.1; Ro 1.17-4.25.

In the expositions attributed to Jesus by the evangelists, the *yellammedenu* form is habitually found in *halakah* type discussions and other questions between Jesus and other Jewish theologians. Thus, Mt 12. 1-8, dealing with

⁷¹ See E. E. ELLIS, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Tübingen 1978) 155ss.

what it is permitted to do on the sabbath: vv. 1-2 contain the theme and the question as evoked by the initial texts (see Ex 20.10; 34.21); vv. 3-5 are the replica and exposition of Jesus by means of supplementary texts (1 Sa 21.7; Nu 28.9; *qusi,a*Ⓣ), related verbally to the theme and initial texts (*poie,w*; *evsqi,w*); vv. 6f give the eschatological application by means of an *a fortiori* argument and a final text (Hos 6.6, *qusi,a*).

Lu 10.25-37 poses the question about what sort of behaviour should be observed to inherit eternal life, this then being followed by the response thereto: vv. 25-27 are a dialogue including a question and the initial texts: Deu 6.5 and Lev 19.18; v. 28 adds a second text: Lev 18.5; vv. 29-36 are the exposition (by means of the 'parable of the Good Samaritan') related to the initial texts by dint of the catch words *o` plhsi,on* (27.29.36) and *poie,w* (28.37a.37b); v. 37 gives the conclusion allusive to the second text (*poie,w*). Similar examples are found in Mt 15.1-9, on the ritual traditions of the Pharisees, and Mt 19.3-8 on divorce.

CONCLUSION

Under the title "Jewish procedures of bible interpretation in the gospels" this essay has presented in systematic form the different forms of biblical interpretation, taken from the Jewish intellectual milieu, that were applied by the evangelists to the "story" of Jesus Christ, with the purpose of proclaiming him narratively as the kerygma of salvation.

The twofold form of interpretation proposed herein considers, in the first place, the *narrative form of interpretation* (and its creative historiography procedures) by means of OT "patterns" (*typoi*) that furnished the semantic content of the account. Secondly, a study is made of the *exegetic form of interpretation* (and its creative philology procedures) which makes use of a host of diverse techniques for interpreting the text and biblical tradition. The various hermeneutic procedures are thus included in the broader framework of both proposed forms of interpretation.

Resumen.- Dada la amplitud y complejidad que han adquirido los estudios sobre el uso del AT en el NT, el autor aboga por una sistematización de los mismos que parta de criterios estrictamente hermenéuticos. Para ello, propone un doble marco en que encuadrar dichos estudios: *la forma narrativa de interpretación y la forma exegética de interpretación* del AT en el NT, a cada una de las cuales le corresponden procedimientos hermenéuticos diferentes. Así, la primera hace uso de procedimientos de *historiografía creadora cristiana*, y la segunda se sirve de los procedimientos de *filología creadora cristiana*. Asimismo, el autor constata que el estudio de los

procedimientos exegéticos del AT en el NT se ha desarrollado ampliamente, mientras que la mediación que desempeña la Escritura en los modernos estudios narrativos de los evangelios apenas está estudiada.

Summary.- *Given the extensive complexity taken by the studies on the Use of the OT in the NT, the author defends a systematization of them starting from strict hermeneutic criteria. He suggests frame the aforementioned studies in two different ways: the narrative form of interpretation and the exegetical form of interpretation (of the OT in the NT). Two different hermeneutic procedures correspond to each one of these forms of interpretation. Thus, the former makes use of the procedures of Christian creative historiography and the second of those of Christian creative Philology. The author also verifies that the scholarly study of exegetical procedures on the OT in the NT has been developed at length, however the mediation played by the Scriptures in the modern narrative analysis on the canonical Gospels hardly has been undertaken by the NT scholars.*