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ABSTRACT

The way in which Paul's appropriation of the Scriptures of Israel should be understood is in dispute. It is argued that Paul's use of Scripture should be understood within the context of contemporary Jewish practices, which highlights the role of scripture as literal text as much as the interpretation thereof by 'inspired exegetes'. Pauline hermeneutics can be described within the context of the reinterpretation of Scripture by one who has received divine revelation concerning Christ while also subscribing to the traditions of Israel. With a necessarily free and creative hermeneutic Paul can establish a true dialogical relationship between Scripture, and his interpretation thereof in the light of Christ. This dialogical aspect can also be illuminated from the perspective of intertextuality, which is briefly referred to.

...there is no question about the important role Scripture played in his (sc Paul's) thinking about the gospel and in the argumentation of his letters (Furnish 1989:333).

1 INTRODUCTION

In as far as Christianity is a 'religion of the book',¹ it was both 'endowed and saddled' with the Old Testament, or more properly, the Scriptures of Israel.² Christianity was—and is—'compelled to find ways of interpreting it (sc. the Old Testament), in all its bulk and variety, in light of Christian perspectives which, as we are now vividly aware, it was never written to display'.

---

* This is an edited version of a paper with the same title which was read at the annual NTSSA conference in April 1996.
1 Talmage (1987:81) argues that the title 'people of the book' was extended to Jews and Christians by Islam, indicating that they were in possession of 'pre-Quranic revelation and therefore assured of the option of retaining their ancestral religion rather than having to convert.' Cf also Borelli 1995:147-155, esp. 153-154; Simonetti 1994:1. For different appropriations of 'the Book' in these religions see Tröger 1995:209-214.
2 Only Philemon and 2 and 3 John in the New Testament do not contain allusions to or quotes of the Old Testament (Evans 1989:169). The terms 'Scriptures of Israel', 'Scripture' and 'Old Testament' will be used interchangeably, with personal preference given to the two former terms on historical and theological grounds.
The Old Testament is in fact so far removed from 'Christianity' in terms of content, that in the past 'only drastic treatment' could render it useful for the Church. In the words of Houlden (1990:110): '(i)t was an invitation to ingenuity, schematization, controversy and (usually unconscious) drastic selectivity.' Methods like typology and allegory were employed to absorb the Old Testament into Christian life, because of 'doctrinally motivated' compulsion: 'it was read in the light of Christian doctrine.'

On face value—that is for readers of the Bible today—the way in which the Old Testament is interpreted or used by New Testament authors seemingly harbours on misinterpretation or abuse. The New Testament authors do not always quote the literal texts, often quote a text out of its context—seemingly without any regard for its original sense—while some authors quote the same text but with different interpretations of it—sometimes it is not even clear whether it is a quote or allusion at all.

In Pauline studies, it has been acknowledged as indeed shown by history, that Pauline appropriation of the Scriptures of Israel—regardless of Paul's stated claims on Jews in general—already bore within it the seeds of a very negative view of these scriptures. Hafemann (1993:679) advances the view that current questions in the interpretation of the letters of Paul, specifically the traditional issues of the Law and the significance of justification and how these issues are involved with Paul's view on 'redemptive history', 'can only be solved by a renewed study of Paul's use and understanding of the OT, within the larger question of the relationship of Paul and his gospel to Israel as the old covenant people of God' (my emphasis).
In his contribution on the use of the 'Old Testament' by the various New Testament authors, Snodgrass (1991:414) contrasts Matthew's sustained interpretive approach to Israel's Scriptures with Paul's approach. Snodgrass refers to Paul's appropriation of these texts as 'circumstantial', as he argues that Paul used those texts merely as substantiation, thus as proof texts.

The view that Paul uses Scripture in a consistent proof text way or Stichwort approach, can eventually lead to the contention that Paul reads or rather misreads Scripture for his particular purposes and outside or even counter to his traditions. Scott (1993a:192 n 18) summarises what he perceives as the position of Hays (1989) in the following way: 'Paul engages in a private reading of Scripture, a spontaneous and intuitive reflection on Old Testament texts which is largely unaffected by intervening Jewish tradition because his reading occurs in the isolated "cave of resonant signification",' and 'Paul is basically an idiosyncratic reader of the Old Testament with some Christian presuppositions and a few hermeneutical constraints'.

In contrast to such a position, it will be argued that in order to investigate Paul's interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel and especially to appreciate it for what it is and wants to accomplish, one has to take Paul's specific socio-cultural setting and his reliance upon received traditions into account. Paul 'found a meaning visible only to the eyes of faith, but he used culturally conditioned tools and presuppositions to bring it to light' (Stockhausen 1990:202). Paul, as the other New Testament authors, did not write his letters 'from scratch'—within a socio-cultural vacuum—but made use of traditions known to him, which in Paul's case amounted to a whole variety of traditions.

A most important range of traditions used by Paul in his writings—if one argues in terms of extent of use—was Jewish. However, even within Jewish

---

of not such great importance, e.g. Dunn (1993b) discusses it as a 'lesser issue' in his study of the theology of Galatians. Dunn (1993b:121) does admit that Paul 'cites the scriptures...explicitly at a number of key points in his main argument'. Cf also Müller 1989:33.

8 Paul does use the proof text approach in some instances, but this can be understood as instances of gezerah shavah (lit. an equivalent regulation): one text may be explained by another, if similar words or phrases occur in both—as in Gal 3 and 4 (Scott 1993:191, 220).


10 Against the idea of Pauline hermeneutical idiosyncrasy, appearing 'peculiar and scandalous' in his day, Evans (1993a:51) stresses '...this kind of deconstruction or "scandalous" inversion, was frequently practiced by Israel's classical prophets'.
thought of the first century there existed a variety of ‘Judaisms’, or different streams or movements within ‘Judaism’.\textsuperscript{11} Other traditions, deriving from the broader first-century Hellenistic setting, also feature in Paul’s writings, implying that it had some sort of influence on Pauline thought.\textsuperscript{12} Naturally, some ‘Christian tradition(s)’, namely traditions deriving from the early communities of followers of Jesus, would also at this stage have been in circulation, and Paul’s letters give evidence of contact with these traditions.\textsuperscript{13}

Taking into consideration that Paul used traditions accounts for an important first step in interpreting Paul’s letters. However, another crucial aspect regarding traditions is that they ‘need interpretation’. As Tuckett (1991:309) argues, different contexts lead to the different usage and appreciation of the same traditions. The issue under investigation in this paper is not so much a ‘statistical’ inventory of Pauline citations of and allusions to the Scriptures of Israel,\textsuperscript{14} but rather an attempt to account for Paul’s usage thereof. Indeed ‘...more important than the question of whether Paul misreads Scripture is how the sacred texts function for him’ (Roetzel 1982:17).

It can fruitfully be argued that freedom is characteristic of Paul’s life and ministry.\textsuperscript{15} It has also been suggested by various scholars that ‘freedom’ is a (the?) core metaphor in Paul’s theology.\textsuperscript{16} The theme of ‘freedom’ which is explicitly present throughout Paul’s writings,\textsuperscript{17} will here be looked at specifi-

\textsuperscript{11} Cf Tuckett (1991:308-309), who refers to many strands of Jewish tradition used by Paul, and stresses that some—typical Jewish (whatever this would mean)—assumptions are presupposed by Paul, e.g monotheism.

\textsuperscript{12} Malherbe (1987) has emphasised some of the Hellenistic traditions; he argues that Paul extensively used the ‘philosophic tradition of pastoral care’. Cf also Tuckett (1991:309), who refers for example to Paul quoting Menander in 1 Cor 15:33.

\textsuperscript{13} Tuckett (1991:309) quotes Hengel who referred to this era, i.e the first twenty years after the death of Christ, as an ‘explosive era’ in the development of Christian thought.

\textsuperscript{14} Many of these studies already exist: Ellis 1957; Hanson 1974; Kaiser 1985; Koch 1986; and many others!

\textsuperscript{15} In different ways, from the popular presented work by Bruce 1977 to, e.g, the two extensive Göttingen studies on how this concept functions in Paul’s writings, Jones 1987 and Vollenweider 1989.

\textsuperscript{16} Cf e.g Longenecker (1964). The point here is not to initiate (yet another!) Mitte search, but to indicate an important aspect in Pauline theology—and to eventually explore how it can contribute towards a more adequate understanding of Pauline issues.

\textsuperscript{17} Statistically Paul uses the Greek word for freedom ἐλευθερία more often than any other writer in the New Testament (28 out of 41; cf Richardson 1979:164). Moreover, Paul frequently employs the ‘meaning’ freedom without necessarily using the above Greek word. Modern Linguistics has shown that meanings are context-dependent and that as much as a word can operate in different semantic domains, a certain ‘meaning’ can be expressed by different words.
cally with regard to his hermeneutics, namely Paul's understanding and interpretation of Israel's sacred scriptures.\textsuperscript{18} This freedom will be shown to refer to both content\textsuperscript{19} and formal aspects: Paul's notion of freedom is not 'preached' but also 'practiced' by him.

Initially, a short overview of recurrent reading and exegetical practices in early Christianity and first-century Judaism(s) will provide some broader perspectives on the hermeneutics contemporary to Paul. These perspectives are necessary to situate the arguments which frequently attempt to justify or vilify Paul on the basis of first-century reading practices. Paul's appropriation of the 'Jesus sayings and traditions' will not be addressed, except where it is necessitated by the discussion.

Finally, the possibility of employing an intertextual reading in Paul's letters will be briefly referred to. It will be contended that intertextuality can indeed facilitate the understanding of Paul's reading of Scripture, and furthermore, shows the interrelatedness and continuity between Paul's views and those of the Scriptures of Israel.

The aim of this study is thus to offer a suggestion for understanding Paul's 'hermeneutics' or strategies of interpretation in a particularly dynamic and free way, while setting them historically amidst a first century framework of the Judaism(s) and early Christianity of the day.

2 FIRST-CENTURY EXEGESIS AND HERMENEUTICS: JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN

In Judaism, exegesis does not begin with the complete, finished text of the Bible; rather, it is the driving force in the development within the Bible, which has constantly taken up earlier sacred traditions anew, adapted them to new situations in life, and made them more profound (Stemberger 1991:37).

Jewish exegesis is rooted in the adaptation, expansion, and interpretation of Israel's sacred tradition (Evans 1989:165).

\textsuperscript{18} The term 'Pauline hermeneutics' is premeditated, cognisant however of the fact that Paul never in his letters available to us embarked on a systematic discussion of his 'hermeneutics' in the modern sense of the word: the term is used for Paul's theory and practice in as far as he uses and interprets Scripture and possibly other traditions as well. The other modern cultural and theological baggage assigned to 'hermeneutics' is neither implied nor assumed in my use of the term when applied to Pauline writings.

\textsuperscript{19} Often however, freedom is only understood theologically (i.e. free from the power of sin and death), without regard for a possible hermeneutical interpretation thereof. Perhaps the theological preoccupation is co-determined by the a priori assumption that Paul's guiding concern is a theological—systematic/doctrinal—one: (the Lutheran legacy's emphasis on) 'justification by faith'. Cf the comments in note 60.
Many of the ‘Jewish’ styles and methods of interpretation ‘remained traditional after the definite estrangement of the church from Judaism.’ In the New Testament many examples can be identified to show that interpretation in early Christianity remained close to its Jewish origins, ‘often with no breach or tension’ (Murray 1990:343—the Marcionites are a notable exception).

Freedom in reading and interpreting Scripture was common amongst first-century Jews, and Christians.20 ‘Like all kinds of Jews, Jewish Christians read their Bible as a collection of divine oracles, which when decoded could give messages for later times’ (Murray 1990:343).

Within the Jewish halakhic tradition the ‘quest for hermeneutical closure’ was seen as an ‘illusion’ (Hays 1989:4). The literal meaning of texts had to be ascended in order to ‘integrate the interpretation of the Scriptures into a larger theological framework’ (Jeanrond 1991:17).

What would today be called the dynamic interpretive freedom of the Jewish tradition did not, however, imply that the text itself could be changed or violated. Jeanrond (1991:17) notes that, apart from transcending the text’s literal meaning, ancient Jewish exegesis is characterised by ‘...a set of rules which instructs and at the same time contains the range of interpretations in the community and thus attempts to protect the community’s religious identity and coherence.’

Even in the case of the Massoretes who over centuries composed the consonantal text of the Hebrew Scripture and vocalised it, no ‘modification’ or any alteration of the text was done, although they sometimes clearly disapproved of particular received readings.21 The Massoretes constructed an elaborate system of notes to ensure the text would be copied correctly. This was known as the massora, and appeared in the margins and also in some cases at the end of the text. In the event where passages were felt to be ‘irreverent to God’ deliberate alterations to the text were suggested.

2.1 Sacred text

With the fixture of the text of Scripture towards the end of the first century, the immense respect for the literality of the existing texts was solidified.

20 Cf Hays (1989:4). The ‘warrant’ for this freedom ‘differed’: for the Rabbi’s it resided in ‘majority opinion within an interpretive community’, but for Paul in ‘claiming immediate revelatory illumination’.

21 Cf Deist (1978:52–59). Deist also refers to the saying of Rabbi Aqiba (Pirqe Avot 3:17) in this regard ‘The massora is a hedge around the law’. Müller (1993:204) argues that ‘growing interest in establishing the wording’ of the Hebrew Scriptures probably led to ‘similar interest’ in bringing the LXX’s wording closer to what would become the MT.
The respect for the literal text is echoed not only in Jewish readings but also in Philo, albeit due to different reasons yet for the same purpose, namely multiple interpretations according to context. Uffenheimer (1988:161) stresses that in the first-century and later Judaisms the 'main tenet' was insipratio verbales which led to the text being approached 'as a metahuman language containing an unlimited multiplicity of meanings'.

Equally, Philo's allegory should not be understood as a negative reflection on the 'inspired nature' or literality of the text: the literal meaning of the text remained for Philo an actual representation of 'real facts', meaning it 'cannot therefore be dismissed as the 'shadow' of the truth, as merely carrying the truth' (Carny 1988:31). The text which not only carries the hidden meaning, but also gives an account of the actual acts, is thus valued by Philo; the literal expression on which the allegory is based, is part of the 'whole structure which must be apprehended integrally' (Carny 1988:34, 37).

Sarna (1987:15-16) after highlighting some aspects of Jewish rabbinical exegesis which he in some cases terms 'fanciful', nevertheless insists that for Jewish commentators 'the biblical canon in its definite form ... functions as normative' and should appropriately be called sacred Scriptures with all that the term implies.

The decisive factor for Scripture as sacred text according to Jewish and Christian perception can be ascribed to the perceived origin of Scripture, namely that it derives from God. Mejia (1987:32) calls this 'an article of faith'; Murray (1990:344) refers to 'the Bible as a body of divine oracles'; and Stemberger (1991:40) argues that 'no letter of the Bible can be done away with: exegesis applies it to each particular situation'. This meant in the

---

22 In this regard Uffenheimer (1988:161) refers to the subsequent well-known rabbinical saying 'the Torah has seventy faces'. Sarna (1987:10) explains the number as 'typological and communicating comprehensiveness'—he adds another saying (attributed to tanna Ben Bag-Bag): 'Turn it over, turn it over, for everything is in it'.

23 A text can only conceivably have a 'deeper' meaning when it is perceived as inspired, which implies that error due to human agency is inconceivable and that the text has universal validity—which needs to be explored in new and different situations (Louth 1990:12). Indeed, the allegorisation of the text was in order to protect the 'divine text' from denigrating God's nature or actions. However, the difference between the Greek and Jewish conceptions of 'inspiration' should be noted: for the Greeks it implied the 'human words' which were inspired, whereas for the Jews the Torah represented God's words (Jeanrond 1991:16).

24 Cf Alexander (1990:457-458) who describes Scripture 'as divine speech', including the 'inerrant nature' thereof, and its 'lack of redundancy'. However, 'there was by no means universal consensus as to rabbinic Judaism's fidelity to the sacred text' (Talmage 1987:81).
extreme that in some communities the 'letter of Scripture' was even revered, as Noll (1993:779) contends happened at Qumran. 25

The very usage of the Targumim is explained by Stemberger (1991:38) in relation to the Jewish valuation of Scripture. Used in homiletical context, the Targumim were clearly understood as something beside the 'revealed Bible', and thus the Mishnah required that the person who read the text of Scripture was not allowed to present the Targum as well.

The concept of 'sacred text' to which nothing should be added and nothing removed, 26 should be balanced by the notion of contextualising this text. Although the text as text was respected very highly and held as inspired and sacred—the full revelation of God—it is nonetheless not the 'final word'. The texts which were transmitted were not considered in any way 'final' or 'complete', on the contrary, only by contemporising the textual traditions could they become the word of God in a 'complete' or 'comprehensive' sense.

2.2 Living text

Scripture, although viewed as the full revelation of God to humans, was not viewed by the Jews as a fixed and dead text but as a 'living organism'. It can be argued that this perception was not formed through a process of post first-century rabbinical interpretation, but was indeed 'a continuation of an established process that was contemporaneous with the formation of biblical literature itself' (Sarna 1987:11).

As emphasised above, the multiplicity of meaning in or polyvalency of Scripture was ascribed to its status as inspired or God-given texts: 'it is the inexhaustible fountain of truth; in a very real sense all truth is latent in it, waiting to be discovered by the application of the right hermeneutical methods'.

The concept of Scripture as sacred text kept the text 'alive' and required continued appropriation thereof, the sacrality becoming indeed a stimulus for and not a taboo against interpretation. It was then not although but because the Jewish perception of the Scriptures as sacred reigned supreme, that the continuing and contextualising interpretation of them was not excluded. Without doubt, the texts were seen to contain a 'potentiality' 27 which not

25 One should not be tempted to make too much of the difference in the lemmatic uses of midrashim and pesherim: the former frequently abbreviates the lemma (with ve-khulleh or 'etc') but the distinction between text and comment remains clear; in pesharim the full text is quoted and never abbreviated (Alexander 1990:456).

26 Perhaps echoed in the sentiments of texts like Mt 5:17–19 (espec. 18) and Gal 3:15?

27 Sarna (1987:16) quotes a rabbinic saying which to a certain extent refers to this potentiality: 'Whatever a mature student may expound in the future, it was already
only can but indeed had to be realised and applied in new situations. This view implied a ‘unitary, comprehensive, holistic approach’ to the text, which was the only way to ‘discern’ this potential. Concerning the teaching of the text, Sarna (1987:16) argues that it was always accompanied by ‘traditional exegesis which succeeded in transforming that which is time-bound into that which is eternally relevant, and in translating the timelessness of the text into that which is supremely timely. The chronological and cultural gap between the reader and the text was effectively bridged’.\(^{28}\) The continuing interpretation of Scripture could only function in a context where the unity of Scripture was accepted.\(^{29}\) This unity included Scripture as such, along with its interpretation based on Scripture.

The more pragmatic concern of making texts relevant to the current day and its issues seems to have played a role as well in the interpretive freedom exercised in Jewish circles. Noll (1993:779) refers to Qumran where he contends interpreters resorted to ‘considerable liberty in introducing variant readings for purposes of clarification of the text’ (my emphasis).

### 2.3 Inspired exegetes

In early Judaism the notion existed that the exegete himself was ‘inspired’, which meant that the interpreter was capable of discerning layers of meaning in the text which were not previously exegeted. (Stemberger 1991:37) This led to a very high valuation of the Oral Torah, which was attributed the same ‘divine authority’ as that of the Torah in written form (Murray 1990:343).

Jewish interpretive practice since the first century, led to the formation of what is commonly called the dual Torah, or in the terms of Sarna (1987) *torah she-bi-khtav* (the written Torah) and the *torah she-be'al peh* (the oral Torah).\(^{30}\) The written Torah refers to the ‘closed, canonic text, fixed and

---

\(^{28}\) The usefulness of such a formulation or understanding of hermeneutics is not the issue here, but the attempt to come to grips with Jewish understanding of hermeneutics: ever-continuing and dynamic.

\(^{29}\) Cf Alexander (1990:457-458) who posits Scripture as a ‘totally coherent and self-consistent body of truth’ as one of the axioms of midrashic hermeneutics. However, ‘internal consistency’ did not mitigate against the idea that Scripture might ‘generate contradictory propositions’: the former was ‘at the level of the actual text’, and the latter ‘at the level of interpretation’. Cf also Stemberger (1991:43) who refers to the emphasis on the ‘absolute unity of revelation’, quoting *Pesahim 6b*: ‘In the Torah there is no before and after’.

\(^{30}\) Not that the notion of dual Torah met with universal consensus; cf Talmage (1987:81, 95 n 1) who refers to the opposition thereof among Karaite Judaism, who
inviolable', whereas the oral Torah refers to the 'open-ended, ever developing' interpretations of the written Torah.

In connection to the idea of 'inspired exegete', one should probably add the notion of 'existential familiarity' of the receiver of the exegesis: Scripture as revelation of God 'was experienced immediately in liturgical action and private prayer' (Kannengieser 1991:30).

Amongst Christians this perception of the interpreter or reader of Scripture being able to establish meaning beyond the literal—the 'real' meaning—was accompanied by the notion of 'the guidance of the Holy Spirit': Scripture was read 'through a prophetic perspective'. Murray (1990:343) regards this aspect in early Christianity of such importance that he calls it 'a rebirth of prophecy'. 'Not only is Jesus the mediator of new revelation, but the Holy Spirit gives his disciples prophetic power to interpret all scripture in terms of Christ' (Murray 1990:344).

In the New Testament Paul can also claim inspiration, or something akin to it, for his arguments, as happens in his advice on marriage in 1 Cor 7.31

2.4 Rabbinic exegesis

It is becoming increasingly common to distinguish Jewish exegesis (until 70 CE) from the later rabbinical practices.32 The rabbinical exegesis known to us dates back in some cases to centuries after the Pauline writings and it is rightly questioned whether rabbinic practices should be seen and employed as heuristic devices for explaining Pauline reading of Scripture. However, rabbinic exegesis seems to illustrate the notions of interpretation which were already present amongst the Jewish interpreters of Scripture in Paul's day.33
In rabbinic view, the Bible did not constitute ‘a single, uniform, self-consistent system, but is a stratified work’, in which the human and thus fallible understanding of God and his nature and commandments by some characters are not hidden. This view of Scripture is well exemplified in the rabbinic—and also medieval—Jewish exegesis which gives ‘every appearance of constituting critiques of biblical morality’, of which the assessments and attempts to clarify and justify certain biblical figures like Abraham (mis-representing his relationship with Sarah) and Elisha (the episode of the children insulting him) are good examples (cf Sarna (1987:12-15). ‘The rabbinic reinterpretation, or rewriting...raises questions about the authority of the text, the legitimacy of the exegesis, and the relationship between tradition and text’ (Sarna 1987:15).

The still dominant grammatico-historical interpretation in its many guises as used and defended by modern day exegetes often fails to appreciate the rabbinic opinion regarding the literal or straightforward sense of Scripture, or פֶּדַע. Although rabbinic interpreters recognized the value of the literal interpretation of Scripture,34 it was argued—perhaps even simply accepted—that the biblical writers wrote not only for their contemporaries as the initial recipients of the documents. Rabbinical interpretation allows for the possibility that biblical authors ‘wrote also for our sake’.35

The plea is not that rabbinic exegesis should, in contrast perhaps with the earlier negative sentiment against it, be accepted as either the only frame of reference for evaluating Pauline exegesis or as the norm for contemporary exegesis.36 ‘Der Vergleich der paulinischen Schriftauslegung mit der zeitgenössischen jüdischen Exegese zeigt hinsichtlich der Verwendung der exegetischen Methoden und Auslegungsregeln die Herkunft des Paulus aus

34 Cf the strong feelings of Maimonides (1135–1204) about the literal sense of Scripture. In his Sefer Ha-Mitsvot he writes ‘there is no Scripture except according to its literal sense’ (Sarna 1987:16).
35 Sarna (1987:17) refers to phrases like ‘When your son shall ask you in the future, “What means ...?”’, and texts like Is. 30:8; Jer 30:2,3; 36:28,29; Dn 12:4 to substantiate this practice. Ultimately Sarna also employs the argument that the biblical text could not conceivably have had its two and a half thousand years of existence if only the historical and literal-original sense was important. The Bible survived—and grew—because it ‘was very early understood to be proleptic in nature’. Frei (1986:74) thinks that a renewed study of midrash and peshat in Jewish writings, might ‘begin to repair a series of contacts established and broken time and again in the history of the church’ with Judaism. Cf the title of the book by Aageson (1993).
36 Earlier rabbinic interpretive practices were severely criticised in medieval Jewish exegesis. Cf Sarna (1987:17–19), referring especially but not exclusively to the ‘Spanish school’. Interestingly, the rabbi’s halakhic or legal rulings were not contested, but ‘the exegesis by which such were derived from the text'.
eingem durchschnittlichen Diaspora-Judentum' (Koch 1986:230). It can be argued that a simplistic appeal to Jewish and early rabbinic practices of interpretation to explain Pauline interpretive wranglings of Scripture, might be found too easy. It will not suffice to argue that as the Jews regarded their sacred texts very highly yet saw fit to adapt them for contemporary purposes, Paul merely did the same. All the difficulties in Pauline hermeneutics and his interpretive methodology cannot be explained with a simple reference to Jewish methods. However, a study of Jewish interpretive assumptions and methodology does bring one a long way down the road of understanding Pauline hermeneutics.

3 PAULINE EXEGETICS AND HERMENEUTICS

The New Testament writers interpreted Old Testament texts within the culture of events contemporary to them. This is not to say that their exegesis was arbitrary or out of context, but it does mean that their reading of Old Testament Scripture was applied, fulfilled, and understood within the framework of their contemporary developments (Pettegrew 1991:283; cf also Thiselton 1980:18).

3.1 Pauline citations and allusions

"...the Bible used by the New Testament writers is an interpreted Bible. Between the Old and the New Testaments lies the intermediary of Jewish tradition..." (Brown 1984:31). The discussion in this section will be limited to some details on Paul's citations which may be considered as essential 'raw data' for the following discussion of Paul's interpretive activity. The emphasis will not be on the data-oriented, statistical listing of the citations or discussion of the statistical implications flowing from it—detailed studies in this regard do exist and will be referred to in the course of what follows—but the discussion will rather center on the apparent reasons for Paul's methodology, as well as his strategy with the citations.

The citations of and especially the allusions to the Scriptures of Israel found in Paul, are often not so easy for modern readers of the Bible to recognize. Furthermore, the textual traditions used by Paul cannot even be determined with certainty. When accounting for Paul's use of Scripture, and

37 Admittedly, both exegesis and hermeneutics are modern terms and were not used by Paul; their functionality for the discussion determines their use. Cf Stockhausen (1990:196). One delimitation at this stage: this study takes into account only the way in which the Scriptures of Israel, or 'Old Testament' was appropriated by Paul. Other traditions used by Paul, would include the 'sayings of Jesus' and the 'early Christian traditions' (Von Lips 1991:30). For specific studies on the 'sayings of Jesus', cf e.g Wenham 1986 on 2 Cor 1:17, 18.
especially when one treads on the shaky terrain of Paul's reception, one will have to recognise the difficulty of the identification of scriptural allusions. In the words of Von Lips (1991:48), 'Dieses Problem stellt sich für uns heute möglicherweise umgekehrt dar als für die damaligen Leser der Paulusbriefe.'

At least some of the first-century listeners of Paul would have been familiar with the Jesus tradition—even in Gentile congregations where at least a broader Pauline tradition would have been present—as well as with the Scriptures of Israel.

3.1.1 Data

In a number of studies, some fairly recent, great efforts were made to statistically account for Pauline citations. Obviously, many categories can be invented according to which these citations can be analysed and the 'broad picture' portrayed: in terms of its introductory formulas (e.g. Stanley 1992), according to the textual corpusses followed, and so forth.

The problem with all such categories are that they tend to be too rigid to accommodate all the many variables contained in Paul's citation practice, as well as the apparent unstable nature of the antecedent texts. Paul's use of citations, as will be seen later, did not preclude the changing or adapting thereof. Furthermore, the textual traditions which can be seen to account for at least the majority of Pauline citations were by the first century not yet fixed and existed in many variegated forms.

3.1.2 Textual traditions

It can be argued that Paul predominantly made use of the Septuagint (hereafter LXX) tradition(s) when he quoted or cited from, or even when he alluded to, passages of Israel's Scriptures in his letters. Although Paul had his training foremost in the Jewish setting, the pervasiveness of first-century Hellenism probably ensured that Paul used and read the LXX, and not the

---

38 Silva (1993:631, whose statistics are based on those of Michel, Ellis and Koch); Ellis 1957; Hanson 1975; Koch 1986 and various others.
39 Cf Silva (1993:631), who employs the following categories: 'Paul=LXX=MT; Paul=MT not=LXX; Paul=LXX not=MT; Paul not=LXX not=MT; debated'. Silva includes the citations of all thirteen letters traditionally attributed to Paul.
40 Cf Silva (1993:632) who complains that some citations could be analysed according to more than one of his categories.
41 Some scholars argue that although born and bred in the Greco-Roman setting of Tarsus, Paul escaped this as a major influence in his life. Paul's early years were spent in the Jewish community in Tarsus, and it is doubted whether he participated in the Greco-Roman educationary process (cf Silva 1993:638).
42 The reason for the composition of the LXX (cf Deist 1978:155). The origin of the Greek translation is generally identified as the large Jewish community of Alexandria.
Massoretic text (hereafter MT). If the number of citations ascribed to the LXX is anything to go by, the LXX was also arguably the more ready choice in terms of availability and accessibility, as put by Müller (1993:194-207) ‘(t)he Septuagint (was) the Bible of the New Testament church’; but it was shared with Judaism (Müller 1989b:55).

The texts or more exactly, textual traditions from which Paul cited, were not yet fixed during the first century but existed in a rather fluid way. Many and diverse copies or editions existed of both the LXX and the MT.

43 As indeed did most of the early Church, in non-Jewish communities as well as Jewish communities. Lemche (1993:190) Brown (1984:30), Von Lips (1991:33) and many others argue for the LXX as the ‘most obvious source’ of New Testament writers. Silva (1993:632,638) argues that Paul’s ‘dependence on the current Greek translation of his day is clearly established...’ although Paul would have been ‘familiar’ with the Hebrew version of Scripture as well. Silva argues further that the latter sometimes determined ‘how he (sc Paul) used the OT’. Regarding the question as to which tradition, LXX or MT, is the more reliable and trustworthy rendering of the tradition, it will not be argued here but simply accepted that the LXX was based on a Vorlage older than the MT known today. Cf Klein (1974:69); Grabbe (1990:340); Evans (1992:70–75) who calls the LXX ‘an important pre-MT witness’; Silva (1993:632) who also refers to findings at Qumran in this regard. Müller (1989b:66 n 27), however, argues with Württemberg against the notion of a ‘pre-Massoretic Massoretic’ text which is supported by Robert. Müller accepts the existence of a proto-Massoretic text, but then only as one of many other textual traditions simultaneously in use during that time. The Hebrew text of Scripture became ‘a critical norm’ only since the time of Origen.

In the earliest forms of Christianity, ‘it made no difference to read the Greek Septuagint rather than the Torah written in Hebrew, at least as far as the divine nature of scripture was concerned’ (Kannengieser 1991:30).

44 Müller (1989b:68–71; 1993:204–207) bemoans the inheritance of the humanist-guided Reformation with its ‘archaeological’ emphasis on the original, which led to the LXX becoming an unequal partner to the ‘Biblica Hebraica’; the disjunction between the two ‘testaments’; and overlooking the ‘flow of traditions which fed the Old Testament canon and characterised it’. He pleads for a revamped role for the LXX, placed at least on equal footing with the ‘Biblica Hebraica’ which is in any case not the original text—for Müller it concerns ultimately ‘the unity of the Christian canon’.

45 ‘Only when the Church...equalized some of its own writings with the sacred books of Judaism did the unique Christian Bible, the two-part canon, emerge’ (Müller 1989b:54). The Jews dissociated themselves from the Greek translation, when the Church at the middle of the second century chose against the Hebrew worded text in favour of the Greek (Müller 1989a:112ff; 1989b:5). Müller (1989b:65) contends that Sundberg ‘proved’ that the ‘Septuagint tradition gained a foothold in Palestine’. This is further supported by Hanhart and Orlinsky.

46 Cf Silva (1993:632): ‘What we (naively) call the Septuagint, or LXX, is really a collection of various translations done at different times by different people who had differing skills and different approaches.’ This naturally makes the identification of ‘the LXX of the first century’ virtually impossible. One should also take into account the long process of textual transmission of ‘the LXX’ which was in Paul’s time probably already into its third century. Cf Evans (1992:73–75), who mentions the ‘diversity of the first-century Greek OT text’ which is ‘documented’ in some of the Qumran writ-
Disagreements in these textual traditions can be found on two levels: the differences between various editions of the same tradition, and differences in the LXX's translation of the MT.

Certain New Testament manuscripts containing the Pauline letters have different versions of the same Old Testament quotation. This is called a 'complicating issue' of 'textual variation' in the Pauline letters themselves by Silva (1993:633). These discrepancies are often explained by referring to variant textual traditions.

Different categories can be drawn according to the way in which the LXX and MT agree with or differ from one another in the instances when Paul quotes from them. Silva (1993:631) provides such a listing, referring to instances where the LXX's translation of the texts used by Paul seems to follow the MT fairly closely (a 'literal translation'), and others where the LXX differs from the MT version of the same passage. In the case of the latter, Paul sometimes seems to follow the LXX version, at other times the MT version. Silva demonstrates how in only 'a handful of cases' Paul follows the MT against the reading of the LXX.

47 The MT version known to us today was probably 'standardized' into its current form only 'some centuries' after Paul. The Massoretic tradition can be dated in the late first or early second century (Deist 1978:50; Evans 1992:71; Müller 1993:194, 195, 198). Müller (1989b:56, 57) argues for an earlier fixing of the 'extent' of the canon, not the 'text', i.e. that at the time of the New Testament the Bible of the Jews consisted 'of the very same books which form the Biblica Hebraica today'. Deist (1978:51) posits two reasons for the urge to produce a 'standardised text': Jewish nationalism and the Jewish-Christian controversy (cf Lemche 1993:190 and Müller 1993:204 on the latter reason). Klein (1974:69–70) argues that the 'MT had a separate history, perhaps in an isolated locale like Babylon'. Deist (1978:52) posits two locations for the origin of the MT: Tiberias in Palestine, as well as Babylonia in the East.

48 Cf Klein (1974:viii, 13ff) for arguments on the existence of 'local' variants of the Hebrew texts, as seen in the Qumran findings. Cf Müller (1993:198) who refers to 'examples of the so-called "proto-Masoretic" text'.

49 Silva (1993:631) accounts for the discrepancies by suggesting three factors which could have influenced the LXX translators: 'free translation'; 'mistranslation'; or the use of 'different MSS' than that which would later constitute the MT. He also adds: 'the translator's method of work, their exegesis, their style, etc' (:632). 'No hard evidence' exists that differences between the LXX and MT can be ascribed to 'the lack of uniformity among Hebrew MSS' (:632).

50 However, it can also be argued that Paul followed a different version of the LXX, one which is not available to us today.
The seemingly endless arguments and counter-arguments on the issue of which textual tradition Paul used is not only tiresome, but apparently does not advance our understanding of Paul's use of Scripture. For example, some passages quoted by Paul do not agree with either the extant MT or LXX versions. The argument, however tiresome and at times inconclusive, needs to continue, because Paul's appropriation of Scripture is not only significant in terms of the context in which he uses it in his letters, but also in as far as he possibly 'adapts' the quote. But if one argues that Paul adapts the quote, surely one should be able to show that the so-called 'adapted' version did not exist in any contemporary but different version of the LXX—or should the burden of proof be put on the other side? If an isolated manuscript or later translation is available that contains the version of the quote that Paul used, it will normally be the easier explanation to argue that Paul used that particular version even if it is less well attested or contained in one of the lesser manuscripts.\(^{51}\)

The process of deciding whether a citation in Paul follows either the LXX or the MT, is appropriately described by Silva (1993:632) to be influenced by a 'strong subjective element'.\(^{52}\) The ideological assumptions of the interpreter of Paul's letters, will guide the reading of Paul's interpretation into a particular direction.

Another complicated, yet unavoidable factor in accounting for Pauline citations and allusions, is that the LXX translators not only provided a Greek equivalent for the Hebrew, but simultaneously 'passed on the tradition' with all that entailed.\(^{53}\) The translators of the LXX did their translation in the early Jewish context, in which such transmission process 'was exceedingly creative'. Müller (1993:202-204) argues that this does not mean that the LXX should be seen as an altogether new interpretation of the Jewish traditions, a 'rewritten Bible', but that '...this translation is to be understood as part of

---

\(^{51}\) Cf Silva (1993:633). Silva also refers to some examples which might reflect a mixed text, like Is 10:22-23 in Rm 9:27-28: Paul uses κύριος as in Codex B, instead of θεός as in Codex A which he usually follows.

\(^{52}\) He offers two examples: Dt 19:5 in 2 Cor 13:1 (on the inclusion of πᾶς by Paul) and Hab 2:4 in Rm 1:17 and Gal 3:11 (did Paul follow the MT against the LXX)?

\(^{53}\) Müller (1993:206) argues that this tradition-transmission as well as interpretive process present in the LXX continues 'in the way it (και the LXX) is absorbed in the New Testament'. In earlier studies, Müller (1989a; 1989b:59-65) reviews the position of the *Letter of Aristeas*, 'the novel written by a Hellenistic Jew living at Alexandria', around 100 BCE: the intent of this Letter is to invest the LXX with 'divine authority', also defending the 'translatory' nature of and sometimes inaccuracies within, the LXX. Stemberger (1991:37) posits that the LXX was influenced by 'implicit exegesis', as opposed to 'explicit' exegesis.
the dynamic process of handing on traditions, in course of which these traditions were given actuality'.

Müller (1993:203) also argues that the guiding principle in the LXX translation was not so much to stay true to the original intent and purposes of the earliest forms of the tradition, the 'archaeological ideals', but to contextualise the translation for its new setting or 'to implement the actual meaning of the text'. Repeating the 'commonplace' that to translate is to interpret, Müller adds that in the case of the LXX this 'necessity' was made a 'virtue': the Jewish Bible is hellenised.

3.1.3 Technique

'Certainly the apostle feels no compulsion in every instance to reproduce texts exactly' (Silva 1993:632). Silva like so many other students of Paul, bemoans the fact that Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel follows no 'simple pattern' (632). However, whereas Paul's 'Manual of Style' differed significantly from ours, it was quite similar to those of his contemporaries as has been shown quite convincingly by Stanley (1992).

Paul varied in his attention to the detail of the citation he used, which he at times seems to gloss over, or even omit. Silva (1993:632) argues that Paul's attention to detail is determined by his evaluation of the appropriateness or necessity of it. At times Paul's attention to detail is not only apparent, but his argument is based on it!

54 As argued earlier (1989b:65), Müller holds that the LXX translators felt no 'disharmony' between the following two interests: 'accentuation of the integrity of the text and the translation of it', and 'recognition that the process...of translation will involve an interpretation'. The paraphrastic nature of the LXX leads Evans (1989:166) to conclude that it is also 'in a sense...a targum'. This loose remark tends to obscure rather than clarify!

55 Müller refers specifically to the translation of נֵפֶר with κύριος, and the difference in the order of the books in the LXX. Roetzel (1982:7-9) contends that the 'Hellenistic spirit influenced the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek' and argues that the Greek of the LXX introduced significant Hellenistic understandings of Jewish ideas as expressed in Hebrew, in at least three areas: the view of God (the disappearance of the personal name, etc); the understanding of the law (the Greek νόμος 'as code which governs community life or an individual's conduct' is at odds with נֵפֶר and its notions of instruction or guidance); and, the perception of faith (the Hebrew distinction between reliability or faithfullness and faith or belief is not found in the LXX).

56 Silva (1993:632) refers to στέρμα in Gal 3:16 as an example of Paul's attention to detail. This remark is unclear, as Paul's argument hinges to a large extent on the reading of στέρμα: it is not simply another piece of detail!
3.1.4 Allusions

To account for the allusions to the Old Testament in Paul’s letters is no small task. The pervasiveness of Scriptural allusions in Paul has caused some to remark on Paul’s practice as one of ‘living in the Bible’. Scripture epistemologically and existentially defined life itself for Paul. Paul’s use of Scripture went beyond the explicit reference to and commentary on selected texts from it (Young & Ford 1987:63, 80–84).

The distinction between allusion and citation or quotation is arbitrary. Paul’s letters do not seem to disclose any concern about the way in which Scripture is cited as opposed to ‘alluded to’, and certainly no fixed formula or criterion exists to make this distinction which lies so heavily on the shoulders and minds of modern scholars. Allusions can indeed refer to a wide range of references: ‘loose quotations, reference to events, intentional appeals to specific passages, verbal similarities used (perhaps unconsciously) to express a different idea, broad undercurrents of themes, even totally unintentional correspondences’ (Silva 1993:634).

This leads Silva to despair of actually managing to list all allusions in the Pauline corpus.

3.2 Mode of Pauline interpretation

Paul’s decidedly pastoral aims with his letters did not, of course, mean that he merely reread Scripture or that he simply accepted that Scripture had the same meaning for his readers as it had for the initial readers of Scripture. Paul assuredly read Scripture in a particular way and used scriptural quotations and allusions with a specific aim in mind. Upon this I will now attempt to comment.

---

57 Silva (1993:634), who argues that ‘hardly a paragraph in the Pauline corpus fails to reflect the influence of the OT on the apostle’s language and thought’.

58 Allusions would entail some form of ‘verbal correspondence’ to scriptural texts, whereas citations or quotations would additionally have some introductory formula.


60 Although not argued here, I accept that Paul should be freed from the restraints imposed by a Lutheran-inspired reading of his letters. It is proposed that Paul be read within the perhaps not so well-established and definitely not monolithic, framework of the new perspective on Paul. It will be argued here that Paul’s reading of Scripture was guided by a firm choice for hermeneutical freedom. However, unless the Lutheran tethers are removed from Paul, Paul’s unbridled approach will not be able to emerge. If it is not accepted that Paul saw himself as within and indeed part of the history of God’s involvedness with ‘his people’, his interpretation of Scripture will similarly be clouded. The view that Paul accepted that Scripture has continuing value and normativity, rests on the position that Paul experienced the relation between his for-
3.2.1 Hermeneutic theologian

Scripture was his (sc Paul's) native air, the text-book of his education, the language of his own theology' (Dunn 1993b:121).

...Paul is primarily...an interpreter who both in his exegesis of the Old Testament and in his appropriation of Christian tradition adapts and reformulates previous interpretation in a distinctive and innovative manner (Beker 1991:15).

Paul can be described a theologian amidst the danger of this being perceived anachronistically.61 For the immediate purpose, it is important that Paul's theological activity be described from the perspective of how he used Scripture.

The Scriptures of Israel were frequently used by Paul to anchor his argument, although often in such a way as to have one ask whether Paul is not indeed abusing these texts for his arguments' sake only. Tobin (1993:299) argues that in his arguments directed at the Roman church 'Paul tried to ground his controversial conclusions by appeals to Jewish Scriptures and to traditionally Jewish viewpoints...' Tobin is at great pains to argue that Paul

mer and current views or beliefs, regarding God and especially God's historical actions with his people as one of continuation. The corollary of this position is that through a careful reading of Paul's letters, it can be shown that Paul did not harbour the traditionally supposed views of Christianity superseding and effectively obliterating Judaism. Cf Hays (1989:53): 'The Reformation theme of justification by faith has so obsessed generations of readers...that they have set Law and gospel in simplistic antithesis, ignoring the internal signs of coherence in Rm. 3:1-26...', and 'Christian caricatures of the Old Testament have made it difficult for belated generations of Gentile readers to grasp Paul's passion for asserting the continuity of his gospel with the message of the Law and the Prophets. By following the echoes of Psalm 143 (sc in Rm 3), however, we can discover the scriptural idea of God's saving justice at the foundation of Paul's argument in Romans.' By a cautiously unbiased approach of Paul's use of the Scriptures of Israel, it can be shown that Paul views his own ideas to be in continuity with those of Scripture. Hays (1989:2,5) argues for 'defamiliarization' as the starting point of examining Paul's reading of Scripture. For Hays this implies the recognition of an even stronger than Christocentric attitude towards the Old Testament, one that can be called a 'christomonistic' reading, often harboured by Christians when reading the Old Testament. Centuries of Christians have grown accustomed to having 'the Bible', and in Hays's mind they do not realise how strange Paul's interpretation of the 'Old Testament' without the accompanying 'New Testament' to which we are accustomed would have been for Paul's contemporaries (1989:1-5; also quoting Meeks). In addition, readers should be defamiliarised according to the Lutheran legacy dominating the understanding of both Paul and Old Testament.

61 The debate on whether Paul should or should not be portrayed as a theologian is beyond the scope of this contribution—my position, however, is clear (cf Hays 1991:246). For some directions in the argument: Beker 1991; Furnish 1990, 1994; Keck 1993; Mauser 1989.
did not view his use of Scripture of Jewish tradition as mere tools to effect the required result with his arguments. Arguing from Romans 1 and 2, Paul can be seen to have gone to great (rhetorical) lengths to show his controversial conclusions firmly rooted in Scripture.

For Paul, Scripture is sacred or divine because Scripture is η γραφή, 'proceeding from God himself' and thus has an 'ultimate authority'—and as such Scripture is for Paul his starting point as well as criterion. In polemical contexts, Paul often used Scripture 'as final court of appeal' (Silva 1993:638, 639).

The notion that 'God ultimately was the source of the Book' was an idea the early church shared with the non-Christian Jews, even after the church separated itself as an 'autonomous body of believers' from the synagogue. 'The radical shift in hermeneutics inaugurated by Paul the apostle created the novelty of a christological focus in a pre-established recognition of divine scripture' (Kannengieser 1991:29). Scripture thus allowed for 'privileged access to God', which guaranteed its continuing relevance for the community: not only old traditions but indeed 'a powerful presence of the inspiring Spirit'.

Returning to Paul's 'theological status', from a Jewish perspective Lapide (1984:34-35) emphasises that Paul, like Jesus, was no theologian in the 'Western sense of the word' because they were Jews. Paul's letters are 'concrete biblical answers to the pressing questions of daily life', within—one should add in Paul's case—the early church. 'All of his responses, even the most well-reasoned, seem curiously fragmentary and remain, in truly Jewish manner, open-ended both vertically as well as horizontally'. Lapide further depicts Paul as an 'undogmatic diogmatist', intend on 'pursuing' the truth for his followers.

Still from a Jewish perspective, Falk (1985) ascribes the conflict between both Jesus and Paul with the Jews of their day to the two, opposing pharisaic schools of the first century: Bet Hillel versus Bet Shammai. Falk (1985:134) argues that Jesus and Paul 'had ties' with the school of Rabbi Hillel (cf Tom-

---

62 In Rm 1 and 2 these are that the impartial God will reward (and punish) both Jew and Gentile equally according to their deeds.

63 This conclusion does not imply that Paul had no ulterior motives with his scriptural appeals—e.g. to calm suspicions and skepticism about him in Rome—but that his appeals never used Scripture as valueless tools.

64 Cf Stockhausen (1990:196, 197). Silva disagrees with Von Harnack who held that Paul merely invoked Scripture as a polemic 'tool' against his Judaising opponents. Silva argues that Paul even invoked Scripture on the issues where he differed from tradition, e.g. Gl 3 on the law which, Paul wants to argue, does not give life as the OT states. For another interpretation, cf Scott 1993a.
son 1990, esp:266, 269), who had the view that 'righteous Gentiles merit salvation'. Another important facet and really the one at issue here, is the one of two opposing notions of interpretation in these two schools: the literalism of the Sadducees and the 'creativity' of the Pharisees.

Although Paul claimed his Pharisaic ties (Phil 3:5), very little is made in biblical scholarship of Paul's possible ties to *Pharisaism* influencing his way of reading. This is probably due to both the negative perception of Pharisees stimulated by their presentation in the Gospels, but even more so due to the difficulty of distinguishing (and categorising) Jewish groups in general, and dating extant Jewish textual material in particular. Loewe (1990:347) refers to the differences between Sadducees and Pharisees as far their appropriation of Scripture was concerned. The Sadducees, 'entertaining a static view of pentateuchal inspiration and regarding "the traditions of the elders" as being without divine sanction, purported to fulfill biblical law *ad litteram*', while the Pharisees, 'conscious that a dynamic approach alone could preserve a divinely revealed law, laid the foundations out of which rabbinic Judaism would develop' (Loewe 1990:347).

The Pharisees then read tradition in a dynamic and creative way, not for novelty's sake or in a disinterested way, but to contextualise the all important Torah for a new situation. In Paul's letters a number of elements normally associated with Pharisaic belief can be detected, of which the interpretive stance is especially important for this study: a 'liberal estimate of what was Scriptural...and...method of Scriptural exegesis.' As Roetzel (1982:14) argues, the important matter here is the fact that the Pharisees read Scripture while being 'open to innovation'.

Loewe (1990:347-348), however, argues that Paul deviated from traditional Jewish interpretation of Scripture. As a general comment Loewe states: '...the exegetical address to the OT found in the NT in no way parallels that of the rabbis'. This can be seen in at least two important instances. Loewe argues that Paul interprets Scripture in a typological way, assuming the fulfillment ('full realization') of the scriptural prophecies in Christ. This leads, in Loewe's view, to a cessation of the paramount importance of the 'exegesis of the Hebrew Bible'. In similar fashion, Paul's identification of the Messiah

---

65 I am not going to argue the (mis-)representation of the Pharisees in the Gospels here. Cf Roetzel (1982:14) on the positive (especially in comparison to the Essenes) views of Pharisees in Josephus.
66 E.g. the resurrection of the just at the end of time; predestination and human responsibility in a dialectical relationship; and, doing a normal day's work. Naturally Paul also differed from the Pharisees in many ways, e.g. free association with Gentiles; a relaxed attitude to purity laws; the role of the Messiah; and, the interpretation of Torah (Roetzel 1982:14).
with a ‘subsumed and transcended Torah’, is said to ‘downgrade the essential channel of revelation in Judaism: ἔθνος (commandment). The notion of commandment, Loewe (1990:347) argues, is replaced by μὑμησις (imitation) and παραλεγεσις (exhortation).

While it can reasonably be assumed that the fruits of the exegetical efforts of Paul when compared with ‘non-Christian’ counterparts will differ as in the latter case, it is questionable to argue that Pauline interpretation does not reckon seriously with the text of Scripture. Indeed, as is argued here, Paul’s letters are permeated with scriptural citations and allusions, and at times Pauline interpretive practice closely resembles ‘rabbinic’ practice.

It is necessary to give some attention to what may be described as important ‘theological lines’ running through Paul’s letters. Describing Paul as a ‘theologian’ naturally means that one looks for particular theological trains of thought in Paul’s letters. One specific orientation is easily detected and has been shown up many times in the past: Paul’s christological approach. The question is in what way christological concerns can be said to have directed Paul’s reading of Scripture. Stockhausen (1990:201) forcefully argues in favour of Paul’s ‘christological interpretation’, referring to 2 Cor 5:19 ‘God in Christ was reconciling the world to himself’. Linking on to the argument that Paul views the gospel as ‘the eschatological fulfillment of Scripture’, Noll (1993:780) contends that the idea of the gospel built on and defined by Jesus Christ was viewed by Paul as an ‘act of God’ and not his own ‘insight’.

Snodgrass (1991:415–420) argues that the ‘key to understanding’ the New Testament authors’ use of Scripture can be discovered in the presuppositions they held, which are in his view located in four areas: corporate personality, christology, typology and eschatology.

Murray (1990:345) discusses in what way christological interpretation of Scripture in the early church took place, naming five modes: ‘passages are interpreted as explicitly speaking of Christ (in terms of the royal, prophetic or priestly models); the reference of the prophetic texts is transferred from their original subjects to Christ; theophanies are interpreted as earlier appearances of Christ; persons, events, or institutions may be regarded...as types of Christ, the cross, the church, etc.; passages could be helped to deliver...by means of interpreted glosses.’ However, as Roetzel (1982:19) argues in relationship to Paul’s use of traditions, ‘Paul’s relationship with Christ was not exhaustive’.

Paul’s christological approach to Scripture was complemented by the relationship between Paul and the Jesus tradition (Müller 1989:40–50). The christological approach of Paul should not be restricted to merely identifying images of Christ and his work in Paul’s theology, but should include a discussion on the continuity—or lack thereof—with Jesus Christ’s words and works in Paul’s letters. Grant (1989:17) argues that Paul was familiar with the collections of sayings of the Jesus tradition, and ‘through these, of what Jesus had taught in regard to the Old Testament’. Concepts similar to Jesus’ arise in Paul’s letters: fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies (1 Cor 11:25); rejection of legalism (Gl 3:10); summary of the Torah (Gl 5:14; Rm 13:9); and, Scrip-
Clearly the fact that Paul had certain christological assumptions is not in any serious contention. Snodgrass (1991:415-420) contends that keeping these presuppositions in mind, and bringing them into play on Paul’s hermeneutics, explains the sometimes novel and often—to us!—simply strange ways in which the New Testament authors interact with the Old Testament. Although Paul’s christological concerns are evident, it remains a question whether these concerns account for Pauline use of Scripture. As Hays contends (1989:120-121), Paul’s christological convictions must be considered but it is his ecclesiocentric hermeneutic (cf Swartley 1994:12 n 16) that puts his hermeneutics into perspective; ‘christology is the foundation on which his ecclesiocentric counterreading are constructed,’ and these concerns are complementary, rather than contradictory. Paul’s understanding of Jesus Christ as the one true heir of the promise to Abraham is the essential presupposition for his hermeneutical strategies, though these strategies are not in themselves christocentric’ (Hays 1989:121).

Another important line in Paul’s thinking, is perhaps also the one most open to abuse: eschatology or eschatological fulfillment. This concept is understood by Noll (1993:780) to mean: ‘consistent appropriation of Scripture, not as past history but as present fulfillment’.

It is important to understand the eschatological notion in first-century terms rather than according to today’s doctrinal formulations, which often direct their gaze to an exclusive focus on certain ‘end-of-time’ events, often with apocalyptic accompaniment, or emphasise a combined ‘realised-futurist’ understanding as the implication of the Christ events. For Paul, Scripture actually prefigures life in the present time, within the community.

However, ‘...the Scriptures do more than rehearse Israel’s sacred story, they also, Paul and the Qumraners believe, anticipate a future,...the Scriptures of old embrace the writer’s future...’ which leads to a ‘dynamic relationship’ between the ‘storied past and the time of Paul and his contemporaries’.70 Past and future (and present) are in a dialectical relationship,

70 Hays (1989:172), although allowing that Qumran texts are ‘the closest analogy to Paul’s temporal sensibilities’ within first-century Judaism, perhaps due in part to his insistence on the idiosyncratic reading by Paul of Scripture, argues for ‘three fundamental differences’ between Pauline hermeneutics and Qumran pesharim: ‘whereas Paul uses Scripture to justify the inclusion of uncircumcised Gentiles in the people of God and to relativize the Law’s ritual requirements, Qumran exegesis operates in service of a rigorously exclusive sectarian Judaism that regards mainstream Jewish practices as ritualistically lax; the scrolls contain no parallel to Paul’s conviction that the decisive eschatological event had already occurred; and Qumran biblical commentary is characteristically apologetic, seeking to vindicate the community’s practices against outsiders,
where the one informs the other (Roetzel 1982:17). Hays (1989:172–173) similarly submits that in both Pauline and Qumran appropriation of Scripture, there is no trace of a 'consciousness of disjunction from Israel's past or a reluctance to speak of God's activity in the present.' Indeed, Paul speaks as one in the long line of biblical prophets (Merklein 1992; Sandnes 1991; Segal 1990).

It is clearly discernible in Paul's letters that Paul sees himself and his communities of readers in the midst of the climactic time, καυσός. Paul views the community addressed by Scripture as the eschatological community. In Pauline hermeneutics 'the eschatological perspective becomes the hermeneutical warrant for major shifts and revisions in the reading of Scripture' (Hays 1989:169).

The often discussed feature called typology, or correspondence in history, is often seen to find its origin in Paul's view of eschatology, again not in the traditional doctrinal sense of the word, but eschatology as finding present and future figurations of the past. Silva (1993:640) regards typology to be the 'guiding principle' in Paul's use of Scripture: 'God was Lord of history.' For Silva, different adjectives describe this concern: typological (focusing on historical correspondences between Old and New Testament people and events), eschatological (focusing on the incarnation of Christ as inauguration of the end of time), and canonical (the meaning of texts is determined by the combination of Old and New Testaments). In short, when a typological reading is detected in Paul, it assumes that Paul 'saw a fundamental and organic connection between OT history and the eschatological realities of Christ's coming.'

whereas Paul uses Scripture to nurture and warn the community.'

In terms of the ability of Scripture to address the present time, Hays (1989:170, 171, referring to Patte 1975) argues that Paul's view of time in relation to the Bible, differed fundamentally from that of other ancient Jewish interpreters (apocalyptic visionaries, Alexandrian allegorists, and rabbinic midrashists): the latter did not allow that Scripture could address contemporary time, only the past and future as indicated (in their view) in Scripture. Thus, 'for the rabbis, God's word is a deposit stored up in time past and entrusted to the community's ongoing interpretation; for Paul, God's word is alive and active in the present time, embodied in the community's Spirit-empowered life and proclamation.' Unlike Paul, other Jewish interpreters of Scripture had to rely on the likes of halakhic interpretation of Scripture to make Scripture present in their lives.

For typology in Paul's writings: Ellis 1957, esp.:126–135. Criticism can be levelled on the rigid contrast often maintained between allegory and typology; insistence on a necessary 'historical correspondence' in typology can also be questioned.

But for Silva (1993:640) the christological nature of Paul's hermeneutics is central: '...the hermeneutics of the apostle to the Gentiles was ultimately rooted in Christ...'

The final remark of Silva (1993:640) comes perilously close to Christomonism, when he argues that 'the whole OT was a witness to Christ'.
However, it is doubtful whether one should conceptualise typology in Pauline hermeneutics along methodological or 'doctrinal-theological' lines, as the typological consciousness detected in Paul probably functioned more as 'a framework of literary-historical sensibility', wherein 'linkage is conceived in figurative terms rather than in terms of literal immanent causality'. 'Typology forges imaginative correlations of events within a narrative sequence; not all narratives, however, are historical' (Hays 1989:161). In this regard then, Hays (1989:95-104) emphasises the Israel/church typology, leading to his conclusion that Paul's hermeneutic can be described as 'ecclesiocentric'.

3.2.2 Tradition and revelation

During the first century the Scriptures of Israel were not seen as the complete and final chapter in the history of God's disclosure to, and interaction with humans. As Decock (1993:280) argues for first-century Judaism—of which first-century Christianity was a constituent part—'...Scripture was not seen as the complete revelation of God's Word by itself'. Hughes (1979:164 n 68) writes that 'the creative interaction of an author with the scriptural text, resulting in a new form of revelation in which both the original scripture writer and his later interpreter are equally agents under God, is found in all the exegetical traditions at the time of our writer (sc of Hebrews).''

Paul and his communities stand in a similar relationship to Scripture, as Scripture was 'not just a chronicle of revelation in the past; the words of Scripture sound from the page in the present moment and address the community of believers with authority' (Hays 1989:165; cf Patte 1983:228ff for the notion of Paul's ever expanding Scripture). Paul's reading was done in and for and on behalf of the church, with the word of Scripture becoming the word for the community. Paul's emphasis on the formation of the com-

75 This view is well attested, in Philo (both writer and interpreter 'are seized with divine possession', Sowers), in the Qumran community (the interpreter is to invoke a 'new and deeper meaning', Bruce; Betz; Brownlee; Elliger), in rabbinic Judaism (whilst accepting Moore's opinion that Judaism 'conceived of itself as revealed religion', many groups saw the 'interpretive process itself as conducted under the direction of the Holy Spirit' and equal to the inspiration of the biblical writer), in orthodox Judaism (the middoth were ascribed an 'equally authoritative' tradition as that of Scripture, Doeve) and in Christian prophetic modes (Boring). (Hughes 1979:164 n 68; cf Decock 1993:280).

76 The 'master hermeneutical trope' is Rm 10:5-10, in which is read 'the word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart'. This trope was not invented by Paul but derives from Dt 5 and 26 (Hays 1989:167).
munity, is understandable in light of his view that 'the enfleshment of the word in the church makes the meaning of Scripture knowable'. There exists then in Paul's view a dialectical relationship between the living word of Scripture and the creation of communities: where Scripture speaks, communities are created, 'whose lives are hermeneutical testimonies'.

As was argued above concerning the 'inspiredness' of the Jewish exegete, in the Pauline writings a similar tendency is found. When Paul justifies his arguments with an appeal to either the Spirit or his apostolic authority, both these appeals imply a claim to the privileged receiving of God's revelation. Paul could interpret his traditions with a 'vom Geist dynamisiertes Traditionsbewußtsein', enabling him to present Jewish and Jesus-traditions anew in his day. Tradition and Spirit functioned together in a 'Wirkungseinheit' and as 'Weg in die Freiheit des Herrn' (Müller 1989:58).

Stockhausen (1990:197, 198) contends that Paul's interpretive approach to Scripture can at times be described as 'modeling'. Paul's relationship to Scripture is then 'immediate' and not mediated: '...Paul's relationship to the Old Testament story is very close and entirely implicit...'. Indeed and even more radically than this, Paul saw himself and his contemporaries as 'the primary recipients of the Word of God in Scripture'. Stockhausen (1990:201) argues that Paul's claim to having immediate access to divine revelation can be found in what she terms the 'deepest level of meaning, the one hidden in Scriptures for all time' and which she finds expressed in Paul's letter to the Corinthians in the following way: 'God has shone in our hearts, that we in turn might make known the glory of God shining on the face of Christ' (2 Cor 4:6; cf Hays 1989:154).

Paul indeed saw himself in line with the biblical prophets (Merklein 1992; Segal 1990; Sandnes 1991; note 38, above) claiming to speak God's word for the present time. In his writings, it is clear that Paul as prophet did not experience 'temporal estrangement from Bible time' (Hays 1989:171).

Paul could hold onto the immediate relevance of Scripture for his day, without negating the appropriateness of what is recounted for the original context. Without denying the first context of Scripture, Scripture addresses the new context without mediation. This naturally means that in Paul's view Scripture contained 'various levels of meaning', but all of which are 'present at the same time through the power and benevolence of its divine author' (Stockhausen 1990:200).

---

77 Cf Müller (1989:36). Paul's apostolic authority derives from the Damascus road encounter with Jesus, 'the most formative item in Paul's experience (1 Cor 9:1; 15:8)' (Roetzel 1982:19).

78 This already indicates his detachment from the modern preoccupation with 'original' or 'historical' meaning of Scripture. Cf below.
Paul found himself in continuity with tradition, which he appropriated through 'a hermeneutic that reads Scripture primarily as a narrative of divine election and promise' (Hays 1989:157). For Paul's reading of Scripture it meant that Law and Gospel are viewed within a narrative unity,79 with the theme of God's righteousness being central to it and which did not lead to the superseding or nullifying of Torah, but rather its transformation into a witness of the Gospel. The important factor in all this is that Paul operated within a 'narrative framework of interpretation' which led to a relationship of continuity between Paul and Scripture (Hays 1989:157).80

Recognising the attitude of Paul towards the traditions, and the relationship between tradition and revelation, another issue remains unresolved: the identification of the traditions used by Paul and accounting for them.

As can be expected from what has already been said, Paul was not intent on merely repeating the traditions. In a specific context, Barr (1995:61) describes Paul's use of the traditions with which he was familiar, as 'imaginative, innovative, centrally concerned about ethics, blazing new trails and saying more than he intended to do'.81

In his scriptural citations it is clear that Paul makes use of a variety of traditions contained in Scripture. It is important to note that the citations seem to be predominantly from four sets of traditions or 'books' from the Scriptures of Israel: Isaiah, Psalms, Genesis and Deuteronomy.82

The predominant use of the Isaiah traditions can be explained as offering 'the clearest expression in the Old Testament of a universalistic, eschatological vision in which the restoration of Israel in Zion is accompanied by an ingathering of Gentiles to worship the Lord; that is why this book is both

79 Some recent contributions on the role of narratives in Paul's thought and writings are Swartley (1994) and Witherington (1994).
80 The kind of discontinuity that Marks (1984) finds and describes so radically, is attributed by Hays (1989:158) to a number of factors: the tradition formed by Marcion, Harnack; the Bloomian tradition with its 'anxiety of influence' which dominates in Marks' evaluation of Pauline interpretation; and the existentialism of Bultmann prescribing the value of interpretation to reside in the 'act itself' and not so much in its conclusion or content. Hays notes also that (1) Paul's eschatological and apocalyptic concerns mitigate against lack of interest in 'the history of the nation and the world', and (2) Paul's so-called concern with 'asserting his autonomy over Israel's traditions is a bizarre anachronism'.
81 Barr discusses the first Thessalonians letter, specifically Paul's use of the traditions about eschatology and even more specifically Paul's contextualisation of ἡμέρα κυρίου (the day of the Lord).
82 Cf Koch (1986:33) for a list of OT books from which Paul quotes, including the number of times he uses each of these books. For Isaiah it is 28, Psalms 20, and Genesis and Deuteronomy 15 each. No other books are quoted from more than five times.
statistically and substantively the most important scriptural source for Paul' (Hays 1989:162). When it is formulated in this way, it is clear how Paul could have associated him with this scriptural tradition and also how he could find value in quoting him in his letters.

The second most used set of traditions from Scripture is the Psalms. Naturally the Psalms would, through liturgical use in the synagogue and perhaps even the first gatherings of followers of Jesus, have been very familiar to Paul and his readers (listeners). However, it can be argued that the particular Psalms referred to are those that exemplify the 'Isaianic theme of Gentile inclusion' or emphasise the 'righteous judgement of God' and that Paul's use of these Psalms was therefore intentional.83

Paul's use of the Genesis quotations centers on the Abraham narrative, and is important to the extent that Paul uses it as 'the paradigmatic prefiguration of God's calling of Jews and Gentiles alike to covenant relation through faith' (Hays 1989:162).

Of the four blocks of traditions mentioned above, the one which is the most difficult to account for in Paul's use thereof, is the Deuteronomic. Hays (1989:163–164) admits that Paul's use of Deuteronomy is actually 'most surprising' as Deuteronomy can be seen as the opposite of what Paul advocates: a 'performance-based religion'.84 But apart from Gl 3:10 and 13, Paul's use of Deuteronomy reflects nothing of the sort; rather 'the words of Deuteronomy become the voice of 'The Righteousness from Faith'.

Scott (1993b:645–665) finds himself in agreement with the view of Hays regarding the importance of Deuteronomy for the thought of Paul, but accuses Hays of not showing 'how Paul's use of Deuteronomy is mediated by OT/Jewish tradition'. Scott argues that to understand Paul's use of Deuteronomy it is not enough to simply argue for a mutual recognition of the graciousness of God, or the shared 'theology of the word' (Via, quoted by Hays 1989:163).

Paul appropriates a pervasive OT/Jewish tradition which we may refer to as the Deuteronomic View of Israel's History... Paul draws on this tradition as a salvation-historical framework to make several important statements about both his own people Israel and their past, present and future relationship to God vis-à-

---

84 Deuteronomy is a book of 'conditional blessing and curses'. Hays also refers to Von Rad who attempted to demonstrate continuity between Deuteronomy and the NT, but Hays (1989:163) argues that the problem in terms of Pauline theology remains one where Deuteronomy exemplifies 'a covenant that is rigorously conditional in character and that pronounces terrifying curses upon Israel for disobedience'.

---
vis the law (Scott 1993b:665).  

3.2.3 Free and creative

'It is in the hammering out of a basis for his theology of freedom that Paul is most creative...It is primarily his reflection on the Hebrew Scriptures, illuminated by his view of Jesus and the implications of Jesus’ death, that encouraged insights not imagined before' (Richardson 1979:165). Some of the texts of Scripture are used by Paul in a 'straightforward way'. The self-evident fashion in which Paul used certain passages from the Old Testament can be seen where they function for illustrative purposes, as Ex 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7.

However, guided by the Jewish tradition-transmission context which encouraged freedom and creativeness, it is not surprising that in many other instances Paul seems to use the scriptural citations in a way such as seems to go against the grain of their original forms, not to mention functions. As Stockhausen (1990:200) boldly puts it: 'At first glance it might seem that Paul is distorting the Scriptures.'

It can be argued that Paul not only had to, but actually found himself capable of, new interpretations of Scripture on the basis of the Christ-event. Noll (1993:780) speaks of Paul’s 'exegetical virtuosity' when describing Paul’s appropriation of Christ’s death and resurrection. In any case, it is questionable whether the need to choose between literal or allegorical inter-

---

85 This 'Deuteronomic View of Israel's History' (taken over from Steck's Das deuteronomistische Geschichtsbild) was present in 'virtually all extant literature' of the 'Palestinian Judaism of about 200 BC to AD 100' and 'covered the whole history of Israel from initial election to ultimate salvation'. It comprised the following six elements: Israel had been persistently disobedient and rebellious; God constantly sent messengers to call his people to repentence; Israel refused to listen to the messenger and remained obdurate; the wrath of God was let loose on Israel resulting in exile; even during exile, Israel had the opportunity for repentence; God will restore the repentent people to the land and a new covenantal relationship with himself (Scott 1993b:645-650; 1993a:187-221; 1994:73-99, esp 89-93).

86 According to Richardson (1979:165) a second factor in Paul’s creative theologising is 'his own spiritual experience' through which he became aware that 'God could do new things through his Spirit'. However, the Jesus traditions which Paul inherited could lead to 'tentative conclusions' on freedom, but provided no 'basis' for it.

87 However, some scholars bemoan the fact that a tendency existed among NT authors to use the OT quotations 'in ways different from their original intention' (Snodgrass 1991:414). This practice of the NT authors was defended in a number of different ways: they were nearer to Christ, they were living within the first century, etc. Snodgrass (1991:414) further notes that the traditional (Catholic) justification of this practice was to view the 'new reading' as sensus plenior or the fuller meaning—which was viewed by some as 'a solution' and by others as 'obfuscation'.
pretation was as serious a question for Paul as for the other New Testament authors. Certainly, this so-called choice as 'the crucial question' in early Christian hermeneutics (Jeanrond 1991:19), should be viewed rather as a modern preoccupation. Paul and his contemporaries seemingly fluctuate without any restrictions between these two interpretive approaches.

An appropriate way to describe Pauline hermeneutics would be free and creative. As Hays (1989:153–155) argues, ἐλευθερία (freedom) is not only a central element for Paul's 'vision for the life of the people of God', but also shapes hermeneutical practice, as it were. Believers in Christ are liberated from 'bondage to a circumscribed reading of the old covenant' and enter into freedom which also entails reading Scripture in a new way. Scripture takes on a metaphorical nature, containing the Gospel as 'hidden meaning' and allowing believers, through the illumination of the Spirit, to find meaning in 'Scripture's own indirect and allusive mode of revelation'. This freedom with which Paul reads Scripture 'is grounded in a secure sense of the continuity of God's grace.'

Tuckett (1991) similarly contends that Paul interpreted the traditions which he received and in which he partakes, 'freely' and thus also in a critical way—which at times borders on discarding the traditions—especially in two critical instances: the Jewish Law (in Romans, Corinthians and Galatians) and the Christian tradition (in 1 Cor 7). He argues that Paul interpreted these traditions according to the contingency of the situations, in order to emphasize freedom. Freedom rises above freedom from the law (a 'peripheral' issue, quoting Jones 1987) and Tuckett (1991:319–320) concludes that '(w)hat Paul is vehemently opposed to is one set of traditions being forced upon other people.' However, Paul's interpretation was always done according to his principle of ἀγάπη or love, which implied maintaining and respecting 'the other person's freedom and integrity'. Still, freedom in interpreting traditions meant also that Paul was 'highly critical of his traditions to the point of rejecting them altogether'.

Not all readers of Paul evaluate Paul's freedom in interpretation the same way, or view his motives in a positive way. Marks (1984:71) is intent on showing Paul's motives to be of such a nature that they can be described as '...motives governing a kind of creative interpretation whose source is the impulse toward imaginative autonomy, or, to use the language of the New

---

88 Tuckett (1991:318) sees in freedom 'an element of consistency and coherence to Paul's apparently divergent attitudes to different groups within his communities in relation to different aspects of his tradition.' For some scholars 'freedom' is also the key-word for explaining Pauline ethics (Lategan 1990; Richardson 1979; Tuckett 1991:322, 324).
Testament, toward *exousia* (power or freedom).* The possibility of viewing Paul's free interpretation as primarily self-serving elocution (recently argued by Castelli 1991), finds stimulus when he is locked in polemic with his opponents and when he has to fend for his apostolic authority, but as Paul consistently operates with a freedom of interpretation, this argument is not convincing as a general description of Pauline hermeneutic.

In view of the contention that Pauline interpretation should be viewed as 'free, creative and loving' interpretation, further illumination is required. The freedom found in Pauline interpretation has to be investigated at least on two levels: (1) how is this kind of interpretation constituted, namely, how does it take place, and against what kind of background should it be understood and (2) why, or what, underlies Paul's notion of 'free interpretation' (motivation) and what does it aim to achieve (goal). An attempt will be made to discuss elements related to the first question in this section, and issues with regard to the second question will have to be addressed at another time.

### 3.2.3.1 Historical context, original meaning and purpose

'The notion that Scripture has only one meaning is a fantastic idea and is certainly not advocated by the biblical writers themselves' (Steinmetz 1980:32). 'Although he (sc Paul) may frequently quote from scripture, the interpretation he gives it often lies beyond the obvious meaning of the text' (Hooker 1981:296). 'Eschatological meaning subsumes original sense' (Hays 1989:156). Silva (1993:641–642) contends that although Paul’s methods differ from modern hermeneutical practice, Paul was not 'careless' in quoting from Scripture. On the contrary, Paul's theology was constructed from and grafted onto a 'serious study of the OT that was both meticulous and comprehensive."

However, Paul had no intention of reading the Scriptures of Israel in order to determine their original *intent and meaning*. Moreover, one never gains the impression that Paul attempts to establish an 'original or historical' meaning which might explain the use and applicability of the text for the first-century Pauline communities—a practice which was extended to the textual traditions used. This argument should not be construed to mean that

---

89 This should not be seen as exceptional: even in the case of the LXX translation, Müller argues that it ‘did not owe its existence to ‘archaeological’ ideals, but to the need to implement the actual meaning of the text’. The debate between whether the text should be read (historico-)critically or ‘traditionally’ is continuing. Cf the comments by Mejia (1987:22ff) on this debate at the turn of the century and many years later (1943, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*) in the Roman Catholic Church.

90 As Müller (1989b:67) contends, the New Testament authors ‘do not seem over-scrupulous when it came to loyalty to the text, as if their prime concern was to quote from and build on one specific “basic text”’. 

---
Paul was uninterested in the meaning, or even the 'true' or 'real' meaning of a text, but rather that the truthfulness or reality of the meaning was not defined in terms of historical fact or literalness. ‘True reading...depends on attentiveness to the prompting of the Spirit’ (Hays 1989:156).91

As Scripture in Judaism was read for what it might be interpreted to mean for the new context in which it was to function, Paul was similarly interested in ‘contemporising’ or ‘contextualising’ the Scriptures of Israel. In the words of Decock (1993:280) ‘(i)t was not a matter of going back to the origins, but of letting Scripture become part of the present life of the readers’ constituting an ‘updating’ of Scripture because Paul, and the other New Testament authors ‘believed that the scriptures contained God’s will for his people here and now’ (Brown 1984:30). Neither was Paul intent on gaining the ‘original intention of the author’, as this simply was not a primary hermeneutical concern (Hays 1989:156).

Paul was not bent on establishing the literal meaning of the texts he dealt with, and although he never accounts for his hermeneutical approach in a special section of his letters, certain explicit statements in Paul’s letters could be understood as clues to his hermeneutics. For example, Paul contrasts the ‘letter’ and ‘spirit’ as two ways of reading, the former resulting in having ‘a veil over the mind’ as was the case with the Jews who failed to appreciate Jesus as referent of Scripture (cf 2 Cor 3). Young (1990:401) concludes on Paul’s exposition: ‘(t)he law was never meant to be taken ‘literally’, rather it had a spiritual meaning’.92

Evans (1989:164) calls the practice of using a text in another situation and finding new meaning for it, resignification and argues against Kaiser’s argument that resignification was avoided by New Testament authors when they were ‘engaged in serious exegesis’.

Although Paul never rested content in merely or only quoting Scripture within and according to its original context, his letters do give evidence of ‘careful and thoughtful reflection on OT texts in their contexts’ as argued by Silva (1993:639). Silva refers to the use of Is 54:1 in Gal 4:27, which at first

91 Although certainly not an exact parallel to this, cf my earlier discussion on the interpreter as ‘inspired’ in the Jewish context.
92 Young (1990:401) claims further that Paul dismissed the halakhic interpretation of the law as ‘literal and unacceptable’ because ‘Christ was the ‘end’ of the Law’. The irony was that the Jews used all but literal methods in the halakhic interpretation of the Law. Hooker (1981:296) argues that it was especially in dealing with the Law, that Paul most clearly demonstrated his ‘apparent ability to do what he will with scripture’. See the discussion by Tomson 1990 of Paul’s letters from the perspective of Halakhah and cf Westerholm’s (1984) contention, contrary to the above, that 2 Cor 3 concerns Pauline ethics and not his hermeneutics.
seems 'to violate' the text, but when read in conjunction with Gen 11:30 (Sarah's barrenness) and Is 52—and even Is 53, framed by the other two chapters—it provides some evidence of a wider context presupposed by Paul.93 Hays (1989:155) contends in a slightly different way that (overt) citations can also become a way of 'troping' exactly by presupposing familiarity with a given 'original (historical) context'.94

In a similar way, Stockhausen (1990:198) refers to 2 Cor 3 and 4 where Paul interprets the second law-giving episode involving Moses on Mount Sinai as narrated in Ex 34 (especially 34:27–35) to demonstrate that Paul is not imprisoned in a historical reading of texts. By making use of the Jeremiah and Ezekiel prophecies, Paul goes beyond Exodus because '(f)or Paul the historical knowledge that the Book of Exodus gave him did not exhaust its meaning.'

Williams (1988:709–720) also attempts to explain Paul's interpretation of Scripture when he investigates the meaning of promise in Galatians. In his explanation of Paul's use of texts from Genesis, Williams (1988:716) states that 'Paul reads beyond the explicit words of scripture to the implicit meaning that for him they contain'.

Paul's letters, as often argued, do display instances of allegory.95 The freedom with which Paul interprets the text, without being bound to the 'original meaning' of the text, can also be explained by Paul's own understanding of being in possession of the Spirit and being called as an apostle with authority.96

In the context of history and its relevance to Paul's thought, Pauline interpretation is often characterised as typological.97 Although the typological

93 Whether one should refer to this as an indication that Paul was concerned about 'historical meaning' (Silva 1993:639) is doubtful. Silva is hard-pressed on this issue and actually admits that 'historical meaning sometimes recedes into the background in the interests of contemporary needs'.

94 Hays wants to argue that this troping can lead to the situation where 'the most significant elements of intertextual correspondence between old context and new can be explicit rather than voiced'.

95 However, this practice is not pervasive at all in Paul, leading Hays to conclude that it is not 'one of Paul's primary hermeneutical strategies'. He refers to how easily Paul could then allegorise circumcision and kasherut, circumventing a lot of trouble these caused him (Hays 1989:166).

96 Cf above; also Müller (1989:40) 'Ähnlich wie seine typologische Auslegung begründet Paulus die Anwendung der Allegorie ebenfalls aus der pneumatischen Kompetenz des Schriftauslegers und seiner Freiheit dem Text gegenüber, die sich als geistesgewirkt versteht.'

97 Typologies—or are some of the following rather allegories?—abound in Pauline writings, including the Adam-Christ contrast (Rm 5), the Abraham-Christ parallel (Rm 4), Sara opposed to Hagar as Sinai opposed to Jerusalem 'above' (Gl 4), and many others (cf Müller 1989:38–40).
inferences that abound in Paul’s appropriation of Scripture cannot be denied, the traditional definition—especially in so-called ‘conservative’ theology—of typological perhaps needs some adjustment (e.g. Young 1994). As was argued above, the historical dimension which is often said to characterise (also) Pauline typology misses the point of Paul’s interpretation of Scripture. Hays (1989:161) argues that typological interpretation in Paul should not be seen as a ‘hermeneutical model’ but rather as ‘a framework of literary-historical sensibility’, wherein ‘linkage is conceived in figurative terms rather than in terms of literal immanent causality’. ‘Typology forges imaginative correlations of events within a narrative sequence; not all narratives, however, are historical’.

There is, however, a temporal factor involved in Pauline typology which is arguably not primarily dependent upon ‘historical correspondence’ but rather involves eschatology. Paul’s notion of the eschatological community gives him a hermeneutical warrant to reread Scripture within the community, leading to the dissolving of ‘temporal boundaries’ and creating ‘time warps’ where what has been said by Moses is spoken anew to the community, and the Gospel has been ‘pre-preached to Abraham’ by Scripture. Pauline typology can be seen in the ‘convergence of time upon’ Paul’s communities.

Although, as far as it can be gleaned from his letters, Paul was not intent on discerning and/or communicating the original meaning of texts, he in any case ‘has different plans for the texts of Scripture’. On the other hand, one can hardly contend that the ‘original meaning’ was for Paul a non-entity. ‘The ‘original’ meaning of the scriptural text, then, by no means dictates Paul’s interpretation, but it hovers in the background to provide a cantus firmus against which a cantus figuratus can be sung’ (Hays 1989:178).

3.2.3.2 Adapting the texts? In many instances Paul’s citations from the Old Testament create the impression that Paul adapted the received text itself for his particular purposes. This impression is not only due to the specific wording of the quotation when compared with textual traditions, but also involves the way in which Paul used the texts quoted. Silva (1993:633) argues that while ‘the mere fact that they contain verbal differences is not a clue to

---

98 Pauline typology is neither in promotion of supersessionist hermeneutics, nor historical. ‘Typology is a trope, an act of imaginative correlation between events in a narrative’ (Hays 1993:44).
99 Naturally the difficulty with such a contention is the variety of MSS in the first century and the fluidity of the tradition (and text), as explained above.
100 E.g Silva (1993:638) ‘...many of the OT citations are not verbally exact’. 
Paul’s hermeneutics’—referring as an example of this to the common situation even today where an uncareful rendering of someone’s message still expresses the same idea as that of the original—sometimes verbal differences ‘do have exegetical significance’.101

As in rabbinic tradition, Paul selected certain textual traditions containing the themes which he reappropriated in his interpretations. Brown (1984:31-32) argues that New Testament authors ‘freely adapted’ the texts of Scripture, by both adapting the ‘Old Testament’ text to conform ‘to its “fulfillment” in the Christian narrative’, as well as adapting the Christian narrative to conform with the Scriptures of Israel.

Koch (1986:346-347) argues that Paul not only feels himself entitled to ‘change’ the text of Scripture, but does so ‘quite drastically’. The justification for Paul’s adaptations is the following: ‘he understand the texts as speaking to the present readers, in their eschatological context; he is not concerned about the message for the original readers in their original context’ (Decock 1993:275).

A very radical discontinuity is advocated by Marks (1984:71-72) who argues that Paul—especially through typological exegesis as revision—subordinated the Scriptures of Israel to ‘their “spiritual” understanding in order to achieve revisionary power realized in the process of overcoming a tyranny of predecession’.

While Hays (1989:157) admits that from a certain perspective, Paul’s hermeneutic is ‘flagrantly revisionary’,102 as Paul recontextualised the texts and within a hermeneutic of freedom, he contends that Paul still emphasises continuity.

---

101 This view naturally allows for many hypotheses. Cf Silva (1993:633) who argues that although Paul presumably had access to the LXX Is 40:13a which read νοῦν (’mind’) κυρίον—a ‘clarifying interpretation’ by the LXX translator?—against the MT Να (’spirit’), he ‘could surely have changed’ it ‘if he wanted’. Silva views this choice of Paul as ‘probably intentional’ and as reflective of ‘the role played by the LXX in Paul’s theological reflection’. Silva argues that Paul ‘means’ with νοῦν κυρίον really ‘Spirit of Christ’ (cf 1 Cor 2:10-11 which stress the role of the Spirit in revealing God), and finally Silva assumes that such instances of the LXX’s renderings could probably be seen as ‘a source of development of Paul’s teaching’. The assumptions in this line of thinking are immense in number and nature! This really begs the question why Paul did not change the νοῦς of Is 40 to πνεῦμα, as he changed so many LXX texts to apparently suit his argument (cf below). Silva’s explanation raises doubt whether his theology (pneumatology) is not determinative for his evaluation of Paul’s use of Is 40. Interestingly, the Afrikaans NT translation of 1983 also reads here ‘Gees’ (capitalised) and not ‘gedagtes’ (as in verse 2a).

102 It is indeed the eschatological that provides the ‘hermeneutical warrant for major shifts and revisions in the reading of Scripture’ (Hays 1989:169).
3.2.3.3 Inner-biblical textual relations. Perhaps the whole question of Paul's 'revision' or re-vision of Scripture can be dealt with from the perspective of the well-known Jewish practice of inner-biblical exegesis. Sarna (1987:11) describes this as follows: ‘...a dynamic process whereby a text, once it is recognized as being Scripture, necessarily and spontaneously generates interpretation and adaptation so that often the original text is transformed into a new and expanded text. Thus is created inner-biblical exegesis.’ As was argued above, the continuing generation of interpretation based on the text rested on the belief in the unity of Scripture (cf Mejia 1987:31).

This practice of re-reading Scripture could function in the Pauline letters as Paul's interpretive method and did not restrict him to the confines of a particular pericope or passage, or even a specific biblical document. Indeed, the whole of Scripture became Paul's hunting ground for catching the elusive fox of meaning. Silva (1993:640) puts it well when he argues that Paul's use of Scripture suggests that he is 'exploiting important associations present in the OT itself'. The whole of Scripture constituted for Paul an appropriate context against which any particular part of Scripture should be read.

This notion is supported by Stockhausen (1990:198–201) who argues that one of Paul's presuppositions is the 'unity of Scripture'. This means that Paul

103 If not in intended result, in any case then in terms of procedure (cf Hays 1989:14). Jewish inner-biblical exegesis is a term which is more frequently used in association with the 'generation' process of the Scriptures of Israel: 'the re-use, re-interpretation and re-application of earlier scriptural material within the OT itself', which happened mostly in one of four ways, through glosses; different arrangements of material; direct quotations; or, re-use of earlier themes and traditions (Mason 1990:313; Fishbane 1980, 1985). Paul used Scripture in a way quite similar to that above; however, in Paul's day the traditions constituting the Scriptures of Israel were virtually 'fixed'. Although Paul indeed cites Scripture as an authoritative tradition, there are many examples in his letters that—it could be argued—constitute attempts to rewrite Scripture. Marks (1984:77) refers to the 'revisionary correspondences' present already in the prophets: 'Hosea interpreting Israel's sojourn in the wilderness foreshadowing God's union with Israel; Isaiah seeing in the exodus from Egypt, the Noahide covenant and the foundation of Zion 'as types of Israel's ultimate redemption'. To this could be added, on a much larger scale, the Chronistic revision of Israel’s history. Cf Hayward (1990:595–598) on the notion of 'rewritten Bible' as description of post-Biblical Jewish writings, e.g Ecclesiasticus (Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira), Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Temple Scroll, and the Book of Biblical Antiquities. Even the Targums, as 'explanatory comments and edifying homiletic material are interweaved into their Aramaic translation,' can be viewed as instances of the 'rewritten Bible' (Loewe 1990:349).

104 Cf also Kirchschlager (1987:39) for the dynamic character of the Bible—he argues for 'the operating of the divine spirit' as the 'dynamic behind' Scripture and locates the concept of 'inspiration' in this operating of the Spirit.
could actually utilise the whole of Israel's Scriptures. Paul would search the Scriptures for texts of which he might avail himself on a particular point by closely focussing on words in the texts. These words formed for Paul a 'divine code' by means of which 'different levels of meaning' are communicated 'at different times'.

3.2.3.4 Rhetorical purpose. Finally, Paul's free appropriation of Scripture should also be understood from the perspective of pragmatic intentions. Paul often rearranges the word order of scriptural citations for rhetorical effect or for the sake of the argument (Koch 1986:104–110, cf Scott 1994:82 n 36).

Silva (1993:640) agrees that one of the reasons for what seems to be Paul's peculiar use of Scripture, is Paul's persuasive strategy. Silva hastens to add that the use of Scripture for rhetorical purposes does not reflect 'disrespect for the OT as source of doctrine nor lack of concern for its historical meaning'.

However, whether rhetorical purpose is an effective way of explaining Paul's creative or merely 'selective' (Snodgrass 1991:411), use of Scripture in an eccentric and even esoteric way, is yet to be seen.

3.2.3.5 On Pauline 'methodology' (see also above, section 3.1.3). Attempting to describe the hermeneutic activities of Paul in terms of models or methods soon lands one in trouble, because '(h)e adheres neither to any single exegetical procedure, nor even to a readily specifiable inventory of procedures' (Hays 1989:160). Paul's interpretive readings of Scripture resemble '(h)elter-skelter intuitive readings, unpredictable, ungeneralisable'. In general, these conclusions can be held valid, as much as Paul did not in any modern sense of the word attempt to exegete Scripture by means of a set method or system of interpretation.

Hays (1989:9, 160) contends that the Tradition-historical approach to Pauline interpretation had accomplished what it could, which is not to be denied or disparaged: 'Pauline quotations and allusions have been catalogued, their introductory formulas classified, their relation to various Old Testa-

---

105 Assuming the unity of Scripture might explain the usage of many and diverse texts of Scripture to make a single point, but does this argument go a long way toward explaining the apparent 'misuse' (abuse?) of the single texts?

106 Although Hays (1989:160–164) supports the idea that Paul had no 'hermeneutical' methods, he does accept that Paul read Scripture with certain 'constraints'.

107 Method as 'a systematic procedure that may be applied to a text to determine its meaning, in such a way that different readers using the same method will arrive at similar interpretations' (Hays 1989:224 n 24).
ment text-traditions examined, their exegetical methods compared to the methods of other interpreters within ancient Christianity and Judaism.' Yet, the Pauline letters as hermeneutical events did not surface and '(t)he questions that scholars have traditionally asked about Paul’s use of the Old Testament have either been answered in full or played out to a dead end'.\textsuperscript{108} Hays despairs of finding in even the study of midrash a way of explaining Pauline interpretation.\textsuperscript{109} He finds in it rather the end of the interpretive process. Other attempts at classifying Pauline exegesis, for example the one by Longenecker (1975), are accused of ‘ex post facto artificiality’.

Although Paul never explicitly espouses any particular interpretive method, it is possible to argue that traces of the then contemporary methods are present in his labour. As argued above certain ‘strains of thought’ seem to have been dominant within Pauline interpretation: allegory, typology, and others. This certainly does not mean that Paul always read Scripture in the same way, but merely that we find—as with theological patterns—retrospective evidence of Paul’s use of certain traditions of interpretation.

Thus, it will continue to be necessary to reflect on the influence that possible interpretive ‘methodologies’ or ways of reading could have had on Pauline interpretation, at least for two reasons: to avoid the danger of ascribing eccentric behavior to Paul; and, to take possible formative influences on Paul’s hermeneutic into account.

3.2.4 Recasting Pauline hermeneutics: intertextuality\textsuperscript{110}

A significant issue raised for Pauline studies is whether Paul employed specific exegetical techniques or to what extent both Paul and the Qumran exegetes exhibit an ‘intertextual’ consciousness that allows them to make citations and allusions

\textsuperscript{108} Five sets of questions were traditionally asked, ranging from textual criticism; incidence of quotation; sources and historical background; theological legitimacy; to biblical inspiration and authority (Hays 1989:9, 10).

\textsuperscript{109} Traditionally, midrash as explaining the exegesis of Paul has been employed in three ways: as form-critical ‘map’ (explaining Paul’s formal structure of writing); as hermeneutical method (however, ‘the interpreter holds the creative options’); or as licence (an apologetic and ‘convenient cover for a multitude of exegetical sins’, Hays 1989:11–14). For the opposite view, cf Evans (1993:50) ‘(r)ecognizing the midrashic features of Paul’s use of Scripture clarifies the apostle’s technique and argument.’

\textsuperscript{110} This term was coined by Julia Kristeva, \textit{intertextualitě}, although this was always an interest to literary critics (Moyse 1994:137). Even in source criticism an intertextual element was already present, but cf also Vorster (1989:20) who argues that the ‘old’ source criticism concentrated more on the ‘bare fact of allusions to other texts within texts’. It is important to realise that intertextuality is not a ‘thing or object’, but an ‘activity or productivity’ (Du Plooy 1990:6).
without recourse to a particular method of exegesis. In this respect the use of Scripture in the Qumran rules may represent the closest parallels to Paul's letters. The rules demonstrate an eclectic use of Scripture, including quotation, allusion and paraphrase in the context of pastoral exhortation (Noll 1993:779-780).

In a very general way, intertextual relationships have already been referred to, not only the way in which an early text is fitted into a later text, but also the way in which Paul succeeded in relating different older texts to one another—which on surface level seem to have no connection to one another. In this section the relationship of texts with one another will be briefly discussed according to a relatively new literary theory, intertextuality.

After his complaints about the inability of modern biblical scholarship to account for the quotations of Scripture in Paul, and their unwillingness to use intertextuality as a way of investigating 'how texts relate to their subtexts', Moyise (1994:138) subsequently proposes to use intertextuality to explain Pauline quotations. Moyise concludes that intertextuality has at least two significant ramifications: one, it relativises the statement that Paul quotes the Scriptures of Israel out of context, as all quotations necessarily are out of context, or relocated; and two, finding quotations or allusions in Paul's writings complicates exegesis thereof, because 'the clues that enable interpretation to take place are coming from two separate sources'. It eventually boils down to the emphasis on the importance of the 'new context' in which the quotations are used.

Intertextuality is not 'characteristic of some texts as opposed to others', as all texts exist as mosaics of conscious and unconscious citations of earlier dis-

111 Although perhaps without employing Intertextuality per se, there are some earlier voices, intent on investigating this very matter, e.g. Martin (1981:4): '...for Paul as for the gospel writers their credal and confessional materials had a pre-history in the tradition of the church before them, and their use of such existing forms was not simply one of borrowing and use. They entered into active dialogue and debate with these statements, sometimes by a correction of them', and Wright (1980:22): '(t)he quotation from Genesis 15:6 in Galatians 3:6 is not an arbitrary proof-text or a subtle Rabbinic ploy: the whole chapter deals with the question as to who Abraham's children really are.'

112 Or alternatively, all quotations are necessarily 'in context', as all texts are related to one another within a mesh of interrelatedness.

113 'Now since context is essential for meaning, there is in fact no possibility that a quotation can bear the same meaning in a new composition as it did in the old' (Moyise 1994:138). For the role of 'context' in interpretation, many sources can be quoted. For some Southern African voices, cf Hunter 1991 for a strong opposition to the relevance or even need of context in interpreting texts for fear of obscuring interpretation; Loubser 1986; Botha 1994; Vorster 1994 for emphasis on the value of context in interpretation—'context' is not understood in the same way by all. Elsewhere Botha (1992:191-193) also argues for holding on to context ('the interpretive community') in terms of an 'ethics of interpretation' approach.
course (Boyarin 1990:12, 14). It is possible, however, to distinguish various levels on which authors used intertextuality in the producing—not creating!—of their texts. Concerning the reading of the New Testament authors and Paul respectively, Moyise (1994:138–141) and Hays (1989:178) refer to Greene’s (1982) four categories of describing the ‘relation between a poet’s work and its predecessors’, the imitation of the text:114

1 ‘Reproductive’ or ‘sacramental’: ‘It is when a poet imitates a previous work with such precision that it is virtually a copy...and the original is treated as a sacred object...’ Moyise finds no evidence of this among the New Testament authors; equally, for Hays (1989:174) ‘no-one’ would read Paul’s letters in such a way.

2 ‘Eclectic’ (or ‘exploitive’, cf Hays 1989:173): ‘...where the author draws on a wide range of sources, seemingly at random, without laying special emphasis on any one of them.’ In a weak sense, this relationship of text and quotations is equal to plagiarism, but Moyise argues that it can also be seen as ‘a vocabulary of a second and higher power, a second keyboard of richer harmonies’—it is often called ‘proofo texting’. Examples in Paul’s letters would include the use of Ps 19:4 in Rm 10:18, or ‘threshing ox’ in 1 Cor 9:8. This use of precursor texts would have some rhetorical force in the discourse: asserting by appealing to Scripture. To have this as Paul’s predominant reading pattern, however, would devalue Paul’s hermeneutic (Hays 1989:175).

3 ‘Heuristic’: ‘...where a new work seeks to define itself through the rewriting or modernising of a past text’. The new text does not imitate, but succeeds the old text, by creating—simultaneously—a chasm between text and quotation and the bridge—rite de passage—between past and present. ‘Heuristic imitation’ is found in ‘discursive passages where the author argues for a particular interpretation of Scripture.’ A good example is the use of Gen 15:6 and Ps 32:1–2 in Rm 4.115 Hays (1989:176) disagrees with the idea that Paul’s letters116 could be read in this—traditional—way, as it

114 A writer-oriented notion of intertextuality, cf Van Zyl 1994:352–353. Green (1993:58–63) castigates Hays for using a ‘minimalist notion of intertextuality’ (:59), avoiding the ‘larger purpose’ of intertextuality, viz ‘the fluidity of meaning’ (:63); saying Hays’ book (Echoes of Scripture) ‘cannot but display the thoroughgoing extent to which intertextuality really is the reader’s work, not the writer’s’ (:61); and so accuses Hays of letting ‘method doing the text’s work for it’, because Hays structures and places the texts in such a way as to illustrate what the method aims to show (:63).  
115 Jas 2:23f shows that another interpretation of Gen 15:6 is possible (Moyise 1994:140).  
116 Except for Galatians, although Hays (1989:176) contends that Paul is even in that situation uncomfortable with this approach (3:21, 5:6, 6:15).
would assume that Paul’s reading supercedes Scripture, consigning it to an old relic from the past, based on the distance created in such an understanding: the ‘Old Testament’ is not in an antithetical relationship to the ‘New Testament’.

4 ‘Dialectical imitation’:117 ‘...when the poem engages the precursor in such a way that neither is able to absorb or master the other’. Hays (1989:176-177) finds this approach the best way to describe Pauline intertextual reading of Scripture, viewing it not as a ‘foil’, ‘primitive stage of religious development’, or ‘shadow of things to come’.118

Finally, Moyise celebrates the ‘anachronism’ which is the result of ‘a kind of struggle between texts and eras which cannot easily be resolved’, an anachronism which now ‘becomes a dynamic source of artistic power’.

In describing and explaining the use of quotations in the New Testament writers, the advantages of intertextuality are apparent and also significant. In the first place, intertextuality shifts the discussion from whether a text was quoted properly or not, to the ‘far more productive’ question of how the New Testament authors used the quoted text. It thus enables the understanding of ‘how texts influence readers and readers influence texts’. Where the earlier approaches to the use of quotations faltered on the realisation that quotations in the New Testament are used differently from their ‘original meaning’, with the accompanying attempts to justify or abhor this different meaning attributed to the quoted text, intertextuality assumes the different meaning of a quotation in its new setting, on the basis of the quoted text being ‘relocated’ (Moyise 1994:141).119

117 Cf also Bakhtin who stresses the ‘dialogical’ nature of intertextuality. This is not a dialogue between author and text, but a ‘polyphonic discourse in and around the text in which non-linguistic texts can cooperate towards meaning’ (Du Plooy 1990:4, 7). Nielsen (1990:91-92) also stresses the aspect of dialogue, between older and younger texts, insisting that this dialogue is not exhausted in either the author’s deliberate or the reader’s free choice of intertextuality.

118 Hays (1989:176-177) reminds readers that Greene’s categories of ‘heuristic’ and ‘dialectical’ both imply ‘friction’ between pretext (subtext) and text (surface text), but the former seeks to overcome it by diachronical means, whereas the latter allows the tension to remain, achieving ‘a fuller contemporaneity with the past’.

119 When an author uses the text of a predecessor, the used text ‘acquires a different identity. Worton & Still (1990:11) argue that ‘(i)nevitably a fragment and displacement, every quotation distorts and redefines the ‘primary’ utterance by relocating it within another linguistic and cultural context’. The quotation fights back when it is repositioned in its new location, by reminding ‘the reader that it once belonged to a different context’ (Moyise 1994:138). In the words of Worton & Still (1990:11) ‘the quotation itself generates a tension between belief in both the original and originating integrity and in the possibility of (re)integration and an awareness of infinite deferral an dissemination of meaning. Quotation as fragmentation does indeed generate centrifugality in reading, but it also generates centripetality, focussing on the reader’s attention on textual functioning rather than hermeneutics.’
Hays (1989:177) argues that Paul's allusive manner of referring to Scripture, creates room for Scripture 'to answer back'. Paul's lack of running commentary on allusions to Scripture, allows it to challenge readers as it stands, for example Rm 11:26 'all Israel will be saved'. Similarly, Moyise (1994:142) argues that 'the reader is asked to listen to a number of voices, which are themselves interacting with one another'. Although unable to explain exactly how it happens, 'one might suggest that this is precisely how texts “get under our skin”—and become part of us. Just as we find ourselves humming tunes (even the ones we do not like!), so the Scriptures can become alive for us with songs new and old'. The juxtapositioning of texts create in their mutual interaction both 'a puzzle to ponder' and 'a dynamic source of artistic power'.

Moyise (1994:142-143) argues that for all the positive aspects to intertextuality as resource in the study of quotations in the New Testament authors, there are certain limitations as well. These limitations can be summarised under the heading of 'historical questions', which such an approach cannot resolve. For historical matter, another method should be looked for.

So: 'The practice of intertextual interpretation is an attempt to struggle against both complicity and exclusion—perhaps something, some shifting of barriers, can thus be achieved even if, in general, none of our thinking can escape constructing identity against differences' (Worton & Still 1990:33).

4 CONCLUSION

Thus, the ancient text were never dead letters. Always pregnant with meaning, the Scriptures served as a powerful force to legitimize the proclamation of the early church and to secure the gospel in the history of Israel (Roetz 1982:17).

Paul's hermeneutics have been applauded by some and rejected and scorned by others. Whether Pauline hermeneutics is renounced or acclaimed, it cannot be denied that Paul's appropriation of Scripture does not accord with modern—at least not academic—hermeneutical practice in many, if not all, respects. Indeed, as Dunn (1993b:122) states it, Paul's interpretations 'raise the question as to how valid was Paul's use of scripture, and whether he treated it simply as a wax nose, to be shaped to his own ends.'

Sometimes Paul's use of Scripture is defended with reference to 'ancient interpretive traditions'. It is then claimed that in an oral culture, like Paul's, the listeners of Paul would have been able to 'fill the logical gaps' which probably only exist for modern readers. (Silva 1993:640).

---

120 Two other directly related issues had to be omitted because space does not allow its discussion here: the motivation for Pauline interpretation which can be described as contextuality, as well as the ecclesiocentric aim Paul had with his reading.
Paul’s interpretive practice is also often defended by reference to rabbinic interpretations, which range between ‘literal’ and ‘playful’\(^\text{121}\) exegesis. Especially the often ‘fanciful’ nature of the rabbinic use of Scripture—to which Paul would have been exposed to a certain extent—is cited as common practice. Less contentious, it is sometimes argued that rabbinic interpretation was greatly compacted or ‘compressed’, where ‘...two or three words might call to mind a whole passage of Scripture, plus other parallel passages, plus a tradition that linked those passages with the point being made.’ Modern failure to recognise this practice in the letters of Paul, it is argued, is exactly that: ignorance of early interpretive practice (Silva 1993:640).

Pauline interpretation of Scripture was, for all its so-called inconsistency and incongruity, never ‘arbitrary and undisciplined’ as was indeed the case with other forms of early—and even medieval—interpretation; as Steinmetz (1980:30) argues, unconcern with the ‘literal’ interpretation did not give ‘free reign to the imagination of the exegete’. On the contrary, ‘(t)he literal sense of Scripture is basic to the spiritual and limits the range of possible allegorical meanings in those instances in which the literal meaning of a particular passage is absurd, undercuts the living relationship of the church to the Old Testament, or is spiritually barren.’

The need to understand Pauline hermeneutics and exegesis within the socio-cultural framework of the first century, is not worthless for explaining the ‘how’ of Pauline practice, as Hays (1989:9) seems to suggest. Keeping that background in mind might have kept Hays from describing Paul’s reading of Scripture as an individualistic and eccentric effort. Paul’s interpretive strategy apparently would not have been conspicuous, as the creative and ‘productive’ reading and interpretation of tradition was a well established and common tendency. This freedom in dealing with the oral and/or written tradition demonstrated by Paul was very much in keeping with contemporary norms, albeit perhaps due to different reasons.\(^\text{122}\)

Even more critically, before any attempts are made to reappropriate Pauline hermeneutics, one should carefully, and within Paul’s situation, evaluate his practices in comparison to contemporary practices. One should also devote much more time and study to the use of Scripture in particular

---

\(^{121}\) Cf Hays’ argument against the defense of Pauline hermeneutics as midrash and therefore ‘free and playful interpretation’ (1989:13).

\(^{122}\) Tradition should not exclusively be understood to mean ‘written’ tradition. The oral tradition existed alongside the written one. This again does not imply that the one was more significant than the other, or that the existence of one implies the absence of the other. Cf also Dunn (1990:43) who, with reference to the question of ‘literary dependence between Matthew and Mark’ calls the ‘presumption’ of mutual exclusion between written and oral tradition ‘a ridiculous idea’.
Pauline documents, as suggested by Von Lips (1991:49) and practiced for example by Young & Ford (1987) on 2 Corinthians.

Given the need and even necessity to explain and thereby account for Paul's interpretation of Scripture, one should however be careful of forsaking the possible use of Pauline practice for guiding contemporary exegesis, and thus consigning Paul's endeavours with Scripture to 'ancient history', never to be repeated again. The other option, however, is not simply to accept Pauline hermeneutical practice uncritically, on face-value and argue for reinstating Pauline hermeneutics as norm. Pauline hermeneutics is not to be merely reassigned a new lease of life, because interpretive theory and practice do change, hopefully also at times for the best and even more importantly, because the uncritical taking over of Paul's practices would exactly be running contrary to Pauline hermeneutics.

It can be argued that, based on Paul's use of Scripture and in light of first-century interpretive practices—and the current notions of intertextuality—the Bible should for Christians today be rather the 'prototype' than the 'archetype'? Or to rephrase this: the Bible should perhaps not function so much as 'source' but rather as 'resource'.
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