

Use of the OT in the NT (Exegese und Verkündigung: 14-30)

1. The older synoptic tradition makes only sparse use of the OT (e.g., Mark 6:34, 8:18, 7:16).

2. These citations have a christological meaning: God's compassion and Jesus' compassion correspond to one another; the enemies of Jesus have always been God's enemies.

3. Significantly, the question about Elijah in Mark 9:12 is also christological. But John the Baptist is interpreted as Elijah on the basis of who Jesus is believed to be. As a forerunner designated as such on the basis of Jesus, the Baptist qualifies Jesus as the Christ. Thus the Baptist is used as an exegesis of Jesus, which serves to place his coming on the side of God.

4. Similarly, other use of the OT has the function of interpreting the Jesus-occurrence and Jesus himself as eschatological occurrence. So, too, in the case of the passion narrative and the cross. The OT citations (e.g., from Isa. 53) that one finds here are not originally proofs from scripture. The servant of God is in no way the "text" that would be interpreted by the Jesus-occurrence, nor is the Jesus-occurrence the fulfilment of a prediction (although this is the case later in Luke). But to begin with, one had no need of this "text":  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  suffices as an assertion. I.e., what is interpreted is the cross; in the proclamation one avails oneself of the OT as the language of interpretation. In this way, the cross is qualified as eschatological occurrence and can be preached as such. One could say that the fact that the OT is used as an interpretation of the cross is the Easter proclamation of the crucified one.

5. <sup>Paul</sup>~~Paul~~'s exegesis in 2 Cor. 3:7-18 makes clear the direction  
^

of his exegesis: the OT is not at all the "text" that is interpreted. On the contrary, the exegesis begins with Christ and picks up the OT saying that is, as it were, merely the material. Christ is interpreted through and with the help of this OT saying, which itself is now repeated and thus becomes proclamation.

6. Later, in Matthew, the use of the OT is carried further and becomes proof from scripture. Although Matthew, too, finds his OT evidences by recourse to the OT, seeking sayings there that can be understood as predictions, the OT is not used by him (at least not primarily or exclusively) in the service of a christological or eschatological assertion, but has itself now become the text. This text, however, is now interpreted by the NT occurrence. Hence the importance of exact correspondences. The OT passages are not understood on the basis of the NT, but conversely--and so occasionally Matthew's source is corrected according to the OT saying, most clearly, perhaps, in 4:13: Jesus does not appear in Galilee (as in the Markan parallel) but (following Isa. 9:1 f.) the site is expanded to Zebulun and Naphtali.

\* \* \* \* \*

One must distinguish between using tradition to affirm what one is already convinced needs to be affirmed and interpreting tradition in order to determine what needs to be affirmed in the first place. Properly speaking, exegesis has to do with the second kind of operation, not with the first.