

Introduction

Psalm 80 tells the story of Israel as a vine planted by God in the land, flourishing to enormous proportions, but then destroyed by wild beasts. The psalmist calls on God to care for the vine and to place God's hand on "the man of your right hand, the son of man you strengthened for yourself" (v. 18). Throughout the psalm, one encounters features that are ripe for eschatological appropriation: the cosmic dimensions of the vine; an appeal for restoration to the golden age of a unified nation; the use of the terms "stalk," "son," "man of your right hand," and "son of man," which could refer to the Davidic king; and a call for God to revive the nation. It is not surprising then that some have proposed that Psalm 80 may be in play in such passages as Mark 14:62 and John 15:1-8. These suggestions are typically made without considering the ancient interpretation of Psalm 80, which might give context and added significance to its use in such passages.

In the last thirty years, however, scholars have begun to recognize that much can be gained by paying close attention to the ways various authors interpreted the same passage differently in separate times and places, taking advantage of the full range of meaning allowed by the text and often interpreting similar texts together to make new meaning. Are there indications that Second Temple interpreters appropriated Psalm 80? Are there New Testament (hereafter NT) passages that can be shown to allude to Psalm 80? If we answer affirmatively, did the authors interpret the psalm consistently or find a variety of meanings in the text?

This study will investigate Psalm 80 as it is interpreted by authors from the time of its writing, throughout Second Temple Judaism, and in the NT, paying special attention to the way the text has been understood eschatologically. The thesis of the study is (a) that Jewish and Christian interpreters found material in Psalm 80 pertaining to events at the end of the age, a time that some interpreters believed had already come upon them and their communities; and (b) that the meaning derived from Psalm 80 most often comes from the images of the vine (vv. 9-17) and the potentially messianic man (vv. 16b, 18), which because of the ambiguity of the text are open to a wide variety of interpretations.

One would think that scholars would already have investigated the history of ancient interpretation of a passage so fraught with eschatological potential. Nonetheless, no study to date has systematically approached the text from this perspective. This is no doubt due to two major factors: Psalm 80 is not quoted in

the NT, and it is not used extensively at Qumran, which are two of the frequent stimuli for such investigations. These factors do not mean the study is not worth undertaking, but they do result in an increased focus on allusion rather than quotation and on other Jewish texts outside of Qumran.

Three terms that are significant for this study require definition. First, by *allusion* I mean any indirect reference to an older text that is not a word for word quotation. I will use “parent text,” “source text,” and “intertext” interchangeably to indicate the text to which an allusion refers. Second, by *eschatology* I mean a wide variety of expectations including return from exile, a restored Davidic monarchy, a reunited nation, rebuilding of Jerusalem or the temple, coming of messianic figures, manifestation of the kingdom of God, judgment of national enemies and the wicked, resurrection from the dead, and new creation.¹ By extension, I use *eschatological interpretation* to indicate a reading that understands a text to refer to one or more of these events, especially when this does not appear to be the original meaning of the text. Many times the interpreter believes himself to be living in the last days and thus interprets the text as referring to contemporary events or events in the near future.

Finally, by *Messiah* I mean any one of several “figures who play an important role in the future hope of the people,”² and whose appearance is associated with other eschatological elements. This figure could be an ideal king, priest, prophet, or heavenly redeemer,³ though in this study it will often be a king. By extension, I use *messianic interpretation* to indicate a reading that understands a text to refer to one or more of these figures, especially when this does not appear to be the original meaning of the text. In treating NT texts, I use the phrase to mean any interpretation of a text as referring to Jesus, which is interchangeable with *christological interpretation*.

REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP

In reviewing previous work on this topic, I will not cover works that simply mention the possible use of Psalm 80 in a text or that give only a few sentences to describing its use. For these references I direct the reader to the notes in each chapter. Instead, I will focus on those few pieces of scholarship that contribute more substance to the discussion, although one will notice that none of them is

1. George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Eschatology (Early Jewish),” in David Noel Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 2:592.

2. John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiah of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 12.

3. *Ibid.*

able to view the history of interpretation of Psalm 80 with the same broad scope that is used in this study. Some of the following chapters will also include brief scholarship reviews on topics specific to those chapters.

It was the work of C. H. Dodd that set me on the path to investigating the interpretation of Psalm 80 more fully. In his influential *According to the Scriptures*, Dodd proposes that Psalm 80 was one of the *testimonia* passages that laid the foundation for the NT writers' theology. This proposal has had considerable impact, though not as much as his proposals on passages actually quoted in the NT. Focusing on the connection between the vine and the son of man (vv. 15–18), he argues that this lack of NT quotation does not necessarily mean it had no role to play in the formation of NT theology: "There is here no passage expressly quoted in the New Testament, but the figure of the Vine, which is also the Son of Man and the Man of God's right hand, combines ideas which in the New Testament are so organically united in the person of Christ that it is impossible to suppose the parallel accidental."⁴

He argues that it is clear from the psalm itself that the figure referred to as "son of man" is simply one way the psalmist describes the people of God. Allowing that the son of man/God's right-hand man may be a representative individual, he states, "It might be held that the Man is the leader of God's people who are symbolized by the vine, but if so, he is so entirely representative of the people that the two figures coalesce."⁵ In the Gospels, however, the individual and corporate are placed on more of an equal footing and, aside from Daniel 7, Psalm 80 is perhaps the clearest source of Christian melding of the corporate and individual in Jesus.⁶

Along with Psalm 8 and Daniel 7, Dodd declares boldly that Psalm 80 "can be *proved* to have been employed for testimonies."⁷ The proof to which he refers is unclear since most scholars would not agree that his evidence rises to such a level. When speaking of the source of the Johannine Son of Man concept in *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, he goes so far as to say that "if we single out any one passage in the Old Testament which might be regarded as the scriptural basis for the Johannine idea of the Son of Man, Ps. lxxix (lxxx) would take precedence of Dan. vii."⁸ Since Dodd's treatment of Psalm 80 in these two major works are part of much larger projects, he does not go into as much detail

4. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 101.

5. *Ibid.*, 101n.1.

6. *Ibid.*, 102. "The New Testament use of the title 'Son of Man' for Christ results from the individuation of this corporate conception," 118.

7. *Ibid.*, 117, italics original.

on the passage as one would have hoped. Nonetheless, such strong statements as these from so influential a figure in NT studies had an understandable impact on the work of later scholars, which we will consider next.

Anthony Gelston tries to solve the riddle of how the Son of Man became linked with the Messiah, a link made clear in such passages as Mark 8:29–31 and 14:61–62. He believes that Psalm 80 may provide the “missing link” between the two concepts, so he considers the psalm in its historical context by interpreting the three images of the vine, the stock/branch, and the man of God’s right hand, then by determining a *Sitz im Leben* for the psalm.⁹ First, according to Gelston, the vine is “introduced as an image which is already familiar” from such passages as Hos 10:1; Isa 5:1–7; Jer 2:21 and 12:10–13; and Ezek 17:1–10 and 19:10–14. He concludes, however, that because there is no verbal parallel between Psalm 80 and these passages they probably represent “two independent developments on the same lines, the one occasioned by the fall of Samaria, the other by that of Jerusalem.”¹⁰

Second, due to questions about the meaning of כִּנְוָה (v. 16a), Gelston thinks it unwise to place any interpretive load on the stock/branch connection to the son of man, though he does point out that the Targum reads the passage messianically, interpreting כִּנְוָה (v. 16b) as “King Messiah.”¹¹ Third, Gelston believes “the man of your right hand,” which is parallel with son of man (v. 18), probably refers to the king since there are parallels in Pss 110:1; 20:6; and 146:3. In addition, Gelston considers briefly whether the son of man in Psalm 80 might mirror the son of man in Daniel 7 as a collective symbol for Israel, but he considers such a connection unlikely for two reasons: (1) Daniel is removed from Psalm 80 by at least five centuries; (2) Daniel 7 clearly identifies the beasts and the one like a son of man as allegorical ciphers, while Psalm 80 leaves them at the level of uninterpreted metaphor, not even clearly identifying the son of man with the certainly collective vine.¹²

Finally, owing to the references to Joseph, Ephraim, Manasseh, and other characteristics that are usually identified with the Northern Kingdom, such as the use of the name Yahweh Sabaoth and references to God sitting on the cherubim common to Shiloh, Gelston concludes that the devastation of the vine

8. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 245.

9. Anthony Gelston, “A Sidelight on the Son of Man,” *SJT* 22 (1969): 191.

10. *Ibid.*, 193.

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.*, 194–95. He does, however, acknowledge that the son of man is somewhat parallel to the collective vine in LXX of v. 16 but dismisses it as an assimilation to v. 18.

probably refers to the fall of Samaria in 721.¹³ Thus, “we may be fairly confident that we have in Ps. 80 a text originating from the north not much later than the closing decades of the eighth century, in which God is asked to come to the help and rescue of His people, in particular by strengthening the king, the ‘son of man.’”¹⁴ Gelston concludes that, though “son of man” usually just means “man,” its use in Psalm 80 as a reference to the king leaves open messianic interpretations that influenced later Jewish authors and Jesus himself to interpret Dan 7:13 messianically. In addition, Jesus’ use of the vine imagery may suggest that the psalm had a more direct influence on his thinking. Ultimately, Gelston admits that the lack of direct quotation in the NT only warrants calling Psalm 80 a “sidelight” on the Son of Man debate, but he believes it cannot be ignored as part of the background.¹⁵

In a brief article from 1973, David Hill pushes the significance of Psalm 80 a few steps beyond Gelston by arguing that “what Ps. xxx [sic] says of the king may itself contain, or could have been interpreted justifiably as containing messianic overtones, apart altogether from the explicit targumic identification of the ‘son.’”¹⁶ Thus, Hill finds messianic significance in Psalm 80 itself, not simply in an interpretation that postdates the psalm by at least seven centuries. He garners two major pieces of evidence, both having to do with parallels between Psalms 80 and 89.

First, Ps 80:18 refers to the king as “the son of man whom you made strong for yourself,” which is very similar to the way the same verb is used in Ps 89:22 when speaking of David and his descendant: “My arm also will strengthen him.”¹⁷ In Psalm 89 the strengthening probably refers to establishing David’s royal authority and his father-son relationship with God, two ideas that Hill suggests underlie the psalmist’s use of the verb in Psalm 80 as well. He concludes that the verbal similarity would indicate to the “observant interpreter” that the strengthened son of man possesses “messianic overtones which belong to the promise in the oracle of Nathan, as adapted in Ps. lxxxix.”¹⁸

The connections between the two psalms, however, do not stop there. Next, he points out that both psalms contrast “the glorious past and the calamitous present,”¹⁹ Psalm 80 by presenting the once flourishing vine now

13. *Ibid.*, 195–96.

14. *Ibid.*, 196.

15. *Ibid.*

16. David Hill, “‘Son of Man’ in Psalm 80 v. 17,” *NovT* 15 (1973): 265.

17. *Ibid.*

18. *Ibid.*, 266.

19. *Ibid.*

trampled and devastated, and Psalm 89 by lamenting the once triumphant Davidic line now “cast off and rejected” (v. 39). This parallel theme of reversal in fortune is solidified in a number of striking verbal similarities such as the sea and rivers in 80:12 and 89:26, the breaking down of walls and plundering in 80:13 and 89:41–42, and the scorn of neighbors and enemies in 80:7 and 89:42–43, similarities which he does not attribute to direct literary dependence between the two psalms but instead to common expressions used in lament situations.²⁰ He concludes that the son of man in Psalm 80 “was open to interpretation in terms of the promise to David, in an expansion of *the* messianic oracle, that ‘Yahweh will strengthen him.’”²¹ Ultimately, Hill only hints at the possibility that Psalm 80 was a source for messianic interpretations for Daniel 7, an issue about which much more can and will be said.²²

O. J. F. Seitz posits Psalm 80 as the connection between Psalm 110 and Daniel 7 in Mark 14:62, though it has left only a trace in the tradition as it is represented in the text of the passage. The usual explanation that Psalm 110 and Daniel 7 have been joined simply because they both contain messianic figures is possible, but in Seitz’s view it is hasty to draw such a conclusion without first asking, “Why and by what manner of reasoning was a biblical testimony concerning ‘one like a son of man’ who comes with the clouds of heaven ever joined to a second text of scripture which is entirely devoid of any such reference to a ‘son of man’? How did these two come to be linked?” Especially when one considers the doubt about whether Daniel 7 was actually used messianically in pre-Christian Judaism, the connection of the two passages without a third linking passage is based on “an all too facile short-cut.”²³

It is plausible that Psalms 80 and 110 were connected using the rabbinic interpretive technique *gezerah shawah*, by which two passages with a common word or phrase are used to illuminate each other, often resulting in a total transfer of meaning between the texts.²⁴ Such a connection would start with Psalms 80 and 110 being linked by reference to a man sitting at God’s right hand; Psalm 110 could be seen as a fulfillment of the plea of Ps 80:18 for God’s hand to be on the man of the right hand. Here Seitz understands the man of God’s right hand and the parallel son of man to be a reference to the collective

20. *Ibid.*, 267.

21. *Ibid.*, 268.

22. *Ibid.*, 269.

23. O. J. F. Seitz, “The Future Coming of the Son of Man: Three Midrashic Formulations in the Gospel of Mark,” in E. A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Evangelica, vol. VI* (Berlin: Akademie, 1973), 480.

24. *Ibid.*, 481–82.

people of Israel and the enthronement to be the people's triumph over their enemies.²⁵

Next, Daniel 7 was interpreted in light of Psalm 80 especially with regard to the son of man being described as a symbol for the people of God in Dan 7:17–27. Thus, Psalm 110 and Daniel 7, though not having a direct connection, are linked by way of Psalm 80, which has verbal and thematic connections to both.²⁶ As far as how the saying of Mark 14:62 came into being, Seitz believes that “the primary source of the reference to the ‘son of man’ was undoubtedly Ps. 80, 17, rather than Dan. 7, 13” because he is described as sitting at the right hand.²⁷ After the primitive saying, “You will see the son of man sitting at the right hand of power,” circulated independently for a period, a reference to Daniel 7 was added in the phrase, “coming with the clouds.” Henceforth, with the rising popularity of the apocalyptic portrayal of the son of man in Daniel 7, it was recognized as the major referent for this Son of Man saying, and the recognition of Psalm 80 as a source faded. Obviously, by the time the Markan tradition was solidified, the figures of Psalm 110 and Daniel 7 were being interpreted as an individual Messiah and the corporate interpretation had dropped out completely.²⁸

Brian McNeil's contribution to our question comes from a very short article that addresses only a small text critical issue in Psalm 80. He concedes that the first mention of the son (v. 16) is likely not original and is probably due to scribal *parablepsis* when the scribe looked away from the text after the **ימינך** of v. 16a and his eye picked back up after the **ימינך** of v. 18a, inadvertently copying v. 18b as v. 16b. This solution based on the similarity between the two verses does not, however, solve the problem, since v. 16 reads simply **בן** while v. 18 reads **בן-אדם** and the LXX and Syriac versions contain “son of man” in both verses. Thus, McNeil proposes a two-stage process by which the current state of the text came about: first, v. 16b was added by *parablepsis* with the reading **על-בן-אדם אמצתה**, and then at a later date **אדם** was deleted either through carelessness or intentional editing.²⁹

The major outcome of this two-stage theory is that the meturgeman behind the Psalms Targum may have been reading **בן-אדם** when he wrote **מלכא משיחא** (“King Messiah”) at the end of v. 16, a clearly messianic rendering. Of course, McNeil acknowledges the difficulty of dating Targumic

25. *Ibid.*, 484.

26. *Ibid.*

27. *Ibid.*, 485.

28. *Ibid.*, 486–87.

29. Brian McNeil, “The Son of Man and the Messiah: A Footnote,” *NTS* 26 (1979/80): 419–20.

material to the era predating Christianity, so he does not make a strong case. He does, however, submit his theory as at least worthy of a footnote to counter the theory that “son of man” is only a circumlocution for “I.”³⁰

Robert Rowe’s contribution takes the form of one article,³¹ focusing on the one like a son of man in Daniel, and one book³² about kingship concepts in the Psalms as a background for the Christology of Mark. In his article, which predates his book by twenty years, Rowe begins with a general description of kingship imagery in the Psalms, focusing on the human king as representative of Yahweh’s kingship and as representative of mankind, standing in for the primordial man and sometimes undergoing suffering in the rituals of ancient Israel.

As supporting evidence that the king stood in as a representative man, Rowe concentrates on Ps 80:18 with its appeal for God’s hand to be on the right-hand man, also called “the son of man whom you have strengthened for yourself.” Though he considers other interpretations of this verse, Rowe concludes that the man and the son of man refer to the king, “who represented Israel as its leader and whose interests could be identified with it.”³³ In support of this belief, he points to similarities between Psalms 80 and 89 similar to Hill above, such as the use of אֲמִצַּת in Psalm 89 with reference to the king, not to mention the “right hand” connection to Psalm 110 referring to the king as well.³⁴ He sums up his conclusions about Psalm 80 in five points:

- (i) The king is called *ben ’adam*; (ii) he is so closely associated with Israel that, as we have seen it is hard to detect when the psalmist moves from speaking of Israel in general as “the vine,” to the king in particular as their representative; (iii) as *ben ’adam*, he is associated with his people in their tribulation (vv.5f.), before his exaltation by Yahweh becomes for them the means of “life” (v.18); (iv) he is called *ben ’adam* in the context of Yahweh’s kingship (v.1); (v) the connection with Psalm 110:1 implies his enthronement at the right hand of Yahweh, associated with his role as *ben ’adam*.³⁵

30. Ibid., 420–21.

31. Robert D. Rowe, “Is Daniel’s ‘Son of Man’ Messianic?” in Harold H. Rowdon, ed., *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie* (Leicester, UK: Inter-Varsity Press, 1982), 71–96.

32. Robert D. Rowe, *God’s Kingdom and God’s Son: The Background to Mark’s Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms*, AGJU 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

33. Rowe, “Daniel’s ‘Son of Man,’” 81.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid., 82.

As Rowe moves on to Daniel 7 to determine whether the one like a son of man there is messianic, he makes use of his findings from Psalm 80 to argue that the Danielic son of man is indeed messianic. In the first place, in responding to the argument that the son of man cannot be the Messiah because the Old Testament (hereafter OT) and Second Temple Judaism contain no traces of a suffering Messiah and the son of man is identified with the suffering “saints of the Most High,” he suggests that the idea of a suffering Messiah came from the Psalms because they portray the Davidic king suffering and the king is called son of man in Psalm 80 where he is identified with Israel in tribulation.³⁶

Second, he appeals to Psalm 80 combined with Psalm 110 as support for drawing parallels between Daniel 7 and coronation language in the Psalms, saying that kingship being given to the son of man indicates that he is the Messiah. Rowe is not ignorant of the fact that many believe the plural “thrones” are set for the heavenly counsel rather than for a coronation of the son of man; he simply observes that “nowhere is the heavenly host represented as seated beside God, though this is the position of the Davidic king in Psalm 110:1.”³⁷ Finally, he appeals to Psalm 80 as an example of a very close link between king and people that still preserves the individuality of the king, as does Daniel 7. He concludes that “since the ‘one like a son of man’ and the ‘saints of the Most High’ are both said to receive the kingship, the most natural conclusion is that the individual figure receives the kingship on behalf of his people, especially when other features of his situation (his receipt of the kingship in the manner of a Davidic king, and his title of ‘son of man’) suggest Messiahship.”³⁸

Rowe’s book, on the other hand, moves the significance of his research further down the timeline as he considers the impact of kingship language from Psalms and Isaiah on the Christology of Mark. Thus, he is not so much concerned with “the background and influence of Psalm 80 in its Old Testament context”³⁹ as he is with the way Jesus used common themes from it, other psalms, Isaiah, and Daniel 7. In his chapter on the use of Psalm 110 in Mark, he addresses Psalm 80 as a possible link between Psalm 110 and Daniel 7 in Mark 14:62, appealing to the work of Dodd and Seitz described above. The links occur mostly from the presence of numerous important keywords that show up in Psalm 80, such as “son,” “strengthened,” and “right hand,” all with messianic significance. “Son” links Psalm 80 with Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14; and Ps 89:27-28; “strengthened” with Ps 89:22; and “right hand” with Pss 110:1 and

36. *Ibid.*, 93–94.

37. *Ibid.*, 95.

38. *Ibid.*, 95–96.

39. Rowe, *God’s Kingdom*, 291.

118:15–16. Of course, the presence of the son of man in Ps 80:18 completes the web by connecting the whole matrix, or at the very least Psalm 110, to Daniel 7.⁴⁰

Each of these authors makes a contribution to the interpretive history of Psalm 80, treating it from one or two of the relevant angles, but none of the work reviewed above has attempted to provide a full analysis of the eschatological interpretation of this psalm. Previous research has not investigated the effect of Psalm 80's placement in the Psalter; its use in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and rabbinic literature; nor its appropriation in several NT passages. In addition, a much fuller treatment of the psalm is needed in its original context, in the LXX, as a source for the vision in Daniel 7, and as a source for some of the NT passages already treated in the literature. Furthermore, it would be helpful to have a comparison of the various interpretations of Psalm 80.

METHOD

Simply put, this study is an examination of the texts that allude to Psalm 80 from the time of its writing through Second Temple Judaism and the NT, a description and analysis of how it is interpreted, and a comparison of those interpretations. Such a project is best described as comparative midrash, which James Sanders defines as “the exercise by which one can probe the depths of intertextuality and its significance for scriptural and other Jewish literature.”⁴¹ “Midrash” is defined in such studies as a literary function rather than a form (e.g., rabbinic midrash), “the function of searching Scripture to seek light on new problems.”⁴² After treating the featured passage in its original context, “one then traces the *Nachleben* or pilgrimage of that passage throughout early Jewish literature, within the Tanak, through the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, Josephus, and the Second Testament—attempting always to determine the receptor hermeneutics used by the various tradents all along the path.”⁴³ Focusing on the variety of interpretations produced, Sanders continues,

One might think of a roundtable with the cited or echoed passage from the Tanak in the middle, and all the tradents who used it in

40. *Ibid.*, 291–92.

41. James A. Sanders, “Canon as Dialogue,” in Peter W. Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 20–21.

42. *Ibid.*, 20.

43. *Ibid.*, 21.

Early Jewish literature, down through the New Testament, seated around the table in imaginary dialogue about the significance of the Scripture traced, even debating which hermeneutics were appropriate in what circumstances in reapplying the passage along its pilgrimage. One might even grant the “original” meaning(s) of the Old Testament passage a place of some prominence at the dialogue table, but only limited prominence, for, after all, those earliest meanings are those assigned to the passage by modern, critical scholarship. And that meaning usually differs according to modern school of thought or *Zeitgeist*.⁴⁴

Two model works that employ this method in an exemplary way are Craig Evans’s dissertation on the interpretation of Isa 6:9–10⁴⁵ and the recent book by Sam Janse on Psalm 2.⁴⁶

Such a study is necessarily eclectic because it treats the interpretive life of a passage as it is appropriated in a wide variety of contexts. For instance, in treating the passage in its original context, as I do in chapter 1, historical-critical methodology is the best tool to uncover the intention of the author and to detect the meaning conveyed to the first readers. Because Psalm 80 was incorporated into the edited Psalter, I must approach the text from a canonical perspective in chapter 2. The LXX and Targum contain translations of the entire psalm, making it necessary to treat the psalm from the perspective of the translators who are interested in both preservation and interpretation of the text. The rest of the study investigates the interpretation of Psalm 80 through the phenomenon of intertextuality, detecting references to the passage in new texts and contexts and considering the new meaning found in it by later authors.⁴⁷

44. Ibid.

45. Craig A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9–10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*, JSOTSup 64 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

46. Sam Janse, “*You are My Son:*” *The Reception History of Psalm 2 in Early Judaism and the Early Church*, CBET 51 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).

47. I am using “intertextuality” in a more narrow, historical sense focused on the intention of the author in making use of the original text and interpreting it for his context. Other approaches to the phenomenon of intertextuality may focus on unintentional connections created between texts or on the perception of the reader and her ability to make connections between texts that are not related historically. See the excellent article by Steve Moyise which lays out and demonstrates the differences to these approaches: “Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament,” in Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga, eds., *Reading the Bible Intertextually* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 23–32.

Because Psalm 80 is not quoted frequently in the ancient texts to be considered, I will rely heavily on detecting allusion to the psalm in those works. In this study I will use a slightly modified approach for detecting allusion developed by Christopher Beetham.⁴⁸ He divides several criteria into two tiers. His first tier consists of three criteria that are essential in his scheme for detecting a genuine allusion. First, the source text must have been available to the author of the later text. Second, the later text must contain lexical overlaps with the source text or else contain conceptual similarities that are sufficiently rare to make it probable that the author had the source text in mind. Third, the reference must be the essential interpretive link, which when recognized “unlocks the riddle of the alluding text.”⁴⁹ I have adopted the first two criteria from his first tier. While I will address word agreement and rare concept agreement in each relevant section of the study, the criterion of availability is clearly met for all of the proposed allusions because the texts I treat are later than Psalm 80 and the collection of psalms was a significant part of Jewish worship in Second Temple Judaism. Thus, I will not address this criterion for each allusion.

I am not employing the third criterion of essential interpretive link. Beetham uses this criterion to distinguish between an allusion and an echo. Put simply, a reference is an allusion if the alluding text can only be fully understood by the reader if the reference to the parent text is recognized; otherwise, the reference is an echo, which is not intended for public recognition and may be either consciously or unconsciously made by the author. I have chosen not to use this criterion because I am not so much concerned with whether or not the reader fully understands the alluding text; rather, my main concern is to detect places where an author is using Psalm 80 so that his interpretation of the psalm can be exposed. Because this distinction is not helpful for this study, I have chosen to call all intentional, non-quotation references to an earlier text “allusions.”⁵⁰

Beetham’s second tier consists of five criteria, which are used to confirm allusions that have met the first-tier criteria. Beetham notes that “these are supplemental in character, and are of limited help in some instances.”⁵¹ These

48. Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, *BibInt* 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 28–35. Beetham is heavily dependent on Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–32. Although both Beetham and Hays are interested only in the letters of Paul, there is nothing intrinsic about the criteria that would preclude their application to other literature.

49. Beetham, *Echoes*, 30.

50. Alternatively, one might also call all such references “echoes,” but I avoid this because an echo may be unconscious whereas I am arguing for conscious references to Psalm 80.

are (a) scholarly assessment, (b) similarity to or difference with the OT and Jewish interpretive tradition, (c) other verified references to the same OT context in the alluding text, (d) occurrence elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, and (e) thematic coherence. I have excluded in this study “occurrence elsewhere in the Pauline corpus” for two reasons: (1) I will not be dealing with Pauline texts; (2) only one text I treat (John 15) belongs to an authorial corpus, but there are no other references to Psalm 80 in the rest of the Johannine literature. The four remaining second-tier criteria will be addressed as they are present in each of the proposed allusions.

STRUCTURE

This study is divided into seven subsequent chapters and a conclusion. *Chapter 1* addresses Psalm 80 in its original context, using historical-critical methods to attempt to find the meaning of the text as it may have been intended by its author and initial audience and performers. I focus mainly on those rich and complex elements in the psalm that might be prime material for future generations of eschatological interpreters. A key feature of the text is the ambiguity between the vine and the son/man/son of man. It will be argued that the Masoretic Text (hereafter MT) itself contains the first stage of messianic interpretation in the addition of v. 16b in the postexilic period. *Chapter 2* treats Psalm 80 in the context of the edited Psalter as a cohesive, inherently eschatological book. This new situation strengthened the restorationist and royal reading of the psalm already available in its original context. By situating it in the purposeful arrangement of the Psalter, the editors encouraged interpretation of Psalm 80 alongside other eschatological royal psalms, incorporating it into a matrix of messianic passages.

Chapter 3 draws attention to the lexical and conceptual overlap between Psalm 80 and Daniel 7, arguing that the author of Daniel 7 used Psalm 80 in fashioning the basic structure of his vision and the figure of “one like a son of man,” among other features. Key to this chapter is the eschatologization of the contents of Psalm 80 as they are transformed into a vision of the end of the age. *Chapter 4* investigates the use of Psalm 80 in the literature of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism, showing that it was interpreted eschatologically and messianically with varying degrees of intensity in the LXX Psalms, one of the *Thanksgiving Hymns* from Qumran, Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 2 *Baruch*, the Psalms Targum, and *Leviticus Rabbah*.

The next three chapters will argue that four passages from the Gospels allude to Psalm 80 and that each interprets the psalm eschatologically and messianically in slightly different ways. *Chapter 5* shows that the Markan passion predictions and Mark 14:62 allude prominently to Psalm 80 as a source for Jesus' self-designation as Son of Man and his prediction of vindication and exaltation. *Chapter 6* argues that Psalm 80 plays an important role in the parable of the Wicked Tenants as the intertext that provides the relationship of the son to the vineyard, among several other features of the passage. *Chapter 7* investigates the use of Psalm 80 in the discourse on the true vine in John 15:1-8 where recognition of Psalm 80 as an intertext explains the three main features of the vine image and provides a better interpretation of the significance of Jesus as the true vine.

In *the conclusion* I synthesize the findings of chapters 1 through 7, paying special attention to the variety of interpretations of Psalm 80.