The Enduring Authority of the Christian Scriptures

Edited by

D. A. Carson

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
Grand Rapids, Michigan / Cambridge, U.K.

© 2016 D. A. Carson
All rights reserved

Published 2016 by
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
2140 Oak Industrial Drive N.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49505 /
P.O. Box 163, Cambridge CB3 9PU U.K.

Printed in the United States of America

22 21 20 19 18 17 16 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Carson, D. A., editor.
Title: The enduring authority of the Christian scriptures / edited by D. A. Carson.
Description: Grand Rapids, Michigan : Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2016. |
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
Identifiers: LCCN 2015038502 | ISBN 9780802865762 (cloth: alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Bible — Evidences, authority, etc.
Classification: LCC BS480 .E53 2016 | DDC 220.1 — dc23
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015038502

www.eerdmans.com

Contents

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL TOPICS

COMPARATIVE RELIGIONS TOPICS

THINKING HOLISTICALLY

FAQS

Abbreviations

AAR	American Academy of Religion
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*
ABH	Long, *The Art of Biblical History*
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
adv. Marc.	Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
A.H.	After Hegira = Anno Hegirae (Muslim calendar)
AH	Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*
AJT	*Asia Journal of Theology*
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*
Ant.	Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
A of F	Articles of Faith (Mormon)
1 Apol.	Justin Martyr, *The First Apology*
ARN	Avot of Rabbi Natan
Asc. Isa.	*The Ascension of Isaiah*
ASNU	Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis
ASV	American Standard Version
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
AThR	*Anglican Theological Review*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
B&C	*Books & Culture*
B&H	Broadman & Holman
Barn.	*Epistle of Barnabas*
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BC	*The Book of Concord*

B.C.E.	Before the Common Era
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHI	Provan, Long, Longman, *A Biblical History*
BI	*Biblical Interpretation*
Bib	*Biblica*
BSLK	*Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*
BST	*Bible Speaks Today*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
Cahiers de l'A.P.F.	*Cahiers de l'Association des Pasteurs de France*
CApion	Josephus, *Contra Apion*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CCels.	*Contra Celsum*
CCSL	*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*
CD	*Church Dogmatics*
CD	Cairo Genizah copy of the *Damascus Document*
CD-B	*Damascus Document* — Recension B
CDV	*Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*
C.E.	Common Era
CFaust.	Augustine, *Contra Faustum*
CivDei	Augustine, *De civitate Dei*
1 Clem.	*1 Clement*
2 Clem.	*2 Clement*
CNTC	*Calvin's New Testament Commentaries*
CO	*Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*
CR	Corpus Reformatorum
CRINT	Compendium rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CT	Codex Tchacos
CTM	*Currents in Theology and Mission*
CTR	*Criswell Theological Review*
DBSup	*Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*
DEC	*Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*
Dial.	*Dialogue with Trypho*
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
EDT	*Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*
Ep.	*Epistle*
Eph.	Ignatius, *To the Ephesians*
Ep. Ptol. Fl.	Ptolemaeus Gnosticus, *Epistula ad Floram*
ERT	*Evangelical Review of Theology*
esp.	especially
ESV	English Standard Version
ET	English Translation

EurJTh	*European Journal of Theology*
Eus.	Eusebius
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
ExAud	*Ex Auditu*
ExpT	*The Expository Times*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOC	Fathers of the Church Patristic Series
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FTC	The Fathers of the Church
FWD	Free Will Defense
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
GD	*The Göttingen Dogmatics*
G. Jud.	*Gospel of Judas*
GNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament
Gos. Thom.	*Gospel of Thomas*
GOTR	*Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
HAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
HC	*History of the Church* (Mormon; 2nd edition, 1950; 7 vols.)
HCSB	Holman Christian Standard Bible
HE	*Historia Ecclesiastica*
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
In Apoc.	Victorinus, *Commentary on the Apocalypse*
Inst.	John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*
Int	*Interpretation*
ISBE	*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*
JBR	*Journal of Bible and Religion*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JGRChJ	*Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSS	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series

JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
KJV	King James Version
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LRB	*London Review of Books*
LW	*Luther's Works*
LXX	Septuagint
Magn.	Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*
MeyerK	Meyer Kommentar
MF	*Muratorian Fragment*
MG	Migne Patrologia Graeca
MT	Masoretic Text
NAB	New American Bible
NAE	National Association of Evangelicals
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NBCLC	National Biblical Confessional and Liturgical Centre (Bangalore)
NBD	*New Bible Dictionary*
NEB	New English Bible
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NET	New English Translation
NH	Nag Hammadi
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NKJV	New King James Version
NLT	New Living Translation
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*

OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
OT	Old Testament
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën/Old Testament Studies*
P&R	Presbyterian & Reformed
Paed.	Clement of Alexandria, *Paidagogus*
Panar.	Epiphanius, *Panarion*
PG	Patrologia Graeca
Phil.	Polycarp, *To the Philadelphians*
Phld.	Ignatius, *To the Philadelphians*
PL	Patrologia Latina
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
Polyc.	Polycarp
P.Oxy.	Oxyrhynchus Papyri
Praesc.	Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*
Princ.	Origen, *De Principiis*
Protr.	Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Heathen*
PRS	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
Ps-Barn.	*Pseudo-Barnabas*
Ps.Sol.	Psalms of Solomon
PTS	Patristic and Text-Critical Studies
1QpHab	*Pesher* commentary on Habakkuk
1QS	*Rule of the Community*
4Q521	*Messianic Apocalypse* (= 4QMessAp)
11QT	*Temple Scroll*
Quis. div. sal.	Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Dives Salvetur*
Quis rer. div. her.	Philo, *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RC	Roman Catholic(ism)
Ref.	Hippolytus, *Refutatio Haereses*
RestQ	*Restoration Quarterly*
Rom.	Ignatius, *To the Romans*
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SBAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
SBJT	*The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SEP	*The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*

Smyrn.	Ignatius, *To the Smyrneans*
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
SPCK	Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge
Spec. Laws	Philo, *The Special Laws*
ST	*Studia Theologica*
Str-B	H. L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*
Strom.	Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*
SUNY	State University of New York
SuppVC	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
Targ. On.	Targum Onkelos
Targ. Ps.-Jon.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*
Test. Abr.	Testament of Abraham
Them	*Themelios*
Theol	*Theology*
TNIV	Today's New International Version
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentary
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentary
Trall.	Ignatius, *To the Trallians*
TrinJ	*Trinity Journal*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin*
UBSGNT	United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTS	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WA	*D. Martin Luthers Werke*
WADB	*D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Deutsche Bibel*
WBC	Word Bible Commentary
WCF	*Westminster Confession of Faith*
WJK	Westminster John Knox
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Preface

In the past, evangelicalism has often been said to turn on a formal principle and a material principle. The formal principle is the authority of the Bible, from which everything else derives. As necessary as the formal principle is, however, it is not sufficient to define evangelicalism. After all, many other groups and movements adhere to some sort of high view of Scripture: consider (to go no further) the Jehovah's Witnesses. So coupled with the formal principle is the material principle — a right understanding of the gospel.

This volume focuses on the formal principle. Few topics touch more issues than the topic of biblical authority: the nature of revelation, different ways of understanding truth, the locus of authority (located in the text or in the teaching office of the church), historical-critical considerations, continuity and discontinuity between the Testaments, the use of the Old Testament in the Old and in the New, the relationship between Scripture and canon, the formation of the canon, epistemology, the nature of inspiration, the notion of double authorship, the claims of Scriptural authority in an age dominated by a vision of science that widely presupposes philosophical materialism, Jesus' own view of the authority of antecedent Scripture, assorted hermeneutical challenges, the impact of certain intellectual giants (e.g., Calvin, Barth), complex histories of the doctrine of Scripture, the Bible's relation to history (and what "history" means), the coherence of certain shibboleth words like "inerrancy," the Western cultural suspicion of all voices of authority in what Charles Taylor calls "the age of authenticity," the perspicuity of Scripture, the way Scripture should and should not be used in the formation of doctrine, and, in an age of globalism, how the Christian doctrine of Scripture is and is not like the way other world religions view their sacred writings. To make matters still more complex, all of these related fields that bear on the nature and authority of the Bible have their own conceptual minefields. Not surprisingly, then, they too throw up challenging debates. Moreover, to survey the topics just listed is to remind oneself how the formal principle can never be completely isolated from the material principle: e.g., if one is wrestling with hermeneutical challenges, the discussion is bound to intrude into the territories of both principles.

About thirty years ago, some of the writers in this volume worked together and with others to produce a pair of volumes that is still in print: *Scripture and Truth* (1983) and *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (1986 — both edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, and both published by Zondervan). The two volumes played their parts in the then-current debates. Some of today's topics are similar, even though the debates have moved on; others are new. Recognizing that Scripture and its authority are being challenged and defended with renewed vigor, a handful of us put our heads together and laid down the topics you will find in this volume. Funded by the Henry Center for Theological Understanding (one of three Centers operated by Trinity Evangelical Divinity School), the project took on life. Scholars agreed to write these essays, and then their papers were circulated among the contributors. In June 2010, thirty-three of the thirty-seven contributors flew to Chicago from their various posts around the world, and spent an intense but hugely enjoyable week working through their essays. On every topic there were at least two or three people in the room who were competent on that subject, and sometimes more. This led to many debates, corrections, modifications, and to much subsequent rewriting. The hours were long, the discussions candid, but a rare camaraderie developed. Most of us went away, I think, holding to the opinion that we had never enjoyed theological discussion more. Not a few new friendships were forged.

For various reasons, rewriting (some of it major) and the writing of a couple of new essays that were not ready at the time of the conference took up three years. The final major revision showed up in January 2015. Probably I should have pushed harder; the blame for some of the delay must be placed squarely at my door. Nevertheless most of these papers are sufficiently weighty and robust that they will not quickly become dated.

It remains to thank the Henry Center for the funding that made this project possible, and for the logistical competence that smoothly and expertly arranged the details of the week of discussion, from transportation to food to acoustics. Special mention must be made of the skillful work of Hans Madueme, then a doctoral student at TEDS, who took detailed notes of these discussions and circulated them to all the participants, making it possible to follow up certain points with ongoing exchanges and clarifications. Warm thanks go to Eerdmans not only for taking on this project, but because (if I may resort to an expression now eclipsed), while they waited and encouraged, they composed their souls in peace. And abundant thanks to Daniel Ahn, Daniel Cole, and Wang Chi-Ying, who prepared the indexes, without which this volume would have been far less useful than it is.

"These are the ones I look on with favor: those who are humble and contrite in spirit and who tremble at my word" (Isa. 66:2).

Soli Deo gloria.

D. A. Carson

TWENTY-THREE

The Problem of the New Testament's Use of the Old Testament

Douglas J. Moo and Andrew David Naselli

Does the use of the OT in the NT argue against Scripture's inerrancy? Many scholars think it does. This essay explains why it does not.

Situating the Problem

The relationship of the two testaments that comprise the Christian Scriptures has been an enduring theological issue. The issue takes many different forms, ranging from very broad and fundamental theological and canonical concerns to very specific matters of textual comparison. Our focus in this essay is on the relationship between the meaning of OT texts in their own contexts and the meaning that NT authors ascribe to these texts. This particular issue has received considerable attention over the centuries, and the flood of literature relating to this matter shows no sign of abating.[1] Of particular interest to us are those as-

1. A good recent survey of the field is provided by Jonathan Lunde, "An Introduction to Central Questions in the New Testament Use of the Old Testament," in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament,* ed. Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde, Counterpoints (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 7-41. The most important monographs include the following: R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1971); D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Martin Jan Mulder, ed., *Mikra: Text,*

This chapter is an updated version of Douglas J. Moo, "The Problem of Sensus Plenior," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon,* ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 175-211, 397-405. Some material is also taken from Douglas J. Moo, "Paul's Universalizing Hermeneutics in Romans," *SBJT* 11 (Fall 2007): 62-90. We thank Jared Compton for his helpful critique. Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture citations are from *The New International Version* (NIV), © 2011.

pects of the problem that constitute a challenge to the doctrine of inerrancy. The essential problem, simply put, is the apparent occasional discrepancy between the meaning of OT texts in their original settings and the meaning that NT authors appear to give them. Paul Achtemeier's statement of the case is typical.[2] Attributing inerrancy to the Bible, he claims, ignores the NT authors' attitude towards the OT as demonstrated in their actual use of it. They habitually modify the OT text and read into that text meanings obviously not intended in the original, so they clearly do not regard the OT as an inerrant document, "the timeless formulation of unchanging truth."[3] Rather, Achtemeier argues, their use of the OT shows that the NT authors regarded the canonical books as part of a living tradition that could be freely modified in order to fit new situations. If we would be true to the NT itself, then, we will not impose on the Bible a static, oracular status such as the doctrine of inerrancy implies; we will view it and use it as the living, changing tradition that it is.

In formulating his argument, Achtemeier has two specific phenomena in mind: (1) places where the NT uses a text form of an OT passage that differs from the accepted Masoretic tradition and (2) places where the NT gives a meaning to an OT passage that does not appear to agree with the intention of the original. These issues are obviously intertwined because changing a text often gives a new meaning to an OT passage. However, since others have dealt competently with the textual side of the problem,[4] this essay addresses the second issue. To put the

---

Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity, CRINT 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988); Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); G. K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature,* SNTSMS 69 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004); Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, eds., *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals,* JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period,* 2nd edition (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004); Stanley E. Porter, ed., *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament,* McMaster New Testament Studies 8 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007); Berding and Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the NT Use of the OT.*

2. Paul J. Achtemeier, *Inspiration and Authority: Nature and Function of Christian Scripture,* 2nd edition (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 52-53, 73-81, 97-99, 115-16. Cf. the more negative assessment of S. Vernon McCasland, "Matthew Twists the Scripture," *JBL* 80 (1961): 143-48.

3. Achtemeier, *Inspiration and Authority,* 70.

4. E.g., Moisés Silva, "The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority," in *Scripture and Truth,* ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids:

problem simply: How can we accord complete truthfulness to writings that appear to misunderstand and misapply those texts from which they claim to derive the authority and rationale for their most basic claims and teaching?

The apparently novel meaning that Jesus and the NT writers attribute to OT texts constitutes a potentially legitimate objection to Scripture's inerrancy. The NT writers do not casually appeal to the OT or argue merely by analogy. They repeatedly assert that we must believe and do certain things *because* of what is said in specific OT texts. The NT authors suggest that their teachings are grounded in the OT. The problem, then, becomes one of authority: Can we adopt as "true" NT claims based on "faulty" OT interpretation? Greg Beale titled his valuable collection of essays on the matter *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* One might ask, however, if the doctrine can be "right" if the texts are "wrong." If the NT errs in drawing these causal relationships, then it has erred fundamentally, not just incidentally. The doctrine of inerrancy "requires that the meaning the New Testament author finds in the Old Testament and uses in the New is really in the Old Testament."[5]

This study investigates whether NT-specified meaning is "really in" the OT. On what basis does the NT so confidently apply OT texts? We begin by isolating the real nature of the problem. We then turn to proposed solutions to the problem and look at some examples of how the proposed approach might deal with some specific texts, and we conclude with some final reflections.

Correctly Defining the Problem

The modern insistence that the "historical" sense is a text's only legitimate meaning has to some extent created the "problem" we are dealing with in this essay. Before the modern period, Christian interpreters were quite happy to explain that

---

Zondervan, 1983), 147-65, 381-86. A broader issue, with serious canonical implications, has been raised recently by scholars working especially on Paul and Hebrews, whose quotations tend to follow the LXX quite closely. They suggest that this phenomenon reveals that for these authors (and perhaps for the NT generally) the "Scripture" is not the Hebrew text but the Greek text. See, for example, Radu Gheorghita, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38,* WUNT 2.160 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); J. Ross Wagner, "Greek Isaiah and the Septuagint as Christian Scripture," in *Scripture's Doctrine: Studies in the New Testament's Normativity for Christian Dogmatics,* ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Alan J. Torrance (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 17-28; Francis Watson, "Mistranslation and the Death of Christ: Isaiah 53 LXX and Its Pauline Reception," in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology,* ed. Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda, McMaster New Testament Studies (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 215-50.

5. S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 66.

the OT is compatible with the NT; their recourse was various forms of what we might call the "figural" sense. They extensively employed allegory and typology to show how the NT appropriates the OT to uncover the OT's true, "spiritual" meaning.[6] The assumption guiding such approaches was that the NT's use of the OT was valid and authoritative. The onset of higher criticism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries seriously challenged those assumptions and methods,[7] and a "hermeneutics of suspicion" replaced a "hermeneutics of consent."

The death knell for the traditional approach to the OT was insisting that the "grammatical-historical" meaning is the text's only legitimate meaning.[8] No longer did many theologians assume that the NT's interpretation of the OT is correct and the normative key to Scripture's unity. Convinced that the NT differs from the findings of modern, "scientific" historical exegesis, rationalist interpreters concluded that the NT errs and that its authors are guilty of arbitrary, illegitimate exegesis.

The response from "conservative" interpreters varied. Some of them proposed unlikely interpretations or forced harmonizations on texts to preserve doctrinal purity. But the majority of scholars, enamored with the "objectivity" that the "historical-grammatical" method illusorily promised, erred in the opposite direction by not approaching our problem with sufficient nuance. They illegitimately expanded the scope of the problem that the NT's use of the OT poses for inerrancy. They overstated the difficulties. We should remove some of these "phantom" difficulties before we analyze some of the most important proposed solutions to the problem.

The Nature of Inspiration

Some people wrongly assume that inerrancy necessarily involves a "dictation" theory of inspiration.[9] But the vast majority of inerrantists reject a mechanical-dictation view of inspiration. Most inerrantists view Scripture as the product of

6. We treat these briefly on pp. 725-30 below.

7. For the degree to which these kinds of problems were already being discussed before the popularity of the "grammatical-historical" method, see John D. Woodbridge, "Some Misconceptions of the Impact of the 'Enlightenment' on the Doctrine of Scripture," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon,* ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 241-70, 410-21.

8. Peter Stuhlmacher, *Vom Verstehen des Neuen Testaments: Eine Hermeneutik,* GNT 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 124; G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe, *Essays on Typology,* SBT 22 (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1957), 15.

9. E.g., Bruce Vawter, *Biblical Inspiration* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 16; William J. Abraham, *The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 105-7.

a "concursive" operation: human authors freely wrote what they wanted while the divine author simultaneously superintended and guided their writing. Since inerrantists do not hold a view of inspiration that entails an ahistorical, oracular process, they allow for flexibility in quotation and attention to historical context.[10]

The Nature and Purpose of References to the Old Testament

The NT appropriates the OT in many different ways: in quotations, allusions, and echoes; by using common themes; by presenting material in similar patterns; by direct references, etc. The OT provides much of the language and cultural context for the NT writers. They therefore often use its language and even quote it in a way that lends a certain air or connotation to what they are saying. For instance, if we warn our children about the consequences of an action by reminding them, "People reap what they sow" (Gal. 6:7), our applying Paul's words to a situation he never envisaged is valid. We are not saying exactly what Paul said or applying his words to the same situation. But we are, in a sense, implying that our warning carries some of the same seriousness that Paul's did. The Scripture language creates an "authoritative resonance."

When NT authors quote the OT to assert its "correct" meaning, their point is valid only if their interpretations of the OT are "correct." But other times to ask about a "valid" interpretation is to ask the wrong question of the text. NT authors do not always use OT language as authoritative proof. This is not surprising since the OT played a prominent role in their lives and cultural milieu. So when they appear to deduce a new meaning from the OT or when they apply it to a new situation, they are not necessarily misusing the text or treating it as errant. Three specific categories of the NT's use of the OT are not part of our problem.[11]

10. See, for instance, the discussion in B. B. Warfield and A. A. Hodge, "Inspiration," *Presbyterian Review* 2 (April 1881); reprinted in *Inspiration,* ed. Roger R. Nicole (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 62-64.

11. Considerable attention has been given to the definitions of, and distinctions among, quotation, allusions, and echoes (see, e.g., Stanley E. Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture,* ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium 50 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008], 29-40). For the purposes of this essay, these formal/literary distinctions can be ignored. For discussions of the function of quotations and allusions, see J. A. E. van Dodewaard, "La Force évocatrice de la citation," *Bib* 36 (1955): 482-91; Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965), 38-42; James Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments* (London: SCM, 1966), 115; and Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas,* SNT 1 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969), 208-9. Silva mentions similar considerations ("NT Use of the OT," 156-59).

Using Old Testament Language as a Vehicle of Expression

The speech of a person raised on the classics is sprinkled with terms and idioms drawn from those texts. Similarly, the NT writers sometimes use OT language as a vehicle of expression without intending to provide a "correct" interpretation of the OT text they are quoting.

For example, Jesus laments in Gethsemane, "My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of death" (*perilypos estin hē psychē mou heōs thanatou*) (Mark 14:34/Matt. 26:38). This almost certainly alludes to the "refrain" of Psalms 42–43 (perhaps originally a single psalm) because *perilypos* is rare (only eight times in the LXX, never in Philo or Josephus, only twice in the NT), especially in combination with *psychē*.[12] But Jesus is not citing the psalm(s) as authoritatively prefiguring his sufferings in the Garden. He uses familiar biblical language simply to express his emotions. He may generally identify with the psalmist's plight (oppressed by enemies, seeking God's vindication and rescue), but even if there is no evidence that Psalms 42–43 predict Jesus' agony in Gethsemane, Jesus is not misusing the OT or reading new meaning into it.[13]

Romans 10:17 is another example of this phenomenon. Paul cites Psalm 19:4 to corroborate his claim that people have "heard": "their voice has gone out into all the earth, their words to the ends of the world." Paul appears to shift the application of Psalm 19:4, which extols God's revelation in nature.[14] Yet the implied object of the verb "heard" in Romans 10:17 must be "the word of Christ"; "their voice" and "their words" must then refer to the voices and words of Christian preachers (see Rom. 10:14-16). The simplest explanation for this application is that Paul is not really "quoting" Psalm 19:4. After all, we have here no introductory formula or quotation in contrast to the clear introductions when Paul quotes the OT in Romans 10:16, 19, 20, and 21. Paul may simply use the language of the psalm, with the "echoes" of God's revelation that it awakes, to assert the universal preaching of the gospel.[15]

The NT authors were more familiar with the OT than any other literature, so this phenomenon is normal and not germane to our problem.

12. Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 240-42.

13. Another example is Paul's use of Deut. 19:15 in 2 Cor. 13:1. See Silva, "NT Use of the OT," 157-58.

14. H. L. Ellison (*The Mystery of Israel: An Exposition of Romans 9–11* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966], 69-71) unconvincingly denies such a shift. Paul's wording exactly follows the majority MSS tradition of the LXX, and the LXX accurately renders the MT.

15. See particularly Hays, *Echoes of Scripture,* 175. For this view, see many of the Greek fathers; Frederic Louis Godet, *Commentary on Romans* (reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977), 388; Dunn, *Romans 9–16,* WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1988), 624; J. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* AB (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1993), 599.

Applying Old Testament Principles

A "willed type," explains E. D. Hirsch, extends or applies an author's language, particularly in legal texts. The author did not specifically, consciously intend that application, but his general meaning legitimately includes the application.[16] This phenomenon occurs when the NT applies an OT principle or law to a new situation.

For example, some criticize Paul for quoting Deuteronomy 25:4 ("Do not muzzle an ox while it is treading out the grain") to support giving money to Christian ministers (1 Cor. 9:9). Paul's use of the OT seems fanciful. What is the warrant for applying a law that protects the welfare of animals to Christian ministry? Moreover, Paul's next words appear to deny that the law had anything to do with animals: "Is it for oxen that God is concerned? Does he not speak entirely for our sake?" (1 Cor. 9:9-10, ESV). Paul appears to equate the "literal" sense with the "spiritual," Christian sense.

Explanations of Paul's use of Deuteronomy 25:4 include the following:

1. This is one of the few examples of allegory in Paul.[17]

2. Paul adopts a Hellenistic Jewish exegetical principle by which interpreters like Philo avoid the crassly literal sense of such laws by appealing to the "higher sense" God really intended.[18]

3. Paul's meaning depends strictly on the OT's original meaning, which in its context teaches masters and owners to care for their laborers — whether animal or human. Paul legitimately draws out the law's significance for the situation of churches and their "workers," and he rightly claims that the law is given for "us" human beings, not primarily for oxen.[19] Moreover, Paul is probably not saying that this is the only meaning of the law; the crucial word *pantōs* (1 Cor. 9:10) is best translated not "entirely" (as in the RSV and ESV) but "surely," "certainly," or "undoubtedly."[20]

4. It is, however, probably going too far to see Paul's interpretation as a

16. E. D. Hirsch Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 121-26.

17. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* 109-10.

18. Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians,* ed. George W. MacRae, trans. James W. Leitch, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 154-55.

19. Walter C. Kaiser Jr., "The Current Crisis in Exegesis and the Apostolic Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10," *JETS* 21 (1978): 3-18. Kaiser expands on Calvin's and Godet's approaches. And see now especially Hays, *Echoes of Scripture,* 165-66.

20. See Luke 4:23; Acts 18:21; 21:22; 28:4; and Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text,* NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 686-87; cf. also David Instone-Brewer, "1 Corinthians 9:9-11: A Literal Interpretation of 'Do Not Muzzle the Ox,'" *NTS* 38 (1992): 225-43.

straightforward interpretation. Rather, we should view this as the application, in light of eschatological realities, of a principle found in Deuteronomy 25:4.[21] The phrase had become a popular proverb to express the idea that a worker deserves to be paid, so Paul's application does not have to match the application given the words in Deuteronomy. Paul implies that a principle expressed in one context can be applied to other contexts that share some kind of similarity.

Paul does not misuse the OT here. It is unfair to apply a rigid concept of meaning to his application of an OT law and then to charge him with misinterpreting the OT for going beyond what the OT specifically intends. A better test is whether the scope of the OT law legitimately includes Paul's application. Would the OT author acknowledge the validity of Paul's further application?

Representing Alternative Points of View

Some statements in 1 Corinthians are probably not Paul's own teaching but slogans of the Corinthians (e.g., "I have the right to do anything" [6:12; 10:23]; "It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman" [7:1]; "We all possess knowledge" [8:1]). Similarly, the NT may quote the OT not to express the OT's teaching but to represent someone else's opinion or teaching.

This explains some of the quotations in Matthew 5 that are antithetical to Jesus' teaching. The clearest example is the addition of "hate your enemy" (Matt. 5:43) to the love commandment (Lev. 19:18). That expresses the teaching current among some Jews (perhaps Essenes).[22] Clear contextual indicators, however, are present here: additional language not in the OT (nor fairly representing OT teaching) and the introductory formula, "you have heard that it was said," which suggests a distance from the OT.

When contextual indicators like that are not present, we must use great caution before hypothesizing that the NT quotes the OT merely to represent the opinion of its listeners or opponents. For instance, some interpreters are uncomfortable with the way Paul appears to oppose one OT text to another in Romans 10:5-8 (which cites Lev. 18:5 and Deut. 30:10-14) and Galatians 3:11-12 (which cites Hab. 2:4 and Lev. 18:5), so they suggest that he may quote Leviticus 18:5 ("whoever does these things will live by them") according to the (false) meaning that

21. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians,* NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 408.

22. Although some scholars claim that the addition genuinely reflects OT teaching, such as is found in the "imprecatory psalms" (Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution,* 2nd edition [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994], 96-97), this is almost certainly not the case. The most likely origin is the Qumran community, whose members were instructed to hate "the sons of disobedience."

his opponents were giving it.[23] But there is simply insufficient evidence that Paul's quotation represents a view different than his own. And there is good reason to think that Paul respects the original intention of Leviticus 18:5.[24]

Our point here, then, is that although it is valid in some cases to attempt to avoid the problem of the NT's use of the OT by disassociating the NT author from the meaning that others give the OT text, its help is very limited, and we must have compelling contextual evidence before adopting it.

The Meaning of Fulfillment Language

Some of the most textually and hermeneutically challenging uses of the OT in the NT are the ones Matthew precedes with fulfillment-formulas.[25] For example, Jesus and his family stayed in Egypt and subsequently returned to Palestine. According to Matthew 2:15, this "fulfills" Hosea's statement, "Out of Egypt I called my son" (Hos. 11:1b). This quotation is a virtual poster child for the NT's alleged misuse of the OT.[26] We do not want to minimize the genuine issues that the text creates, but it is important at the outset to eliminate one of the problems: Matthew claims that the Holy Family's departure from Egypt "fulfills" Hosea 11:1b.

If Jesus "fulfills" the OT only by doing what specific OT prophecies say the Messiah will do, then Matthew 2:15 is a problem because Hosea 11:1 simply states a fact (i.e., God called Israel out of Egypt) and does not prophesy that the Messiah will depart Egypt. But the meaning of "fulfill" (*plēroō*) is not so narrow. The NT authors use this word as a general way of describing the relationship of the OT to the NT. It describes how the new, climactic revelation of God in Christ "fills up," brings to its intended completion, the OT as a whole (the preparatory, incomplete revelation to and through Israel).[27] Thus, Mark summarizes Jesus' preaching

23. Cf. Silva, "NT Use of the OT," 159; Daniel P. Fuller, *Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 98-99 (on Gal. 3:12).

24. See especially Preston M. Sprinkle, *Law and Life: The Interpretation of Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and in Paul,* WUNT 2.241 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008). Contra, e.g., Vawter, *Biblical Inspiration,* 5; Achtemeier, *Inspiration and Authority,* 98-99.

25. See Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament,* ASNU 20 (Lund: Gleerup, 1954); Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope,* NovTSup 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1967); Wilhelm Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthaüs-Evangeliums: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung,* BWA[N]T 5.8 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969).

26. E.g., Dewey M. Beegle, *Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 237.

27. This is emphasized (perhaps too one-sidedly) by C. F. D. Moule, "Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse," *NTS* 14 (1967-68): 293-320. See also Bruce M. Metzger,

as announcing that time itself has been "filled up" and that the kingdom of God is at hand (1:15); Jesus claims that his teaching is the ultimate, climactic expression of God's will to which the OT law pointed (Matt. 5:17; cf. 11:13).[28] So when a NT author introduces an OT quotation with "fulfill," he does not necessarily regard the OT as a direct prophecy. Nor is he necessarily misusing the OT. Rather, he is making a claim about the way the testaments relate to one another, a claim that must be analyzed and verified on a broad theological basis. In the case of Matthew 2:15, then, the evangelist may suggest that Jesus, God's "greater son," brings to a climax ("fills up") the Exodus motif, a theme that had become eschatologically oriented even in the OT.[29]

Proposed Solutions to the Problem

We have reduced our problem's scope, but the problem remains. The force of the NT's argument often depends on the OT's proper, authoritative meaning (e.g., when it cites the OT to support theological conclusions or it explicitly says that the OT prophesies events it narrates), and sometimes the NT appears to give the OT meanings that we cannot demonstrate exegetically. What do we do with these texts? This section examines nine popular solutions: fideism, subjectivism, Jewish exegetical methods, dual authorship, theological exegesis, intertextuality, typology, *sensus plenior,* and a canonical approach. Several are inadequate, and others useful to various degrees.

Fideism

A fideistic approach argues that the modern view of exegetical procedure — not the NT — is at fault. The revelatory stance of the NT validates its inter-

"The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," *JBL* 70 (1951): 297-307; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate,* 48-49; George Soares-Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt 1–2,* AnBib 63 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976), 46-47; Gottlob Schrenk, in *TDNT,* 1:758-59.

28. For this interpretation of these key Matthean texts, see especially Robert J. Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition,* SNTSMS 28 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), especially 207-12; John P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt. 5:17-48* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976), esp. 66-75; on Matthew 1–4 in particular, see Joel Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel,* WUNT 2.257 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

29. D. A. Carson, "Matthew," in *Matthew-Mark,* 2nd edition, Expositor's Bible Commentary 9 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 118-20; cf. also G. K. Beale, "The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: One More Time," *JETS* 55 (2012): 697-715.

pretations, and when we cannot discover this meaning in the OT through our exegetical techniques, we should either abandon that method or else admit its inadequacy.[30]

This proposal makes a valid point. We are susceptible to "chronological snobbishness," the conviction that only we moderns have somehow transcended cultural bias and are uniquely able to understand things correctly. We must be careful not to think that "the authority and validity of apostolic interpretation . . . depend on its conformity to modern exegetical method."[31] In this, as in all other matters, Scripture itself must judge our understanding, not we it. Ultimately, it is impossible to "validate" the NT's use of the OT, in general or in detail, without a prior decision to accept what it says as true and authoritative.

While at one level this kind of response is adequate for the problem, it is less than satisfactory for three reasons:

1. In the last resort, it places Scripture in a realm above any real historical investigation or criticism. It is appropriate to a degree to dismiss these kinds of problems by appealing to the uncertainties and fallibility of all knowledge (the record of ancient history is far from complete, modern science could very well be wrong, etc.), but at some point the weight of unexplained discrepancies is too much for the doctrine to bear.

2. It places us in a rather vicious circle. We dismiss out of hand apparent discrepancies between our reading of the OT and the apostles' reading because our interpretation is fallible. But how can we know what the apostles' interpretation of the OT is except by using those same methods that we have rejected?

3. It leaves an issue fundamental to Christianity unresolved. The NT's appeal to the OT is too basic to the church's very identity to leave it in the realm of unexplained assertion. For all our legitimate emphasis on Christ as the center and fulfillment of revelation and as the "hermeneutical key" to the OT, we sacrifice too much by refusing to allow the OT to stand to some extent as an independent witness to the NT.[32] "All the while that we insist that nothing is exempt from the judgment of Christ — even our faith-understanding of the Old Testament — we must remember that the Old Testament was and, in some sense, is the criterion whereby Christ is Christ."[33] How can people validate the church's claim that it

30. The approach of Wilhelm Vischer (*The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ,* Lutterworth Library 33 [London: Lutterworth, 1949], 28-29) comes very close to this position. See also Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 226.

31. Silva, "NT Use of the OT," 163.

32. See, e.g., the concerns expressed by Christopher R. Seitz, "Christological Interpretation of Texts and Trinitarian Claims to Truth," *SJT* 52 (1999): 209-26.

33. James A. Sanders, "Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul, and the Old Testament," *JR* 39 (1959): 235. And see Francis Watson's extensive and detailed argument that the OT generated some of Paul's key theological ideas *(Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith).*

(not Judaism) is the true "completion" of the OT if its (not Judaism's) use of the OT cannot demonstrably accord with the OT's meaning?

Subjectivism

A subjective approach eliminates the problem by arguing that all meaning and interpretation are inevitably subjective. For A. T. Hanson, for instance, a text does not have a "correct" meaning; rather, your presuppositions *(Vorverständnis)* decisively determine the meaning you arrive at.[34] And, of course, some forms of postmodernism, questioning the interpreter's ability to transcend his or her own context and determine a text's meaning, make a similar point with the aid of sophisticated philosophical and literary analysis.

Presuppositions certainly play a critical role in the way we read and apply the OT, and those presuppositions are due in part to faith rather than unaided reason. Yet it is ultimately both nonsensical and disastrous to the Christian faith to deny that interpreters can, humbly and always somewhat tentatively, come to conclusions about the "true" meaning of the biblical text.[35] Our presuppositions can and must be adjusted to "fit" the material under investigation: the "horizon" of the text and that of the interpreter can be "fused." Thus, without denying that interpretation is subjective, it is both reasonable and necessary that a text's "correct" interpretation exists and that we can find it.

Our ultimate decision about the validity of the NT's use of the OT depends considerably on whether we accept or reject the presuppositions of the NT authors. The NT authors based their detailed applications of specific OT texts on presuppositions that we must evaluate. One way to test them is to consider whether their acceptance leads to a more natural understanding of the OT than, say, the presuppositions at work in the Qumran community or among the rabbis. The process is inevitably circular, but the circle is not a closed one. Our goal is threefold: (1) "break into" the circle at the level of the actual use of the OT in the NT; (2) consider this use in light of fundamental theological and hermeneutical presuppositions; and (3) show that, granted these presuppositions, the NT's interpretations of the OT are not necessarily erroneous.

34. Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1980), 13.

35. The issue is a huge one, treated elsewhere in this volume. For some useful suggestions along these lines, see N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God,* Christian Origins and the Question of God 1 (London: SPCK, 1992), 31-46; D. A. Carson, *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996); Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998).

Jewish Exegetical Methods

The NT authors appropriated Jewish methods of interpretation popular in their day, and today virtually all interpreters agree that this at least partially explains the NT's use of the OT. In this section, however, we examine the degree to which appealing to Jewish exegetical methods might solve our problem.

The similarities between exegetical methods in the NT and first-century Jewish sources are amply documented and undeniable. Both utilize similar citation techniques. For example, they combine verses on the basis of verbal resemblance (what the rabbis called *gezerah shawah;* cf. Pss. 110:1 and 16:8-11 in Acts 2:25-34); they argue from the lesser to the greater (*qal wahomer;* cf. John 7:23); they convey messages by subtly alluding to texts and themes (cf. the use of the "lament psalms" in the crucifixion narratives in the Synoptics); and they choose textual forms most conducive to their point (e.g., Acts 15:16-18). At another level, both the NT authors and their Jewish contemporaries are convinced that the OT ultimately speaks about their own community or situation.

So although modern readers may find the NT's use of the OT to be peculiar and unconvincing, a first-century audience familiar with such interpretive techniques and assumptions may have found them thoroughly convincing. We first need to understand just what the NT authors are doing with the OT vis-à-vis the OT and then evaluate the phenomenon's significance.

Evaluating Jewish Exegetical Methods Humbly

While rejecting a postmodern view that exegesis is completely relative and that our cultural context makes it impossible for us to find an ancient text's "correct" meaning, our own exegetical method requires humility. When we criticize Jewish exegetical methods, too often we assume that we, from our lofty twenty-first-century standpoint, have discovered *the* true method of interpretation against which all others must be compared. The relatively recent rediscovery of these useful ancient methods of interpretation soundly corrects such modern arrogance.[36] On the other hand, we should not entirely abandon a conviction about the general parameters of what constitutes "appropriate" interpretive methods. Therefore, our evaluation of Jewish exegetical methods found in the NT must combine careful analysis with a dose of humility.

36. The point is overstated by David Steinmetz, "The Superiority of Pre-critical Exegesis," *Theology Today* 37 (1980): 27-38.

Understanding Jewish Exegetical Methods

Jewish exegetical methods varied. While it has become popular to highlight examples that seem to modern interpreters to play fast and loose with the biblical text, there is evidence that the exegetical methods of the rabbis in the period before 70 C.E. were sober and careful.[37]

Another complicating factor is that people indiscriminately use terms such as "midrash" and "pesher" for Jewish exegetical procedures. "Midrash" often describes the interpretative approach of mainstream "Rabbinic" Judaism, while "pesher" describes the particular interpretive approach found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some interpreters think that simply describing NT exegesis as "midrashic" or "pesher" discredits its validity, but that conclusion depends on a particular definition of these terms. And there is no general consensus on how to define these terms.[38] Longenecker illustrates this problem by finding a considerable amount of "pesher" exegesis in the NT. That suggests to some people that the NT authors distort the text by following inappropriate exegetical practices, but for Longenecker, pesher includes the NT's "direct" application of the OT when proceeding from a revelatory basis.[39] So pesher, according to Longenecker's definition, does not necessarily invalidate the NT's exegetical conclusions.

This terminological uncertainty suggests that it is best simply not to use the terms "midrash" and "pesher" in our analysis. What is important is that we carefully compare the techniques we find in the NT with Jewish techniques. The NT authors' exegetical procedure undoubtedly resembles specific Jewish techniques,

37. David Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE*, TSAJ 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

38. The bibliography on "midrash" and "pesher" in Jewish literature and the NT is enormous. Douglas J. Moo describes and categorizes some of these methods in *OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives,* 5-78. Useful surveys and discussions can be found in Joseph Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et Exégèse paulinienne,* Bibliothèque de théologie historique (Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1939); R. Bloch, "Midrasch," in *DBSup* 5:1263-81; Otto Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte,* WUNT 6 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960); F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1961): 297-333; Roger Le Déaut, "Apropos d'une définition du Midrash," *Bib* 50 (1969): 395-413 [ET in *Int* 25 (1971): 259-82]; E. Earle Ellis, "Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations," in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black,* ed. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), 61-69; Ellis, "How the New Testament Uses the Old," in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods,* ed. I. Howard Marshall, 2nd edition (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1979), 198-214; Merrill P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSJ* 2 (1971): 29-82; R. T. France and David Wenham, eds., *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels,* Studies in Midrash and History 3 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983); Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* 18-30.

39. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* 54-57, 191-93.

but we must distinguish them in order to appreciate both their similarities and differences.

Comparing Jewish Exegetical Methods and NT Practices

Scholars often exaggerate the influence of Jewish exegetical methods on the NT. A vast gulf separates the often fantastic, purely verbal exegeses of the rabbis from the NT's sober, contextually oriented interpretations.[40] Indeed, the NT differs most from other Jewish literature when the latter strays furthest from what we would consider sound hermeneutics.

Distinguishing Appropriation Techniques and Hermeneutical Axioms

We may skew our analysis of the degree to which the NT is similar in its interpretational approach to ancient Judaism if we do not distinguish two levels of influence: what we might call "appropriation techniques" and "hermeneutical axioms."

Appropriation techniques are specific, "on the surface" methods that authors use to appropriate a text for a new situation. They may straightforwardly identify one situation or person with another, modify the text to suit the application, or associate several passages. It is at this level that the NT is often said to resemble the interpretive practices of its Jewish environment.

Hermeneutical axioms lie behind appropriation techniques and are ultimately crucial for how and where authors employ them. Hermeneutical axioms are a community's basic convictions about Scripture, its own identity, and God's movement in history.

For instance, the Qumran community directly applied the details of Habakkuk's prophecy to themselves and their enemies.[41] They utilized a variety of specific appropriation techniques to match the prophet's words with their own situation, but their hermeneutical axioms guided and validated (in their own minds) their appropriation: they were convinced that they were the people of God, that the last days had arrived, and that the prophets spoke in riddles about the last days. We find their exegesis strained and unconvincing because we are not convinced of their hermeneutical axioms, but it obviously made perfect sense to them.

Similarly, NT exegesis assumes the hermeneutical axioms that Jesus Christ is the culmination of God's plan and that "all the law and the prophets" ultimately point to him. Identifying Jesus with OT figures may lie behind NT "fulfillments" that appear merely to resemble OT texts. This does not mean that valid exegesis

40. See Moo, *OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives,* 388-92.
41. E.g., in 1QpHab, the pesher commentary on Habakkuk.

is entirely a product of arbitrary, unprovable hermeneutical axioms; some axioms and exegeses provide a much better "fit" with the material itself than others. Rather, the point is that at the level of appropriation technique the NT can closely resemble contemporary Jewish methods, but below the surface, basic theological connections between the Testaments provide the "validating" matrix for what may seem to be arbitrary exegesis.[42]

Solving the Problem?

If Jewish exegetical methods influenced the NT's appropriation of the OT as nuanced above, what does this imply for our problem?

Peter Enns argues that (1) the NT writers quite extensively accommodate their exegetical procedure to their hermeneutical environment and that (2) this similarity sheds light on how we should understand inerrancy.[43] Adopting what he calls an "incarnational" model of inspiration, Enns argues that determining whether the NT's appropriation of the OT is valid depends on the standards of their day, not ours. So we may defend inerrancy on the grounds that the NT interpretation is correct according to ancient standards, even if it is not according to modern standards. "What is 'proper' exegesis for Paul is determined by *his* time, not ours."[44] Enns has a point (as we suggest above): we too easily assume that we may objectively evaluate the interpretations of others from our lofty perch above the historical conditions of life. But Enns's approach goes much too far in the direction of subjectivity, finally providing no basis on which to decide the question of truth.[45] The doctrine of inerrancy, as generations of Christians have classically defined and held it, does not assert that a given teaching or conclusion is true only *for them* but that it is ultimately and timelessly true.

With respect to the issue before us, then, it is not enough to argue that the NT's use of the OT is "true" because it conforms to Jewish practices in place at

42. Moo, *OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives,* 75-78.

43. See Glenn Sunshine's essay in this collection, chapter 8: "Accommodation Historically Considered."

44. Peter Enns, "Fuller Meaning, Single Goal: A Christotelic Approach to the New Testament Use of the Old in Its First-Century Interpretive Environment," in Berding and Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the NT Use of the OT,* 185. See also Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament,* 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 121-49. For similar approaches to inspiration and inerrancy, see A. T. B. McGowan, *The Divine Spiration of Scripture: Challenging Evangelical Perspectives* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2007); Kenton L. Sparks, *God's Word in Human Words: An Evangelical Appropriation of Critical Biblical Scholarship* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008).

45. See especially the criticisms of G. K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008).

that time. We must humbly evaluate the NT's use of the OT in light of what we would consider valid interpretational models. And recognizing that NT interpretational practices and Jewish techniques are similar does nothing to help us. Negatively, this similarity does not create any *prima facie* reason to question that the NT's interpretation is valid.[46] Positively, studying Jewish exegetical procedures may help (1) explain *what* the NT authors sometimes do with Scripture, (2) explain *why* they do it, and (3) show that Jesus and the NT authors often use methods that many of their contemporaries knew and accepted.

Some conservatives are content simply to note these similarities and then validate the NT authors' interpretations by appealing to their "charismatic" stance. They argue that the NT authors wrote inspired Scripture but that we cannot; therefore, we cannot replicate their non–historical-grammatical exegesis. Ellis explains Paul's procedure this way:

> His idea of a quotation was not a worshipping of the letter or "parroting" of the text; neither was it an eisegesis which arbitrarily imposed a foreign meaning upon the text. It was rather, in his eyes, a quotation-exposition, a *midrash pesher,* which drew from the text the meaning originally implanted there by the Holy Spirit and expressed that meaning in the most appropriate words and phrases known to him.[47]

We may assert on dogmatic grounds that the NT's exegesis of the OT finds the meaning that the Spirit intends, and it may be that our only alternative is a dilemma: (1) accept the NT's exegesis of the OT because of the NT's authority or (2) reject the NT's authority because it obviously misinterprets the OT. But it becomes clear at this point that appealing to Jewish exegetical techniques in the NT does not provide an answer to our fundamental problem: Is the meaning that these techniques discover "really in" the OT? Hays is correct:

> The more closely Paul's methods can be identified with recognized interpretive conventions of first-century Judaism, the less arbitrary and more historically understandable they appear; however, at the same time, such historical explanations of Paul's exegesis render it increasingly difficult to see how interpretations that employ such methods can bear any persuasive power or normative value for that mythical creature of whom Bultmann spoke with such conviction: modern man.[48]

46. Contra, e.g., Beegle (*Scripture,* 237-38 — on Matt. 2:15).

47. E. Earle Ellis, "Midrash Pesher in Pauline Hermeneutics," in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 180. For a similar approach, see Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* 191-92.

48. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture,* 8-9.

To employ the categories we introduce above, resemblance at the level of appropriation techniques does not get to the heart of the issue. Only when we consider hermeneutical axioms and the interpretations that they generate may we answer whether the interpretations are valid.

Do other proposals offer a better solution to our problem by demonstrating that the NT's exegesis is valid and coherent?

Dual Authorship

One time-honored solution to our problem (followed, e.g., by S. Lewis Johnson) is claiming that because NT authors wrote inspired Scripture, they could perceive meanings in the OT that the divine author intended but that the human authors neither expressed nor perceived. This approach correctly emphasizes that the NT authors claim to find the meaning that they give OT texts in the OT texts themselves, and, of course, we can agree that God was active in producing Scripture. But the theory of inspiration that it rests upon — positing that the divine and human authors did not mean the same thing — runs into severe difficulties with the traditional "concursive" view of how the divine and the human authors relate. Moreover, it is difficult for the view to explain why in passages such as Acts 2:29-35 the NT author directly refers to the human author of Scripture (in this case David, in Ps. 16:8-11) when claiming that the OT text is eschatologically significant.

Walter Kaiser's Theological Exegesis

Few people in our generation have given as much attention to the implications of the use of the OT in the NT for inerrancy as Walter C. Kaiser Jr.[49] His approach raises some of the most important questions involved in our problem.

Definition

From a doctrinal standpoint, Kaiser is convinced that it is illegitimate for a NT author to find more or different *meaning* in an OT text than the original human author himself intended. "The whole revelation of God as revelation hangs in

49. Many of the relevant articles are compiled and revised in Walter C. Kaiser Jr., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985); and see, more recently, Kaiser, "Single Meaning, Unified Referents: Accurate and Authoritative Citations of the Old Testament by the New Testament," in Berding and Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the NT Use of the OT,* 45-89 (responses: 152-58, 218-25).

jeopardy if we, an apostle, or an angel from heaven try to add to, delete, rearrange, or reassign the sense or meaning that a prophet himself received."[50] NT authors may draw out some implications or applications from OT texts, but this involves *significance,* not meaning. Hermeneutically, Kaiser endorses an "intentionality" theory of meaning: a text's meaning is tied to what the author of that text intended to say.[51] This meaning is single, although it may embrace more than one concept or application. A text cannot have more than one meaning.

Kaiser goes beyond dogmatic assertion; he seeks to demonstrate his approach's validity by inductively tackling some of the NT's knottiest problem-quotations. For example, our section on "Applying Old Testament Principles" (pp. 708-9 above) summarizes how he interprets 1 Corinthians 9:9. His approach to the text illustrates his method: he carefully considers the OT context of the text cited, particularly the larger theological context that many exegetes ignore or fail to see. An illegitimately atomistic exegesis or a narrow, one-sided concern with form-critical questions frequently prevents exegetes from recognizing the "informing theology," the rich tapestry of unfolding theological themes and concepts within the OT that provide the crucial context for many OT texts that the NT cites.[52] If we sufficiently account for this theological context in both the OT and the NT, apparent discrepancies disappear between the meaning of OT texts and the meaning that the NT gives OT texts.

Strengths

Kaiser commendably highlights how serious this issue is, and much of his approach is right on target.

1. Kaiser exegetes theologically. Far too many OT exegetes focus exclusively on putative stages of tradition and rigidly interpret texts in terms of hypothetical *Sitze im Leben.* Or they are so concerned to find and defend the "original" meaning of the text that they simply ignore larger theological and canonical concerns. Such myopic exegesis entirely ignores or obscures the OT's theological significance. Because it does not interpret the OT naturally, contextually,

50. Walter C. Kaiser Jr., "Legitimate Hermeneutics," in *Inerrancy,* ed. Norman L. Geisler (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 135.

51. Here Kaiser leans heavily on Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation,* although there is some doubt as to whether Kaiser fully appreciates Hirsch's own refined perspective. See E. D. Hirsch Jr., "Meaning and Significance Reinterpreted," *Critical Inquiry* 11 (1984): 202-24; "Transhistorical Intentions and the Persistence of Allegory," *New Literary History* 25 (1994): 549-67. And see especially the restatement of an author-focused approach in Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?*

52. Kaiser has been strongly influenced by Willis J. Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise,* L. P. Stone Lectures (New York: Crowell, 1905).

or *theologically,* the alleged discrepancies it finds between the OT and NT are neither significant nor surprising since the NT authors read the OT as a single, thoroughly theological book.

2. Kaiser insists that a text has a single, determinative meaning. "Hermeneutical nihilism" plagues much modern literary criticism.

3. Kaiser successfully demonstrates that his theory explains several otherwise problematic NT applications of OT texts.

Weaknesses

Kaiser's proposal raises several questions. Some wrongly criticize him for committing the "intentional fallacy."[53] More serious is the criticism that he does not sufficiently allow for the intention of the divine author of Scripture or for the "added" meaning that a text takes on as a result of the ongoing canonical process. We deal with those issues in our sections addressing "Typology," *"Sensus Plenior,"* and "Canonical Approach" (pp. 725-36 below). Here we simply note that it is not so certain that meaning should be confined to the intention of the human author of Scripture.

1. While many OT exegetes miss or marginalize overarching theological constructs that undergird OT texts, Kaiser occasionally finds more theology than OT texts clearly support. For example, Kaiser argues that the key to the use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15 is that Hosea "no doubt understood the technical nature of 'my son' along with its implications for corporate solidarity."[54] It is of course true that the OT uses "son" to describe Israel (e.g., Exod. 4:22). But what is the evidence that these other texts, or, more importantly, Hosea himself, used "son" in a corporate and individual sense? Ultimately, the crucial question is whether Kaiser's approach can solve every "problem text." Kaiser's approach succeeds only if the "informing theology" of the OT sufficiently undergirds the context of each OT text.

2. Kaiser's distinction between an OT text's meaning and significance does not always work. He argues that (1) the NT must apply an OT text's *meaning* in a way its OT author intended, but (2) the NT may apply an OT text's *significance* in a way its OT author did not consciously intend. For example, in the use of

53. See the criticism of Philip B. Payne, "The Fallacy of Equating Meaning with the Human Author's Intention," *JETS* 20 (1977): 243-52. See Walter C. Kaiser Jr. and Moisés Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning,* 2nd edition (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 29-30. The "intentional fallacy" describes the notion that one can appeal behind the text to the intention of the author. But Kaiser clearly insists that intention be tied to the evidence of the text. See also John Warwick Montgomery, "Biblical Inerrancy: What Is at Stake?" in *God's Inerrant Word: An International Symposium on the Trustworthiness of Scripture,* ed. John Warwick Montgomery (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1974), 31.

54. Kaiser, *Uses of the OT in the New,* 47-53.

Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:9, the OT text's *meaning* is the principle that workers (whether animal or human) deserve to be rewarded. Paul validly applies that principle to Christian ministers because he draws out the text's *significance.*

But that distinction is not so neat when NT authors appear to assign more or different "meaning" to an OT text than we can legitimately infer was part of the OT author's intention. This seems to be the case when the NT applies to Jesus OT texts describing God or Yahweh. Romans 10:13, for instance, applies to faith in Jesus the words of Joel 2:32: "Everyone who calls on the name of the LORD will be saved." There is no evidence from Joel or "antecedent theology" that the prophet intentionally refers to Christ. Of course, from what the NT reveals about Jesus, we understand that the NT legitimately applies OT passages about God to Jesus. Perhaps Kaiser regards this as an instance where an NT author perceives further significance in the Joel text, but this kind of procedure seems to go beyond drawing out the OT text's significance. Paul expands and more precisely defines the meaning of the word "Yahweh" (= LXX *kyrios*).[55]

Similarly, the NT applies to Jesus texts like Psalm 2:7 ("You are my son; today I have become your father") and 2 Samuel 7:14 ("I will be his father, and he will be my son"). The concept of the Davidic king and his descendants as the heirs to the promise is behind both texts, but the meaning of the word "son" is distinctly different when applied to David or Solomon than when applied to Jesus.

Partial Solution

Kaiser's theological exegesis partially solves our problem. We are extremely sympathetic to Kaiser's general approach and strongly support much of it, but it does not satisfactorily answer all the problems raised by the NT's use of the OT. Sometimes the NT attributes to OT texts more meaning than the OT author could have possibly known. That is fatal to inerrancy only if the meaning of OT texts must be confined to what we can prove their human authors intended. The next four proposed solutions look beyond the original human author.

Richard B. Hays's Intertextual Approach

One of the most innovative books on the use of the OT in the NT in recent decades is Richard B. Hays's *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* Hays argues for an intertextual approach to Paul's use of the OT, and his carefully worked out view is a good representative of this latest direction in interpretation.

55. However, see, for a different approach, C. K. Rowe, "Romans 10:13: What Is the Name of the Lord," *HBT* 22 (2000): 135-73.

Definition

Intertextuality, like so many recent developments in biblical exegesis, is indebted to insights from literary analysis. It focuses on how texts written at different times and places can resonate with one another, shedding new insight on both the old text and the new one. Intertextuality emphasizes that texts relate to one another at more fundamental levels than the explicit quotations we have focused on. Authors influenced by another text will express their dependence in a variety of ways, some of them subtle and discerned only by very careful reading.[56] We can clearly observe this process in the OT itself, and Hays sees Paul as continuing that pattern of intertextual interpretation that the Scripture itself appears to validate.

Hays focuses particularly on the literary convention of what he calls "allusive echo," *transumption,* or *metalepsis,* which he explains as follows: "When a literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text, the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts."[57] In other words, an intertextual approach views allusions between texts in light of a broad interplay between those texts. Explicit quotations are the tip of an intertextual iceberg, representing only the surface level of far-ranging intertextual relationships.

Hays's insistence that Paul quotes OT texts with attention to their larger context is similar to C. H. Dodd's famous argument that NT writers quote from blocks of OT texts.[58] But Hays goes much further than Dodd in finding what he calls "echoes" that NT quotations and allusions awaken as the perceptive reader reflects on the rich and sometimes confusing interplay between NT fulfillment and OT context and narrative.

Example: Isaiah 52:5 in Romans 2:24

Hays's interpretation of Paul's quotation of Isaiah 52:5 in Romans 2:24 is a good example.[59] At the surface level, Paul seems to misquote the OT text. But when

56. The intertextual approach is usually traced especially to the work of Julia Kristeva. See the collection of her essays in *The Kristeva Reader,* ed. Toril Moi (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986). "Intertextuality," properly defined, carries with it assumptions about the way texts relate that would generally not be accepted among evangelicals. So it is important that evangelicals who do use this word use it knowledgably and clarify what they mean by it. See Richard J. Schultz, "Intertextuality, Canon and 'Undecidability': Understanding Isaiah's 'New Heavens and New Earth' (Isaiah 65:17-25)," *BBR* 20 (2010): 19-38.

57. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture,* 20.

58. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), esp. 126-27.

59. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture,* 45-46.

we view the quotation in the light of the larger context of Isaiah 52 and of the direction of the argument in Romans, a different picture emerges. Isaiah 52 goes on to speak of God's eventual mercy to Israel, and Paul, of course, does the same thing as Romans progresses. Thus, Hays argues, once we have read to the end of Romans, we recognize that Paul's negative reading of Isaiah 52:5 is only provisional in light of the letter's larger argument.

Strengths

Hays's particular version of intertextuality has at least two strengths:

1. Against those who think that Paul quotes atomistically in proof-text fashion, Hays rightly insists that Paul often shows regard for the larger context from which he quotes.

2. Hays is also right, we think, to suggest that a rather linear and simplistic model of literary relationship has often constricted our approaches to the problem of the OT in the NT. Texts with which we are very familiar shape our thinking and writing in many different ways — some obvious, some very subtle. Hays rightly argues that we must approach Paul's interaction with the OT expecting that the OT will influence his writing in a variety of ways, some of them subtle and perhaps even unconscious to Paul himself.

Weaknesses

But we are not yet ready to jump on the intertextual bandwagon.

1. Our reaction to many interpretations indebted to a broadly intertextual approach is that they are too clever by half. Subtle relationships — sometimes too subtle for us to discern — become the central interpretive focus, often subordinating or even driving out what seem to be the text's explicit concerns. We are not so sure, for instance, that a reader of Romans, however perceptive, would note the word of promise that Hays finds in Paul's quotation of Isaiah 52:5.

2. But a more serious problem, particularly relevant to our own agenda, is the problem of validity. Hays's intertextual proposal offers little help at this point. He argues that Paul was not concerned about exegeting the OT's "original sense." Rather, under the influence of the Spirit, Paul read the OT in light of its culmination in Christ and uncovered latent meaning in the text of which the original authors themselves would often have been unaware.[60] Paul was himself convinced that his interpretations brought out the true, eschatological sense of the Scriptures, but the gap that we perceive between the original sense and the

60. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture,* 154-56.

NT application remains. Hays, we think, would argue that this gap — or at least the problem of the gap — is partly of our own making. It is only because we insist that the "historical-grammatical" method is the only way to uncover the "true" sense of the text that we have a problem at all. The gap we are talking about is created by our rather immodest insistence that the only true meaning is the meaning that *we* discover by *our* methods.

We have some sympathy with this response to the problem, but we need to look at this issue from a slightly broader perspective. We must proceed cautiously because we are moving onto ground that Hays himself does not cover. But we would at least tentatively suggest that postmodern views of meaning and interpretation influence Hays's intertextual approach (along with other similar intertextual methods). Hays seems to suggest that we can affirm that Paul's interpretation of the OT is valid only within the parameters of his hermeneutical assumptions about the fulfillment of the OT story in Christ. Further, Hays suggests that the OT may "echo" in Romans in ways of which Paul himself is not conscious. As Charles Cosgrove comments on Hays's proposal, "Paul becomes Paul-with-his canon, an intertextual field."[61] Lurking in the background seems to be the assumption that we have no "objective" perspective from which we can assess ultimate or absolute validity of interpretation. We have no metanarrative that enables us to evaluate and pronounce right or wrong the narrative of God's activity that Paul finds in the OT.

Postmodernism, to the degree that we understand it, poses both opportunities and challenges to evangelical Christianity. But surely its greatest challenge is the denial that we can discover absolute truth. And it is at this point that we are finally unsatisfied with Hays's proposal about Paul's interpretation of the OT. For all its strengths, it does not go quite far enough in dealing with the problem of validity.

Typology

For many scholars, typology is the key to understanding the NT's use of the OT.[62] Unfortunately, there is widespread disagreement about what it is.

61. Charles Cosgrove, *The Elusive Israel: The Puzzle of Election in Romans* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 56.

62. See, above all, Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (1939), trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 198: "Typology is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the NT and characteristic of it." See also Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture: Viewed in Connection with the Whole Series of the Divine Dispensations,* 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975); Roger Nicole, "Patrick Fairbairn and Biblical Hermeneutics as Related to the Quotations of the Old Testament in the New," in *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible: Papers from ICBI Summit II,* ed. Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 767-76; S. Lewis Johnson,

Definition

Typology is not a method of exegesis; rather it is "an effort to hear the two-testament witness to God in Christ, taking seriously its plain sense, in conjunction with apostolic teaching."[63] More specifically, Baker's "working definitions" are helpful:

- A *type* is a biblical event, person or institution which serves as an example or pattern for other events, persons or institutions.
- *Typology* is the study of types and the historical and theological correspondences between them.
- The *basis* of typology is God's consistent activity in the history of his chosen people.[64]

This real correspondence between the OT and NT assumes that God acts similarly in both Testaments, and it is based on the narratives of God's activity in history. The NT antitype heightens the OT type with eschatological "fullness" or an advance *(Steigerung)*.[65] Typology is a specific form of the larger "promise-fulfillment" framework essential for understanding the OT and NT's relationship; it is a core component of the canonical approach (see pp. 734-36 below). This "salvation-historical" movement from OT to NT permeates the NT and ultimately validates its specific, extensive use of the OT.[66] Both the OT and NT

"A Response to Patrick Fairbairn and Biblical Hermeneutics as Related to the Quotations of the Old Testament in the New," in Radmacher and Preus, eds., *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible,* 794; Grant R. Osborne, "Type; Typology," in *ISBE,* 4:930-32; "Type, Typology," in *EDT,* 1222-23; John E. Alsup, "Typology," in *ABD,* 682-85; G. P. Hugenberger, "Introductory Notes on Typology," in Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* 331-41.

63. Christopher R. Seitz, *Figured Out: Typology and Providence in Christian Scripture* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 10. Seitz is referring especially to what is called "figural reading," but his definition appears to be appropriate to typology as a form of figural reading. Goppelt calls it "a spiritual approach that looks forward to the consummation of salvation and recognizes the individual types of that consummation in redemptive history" (*Typos,* 202).

64. David L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: The Theological Relationship between the Old and New Testaments,* 3rd edition (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010), 180.

65. Kurt Frör, *Biblische Hermeneutik: Zur Schriftauslegung in Predigt und Unterricht,* 3rd edition (Munich: Kaiser, 1967), 86-87: "In every typological reenactment, that which is coming is placed in comparison to the old. It is not a matter of a simple completed form of the old, or of a stage of development . . . but of an eschatological fullness. The relationship, then, is neither a repetition nor a comparison, but a unique end-time consummation" (translation by authors). See also Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture,* 1:150; Goppelt, *Typos,* 17-18.

66. Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History,* trans. Sidney G. Sowers (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), is one of the more important statements of the position, but it is a widely recognized scheme. See also Herman N. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology,* trans. John Richard

unfold God's character, purpose, and plan, but God's salvation through Christ fulfills OT history, law, and prophecy. That is why NT persons, events, and institutions sometimes fulfill OT persons, events, and institutions; they repeat the OT situation at a deeper, climactic level.

Scholars disagree, however, on whether types must always be *historical* figures, events, or institutions.[67] It seems likely, however, that the NT uses typology with at least the assumption that comparisons are being made with actual history.[68] Related to this issue is the question of the relationship between typology and allegory. Some think that any attempt to differentiate these two approaches is artificial.[69] However, it does seem appropriate to distinguish them, with allegory functioning at the level of the text and the symbolic world it creates (what Treier calls "symbolic mimesis") and typology at the level of history and narrative ("iconic mimesis," according to Treier).[70] Typology is strongly historical; a "real" correspondence must exist between type and antitype. But the real meaning of allegory depends on an extra-textual hermeneutical grid.

Scholars disagree whether typology may function both prospectively (i.e., the OT type has a genuinely predictive function) and retrospectively (i.e., typology is a way of looking back at the OT and drawing out resemblances).[71] Does

---

de Witt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 44-90; and, for an evaluation of the movement, Robert W. Yarbrough, *The Salvation Historical Fallacy? Reassessing the History of New Testament Theology,* History of Biblical Interpretation Series 2 (Leiden: Deo, 2004).

67. Some claim that a historical basis for the type is unnecessary; all that is required is a "*salvation*-historical" basis. E.g., Gerhard von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," in *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics,* ed. Claus Westermann (London: SCM, 1963), 20-38. However, Richard M. Davidson argues convincingly that the NT's use of typology depends for its validity on the historical reality of the type (*Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical* Τύπος *Structures,* Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 2 [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981], 398).

68. Davidson, *Typology,* 398. Jean Daniélou, "The Fathers and the Scriptures," *Theology* 57 (1954): 85: "Typology means not that there is a relation between things visible and invisible, but that there is a correspondence between historical realities at different stages of redemptive history." Typology is inextricably bound up with a salvation-historical scheme, while allegory is not. So Cullmann, *Salvation in History,* 132-33. Cf. Francis Foulkes, *The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament,* Tyndale Old Testament Lecture (London: Tyndale, 1958), 35.

69. E.g., Mark Gignilliat, "Paul, Allegory, and the Plain Sense of Scripture: Galatians 4:21-31," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 2 (2008): 137-41.

70. Daniel J. Treier, "Typology," in *Dictionary for the Theological Interpretation of the Bible,* ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 825.

71. Davidson (*Typology,* 94) points out that typology has traditionally been viewed as having a predictive function, while many modern advocates see it as entirely retrospective. Thus, Fairbairn (*Typology of Scripture,* 1:46) requires that God design and ordain the type. See Goppelt, *Typos,* 17-18; Johnson, *OT in the New,* 56. On the other hand, others carefully distinguish typology from exegesis and claim that types need have no intrinsic prospective function. See Foulkes, *Acts*

the OT intend the NT's typological correspondence? We would answer "no" if "intend" means that the participants in the OT situation or the OT authors were always aware of the typological significance. On the other hand, we would answer "yes" if "intend" means that the OT has a "prophetic" function. In 1 Corinthians 10, Paul suggests that there is some kind of "prospective" element in typological events. He warns the Corinthians about presuming that the sacraments will shield them from God's judgment by pointing out that the Israelites also possessed a "baptism" and "spiritual food" but nevertheless experienced God's judgment. These events "occurred" to the Israelites "as examples" or types (*typoi* [1 Cor. 10:6]; *typikōs* [1 Cor. 10:11]), which implies that the events were typologically significant when they occurred.[72] While the OT participants and authors in these typological situations may have dimly perceived "anticipatory" elements, God ordered typological situations to function "prophetically."

Example: Psalm 22 in the Gospels

Psalm 22, usually categorized as an "individual lament," figures prominently in the narration of Jesus' crucifixion. Jesus uses its opening words to express his abandonment (Mark 15:34/Matt. 27:46); John 19:24 states that the dividing of Jesus' clothes "fulfilled" Psalm 22:18; and all four evangelists allude to Psalm 22 to depict the crucifixion. On what basis does the NT apply this psalm that does not appear to prophesy Jesus' passion? Five views are noteworthy:

1. There is no basis at all. Albert Vis argues that the early church arbitrarily and illegitimately applied the psalm to Christ for apologetic reasons.[73] But David, who wrote the psalm, is much more than an "individual" righteous sufferer. Many of his psalms are corporately and even eschatologically significant because he was Israel's king and because God made promises to him and his progeny.[74]

---

of God, 20-34; France, *Jesus and the OT,* 39-40; David L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," *SJT* 29 (1976): 149. For an example of typology that is primarily retrospective rather than prospective, see Andrew David Naselli, *From Typology to Doxology: Paul's Use of Isaiah and Job in Romans 11:34-35* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012).

72. See especially the careful exegesis of Davidson, *Typology,* 193-297.

73. Albert Vis, *The Messianic Psalm Quotations in the New Testament: A Critical Study on the Christian "Testimonies" in the Old Testament* (Amsterdam: Hertzberger, 1936), 38-40.

74. See Bruce K. Waltke, "A Canonical Approach to the Psalms," in *Tradition and Testament: Essays in Honor of Charles Lee Feinberg,* ed. John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg (Chicago: Moody, 1981), 11-14. Modern scholarship too often ignores this larger theological setting and significance. Cf. the critique of George Dahl, "The Messianic Expectation in the Psalter," *JBL* 57 (1938): 2: "There seems to be abroad a strangely perverted and sadistically exaggerated sense of honesty in estimating our sacred writings, according to which one ought always to choose the less worthy and less religious of two possible interpretations of any given passage. Whenever in the Psalms the word 'Messiah' appears, every nerve is strained, and every

2. Psalm 22 is a direct messianic prophecy. But the historical circumstances are too clear to accept this proposal.

3. Psalm 22 is part of a widespread "righteous sufferer" motif that the evangelists used to show the innocence of Jesus. This, of course, is true, but simply extends the problem to a larger series of passages.[75]

4. This is an instance of *sensus plenior* (see pp. 730-34 below).[76]

5. The NT applies Psalm 22 typologically.[77] This view is most persuasive. Jesus ultimately "fulfills" the experience and feelings that David undergoes in Psalm 22. David was not necessarily aware of his language's ultimate significance, but God so ordered David's experiences and psalm that they anticipate the sufferings of "David's greater son." Identifying Christ with David in a typological relationship — not chance verbal similarities — undergirds the NT's use of Psalm 22.

Partial Solution

Typology has a prospective element, but sometimes people can recognize it only retrospectively. The Israelites and OT authors certainly recognized the symbolic value of some of their history (e.g., the Exodus) and institutions (e.g., their cultus), but they did not recognize all of the OT types that God designed. Although the NT does not have to specifically designate an OT situation as a type for it to be a type,[78] (1) we would not know of some types if the NT did not reveal them to us, and (2) any types we may suggest lack Scripture's authority.

Typology obviously helps us with our problem. The NT may appear to apply

device of forced exegesis utilized, in order to make it refer merely to the secular king and his mundane affairs. Even where the whole context is saturated with the characteristic motifs of Israel's dynamic and intensely religious Messianic expectation, one must never admit that the Messiah is meant."

75. Eduard Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern,* ATANT 28 (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1955), 22-24; Lothar Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs,* SBS 59 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1972). On the background of the concept, see Hans Werner Surkau, *Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938), 7-29.

76. Pierre Grelot, *Sens chrétien de l'Ancien Testament: Esquisse d'un traité dogmatique,* 2nd edition, Bibliothèque de Théologie 1; Théologie Dogmatique 3 (Paris: Desclée, 1962), 463-64; Donald A. Hagner, "The Old Testament in the New Testament," in *Interpreting the Word of God: Festschrift in Honor of Steven Barabas,* ed. Samuel J. Schultz and Morris A. Inch (Chicago: Moody, 1976), 94-102.

77. Goppelt, *Typos,* 103; Moo, *OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives,* 289-300. For the Davidic connection, see John R. Donahue, "Temple, Trial and Royal Christology (Mk. 14:53-65)," in *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14–16,* ed. Werner H. Kelber (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 75-77.

78. On this point, see the arguments of Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture,* 1:21.

OT texts arbitrarily (e.g., based on mere verbal analogies), but these are often based on deeper, typological structures. Typology often explains how the NT's use of the OT is legitimate and coherent, although it is legitimate only if its foundational assumptions (i.e., hermeneutical axioms) are correct: God ordered OT history to prefigure and anticipate his climactic redemptive acts, and the NT is the God-breathed record of those redemptive acts.

But typology solves our problem only partially because it does not explain every problematic use of the OT in the NT. Many NT uses of the OT involve an apparently strained interpretation of specific words, and sometimes the element of correspondence is not clear.

Sensus Plenior

Definition

Sensus plenior means "fuller sense."[79] It is the idea that a scriptural text may have a "fuller sense" than what its human author consciously intended but what God, Scripture's ultimate author, did intend. When NT authors discern this fuller sense, they appear to find "new" meaning in OT texts. But this "new" meaning is part of the author's intention — the divine author but not necessarily the human author.

Raymond Brown, who wrote the most important statement and defense of *sensus plenior,* describes it as

> that additional deeper meaning, intended by God but not clearly intended by the human author, which is seen to exist in the words of a biblical text (or group of texts, or even a whole book) when they are studied in the light of further revelation or development in the understanding of revelation.[80]

79. Catholic scholars coined the term and thoroughly analyzed and debated the concept, but the term's concept (and often the term itself) is also popular among Protestants.

80. Raymond E. Brown, *The* Sensus Plenior *of Sacred Scripture* (Baltimore: St. Mary's University, 1955), 92. See also Brown's later article "The *Sensus Plenior* in the Last Ten Years," *CBQ* 25 (1963): 262-85; Raymond E. Brown and Sandra M. Schneiders, "Hermeneutics," in *New Jerome Biblical Commentary,* ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, 2 vols. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990), 1146-65; Edward F. Sutcliffe, "The Plenary Sense as a Principle of Interpretation," *Bib* 34, no. 34 (1953): 333-43; Pierre Benoit, "La plénitude de Sens de Livres Saints," *RB* 67 (1960): 161-96; Grelot, *Sens chrétien,* 458-97; and the survey in Henning Graf Reventlow, *Hauptprobleme der Biblischen Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert,* Erträge der Forschung 203 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983), 39-49. Andrea Fernández apparently first used the phrase *sensus plenior* in this sense in 1927 (Brown, *The* Sensus Plenior, 88).

Brown's definition has five significant elements:

1. The human author could dimly but not fully perceive the fuller meaning. His awareness of the *sensus plenior* could range "from absolute ignorance to near clarity."[81] Generally, however, *sensus plenior* refers to a meaning that traditional grammatical-historical exegesis cannot demonstrate.

2. The literal sense that the human author intends must relate to the fuller sense that God intends.[82] Advocates of *sensus plenior* insist on this control lest people use the concept to excuse uncontrolled allegorizing.

3. The *sensus plenior* is different than typology. The former involves the deeper meaning of *words,* the latter the extended meaning of *things.*[83] The bronze serpent in the wilderness may be a "type" of Christ on the cross, but applying Psalm 2:7 ("You are my son") to Christ involves a "deeper sense" of the words themselves.

4. The *sensus plenior* is different than what Roman Catholic scholars call "accommodation," applying a biblical text to a situation that the text itself does not envisage.[84] The *sensus plenior* approach is necessary, argues Brown, because "accommodation" cannot adequately handle the data: "[The NT writers] certainly give no evidence that they are using the Scriptures in a sense not intended by God (accommodation); on the contrary, they make it clear that their spiritual meaning is precisely that meaning intended by God, but not realized by the Jews."[85]

5. We can deduce a valid *sensus plenior* only on the basis of "revelation" or "further development in revelation." For Brown and other Roman Catholics, this authority includes the church (the "magisterium") and the NT.[86] The *sensus plenior* is thus very important for Roman Catholics because it provides a way to scripturally justify Mariology and other poorly supported theological concepts. The *sensus plenior* approach is also very popular among Protestants, who confine that "further revelation" to the NT.[87]

81. Brown, *The* Sensus Plenior, 113. Grelot (*Sens chrétien,* 453-55) argues that the author of a given text would not have been aware of the *sensus plenior* in a "notional" way but may have been conscious of a fuller meaning in some other sense.

82. Brown, "The *Sensus Plenior,*" 277; Benoit, "La plénitude," 189.

83. Brown, *The* Sensus Plenior, 92. This distinction can be traced back at least as far as Aquinas.

84. "Accommodation" in this sense is different than "accommodation" as used with respect to God's adapting himself to human words in the process of revelation.

85. Brown, *The* Sensus Plenior, 70.

86. Benoit ("La plénitude," 184-86) wants to confine the *sensus plenior* to relationships between the Testaments.

87. John Wenham succinctly states a kind of *sensus plenior* approach: "The Holy Spirit knew beforehand the course of history with its consummation in Christ, and so in guiding the writers he intended a deeper meaning than they understood" (*Christ and the Bible,* 3rd edition [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994], 107). Cf. Hagner, "OT in the NT," 91-92; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* xxxii-xxxiv.

Objections

People commonly object to *sensus plenior* for at least three reasons:

1. *Sensus plenior* lacks objective controls and is easily abused. On what basis does one decide what the Spirit's fuller meaning is through the text's words?[88] Some respond that we should accept only the "deeper meanings" that the NT specifically establishes. But whether we accept that restriction or not, this objection breaks a well-known logical principle: difficulties that a theory creates are never sufficient to falsify that theory if it is well-enough established on other grounds. If *sensus plenior* is a viable concept, we must simply live with the difficulties, much as we live with the difficulties inherent in a teleological view of world history.

2. *Sensus plenior* ruins the NT's apologetic value. The NT authors would not have appealed to a "hidden" meaning in the text because that would discredit their argument. Would skeptical Jews be likely to accept the early church's claims if they were based on unprovable assertions about what the OT "really" means? This objection has a point, but two considerations mitigate its force. (1) We must assess the "validity" of an interpretation in conjunction with the hermeneutical axioms that guide an interpretation. We would not expect, for instance, a Jewish rabbi to be immediately convinced by an NT interpretation of an OT text whose validity depends on the assumption that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah. (2) This objection assumes that the NT's audience was general and its purpose apologetic. But the design of much if not most of the NT's use of the OT is to assure or convince Christians who already assumed that the OT is relevant for the church.[89]

3. *Sensus plenior* is inconsistent with inspiration. This is the most serious objection. Since no biblical text clearly teaches *sensus plenior* and no biblical text clearly refutes it,[90] whether we accept or reject it finally depends on three factors:

88. John L. McKenzie, "Problems of Hermeneutics in Roman Catholic Exegesis," *JBL* 77 (1958): 202.

89. Cf. Hagner, "OT in the NT," 103 (though he overstates the case).

90. The text often cited with respect to this question is 1 Peter 1:10-12: "Concerning this salvation, the prophets, who spoke of the grace that was to come to you, searched intently and with the greatest care, trying to find out the time and circumstances [*tina ē poion kairon*] to which the Spirit of Christ in them was pointing when he predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glories that would follow. It was revealed to them that they were not serving themselves but you, when they spoke of the things that have now been told you by those who have preached the gospel to you by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven. Even angels long to look into these things." Kaiser argues that both indefinite pronouns in verse 10 refer to *kairon,* so that Peter is not saying that the prophets were uncertain about the person (see, e.g., "Current Crisis in Exegesis," 8). But it is perhaps more likely that the pronouns refer to two different matters: the person as well as the time (e.g., Wayne Grudem, *The First Epistle of Peter,* TNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988], 74-75).

(1) Is it necessary to explain the phenomena? (2) Does it adequately explain the phenomena? (3) Does it cohere with an acceptable theory of inspiration?

Inspiration is how God breathed out his words through human authors, and the relationship between God and the human authors is "concursive." The final product is Scripture that is definitely and uniquely *God's* word and at the same time the culturally and historically conditioned words of those human authors. The argument against *sensus plenior* claims that if this is so, then *sensus plenior* is inconsistent with inspiration because God would be placing in Scripture meanings unknown to the human authors. This "fuller meaning" cannot be part of the *text* because the meaning of that text is limited to what the divine/human author intended.[91]

This objection has some validity. A view of inspiration that "divides" Scripture's divine and human authors may be as theologically suspect as a Christology that rigidly separates Jesus' divine and human natures.

But this objection is not decisive. Brown replies that Scripture's human authors were not God's "instruments" in a rigid, technical sense. As long as God uses that "instrument" (the human author) according to its "proper sphere" (i.e., cognition and intention) and the human author is always an instrument (in the sense that the "literal" sense is always present and the "fuller" sense does not exclude it), then it is neither impossible nor objectionable that God could "elevate that instrument to produce an additional effect outside the sphere of its proper activity." Brown quotes Manuel de Tuya: "From the fact that God is using an instrument which is capable of knowledge, it does not follow that God can use this intelligent instrument only in as much as he actually knows all that God wanted to express."[92] While not strictly parallel, since the production of inspired Scripture is not involved, the example of the "prophecy" of Caiaphas (John 11:49-52) is suggestive: as "high priest that year," he communicated a message from God that goes beyond anything he consciously intended.

Walter Kaiser objects, "Could God see or intend a sense in a particular text *separate* and *different* from that conceived and intended by his human instrument?"[93] But this erects a wider chasm between the "literal" and "fuller" senses than advocates of a *sensus plenior* conceive. Brown insists that the *sensus plenior* be "homogeneous" with the literal sense,[94] and J. I. Packer, defending a limited "fuller sense," insists that this further meaning "is simple extension, development,

91. Rudolf Bierberg, "Does Sacred Scripture Have a 'Sensus Plenior'?" *CBQ* 10 (1948): 195; John J. O'Rourke, "Marginal Notes on the 'Sensus Plenior,'" *CBQ* 21 (1959): 65-66; Vawter, *Biblical Inspiration,* 115-16; Kaiser, "Current Crisis in Exegesis," 8-9.

92. Brown, *The* Sensus Plenior, 133.

93. Walter C. Kaiser Jr., "Author's Intention: Response," in Radmacher and Preus, eds., *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible,* 444.

94. Brown, "The *Sensus Plenior,*" 277.

and application of what the writer was consciously expressing."[95] The question should rather be this: Can God intend a sense related to but more than what the human author intends? The doctrine of inspiration does not require that the answer be negative.

Partial Solution

The usual objections against the idea of a *sensus plenior* are not cogent, so there does not appear to be any compelling reason for rejecting the hypothesis. We think that a suitably nuanced *sensus plenior* describes at a fundamental level much of what is happening as the NT authors appropriate the OT. Jesus and the apostles discern a "deeper" or "fuller" meaning in the very words of the Old Testament. It is the basis on which we discern this deeper meaning that becomes a critical matter, and to that we turn in our next section.

Canonical Approach

Definition

Recent scholarship has seen a very welcome shift away from atomistic exegesis and being preoccupied with what is "behind" the text (source criticism, etc.) toward a renewed concern with the text's final form. Brevard Childs has put a "canonical approach" on the map of contemporary studies, and the somewhat amorphous and hard-to-define "theological interpretation" approach is also known for such a focus. While recognizing the considerable differences among Childs and the various proponents of theological interpretation, we might summarize the matter by saying that these approaches attempt to solve our problem by focusing on the ultimate canonical context of any single OT text as the basis on which to find a "fuller" sense in that text beyond what its human author consciously intends.

Many scholars who for various reasons do not accept the *sensus plenior* approach embrace this canonical approach. Norbert Lohfink, for example, argues that people think a *sensus plenior* is necessary because historical-grammatical exegesis imposes unnecessarily stringent restrictions on what the "literal sense" is. His solution is a " 'theological' literal sense," which "means nothing other than the meaning of the Scripture read as a whole and in the *analogia fidei.*"[96]

95. J. I. Packer, "Infallible Scripture and the Role of Hermeneutics," in Carson and Woodbridge, eds., *Scripture and Truth,* 350.

96. Norbert Lohfink, *The Christian Meaning of the Old Testament* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1968), 42-43.

Many other scholars advocate a similar proposal,[97] although they do not call it a " 'theological' literal sense" because that term is easily confused with the human author's conscious intention, which is often "theological." They argue that you can legitimately interpret any specific biblical text in light of its ultimate literary context — the whole canon — which receives its unity from its single divine author. The human authors may have had inklings that their words were pregnant with meanings that they did not yet understand, but they would not have been in a position to see the entire context of their words. Some biblical books written before them may not have been available to them, and they were unaware of subsequent revelation.

Strengths

The canonical approach has much to commend it.

1. The canonical approach builds on a salvation-historical framework. In this scripturally sound scheme, the OT as a whole points forward to, anticipates, and prefigures Christ and the church: "all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John" (Matt. 11:13); "Christ is the culmination [*telos;* goal and end] of the law" (Rom. 10:4).[98] The NT views the OT as a collection of books that, in each of its parts and in its whole, was "incomplete" until Jesus "fulfilled" it by coming and inaugurating the era of salvation. Jesus "fills up" Israel's law (Matt. 5:17), history (Matt. 2:15), and prophecy (Acts 3:18). He also "fills up" the meaning of many specific OT texts.

2. The canonical approach has precedents within the OT itself because it gives deeper meaning to antecedent OT texts ("inner-canonical exegesis"). Outstanding events like the exodus become increasingly significant as they model God's future dealings with his people.[99] As the OT unfolds, Israel's Davidic king more clearly and specifically anticipates the messianic king. The "meaning" of the choice of David to be Israel's king deepens in light of further OT revelation; it goes beyond what David's contemporaries or even David himself recognized.

97. William Sanford LaSor, "Prophecy, Inspiration, and *Sensus Plenior,*" *TynBul* 29 (1978): 54-56; "The 'Sensus Plenior' and Biblical Interpretation," in *Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation: Essays Presented to Everett F. Harrison by His Students and Colleagues in Honor of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday,* ed. W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford LaSor (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 273-75; Waltke, "Canonical Approach," 5-13; Packer, "Infallible Scripture," 350; Carson, "Matthew," 118-20. Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* 60-61.

98. For this interpretation of this controversial text, see Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans,* NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 636-43.

99. Von Rad's salvation-historical approach particularly emphasized this phenomenon. See his *Old Testament Theology,* 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962). Cf. Walther Zimmerli, "Promise and Fulfillment," in Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics,* 112.

And this meaning reaches its deepest level when the greater son of David appears on the scene.

3. The canonical approach decreases and may eliminate the questionable division between the human and divine authors' intentions in a given text. This approach does not appeal to the divine author's meaning that is deliberately concealed from the human author in the process of inspiration (a *sensus occultus*); it appeals to the meaning of the text itself that takes on deeper significance as God's plan unfolds (a *sensus praegnans*). When God breathes out his words through human authors, he surely knows what the ultimate meaning of their words will be, but he has not created a *double entendre* or hidden a meaning in the words that we can uncover only through special revelation. The "added meaning" that the text takes on is the product of the ultimate canonical shape, although often we can clearly perceive it only if God reveals it.

4. The canonical approach's conclusions are verifiable to some degree. We can often verify the "fuller sense" that the NT discovers in the OT by reading OT texts as the NT authors do: as part of a completed, canonical whole.

Conclusions

As will have become clear, we are not convinced that any one of the approaches we have surveyed is adequate, by itself, to explain the multifaceted nature of the NT's use of the OT.[100] But we do think that three of these approaches, in particular, are important in providing a rationale for the NT's use of the OT. These approaches focus on slightly different aspects of the problem that we are considering.

1. The canonical approach provides the interpretive framework by answering the "why" question.
2. Typology describes one critical way in which the two testaments within the one canon can be seen to relate to each other — the "how."
3. And *sensus plenior* is the "what": the fuller, or deeper, sense that NT writers find in OT texts as they read canonically.[101] The NT authors discern a "fuller"

100. On the complicated relationship between NT and OT, analyzed in terms of the two key trajectories of "mystery" and "fulfillment," see D. A. Carson, "Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul's Understanding of the Old and the New," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism,* vol. 2, *The Paradoxes of Paul,* ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 393-436.

101. For this kind of approach in general, see also, e.g., Waltke, "Canonical Approach"; Vern Sheridan Poythress, "Divine Meaning of Scripture," *WTJ* 48 (1986): 241-79; Douglas A. Oss, "Canon as Context: The Function of Sensus Plenior in Evangelical Hermeneutics," *Grace Theological Journal* 9 (1988): 105-27; Darrell L. Bock, "The Hermeneutics of Progressive Dispensationalism," in *Three Central Issues in Contemporary Dispensationalism: A Comparison of*

meaning in OT passages by placing those texts in a wider context than the original authors could have known.

The most basic of all NT "hermeneutical axioms," then, is the authors' conviction that the God who had spoken in the OT continued to speak to them and that it was this final divine context for all of Scripture that determines the meaning of any particular text.

A question often raised at this point is what Richard Longenecker famously asked in his 1969 Tyndale lecture: "Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament?"[102] He and many after him have answered negatively. To be sure, our answer requires nuance. On the one hand, we do not have the same revelatory authority to reproduce the NT's specific applications. But on the other hand, we can usually see the theological structure and hermeneutical principles on which the NT's interpretation of the OT rests, and our interpretation can follow the NT by applying similar criteria.[103] The NT establishes a hermeneutical trajectory for future interpreters.

We can better appreciate this approach's nature and usefulness by applying it to some specific examples. In the following examples, the NT extends the OT's meaning, and the best explanation is that further revelation deepens the OT's meaning.

Psalm 8:6 in 1 Corinthians 15:27

In 1 Corinthians 15:27, Paul uses language from Psalm 8:6b to support his claim that all things would eventually be subjected to Christ: "he [probably God][104] 'has put everything under his feet' [*panta gar hypetaxen hypo tous podas autou*]."[105] The reference to this text illustrates the similarity at the level of appropriation tech-

---

Traditional and Progressive Views, ed. Herbert W. Bateman IV (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999), 85-101; Bock, "Single Meaning, Multiple Contexts and Referents: The New Testament's Legitimate, Accurate, and Multifaceted Use of the Old," in Berding and Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the NT Use of the OT,* 105-51 (responses: 90-95, 226-31), especially 116; Jared M. Compton, "Shared Intentions? Reflections on Inspiration and Interpretation in Light of Scripture's Dual Authorship," *Them* 33, no. 3 (2008): 23-33.

102. Richard Longenecker, "Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament?" *TynB* 21 (1970): 3-38.

103. See Johnson, *OT in the New,* 73-83, 93-94; Silva, "NT Use of the OT," 162-64; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis,* 193-98; Beale, *Right Doctrine.*

104. See Fee, *First Corinthians,* 757-59.

105. Unlike both the MT and the LXX, Paul's citation uses the third-person singular verb rather than the second person, but this does not really affect the meaning; the change is necessary to fit the verse into Paul's context.

nique between Paul's use of Scripture and Jewish methods, for in 1 Corinthians 15:25, Paul alludes to the language of Psalm 110:1: "he [Christ] must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet [*hypetaxen pantas tous echthrous hypo tous podas autou*]." Paul associates these texts on the basis of their similar wording, similar to the Jewish practice of *gezerah shewa*.

Hebrews 2:6-8, another NT text that quotes Psalm 8, is similar. The author of Hebrews apparently associates his quotation from Psalm 8 in Hebrews 2:6-8 with Psalm 110:1, which he quotes in Hebrews 1:13. However, whereas the Jewish technique of associating texts sometimes rested on no more than an incidental verbal similarity, associating Psalm 110:1 with Psalm 8:6 rests on a more substantive foundation. Psalm 8 praises God's majesty and expresses awe that he has given to insignificant humans such dignity and supremacy (with considerable dependence on Gen. 1:26-28); it has no ostensible "Messianic" meaning. What, then, is Paul's warrant for applying this language to Christ?

1. Paul does not really "quote" the psalm but simply borrows its language to make his point (cf. p. 707 above).[106] But although Paul does not introduce the quotation with a formula, he appears to cite the OT as evidence because his appeal is so significant in its context.

2. This is a case of the NT author finding in the OT a meaning unknown to the human author but revealed to the apostle. It is "an inspired exposition of its [the psalm's] hidden meaning."[107] We cannot exclude this possibility, but we should explore other options first.

3. A typological or even prophetic understanding of Psalm 8 validates how the NT applies it. An implicit "Son of Man" Christology lies behind the use of Psalm 8 in both 1 Corinthians 15 and Hebrews 2 because Psalm 8:4 uses the language "son of man."[108] This connection is possible, but it is not clear because neither Paul nor Hebrews has an explicit "Son of Man" Christology.

4. A canonical approach recognizes the theological significance of Paul's Adam-Christ comparison, specifically in 1 Corinthians 15. Paul sees Christ as the "second Adam," the "spiritual," "heavenly," eschatological Adam (1 Cor. 15:45-47).[109] Christ is both "like" Adam as a significant "representative head" and dif-

106. Jan Lambrecht, "Paul's Christological Use of Scripture in 1 Cor. 15:20-28," *NTS* 28 (1982): 510.

107. Charles Hodge, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (1857; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980), 332; Sutcliffe, "Plenary Sense," 333-34.

108. Joachim Jeremias, in *TDNT,* 1:143; Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959), 188; George Wesley Buchanan, *The Epistle to the Hebrews,* AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 1972), 38-51; Pauline Giles, "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *ExpT* 86 (1975): 330-31. Francis J. Moloney has argued that the targum on the psalm may preserve an early semi-messianic interpretation that could have prepared for Paul's use ("The Reinterpretation of Psalm VIII and the Son of Man Debate," *NTS* 27 [1980]: 656-72).

109. See particularly the discussion in Ridderbos, *Paul,* 85.

ferent from Adam in his origin, nature, and impact on humanity (cf. also Rom. 5:12-21). Paul views Christ as the "perfect" human being — the ideal that Adam did not realize but that the "last Adam" now embodies. Granted Paul's viewpoint, we can see why he attributes language about the ideal human to Christ. The psalm itself does not indicate that it has in view anything other than human beings in their ideal, created state. But in light of NT revelation, we can see that only Christ fulfills the role of this ideal human. Paul does not appeal to a meaning that God deliberately hid in the OT text; he appeals to an extended or ultimate meaning of the text as it is seen in the light of Christ's significance.[110]

So Paul uses Psalm 8:6 in 1 Corinthians 15:27 by applying a NT hermeneutical axiom: Christ, the second human *(Adam),* is the ideal human being. Paul discerns in the psalm a "fuller sense" in light of the larger, canonical, context.

Habakkuk 2:4b in Romans 1:17 and Galatians 3:11

No OT text is more significant for Paul than Habakkuk 2:4b: "the righteous person will live by his faith." Paul quotes it in Romans 1:17 and Galatians 3:11 to substantiate his crucial doctrine of justification by faith. The MT of Habakkuk 2:4b is *wᵉṣaddîq beʾĕmûnātô yiḥyeh:* "the righteous person will live by his faith/faithfulness." The LXX has two readings:

1. *ho de dikaios ek pisteōs mou zēsetai* (mss S, B, Q, V, and W*): "the righteous person will live by my faith/faithfulness"
2. *ho de dikaios mou ek pisteōs zēsetai* (mss A and C): "my righteous one will live by faith/faithfulness"[111]

In both his quotations, Paul departs from all known forms of the text by not using any pronoun. He has probably dropped the pronoun to aid his application

110. "As ever, the coming of Christ revealed a whole landscape on the horizon to which the Old Testament was pointing" (Derek Kidner, *Psalms 1–72: An Introduction and Commentary on Books I and II of the Psalms,* TOTC [London: Inter-Varsity, 1973], 68). Cf. Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians,* 357; Dodd, *According to the Scriptures,* 117-18; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews,* NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 36; Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 83-87; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, "1 Corinthians," in Beale and Carson, eds., *Commentary on the NT Use of the OT,* 742; Thiselton, *First Corinthians,* 1235.

111. Other Greek versions use the third-person qualifier (8 Hev XII gr, col. 12; Aquila) or the even more clear reflexive (Symmachus). On the textual situation, see Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), 231; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 240-42; D.-A. Koch, "Der Text von Hab 2 4b in des Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament," *ZNW* 76 (1985): 68-85.

of the text.[112] It is less clear that Paul has used this text because it had already become one of the early Christian "testimonies" to Christ in the OT.[113]

To understand how Paul is applying this verse, we must first set it in its context. Habakkuk 2:1 concludes the prophet's second complaint about the Lord's way with his people (1:12–2:1) with him taking his stand to await the Lord's answer, which comes in verses 2-4:

> 2Then the Lord replied: "Write down the revelation and make it plain on tablets so that a herald may run with it. 3For the revelation awaits an appointed time; it speaks of the end and will not prove false. Though it linger, wait for it; it will certainly come and will not delay. 4See, he is puffed up; his desires are not upright — but the righteous will live by their faithfulness — "

As the dashes around verse 4b in the NIV suggest, the reference to the "righteous person" interrupts a denunciation of the person whose soul is "puffed up" or "not upright" (v. 4a; the Heb. here is difficult). A few interpreters suggest that "the righteous" might refer to the Messiah,[114] but the implied contrast with the "puffed up" person along with Habakkuk's other uses of *ṣaddîq/dikaios* (1:4, 13) shows that he is referring to the person within the covenant community who remains loyal to Yahweh. This kind of person, Habakkuk proclaims, "will live by his faith/faithfulness." The identification of the antecedent of the pronominal suffix is unclear. The NIV, along with most English versions, assumes that the pronoun refers to "the righteous." But it could also refer to the Lord (this is the way the LXX reads it, whether as an inadvertent misreading or a deliberate interpretation) or to the "revelation."[115] Probably, however, Habakkuk 2:4b refers to the stance

112. See especially Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic,* 231; Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus,* Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 68-85; A. Feuillet, "La citation d'Habacuc II.4 et les Huit premiers chapîtres de L'Epitre aux Romains," *NTS* 6 (1958): 52-80; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* 2 vols., ICC (London: T. & T. Clark, 1975-79), 1:101-2.

113. As Dodd argues (*According to the Scriptures,* 49-51).

114. Richard Hays, " 'The Righteous One' as Eschatological Deliverer: A Case Study in Paul's Apocalyptic Hermeneutics," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn,* ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), although Hays thinks the text also alludes to people who are righteous by the faith of the Messiah/their own faith; Douglas Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 683-84 (and 613-16 for more detail on Rom. 1:17); Desta Heliso, *Pistis and the Righteous One: A Study of Romans 1:17 against the Background of Scripture and Second Temple Jewish Literature,* WUNT 2.235 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), who offers the fullest treatment and does not conclude in favor of a messianic interpretation but does argue that scholars should be open to the option.

115. J. Gerald Janzen, "Habakkuk 2:2-4 in the Light of Recent Philological Advances,"

of the righteous person, the interpretation found in both the Dead Sea Scrolls (faithfulness or loyalty to the Teacher of Righteousness [1QpHab 8:1-3]) and later rabbinic texts (Hab. 2:4b summarizes the entire Mosaic law [*b. Mak.* 24a]).

How has Paul appropriated this text? We may identify three "problems":

1. In both Romans and Galatians, "live" has the theological sense of ultimately attaining eternal life. But most scholars think that in Habakkuk "live" means "live out one's life," although the use of *ḥyh* in the Book of the Twelve gives some reason to suspect that the word may have a more theological sense. The verb occurs sixteen times, and apart from places where it refers simply to "living beings," most of the occurrences refer to "true life," "life before God," "blessing" (Hos. 6:2; 14:7; Amos 5:4, 6, 14; Zech. 10:9; the only other occurrence in Habakkuk refers to God's "reviving" his works [3:2]). To be sure, there is still a difference between Habakkuk and Paul, but it is the difference of a fuller conception of what life with the Lord consists in, not a shift from one concept to a completely foreign one.

2. In Habakkuk, "faith/faithfulness" modifies the verb, as the Masoretic punctuation suggests.[116] The situation is not so clear in Paul, who probably connects "by faith" with "righteous" in Romans 1:17.[117] In Galatians 3:11, the issue is much harder to determine; perhaps here Paul connects "by faith" with "live."[118] But even if Paul connects "by faith" with "righteous" in both passages, the difference from Habakkuk is again not great. "Righteous" in Habakkuk does not refer to a person who is morally righteous, but to one who is a faithful member of God's covenant people.

3. The word *ʾĕmûnâ* has the sense of faithfulness (NIV), fidelity, or steadfastness.[119] In the OT, of course, people demonstrated this faithfulness to the Lord by obeying his law. Paul, however, appropriates the text to prove that people are in a right relationship with God based on "faith" apart from the law. Again, however,

---

HTR 73 (1980): 53-78; Francis I. Andersen, *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* AB 25 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 213-14; Rikki E. Watts, " 'For I Am Not Ashamed of the Gospel': Romans 1:16-17 and Habakkuk 2:4," in *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday,* ed. Sven Soderlund and N. T. Wright (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 9-10.

116. We assume that "faith" in both texts refers to human believing rather than to the faith/faithfulness of Christ (contra, e.g., Frank J. Matera, *Galatians,* SP 9 [Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992], 119; Campbell, *Deliverance,* 863 [on Gal. 3:11]). I doubt that "faith" refers to Christ's faith/faithfulness anywhere in Paul. For a survey of the "faith of Christ" debate, see especially Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle, eds., *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009).

117. See especially Moo, *Romans,* 77-78.

118. See especially H. C. C. Cavallin, " 'The Righteous Shall Live by Faith': A Decisive Argument for the Traditional Interpretation," *ST* 32 (1978): 33-43; Maureen W. Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul: A Comparison with Special Reference to "Faith That Can Remove Mountains" and "Your Faith Has Healed/Saved You,"* WUNT 2.147 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 208-10.

119. A. Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:154-55.

while Habakkuk and Paul are not saying exactly the same thing, their meanings are not as far apart as they might first appear (or as many interpreters insist they are). In the OT *ʾĕmûnâ* refers to an underlying commitment to the Lord, to a "trust" in his person or promises, and in this context to "confident waiting on God to act."[120] In the old covenant era, this trust *resulted* in obeying God's law, but we should not equate it with obeying God's law. The sense of *ʾĕmûnâ* here is not so distant from Paul's concept of "faith," especially if the emphasis on faith in Habakkuk 2:4 depends on Genesis 15:6.[121] As Watson comments, " 'Faithfulness' speaks more adequately of the way of life that corresponds to the vision, whereas 'faith' speaks of the fundamental orientation towards the vision presupposed in this way of life; but each clearly entails the other."[122]

Paul, therefore, deepens the sense of some of the key words in Habakkuk while faithfully affirming what Habakkuk emphasizes: the person who is loyal to God will look for and wait for his vindication on the basis of a deep-seated trust in the Lord and his promises. Paul gives each term a specific nuance that the original does not have, but his interpretation preserves Habakkuk's essential thrust. This is far different from how Qumran documents and rabbinic texts apply Habakkuk 2:4 to law-keeping.[123]

Paul gives Habakkuk 2:4 more depth, new richness, and a more precise significance in the light of the revelation of the righteousness of God (Rom. 3:21).[124] God

120. F. F. Bruce, "Habakkuk," in *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary,* ed. T. E. McComiskey (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 2:861. Cf. Richard D. Patterson, *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah,* WEC (Chicago: Moody, 1991), 178-81; Charles H. H. Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 704-6.

121. Moisés Silva, "Galatians," in Beale and Carson, eds., *Commentary on the NT Use of the OT,* 802.

122. Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith,* 161; cf. his larger discussion on 157-63.

123. 1QpHab 7:17 quotes Hab. 2:4 and applies it to "all the doers of the law in the house of Judah" who will be delivered out of the house of judgment because of their sufferings and their faith in the teacher of righteousness (8:1-3a). Clearly, "faith in the teacher of righteousness," linked as it is to doing the law, means something far different from Paul's "faith in Jesus Christ." The rabbis set forth Hab. 2:4 as a key summary of God's demand, but it was related to keeping the law and monotheism (cf. b. Mak. 23b; Cranfield, *Romans,* 1:101).

124. Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer,* 14th edition, KEK 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 90: "The OT and Jewish thought form has been expanded through the gospel" (translation by authors). Cf. Hermann Cremer, *Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre im Zusammenhange ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen,* 2nd edition (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1900), 348-49; Ridderbos, *Paul,* 172. August Strobel ties Paul's use of this verse to a Jewish eschatological scheme based on Habakkuk 2:3 (*Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem: Auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2 ff,* NovTSup 2 [Leiden: Brill, 1961], 173-202), while Ellis suggests that Hab. 2:4 may function as part of a midrashic structure with Gen. 15:6 as its basis ("Midrash Pesher," 174-77). Neither suggestion has enough evidence to make it convincing.

obviously foresaw this added dimension to his words through the prophet, but there is no evidence that Paul cites the verse on the basis of a hidden meaning in it. God's further revelation is what gives Habakkuk's great principle its ultimate meaning.

Hosea 2:23 and 1:10 in Romans 9:25-26

Paul appropriates the OT a little differently in his mixed quotation from the prophet Hosea that defends his claim that God has "called" "objects of his mercy . . . not only from the Jews but also from the Gentiles" (Rom. 9:23-24). Paul applies Hosea with a striking "shift in application," what Ross Wagner calls "a radical rereading."[125] What might justify this?

Paul quotes freely from Hosea 2:23 (MT and LXX 2:25) in Romans 9:25 and then verbatim from the LXX version of Hosea 1:10a (MT and LXX 2:1b) in Romans 9:26. Paul changes the sequence of the verses, reverses the order of the two clauses he cites from 2:23, and uses wording different from both the LXX and MT:

> As he says in Hosea: "I will call them 'my people' who are not my people [Hos. 2:23c]; and I will call her 'my loved one' who is not my loved one" [Hos. 2:23b], and "In the very place where it was said to them, 'You are not my people,' they will be called 'children of the living God [Hos. 1:10].' " (Rom. 9:25-26)

These differences lead some to suggest that Paul has taken these quotations (perhaps with the others in Rom. 9:25-29) from a catena already in existence.[126] This is certainly possible, since 1 Peter 2:10 attests how popular this language from Hosea was in the early church.[127] Paul does modify the text in several ways, most notably by replacing the more generic verb "I will say" (in both the MT and LXX) with *kalesō,* "I will call." This is almost certainly Paul's own change since it matches exactly the point for which he quotes Hosea (cf. "call" in Rom. 9:24).[128] By reversing

125. J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans,* NovTSup 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 89.

126. E.g., O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer,* MeyerK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 316.

127. Others, however, doubt the existence of a pre-Pauline testimonium: Koch, *Schrift,* 104-5, 166-67; Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture,* 109-13. For the use of Hosea in early Christianity, see Dodd, *According to the Scriptures,* 75.

128. Another difference between Paul's quotation and the majority LXX tradition is his use of the verb *agapaō* ("love") in Rom. 9:25b rather than *eleeō* ("have mercy"). It is possible that Paul found *agapaō* in his text (MS B has this verb). Lindars (*New Testament Apologetic,* 243), on the other hand, thinks that Paul independently translates the Hebrew. But it is more likely that Paul himself makes the change in order to compare it with Rom. 9:13: "Jacob I *loved,* but Esau I hated" (Mal. 1:3; emphasis added). See Wagner, *Heralds,* 81-82.

the order of the clauses in Hosea 2:23, Paul places *kalesō* at both the beginning and end of his composite quotation, which clearly indicates where his stress lies.[129]

But a potentially more serious instance of what seems to be arbitrary hermeneutics is how Paul applies these Hosea texts to the calling of Gentiles. Hosea predicts that God will renew his mercy toward the rebellious northern tribes of Israel (or perhaps toward Israel as a whole):[130] God again shows mercy and adopts as his people those whom he rejected and symbolically named (*Loʾ-Ruḥāmâ;* "not pitied") and (*Loʾ-ʿAmmî;* "not my people") (Hos. 1:6-9). Interpreters have sought to get around this difficulty by arguing that Hosea's prophecy includes the Gentiles.[131] But, however much one might want to justify this conclusion theologically, there is no exegetical evidence for it. Others avoid the difficulty by arguing that Paul applies these passages to the calling of the Jews rather than the Gentiles.[132] But the chiastic structure of the passage that we note above is against it, and the explicit mention of Israel in the introduction to the Isaiah quotations in Romans 9:27 implies a change of subject. Other apologists for the apostle's hermeneutics think that Paul may imply an analogy: God's calling of Gentiles operates on the same principle as God's promised renewal of the ten northern tribes.[133] But Paul requires more than an analogy to establish from Scripture that God calls Gentiles to be his people.

One of Paul's hermeneutical axioms helps to explain how he applies these Hosea prophecies to God's including Gentiles in Paul's day: the Christian church embodies the ultimate fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham. For Hosea's prophecy echoes the Abrahamic promise of Genesis.[134] The opening words of

129. Rom. 9:26 concludes, "they shall be called *(klēthēsontai)* sons of the living God."

130. Most commentators on Hosea think that Hos. 1:10 refers to the northern tribes only, but Douglas Stuart thinks that it refers to reunited Israel as a whole (*Hosea-Jonah,* WBC [Waco, TX: Word, 1987], 38).

131. See Theodore Ferdinand Karl Laetsch: "Very clearly God here prophesies the admission of the heathen into covenant relations with God" (*Bible Commentary: The Minor Prophets* [St. Louis: Concordia, 1956], 75).

132. John A. Battle Jr., "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:25-26," *Grace Theological Journal* 2 (1981): 115-29.

133. See, e.g., S. Lewis Johnson, "Evidence from Romans 9–11," in *A Case for Premillennialism: A New Consensus,* ed. Donald K. Campbell and Jeffrey Townsend (Chicago: Moody, 1992), 207-10; Jean Noël Aletti, *Comment Dieu est-il juste? Clefs pour interpréter l'épître aux Romains* (Rome: Editions du Seuil, 1991), 219-22; Jan Ridderbos, *Isaiah,* trans. John Vriend, Bible Students Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 565-66. Scott J. Hafemann suggests that Paul's use of *hōs* ("as") in the introductory formula may signal the presence of such an analogy ("The Salvation of Israel in Romans 11:25-32: A Response to Krister Stendahl," *ExAud* 4 [1988]: 47).

134. Perhaps this is why some rabbis applied these Hosea texts to the conversion of proselytes (cf. *Pesiq. R.* 87b; H.-J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961], 240).

Hosea 1:10 (which Paul does not quote) predict, "Yet the Israelites will be like the sand on the seashore, which cannot be measured or counted." This theme of innumerable descendants is a constant refrain in the Abrahamic promise texts of Genesis, and the analogy with the "dust of the earth" or "the sand on the seashore" occurs four times.[135] Other OT texts use the language in the same way, and Paul quotes one of those texts in the very next verse (Isa. 10:22 in Rom. 9:27).[136] As Stuart reconstructs the logic, "Those who are in Christ constitute Abraham's seed, of whom this prediction of great growth was made."[137] So Paul does not apply Hosea arbitrarily. Rather, he reads the movement of salvation history in which he understands the "seed" of Abraham ultimately to encompass believers from all nations (Rom. 4). The legitimacy of Paul's interpretation of the OT rests on the movement of revelation. Only those who accept Paul's hermeneutical assumptions about the direction of this movement will see this application of Hosea's prophecy as legitimate.

A Final Note

At the end of the day, then, our conclusion to the problem of the OT in the NT is a limited one. We cannot *prove* that the NT's interpretation of the OT is correct at every point. What we can do, however, is to show how the NT's interpretation of the OT repeatedly rests on fundamental hermeneutical axioms that nearly all early Christians shared. In other words, we can demonstrate that their appropriation of the OT is internally consistent.

Perhaps we can shed some light on our approach by looking at some broader issues in contemporary interpretation. The traditional approach to validating the NT's use of the OT rests on what philosophers would call "foundationalism," the idea that we have a solid, unassailable foundation on which to construct and by which to assess our truth claims. Scholars would assume that modern historical-critical techniques would reveal *the* meaning of a particular OT text and that any deviation from that meaning in a NT quotation spells trouble for its validity. Postmodernism, of course, rejects any such foundation and, therefore, has the potential to throw us into a sea of relativism and chaos. But there is a middle position that both acknowledges the problems with foundationalism and yet rejects the relativity of postmodernism. Kevin Vanhoozer calls this "fallibilism," and he insists that the key issue is testability.[138] We may not be able to construct a truth

135. Gen. 13:16 and 28:14 use the Hebrew word *ʿāpār* ("dust") while Gen. 22:17 and 32:12 use the word *ḥôl* ("sand"). The LXX translates both with *ammos,* which also occurs in Hos. 2:1.

136. Wagner (*Heralds,* 89-92) emphasizes this point.

137. Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah,* 41.

138. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "Christ and Concept: Doing Theology and the 'Ministry' of Phi-

claim from the ground up, each proposition following inevitably and rationally from the previous one and all resting on the unshakable foundation of agreed-upon propositions. But any truth claim must be able to survive the test of rationality and adequacy. Does it make sense? Does it explain the phenomena? If we apply this fallibilism to the problem we are addressing, then we should be asking, "Does the NT's interpretation of the OT make sense? Does it make better sense than the interpretation of the OT found at Qumran or in the rabbis?" We still may not be able to "prove" that the NT fulfills the OT.[139] But we can ask whether the overall framework of biblical truth established by the NT's interpretation of the OT validates their assumed unity.[140] Such a task goes far beyond the bounds of our present more modest study.

The phenomena of the OT in the NT, then, constitute a mixed picture for the doctrine of inerrancy. On the one hand, NT writers claim meanings for OT texts that cannot be demonstrated on the basis of the typical canons of modern grammatical-historical criticism. On the other hand, those canons are themselves no longer given the kind of objective and final weight in our interpretation of Scripture that they once were. In particular, as we have argued, meaning must be a product ultimately of the broader context in which we understand particular texts. Once we admit as vital to our interpretation of all of Scripture the reality of the developing canon, we can cogently argue that the NT's interpretation of the OT is reasonable.[141] Certainly, in our view, the issues do not constitute enough "inductive" data to overthrow the clear claims of Scripture for itself, claims that the Christian church through the centuries has recognized as significant to provide clear and enduring authority for the people of God.

---

losophy," in *Doing Theology in Today's World: Essays in Honor of Kenneth S. Kantzer* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 99-145, esp. 103.

139. See Peter Jensen's essay, "God and the Bible," chapter 16 in this collection.

140. The interplay of induction and deduction, noted by Watson, *Hermeneutics of Faith,* 190-91, is a similar approach to this issue. He explains, "The deductive approach keeps the inductive one from interpretative arbitrariness by insisting that it remains accountable to the texts; the inductive approach keeps the deductive one from abstraction by insisting that it remains accountable to the actuality of Christ."

141. For some examples, see especially Beale and Carson, eds., *Commentary on the NT Use of the OT.*