

HANDBOOK
on the
NEW TESTAMENT Use
of the OLD TESTAMENT

EXEGESIS AND INTERPRETATION

G. K. Beale


Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

© 2012 by G. K. Beale

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287
www.bakeracademic.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Beale, G. K. (Gregory K.), 1949–

Handbook on the New Testament use of the Old Testament : exegesis and interpretation /

G. K. Beale.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 978-0-8010-3896-9 (pbk.)

1. Bible. O.T.—Relation to the New Testament. 2. Bible—Hermeneutics. I. Title.

BS2387.B43 2012

225.6—dc23

2012013968

Unless otherwise identified, Scripture quotations are from the New American Standard Bible®, copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Scripture quotations labeled KJV are from the King James Version of the Bible.

Scripture quotations labeled NIV are from the Holy Bible, New International Version®. NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2010 by Biblica, Inc.™ Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide. www.zondervan.com

Scripture quotations labeled NRSV are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

The internet addresses, email addresses, and phone numbers in this book are accurate at the time of publication. They are provided as a resource. Baker Publishing Group does not endorse them or vouch for their content or permanence.

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



To the memory of S. Lewis Johnson, who first taught me
about how the New Testament uses the Old Testament

Contents

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction	xvii
1 Challenges to Interpreting the Use of the Old Testament in the New	1
2 Seeing the Old Testament in the New: Definitions of Quotations and Allusions and Criteria for Discerning Them	29
3 An Approach to Interpreting the Old Testament in the New	41
4 Primary Ways the New Testament Uses the Old Testament	55
5 Hermeneutical and Theological Presuppositions of the New Testament Writers	95
6 The Relevance of Jewish Backgrounds for the Study of the Old Testament in the New: A Survey of the Sources	103
7 A Case Study Illustrating the Methodology of This Book	133
Select Bibliography on the New Testament Use of the Old	149
Author Index	163
Ancient Writings Index	167

Preface

My first substantive exposure to the use of the Old Testament (OT) in the New Testament (NT) was in a course I took on this subject during the mid-1970s from S. Lewis Johnson. This piqued my great interest in the subject. When I decided to do doctoral work at the University of Cambridge, Dr. Johnson suggested that one of the areas needing study was the use of the Old Testament in John's Apocalypse. So I rushed into a subject where angels fear to tread (though they do tread a lot in this book). When I finished the dissertation, I continued to write in the area of the OT in the NT and have done so since then.

This book had its birth in a class on the use of the OT in the NT, which I first taught in 1985 at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. There I tried to develop further what I had learned in Dr. Johnson's class on the subject. Over the years I continued to teach the course at Gordon-Conwell on a regular basis and at Wheaton College Graduate School, and most recently I have taught it at Westminster Theological Seminary. Part of the culmination of my studies in this area over the years has been the recent publication of two major works: *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), which I edited together with D. A. Carson, and *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), which focused on the biblical-theological relationship of the Old Testament to the New. This handbook provides a sketch of the method lying behind the *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, which Don Carson and I asked all the contributors to that volume to follow. The methodology of this handbook also lies behind much of the analysis in my *New Testament Biblical Theology*.

I have come to realize that no existing book primarily aims to set forth an approach to interpret OT citations and allusions in the NT. Therefore, seeing this need, I have tried to fill that gap with this handbook on the subject. The purpose of this book is to provide pastors, students, and other serious readers

of Scripture with a how-to approach for interpreting the use of the OT in the NT. I hope that scholars will also find the book helpful.

As with my past projects, I am indebted beyond words to my wife, Dorinda, who has discussed aspects of this book with me during the past years and remains as excited as I am about the subject. She has been one of the main instruments through which I have been able to understand this topic in more depth.

I thank Jim Kinney and his staff for accepting this book for publication. I am thankful for the careful editorial work done by the staff at Baker Academic.

I am likewise grateful to a number of churches and seminaries that over the years have asked me to speak at conferences on some of the themes of this book. I particularly want to acknowledge the following schools and organizations who invited me to speak on parts of chapters of this book in 2011 and 2012: Johaanelunds Theological Seminary (Uppsala, Sweden), Örebro Theological Seminary (Örebro, Sweden), University of Lund (Lund, Sweden), Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (Louisville, Kentucky), Theofil Conference (affiliated with the International Fellowship of International Students; Lund, Sweden), and the regional conference of the New England branch of the Evangelical Theological Society. Likewise, I am thankful to generations of students—from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Wheaton College Graduate School, and more recently, Westminster Theological Seminary—who have asked many questions about the topic, causing me to reflect more deeply and to try to clarify my perspectives.

I also want to offer appreciation to the following research students who either helped do research or double-checked and edited the manuscript of this book: Matthew A. Dudreck and Nick Owens. I am also grateful to my colleagues Vern Poythress and Brandon Crowe for reading a rough draft of this book and making many helpful comments, which I have incorporated at points. Above all, I am thankful to God for enabling me to conceive the idea for this book, building on the shoulders of others before me, and giving me the energy and discipline to write it. It is my prayer that God's glory will be more greatly manifested as a result of readers' using this book.

A few comments about some stylistic aspects of the book are in order. English translations follow the New American Standard Bible unless otherwise indicated; when a translation is different, it often represents my own translation (AT, author's trans.). With respect to all translations of ancient works, when the wording differs from standard editions, then it is my translation or someone else's (whom I indicate).

References to the Greek NT are from the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed. (NA²⁷). I cite the Hebrew OT from the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (MT = Masoretic Text). For the Septuagint (LXX), I use the Greek-English parallel text of *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament and Apocrypha with an English Translation*, by Lancelot C. L. Brenton (1851;

repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972), which is dependent on Codex B and is published by special arrangement with Samuel Bagster and Sons (London), and later under the title *The Septuagint with Apocrypha* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986). This will enable those not knowing Greek to be able to follow the Septuagint in a readily available English edition.

My references to the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) come primarily from the edition of Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), and sometimes I make reference to *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2000). In addition, other translations of DSS were consulted and sometimes preferred in quotations (such as the one by A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961]). At times variations in the translation from the primary text of García Martínez reflect my own translation.

G. K. Beale
Professor of New Testament and Biblical Theology
Westminster Theological Seminary
Philadelphia
July 2012

Abbreviations

General

AT	author's translation	p(p).	page(s)
chap(s).	chapter(s)	repr.	reprint
esp.	especially	rev.	revised
ibid.	in the same source	v(v).	verse(s)
idem	by the same author		

Divisions of the Canon

NT	New Testament	OT	Old Testament
----	---------------	----	---------------

Ancient Texts, Text Types, and Versions

DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls	MT	Masoretic Text
LXX	Septuagint	OG	Old Greek

Modern Editions

NA ²⁷	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . Edited by [E. and E. Nestle], B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger. 27th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993
USB ⁴	<i>The Greek New Testament</i> . Edited by B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / United Bible Societies, 1993

Modern Versions

KJV	King James Version
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version

Hebrew Bible / Old Testament

Gen.	Genesis	Song	Song of Songs
Exod.	Exodus	Isa.	Isaiah
Lev.	Leviticus	Jer.	Jeremiah
Num.	Numbers	Lam.	Lamentations
Deut.	Deuteronomy	Ezek.	Ezekiel
Josh.	Joshua	Dan.	Daniel
Judg.	Judges	Hosea	Hosea
Ruth	Ruth	Joel	Joel
1–2 Sam.	1–2 Samuel	Amos	Amos
1–2 Kings	1–2 Kings	Obad.	Obadiah
1–2 Chron.	1–2 Chronicles	Jon.	Jonah
Ezra	Ezra	Mic.	Micah
Neh.	Nehemiah	Nah.	Nahum
Esther	Esther	Hab.	Habakkuk
Job	Job	Zeph.	Zephaniah
Pss./Pss.	Psalms	Hag.	Haggai
Prov.	Proverbs	Zech.	Zechariah
Eccles.	Ecclesiastes	Mal.	Malachi

New Testament

Matt.	Matthew	1–2 Thess.	1–2 Thessalonians
Mark	Mark	1–2 Tim.	1–2 Timothy
Luke	Luke	Titus	Titus
John	John	Philem.	Philemon
Acts	Acts	Heb.	Hebrews
Rom.	Romans	James	James
1–2 Cor.	1–2 Corinthians	1–2 Pet.	1–2 Peter
Gal.	Galatians	1–3 John	1–3 John
Eph.	Ephesians	Jude	Jude
Phil.	Philippians	Rev.	Revelation
Col.	Colossians		

Apocrypha and Septuagint

Bar.	Baruch	1–4 Macc.	1–4 Maccabees
1–2 Esd.	1–2 Esdras		

Secondary Sources

AB	Anchor Bible
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
EBC	Expositor's Bible Commentary
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
NAC	New American Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTM	New Testament Monographs
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Introduction

The purpose of this handbook is to provide a short guide to the use of OT citations and allusions in the NT. The intended audience is serious-minded Christians, students, and pastors, with the hope that even scholars might benefit. The way the OT is used in the NT has been a topic of many, many books and scholarly articles since the mid-twentieth century. No one, however, has yet attempted to produce a handbook that can help guide interpreters through the process of analyzing the multitude of OT references. There will never be a perfect handbook for this topic. Nevertheless, the present project is an attempt to provide more help in this endeavor than previously available.

This book does not try to give thorough discussions of the various issues that it addresses. Rather, the focus is on methodological approaches and sources to aid in the task of understanding how the NT writers refer to the OT. The main guidelines covered in this book lie behind the work done in the *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*.¹

Chapter 1 begins with a brief discussion of some of the most important debates about the use of the OT in the NT. The purpose here is to alert readers to some of the challenging issues confronting interpreters in this area before they begin the interpretative work themselves.

After reviewing some of the difficult problems confronting interpreters in this field, chapter 2 begins to focus on the first step in analyzing the OT in the NT: how does one know when a NT writer is actually referring to an OT passage? In particular, this chapter discusses the criteria for recognizing quotations and especially allusions. The criteria for discerning allusions have been the subject of much debate over the last few decades.

1. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

Chapter 3 addresses the main concern of this handbook: what method should be used for interpreting how the NT uses the OT? A ninefold procedure is offered for analyzing OT references. Some scholars do not like the suggestion that a “method” or “procedure” can be offered that is adequate for any interpretative enterprise in the Bible. Naturally, no procedure can be used as a strict formula that, when followed, guarantees finding the “true interpretation” or “exhaustive” meaning. This is because interpretation is not only a science but also a literary art. Furthermore, no interpretation can exhaust the full meaning of a text, though good interpretation can uncover meaning so that readers can obtain a sufficient understanding of a passage. Accordingly, the guidelines offered in this chapter are just that—guides—not formulas that inevitably lead to correct interpretations. The approaches analyzed in this chapter offer various angles from which readers can view the biblical text, angles that cumulatively help readers to better understand the way the NT uses the OT. Other angles of reflection can certainly be added to the ones covered here. The goal is to better grasp the way the two Testaments are related at the particular points where OT references are found. Our ultimate aim is to hear and understand more clearly the voice of the living God as he has spoken and continues to speak in his “living words” (Acts 7:38 NIV) and accordingly to know and encounter God increasingly, to know his will, and so to honor him.²

Chapter 4 elaborates on one of the elements of the approach mentioned in chapter 3: the kinds of interpretative uses of the OT in the NT. This certainly is not an exhaustive list. Instead, it is an effort to discuss the main ways NT writers have interpreted OT passages. This section is based partly on the work of past scholars in their studies of this subject.

Chapter 5 further develops another aspect of the central discussion from chapter 3: the theological and hermeneutical presuppositions underlying the NT authors’ use of the OT. Not all agree about what these presuppositions are.

Chapter 6 likewise expands on yet one more aspect of the central discussion in chapter 3: How does one discover the various ways Judaism has interpreted a particular OT passage referred to in the NT? What primary sources in Judaism are important in this task? How does one use these sources to discover how they interpret OT passages? Tracing such an interpretative tradition in Judaism can sometimes shed light on the way a NT writer uses an OT passage. Such Jewish interpretations may positively illuminate the meaning or may show how unique the NT’s use is in contrast to that of Judaism.

The last chapter provides a fleshing out of the preceding chapters on methodology. There is a case study illustrating a typical use of the OT in the NT.

A select bibliography appears at the end of the book.

2. Although I realize that not everyone in the academic guild shares this goal.

1

Challenges to Interpreting the Use of the Old Testament in the New

Before proceeding to suggest guidelines for studying the OT in the NT, readers should be generally aware of several classic debates that have arisen over the way the NT writers and Jesus use the OT.

How Much Continuity or Discontinuity Is There between the Old Testament and the New?

The most important debate is about whether the NT interprets the Old in line with the original OT meaning. Does the NT show awareness of the contextual meaning of the OT references to which it appeals? How much continuity or discontinuity is there between the original meaning of the OT passages and their use in the NT? Scholars give conflicting answers to these questions.

The Debate about the Influence of Jewish Interpretation on the New Testament Writers

One widely held position is that Jesus and the writers of the NT used noncontextual hermeneutical methods that caused them to miss the original meaning of the OT texts that they were trying to interpret. In doing so, they were influenced by their Jewish contemporaries, whether in earlier rabbinic midrashic exegesis, Qumran scrolls, or Jewish apocalyptic literature. Today we generally regard noncontextual methods as illegitimate. While

they refer to the OT, they do not interpret it in a way consistent with the original meaning of the OT passage.¹ For example, it is held that the NT allegorizes various OT texts, reading in foreign meanings that completely miss the earlier meaning of the OT author. Some scholars conclude that such uncontrolled interpretations are but one of the many ways the NT bears the mark of human fallibility.

Others agree that at certain places the NT writers missed the meaning of the OT yet believe that they were guided in their interpretation by the example of Christ and by the Spirit. Thus, while their interpretative procedure was flawed, the meaning they wrote down was inspired. Accordingly, though we cannot imitate their interpretative methods today, we can trust their conclusions and believe their doctrine.² It is comparable to listening to preachers whose interpretation of a particular passage is clearly off the mark, but what they say is good theology and found elsewhere in the Bible, though not in the passage they are expounding.

Thus many would conclude that an inductive study reveals an oft-occurring disconnection of meaning between NT writers' interpretations of the OT and the original meaning of that OT text. Examples of such alleged misinterpretations include:³

1. Ad hominem argumentation: the role of angels in revealing the law in Gal. 3:19; the exodus "veil" theme in 2 Cor. 3:13–18; and the "seed" of Gen. 12:7 (KJV) and 22:17–18 in Gal. 3:16.
2. Noncontextual midrashic treatments: the understanding of baptism and the "following rock" in 1 Cor. 10:1–4; Deut. 30:12–14 in Rom. 10:6–8; Gen. 12:7 (KJV) and 22:17–18 in Gal. 3:16; Ps. 68:18 in Eph. 4:8; Hosea 11:1 in Matt. 2:15.
3. Allegorical interpretations: Deut. 25:4 in 1 Cor. 9:9; the use of the OT in Gal. 4:24; Gen. 14 in Heb. 7.
4. Atomistic interpretations, uncontrolled by any kind of interpretative rules: Isa. 40:6–8 in 1 Pet. 1:24–25.

However, some scholars are more optimistic about the NT authors' ability to interpret the OT.

1. Yet in light of postmodern influence, I am aware that some scholars claim that the uncontrolled Jewish hermeneutic was a legitimate approach then but perhaps not for us, though some would say it may be a guide for modern interpreters too.

2. For a clear and sympathetic presentation of this sort of view, see the writings of R. N. Longenecker, including his article "'Who Is the Prophet Talking About?' Some Reflections on the New Testament's Use of the Old," *Themelios* 13 (1987): 4–8.

3. Here for the most part I am using R. N. Longenecker's examples from his "Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 21 (1970): 3–38; and idem, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

It is not at all clear that noncontextual midrashic exegesis was as central to earlier Pharisaic and Qumran exegesis as is suggested by scholars favoring the approach we have described above. First, it may not be appropriate to speak of a noncontextual *rabbinic* method before AD 70 since most examples come from later, and earlier ones that can be dated with probability do not appear to reflect such an uncontrolled interpretative approach.⁴ Second, concern for contextual exegesis is characteristically found in both Qumran scrolls and Jewish apocalyptic.⁵ This analysis has far-reaching negative implications for the argument of those who believe that early Christian interpreters were influenced by a prevalent Jewish hermeneutic that was not concerned about the original meaning of OT passages.

But even this assumption of Jewish influence on NT exegesis of the Old may be questioned. It sounds a priori plausible that the interpretative procedures of the NT would resemble those of contemporary Judaism. And yet, since early Christianity had a unique perspective in comparison with early Judaism, one should not assume that first-century Jewish and Christian exegetical approaches are mostly the same.⁶ To assess the issue, it is necessary to look at the NT itself without prejudice about methodological continuity or discontinuity. Though this is a debated assessment, it is not unusual. For example, along these same lines, Richard Hays has declared:

Rabbinic Judaism, no less than early Christianity, represents (along with the Qumran community and Philo's scholastic Alexandrian Judaism, inter alia), one of several different adaptations of the religious and cultural heritage represented by Israel's Scriptures. These different adaptations should be studied, at least initially, as parallel phenomena, related but distinct dispositions of that heritage. To argue that one of these phenomena represents a source of influence for another is likely to be misleading unless some documentable line of historical dependence can be demonstrated. One thing that is clearly documentable is

4. On this latter point, David Instone-Brewer has identified all the exegetical examples representing this early period (about 100) of purported pre-AD 70 protorabbinic exegesis. He has tried to demonstrate how every example shows that, although these Jewish exegetes may not always have succeeded, they tried to interpret the OT according to its context and never supplanted the primary meaning by a secondary or allegorical one. Even if his conclusions are judged to be overstated, as some have affirmed, they nevertheless reveal an early concern for context to varying significant degrees, a concern previously not sufficiently acknowledged. See his *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 C.E.*, *Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum* 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

5. In Qumran, e.g., 1QM 1; in Jewish apocalyptic, e.g., 1 *Enoch* 36–72; 4 *Ezra* (= 2 *Esd.*) 11–13; 2 *Baruch* 36–42; *Testament of Joseph* 19:6–12. See G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984); L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966).

6. As, e.g., Longenecker surprisingly seems to assume (“New Testament’s Use,” 7), since he points out the same kind of presuppositional fallacy on the part of others (*ibid.*, 1). See further on Longenecker’s view at note 10 below.

that all of them deliberately regard Scripture as source and authority for their own quite different theological developments. Thus, we are undertaking a valid and necessary (even if preliminary) task when we inquire independently into the way in which any one of them uses scriptural texts.⁷

This is not a conclusion reached only by more conservative American or English scholars. For example, Hans Hübner in his *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* concludes that the key to Paul's interpretation of the OT is not found by seeing Judaism as the determinative influence on him. Rather, the way NT authors handle their Scripture should be analyzed first from their own writings, independent of Jewish methods of interpretation.⁸

Furthermore, it is not certain that the typical examples of noncontextual exegesis adduced above are really conclusive. A number of scholars have offered viable and even persuasive explanations of how they could well be cases of contextual exegesis.⁹ In addition, even if it were granted that they are convincing examples of noncontextual hermeneutics, it does not necessarily follow that they are truly representative of a wider hermeneutical pattern in the NT.¹⁰ They may be exceptional rather than typical.

7. R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 11.

8. H. Hübner, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 1:258–59, where he also cites other German scholars in agreement, even though he ends up concluding that the NT's christological focus caused a significant discontinuity between a text's meaning in the OT and its use in the NT.

9. On 1 Cor. 10 and Gal. 3–4 see E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (1957; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 51–54, 66–73; R. M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 193–297; and D. A. Hagner, "The Old Testament in the New Testament," in *Interpreting the Word of God: Festschrift in Honor of S. Barabas*, ed. S. J. Schultz and M. A. Inch (Chicago: Moody, 1976), 101–2, who sees a broad contextual and typological approach in these texts.

On 2 Cor. 3 see W. J. Dumbrell, *The Beginning of the End* (Homebrush West, Australia: Lancer, 1985), 107–13, 121–28; and on 2 Cor. 3:6–18 see S. J. Hafemann, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel*, WUNT 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); for further argument claiming a noncontextual use of the OT in the same passage, see L. L. Belleville, *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3.1–18*, JSNTSup 52 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

On 1 Cor. 9:9 see R. E. Ciampa and B. S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 404–7; cf. A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: SPCK, 1974), 161–66; S. L. Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 39–51; D. J. Moo, "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan / Academic Books, 1986), 179–211.

On Rom. 10, cf. M. A. Seifrid, "Paul's Approach to the Old Testament in Romans 10:6–8," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 3–37, who sees a contextual and typological use.

10. But Longenecker has contended that among NT writers we can find only "some literalist, straightforward exegesis of biblical texts"; that the pesher method (which he defines as an atomistic approach and which includes typology) "dominates" Matthew, John, and the early chapters

A substantial and sometimes neglected argument against the view that the NT uses the OT differently from its original meaning is C. H. Dodd's classic work *According to the Scriptures*.¹¹ In brief, Dodd observes that throughout the NT are numerous and scattered quotations that derive from the same few OT contexts. He asks why, given that the same segment of the OT is in view, there are so few identical quotations of the same verse; and second, why different verses are cited from the same segments of the OT. *He concludes that this phenomenon indicates that the NT authors were aware of broad OT contexts and did not focus merely on single verses independent of the segment from which they were drawn.* Single verses and phrases are merely signposts to the overall OT context from which they are cited. Furthermore, he concludes that this was a *unique hermeneutical phenomenon* of the day, in contrast to Jewish exegesis. He goes on to assert that since this hermeneutical phenomenon can be found in the very earliest strata of the NT traditions, and since such innovations are not characteristic of committees, then Christ was the most likely source of this original, creative hermeneutic, and from him the NT writers learned their interpretative approach.¹²

Some disagree with Dodd, and indeed many scholars in this field generally affirm that the NT writers often employ a noncontextual exegetical method.¹³ Nevertheless, others have confirmed Dodd's thesis about the NT's unique and consistent respect for the OT context.¹⁴

of Acts and 1 Peter; and that midrashic interpretation (which he also views as a noncontextual method) "characterizes" Paul and Hebrews ("New Testament's Use," 6–8; cf. his *Biblical Exegesis*, 218–19). He does qualify this by saying that NT authors employed a "controlled atomistic exegesis" ("New Testament's Use," 7), but this is unclear, and he never explains what he means by this.

11. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952).

12. *Ibid.*, 110, 126–27.

13. Thus, e.g., B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961); S. V. McCasland, "Matthew Twists the Scripture," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 143–48; S. L. Edgar, "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament," *NTS* 9 (1962–63): 56–59; A. T. Hanson, *The Living Utterances of God* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 184–90; M. D. Hooker, "Beyond the Things That Are Written? St. Paul's Use of Scripture," *NTS* 27 (1981–82): 295–309; B. Lindars, "The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology," *NTS* 23 (1977): 59–66. For other references in this respect, consult Longenecker's bibliography in *Biblical Exegesis*, 223–30; C. D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004); S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, *JSNT* 115 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); *idem*, "The Old Testament in the New: A Reply to Greg Beale," *Irish Biblical Studies* 21 (1999): 54–58; *idem*, "Does the New Testament Quote the Old Testament out of Context?" *Anvil* 11 (1994): 133–43, which tries to take a both-and view on the issue in the light of intertextual theory, though still leaning toward the noncontextual approach.

14. In addition to the sources cited above in this regard, see also, e.g., S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Van Soest, 1961); R. Rendell, "Quotation in Scripture as an Index of Wider Reference," *Evangelical Quarterly* 36 (1964): 214–21; Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971); *idem*, "The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication," *NTS*

The Testimony Book Debate

Additionally, some scholars have contended that the NT writers took their OT quotations from a so-called testimony book, which contained various kinds of proof texts (*testimonia*) commonly used for apologetic reasons.¹⁵ If this were the case, then the NT authors would not have been using these OT references with the literary context of the OT in view. Others have qualified the hypothesis of one testimony book and have proposed that there were excerpts of Scripture texts on various topics made by individuals and used either privately or circulated more generally.¹⁶

This qualified view of excerpted Scripture lists, if true, would still point to the likelihood that the NT writers were not interpreting OT passages holistically in the light of their literary context, but were merely using texts from an abstracted list of selected OT verses. Some argue for the existence of such lists because similar lists were found with the Qumran scrolls and among the writings of the later church fathers; they claim that these findings point to the existence of such excerpts among apostolic writers like Paul. In addition, such lists appear to be the more likely source of the NT writers' OT references, since whole manuscripts of OT books would have been expensive and not easily available. Accordingly, someone like Paul would presumably have made his own anthological lists from such manuscripts possessed by more wealthy Christians in the various places where he traveled.¹⁷

27 (1980–81): 233–51; D. Secombe, "Luke and Isaiah," *NTS* 27 (1980–81), 252–59; Johnson, *Old Testament in the New*; D. J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983); W. C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985); Moo, "Problem of *Sensus Plenior*"; G. K. Beale, "The Influence of Daniel upon the Structure and Theology of John's Apocalypse," *JETS* 27 (1984): 413–23; idem, "The Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Festschrift in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 318–36; idem, "The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5–7 and Its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1," *NTS* 35 (1989): 550–81; R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in Paul*; idem, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); J. R. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "in Concert" in the Letter to the Romans* (Boston: Brill, 2003).

15. The classic formulation of such a testimony book was first given by J. R. Harris, with V. Burch, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–20).

16. See, e.g., C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 69 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 73–79, 341–42, 349, 351; M. C. Albl, "And Scripture Cannot Be Broken": *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96 (Boston: Brill, 1999), who says, e.g., the "core of all *testimonia* hypotheses is the claim that early Christians did not use the Jewish Scriptures as an undifferentiated whole, but rather selected, shaped, and interpreted certain passages in support of emerging Christian beliefs" (65; see also his overall view on 65–69, 286–90). Albl holds that Paul, e.g., made his own list of Scriptures or inherited such a list from Christian tradition, from which he drew in his various epistles.

17. For other reasons offered in favor of Paul's making such lists, see Stanley, *Paul and Scripture*, 69–78.

Since C. H. Dodd believed that his conclusions about the NT authors' awareness of the context of OT references show that *a* testimony book did not exist, some have said his arguments do not have as much force against the idea that there were multiple testimony books or especially excerpted Scripture lists of different kinds. Other scholars have concluded, however, that Dodd's arguments still hold, even if several testimony books or excerpted testimony lists also existed.

The most balanced view appears to be that such excerpted lists did exist but that the NT writers also had access to actual OT scrolls containing whole books. In addition, they would likely have committed a number of OT books or segments thereof to memory, which to some extent would also have naturally occurred through their having been saturated with liturgical readings of Scripture sections in synagogue worship. The probability that authors like Paul were not limited to accessing excerpts is indicated by a spate of works appearing since Dodd's *According to the Scriptures*, works showing that NT writers were aware of the broader OT contexts from which they cited specific verses. A good example of such works most recently is by Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, and others have followed in his wake.¹⁸ But even if NT writers were often dependent on such testimony books, since they would also have been familiar with the OT and memorized portions of the OT, as we have posited just above, would it not be that such individual testimony quotations would invoke for them the wider context of that cited verse? In this respect David Lincicum's conclusion is on target: "The more convincing such readings [with contextual awareness of the OT] may be shown to be, the less likelihood there is that Paul was solely reliant upon a collection of excerpta."¹⁹

The Christocentric Debate

The influence of contemporary Jewish interpretation and dependence on lists of excerpted Scripture verses are not the only reasons that certain scholars see NT writers as interpreting the OT contrary to its original meaning. Some believe that the apostolic writers were so christocentric in their understanding of the OT that they read Christ into passages that had nothing to do with the coming Messiah. In so doing, they (allegedly) distorted the meaning of the

18. See, e.g., Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*; C. A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, *Biblical Interpretation* 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use*; B. L. Gladd, *Revealing the Mystery: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with Its Bearing on First Corinthians*, *BZNW* 16 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009); S. Mihalios, *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature*, *Library of New Testament Studies* 436 (New York: T&T Clark, 2011).

19. D. Lincicum, "Paul and the *Testimonia: Quo Vademus?*" *JETS* 51 (2008): 307. See the entirety of the article (297–308), providing a good, balanced perspective, with which my conclusion is in line, and discussing more scholars on both sides of the issue.

OT writer by reading in their presupposition that all of OT Scripture points to Christ.²⁰ Similarly, others believe that many of the NT authors were so caught up in defending Christ as Messiah that they twisted OT passages to support their viewpoint about the truth of the gospel.²¹

On the one hand, according to traditional exegetical criteria, this christocentric misreading of the OT is counted by some as mistaken interpretation. On the other hand, those of a more postmodern bent (see below), while acknowledging that the OT meaning has been distorted, would merely say that modern interpreters have no right to impose their standards of interpretation on the ancient writers and judge them by those standards. Still others of a more conservative persuasion, while agreeing with the postmodern assessment, claim that what we moderns might view as a defective interpretative approach of the NT authors resulted in a divinely inspired doctrinal conclusion. That is, the apostolic writers preached the right doctrine but from the wrong texts, though the interpretations they wrote down were done so with divine authority.

But does a christocentric presupposition necessitate a misreading of the OT? It certainly could, but must it? The answer to the question depends to a large degree on how one defines what is a christocentric hermeneutic. Some prefer to call this a “christotelic” approach, but this faces the same problem of finding a precise definition. In addition to the vagueness of definition, a christocentric or christotelic approach is one of a number of presuppositions that the apostles held in their understanding of the OT. A later chapter discusses this presupposition in the light of other presuppositions in order to obtain a more precise and balanced perspective of it. Then we can further address the question about whether such an interpretative assumption reads into the OT a foreign idea that distorts the original meaning.

In addition, a case-by-case study of each instance of a purported christocentric or christotelic interpretation of OT passages would need to include careful exegetical examination before one could determine whether distortion of the OT’s meaning has taken place. Even after such thorough investigations, however, scholars will still disagree. There is one criterion, however, that can eventually point us in the right direction for solving this difficult issue: Do such analyses show that these christocentric readings reveal an awareness of the broader OT context and provide satisfying rhetorical and insightful

20. P. Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 113–66; idem, “Apostolic Hermeneutics and an Evangelical Doctrine of Scripture: Moving beyond the Modern Impasse,” *WTJ* 65 (2003): 263–87, who prefers to call this approach a “christotelic” perspective: the NT writers viewed the OT as designed to point toward Christ. Enns admits that the NT writers’ hermeneutic may be viewed as a distortion of the OT meaning from the vantage point of what many have considered traditionally to be a correct exegetical method. He says that, according to first-century standards of acceptable Jewish exegesis, the apostles’ approach should be viewed as legitimate.

21. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*.

interpretative and theological readings of both the OT and NT contexts? Or do these readings reveal significant discontinuity between the OT and NT contexts? This will not be an absolute guarantee of deciding the issue, since interpretation is a subjective enterprise whereby what satisfies and appears insightful to one interpreter will not be so to another interpreter. Nevertheless, I believe that there is sufficient corroborating and cumulative hard evidence in this task that can provide us a way forward in debating this in the public domain, which involves comparing one's presuppositions with the assumptions of others who disagree.²²

The Rhetorical Debate

Still others affirm that writers like Paul were not primarily concerned to use the OT to convey its contextual import but rhetorically to persuade readers to obey their exhortations. Thus only the wording of the OT is appealed to without consideration for its sense—in order to enhance the NT writer's apostolic authority in a “power move” to make the readers submit.²³ Some contend that NT writers would not care about what an OT verse means in its context since the majority of the readers/hearers in churches would have been gentiles, lacking the educational background to read the OT and appreciate its significance. Furthermore, such a view likely entails that even if many had possessed such an educational preparation to be able to read Greek, since they were recently converted pagans, they would not have had any exposure to the Greek OT. Consequently, in either case they would not understand Paul's contextual use of the OT.

According to some scholars, such considerations make it unlikely that NT writers would have expected the majority of their readers to understand the OT contextual ideas of the verses that they cite in their writings. Therefore, according to this perspective, the upshot of the preceding considerations makes it unlikely that these writers referred to the OT with its contextual sense in mind.

Were the apostolic writers primarily concerned to use the OT only for its rhetorical force to persuade readers to obey them, so that they were unconcerned about what the OT originally meant? Were the majority of Paul's readers uneducated and unable to read the Greek (much less the Hebrew) OT? Furthermore, since the majority of the readers/hearers in the early churches were recently converted gentiles, does that mean that they would not have been in a position to appreciate the intended meaning of the OT writings cited by NT writers?

22. In this respect, one should decide whether the presuppositions of the NT writers (laid out in chap. 5) are true for today's interpreters or are culturally relative.

23. See, e.g., C. D. Stanley, *Arguing with Paul: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

In response to these questions, one should remember that, for the most part, apostolic writings were first read by someone like a lector, and the rest of the church heard what was read (cf. Acts 13:15; Col. 4:16; Rev. 1:3). One does not need education in Greek and Hebrew to *hear* what was read, whether that be letters from Paul or readings from the OT Scriptures, which was the Bible of the first-century churches (cf. Rom. 15:4; 1 Cor. 10:11; 2 Tim. 3:14–17; 2 Pet. 1:20–21). On the one hand, it is true that the majority of the first hearers of apostolic missives in the churches would have been recently converted gentiles, which means that they would not have much understanding of the meaning of the OT references that they heard as the apostles' writings were read aloud. On the other hand, as is acknowledged by most, there were at least three levels of hearers in the earliest churches: (1) A small group of Jewish Christians understood and appreciated the context of the OT references to which appeal was made. (2) A group of gentiles (perhaps God-fearers) had continued contact with the Jewish synagogue and growing acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures. They had some appreciation of the OT references, though not as much as the Jewish hearers. (3) The third group, the majority, were recently converted gentiles and did not understand much about the OT quotations on a first hearing.

Yet from the NT itself, it is apparent that letters were to be read and reread not only in different churches but probably also in the same churches. Furthermore, new believers would have been increasingly exposed to the content of the OT: we know that part of the early church's meetings and instruction included the reading and teaching of the OT Scriptures (e.g., cf. Rom. 15:4; 1 Cor. 10:6, 11; 1 Tim. 4:13–16; 5:17–18; 2 Tim. 2:15; 3:16–17). In addition, we also know that letter carriers likely explained part of the meaning of the letters,²⁴ which probably would include at least some OT references. These last three considerations point to the plausibility, if not probability, that ultimately most would have sufficiently apprehended the meaning of OT references read from the apostles' works (esp. with the letter carrier's explanations). The new gentile believers would not have gathered as much out of these quotations as the first two groups on a first hearing, but they would have understood better on second, third, and subsequent readings. The richness of the NT writers' theology (e.g., Paul), including their views of eschatology and the power of the gospel, are such that from the beginning they speak truth in depth even to those who understand very imperfectly at first. Authorial communication is not exhausted by the immediate reader/listener uptake.²⁵ This is the reason,

24. P. M. Head, "Named Letter-Carriers among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri," *JSNT* 31 (2009): 279–99; idem, "Letter Carriers in the Ancient Jewish Epistolary Material," in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, ed. C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, *SSEJC* 13, Library of Second Temple Studies 70 (London: T&T Clark / Continuum, 2009), 203–19.

25. I am grateful to a private communication from my colleague Vern Poythress, who has made these points.

together with the fact that these letters became regarded as Scripture, that the letters were to be read again and again.

While many of the ancient common people may not have been educated through their own reading of the textual traditions of the Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, they were more likely to have been orally and culturally literate. They doubtless heard the reading and telling of some of the great works of the ancient world and committed some passages to memory. Therefore, they were capable of doing the same thing with the OT Bible.

Another point fuels the idea that appeals to the OT carried with them the broader OT context: the rhetorical impact is heightened when the broader contextual meaning is taken into consideration. Naturally, such a conclusion about this heightening is an interpretative decision, which needs substantial analysis on a case-by-case basis and may be more persuasive in some cases than in others. Thus we are not skeptical that NT writers use the OT rhetorically but believe that when this happens, the OT contextual meaning of the passage cited enhances the rhetorical impact.

The Postmodern Debate

A postmodern approach, which is a more recent development in biblical studies, has contributed further to the pessimism that the NT has continuity with the meaning of the OT references cited there. “Hard postmodernists” (or hard reader-response critics) hold that it is impossible for an ancient (or modern!) reader to be able to understand the earlier meaning of a text that is being read. All readers have presuppositions, and it is impossible for readers “objectively” to interpret the writings of others. Rather, their presuppositions distort or change the original authorial meaning so much that the intended meaning is obscured. This is equally true of NT writers themselves in trying to understand the OT. “Soft postmodern” interpreters would acknowledge some significant distortion on the part of readers’ presuppositions but allow that some of the intended meaning is apprehended, and they would make the same conclusion about the NT writers’ view of the OT.

If it is true that no one interprets without their own presuppositions, does that mean it is impossible for anyone to sufficiently understand the oral and written speech acts of others? Was this the case with NT writers’ interpreting the OT, and is it the case with modern readers in their attempt to understand the Bible? Such a major hermeneutical and philosophical problem certainly cannot be adequately addressed in this short section. The conclusions one reaches about this particular issue depend on one’s own philosophical and theological assumptions about epistemology. Those who presuppose that there is an inability for humans to know the intentions of other humans, whether in written or spoken communication, will be skeptical that NT writers could sufficiently understand what OT authors intended to communicate.

Alternatively, others presuppose that God has designed human minds and imparted to them an ability to be able to function in such a way as to produce true beliefs.²⁶ This includes being able to perceive authorial communications sufficiently and reliably but not exhaustively. Such a perspective makes it possible to consider the plausibility of NT authors' being able to perceive what OT authors wanted to convey and to cite them in line with their intentions.²⁷ Here we cannot elaborate further on this thorny philosophical and theological problem of epistemology. Whole books have been written on this issue and will continue to be written as the debate persists.²⁸

Conclusion

The issue of how much continuity there is between the OT and the NT will continue to be debated. My own overall judgment is that NT authors display varying degrees of awareness of literary contexts, as well as perhaps historical contexts, although the former is predominant. Texts with a low degree of correspondence with the OT literary context can be referred to as semicontextual since they seem to fall between the poles of what we ordinarily call contextual and noncontextual usages.²⁹ Indeed, there are instances where NT writers handle OT texts in a diametrically opposite manner to that in which they appear to function in their original contexts. Upon closer examination, such uses often reveal an ironic or polemical intention.³⁰ In such examples it would be wrong to conclude that an OT reference has been interpreted noncontextually. Indeed, awareness of context must be presupposed in making such interpretations of OT texts. On the one hand, caution should be exercised in labeling usages of the OT merely either as contextual or noncontextual since

26. On which see, e.g., J. H. Sennett, *The Analytic Theist: An Alvin Plantinga Reader* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 162–86, though this is an optimistic reading of Plantinga in support of the above point. For a summary and qualifications of Plantinga's epistemology from a Reformed presuppositional perspective, see K. S. Oliphint, "Plantinga on Warrant," *WTJ* 57 (1995): 415–35; idem, "Review Essay: Epistemology and Christian Belief," *WTJ* 63 (2001): 151–82.

27. On which see further G. K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2008), 251–59, amid a discussion of issues concerning whether NT authors could understand the intentions of OT authors living hundreds of years earlier; e.g., "The enduring foundation for 'an absolute transcendent determinant meaning to all texts' is the presupposition of an omniscient, sovereign, and transcendent God, who knows the exhaustive yet determinant and true meaning of all texts because he stands above the world he has constructed and above all the social constructs his creatures have constructed; yet he has created them as his analogue to reflect his attributes, so that they may have some determinant meaning of the communicative acts of others" (257 [though some wording is changed here]).

28. See, e.g., K. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), and the works cited therein on various perspectives about this issue.

29. Cf. Beale, "Old Testament in Revelation," 318–36, here 322.

30. Cf. *ibid.*, 330–32.

other more precisely descriptive interpretive categories may be better. On the other hand, my position lies on the side of those who affirm that the NT uses the OT in line with its original contextual meaning.³¹

The point of this section is to inform the reader briefly about the debates on this issue and not to make a sustained argument for any viewpoint. Indeed, a substantial book could be written only on this topic. In fact, the 1,200-page *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* has done just this: the vast majority of discussions in it have concluded that, to varying degrees, the context of the OT is important for understanding its use in the NT. The approach of this handbook will continue this perspective and will assume that the NT refers to OT passages, at least to one degree or another, with awareness of the wider literary context. This debate about how much NT references show awareness of OT contexts will surely continue.

The Debate over Typology

The definition and nature of typology has been one of the thorniest issues to face in OT-in-the-NT studies in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Part of this debate concerns the topic of the directly preceding section since some see the NT's typological interpretation of the Old to be close to allegory, an approach that reads foreign NT meanings into OT passages. Accordingly, some see typological interpretation to have no continuity with the original meaning of OT texts and to be reading Christ into OT passages that have nothing to do with the Messiah or the church.

Therefore this issue of the NT's continuity versus noncontinuity with the OT will continue to be addressed in the remainder of this chapter, though the question about typology tackled here is broader and will go beyond this and touch other concerns and issues as well.

The Definition and Nature of Typology

One major question at issue here is whether typology³² essentially indicates an analogy between the OT and NT³³ or whether it also includes some kind

31. See, e.g., G. K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), esp. its last chapter, which is my early attempt at a programmatic article on this subject.

32. This section has been shaped by class notes from the unpublished lectures of S. Lewis Johnson on typology delivered in a class on "The Use of the Old Testament in the New" at Dallas Theological Seminary in 1974. To a significant degree the notes have been revised in the light of my further studies in this field.

33. So D. L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," in Beale, *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, 313–30.

of forward-looking element or foreshadowing.³⁴ Even among those who may include the notion of the forward-looking element, most hold that it is so only from the NT writer's viewpoint and *not from the OT vantage point*.³⁵ Many would qualify this further by saying that, although the OT author did not consciously intend to indicate any foreshadowing sense, the fuller divine intention did include it. Some who also hold to a retrospective prophetic view from the NT writer's viewpoint, however, may not see this as even part of the fuller divine intention in the OT, but a completely new meaning given under inspiration.³⁶ The last two positions, especially the last, view the NT's typological interpretation not to be in line with the meaning of the OT passage. Some other scholars do not hold to any form of divine inspiration of Scripture and view the NT's typological interpretation of the OT to be a distortion of the OT intention.

A definition of typology that includes both analogy and a prophetic element is the following: *the study of analogical correspondences among revealed truths about persons, events, institutions, and other things within the historical framework of God's special revelation, which, from a retrospective view, are of a prophetic nature and are escalated in their meaning*.³⁷ According to this definition, the essential characteristics of a type are (1) analogical correspondence, (2) historicity, (3) a pointing-forwardness (i.e., an aspect of foreshadowing or presignification), (4) escalation, and (5) retrospection.

The latter two elements need some explanation. By "escalation" is meant that the antitype (the NT correspondence) is heightened in some way in relation to the OT type.³⁸ For example, John 19:36 views the requirement of not breaking the bones of the Passover lamb in the OT epoch to point to the greater reality of the bones of Jesus not being broken at his crucifixion (for this prophetic nuance, note the phrase "that the Scripture might be fulfilled" [NRSV]). By "retrospection" is meant the idea that it was after Christ's resurrection and under the direction of the Spirit that the apostolic writers understood certain OT historical narratives about persons, events, or institutions to be indirect prophecies of Christ or the church. A qualification, however, needs to be made about how the retrospective view is understood. Recent ongoing research is

34. See, e.g., L. Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); F. Foulkes, "The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament," in Beale, *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, 342–71; Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*.

35. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 38–43.

36. See, e.g., this view apparently in R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), e.g., 124–34.

37. For example, escalation would be the correspondence of God providing literal manna from heaven for physical sustenance and providing the manna of Christ from heaven for spiritual sustenance—though physical resurrection of believers is the final escalation of Christ providing spiritual sustenance (on which see John 6:31–40).

38. From here on it is important to remember that the OT element is called the "type," and the NT correspondence is the "antitype."

finding that in the context of some of these OT passages viewed as types by the NT, there is evidence of the foreshadowing nature of the OT narrative itself, which then is better understood after the coming of Christ.³⁹

But even when the immediate context of a passage does not indicate that something is being viewed typologically from the OT author's conscious vantage point, the wider canonical context of the OT usually provides hints or indications that the passage is typological. I will argue later that the portrayal of Eliakim as a ruler in Isaiah 22:22 is viewed typologically in Revelation 3:7: Christ is the one "who has the key of David, who opens and no one will shut, and who shuts and no one opens." I will argue further that the immediate context of Isaiah 22 provides clues that this OT passage was intended originally by Isaiah as a type that points forward (on which see chap. 8). But even if there were no such contextual intimations within the book of Isaiah itself, one can plausibly say that Isaiah had generally understood the prior biblical revelation about Israel's coming eschatological ruler and David's heir, so that even if messianic nuances were not in his mind when he wrote that verse, he would not have disapproved of the use made of his words in Revelation 3:7. Thus, Isaiah supplied a little part of the revelation unfolded in the course of salvation history about kingship, but he himself perceived that part to be a pictorial representation of the essence of Davidic kingship.⁴⁰ In this respect D. A. Carson affirms with respect to the NT writers' use of typology,

The NT writers insist that the OT can be rightly interpreted only if the entire revelation is kept in perspective as it is historically unfolded (e.g., Gal. 3:6–14). Hermeneutically this is not an innovation. OT writers drew lessons out of earlier salvation history, lessons difficult to [completely] perceive while that history was being lived, but lessons that retrospect would clarify (e.g., Asaph in Ps 78; cf. on Matt 13:35). Matthew [for example] does the same in the context of the fulfillment of OT hopes in Jesus Christ. We may therefore legitimately speak of a "fuller meaning" than any one text provides. But the appeal should be made, not to some hidden divine knowledge, but to the pattern of revelation up to that time—a pattern not yet adequately [or fully] discerned. The new revelation may therefore be truly new, yet at the same time capable of being checked against the old [and thus clarifying the older revelation].⁴¹

Therefore, NT writers may interpret historical portions of the OT to have a forward-looking sense in the light of the whole OT canonical context. For

39. See, e.g., G. K. Beale and S. M. McDonough, "Revelation," in Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use*, 1096–97, on the use of Isa. 22:22 in Rev. 3:7, which is expanded further in chap. 7 below.

40. In these last two sentences, I have adopted the wording applied to another typological passage, the use of Hos. 11:1 in Matt. 2:15, by D. A. Carson, *Matthew*, vol. 1, *Chapters 1 through 12*, EBC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 92.

41. *Ibid.*, 92–93.

example, the portrayal by various eschatological prophecies about a coming king, priest, and prophet throughout OT revelation were so intrinsically similar to the historical descriptions of other kings, priests, and prophets elsewhere in the OT that the latter were seen to contain the same pattern of the former (except for the historical failure) and thus to point forward to the ideal end-time figures, who would perfectly carry out these roles.

There are other kinds of typological anticipation of which OT authors and their readers may have been conscious. A later OT author may style some historical character being narrated about according to the pattern of an earlier OT character in order to indicate that the earlier historical person is a typological pointer to the later person in focus. For example, there is abundant evidence that Noah is patterned after the first Adam and that the intention for this patterning is to indicate that Noah is a typological fulfillment of Adam.⁴² Noah, for example, is given the same commission as is the first Adam (cf. Gen. 1:28 with Gen. 9:1–2, 7). It becomes quite apparent, however, that Noah as a second Adam figure does not accomplish the commission given to the first Adam (Gen. 1:26–28; 2:15–17), just as the first Adam failed in the same way. Thus, the completion of fulfilling God’s commission to Adam remained unfulfilled even in the semi-typological fulfillment in Noah, so that both the first Adam and Noah, as a secondary Adamic figure, pointed to another Adam to come, who would finally fulfill the commission.

A similar kind of typology involves OT prophets who issued prophecies that were to be fulfilled in the short term, at least at some point within the OT epoch itself. When the prophecy is fulfilled, it is clear that the full contours of the prophecy have not been consummately fulfilled. Then the partial historical fulfillment itself becomes a foreshadowing of or points to a later complete fulfillment in the latter days. Good examples of this are prophecies of the “day of the Lord,” which predict judgment on a catastrophic scale. Although these “day of the Lord” prophecies are fulfilled in various events of judgment within the OT period itself (such as parts of the prophecy of Joel, where the phrase occurs five times), all the details of the predicted destruction are not. Consequently, the nature of the fulfillment within the OT itself contains a pattern that points yet forward to the climactic period of such fulfillment when the pattern is fully filled out⁴³ (the “day of the Lord” *par excellence*).⁴⁴

42. For example, see W. A. Gage, *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology* (Winona Lake, IN: Carpenter Books, 1984), 3–72.

43. Note that the “day of the Lord” occurs seventeen times in the OT with reference to some historical destruction coming within the OT era and five times in the NT with respect to the final end-time day, two of which specify eschatological destruction.

44. I am following here an example given by D. Bock, “Scripture Citing Scripture,” 272. It is possible to categorize some of these kinds of typological uses as examples of a “first fulfillment and second fulfillment” or a “double fulfillment” or a “semi-fulfillment and complete fulfillment” of direct verbal prophecy. For example, the prophecy of a young woman (or virgin) giving birth to a child named “Immanuel” in Isa. 7:13–14 finds its first provisional fulfillment in the birth of

That typology is more than the drawing of a mere analogy is apparent from the numerous examples where a fulfillment formula or the equivalent introduces or is connected to the OT reference, whether that be reference to a historical person, event, or institution. Matthew's famous quotation of Hosea 11:1, "Out of Egypt I called my son," is a classic example. The specific verse in Hosea is clearly an allusion to Israel's exodus from Egypt and not a prophecy. Matthew, however, quotes it and prefixes to it the formula "to fulfill what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet" (2:15). Jesus's going to Egypt and then later out from Egypt is the fulfillment in some way of the historical portrayal of Hosea 11:1. The same or similar prophetic fulfillment formulas accompany similar kinds of historical descriptions from the OT elsewhere in the Gospels; hence it is hard to deny that the NT writers viewed such historical events as prophetic (e.g., see Matt. 1:22–23; 13:35; 27:9–10; John 13:18; 19:24, 28, 36; Acts 2:16–21).

In this light many scholars conclude that typology is more than mere analogy but includes some kind of prophetic sense, as viewed from the NT perspective. If this is a correct conclusion, then what is the difference between fulfillment of verbal prophecy and typology? Both are prophetic. Verbal prophecy, however, is seen to be directly fulfilled, whereas typological foreshadowings are viewed to be indirectly fulfilled. On the one hand, for example, Matthew 2:4–6 understands the straightforward verbal prophecy in Micah 5:2, that the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem, to be directly fulfilled in Jesus's birth there. On the other hand, as we saw above, John 19:36 views the historical narrative about the requirement of not breaking the Passover lamb's bones in Exodus 12:46 and Numbers 9:12⁴⁵ to be fulfilled in the soldiers' not breaking Jesus's bones at the cross. Since these OT references are not prophecies but historical narratives and John sees them as prophecy being fulfilled, it would appear best to say that this is an *indirect fulfillment* of what John considered to be foreshadowed by the historical event involving the Passover lamb. There is another way to describe

Isaiah's son (Isa. 8:3–4; cf. 8:8, 10, 18). Yet the greater fulfillment is predicted in Isa. 9:1–7, where the prophesied Davidic king is called "Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace," and Matt. 1:22–23 shows this is fulfilled climactically in Jesus. I think this is best explained as fulfillment of prophecy within the OT itself that contains a typological pattern that points yet forward to the climactic period of such fulfillment when the pattern is fully filled out in Jesus. That Isaiah himself was aware that Isaiah's child was a typological pointer to Jesus is evident in his prophecy in 9:1–7. However, it is possible to see this also as an example of "first fulfillment and second fulfillment" or a "semi-fulfillment and complete fulfillment" or a "double fulfillment" of direct verbal prophecy (the latter terminology is preferred in this case by C. Blomberg, "Matthew," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 3–5). Throughout the church's tradition, there have also been those who have seen Isa. 7:13–14 as a direct verbal prophecy of Jesus and fulfilled only in him (which is less likely in light of the above discussion), while many modern commentators see no predictive element at all in Isa. 7:13–14, which denies the authority of the text (for sources of both of these last two views, see Blomberg, "Matthew," 3–5).

45. Cf. also Ps. 34:20, which may also be part of the allusion, though there is not space here to elaborate on its significance. Brief comment will be made on this in chap. 4.

the distinction between the two types of prophecy: one as direct prophecy by word, the other as indirect prophecy by foreshadowing event.

A number of scholars have understandably concluded that such typological fulfillments drawn by the apostolic authors read foreign meanings into the OT passage.⁴⁶ It is obvious, for example, that the Exodus 12 description of the Passover lamb and the Hosea 11 reference to Israel's coming out of Egypt are part of a historical narrative and not specific prophecies. What could be more of a misreading of the OT than this? Would not interpreting an OT text to be a prophecy when in reality it is a historical description seem to be the epitome of misinterpretation? Would this not be a supreme example of what many consider to be a violation of a historical-grammatical interpretative approach, which has been the traditionally accepted modern standard of a proper interpretative method?⁴⁷

Others, however, affirm that there are other viable approaches to interpreting the OT than that of the historical-grammatical method. Such other approaches do not have to entail an allegorical or atomistic interpretative approach, which pays no attention to what an OT text originally meant. Some hold that typological interpretation is an example of a viable method and does not need to involve reading into the OT completely new meanings foreign to it.⁴⁸ Like any proper interpretative method, however, typological interpretation can be and often has been used to read foreign meanings into the OT, thus twisting and distorting the meaning.

Though my own assessment is that typological interpretation is a viable approach when used cautiously, others obviously disagree. The purpose of this section is not to try to argue for one view over another but to lay out the options and debates concerning typology. Part of this debate also involves one's perspective on the hermeneutical and theological presuppositions underlying Jesus's and the apostles' interpretative approach to the OT. These presuppositions, as we will see, are also debated. One's perspective on the typological debate will depend on what one views these hermeneutical and theological presuppositions to be and whether they are counted as viable presuppositions.⁴⁹ These presuppositions are discussed in chapter 5 below.

46. On which, e.g., see Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*, 113–66; idem, "Apostolic Hermeneutics," 263–87; and sources cited in these.

47. Now in the wake of postmodernism, some say there is no traditional standard of what can be considered a "correct" interpretative approach, but every interpretative community determines its own approach; each community's approach, no matter how different from others, is to be considered just as legitimate as the others.

48. On which, e.g., see Goppelt, *Typos*; Foulkes, "Acts of God"; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 365–71; G. K. Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of Jesus' and the Apostles' Exegetical Method," *Themelios* 14 (1989): 89–96.

49. Some would say that even if modern interpreters judge the first-century Jewish or apostolic presuppositions not to be valid according to today's standards, we should not consider

The Criteria for Determining What Is a “Type”

Scholars propose different criteria for discerning types. Part of the problem in even beginning to formulate criteria is to recall that the basic definition of typology is debated. We saw above that there is debate concerning whether typology is essentially analogical or whether it also includes an implicit prophetic-fulfillment element in the NT use. Our following discussion will assume that types include both analogy and some kind of foreshadowing sense that is seen to be fulfilled in the NT antitype.

Some have been so narrow as to identify types only as being in passages that actually contain the word *type* (Greek, *typos*, e.g., as in Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 10:6).⁵⁰ Most scholars do not agree with this strict criterion. Others identify types to occur only where the immediate NT context directly connects a textual feature to some kind of a “fulfillment” formula (e.g., “that it might be fulfilled”) or indicates fulfillment⁵¹ of the OT reference (of a person, place, event, institution, etc.). Accordingly, commentators may differ over identifying types: when there is no clear fulfillment formula, there may be disagreement over whether the immediate context conveys a sense of fulfillment for the OT reference. When the NT context gives no indication of a sense of fulfillment, then the OT reference should not be considered a “type” but merely an analogy.

Despite varying definitions of types, we have proposed above that for something to be recognized as a type in the NT, it must meet the definition of a type: (1) close analogical correspondence of truths about people, events, or institutions; (2) historicity; (3) a pointing-forwardness; (4) escalation in meaning between correspondences; (5) and retrospection. We have seen that types in the NT are not always easy to identify through interpretative examination, though it is clearest when there are fulfillment formulas and other similar indicators attached to the citations of or allusions to OT persons, events, things, or institutions.

Some other criteria for a prophetic type, though not widely recognized, should be kept in mind. Is there evidence in the immediate context of the focus OT passage itself that the reference was already conceived to be part of a foreshadowing pattern? If so, then there would be some grounds in the OT context itself that would lead a NT writer to understand such a reference to

them to be “wrong” but to be “correct” according to the ancient standards of their own day. In my own view, this is a postmodern perspective, to which I do not adhere.

50. This includes forms based on the root *typos* that, e.g., are found in 1 Cor. 10:11 and 1 Pet. 3:21. Such a restrictive view, however, was unusual in the history of the study of typology (on which see the discussion of G. P. Hugenberger, “Introductory Notes on Typology,” in Beale, *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, 339).

51. Note such formulas mentioned earlier: Matt. 1:22–23; 13:35; 27:9–10; John 13:18; 19:24, 28, 36; Acts 2:16–21. Such fulfillment formulas may vary, as with “therefore it is necessary that” in Acts 1:15–22. Even without formulas, a fulfillment sense may be deducible from other features in the nearby NT context.

be a typological fulfillment, even if there is not a fulfillment formula or some clear indication of fulfillment in the nearby NT context.⁵²

There can be various kinds of evidence in OT contexts themselves that a narration about a person, event, or institution was already understood as having a foreshadowing sense.⁵³ One such indication was formulated by Gerhard von Rad. He observed that in certain sections of the OT are repeated narrations of Yahweh's commissioning people to fill certain offices (like that of the judges, prophets, priests, or kings). In these clusterings of narrations are the repeated descriptions of a commission, the failure of the one commissioned, and judgment—and then the same cycle is repeated.⁵⁴ Von Rad proceeds to draw the following typological significance of these narratives:

[The] range of OT saving utterances is that which tells of the calls of charismatic persons and of people summoned to great offices. . . . In the case of certain descriptions of the call and the failure of charismatic leaders (Gideon, Samson, and Saul), we are dealing with literary compositions which already show a typological trend, in that the narrators are only concerned with the phenomenon of the rise and speeding failure of the man thus called. Here, too, in each case there is a fulfillment, the proof of the charisma and victory. Suddenly, however, these men are removed, Jahweh can no longer consider them, and the story ends with the reader feeling that, since Jahweh has so far been unable to find a really suitable instrument, the commission remains unfulfilled. Can we not say of each of these stories that Jahweh's designs far transcend their historical contexts? What happened to the ascriptions of a universal rule made by Jahweh to the kings of Judah (Pss. II, LXXII, CX)? It is impossible that the post-exilic readers and transmitters of these Messianic texts saw them only as venerable monuments of a glorious but vanished past. . . . These men [the judges, Saul, David, etc.] all passed away; but the tasks, the titles and the divine promises connected with them, were handed on. The Shebna-Eliakim pericope [Isa. 22:15–25] is a fine example of such transmission. . . . The almost Messianic full powers of the unworthy Shebna will fail. Thus, the office of "the key of David" remained unprovided for until finally it could be laid down at the feet of Christ (Rev. III. 7).

52. See also Foulkes, "Acts of God," who likewise says that a NT writer's recognition of a type does not mean "that the [OT] writer was conscious of presenting a type or foreshadowing of the Christ, although we have seen that there was sometimes in the OT the consciousness that the acts of God in the past pointed forward to similar but much more glorious acts in the future" (370). Similarly, Moo, "Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," who says the "'anticipatory' element in these typological experiences may sometimes have been more or less dimly perceived by the participants and human authors," though he says at other times it could be seen only retrospectively after Christ's death, resurrection, and coming of the Spirit (106–7). Cf. also J. E. Alsup, "Typology," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 6:684.

53. See chap. 7 with respect to the use of Isa. 22:22 in Rev. 3:7; for discussion of the use of Hosea 11:1 in Matt. 2:15, see G. K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 406–12.

54. Thus note the book of Judges and Isa. 22:15–25, as well as the rise and fall of the many kings in the northern and southern kingdoms, as narrated in Kings and Chronicles.

It is in this sense—*i.e.*, in the light of a final fulfillment and of the ceaseless movement towards such a fulfillment—that we can speak of a prophetic power resident in the OT prototypes. . . .

No special hermeneutic method is necessary to see the whole diversified movement of the OT saving events, made up of God's promises and their temporary fulfillments, as pointing to their future fulfillment in Jesus Christ. This can be said quite categorically. The coming of Jesus Christ as a historical reality leaves the exegete no choice at all; he must interpret the OT as pointing to Christ, whom he must understand in this light.⁵⁵

Thus von Rad contends that the literary clustering of repeated commissions and failures is evidence of a type within the OT itself. Furthermore, the forward-looking nature of these cyclic narratives of people and events can be discerned within the OT itself and often within each of the narratives themselves. Accordingly, if von Rad is correct, and I believe he is, this would mean that we can recognize OT types as having a prophetic element even before the fuller revelation of their fulfillment in the NT.

There is another criterion for discerning OT types. If it can be shown in the OT itself that a later person is seen as an antitype of an earlier person, who is clearly viewed as a type of Christ by the NT, then this later OT person is also likely a good candidate to be considered to be a type of Christ. An example would be the case of Joshua in renewing the covenant and leading the people of God into the promised land. "Since the original reader/observer would have been justified in interpreting Joshua as a second Moses figure (cf. Deut. 31, Josh. 1; 3:7), and since Jesus may also be viewed as a second Moses, it is possible to correlate the significance of Joshua's acts of salvation and conquest of the promised land to the work of Christ."⁵⁶ Or consider the relation of Adam, Noah, and Christ—an example discussed briefly earlier in this chapter. Significant OT commentators view Adam to be a type of Noah in the Genesis narrative itself. Nowhere in the NT, however, does it say that Noah is a type of Christ.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, if Noah is a partial antitype of the first Adam but does not fulfill all to which the typological first Adam points, then Noah also can plausibly be considered a part of the Adamic type⁵⁸ of Christ in the OT.

55. G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 2:372–74; see also 384–85.

56. Hugenberger, "Notes on Typology," 341.

57. There are NT passages saying that the climax of the age will resemble the apostate days of Noah (see Matt. 24:37–39), that baptism is an antitype of Noah's flood (1 Pet. 3:20–21), or that the flood is a precursor of the universal destruction of the world by fire (2 Pet. 3:5–7), though none of these passages say that Noah himself is a type of Christ; nevertheless, these passages further point to the above observation being made about Adam and Noah in relation to Christ. Noah is called "a preacher of righteousness" in 2 Pet. 2:5. While it is possible to see Noah as a type here, it is more probable that he is to be viewed only as an analogy for the present time.

58. See E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 44–67, for explanation of a "willed type," which helps to explain the idea that we have in mind

Candidates for types may also be those major redemptive-historical events that in some fashion are repeated throughout the OT and share such unique characteristics that they are clearly to be identified with one another long before the era of the NT. For example, OT commentators have noticed the following: (1) The emergence of the earth out of the water of Noah's flood has a number of affinities with the emergence of the first earth from the chaos waters described in Genesis 1. (2) In several ways the redemption of Israel from Egypt is patterned after the creation in Genesis 1. (3) Israel's return from Babylonian exile is pictured as a new creation, modeled on the first creation. Likewise, it is commonly recognized that second-generation Israel's crossing of the Jordan is depicted like the first generation's crossing through the Red Sea, as likewise is Israel's restoration from Babylonian exile portrayed as another exodus like the first out of Egypt. Israel's tabernacle, the Solomonic temple, and Israel's second temple are all uniquely patterned in many ways after essential features in the garden of Eden. In each of the three above examples of creation, exodus, and temple repetitions, the earlier events may not only correspond uniquely to the later events but within the OT itself may also be designed to point forward to these later events. Accordingly, these earlier OT references that are linked together also typologically point to these same escalated realities in the NT's reference to Christ and the church as the beginning of the new creation, the end-time exodus, and the latter-day temple. But even when key redemptive-historical events are not repeated, a candidate for a type can still be discerned. It should, however, not be found among the minute details of a passage but in the central theological message of the literary unit, and it should concern God's acts to redeem a people⁵⁹ or in his acts to judge those who are faithless and disobedient.

There are other interpretative ways to discern OT types from the OT itself, but these must suffice for the purposes of the present discussion.⁶⁰

Debate on Recognizing Types in the Old Testament

The question here is this: Should modern interpreters follow the typological approach of the apostles as a model for interpreting other parts of the OT not addressed as types by the NT? As we have already seen, some commentators do not see typology as a legitimate approach to be used by contemporary Christians in understanding OT passages typologically, which NT writers have

here between Adam, Noah, and Christ, yet it also goes beyond the concept of typology discussed so far in this chapter.

59. Sidney Greidanus, *Preaching Christ from the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 257.

60. For a good selective bibliography on typology, see esp. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture*, 426–96; and D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1976), 239–70; cf. also Alsup, “Typology,” 682–85.

not addressed. Others affirm that while typological interpretation is a viable interpretative approach, it was proper only for the apostles, who did so under divine inspiration. Others trying to use the approach would too often go astray since they do not operate under divine influence, which would restrain their eisegetical tendencies. Such caution is borne out by the checkered history of the church's misuse of typology, which sometimes was outright allegory. Another perspective views the apostolic typological method as prescriptive for Christian interpreters today. For the most part the reasons supporting such an approach have been given in the preceding section, especially with respect to how one may discern types in OT texts not mentioned by Jesus and the NT writers.⁶¹ Here we especially have in mind the criteria of (1) discerning an OT type as exegetically discerned from the OT writer's authorial perspective, (2) the clustered narrational principle cited by von Rad, (3) discerning OT people modeled on other earlier well known and established OT types,⁶² (4) observing major redemptive-historical events that are repeated (e.g., the repeated new creation narratives throughout Scripture), (5) being aware that types may be discernible in the central theological message of the literary unit and not in the minute details of a particular verse, and (6) being aware of OT prophecies that are only partially fulfilled within the OT epoch itself and that contain patterns that still point forward to a complete fulfillment (e.g., the "day of the Lord" prophecies).

Therefore typology by nature does not necessitate a noncontextual approach (although like any method it can be misused in that way), but it is an attempted identification of OT contextual features with similar escalated NT correspondences. Whether an interpreter has made a legitimate typological connection is a matter of interpretive possibility or probability. One may not reply that this is an inappropriate method on the basis that the authorial intention of OT writers, especially of historical narratives, would never have included such forward-looking identifications. Furthermore, one should also take into consideration the divine intention discernible from a retrospective viewpoint (after Christ's death and resurrection and the coming of the Spirit). That is, can a divine meaning, consistent with the OT writer's human intent, be discerned subsequently to grow out of and be fuller than the original human meaning? The larger context of canonical-redemptive history reveals how such narrow human OT intentions are legitimately and consistently developed by other biblical writers (and ultimately the divine author) to include wider meaning, so that the whole canon of Scripture becomes the ultimate context for interpreting any particular passage.⁶³ Nevertheless, these are only general parameters and will not be infallible

61. See, e.g., Foulkes, "Acts of God," 371.

62. Such as Noah in Genesis being modeled on the well known type of Adam, so that Noah himself can be considered an Adamic type.

63. On this point see the discussion in chap. 6 (below) of the fifth presupposition of early Christian exegesis of the OT, that later parts of biblical history function as the broader context for interpreting earlier parts.

guards against misuse and misinterpretation. We must also remember that the conclusions of all biblical interpretation are a matter of degrees of possibility and probability; the conclusions of typology must be viewed in the same way.

Some dispute that typology should be referred to as an exegetical method since exegesis is concerned with deriving a human author's original intention and meaning from a text.⁶⁴ But this question is also bound up with the prior question of whether typology is looking forward from the OT vantage point itself.⁶⁵ If typology is classified as partially prophetic even from the OT human author's viewpoint, then it can be viewed as an exegetical method. This is true because such an anticipatory aspect of an OT passage can be discerned by a historical-grammatical approach. There are likely several types in the NT that were not consciously intended by OT authors. In such cases, the NT correspondence would be retrospectively drawing out the fuller prophetic meaning of the OT type that was originally included by the divine author but apparently outside the conscious purview of that human author. We have qualified this earlier in this chapter by saying that such OT authors likely would not have disapproved of the later prophetic use of their historical descriptions made by NT writers. One's presuppositions also can determine how typology is classified. For example, if we concede that God is also the author of OT Scripture, then we are concerned not only with discerning the intention of the human author but also with the ultimate and wider divine intent of what was written in the OT, which could well transcend and organically grow out of the immediate written speech act of the writer but not contradict it.⁶⁶ The attempt to draw out the forward-looking typological aspect of the human and/or the divine intention of an OT text is certainly part of the interpretative task. And above all, if we assume the legitimacy of an inspired canon, then we should seek to interpret any part of that canon within its overall canonical context (given that one divine mind stands behind it all and expresses its thoughts in logical fashion). In fact, should not divine authorship of all OT passages in relation to the NT be a part of even "grammatical-historical interpretation"? An affirmative answer should be given to this question, since OT writers were themselves writing with an awareness of divine inspiration and, for interpreters who accept this claim, part of interpreting such OT passages is to obtain both the human and divine authors' intention. But, even if interpreters do

64. See, e.g., France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 40–41; and Baker, "Typology," 149.

65. *Ibid.*

66. On the fallacy of equating meaning exhaustively with authorial intention, see P. B. Payne, "The Fallacy of Equating Meaning with the Human Author's Intention," *JETS* 20 (1977): 243–52, in contrast to the more extreme position of W. Kaiser, "The Eschatological Hermeneutics of 'Evangicalism': Promise Theology," *JETS* 13 (1970): 94–95; *idem*, "The Present State of Old Testament Studies," *JETS* 18 (1975): 71–72. Kaiser thinks that discerning only the human author's intention exhausts the *full meaning* of an OT text and that the NT provides no fuller meaning of OT texts that the OT authors would not also have been completely cognizant of; the somewhat unusual interpretations that result from this view can be seen in Kaiser's *Uses of the Old Testament*.

not believe in divine inspiration of OT authors, if they believe that a prophet like Jeremiah thought that he wrote God's Word, that intention has to be projected onto the process of interpreting the texts in Jeremiah in terms of how the prophet would likely have perceived the authorial implications of writing under such inspiration.⁶⁷

In this regard, typology can be called contextual exegesis within the framework of the canon since it primarily involves the interpretation and elucidation of the meaning of earlier parts of Scripture by later parts. If one instead wants to refer to such canonical contextual exegesis as the doing of biblical or systematic theology, or as theological interpretation of Scripture, or even as scriptural application, that would seem to be a purely semantic distinction. Rather than interpreting a text only in the light of its immediate literary context within a book, we are now merely interpreting the passage in view of the wider canonical context. The canonical extension of the context of a passage being interpreted does not by itself transform the interpretative procedure into a noninterpretative one. Put another way, the expansion of the database being interpreted does not mean that we are no longer interpreting but only that we are doing so with a larger block of material. Even those rejecting typology as exegesis employ exegetical language to describe typology.⁶⁸

The suggestion is plausible that typological interpretation is normative and that we may seek for more OT types than the NT actually states for us; in support, we observe that this method is not unique to the NT writers but pervades the OT, some examples of which we have given above.⁶⁹ The fact that later OT writers understand earlier OT texts typologically also dilutes the claim that the NT writers' typological method is unique because of their special charismatic stance.⁷⁰ It is nevertheless still true that we today cannot reproduce the inspired *certainty* of our typological interpretations as either the OT or NT writers could, but the consistent use of such a method by biblical authors throughout hundreds of years of sacred history suggests strongly that it is a viable method for all saints to employ today.

67. I am grateful to Vern Poythress for communicating these points to me.

68. Thus, e.g., Baker, "Typology," says, "Although it is not a method of exegesis, typology supplements exegesis by throwing further light on the text in question" (155); cf. Goppelt, *Typos*: although referring to typology as not "a systematic exposition of Scripture, but as a spiritual approach," he says it "is the method of interpreting Scripture that is predominant in the New Testament" (152, 198).

69. See further Foulkes, *Acts of God*, passim, also 371, stating that observation of types in the OT is not limited to cases listed in the NT but that typological interpretation is a normative interpretative approach for Christians even today.

70. See Foulkes, *Acts of God*; M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 350–79, and sources cited therein for discussion of such typological exegesis within the OT itself; H. G. Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 28–29; H. D. Hummel, "The OT Basis of Typological Interpretation," *Biblical Research* 9 (1964): 38–50.

Conclusion

The significance of this chapter so far should not be limited to interpretative method; it also has a bearing on theology and a theological approach to Scripture. This is true because the use of the OT in the NT is the key to the theological relation of the Testaments, which many scholars have acknowledged.⁷¹ If we are limited to understanding this relation only by the explicit conclusions concerning particular OT passages given by NT writers, vast portions of the OT are lost to us. We can use the contextual method of interpreting these portions, but we must remember, according to some scholars, that this was not the dominant hermeneutical approach of the NT writers. Therefore a hiatus remains between the way they linked the Testaments both interpretatively *and* theologically and the way we should link them. If the contemporary church cannot interpret and do theology as the apostles did, how can it feel corporately at one with them in the theological enterprise? If a radical hiatus exists between the interpretive method of the NT and our method today, then the study of the relationship of the OT and the NT from the apostolic perspective is something to which the church has little access. Furthermore, if Jesus and the apostles were impoverished in their exegetical and theological method, and if only divine inspiration salvaged their conclusions, then the intellectual and apologetic foundation of our faith is seriously eroded. What kind of intellectual or apologetic foundation for our faith is this? Moisés Silva is likely correct in stating, “If we refuse to pattern our exegesis after that of the apostles, we are in practice denying the authoritative character of their scriptural interpretation—and to do so is to strike at the very heart of the Christian faith.”⁷² Indeed, the polemical and apologetic atmosphere of early Christian interpretation also points to an intense concern for correctly interpreting the OT (e.g., Acts 17:2; 18:24–28; 1 Tim. 1:6–10; 2 Tim. 2:15).

Thus I believe a positive answer can and must be given to the question “Can we reproduce the exegesis of the NT?” Yes. Yet we must be careful in distinguishing between the normative and descriptive (in this area evangelicals have various disagreements), but in the case of the NT’s method of interpreting the OT, the burden of proof rests on those who are trying to deny its normativity.

Does this mean that there is a one-to-one exact correspondence of meaning between an OT passage and the NT use of that passage? Sometimes yes and sometimes no. Much of the time the latter is the case. Accordingly, this

71. See, e.g., G. Hasel, *Current Issues in New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978); D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible* (3rd rev. ed., 2010); Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology*. So also Longenecker, “New Testament’s Use,” 1.

72. M. Silva, “The New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Text Form and Authority,” in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 164, though he does slightly qualify this assertion; so likewise Johnson, *Old Testament in the New*, 67.

means that in the light of progressive revelation, OT passages do not receive brand-new or contradictory meanings but undergo an organic expansion or development of meaning, such as the growth of an “acorn to an oak tree, a bud to a flower, or a seed to an apple.”⁷³ Another way to say this is that OT passages contain thick descriptive meanings that are unraveled layer after layer by subsequent stages of canonical revelation. This means that OT passages can be understood more deeply in the light of the developing revelation of later parts of the OT and especially of the NT. The OT authors had a true understanding of what they wrote but not an exhaustive understanding. This means that a NT text’s contextual understanding of an OT text will involve some essential identity of meaning between the two, but often the meaning is expanded and unfolded, growing out of the earlier meaning. Chapter 5, “Hermeneutical and Theological Presuppositions of the New Testament Writers,” will elaborate further on this notion of how OT passages are to be understood in the light of the entire canon.

The purpose of this first chapter has been briefly to introduce readers to some of the most significant debates among scholars in the area of how the NT uses the OT. I have laid out my own position on these issues, though readers can consult much literature that elaborates further on both sides of the debate (indeed, the purpose of my *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* was to lay out for readers both sides of the various debates). No matter on which side of these debates readers find themselves, the methodological approach elaborated in the rest of the book will be of use to all. The reason for this utility is that one must go through the process laid out in the rest of the book to determine whether an OT passage has been used or misused by a NT writer. I have repeatedly found that this methodological approach reveals the depth, beauty, interpretative richness, and unity of Scripture, including wonderful ways in which these uses help modern Christians understand their own relationship to Christ and his church within the context of the unfolding redemptive-historical story line of Scripture.

73. See J. M. Compton, “Shared Intentions? Reflections on Inspiration and Interpretation in Light of Scripture’s Dual Authorship,” *Themelios* 33 (2008): 23–33, esp. 30–31nn43–47, <http://andynaselli.com/themelios-333>, and the bibliography throughout the notes. The entire article is a good explanation of the concept entailed in how OT passages can be seen to expand in meaning in the light of the progressive revelation of the whole canon.