

The Right Doctrine, Wrong Texts: Can we follow the Apostles' Doctrine but not their Hermeneutics?

Greg Beale, Westminster Theological Seminary, PA.

Introduction

In 1989, I published an article titled 'Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of the Apostles' Exegetical Method.'¹ This was an article that surveyed the recent history of the use of the Old Testament in the New, with focus on the works of Richard Longenecker. Longenecker had argued that the trend of the New Testament was to use the Old Testament in non-contextual ways, which we today would consider illegitimate and which we certainly should not imitate in the way we interpret the Old Testament. I will summarize the essence of that article here and also integrate into it briefly the developments within especially evangelical scholarship on this issue since my 1989 article. Then I will take a single case study of a notoriously difficult text to see how one might approach other thorny uses of the Old Testament by the New.

First, a summary of my 1989 article with a few updates, the concerns of which continue up to today.

The degree of continuity and discontinuity in both theology and interpretative method between Christianity and its Jewish environment has been a point of much debate in NT studies. This has especially been the case with the issue of the use of the OT in Judaism and in the NT.

One widely held position is that Jesus and the writers of the New Testament used non-contextual and atomistic hermeneutical methods such as were used by their Jewish contemporaries. We today would regard such methods as illegitimate. But, we are assured, they were guided in their interpretation by the example of Christ and by the Spirit, and so, although we cannot and should not imitate their methods today, we can trust their conclusions and believe their doctrine.² A recent development of this view goes further and contends that the New Testament writers used what we would consider today to be wrong methods of interpreting the Old Testament and that we should follow these wrong methods!³ My 1989 *Themelios* article was intended to raise questions about these kind of approaches and to offer a possible alternative, which I now summarize, along with a response to a few subsequent developments, which I believe is just as applicable to the present debate as it was then.

The Issue of Non-Contextual Exegesis in Post-biblical Judaism and Its Relation to the NT Methodology

Our starting point is to observe that it is not at all clear that non-contextual midrashic exegesis was as central to earlier Pharisaic and Qumran exegesis as is suggested by scholars favouring the approach we have described. First, it may not be appropriate to speak of a non-contextual *rabbinic* method in the pre-70 AD setting, since most examples come from after 70 AD and those which can be dated with probability before that do not appear to reflect such an atomistic approach.⁴ Second, concern for contextual exegesis is found not uncharacteristically both in Qumran and in Jewish apocalyptic.⁵ This analysis has far-reaching implications for the argument of those who believe that early Christian exegetes were influenced by a prevalent atomistic Jewish hermeneutic.

But even this assumption of influence may be questioned. It sounds *a priori* plausible that the exegetical 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 Jewish and Christian hermeneutical approaches will necessarily have been identical in every way.⁶ It is necessary to look at the NT itself, without prejudice about methodological continuity or discontinuity, in order to assess the issue.

It is often claimed that an inductive study of the NT reveals a predominantly non-contextual exegetical method. But, in fact, of all the many OT citations and allusions found in the NT, only a very few plausible examples of non-contextual usage have been noted by critics. These include⁷:

1. *ad hominem* argumentation: the role of angels revealing the law in Gal. 3:19; the Exodus 'veil' theme in 2 Cor. 3:13-18.
2. non-contextual 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. 12:7ff. in Gal. 3:16; Ps. 68:18 in Eph. 4:8.
3. allegorical interpretations: Deut 25:4 in 1 Cor. 9:9; the use of the OT in Gal. 4:24; Gen. 14 in Hebrews 7.
4. atomistic interpretation: Isa. 40:6-8 in 1 Pet. 1:24ff.

Two things need to be said about such examples. First, it is by no means certain that even these examples are actually non-contextual. A number of scholars have offered viable and even persuasive explanations of how they could well be cases of contextual exegesis.⁸ But, second, even if it is granted that they are convincing examples of non-contextual hermeneutics, it does not necessarily follow that they are truly representative of a wider hermeneutical pattern in the NT.⁹ They may be exceptional rather than typical.¹⁰

The Christocentric Debate

In addition to attributing uncontrolled exegesis to the influence of contemporary Jewish interpretation, scholars offer other reasons as well. Some have believed that many of the New Testament authors were so caught up in defending Christ as Messiah that they twisted Old Testament passages to support their viewpoint about the truth of the gospel.¹¹ Similarly, others have argued, especially more recently, that the apostolic writers were so christocentric in their understanding of the Old Testament that they 'read' Christ into passages that had nothing to do with the coming Messiah. In so doing, they distorted the meaning of the Old Testament writer by reading in their presupposition that all of Old Testament scripture pointed to Christ.¹²

I believe that one can have a christocentric perspective on the Old Testament without reading in distorted meanings into it. I will address the reason for this in the last segment of this introductory section. But before doing so, there is one more recent trend of interpretation that needs addressing.

The Rhetorical Debate

Still others affirm that writers like Paul were not primarily concerned to use the Old Testament to convey its contextual import but rhetorically to persuade readers to obey their exhortations. Thus, only the wording of the Old Testament is appealed to without consideration for its sense in order to enhance the New Testament writer's apostolic authority in trying to make a 'power move' to make the readers submit.¹³ Some would contend that New Testament writers would not care about what an Old Testament verse meant in its context, since the majority of the readers/hearers in churches

would have been Gentiles, who would not have had the educational background to read the Old Testament and appreciate its significance. Furthermore, such a view likely entails that even if many had possessed such an educational preparation to read the Hebrew and Greek Old Testament, since they were recently converted pagans, they would not have had any exposure to the Old Testament. Consequently, in either case, they would not understand Paul's contextual use of the Old Testament.

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

While there is not space here to respond sufficiently to this, suffice it to say that the following makes the rhetorical approach less likely: (1) Gentiles did not need a high level of education to understand the Old Testament references in apostolic writings, since these would have been read to the churches and the hearers did not have to read the letters themselves; (2) furthermore, there would likely have been more than only one reading of a letter to a church, but repeated subsequent readings, which would help the hearers understand them better and the Old Testament references therein; (3) letter carriers probably explained some of the contents of the letters, including the Old Testament references; (4) discipleship in the churches would have been carried on by those who knew the Old Testament and could explain its use in apostolic letters to newly converted Gentiles.

But perhaps the best evidence against a mere rhetorical force of Old Testament references is that the rhetorical impact is heightened when the broader contextual meaning of the Old Testament passage is taken into consideration. Naturally, such a conclusion about this heightening is an exegetical decision, which needs substantial analysis in a case-by-case basis and may be more persuasive in some cases than others.

There are other reasons that scholars do not see continuity between Old Testament references in the New,¹⁴ but I have covered the primary ones in the preceding. In the next section, I respond further to why the above objections to a contextual reading of the Old Testament by New Testament writers are not ultimately persuasive.

The Contribution of C.H. Dodd

A substantial and too-often neglected argument against the view that the NT uses the OT atomistically is C.H. Dodd's classic work *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952). Dodd was responding to the so-called 'Testimony Book Hypothesis,' which contended that the New Testament writers took their Old Testament quotations from a so-called 'testimony book,' which contained various kinds of proof texts that were commonly used for apologetic reasons. If this were the case, then the New Testament authors would not have been using these Old Testament references with the literary context of the Old Testament in view.

In brief, Dodd responded by observing that throughout the NT there are numerous and scattered quotes that derive from the same few OT contexts. He asks the question why, given that the same segment of the OT is in view, there are so few identical quotations of the same verse and, secondly, why it is that different verses are cited from the same segments of the OT. He concludes that this phenomenon indicates that 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 were cited. Furthermore, he

concludes that this was a *unique hermeneutical phenomenon* of the day. 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 ecclesiastical committees, then Christ was the most likely source of this original, creative hermeneutic and it was from him that the NT writers learned their method.¹⁵

Some disagree with Dodd, and indeed, many scholars in this field generally affirm that the NT writers often employ a non-contextual exegetical method.¹⁶ Nevertheless, others have confirmed Dodd's thesis about the NT's unique and consistent respect for the OT context.¹⁷ In particular, some have recently tried to resurrect the testimony book theory by arguing that there was not one testimony book, as argued earlier, but there were many circulating excerpts of scripture texts on various topics to which New Testament writers could have appealed. But even if this were so, it is evident that New Testament authors would have had access to more data than this, such as large tracts of the Old Testament put to memory and to Old Testament scrolls themselves.¹⁸

It must be taken into consideration, however, that NT authors display varying degrees of awareness of literary context, as well as perhaps historical context, although the former is predominant. Those texts with a low degree of correspondence with the OT literary context can be referred to as semi-contextual, since they seem to fall between the poles of what we ordinarily call 'contextual' and 'non-contextual' usages.¹⁹ 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. Often, upon closer examination such uses reveal an ironic or polemical intention.²⁰ In such examples it would be wrong to conclude that an OT reference has been interpreted non-contextually. Indeed, awareness of context must be presupposed in making such interpretations of OT texts. On the other hand, non-contextual uses of the OT may be expected to occur where there is unintentional or unconscious allusion. Caution should be exercised in labeling OT usages merely either as contextual or non-contextual, since other more precisely descriptive interpretive categories may be better.

The Distinctive Presuppositions of the Apostles' Exegetical Method

But neither Dodd nor his followers have inquired deeply enough into the more fundamental issue concerning the reason why the NT is different from Judaism in its contextual approach (assuming for the sake of argument that a non-contextual method was an inherent trait of Jewish exegesis, a position we have tentatively questioned). Therefore, what were the presuppositions which inspired what Dodd and others believe to be a unique, consistent contextual approach to the OT?

The answer which makes most sense of the data is that Jesus and the apostles had an unparalleled redemptive-historical perspective on the OT in relation to their own situation (there are some parallels with Qumran but there is not space to discuss the reasons for its methodological differences with the NT, except to note the following assumptions of the NT writers). This perspective involved a framework of five hermeneutical and theological presuppositions:

1. the assumption of *corporate solidarity or representation* ;
2. that Christ is viewed as representing the *true Israel* of the OT and true Israel, the church, in the NT;
3. that *history is unified* by a wise and sovereign plan so that the earlier parts are designed to correspond and point to the latter parts (cf. Matt. 11:13f);
4. that the age of *eschatological fulfilment* has come in Christ;
5. as a consequence of (4), it may be deduced that the latter parts of biblical history function as the broader context to interpret earlier parts because they all have the same, ultimate divine author who inspires the various human authors, and one deduction from this premise

is that Christ as the centre of history is the *key to interpreting the earlier portions of the OT and its promises*.

It is only in the light of this fifth presupposition that we may legitimately speak of a *sensus plenior* of scripture, although it is probably best not to use this phrase since it is not often understood in this precise manner (*sensus plenior* is typically defined as the full meaning of scripture of which an author was likely not cognizant, although there is a wealth of literature discussing the legitimacy of seeing such meanings).²¹ On this view it is quite possible that the OT authors did not exhaustively understand the meaning, implications and possible applications of all that they wrote.

Subsequently, NT scripture interprets the OT scripture by expanding its meaning, seeing new implications in it and giving it new applications.²² I believe, however, that it can be demonstrated that this expansion does not contravene the integrity of the earlier texts but rather develops them in a way which is consistent with the OT author's understanding of the way in which God interacts with his people – which is the unifying factor between the Testaments. Therefore, the canon interprets the canon; latter parts of the canon draw out and explain more clearly the earlier parts.²³ LaSor has explained well the fifth presupposition of canonical contextual interpretation:

'In one sense, it [the *sensus plenior* or fuller meaning] lies outside and beyond the historical situation of the prophet, and therefore it cannot be derived by grammatico-historical exegesis. But in another sense, it is part of the history of redemption, and therefore it can be controlled by the study of Scripture taken in its entirety. Perhaps an illustration will make [this] clear... An ordinary seed contains in itself everything that will develop in the plant or tree to which it is organically related: every branch, every leaf, every flower. Yet no amount of examination by available scientific methods will disclose to us what is in that seed. However, once the seed has developed to its fullness, we can see how the seed has been fulfilled... [and] we have sufficient revelation in the Scriptures to keep our interpretations of *sensus plenior* from becoming totally subjective.'²⁴

The biblical basis for each of these presuppositions needs more elaboration than the limits of this essay allows.²⁵ It is also important to realize that these presuppositions were not newly created by Jesus and the church but can be found in the Old Testament itself, though there is not space here to demonstrate that. It is within the framework of these five presuppositions that we are to understand why the early church believed that through identification with Christ it was the continuation of true Israel, living in the inauguration of the latter days. As such it was beginning to fulfil the OT prophecies and promises about eschatological Israel.

It is within this framework too that the whole OT was perceived as pointing to this eschatological age, both via direct prophecy and the indirect prophetic adumbration of Israel's history. This latter point is especially significant; OT history was understood as containing historical patterns which foreshadowed the period of the eschaton. Consequently, the nation Israel, its kings, prophets, priests and its significant redemptive episodes composed the essential ingredients of this sacred history. This is what scholars sometimes call 'typology,' which is often defined as the study of correspondences between earlier and later events, persons, institutions, etc., within the historical framework of biblical revelation, and which from a retrospective viewpoint are perceived to have a prophetic function. Ideal or even enigmatic depictions in the OT became 'ideal' candidates to select for descriptions of features in the eschatological period which had finally arrived. These came to be considered as typical or ideal prophetic portraits.

I would argue that this broad redemptive-historical perspective was the dominant framework within which Jesus and the NT writers thought, serving as an ever-present heuristic guide to the OT. In fact, it is this framework which should be seen as the wider literary context within which the NT authors interpreted OT passages. Consideration of the immediate literary context of OT verses, which is what most exegetes affirm as an essential part of the historical-grammatical method, should therefore be supplemented with the canonical literary context.

But when these five presuppositions are related closely to the NT's exegetical method, they provide the best explanation for Dodd's observations and conclusions, especially why the NT does not focus on verses independent of their contexts. Their selection of OT texts was determined by this wider, overriding perspective, which viewed redemptive history as unified by an omnipotent and wise design. Throughout this plan are expressed the unchanging principles of faith in God, God's faithfulness in fulfilling promises, the rebellion of the unbelieving, God's judgment of them and his glory. Therefore, there was an emphatic concern for more overarching historical patterns or for significant persons (e.g. prophets, priests and kings), institutions and events which were essential constituents of such patterns. Such an emphasis was probably facilitated by the belief that Christ and the church now represented true Israel so that it would have been attractive to see various segments and patterns of Israel's history from the OT as recapitulated in the NT. This then was a holistic perspective, guiding them away from concentrating on exegetically or theologically insignificant minutiae in passages and quoting individual references as signposts to the broad redemptive-historical theme(s) from the immediate and larger OT context of which they were a part. Is not this the most likely explanation for the phenomena in the NT of so few identical quotations but different citations from the same segments of the OT?

In the light of our overall discussion, the proposal of many that the NT's exegetical approach to the OT is characteristically non-contextual is a substantial overstatement. It would take more space than allowed in this article to discuss all the relevant cases where the OT is used in the NT, but the present aim has been to focus on methodological and presuppositional issues which often influence the exegetical task itself. I remain convinced that once the hermeneutical and theological presuppositions of the NT writers are considered, there are no clear examples where they have developed a meaning from the OT which is inconsistent or contradictory to some aspect of the original OT intention.²⁶ However, there will probably always remain some enigmatic passages that are hard to understand under any reading.

In the light of the validity of the above argument and presuppositions, I concluded the 1989 *Themelios* article by saying that we should imitate the interpretative approach of the New Testament writers when interpreting parts of the Old Testament not addressed by them.

NOTE: We are unable to publish the case study that Professor Beale used to end his paper but the substance of what he delivered (on another occasion) is available in both audio and video format for free download at this address: <http://www.sbts.edu/resources/lectures/gheens/a-classic-proposed-example-of-the-misuse-of-the-old-testament-in-the-new-testament-hosea-111-in-matthew-215/>

¹ *Themelios* 14, 89-96.

² For a lucid and sympathetic presentation of this sort of view see, for example, the writings of Richard 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 Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 113-166, and idem., 'Apostolic Hermeneutics and an Evangelical Doctrine of Scripture: Moving Beyond the Modern Impasse.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 65 (2003): 263-287.

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

⁵ In Qumran e.g. 1QM1; 1QS A 1; in Jewish apocalyptic, e.g. Enoch 36-72; 4 Ezra; 2 Baruch; The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. See my own *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham: University Press, 1984); L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966).

⁶ E.g., as Longenecker surprisingly assumes ('NT's Use of the Old,' 7), since he points out the same kind of presuppositional fallacy on the part of others (*Ibid.*, 1).

⁷ Here I am using Longenecker's examples from his 'Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament?' *Tyndale Bulletin* 21 (1970), 3-38, and *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

⁸ On 1 Corinthians 10 and Galatians 3-4 see E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957), 51-54, 66-73; R. M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture* (Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University, 1981), 193-297 and D. A. Hagner, 'The Old Testament in the New Testament' in *Interpreting the Word of God*, FS in honour of S. Barabas, ed. S. J. Schultz and M. A. Inch (Chicago: Moody, 1976), 101-102, who sees a broad, contextual and typological approach in these texts.

On 2 Corinthians 3 see W. J. Dumbrell, *The Beginning of the End* (Homebrush West, Australia: Lancer, 1985), 107-113, 121-128, and S. Hafemann, Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel (WUNT 81; Tübingen: Mohr, 1995).

On 1 Cor. 9:9 cf. A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: SPCK, 1974), 161-166; 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, 1986), 179-211.

On Romans 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.

⁹ But Longenecker has most recently contended that among NT writers there can be found 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 of Acts and 1 Peter, and that midrashic interpretation (which he also views as a non-contextual method) 'characterizes' Paul and Hebrews ('NT's Use of the Old', 6-8; cf. his *Biblical Exegesis*, 218- 219). He does qualify this by saying that NT authors employed a 'controlled atomistic exegesis' (*Ibid.*, 7) but this is unclear and he never explains what he means by this.

¹⁰ See G. K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2008), 85-122, for an updated response to the notion that the New Testament's interpretation of the Old is dominantly influenced by the surrounding non-contextual Jewish approach.

¹¹ Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961).

¹² Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*, 113-166, and idem., 'Apostolic Hermeneutics and an Evangelical Doctrine of Scripture: Moving Beyond the Modern Impasse,' who prefers to call this approach a 'christotelic' perspective, i.e., that the Old Testament was viewed by the New Testament writers as designed to point toward Christ. Enns would say that the New Testament writers'

hermeneutic would be viewed as a distortion of the Old Testament meaning from the vantage point of our modern standards of what is a correct exegetical method. According to the first century standards of acceptable Jewish exegesis, their approach should be viewed as legitimate.

¹³ See, e.g., Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Paul: the Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York/London: T & T Clark International, 2004).

¹⁴ E.g., Some postmodern-minded interpreters believe that it is virtually impossible to understand what an ancient writer meant because no person can escape from interpreting any oral or written communication, including ancient letters, without reading in their own presuppositions and thus distorting the meaning of the speaker or writer. Accordingly, New Testament writers would have distorted the meanings of Old Testament writers.

¹⁵ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 110, 126-127.

¹⁶ E.g., B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961); S. V. McCasland, 'Matthew Twists the Scripture,' *JBL* 80 (1961), 143-148; S. L. Edgar, 'Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament,' *NTS* 9 (1962-1963), 56-59; A. T. Hanson, *The Living Utterances of God* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983), 184-190; M. D. Hooker, 'Beyond the Things That are Written? St. Paul's Use of Scripture,' *NTS* 27 (1981-1982), 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*, 223-230.

¹⁷ In addition to the sources cited above in this regard, see also, among many others, 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,' *EQ* 36 (1964), 214-221; 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* 27 (1980-1981), 233-251; D. Secombe, 'Luke and Isaiah,' *NTS* 27 (1980-1981), 252-259; Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New*; Moo, *The OT in the Passion Narratives*; W. C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985); Moo, 'The Problem of Sensus Plenior;' Beale, *The Influence of Daniel Upon the Structure and Theology of John's Apocalypse*, *JETS* 27 (1984), 413-423; *idem.*, 'The Use of the OT in Revelation' in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, FS for B. Lindars, ed. D. A. Carson and H. Williamson (Cambridge: University Press, 1988), 318-336; *idem.*, 'The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5-7 and Its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1', *NTS* (1989), approx. 25pp.

¹⁸ See David Lincicum, 'Paul and the Testimonia: Quo Vademus?' *JETS* 51 (2008), 297-308, for a good discussion of the issue with similar conclusions.

¹⁹ Cf. G. K. Beale, 'OT in Revelation.'

²⁰ Cf. G. K. Beale, 'OT in Revelation,' 330-332.

²¹ For a survey of significant literature discussing *sensus plenior* see G. Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century* (London: SCM, 1986), 37-47.

²² For a partial exegetical demonstration of this see the representative literature in favour of a contextual interpretation of the OT in the NT cited throughout the present article.

²³ So also Moo, 'The Problem of Sensus Plenior,' 204-211; V. S. Poythress, 'Divine Meaning of Scripture,' *WTJ* 48 (1986), 241-279; W. S. LaSor, 'Prophecy, Inspiration, and Sensus Plenior,' *TynBull* 29 (1978), 54-60; *idem.*, 'The 'Sensus Plenior' and Biblical Interpretation,' *Scripture, Tradition and Interpretation*, FS for E. F. Harrison, ed. W. W. Gasque and W. S. LaSor (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 272-276; D. A. Carson, *Matthew in The Expositor's Bible Commentary* 8 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 92-93; J. I. Packer, 'Infallible Scripture and the Role of Hermeneutics,' *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids' Zondervan, 1983), 350; see Moo and LaSor for examples of how this method can be applied.

²⁴ 'Prophecy, Inspiration and Sensus Plenior,' 55-56.

²⁵ A beginning biblical basis for each presupposition is found in my 1989 Themelios article.

²⁶ This conclusion is corroborated by the articles of Moo, 'The Problem of Sensus Plenior,' R. Nicole, 'The New Testament Use of the Old Testament' in *Revelation and the Bible*, ed. C. F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958), 135-151 and *idem.*, 'The Old Testament in the New Testament' in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary I*, ed. F. E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), 617-628.