

*Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 5/1 (1994):14-39.  
Article copyright © 1994 by Richard M. Davidson.

## NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

By Richard M. Davidson

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Andrews University

### Introduction

One of the most crucial issues involved in the inspiration of Holy Scripture is the question of the relation between the Old and New Testaments, and in particular, the use of OT quotations by NT writers.<sup>1</sup> Those who maintain a high view of the inspiration of Scripture recognize the Bible's self-testimony affirming the fundamental unity and harmony among its various parts.<sup>2</sup> Accepting this affirmation leads to the assumption that the NT writers remain faithful to the original OT contexts in their citation of OT passages. This has been the consistent position of Christian scholarship until the rise of the historical-critical method in the wake of the Enlightenment.

The rationalistic presuppositions and procedures of historical criticism have led to an entirely different view of both inspiration and the relationship between the Testaments. A corollary of the historical-critical method posits a fundamental disunity among and between the Testaments, since they are seen as the products of a long development of oral tradition and various written sources redacted by fallible human writers with differing theological agendas.<sup>3</sup> According to the prevailing view of current critical scholarship, Jesus and the NT writers often took OT passages out of context, reinterpreted and reapplied them in light of the Christ-event, and thus imposed a NT meaning upon the OT that was foreign to the original meaning.

Raymond Brown summarizes the liberal, historical-critical

perspective with regard to OT materials cited by NT writers as predictions of the Messiah as follows: "This conception of prophecy as prediction of the distant future has disappeared from most serious scholarship today, and it is widely recognized that the NT 'fulfillment' of the OT involved much that the OT writers did not foresee at all." He continues, "There is no evidence that they [the OT prophets] foresaw with precision even a single detail in the life of Jesus of Nazareth."<sup>4</sup>

Even among evangelical scholars, it is frequently asserted that the NT methods of interpreting the OT passages often do not incorporate sound exegesis, but rather utilize Christological reapplication based upon first-century interpretational techniques such as rabbinic midrash, Hellenistic allegory, and/or Qumran-style *raz pasher* ("mystery interpretation.")<sup>5</sup> It is further suggested that since the NT writers (and Jesus) were inspired, they had the right and authority under the Holy Spirit's guidance to reinterpret and reapply to Jesus what originally in the OT did not refer to Him.<sup>6</sup> The implication of these modern claims argues for the necessity of modifying the traditional view of inspiration in order to accommodate the apparent distortions of the OT passages by the NT writers.<sup>7</sup>

But is it necessary to dilute the historic high view of the inspiration of Scripture? Is it true that the NT writers have followed a common first-century Jewish practice of reapplying, and thus distorting, the contextual meaning of the OT passages they have cited?

A recently published Cambridge dissertation by David I. Brewer may be destined to rock the presuppositions, and even topple the "assured results," of current critical scholarship regarding first-century Jewish exegetical methods. Brewer summarizes the conclusions of his research: "the predecessors of the rabbis before 70 CE did not interpret Scripture out of context, did not look for any meaning in Scripture other than the plain sense, and did not change the text to fit their interpretation, though the later rabbis did all these things."<sup>8</sup>

Brewer then throws down a challenge: "If the conclusions of this work are correct it demands a fresh examination of the New

Testament, which may yet provide a model for the modern exegete."<sup>9</sup>

This "fresh examination" of NT exegetical methods has already begun in recent decades. A growing number of studies reexamining NT citations of OT passages have concluded that NT writers (and Jesus Himself) were careful exegetes, faithfully representing the original plain contextual meaning of the OT texts for the NT readers.

From my own research I likewise have become increasingly convinced—contrary to my previous understanding—that the NT writers did not take OT Scriptures out of context in their citations, did not read back into the OT what was not originally there, but rather consistently remained faithful to the OT intention, and consistently engaged in solid exegesis of the OT passages using sound hermeneutical principles.

This conclusion has gradually emerged as I have reexamined the major examples of NT citations of OT passages where it has been claimed that the NT has not remained faithful to the OT meaning in its original context.<sup>10</sup> The passages most frequently referred to include the following: (1) Matt 1:23, citing Isa 7:14; (2) Matt 2:15, citing Hos 11:1; (3) Matt 2:18, citing Jer 31:15; (4) Matt 2:23, citing "the prophets"; (5) the various NT citations of Ps 22 (Matt 27:35, 36; John 19:24, 37; etc.); (6) Acts 2:25-33, citing Ps 16:8-11; (7) 1 Cor 9:8-10, citing Deut 25:4; (8) Jesus' reference to the sign of Jonah (Matt 12:40 referring to Jonah 1:17); (9) Paul's reference to Christ as the seed of Abraham in Gal 3:16 (citing Gen 22:17-18); and (10) Paul's "allegory" of the two covenants in Galatians 4 (citing Gen 21:10). These passages we will discuss in some detail.

Other NT examples of supposed distortions of OT Scripture, less frequently employed in the discussion, include such passages as: (1) Paul's citations of Hab 2:4 in Rom 1:21; (2) his quotation of Lev 18:5 and Deut 30:12-14 in Rom 10:5-8; (3) the citation of Ps 40:6-8 in Heb 10:5-10; and (4) the citation of Ps 95:11 in Hebrews 3-4. The conclusions of recent research on these latter passages will be indicated in a brief final section of the article.

### Alleged NT Distortions of OT Passages

#### The Virgin Birth (Matt 1:23, citing Isa 7:14)

Isaiah 7:14 has been called "the most difficult of all Messianic prophecies"<sup>11</sup> and is perhaps the most studied text in biblical scholarship.<sup>12</sup> It is not possible to delve into all the exegetical issues in this passage.<sup>13</sup> Rather, our focus is upon the question: Does Matthew remain faithful to the OT context of this passage when he cites it as a prediction of the virgin birth of the Messiah (Matt 1:23)?

The interpretations of the prophecy fall into three major categories: (1) those which maintain only a local fulfillment in the time of Isaiah; (2) those which posit a reference in the text only to the virgin birth of the Messiah; and (3) those which argue for both.

A careful look at the immediate context does seem to reveal a local dimension to the fulfillment of the prophecy. The historical setting is the time of the Syro-Ephraimite War (ca. 734 B.C.). The northern kingdoms of Syria and Israel have banded together to attack their southern neighbor of Judah (Isa 7:1, 4-6). Ahaz, king of Judah, is terrified of the impending invasion, but God sends Isaiah with the comforting word that the northern coalition will not succeed in their plans to overthrow Ahaz (Isa 7:2, 3, 7-9). In this situation God gives Ahaz a sign through Isaiah: "Behold, the virgin [*almah*] shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call His name Immanuel" (vs. 14, literal translation).

The succeeding verses give the time frame of the local fulfillment of this sign: "For before the child knows how to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land before whose two kings you are in dread will be deserted" (vs. 16, RSV). Obviously, the child would be born in the time of Ahaz, and before it reached the age of accountability, the Syro-Ephraimite coalition would be dissolved.

This local interpretation is confirmed in the succeeding chapter. Isaiah goes in to "the prophetess," she conceives, and bears a son (Isa 8:3). The link between this son and the prophecy is made in vs. 4 by a statement that clearly parallels with 7:16: "For before the child knows how to cry 'my father' and 'my mother,' the wealth of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria will be carried away before the king of Assyria" (RSV). The time elements implied in Isaiah 7:16 and 8:4 were fulfilled precisely: in 732 B.C. (within two years of the prophecy of 7:14, before the child could say "father" or

“mother”) Damascus fell, and in 722 B.C. (before the child was twelve and had reached the age of accountability) Samaria fell.

Thus, Isaiah 7:14 does have a local dimension of fulfillment. But is this all that is implied in the text, and in the larger context? Let us look more closely. We note, first of all, that the prophecy is not addressed only to Ahaz, but to the “house of David” (vs. 13). When Isaiah records that “The Lord Himself will give *you* a sign” (italics mine), the word “you” is in the plural, not the singular, implying a wider application than just to Ahaz.

Furthermore, in 7:14 the Hebrew word *‘almāh* (“virgin, young woman”), translated in the LXX (Septuagint) and Matthew 1:23 by *parthenos* or “virgin,” means more than just “virgin.” There is another Hebrew word which means “virgin,” namely *betūlāh*. But *betūlāh* does not specify the age of the virgin or whether or not she is married. The word *‘almāh*, however, means “young woman of marriageable age, sexually ripe,” who in OT usage normally is unmarried, and therefore a virgin.<sup>14</sup> Thus *‘almāh*, much like the English term “maiden,” has “overtones of virginity about it”<sup>15</sup> even though this is not the main focus. In the prophecy Isaiah utilizes a term that does not stress the virginity, and thus could have significance for Ahaz’ situation with a local, partial fulfillment;<sup>16</sup> at the same time the term has connotations of virginity, thereby pointing beyond the local setting to the ultimate sign in the virgin birth of the Messiah.

What is hinted at in the text is made explicit in the larger context. Scholars generally agree that 7:14 is part of a larger literary unit of Isaiah encompassing Isaiah 7-12, which is often called the “Volume of Immanuel.” While scholars recognize this larger unit of Isaiah, they have often failed to view 7:14 within this larger setting. When Isaiah’s son was born, he was not named “Immanuel” as the prophecy of predicted. God told Isaiah to name him Maher-shalal-hash-baz, “Speed the spoil, hasten the booty.” The name Immanuel is used later in chapter 8 in a context that seems to move from the local to the cosmic and Messianic level (see vs. 8-10).

Also in chapter 8 Isaiah and his sons are said to be “signs” in Israel (vs. 18) for future events to be brought about by God. These events move from the local level at the end of Isaiah 8 to the

eschatological Messianic level in Isaiah 9. The land which was in gloom and darkness (8:22) will become a land where the gloom is removed (9:1) and “the people who walked in darkness have seen a great light” (9:2). Most significantly, Isaiah’s son was a sign to Israel, but in the Messianic age Isaiah predicts that the greater Son, the ultimate fulfillment of 7:14, will appear: “For to us a child is born, to us a son is given; and the government will be upon his shoulder, and his name will be called ‘Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace’” (Isa 9:6, RSV). This Messianic motif is further expanded in 11:1-9, with the description of the coming and work of the Messiah.

Thus within the wider context of 7:14, Isaiah himself, under divine inspiration, indicates that although the prediction will have local fulfillment in the birth of a son in the time of Ahaz, yet this local fulfillment is a type of the ultimate Messianic fulfillment in the divine Son, Immanuel. We may diagram the typological relationships in Isaiah’s volume of Immanuel as follows:

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| 1. Type     | Isa 7:14 (Immanuel prophecy)                    |
|             | Isa 8:1-4 (local fulfillment of Isa 7:14)       |
| 2. Antitype | Isa 9:1-7 (ultimate fulfillment in the Messiah) |
|             | Isa 11:1-9 (further description of the Messiah) |

Matthew, therefore, far from taking Isaiah 7:14 out of context, has recognized the larger Messianic context of Isaiah 7-12, which critical scholarship has usually ignored.

**“Out of Egypt Have I Called My Son” (Matt 2:15, RSV, citing Hos 11:1)**

Matthew 2:15 represents another instance in which the critical scholars, who have charged Matthew with unfaithfulness to the OT context,<sup>17</sup> have themselves failed to discern the larger context of Hosea 11:1.

It is true that Hosea 11:1 in its immediate historical context refers to the past historical Exodus of ancient Israel from Egypt. The verse reads: “When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son” (RSV). The next verse describes the historical circumstances of national Israel’s turning away from Yahweh to serve the Baals.

However, it is crucial to see not only the immediate context but

also the wider context of this verse. C. H. Dodd, in his book *According to the Scriptures*, has demonstrated how the NT writers often cite a single OT passage as a pointer for the reader to consider the larger context of that passage. Dodd has shown that the larger context of 11:1—both in the book of Hosea itself and in other contemporary eighth-century prophets—describes a future New Exodus connected with Israel's return from exile and the coming of the Messiah.<sup>18</sup> (Note especially the following passages: Hos 2:14-15; 12:9, 13; 13:4-5; Isa 11:15-16; 35; 40:3-5; 41:17-20; 42:14-16; 43:1-3, 14-21; 48:20-21; 49:3-5, 8-12; 51:9-11; 52:3-6, 11-12; 55:12-13; Amos 9:7-15; Mic 7:8-20. Cf. Jer 23:4-8; 16:14-15; 31:32).

In fact, the typological interconnection between ancient Israel's Exodus and the Messiah's Exodus from Egypt is already indicated in the Pentateuch. In the oracles of Balaam in Numbers 23-24, there is an explicit shift from the historical Exodus to the Messianic Exodus. In Num 23:22 Balaam proclaims, "God brings *them* out of Egypt; He [God] has strength like a wild ox." In the next oracle, Balaam shifts to the singular, "God brings *him* out of Egypt" (Num 24:8), and in the next and final oracle, referring to the "latter days" (24:14), Balaam indicates the Messianic identification of the "him": "I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not nigh; a star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a scepter shall arise out of Israel; it shall crush the forehead of Moab, and break down all the sons of Sheth" (24:17, RSV).<sup>19</sup>

Thus the Pentateuch and the latter prophets (especially Hosea and Isaiah) clearly recognized that Israel's Exodus from Egypt was a type of the new Exodus, centering in the New Israel, the Messiah. Matthew remains faithful to this larger OT context in his citation of Hosea 11:1. In harmony with the OT predictions, Matthew depicts Jesus as the New Israel, recapitulating in His life the experience of ancient Israel, but succeeding where the first Israel failed.

The first five chapters of Matthew describe in detail Jesus as the New Israel experiencing a New Exodus: coming out of Egypt after a death decree (Matt 2:15), and going through His antitypical Red Sea experience in His baptism (Matthew 3; cf. 1 Cor 10:1, 2). This is followed by His wilderness experience of 40 days paralleling the 40 years of ancient Israel in the wilderness. During this time

Jesus indicates His own awareness of His role as the New Israel in the New Exodus by consistently meeting the devil's temptations with quotations from Deuteronomy 6-8 (where ancient Israel's temptations in the wilderness are summarized). Finally, Jesus appears on the Mount as a new Moses, with His 12 disciples representing the tribes of Israel, and repeats the Law as Moses did at the end of the wilderness sojourn. Matthew and the other Synoptic Gospels also depict the death and resurrection of Jesus as a New Exodus.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, far from distorting the original OT context of Hosea, Matthew "quoted a single verse not as a proof text, but a pointer to his source's larger context. Instead of interrupting the flow of his argument with a lengthy digression, he let the words of Hosea 11:1 introduce that whole context in Hosea."<sup>21</sup> Matthew faithfully captured the wider eschatological, Messianic context of this passage as portrayed by Hosea and his prophetic contemporaries.

#### "Rachel Weeping for Her Children" (Matt 2:18, RSV, citing Jer 31:15)

L. S. Edgar considers Matthew 2:18 to be "the most striking case of disregard of context in the NT."<sup>22</sup> What does Rachel's weeping for her children killed by the Babylonians or gone into Babylonian captivity have to do with the slaughter of the Bethlehem babies at the time of Jesus' birth?

Again, it is true that the local historical context of Jeremiah 31:15 has to do with the inhabitants of Judah at the time of their going into exile in Babylon: "A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping. Rachel is weeping for her children; she refuses to be comforted for her children, because they are not" (Jer 31:15, RSV). It was in Ramah that Nebuzaradan, the captain of the Babylonian guard, assembled the Judean captives, before taking them in chains to Babylon (Jer 40:1). Rachel, a "mother" of Israel (see Ruth 4:11), is portrayed as weeping for her descendants, especially the children who were "no more" (Jer 31:15), apparently put to death by the Babylonians near her tomb at Ramah (see Ps 137:8, 9; cf. Isa 13:16), or ready to be taken into exile.

But while the immediate local context of Jeremiah's statement is the Babylonian exile, the larger context in this very chapter involves the eschatological gathering of Israel from exile (vss. 7-8)

in the setting of the Messianic New Covenant (vss. 31-34). Walter Kaiser details the larger context:

Even though Jeremiah clearly says that the Babylonian Exile will last for seventy years (Jer. 25:11, 12; 29:10), it is just as clear that he knows that the Exile will not end until the coming of the new David. The whole book of comfort (Jer. 30-33) offers not only the renewal of the ancient covenant with the inhabitants of Judah and Israel, but a new David who will sit on the throne of Israel once again (30:8-9; 33:14-15, 17). . . . Clearly, the context of Rachel's weeping lies within the bounds of the ultimate hope of God's final eschatological act. . . . The whole context of the book of comfort must be brought to bear on the total understanding of this passage. Thus, Rachel must weep yet once more in Herod's time before that grand day of God's new David and new Israel.<sup>23</sup>

Kaiser's conclusion with regard to Matthew's use of Jeremiah and Hosea in the second chapter of his Gospel is on the mark: "Matthew displayed a sensitivity for the whole context of Hosea and Jeremiah—one that involved an awareness of their canonical, theological, and eschatological contexts in addition to their historical context."<sup>24</sup>

**"He Shall Be Called a Nazarene" (Matt 2:23, RSV, citing "the prophets")**

Matthew 2:23 reads: "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that what was spoken by the prophets it might be fulfilled, 'He shall be called a Nazarene'" (RSV). In the case of this citation, no specific OT passage is cited. Many scholars have seen here a reference to the law of the Nazirite in Numbers 6 (cf. Judg 13:4-5), and they have pointed out how the context simply does not fit the situation of Jesus.

It is true that Jesus was not a Nazirite. He did not refrain from drinking the juice of the grape nor from shaving His head. But the problem is not with Matthew mistakingly connecting Nazareth with the Nazirites; it is rather with those scholars who mistakenly see Matthew making such a connection.

What needs to be recognized is that the Greek letter *zeta* or "z" is used to transliterate two Hebrew letters, *zayin* (or "z") and *sade* (or "s"). The Hebrew for the town Nazareth comes the Hebrew root *nsr*, not *nzr*. The OT noun built on this stem is *neser*, which means "sprout, shoot, branch." This Hebrew word is the technical term

for the Messiah utilized in the prediction of Isaiah 11:1: "There shall come forth a Rod from the stem of Jesse, And a Branch [*nēšer*] out of his roots" (NKJV).

Matthew, far from positing a false connection between Jesus and the Nazirite, is recognizing the connection between the name of the town "Nazareth" and the title of the Messiah! Messiah, the Branch [*nēšer*], grows up [*nšr*] in the City of the Branch [*nēšāret*]! Again, Matthew is remaining faithful to the original Messianic context of the Volume of Immanuel, Isaiah 7-12, in his allusion to Isa 11:1.

Thus far, we have concentrated upon passages in the book of Matthew, which scholars have insisted represent a twisting of the OT Scriptures.<sup>25</sup> Far from substantiating charges by scholars like McCasland that "Matthew felt free in changing and distorting the Scriptures,"<sup>26</sup> we find Matthew (and Jesus) remaining faithful to the OT context, and upholding a unity and harmony between the Testaments.

**The "Psalm of the Cross" (NT references to Psalm 22)**

Numerous NT passages cite Psalm 22 as being fulfilled in the various events surrounding the death and resurrection of the Messiah: Matthew 27:45 and Mark 15:34, Jesus citing vs. 1; Matthew 27:39 and Mark 15:29, gospel narrators citing vs. 7; Matthew 27:43, citing vs. 8; Matthew 27:35 and parallels (Mark 15:24, Luke 23:34, John 19:24), citing vs. 18; and Hebrews 2:12, citing vs. 22. The problem arises because the Psalm itself does not explicitly indicate that it is referring to the Messiah. Psalm 22 is written by David<sup>27</sup> in the first person, and, therefore, apparently describes David's own personal experience. How then can the NT writers and Jesus Himself see this psalm as pointing to the Messiah? Many scholars simply assume that the NT is again engaging in reinterpretation, reading back into the OT something which is not there.

However, there is a crucial key overlooked in much of the study of the Messianic psalms: the OT itself provides verbal indicators that identify the typological nature of these psalms.

In Psalm 22, despite the Davidic authorship and use of first person description, various commentators have recognized that "the features of this psalm far transcend the actual experiences of David."<sup>28</sup> "David's language overflows all its natural banks."<sup>29</sup> As

A. Bentzen accurately notes, Psalm 22 presents “not a description of illness, but of an *execution*.”<sup>30</sup> The executed one is actually brought “to the dust of death” in vs. 15; and yet in vss. 22ff. he is again alive and well, declaring Yahweh’s name to His brethren! As Franz Delitzsch has observed, “In Psalm 22 David descends, with his complaint into a depth that lies beyond the depth of his affliction, and rises, with his hopes to a height that lies far beyond the height of the reward of his affliction.”<sup>31</sup>

How the language of Psalm 22 can be written by David in the first person and yet move beyond his own personal experience, is clarified in connection with the first Messianic psalm of the Psalter. In Psalm 2, also written by David (Acts 4:25), there is striking evidence that the anointed Davidic king is to be regarded as a type of the future Messiah. Psalm 2 moves from the local level of the earthly installation of the Davidic king as Yahweh’s “son,” to the cosmic level of the divine Son, the Messiah. The final verse indicates this typological movement: “Kiss the Son, lest He [the Son<sup>32</sup>] be angry, And you perish in the way, When His [the Son’s] wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all those who put their trust in Him [the Son]” (vs. 12, NKJV). The expression “put trust in” (Hebrew *hasah*), elsewhere in the Psalms (over two dozen occurrences) is always reserved for the deity; the Son of vs. 12, therefore, is none other than the divine Son of God.<sup>33</sup> This internal, typological indicator in Psalm 2 sets the tone for the remainder of the Davidic psalter: the Davidic *mešiah* or “anointed one” is a type of the eschatological divine Messiah.

What is implicit in the Psalms becomes explicit in the prophets. Numerous OT prophets, under inspiration, predicted that the Messiah would come as the new antitypical David, recapitulating in His life the experience of the first David. Note the following passages: Jer 23:5; Ezek 34:23; 37:24; Isa 9:6-7, 6; 11:1-5; Hos 3:5; Amos 9:11; Zech 8:3; etc. Thus the Davidic psalms relating to David’s experience as the anointed one—namely, his suffering and his royal reign—already in the OT are announced as types of the coming Davidic Messiah. The NT writers and Jesus Himself, in citing from Davidic psalms denoting the suffering and royalty of the anointed one, are simply announcing the fulfillment of what was already indicated in the OT.<sup>34</sup>

With regard to Psalm 22 in particular, the prophet Daniel gives specific evidence of its Messianic import. In Dan 9:26, referring to the death of the Messiah, the angel Gabriel alludes to this psalm. Jacques Doukhan points out<sup>35</sup> how the expression *’ên lô* “he has no . . .” is a contracted form of *’ên ’ôzer lô* “he has no help” of Dan 11:45, and alludes to the abbreviated form of this phrase in Psalm 22:11 (Heb 12): *’ên ’ôzer* “no help.” Doukhan shows how Daniel 9:26 thus indicates that the Messiah would fulfill the words of Psalm 22. This typological indicator points to Psalm 22 as the special psalm of the Messiah at His death.

Jesus, as a careful exegete of the Messianic prophecy of Daniel 9, apparently understood that His death would be linked in fulfillment with Psalm 22. In fact, it is very possible that Jesus faced the experience of Calvary fortified by the words of Psalm 22, perhaps even mentally moving through the Psalm as the events of His crucifixion unfolded.

It seems no coincidence that as His unity with the Father is breaking up, separated by the sins of the world which He bore, Jesus cries out using the opening words of Psalm 22: “My God, my God, why have You forsaken Me?” As He hangs on the cross, He cannot see through the portals of the tomb, but by naked faith, perhaps He holds on to the assurances of this Psalm and sees the events described in Psalm 22 transpiring before Him.

All around Him are those mocking in the very words of Ps 22:8: “He trusted in the Lord, let Him rescue Him; Let Him deliver Him, since He delights in Him!” (NKJV), (see Matt 27:43; Luke 23:35). All His disciples have forsaken Him, as vs. 11 depicts: “there is none to help.” In his thirst, He experiences vs. 15: “My strength is dried up like a potsherd, And My tongue clings to My jaws.” In the pain coming from the nail-pierced hands and feet, He is reminded of vs. 16: “they have pierced My hands and My feet.” As the soldiers cast lots for His garment, vs. 18 comes true before His eyes: “They divide My garments among them, And for My clothing they cast lots.”

Jesus’ faith may well have pierced the gloom as He recalled the words that come in the second half of the psalm, starting with the abrupt affirmation in vss. 21-22: “You have answered me! I will declare Your name to My brethren.” Here is the assurance of the resurrection from the “dust of death” (NKJV) described in vs. 15.

Is it only a coincidence that Jesus' first instructions to the women—near the tomb after His resurrection—were echoing the words of Psalm 22? "Go and tell my brethren . . ." (Matt 28:10).

Perhaps Jesus' faith was fortified in those last minutes on the cross by the encouragement of the final verses of Psalm 22, describing the future spread and acceptance of His testimony in "all the ends of the world" and succeeding generations (vss. 27-31, NKJV). The final words of Psalm 22 may be translated either as "He has done [it]" or "It is done!" If we accept the latter translation, then Jesus dies in triumph with the closing message of the Psalm on his lips!

Whether Jesus consciously worked His way through Psalm 22 in His crucifixion, it is clear that the fulfillment of this Psalm in His death and resurrection is no reapplication of a Psalm in the light of the Christ-event. The OT has already indicated that the ultimate meaning of the Psalm moves beyond David to the antitypical David, the Messiah, in His suffering and death.

**OT Prediction of the Resurrection (Acts 2:29-33; 13:31-37, citing Ps 16)**

In his Pentecost sermon of Acts 2, Peter quotes Psalms 16:8-11 to show that the OT predicted Christ's resurrection from the dead. To prove the same point, Paul cites Psalms 16:10 in his sermon at Antioch (Pisidia) in Acts 13.

In the case of this OT citation, Peter leaves no doubt about how much the OT prophet David actually understood. He states emphatically (Acts 2:30-31): "Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his body, according to the flesh, He would raise up the Christ to sit on his throne, he, foreseeing this, spoke concerning the resurrection of the Christ, that His soul was not left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption" (NKJV). Thus Peter is convinced that David consciously gave an explicit prediction of the resurrection of Christ.

Modern critical scholarship, on the other hand, contends that Peter is here reading into the OT psalm a meaning imported from his NT faith, thus doing violence to the psalm in its original OT context.

Let's take a closer look. Note in particular the two arguments of both Peter and Paul supporting their conclusion.

The first concerns the language of Psalm 16 itself. Peter and

Paul argue that the description of the Psalm goes beyond the historical experience of OT David. The psalm asserts that God will not leave His Holy One in Hades nor let Him see corruption. This simply did not happen to David. He died and was buried, and his tomb was still in Jerusalem in the first century. He was left in the grave and as Paul points out, his body did see corruption.

This argument illustrates what we have already seen with regard to Psalms 2 and 22—the experiences of the historical David may have a partial, local fulfillment in the time of David, but the language ultimately points beyond OT David to the New David, the Messiah.

The second argument of both Paul and Peter points to the wider OT context of the passage. Peter refers to Psalms 89 and 132, and God's oath to David concerning his posterity, while Paul points to the larger canonical context of Isa 55:3, and God's promise to give Israel "the sure mercies of David." Both Peter and Paul see in these broader contexts evidence that David himself understood the predictive, Messianic character of God's oath and promise to him.

Walter Kaiser has done a careful study of the relation of these latter passages to Psalm 16.<sup>36</sup> He has pointed in particular to the pregnant meaning of the Hebrew *ḥasîd* ("Holy One") in Psalm 16 and parallel passages.

In Psalm 4:3 (vs. 4, Heb) David claims that He is Yahweh's *ḥasîd* or "favored one." Then in Psalm 89, one of the psalms to which Peter alludes in Acts 2, David connects this term with others that are technical Messianic terms elsewhere in Scripture. In vss. 18-20 (19-21, Heb) of the Psalm David is called not only *ḥasîd*, but also "horn," "king," "my servant," and the "anointed."

Already in Deuteronomy 33:8 the term *ḥasîd* moves beyond the local human level. Moses in his last blessing upon the tribe of Levi, speaks of the "man of your *ḥasîd* whom you [Israel] tested at Massah." Exodus 17:7 indicates that the One tested at Massah was none other than the Lord Himself. The "man of your *ḥasîd*" is thus a divine personage.

In the OT there is an oscillation between the plural *ḥ<sup>a</sup>siḏim*, referring to faithful Israelites, and the singular *ḥasîd*—the same oscillation that we find between corporate and individual in the terms "seed"<sup>37</sup> and "servant."<sup>38</sup> The corporate Israelite *ḥ<sup>a</sup>siḏim*

find their individual representative in the Davidic *hasîd*, and the Davidic “favored one” typifies or foreshadows the ultimate antitypical “Favored One,” the Messiah.

Paul’s reference to Isaiah 55:3 and the “sure mercies [*hasdê*] of God to David” captures the whole covenant context of 2 Samuel 7, which Kaiser has elsewhere shown to contain the Messianic allusion to the ultimate descendant of David who would bear the “charter for all mankind.”<sup>39</sup>

Both Peter and Paul, therefore, have rightly discerned the Messianic allusions in the wider context of OT passages echoing Psalm 16, as well as in the language of the psalm itself.

The ultimate reference to the Messiah as the only One who could totally fulfill the language of Psalm 16, does not eliminate the partial local fulfillment in David, the type of the Messiah. Peter recognizes this as he “carefully introduces the quotation from Ps 16:8-11 with the phrase, ‘David says with reference (*eis*) him’ (vs. 25), rather than ‘concerning (*peri*) him’ (which would have meant that the total reference was to the Messiah alone).”<sup>40</sup> At the same time Peter and Paul are both insistent—as the OT contextual evidence bears out—that David himself knew the resurrection of the Messiah was ultimately in view. As we have seen with regard to Psalm 22, David’s experience was a type of the New Antitypical David, Jesus Christ, and this typological connection is already indicated in the OT.

**“You Shall Not Muzzle an Ox” (1 Cor 9:8-10, NKJV, citing Deut 25:4)**

It is often claimed that Paul utilized an allegorical approach to Scripture when he cites Deuteronomy 25:4: “You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the grain.” This is seen as a prime example of biblical writers’ “interpreting a text in a sense which completely ignores its original meaning, or in a sense whose connection with its original meaning is purely arbitrary.”<sup>41</sup>

But a careful study of this Pauline passage<sup>42</sup> reveals quite the contrary. Here is a model approach showing Christians how to recognize the underlying principles in the Israelite civil law and apply them in a modern situation. The approach is in harmony with Paul’s assertion that “Whatever things were written before [OT Scripture] were written for our learning, that we through the

patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope” (Rom 15:4, NKJV).

Paul does not depart from the literal sense of Deuteronomy 25:4 by means of allegory, rabbinic argument, or Hellenistic Jewish exegesis, as some have suggested. Rather, he engages in what Kaiser calls “literal theological exegesis.”<sup>43</sup> Once more, Paul has captured the broader context of Deuteronomy 24-25 which has escaped many critical scholars. The laws in these chapters all concern the basic principles of mercy and equity. Paul takes the basic principle with regard to the treatment of oxen, and applies the same principle to the Christian minister. In the case of the oxen, even they deserved to eat from the object of their labor. How much more is it true of the Christian laborer, the minister, that he deserves to eat from the object of his labor, namely, the Christian church he ministers to.

As the commentator F. Godet puts it:

Paul does not, therefore, in the least suppress the historical and natural meaning of the precept. . . . He recognizes it fully, and it is precisely by starting from this sense that he rises to a higher application. . . . Far from arbitrarily allegorizing, he applies, by a well-founded *a fortiori*, to a higher relation what God had prescribed with reference to a lower relation. . . . It is difficult to suppress a smile when listening to the declamations of our moderns against the allegorizing mania of the Apostle Paul. . . . Paul does not in the least allegorize. . . . From the literal and natural meaning of the precept he disentangles a profound truth, a law of humanity and equity.<sup>44</sup>

**The Sign of Jonah (Matt 12:40, citing Jonah 2)**

Elsewhere<sup>45</sup> we have pointed out how various persons, events, and institutions regarded as types in the NT have already been indicated as such in the OT, and how this is true also in the case of Jonah. Let us look more closely at the typology of Jonah referred to by Jesus.

Already in Jonah’s prayer during the three days and nights in the belly of the great fish, the language the prophet employs goes beyond his own literal experience. What he describes is a virtual death-resurrection experience: “out of the belly of Sheol [the grave] I cried”; “the earth with its bars closed behind me forever; yet You have brought up my life from the pit [the grave]” (Jonah 2:2, 6, NKJV).



Only a few short years after Jonah's experience, while the memory of his "death-resurrection" was still vivid in Israel, the contemporary eighth-century prophet Hosea seems to make allusion to this event. Hosea 6:1-3 clearly refers to Israel's captivity and restoration as a "death" and "resurrection" on the "third day,"<sup>46</sup> parallel to the experience of Jonah.<sup>47</sup> From this allusion it appears that Hosea envisions Israel as recapitulating the experience of Jonah in their "death-resurrection" experience.

In the same eighth-century B.C. context Isaiah clearly describes the Messiah as a New Israel, as we have already seen.<sup>48</sup> Isaiah reveals that the Messianic Servant will represent and recapitulate the experience of the first Israel, especially with regard to His death and resurrection.<sup>49</sup>

Thus, to summarize, Hosea seems to indicate that Israel is like Jonah, experiencing a "death-resurrection" on the third day, and Isaiah shows that the Messiah is a new Israel, undergoing a death-resurrection like the first Israel. It remains for Jesus, the Master Exegete, to call attention to these OT connections between God's "servant" Jonah (2 Kgs 14:25), the servant Israel, and the Messianic Servant. Based upon these typological relationships already set forth in the OT, Jesus can confidently proclaim the sign of Jonah: as Jonah was in the belly of the great fish for "three days and three nights,"<sup>50</sup> so the new Jonah/Israel would be in the heart of the earth and rise after three days.

Also, apparently based upon these OT typological connections between Jonah, Israel, and Jesus, it is possible for Paul to say that Christ "rose again the third day according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor 15:4).<sup>51</sup> Both Jesus and Paul remain faithful to the wider OT context of Jonah's experience, and accurately announce the fulfillment of the Jonah/Israel typology indicated by the OT prophets.

#### Christ as Abraham's "Seed" (Gal 3:16, citing Gen 22:17-18)

In a previous *JATS*<sup>52</sup> article we briefly discussed how Paul in Galatians 3:16 cites Genesis 22:17-18.<sup>53</sup> Paul's argument indicates that he understands how the use of the Hebrew word *zera'* ("seed") in Genesis 22:17 moves from a collective (plural) idea to a single "Seed." Then a few verses later (Gal 3:29) Paul correctly points to the collective plural aspect of this same term in the wider context of Genesis 22:18.

We noted how in Genesis 22:17a the word *zera'* ("seed") clearly has a plural idea in the context of "the stars of heaven" and "the sand which is on the seashore." However, in vs. 17b the *zera'* (seed) narrows to a singular Messianic "Seed" who would "possess the gate of His [singular] enemies." This phrasing is parallel to Genesis 3:15, where we find the same narrowing of the word "seed" from a collective to Messianic singular.<sup>54</sup>

Since penning that brief treatment in *JATS*, my attention has been called to a recent dissertation by Dale Wheeler, devoted entirely to the issue of Paul's citation of the OT in Galatians 3:16.<sup>55</sup> A number of other lines of evidence are adduced in this study which confirm my own assessment of Paul's respect for OT context. Wheeler concludes: "rather than twisting the Old Testament to prove a point Paul is using the passage in exactly the way it was intended, following its original sense and understanding the nature of who might be its referents."<sup>56</sup>

#### Paul's "Allegory" of the Two Covenants (Gal 4:21-31; citing Gen 21:10)

Paul has been frequently charged with allegorizing in his discussion of the two covenants in Galatians 4. However, several recent studies of Galatians 4 have concluded that despite Paul's use of the term *allegoreo* in vs. 24, he does not engage in what the modern term "allegory" implies, but rather recognizes the *typological* framework of the OT accounts to which he refers.<sup>57</sup>

In this passage, Paul seems to grasp the heart of parallel historical experiences that centered around salvation by works. Israel at Sinai entered into a covenant with God which (at least initially) they thought they could fulfill by their own efforts. Abraham's union with Hagar was an attempt to fulfill God's promise by human means. These two historical occurrences typified the experience of "Jerusalem and her children," contemporary with Paul, who were seeking a righteousness by works.

By contrast, Paul presents the account of the birth of Isaac, accomplished not by the prowess of man, but by the miracle of God in faithfulness to His promise. The birth of Isaac, the promised "seed," embodies the principle of righteousness by faith, and is a type of Abraham's future spiritual "seed" symbolized by the true, heavenly Jerusalem and her children. All believers in Christ are the children of promise, Abraham's seed (Gal 3:29). These conclusions

are based upon the realization of the Christocentric nature of the "seed" promises already indicated in the OT, as we have noted in our discussion of Galatians 3:16.

Paul is not assigning arbitrary, fanciful meanings to the participants in his "allegory," as was the case in the Jewish allegorism of Philo (and the later Christian allegorical method of the Alexandrian school). Rather, he is pointing to the rich historical-typological correspondences that illustrate the principles of righteousness by works versus righteousness by faith. By so doing, he provides a clear designation of the Christian church as the seed of Abraham, the children of promise.

One should remember that the Greek verb *allegoreo*, which Paul employs, can merely indicate that "the obvious meaning is not the basic one,"<sup>58</sup> and not involve the Platonic-Philonic mode of allegorism. It seems that in Galatians 4:21-31, Paul is saying in effect: the experiences of Sarah and Hagar have a deeper meaning than just telling a story. The two women's experiences are representative of two rival systems for attaining righteousness—righteousness by faith and righteousness by works. Hagar's experience (Abraham's attempting to fulfill the divine promise of a son within her by taking things into his own hands instead of trusting God) parallels the (initial) experience of the children of Israel at Mt. Sinai (legalistic response to God), and both find a correspondence in contemporary (first-century) Judaism. It is the way of bondage—of righteousness by works. The experience of Sarah, on the other hand (trusting God to fulfill the promise of a son even when it seemed humanly impossible, Rom 4:13-25), presents a type of the way of "heavenly Jerusalem," of freedom—the way of righteousness by faith.

Thus Paul is not taking the OT accounts out of context, but rather pointing up their inherent deeper meaning and their typological referents.

#### Integrity of NT Writers Affirmed

A number of recent studies have dealt with various other passages utilized by critical scholars to support the claim that NT writers have "twisted" the OT Scriptures. The studies demonstrate

these claims to be unfounded. We will survey briefly the conclusions of some of this research dealing with several OT citations in the NT.

*Habakkuk 2:14 cited in Romans 1:17.* Despite alleged Pauline disregard for OT context, recent study has produced strong evidence of Paul's faithfulness to the context of the Habakkuk passage he cites. Contrary to the claims of "the commentators who say Paul stretched, misunderstood, reused Habakkuk," R. M. Moody shows that Paul's usage is in harmony with the original context of Habakkuk.<sup>59</sup>

*OT citations in Romans 10:5-8.* Two noteworthy studies<sup>60</sup> have analyzed Paul's citations of Leviticus 18:5; Deuteronomy 9:4; and 30:11-14. Raymond Zorn specifically focuses on "the determination of Paul's method of using the Old Testament in the setting forth and establishment of his argument."<sup>61</sup> His conclusion: "Paul, therefore, does not quote the Old Testament in the arbitrary interpretation of the allegorical form, nor simply in the loose fashion of the familiar, suitable, and proverbial language, but effectively, *ad sensum*, in an organic relationship with that of prophecy and promise of the Old Testament which now had found fulfillment in the Christ of the Gospel he so eloquently proclaimed."<sup>62</sup> Likewise, Mark Seifrid, with the same methodological goal and after even more rigorous analysis, concludes that Paul's use of OT citations in Romans 10:6-8 evidences "both a clear respect for the OT context, and a considerable distance from the techniques of Qumran."<sup>63</sup>

*OT Citations in Hebrews.* George Caird has analyzed citations of OT passages in Hebrews with the conclusion that "so far from being an example of fantastic exegesis which can be totally disregarded by modern Christians, Hebrews is one of the earliest and most successful attempts to define the relation between the Old and New Testaments, and that a large part of the value of the book is to be found in the method of exegesis which was formerly dismissed with contempt."<sup>64</sup>

This conclusion has been reaffirmed by two studies of specific OT citations in Hebrews, conducted by Walter Kaiser.<sup>65</sup> Regarding the citation of Psalms 40:6-8 in Hebrews 10:5-10, Kaiser points out crucial internal clues within Psalm 40—just before and just after the central Messianic section—"catchwords that signaled that

more was underfoot in this public praise than a testimony to God for a rather private and personal escape. Instead it had communal, indeed, world-wide implications; it was another link in God's promise-plan."<sup>66</sup>

Kaiser argues that the writer to the Hebrews was not "guilty of using homiletical midrash in Psalm 40 where the original setting was either forgotten or considered irrelevant and thus was blithely applied to Jesus," nor was he using a *peshet* type of exegesis, according to which the psalmist delivered a mystery (a *raz*) for which he had no explanation, but which only a much later *peshet* could unlock."<sup>67</sup> Although he allows that "Psalm 40:6-8 contains fewer messianic clues and less promise phraseology than other messianic passages," yet "patient attendance on the text will reveal that the writer to the Hebrews was on strong exegetical grounds."<sup>68</sup>

Regarding the citation of Ps 95:11 in Hebrews 3-4, Kaiser asks about the hermeneutical approach of the writer to the Hebrews: "Is he guilty of a forced exegesis in which he is merely accommodating the old threats and promises formerly addressed to Israel for Christian readers? Is this piece of text in Hebrews a sample of the writer's fanciful misapplication of OT texts for Christian ears and eyes? Or has he just plain allegorized the Canaan rest into some spiritual dimension or into a symbol of heaven?" His answer: "Each of these charges fails to sustain its case in light of the OT context of Psalm 95, the OT usage of 'rest,' and the total message of Hebrews."<sup>69</sup> My own analysis of the Joshua typology in Scripture confirms that there are strong indicators of this typological motif already in the OT, and the writer to the Hebrews is simply announcing what had already been indicated in the OT.<sup>70</sup>

### Conclusion

In light of the evidence examined in research for this article, my understanding has grown into a settled conviction that the NT citations of OT passages do not involve "Christological re-interpretation," Hellenistic allegory, rabbinic midrash, Qumran-type *peshet*, or other methods of interpretation that distort the original meaning of the OT citations. Rather, the NT writers consistently remain faithful to the original passages in their immediate and wider OT contexts.

This is not to say that there is no further work to be done in examining NT citations of the OT. We have not looked at every alleged instance of NT distortion of the OT, and the ones we have treated call for more detailed analysis. But enough evidence has been surveyed to allow our basic conclusion to emerge.

If this conclusion is sound, it is therefore not necessary to modify the historic understanding of inspiration in order to accommodate supposed NT distortions of the OT. The same Spirit who inspired the truths set forth in OT passages has inspired or "carried along" (*phero*, 2 Pet 1:21) the NT writers to reflect faithfully and accurately the deep meaning inherent in these passages when viewed in the light of their broader OT contexts.

### Endnotes

1 That the relationship between the OT and the NT is one of the major, if not the major, issue in biblical theology, is recognized by many. See, e.g., Henning Graf Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), p. 11, citing and translating N. H. Ridderbos, "De verhouding van het Oude en het Nieuwe Testament," *Gereformeerde theologisch Tijdschrift* 63 (1968): 97: "The relationship between Old and New Testaments: that is just about the whole story; the whole of theology is involved in that." Likewise, Walter Kaiser, Jr., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985), p. 2, writes, "the relationship between the OT and the NT stands as one of the foremost, if not the leading, problems in biblical research of this century."

2 There are of course many areas of concern in the study of the relationship of the Testaments. We have limited ourselves in this article to the explicit citations of OT passages in the NT. Here, again our study could go in many directions, such as examining the text types underlying the various citations. In this article we limit our discussion to the central question we are addressing: do the NT citations of OT Scripture remain faithful to the original OT contexts, or do they reinterpret these passages by reading back into the OT a meaning that is imported from the NT?

3 See my discussion of the unity of Scripture according to the Bible writers' self-testimony in "Interpreting Scripture: An Hermeneutical Decalogue," *JATS* 4/2 (Autumn 1993): 99-100.

4 See my discussion of this development in "The Authority of Scripture: A Personal Pilgrimage," *JATS* 1/1 (Spring 1990): 43, 51-52.

5 Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), p. 147.

6 See, e.g., Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), p. 218: "I suggest that we cannot reproduce their [the NT writers'] *peshet* exegesis. . . . Likewise, I suggest that we should not attempt to reproduce their midrashic handling of the text, their allegorical explications, or much of their Jewish manner of argumentation. All of this is strictly part of the cultural context through which the transcultural and eternal gospel was expressed." Cf. E. Earle Ellis, "How the New Testament Uses the Old," in *New Testament Interpretation*, ed. I. Howard Marshall (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 201-208.

7 See, e.g., Norman Hillyer, "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament," *Evangelical Quarterly* 36 (1964): 25; E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957), p. 83; and Longenecker, p. 207. This view has been taken even further by

some SDA scholars, who claim that such doctrines as the pre-Advent, investigative judgment are not taught in the book of Daniel, and that Ellen White, as an inspired prophet, had the right—as did the NT prophets—to reinterpret the OT prophecies.

7 See, e.g., the view of Alden Thompson, *Inspiration: Hard Questions, Honest Answers* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1991), especially pp. 205-213.

8 David Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992), p. 1.

9 Ibid.

10 The number of such examples is actually not large. Of the more than 300 formal OT quotations by NT writers (UBS Greek NT lists 318), the majority are uncontested as representing a literal usage that is faithful to the original context. In this study we are not dealing with the multitude of NT allusions to the OT. The NT writers, steeped in OT language and imagery, often employ Scriptural language in passing without a formal quotation.

11 Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics* (New York, NY: Phillips and Hunt, 1883), p. 331, cited by J. Barton Payne, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1973) p. 291.

12 For a representation of the immense bibliography, see John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 24 (Waco, TX: Word, 1985), pp. 95-103.

13 For further discussion of this passage, see especially Gleason Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), pp. 266-268; and John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah; Chapters 1-39*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), pp. 192-248.

14 The eight other occurrences of 'almāh in the OT are in the following passages: Gen 24:43; Exod 2:8; 1 Chr 15:20; Ps 46:2 (Eng. 1); 68:26 (Eng. 25); Prov 30:19; Cant 1:3; 6:8. Numerous conservative scholars have forcefully argued that in none of these passages does 'almāh refer to a married woman or one who is no longer a virgin. Even Prov 30:19; "the way of a man with a maiden ['almāh]" when viewed in its immediate context of mysteries (vss. 18-19), seems to describe the amazing process of falling in love and courtship, and not the sexual act after marriage. Likewise Cant 6:8, 9 contrasts the Shulamite with all other women present—queens, concubines, and maidens ("lamōt, i.e. unmarried young women); she is "first among women" (6:1). For further discussion and bibliography, see especially Oswalt, pp. 208-211.

15 Ibid, p. 210. Oswalt points out how this interpretation best explains the origin of the LXX translation of 'almāh in Isa 7:14 with the Greek *parthenos*, "virgin."

16 In addition to recognizing that the rich semantic range of 'almāh is well suited to encompass the dual focus of this prophecy, another plausible explanation has been advanced by Archer, p. 267: "At the time Isaiah 7:14 was given, the 'prophetess' mentioned in 8:3 would have been a virgin and would have been known to King Ahaz and his court as the woman to whom Isaiah (presumably a widower by this time, having lost through death the mother of Shear-jashub mentioned in 7:3) was engaged. Before they married the Lord revealed to Isaiah that the first child he would have by this godly young woman would be a boy. . . ." This latter explanation is far from certain, although some support is found in the fact that Shear-jashub was accompanying his father in his prophetic duties (7:3) which might imply the loss of his mother by this time.

17 See, e.g., S. Marion Smith, "New Testament Writers Use the Old Testament," *Encounter* 26 (1965): 239, who states that in citing Hos 11:1 Matthew employs "a method that can be rejected outright as an untenable use of Scripture. . . ."

18 C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Collins, 1952), pp. 74-133.

19 See John H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), pp. 407-409, for further discussion.

20 Note, e.g., how at the Transfiguration the first Moses speaks to the New Moses about His "departure" (Greek *exodus*) which He was to accomplish at Jerusalem (Luke 9:31). Jesus' death is His ultimate Red Sea experience. After His resurrection He remains in the wilderness of this earth 40 days (like Israel's 40 years in the wilderness) and then as the New Joshua enters heavenly Canaan as the pioneer and perfecter of our faith. See George Balentine, "Death of Christ as a New Exodus," *Review and Expositor* 59 (1962): 27-41; and

idem, "The Concept of the New Exodus in the Gospels," (Th.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1961).

21 Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, p. 52.

22 S. L. Edgar, "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament," *NTS* 9 (1962): 58.

23 Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, pp. 55-56.

24 Ibid., p. 57.

25 Note the title of S. Vernon McCasland's article, "Matthew Twists the Scriptures," *JBL* 80 (1961): 143-148.

26 Ibid., p. 146.

27 The superscription (Ps 22:1) reads, *mizmōr l'ḏāwīd*, "A Psalm of David." Many critical scholars refuse to accept at face value the information conveyed in the superscriptions to the Psalms. For evidence supporting the authenticity of the superscriptions in the Psalms and David's authorship of Psalms with this superscription, see, e.g., Derek Kidner, *Psalms 1-72: An Introduction and Commentary on Books I and II of the Psalms*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (London: Tyndale Press, 1973), pp. 32-35; H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1959), pp. 5-8.

28 Leupold, p. 21.

29 Kidner, p. 109.

30 A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (Lutterworth, 1955), p. 94, n. 40 (italics his).

31 Franz Delitzsch, "Psalms," in *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*, by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976 [orig. 1867]), 5:306.

32 The most natural antecedent to the pronoun is the nearest noun, the Son, rather than Yahweh in the previous verse.

33 For a rich discussion of the NT Messianic fulfillment of Psalm 22, see especially Hans LaRondelle, *Deliverance in the Psalms* (Berrien Springs, MI: First Impressions, 1983), pp. 53-60.

34 Besides Psalms 2, 16, and 22 (the latter two discussed below), other Davidic psalms thus cited include: Ps 35:19 (John 15:25); Ps 40:6-8 (Heb 10:5-9); Ps 41:9 (John 13:18); Ps 69:4 (John 15:25), 9 (John 2:17; Rom 15:3), 21 (Matt 27:34 and parallels); Ps 109:8 (Acts 1:20). Along with these psalms that are typologically Messianic as they are fulfilled in the New David, there is also David's reference to the "son of man" (Ps 8:3-8) alluding to Adam (Gen 1:26, 28), which in light of other OT references to the Messianic Son of Man (Ps 80:17; Dan 7:13, 14), establishes the typological basis for Adam-Christ typology and the citation in Heb 2:6-9. Another Davidic psalm (Ps 68:18) describes the activity of Yahweh, which in light of the recognition already in the OT that the Angel of Yahweh is also Yahweh (e.g., Gen 16:7-13; 18:1, 2, 33; 19:1; Gen 31:11-13; 32:24, 30; 48:15-16; Exod 3:2-7; Judg 13:17-22) and the NT identification of Yahweh with Christ (e.g., John 8:58), is seen as referring to Christ in Eph 4:8. (Cf. the non-Davidic psalms similarly cited: Ps 97:7 [Heb 1:6] and Ps 102:25-27 [Heb 1:10-12]). Finally, there is the directly Messianic Davidic Psalm of Psalm 110, where the Lord [the Father] spoke unto David's Lord [the Messiah]. This latter passage is faithfully exegeted in Matt 22:41-46 and Heb 5:5-11; 7:11-27.

35 Jacques Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study," *AUSS* 17 (1979): 18-19.

36 See Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, pp. 25-41. The discussion that follows related to Psalm 16 builds upon Kaiser's research.

37 See below, in our discussion of Gal 3:16.

38 See below, in our discussion of Matt 12:40, and endnote no. 49.

39 See Walter Kaiser, Jr., "The Blessing of David: A Charter for Humanity," in *The Law and the Prophets*, ed. John Skilton (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing House, 1974), pp. 298-318; and idem, *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978), pp. 149-155.

40 Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, pp. 37-38.

41 A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 159.

42 See Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, pp. 212-220.

43 Ibid., p. 215.

44 F. Godet, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. J. W. Leitch (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1975), p. 155, n. 38, cited in Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, p. 215.

45 See Richard M. Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology," in *Symposium on Revelation—Book I*, ed. Frank Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol 6 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), pp. 106, 128.

46 See Bertrand C. Pryce, "The Resurrection Motif in Hosea 5:8-6:6: An Exegetical Study" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1989), for examination of the exegetical evidence for the death-resurrection motif in this passage.

47 It may also be more than co-incidental that in the next chapter Hosea says Israel is "like Jonah" (Heb *k'yōnāh*, with *yōnah* the name for Jonah, meaning "dove") who flees from Yahweh and goes to Assyria (Hos 7:11, 13).

48 See above, our discussion of the New Israel/New Exodus theme as it related to the citation of Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15.

49 In the Servant Songs of Isaiah 42-53, what is most striking is the frequent alternation between the corporate and the singular servant, with both individual and corporate servants described in the same language. In this way the prophet indicates that the Messianic Servant would be the New Israel. See H. H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays* (London: Lutterworth, 1952), for further discussion. For treatment of the death-resurrection motif with reference to the Messianic servant in Isaiah, see especially Duane F. Lindsey, *The Servant Songs: A Study in Isaiah* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1985).

50 For discussion of the meaning of this phrase, and biblical evidence for inclusive reckoning so that this expression indicates any part of three days, see *SDABC*, 5:248-251.

51 The third-day timing of the Messiah's resurrection is also probably indicated in the typology of the wave sheaf in Leviticus 23. A sheaf of barley was to be waved "on the day after the Sabbath" of Passover week (Lev 23:11). If the Sabbath referred to here is the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Nisan 15), then the wave sheaf would always be waved on Nisan 16, the third day from Nisan 14 when the Passover was celebrated. Paul recognizes that Jesus in his resurrection is the antitypical wave-sheaf, the first-fruits of the coming harvest (1 Cor 15:20, 23).

52 Davidson, "Interpreting Scripture," pp. 105, 112.

53 For evidence that Paul in Galatians 3 is not simply citing Genesis 12, but in particular had Gen 22:17-18 in mind, see the discussion of Gal 3:8 in Max Wilcox, "Upon the Tree"—Deut 21:22-23 in the New Testament," *JBL* 96 (1977): 94-97.

54 See O. Palmer Robertson, *Christ of the Covenants* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980), pp. 93-100, for excellent discussion of Gen 3:15.

55 Dale M. Wheeler, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Gal 3:16" (Th.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1987).

56 Ibid., pp. 332-333.

57 See, e.g., Francis Foulkes, *The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Press, 1958), pp. 36-37; Ellis, *Paul and the OT*, p. 127; Hanson, pp. 94-95.

58 See Robert M. Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (London: SPCK, 1957), p. 122.

59 R. M. Moody, "The Habakkuk Quotation in Romans 1:17," *The Expository Times* 92 (1981): 205-208; quotation from p. 206.

60 Raymond O. Zorn, "The Apostle Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 10:5-8," *Gordon Review* 5 (1959):29-34; and Mark A. Seifrid, "Paul's Approach to the Old Testament in Rom 10:6-8," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 3-37.

61 Zorn, p. 29.

62 Ibid., p. 34.

63 Seifrid, p. 37. Seifrid is especially helpful in pointing out the wider Deuteronomic context which is presupposed in Paul's use of the Deuteronomy passages.

64 George B. Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 5 (1959): 49-51. Regarding Hebrews' use of Jeremiah 31, for example, Caird, p. 47, describes this as "a perfectly sound piece of exegesis."

65 For the exegesis of Ps 40:6-8 in Heb 10:5-7, see especially Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, pp. 122-141; for the exegesis of Ps 95:7-11 in Hebrews 3-4, see *ibid.*, pp. 153-175.

66 Ibid., p. 132.

67 Ibid., p. 138.

68 Ibid., p. 141.

69 Ibid., p. 169. Kaiser's extended discussion of Romans 9-11 in this context is not as helpful, where he seems to argue for a literal return of Israel to Palestine as part of the fulfillment of God's promise/plan. For a better analysis of Romans 9-11 and this whole issue, see Hans LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983).

70 See my forthcoming commentary on Joshua published by Review and Herald Publishing Association (in 1995).