

## THE NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Robert L. Thomas  
Professor of New Testament

*When interpreting the OT and NT, each in light of the single, grammatical-historical meaning of a passage, two kinds of NT uses of the OT surface, one in which the NT writer observes the grammatical-historical sense of the OT passage and the other in which the NT writer goes beyond the grammatical-historical sense in his use of an OT passage. Inspired sensus plenior application (ISPA) designates the latter usage. Numerous passages illustrate each type of NT use of the OT. The ISPA type of usage does not grant contemporary interpreters the right to copy the methodology of NT writers, nor does it violate the principle of single meaning. The ISPA meaning of the OT passage did not exist for man until the time of the NT citation, being occasioned by Israel's rejection of her Messiah at His first advent. The ISPA approach approximates that advocated by Walton more closely than other explanations of the NT use of the OT. "Fulfillment" terminology in the NT is appropriate only for events that literally fulfil events predicted in the OT.*

\* \* \* \* \*

An earlier article, "The Principle of Single Meaning," elaborated on an important hermeneutical maxim.<sup>1</sup> That discussion raised the important issue of the NT use of the OT in instances where the NT writer went beyond the grammatical-historical meaning of an OT passage and assigned it an additional meaning in connection with his NT context. As a follow-up to that discussion, this essay will apply the principle of single meaning exactly to a discussion of the NT use of the OT.

That important principle dictates that every OT passage must receive its own grammatical-historical interpretation, regardless of how a NT writer may use it. The OT must not receive multiple meanings by being read through the eyes of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert L. Thomas, "The Principle of Single Meaning," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 12/1 (Spring 2001):33-47.

NT. When this principle is applied—i.e., when each OT passage is limited to its single grammatical-historical meaning—the results are enlightening. When this is done, one finds two kinds of uses of the OT by NT writers: one in which the NT writer abides by and applies the grammatical-historical sense of the OT passage and another use in which the NT writer goes beyond the grammatical-historical sense of the OT passage to assign the passage an additional meaning in connection with its NT context. In the former instance, a NT writer uses the OT in its literal sense. The latter instance is a nonliteral use of the OT. We may call this an “inspired *sensus plenior* application” (hereafter usually ISPA) of the OT passage to a new situation. It is “inspired,” because along with all Scripture, the NT passage is inspired by God. It is “*sensus plenior*” in that it gives an additional or fuller sense than the passage had in its OT setting. It is an “application” because it does not eradicate the literal meaning of the OT passage, but simply applies the OT wording to a new setting.

In the following discussion, space will permit only an overview of a few examples of each of these two types of usage. Old Testament predictive prophecies of the first coming of Christ furnish some of the illustrations. Other examples come from non-prophetic portions of the OT.

## TWO TYPES OF NT TREATMENTS OF OT PROPHECIES

### Literal Use of the OT in the NT

A number of OT passages receive a literal treatment, that is, the NT records actual events or principles that satisfy the grammatical-historical sense of the OT passage. Several examples illustrate this.

**Matt 1:23 with Isa 7:14.** The Lord through Isaiah offered King Ahaz a sign in Isa 7:10-11, but Ahaz in feigned humility refused the offer in Isa 7:12. Since Ahaz refused that sign, the Lord chose another sign described in Isa 7:14, the miraculous birth of a son to a virgin. The Hebrew word translated “virgin” refers to an unmarried woman (Gen 24:43; Prov 30:19; Song 1:3; 6:8), indicating that the birth of Isaiah’s own son in Isa 8:3 could not have fulfilled this prophecy. Besides, birth of a son to Isaiah would hardly have satisfied the promise of a “sign” and the son’s name of “Immanuel” in 7:14. Matthew noted the fulfillment of this prophecy in the birth of Israel’s Messiah in Matt 1:23 and applied the name “Immanuel” (i.e., “God with us”) from Isa 7:14 to Him. That was a literal fulfillment of Isaiah’s OT prophecy.

**Acts 13:23 with Isa 11:1.** Isaiah 11:1 predicts the coming of a Rod from the stem of Jesse and a Branch growing from Jesse’s roots. The Babylonian captivity appears to have ended the Davidic dynasty in Israel, but life remained in the “stump” and “roots” of the Davidic line. Jesse was the father of David through whom the Messianic king was to come (Ruth 4:22; 1 Sam 16:1, 12, 13). Paul’s sermon in Acts 13:23 notes the literal fulfillment of that prophecy through David, the son of Jesse, from whose offspring God would bring to Israel a Savior whose

name was Jesus.

**Matt 21:42 with Isa 28:16 and Ps 118:22.** OT references to “the chief corner stone” and “the stone which the builders rejected” found their literal fulfillment in the incarnation and death of Jesus Christ, according to Matt 21:42 along with Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; Rom 9:33; Eph 2:20; 1 Pet 2:6-8. He provided the only sure refuge for Israel who had made the mistake of relying on foreigners instead. At Jesus’ first coming, Israel rejected Him, thereby stumbling in literal fulfillment of this prophecy.

**Luke 3:4-6 with Isa 40:3-5.** All four Gospels record the fulfillment of this prophecy of a voice crying in the wilderness through the preaching of John the Baptist. His was a prophetic exhortation to Israel to prepare for the revelation of the Lord’s glory with the arrival of the Messiah. Luke 3:4-6 gives the fullest account of the fulfillment with Matt 3:3; Mark 1:3; John 1:23 furnishing briefer notices of the same. The remnant of Israel was to remove obstacles from the coming Messiah’s path by repenting of their sins. Both John the Baptist (Matt 3:2) and Jesus (Matt 4:17; Mark 1:15) reminded people of this necessity.

**Matt 3:16-17 and 17:5 with Isa 42:1a.** The personal Servant of the LORD spoken of in Isa 42:1a is Israel’s Messiah who was chosen (Luke 9:35) because the LORD delights in Him. In Matt 3:16-17 (see also Mark 1:10-11 and Luke 3:22) at Christ’s baptism and in Matt 17:5 at His transfiguration, Matthew records the literal fulfillment of God’s recognition of the Messiah as the one in whom He is pleased.

**Matt 26:67 and 27:26, 30 with Isa 50:6.** Isaiah foresaw the cruel treatment of Jesus by the soldiers during and after His trial. Matthew records His being struck, slapped, scourged, and spat upon, as do Mark, Luke, and John also (see Mark 14:67; 15:19; Luke 22:63; John 18:22). The OT anticipated that abusive treatment of the Messiah, and the NT recorded the prophecy’s literal fulfillment.

**John 12:37-38 with Isa 53:1.** When he wrote, “Who has believed our report?,” the prophet anticipated that Israel would not recognize her Messiah when He arrived. That expectation found literal fulfillment when Christ came. John 12:38 explicitly notes the fulfillment, while John 1:9-11 implicitly does so by speaking of His coming to His own people and His own people not welcoming Him.

**Acts 8:32-33 with Isa 53:7-8.** For the sake of the Ethiopian eunuch who was reading Isaiah 53, Philip identified Jesus as the one who fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah about “a sheep that is silent before its shearers.” Philip called the eunuch’s attention to how Jesus, by remaining silent, was like “a lamb before its shearer.” This fulfillment is literal again and serves as a good example to prove that Jesus fulfilled OT prophecy and thus was the promised Messiah of Israel.

**Matt 26:63 and 27:12, 14 with Isa 53:7.** Isaiah prophesied about the Servant of the LORD that He would not open His mouth to protest His mistreatment. Matthew repeatedly notes that Jesus “kept silent,” “made no answer,” and “did not answer.” Mark, Luke, John, and Peter emphasize the same point (Mark 14:61; 15:5; Luke 23:9; John 19:9; 1 Pet 2:23). Jesus fulfilled the prophecy literally.

**John 1:29 with Isa 53:7.** Isaiah refers to the Servant of the LORD as a lamb led to slaughter. The writer John quotes this recognition of Jesus as the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (John 1:29). Peter refers to Him as an unblemished and spotless lamb (1 Pet 1:19). The writer John refers to Him again in a similar way when in a vision he saw a lamb standing as though slain (Rev 5:6). Here is another NT recognition of literal fulfillment of OT prophecy.

**First Pet 2:22 with Isa 53:9.** Isaiah wrote of the Servant’s refraining from violence and from speaking deceitfully. In 1 Pet 2:22 Peter picks those details to show how Jesus fulfilled the predictions literally. He was innocent of all charges leveled against Him.

**Luke 22:37 with Isa 53:12.** Luke observes how Jesus was numbered with transgressors in literal fulfillment of the very same words recorded by Isaiah many centuries earlier.

**Luke 4:18-19 with Isa 61:1-2a.** Luke quotes Jesus when He announced His own literal fulfillment of the prophecy about bringing good news to the afflicted. He offered promised kingdom blessings to his home town of Nazareth in Israel, but that generation of Israelites rejected Him at His first coming, causing a postponement of the promised kingdom.

**Matt 21:5 with Isa 62:11 and Zech 9:9.** In describing Jesus’ triumphal entry, Matthew connects the occasion with the literal fulfillment of the words of Isaiah and Zechariah, both of which were spoken to the daughter of Zion concerning her King’s coming to her riding on a donkey.

**The function of literal fulfillment.** Fulfillments such as those listed above had great apologetic value in proving to Jewish readers of the OT and others that Jesus was the promised Messiah. What Isaiah and other OT prophets predicted would happen when the Messiah came actually happened in a letter-perfect manner. The way Jesus met all the criteria expected of Israel’s Messiah was phenomenal, so much so that any clear-thinking person was bound to acknowledge that this was the one whom the OT expected. The fulfillments were that precise.

#### **Nonliteral Uses of the OT in the NT**

In the second type of NT citations of the OT, we have inspired *sensus plenior* applications of the OT words. In such uses NT writers took words from the

OT and applied them to situations entirely different from what was envisioned in corresponding OT contexts. They disregarded the main thrust of the grammatical-historical meanings of the OT passages and applied those passages in different ways to suit the different points they were putting across. They usually maintained some connecting linkage in thought with the OT passages, but the literal OT meanings are absent from the NT usages in this kind of citation.

A number of passages in which differences in meaning of OT and corresponding NT usages illustrate this ISPA usage.

**Luke 20:17-18 with Isa 8:14-15.** Isaiah's historical context refers the words to the stumbling of those who opposed Isaiah's message and their consequent captivity in Babylon. Luke takes the same words and applies them to the stumbling of the generation of Israelites that rejected Jesus as the Messiah and their consequent judgment by God. Paul and Peter do the same with Isa 8:14-15 (Rom 9:32-33; 1 Pet 2:8). Note the change of reference. In the OT instance the words referred to the personal enemies of Isaiah and the temporal judgment inflicted on them; in the NT the generation of Israel that rejected Jesus at His first coming and the eternal judgment against them are in view.

**Heb 2:13a with Isa 8:17.** For Isaiah, the words of hope spoke of the prophet's willingness to await the Lord's deliverance and His promised national salvation for the faithful remnant of Israel. The writer of Hebrews uses the same words to apply to Christ's trust and hope in God and His willingness to call them "brothers" who come from the same Father as He.

**Heb 2:13b with Isa 8:18.** The Isaiah passage speaks of Isaiah and his two sons. The writer of Hebrews applies the same words to Jesus, the Son of God, and His fellow human beings to show Jesus' human nature and His full identification with the human race (Heb 2:13b). In the NT sense the reference is to Jesus instead of Isaiah and to humanity instead of Isaiah's two sons.

**Matt 4:12-16 with Isa 9:1-2.** Isaiah's words speak of the gloom caused at the northern border of northeast Galilee when the Assyrian king invaded Israel, because that area was the first to suffer from the invasion as the Assyrians entered the land. The verses then speak of the coming of a great light by way of the transformation of that gloom at the end of Israel's captivity to foreign invaders, which will come at the second advent of Jesus Christ. In an ISPA of the words, Matt 4:12-16 applies the two Isaianic verses to the time of Christ's first advent and the honor received by Galilee when He launched His Galilean ministry in that territory. That, of course, was not a literal fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy.

**John 4:10, 14 with Isa 12:3.** In Isaiah's context, the words anticipate the time when the Messiah will come to satisfy the physical thirst of the future generation of Israelites at the Messiah's second advent, at the time when He will

deliver Israel from her political opponents and the spiritual oppression of her sins. The nation will enjoy the same provision then as the generation under Moses who had their physical thirst satisfied in the wilderness (cf. Exod 17:1-7). According to John's Gospel, Jesus took the words and applied them to the woman of Samaria and her opportunity to receive from Him "living water," a figurative reference to eternal life (John 4:10, 14). This is another ISPA of the OT, this time by Jesus through the Gospel writer.

**First Cor 15:54 with Isa 25:8.** The Isaiah context of 25:8 speaks of the time of Christ's future reign over the nations when God will "swallow up" death. He promises a time of prosperity for ethnic Israel. In Corinthians, Paul applies the words to the future resurrection of those in Christ, the church, because of the resurrection of Christ Himself (1 Cor 15:54). Here is another nonliteral application of OT prophecy.

**First Cor 14:21-22 with Isa 28:11.** Isaiah foresees the Lord's prediction of subservience of the drunkards of Ephraim and Jerusalem to Assyrian taskmasters who would give them instructions in a foreign language. This is God's punishment doled out to them for not listening to His prophets speaking their own language. In his application of the same words in 1 Corinthians, Paul refers to God's use of the miraculous gift of tongues as a credential to identify those who conveyed new revelation immediately following the first coming of Christ (1 Cor 14:21-22).<sup>2</sup> The meaning in Corinthians is quite different from Isaiah.

**Matt 11:5 with Isa 29:18 and 35:5.** Isaiah speaks of the day of the LORD when the spiritual deafness and blindness of Israel will be replaced with spiritual hearing and eyesight. These will come in conjunction with Israel's repentance at the future advent of her Messiah. In Matt 11:5 Jesus applies the words in a nonliteral way to the physical healing of the deaf and blind that He accomplished during His earthly ministry at His first advent.

**Heb 8:6, 10-12 with Isa 42:6.** Isaiah promises that the Servant of the LORD will be a covenant to the people and a light to the Gentiles in the day when Israel enters the benefits of her new covenant (see Jer 31:31-34). That will happen when the Messiah returns and establishes Israel's kingdom on earth. Hebrews 8:6, 10-12 show that because of Israel's rejection of the Messiah at His first advent, the Servant extended the redemptive benefits of that new covenant to the church.

**Matt 11:5 and Luke 4:18 with Isa 42:7.** Isaiah promises that the servant of the LORD will open blind eyes and release Israel's prisoners from prison by giving

---

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Robert L. Thomas, *Understanding Spiritual Gifts*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999) 103-5, 250-54, for a discussion of the 1 Corinthians passage.

them freedom in the future day of the LORD. Those will be days when spiritual eyes will be opened and spiritual freedom from physical captivity to their enemies will be achieved. Rather than referring the words to His second coming and to spiritual enlightenment and literal freedom, however, Jesus in Matt 11:5 and Luke 4:18 applied the words to acts of physical healing and the release of spiritual captives accomplished during His first advent.

**Acts 13:47 with Isa 49:6.** The Isaiah text contains God's promise that His Servant, the Messiah, will be a light to the Gentiles in providing salvation to the ends of the earth. That, of course, will happen during the future kingdom after His return. But in Acts 13:47 Paul uses the words in an entirely different manner. He applies the words to his own ministry among the Gentiles during the present age, not to that of the LORD's Servant during the future age of the kingdom. Here again is clearly a nonliteral application of the prophet's words.

**Matt 8:16-17 with Isa 53:4.** Isaiah promises that the Messiah Servant will bear Israel's spiritual griefs and carry their spiritual sorrows when He suffers on behalf of the nation. That was fulfilled in Jesus' death on the cross when He was wounded for their transgressions and bruised for their iniquities (Isa 53:5). Yet Matt 8:16-17 applies the words to Jesus' healing of physical ailments during His incarnation.<sup>3</sup> This is another example of the NT's nonliteral application of the OT. This is another meaning that God intended for Isa 53:4, but not a meaning whose authority lies in the OT passage. The only way one knows this meaning is through the NT's insight into that additional meaning.

**John 6:45 with Isa 54:13.** Isaiah promises that all Israel's children will be taught by the LORD during the future kingdom when Christ is personally present to rule the earth. An authoritative application of the words, according to John 6:45, is to those with enough spiritual insight to come to Him during His first advent. Jesus made this application during His great Discourse on the Bread of Life as He referred to those whom the Father draws to Him.

**Rom 10:20 with Isa 65:1.** Isaiah speaks of the unexpected turning of Gentiles to God during the time of Israel's blessing in her future kingdom, but Paul applies the verse to the church during the present age. Since the existence of such a body as the church was a mystery throughout the OT, this must be an ISPA of the Isaiah passage. The principle of single meaning necessitates that the passage could

---

<sup>3</sup>For a discussion of the relationship between Isa 53:4 and Matt 8:16-17, see Richard L. Mayhue, "For What Did Christ Atone in Isa 53:4-5?," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 6/2 (Fall 1995):121-41.

not refer to both.<sup>4</sup>

**Matt 2:15 with Hos 11:1.** Sometimes the NT uses a non-prophetic OT passage such as Hos 11:1 and treats it as though it predicted a NT occurrence. Hosea wrote about the historical exodus of the people of Israel from Egypt, but Matthew applies the same words to Jesus' departure from Egypt with His family after their flight there to escape the murderous intentions of Herod the Great.<sup>5</sup> This furnishes another instance of ISPA.

**Rom 3:10b-18 with Pss 5:9; 10:7; 14:1-3; 36:1; 53:1-3; 140:3; Prov 1:16; Eccl 7:20; Isa 59:7-8.** Another example of a NT use of non-prophetic OT passages comes by way of proof of the universal sinfulness of mankind in Rom 3:10b-18. This too is a nonliteral use of OT passages which particularizes the sinfulness of the wicked only, but Paul uses the same passages to show that all mankind is guilty of sin.<sup>6</sup>

**The function of ISPA.** From these examples it is quite clear that the NT sometimes applies OT passages in a way that gives an additional dimension beyond their grammatical-historical meaning. This does not cancel the grammatical-historical meaning of the OT; it is simply an application of the OT passage beyond what it originally meant in its OT context, the authority for which application is the NT passage, not the OT passage in itself. This application is an ISPA.

#### QUESTIONS RAISED BY ISPA-TYPE CITATIONS

The ISPA of OT passages by NT writers raises several questions. The first one is, Can the present-day interpreter assign additional and different meanings to OT passages in imitation of the applications made by the NT writers? The answer is no because of the principle of single meaning. To assign additional meanings would violate that inviolable rule of grammatical-historical interpretation. Current interpreters and preachers may apply the OT passages to different situations, but their applications are not inspired as are those of NT writers.

But someone will say, "The NT writers did it; why can't we? Don't we

---

<sup>4</sup>For a thorough discussion of the issues involved with these passages, see James Kristian Brackett, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9-11" (Th.M. thesis, The Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, Calif., 1998) 83-113.

<sup>5</sup>See John H. Walton, "Inspired Subjectivity and Hermeneutical Objectivity," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 13/1 (Spring 2002): 74-75, for further discussion of the relationship between these passages.

<sup>6</sup>For detailed discussion of these passages, see Brian A. Shealy, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 3:10-18: A Test Case for 'Inspired *Sensus Plenior* Application'" (Th.M. thesis, The Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, Calif., 2002) 51-139.

learn our hermeneutics from them?” The answer lies in a difference of qualifications. NT writers possessed the gift of apostleship and/or the gift of prophecy that enabled them to receive and transmit to others direct revelation from God. No contemporary interpreter possesses either of those gifts. Those gifts enabled the gifted ones to practice what is called “charismatic exegesis” in their use of OT texts.<sup>7</sup> That practice entailed finding hidden or symbolic meanings that could be revealed through an interpreter possessing divine insight.<sup>8</sup> It was similar to the technique called *midrash pesher* that members of the Qumran community utilized,<sup>9</sup> but neither did members of that community possess such gifts as apostleship and prophecy.

Another way of expressing the differences in qualifications is to point out that NT writers were directly inspired by God. Current interpreters of Scripture are not. That allowed the NT authors certain prerogatives that readers of Scripture do not presently enjoy. Through direct revelation from God biblical writers could assign applications based on additional meanings assigned to OT passages. That rules out ISPA of OT texts to new situations other than those applications that appear in the NT.

A second question relates to the principle of single meaning. Does not the NT’s assigning of an application based on a second meaning to an OT passage violate that principle? That the passage has two meanings is obvious, but only one of those meanings derives from a grammatical-historical interpretation of the OT itself. The other comes from a grammatical-historical analysis of the NT passage that cites it. The authority for the second meaning of the OT passage is not the OT; it is the NT. The OT produces only the literal meaning. The *sensus plenior* meaning emerges only after an ISPA of the OT wording to a new situation. The NT writers could assign such new meanings authoritatively because of the inspiration of what they wrote.

A third question one might ask is, “Did God know from the beginning that the OT passage had two meanings?” The answer is obviously yes. But until the NT citation of that passage, the second or *sensus plenior* meaning did not exist as far as humans were concerned. Since hermeneutics is a human discipline, gleaning that second sense is an impossibility in an examination of the OT source of the citation. The additional meaning is therefore not a grammatical-historical interpretation of the OT passage. The additional meaning is the fruit of grammatical-historical interpretation of the companion NT passage. The OT passage has only a single meaning.

A fourth question might be, “Why did the NT writers attach these *sensus plenior* meanings to OT passages?” In almost if not every instance, the new

---

<sup>7</sup>David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 252; David Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979) 91.

<sup>8</sup>Robert L. Thomas, *Revelation 1–7: An Exegetical Commentary* (Chicago: Moody, 1992) 26 n. 70; idem, *Understanding Spiritual Gifts* 33–34, 58–61, 133–72.

<sup>9</sup>Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity* 252; Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* 91.

meaning given an OT passage related to Israel's rejection of her Messiah at His first advent and the consequent opening of the door to a new people, the Gentiles, for God to bless (see Romans 9–11). The new people consisted of both Jews and Gentiles as fellow members of the body of Christ. That such a new union would exist was unrevealed in the OT, as Paul points out in Eph 3:1-7. New meanings through special divine revelation were necessary to give this new program a connection with what God had been doing throughout the OT period.

### COMPARISONS WITH OTHER APPROACHES TO NON-LITERAL CITATIONS

Comparing the above method of handling the NT use of OT passages—where the NT assigns inspired *sensus plenior* applications—with other methods of handling companion passages will clarify what the explanation entails.

#### S. Lewis Johnson and J. I. Packer

J. I. Packer classifies the divine intent behind such OT prophetic passages as “an extrapolation on the grammatico-historical plane, not a new projection onto the plane of allegory.”<sup>10</sup> S. Lewis Johnson agrees.<sup>11</sup> ISPA agrees with them when they conclude that the NT finds a *sensus plenior* meaning in addition to the literal meaning of the OT, but ISPA would emphasize that if that meaning is an extrapolation on that plane of the literal meaning, it exceeds the limits of grammatical-historical interpretation of the OT. Though their method may not be classed as allegory, its handling OT passages is not through grammatical-historical means.

Johnson goes a step further and advocates that modern interpreters reproduce the exegetical methodology of the NT writers in their handling of the OT.<sup>12</sup> That means going beyond the literal meaning of the OT to discover *sensus plenior* meanings of OT passages in addition to the ones divulged in the NT. That is another distinction between his approach and the ISPA approach which would emphasize the unique prerogative of NT writers to employ charismatic exegesis, and would insist that no one today possesses that same prophetic gift.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>James I. Packer, “Biblical Authority, Hermeneutics, and Inerrancy,” in *Jerusalem and Athens: Critical Discussion on the Theology and Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til*, ed. E. R. Geehan (Nutley, N. J.: Presbyterian Reformed, 1971) 147-48.

<sup>11</sup>S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) 50.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 93-94.

<sup>13</sup>James De Young and Sarah Hurty disagree with the cessation of the gift of prophecy in the early church and advocate that the gift, like all the other NT gifts, is available to all Christians today, enabling them to find meanings in Scripture that are deeper than the grammatical-historical meaning (*Beyond the Obvious* [Gresham, Ore.: Vision House, 1995] 136-38). Like S. L. Johnson, they believe that we should practice the hermeneutical methodology of the NT writers (*ibid.*, 68-80).

**Elliott E. Johnson**

Elliott E. Johnson resembles S. L. Johnson and J. I. Packer in finding two meanings, the divine author's meaning and the human author's meaning. He writes,

The words of the text are both the words of God and the words of the human author. In some sense, then, the meaning of God and the human author is the same. In another sense, the meaning intended by God may well be richer than the meaning of which the human author was aware (1 Peter 1:10-11). The shared meaning must be based on the words of the text. This meaning expressed may be conceived as a comprehensive or generic message.<sup>14</sup>

ISPA would differ with E. E. Johnson in his view that both divine and human meanings are discoverable in the OT text and that it therefore has a generic message. That does not do justice to the principle of single meaning. It agrees with him that the text has a stable meaning and is not changing with the passage of time, under the influence of human reflection, as complementary hermeneutics insists. But that stable meaning is single and not generic or many-faceted.

**Bruce K. Waltke**

Bruce Waltke in his canonical approach gives priority to NT revelation by asserting that the OT is always to be read in light of the NT. He focuses on the divine intent of the OT passage even though the human author may not have comprehended the scope of what he was writing about. He agrees that "the text's intention became deeper and clearer as the parameters of the canon were expanded" and that "older texts in the canon underwent a correlative progressive perception of meaning as they became part of a growing canonical literature."<sup>15</sup> He rules out *sensus plenior* as a possible explanation, stating that the OT writers wrote in ideal language. The unity between that ideal language and God's intention excludes the need to conclude that the NT writers through inspiration discovered a fuller sense in the OT text. That fuller sense was always there, says Waltke.

Waltke's approach violates grammatical-historical principles which state that the meaning of a text is discoverable on the basis of the facts of the original historical setting and the principles of grammar. Literal interpretation does not postulate that the original readers were shut out from a text's meaning that could come to light only after centuries of waiting. Waltke by implication also violates the principle of single meaning when he implies that the author and original readers received one meaning and later recipients of the NT received another. For him, the multiple meanings included a literal fulfillment of OT promises in the spiritual form

---

<sup>14</sup>Elliott E. Johnson, "A Traditional Dispensational Hermeneutic," in *Three Central Issues in Contemporary Dispensationalism*, ed. by Herbert W. Bateman IV (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999) 67.

<sup>15</sup>Bruce K. Waltke, "A Canonical Process Approach to the Psalms," in *Tradition and Testament*, ed. John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg (Chicago: Moody, 1981) 7.

of the kingdom in the NT.<sup>16</sup> In reference to the psalms, he explicitly rejects “the Antiochian principle of allowing but one historical meaning that may carry with it typical significance.”<sup>17</sup>

**Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.**

Walter Kaiser’s strong point is his insistence on authorial intent as determinative of a text’s meaning. He rejects *sensus plenior*, also a commendable feature that limits unbridled attempts to find new meanings in a text,<sup>18</sup> but he fails to allow for the NT furnishing additional meanings for an OT text. Rather he opts for attributing more to the OT writers than is justifiable under grammatical-historical rules and for allowing that their promises were generic and had a series of fulfillments.<sup>19</sup> Though Kaiser claims that the series constitutes one idea, it is still a series. This idea of a series of meanings violates the principle of single meaning.

He also contends that the human author was aware of all the stages of fulfillment, but did not know the time of their fulfillment.<sup>20</sup> This assumption goes beyond what literal interpretive principles will justify. Some of Kaiser’s exegetical practices in arriving at such a conclusion are severely strained. For example, he cites seven isolated words that David used in composing Psalm 40 to indicate David’s awareness that his office and function served “as the current representative in a long series of fulfillments of the coming man of promise.”<sup>21</sup> The seven words prove no such thing, but serve only as an excuse for Kaiser to read into the passage a preconceived meaning. This borders closely on use of the analogy of faith in the exegetical process that Kaiser himself so strongly opposes.<sup>22</sup>

**Richard N. Longenecker and Douglas J. Moo**

Richard Longenecker understands that when the NT writers cited the OT, they used methods of Jewish exegesis prevalent around NT times. He sees the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls as opening a new area of possibility for explaining how NT writers interpreted the OT.<sup>23</sup> He classifies Jewish exegetical procedures

<sup>16</sup>Bruce K. Waltke, “Is it Right to Read the New Testament into the Old?,” *Christianity Today* (September 2, 1983):77.

<sup>17</sup>Waltke, “Canonical Process Approach to the Psalms,” 7.

<sup>18</sup>Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., “Legitimate Hermeneutics,” in *Inerrancy*, ed. Norman Geisler (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979) 125-28; idem, “The Single Intent of Scripture,” in *Evangelical Roots: A Tribute to Wilbur Smith* (Nashville: Nelson, 1978) 137.

<sup>19</sup>Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985) 67-68.

<sup>20</sup>E.g., *ibid.*, 131-32.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 69.

<sup>23</sup>Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) xxi-xxii.

under four headings: literalist, midrashic, pesher, and allegorical.<sup>24</sup> He asks the question, “Is there a *sensus plenior* in the New Testament’s use of the Old?” and answers it affirmatively. He cites with approval a statement of Douglas Moo: “The question should rather be: Could God have intended a sense *related to* but *more than* that which the human author intended? I cannot see that the doctrine of inspiration demands that the answer to that question be negative.”<sup>25</sup> Moo later adds,

It may be that some citations are best explained according to the traditional *sensus plenior* model: by direct, inspired apprehension, the New Testament authors perceive the meaning in a text put there by God but unknown to the human author. Even in this case, however, it is important to insist that this “deeper meaning” is based on and compatible with the meaning intended by the human author.<sup>26</sup>

Longenecker then asks another question: “Can we reproduce the exegesis of the New Testament?” He then rephrases the question: “Are the exegetical methods that the New Testament writers used to arrive at their interpretations also either normative or exemplary for the interpretive practices of Christians today?” To this question he responds basically in the negative when he writes, “I do not think it my business to try to reproduce the exegetical procedures and practices of the New Testament writers, particularly when they engage in what I define as ‘midrash,’ ‘pesher,’ or ‘allegorical’ exegesis. Those practices often represent a culturally specific method or reflect a revelational stance or both—neither of which I can claim for myself.”<sup>27</sup>

ISPA would concur with Longenecker and Moo regarding the presence of *sensus plenior* meanings attached to OT passages by NT writers, and would agree with Longenecker in denying the prerogative to exercise the methodology of NT writer in today’s exegesis, but ISPA would disagree with both of them when it strongly emphasizes the difference between the methods of Jewish hermeneutical practices such as at Qumran and those of the NT writers. The latter had the added guidance of the Holy Spirit in what they wrote, being in possession of revelational gifts of the Spirit that were unavailable to Jewish interpreters. In this regard, the methodology of the NT writers was absolutely unique and therefore unrepeatable by present-day interpreters.

### **Darrell L. Bock**

Darrell Bock formulates his methodology based on an eclectic approach

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., xxv.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., xxxiii-xxxiv; Douglas J. Moo, “The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*,” in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*, ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995) 204

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 210.

<sup>27</sup>Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis* xxxviii.

that draws on elements of each of the methods described above.<sup>28</sup> Eclecticism in hermeneutics generally entails inconsistency because of following several conflicting approaches. He describes his view under four headings: dual authorship, language-referent, progress of revelation, and differing texts. Regarding dual authorship, he opts for a limited identification of the divine intent with the human author's intent. In other words, he states, "God could intend more than the human author did but never at the expense of the thrust of his wording."<sup>29</sup>

Bock's second heading, the language-referent, deals with where meaning resides. Is it at the level of sense—by which he refers to the definitions of words within a passage—or at the level of referents—by which he refers to the larger context of a passage's biblical theological context?<sup>30</sup> To this question Bock would answer "both . . . and," not "either . . . or." Next he deals with the progress of revelation. Under this third heading he discusses the impact of the history of Jesus' life and ministry on apostolic understanding of Scripture.<sup>31</sup> This approach has the events of the NT "refracting" or changing the church's understanding of the OT by way of a deepened understanding.

Bock's fourth heading is differing texts by which he refers to places where NT writers altered the Hebrew text when they cited OT passages. Here he suggests three possible explanations: distinguishing between the textual (i.e., what OT text was used) and conceptual (i.e., what point the text is making) forms of citations, changes in wording that are legitimate in light of an altered NT perspective, and changes because of a larger literary context.<sup>32</sup>

In his eclectic approach to the NT use of the OT, Bock has inevitably violated grammatical-historical principles, since these principles were not his main concern in his survey of current methodologies. He has forsaken the quest for objectivity and inserted the interpreter's preunderstanding as a major factor in interpretation.<sup>33</sup> He has substituted his "complementary" or multilayered reading of an OT text that views a text's meaning from the standpoint of later events rather than limiting that meaning to the historical setting of the text's origin.<sup>34</sup> In the name of progress of revelation, he has refrained from limiting a passage to a single meaning

---

<sup>28</sup>Darrell L. Bock, "Part 1, Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New," *BSac* 142/567 (July 1985):220.

<sup>29</sup>Darrell L. Bock, "Part 2, Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New," *BSac* 142/568 (October 1985):309.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, 309.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, 311-14.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, 314-15.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. Robert L. Thomas, "A Critique of Progressive Dispensational Hermeneutics," in *When the Trumpet Sounds*, ed. Thomas Ice and Timothy Demy (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 1995) 417-18; see also *idem*, in Chapter 13 of *Evangelical Hermeneutics: The New Versus the Old* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, forthcoming).

<sup>34</sup>Cf. Thomas, "Critique of Progressive Dispensational Hermeneutics" 419-20.

in order to allow for later complementary additions in meaning, which of necessity alter the original sense conveyed by the passage.<sup>35</sup> He has advocated assigning a text meanings beyond what its grammatical-historical analysis will bear.<sup>36</sup> These deviations illustrate what an eclectic approach to hermeneutics will yield.

### John H. Walton

John Walton has made several important observations regarding the NT use of the OT. One of his valid points is that objectivity in interpretation is an important goal, because a lack of objectivity is not so much a sacrifice of truth as it is a challenge to divine authority.<sup>37</sup> He laments the intrusion of the analogy of faith and its subjectivity when it glosses “a theological concept into a context where it has no ostensible role.”<sup>38</sup> To allow such an intrusion is to lapse into subjectivity in interpretation.

In his discussion of typology, Walton distinguishes two separate methods of interpretation, one of them using hermeneutical guidelines that are objective in nature and the other relying on inspiration from God that is subjective in nature. He continues, “If you have inspiration, you do not need historical-grammatical hermeneutics. If you do not have inspiration, you must proceed by the acknowledged guidelines of hermeneutics. The credibility of any interpretation is based on the verifiability of either one’s inspiration or one’s hermeneutics.”<sup>39</sup> Because no contemporary interpreter can claim inspiration, he concludes, “We cannot speak of reproducing the methods of the NT authors, for the subjectivity of their methods is not allowed to those of us whose interpretation does not enjoy the affirmation of inspiration.”<sup>40</sup>

In commenting on the citation of Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15, Walton notes that the verse in the context of Hosea’s prophecy has little connection with the use Matthew makes of it. He observes that Matthew is not interpreting the message of Hosea which was understood by Hosea and his audience through objective principles of historical-grammatical hermeneutics.<sup>41</sup> Even though Matthew associates fulfillment—using the verb *plēroō*—with Jesus’ being brought by His parents from

---

<sup>35</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 420-21.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. *ibid.*, 422-23. Bock rejects “principlal-traditional hermeneutics,” which is his name for grammatical-historical interpretation (cf. Darrell L. Bock, “Hermeneutics of Progressive Dispensationalism,” in *Three Central Issues in Contemporary Dispensationalism: A Comparison of Traditional and Progressive Views*, ed. Herbert W. Bateman IV [Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999] 86, 97).

<sup>37</sup>Walton, “Inspired Subjectivity” 65-67.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.*, 68. In this regard his opinion resembles that of Kaiser (Kaiser, *Uses of the Old Testament* 69).

<sup>39</sup>Walton, “Inspired Subjectivity” 70.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*; cf. also William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard, *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Dallas: Word, 1993) 125-32, and Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis* 193-98.

<sup>41</sup>Walton, “Inspired Subjectivity” 75.

Egypt, Walton emphasizes that one cannot glean that from Hosea. That conclusion can come only from subjective association exercised through inspiration by the writer Matthew. Matthew does not interpret the message of Hosea; he identifies the fulfillment.<sup>42</sup>

Walton's comments underline a very important principle. On the basis of grammatical-historical interpretation, an OT passage may have only one meaning, the meaning based on objective principles of literal interpretation. But on the basis of inspired subjectivity of a NT writer, it may also have an additional meaning, a meaning resting not on the authority of the OT text itself but rather on the authority of the NT citation of that text.

ISPA agrees with Walton closely, the only difference being in the choice of terminology. It would use a different way of identifying the meaning of *plēroō* in such places as Matt 2:15, as will be explained below.

#### **Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard**

Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard offer several options related to the NT use of the OT:

- Biblical authors intended *only one sense* (meaning), and this historical sense—what the text would have meant at the time written to its original readers—remains the only legitimate object of exegesis. Whatever NT writers may have done with the OT, we must limit our exegesis to the original historical sense of the text.
- Biblical writers intended to convey *multiple meanings* or levels of meanings in at least some of their writings. These texts have several meanings that readers may subsequently discover.
- Biblical authors intended only one sense, but that sense need not limit how later readers understand a text since perception always involves a creative interaction between text and readers. Interpretation is a “*reader-response*” enterprise; so later readers—like the writers of the NT—may invent meaning never envisioned in the original context. Interpreters may do the same today.
- Biblical authors intended only one sense, but unknown to them the Holy Spirit encoded in the text additional and hidden meaning(s). When NT writers employed OT texts, in places they were drawing out this fuller sense, the *sensus plenior*. Such a process may or may not be repeatable for modern interpreters.
- Biblical authors intended only one sense, though later readers may employ *creative exegetical techniques* to discover additional valid senses not intended by the original authors. Such techniques include Jewish methods like midrash, peshet, or typology. There probably was some connection between original text and later sense, though the connection may appear arbitrary, if not undecipherable, to others. The process may or may not be repeatable today.<sup>43</sup>

Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard eventually choose the last two options, noting that

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., 70.

<sup>43</sup>Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard, *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* 131-32.

a fresh meaning need not be limited to the original sense.<sup>44</sup>

As earlier discussion has consistently observed, however, only their first option abides by the guidelines of grammatical-historical interpretation. The principle of single meaning and the objectivity of sound hermeneutics requires the exclusion of additional meanings subjectively derived.

### APPROPRIATE TERMINOLOGY

Some final considerations regarding “fulfillment” terminology seem to be in order. We repeat the words of Terry in this connection:

We have already seen that the Bible has its riddles, enigmas, and dark sayings, but whenever they are given the context clearly advises us of the fact. To assume, in the absence of any hint, that we have an enigma, and in the face of explicit statements to the contrary, that any specific prophecy has a double sense, a primary and a secondary meaning, a near and a remote fulfilment, must necessarily introduce an element of uncertainty and confusion into biblical interpretation.<sup>45</sup>

Terry’s elimination of the possibility of a near and a remote fulfilment is relevant at this point. ISPA concurs with his opinion of avoiding any more than one fulfilment, but probably for different reasons.

Most if not all English translations frequently render the Greek verb *p̄l̄roō* by the English word “fulfill.” In some instances this is unfortunate because the two words do not cover the same semantic range. In English “fulfill,” when used in connection with OT citations, carries the connotation of a historical occurrence of something promised or predicted. The Greek *p̄l̄roō*, however, covers more linguistic territory than that. Moo speaks to this point:

*P̄l̄roō* cannot be confined to so narrow a focus [as referring to fulfillment of an OT prophecy]. . . . What needs to be emphasized, then, is that the use of *p̄l̄roō* in an introductory formula need not mean that the author regards the Old Testament text he quotes as a direct prophecy; and accusations that a New Testament author misuses the Old Testament by using *p̄l̄roō* to introduce nonprophetic texts are unfounded.<sup>46</sup>

The Greek verb carries other meanings in various contexts. One of those meanings is “complete.” In the Matt 2:15 citation of Hos 11:1, Matthew uses it to indicate the completion of a *sensus plenior* meaning he finds in Hos 11:1. The Hosea passage is not a prophecy, and translating the word “fulfil” in this instance is

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 145.

<sup>45</sup>Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics: A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments*, 2nd ed. (reprint; Grand Rapids, Zondervan, n.d.) 495; cf. Robert L. Thomas, “The Principle of Single Meaning,” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 12/1 (Spring 2001):44.

<sup>46</sup>Moo, “Problem of *Sensus Plenior*” 191.

misleading. Matthew's meaning is that in some sense the transport of Jesus by His parents from Egypt completed the deliverance of Israel from Egypt that had begun during the time of Moses (cf. Exod 4:22-23).

In Mark 1:15 Jesus uses the same Greek verb to speak of the completion of a period of time prior to the drawing near of the kingdom of God. The English word "fulfill" would hardly communicate the correct idea in a case like that.

Such observations lead to the conclusion that it is unwise to use fulfillment terminology in connection with the OT passages to which the NT assigns inspired *sensus plenior* applications. Frequently, expositors and commentators have used such expressions as "initial fulfillment," "partial fulfillment," "near fulfillment," or something comparable to speak of Peter's use of Joel 2:28-32 in his Acts 2 sermon. That language gives the wrong impression because the OT passage did not predict what was to happen on the day of Pentecost. What happened on that day was an ISPA of Joel 2, an application whose authority was the Acts passage, not the Joel passage. The phenomena on the day of Pentecost were in no sense a fulfillment of Joel's prophecy, a prophecy that pertained to the people of Israel, not to the church. The relevance of the happenings on that day were an ISPA of the Joel passage to an entirely different situation by Peter who spoke and Luke who recorded the words. It is misleading to call them in any sense a fulfillment of Joel.

"Fulfillment" language is perfectly in order for prophecies that literally fulfil what the OT writers referred to, however. Such an instance is Matthew's reference to the virgin birth of Christ (Matt 1:23) in fulfillment of Isa 7:14.

### THE WRAP-UP

Sometimes the NT interprets OT prophecies in their literal sense, but other times it assigns an ISPA sense to them. That does not give license to the contemporary interpreter to imitate the hermeneutics of NT writers, because such a procedure would violate the grammatical-historical principle of single meaning. The NT writers could do it because of their status as writers of inspired Scripture.

When the NT writers made such applications, it did not violate that principle of single meaning, because the authority for the additional meaning was not the OT source, but the NT citation of that source. The OT passage in itself continued to have only one meaning.

Of course, God from the beginning knew the OT passage would eventually have that additional meaning, but a literal interpretation of that passage did not yield that meaning. The grammatical-historical interpretation of the NT citation of that passage is what yields the additional meaning.

A suggested reason for the inspired *sensus plenior* applications of OT passages in the NT is Israel's rejection of her Messiah at His first advent. One of the ramifications of that rejection was new revelation regarding OT passages related to a body called the church, revelation that was not foreseen in or a part of the OT.

Comparisons of this analysis of the NT's use of the OT with other explanations revealed that none exactly coincides with the proposal here. The

closest is that of John Walton in his article on “Inspired Subjectivity and Hermeneutical Objectivity.” An observation resulting from the current proposal is that expositors and exegetes should refrain from using “fulfillment” terminology in cases where NT writers have made inspired *sensus plenior* applications of OT passages to new situations.

**SUMMARY OF “THE NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT”**

<p><i>Examples and Principles of Direct Fulfillment of OT prophecy</i></p> <p>Examples: <b>Matt 1:23</b> with Isa 7:14; <b>Acts 13:23</b> with Isa 11:1; <b>Matt 21:42</b> with Isa 28:16 and Ps 118:22; <b>Luke 3:4-6</b> with Isa 40:3-5; <b>Matt 3:16-17</b> and <b>17:5</b> with Isa 42:1a; <b>Matt 26:67</b> and <b>27:26, 30</b> with Isa 50:6; <b>John 12:37-38</b> with Isa 53:1; <b>Acts 8:32-33</b> with Isa 53:7-8; <b>Matt 26:63</b> and <b>27:12, 14</b> with Isa 53:7; <b>John 1:29</b> with Isa 53:7; <b>1 Pet 2:22</b> with Isa 53:9; <b>Luke 22:37</b> with Isa 53:12; <b>Luke 4:18-19</b> with Isa 61:1-2a; <b>Matt 21:5</b> with Isa 62:11 and Zech 9:9</p> <p>Principles: “Fulfillment” terminology appropriate only for NT passages that literally fulfil the single meanings of OT prophecies</p>		<p><i>Examples and Principles of Inspired Sensus Plenior Application (ISPA) of OT Passages</i></p> <p>Examples: <b>Luke 20:17-18</b> with Isa 8:14-15; <b>Heb 2:13a</b> with Isa 8:17; <b>Heb 2:13b</b> with Isa 8:18; <b>Matt 4:12-16</b> with Isa 9:1-2; <b>John 4:10, 14</b> with Isa 12:3; <b>1 Cor 15:54</b> with Isa 25:8; <b>1 Cor 14:21-22</b> with Isa 28:11; <b>Matt 11:5</b> with Isa 29:18 and 35:5; <b>Heb 8:6, 10-12</b> with Isa 42:6; <b>Matt 11:5</b> and <b>Luke 4:18</b> with Isa 42:7; <b>Acts 13:47</b> with Isa 49:6; <b>Matt 8:16-17</b> with Isa 53:4; <b>John 6:45</b> with Isa 54:13; <b>Rom 10:20</b> with Isa 65:1; <b>Matt 2:15</b> with Hos 11:1; <b>Rom 3:10b-18</b> with Pss 5:9; 10:7; 14:1-3; 36:1; 53:1-3; 140:3; Prov 1:16; Eccl 7:20; Isa 59:7-8</p> <p>Principles: limited to those with revelatory gifts <i>sensus plenior</i> based on NT authority <i>sensus plenior</i> unknowable until the NT <i>sensus plenior</i> caused by Israel’s rejection</p>	
<p><i>NT Use of OT Advocates</i></p>	<p><i>Principles Advocated</i></p>		<p><i>ISPA Response</i></p>
<p>S. Lewis Johnson and J. I. Packer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>sensus plenior</i> in addition to the literal meaning of the OT</li> <li>• <i>sensus plenior</i> an extrapolation on the plane of the literal meaning</li> <li>• modern interpreters reproduce exegetical methodology of the NT writers</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> </ul>
<p>Elliott E. Johnson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• two meanings discoverable in the OT</li> <li>• the text has a stable meaning, unchanged with passing of time</li> <li>• stable meaning is generic or many-faceted</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> </ul>
<p>Bruce K. Waltke</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OT always read in light of the NT</li> <li>• fuller sense of OT texts always there, their changed intention deeper and clearer with canon’s expansion</li> <li>• original writers and readers were shut out from the text’s meaning</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> </ul>

<i>NT Use of OT Advocates</i>	<i>Principles Advocated</i>	<i>ISPA Response</i>
Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rejects NT assignment of <i>sensus plenior</i> meanings to OT</li> <li>• rejects <i>sensus plenior</i> meanings discoverable by modern interpreters</li> <li>• generic meanings in OT allow for several fulfillments of single passage</li> <li>• human author was aware of the series of fulfillments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> </ul>
Richard N. Longenecker and Douglas J. Moo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>sensus plenior</i> meanings attached to OT passages by NT writers</li> <li>• methods of Jewish exegesis by NT writers produced <i>sensus plenior</i> meanings for OT</li> <li>• contemporary interpreters can't produce NT methods of handling the OT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> </ul>
Darrell L. Bock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• eclecticism drawing on other approaches</li> <li>• God sometimes intended more than the human author did</li> <li>• NT events changing the way the church understood the OT</li> <li>• interpreter's preunderstanding a major factor in interpretation</li> <li>• allows later complementary additions in meaning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> </ul>
John H. Walton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• objectivity in interpretation an important goal</li> <li>• intrusion of the analogy of faith not allowed</li> <li>• subjectivity allowable only with inspiration</li> <li>• contemporary interpreter cannot claim inspiration</li> <li>• Matt 2:15 a <i>fulfillment</i> of Hos 11:1</li> <li>• objective interpretation determines only one meaning for OT passages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• agrees</li> </ul>
Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• biblical authors intended only one meaning, but the Spirit encoded additional meanings for modern interpreters</li> <li>• biblical authors intended only one meaning, but modern interpreters may uncover additional senses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dis-agrees</li> <li>• dis-agrees</li> </ul>