

A Critique of Peter Enns's Understanding of the New Testament Use of the Old Testament

Sung Jin Kim

(Ulsan Simin Church, Associate Pastor, Old Testament Theology)

- I. Introduction
- II. Did the Apostles Share the Same Hermeneutics with Second Temple Jewish Writers?
- III. Did the Apostles Abandon Grammatical-Historical Exegesis?
- IV. Enns's Interpretation of Matthew 2:15 And Romans 11:26-27: Is It Justifiable?
- V. Conclusion

[Abstract]

In the fourth chapter of his book, *Inspiration and Incarnation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1st ed. 2005/ 2nd ed. 2015), Peter Enns argues that NT authors, when quoting the OT, did not strictly adhere to the canons of grammatical-historical exegesis. Rather, as citizens of the Second Temple period, they adopted the hermeneutics of their Jewish contemporaries (e.g., a midrashic or peshar approach) that would quote the OT text without concern for original context/intention and even add or rearrange words to the cited text if it could help them establish their point (i.e., *Christotelic* reading of the OT). To prove the case, Enns provides five examples of the NT use of the OT that illustrate the NT authors' adherence to the Jewish hermeneutics of their day.

This paper, on the other hand, attempts to disprove Enns's argument. First, various counter-evidences exist and they show that the hermeneutics of NT writers was in fact quite distinctive from that of Second Temple Jewish writers. Second, contrary to Enns's examples, numerous quoted OT texts by NT authors demonstrate that NT authors strictly followed the rule of grammatical-historical exegesis. Third, Matthew 2:15 (cites Hos 11:1) and Romans 11:26-27 (cites Isa 59:20-21), two major examples that Enns brings forth to prove the case, can be interpreted otherwise. This paper concludes that the NT writers were not bound by the hermeneutics of Second Temple period, but maintained exegetical principles that respected the context/intent of the OT.

Key Words: Peter Enns, NT Use of the OT, Biblical Hermeneutics, Typology, Matthew 2:15, Romans 11:26-27

논문투고일 2020.01.31. / 심사완료일 2020.02.27. / 게재확정일 2020.03.04.

I. Introduction

The fourth chapter of Peter Enns's book *Inspiration and Incarnation*¹ presents a stimulating argument concerning NT authors' use of the OT. To Enns, the apostles did not strictly adhere to the canons of grammatical-historical exegesis when interpreting the OT. Rather, as citizens of the Second Temple period, they shared the hermeneutics of their Jewish contemporaries (e.g., a midrashic or *peshet* approach) that would add interpretive traditions to their literature. Enns provides five major examples of the NT use of the OT that illustrate how the apostles adopted the Jewish hermeneutics of their day.² Accordingly, the NT authors not only quoted the OT text without concern for original context/intention, but also added or rearranged words to the cited text if it could help them establish their point, that is, a *Christotelic* reading of the text. Hence the NT authors put Christ as the ultimate goal and end of the OT story, and they read backward from Christ onto the OT passage, even if the point would not agree with the original context/intent of the OT passage.³

The aim of this paper is to critically engage with Enns's proposal that apostolic reading of the OT resembles Second Temple Jewish

¹ Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005), 113-65. Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 103-56. The chapter is a revised and expanded version of his earlier article: Peter Enns, "Apostolic Hermeneutics and an Evangelical Doctrine of Scripture: Moving Beyond a Modernist Impasse," *WTJ* 65, no. 2 (2003), 263-87.

² Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15; Isa 49:8 in 2 Cor 6:2; Use of Abraham's "seed" in Gal 3:16, 29; Isa 59:20-21 in Rom 11:26-27; and Ps 95:7-11 in Heb 3:7-11.

³ Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*, 113-65.

interpretation of the OT. To do so, this paper deals with three major questions: (1) Did the apostles share the same hermeneutics with Second Temple Jewish writers? (2) Did the apostles abandon grammatical-historical exegesis? (3) Is Enns's interpretation of Matthew 2:15 and Romans 11:26-27 justifiable? This paper argues that the NT writers were not bound by the hermeneutics of Second Temple period, but maintained exegetical principles that respected the context/intent of the OT.

II. Did the Apostles Share the Same Hermeneutics with Second Temple Jewish Writers?

Before addressing the first issue, Enns needs to be commended for his thought-provoking proposal of understanding the NT use of the OT in light of Second Temple hermeneutics. It is reasonable to think that the NT authors would have been familiar with interpretive tradition of their contemporary Jewish writers. Nevertheless, Enns did not consider the *degree* to which such interpretive methods would have been accepted and used by the NT writers.⁴ Did the apostles fully follow the hermeneutics of the rabbis? Or did they adopt it only in a partial or limited sense? There are three points to ponder concerning this issue.

⁴ So Dennis L. Stamps, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 14-16 (14). Douglas J. Moo, "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1986), 192-95.

First, the first century Jewish interpretative tradition was not monolithic. There were various Jewish communities (Qumran, Alexandrian, Antiochene, Syrian, Ethiopian), traditions of Judaism (wisdom, apocalyptic, rabbinic, or pharisaic), and scopes of literature (apocryphal, pseudepigraphal, Dead Sea Scroll, works of Philo/Josephus/Origen, etc.) that probably exhibited diverse exegetical traditions.⁵ For instance, G. K. Beale provides a helpful summary on recent scholarship that demonstrates different exegetical methods within Judaism: (1) D. I. Brewer's work suggests that pre-AD 70 pharisaic exegesis attempted to find the 'literal' meaning of the OT text, though they did not always succeed. (2) There is a strong strain in early Jewish apocalyptic texts which reveals a contextual awareness of the OT contexts from which they cite. (3) Hillel's seven rules of (Jewish) interpretation do not show any concern about twisting the meaning of the OT text, but could well be compatible with a contextual interpretation of the OT (e.g., none of the rules includes allegory or a necessary atomistic interpretation of the OT). (4) S. Sandmel's study on the relationship of Egyptian Judaism to Palestinian Judaism suggests that "independent, parallel developments seem the better explanation than that of major dependency in either direction."⁶ Beale further points out that "Enns makes no acknowledgement of the two kinds of exegesis (biblical-theological and typological)" that "also is present in early Judaism."⁷ The evidence, then, suggests that the Jewish interpretative

⁵ Stamps, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device," 14-16.

⁶ Gregory K. Beale, "Did Jesus and the Apostles Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Revisiting the Debate Seventeen Years Later in the Light of Peter Enns's Book, *Inspiration and Incarnation*," *Themelios* 32, no. 1 (2006), 27-28.

⁷ Beale, "Did Jesus and the Apostles Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?,"

world cannot be simply pinned down to a single tradition that largely neglects the context of the OT.⁸

Second, Enns fails to consider some notable differences between the NT and Second Temple literature. For example, D. J. Moo concludes after a comparative study of NT and Jewish approaches to the OT text, that the level of influence of Jewish exegetical methods on the NT has “often been considerably exaggerated.” He argues that “a vast gulf” exists between “the often fantastic, purely verbal exegeses of the rabbis” and “the generally sober and clearly contextually oriented interpretations” observed in the NT.⁹ A similar point has been made with regard to Qumran *peshet* (biblical exegeses found in Dead Sea Scrolls such as 1QpHab). Unlike Enns and others who contend that the NT use of the OT shares the same exegetical principles as Qumran *peshet*,¹⁰ a growing number of scholars recognize that the NT authors’ interpretive method cannot be narrowed down to Qumran’s *peshet*. Despite “superficial similarities,” scholars have noted more differences than commonalities between

26.

- 8 In this regards, D. L. Stamps rightly comments, “The sheer scope and diversity of this [Jewish] literature suggests that one must be careful to avoid generalizations and facile conclusions about the Jewish context out of which NT writers ‘borrowed’ their interpretive practice with regard to the OT. One has to take care not to let the scholarly analysis of NT use of the OT become an exercise in finding a match in the vast array of Jewish practice without giving due attention to distinction and differences between different Jewish groups.” Stamps, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device,” 15. Similarly, Beale, “Did Jesus and the Apostles Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?,” 29.
- 9 Moo, “The Problem of Sensus Plenior,” 192-95 (193). Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 388-92.
- 10 E.g., Krister Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew & Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1954). E. E. Ellis, “How The New Testament Uses The Old,” in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, ed. I. Howard Marshall (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977), 201-08.

these two traditions. For example, (1) Qumran *peshet* has more “arbitrary types of exegesis (allegory, altering texts, *haggadah*)”; these types of exegesis are comparably rare in the NT.¹¹ (2) *Peshet* has “distinctive” structure (e.g., it is a scriptural commentary that expounds on a biblical verse, while the NT has no such commentary form) and content (e.g., *peshet* literature is eschatologically oriented and has a contemporizing tendency) that may not be “homogenized” into an “undifferentiated” Jewish-Christian biblical interpretation.¹² (3) *Peshet* assumes that the OT has a hidden meaning that must be decoded, while the NT uses OT citations as “a process of selection and adaptation of proof-texts.”¹³

Third, Enns does not inquire deeply enough into the issue of how different presuppositions could have affected the hermeneutics of the NT authors. Different theological convictions or axioms would have separated the NT authors from the contemporary Jewish writers.¹⁴ For example, D. L. Bock argues that six presuppositions—(1)

11 Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New* (London: Continuum, 2001), 132.

12 Timothy H. Lim, *Pesharim*, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 24-53, 81-85. See also I. Howard Marshall, “Counter-Response in Favor of C. H. Dodd’s View,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, ed. Gregory K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994), 209.

13 Barnabas Lindars, “The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994), 141.

14 Concerning NT authors’ presupposition, see Ellis, “How The New Testament Uses The Old,” 199-219. Gregory K. Beale, “Positive Answer to the Question Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, ed. Gregory K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994), 387-404. Gregory K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 95-102. K. Snodgrass, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, ed. Gregory K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994), 36-41. Similarly, Moo, “The Problem of Sensus Plenior,”

“the bible is God’s word”, (2) “the one in the many (corporate solidarity),” (3) “pattern in history (correspondence or typology),” (4) “these are the days of fulfillment,” (5) “now and not yet (the inaugurated fulfillment of Scripture),” and (6) “Jesus is the Christ”—affected NT writers’ understanding of the OT, out of which only the first three were shared by the rabbis of their day.¹⁵ In this regard, D. A. Carson rightly asks, “If Paul’s way of reading the Hebrew Bible, the OT, is methodologically indifferentiable from the way of reading deployed by his unconverted Jewish colleagues, how are they managing to come to such different conclusions while reading the same texts?”¹⁶ This point, then, provides a more profound level of explanation as to why the apostolic interpretation was different from that of Judaism. Contrary to Enns’s assertion, the distinct theological presumptions of the NT authors may have affected the way they interpreted and used the OT.

III. Did the Apostles Abandon Grammatical–Historical Exegesis?

The next issue is whether the apostles often dismissed grammatical–historical exegesis in interpreting the OT. Did the NT writers faithfully adhere to the original context of the OT or, as Enns argues, did they arbitrarily appropriate the text to create artificial proof–texts that suited their purpose? Three points deserve our

194.

¹⁵ Darrell L. Bock, “The New Testament’s Legitimate, Accurate, and Multifaceted Use of the Old,” in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. Kenneth Berding (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008), 111.

¹⁶ Donald A. Carson, “Three More Books on the Bible: A Critical Review,” *TRINJ* 27, no. 1 (2006), 40–43.

attention.

First, Enns's supporting evidence is not comprehensive. Enns provides five NT passages as crucial proof-texts for his argument (see footnote 2). Arguing that these texts' use of the OT strictly follows the techniques of Second Temple hermeneutics (e.g., citing out of context, adding or rearranging words), he avers with a generalizing statement that "the odd uses" of the OT by NT writers are "a very common dimension of the New Testament."¹⁷ But could such a statement be correct? Some have counted 401 OT quotations or allusions in the NT based on the UBS's first (1966) edition of the Greek NT.¹⁸ Since that is the case, could Enns's five examples accurately represent the other 396 citations that he does not consider? In his seminal work, *According to the Scriptures*,¹⁹ C. H. Dodd argues that the NT authors often cited the OT text with a larger OT context in mind. He particularly observes a number of cases in which various quotations in the NT are derived from the same OT context. For example, Isaiah 52:13-53:12, a self-contained passage on the suffering Servant of the Lord, is numerouslly cited by different NT authors (e.g., M. J. Wilkins contends that Isa 52:13-53:12 is quoted or alluded to at least fifty times in the NT.²⁰ For Wilkins' full list,

¹⁷ Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*, 116.

¹⁸ K. Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, ed. Gregory K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994), 35.

¹⁹ C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952). A summary of this book can be found in C. H. Dodd, "The Old Testament in the New," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, ed. Gregory K. Beale (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994), 167-81.

²⁰ Michael J. Wilkins, "Isaiah 53 and the Message of Salvation in the Foul Gospels," in *The Gospel According to Isaiah 53: Encountering the Suffering Servant in Jewish and Christian Theology*, ed. Darrell L. Bock and Mitch Glaser (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2012), 112-14.

see Appendix 1). Dodd notices an interesting pattern here: (1) No one author quotes the passage extensively (often it is a single sentence, or even a single phrase), and (2) rarely do two or more writers quote the same verse. After observing analogous citing patterns with other passages as well,²¹ he concludes that the NT authors “often quoted a single phrase or sentence not merely for its own sake, but as a pointer to a whole context.”²² If Dodd’s observation is correct, then Enns’s explanation does not explain the fifty or more NT quotations and allusions to Isaiah 52:13-53:12 that correspond to the original context. A crucial problem is that Enns’s thesis hinges on some few NT passages. That number is far too small compared to these numerous counter examples.²³

Second, even Enns’s five NT passages are debated. Admittedly Enns’s interpretation has its supporters, but this does not mean that Enns’s interpretation is the representative view of the scholarship. For example, D. Sloan reexamines Enns’s passages and concludes that in none of these has he found that the NT authors did not respect the context of the OT texts they cited; rather the NT writers were so “thoroughly immersed in the OT” that there were “contextual links between each of the passages and their use in the NT.”²⁴ D. A. Carson and B. K. Waltke also criticize Enns for failing to see “typological” and “redemptive historical” trajectories embedded in these quotations.²⁵

²¹ E.g., Pss 8, 69; Dan 7; Joel 2-3; and Zech 9-14. For more examples, see “III. The Bible of the Early Church” in Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 61-110.

²² Dodd, “The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?,” 170-76.

²³ So G. K. Beale, who comments that Enns needs a large number of proof-cases to support his claim. Beale, “Did Jesus and the Apostles Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?,” 23-24.

²⁴ David Sloan, “Apostolic Hermeneutics Revisited: An Examination of Enns’s Examples,” *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, New Orleans, 2009*, 1-8.

For instance, Carson disagrees with Enns on Hebrews 3:7-11 (quoting Ps 95:7-11) by insisting that both trajectories—typological and redemptive historical—have to be put into consideration to correctly understand the Hebrew author's citation.²⁶ These possible alternative views, then, weaken Enns's supporting evidence all the more.

Third, various examples attest that the apostles consciously studied the historical dimension in their exegesis. For example, Carson notes how Paul developed his argument based on the historical sequence/context of the OT:

In Galatians 3, Abraham was justified by faith *before* the giving of the law, and the promise to him and to his seed similarly came *before* the giving of the law. That means that the law given by Moses has been relativized; one must now think afresh exactly why it was given, "added" to the promise. Again, in Romans 4 Paul analyzes the relation between faith and circumcision *on the basis of which came first*: it is the historical sequence that is determinative for his argument.²⁷

Similarly, the Gospel of Matthew opens with a genealogy that recapitulates OT history from Abraham to David, David to the Babylonian exile, and the exile to the birth of Christ. Matthew is using a real historical process here. Likewise, in Acts 7, Stephen addresses the OT strictly based on a historical sequence that begins with Abraham and ends with Solomon.²⁸ Zechariah 9-14 is another example. Zechariah 9-14, which provides imagery for Jesus'

²⁵ Bruce K. Waltke, "Revisiting Inspiration and Incarnation," *WTJ* 71, no. 1 (2009), 91-94. Carson, "Three More Books on the Bible," 40-43.

²⁶ Carson, "Three More Books on the Bible," 40-43.

²⁷ Carson, "Three More Books on the Bible," 41-42.

²⁸ Dodd, "The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?," 169.

eschatological roles, is fulfilled in the NT as the apostles quote it to describe real historical events: (1) “The king who enters Jerusalem on a donkey (Zech 9:9 in Matt 21; Mark 11),” (2) “The one whose blood re-establishes the covenant (Zech 9:11 in Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24),” (3) “The shepherd valued at 30 pieces of silver (Zech 11:12, Matt 26:14-15),” (4) The 30 pieces of silver would be returned to the potter’s field (Zech 11:13, Matt 27:3, 5, 6-7, 9-10), (5) “The one is pierced and mourned (Zech 12:10 in Matt 24:30; Mark 14:62; John 19:37),” (6) “The rejected shepherd whose sheep scatter (Zech 13:7-9 in Matt 26:31; Mark 14:27),” (7) “The one who ushers in the resurrection age (Zech 14:5 in Matt 25:31; 27:51-53),” and (8) “The one who brings about the purified temple (Zech 14:21 in Matt 21:12-13; Mark 11:15-17).”²⁹ As a result, these instances—contra to Enns—further corroborate the fact that the NT authors were at home with grammatical-historical exegesis in interpreting the OT.

IV. Enns’s Interpretation of Matthew 2:15 And Romans 11:26-27: Is It Justifiable?

The last discussion turns to specific passages that Enns provides as example of the Second Temple midrash/*pesher* techniques. Because of space constraints, this section will deal with only two passages (out of Enns’s five passages), namely Matthew 2:15 (cites Hos 11:1) and Romans 11:26-27 (cites Isa 59:20-21). Enns takes these

²⁹ This list is my revised version based on Mark Black, “The Messianic Use of Zechariah 9-14 in Matthew, Mark, and the Pre-Markan Tradition,” in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O’Day (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 97-98.

passages as instances in which the NT authors appropriated the OT text out of the original context (e.g., Matt 2:15), and modified the text in order to reflect a theological agenda (e.g., Rom 11:26-27).³⁰ But against Enns, could different citation techniques have been used in these verses?

First, Matthew 2:15's quotation may be interpreted in light of typology. Scholars debate Matthew 2:15's use of Hosea 11:1, propounding at least three different approaches—historical, typological, or midrashical—to the text. For example, (1) W. C. Kaiser and J. H. Sailhamer take Matthew 2:15 as in agreement with the “historical” meaning of Hosea 11:1.³¹ (2) D. A. Garrett, D. A. Carson, G. K. Beale, and J. H. Hamilton, on the other hand, read Matthew 2:15 “typologically” by holding forth Jesus as the one who recapitulates Israel history.³² (3) Lastly, Peter Enns and others argue that “midrashic/*pesher*” exegesis is the rubric of Matthew's use of Hosea 11:1.³³ Among these, I think the typological reading has the

³⁰ Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*, 132-34, 139.

³¹ Walter C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), 47-53; John Sailhamer, “Hosea 11:1 and Matthew 2:15,” *WTJ* 63, no. 1 (2001), 87-96.

³² Duane A. Garrett, *Hosea, Joel*, NAC (Nashville, TN: B&H Publishers, 1997), 250-55; Donald A. Carson, *Matthew*, EBC (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984), 91-93; Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 60-64; Gregory K. Beale, “The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: One More Time,” *JETS* 55, no. 4 (2012), 697-715; James M. Hamilton Jr., “‘The Virgin Will Conceive’: Typological Fulfillment in Matthew 1:18-23,” in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland (Eerdmans, 2008), 228-47.

³³ Dan G. McCartney and Peter Enns, “Matthew and Hosea: A Response to John Sailhamer,” *WTJ* 63, no. 1 (2001), 97-105; Martin Pickup, “New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis,” *JETS* 51, no. 2 (2008), 353-81. Enns, however, slightly modifies his stance. In his earlier work Enns connects Matthew 2:15 to Hosea 11:1 (McCartney and Enns, “Matthew and Hosea,” 98. n.1.), but he later expands it to the larger context of Hosea 11 (Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*, 143).

greatest merit. F. F. Bruce's helpful summary shows that the exodus typology is particularly common in the NT.

Matthew seems to view the infancy of Jesus as a recapitulation of the early experiences of Israel, which went down to Egypt and came up again (Mt. 2:15). John, by the chronology of his Gospel and otherwise, implies that Christ is the antitypical Passover lamb (cf. Jn. 19:14, 36). Peter's language points in the same direction (1 Pet. 1:19), while Paul makes the thought explicit: since 'Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed', the ensuing festival should be celebrated by his people 'with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' (1 Cor. 5:7f.). As the Israelites passed through the Sea of Reeds, so Christians have been baptized into Christ; as the Israelites received bread from heaven and water from the rock, so Christians have their distinctive 'supernatural food and drink' (1 Cor. 10:1-4). As, despite all those blessings, the Exodus generation died in the wilderness because of unbelief and disobedience and so failed to enter the promised land, Christians for their part are exhorted to take warning lest they fall (1 Cor. 10:5-12; cf. Heb. 3:7-4:13; Jude 5). For these things befell the Israelites 'as a warning (*typikōs*), but they were written down for our instruction, upon whom the end of the ages has come' (1 Cor. 10:11).³⁴

Moreover, the typological use of the OT is pervasive in Matthew's Gospel. Commentators have noted that Matthew, from the beginning of his composition, used Moses/Israel typology to present the life of Christ (e.g., Herod slaughters children as Pharaoh killed children

³⁴ F. F. Bruce, "Typology," in *NBD*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 1214-15.

[Matt 1-2 / Exod 1:1-2:10]; Jesus crosses the water as Israel passed through the water [Matt 3:13-17 / Exod 14:10-13]; Jesus is presented as lawgiver on the Mount as Moses gave Torah at Sinai [Matt 5-7 / Exod 19:1-23:33]; etc).³⁵ Since the surrounding context of Matthew 2:15 (e.g., Herod slaughters children / Jesus flees from Herod and then returns) is similar to that of Exodus 1-4 (e.g., Pharaoh kills children / Moses flees from Pharaoh and then returns), it is highly probable that Matthew also used a Moses/Israel typological correspondence for Matthew 2:15.

Concerning Matthew 2:15's use of Hosea 11:1, G. K. Beale notes that what Matthew quoted is not merely Hosea 11:1 ("Out of Egypt I called my son"), but the whole chapter of Hosea 11. Hosea 11 begins with the past exodus (v.1) and ends with another exodus that will recur in the future (v.11). So the main point of Hosea 11 is that the pattern of the first exodus will be repeated in the end time, as witnessed in Jesus' early life (Matt 2).³⁶ Chang Hoon Kim further elaborates this view. Accordingly, Matthew 2:15 fulfills Hosea 11 in four levels: (1) "The historical level" in which "Hosea presupposes

³⁵ Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 268. P. J. Leithard Peter J. Leithard, "Jesus as Israel The Typological Structure of Matthews Gospel," *Unpublished Article*, 1-37. <http://www.leithart.com/pdf/jesus-as-israel-the-typological-structure-of-matthew-s-gospel.pdf> (accessed on September, 2014). Victor J. Eldridge, "Typology - the Key to Understanding Matthew's Formula Quotations," *Colloquium* 15, no. 1 (1982), 43-51. George W. Buchanan, *Typology and the Gospel* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987). Cf. John Lierman, *The New Testament Moses: Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion*, WUNT 173 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). Wayne S. Baxter, "Mosaic Imagery in the Gospel of Matthew," *TJ* 20, no. 1 (1999), 69-83.

³⁶ Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 60-64. G. K. Beale, "The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: One More Time," *JETS* 55/4 (2012), 697-715. See also Garrett, *Hosea, Joel*, 250-55; Carson, *Matthew*, 91-93; Hamilton Jr., "The Virgin Will Conceive," 228-47.

the historicity of the first exodus which took place in 1446 BC.” (2) “The Israel-typological level” in which “Hosea looks forward to seeing the new exodus through which Israel will experience the liberation in the future.” (3) “The Moses-typological level” in which “Hosea anticipates the new Moses who will lead the new exodus in the future.” (4) “Jesus’s fulfillment level” in which “Jesus both as the representative of the new Israel and as the new Moses fulfills Hosea’s expectation of the new exodus.” Hence Jesus is the “antitype” foreshadowed by the “types” (i.e., Israel and Moses of the first exodus), and Matthew 2:15 depicts Jesus both as “the representative of the beneficiary of the new exodus” (i.e., the new Israel) and as “the agent of the new exodus” (i.e., the new Moses).³⁷ Contra to Enns, then, Matthew 2:15 accurately reflects Hosea 11 as well as the broader biblical-theological context and rightly portrays Jesus as recapitulating the history of Israel.

Second, the citation technique used in Romans 11:26-27 does not indicate Paul’s arbitrary manipulation of the text; rather, it may also reflect his deep respect for a larger context. Enns critically argues that Paul, when he quoted LXX Isaiah 59:20 (καὶ ἦξει ἐνεκεν Σιῶν ὁ ρυόμενος “The deliverer will *come for* Zion” [cf. MT וְיָבִיא לְבֵיתֵינוּ יוֹשֵׁעַ “A Redeemer will *come to* Zion”]) in Romans 11:26 (ἦξει ἐκ Σιῶν ὁ ρυόμενος “The deliverer will *come out of* Zion”), deliberately changed the preposition ἐνεκεν to ἐκ to reflect his tendentious purpose. Enns’s point, however, seems to be exaggerated, considering that “conflation” (i.e., joining originally discrete verses into a single quotation) is one of the common citation techniques

³⁷ Chang Hoon Kim, “‘Out of Egypt I Called My Son’(Matthew 2:15): Matthew’s Christological-Typological Interpretation of Hosea 11:1,” *Reform & Revival* 24 (2019), 7-28.

Paul employed in his writing. C. D. Stanley, in his extensive treatment of Paul's citation technique, suggests that Paul sometimes freely adjusted the OT text not to create artificial proof-texts, but to help the audience grasp the point of the original text as Paul apprehended and wanted to present it.³⁸

In this regards, several proposals on how Paul might have combined/conflated the text in Romans 11:26 require our attention: (1) T. R. Schreiner argues that Paul conflated LXX Psalm 13:7 (English 14:7, τίς δώσει ἐκ Σιων τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ “Who will bring the salvation of Israel out of Zion?”) with Isaiah 59:20 (ἦξει . . . ὁ ῥύόμενος).³⁹ (2) C. D. Stanley adds more passages to this conflation. He thinks that the theme of the Lord bringing salvation to Israel and establishing his rule “out of Zion (ἐκ Σιων)” is widely expressed in various OT contexts (e.g., LXX Pss 13:7, 49:2, 52:7, 109:2; LXX 2 Kgs 19:31; LXX Isa 2:3, 37:32; LXX Joel 4:16 [cf. Amos 1:2], LXX Obad 21, LXX Mic 4:2). Thus Paul took this notion of ἐκ Σιων together with Isaiah 59:20 (ἦξει . . . ὁ ῥύόμενος) and presented it in Romans 11:26.⁴⁰ (3) C. R. Bruno, on the other hand, maintains that Paul conflated within the Isaiah corpus, namely Isaiah 2:3 (ἐκ γὰρ Σιων ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ “For out of Zion

³⁸ Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 338-60.

³⁹ Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998), 619. Cf. John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 98-99.

⁴⁰ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 167-68. Christopher D. Stanley, “‘The Redeemer Will Come Ek Siōn’: Romans 11:26-27 Revisited,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 83 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 118-42. Stanley, however, does not attribute this conflation to Paul, but to the *Vorlage* that Paul used as a reference.

will go out the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem”) and 59:20 (ἤξει . . . ὁ ῥυόμενος).⁴¹ Bruno particularly observes a thematic coherence between Romans 9-11 and Isaiah 2:3, 27:9, 59:20-21 (e.g., “God’s faithfulness to his covenant people,” “the inclusion of the nations,” and “the salvation of Israel”) and contextual similarity among these three Isaiah passages (e.g., “The Lord returns to Zion/the covenant is renewed” [2:2a, 27:6, 59:20-21]; “The Lord’s victory over his enemies/removal of sin” [2:12-22, 27:1, 9, 59:16-17]; “Accompanying blessing for the Gentiles” [2:2b-4, 27:12-13, 59:18-19]). Based on the observation, he argues that Paul is drawing together the similar theme found in Isaiah 2:3, 27:9, 59:20-21 into Romans 11:26-27, and particularly as for Romans 11:26, Paul combines Isaiah 2:3 (ἐκ Σιών) and 59:20 (ἤξει . . . ὁ ῥυόμενος).

G. K. Beale’s analysis of Paul’s quotations in Romans 9:25-11:35 suggests that all three proposals above are quite plausible. Beale counts at least 29 OT quotations within Romans 9:25-11:35 and among them, 20 quotations (including Romans 11:26-27) share the same theme, namely the “captivity-restoration theme” (See Appendix 2). Interestingly, these 20 quotations originate from diverse books of the OT.⁴² Hence the original source of Romans 11:26 could come from either direction, from within the Isaiah corpus (as Bruno argues) or from a mixture of various books (as Stanley/Schreiner maintain).

⁴¹ Christopher R. Bruno, “The Deliverer from Zion: The Source(s) and Function of Paul’s Citation in Romans 11:26-27,” *TynB* 59, no. 1 (2008), 119-34. See also N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 250.

⁴² Isa (9 times), Deut (4 times), Jer (2 times), Hos (2 times), Joel (1 time), and combination of several books (e.g., Isa + Hos / Isa + Ps). Concerning the quotation in Rom 11:26, Beale agrees with Schreiner that it is conflation of both Isa 59:20 and Ps 14:7. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 87-89.

In any case, an important point is that they all come from texts that *share an identical theme* (i.e., the restoration theme). If so, this shared theme proves that Paul was very conscious of what he was citing. Paul correctly knew the broader context and theme of the Isaiah corpus/OT and he reflected the gist of it through conflation, as attested in Romans 11:26's quotation: ἤξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος.

V. Conclusion

Despite Enns's effort to prove that the apostolic hermeneutics often resemble the midrash/*peshar* tradition of Second Temple period, this study has shown that his argument is unsubstantiated in many aspects. In particular, his supporting evidence (e.g., the five major examples of the NT use of the OT), perhaps the main thrust of his thesis, may be read differently. Enns seems to be mistaken to generalize from this limited observation that the NT writers often appropriated or manipulated the OT text by dislodging it from its original context/intent. Quite to the contrary, this paper demonstrates that the NT writers' use of the OT predominately arose from a serious study of the OT context/intent, and upon this foundation, their interpretations advanced to the typological or redemptive historical trajectory that might undergird the OT context. While Enns should be credited to coin the term "*Christotelic*" to characterize the apostolic reading of the OT, one should not, nevertheless, disregard the organic connection that exists between NT citation and the original OT text.

Appendix 1

(1) Quotations of Isaiah 52:13-53:12 in the NT⁴³

Isaiah	New Testament
52:15 LXX	Rom 15:21
53:1 LXX	John 12:38, Rom 10:16
53:4	Matt 8:17
53:7-8 LXX	Acts 8:32-33
53:9	1 Pet
53:12	Luke 22:37

(2) Allusions and Conceptual Influence

Isaiah	New Testament
52:13 (lifted up)	John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32
53 (Moses and all the Prophets)	Luke 24:27
53 (suffer and rise)	Luke 24:46
53 (delivered over/into)	Matt 17:22 (and parallels)
53 (delivered over/into)	Matt 20:18 (and parallels)
53 (delivered over/into; "it is written")	Matt 26:24 (and parallels)
53 (delivered over/into)	Matt 26:45 (and parallels)
53:2 (like a root)	Matt 2:23
53:3 (suffer, contempt)	Matt 17:12b; Mark 9:12b
53:4 (derided and mocked)	Matt 27:39-43 (and parallels)
53:5 (chastisement)	Matt 26:67
53:6-7 (sin of all)	John 1:29
53:7 (life of shepherd for sheep)	John 10:11, 15, 17
53:7 (remained silent)	Matt 26:63; Mark 14:61
53:7 (life of shepherd for sheep)	John 10:11, 15, 17
53:7 (remained silent)	Matt 26:63; Mark 14:61
53:7 (remained silent)	Matt 27:12
53:7 (remained silent)	Matt 27:14; Mark 15:5; John 19:9
53:7 (remained silent)	Luke 23:9
53:9 (grave with wicked)	Matt 26:24
53:9 (rich man)	Matt 27:57

⁴³ Wilkins, "Isaiah 53 and the Message of Salvation in the Foul Gospels," 112-14.

53:10-12 (bore the sin of many)	Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45
53:11 (righteous one make righteous)	Matt 3:15
53:12b (divide the spoil)	Luke 11:22
53:12b (divide the spoil)	Luke 23:34
53:12d (numbered with transgressors)	Matt 27:38
53:12d (numbered with transgressors)	Luke 23:33
53:10, 12c (soul to death)	Matt 26:28; Mark 12:24; Luke 22:20

Appendix 2

G. K. Beale's study on Paul's OT quotations in Romans 9:25-11:35 shows that Paul cited various OT texts under "the prophesied captivity-restoration theme."⁴⁴

V = Captivity-restoration theme

C = Captivity-restoration theme in the context

O = No presence of a restoration theme

Theme	OT	Romans
V	Hos 2:23 (25 MT)	9:25
V	Hos 1:10 (2:1 MT; cf. LXX)	9:26
V	Isa 10:22; Hos 1:10 (2:1 MT)	9:27
V	Isa 1:9	9:29
O	Isa 8:14	9:32
C	Isa 28:16	9:33
O	Lev 18:5	10:5
V	Deut 30:12	10:6
V	Deut 30:13	10:7
V	Deut 30:14	10:8
C	Isa 28:16	10:11
V	Joel 2:32 (3:5 MT; cf. LXX)	10:13

⁴⁴ Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 87-89.

V	Isa 52:7 (cf. Nah 1:15 [2:1 MT])	10:15
V	Isa 53:1 (cf. LXX)	10:16
O	Ps 19:4 (18:5 LXX; 19:5 MT)	10:18
C	Deut 32:21 (cf. LXX)	10:19
C	Isa 65:1 (cf. LXX)	10:20
C	Isa 65:2 (cf. LXX)	10:21
O	1 Sam 12:22	11:2
V	Jer 31:37	11:2
O	1 Kgs 19:10, 14 (remnant)	11:3
O	1 Kgs 19:18 (remnant)	11:4
O	Deut 29:3; Isa 29:10; 6:9-10	11:8
O	Ps 69:22-23 (68:23-24 LXX; 69:23-24 MT)	11:9-10
V	Isa 59:20-21; Ps 14:7	11:26
V	Jer 31:33-34	11:27
V	Isa 27:9	11:27b
V	Isa 40:13 (cf. LXX)	11:34
O	Job 31:11 (41:3 MT)	11:35

[Bibliography]

- Allison, Dale C. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Baxter, Wayne S. "Mosaic Imagery in the Gospel of Matthew." *TJ* 20, no. 1 (1999), 69-83.
- Beale, Gregory K. "Did Jesus and the Apostles Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Revisiting the Debate Seventeen Years Later in the Light of Peter Enns's Book, *Inspiration and Incarnation*." *Themelios* 32, no. 1 (2006), 18-43.
- . *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- . "Positive Answer to the Question Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?" In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, edited by Gregory K. Beale. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994.
- . "The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: One More Time." *JETS* 55, no. 4 (2012), 697-715.
- Black, Mark. "The Messianic Use of Zechariah 9-14 in Matthew, Mark, and the Pre-Markan Tradition." In *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, edited by Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Bock, Darrell L. "The New Testament's Legitimate, Accurate, and Multifaceted Use of the Old." In *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, edited by Kenneth Berding. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.
- Bruce, F. F. "Typology." In *New Bible Dictionary*, edited by I. Howard Marshall, A. R. Millard, J. I. Packer, and D. J. Wiseman, 3rd ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996.

- Bruno, Christopher R. "The Deliverer from Zion: The Source(s) and Function of Paul's Citation in Romans 11:26-27." *TynB* 59, no. 1 (2008), 119-34.
- Buchanan, George W. *Typology and the Gospel*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.
- Carson, Donald A. *Matthew*. EBC. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984.
- . "Three More Books on the Bible: A Critical Review." *TRINJ* 27, no. 1 (2006), 1-62.
- Kim, Chang Hoon, "'Out of Egypt I Called My Son'(Matthew 2:15): Matthew's Christological-Typological Interpretation of Hosea 11:1," *Reform & Revival* 24 (2019), 7-28.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- . "The Old Testament in the New." In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, edited by Gregory K. Beale. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994.
- Eldridge, Victor J. "Typology - the Key to Understanding Matthew's Formula Quotations." *Colloquium* 15, no. 1 (1982), 43-51.
- Ellis, E. E. "How The New Testament Uses The Old." In *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, edited by I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Enns, Peter. "Apostolic Hermeneutics and an Evangelical Doctrine of Scripture: Moving Beyond a Modernist Impasse." *WTJ* 65, no. 2 (2003), 263-87.
- . *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.
- . *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Garrett, Duane A. *Hosea, Joel*. NAC. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishers, 1997.
- Hamilton Jr., James M. "'The Virgin Will Conceive': Typological Fulfillment in Matthew 1:18-23." In *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel*

- of Matthew*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Eerdmans, 2008.
- Kaiser, Walter C. *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.
- Kwakkel, Gert. "‘Out of Egypt I Have Called My Son’: Matthew 2:15 and Hosea 11:1 in Dutch and American Evangelical Interpretation." In *Tradition and Innovation in Biblical Interpretation*, edited by W.Th. van Peursen and J. W. Dyk. Leiden: Brill Academic Publisher, 2011.
- Leithard, Peter J. "Jesus as Israel The Typological Structure of Matthews Gospel." *Unpublished Article*. <http://www.leithart.com/pdf/jesus-as-israel-the-typological-structure-of-matthew-s-gospel.pdf> (accessed on September, 2014)
- Lierman, John. *The New Testament Moses: Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion*. WUNT 173. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Lim, Timothy H. *Pesharim*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology." In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, edited by Gregory K. Beale. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Counter-Response in Favor of C. H. Dodd's View." In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, edited by Gregory K. Beale. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994.
- McCartney, Dan G., and Peter Enns. "Matthew and Hosea: A Response to John Sailhamer." *WTJ* 63, no. 1 (2001), 97-105.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
- . "The Problem of Sensus Plenior." In *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*, edited by D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1986.

- Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the New*. London: Continuum, 2001.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.
- Pickup, Martin. "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis." *JETS* 51, no. 2 (2008), 353-81.
- Sailhamer, John. "Hosea 11:1 and Matthew 2:15." *WTJ* 63, no. 1 (2001), 87-96.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998.
- Sloan, David. "Apostolic Hermeneutics Revisited: An Examination of Enns's Examples." *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society*, New Orleans, 2009.
- Snodgrass, K. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New." In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, edited by Gregory K. Beale. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994.
- Stamps, Dennis L. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal." In *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- . "The Redeemer Will Come Ek Siōn': Romans 11:26-27 Revisited." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 118-42. *JSNTSup* 83. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Stendahl, Krister. *School of St. Matthew & Its Use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1954.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "Revisiting Inspiration and Incarnation." *WTJ* 71, no. 1 (2009), 83-95.

- Wilkins, Michael J. "Isaiah 53 and the Message of Salvation in the Foul Gospels." In *The Gospel According to Isaiah 53: Encountering the Suffering Servant in Jewish and Christian Theology*, edited by Darrell L. Bock and Mitch Glaser. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2012.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

[초록]

신약 저자의 구약 인용에 대한 피터 엔즈의 견해 비판

김성진(울산시민교회, 부목사, 구약신학)

피터 엔즈는 자신의 저서 *Inspiration and Incarnation* (1st ed. 2005, 2nd ed. 2015; 『성육신의 관점에서 본 성경 영감설』, 김구원 역[CLC, 2006]) 4장에서, 신약 저자들이 구약을 “그리스도 완결적/목적적”(Christotelic)으로 해석하는 가운데, “문법적, 역사적 주해의 원리”를 엄격하게 따르지 않았다고 주장한다. 신약 저자들은 제2성전 시대의 유대교 해석학(예, 미드라시 접근 또는 페셔[*peshar*] 접근)을 따라, 인용하는 구약 본문의 문맥이나 의도를 고려하지 않거나, 심지어 인용 본문에 단어의 인위적 추가, 수정, 재배열도 서슴지 않았다는 것이다. 피터 엔즈는 자신의 주장을 뒷받침하기 위해, 신약 저자들이 당시 유대인의 해석학을 따라 구약 본문을 사용한 것으로 보이는 다섯 개의 대표적인 예를 제시한다(마 2:15[호 11:1 인용], 고후 6:2[사 49:8 인용], 갈 3:16[아브라함의 ‘씨’], 롬 11:26-27[사 59:20-21 인용], 히 3:7-11[시 95:7-11 인용]).

한편, 이 논문은 피터 엔즈의 주장에 문제가 있음을 보인다. 첫째, 신약 저자들의 해석학이 제2성전 시대 유대교 해석학과 상당히 차별되었음을 보여주는 증거들이 있다. 둘째, 피터 엔즈의 제한된 예시와 달리, 신약 저자들이 구약을 인용한 수많은 본문은 신약 저자들이 “문법적, 역사적 주해 원리”를 엄격하게 따랐음을 보여준다. 셋째, 피터 엔즈가 자신의 주장을 입증하기 위해 든 두 가지 예, 마태복음 2장 15절(호세아 11장 1절을 인용)과 로마서 11장 26-27절(이사야 59장 20-21절을 인용)은 그의 주장과 달리 해석될 수 있다. 본 논문은 신약 저자들이 제2성전 시대의 해석학에 묶인 것이 아니라, 구약의 맥락과 의도를 충실히 따르는 주해적 원리를 유지했다고 결론 내린다.

키워드: 피터 엔즈, 신약의 구약 사용/인용, 성경 해석, 모형론, 마태복음 2:15, 로마서 11:26-27