

REVIEW ARTICLES

REVISITING *INSPIRATION AND INCARNATION*

BRUCE K. WALTKE

I. *Introduction*

Professor Enns invites evangelicals to interact with his provocative ideas for sharpening theological discussion about the nature of Scripture. Upon my first reading I was struck with his commendable, unflinching honesty. Not allowing dogma to overwhelm data, he attempts pastorally to assist students who think the Reformed doctrine of Scripture is not viable. Enns holds with conviction the concept that both the Word of God as Scripture, and the Word of God as Jesus Christ, become incarnate: fully divine and fully human, as Warfield propounded in his concursive theory of inspiration.

Upon my second reading and more reflection, however, I questioned whether Enns's answer helped doubters to keep the faith. This forced me to reflect more deeply upon the theologically disturbing cache of texts that Enns so helpfully collected, categorized, and then sought to resolve by his "incarnation" model of thinking about Scripture. A model, however, that represents the Mosaic Law as flexible, the inspired religion of Israel in its early stage as somewhat doctrinally misleading, the Chronicler's harmonization as incredible, NT teachings as based on questionable historical data, and an apologetic for Jesus of Nazareth's Messianic claim as arbitrary, would not be helpful to me in my theological education. Nevertheless, I owe Enns a tremendous amount of gratitude for challenging me to think honestly and soberly about these texts that are troubling to all who hold Reformed convictions about the inspiration of holy Scripture.

And so in this essay I hope to collaborate with Enns in our common endeavor to assist students by offering alternative interpretations that to me are more exegetically and theologically satisfying. By the latter I mean interpretations that do not call into question the infallibility of Scripture. My concerns as laid out in this review are strictly exegetical, though of course exegesis is foundational to doctrine. Furthermore, my apologetic is based exclusively on exegetical data

Bruce K. Waltke is Professor of Old Testament at Reformed Seminary, Orlando, Fla., and Professor Emeritus of Biblical Studies, Regent College, British Columbia. He reviews Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament by Peter Enns (Baker Academic, 2005). A response from Peter Enns, and a reply from Bruce Waltke to this response, also appear in this issue.

and a *posteriori* reasoning, not on doctrine and a *priori* reasoning, though the latter is certainly appropriate in an apologetic.

My method will be to follow the book's logic in chapters 3 and 4, first presenting Enns's interpretation, and then an alternative interpretation. Out of the cache of Enns's texts I selected only the more salient and representative texts. Please excuse me for offering the alternatives so tersely. This is necessary to cover Enns's categories within the restricted space in the literary genre of a journal article. The texts in question and Enn's interpretations are presented in italics to the extent that I think necessary for the reader to understand the discussion.

II. *The Old Testament and Theological Diversity*

1. *Diversity in Wisdom Literature*

1. *Proverbs*

Proverbs 26:4 and 26:5: "Do not answer a fool according to his folly, / or you will be like him yourself. Answer a fool according to his folly, / or he will be wise in his own eyes." . . . Both of these sayings are wise, even though—to state the obvious—they say the opposite. . . . The reader [must] invest energy in discerning whether a certain proverb is relevant for a certain situation. (p. 74)

Many commentators hold with Enns that the Proverbs are situationally, not universally, true and use Prov 26:4, 5 as a text-book example to prove their thesis. However, as I argue in my Proverbs commentary, which I presume was not available to Enns when he wrote, the first command pertains to a fool's style of speaking (e.g., rashly, deceptively, and/or heatedly), as can be seen in its rationale, "or you yourself will be just like him, even you"; and the second pertains to the substance of the fool's talk, as can be seen in its rationale: "or he will be wise in his own eyes."¹ In short, the proverb pair instructs the disciple to save a person by answering his foolish argument but not to answer as fools do, for if you do, you too will be condemned by God as well as the fool.

Another example is what Proverbs says about wealth: "The wealth of the rich is their fortified city, but poverty is the ruin of the poor" (10:15). "The wealth of the rich is their fortified city; they imagine it an unscalable wall" (18:11). [In] the first proverb . . . rich is seen as a positive thing. . . . In 18:11, however, the matter is quite opposite. . . . The implication is that, for some, wealth is a source of security, a fortification from poverty (10:15). For others . . . their wealth is a source of arrogance. (p. 75)

But, if you please, is it not universally true that in this life wealth is a form of security? Chuck Colson—who is a highly credible authority on America's courts and prisons—is reported to have said that enough money can free anyone from prison or put anyone in it. That may be an exaggeration, but it is true enough to validate the truth of Prov 10:15. And is it not universally true that those who trust wealth for their salvation are eternally damned?

I won't go further in Proverbs, for in my commentary I iconoclastically defend the notion that all proverbs are universally, not situationally, true.

¹ Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs 15–31* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 346–47.

2. Ecclesiastes

Proverbs hammers home again and again that “wisdom works,” that it is always there and does not fail. . . . Qoheleth is not sure that wisdom always works. . . . Qoheleth observes that everyone—the wise and unwise—will die anyway. So, in the end, there really is no payoff for anything we do. (For what it’s worth, Qoheleth clearly has no notion of the afterlife such as Christians take for granted—see 3:18-21.) (pp. 78-79)

Although Enns acknowledges that Proverbs is conscious of the ups and downs of life, I suggest he gets us in trouble by saying that Proverbs teaches that wisdom always works, which seems to be in this clinical life (i.e., before physical death). I discuss this common reading of Proverbs fully in my commentary in an essay, “Does Wisdom Promise Too Much?” In it I quote from Raymond van Leeuwen’s excellent study: “There are many proverbs that assert or imply that the wicked prosper . . . while the innocent suffer.”² For example, in Solomon’s second proverb he recognizes that the wicked have treasures (Prov 10:2), implying they were acquired at the expense of the innocent.

By taking note of the different genre perspectives of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes one can better understand why Proverbs represents wisdom as always working, while Ecclesiastes denies that truth. Proverbs looks at the end of a matter, focusing on a future when the righteous rise, not on a present when they fall. This genre perspective of Proverbs can be seen clearly in Prov 24:16: “For though the righteous fall seven [the number of perfection] times, they rise again, but the wicked stumble when calamity strikes.” A paraphrase might express the thought this way: “Though the righteous are knocked out for the count of ten, they rise; but when the wicked are knocked out, they stay down.” By using a concessive clause, Proverbs by faith throws away the harsh reality that for a moment the righteous are knocked down. In other words “always” (as in *always working*) does not refer to all the vicissitudes of this life before the righteous finally rise. By contrast, Qoheleth focuses on the suffering of the wise before they rise, on the poor bloke who lies knocked out on the mat before he gets up.

Moreover, while it is true that Qoheleth does not have a notion of the afterlife *such as Christians take for granted*, it is not true, as I think Enns infers, that Qoheleth has no notion of an afterlife. Qoheleth’s chosen perspective is essentially empirical, what is seen under the sun; but he also sees by faith, not by empiricism, that God is just. Before citing the limitations of human epistemology regarding life after death in Eccl 3:18-20, Qoheleth protects his empirical statement, saying: “God will bring into judgment both the righteous and the wicked, for there will be a time for every activity, a time to judge every deed” (3:17). If there is no afterlife, God is not just; but that is not Qoheleth’s conclusion: “And God will call the past to account” (3:15). Elsewhere Qoheleth notes: “Although the wicked person who commits a hundred crimes may live a long time, I know that it will go better with those who fear God, who are reverent for him” (8:12). In *An Old Testament*

² R. van Leeuwen, “Wealth and Poverty: System and Contradiction in Proverbs,” *HS* 33 (1992): 29.

Theology, I make the case with many commentators that Qoheleth engages in an agonizing debate between skepticism and faith with the latter winning out.³

3. *Job*

If disobedience leads to God's curse (Deut. 28:15-68), then it is not too hard to reason back the other way: if you are cursed, you must have done something to deserve it. This is the assumption [of Job's friends]. . . . Anyone well versed in Old Testament teaching would likely have drawn the same conclusion [as Job's three friends]. (p. 81)

But this statement is not accurate or helpful to me. Is it true that anyone well-versed in the OT would draw the conclusion that it teaches that a person who is cursed—I take it that Enns uses the word loosely, for the friends never use it of Job—must have done wrong? A person well-versed in Scripture—so it seems to me—certainly knows that righteous Abel is murdered by Cain and, while Abel's blood cries out for justice, the murderer lives out a normal life-span. After Abraham by faith arrived in the Promised Land, God inflicted a famine on the land, a drought so severe that Abraham felt compelled to leave the Promised Land. Innocent Joseph was sold into slavery where he suffered hard iron. Job points to numerous situations where the righteous suffer and the wicked prosper within the divine scheme of things, and that surely his friends also knew. (A person less well-versed in the OT literature may not be aware that in the book of Proverbs the father's first lecture represents the wicked as dispatching the innocent to a premature death while the wicked fill their house with plunder taken from him [Prov 1: 11-14].) Moreover, one does not have to be well-versed in the OT literature to know from the NT that the righteous Son of God was nailed to the cross and that his apostles were martyrs for their faith in Jesus Christ. In sum, the three friends illogically drew a conclusion that did not square with the teachings of Proverbs, which is also well aware that the wicked are full while the righteous hunger (cf. Prov 16:8)—but that is not the whole story.

2. *Diversity in Law*

1. *The Ten Commandments*

Regarding the Sabbath commandment: *Deuteronomy presents Moses as someone who, forty years after the fact, recounts God's words differently than were given in Exodus. . . . God seems to be perfectly willing to allow his law to be adjusted over time.* (p. 87)

But another possible interpretation, which only came to me recently, distinguishes God's single, unchanging commandment to keep the Sabbath and Moses' differing rationales for keeping it as presented in Exodus and Deuteronomy. In other words, I suggest the situation is similar to narrative. The commandment to keep the Sabbath is like the ostensive story in narrative, and the rationale for keeping it is like the narrator's creative plot. Exodus 20 and Deut 5 both refer to God's original command *at Sinai* to keep Sabbath. Probably Moses, however, in Exod 20 adds to the command its rationale: "for . . . the Lord . . . rested on the seventh day . . ." In Deuteronomy Moses clearly interrupts the Lord's giving of the Ten Commandments: "Observe the Sabbath day to sanctify it *as the LORD*

³ Bruce K. Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology: A Canonical and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 947-69.

your God commanded you.” In keeping with the theology of his addresses in the book of Deuteronomy, probably Moses, not God, explains: “Remember that you were slaves in Egypt and that the LORD your God brought you out of there . . .” Moses does not change the commandment but adds a second rationale for keeping it. In short, the Lord’s commandment is not adjusted over time, but Moses expands his rationales to include motives consistent with the theology of the so-called Tetrateuch and *his* Book of the Law.⁴

Regarding the third commandment: *Both Exodus and Deuteronomy . . . [say] that the actions of one generation, for good or ill, will affect how God deals with subsequent generations. . . . [But] the point Ezekiel makes . . . is that the second (violent) generation does not benefit from the righteousness of the first, nor is the third (righteous) generation punished for the wickedness of the second. . . . The prophet speaks in a way that relativizes the letter of that commandment.* (pp. 88-89)

Let me suggest a different tack. Ezekiel 18:19-20 may not relativize Exod 20:5-6, because both may teach that God punishes the iniquity of the children. The rationale given in Exodus and Deuteronomy for the third commandment in the Hebrew text reads: *poqed* ‘*awon* ‘*abot* ‘*al-banim* ‘*al-shilleshim w*‘ ‘*al-ribbe* ‘*im l’son’ay* (“visiting the iniquity of the parents upon the children to the third and fourth generations of those who hate me”). The restrictive clause, “those who hate me,” may qualify its nearest antecedent, namely, the children who continue the iniquity of the parents.

2. *Passover*

What Exodus [12:8-9] says emphatically not to do—to boil the meat—is precisely what [the same law in] Deuteronomy [16:5-7] says to do. . . . There is a clear difference between the two laws, which is demonstrated by a third passage, 2 Chronicles 35:13. . . . Chronicles says that they “boiled the Passover animals in the fire.” [This makes little sense] yet that is precisely what Chronicles says. (pp. 92-93)

Enns’s exegesis here I find superficial. Whether or not Exod 12:12-13 contradicts Deut 16:5-7 depends on the meaning of *bashal* (Piel). Instead of positing “to boil” as its only possible gloss, we can enrich the discussion by noting that according to authoritative lexicographers *bshl* (Piel) frequently means “to cook” (cf. Num 11:8).⁵ The medium of cooking colors that broad sense to include hyponyms such as “boil,” “bake” (2 Sam 13:8), or “roast.” Exodus 12:12-13 says, “do not *bashal* in water,” but 1 Chron 13:35 says “*bashal* it in fire.” Perhaps the Chronicler is not ludicrously harmonizing Exod 12:12-13 and Deut 16:5-7, but screening out the potential misunderstanding that *bshl* with the Passover could include its hyponym “to boil.” Since “boil it in fire” is not semantically pertinent, the hyponym “to roast” (NIV/TNIV) is a better gloss than “to boil.”⁶

⁴ For clarification of the distinction between the book of Deuteronomy and the Book of the Law, whose history the book recounts, see Daniel I. Block, “Recovering the Voice of Moses: The Genesis of Deuteronomy,” *JETS* 44 [2001]: 385-408; and especially, David Abram Bergen, “Diallogic in the Narrative of Deuteronomy” (Ph.D. diss., University of Calgary, 2003).

⁵ *HALOT* (p. 164, s.v. “*bshl*”) glosses *bshl* by “boil, cook, fry.”

⁶ This was the rationale behind the NIV/TNIV.

3. *Sacrifice*

No one would think [by reading the Mosaic Law] that sacrifice was optional or that refusing to sacrifice would carry anything other than strict penalties. Still . . . there is a strand in prophetic literature that adds a dimension to the matter: A well-known passage is Hosea 6:6: “For I desire mercy, not sacrifice.” (p. 93)

Here too Enns follows a common academic notion, but I suggest it misrepresents the Mosaic Law. Both the Law and the prophets teach that sacrifices must be anointed with the oil of covenant commitment in order for a sacrifice to be acceptable to God. God gave Moses the liturgical commandments, including sacrifices (Exod 25–Lev 9), only after Israel accepted the theology and ethics of the Ten Commandments and the Book of the Covenant (Exod 20–24). When Israel reneged on these covenant obligations in the sin of the golden calf, God refused to give Israel further liturgical regulations until they humbled themselves and were spiritually fit to worship (Exod 32–34). The Law, the prophets, and Jesus do not pit the necessity of sacrifice against the necessity of spiritual fidelity. Both are true in all three literary genres of the Bible.

4. *Gentiles*

We see [in Deut 23:3] that Ammonites and Moabites are not permitted ever to enter the “assembly of the LORD.” . . . On the other hand, Ruth is a Moabitess . . . and their [Boaz’s and Ruth’s] child Obed became the ancestor to none other than David himself. There clearly seems to be some flexibility in the binding injunction of Deuteronomy 23:3.

This is an old chestnut. Here’s another possible interpretation rather than suggesting the story of Ruth relativizes the Law: Probably Deut 23:3 disallows Moabite males (*mo’abi*) from entering the congregation of the Lord; it does not necessarily disallow a covenant-keeping Moabite female married to a faithful Israelite man or their offspring from entering the assembly of the Lord. Similarly, in the case of holy war, the Law mandated the execution of males, but not females. The weakness of the alternative resolution is that the so-called Hebrew masculine gender may include females.

3. *God and Diversity*

1. *One God or Many Gods?*

Several key passages in the Old Testament speak of Yahweh alone as God [Isa 44:6-20 . . . Jer 10:1-16]. . . . But . . . the Old Testament paints a more varied portrait of God. . . . “Among the gods there is none like you, O Lord . . .” (Ps. 86:8). . . . [In] Joshua 24:2, 1-15 Joshua is exhorting Israel to serve Yahweh alone. To serve him alone means not to serve other gods. . . . The first commandment says not “There are no other gods” but “you shall have no other gods.” . . . The way [that the second commandment] is phrased seems to imply that idols can be real rivals of Yahweh. . . . The Israelites of the exodus were . . . taking their first baby steps toward a knowledge of God. . . . At this point in the progress of redemption, . . . the gods of the surrounding nations are treated as real. (pp. 97-102)

A more tenable explanation, I suggest, is that the first two commandments, which tacitly assume the existence of other gods, belong to the genre of religious commandments, whereas Moses’ statement in Deut 4:39 (“there are no other

gods”)—not cited by Enns—and the monotheistic prophetic statements that he does cite, pertain to the genre of theological statements. The statements about other gods in the Psalms and in Josh 24, as well as in the first two commandments, pertain—so it seems to me—to the epistemological reality that people fabricate non-existent gods and fatuously worship them (cf. 1 Cor 8:4-6); the theological statements pertain to the ontological reality that other gods do not exist. In other words, the statements about other gods tacitly assume human depravity, not henotheism (i.e., the worship of only one God, while assuming the existence of others).⁷

2. *Does God Change His Mind?*

God acts more humanlike than godlike . . .

As for statements that seem to entail that God’s knowledge is restricted or that he changes his mind, a better resolution, I suggest, is that these statements pertain to God’s relative epistemological knowledge in his very real involvement in salvation history. Other texts assert God’s ontological, comprehensive knowledge. Both kinds of knowledge are real and are better not pitted against each other.

III. *The Old Testament and Its Interpretation in the New Testament*

1. *Biblical Interpretation in the Second Temple Period*

1. *Innerbiblical Interpretation: The New Testament’s Use of the Old Testament*

There [in Dan 9] we read of Daniel’s interpretation of the seventy years of Babylonian captivity prophesied by Jeremiah (Jeremiah 25:11; 29:10). . . . For him [Daniel], the seventy years are to be understood in a surprising way, as “seventy sevens” of years. . . . [This is so] because Gabriel then [while Daniel is praying for forgiveness of Israel’s sins] proceeds to explain to him the meaning of Jeremiah’s words: the seventy years really refer to “seventy sevens” of years. This is nothing less than illumination from heaven to provide Daniel with the deeper meaning contained in Jeremiah’s words . . . (p. 118)

I confess I am not convinced by this interpretation. Daniel 9:21-22 says that Gabriel came to give Daniel “insight and understanding,” not to give him insight into a deeper meaning of Jer 25:11; 29:10. The new insight and understanding can be understood to mean that God is giving Daniel insight that *I AM* is now going to keep his covenant curses. In spite of the captivity, Israel is still not purified, as Daniel confesses: “While I was . . . confessing my sin and the sin of my

⁷ Moreover, Enns’s interpretation opens the door both to a liberal definition of progressive revelation and to open theism. According to the liberal definition, “progressive revelation” refers to an evolutionary development of religion wherein earlier revelation is primitive and rudimentary and its teachings about divine reality and morals must be assessed and corrected by later revelation. Schleiermacher (1768–1834), an extreme example, places the OT on the same level as heathenism (Greek and Roman thought): “The Old Testament Scriptures do not . . . share the normative dignity or the inspiration of the New” (Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith* [ET of 2d rev. ed. of 1830; ed. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928], section 132). The notion of progressive revelation, when defined in this way, is inconsistent with the doctrine that all Scripture is inspired of God. As for open theism, see John M. Frame, *No Other God: A Response to Open Theism* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2001); Bruce A. Ware, *God’s Greater Glory: The Exalted God of Scripture and the Christian Faith* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2004).

people Israel . . .” Israel’s additional seven-fold punishment fulfills the covenant curse: “If after all this [destruction, drought, and defeat] you will not listen to me, I will punish you for your sins seven times over” (Lev 26:18). If that alternative is accepted, Gabriel does not give new meaning to Jeremiah’s prophecy but gives a new insight into God’s salvation history, namely, that Israel’s punishment of seventy years of captivity will be multiplied seven times over in later distinct periods of punishment.

In this connection, Enns segues into Luke 24:44-48: *As an angel illumined Daniel with a deeper understanding of Scripture, we see Jesus doing something very similar at the end of Luke. In fact I would say that he establishes a hermeneutic foundation for how the Old Testament is now to be understood by Christians. . . . “He said to them . . . ‘Every Scripture must be fulfilled that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms.’ Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures. He told them, ‘This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day.’”* (p. 119) *The Dead Sea Scrolls pesher commentary . . . interpreted this prophecy [Hab 1:5] in a way that had absolutely nothing whatever to do with its function in the book of Habakkuk* (p. 129). *They [biblical interpreters of the Second Temple period, including Christ and the apostles] were not motivated to reproduce the intention of the original human author.* (p. 131)

Enns’s big picture presents the NT using the Qumran covenanters’ *pesher* method of interpretation, a hermeneutic that totally bypasses the historical sense. But this questionable hermeneutic allegedly based on Luke 24 in fact lacks exegetical support. Before Jesus explained to the disciples on the Emmaus way what was said in all the Scriptures—beginning with Moses and all the prophets—concerning himself, he condemned them for failing to understand the text’s plain sense: “How foolish you are, and how slow to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Did not Messiah have to suffer these things and then enter his glory?” (Luke 24:25-26). Christ rebuked these disciples for not believing what should have been apparent upon a plain reading of the text. As I read the whole context of Luke 24, Jesus Christ did not rely upon an arbitrary *pesher* method of hermeneutics to validate his claims. The failure to see Christ in the Psalms, as I read Christ’s full statement, is not due to being hide-bound to the plain sense of Scripture but to the slowness of the human heart to believe in the death of Christ for sin and in his resurrection from the dead. Indeed, it takes the Holy Spirit to remove this veil of unbelief. The radical power of “the Spirit” over “the letter” that introduced the centrality of Christ into apostolic exegesis of the OT in a totally new way in the history of interpretation is due to God’s grace that, according to Paul, “has now been revealed through the appearing of our Savior, Christ Jesus, who has destroyed death and has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel” (2 Tim 1:10); it is not due to negating the plain sense of Scripture. In sum, the veil of unbelief, not a negation of philology and history, had to be lifted for the radical power of the Spirit to empower an accredited reading of Scripture.⁸

⁸ Re. Luke 24:45: “The most pressing question for us is where specifically does the Old Testament say that Christ will suffer and rise from the dead. Some suggest Hosea 6:2 as a likely candidate. . . . But appealing to this one

2. *Apostolic Hermeneutics as a Second Temple Phenomenon: Interpretive Methods*

1. *Matthew 2:15 and Hosea 11:1*

For Matthew, Jesus' trip as a boy to Egypt to escape Herod is a fulfillment of Hosea 11:1. . . . Scanning the context of Hosea 11, it becomes quite clear that Hosea himself is not talking about the boy Jesus, nor is he thinking of a future messiah. (p. 133)

Enns earlier informs his readers that authors in Second Temple literature anchored their interpretations in what they knew to be right. This involved manipulating the text to suit their purposes. He suggests this is the interpretative method used in Matt 2:15. But I find that that interpretation depreciates a high regard for Scripture's inspiration. May I suggest an alternative interpretation, namely, that Matthew is using the hermeneutic of typology, which is well attested in the OT literature and not in Second Temple literature—at least in the data Enns presents.⁹ A classic example of typology is that of the story of Balaam and his donkey. The type, namely, the donkey, who with wide open eyes three times sees visions that a pained and angry Balaam cannot see, prefigures the antitype, namely, the prophet Balaam, who with wide open eyes three times sees visions that a pained and angry Balak cannot see. To use NT terminology, the antitype fulfills the type, a fulfillment that only God foresaw and prefigured, not a fulfillment that mortals could have anticipated ahead of time. Likewise, Isaiah sees Israel's exodus from Egypt as a type of her exodus from Babylon. Of course, the exodus from Babylon was not in view in Moses' mind when he recounted the exodus from Egypt. But when Isaiah saw Israel's return to the land, he saw the unannounced fulfillment.

Typology is a unique species of promise and fulfillment. Whereas prophecy is concerned with prospective words that were expected to be fulfilled, typology is concerned with comparative historical events, persons, and institutions. Matthew, not so oddly, sees a typological fulfillment between Israel as son of God coming out of Egypt (Hosea 11:1) and Christ as Son of God coming out of Egypt (Hos 11:1; Matt 2:15).

Typology is based on a worldview that embraces salvation history. In that view of history the perfect mind of the Author of the whole canon transcends the

passage to find concrete textual support of Christ's resurrection borders on the absurd." But consider Peter's famous Pentecostal sermon. To validate that Jesus Christ is Messiah, Peter cites Ps 16:10: "Because you will not abandon me to the realm of the dead, you will not let your holy one see decay." Whereupon he argues: "We all know that . . . David died and was buried, and his tomb is here to this day. But he was a prophet. . . . Seeing what was to come, he spoke of the resurrection of the Messiah . . ." His argument is based on a plain sense, not *peshet*, hermeneutic. Moreover, if Messiah is buried and his body does not decay, he had to be raised before the third night after his death. This is so because the body begins to corrupt by the fourth day (see John 11:39). Turning from Psalms to the prophets, Isa 52:13–53:12 predicts Messiah's death and resurrection: "And though the LORD's will makes his life an offering for sin, he will see his offspring and prolong his days." Who but Jesus by his death made an atonement for sin? And how could the Servant see his offering after his death other than by his resurrection? Finally, turning to the Law, the first martyr, Abel, died without vindication, and yet Abraham knew the Ruler of the earth did what was right. And was not Enoch translated?

⁹ Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology*, 136-42.

mind of the human author's partial contribution to the Bible before its final chapter was written. In the worldview of the biblical authors, God has an eternal plan that is a mystery until it is fully revealed in the advent of Jesus Christ (cf. Eph 3:1-11). For those more philosophically inclined, I suggest the biblical worldview is more like Neo-Platonism (i.e., begins with the Reality of the mind of the Eternal that is shadowed in earth's historical development) than nominal (i.e., begins with humans distinguishing one thing from another). Understanding begins with God, as Anselm said: "I believe in order to understand."

2. *2 Corinthians 6:2 and Isaiah 49:8*

There is nothing here [Isa 49:8] at all about being reconciled to God in Christ, as Paul uses these words. . . . Paul's intention . . . was . . . an interpretive exercise founded on his conviction that Christ is the ultimate fulfillment of Israel's story. (p. 135)

But maybe Paul's citing of Isa 49:8 does not illustrate Second Temple Jewish hermeneutics and, in fact, has nothing to do with fulfillment. Paul cites Isaiah, but, unlike Matthew, does not say that Christ fulfills Isaiah. More probably—so it seems to me—Paul is employing the rhetoric and norms of citation in Jewish and Graeco-Roman literature, for he is addressing a Greek church. Christopher Stanley, in order better to locate Paul's citational method in its first-century context, surveyed citational techniques and tendencies in both Jewish and Graeco-Roman authors and concluded that Paul generally adhered to the accepted practices of his day: (1) Joining two originally discrete verses or even commingling the language of such verses into a single "quotation" to address a special literary or rhetorical concern. (2) Quoting texts verbatim or adapting them according to "how well the original wording coincided with the point the later author wanted to make in adducing the passage." (3) Altering the text in order to help the reader/hearer apprehend the point of the original text as the later author understood it. (4) "The most noteworthy point about the adaptations . . . is the sheer obviousness and even naiveté with which many of them are carried out," suggesting the social acceptability of such practices. Stanley proposes that "interpretive renderings are an integral part of every public presentation of a written text, a reality well understood and perhaps even anticipated by ancient audiences."¹⁰

Galatians 3:16, 29; Rom 11:26-27; and Isa 59:20 reflect, I suggest as an alternative interpretation, the Jewish and Graeco-Roman *citational customs* of Paul's world, not the arbitrary *pesher* hermeneutics of the Qumran covenanters.

3. *Second Temple Interpretative Traditions*

1. *Jannes and Jambres*

That Paul mentions these figures is not to be understood by us today as a historical declaration. It is, rather, an indication of what constituted Paul's "interpreted Bible." (p. 143)

¹⁰ See Christopher Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 342-47.

As an alternative to interpreting the apostles as grounding some of their doctrines in the allegedly fictitious traditions of Second Temple literature, I prefer to think that these stories cited by the apostle are historically true. In my opinion Second Temple literature *preserved*, not *generated*, these non-biblical stories. The apostles seem to represent these ancient traditions as real history and so has the church in the history of interpretation. If the stories are not true, the theological truth based on them is also called into question. A community to sustain itself must be based on reality, not on fiction. Though Enns is trying to be helpful, he does not succeed.

Stories found in the NT and Second Temple literature, but not in the canon of Scripture, such as “Jannes and Jambres,” “Noah, the Preacher of Righteousness,” “The Dispute over Moses’ Body,” and “Jude and Enoch’s Prophecy” may be more than Jewish traditions being circulated during the Second Temple epoch. It is not dishonest to think that the prophecy preserved in *First Enoch* is a true prophecy. Jude’s point is to show that this prophecy is *very* old. It was given to Enoch, the seventh from Adam in the genealogy preserved in Gen 5. The text says he walked (and so conversed) with God. Is it not plausible that while walking with Enoch and teaching him, God prophesied that he was coming with myriads of his holy ones in his final judgment on the wicked?¹¹

Serious scholars have long maintained that these additions retain real history that was passed down hand to hand within Israel. This is probably the case with regard to “The Law Was Put into Effect through Angels” (Gal 3:19). This tradition, as Enns notes, could be based on Deut 33:2: “*The LORD came from Sinai and dawned over them from Seir; he shone forth from Mount Paran. He came with myriads of holy ones from the south, from his mountain slopes.*” Enns plausibly reasons that “the holy ones” in Deut 33:2 is a metonymy for the Israelites, not for angels, because the “holy ones” in Deut 33:3 are clearly the Israelites. If “holy ones” in Deut 33:2 are Israelites, not angels, Enns contends that there is no scriptural basis for Paul’s statement in Gal 3:19.

Other data, however, besides the immediate context of Deut 33:2-3, enrich the discussion. Habbakuk and Deborah also bear witness to the ancient tradition preserved in Deut 33:2. Habakkuk 3:3, a poetic prayer of Habakkuk, speaks of God coming from mountains in the south: “God came from Teman [‘Southland’], the Holy One from Paran.” Moreover, the Song of Deborah, the *oldest poem in Biblical Hebrew*, reflects this tradition: “When you, LORD, went out from Seir, when you marched from the land of Edom . . . the mountains quaked before the LORD, the One of Sinai, before the LORD, the God of Israel” (Judg 5:5). These three poems, all earlier—two much earlier—than Second Temple literature, preserve a tradition that the LORD came from the south, from his mountain slopes, a tradition not found in Exodus. The Israelites did not

¹¹ If Gen 5:23 read that Enoch lived 365 years, and if *1 Enoch* added that Enoch’s years matched the 365 days of the year, the addition would be proof that the addition was spurious. And if Jude had noted this fact, it would be proof that he regarded pseudepigrapha as Scripture, as James Barr has suggested (*The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999], 568).

come from the southern mountains, from Edom, but from Egypt. Plausibly, then, the “myriad of holy ones from the south, from his mountain slopes” in the Song of Moses are an angelic host who accompanied *I AM*. According to my understanding of Moses’ blessing in Deut 33:2-3, the Lord of hosts had two companies of holy ones at Sinai: a heavenly angelic host who accompanied him to Sinai and the Israelites who bowed at his feet.

The notion that the other citations in the NT of Second Temple additions retain ancient, true stories finds further support in their plausibility, such as “Noah, the Preacher of Righteousness” and “Moses’ Egyptian Education.” Moreover, Israel constantly contested Moses’ leadership; that the names of an historical Jannes and Jambres, two notorious rebels, are preserved by tradition is unexceptional. In contrast to these plausible traditions, the “interpretative traditions” in the Wisdom of Solomon, such as that Cain caused the flood, are implausible.

IV. Conclusion

I owe a debt of gratitude to Enns for provoking me to think about these texts and the incarnation of Scripture. The church needs gadflies to provoke its thinking.

Enns believes his theory of incarnation is consistent with Warfield’s concursive theory of inspiration. I do not. A theory that entails notions that holy Scripture contains flat out contradictions, ludicrous harmonization, earlier revelations that are misleading and/or less than truthful, and doctrines that are represented as based on historical fact, but in fact are based on fabricated history, in my judgment, is inconsistent with the doctrine that God inspired every word of holy Scripture. To be sure, the Scripture is fully human, but it is just as fully the Word of God, with whom there is no shadow of turning and who will not lie to or mislead his elect. But the theological reflection that Enns’s view of Scripture contradicts the notion of its infallibility needs to be defended in another article, better written by a systematic theologian than by an exegetical theologian. As an exegetical theologian, I aim to give systematic theologians the fruit of my exegetical labors for their reflection.

My concerns in this article are strictly exegetical. I represent my conclusions somewhat tentatively because, since Enns covers a waterfront of issues without always defending his interpretations, I have also covered the waterfront with him, selecting crucial texts to test the viability of his thesis to the extent that he represents them. Within that frame of reference I offer the reader viable alternatives, leaving it to the reader to decide which interpretation has better exegetical support. Moreover, not all orthodox exegetes agree with me. Although the truth represented in Scripture is absolute and certain, our interpretations of it are not always such; we all still see through a glass darkly. And so I remain open to further discussion in our common quest for maturity in the faith.

I did not come to these exegetical conclusions to defend my understanding of an orthodox interpretation of Scripture. I approached the data *a posteriori*, not *a priori*. From that perspective I find none of Enns’s data supports his understanding of inspiration. And should I find that the *a posteriori* data supports his notion

of inspiration, I would still not accept his theory as Enns represents himself, for I could not hold his theory with integrity. My heart has priority over reason. My conscience, informed by holy Scripture, persuades me that our inerrant God represents truth in infallible Scripture. I know from personal contact that Enns also believes that God is the inerrant Source of Scripture, so I suppose that he too thinks it is infallible for faith and practice. Yet, for me to accept his understanding of inspiration as represented in *Inspiration and Incarnation* would entail confessing that it contains errors. Enns studiously avoids the term; I suppose he, unlike me, does not think his theory entails that Scripture contains errors.

Each of us has his or her own walk with God; in that connection I do not call into question Enns's integrity. I know he is a man of unflinching honesty. But as for me, his theology is unstable and the exegesis that supports it is flawed.

In addition to a private walk with God, each believer according to his or her own conscience, also has a public walk with God. As members of the covenant community, the elect are heirs of the Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic, and New covenants. As heirs of all of God's sovereign grace covenants, they are bound together as the seed of Abraham in Christ, are committed to the teachings of the Mosaic Law, surrender their lives to the son of David in the flesh and the Son of God through the Spirit of holiness, know that their sins are forgiven through Christ's blood of the everlasting covenant, and have the law written on their hearts through the Holy Spirit. As such, they walk together in love, looking to Jesus the Pioneer and Perfecter of their faith, until they together reach maturity in the faith. Believing sincerely that Enns and I share one Lord, one faith, one baptism, I endeavor with him to keep the unity of the Spirit. I hope this article reflects both my significant exegetical and theological differences from Enns and my sincere endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit between us.