A History of Hermeneutics Lecture 4

3-24 prof. MJ Ahn (PTU)

Hermeneutic of Jesus

Jewish Hermeneutic- ***halakah, haggada,* midrash, Pesher**

Hermeneutic of paul

New Testament Use of Old Testament

**Why should we know Jesus’ method**

**1. Jesus' use of the OT shows his method of hermeneutics**

Jesus Opens the Meaning of Scriptures

Luke 24:44 – 45 Now He said to them, "These are My words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that all things which are written about Me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled." 45Then He opened their minds to understand the Scriptures,…

**Jesus’ method is the model to follow as he commanded**

**He** interpreted the Old Testament, it is the standard for our interpretation.

(Mark 10:2ff.).

**Jesus’ Interpretation of Scripture- significance of his interpretation**

[**http://www2.bhpublishinggroup.com/readthebible/downloads/cdrom/Week\_01/Bible\_Interpretation.pdf**](http://www2.bhpublishinggroup.com/readthebible/downloads/cdrom/Week_01/Bible_Interpretation.pdf)

An assumption held **in common** by both Jesus and the religious leaders of His time was that the Hebrew Scriptures were the Word of God. Also held in common were a number of methods of interpreting Scripture: literal, midrash, pesher, and typological. Yet Jesus and the religious leaders interpreted Scripture very **differently**. One of the first activities of the risen Christ was interpreting Scripture. As He walked with Cleopas and another disciple on the road to Emmaus, “beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, He interpreted for them the things concerning Himself in all the Scriptures” Interpreting the Bible (Luke 24:27). Jesus’ interpretation of **who He was and His mission** in light of the Hebrew Scriptures is the foundation of the church and historically is the factor that created separation between the church and the synagogue. Jesus’ interpretative activity forges a **connection** between the Hebrew Scriptures and what later came to be called the New Testament. Not only does Jesus’ teaching bring the two testaments together, but it provides the key for seeing how they fit together, how they are mutually dependent.

**2. His interpretation was above the authority which Moses commanded. His interpretation showed the original and deep and real intention of the God.**

**EX. Mark 10:2-12 New International Version (NIV) , On divorce**

**2** Some Pharisees came and tested him by asking, “Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?”

**3** “What did Moses command you?” he replied.

**4** They said, “Moses permitted a man to write a certificate of divorce and send her away.”

**5** “It was because your hearts were hard that Moses wrote you this law,” Jesus replied. **6** “But at the beginning of creation God ‘made them male and female.’[a] **7** ‘For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife,[b] **8** and the two will become one flesh.’[c] So they are no longer two, but one flesh.**9** Therefore what God has joined together, let no one separate.”

**10** When they were in the house again, the disciples asked Jesus about this. **11** He answered, “Anyone who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her. **12** And if she divorces her husband and marries another man, she commits adultery.”

**3. Human’s reason could not understand the things of the heaven, we need the correct understanding of the misunderstanding of the false doctrine made by the traditional interpretation. We have the limitation to understand the God’s Word as the Sadducees. due to Our sin we become blind.**

One Bride for Seven Brothers (Luke 20:27-40) **ignorance** of **the Resurrection and Marriage.**

**especially the future things is not to be revealed to us clearly.**

**7** Some of the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to Jesus with a question. **28** “Teacher,” they said, “Moses wrote for us that if a man’s brother dies and leaves a wife but no children, the man must marry the widow and raise up offspring for his brother.**29** Now there were seven brothers. The first one married a woman and died childless. **30** The second **31** and then the third married her, and in the same way the seven died, leaving no children. **32** Finally, the woman died too. **33** Now then, at the resurrection whose wife will she be, since the seven were married to her?”

**34** Jesus replied(interpreted), “The people of this age marry and are given in marriage. **35** But those who are considered worthy of taking part in the age to come and in the resurrection from the dead will neither marry nor be given in marriage, **36** and they can no longer die; for they are like the angels. They are God’s children, since they are children of the resurrection. **37** But in the account of the burning bush, even Moses showed that the dead rise, for he calls the Lord ‘the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.’[a] **38** He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for to him all are alive.”**39** Some of the teachers of the law responded, “Well said, teacher!”**40** And no one dared to ask him any more questions.

**characteristic of t**he THE HERMENEUTIC OF JESUS,

Let me introduce a few scholars.

1. Jesus’ Hermeneutical Principles by Dave Miller, Ph.D.

<http://apologeticspress.org/APContent.aspx?category=11&article=2307>

**JESUS’ USE OF SCRIPTURE**

1. He(Jesus) **relied very heavily upon Scripture**. He quoted from the Old Testament frequently. He constantly reiterated(repeated) to His disciples how the written Word of God should permeate life (e.g., Luke 24:27). He consistently affirmed the certainty of Scripture’s fulfillment in the world (e.g., Luke 24:44-46). He possessed a sense of the unity of history and a grasp of its wide sweep (e.g., Luke 11:50-51).

2. In addition to a heavy reliance upon scriptural quotation, Jesus repeatedly demonstrated incredible proclivity(tendency) for **rationality** in His sharp, potent, penetrating use of logic and sound argumentation. His first recorded responsible activity consisted of logical dialogue between Himself and the Jewish theologians at the age of 12. His logical prowess(bravery, or ability) was evident not only to the doctors of the law, but to His parents as well (Luke 2:45-51). On the occasion of His baptism, He reasoned with John in order to convince John to immerse Him (Matthew 3:13-15). He advanced a logical reason to justify the action.

3. Closely related to Jesus’ emphasis upon logic is His **virtually constant use of implication**. Modern scholars are surely uncomfortable with Jesus’ use of what many have called “necessary inference.” Indeed, cries that call for an abandonment of implication in interpreting the Scriptures have grown louder. Not only is such thinking self-contradictory, it is patently foolish in light of Jesus’ own frequent and accurate use of implication.

2. Joe Machuta, The hermeneutics of Jesus and his followers I

[http://paradigmshift-jmac.blogspot.kr/2011/09/hermeneutics-of-jesus-and-his-followers.html.](http://paradigmshift-jmac.blogspot.kr/2011/09/hermeneutics-of-jesus-and-his-followers.html)

If Jesus had a specific hermeneutic and, if we could understand it, why wouldn’t the followers of Jesus use his hermeneutic only?

So then, what is the hermeneutic of Jesus and his followers? In short, it is a **solely redemptive Christo-centric hermeneutic** that uniquely sees Jesus of Nazareth as the fulfillment of the entire Jewish scripture. I am speaking of both the Torah and the Tanakh; i.e., the thirty nine books that make up the Old Testament, and Jesus hermeneutic, is found in the pages of the twenty seven books of the New Testament. A large portion of the New Testament text is the explanation of --the interpretation of --the Old Testament in a solely redemptive, Jesus of Nazareth centric, way

The foundation of Jesus hermeneutic is found in Luke chapter twenty-four. It can be specifically found in Luke 24:27 & 44-47. I will post each of these passages here.

The hermeneutics of Jesus and his followers II

Luke 24:27 Then beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, He interpreted for them the things concerning ***Himself in all the Scriptures.***

In the above passage the word diermeneuo is translated as interpreted. So then, Jesus used hermeneutical interpretation with his followers and taught them the interpretation method that he used. What was that lens you ask? It was a lens that saw Jesus as the Messiah. While it is true that the scribes and Pharisees had **a Christo-centric, messiah centered hermeneutic;** the thing that differentiated Jesus from them was that he saw himself as the Messiah and the center of all scripture. Therefore he alone was able to show how the scripture prophecies applied to him. His hermeneutic was Spirit directed. The scribes and Pharisees hermeneutic was scripture directed. In fact, the Pharisees declared that he was not the Messiah based upon the scripture when they asked; “has any of us thought that he was the Messiah? Yet, this group that does not know the scripture is accursed” (John 7:47-49.)

In other words, the **scribes and Pharisees** were depending on their interpretation of the scripture to be able to identify the Messiah, and their interpretation worked in the opposite… they determined by scripture that Jesus was **not the Messiah**. This is important because it shows that Jesus and his follower’s interpretation must have precedence over all other methods of interpretation. This creates a top down hermeneutic in which one has to view the Old Testament prophesies in **view of the Spirit filled interpretation of Jesus and his followers.**

3. MARY HEALY (Sacred Scripture at Sacred Heart Major Seminary in Detroit)

The Hermeneutic of Jesus

<http://www.communio-icr.com/files/healym37-3.pdf>

He has a Catholic Perspective.

First, for the tradition, it is not merely the text but the events recounted that have a **hidden signification will**ed by God.

Second, its definitive, **eschatological culmination** in Christ. Christ’s coming is not simply another event in history that can be typologically paralleled with other events, but rather a turning point of radical newness, breaking outside the bounds of history.

Third, the very term “**spiritual sense**” reminds us that such understanding of the Scriptures is dependent on the Spirit, and consequently on a heart that is docile and receptive to the Spirit’s work.

Evaluation : Hermeneutics of Jesus

The most important presupposition is to admit that Jesus is the center of the Bible. John 5: 39

Jesus showed us that Jesus is his interpreter with divine authority. He proved that he is the best interpreter.

Jesus taught the texts should be interpreted through the writings of Moses and Prophes. (Luke 24:27).

His hermeneutical principle included the eschatological perspective and the progress of redemptive revelation. Promise and fulfillment And He closed the book, gave it back to the attendant and sat down; and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on Him. [21](http://biblehub.com/luke/4-21.htm)And He began to say to them, "Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing."

He commanded us to consider his teachings which he said, Christ -centered words.

**Jewish Hermeneutic**

Jewish exegetes believed that every word of scripture had been spoken by God. There could be no question of its inspiration or authenticity. And anyone who uttered such a question clearly revealed his own separateness from the holy congregation of Israel.

1. Non messianic interpretation of scripture

Jew denied **Messiahic Interpretation, Christological-eschatological hermeneutics.**

These very scriptures contain an element of

prophecy which bears witness to Jesus himself (John 5:39), and

this is their true and ultimate meaning. **Grant. P.8.**

“But what the scribes cannot understand is a figure who suffers.

They cannot believe that Isaiah 53 can refer to an individual

as well as to the nation. Indeed, Jewish exegesis of Isaiah 53 never

interpreted messianically the passages referring to suffering and rejection4

Here Jesus’ interpretation is unique. He goes beyond

contemporary Judaism and interprets the prophecies of the Old

Testament in reference to his movement and to himself. It is fairly

clear in another passage (Matt. 11:5; Luke 7:22) that Jesus regarded

his “signs” as fulfillments of the prophecy of Isaiah. And at

the end of his life, in the Last Supper in the upper room, he sealed

with his disciples a new covenant which fulfilled the prophecy of

Jeremiah (Mark 24:24).“ Grant, 20.

2. Interpretation with ***halakah, haggada,* midrash, Pesher**

***halakah-*** The legal part of Talmudic literature, an interpretation of the laws of the Scriptures.

***haggada, -*** Traditional Jewish literature, especially the nonlegal part of the Talmud. Also called Aggadah. The book containing the story of the Exodus and the ritual of the Seder, read at the Passover Seder.

**midrash** Any of a group of Jewish commentaries on the Hebrew Scriptures compiled between ad 200 and 1200 and based on exegesis, parable, and haggadic legend.

**Pesher(**Hebrew: פשר‎, pl. pesharim from a Hebrew word meaning "interpretation" in the sense of "solution") is an approach to Biblical interpretation, found most notably in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is based on reading scriptural prophecies as allegorically referring to one's present situation. For example, the Dead Sea Scrolls interpreted biblical prophesies addressing the Babylonians to actually refer to the Romans, since for the community which wrote them, the Romans were a real and present source of oppression, the Babylonians distant and irrelevant to their lives. Similarly, they also interpreted a number of biblical prophesies to refer to the founder of their own community (the Teacher of Righteousness) and his archrival (the Wicked Priest). wiki.

**Grant, 23-24**

A final question requires our attention. What was the relation of

this new understanding of the Old Testament to the exegesis of

contemporary rabbis? Let us consider an example in which the

form and content of Jesus’ interpretation lies close to that of his

contemporaries. “You have heard that it was said to the ancients,

‘Do not swear falsely, but pay your oaths to the Lord’ (Lev. 19: 12;

Exod. 20:7; Num. 30:2). But I say to you, Do not swear at all; not

by heaven, for it is the throne of God; not by earth, for it is the

footstool of his feet (Isa. 66:l); not by Jerusalem, for it is the city

of the great king (Ps. 48:2); not by your head shall you swear, for

you cannot make one hair white or black” (Matt. 5:33ff.).

The content of this example of exegesis is Jewish; we may compare

Sir. 23:9: “Accustom not thy mouth to an oath, and be not accustomed

to the naming of the Holy One.” The form is also Jewish; it

is what the rabbis called ***halakah,*** from the verb ***halak*** (to walk),

in the sense of following a way of life.

Another example of Jesus’ teaching method which is characteristically

Jewish may be found in Mark 12:26f. “Concerning the

resurrection of the dead, have you not read in the book of Moses

how God spoke to him at the bush and said, ‘I am the God of

Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob’ (Exod. 3:6)?

He is not the God of the dead but of the living.” According to

Luke 22:39 some of the scribes said, “Teacher, you have spoken

rightly.” The answer was typical of the exegesis called ***haggada,***

theological and mythological interpretation; a very similar example

is to be found in 4 Maccabees. It illustrated the statement of the

oldest **midrash** on Deuteronomy: “Those who search out the intimations

of scripture say, ‘If you wish to know the Creator of the

world, learn ***huggudu;*** from it you will come to know God and

cleave to his ways. ‘“6

These sayings of Jesus

Grant, 54.

All scripture is inspired and helpful for instruction or Every inspired

scripture is helpful for instruction [2 Tim. 3:16].

“In either case, Paul is represented as emphasizing the value of the

Old Testament. Timothy is expected to resist those who “desire to

be teachers of law,” however; the Law is good, but it must be used

lawfully; it requires interpretation (1 Tim. 1:7f.). Timothy must

also avoid “myths and endless genealogies” (1 Tim. 1:4) or, as

they are elsewhere called, “Jewish myths and human commandments”

(Titus 1: 14). Are not the interpretations of Timothy’s opponents

the two divisions of Jewish exegesis? The “myths and

genealogies” are the ***haggada,*** interpretations of a theological

rather than a legal nature; the “human commandments” are the

***halaka,*** rules regulating conduct.”

PAUL’S MIDRASH/PESHER IN GALATIANS 4:21-31

<http://www.deanbibleministries.org/dbmfiles/notes/2009-ChaferConf-Fruchtenbaum-Paper.pdf>

MIDRASH/PESHER AND HERMENEUTICS

By: Dr. Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, T

Paul rarely uses the midrash/pesher hermeneutic, but one place he obviously does so is in Galatians 4:21-31. The reason he chooses to do so is because the Gentile Galatians have become enamored(fallen) with the rabbinic style of exegesis by false teachers. These were people who were able to deceive the Galatians using a false application of the midrash/pesher hermeneutic. So Paul tells them if they are enamored with that kind of an exegesis it can work both ways. Thus he uses Abraham, Isaac, Sarah, Hagar, Ishmael, Mount Sinai, the Law as typologies for law and grace and bondage and freedom. Contrary to some misunderstandings about themidrash/pesher hermeneutic, it should be noted that Paul does not deny that there was a literal Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Hagar, Ishmael and Mount Sinai. He accepts those as literal truth as those spelled out in the Book of Genesis. What he provides here is strictly for the Galatians is to show that this kind of hermeneutic can lead to different conclusions, and the exact **opposite of the ones the Judaizers** were concluding.

**Hermeneutics of paul**

Grant, Paul and the O.T. 28-

Rejecting legalism, Paul faithfully followed Jesus’ method. 1 cor 11: 25

For exemple. Interpretation about the Law he understood the Jesus’ Perspective.

According to the Scriptures 1 cor 15:8f.

**Paul’s Hermeneutic**

**1. τύπος** - Type he employed ..

1 Thess 1: 7 For I do not want you to be ignorant of the **fact**, brothers and sisters, that our ancestors were all under the cloud and that they all passed through the sea. **2** They were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea. **3** They all ate the same spiritual food **4** and drank the same spiritual drink; for they drank from the spiritual rock that accompanied them, and that rock was Christ. **5** Nevertheless, God was not pleased with most of them; their bodies were scattered in the wilderness.

**6** Now these things occurred as examples to keep us from setting our hearts on evil things as they did

[**Nestle GNT 1904**](http://biblehub.com/nestle/1_corinthians/10.htm)

Ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κἀκεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν.

Here we see proper allegory even though the words mean different things,

Rom 5: 14 Adam is called a type of one to come.

[**English Standard Version**](http://biblehub.com/esv/romans/5.htm)

Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come

Gal. 4: 24

[**Nestle GNT 1904**](http://biblehub.com/nestle/galatians/4.htm)

ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο διαθῆκαι, μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ, (trans. meant allegorically)

Gal. 4: 24

**KJV**

Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar

**ESV**

[**24**](http://biblehub.com/galatians/4-24.htm)Now this may be interpreted allegorically: these women are two covenants. One is from Mount Sinai, bearing children for slavery; she is Hagar.

**2. Christocentric Interpretation**

True understanding comes from God. 2 cor 4:2, Rom 2:15

Everything is finally determined by its reference to Christ. John 2: 15 Zeal for you house has consumed me.

Not rabbinic method. With freedom Psalm 69: 9 in Rom 15: 3

[2](http://biblehub.com/romans/15-2.htm)Each of us is to please his neighbor for his good, to his edification. [3](http://biblehub.com/romans/15-3.htm)For even Christ did not please Himself; but as it is written, "THE REPROACHES OF THOSE WHO REPROACHED YOU FELL ON ME

2 cor 3: 14 f

**NT Interpretation**

**Hebrew Author**

**1. Typology very close to allegorization**. Grant 44.

Hebrews sees typified the person and work of Christ, Grant, 45.

These are the mysterious Melchizedek, priest-king of Salem (Gen. 14:17ff.; Hebrews7),

Jesus can be shown to have been foreshadowed in Melchizedek.

Grant, 33,

“The epistle to the Hebrews played an important role in the history

of exegesis. It encouraged the fancifulness of allegorists and

others who sought for hidden meanings in the Old Testament. At

the same time it achieved more positive results. Without the typological

method it would have been almost impossible for the early

church to retain its grasp on the Old Testament.

While the epistle to the Hebrews represents the most thorough

analysis of the Old Testament in typological terms which we possess

in the New Testament, there are many other examples of typology.”

**2. Christocentric Interpretation. Grant. 48**

Without faith the Old Testament history is no history,

but a collection of fragments. By means of the key of faith

the author of Hebrews finds in it a “cloud of witnesses” who like

Christians look to Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith (Heb.

12:2).

Grant, 54-55.

In conclusion we may say that the New Testament method of interpreting

the Old was generally that of typology. Types and

prophecies of the coming of Christ were sought throughout the Old

Testament and, with the life of Christ already known to all, they

were readily found. Only tentative statements of a theory of typology

are set forth. But had the earliest Christians been interested in

theory, it is likely that they would have expressed themselves

much as Justin does

For more studyings

**In** The New Testament Use of the Old Testament

<http://www.evidenceunseen.com/theology/scripture/hermeneutics/the-new-testament-use-of-the-old-testament/>

*By* [*James M. Rochford*](http://www.evidenceunseen.com/aboutjamesrochford/)

This view is also called “The Historical Progress of Revelation School.” Advocates would include Earle E. Ellis, Richard Longenecker,[7] Martin Pickup,[8] andWalterDunnett.

Under this school, the NT authors should be understood in terms of other contemporaneous rabbinic authors, as well as their hermeneutical methods. After all, the NT authors were largely Jewish, and they should be understood in this context. Richard Longenecker states, “The Jewish roots of Christianity make it *a priori* likely that the exegetical procedures of the New Testament would resemble, at least to some extent, those of Judaism of the time.”[9] These interpreters argue that we cannot understand the NT if we divorce it from its Jewish roots of midrashic interpretation. As a result, these scholars compare the NT use of the OT with common rabbinic methods of interpretation, such as midrash, pesher, and Hillel’s rules of interpretation.

Midrashic interpretation often noted word parallels, analogies, or other literary connections between authors. They viewed these as indicators of the Divine Mind speaking through all of the authors—not just individuals.[10] MartinPickupwrites,

The NT writers—like virtually all ancient Jewish interpreters—understood that, in a sense, there could be multiple meanings in the words of the OT, for a statement made in one context might convey another relevant truth when considered within another context that God had revealed. All of this was due to the intention of the omniscient God who gave the OT Scriptures to Israel as a partial unveiling, in the temporal realm, of his eternal plan.[11]

This school criticizes the grammatical-historical approach for exegeting a passage *first* (according to the author, audience, and historical circumstance), rather than considering the *part* in light of the *whole*. They argue that the OT documents are not simply scattered religious documents. While an individual passage should be interpreted grammatically and historically, advocates of this view hold that these parts should be interpreted in light of the whole narrative of salvation history. Since Jesus is at the heart of the entirety of the OT (Lk. 24:44), we should see him at the heart of all OT Scripture.

Of course, advocates of this view do not believe that we should use this method for the NT texts. Martin Pickup writes, “Midrashic exegesis and its process of recontextualization can be applied legitimately only to the books of the OT, not to the books of the NT. The authors of the NT use the midrashic technique to provide the final explanation of God’s OT mystery. One would not treat the explanation as if it were also a mystery. This is why Qumran’s sectarian literature midrashically exegetes the OT but not other sectarian literature, and why rabbinic midrash compilations ex­pound the OT but not other midrash compilations.”[12]

[7] Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Age* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.

[8] Pickup, Martin, “New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis.” *JETS* 51/2 (June 2008).

[9] Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Age* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975. 186.

[10] Pickup, Martin, “New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis.” *JETS* 51/2 (June 2008). 360.

[11] Pickup, Martin, “New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis.” *JETS* 51/2 (June 2008). 379.

[12] Pickup, Martin, “New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament: The Theological Rationale of Midrashic Exegesis.” *JETS* 51/2 (June 2008). 381.

**New Testament use of the Old Testament**

Theopedia

<http://www.theopedia.com/new-testament-use-of-the-old-testament>

New Testament use of the Old Testament

The New Testament use of the Old Testament is a topic in New Testament Studies where scholars study why NT authors quoted various OT passages. It is an important issue within the study of the interpretation of the Bible, especially in the area of messianic prophecies concerning Jesus. "The fourth edition of the United Bible Societies' Greek Testament (1993) lists 343 Old Testament quotations in the New Testament, as well as no fewer than 2,309 allusions and verbal parallels. The books most used are Psalms (79 quotations, 333 allusions), and Isaiah (66 quotations, 348 allusions). In the Book of Revelation, there are no formal quotations at all, but no fewer than 620 allusions."^[1]^ Furthermore, "the OT is quoted or alluded to in every NT writing except Philemon and 2 and 3 John."^[2]^

View of the OT

Relevance of the OT

The NT writers viewed the Old Testament as an entire unit. God was it's author, and the NT writers believed that what was written then still had meaning for their day and time. Because the OT was true, prophecy found within its texts were to also be regarded as true, meaning the promises that were made were to accompany an expectation of fulfillment.^[3]^ Paul's view of the OT fits this mold when he says that everything that "was written in former days was written for our instruction, that through endurance and through the encouragement of the Scriptures we might have hope" (Romans 15:4).

The OT as the Word of God

It should also be noted that the NT writers, including Jesus himself, believed the OT to be the Word of God. An often quoted passage, 2 Timothy 3:16 states that "All Scripture is God-breathed." The "all Scripture" is to be understood as a reference of Paul to the OT. Elsewhere, Paul writes that "They [the Jews] have been entrusted with the very words of God," (Rom 3:2). Jesus, while dealing with the topic of divorce, quotes Genesis 2:24 in Matthew 19:5. It is interesting to note that Genesis 2:24 is part of the narrative of creation rather than a direct utterance of God ^[4]^. Other general examples of the OT as the Word of God include Mark 12:36, Acts 1:16, Acts 28:25, and Hebrews 1:5-8.

Typology

The term typology comes from the Greek word typos which literally means "impression," or "mark". Also, "it is not so much a method of exegesis as it is a presupposition underlying the Jewish and Christian understandings of Scripture, particularly its historical portions" ^[5]^. The basic idea of typology is that the story of the past has some kind of bearing on the present. Furthermore, the present can be seen as having been foreshadowed in the biblical story. What makes typology different from allegory (see below) is that typology is closely tied to history.

Within typology, the event (or even person) that happened in the past is seen as the "type". For example, the great event of the exodus is seen as a "type" for the post-exilic return to the land of Israel (Isaiah 43:16-17). Moreover, Jesus gives a comparison of the judgment that fell on Sodom with the coming final judgment (Luke 17:28-30). Probably the best known example in the NT is that of Jonah's experience with that of Jesus' burial and resurrection. Yet, of all the writings in the NT, Hebrews makes the shows the most extensive use of typology (ibid., p. 134; Matt 12:40; Luke 11:30).

**Exegetical methods**

Differing exegetical methods existed during the time of the NT writers. By "exegetical methods" it is meant the methods by which individuals used to interpret portions of the Old Testament.

**Midrash**

Midrash comes from the Hebrew word darash, meaning "search" or even "commentary". It "entails searching the text for clarification beyond the obvious ^[6]^. In other words, midrash is a method which involves commentary on a specific passage of the Bible. "In 'searching' the sacred text, the rabbis attempted to update scriptural teaching to make it relevant to new circumstances and issues. This was approach was felt to be legitimate because Scripture was understood as divine in character and therefore could yield many meanings and applications..." ^[7]^. One of the best examples in the NT is John 6:25-59 which comments on Exodus 16:4, Psalm 78:24 (cf. Jn 6:31). Jesus' words are considered by some scholars as a running "commentary" on this passage found in the book of Exodus.

Light and heavy

One of the most significant midrashic methods is known as light and heavy. According to this method, if something is true in a less important, "light" situation, it proves important in a greater, "heavier", situation. For example, Jesus assures his disciples that since God cares for the birds (light), he also cares for them (heavy; Matt 6:26; cf. Luke 12:24). This method is usually recognized by an "if" statement followed by a "how much more...", found both in the words of Jesus and Paul (cf. Matt 7:11; Rom 5:10).

Equivalence

The rule of equivalence is seen when "passages clarify one another if they share common vocabulary ^[8]^. Consider 1 Peter 2:4-8 which quotes Isaiah 28:16, Psalm 118:22, and Isaiah 8:14. Here, the term "stone" is used in equivalent regulation. Another example is Jesus' use of 1 Samuel 21:6 in Mark 2:23-28.

**Pesher**

After the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), scholars concluded that these and other writings found were from a community called Qumran. The community was a group of Essenes, considered isolationists, who had split off and found the area known as Qumran. Qumran serves as a good example of the method of pesher, for at Qumran "scripture was viewed as containing mysteries in need of explanation. The 'pesher' was the explanation of the mystery", usually involved in prophecies ^[9]^. Examples include Acts 2:17-21 citing Joel 2:28-32, and Mark 12:10-11 citing Psalms 118:22-23 (cf. Eph 3:4-6).

**Allegorical**

Some NT writers also understood the OT allegorically. Caution is due, in that this method is the least common, yet its place and presence in the NT should still be noted. Allegorical interpretation typically involves a symbolic meaning found within a text. There is, to some degree, a deeper meaning that is beneath the obvious letter of the passage ^[10]^. The best known first-century allegorist was Philo of Alexandria. However, the most obvious example in the NT can be found in on of Paul's letters, Galatians 4:24-31. In this text, Sarah and Hagar symbolize two covenants. It should be noted that Jesus' parables are not allegories although they do sometimes contain allegorical features (ibid.; cf. Mark 12:1-9).
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