

Had the NT authors misused the OT?: An Examination for the NT use of the OT

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 23 January 2011

Preacher: Joseph H.S. Lee

[0 : 00] Welcome and introduce me. My name is Joe once again and it is a privilege and I'm honored to be here and to speak about this topic of the New Testament Museum of the Old Testament.

The interest of this study for me has been started and begun here in Vancouver at Regent College as I study biblical studies and theological studies.

So this is one of the subjects that I am interested in so that's why I brought this today. So hopefully it will be intriguing as well as interesting to you and we'll learn something for the benefit of our souls and for our Christian life.

So let us begin with a prayer, shall we? Father, we thank you for this morning and gathering us here today.

It is always mind-blowing to think about your scriptures and how you have revealed yourself to us in the words that we can understand.

[1 : 07] So God, I ask that as we are getting into this topic of how the New Testament writers brought the texts or the scripture to life, I ask that you will help us to understand your scripture better by doing so that we will understand you better and know you more in our lives so that we may live our lives for you and for your glory only.

We pray these things in Christ's name. Amen. Amen. Amen. Right before the last Christmas, the worldwide jewelry industry had its record-breaking news in its history.

BBC News says this, and I am quoting, One of the world's rarest diamond has sold for a record-breaking of \$46 million, 29 million pounds, that is, the highest price ever paid for a stone. The 24.78 carat fancy, intense pink diamond was sold to a well-known British dealer at an auction in Geneva. And it was purchased by a top diamond trader in the UK who bid by telephone. So \$46 million or 29 million pounds on a one phone call. Such a high value was put and the money was spent for this rare stone called pink diamond.

[2 : 44] If there is a rare pink diamond that is as much or more valuable as this in the field of biblical studies, I will think of the studies in the New Testament use of the Old Testament.

The reason I say that is because just like discerning a real and rare diamond like that requires a careful examination of each stone, the New Testament use of the Old Testament studies also requires a careful examination of variety aspects of scriptures and its texts.

And by paying a close attention to the texts of both Old Testament and the New Testament and their context and how the human authors, human writers of the New Testament use their scripture, namely the Old Testament, we may deepen our understanding of the scriptures and by doing so, our understanding of the capital A author of the scriptures, our God.

So as I was thinking about today's learners exchange session and this talk, I thought this topic of the New Testament and use of the Old Testament would be suitable for such time as this because we are on this sermon series of Romans.

And if you look at the first chapter of Romans, this is how Paul describes the gospel of Jesus Christ. He says, Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he had promised aforementioned by his prophets in the holy scriptures, concerning his son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead, by whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations for his name, among whom are we also the called of Jesus Christ, to all that be in Rome, beloved of

God, called to be saints.

[5 : 00] Grace to you, peace from God, our Father and Lord Jesus Christ. Did you hear that? Paul says the gospel of God was promised by the prophets in the holy scriptures concerning Jesus Christ.

So, from the very beginning of Romans, we can see that Paul takes the Old Testament scriptures very seriously when it comes to understanding of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

And this might explain why we see so many Old Testament scripture references in the letter of Paul to Rome.

And quite frankly, I think, it is very difficult, it is somewhat difficult, to understand and interpret Romans, unless we pay attention to how Paul uses his scriptures in his letter.

That's why I think this New Testament use of the Old Testament studies is a must for all Christians who read the Bible, who take the Bible seriously.

[6 : 09] And therefore, I present this talk and present this to you this morning. And hopefully, by doing this, it is my prayer that we all can benefit as we learn how to pay close attention to the context of the scriptures in both the Old Testament as well as the New Testament.

However, as almost every area or any area of biblical studies, the New Testament use of the Old Testament is not exceptional for debates and controversies.

But, with today's talk, it is not my aim to delineate all the problems and all the issues that were raised in this study or in this area, but it is my aim to provide or it is my aim to talk about, first, why the New Testament use of the Old Testament is important, and secondly, why or what this study entails, and secondly, I hope to look at one or two of the major issues in the New Testament use of the Old Testament, and lastly, I'll try to answer our main question that I proposed, has the New Testament authors or writers misused their Old Testament scriptures?

And hopefully, at the end, I'll draw some implication for all of us from the New Testament use of the Old Testament studies. So first, the New Testament use of the Old Testament.

Before I delineate any of the major issues, first, we need to think about the significance of the Old Testament references in the New Testament.

[8 : 01] And then after that, we'll look at the religious, social, and linguistic settings of the New Testament authors where they were writing their text. So in the New Testament, the Old Testament references are very significant, as you might have noticed from our studies in Romans.

C.H. Toy, one of the Old Testament scholars in the late 19th century and early 20th centuries, discovered that there are 613 clear Old Testament allusions and citations in the New Testament. Wilhelm Dietmar found 1640 Old Testament references, and Yujan Hün, I don't know how to say it exactly, but I might, I don't think I can do better than that.

He said there are 4,105 Old Testament references in the New Testament. Two more recent times, NA27, which is the Greek New Testament, in 27th edition, it lists there are 950 citations and allusions to the Old Testament.

And Bible Society's UBS Greek New Testament, the 4th edition, lists 2,500 Old Testament references out of 1,800 Old Testament verses.

[9 : 24] That's a lot of numbers. And late Professor Roger Nichol notes that, considering strictly only to the specific quotation and direct allusions in the New Testament, there are 278 Old Testament verses cited in the New Testament, 94, and I'm quoting now, 94 from the Pentateuch, which is the Torah, 5 books of the Bible, 5 books of Moses, 99 from the Prophets, and 85 from the Writings.

This is how Hebrew Bible is categorized. And out of the 22 books in the Hebrew Bible, there are only 6 books in the canon that are not explicitly referred to from the New Testament.

So as you can see, the Old Testament references or Old Testament texts are very important to the New Testament writers. Just think about our current sermon series, Paul's letter to Romans.

One recent New Testament scholar observes that, and I quote, Paul's letters contain about 100 explicit quotations concentrated in Romans with 60, Corinthians with 27, and Galatians with 10.

There are also 5 quotations in Ephesians and 2 in the pastoral letters or pastoral epistles. And especially if you have read or if you read Romans 9 through 11, it is the most concentrated section in the entire New Testament where I've counted about 26 or 27 explicit Old Testament citations in these 3 chapters.

[11 : 25] And this tells us how important, how significant the Old Testament was to the New Testament authors like Paul and others.

Now, we need to consider little background of the 1st century world for their religion, society, and culture and language because that's where the New Testament authors are writing their texts. So, for them, when we are talking about their scriptures, we're not talking about Old Testament and New Testament, but when they think about the Bible or scripture, they're thinking about the Old Testament for our Bible.

So, 1st century New Testament background. Religiously, the New Testament authors were writing largely from the 1st century Jewish perspective. Every single one of the New Testament authors was a Jew except Luke, who wrote two books of the New Testament, namely Luke and Acts, or Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts.

So, the 1st century Jewish perspective must be taken seriously for us to understand the kind of worldview these people were writing from. And for the 1st century Judaism, or so-called as the Second Temple Judaism, because they rebuilt the temple for the second time, we must note that Yahweh's dealings, or God's dealings with His people Israel, namely the history of Israel, Israel was taken seriously, and has to be taken seriously.

[13 : 07] That's why what represents this identity of Yahweh's people Israel, such as the Temple, Torah, which is the Old Testament laws, perhaps more accurately, the Old Testament moral and cultic instructions, were the integral parts of their history and identity.

That's why when the Jewish leaders thought that Jews, or Jewish leaders thought that Jesus was messing with the identity of Yahweh, the Temple, and Torah, they plotted to kill Him.

So, religiously, the identity of Israel as the people of Yahweh, and the Temple, and Torah, as representations of that identity, were very significant to the Jewish mind in the 1st century.

Now, the Second Temple Judaism and the Jews by this time, socially, were not a strictly just homogeneous religion or a people group.

There were many sects of the religious groups, such as Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Zealots, and others, because of their differences in religious and theological and also political aspects or perspective.

[14 : 27] Also, because the Jews were still under the influence of Hellenism of Greek, Alexander the Great, and Greek culture, and the rule of the Roman Empire, we cannot dismiss the importance of Greco-Roman culture and society in which all the authors and the recipients of the New Testament texts were recited in.

This means that their language and culture were multilingual and multicultural like ours today. You know, we think our Great Vancouver area or Greater Vancouver area is so multilingual and multicultural, and yes, that is true.

Many of us speak English and other languages, French, Chinese, Korean, and so on and so forth, but so were the Palestinian and Mediterranean regions of people in those regions in the first century.

Linguistically, Jews in Palestine perhaps, and this is also debated, perhaps spoke their regional dialect in Aramaic and also spoke and understood the lingua franca of the day in the Greco-Roman world, Koine Greek.

That's a common people's language in Greco-Roman world. This multilingual and multicultural environment was not new or foreign to any of the authors and the recipients of the New Testament.

[15 : 55] And this is a very important point because the entire New Testament books, the Gospels, the Book of Acts, the letters, and the Revelation of John were all, probably all, written in Koine Greek, with a few Aramaic words here and there.

So an average Jew from Galilee like Matthew, Mark, John, or even Jesus could be possibly trilingual with Aramaic, Hebrew, and Koine Greek.

And this also is debated issue. But we're not going to go there. One more important aspect we need to talk about now before discussing major issues in the New Testament use of the Old Testament is this question.

What were the scriptures for the New Testament authors and their recipients in the first century? In other words, what were the Old Testament scriptures that the New Testament authors based on their citations, allusions, and other references?

Just this morning as I was reciting Romans 1 verses 1-7, I was reading from King James Version deliberately because this year is year 2011 and it is the 400th anniversary of the King James Bible. [17:23] So I'm going to read all the passages today from King James Version unless it is necessary to translate the original Greek or Hebrew if it is necessary and hopefully that is okay with you.

It is not that I am a King James Bible only person or anything like that. It is just to commemorate the significance of King James Version in the Bible.

The scriptures that both the New Testament writers and their recipients or readers were familiar with were probably the Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures called Septuagint.

Many Palestinian Jews might have been more familiar with their Aramaic translation of the Hebrew Bible called Targum but the most people probably used Greek Bible.

And if you look at Acts chapter 17 verses 11 and 12, Paul encounters some Greeks who are studying the scripture every day in Berea even prior to their meeting with Paul.

[18:33] Verse 11 says, These were more noble than those in Thessalonica in that they received the word with all readiness of mind and searched the scriptures daily whether those things were so.

Therefore many of them believed also of honorable women which were Greeks and of men not a few. So these Greek men and women they were studying the scriptures daily and because they are in the Greco-Roman world and Greco-Roman society they probably used the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible which is the Septuagint.

So these Greeks most likely used the Septuagint as their scripture and studied them. But then the issues arise with this relationship to which scripture was the New Testament authors were using because not all once again I stress that not all scripture citations are strictly and precisely verbatim to the Septuagint the Greek scriptures or the Hebrew scriptures and I'll give you an example later when we talk about when we try to answer the main question if the New Testament writers misused the Old Testament scripture.

So now let us move on to some of the major issues in the New Testament use of the Old Testament studies. One of the major issues and probably the most controversial issue in the New Testament use of Old Testament studies is whether or not the New Testament authors use the Old Testament properly when they cite the Old Testament passages.

One of the well-known scholars to a popular audience Bart Ehrman you might have heard of him might not and one of his arguments against the gospel of Mark is this use of the Old Testament by Mark.

[20:41] From the beginning of the gospel of Mark Professor Ehrman notices from his textual critic studies that some manuscripts of Mark chapter 1 verse 2 have omitted the word Isaiah because the Old Testament passage that was quoted here in verse 2 was not from Isaiah but from Exodus and Malachi and I quote from his book misquoting Jesus sometimes scribes change their texts because they thought the text contained a factual error.

This appears to be the case at the very beginning of Mark where the author introduces his gospel by saying just as is written in Isaiah the prophet behold I am sending a messenger before your face makes straight his path.

The problem is that the beginning of the quotation is not from Isaiah at all but represents a combination of a passage from Exodus chapter 23 verse 20 and 1 from Malachi 3 verse 1.

Scribes recognized that this was a difficulty and so changed the text making it say just as is written in the prophets. Now there is no problem with the misattribution of the quotation but there can be little doubt concerning what Mark originally wrote.

the attribution to Isaiah is found in our earliest and best manuscripts. And as you can see in these two King James Version as well as English Standard Version the King James Version was relying on maybe more later manuscripts because the earlier manuscripts weren't discovered back in 1600 and as you can see in English Standard Version as it is written in Isaiah is put it back in inserted back in because we found more earlier or earlier manuscripts of the copy of Mark.

[22:52] So Bart Ehrman's argument is if you ever heard his lecture at Stanford University or his debates with other biblical scholars is that Mark just simply wasn't careful or he wasn't aware of his Old Testament references.

Therefore he made a huge mistake in his Gospel and accumulating all these mistakes and contradictions in the Gospels their account shouldn't be taken seriously as a historical account of

the life of Jesus.

But it was added or they were added to the Bible later for the evangelist or the early church's assertion for Jesus' resurrection and divinity and that's his basic argument.

Intriguing isn't it? However I should make a note here and say that for Bar Ehrman's statement here he's right to say that the attribution to Isaiah in Mark chapter 1 verse 2 is from the earliest and best manuscripts.

So it is most likely in the original Gospel of Mark. As far as New Testament textual criticism and manuscript studies I find some of his studies very helpful.

[24 : 11] But his conclusion against the evangelists Gospel writers Jesus' resurrection and the early church I find problematic. Also in Bar Ehrman's more recent book Jesus Interrupted in 2009 picked up on what other scholars in the past already asserted before.

His argument as well as other scholars' argument is that Matthew misused Isaiah 7 14 in Matthew chapter 1 23 the famous Emmanuel sayings or Emmanuel passage.

The argument goes like this. In Isaiah 7 14 the Hebrew word Alma means young woman rather than a virgin.

Matthew the evangelist intentionally dismissed this Hebrew word which means young woman and replaced it with the Greek word Parthenos Parthenos which means a virgin in order to construct his or early church's theological doctrine or theological concept of the virgin birth.

And you probably heard this argument before in the past and like the preacher of Ecclesiastes has said there is nothing new under the sun.

[25 : 37] Not only twisting so you can see how the New Testament and the Old Testament can be used against the church and the evangelists saying that there are twists in the meaning of the word in the Gospels therefore the Gospels are not reliable.

Not only twisting a meaning of the word between the Testaments became an issue but also some scholars assert that the New Testament authors used the Old Testament many times as free-willing proof texts to ascertain their theological convictions and drift away from the original Old Testament meanings and contexts.

Some of these scholars assert that New Testament authors' writers do this by conflating two Old Testament passages however they want just fit them together for their rhetorical and polemical use of the text.

There are many arguments for this few out there but one of the more recent developments has been around Paul's use of the Old Testament in his letters and one of the scholars who is an expert in this assert that Paul's use of conflated combined Old Testament citations is his rhetorical device adopted from the conflated Jewish tradition of the Old Testament scriptures.

So I'm going to use this example for my argument as well as my answer to the main question. So for example Paul uses a conflated citation from Isaiah chapter 59 verses 20 and 21 and Isaiah chapter 29 verse 7 in Romans chapter 11 verses 26 and 27.

[27 : 25] As you can see on the screen. Here Paul seems to follow closely to the substitution version of the Isaiah passages.

However, for some reason there are several discrepancies between Paul's citation and Isaiah passages. So I have examined three versions of how Paul uses Isaiah passages in Romans chapter 11, 26 and 27 in Greek.

The substitution version of Isaiah chapter 59 verses 20 and 21 and chapter 27 verse 9 and Hebrew version of the same Isaiah passages. Romans 11, 26 and Hebrew Bible.

Paul has used a different preposition from out of in Romans 11, 26 which is different from for the sake of in substitution or to Zion or to in Hebrew Bible.

So that's the first differences. And secondly, the half the half of, and secondly, the half of the Isaiah chapter 59 verse 21 has been omitted.

[28 : 57] It's gone. And it was replaced by Isaiah chapter 29 verse 7, not the whole verse, but just the middle part of the middle part of the verse 27 right here, verse 9 right here.

And that's really interesting. I don't know if you find that interesting, but that's really interesting for me. So I dug deeper. And I came across various explanations, and one of them was this issue of Paul's usage of a conflated Jewish tradition to fit and bolster his argument in his letter without much consideration to the context of Old Testament texts.

So the question is, is it really that Paul and other New Testament writers misused the Old Testament scripture, free willingly, without any consideration to the Old Testament context and their original meanings?

So, going to our main question. So has the New Testament authors misused the Old Testament? Did they really pay no attention to the context of the Old Testament passage?

passages they were making references or citations to? No, I believe they did pay a close attention to the Old Testament context. But what's been changed for the New Testament authors is that their lens, their lenses to see how the scripture and the history of Yahweh's people all fit together has changed.

[30 : 34] As they have witnessed the life, the death, and the resurrection of Jesus, the New Testament writers now recognize this person and works of Jesus Christ as the fulfillment, the continuation, and the culmination of Yahweh's dealings with his people.

And as they recognize this new reality, their hermeneutical, their interpretive lenses have been changed. But the Old Testament context and means have not changed.

Let me explain what I mean by that with this example from Romans chapter 11 verses 26 and 27. In Romans chapter 11 verse 26 to 27, both Isaiah 59 and Isaiah 29 are conflated, as I said before, used in Paul's argument that all Israel will be saved.

The reason why these two Isaiah passages are brought together is because of their context. If you examine the wider context of both passages, chapter 59 and 27, you will find two similarities.

[31 : 47] First, both passages in chapter 59 and chapter uh, both passages in chapter 59 and chapter 29, Yahweh, God is, is the redeemer warrior fighting against his enemies.

From Isaiah chapter 29, verse 1, Yahweh slays the serpent, the Libyathon from the sea. And from Isaiah 59, verse 15, from onward, Yahweh puts on his divine characters of righteousness, salvation, vengeance, and jealousy as his armor and engages in war.

And these two passages resemble Psalm 74, verses 13 and 14, 13 and 14, where the psalmist implores Yahweh to bring salvation to Israel, singing, and I quote, singing Yahweh's victory over his enemies at Red Sea or Red Sea in Exodus.

Therefore, there is correlation to Exodus and Moses' song in Exodus 15, verse 5, where he declares that Yahweh is a man of war.

And even before the Red Sea crossing in Exodus chapter 14, Moses declares that Yahweh will fight for you. So both Isaiah passages and Psalm passage have connection to Exodus imagery and motif.

[33 : 26] So that's the first thing that I found. Second thing I found is the context that followed after Isaiah passages as a result of Yahweh's mighty victory.

In Isaiah chapter 27, verses 12 and 13, Yahweh's victory will be fully realized in a redeemed worshipping people at the holy mountain at Jerusalem, namely Zion.

It doesn't say Zion, but the holy mountain at Jerusalem is Zion. And in Isaiah chapter 60, after 59, verses 10 to 12, the nations are gathered to see the glory of Yahweh at Zion, the holy mountain.

And the strangers to Jacob, Gentiles, are engaged in rebuilding Jerusalem and ministering to the people of Jacob. Therefore, the conflation of these two Isaiah passages was more natural to Paul because of their context with Redeemer warrior and new creation, new Exodus motifs in Yahweh's restoration of his people at Zion.

So the original meanings and the context have not been changed or dismissed or taken lightly. But how the Redeemer warrior, the Yahweh of Israel, brings new Exodus and new creation at what constitutes Yahweh's people in Paul's mind might have been changed.

[35 : 08] For he encountered the crucified and resurrected Messiah, Jesus. Now for Paul, Yahweh, the Redeemer warrior, is Jesus Christ.

And his crucifixion is the moment of the Redeemer coming to Zion for salvation and restoration of Israel. From there, this Zion, the worldwide people of Yahweh, will be reconstituted as Israel, the people of God, as they gather together to worship their Redeemer.

Israel. And this was promised through the prophet Isaiah in Isaiah 56 to 66. And it is now fully realized and fulfilled in the person and work of Jesus Christ.

So was Paul faithful to his scriptures? Yes, Paul was ever faithful to the scriptures as he teaches from the prophets of old.

And I believe this part of Romans 11 is the climax of the letter. As bringing all this to conclusion, I would like to ask ourselves, what implication or implications can we draw from this study?

[36 : 30] Many of us are not part of biblical scholarship and do not have academic or technical trainings in biblical languages or exegeses? Does this mean we cannot really engage in the New Testament study of the Old Testament?

No, I don't believe so. Yes, the New Testament use of the Old Testament studies does require some specialized linguistic, exegetical, and academic skills in order to engage with some scholarly work.

However, if we learn how to read the scriptures with their context in mind, not just bits and pieces of each verse, but the bigger or greater context, and if we ask ourselves right questions when reading the scriptures, I believe, we are able to learn how the New Testament authors or writers use the Old Testament.

And by doing so, we will learn how Yahweh, our Redeemer, has dealt with his people, Israel, in the past, faithfully, and how he will continue to deal with these worldwide people of God faithfully with his covenant love and mercy.

So the New Testament use of the Old Testament studies is about taking the history of people of God seriously and learning God's characters so that his people, we, may learn to live, bearing his image among his creation, and being a blessing to others, because that is what it means to be Israel from the first place, and it was demonstrated by our Lord Jesus Christ himself on the earth.

[38 : 11] Therefore, let us take our readings of the scriptures seriously and pay a close attention to the context of each reading and learn how God, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit work with his people, and so we may glorify him.

Thank you. I believe we have 10 or 15 minutes, so if you have questions or comments or suggestions or anything, this is a good time to do that, so please go ahead.

Yeah. Does your research give you any anxiety at all as you read it? don't trust it to your check-in-law directions?

Not really, because what I'm, well, even though I'm looking into some of the technical stuff in Hebrew and Greek scriptures, I think just the base of where my faith is in the character of God, and that's probably the more important than the little prepositions that I find, so it doesn't really shape my faith, but it just helps me to engage the scriptures in a deeper way, I think, and really try to understand that this is not just a book just dropped from heaven magically, but it was God used his people in putting this all together, so I think that human aspect of scripture is also intriguing for me, so yeah, it doesn't really shake, or doesn't give me any anxiety, yet, yet, I should say.

Yes, go ahead. somewhere along the line of the history of the Bible publishing industry, someone or somebody decided to publish the New Testament Bible only, so I want to comment on does it have an effect on how people read the Bible, read the New Testament and never read the Bible.

[40 : 44] Definitely, I mean, this is like I said before, there's nothing new under the sun, I mean, this was done back in second century in church history from Marcion, who was trying to just forget the Old Testament because God is God of vengeance there and not really God of love, so this is nothing new, but I think we need to take, I mean, in my opinion and opinions of others and our teachers as well, that we need to take the Old Testament seriously and how God, because God is our God's personal God and he engaged with his people, engaged with people in history, so if we just forget the history of Israel and how God dealt with his people, then I don't think we can have deeper understanding of what God is doing in the church.

Therefore, there's continuity, as well as discontinuity, but more continuity between what God is doing in the past and present, so I think that's what it means to be faithful to the scripture as well as to God who gave us the scripture, so I think that's, in my opinion, it's not a good idea to just have New Testament, but it is good to read both Old and New Testament.

Yes? The same type of question, I have friends who are New Testament people, and compared to my friends who are Old Testament people, one group is very frivolous and the other one extremely austere, and I've been trying to develop a statement that was, or two statements if I had to, but that was kind of say, you're both missing the point, and yet accept the altruism, so I was wondering what you would say about that.

Once again, that's not new in our biblical reading or even biblical scholarship, I mean, there's a book about Between the Testament, and a book called Between the Testaments, and the first section is just scholars who think we need to take Old Testament more seriously, and the second

part is with the scholars who say, we need to take New Testament more seriously, and the third part is, no, we need to take both seriously, so this is not nothing new, but I would say that the Old Testament is, so I would say that what is the scripture for Jesus when he was on the earth, and it was the Old Testament, so that's why we need to take Old Testament seriously, and then how we know the life and death and resurrection of Jesus, and what God is doing through church, is in the New Testament, that's why we need to take New Testament seriously, otherwise, I don't think we will have a fuller working of how God is dealing with his people, I think our God is personal God, so God deals with his people, and God engages us with love, grace, and justice, and righteousness, so without knowing, it's like how we engage others, unless I know this person's story, I will know that person, personally, I might know your name, I might know your face, but I wouldn't know you personally, and what made you who you are, and in your upbringings, so if we don't take the history seriously, I don't think we will, we are able to know God well, in a deeper way, so that's why I'll say, yes, let's take Old Testament seriously, I agree with you, but yes, I agree with you, let's take Newton seriously, yes, I agree with you, but no, we need to take both seriously. [44 : 34] Yes, go ahead. Are you telling us then that Matthew said to himself, I happen to know that the virgin birth is true, therefore, this new fact tells me what this Isaiah passage said.

That's interesting, yeah. It's unprecedented or common. Right. I avoid to answer that Bar-Erin's argument deliberately because of the time, but if we, I think, I mean, he is a good textual critic, and he does a good job in textual criticism, but his argument for that Matthew's passage is poorly done in my opinion, because if you look at the Septuagint version of Isaiah, that word for virgin is already used.

So Matthew is not just reading Hebrew and then make up the Greek word, or change it to different word in Greek. He's just quoting from the Septuagint or the Greek translation that was already translated in the past.

And the Hebrew word could mean both young woman and virgin. So I don't think Matthew is disregarding the original meaning, but I don't think the point there is not about virgin birth, in my opinion.

I think the point there is about God is Emmanuel, meaning that in Isaiah chapter 7, when Ahaz, the king Ahaz, asked for the sign for this age, and Isaiah the prophet says, yes, young woman or virgin will bear a son, and his name will be Emmanuel, meaning that when Yahweh is amongst us, in our idolatrous status, then we'll have judgment.

[46 : 21] I think that's the Isaiah context, and I think what Matthew is doing is using that as, yes, when Jesus Christ is on the earth, if we are idolaters, then there is judgment at Emmanuel, and right after that there is a name, Yeshua, Jesus, which means God saves us, so there is judgment and salvation, are hand in hand in the person and work of Jesus Christ, I think that's what Matthew is presenting there, so I don't think it's about virgin birth, but not that I believe virgin birth, I think Matthew and Luke, I think they're just testifying or taking account for what they heard and what they know from Mary, I think they're just testifying that, but I don't think that Matthew's passage is strictly about virgin birth, but it's more about who Jesus Christ is, he's the one who brings judgment and salvation, yeah.

Did Professor Erdman have a fundamentalist background? Well, that's his upbringing, he began his studies in biblical studies as a fundamentalist, and then after he went to evangelical school and doctorate studies, I think his upbringing didn't really, I mean his fundamentalistic view really didn't change, in my opinion, but he's just using that against the scripture and who Jesus Christ is, so, yeah.

Jim, can you have a comment from Dr. Patrick? Yes. On this issue, seeing the Dr. Patrick being very much involved in that. Yes, definitely. Would you mind?

Oh, no, I'll be honored. Okay, just get a point of view. Sure. Well, I would like to tell you about two books. The first is a book that I read, oh, I should think 60 years ago.

I remember its title, I can't remember its author, but the title was The Kingdom of God in Prophecy and Fulfillment.

[48 : 44] Prophecy, and in that book, the writer is working out what seems to me to be a profoundly true and very, very important and precious principle for the Bible student, namely, that prophecy, Old Testament prophecy, is given in terms of the dispensation that then was the divine order of things, which we know was in many respects typical of what was to come.

It was a picture, in other words, that was going to be fulfilled. The Kingdom of God, as I say, in prophecy, is presented in terms of the dispensation that operates at the time the prophecy is given, that is the Old Testament order of things, but the prophecy is fulfilled in terms of the fulfilled order of things, that is, the New Testament dispensation, and that's a theological truth, in light of which the New Testament writers adapt, and verbally adapt, the prophecies that they quote, again and again, working into their quotation the shift of dispensation.

That came as a tremendous flood of light into my mind at the time when I read the book. And for the last 60 years I've been studying Old Testament prophecy and New Testament quotation of it in terms of that principle, prophecy given in terms of the dispensation that then was, but fulfilled in terms of the dispensation that now is.

And all the knots seem to untie themselves before my mind as I do so. The second book is a book that I thought you were going to mention, actually, Joe.

I think its title is a commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament. book. It's a set of essays edited by Don Carson and Greg Beal.

[51 : 33] They are two top New Testament scholars of our day. And the essays work out in great detail exactly this principle that I've just stated did.

And that Joe has been assuming, working in terms of, shall I say, in just about everything that he said to us this morning. This has been the foundational assumption about Old Testament prophecy and the New Testament understanding of it, on which you've been building, Joe.

That's right, isn't it? That's right. And I think everybody ought to know that there is this elaborate dictionary length work of reference.

It's, oh, I don't know, it's about a thousand pages, I think, of smallish type. And the book weighs five or six pounds.

It looks like any Bible dictionary actually, one-volume Bible dictionary. You know how big those are. Well, as I say, I've not read every page of this volume, but I have read some and rejoiced at what I read it, because it's all been done in terms of this, as I believe, true and basic principle of Old Testament prophecy and the New Testament use of it.

[53 : 07] So, there were moments in what you were saying, Joe, when my heart prompted me to shout out, I didn't do it, but I wanted me to shout out, that's it, Joe, tell them, and don't feel, or refer to Beale and Carson, who are, well, who I, well, I'll say it this way, who I think have done a superb job in the way that they've edited this folder.

And I would say to chaps like Bart Ehrman, brother, I don't want to hear anything from you until you have digested Bart and Carson, Beale, sorry, and Carson, and when you've done so, relate your detailed criticisms of the New Testament, to what Beale and Carson have said.

Now, I don't know about Bart Ehrman, but who knows who we're going to meet before we get whisked off to glory. You cited him as a post-fundamentalist, as he called himself, who is now concerned as part of his mission as a scholar to tell us that the New Testament is full of mistakes. He wants us to know that. Well, I want to come back to him at the level of first principles. And these are the first principles that I want to rub his nose in. Well, that's what I wanted to say, and I hope that that hurts.

Thank you. Thank you, Dr. I just wanted to say that at the beginning it sounded like what you were saying as one of Paul's errors in translation sounded like you said when further writing manuscripts came to light, it actually was writing the way he was interpreting it.

[55 : 29] So, yes, that change in preposition from Hebrew to the substitution to the New Testament is there.

I mean, it's not like I'm going to compromise and say, no, it's all right for him to do that. But I think he deliberately did that because the way he understood those Isaiah passages and how that prophecy has been fulfilled in the person and work of Jesus Christ.

Because of that reality, I think that he, well, this could be debated, but in my opinion, I think that's why he changed that preposition purposefully. But even in your first slide, where you were quoting from King James Version and somewhere else, you said the manuscript came to light, sounded exactly like what he had already proposed that something meant, that the passage meant.

He quoted from Isaiah and the prophet, and then new manuscripts that it was from. Right, so there was no, as it is written in Isaiah, in the maybe later manuscripts, but it was discovered earlier, but then later, we discovered more manuscripts that were earlier that had Isaiah word in it.

So I think those were the original ones, or it was close to original, the gospel of Mark in my opinion, and Ehrman's argument against that is, I think what's happening is, because he's quoting from Malachi actually, Matthew's quoting from Malachi, and then verse 3 is from Isaiah 49, and 40 verse 9.

[57 : 11] So what Mark is doing is, both passages, it's not about, it's not about, both passages, not about really, just, just, it's about God sending a messenger for both passages, for Yahweh's presence, before Yahweh's presence.

So I think Malachi, the word Malachi means my messenger anyway, so whether it is Malachi who's the prophet in the tradition of Isaiah, or if it's the Malachi, the person Malachi, that's also debated, but I think the point in there is, is that both Malachi and Isaiah passages are in the context of Yahweh's presence, and before Yahweh's presence, Yahweh will send a messenger to prepare his way.

I think that's why Mark uses in the, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet, because it is Isaiah who who said it before Malachi, and it's in the same, same tradition of prophecy, and also in the same motif of new exodus or restoration as Yahweh comes for judgment and salvation.

So I think that's why Mark uses both Malachi and Isaiah there, or says Isaiah the prophet said this. So I don't think that's, yeah, go ahead.

Well, simply to either put what you just said, in the rabbinic manner of quoting the Old Testament, it's common for quotations to be strung together as a single message as here, and for the last bit of the what they call the catena of the chain of quotations, to have in itself the principle for interpreting the early units in the catena, which is what Mark was doing, you see, saying in effect that Isaiah's word, make straight the way of the Lord, that's the key to understanding the significance for us of the

[59 : 39] Malachi promise, that God will send his messenger before his face. But our habit, if we use a string of quotations, is for the first quotation, I mean, we do this in a bit, the first quotation in the chain, gives the key to understanding the second and the third and fourth of the limiters to pick up the chain.

And because this is our habit of mind, people, they don't see that we are the people whose linguistic convention has changed since the New Testament was written, it's rather that he's assuming we are the people who could see straight, and in the first century, they could only see crooked. But he wasn't like that. It's a different linguistic convention. Sure. Definitely. Yeah. Yeah. That's the whole other area of issues and debates on New Testament is a Old Testament is how much of the first or second temple Judaism and how rabbis use their scripture has influenced the New Testament writers.

But that's just a whole other time probably will take. Yes. Do you believe, or anybody that you have studied so far, is any New Testament writer capable of believing that Jesus brings with him the totally unprecedented, and that for which there is nothing by way of anticipation in Old Testament scripture?

Is that a possibility or do they rule that out? From the New Testament writers? Yes. I think in the first century, second temple Judaism, I don't think there is any anticipation of Messiah or the Messiah to be or Christ to be Yahweh himself.

[61 : 55] I don't think there's any anticipation of that. So how Mark presents Jesus as the Yahweh's presence who brings the new exodus and new creation, I think that's unprecedented in my opinion, to Jewish anticipation of Messiah in the first century.

Also, there was no anticipation among the first century Jewish minds for Messiah to perform healings or miracles, we usually call it.

I don't think there was any anticipation of that. That's why when Jesus heals, no one goes, oh, is this Messiah? No one say that because they don't have any idea that Messiah will bring healing, but in their mind, I think there is more of a political leader who will save them from the Roman Empire or so on and so forth.

So yes, I think in my opinion, New Testament writers, their understanding of Messiah and Christ wasn't anything that was anticipated by their contemporaries, in my opinion.

Does that answer? Well, therefore he's both anticipated and unprecedented, and that must put a stamp on the way they read Scripture.

[63 : 16] If it was totally unprecedented, they would have said, hey, maybe let's just forget about the Scripture. Because the unprecedented is right. Like, just, for example, like in Mark, Jesus was

with his disciples in a boat on the Sea of Galilee, and there's a storm, mighty wind, and so on, and then he calms the sea, and then disciples were warned, they weren't like, whoa, now we're saved.

No, they weren't like that. They were terrified, according to Mark. They were terrified. And their question was, who is this? Who is this?

And that is because only, there's only one person who could command the sea, and say, either part of the way, or come, or other things, and there's only one person, and that is Yahweh, the creator God.

That's why when they saw that, they were terrified. So definitely there was unprecedented in their minds, and they're like, who is this? And that happens over and over again.

So, yeah, definitely. Yes, sir? One of the interesting things for me was your early slide showing a kind of a history of this and different talents reached by different people.

[64 : 53] There is no number, per se. There are a set of numbers, and to me that says that there is a spectrum that extends from what you might call illusion to counting footnotes, and that it is not possible to count footnotes in this circumstance.

people probably very much would like to be able to count footnotes because that is a tradition that we have developed in terms of precise citation, at least in academic circumstances, rather than plagiarism.

so in this sort of context, how do you feel about the task of identifying what is in fact a citation? one thing that I didn't bring in this talk is because once again this is another hour or two hours, how many ever long we can spend, is the topic of illusions and indirect citation as illusions, and even some scholars call it echoes, illusions and echo, then they differentiate different things.

so I think those differences in numbers, I think it's because of not only just direct citations, but because they're counting the direct allusions as well as indirect allusions and echoes as well.

[66 : 36] Well, what are called allusions and what are called echoes is also debated among scholars, but I think what's significant in that is not which number is precise, but how significant the Old Testament scripture was to the New Testament, and also I think in my opinion the New Testament writers, their foundation and base of how they see Jesus Christ now is from their understanding of the Old Testament prophecies, as they have witnessed, I witnessed Jesus and what he does and how he lived his life.

So I think those numbers, yes, there are differences in numbers, but that just tells us how significant the study and how significant the Old Testament was to the New Testament in America.

Thanks so much. Oh, thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you.