PAUL'S QUOTATIONS OF ISAIAH 40:13a AND

ITS VALUE TO PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

by

Joe Bartemus

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Divinity in
Grace Theological Seminary
May 1983

Title: PAUL'S QUOTATION OF ISAIAH 40:13a AND ITS VALUE
           TO PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
Author: Joseph R. Bartemus
Degree: Master of Divinity
Date: May, 1983
Adviser: John Davis, Th.D.

The hermeneutical methodology which the New Testament writers used to interpret the Old Testament has often been a question which provides much intrigue to biblical scholarship. Paul quoted the Old Testament anywhere from eighty to ninety times or more. Some scholars feel that there are several occasions where Paul totally disregards and misuses the sense of the Old Testament text which he quotes. Others feel that Paul's hermeneutical methodology would fit into the category of literal, historical, and grammatical. Paul's use of Isaiah 40:13a in both Romans 11:34 and in 1 Corinthians 2:16 provides an interesting test case for this controversy.

The methodology used to understand Paul's quotations of Isaiah 40:13a is to, first of all, reach an understanding of the Old Testament passage. The LXX uses some unique words to translate תָּכַן and רוּחַ using γινώσκω and νοῦς respectively. Both of these translations are possible and fit the context of Isaiah rather well as the verse could read "who hath known the mind of the Lord." Paul quotes the LXX twice and in Romans he infers that no one has the mind of the Lord, while in 1 Corinthians he says "we have the mind of Christ." The explanation for these two different interpretations can be described as relating to progressive revelation (canonical hermeneutics) and the enlightenment possible through Christ.

This quotation can serve as a model to handle Paul's other Old Testament quotations. Of prime importance is to realize that Paul presupposed that the Old Testament was God's word. An analysis of the data shows that there really are not a great number of quotations where there is debate over whether Paul was literal in his hermeneutics. The relatively few problem verses do have a possible explanation. The final conclusion seems to be that if Paul did have a high view of Scripture, then it would be more likely valid to believe that he would not abuse its sense. Paul quoted the Old Testament using a literal, historical and grammatical hermeneutics.

Accepted by the Faculty of Grace Theological Seminary
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree
Master of Divinity

_____
                        Adviser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv

INTRODUCTION

The domain of biblical studies is extremely fasci-
nating, partly because of the intricate interrelationships
between many of the sub-disciplines. This particular study
brings out this point very clearly as hermeneutics, grammar,
exegesis, history, and other areas must be put together
coherently in order to solve a particular problem. The
problem to be discussed here is a question of hermeneutics
in regards to Paul's use of Isaiah 40:13a. Paul quotes the
passage twice, in Romans 11:34 and 1 Corinthians 2:14. At
first glance it appears that Paul quotes the passage giving
it two totally different interpretations. This paper will
attempt to argue that, in reality, Paul used a very literal,
historical, grammatical, hermeneutical methodology in quot-
ing Isaiah.

This paper will be divided into three chapters.
Chapter 1 will be a basic discussion of the interpretation
of Isaiah 40:13a. This chapter will discuss the textual
problems of the passage, then move into the important analy-
sis of the words תִּכֵּן and רוּחַ. The context of the passage
will also be carefully considered leading finally to a conclu-
sion as to the true interpretation of the passage. This in-
terpretation will be the grammatical, literal, historical
meaning of the passage which should be the same as the

1

meaning which Isaiah intended when he wrote.

Chapter 2 will move into the New Testament and Paul's quotations of the Isaiah passage. The words νοῦς and πνεῦμα will be considered as will the contexts of both passages. This chapter will conclude that Paul's hermeneutics were not faulty; he knew what Isaiah was saying, and he preserved the meaning of the Old Testament writer.

The final chapter of this paper is in the form of a suggestion for those studying the area of Paul's usage of the Old Testament in light of Paul's use of Isaiah 40:13a. The suggestion is that when investigating Paul's use of the Old Testament, the student should realize that Paul had an extremely high view of the Old Testament and therefore would not likely abuse its original meaning. Exegetes should first look to see how it might have been possible for Paul to have used a literal, historical, grammatical system of hermeneutics. Most often this is clear and the times when it is not, more study should be brought to bear on the passage in question. Simply stated the suggestion is that Paul's hermeneutic was a literal, historical, grammatical one, and good exegesis will discover this truth. This does not exclude typology or progressive revelation, but rather makes these aspects very important.

This last chapter is only a suggestion because the bulk of material covering Paul's use of the Old Testament is voluminous. The suggestion may be succeptible to challenge, but seems to be the correct direction in which to head. Rather

than assuming that Paul's hermeneutic was steeped in rabbinic tradition and was therefore at times fanciful, let the student assume that Paul had a high view of the Scripture and would not abuse its meaning. Starting with this view will make a lot of problem passages less problematic. In conclusion, Paul under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit says rather clearly, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable . . . ." (2 Tim 3:16). This gives the high and lofty basis for all in-depth biblical study.

CHAPTER I

INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH 40:13a

Any discussion of an Old Testament quotation in the
New Testament must first gain an adequate understanding of
the Old Testament passage as it stands in its context. This
chapter will attempt to do just that by considering three
major areas. The first area revolves around the various
texts which include this verse and the problems associated
therewith (textual criticism). The other two areas deal
with the context of the passage and in particular the word
תִּכֵּן and its meaning as well as רוּחַ and its meaning.

Problems of the Passage

To understand a passage, one must first know what it
says. This involves the art of textual criticism to determine
what the original actually stated. Appendix I sets up the
readings from various sources which are relevant to this
problem. Included are the Masoretic text, the Septuagint
(hereafter referred to as the LXX), Aramaic Targum, the Dead
Sea Scroll of Isaiah, the Vulgate, and the Greek of the New
Testament passages.

An analysis of these passages show that the problems
are not extremely great, but are worthy of consideration.
The Masoretic text, Aramaic Targum and the Dead Sea Scroll

4

of Isaiah are all basically the same. The Vulgate is a bit
unclear but seems to follow these ancient texts. The problem
comes with the Greek and the LXX. Paul is the only New
Testament writer to quote this passage and he quotes the
LXX translation. The problem with that translation revolves
around two words where the translators used γινώσκω for
תְּכֵן and νοῦς for רוּחַ. Both of these translations seem a bit
peculiar and are worthy of some investigation.

The Use of תְּכֵן

This word is probably the most controversial in the
passage. Its exact meaning is questionable as is the LXX
translation. This section will analyze the statistic data
on the term, opposing views as to its meaning, its context
and finally a conclusion as to its meaning.

Statistical Analysis

While statistics do not define any word in its con-
text, it is helpful to see how, when, and where it has been
used elsewhere. תְּכֵן is only used thirteen times in the
Masoretic text of the Old Testament.[1] The meaning usually
seems to revolve around the idea of weighing or measuring
as in Proverbs 16:2 "Lord weighs motives" and 1 Samuel 2:3
"with him actions are weighed."

The LXX uses a form of γινώσκω to translate תְּכֵן.
Of the thirteen uses of תְּכֵן there is only one other time

---

[1]Solomon Mandelkem, *Veteris Testament Concordantia*
(U. Verlagsanstalt: Akademische Druck, 1955), p. 1245.

when the LXX uses the translation of γινώσκω (Prov 24:12).
Seven other Greek words are used in various other contexts.[1]
The Greek term γινώσκω is usually used to translate לֵב.
Though γινώσκω does not usually translate תִּכֵּן, neither does
any other word making it a unique term to translate.

Controversy

Several scholars have written on this verse and have
disagreed as to the correctness of the translation in the
LXX. Alexander says that תִּכֵּן has nothing to do with knowing
but is rather a verb of measurement.[2] The LXX simply made a
poor translation. The Interpreter's Bible agrees saying
that the LXX is a poor translation because "knowing" is an
action of the לֵב (mind) not the רוּחַ (spirit).[3] These people
are content to merely conclude that the LXX is wrong, but
they do not grapple with the problem that Paul quotes from
the LXX.

There is another group of scholars who argue that
the translation of the LXX is a very viable translation here.
Whybray did quite a bit of work in this area and concluded
the meaning being "to adjust" or "estimate" by comparing to
a gauge.[4] The idea is more to estimate than to measure.

---

[1]Elmar Dos Santos, An Expanded Hebrew Index for the
Hatch Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint (Jerusalem:
Dugith Publishers, n.d.), p. 221.

[2]Joseph Alexander, Commentary on Prophecies of Isaiah
(Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1974), p. 104.

[3]George Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Bible,
Vol. V (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 436.

[4]G. Whybray, The Heavenly Counselor in Isaiah 40:13-14
(Cambridge: The University Press, 1971).

Bruce Waltke adds his agreement by saying the LXX has a correct translation. The passage refers to the orderliness of the universe coming from an orderly creative mind which no one can know.[1]

Driver says that the term תָּכֵן has its etymological roots in the word כון which means to "set straight or adjust."[2] The idea of measured crept in later and was not the original idea of the word. This idea is also possible in Isaiah 40:12 in the immediate close context. To adjust or estimate or gauge something, one must know the item being estimated. This led to the translation of the LXX.

Context and Conclusion

The context is very important in determining the meaning of words. Isaiah 40 describes the transcendence of the great God. In verse 12 the term תִּכֵּן could have the idea of "Who adjusted the heavens with a span." Verse 13 then goes on to say "who has adjusted (or known) the mind (or spirit) of the Lord." It would fit the context to say that no one knows the transcendent God. The LXX therefore is at least permissible contextually.

A conclusion summarizing the arguments seems to be appropriate. There is no doubt that γινώσκω is an unusual translation in the LXX for תִּכֵּן, but it must be noted that

---

[1]Bruce Waltke, "תָּכֵן," in Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, ed. R. Laird Harris (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), p. 970.

[2]G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes," Vetus Testamentum 2 1 (January 1921):241-43.

there is no common translation for that Hebrew word. The meaning of the term תִּכֵּן is flexible with "adjusted" or "fixed" as a preferable definition over the idea of measurement, though "to measure" is possible. The etymology of תִּכֵן goes back to כון which has the possible semantic meaning in the cognitive domain as in Deuteronomy 17:4. "To Know" (γινώσκω) is a possible and viable translation of "fixed" or "adjusted" because of the cognitive activity of the verb. The context of Isaiah 40 does not prohibit the idea of γινώσκω for תִּכֵן. All of these arguments together make it clear that the LXX has provided a valid translation in this passage.

The Use of רוּחַ

In the above discussion one of the two problem words in this passage was discussed in detail. There is one other word which must also be considered before one can correctly interpret Isaiah 40:13a and Paul's subsequent usage of that passage. That other word is a common Old Testament word, רוּחַ. This study will cover the lexical meaning of רוּחַ in the Old Testament in a general sense, then will consider the LXX translation, and finally will observe the context and make some conclusions.

Lexical Meaning of רוּחַ

A full scale lexical analysis of this term could easily make a complete thesis and much work has already been done in this area. The term has a rather broad semantic

range of meaning, but can be summarized as Whitlock does in
at least four major domains as follows: 1) Breath or wind
(Gen 8:1); 2) Spirit (Hosea 4:12); 3) Will and counsel
(1 Chron 5:26); 4) Intellect (Isa 29:24).[1] In its earliest
stage רוּחַ came to be used of the Spirit of God as that
through which the power of God is manifested as in creation[2]
(Gen 1:2). There is no doubt that often when רוּחַ is
referring to God, it does not refer to His essence, but His
power or some aspect of His character. It can be easily
shown that רוּחַ may at times refer to the seat or organ of
mental activity as is shown in passages such as Exodus 28:3
and Deuteronomy 34:9.[3]

LXX Translation

The potential problem in this passage comes from
the use in the LXX of νοῦς for רוּחַ. Of the hundreds of
times רוּחַ is used in the Old Testament this is the only time
the LXX uses the translation of νοῦς. The word πνεῦμα is
used 268 times and ἄνεμος is used forty-nine times being
the most common words to translate רוּחַ, while there are

---

[1]Glenn Whitlock, "The Structure of Personality in
Hebrew Psychology," Interpretation 14:1 (January 1960):3-18.

[2]Ernest Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary
on the Epistle to the Galatians (New York: Charles Scribner's
Son, 1920), pp. 486-92.

[3]Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, Charles Briggs, editors,
A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (New York:
Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1906), p. 925.

twenty-five other Greek words used less than seven times to translate רוּחַ.[1] Several of these terms used are only used once, so νοῦς is not unique in its single use. The conclusion would be that νοῦςis not a common translation, but it is not the only word to be used once for רוּחַ in the LXX.

Another angle to the same problem is an analysis of the times νοῦς is used in LXX. It is used thirty-two times of which twenty-five translate לֵב. This is the only place νοῦς is used for רוּחַ.[2] The conclusion to this statistical analysis could be twofold. First of all, νοῦς is a very uncommon translation, but not unique because other Greek words were used only once also. Secondly, it would seem likely that the ancient translators intended to give a unique nuance to the word רוּחַ in Isaiah 40:13a so they used this irregular translation, possibly for emphasis. Paul also picked up this idea by using the LXX in his quotations. This conclusion is at least possible and likely probable.

Context and Conclusion

The context is very helpful in validating the LXX translation. The passage seems to be in a chiastic relation to verse 14. It seems to be an ABBA structure.[3] This being

---

[1]Dos Santos, Expanded Hebrew Index, p. 190.

[2]Edwin Hatch, Henry Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint, Vol. 2 (Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck U. Verlagsanstalt, 1952), p. 950.

[3]E. J. Young, The Book of Isaiah, Vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 45-46.

the case, רוּחַ would parallel teaching and knowledge giving
it a very cognative idea. νοῦς would fit in nicely in this
type of context to refer to an action of the mind. The
whole chapter is referring to the transcendence of God, and
these particular verses are alluding to the transcendence
of His intellectual capacities. The context makes νοῦς a
very legitimate translation.

A conclusion summarizing the arguments would again
be appropriate here. There is no doubt that νοῦς is an
unusual translation for רוּחַ, but there are other unusual
words also used by the LXX to translate רוּחַ, so it is not
totally unique. νοῦς is definitely within the semantic
range of meanings for the word רוּחַ, and the context of the
passage makes it appear to be a very good word to convey
the idea of the passage. All these concepts together indicate
that the LXX has a good translation of this verse.

Conclusion to Chapter One

The purpose of this chapter was mainly to come up
with a correct interpretation of Isaiah 40:13a and in
particular its translation in the LXX. Paul in the New
Testament quotes from the LXX which appears to have a
different meaning than the Hebrew text. The controversy
revolves around the translation using γινώσκω for תָּכֵן and
νοῦς for רוּחַ. In both cases the words used are rather
irregular, but valid translations, and the text of the LXX
has been shown to very adequately portray the idea of the

Hebrew text in Isaiah 40:13a. Paul, therefore, does not abuse the original text when he uses the wording of the LXX in his quotations.

CHAPTER II

AN ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S QUOTATIONS
OF ISAIAH 40:13a

Paul was a very avid quoter of the Old Testament as
will be shown in greater detail in the next chapter.
Appendix I shows the Greek text of Paul's two quotations of
Isaiah 40:13a. Both passages use exactly the same Greek
constructions and are the same as the LXX with the addition
of the Greek γαρ.

The real problem comes in the area of hermeneutics
and Paul's use of this Old Testament passage. Chapter I
has shown that the LXX correctly translated the Hebrew text
of Isaiah 40:13a. It would seem most probable that the
people to whom Paul was writing would be familiar with this
very common Old Testament passage.[1] The problem comes from
the seemingly different ways that Paul uses this passage in
his quotations. In Romans 11:34 Paul infers that no one
knows the mind of God, then in 1 Corinthians 2:16 Paul says
"we have the mind of Christ." These seem to be contradictory
statements both referring back to the same Old Testament
passage. In the editor's note in Calvin's commentary, the
editor says that Paul must have let his eye slip in his

---

[1]Henry Jacobs, The Lutheran Commentary, Vol. 7
(New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1896), p. 250.

memory to verse 12 of Isaiah and the word "weighed."[1] If
this is the case, Paul's hermeneutical methodology would be
definitely suspect.

This chapter will assert that Paul used a literal,
grammatical, historical method of interpretation in these
particular quotations. In an attempt to support this state-
ment, there will be four categories of argument. First
will be an investigation of the meaning of νοῦς in the New
Testament. Next the context of Romans 11:34 will be con-
sidered. Thirdly, the context of 1 Corinthians 2:13 will
be analyzed with the fourth section summarizing and colating
all the data.

The Use of νοῦς in the New Testament

As with other words discussed in this thesis, the
word νοῦς could be the subject of a full paper. The needs
of this paper do not necessitate such an indepth study, but
the word does need to be investigated. This section will
look at the lexical meaning of νοῦς, the relation of νοῦς
to Greek mysticism, and the relation of νοῦς to πνεῦμα.

Lexical Range of Meaning

The term νοῦς as with רוח has a very broad range of
meaning. Some of the possible meanings will now be dis-
cussed. The νοῦς could have the idea of the spirit which

---

[1]John Calvin, Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the
Apostle to the Corinthians, trans. by John Pringle (Grand
Rapids: Baker Book Company, 1979), p. 119.

is the source of thoughts, counsels, and plans.[1] The emphasis
is more on the action rather than the essence. Along the
same line is the idea that the νοῦς is the "mystery, wisdom,
and power of God. The mind of the Lord is the affairs of
God's Spirit . . . all this is the permanent possession of
the Christian community."[2] This idea is further carried as
Moffatt says that this νοῦς that Paul is referring to is the
spiritual mind or actually Christ's thoughts as revealed
in the cross.[3] This whole concept that νοῦς can be an
action and not merely an essence is well stated by Godet
in saying, "the minister of a sovereign can say after an
intimate conversation with his king 'I am in full possession
of my master's mind.'"[4]

   While the previous definitions of νοῦς will be most
helpful in this paper, there are other ideas which should
be mentioned. Behm says that νοῦς has no precise meaning,
but could mean 1) Mind--Romans 1:28; 2) Understanding--
Philippians 4:7; 3) Practical reason--Romans 7:22; or

---

[1]Charles Kling, "Corinthian Epistles," in Commentary
on the Holy Scriptures, ed. John Lange, trans. Philip Schaff
(Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 63.

[2]William Orr, James Walther, I Corinthians--A New
Translation (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1976),
p. 167.

[3]James Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the
Corinthians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943), p. 34.

[4]F. Godet, Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul
to the Corinthians, trans. A. Cusin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan
Publishing Company, 1957), p. 163.

4) Thoughts.[1] He continues on to say that νοῦς in the two passages under consideration has to do with the saving purpose of God or the hidden plan of salvation.[2] The idea to be emphasized is the broad range of ideas possible behind the word νοῦς and the definite legitimacy of the idea that νοῦς refers to an action more than essence.

Relation of νοῦς to Greek Mysticism

This may be a slightly minor point under the definition of νοῦς, but it does seem to carry some importance in the hearer's understanding of the term. At the time of Paul's writing it was common for the Greeks in their mystery religions to use the term νοῦς to equate πνεῦμα, which they defined as the divine element.[3] They looked at the mind as being a divine aspect of one's spirit. Paul was not at all a mystic, but, as Younger points out, he was aware of the Old Testament Hebrew for רוּם and he did know the Greek idea of νοῦς and πνεῦμα.[4]

Scroggs goes on to point out that these passages under consideration are the only times that Paul uses νοῦς in a way that would appear to be similar to πνεῦμα.[5] This

---

[1]Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, s.v. "νοῦς," by J. Behm, 4:958.

[2]Ibid., p. 959.

[3]Ibid., p. 958.

[4]Paul Younger, "A New Start Towards a Doctrine of the Spirit," Canadian Journal of Theology 13 (April 1967):123-33.

[5]Robin Scroggs, "Paul: σοφος and πνευμα," NT Studies 14:1 (October 1967):33-55.

evidence points to the idea that Paul, though definitely not a mystic, used the language of a mystic (νοῦς) to refer to the concept behind רוּחַ in Isaiah 40:13a as the writers of the LXX did. This would be understandable to the people and communicate the correct idea.

Relation of νοῦς to πνεῦμα

There seems to have risen a debate as to whether the term νοῦς can be equated to πνεῦμα. This is important to determine because if the two cannot be related it is likely that Paul abused the idea of רוּחַ in Isaiah 40:13a. The previous discussion gave the evidence from the mystery religions that νοῦς is closely associated with πνεῦμα. Now arguments will be presented on both sides in relation to the New Testament evidence.

Several commentators feel that the two terms cannot be equated. Thomas Edwards says that the νοῦς is not the πνεῦμα of God, but the intellect or mind of God.[1] Godet adds his voice to this opinion stating emphatically that νοῦς is not synonymous with the spirit.[2] One of the problems with this position is that if it is true, it needs to explain how this could fit into Paul's use of Isaiah 40:13a, unless he merely abused the Old Testament meaning.

---

[1] Thomas Edwards, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897), p. 68.

[2] F. Godet, Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, p. 163.

There are several scholars, on the other hand, which say that νοῦς and πνεῦμα are equated. Arthur Stanley states that νοῦς is equal to πνεῦμα showing that the LXX is correct in its translation. Robertson and Plummer are even more descriptive as they say that "in God, νοῦς and πνεῦμα are identical."[1] This is similar to verse 14 as it relates to man. The difference between these two words is that νοῦς is suitable to denote divine knowledge while πνεῦμα shows divine action.

In briefly observing these arguments it would seem most likely appropriate to say that in God νοῦς and πνεῦμα are similar. They are the same entity with different aspects being described; the spirit is the agent by which the mind of God is communicated. This equation is crucial to Paul's quote. Paul was careful to use a term which would adequately communicate the idea of רוּח or πνεῦμα. νοῦς does this very capably as the compilers of the LXX understood.

Context of Romans 11:34

In Romans 11:34 Paul quotes Isaiah 40:13. Of the two times that Paul quotes this passage, this one is the most similar in meaning to the passage of Isaiah. Both passages are referring to the greatness and transcendence of God. In Isaiah the writer is talking of God's knowledge in creation and Paul takes the same idea and extends it to

[1]Archibald Robertson, Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1916), pp. 50-51.

God's whole providential government.[1] The Romans would see
this quote and would be able to clearly see the great
transcendence of God. Paul communicates the same idea as
Isaiah did in this short quotation.

It is also interesting to note that Paul often uses
an Old Testament quotation to validate his arguments. In
Romans 9-11 he quotes Isaiah 1:9; 6:9; 8:14; 10:22-23; 28:16;
53:1; 65:1-2 to illustrate Israel's fall. Then he also uses
Isaiah 27:9; 52:7 and 59:20 as evidence of their recovery.[2]
The quotation of Romans 11:34 is used to validate Paul's
argument also. Verses 33 and 36 are doxologies where Paul
is praising God. Verses 34 and 35 are composites of short
Hebrew verses to support the doxologies.[3] Paul's scheme is
well thought out and the Hebrew verse of Isaiah 40:13a is a
very proper verse to use in support of his argument.

The message of Romans 11 is that God's mind and plan
are great and far above man--no one can know Him. This is
the same message of Isaiah 40 where God's transcendence is
very obvious and declared with clarity. It seems very easy
to say that Paul used a literal, grammatical, historical,
hermeneutical methodology in using Isaiah 40:13a in his
verse in Romans 11:34.

---

[1]F. Godet, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,
trans. by A. Cusin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing
Company, 1956), p. 418.

[2]W. Kay, "Romans," in The Bible Commentary, Vol. 5,
ed. F. C. Cook (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883),
p. 226.

[3]Dale Moody, "Romans," in Broadman Bible Commentary,
Vol. 10 (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1970), p. 247.

Context of I Corinthians 2:16

The real tension comes when one attempts to reconcile
I Corinthians 2:16 with Isaiah 40:13 and Romans 11:34. The
passages have much in common but the actual interpretation
of I Corinthians 2:16 seems quite different. Unlike the
other passages, I Corinthians says that "we have the mind of
Christ." If the mind of the Lord is above us, how can we
also possess this; and further, how can Paul quote this
Old Testament passage for this point?

The passages actually have quite a bit in common.
All three talk about the mind of God which includes His
plan. Romans and I Corinthians seem to be referring to the
saving plan of God, while Isaiah talks of the creative plan
of God, but all have in mind God's plan of action. Romans
leaves the reader with the idea that God's mind can not
be known and there the concept ends. In I Corinthians Paul
has the same idea but goes on to add a new concept, "but
we have the mind of Christ." Paul does not contradict the
message of Isaiah, but adds to the revelation along the
idea of progressive revelation.

The question is, "how can the mind of God be
unknown, yet known"? Kasemann gives a good suggestion as
he says that "Since all theology is defined by the dis-
tinction between the gracious God and fallen creature . . .
the divine ways cannot be grasped by the reason and might
of the world."[1] He goes on in the same passage to say that

---

[1]Ernst Kasemann, Commentary on Romans, trans. Geoffrey
Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,
1980), p. 319.

"pneumatics know about what is hidden from the world because God has revealed his will." The idea is simply that Paul understood the Old Testament concept of Isaiah 40:13a, but also had further revelation that Christ would allow people to share in His mind.

The question of the mind of Christ is quite interesting though not exactly within the scope of this paper. A short comment may be helpful nevertheless. This is the only passage where the "mind of Christ" is mentioned in this manner. Paul uses the mind here in an anthropomorphic expression expressing an activity of the mind. Some have suggested that this mind of Christ equals the Holy Spirit[1] which has interesting implications with רוּחַ.

It would seem more likely that the νοῦς of Christ does have to do with the spirit of God, but not the divine Holy Spirit. Christ's spirit in this type of context is His own "power of self-consciousness and also the gift of spiritual insight given to man so he can understand God."[2] To have the mind of Christ is to be one with Christ as in salvation. As believers, Christians have the spirit of Christ, or the mind of Christ. This is explained:

[1]F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), p. 319.

[2]Margaret Thrall, The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 27.

The Spirit for Paul has been constitutively stamped with
the character of Christ. Christ by his resurrection
entered wholly upon the realm of the Spirit (Rom 1:4;
8:11).[1]

This renders great importance to having the mind of Christ.

After having briefly analyzed the concept behind the
"mind of Christ," the ultimate question is how Paul can
use the Old Testament passage here. A very satisfactory
answer is to use a methodology known as the canonical method
of understanding the Bible. This methodology says that the
whole Bible is a unity and can legitimately be interpreted
together.[2] The Isaiah passage says that no one can know
the mind of the Lord. The New Testament comes along and
says that the natural man cannot know the spirit or mind of
God, but believers have the mind of Christ. They are in
Christ and He is in them so they are able to know what
unbelievers cannot know. Christ becomes the answer to the
ignorance of Isaiah 40:13a.

Conclusion to Chapter Two

This chapter has attempted to take an honest look
at the two quotations by Paul of Isaiah 40:13a to see how
Paul interpreted that passage. The Greek word νοῦς was
shown to have a close association with πνεῦμα which would
be understood by Paul's readers. This explains partly why
Paul would quote the LXX which used νοῦς for רוח. An analysis

---

[1]J. D. G. Dunn, "Spirit," in New International
Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Vol. 3, ed. Colin
Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1979), p. 703.

[2]Brevrand Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament
As Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 73.

of the context of Romans 11:34 showed that Paul definitely understood the Old Testament passage which he quoted, as the contexts of Isaiah and Romans are very similar.

Finally, the context of the more difficult passage in I Corinthians was considered. It was shown that there were many similarities between the passages in Isaiah, Romans, and I Corinthians. The problem aspect is the phrase "we have the mind of Christ." In light of the value of a canonical approach to the Scripture and the reality of progressive revelation, it is clear that Paul understood and correctly used the Old Testament passage, then exclaimed that with the advent of Christ, believers can possess the νοῦς of Christ as a result of the new birth. The ultimate conclusion of this chapter is that Paul used a legitimate, grammatical, historical, literal method of interpretation in his use of the Old Testament.

CHAPTER III

AN APPRAISAL AND SUGGESTION REGARDING
PAULINE QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

This final chapter in this thesis will be an
attempt to sort out some of the massive amount of data on
Paul's use of the Old Testament and make at least one important
suggestion with regard to hermeneutical methodology in
this domain. This chapter will include three major sections
to be considered briefly and by no means exhaustively.
The first section will discuss the general topic of Paul's
view of the Old Testament and more specifically his quota-
tions thereof. The second section of this chapter will
attempt to analyze the current debate in conservative
circles as to whether Paul was literal, historical and
grammatical in his quotations or not. The final section
will be in the form of a suggestion stating merely that
the exegete should first look for the explanation of Paul's
hermeneutic on any given passage in the domain of a
literal, historical and grammatical interpretation.

The significance of this whole topic is very crucial
and important to conservative, evangelical theology. The
whole subject of the use of the Old Testament in the New
is getting a great deal of press, and the solutions suggested
for some of the problems can open the door for real problems

in one's theology. S. Lewis Johnson very capably discusses this topic and states at least seven areas of theology where one's view of the Old Testament in the New is influential. It can influence 1) one's view of the authenticity of Jesus' words; 2) one's hermeneutical methodology; 3) the deity of Christ; 4) one's view of typology; 5) one's view of women; 6) one's view of spiritualizing prophecy; and 7) one's view of inspiration.[1] Of utmost concern to this writer and in the specific area of Pauline Old Testament quotations is Paul's view of Scripture. The question to be answered is this--"If Paul did not correctly represent the Old Testament when he quoted it, what did he consider its value to be?"

In the whole area of theology (as well as any other area of life), a person will never rise to a position higher than their presuppositions. This paper will presuppose that God has revealed Himself in His Word--the Old and New Testaments. That revelation is exactly what God wants man to know; is without error; and is of infinite value. Paul believed similarly, and from that starting point, an analysis of his quotations of the Old Testament will be extremely valuable.

---

[1]S. Lewis Johnson, The Old Testament in the New (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980), p. 13.

Paul's View of the Old Testament
and His Quotations

This discussion must be the starting point for any evaluation of Paul's use of the Old Testament. It includes the deductive as well as inductive elements. The first section is the deductive aspect which looks at Paul's presupposition, namely, what he believed about the nature of the Old Testament which he quoted. The second section deals with the more inductive element looking at all the Pauline quotations and briefly evaluating them.

Paul's View of Scripture

For Paul his Scripture was obviously only the Old Testament, but it does not take long to see that Paul understood the supernatural nature of the holy text. His high view of Scripture is proved by a number of different factors. Roger Nicole presents three of these factors which show Paul to hold the Old Testament in high regard.[1] First, in referring to the Old Testament, Paul calls it Scripture signifying its unique status. In Romans 4:3 Paul quotes Genesis 15:6 and calls it Scripture. Most often when Paul refers to the Old Testament, he calls it Scripture. Secondly, Paul argues from the Old Testament assuming that there is no higher court of appeal. In Romans 4:3 again, Paul uses the Old Testament example of

---

[1]Roger Nicole, "New Testament Use of the Old Testament," in Revelation and the Bible, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958), p. 139.

Abraham to prove that salvation is by faith alone. The third point made by Nicole was that often in the introductory formulas, Paul shows that God is the divine author of the Old Testament. An example of this is in Romans 9:25 when Paul says that God spoke through Hosea.

Paul saw the Old Testament as being "God-breathed" (2 Tim 3:16) and therefore, a revelation of the true God. Ellis sums it up by saying, "To him (Paul) the Scriptures are holy and prophetic (Rom 1:2), they constitute the very oracles of God (Rom 3:1-2), and they were written for our learning."[1] Can there be any doubt that Paul had a high and lofty view of the self revelation of the infinite God in the inscripturated Old Testament? This statement should be the starting point for an evaluation of Paul's use of the Old Testament because it was Paul's starting point when he quoted. He believed he was quoting God's Word. Deductively, therefore, one might deduce that since Paul had such a high view of the Old Testament, he would be unlikely to abuse its sense in his quotations. Nicole even goes on to say that "The doctrine of verbal inspiration requires that we should accept any New Testament interpretation of an Old Testament text as legitimate."[2]

---

[1]E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981), p. 20.

[2]Roger Nicole, "New Testament Use of the Old Testament," p. 149.

One of the strongest arguments for Paul's high view of the Old Testament is the fact that he is very ready and willing to quote and refer to it in his discussions. This paper is dealing only with quotations (not allusions) and there are anywhere from eighty-three[1] to ninety-three[2] quotations, depending on who is counting. Most of the quotations are in the Hautbriefe (Romans, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, and Gal) with over half of those being in Romans alone. There is definite significance to Paul's quotations and at least part of the significance is that Paul held the text of Scripture to be very important.

Paul does not always use quotations for the same literary purpose. Professor Wallace has suggested at least five different uses which New Testament writers found for the Old Testament.[3] First, they may use it for illustration as Paul did in 1 Corinthians 1:19. Secondly, it can be used to make applications as in Romans 9:15. Thirdly, the New Testament writer may have the idea that he is writing in fulfillment of an Old Testament prophecy as in Romans 9:7. Sometimes, fourthly, the Old Testament may be

---

[1] Richard Longnecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), pp. 108-11.

[2] E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, pp. 150-52.

[3] Daniel Wallace, "A Very Brief Introduction to the New Testament's Use of the Old," in Supplementary Packet for New Testament Exegetical Methods (Dallas: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1980), p. 7.

cited for a rhetorical use as in Romans 10:15, and finally
(and very frequently) it may be quoted for some theological
purpose. Other reasons may be construed for Paul's inten-
tion behind quoting the Old Testament, but it is rather
clear that Paul had a high view of this portion of Scrip-
ture and found it very helpful in his own writings as
directed by the inspiring work of the Holy Spirit.

When studying the vast sphere of Pauline usage of
the Old Testament, many areas should be addressed. This
paper is only concerned with the simple question as to
whether Paul used a literal hermeneutic or not in inter-
preting the Old Testament which he quoted. A study of the
whole field could however include a look at Paul's use
of the LXX over the Hebrew text. The quotations of Isaiah
40:13a revealed the importance of this study. A study of
the introductory formulas could also be valuable, but
Dr. Zemek comments on this area saying that it is unwise
to oversimplify or categorize on the basis of introductory
formulas.[1] Longnecker adds to this idea saying that the
introductory formulas are mainly "stylistic and tell
little about his use of the Old Testament."[2]

This paper is only looking at Pauline quotations,
but there are also many passages where Paul alludes or

---

[1]George Zemek, "Introductory Formulas As a
Hermeneutical Key," Unpublished Paper presented for
Seminar on Biblical Hermeneutics, Grace Theological
Seminary, 1976.

[2]Richard Longnecker, Biblical Exegesis in the
Apostolic Period, p. 114.

refers to the Old Testament without directly quoting the passage. A study of this domain could indeed reap great wealth. In a few instances Paul seems to quote from other than the Old Testament and study of these passages should be undertaken.

The conclusion of these last few lines is simply that Paul's use of the Old Testament is an extremely broad topic worthy of much study from various angles. This paper has already analyzed in some depth Paul's quotations of Isaiah 40:13a. In light of the fact that Paul used the literal sense of Isaiah, it seems possible that Paul did likewise in his other quotations. This first section of chapter 3 has then asserted that Paul's high view of Scripture would make him quote it in a literal sense. This has been the deductive reasoning. The next section will deal with the inductive argument in favor of Paul's literal use of the Old Testament.

Pauline Quotations of the Old Testament

As was afore mentioned, there could always be some debate as to exactly how often Paul quoted the Old Testament or what exactly constitutes a quotation. It is totally outside the scope of this paper to deal with that debate. The whole area will of necessity involve a degree of subjectivity. If a passage looks exactly like an Old Testament passage or appears in context to be quoting the Old Testament, then it can be considered a quotation. The subjective element here becomes very obvious.

Different writers have different views of the number of quotations Paul uses. Again, it is not the purpose of this paper to debate the number of quotations exactly. For purpose of argument the list provided by Earle Ellis will be used.[1] Ellis is probably the leading scholar in the specific field of Paul's use of the Old Testament. Appendix II has been set up to analyze Paul's quotations. An explanation of this chart is definitely in order. As was previously mentioned, this list of quotations was taken directly from Ellis' book. Ellis also evaluated the use of the LXX in Paul's writing. For the purpose of this paper, this writer included another category with reference to Paul's hermeneutical methodology in each quotation. Three categories were possible. First, the quote could be seen to be literal at a cursury glance. These were marked with an "L." Secondly, some quotes would be questionable in regards to their literality, but not great problems. These were marked with a "Q." Finally, there were the few verses which seemed to some to be a great problem and not possibly literal. These were marked with a "P."

This writer will be the first to admit that his categorization of these quotations is anything but inerrant. The purpose was not to be totally infallible, but to get at least some idea of the extent of the problem

---

[1] E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, pp. 150-52.

which existed in reference to Pauline quotations. The chart shows that there are relatively few cases where Paul's quotations fall into the category of a problem. Most of those problem verses will be dealt with in the final section of this chapter, and a very possible explanation will be presented for them. This thesis dealt with one of the questionable quotations (Isa 40:13a) and satisfactory explanations could be given for the others. This approach to Pauline quotations is as inductive as possible and shows rather clearly that the problem with Paul's use of the Old Testament is not a real large problem. The remainder of this paper will attempt to prove that even in the problem areas a satisfactory solution can be arrived at.

The conclusion to this first major section of Chapter 3 should be carefully considered. It is merely that in light of deductive as well as inductive arguments, it is very well within the realm of possibility to assert that Paul used a literal, historical, grammatical, hermeneutical methodology in his quotations. Deductively, it would seem inconsistent for Paul to affirm the Old Testament to be the very word of God, then to take it lightly and abuse it. Inductively, the evidence does not point to a great problem and the problems can usually be resolved in a satisfactory manner. In light of this evidence, the simple suggestion of this chapter is that when the exegete comes to a verse where Paul quotes the Old Testament, he should study in great depth to see how

Paul was literally using the Old Testament. This type of an exegetical approach provides the highest view of Scripture, and more importantly, the highest view of the God of that Bible.

Controversies Over Paul's Quotations

The cause which gave rise to the writing of this thesis was the author's observation of divergent opinions among conservatives in regards to the use of the Old Testament by New Testament writers. With regard to Pauline quotations in particular the debate rages hotly with several authors on totally opposite sides of the issue in reference to Paul's hermeneutics. This paper is mainly interested in the question as to whether Paul used a literal, historical, and grammatical method to interpret the passages which he quoted. This section will merely compile some data from each side. The first side to be presented will be those who do not accept Paul as being literal in his quotations, while the second side will take the opposite position.

Paul's Hermeneutic Is Not Literal

Recently it has become rather popular in scholarly circles to put great emphasis on the influence of the Judaism on Pauline thinking and particularly his use of the Old Testament. This whole phenomena should be investigated at least to some extent because it is the major argument of those who reject the literality of Paul's

hermeneutics. Richard Longnecker discussed the Jewish
hermeneutics in the first century in the first chapter of
his book, Biblical Exegesis In The Apostolic Period.
Basically he states that Jewish exegesis can be classified
under four headings: literalist, midrashic, pesher, and
allegorical.[1]

These four categories are important to understand
to see how the Jews viewed their Bible. The first category
is self-defined as it merely means to take the usual,
ordinary meaning of the passage in its context. Midrashic
exegesis was the most prominent technique used in Judaica.
This is an exegesis which goes "more deeply than the mere
literal sense, and attempts to penetrate into the spirit of
the Scriptures, to examine the text from all sides, and
thereby to derive interpretators which are not immediately
obvious."[2] This category of Jewish studies is very broad
and involves much more studying than this thesis needs.
The third category is called pesher exegesis and is very
important in this debate. This comes basically from the
Qumran society. The word itself means "solution" or
"interpretation," and has strong apocolyptic tendencies.
Pesher exegesis tries to look for and discover the "veiled,
eschatological meaning"[3] of the prophets in the Old Testament.

---

[1]Richard Longnecker, Biblical Exegesis in the
Apostolic Period, pp. 28ff.

[2]Ibid., p. 33.

[3]Ibid., p. 39.

The final category of Jewish interpretation is allegory. Philo was the great leader in this domain and he usually "treated the Old Testament as a body of symbols given by God for man's spiritual and moral benefit, which must be understood other than in a literal and historical fashion."[1] Much detailed work has been done in these various areas of Judaic studies, but the interest of this paper is Paul's use of this methodology. It will be shown that some argue that Paul used rather extensively the Jewish techniques of pesher and allegory as he interpreted the Old Testament.

I. Howard Marshall is one who seems to have some question as to whether Paul uses a literal, hermeneutical methodology or not. He says that Paul uses pesher exegesis in passages such as Ephesians 5:3 and Galatians 4:22.[2] Marshall goes on to show an interesting illustration of where Paul uses midrashic exegesis in Romans 9:6-29.[3] In verse 6 Paul sets up his theme by quoting Genesis 21:12. Then in verse 9 Paul gives his second text from Genesis 18:10 to support his arguments. Thirdly, in verses 10-28 Paul gives the main exposition using the catch words of

---

[1]Richard Longnecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, pp. 28ff.

[2]I. Howard Marshall, "How the New Testament Uses the Old," in New Testament Interpretation, ed. I. Howard Marshall (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), p. 207.

[3]Ibid., p. 204.

"call" and "son." Verse 29 ends with an Old Testament catch word of seed. This type of Old Testament quotation and wording led many to see rabbinic midrashic exegesis in Paul's writing here. There definitely seems to be a similarity between Paul's method and the Jews, but Marshall honestly admits that there are also many differences.[1] Marshall does not clearly say that Paul does not interpret the Old Testament literally, but he seems to leave the question open.

Other writers are much clearer in describing Paul's hermeneutics as less than literal. James Barr says that in reference to 1 Corinthians 9:9, "the literal and original sense is explicitly repudiated by the apostle."[2] Earle Ellis seems to go back and forth in this debate, but his position can be summarized by his classic statement that "Pauline exegesis might be termed 'grammatical-historical plus.'"[3] The "plus" indicates that it is not always exactly literal.

Henry Shires is very clear in his assertion. He states bluntly, "On many occasions Paul utilizes the Old Testament in its literal and historical sense, but just as often he may pay no attention to the context of a cited

---

[1] I. Howard Marshall, "How the New Testament Uses the Old," p. 206.

[2] James Barr, Old and New in Interpretation (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966), p. 109.

[3] E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, p. 147.

passage."[1] This section on the writers who deny Paul's
literal hermeneutic will be concluded with an analysis of
Longnecker. He is a good scholar and has written a very
helpful book, but he definitely doubts Paul's literal use
of the Old Testament. He states that in the majority of
the Old Testament citations, Paul adheres to the original
sense.[2] This type of statement infers that there are times
when Paul abuses the literal sense. He feels that at times
such as Galatians 3:19 Paul argues in "typically rabbinic
fashion from Jewish legends."[3] These men represent the
group who feel that Paul's hermeneutic was not always
literal.

<div align="center">Paul's Hermeneutic Is Literal</div>

More recently there have been several scholars in
conservative realms who have been willing to question the
theory that Paul, being so steeped in Judaism, naturally
used their non-literal techniques. S. Lewis Johnson is one
of the most clear writers in this domain. He says rather
bluntly that "I suggest that they (New Testament writers)
hold the Old Testament to be historical, revelational,
strongly messianic in context, always predictive and typical
in its forward look, and always inspired and inerrant in its

---

[1]Henry Shires, Finding the Old Testament in the New
(Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), p. 57.

[2]Longnecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic
Period, p. 121.

[3]Ibid., p. 120.

teaching."[1] Dr. Johnson has done much research in this domain and he feels it to be necessary to assert a literal interpretation of the Old Testament.

Walter Kaiser comes from a slightly different theological stance than Johnson, but his conclusion is similar on this point. He has stated that:

> In all passages where the New Testament writers quote the Old to establish a fact or doctrine and use the Old Testament passage argumentatively, they have understood the passage in its natural and straight-forward sense. This is not to say they did not cite the Old Testament for other purposes--they did. For example, they at times borrowed its language with-out appealing to its argument, they used it for illus-trative purposes, and they drew on its word pictures.[2]

Kaiser argues for the concept of a single meaning for every passage, and that the New Testament writers did not abuse that meaning.

Earle Ellis was used as an advocate for the position opposing Paul's literal hermeneutics, but reading his writing provides good statements on the other side. He makes an interesting statement with reference to Paul's Old Testament quotations by saying that "While his results do not always tally with the statistical probabilities of the grammar, they do lie within its possible meanings or reasonable inferences therefrom."[3] This statement shows

---

[1]S. Lewis Johnson, The Old Testament in the New (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980), p. 13.

[2]Walter Kaiser, Toward An Exegetical Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981), p. 51.

[3]E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, p. 148.

the extreme importance of one's presuppositions. He states
that Paul's interpretations are all possible, so the
determining of whether he is literal or not becomes greatly
based on one's answer to Paul's presuppositions with
relation to the Scripture.

Ellis goes on to say that the "essential difference
between Paul and the Jews in their employment of Scripture
is an interpretative one."[1] Along the same line Ellis said
that "If Paul used Jewish interpretations he culled and
moulded them to a Christological understanding of the Old
Testament. . . . Paul was a disciple of Christ not of
Gamaliel."[2] His point is a very important one as he is
expressing the very relevant idea that Paul did not need
to be involved in fanciful interpretations like the
rabbis, but would follow the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

One last author will be cited expressing this idea
that Paul's hermeneutic was literal as he quoted the Old
Testament. Allan Harman did some work on Paul's use of
the Psalms. He concluded that "whereas the Qumranic
commentaries neglect the sense and context of the original,
this is not a feature of Paul's use of the Psalms."[3] He
points out in his article that Paul used a literal

---

[1]E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament,
p. 26.

[2]Ibid., p. 83.

[3]Allan Harman, "Aspects of Paul's Use of the Psalms,"
in Westminster Theological Journal 32 (November 1969-
May 1970):17.

hermeneutic in his quotations from the Psalter.

This section has attempted to present an analysis of the current debate as to Paul's hermeneutical use of the Old Testament. The debate is rather important and the solution may not be real easy. Many good men line up on both sides and some seem to be in the middle-of-the-road. In attempting to resolve the debate it seems very important to think through the data deductively as well as inductively as was afore mentioned. The final section of this paper will be a suggestion for those studying Paul's Old Testament quotations.

<u>A Suggestion Concerning Paul's</u>
<u>Old Testament Quotations</u>

This suggestion has been alluded to on several occasions in this paper and will now be expressed in as clear of terminology as possible. After having studied the problems of Paul's quotations of Isaiah 40:13a, having analyzed the overall situation of Pauline quotations both deductively and inductively, and having briefly observed the controversy in the conservative camp, the following suggestion is submitted. Since Paul viewed Scripture to be the Word of God and therefore very sacred, and since some of the verses considered by some to be abuses of the Old Testament can be explained literally, it is suggested that when the exegete observes a Pauline quotation of the Old Testament, he should assume Paul to have interpreted it literally.

There is no doubt that this suggestion will require much work and study, as was evidenced by the twenty-three page discussion of Paul's use of Isaiah 40:13a in the first two chapters of this thesis. This type of an approach will, however, maintain a high view of the holy Word of God, and will prove to be a great blessing to the student. This last section of this paper will be divided into two portions which will hopefully be supportive of this suggestion. The first portion will describe two very legitimate methods which can be helpful in exegeting Pauline quotations. The final portion will list several of the problem verses and suggest very brief but tenable solutions to the verses.

Two Methods of Viewing Pauline Exegesis

Just before discussing these two methods, it may be helpful to define exactly what is meant by a literal hermeneutic. To interpret the Old Testament literally is merely to take its usual or normal meaning. This is rather vague but is made a bit clearer when modified by the terms grammatical and historical. Terry states that:

> The grammatico-historical sense of a writer is such an interpretation of his language as is required by the laws of grammar and the facts of history. . . . The grammatical is essentially the same as the literal.[1]

Paul would probably never use the term literal for his hermeneutics, but his concern for adequately representing

---

[1]Milton Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), p. 203.

the Old Testament is very obvious. This paper asserts
that Paul used a literal, grammatical, historical methodology
in his hermeneutics. This does not, however, forbid the
use of figures of speech and typology. The following
discussion will present two aspects of Paul's exegesis
which will be helpful in explaining how Paul interprets
literally the Old Testament Scripture.

Canonical Approach in Exegesis

This author was first exposed to this concept a few
years ago when listening to a lecture by Dr. Bruce Waltke.
After spending a bit of time over the years reflecting on
the approach, it seems to be very viable and helpful in
understanding the Scriptures and, in this case, Paul's use
of the Old Testament. The canonical approach to hermeneutics
states basically that for one to truly understand the full
scope of meaning of any single passage, the exegete must
understand it in light of the entire canon of Scripture.
Waltke expressed it by saying, "The text's intention became
deeper and deeper as the parameters of the canon were
expanded."[1]

This type of a view of Scripture presupposes at
least four aspects as mentioned by Waltke.[2] One must
believe 1) the people of God have always believed the same

---

[1]Bruce K. Waltke, "A Canonical Approach to the Psalms,"
in Tradition and Testament, ed. John Feinberg, Paul Feinberg
(Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), p. 7.

[3]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

though their knowledge has expanded; 2) God is the author
of progressive revelation; 3) as the canon developed, texts
were combined; 4) the canon was closed with the New Testa-
ment. This author feels these presuppositions are legiti-
mate and hence the canonical system has merit to describe
the phenomenon of progressive revelation in light of
previous, less detailed revelation. The previous discussion
of Isaiah 40:13a as quoted in 1 Corinthians 2:16 concluded
that (using the canonical approach) the mind of God is
unknown to the unregenerated, but made knowable by the
advent of Jesus Christ. This is an illustration of how
Pauline quotations can use the Old Testament literally,
but add further light as a result of newer revelation.

Some may argue that this is no more than sensus
plenior and leaves the door open to extreme subjectivity
as to the meaning of the text. This is not the case, as
the canonical approach closes the door with the last
chapter of Revelation. The Scripture is not given any
sense that is not within the canon. Dodd adds some important
remarks along this line as he states that, "The various
Scriptures are accurately interpreted along lines already
discernable within the Old Testament canon itself . . . ,
in many cases, I believe, lines which start from their
first historical intention--and these lines are carried
forward to fresh results."[1] This gives the Scripture a

[1]C. H. Dodd, According to the Scripture (London:
Nisbet and Company, 1952), p. 109.

true and dynamic force as the Old Testament had great value

to its people as the Word of God, but becomes even clear

today as the canon is complete and can be exegeted as a

whole.

This canonical approach will be very helpful in

understanding Paul's quotations. He did not abuse the

literal Old Testament meaning, but often used it in the

light of the more complete light of the gospel of Christ.

The exegete should look for this as he studies Pauline

literature. An understanding of this approach seems crucial

to understanding Paul's hermeneutics. A quotation from

Tasker would be very appropriate to conclude this section.

He stated:

> Paul's exegesis . . . is not fanciful or arbitrary
> when once it is recognized that the Old Testament
> is not just history, but sacred history. . . . In
> the old covenant was prefigured the shape of things
> to come.[1]

This quotation is an excellent introduction to the next

section on typology.

Typology in Exegesis

Much has been written and expounded on this topic,

but this paper will merely take a brief look at it and

suggest that it will be helpful in one's understanding of

Paul's hermeneutics. Dr. S. Lewis Johnson is rather help-

ful in this particular area as he stresses that a type must

---

[1]R. V. G. Tasker, The Old Testament in the New
(Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954),
p. 93.

include 1) correspondence; 2) historicity; and 3) pre-
dictiveness.[1]   This three point outline gives a good
definition of a proper type.   Paul uses typology very
often.   An example would be in 1 Corinthians 10 where
Israel is a type of the church.   It must be made very clear
that typology does not by any means destroy the literal
interpretation of the Old Testament passage.

It would seem very legitimate to assert that Paul
understood the typological significance of some Old Testa-
ment passages.   The exegete must determine if Paul is using
this methodology in his quotation.   Grogan again emphasizes
the fact that typological interpretations are not non-
literal.   He states that:

> Allegory and type must be clearly distinguished. . . .
> A type sees a divinely intended correspondence between
> two persons, events, or institutions in history, and
> its historical reference is fundamental to the very
> notion of it.[2]

Typology combined with an understanding of the canonical
approach to hermeneutics are two very valuable tools in
the hand of the exegete to determine Paul's hermeneutical
use of the Old Testament.

A Brief Commentary on Some Problem Verses

This final portion of this paper will show to the
interested observer some very possible solutions to some of

---

[1]S. Lewis Johnson, The Old Testament in the New,
p. 56.

[2]G. W. Grogan, "The New Testament Interpretation of
the Old Testament," Tyndale Bulletin 18 (1967):65.

the problem verses in this debate. The reader is encouraged
to consult the sources cited for a more complete commentary.
This paper tried to do a rather complete exegesis of Paul's
use of Isaiah 40:13a, but this portion of the paper is
designed only to show that a literal hermeneutic is possible
even in Paul's problem verses. The first four verses
evaluated were ranked as problem (P) verses in Appendix II,
while the other verses were ranked as questionable (Q).

1 Corinthians 9:9

This is probably the most often quoted problem verse
in regards to Paul's literal use of the Old Testament.
Dr. Johnson has an entire chapter in his book on this
issue.[1] He handles the textual problems and comes up with
the conclusion that in reality Paul does not abuse the
literal meaning of this Old Testament text. He states that
Paul is not merely referring to oxen in Deuteronomy, but
giving the principle that men should practice moral justice
to all creatures. This same type of idea comes to play in
1 Corinthians. It is in reality possible that Paul had the
literal interpretation in mind and he did not misuse it.
Walt Kaiser reiterates a similar opinion feeling that
Moses was speaking to men more than oxen.[2] This problem

---

[1]S. Lewis Johnson, The Old Testament in the New,
p. 42ff.

[2]Walter Kaiser, "The Current Crisis in Exegesis and
the Apostolic Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10,"
Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 24:1 (March
1978):11.

verse can very easily be seen to show Paul's literal
interpretation.

Romans 10:6-8

Appendix II reveals that the whole of Romans,
chapter 10 is a problem. Verses 6-8 are some of the more
difficult to handle, but again can be seen to be literal.
It is interesting to note that in most of these problem verses,
there are always some commentators who see the passages as
interpreting the Old Testament literally. Romans 10:6-8
is no exception. John Calvin said that Moses was not speaking
only of the law because he knew better than to think one
could work his way to heaven.[1] Cranfield, in his superb
work on Romans, expresses similar sentiments. Cranfield
says that both Paul and Moses are interested in "inward
justification." "It is not arbitrary typology, but true
interpretation in-depth."[2] Paul as well as Moses understood
the law as being very incomplete for salvation. Both men
knew of the reality that there was more to life than merely
the law. Paul had more revelation and saw the truth clearer,
but he did not abuse what Moses meant.

Ephesians 4:8

This is another problem verse as Paul quotes the
Old Testament to indicate the officers in the New Testament

---

[1]John Calvin, Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to
the Romans (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
1947), p. 388.

[2]C. E. B. Cranfield, The Epistle to the Romans,
Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1979), p. 524.

church. Gary Smith wrote an article on this text and
affirmed the idea that Paul did not abuse the literal sense
of the Psalm. He says, "Paul wants his readers to under-
stand that God has throughout history chosen special men
as leaders of the community of believers."[1] The suggestion
is that the gifts in the Old and New Testaments refer to
God's leaders whether Levites or church officers. Paul
used an Old Testament reference of leaders and showed how
God's plan for human leadership had developed.

Galatians 3:16

        There are several supposed problem areas in the book
of Galatians. When referring to the "seed" of Abraham and
the new Adam some say "seed" cannot refer to only one person,
and it does not refer to descendents. Ridderbos in his
fine commentary says that Paul is referring to the difference
between the seed of Isaac and Ishmael.[2] In light of new
revelation, Paul said (correctly) that the difference
between Isaac and Ishmael is personified in Jesus Christ
as the one who produces true belief and faith. The reality
of the differences between Abraham's seeds become much more
significant with the new covenant and the Messiah. Paul
then did not misrepresent the Old Testament in this quotation.

---

[1]Gary Smith, "Paul's Use of Psalm 68:18 in Ephesians
4:8," in Journal of Evangelical Theological Society 18:3
(Summer 1975):188.

[2]Herman Ridderbos, Epistle of Paul to the Churches
of Galatia (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
1953), p. 133.

Other References

The preceding four passages are among the most controversial among Paul's quotations. Three other references will be mentioned here as this section is brought to a close. In Romans 9:25, Paul quotes from the Old Testament saying Israel will be restored. Battle writes an extended article to show that Paul's literal hermeneutic here is very helpful to the premillenialist.[1] Galatians 4:24 is the passage where Paul calls an Old Testament passage an allegory. Earle Ellis even states of this passage that Paul uses more typology than allegory.[2] Romans 1:17 also takes investigation to see how Paul literally interpreted this passage. S. Lewis Johnson spends quite a bit of time to show that Paul did not misuse the sense of Habakkuk.[3]

Conclusion to Chapter Three

This last section has by no means been designed to be detailed exegesis of these quotations. This thesis used Isaiah 40:13a as a model to follow which could be used for every problem verse. The purpose of the section was to suggest bibliographic sources to solve problems and also to show that accepting Paul's quotations as literal is a very

---

[1]John Battle, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:25-26," Grace Theological Journal 2:1 (Spring 1980): 115-29.

[2]Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, p. 53.

[3]S. Lewis Johnson, "The Gospel That Paul Preached," Bibliotheca Sacra (October-December 1971):128:512.

legitimate procedure. Hopefully this data will give more people the willingness to accept Paul's hermeneutic as literal.

CONCLUSION

Upon completion of this paper this writer is left with two major thoughts in his mind. First of all, the greatness of God has become even a bit clearer, and the significance of His inscripturated self-revelation has appeared even more overwhelming. The process whereby the Holy Spirit inspired men to write the inerrant and infallible Scriptures is an unspeakable, but unquestionable mystery. The fact that humans possess the very words of the God is one of the greatest truths possessed by man.

The second thought flows out of the first, as this writer feels more accutely the inadequacy of the human mind to fully understand God or His self-revelation. Eternity will not be enough time to fully comprehend the depths of God's Scripture which is by no means a complete revelation of the infinite God. The response of humans should be submission and obedience and total dedication to the pursuit of knowing God better.

This paper in its three chapters has had one major theme. That theme is that Paul used a literal hermeneutic in quoting the Old Testament. The first two chapters were an in-depth analysis of Paul's use of Isaiah 40:13a and concluded that Paul quoted this passage literally. Chapter three was a suggestion that students of the Word should

assume that Paul would quote literally because, deductively,
Paul believed the Old Testament to be the Word of God, and
inductively, because the supposed problems in Paul's
quotations can be explained with a bit of studying.
The value of this study to this writer has been more than
merely to engage in theological debate. It has been
extremely helpful to show the real beautiful interplay
between the Old and New Testaments and the obvious existance
of the supernatural in the compilation of the Scripture.
The challenge becomes to be more dilligent in discovering
the meaning of the only absolute truth available to man--
the Scripture.

> Jeremiah 9:24a
> But let him that glorieth glory in this,
> that he understandeth and knoweth me,
> that I am the Lord.

APPENDIX I

TEXT ANALYSIS

Isaiah 40:13a

Masoretic Text:

מִי־ תִכֵּן אֶת־ רוּחַ יְהוָה

Septuagint:

τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου

Aramaic Targum:

מן תקין יהוה

Dead Sea Scroll:(Isaiah)

מיא תכואת רוח יהוה

Vulgate:

quis adiuvit spiritum Domi

Romans 11:34

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου

1 Corinthians 2:16

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου

*See Bibliography for bibliographic data on texts

APPENDIX II

QUOTATIONS IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Classification:
    1--in agreement with the LXX and the Hebrew.
    2--in agreement with the LXX against the Hebrew.
    3--in agreement with the Hebrew against the LXX.
    4--at variance with the LXX and the Hebrew where they agree.
    5--at variance with the LXX and the Hebrew where they vary.

    L--literal
    Q--questionable
    P--problem

NT	OT	Classif.
Rom. 1:17	Hab. 2:4	5 Q
2:24	Isa. 52:5	5 Q
3:4	Ps. 50(51):6	4 Q
3:10-12	Ps. 13(14):1-3	4 L
3:13a	Ps. 5:10	1 L
3:13b	Ps. 139(140):4	1 L
3:14	Ps. 9:28(10:7)	5 L
3:15-17	Isa. 59:7-8	5 L
3:18	Ps. 35(36):2	4 L
4:3 (9,22)	Gen. 15:6	2 L
4:7-8	Ps. 31(32):1-2	2 L
4:17	Gen. 17:5	1 L
4:18	Gen. 15:5	1 L
7:7	Exod. 20:17(Deut. 5:21)	1 L
8:36	Ps. 43(44):23	1 Q
9:7	Gen. 21:12	1 L
9:9	Gen. 18:10,14	5 L
9:12	Gen. 25:23	1 L
9:13	Mal. 1:2-3	4 L
9:15	Exod. 33:19	1 L
9:17	Exod. 9:16	5 L
9:25	Hos. 2:23(25)	4 Q
9:26	Hos. 1:10(2:1)	5 Q
9:27-28	Isa. 10:22-23	5 Q
9:29	Isa. 1:9	2 Q
9:33	Isa. 8:14+28:16	5 L
10:5	Lev. 18:5	4 Q
10:6-8	Deut. 30:12-14	5 P

Rom.	10:11	Isa. 28:16	5 Q
	10:13	Joel 2:32(3-5)	1 Q
	10:15	Isa. 52:7	5 Q
	10:16	Isa. 53:1	2 Q
	10:18	Ps. 18(19):5	2 Q
	10:19	Deut. 32:21	4 Q
	10:20	Isa. 65:1	5 Q
	10:21	Isa. 65:2	2 Q
	11:3	3(1)Kings 19:14	4 L
	11:4	19:18	5 L
	11:8	Isa. 29:10+	
		Deut. 29:4(3)	4 L
	11:9-10	Ps. 68(69):23-24	5 Q
	11:26-27	Isa. 59:20-21+27:9	5 L
	11:34	Isa. 40:13	5 Q
	11:35	Job 41:3	3 L
	12:19	Deut. 32:35	5 L
	12:20	Prov. 25:21-22	3 L
	13:9	Deut. 5:17-21	
		(Exod. 20:13-17)+	
		Lev. 19:18	1 L
	14:11	Isa. 45:23(+49:18)	5 Q
	15:3	Ps. 68(69):10	1 P
	15:9	Ps. 17(18):50	
		(cf. 2 Ki. 22:50)	4 L
	15:10	Deut. 32:43	2 L
	15:11	Ps. 116(117):1	4 L
	15:12	Isa. 11:10	5 L
	15:21	Isa. 52:15	2 Q
1 Cor.	1:19	Isa. 29:14	5 L
	1:31	Jer. 9:24(23)	4 L
	2:9	(Isa. 64:4+65:16)?	5 Q
	2:16	Isa. 40:13	5 Q
	3:19	Job 5:12-13	3 L
	3:20	Ps. 93(94):11	4 L
	6:16	Gen. 2:24	2 L
	9:9	Deut. 25:4	5 P
	10:7	Exod. 32:6	1 L
	10:26	Ps. 23(24):1	1 L
	14:21	Isa. 28:11-12	5 L
	15:27	Ps. 8:7	4 L
	15:32	Isa. 22:13	2 L
	15:45	Gen. 2:7	4 L
	15:54	Isa. 25:8	5 L
	15:55	Hos. 13:14	5 Q
2 Cor.	4:13	Ps. 115(116):1(10)	1 L
	6:2	Isa. 49:8	1 L
	6:16	Lev. 26:11-12	
		(Ezek. 27:37)	4 L
	6:17	Isa. 52:11-12	4 Q
	6:18	2 Ki. (2 Sam.)7:14	4 Q
	8:15	Exod. 16:18	3 L
	9:9	Ps. 111(112):9	1 L

	10:17	Jer. 9:24	4 L
	13:1	Deut. 19:15	5 L
Gal.	3:6	Gen. 15:6(12:3; 18:18)	2 L
	3:8	Gen. 12:3(+18:18)	4 L
	3:10	Deut. 27:26	5 L
	3:11	Hab. 2:4	5 Q
	3:12	Lev. 18:5	4 Q
	3:13	Deut. 21:23	5 Q
	3:16	Gen. 22:18(cf. 12:7; 13:15; 17:7)	1 P
	4:27	Isa. 54:1	2 L
	4:30	Gen. 21:10	4 Q
	5:14	Lev. 19:18	1 L
Eph.	4:8	Ps. 67(68):19	4 P
	5:14	?	
	5:31	Gen. 2:24	5 L
	6:2-3	Deut. 5:16(Exod. 20:12)	5 L
1 Tim.	5:18	Deut. 25:4+ (Matt. 10:10?)	2 P
2 Tim.	2:19	Num. 16:5+ (Isa. 26:13?)	3 L

Adapted from E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Joseph. Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah.
    Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.

Alt, A.; Eisfeldt, O.; Kittel, R., ed. Biblia Hebraica
    Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung,
    1967.

Anderson, A. A. "The Use of RUAH in 1QS, 1QH, and 1QM."
    Journal of Semetic Studies 7:2 (Autumn 1962).

Ashman, Charles. "Paul's Use of the Old Testament."
    Unpublished Seminar on Biblical Hermeneutics.
    Grace Theological Seminary. Spring 1964.

Barnes, Albert. Commentary on 1 Corinthians. Grand Rapids:
    Baker Book House, 1979.

_____. Commentary on Isaiah. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids:
    Baker Book House, 1969.

Barr, James. Old and New in Interpretation. New York:
    Harper and Row Publishers, 1966.

_____. The Semantics of Biblical Languages. London:
    Oxford University Press, 1975.

Battle, John. "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans
    9:25-26." Grace Theological Journal 2:1 (Spring
    1981):115-29.

Behm, J. "νοῦς." Theological Dictionary of the New
    Testament. 4:958.

Bengel, John. New Testament Word Studies. Vol. 2.
    Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1971.

Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R.; Briggs, Charles. A Hebrew
    and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. New York:
    Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1906.

Brown, Kenneth. Seminar in Biblical Hermeneutics. Grace
    Theological Seminary, Spring 1962.

Brown, Raymond; Fitzmeyer, Joseph; Murphy, Roland, ed.
    The Jerome Bible Commentary. New Jersey: Prentice-
    Hall Inc., n.d.

Burrows, Millar, ed. The DSS of St. Mark's Monastary.
        Vol. 1. New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental
        Research, 1950.

Burton, Ernest. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on
        the Epistle to the Galatians. New York: Charles
        Scribner's Son, 1920.

Buttrick, George, ed. The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 5.
        New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Calvin, John. Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle
        to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Baker Book
        House, 1979.

_____. Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah. Vol. 3.
        Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,
        1948.

_____. Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans.
        Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.

Childs, Brevrand. Introduction to the Old Testament as
        Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Classic Latin Dictionary. New York: Hinds and Noble
        Publishers, n.d.

Craig, Clarence. "Corinthians." The Interpreter's Bible.
        Vol. 10. George Buttrick, ed. New York:
        Abingdon Press, 1953.

Cranfield, C. E. B. The Epistle to the Romans. Vol. 2.
        Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1977.

Davis, Thomas. "Paul's Use of the Old Testament Quotations
        in the New Testament Resurrection Passages." M. Div.
        Thesis. Grace Theological Seminary, 1978.

Delitzsch, Franz. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies
        of Isaiah. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark,
        1869.

Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet
        and Company, 1952.

Dos Santos, Elmar. An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch
        Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint. Jerusalem:
        Dugith Publisher, n.d.

Driver, G. R. "Hebrew Notes." Vetus Testamentum 2
        1 (1921):241-43.

Dunn, J. D. G. "Spirit." New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Vol. 3. Colin Brown, ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979.

Edwards, Thomas. A Commentary on the First Epistle. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897.

Efird, James, ed. The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays. Durham: Duke University Press, 1972.

Ellis, E. Earle. "Midrash, Targum, and New Testament Quotation." Neotestamentica et Semitical. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox, eds. Edinburg: T. and T. Clark, 1969.

_____. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.

Godet, F. Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.

_____. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956.

Grogan, G. W. "The New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament." Tyndale Bulletin 18 (1967):54-76.

Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976.

Hagner, Donald. "The Old Testament in the New Testament." Interpreting the Word of God. Samuel Schultz and Mom's Tuch, eds. Chicago: Moody Press, 1976.

Harder, G. "Reason." New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Colin Brown, ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979.

Hatch, Edwin; Redpath, Henry. A Concordance to the Septuagint. Vol. 2. Graz-Austria: AKademische Druck U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Harman, Allan. "Aspects of Paul's Use of the Psalms." Westminster Theological Journal 32 (November 1969-May 1970).

Hendrickson, William. New Testament Commentary on Romans. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.

Jacobs, Henry, ed. The Lutheran Commentary. Vol. 7.
    New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1896.

Johnson, S. Lewis. The Old Testament in the New.
    Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.

_____. "The Gospel That Paul Preached." Bibliotheca
    Sacra 128:512 (October-December 1971).

Kaiser, Walter. "Leviticus 18:5 and Paul: Do This and You
    Shall Live"? Journal of Evangelical Theological
    Society 14:1 (Winter 1971):19-28.

_____. "The Current Crisis in Exegesis and the Apostolic
    Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10."
    Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
    21:1 (March 1978):3-18.

_____. Toward an Exegetical Theology. Grand Rapids:
    Baker Book House, 1981.

Kasemann, Ernst. Commentary on Romans. Grand Rapids:
    Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.

Kay, W. "Isaiah." The Bible Commentary. Vol. 5.
    New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.

Kent, Homer. "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament."
    Bibliotheca Sacra 121:481 (January-March 1964):
    34-43.

Kleinknecht, J. "πνευμα." Theological Dictionary of the
    New Testament 6:332-451.

Koehler, Ludwig; Baumgartner, Walter, eds. Lexicon in
    Veteris Testamenti Libros. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids:
    Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953.

Knight, George. Deutero-Isaiah. New York: Abingdon Press,
    1965.

Kling, Christian. "Corinthians." Commentary on the Holy
    Scripture. John Lange, ed. Grand Rapids:
    Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.

Lange, John. "Isaiah." Commentary on the Holy Scriptures.
    John Lange, ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing
    House, n.d.

Lehman, John. "Paul's Typological Use of the Old Testament."
    M. Div. Thesis. Grace Theological Seminary, 1976.

Lenski, R. C. H. Interpretation of I and II Corinthians.
        Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963.

_____. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the
        Romans. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House,
        1961.

Liddell, H. George; Scott, Robert. Greek-English Lexicon.
        Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Longnecker, Richard. Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic
        Period. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
        Company, 1975.

_____. "Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testa-
        ment"? Tyndale Bulletin 21 (January 1970):3-38.

Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testament Concordantia.
        U. Verlagsanstalt: AKademische Druck, 1955.

Marshall, I. Howard. "How the New Testament Uses the Old."
        New Testament Interpretation. I. Howard Marshall,
        ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
        Company, 1977.

Meyer, Henrick. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the
        Epistle to the Corinthians. Winona Lake: Alpha
        Publications, 1979.

_____. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle
        of the Romans. Winona Lake: Alpha Publications,
        1980.

Moffatt, James. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corin-
        thians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943.

Moody, Dale. "Romans." Broadman Bible Commentary. Vol. 10.
        Nashville: Broadman Press, 1970.

Morris, Leon. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.
        Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,
        1976.

Murray, John. Epistle to the Romans. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
        Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.

Nestle, Eberhard; Aland, Kurt. Novum Testamentum Graece.
        Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibelstifung.

Nichol, Francis, ed. The Seventh Day Adventist Bible
        Commentary. Vol. 6. Washington: Review and
        Herald Press, 1957.

Nicole, Roger. "New Testament Use of the Old Testament." Revelation and the Bible. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958.

_____. "The Old Testament in the New Testament." Expositor's Bible Commentary. Vol. 1. Frank Gabelein, ed.

North, Christopher. Isaiah 40-55. London: SCM Press LTD, 1957.

Orr, William; Walther, James. I Corinthians, A New Translation. Garden City: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1976.

Parry, R. St. John. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916.

Payne, J. Barton. "רוּחַ." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. R. Laird Harris, ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. Vol. 2. Stuttgart: Privileg: Wurtt Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Ridderbos, Herman. Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.

Robertson, Archibald; Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Scroggs, Robin. "Paul: σοφια and πνευματικος." New Testament Studies 14:1 (October 1967):33-55.

Shires, Henry. Finding the Old Testament in the New. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.

Skinner, J. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.

Smith, Gary. "Paul's Use of Psalm 68:18 in Ephesians 4:8." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 18:3 (Summer 1975):181-82.

Smith, S. M. "New Testament Writer's Use of the Old Testament." Encounter 26:2 (Spring 1965).

Sperber, Alexander, ed. "The Later Prophets According to Targum Jonathan." The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. 3. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.

Stanley, Arthur. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. London: Scottis Woode and Company, 1876.

Sutton, Glen. "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Galatians 3:10-14." M. Div. Thesis. Grace Theological Seminary, 1979.

Swete, Henry. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968.

Tasker, R. V. G. The Old Testament in the New. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.

Terry, Milton. Biblical Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.

Thrall, Margaret. The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Wallace, Daniel. "A Very Brief Introduction to the Use of the Old Testament in the New." Supplementary Packet for New Testament Exegetical Methods. Dallas: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1980.

Waltke, Bruce K. "A Canonical Approach to the Psalms." Tradition and Testament. John Feinberg and Paul Feinberg, eds. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981.

_____. "תָּכַן." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. R. Laird Harris, ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.

Weber, Robertus, ed. Biblia Sacra Iuxtra Vulgatam Versionew. Vol. 2. Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969.

Westermann, Claus, ed. Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963.

Whitlock, Glenn. "The Structure of Personality in Hebrew Psychology." Interpretation 14:1 (January 1960): 3-18.

Young, E. J. The Book of Isaiah. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.

Younger, Paul. "A New Start Toward a Doctrine of the Spirit." Canadian Journal of Theology 13 (April 1967):123-33.

Zemek, George. "Introductory Formulas as a Hermeneutical
        Key." Seminar on Biblical Hermeneutics. Grace
        Theological Seminary, 1976.