

**REPRODUCING THE HERMENEUTIC OF JESUS:
KINGDOM REALITY AS A BIBLICAL HERMENEUTIC**

Revised

James B. De Young
and
Sarah L. Hurty
Portland, Oregon

Paper Presented to
The Evangelical Theological Society
Washington, DC
November 18, 1993

Revised and Presented to
The Northwest Region
The Evangelical Theological Society
April 2, 1994

REPRODUCING THE HERMENEUTIC OF JESUS: KINGDOM REALITY AS A BIBLICAL HERMENEUTIC

INTRODUCTION

Hermeneutics is at the center of a revolution in thinking. In a previous study,ⁱ we began to investigate the current crisis in hermeneutics which calls into question how we interpret Scripture and therefore how we do theology. In the past the focus has been on the author and his text. In recent decades the focus of interest has shifted from the text to the self, from developing a method for interpreting the text to studying the structure of understanding itself.ⁱⁱ Form and redaction criticism, with their emphasis on diachronic matters, failed to deal with genre and plot development (synchronic matters). So structuralism brought the focus to what the text means in the present with no concern for the author's intended meaning. Its stress on uncovering the structures behind the author's thought and reordering experience and reality in terms of a deeper meaning led to the reaction of poststructuralism. In the latter, various contemporary world views are used to examine the text and plural meanings result, so that we are even further removed from the author and text.ⁱⁱⁱ Then came reader-response criticism to posit "not only the autonomy of the text but the veritable union between text and reader at the moment of response."^{iv} Finally deconstruction sought to correct its predecessor by challenging "the communicative power of language itself."^v

Yet diachronic and synchronic approaches are complementary and interdependent. This has led to mediating positions whereby all three elements of author, text and reader play a role.^{vi} This occurs in canon criticism. Others such as Betti, Hirsch, Juhl and Kaiser seek to recover the author's intended meaning or the text's intended meaning.

The revolution in hermeneutics reflects the need and search for a relevant message. Our

number one problem is how to bridge the gap from the First Century to the present one. In his helpful and timely book M. Erickson has recently written: "Differing times and differing contexts call for differing approaches to hermeneutics."^{vii} Indeed the changes today are so great^{viii} that a major paradigm shift away from the foundations of modernism is occurring. The very future of Western culture may be at stake. Erickson cites Diogenes Allen, who writes: "What is crumbling are the pillars of western society, which were erected during the Enlightenment."^{ix} Through great disillusionment modernism, the modern world view, is being rejected and deconstructive postmodernism is taking its place. The latter affirms that there is no longer one unifying center or basis of meaning, no truth, only interpretations of interpretations.

Evangelicals must rise to meet the challenge of postmodernism because of its growing influence and because the very foundation of knowledge is at stake.

More specifically, evangelicals should be especially concerned because hermeneutics and theology are inseparably linked, for our theology both flows from our hermeneutics and yet also informs (perhaps too often) our hermeneutics. Indeed "the core of the most fundamental problem of biblical theology" is the distinction "between what a text meant and what a text means."^x This has been variously expressed as the distinction between meaning and significance,^{xi} or between what is descriptive and what is normative, or whether a text has more than one meaning.

In addition the changing face of the Church compels change. In a world where now the majority of Christians have never known the force of the Reformation and Renaissance with their cultural as well as spiritual heritage, we must formulate afresh our hermeneutics, systematic and practical theology. Liberation theology is one extreme manifestation of this.

We believe that it is necessary to return to the only normative or authoritative source of hermeneutics that we have as Christians. We must go to Scripture and discover its method of interpreting previous Scripture, including those instances where the New finds additional or

deeper meaning than the Old yields by literal interpretation. The fact that hermeneutics should specifically be addressed from the vantage point of the use of the Old Testament in the New is crucial to Christians. The relation of the Testaments is the "central issue for any proper biblical theology"^{xii} and hence foundational to systematic theology. Since "the use of the OT in the NT is the key to the theological relation of the testaments,"^{xiii} biblical and systematic theology and theological method are all affected. Indeed the way one views the relationship of the testaments determines the kind of theology one believes, the kind of Gospel one proclaims and the kind of lifestyle one lives.^{xiv} Scripture's use of Scripture, then, is foundational to all the rest.

In addition, if the hermeneutic of the New Testament can be reproduced by us today we have amidst the various approaches being advocated a normative and compelling approach whereby to interpret Scripture. If we refuse to pattern our interpretation and methods after that of the apostles, we are, in the strong remarks of M. Silva, "in practice denying the authoritative character of their scriptural interpretation. . . and to do so is to strike at the very heart of the Christian faith."^{xv} Yet few believe that we can or should reproduce the hermeneutic of the New Testament.

We believe that we must look again to the Scriptures to discover our hermeneutics for today and to meet the demands of our future postmodern world.^{xvi} We must tie our hermeneutics to a world view that arises within Scripture itself. Thereby we have at least a transcultural and transtemporal hermeneutic. In a real sense ours is a journey "back to the future."

This journey is especially crucial for dispensationalism, for it comes at a time when dispensationalism is reexamining its foundations. One of the sine qua non of revised dispensationalism is literal or normal interpretation. Yet early dispensationalism to some extent allowed for spiritual or allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament. As a result of new findings in the areas of literary forms and semantics, contemporary progressive

dispensationalists are questioning the meaningfulness of the label "literal" and this has consequences for such theological issues as the distinction between Israel and the Church.^{xvii} On the other hand covenant theologians are reexamining their "spiritual" hermeneutic.

In our previous study we focused on Jesus and the Old Testament, for all Scripture bears witness to Him (Lk. 24:25-27, 32, 45; Rev. 19:10; 1 Pet. 1:10-12), and His use must be related to that of the Apostles,^{xviii} and indeed to ours. We used Jesus' citation of Malachi 3:1 in Matthew 11:10 because this instance, with its unique characteristics of form and content, clearly raised the problem of hermeneutics.

We here cite the conclusions of that study in the areas of context, textual criticism, hermeneutics and theology. We will then focus on our chief concern--reproducing the hermeneutic of the New Testament.

THE PROBLEM OF JESUS' USE OF MALACHI 3:1

IN MATTHEW 11:10

NT Context

In Matthew 11:10 Jesus, quoting Malachi 3:1, says of John the Baptist: "This is the one about whom it is written: 'I will send my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way before you.'" In the context there is clearly an emphasis on the Kingdom. John has heard about the works of the Messiah^{xix} and asks if Jesus is "the coming One."^{xx} Jesus in His answer alludes to several Old Testament passages regarding the work of Messiah (Is. 35:5-6; 42:18; 61:1). Jesus says that John is a prophet. Yet he is much more than a prophet--he is forerunner of the One, "the coming One", prophesied in Malachi 3:1 (11:10). Jesus' own assessment is that there is none greater than John the Baptist, "yet he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." This paradox of verse 11 suggests that with the arrival of the Kingdom, the least person in the Kingdom would experience greater benefits or privileges or power than he.

Jesus' assessment of John's greatness is based upon the advancing of the Kingdom^{xxi} (v. 12); the fact that "all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John" (v. 13)--John begins the era of fulfillment;^{xxii} and that, if the people are willing to accept it, he is "the Elijah who was to come" (v. 14). The scope of John's ministry is only limited by their response. The wise person should take care to listen correctly (v. 15).

OT Context

Malachi sets forth God's call to Israel to return to the God who has loved her. The prophetic oracle of 3:1-4:6 is intended to answer the evil attitude of Israel that Yahweh rewards the evil as good and that the God of justice did not exist (2:17). Yet the day of judgment and reward is coming (4:1-4), preceded by the prophet Elijah (4:5).

Malachi 3:1 demonstrates the use of the Old Testament in the Old Testament. The first words are similar to Exodus 23:20-24 where Yahweh promises to send His angel before Israel to bring her to the place He has prepared. The angel has the name of Yahweh in him and has the authority of Yahweh to bring judgment on the inhabitants of the land. The point of Malachi 3:1 is that now a messenger of judgment will come to Israel herself before Yahweh comes to set up His kingdom.

The second phrase of Malachi 3:1 reflects another earlier promise, Isaiah 40:3: "A voice is calling, 'Clear the way for the LORD in the wilderness; Make smooth in the desert a highway for our God.'" The person whose voice Isaiah heard calling to make the way of Yahweh in the desert, that the glory of Yahweh might be revealed to all flesh, is here described as , whom Yahweh will send before Him, i.e. before His coming.^{xxiii} The following verses in Isaiah 40 again place emphasis on the Kingdom.

Textual Considerations

The textual variations between the New Testament and the Old Testament via both the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Septuagint (LXX) lay the foundation on which hermeneutical considerations will be made. In summary we can say that the quote in Matthew 11:10 is closer to the MT of Malachi 3:1 than to the LXX.

When we compare the LXX and the New Testament, there are three differences of little significance. When we compare the Hebrew MT with the LXX and the New Testament, we find that the remaining differences show that the LXX and MT are in agreement against the New Testament, and these again are without *grammatical* significance.

However, some of these changes may have significance for hermeneutical or theological reasons. The LXX of Exodus 23:20 (except for its initial $\kappa\alpha\iota$) is exactly the same as the first clause of Matthew 11:10. This leads Gundry to conclude that Jesus is citing Exodus 23:20, and using $_ \varsigma$ in place of $\kappa\alpha_$ as a literary device to connect the quotes from both Exodus 23 and Malachi 3:1.^{xxiv}

This would mean that Jesus may deliberately want to point to Himself as the angel sent before Israel in the desert. Yet whether Jesus is citing Exodus is, in the end, not necessary to resolve, for it seems that Malachi at least alludes to Exodus. So Jesus alludes to Exodus through Malachi. In a sense this means that the first and second "messengers" of Malachi 3:1 have much in common.

Finally there is hermeneutical and theological significance for the uses (3x) of $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ in Matthew 11:10: the first two are added (if the quote is based on Mal. alone); the last represents a change from $\mu\omicron\upsilon$. Thereby Jesus changes the text of Malachi from an address about Messiah into an address to Him, and emphasizes the point. In so doing He identifies the Messiah with Yahweh, as Exodus 23:20ff identifies the "angel" with Yahweh.

Hermeneutical Considerations

The introductory formula, ο_τ_ς_σ_τ_ι_περ_ο_υ_γ_ρ_α_π_τ_α_ι, occurs only here and in the parallel, Luke 7:27 (cf. γ_γ_ρ_α_π_τ_α_ι_περ_ in Mt. 26:24). This stresses the significance of the statement in the mind of Jesus. More particularly it stresses the important place of John in prophecy. Indeed, Jesus claims that if the Jews would accept this prophecy about John, the Kingdom would apparently come and John would be "the Elijah who was to come" (Matthew 11:14). So Jesus links John to Elijah; He brings Malachi 3:1 and 4:5 together. He reinforces this after the events which occurred on the Mount of Transfiguration where Moses and Elijah appeared with Jesus as He was transfigured. Jesus tells the three apostles that "Elijah has already come" (Mt. 17:12). The disciples "understood that he was talking to them about John the Baptist" (17:13). Yet, clearly John did not see himself as Elijah. When directly asked if he was, he said, "No" (Jn. 1:21). The Pharisees believed his statement (1:25). Thus the Synoptics and John seem to be in contradiction.

So then, there are two problems.^{xxv} First, why does Jesus make the changes from the first person pronoun in Malachi 3:1 to the second person pronoun in Matthew 11:10? Second, why does He identify the messenger with John the Baptist? The first question concerns Jesus' identification; the second concerns John's.

Part of the resolution depends on the identification of the persons intended in Malachi 3:1. We believe that there two persons in addition to Yahweh ("I"): the messenger, and "the Lord" expanded exegetically by the *waw* as "Messenger of the covenant," rather than three: the messenger, the Lord, and the "messenger of the covenant." Hence, the "Lord" and "the Messenger of the covenant" are titles for one, divine Person.^{xxvi} He is also related to Yahweh.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM

In the remainder of this study we will use this example of Jesus' use of the Old Testament to address larger hermeneutical and theological issues. What is the hermeneutic of the New

Testament? Should we reproduce it? If so, how are we to do so?

Various methods have been practiced in interpreting the New Testament's use of the Old Testament in general, and we update and summarize here our application of these to Jesus' use of Malachi 3:1; 4:5.^{xxvii}

The Literal Method

The Old Testament quotations in the New generally have the same normal meanings as they did in their original contexts. They are in line with historical, authorial intent. W. Kaiser's view is an example of what is commonly understood as the literal method, namely that meaning is found only in the author's single-meaning original intention.^{xxviii}

Yet is the literal method able to explain this use of the Old Testament and all the others? This example and others seem to go beyond the grammar, history and context of single-meaning authorial intent so that several writers qualify "literalness." Several turn for relief from this problem by appealing to new findings in semantics and the concept of meaning. For example, M. Erickson in his recent work departs from separating meaning and significance because this tends to make them understood as "then" and "now." He suggests that the meaning of a text encompasses the two aspects of the original signification (both referents and principles) and the later significance (application of principles). He redefines "intention" as "assertion" so that the focus is on the product rather than the process. Hence the affirmed meaning includes both future persons and situations as well as those originally addressed.^{xxix} Glennly suggests that meaning is multi-dimensional so that the meaning in the original context takes on new dimensions of meaning when the text is placed in a new context or as the canonical context grows.^{xxx}

Others fault "literal" interpretation for its limited nature. They affirm an extra meaning as the "plus" in a biblical hermeneutic.^{xxxi} For example, F. F. Bruce argues that "grammatico-historical exegesis is not sufficient for the interpretation of the biblical documents. . . .

Theological exegesis is also necessary, although it cannot override grammatico-historical findings.^{xxxii} He goes on to appeal to the part which the Holy Spirit fulfills in opening the Scripture for us as the risen Christ did for the Apostles. Bruce also shows that medieval doctrine held to a fourfold sense: the literal, allegorical, moral and anagogical sense--which derived heavenly meanings from earthly facts. More recently he writes of an "increment of meaning" derived from the experience of Christians through the ages.^{xxxiii} B. Waltke has also advocated a reconsideration of this four-fold sense. The idea is that we are in the heavenlies now and mystically participating in the future age^{xxxiv} (Gal. 4:26; Eph. 1:3; 2:6, 19; Heb. 12:22ff). He believes that prophecy ". . . should be interpreted as having an invisible, spiritual fulfillment."^{xxxv} The ". . . images of the old dispensation were resignified to represent the heavenly reality of which they always spoke."^{xxxvi} His hermeneutic greatly affects eschatology.

Furthermore, in regard to the Apostles' own hermeneutics, E. E. Ellis argues that Pauline exegesis might be termed "grammatical-historical plus".^{xxxvii} Exegesis provides the possibilities for what a text *says*; the *meaning* of the text arises from an "added factor"--in the meaning of an event for its later fulfillment. Longenecker writes that biblical exegesis has a revelatory stance which took the authors beyond the literal method.^{xxxviii} Finally, a reader-response approach to Scripture leads to the creation of meaning beyond the original sense.^{xxxix}

The witness of Scripture itself points to the fact that human authors often did not understand their writings. Several passages make this clear (Dan. 8:27; 12:6-9; Jn. 11:44-52; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; cf. 2 Pet. 3:16).

Now if the Apostles go beyond the original meaning, who taught them this approach? The answer is Jesus Christ.^{xl} In regards to Matthew, Gundry traces every one of Matthew's hermeneutical principles to Jesus, including the case of Malachi 3:1 in Matthew 11:5, 10, 28 and 29 where Jesus assumes the role of Yahweh.^{xli}

So, historical questions on the horizontal plane and theological questions on the vertical

plane are intertwined. This points to direct revelation and divine intent beyond that of Old Testament authors.^{xlii} The Holy Spirit is at work.

It is in Jesus, then, in His use of the Old Testament (e.g. Ps. 110), that we discover that "a messianic interpretation heightens the meaning of any passage of Scripture."^{xliii} There is considerable consensus that Jesus, by identifying John with Elijah in Matthew 11, goes beyond the single-meaning original intention of Malachi, beyond a literal hermeneutic, defined as grammatical, historical and contextual.^{xliv}

Pesher, Midrash, and Allegorical Methods

To meet the inadequacies of the literal method, some posit other methods. Stendahl,^{xlv} Longenecker^{xlvi} and others support a pesher approach here, although it may be midrash (Jesus' unique form, "This is the one about whom it is written," Matt. 11:10, argues for pesher). Yet Jesus does not follow Qumran; He does not disregard context, nor are there "far-fetched allegorical interpretations and ingenious word-play."^{xlvii} While there may be parallels between Qumran and rabbinic methods and the New Testament,^{xlviii} Jesus does not follow rabbinic methods^{xlix} here.¹ Devices such as decoding hidden meanings and atomistic use of the Old Testament are simply not present in the New Testament.^{li} Neither Jesus nor Matthew searches "either haphazardly or systematically for isolated proof texts."^{lii} Both pesher and midrash fail to give adequate place to the author's intended meaning and lack sufficient controls or parameters for the new meaning. They fail to be the explanation for Malachi's own non-literal meaning hundreds of years before Qumran. Even more importantly, they do not seem possible for us to discover or practice today with a satisfactory degree of confidence.

With regard to allegory, von Rad notes that the biblical author is concerned with facts, the historical sense, not spiritual truths rigidly attached to the very letter of the text.^{liii} Jesus' use in Matthew 11:10 is not allegorical in that He does not make the messenger or Elijah into an idea

or concept or truth. He finds fulfillment in another person.

Typological Method

This method is a genuine approach widely practiced in the New Testament and is a possible explanation for what Jesus does in Matthew 11. In seeking to identify whether this is typology, it seems that two extremes must be avoided. One extreme goes too far and forces from the text those types and antitypes that have virtually no substantiation from the literal method. The other extreme doesn't go far enough, for it makes a type nothing more than an example or pattern.^{liv} This seems to ignore a predictive element, the impact of redemption history, and heightening or climax. This position also rejects typology as an exegetical method, since it is not consistent with a literal meaning which "embraces essentially one meaning," found by means of grammatical, historical study. Typology, it is said, embraces significance not intended by the author.^{lv}

Yet, we believe with von Rad that typology is not to be divorced from historical exegesis, even though it cannot be fully "regulated hermeneutically, but takes place in the freedom of the Holy Spirit." He cites additional characteristics as well.^{lvi}

The criteria necessary for a type seem to be present in our problem text: there are several obvious correspondences in the context; there is the historical event; there is predictiveness;^{lvii} and there are even divine intent and prefiguration.^{lviii} Heightening^{lix} occurs in Jesus' words that there "has not risen anyone greater than John" and that "all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John" (Mt. 11:11, 13). In the case that Jesus is practicing typology here, the "messenger" and "Elijah" are types of John the Baptist. Indeed, Malachi himself may be.

Yet, Jesus seems to go beyond typology when He asserts that John is Elijah (11:14; 17:12-13) and that he fulfills Malachi 3:1 ("This is the one," 11:10). Indeed, future fulfillments are yet to come (Mt. 11:11) and perhaps the actual Elijah before the day of judgment (Mal. 4:5).

While typology is explicitly defined or designated in Scripture (1 Cor. 10; Rom. 5), it does not seem to be broad enough in scope to serve as an all-encompassing hermeneutical method for significant portions of Scripture, such as wisdom, apocalyptic, and major portions of discursive literature. Its exact content and scope cannot be defined.^{lx} It holds little value as a structure to guide today our ongoing interpretation of the New Testament. In addition, as Pannenberg points out, typology tends to undermine the historical facts connecting the testaments by being "a finally unhistorical, purely structural similarity." It depreciates the "shadowy preliminary representation" in Old Testament history, making the latter only a "copious picture book."^{lxi} We believe that there is a better explanation than typology for such uses of the Old Testament in the New.

Theological Methods

Because purely structural relationships have proved inadequate, various theological ideas or motifs have been posited to explain the additional factor which acts as a conceptual link in the relationship of the testaments. We will test them as explanations for Jesus' use of Malachi 3:1; 4:5 in Matthew 11:10-14.

1) *The purpose of God.* This motif means that the New Testament declares that the plan of God has been brought to fulfillment. History, then, is the working out of the divine purpose. This motif may be represented in prophecy by double or multiple fulfillment or sense.

This view means that several successive persons or events fulfilled Malachi 3:1. It would at least include Malachi himself, John the Baptist, and a final figure to appear during the final form of the "Day of the Lord."

This motif is a plausible solution to our problem. However, it lacks specificity. We need to know what is this purpose in order to use it to discover the full meaning of such texts.

2) *Covenant.* The motif of the covenant acts as an integrating theme of Scripture.^{lxii} It

ranges from the agreement made with Adam and Eve to that made with Noah, Israel and David. It includes the actualizing of the New Covenant during the present age.

Covenant is a strong emphasis in the context of Malachi (2:5, 8, 10, 14; 3:1; 4:4). Almost all of the references refer to the Mosaic Covenant which is operative in Matthew. Nevertheless, covenant does not tell us what meaning or fulfillment Malachi had in mind and why--whether John, multiple fulfillments, or something else. Also covenant fails to encompass all biblical motifs.

3) *Christology*. The significance of christology as a link between the testaments can hardly be overestimated. The living presence of Christ is a determining factor in all New Testament exegesis and the Old Testament is to be interpreted christocentrically. It is one of the four major exegetical presuppositions of the earliest Christian use of the Old Testament.^{lxiii} Christology seems to explain why Jesus interprets Malachi 3:1 of Himself and John. However, this motif or concept is inadequate by itself.^{lxiv} Christ is the crux of a broader concept and the means of achieving it, a concept which better answers the question, Why the Christ? Further, the christological approach has been faulted for spiritualizing or allegorizing the Old Testament and thus demeaning the value of the Hebrew religious experience in its own right (and history along with it).

4) *Heilsgeschichte*. *Heilsgeschichte* is the history of God's saving acts, culminating in and encompassed by the Christ-event. God is sovereign over history and works His purposes in it to accomplish His goals. This concept brings coherence and consistency to all that takes place. However, it is inadequate to explain detailed fulfillments and it is doubtful that all Scripture has this as its basic theme.^{lxv} We are not sure how salvation history helps us understand why John fulfills Malachi 3:1--whether meaning is single or double, with additional fulfillments. The terms "salvation history" and perhaps even the concept itself do not arise out of the biblical text.^{lxvi} More significantly, as Pannenberg has pointed out, *Heilsgeschichte* depreciates history

(*Historie*). This is its error shared with existential theology in its reduction of history to historicity.^{lxvii}

5) *Promise-fulfillment*. The concept of promise-fulfillment is another way to evaluate the use of the Old Testament in the New.^{lxviii} This concept shows the proper preparatory nature of the Old Testament. It is essential to history and our concept of God, as Pannenberg shows.^{lxix} It is implicit as well as explicit in Scripture (e.g. Jer. 33:14; Heb. 11).

Thus Matthew 11:10, 14 is the fulfillment of the promise that the messenger Elijah will come in the era of judgment. Or is it? Does Jesus exhaust the promise? There appears to be no way to know beforehand what fulfills the promise. While this motif may be a helpful way of viewing the testaments in relationship to each other and specific passages which are clearly promise-oriented, it is too narrow or limited and fails as a hermeneutic for the rest of Scripture^{lxx} (especially in a genre such as wisdom literature).

6) *Analogous fulfillment*. J. Weir believes that analogous fulfillment is the overarching model which includes all the above methods. His model is based on the observation that there is "both a similarity and a difference between one object, event, or idea and another object, event, or idea."^{lxxi} Weir observes that "fulfillments are normally analogical and only occasionally literal. Even literal fulfillments are analogous due to differences of space and time."^{lxxii} However, while this method provides a major explanation for the fulfillment of the Old Testament in the New, the method fails to explain why the analogue of Elijah and John exists and how we today may discover others to contextualize the message for our era.

7) *Generic promise*. Generic promise, originally generic prediction^{lxxiii} and recently popularized by Kaiser, seeks to uphold the original intentional meaning of the author and the later significance of an utterance, supposedly following Hirsch's distinctions.^{lxxiv} According to generic promise prophecy has one meaning which is of a generic or corporate nature.^{lxxv} K. Barker calls this the progressive fulfillment of prophecy.^{lxxvi}

As applied to our problem passage, generic promise means that not only John the Baptist "fulfills" Malachi 3:1; 4:5 (Lk. 1:17, 76-79), but others do so before or after until the final "completer" comes before the day of judgment. Malachi had in mind not one specific person but a generic messenger who comes in the spirit and power of Elijah throughout time. Yet the meaning is still one.

However, in the present passage Jesus pointed out John specifically, as the one who begins the era of fulfillment. The prophet Malachi does not appear to have as his authorial intent a whole string of generic "fulfillments."^{lxxvii} It seems that authorial intent has been redefined by a retrospective look at the phenomena in order to protect a literal hermeneutic and to reject dual authorship (contra. 1 Pet. 1.10-12) as an explanation for additional meaning.^{lxxviii} Yet the human authors of prophecy emphasize divine intention.^{lxxix} Furthermore, it does not seem that generic promise is an all-encompassing hermeneutic applicable to all forms of literature. In addition, even with Erickson's concessions,^{lxxx} there is no guiding central theme and no pattern whereby we can reproduce this hermeneutic.

8) *Sensus plenior*. Some, especially Roman Catholic writers, appeal to a hidden meaning called *sensus plenior*.^{lxxxii} It is that fuller, deeper, spiritual sense which lies below or beyond the literal sense. As applied to Malachi 3:1; 4:5, it means that the fulfillment of Elijah in John the Baptist is a meaning not consciously intended by the human author (Malachi), but is a meaning intended by God and integral to the text and later discerned by Jesus.

Moo, citing Brown's defense of *sensus plenior*, shows that this meaning may have at times been dimly perceived by the human author as shown by the context (it need not be a meaning "reserved by God to Himself"^{lxxxiii}); that there is a relationship between the literal sense and the "fuller" sense; that it differs from typology since it concerns words rather than events; and that it differs from accommodation (God truly intends this meaning).^{lxxxiii}

While *sensus plenior* is helpful, we need to be more certain as to the parameters of

control. Considerable subjectivity in identifying the additional meaning in Malachi remains. It seems difficult to practice today with the needed sense of assurance or authority that the deeper sense is normative. *Sensus plenior* really does not resolve the difficulty,^{lxxxiv} for it fails to delineate what is the relationship of the senses and how one gets from the literal to the deeper meaning and why one should do so.

9) *Canonical approach*. In order to meet the concerns of the subjectivity of a *sensus plenior* approach to the use of the Old Testament in the New, some have turned to the ultimate canonical context to find the basis for a "fuller" sense to Scripture and human intention. Moo favors this approach because (1) the meaning is built on the redemptive-historical framework of the Old Testament in the New; (2) it is represented by the use of the Old Testament in the Old Testament; (3) it imparts a meaning not deliberately concealed from a human author but a meaning which unfolds as the canon grows; (4) it is open to verification to some extent.^{lxxxv} Moo seeks to avoid dual meaning by positing that God did not intend or implant additional meaning necessarily hidden from the human author at the point of inspiration, though He knew in His providence that greater meaning would be unfolded.^{lxxxvi} However, Packer appears to support dual meaning when he writes that "though God may have more to say to us from each text than its human writer had in mind, God's meaning is never less than his. . . . God's further meaning, as revealed when the text is exegeted in its canonical context, in relation to all that went before and came after, is simply extension, development, and application of what the writer was consciously expressing."^{lxxxvii}

B. Waltke supports a "canonical process approach" similar to B. Childs' view. A progressive perception of meaning paralleled the growth of the canon and its progressive history.^{lxxxviii} V. Poythress has built on Waltke's approach by finding three contexts (original, intermediate canonical, and completed canonical); the later understanding is a fuller, divine meaning.^{lxxxix}

Hence, our understanding of what Malachi 3:1; 4:5 means is derived from its use in Matthew 11; 17; and elsewhere. The messenger is John the Baptist and he heralds Jesus as the "Lord to come to His Temple."

This approach, while having an advantage over *sensus plenior*, cannot tell us how or why the passages are linked, that is, what principles or conceptual center guided Jesus as He unfolded the meaning of Malachi from within His canon. Consequently we cannot pattern our hermeneutic after His in order to discover anything beyond what He (or His disciples) have explicitly unfolded.

10) *Restrained reader-response interpretation*. A final form of theological exegesis used to justify additional or new meaning never envisioned in the original context is that of reader-response. Different communities of believers generate new meanings. The most legitimate form of reader-response interpretation appears to be that of Klein, *et al*, who, as others above, cite the precedent of the use of the Old Testament in the New. The emphasis is on understanding a text in its literary context instead of the author's intended meaning. The new or fresh meaning of Jesus beyond the original, historical intention of Malachi is possible yet the historical meaning of the text remains primary.^{xc}

This approach avoids the usual subjectivity of reader-response criticism while acknowledging the "creative enterprise" of understanding a biblical text. However, this approach really fares little better than the two preceding. It gives no objective criteria from within Scripture for determining the particulars in the "creative enterprise."

In summary, all the approaches as attempts to explain the relationship of the testaments to each other, and, in particular, Jesus' use of Malachi, fall short in one of two ways. First, the more structural methods, while giving some explanation for Jesus' claim of fulfillment in Matthew 11:10, fail to explain why the structures exist, and to give parameters for interpretation of the meaning in the structures. This led to the search for a theological center. Second, all the

theological centers or methods as expounded fail to provide specific enough guidance for discovering additional meaning and emphases in Malachi and other genre, and fail to encompass all motifs. Both approaches provide no means to reproduce the hermeneutic of Scripture, or at least they do not claim to.

A PROPOSED SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF JESUS' USE OF MALACHI: ACTUALIZATION OF ESSENTIAL REALITY

A Kingdom Center

The explanation for the use of the Old Testament in the New is tied first of all to a proper biblical center or theme.^{xci} We believe that the ultimate reality, the center of the Old and New Testaments, is the Kingdom of God. More specifically, we posit that it is God's mission to glorify Himself by establishing His Kingdom through the redemption of mankind. In response to the fall of Satan God created man and woman as His vice-regents to establish His Kingdom on earth in opposition to the domain of darkness.^{xcii} When sin entered human history, a schism erupted, dividing the Kingdom of God from the kingdom of the world. Ever since, God has sought to actualize His Kingdom in the world by saving (including justifying and sanctifying and eventually glorifying) mankind and enlisting him in the cosmic war against Satan and his domain. The Kingdom of the eschaton was inaugurated on earth by the first advent of Christ. The ongoing work of the Church is to actualize the Kingdom by living and proclaiming the gospel of Christ and his Kingdom. With the second advent of Christ comes the full realization of the Kingdom, when the kingdom of the world and His Kingdom are one and the same.^{xciii} Finally, in the New Heavens and Earth, God rules over a people who are truly one with Him.

We are aware of the objections to a Kingdom center. However, the key is how one

defines kingdom. Kingdom is commonly understood as emphasizing the transcendence of God in His rulership (ideas represented by Kohler, Seebass, Klein), lacking the emphasis of immanence found in the concept of covenant (Eichrodt) or communion (Vriezen). This tension has led to a positing of a dual center such as rule of God/communion between God and man (G. Fohrer).^{xciv} A biblical understanding of the Kingdom of God emphasizes both transcendence and immanence, for God is both and relates to man from both. Thus the Kingdom theme has the dual motifs of rulership and relationship. We believe that this Kingdom theme meets various concerns and criteria for a biblical center, as discussed by Hasel and Osborne.^{xcv}

The actualization of the Kingdom as a center commends itself, for it avoids a canon within a canon; it arises within Scripture itself, not from external creeds, tradition or modern philosophy; it is broad enough to encompass all Scripture; it encompasses christocentricity and *Heilsgeschichte*; and it avoids arbitrariness, subjectivity, and reductionism. It also promotes continuity while recognizing discontinuity.

The Paradigm of Reality

We propose that a paradigm of reality is a plausible solution to the problem uncovered in Jesus' use of Malachi 3:1; 4:5 and the New Testament's use of the Old Testament in general (and indeed the use of the OT by the OT), when a later text finds meaning that often goes beyond the original author. It is a paradigm or model involving three elements: existential reality, essential reality and a process of actualization involving the concerns for love and truth.^{xcvi}

By existential reality we mean those values or concepts that are changeable, temporary or transitory. It is all that we can perceive with our senses regarding the physical world and all that we experience in relationships and the social structures of our society. These things are accidental in the philosophical sense. This roughly corresponds to the kingdom of darkness in the present world. Yet the Christian faith, by its very nature, demands belief in another reality,

an unchangeable constant, an absolute that is the ground of our existential reality. This is essential reality, the realm of God Himself. This realm, God's Kingdom, contains all that will endure for eternity and is thus essentially and forever true. First and foremost this is God; He is ultimate reality. He embodies all truth. All that exists in Him or by His sustenance. He exists necessarily; all else exists contingently. By a process of actualization we mean that there is an ongoing imperative to actualize essential reality in existential reality.^{xcvii} Eternal truths and realities must constantly be brought to bear so as to conform existential reality to essential reality. This concern for truth must be tempered by love.

This paradigm of reality corresponds to the actualization of the Kingdom as a center. It is a philosophical or "systematic theological" restatement of the "biblical theological" theme of the Kingdom and its realization. Essential reality roughly corresponds to God and His Kingdom, and existential reality to the world and its institutions presently oriented away from God. The process of actualization concerns the accomplishment of the Kingdom on earth in fulfillment of the Lord's prayer (Mt. 6:9-13) and His prayer in John 17. The ultimate expression is union with God. It means that we are His people and He is our God. This was promised in the Old Testament (eg. 2 Sam. 7:14; Jer. 30:22; 31:1, 31-34; 32:8) and is actualized in the New Covenant (Heb. 8:8-12; 2 Cor. 3:6-18), in Christ (Jn. 14:9-14, 20-21; 17:20-26; Rev. 21:3, 7).

The paradigm of reality is reflected repeatedly in Scripture. Explicit examples occur in Jesus, when He differentiated between heavenly and earthly things when speaking with Nicodemus (Jn. 3:12); in Paul (Rom. 8:18-25; 1 Cor. 2:6-14; 2 Cor. 3:7-18; 4:16-18); and in Hebrews (2:5-10; 12:22ff). In an earlier study we have applied the paradigm to cultural patterns, institutions (the home, government, slavery) and women in ministry (1 Cor. 11; 14; 1 Tim. 2).^{xcviii}

The Paradigm of Reality as a Hermeneutic

As a hermeneutic the paradigm of reality calls for us to discover the existential meaning which is basically equivalent to the literal meaning or single, original intention of the author. However, we are also to seek in the passage the essential reality which is the "deeper" meaning to which actualization of the Kingdom leads the interpreter. This is derived from the truth revealed in the rest of the canon, before or after the passage, but may also be articulated in forms which Church tradition has validated. The interpretation or exegesis is not complete at any one text until this process has been applied, although not all texts will yield additional meanings. The process rests on the dual authorship of Scripture,^{xcix} unique among the world's literature.

How does the paradigm of reality explain Jesus' somewhat "non-literal" use of Malachi 3:1; 4:5 in Matthew 11? The existential reality (basically equivalent to the historical meaning) is that Malachi prophesies a "messenger" to come (3:1) called "Elijah" (4:5) to herald the Lord coming to His temple as the "messenger of the covenant." The essential reality of Malachi's words (the deeper meaning) is that this messenger will be one in "the spirit and power of Elijah" and embodied in anyone who heralds the Lord's coming in/with His Kingdom. In light of Old Testament usage before and after Malachi we need not to understand this as actual Elijah (or, at least of actual Elijah only); such a messenger was already widely known to precede God's way and His eternal Kingdom (such as the Angel of Yahweh, etc; as discussed above). Hence, it is appropriate that Jesus identify John as such a messenger, especially since the various contexts concern the Kingdom and its *actualization* (Is. 40; Mal. 3-4; Mt. 11:12-14): if the Jews receive John and Jesus, the Kingdom is realized. If they reject Jesus, they thereby reject John as the final messenger, as "Elijah" before the "great and dreadful day of the LORD."

This interpretation is also commensurate with Malachi's own play on words regarding his name and with the concept that Jesus, as the Angel of Yahweh (Exod. 23:20ff) before Him, fulfills the role of "messenger" before Yahweh. Yet, again, in line with actualization of essential reality, Jesus fills the role of, is Yahweh. Indeed, in general it may be said, in light of this aspect

of the paradigm, that Yahweh is Jesus in the Old Testament whenever He appears as the One revealed, as coming, as glorified.^c Hence, Jesus' change of pronouns, from μου to σου, identifies Him with Yahweh, the speaker, no longer the addressee, and is appropriate with the actualizing of reality--that Jesus is essentially deity. Jesus and His ministry comprise the key to interpretation (cf. Rev. 19:10).^{ci}

In light of the additional passages (Exod. 23; Is. 40) alluded to in Malachi 3:1, it is clear that there is more than one instance of a "deeper" additional sense. One concerns the messenger as the Angel, another concerns the messenger as Elijah. The paradigm of reality leads us to understand that the messenger is essentially one who goes before Yahweh, who is sent by Him, before the Kingdom comes. Cannot Jesus, Elijah, John and others yet future all be equated with this "messenger"? Even Jesus' contemporaries believed that He might be Elijah (Mt. 16:14). So, Jesus is (1) the essential "messenger," (2) the Lord to come to His temple, and (3) Yahweh Himself.

The paradigm of reality may also help to explain Jesus' somewhat enigmatic statement that while there is none greater than John among those who are born to women, "yet he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Mt. 11:11). According to the actualization of essential reality, anyone who embraces the Kingdom and its eternal principles may exceed John in his ministry and person, first, because he will have added truth and experience, and second, because in the prophetic tradition he proclaims in the Spirit and power the coming of the now present and ever approaching Kingdom of God.

Reproducing the Hermeneutic of the Paradigm of Reality

Granted that the New Testament authors (and OT authors citing previous OT revelation) went beyond the original intention of the human author of the Old Testament passage they cited, the obvious question is whether or not we may practice their hermeneutic. The usual answer is

no, and the usual reason given is that God is also the author of Scripture, and His inspiring the writers makes their hermeneutic qualitatively (or essentially) different from ours. The problem is that there is no command against our reproducing their hermeneutic. In fact, it seems that they set an example for us and encourage us to do so (Lk. 24; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; Rev. 19:10). Further, promises regarding the ongoing ministry of the Spirit in teaching and leading into all truth (cf. Jn. 14; 17; 1 Jn. 2:27) seem to assume it. And the Church was built not only on the apostles, but also on the prophets.

The major objections against our reproducing their hermeneutic are fear of where it will lead and ambiguity regarding the correctness of the results. Regarding the fear, it is important to remember that the Holy Spirit is guarding His Church. Besides, one cannot dismiss a truth because of its problems.^{cii} The slippery slope argument is invalid; it is just as likely to keep us from truth as it is to keep us from error. And as for how we are to know if we have arrived at correct meaning, the process is no different for this than it is now for exegesis and theological development. Interpretations and doctrines are posited at a point in history. From there they are tested by the Church as they wrestle with truth in their historical circumstances. Gradually truth is affirmed, some of which becomes orthodox, nearly as authoritative as Scripture itself (e.g. the conclusion of Nicea re. the deity of Christ). Other more uncertain interpretations are held in tension. In the end, all interpretations and doctrinal formulations are subject to Scripture. The canon is closed^{ciii}, and we cannot claim normativity for our interpretations. Only time will tell. Until Christ comes we may never know for sure if an interpretation is truth (1 Cor. 13:9-12; 2 Pet. 3:17; 1 Jn. 2:26-27). Little more ambiguity is admitted by searching for a deeper sense, because although Scripture is the final rule, our hermeneutic determines somewhat the results of our exegesis--and 1600 years after the close of the canon, we cannot even agree on our hermeneutic!

The paradigm provides strong controls for finding additional meaning anyway and does

so better than other methods do. For example, while typology is similar to the paradigm of reality in that both embrace meaning not intended by the author, the paradigm enables us to understand why certain types are cited and to discover new types to demonstrate the contemporaneous nature of Scripture.^{civ} The paradigm guides us in doing typological exegesis as the New Testament authors practiced it, a pursuit Beale advocates.^{cv} The paradigm identifies the type as existential reality, the antitype in most cases as essential reality, and process means that the antitype is being actualized, often progressively, during the present age. As far as the traits of typology are concerned, actualization encompasses both predictiveness and heightening and explains why they occur. The paradigm relates the testaments on a more level footing, since it is intrinsic to both testaments. The actualization of essential reality finds greater expression in the New Testament because the latter reveals God in man, Who is ultimate reality.^{cvi}

How does the paradigm with its actualization of the Kingdom fare in regard to the various theological methods or motifs discussed above? With respect to covenant, the actualization of the Kingdom (as both transcendent and immanent) is that which covenant concerns and secures. The paradigm of reality explains how a covenant might be both conditional (existential reality) and unconditional (essential reality). Both of these aspects are found in such places as Genesis 12-15; Psalm 45; 89; 145; 2 Samuel 7:14ff.; Hebrews 11; etc. The transcendence aspect of the emphasis in Kingdom encompasses some motifs that covenant alone may not.

With respect to christology, the paradigm gives full place to the centrality of Christ; He is the King. The paradigm answers the question, Why the Christ? better than does christology alone. It also avoids allegorizing by giving full merit to history and experience in the Old Testament.

With respect to *Heilsgeschichte*, actualizing the Kingdom in the paradigm of reality gives definiteness to salvation history and encompasses all Scripture. It provides the basis for

God's acts in history. The paradigm affirms actual history (*Historie*) as that in which existential reality resides. It is only within such that actualization of the essential reality of the Kingdom into the present is possible. The paradigm sets forth the actualizing of the Kingdom as the goal or end toward which all history points.^{cvii}

With respect to *promise-fulfillment*, the paradigm of reality provides the essence of the promise--the actualization of the Kingdom. The paradigm does justice to history. Because Jesus and His Kingdom as the promised goal is fulfilled, God is proven to be God, meeting Pannenberg's concerns.^{cviii} Yet while Pannenberg can speak only of the eschaton as "mysterious, overpowering, incomprehensible"^{cix} the paradigm of reality is more clarifying. Essential reality, while not suprahistorical, is not dependent on history for reality but is actualized within history, and then only in relationship to us and not to itself.^{cx} It outlasts history as we know it.

With respect to *generic promise*, because the paradigm embraces the dual authorship of Scripture, we are able to reach into subsequent revelation to help interpret the full meaning of a passage. In addition Kaiser and the earlier Hirsch go too far in separating meaning and significance, in light of the many aspects of meaning; the paradigm of reality calls for the engagement or actualization of meaning reflecting essential reality with that reflecting the existential reality. Whereas generic promise insists that the prophet himself understood the prophecy as generic, the paradigm attributes the generic idea (if it exists) to essential reality in the mind of God which may have been hidden from the prophet. The paradigm gives guidance or parameters for discovering examples already actualized in history and those yet to come. Where generic promise fails to be an all-encompassing hermeneutic, the paradigm succeeds. Finally, Kaiser and generic promise cannot answer any better his own question: "In whose hands does the final court of appeal rest for deciding normative theology for contemporary readers of Scripture?"^{cx} The answer is the same for now, as it has been for 2,000 years. The Church in community, built upon the apostles and prophets, is the court of appeal as it seeks by the Holy

Spirit to actualize essential reality.

We believe that the paradigm of reality is an advance over all other methods in which dual authorship is also basic (*sensus plenior*; canonical approach). By itself the dual authorship approach may project a dichotomy between authors (the human and Divine) while the paradigm of reality provides a center around which the meanings intended by the two authors are joined. In addition, the paradigm of reality is more comprehensive; avoids the dichotomy of two testaments; unites God's revelation as a whole; has a future perspective beyond even the present; brings the future into focus and scope of our searching; respects the special, supernatural nature of Scripture; and allows for the progress of revelation beyond our canon, ie., allows for interpretation guided by the Holy Spirit and the collective Church, and this may become orthodox in the end.

At this point, many ask why we should search for more or additional meaning,^{cxiii} as though what we have is enough. The answer is obvious--to know God and His truth more fully, the goal of all experience and Scripture. Justification is enough, too, but it is not all that a long, intimate life with God is. We act as though the Church's task in exegesis is only to rediscover the fully developed truth that died with apostles. It is much more likely that we are working out their seminal truths in full doctrinal formulation. Even if the former is true, surely the New Testament does not contain *all* the Truth about Jesus (cf. Jn. 20:30; 21:25), nor *all* that the writers saw in the Old Testament (eg., further types in Melchizedek, the Tabernacle, etc.). This did die with them. We have been given enough to rediscover with the aid of the Holy Spirit what was lost. And, if history is at all revelatory, this plays a part in the search for meaning, or we are no more capable of knowing full truth today than were those in the early church. Surely Christ's promise to build His Church refers to growing maturity as time passes and not to numbers only (see Heb. 11:39-40; Eph. 4:11-16; Col. 1:24-28; 2:19).

THE PARADIGM OF REALITY APPLIED

TO ATTENDANT DISCIPLINES

Biblical Theology

Since hermeneutics is foundational to biblical theology, how does the paradigm of reality enable us to do biblical theology? Space permits only initial observations. Concerned with this matter, G. Osborne discusses five criteria by which to judge a viable biblical theology.^{cxiii} The paradigm of reality meets these, for it (1) corresponds with all aspects of Scripture,^{cxiv} (2) shows the historical and dogmatic coherence in the relationship of the testaments,^{cxv} (3) unites the various strands of theology in the Bible, (4) reflects canonical history as it links the biblical message of salvation and the church's attestation of faith, and (5) is based on exegesis and hermeneutics.

Systematic Theology

The paradigm of reality provides a plausible model for constructing systematic theology. It fulfills Osborne's five components of theological construction,^{cxvi} for it embraces the ultimate authority of Scripture, the place of tradition, the community, personal experience, and the role of philosophy,^{cxvii} though it is neither derived from it nor dependent on it. It arises within Scripture itself. It also meets the criteria of verification or validation,^{cxviii} which are coherence, comprehensiveness, adequacy, consistency, continuation, and cross-fertilization.

Osborne's call for a new model of systematic theology which departs from Neo-Platonic and Aristotelian patterns of thinking is timely.^{cxix} It will show an interdependence of doctrines and more balance between competing systems and will present this in a narrative approach or "story theology" form, putting an emphasis on praxis rather than abstract meaning.^{cxx} The paradigm of reality/Kingdom center holds promise of being at the core of such a new model.

The paradigm of reality may serve well to bring about a more united Church. It tends to identify non-essentials (the adiaphora of Lutherans) and enable bonding around the essentials. It

appears to be compatible with amillennialism as well as premillennialism. It may provide progressive dispensationalism with a new approach to hermeneutics not far from early dispensationalism's approach.^{cxxi}

Contextualization

Contextualization or application involves such matters as form and content,^{cxxii} two^{cxxiii} or three^{cxxiv} horizons, deculturalization,^{cxxv} principle-making,^{cxxvi} abstractions,^{cxxvii} and validation of application based on the degree of continuity between audiences, i.e., the degree of transfer.^{cxxviii} Contextualization also concerns the discernment of universal moral absolutes. The way one views the relationship of the testaments is fundamental to discerning which Old Testament laws are moral absolutes, as T. Tiessen observes.^{cxxix} While absolutes must be consistent with the progress of God's redemptive program (Tiessen's fifth principle for discerning such norms), this is too narrow. The Kingdom center, with its joint concerns for truth and love, for transcendence and immanence, is a better criterion than redemption.

The paradigm of reality is more compatible with R. Longenecker's "developmental hermeneutic" (discussed by Tiessen) whereby Galatians 3:28 is the "heart of the gospel" and emphasis is placed on redemption as exceeding what is inherited from creation.^{cxxx} Yet again the paradigm of reality with its Kingdom (transcendent and immanent) center provides a norm which exceeds redemption and provides a model for discovery pertinent to this age in which "the true light already shines" and God is one with His people.

In addition, rather than doing contextualization only after doing exegesis, biblical, and systematic theology in this linear process, the paradigm of reality calls for discovering the truths of essential reality as part of exegesis because of the dual authorship of Scripture. This results in a much more integrative exegetical-theological-applicational process, which is also in line with the multi-dimensionality of meaning.^{cxxxi} As the process unfolds within confines of concerns

for truth and love, we achieve the incarnation of both truth and love (rather than truth alone^{cxxxii}).

World View

According to one perspective a world view must meet the criteria of (1) reality (Does it help to elucidate all of life? Is it informed by Scripture?); (2) internal coherence (Is it logically coherent and does it represent a "unity of commitment"?); and (3) openness (Does it open life up or close it down? Does it learn from other visions of life?)^{cxxxiii} The paradigm of reality meets all three of these criteria, reproducing the world view of Scripture. It embraces two realities; it has a central focus; it is applicable to all of life; and it draws upon much common understanding.

The paradigm of reality also meets the four conditions of a Christian cultural vision.^{cxxxiv} It acknowledges the spiritual and abandons the idols of materialism; it recognizes the multidimensionality of life (rejecting reductionism); it embraces God's norms for His creatures; and enables one to live in community with others in a renewed way.

It makes sense that God's "world view" should be the biblical center, and the paradigm of reality with its actualization of the Kingdom center provides this. It seems to fare better than other centers in answering world view sorts of questions. To be relevant and viable, it must tell us of ultimate reality and account for reality as we find it. It must tell us who God is and what He is doing, explain why life is the way it is, reveal who we are, how we relate to God and others, and what our purpose is. It must do all this in a coherent, consistent manner. The paradigm appears to do this.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study of Jesus's use of Malachi 3:1; 4:5 in Matthew 11, we suggest that the traditional way of defining or understanding a biblical hermeneutic is faulty or lacking. Grammar, history, and context are not enough to explain some of the meanings found by later

authors of Scripture in earlier writings; there is a "plus" to a literal hermeneutic. We surveyed a number of methods used to account for this "plus", including peshet, midrash, typology, allegory, and various theological motifs and methods. Some of them are plausible solutions to our problem here. When these various solutions are considered for other commonly recognized problems, they seem inadequate as a hermeneutic for all of Scripture. The more "structural" methods either do not apply to certain genre or phenomena, discount Old Testament historical experience, or lack guidelines to govern the finding of deeper meanings. Theological motifs or methods posited to fill these needs fail to be all encompassing, lack sufficient specificity, and do not provide necessary parameters for finding meaning.

As an attempt to find a better solution to this problem, we posit that a certain biblical center, namely, the actualization of the Kingdom (understood as transcendent and immanent) through the redemption of mankind, and its corresponding paradigm of reality provide a promising hermeneutic to explain the "plus" which goes beyond a strictly literal hermeneutic. The dual authorship of Scripture accounts for the deeper meaning subsequent biblical authors found in Scripture that extended beyond the first human author's intention. The divinely intended meaning is based upon the literal meaning and never violates its essence.

There are certain corollaries which must attend this hermeneutic. One is the community of the Church; it over time is growing in maturity and acts as the discerners of the Truth in the interpretation of Scripture. The second is the Holy Spirit. He continues to teach His Church but will not contradict what He has already taught (1 Jn. 2:27). The third is personal holiness. The believer is called to imitate Jesus Christ and the Apostles, to think as He thought and do as He did, to experience renewal, to grow in subjective union with God. A model of sanctification which directs such growth is necessary.^{cxxxv} Finally, we should view truth as trinitarian, i.e., as being personal^{cxxxvi} and moral^{cxxxvii} as well as propositional.

Exegesis, then, involves a subjective element, and the paradigm weds objectivity and

subjectivity.^{cxxxviii} It finds precedence in the Antiochene "school" (properly understood) of the early church and in the anagogical sense of Scripture.^{cxxxix} Results of such exegesis are tested through time by the Church in the same way that theology has been formulated since the Church's beginning.

The Kingdom center and its paradigm of reality is the divine perspective, shared by the human authors, which guided the additional meaning. The center and the paradigm arise from the biblical text, encompass all genre and phenomena of Scripture, and provide sufficient parameters for finding the additional meaning. It is the world view, and thus the hermeneutic, from which the biblical authors read and wrote Scripture. It then has promise for changing the way we do biblical and systematic theology and contextualization.

The paradigm of reality allows us to own, indeed to reproduce, the hermeneutic of the Scriptures received from Jesus Himself. The paradigm has as its center the heart of the writers and speakers of both testaments, including our Lord Himself. It reflects their world view and we must adopt their world view if we are to be truly biblical and Christian.

ENDNOTES

- i.. See J. De Young and S. Hurty, "Reproducing the Hermeneutic of Jesus: Kingdom Reality as a Biblical Hermeneutic," paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, Washington, D.C., Nov. 18, 1993.
- ii.. G. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1991), 368.
- iii.. *Ibid*, 375.
- iv.. *Ibid.*, 377.
- v.. *Ibid.*, 380.
- vi.. *Ibid.*, 386.
- vii.. M. Erickson, *Evangelical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 99.
- viii.. Such change, past and future, was comprehensively surveyed by the Oct. 25, 1993, issue of *USNWR*. The essay by W. Manchester, "A World Lit Only By Change," pp. 6-9, is especially informative.
- ix.. Erickson, *Interpretation*, 108.
- x.. G. F. Hasel, "The Relationship Between Biblical Theology and Systematic Theology," *Trinity Journal* 5 NS (1984) 117. This emphasizes that "what is at issue is precisely how exegetical study is related to doing theology" [D. H. Kelsey, *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 202-3 n. 18, cited in *ibid*, 118]. Hasel designates this also as the distinction between the descriptive and the normative and cites criticisms of this distinction (pp. 116-119). See also, W. Kaiser, *The Uses of the OT in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), 1, 145ff, 207, 211, 217. Cf. B. W. Anderson, ed., *The OT and Christian Faith: A Theological Discussion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 1, who says that on the question of the relation of the OT to the New "hangs the meaning of the Christian faith." B. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984), 186ff., points to Jesus' use of the OT as strategic for our hermeneutic.
- xi.. E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale U., 1957), 8. See W. Kaiser, *Uses*, 218-220, for application of the distinction to the use of the Old Testament in the New.
- xii.. So G. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1991), 277.
- xiii.. G. K. Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?" *Themelios* 14 (April, 1989): 94.
- xiv.. As observed by R. Longenecker, "Three Ways of Understanding Relations Between the Testaments: Historically and Today," *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, ed. G. Hawthorne and O. Betz (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 22.
- xv.. M. Silva, "New Testament Use of the OT," in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D.A. Carson and J. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 164. Yet, he warns that "indiscriminate imitation is not called for; we need not reproduce the NT hermeneutic in all its features (any more than to do apostolic evangelism requires us to board ships instead of airplanes)."
- xvi.. Erickson, *Interpretation*, 114-125, presents eleven guidelines for a postmodern hermeneutic. We believe that our

paradigm meets many of these.

xvii.. C. Blaising and D. Bock, eds., *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 16-34.

xviii.. Many have defended this, including Dodd, Gundry, Longenecker, and others cited in this study. Jesus seems to set forth Himself as an example for His apostles (eg., Lk. 24).

xix.. This reading appears best among the possibilities ("Christ"; "Jesus"; or "our Lord").

xx.. $\text{--}\rho\chi\text{--}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is a messianic title; cf. Ps. 118.26; Dan. 7.13; Mal. 3.1-2; Mt. 3.11; Mk 11.9; Lk. 13.35, 19.38; Jn 1.15, 27, 6.14; Acts 19.4; Heb. 10.37; Rev. 1.4, 8.

xxi.. The exact force of $\beta\lambda\text{--}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ and $\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\text{--}$ is debated. It may be passive ("is stormed" positively by the people or "advanced forcefully" by John and Jesus); or it may be middle (positively, "forcefully advances" [NIV], or negatively, "suffers violence" [NRSV, NASV?] by the people). It seems best to take it as middle.

xxii.. This is a point that Matthew reporting Jesus wishes to emphasize--that John is in the era of fulfillment, not in the time of prophecy--so he uses a preposition for "until" ($\text{--}\omega\varsigma$) differing from the one ($\mu\text{--}\chi\rho\iota$) that Luke uses. See R. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 210. Others see it oppositely.

xxiii.. C. F. Keil, *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.) 2:457.

xxiv.. R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the OT in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 11-12. Gundry's view is supported by rabbinic exegesis; the homiletic literature on Exod. 23:20 shows that the sermon was given on Mal. 3:1-8, 23-24, according to Stendahl, *School*, 50; he notes that this fusion of texts may point to an Aramic version used in the synagogues.

xxv.. There is a prior question, however, which needs to be addressed, for it affects our understanding of Jesus' hermeneutic. It is whether there is any Jewish basis at all in the first century for the belief that Elijah's coming is connected with the coming of the Messiah. Some, including M. Faierstein and J. Hughes, have written to deny such a connection so that Jesus would be the originator of such a belief. [M. M. Faierstein, "Why Do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First?" *JBL* 100 (1981): 86; J. H. Hughes, "John the Baptist: The Forerunner of God Himself," *NOVT* 14 (1972): 212; both cited in Kaiser, *Uses*, p. 78 n. 2.] It is sufficient to note here that such a view overlooks Malachi 3:1; 4:4-5 itself, the repeated NT allusions reporting current Jewish expectations, possible reference in a Qumran fragment, eighteen rabbinic texts L. Ginzberg analyzed which suggest such a connection, [L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976), p. 212; cited in Kaiser, *ibid.*, 19, n. 4.] and modern Judaism's celebration of a cup and seat reserved for Elijah at every Passover. [Kaiser, *ibid.*, marshalls these supports]. In addition D. C. Allison, "Elijah Must Come First," *JBL* 103 (1984): 256-58, gives five additional reasons for holding to the traditional view rather than following Faierstein, J. A. T. Robinson, Fitzmyer and Martyn. He shows how the Elijah of Malachi 4:5-6 can logically be linked to 3:1 and cautions against arguing from silence.

The Mishnah anticipates a return of Elijah in Shek. 2.5; B. Met. 1.8; 3.4, 5; Eduy. 8.7; in Sot. 9.15 the resurrection of the dead comes through Elijah. In light of this and the above there appears to be strong support for the traditional view that the NT represents contemporary Jewish belief and practice rather than creating something new.

xxvi.. B. V. Malchow, "The Messenger of the Covenant in Mal. 3.1," *JBL* 103 (1984): 252-55, argues that there are three

persons. He makes the third to be a priestly messenger, one of two messiahs. This is based on an alteration of Zech. 4:11-14; 6:9-14 and on reading Onias II as "the prince of the covenant" in Dan. 11:22, and called a "messiah" in Dan. 9:26. Hence, "messenger of the covenant" is an interpolation made after the writing of Daniel in 165 B.C.E. Yet, such textual additions have no support in the manuscript evidence and seem to rest on higher critical presuppositions.

xxvii.. There is little uniformity in nomenclature here. We have taken the first five as more or less structural models recognized somewhat universally, and then grouped all the remaining motifs or concepts under "theological methods," loosely defined to include any concept serving as a theme or method that may lead to such a concept, even though this is not entirely satisfactory. See J. Weir, "Analogous Fulfillment: The Use of the OT in the New," in *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 9 (1982): 67-69; R. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 28-50, who posits the literal, pesher, midrash and allegorical methods. See also D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments: One Bible* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1991 rev.); Kaiser, *Uses*, 6-9, 212-220; P. Verhoef, "The Relationships Between the Old and the New Testaments," in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, ed. J. B. Payne (Waco: Word, 1970), 280-303.

xxviii.. See Kaiser, *Uses*, 63ff. More broadly, W. Klein, C. Blomberg, R. Hubbard, *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Dallas: Word, 1993), 97-98, write that the goal of hermeneutics is to enable interpreters to arrive at "the meaning the biblical writers 'meant' to communicate at the time of the communication, at least to the extent that those intentions are recoverable in the texts they produced" (see also pp. 133-138).

xxix.. Erickson, *Interpretation*, 31-32. He is in basic agreement with Hirsch and Kaiser, but allows for the Holy Spirit as co-author of Scripture and for later Scripture to interpret earlier.

xxx.. W.E. Glenny, "The Divine Meaning of Scripture: Explanations and Limitations", 4-8, a paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, Washington, D.C., November 19, 1993. In his excellent paper he traces evangelical struggles over deeper meaning and argues well that the divine meaning of Scripture cannot be equated with the human author's intention, but often exceeds it.

xxxi.. C. Evans, "The Function of the Old Testament in the New," in S. McKnight, ed., *Introducing New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), 164, puts this in the category of resignification and believes that it witnesses to an exegetical pluralism in the NT.

xxxii.. F. F. Bruce, "Interpretation," in *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*, ed. E. F. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1960), 293.

xxxiii.. For Bruce ["Interpretation of the Bible," *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. W. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 565-568], this "increment of meaning" constitutes the "plenary sense" or *sensus plenior*. It is that supplied by the "whole of Christian history"; what the Bible "has come to mean in the experience of Christian readers, generation by generation, has added something to its meaning for Christian readers today" (567). Bruce seems to be combining *sensus plenior* here with a form of reader response and other approaches. We believe that our proposed solution fits well with Bruce's views.

xxxiv.. In an address at the Northwest Section, Evangelical Theological Society, Multnomah School of the Bible, Portland, OR, April 9, 1983. For similar assertions, see B. Waltke, "An Evangelical Christian View of the Hebrew Scriptures," *Evangelicals and Jews in an Age of Pluralism*, ed. M. Tannenbaum, M. Wilson, and J. A. Rudin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 105-139.

xxxv.. B. Waltke, "A Response" in *Dispensationalism*, 355.

xxxvi.. *Ibid.*, 358-359.

xxxvii.. E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the OT* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), 147-148.

xxxviii.. Longenecker, *Exegesis*, 218ff. K. Snodgrass, "The Use of the OT in the New," in *NT Criticism and Interpretation*, ed. D. A. Black and D. S. Dockery (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 414, speaks of the tendency of NT writers to use the OT "in ways different from their original intention." Baker, *Testaments*, 190, and others argue for one meaning, the literal meaning.

xxxix.. Klein, *et al*, *Biblical Interpretation*, 138-145.

xl.. So many attest, including Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 213; H. M. Shires, *Finding the OT in the New* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 92ff.; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953) 110, 126-127; Beale, "Jesus and His Followers," 90, n. 8; R. T. France, *Jesus and the OT* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1971), 225-226; Ellis, *Paul's Use*, 112-113; N. Hillyer, "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament," *EQ* 36 (1964): 24, who also suggests that Matthew's peculiar use of the OT may well come from "a consecrated spiritual mind with the New Testament gift of prophecy"--from Matthew led by the Holy Spirit (25); and Chilton, *Galilean Rabbi*, 168ff.

The biblical support is Jesus' own words in Lk. 24:27-44 and also such passages as 1 Pet. 1:10-12; Rev. 19:10; etc.

xli.. Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 213ff.

xlii.. *Ibid.*, 216ff. He cites H. H. Rowley as appealing to the "activity of the Spirit of God in men" as prophecy arose and "the activity of God in history and experience" to explain the fulfillment (n. 3).

xliii.. *Ibid.*, 229. In n. 2 he adds that underlying "Jesus' interpretation is the idea that Scripture may contain a divinely intended significance higher (or deeper) than the human author intended." Terms in Ps. 110:1, 4 are proof of this.

xliv.. Yet even a literal hermeneutic may discover that a deeper sense may be inherent in Malachi also. Malachi means "my messenger" and so there is a play on words implicit to Mal. 3:1. Malachi himself is God's sent messenger. Yet, Malachi says also that God will "send" Elijah, and both sendings are followed by references to the coming of the awesome "day of the Lord" (3:2; 4:5). Malachi himself may not have expected the historical Elijah to reappear. In this sense, at least, Jesus and Malachi are not far apart. Kaiser argues that an actual Elijah was not in Malachi's mind (Kaiser, *Uses*, 82-84). So in its most

narrow form the literal method limits the meaning or significance of the prophecy of Mal. 3:1; 4:5 to a single actual Elijah to come in the Day of Yahweh. On the other hand, if a more broad literal meaning is followed so that meaning can be expanded

to significance then more than a single person may be in view, and even a metaphorical Elijah. Yet this approach cannot account for two comings and two or more such ones fulfilling this, especially since the characteristics attending the promise in Malachi will not be fulfilled as envisioned until the second coming. In addition a literal hermeneutic fails to give certainty or sufficient guidelines for discovering the deeper significance. Even should the literal method work here, it does not work everywhere.

Another, deeper meaning seems to appear in the NT at Jn. 11:51; 17:12; 18:9; 1 Pet.1:10-12; Rev. 19:10. Gundry argues that anapleroun may be rendered "to fill again," "to fill completely" (Mt. 13:14 citing Is. 6:9, 10) (*Use of the OT*, 213, n. 4).

xliv.. K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 183-84.

xlvi.. Longenecker, *Exegesis*, 41, 50ff.; he supports the idea of following the NT when it engages in literal hermeneutics, but not when it engages in pesher, midrash or allegory, for these require a "revelatory stance" (217-219).

xlvii.. Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 213. In n. 7 he appeals to F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis*, 11ff., 68f., as standing in contrast to Stendahl and seeing a wide gulf between Qumran and the NT.

48. Silva, "NT Use," 161, believes that the differences between biblical and rabbinic interpretation is "quantitative rather than qualitative." Chilton, *Galilean Rabbi*, shows that targumic material was also used by Jesus and believes it to be the key to His use of the OT.

xlix.. Longenecker, *Exegesis*, 66-70.

l. I. H. Marshall, "An Assessment of Recent Developments," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: University Press, 1988), 13.

li.. *Ibid*, 14.

lii.. Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 208, says this of Matthew, and he later identifies Matthew's use as derived from Jesus, including a "deeper sense" (213). K. J. Thomas, "Torah Citations in the Synoptics," *NTS* 24 (1977): 96, notes that Jesus was more concerned with the "broader purpose and intention of the Torah as the revelation of God's will." He did not use "atomizing literalism."

liii.. G. Von Rad, "Typological Interpretation of the OT," *Essays on OT Hermeneutics*, ed. C. Westermann, trans. J.L. Mays (Richmond: John Knox, 1963), 21.

liv.. Baker, *Two Testaments*, 199. He denies that it is exegesis, prophecy, allegory, symbolism or a method or system.

lv.. *Ibid.*, 190. Cf. France, *Jesus*, 41-42.

lvi.. von Rad, "Typological," 36-39. For example, typology goes beyond the "historical self-understanding" of the text; and it may not survive as a term per se.

lvii.. S. L. Johnson, *The OT in the New* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 55-56.

lviii.. Kaiser, *Uses*, 106-110.

lix.. L. Goppelt, *Typos* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 18, 200-202.

lx.. Verhoef, "Relationships," 286, warns against making typology more than one aspect of the "scheme of redemptive

history." Other ways to connect the testaments are legitimate.

61. W. Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event and History," *Essays on OT Hermeneutics*, ed. C. Westermann, trans. J. Mays (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963), 327-329.

lxii.. See Kaiser, *Uses*, 147; G. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 139-141; and others.

lxiii.. Longenecker, *Exegesis*, 93-95. The other three are corporate solidarity, correspondences in history and eschatological fulfillment. Longenecker terms christology "messianic presence."

lxiv.. G. Hasel, *NT Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 155-164, thinks christocentricity is the center of the NT, but it should not become the structure upon which to write a NT theology (164).

lxv.. See Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 215-216. Hasel, *NT Theology*, 111-139, 148-153, shows that salvation history seems to be inadequate. In addition, Chilton, *Galilean Rabbi*, 154ff., argues that it is only an assumption that biblical history amounts to salvation.

lxvi.. It is possible to distinguish between a valid use of *Heilsgeschichte* and an invalid one. R. Allen has defended the moderate view which was, apparently, the position of the originator of the term, von Hofmann. See R. Allen, "Is There *Heil* for *Heilsgeschichte*?" A paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, MI, Dec. 30, 1975. Allen goes on to suggest eight considerations or prerequisites necessary for a careful use of *Heilsgeschichte* (17-20).

lxvii.. Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event," 314-315. Both *Heilsgeschichte* and existential theology are often employed as means to escape the feared destruction of faith caused by that kind of historical-critical investigation which seems to destroy the historical reliability of the Scripture. Pannenberg notes that "redemptive history is not a suprahistory, but because of its universal tendency essentially includes all events" (330). Yet in the end Cullman's approach preserves canonical faith better than Pannenberg's, as T. Dorman argues. See T. Dorman, "Can We Speak of 'Canonical' Scripture? Oscar Cullman's thesis in Light of Wolfart Pannenberg's Proposal." A paper read at the Evangelical Theological Society, Kansas City, MO., Nov. 21-23, 1991.

lxviii.. See Baker, *Two Testaments*, 203-233; Hasel, *OT Theology*, 181ff.; *NT Theology*, 127-132, where he cites Goppelt (*Theology of the NT*) as limiting salvation history to promise and fulfillment.

lxix.. Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event," 316-317. He writes that reality is a linear history moving toward a goal, for God initiates new events in the course of His creation. This "history arises because God makes promises and fulfills these promises" (317). "History is event so suspended in tension between promise and fulfillment that through the promise it is irreversibly pointed toward the goal of future fulfillment" (317). "The goal here of Yahweh's action in history is that he be known--revelation. . . His action comes from his love, begins with his vow, and aims at the goal that Yahweh will be revealed in his action as he fulfills his vow" (317).

lxx.. Verhoef, "Relationships," 289-290, believes that the whole of the Testaments is to be covered by each term (ie., promise

and fulfillment). Yet he acknowledges that this formula must be supplemented by such concepts as unity of perspective regarding the coming of the Kingdom of God and continuity/discontinuity (292).

lxxi.. Weir, "Analogous Fulfillment," 72. Mickelsen, Wolff, von Rad, D. S. Russell and De Vries all hint at analogous fulfillment, according to Weir. He finds that the analogous fulfillment model meets the four criteria necessary for the fulfillment of the OT in the NT (66). Chilton, *Galilean Rabbi*, 184ff., prefers analogy over typology in his process called "fulfilled interpretation" (involving analogical, critical meditation, and experiential steps).

lxxii.. *Ibid.*, 75.

lxxiii.. W. J. Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963 [1905]).

lxxiv.. Kaiser, *Uses*, 204. Hirsch more recently changed his theory of meaning and significance to allow a deepening concept of meaning. Hirsch allows that an older, broad verbal meaning with a future directed intent may have many future applications or exemplifications. This revision in meaning can only be small in mental content and be subsumed by the original intention-concept. (E.D. Hirsch, "Meaning and Significance Reinterpreted," *Critical Inquiry* 11 (Dec. 1984), 202-225). Kaiser (*Uses*, 204) laments this change.

lxxv.. Thus Kaiser, *ibid.*, 230, defines generic prophecy as that which "envisages an event as occurring in a series of parts, often separated by intervals of times, yet, expressed in such a way that the language of the OT may legitimately apply either to the nearest, remoter or climactic event. Thus, the same word, with the same sense or meaning of the OT authors, may apply at once to the whole complex of events or to any one of its parts in any particular era without destroying what the author had in mind when he first gave that word."

lxxvi.. K. Barker, "The Scope and Center of Old and New Testament Theology and Hope", ch. 10 in *Dispensationalism*, 323-328.

lxxvii.. Barker's idea of "progressive fulfillment" suffers the same faults as does Kaiser's view. (1) It says nothing of dual authorship with the Holy Spirit as co-author (p. 324), treating Scripture as secular literature when the NT clearly did not. (2) It focuses on progressive "stages" or climaxes, while it seems better to think of progressive development, a progressive actualization more and more throughout any and all stages, as our paradigm will suggest, just as progressive revelation suggests. (3) The "both-and" idea still suggests a dual mindset (pp. 294, 328). Yet it should be more; it is "here but not yet" in ongoing actualization. (4) It does not represent a total world view so as to provide an approach for hermeneutics, as well as theology, which finds biblical authority. (5) Our paradigm will allow for community contributions to progressive revelation even beyond the canon. Hebrews 11:39-40 is still applicable during the whole present age.

lxxviii.. The whole Book of Hebrews reflects this, never attributing Scripture directly to a human author. In addition the book is anonymous perhaps for this very reason--to have it received as a divine message, not a human one. Finally, God is also the co-author of NT Scripture.

lxxix.. This and other reasons lead P. Payne to assert that it is fallacious to equate meaning with the human author's intention.

- See P. B. Payne, "The Fallacy of Equating Meaning with the Human Author's Intention," *JETS* 13 (1970): 243-252.
- lxxx.. Erickson, *Interpretation*, 19-31.
- lxxxi.. R.E. Brown, "The History and Development of the Theory of a Sensus Plenior," *CBQ* 25 (1963): 262-285. Those evangelicals who hold to some form of *sensus plenior* include: S.L. Johnson, J.I. Packer, E.E. Johnson, W. Dunnnett, P.B. Payne, W.S. Lasor, D.A. Hagner, and D. Moo.
- lxxxii.. This is an objection raised by B. Vawter and endorsed by Kaiser, *Uses*, 209.
- lxxxiii.. D. Moo, "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. Woodbridge, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 201-202. See also Baker, *Two Testaments*, 193-194.
- lxxxiv.. J. J. O'Rourke, "The Fulfillment Texts in Matthew," *CBQ* 24(1962): 402-403, says that "we should not call a *sensus plenior* something which we cannot otherwise classify; that would be merely labeling a difficulty, not resolving it" (403). He believes that Matthew viewed his use of the OT as legitimate and proper, but so varied from "our point of view that no completely satisfactory classifying of them has yet been produced" (403).
- lxxxv.. Moo, "*Sensus Plenior*," 205-206.
- lxxxvi.. So Moo defines the canonical approach ("*Sensus Plenior*," 210).
- lxxxvii.. J. I. Packer, "Infallible Scripture and the Role of Hermeneutics," in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 350.
- lxxxviii.. B. Waltke, "A Canonical Process Approach to the Psalms", in *Tradition and Testament*, eds. John S. and Paul D. Feinberg (Chicago: Moody, 1981), 3-18. The ideal language of the Psalmist is perceived from later revelation and is equal to God's meaning and intention.
- lxxxix.. V. Poythress, "Divine Meaning of Scripture" *WTJ* 48 (1986): 241-279. See Glenny's excellent summary ("Divine Meaning," 16-17. Glenny also evaluates (17-19) the "multi-dimensional" approach of D.A. Oss ("Canon as Context: The Function of Sensus Plenior in Evangelical Hermeneutics," *GTJ* 9.1 (1988): 115-127.) Yet Oss fails to distinguish the author's historical meaning from the later divine meaning, so that there is no discernible meaning for the original recipients.
- xc.. Klein, *et al*, *Biblical Intrepretation*, 138-145.
- xci.. See the extensive discussion of other potential centers in Hasel, *OT Theology*, 139-168; 191-193. He argues that the center must be an "internal key," from within the Bible itself, "based on the inner biblical witnesses" (159). We think that our approach meets this criterion.
- xcii.. Such an interpretation of the creation account is supported by B. Waltke, *Creation and Chaos*, a series of lectures delivered at Western Seminary, Portland, OR., 1974; and by S. Ellisen, "Everyone's Question: What is God Trying to Do?" in *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement*, ed. R. Winter and S. Hawthorne (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1981), 19-23. However, the discussion about a biblical center and the paradigm of reality remains intact regardless of one's view of the creation account.

xciii.. For a fuller discussion of the Kingdom as center, and the implications for creation and redemption of man, see S. Hurty, "'The Truth Shall Make You Free': A New Model of Sanctification Based on a Synthesis of the Models from the Reformed and the Contemplative Traditions." A Th.M. thesis presented to Western Seminary, Portland, OR, April, 1993, 66ff.

xciv.. Hasel, *OT Theology*, 139-171.

xcv.. For examples, see Hasel, *OT Theology*, 139-171; 205-206; Osborne, *Spiral*, 293.

xcvi.. For a fuller description of the elements of the paradigm, see Hurty, "'Truth Shall Make You Free'," 72-75. For exegetical demonstrations and further applications of the paradigm of reality, see J. De Young with S. Hurty, "Here But Not Yet: A Paradigm Toward Understanding the Role of Women in Ministry," a paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, San Francisco, CA, Nov. 20, 1992.

xcvii.. In regards to actualization, Baker (*Two Testaments*, 304-306) suggests that this may be the unifying concept to bind von Rad's complex solution (involving typology, promise and fulfillment, tradition history, and salvation history) together. Von Rad uses the term in a limited way, chiefly to describe how "the saving events connected with the festivals were 'actualized' in the cultic celebration," and how Deuteronomy is "a unique actualization of God's will to counter specific dangers" in Israel's later history [von Rad, *OT Theology*, vol. 2 (1960), quoted by Baker, 305]. He also uses the sense of it when speaking of "the way in which the OT is absorbed in the New" (*ibid.*). Von Rad writes: "The question therefore is whether the reinterpretation of OT traditions in the light of Christ's appearance on earth is not also hermeneutically perfectly permissible.... The Apostles clearly take the view that the texts of the OT only attain their fullest actuality in light of their fulfillment" (*ibid.*, 305-306).

For Baker, this concept is closely related to the idea of "re-presentation" used by Noth, Westermann and Dreyfus.

We seek to take actualization more specifically (relating it to Kingdom) and more extensively (a central concept).

xcviii.. J. De Young with S. Hurty, "Here, But Not Yet: A Paradigm Toward Understanding the Role of Women in Ministry," paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society, San Francisco, CA., Nov. 20, 1992; revised, Dec., 1992.

xcix.. See Glenny, "Divine Meaning," 4-8 for several excellent reasons why God's intention cannot be limited to the human author's intention.

c.. So F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1871; rep. 1978), 71-72, writes on the application to Jesus Christ of Deut. 32:43 in Heb. 1:6. This principle that Jesus is Yahweh revealed "constitutes the innermost bond between the two Testaments," he says. He includes a reference to Mal. 4:5. P. E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 60-61, concurs. See also Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 209, 224-225.

ci.. Snodgrass, "Use of the OT," 427, holds to a related idea when he states: "We have not completed the interpretive task until we have determined how a text does or does not correspond with Jesus' ministry or the ministry of the church." We simply narrow this hermeneutical idea to Jesus and the Kingdom.

cii.. Moo, "*Sensus Plenior*," 202.

ciii.. Yet even on the subject of the canon, there is a pluralistic view within the Church, as one compares the Roman Catholic and Eastern traditions with the Protestant. See C. Evans, "The Function of the Old Testament in the New," in *Introducing New Testament Interpretation*, ed. S. McKnight (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), 164-165 and R.T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 478-505.

civ.. See von Rad, "Typological Interpretation," 36.

cv.. Beale, "Jesus and His Followers," 90-94, in his approach to typology, shows that the use of the OT by the NT is contextual and not atomistic; that Christ as the center of history is the key to interpreting earlier portions of the OT; that there is dual authorship; that we can and must reproduce the exegetical method of NT writers in order to feel "corporately" at one with them, although we may not be able to claim that our interpretation is normative.

The actualization of essential reality affirms all that Beale asserts and goes further by providing a better basis for doing exegesis. While in the present era there is an advance in understanding what the essential reality is, yet even this does not exhaust the meaning. The paradigm allows us to reach into the future, for in the eternal state the essential reality will be fully actualized.

If NT writers could discern, according to Beale, the divine intention from a "retrospective viewpoint, which is fuller than the original human intention but does not contradict its contextual meaning," (93) then cannot we after 2,000 years discern an even more full divine intention beyond the human intention? By the paradigm of reality we today can still feel corporately at one with the Early Church, and our context includes not only the canon but interpretations of a maturing Church in line with the canon.

cvi.. A pertinent concern regarding typology as an explanation of the use of Malachi 3:1 by Jesus is whether the type was recorded with the deliberate intent to instruct the Church. Can typology be a means of interpreting both the OT and NT or just the NT? Without deciding the issue per se, it is at least plausible, with the dual authorship of Scripture, that Matthew 11 helps to interpret Malachi 3. As Marshall writes, it seems to be a paradox, yet balanced view, that "the OT may be regarded in some ways as servant and in some ways as master in the process of formation of NT theology" (18). The paradigm of reality would support this idea, for essential reality permeates both testaments. See Marshall, "Assessment," 16-18.

cvii.. This meets the concern of Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event," 334, who writes that "an understanding of history as a whole is made possible for the first time because the end of history is already present."

cviii.. W. Pannenberg, "The God of History: The Trinitarian God and the Truth of History," trans. M.B. Jackson, *The Cumberland Seminarian*, 19 (1981): 28-41.

cix.. Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event," 334.

cx.. It is possible to misunderstand the concept of actualization to mean that God is somehow "becoming" in His deity or that His Kingdom is being made more "real" through being manifest in history. This is unequivocally not what we mean. Rather, God and His Kingdom are being actualized in their relationship to creation, which is now separate from them. The only reason that such actualization proves that God is God is because He promised that actualization. Had He not promised, He would still be God.

- cxii.. Kaiser, *Uses*, 208.
- cxiii.. Osborne, *Spiral*, 277.
- cxiv.. We will take a common area of failure briefly as an example. The Kingdom center and the paradigm of reality apply to wisdom literature in two ways. First, wisdom literature focuses upon practical living. This concerns how to live and view life from a Kingdom perspective according to Kingdom principles in our present existential reality. Second, it helps us discover layers of meaning in wisdom literature. For instance, Madame Folly represents (especially sexual) immorality, temple cult prostitutes, and the way of evil and Death. Lady Wisdom represents godliness and fidelity in all relationships, Life, and ultimately Yahweh Himself! Each is also folly and wisdom, of course.
- cxv.. On the issue of continuity versus discontinuity, see Verhoef, "Relationship," 293-295; K. L. Barker, "False Dichotomies Between the Testaments," *JETS* 25/1 (1982): 3-16; M. Karlberg, "Legitimate Discontinuities Between the Testaments," *JETS* 28/1 (1985): 9-20. The last two works seek to show the growing rapprochement between dispensationalists and covenant theologians. Karlberg, in particular, draws attention to a third view which holds that promises to Israel will be realized in history prior to the consummation of history; how or when is unknown. The paradigm of reality accommodates both views and offers a compromise.
- cxvi.. Osborne, *Spiral*, 287ff.
- cxvii.. See J. Ellul, *The Presence of the Kingdom* (Colorado Springs: Helmers & Howard, 1989), xxvi, 30-35, for his philosophical approach to the ongoing dialectic between God's kingdom and this world. The paradigm also reflects the positive contributions of people such as F. Schleiermacher and R. Bultmann. See D. McCartney and C. Clayton, *Let the Reader Understand* (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1994), 98-111.
- cxviii.. Osborne, *Spiral*, 311.
- cxix.. In a similar vein, Erickson, *Interpretation*, 99ff., calls for a new hermeneutic for our postmodern era.
- cxx.. Osborne, *Spiral*, 317. For a critique of narrative theology in the arena of apologetics, see D. Clark, "Narrative Theology and Apologetics" *JETS* 36/4 (Dec., 1993): 499-515.
- cxxi.. While at first one might think that this paradigm is more compatible with amillennialism, especially the idea that prophecy pertaining to events after the ascension is to be fulfilled spiritually (per Waltke, "Response," 355), it need not be. The paradigm affirms both realities of meaning, the human author's and the divine author's, and both were realities at the time of origin. Scripture always had an essential reality to be actualized in the existential.
- cxxii.. Osborne, *Spiral*, 325. We agree with Osborne, however, that it is wrong to assume that form as well as content is normative (326). Within Scripture and church history forms have undergone change while the content has stayed the same.

See additional discussion of this in T. Tiessen, "Toward a Hermeneutic for Discerning Universal Moral Absolutes," *JETS* 36 (1993): 192, 199-200.

cxxiii.. The aspect of actualization in the paradigm of reality is related to the concept of horizons and the goal of the new hermeneutic or hermeneutical circle. The interpreter is to enlarge his horizon until it fuses with the text's horizons. The goal is a "fusion of worlds" or "merging of horizons." See A. C. Thiselton, "The New Hermeneutic," *New Testament Interpretation*, ed. I. H. Marshall (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 317.

However, the paradigm affirms both realities, the existential and essential and upholds the integrity of original intention. It is not so much a fusion of horizons, as though God's Kingdom or essential reality might change, as it is a subjection of one reality to another, with our world view being brought into conformity with it. See R. G. Gruenler, "The New Hermeneutic," *The Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. W. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 763-765.

cxxiv.. D. Hesselgrave, "The Three Horizons: Cultural, Integration and Communication," *JETS* 28/4 (1985): 453. He projects the third world as a third horizon, yet it seems better to make the essential reality of the Kingdom such a horizon, for it is transcultural, appealing to all cultures to conform to the realm of God's Kingdom.

cxxv.. J. K. Willsey, "Biblical Application in Cross-Cultural Perspective," a paper presented to the Northwest Section, Evangelical Theological Society, Portland, OR, April, 1993, 2.

cxxvi.. *Ibid.*

cxxvii.. *Ibid.*, 21.

cxxviii.. D. Estes, "Audience Analysis and Validity in Application," *BibSac* 150 (1993): 219-229.

cxxix.. See Tiessen, "Toward a Hermeneutic," 189-207. He sets forth five helpful principles.

cxxx.. *Ibid.*, 203-205.

cxxxii.. See Glenny, "Divine Meaning."

cxxxiii.. Willsey, "Biblical Application," 26.

cxxxiv.. So B. Walsh and J. Middleton, *The Transforming Vision* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1984), 37-39.

cxxxv.. *Ibid.*, 151-152.

cxxxvi.. See the proposal for directing such growth by a new model of sanctification based in the paradigm of reality, in Hurty, "Truth Shall Make You Free" (cited above).

cxxxvii.. J.I. Packer, "Infallible Scripture and the Role of Hermeneutics," in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D.A. Carson and J. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 334-335.

cxxxviii.. See J. Dahms, "The Nature of Truth," *JETS* 28/4 (1985): 455-465, who defends truth as trinitarian.

cxxxix.. We are indebted to the Reformation for its restoration and advocacy of objectivity, but it went too far in its desire to avoid subjectivity. We must also avoid the secular subjectivity of the Enlightenment which went too far in its pendulum swing reaction to objectivity (so Rousseau and Kant). See K. Bockmuehl, *Listening to the God Who Speaks* (Colorado Springs: Helmers & Howard, 1990), 121-137.

cxxxix.. Moo, "*Sensus Plenior*," 182-183.