

**Bibliography for “Evangelicalism, Inerrancy and Current OT Scholarship” by Todd Beall, *Bible and Spade*, Volume 28:1, Winter 2015.**



<sup>1</sup>Dr. Beall was formerly adjunct Professor of Old Testament at Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary and Capital Bible Seminary.

<sup>2</sup>For the full Chicago Statement, see [http://www.etsjets.org/files/documents/Chicago\\_Statement.pdf](http://www.etsjets.org/files/documents/Chicago_Statement.pdf) (accessed 12 December 2013).

<sup>3</sup>For the complete statement, see [http://library.dts.edu/Pages/TL/Special/ICBI\\_2.pdf](http://library.dts.edu/Pages/TL/Special/ICBI_2.pdf) (accessed 12 December 2013).

<sup>4</sup>Peter Enns, “Fuller Meaning, Single Goal,” in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 174. Enns argues that the NT writers were using Second Temple interpretive practices, so it is “incumbent upon us to do what we can to uncover those practices” (ibid.).

<sup>5</sup>For example, see Tremper Longman, *How to Read the Psalms* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 68: “No psalm is exclusively messianic in the narrow sense.” Longman’s book is an excellent introduction to the Psalms for the most part, but I disagree with his point here.

<sup>6</sup>John Stek, “Psalms,” *The NIV Study Bible*, ed. Kenneth Barker (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 906. By contrast, Barry C. Davis affirms that the psalm is exclusively Messianic (“Is Psalm 110 a Messianic Psalm?” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 157 [April–June 2000]: 160–73). Craig Blomberg similarly sees Ps 110 as a case of “straightforward prediction and fulfillment” (“Matthew,” in *Commentary on the NT Use of the OT*, ed. Greg Beale and D. A. Carson [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 84).

<sup>7</sup>Leslie Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 86, 84.

<sup>8</sup>John Goldingay, *Psalms Volume 1: Psalms 1–41* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 340–41. Goldingay’s comment that the NT use of the psalm “wrenches it out of its setting” reminds me of S. V. McCasland’s essay, “Matthew Twists the Scriptures,” where he argues that Matthew deliberately misquotes the OT for his own purposes. For instance, he says that Matthew deliberately misinterpreted Isa 7:14 to infer a virgin birth from a passage simply talking about a birth which happened in Isaiah’s own day (S. V. McCasland, “Matthew Twists the Scriptures,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 [June 1961]: 143–48; reprinted in G. K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994], 146–52). Of course, to my knowledge McCasland was not an evangelical, but my point is that Goldingay and McCasland appear to be saying virtually the same thing.

<sup>9</sup>Other portions of Ps 22 are cited by NT writers in reference to Christ as well. Verse 18

(19 Heb) is cited in John 19:24; Matt 27:35; Mark 15:24; and Luke 23:34; verse 8 (9 Heb) is cited in Matt 27:43; and verse 22 (23 Heb) is cited in Heb 2:12: all refer to the Messiah.

<sup>10</sup>John Goldingay and David Payne, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*, 2 vols., International Critical Commentary (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 1:54–55.

<sup>11</sup>Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 2:281.

<sup>12</sup>See Matt 8:17; Mark 15:28; Luke 22:37; John 12:38; Acts 8:32–33; Rom 10:16; 15:21; and 1 Pet 2:22–25.

<sup>13</sup>For another sad treatment of this passage, see Watts, who views the Servant of Isa 53 to be Zerubbabel (of Ezra’s day). Yet he graciously states, “This identification should take nothing away from the model or symbol of Yahweh’s appointed one who patiently bears suffering even to death which means so much for NT christology. The importance of chap. 53 lies in showing God’s attitude toward and use of an innocent death to accomplish peace and healing for the community.... God is shown to be goal-oriented. His justice looks forward, not backward. His drive toward deliverance and salvation, toward restoration and fellowship, can use innocent death to achieve these goals for others” (J. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word, 1987], 228, 233).

<sup>14</sup>For a helpful introduction, see Roger Nicole, “The New Testament Use of the Old Testament,” in Beale, *Right Doctrine*, 13–28.

<sup>15</sup>It is, therefore, quite distressing to me to see OT commentaries that hardly mention the NT, even when a NT passage cites the OT passage being discussed in the commentary.

<sup>16</sup>For the complete statement, see [http://library.dts.edu/Pages/TL/Special/ICBI\\_2.pdf](http://library.dts.edu/Pages/TL/Special/ICBI_2.pdf) (accessed 12 December 2013).

<sup>17</sup>The Gap Theory was popularized by the *Scofield Reference Bible* notes, among other places. The Day-Age theory has also been popular among some evangelical OT scholars. See, for example, Gleason Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1994), 200–203.

<sup>18</sup>Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 50. Though Enns calls Genesis 1–11 “myth,” he believes that it is a genuine revelation from God.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 55.

<sup>21</sup>*Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, s.v. “Creation,” by J. H. Walton, 156.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, 161–62.

<sup>23</sup>John H. Walton, *Genesis*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 84.

<sup>24</sup>Johnny Miller and John Soden, *In the Beginning...We Misunderstood: Interpreting*

*Genesis 1 in its Original Context* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012),

164. Interestingly, their position shifts in Gen 2: “Understanding Genesis 1 (Gen. 1:1–2:3) symbolically does not also require a figurative understanding of everything in Genesis 2 (Gen. 2:4–25). In fact, Genesis 2 presents a different sort of account, one in which Adam and Eve are the historical ancestors of the human race” (167).

<sup>25</sup>The symposium was held on Sept 30–Oct 1, 2011. A book encapsulating the five views represented at the symposium has recently been published: J. Daryl Charles, ed., *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013).

<sup>26</sup>See Todd S. Beall, “Contemporary Hermeneutical Approaches to Genesis 1–11,” in *Coming to Grips with Genesis: Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*, ed. Terry Mortenson and Thane Ury (Green Forest, AZ: Master, 2008), 131–62. See also idem, “Reading Genesis 1–2: A Literal Approach,” in *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation*, ed. J. Daryl Charles (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2013), 45–59. Also see idem, “Genesis 1–11: A Plea for Hermeneutical Consistency,” presented at Evangelical Theological Society Annual Meeting, 19 November 2010.

<sup>27</sup>Walter Kaiser, *The Old Testament Documents: Are They Reliable and Relevant?* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 82.

<sup>28</sup>See fn. 26, above.

<sup>29</sup>See, for example, Exod 23:20–33; 34:10–17; Deut 18:9–14.

<sup>30</sup>Walton has one ancillary reference (Col 1:16–17 is mentioned but not explained), and two references to Paul and Hebrews, but no passages cited. My essay in the same volume contained around 40 NT references. Admittedly, Walton is trying to establish parallels with ANE literature, but why not also deal with the NT texts? Miller and Soden’s work demonstrates a similar imbalance, with extensive summaries of ANE literature from Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Canaan, but almost no mention of the NT.

<sup>31</sup>Notice the shift in tone in Miller and Soden’s work once we get to chap. 2. See fn. 24, above.

<sup>32</sup>Tremper Longman, “What Genesis 1–2 Teaches (and What it Doesn’t),” in *Reading Genesis 1–2: An Evangelical Conversation*, 122. Note that Longman says that he has not come to a settled conclusion on the matter.

<sup>33</sup>Peter Enns, *The Evolution of Adam* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 140.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 138.

<sup>35</sup>G. K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008), 124.

<sup>36</sup>Richard L. Schultz, “How Many Isaiahs were There and What Does It Matter?” in *Evangelicals and Scripture: Tradition, Authority, and Hermeneutics*, ed. Vincent Bacote, Laura Miguez, and Dennis Okholm (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 151.

<sup>37</sup>See Gleason Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* 3rd ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1994), 365–90 [note that the section on Isaiah is not substantially different from the second edition, published in 1974]; E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 202–11; Hobart Freeman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophets* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1976), 196–203; R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 764–95. Note that Harrison was open to Cyrus in Isa 44:28 and 45:1 being a later explanatory gloss (p. 794). See also Oswalt T. Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1950). Allis provides a strong defense of the authorship of Isaiah by the eighth-century prophet.

<sup>38</sup>See <http://hamiltonmj1983.wordpress.com/2011/10/31/why-is-multiple-authorship-of-isaiah-still-an-issue> (accessed 12 December 2013).

<sup>39</sup>Beale, *Erosion of Inerrancy*, 124.

<sup>40</sup>J. Daniel Hayes, *The Message of the Prophets* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 98.

<sup>41</sup>Andrew Hill and John Walton, *A Survey of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 7.

<sup>42</sup>John Walton and Brent Sandy, *The Lost World of Scripture: Ancient Literary Culture and Biblical Authority* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013), 30.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*, 33–34.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>45</sup>*Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>46</sup>Brevard Childs, *Isaiah* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 1–4, 289–91.

<sup>47</sup>Tremper Longman and Raymond Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 311.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, 310.

<sup>49</sup>William Sanford LaSor, David Allan Hubbard, and Frederic William Bush, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 281.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, 282.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, 285–86.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, 286.

<sup>53</sup>On the positive side (from my perspective), Ed Hindson and Gary Yates offer strong support for Isaianic authorship: “The canonical witness of the New Testament confirms Isaiah’s authorship of all parts of the book.” See Ed Hindson and Gary Yates, eds., *The Essence of the Old Testament: A Survey* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2012), 296.

<sup>54</sup>Gordon McConville, *Exploring the Old Testament: The Prophets*

(London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2002), 9–11.

<sup>55</sup>Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 1:2.

<sup>56</sup>John Goldingay, *Isaiah*, New International Biblical Commentary  
(Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 2–5.

<sup>57</sup>Edgar Conrad, *Reading Isaiah* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991), 19.

<sup>58</sup>Neither space nor time permits me to list here the strong reasons for holding to single authorship of Isaiah. But the NT evidence should be determinative. See esp. John 12:37–41, where Isa 53:1 and Isa 6:10 are cited together and attributed to the prophet Isaiah. For further discussion, see Schultz, “How Many Isaiahs?” 153–70; and Beale, *Erosion of Inerrancy*, 124–

59. In particular, Isa 40–48 demonstrates that God alone can tell the future— and one of the key evidences of that fact is his prediction of Cyrus in Isa 44:28 and 45:1.

<sup>59</sup>Beale, *Erosion of Inerrancy*, 20.

<sup>60</sup>Schultz, “How Many Isaiahs?” 159.

<sup>61</sup>John Goldingay, *Models for Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 248.

<sup>62</sup>See 1 Pet 1:10–12.