

## Apostleship and Prophetic Function in the New Testament: The Apostles as Prophetic Scripture Interpreters\*

Thomas Scott Caulley  
Kentucky Christian University  
Grayson, KY

This article explores interrelationships between ancient Jewish and Christ-believer attitudes toward scriptures, and the role of the apostles as scripture interpreters. Taking a cue from some recent work on Jewish scripture interpretation as “rewritten scripture” (within the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Second Temple texts),<sup>1</sup> this article revisits the idea of the apostles as prophetic scripture interpreters, but specifically as standing within this Jewish reading (and “rewriting”) tradition.

The thesis of this article is that Paul was a prophet, and functioned in his prophetic role as an authoritative scripture interpreter. In light of what we know about the state of the scriptures in the first century, as well as certain outcomes *vis-à-vis* apostolic authority we observe in some later New Testament documents, it is important to interpret the scripture praxis of Paul and the other New Testament writers in terms of prophetic scripture interpretation.

---

\*A version of this article was presented at the Stone-Campbell Journal Conference, April 5-6, 2019, Johnson University, Knoxville, TN.

The prophetic role of the Apostles as interpreters of scripture was explored in the last generation by such scholars as E. Earle Ellis and David Aune, but within the narrow scope of “charismatic exegesis.” Contrary to Aune’s claim—that charismatic exegesis always remained at a level secondary to the inspired (canonical) texts being interpreted<sup>2</sup>--this article is prologue to the idea that several of the New Testament documents may be understood as part of the Jewish interpretive tradition of “rewritten scripture,” within the church’s understanding of the Apostles as inheritors of the prophetic gift of inspired scripture interpretation. Moreover, this approach to scripture within Judaism (and by extension, in the early church) was not the exception but the rule.<sup>3</sup> As such, in the context of the early church’s Christological hermeneutic as controlling interpretive lens, examples of “rewritten scripture” became canonical (Mark as the preached Good News understood as narrative; the latter gospels which, in part, rewrote Mark; Ephesians as a rewriting of Colossians; 2 Peter rewriting Jude; perhaps also the second half of Acts as a “narrativizing” of Romans 1:16-17; 1 Peter as reworking themes of Romans; etc.).

#### *“Rewritten Scripture” in Second Temple Judaism*

Second Temple Judaism (the time between the rebuilt temple in 516 BCE and the destruction of Herod’s remodeled temple in 70 CE) produced a great deal of literature. Much of this literature has been known for a long time, and more writings came to light with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran. There has long been awareness of the Jewish practice of rewriting scriptural texts, some of which ostensibly goes back to 1 and 2 Chronicles’ use of 1 and 2 Kings, the building upon tradition within the

three acknowledged sections of Isaiah, as well as the reissuing of the law in the form of Deuteronomy. Also important is the practice of some later Hebrew prophets of using and re-contextualizing earlier scriptural themes.<sup>4</sup> The purpose of this “rewriting” seems to include meeting the need to update or re-contextualize the older material. Noteworthy is that the enhancing (“rewrit-ing”) of scriptural texts apparently was not done to replace the old texts, but the new texts coexisted with the old texts, and both were considered inspired scripture.

The literature from Qumran offers a rich variety of different rewritten texts—both scripture texts and “para-scriptural” documents. The rewriting included the production of variant texts of the actual scriptural books, to re-contextualizing of various Biblical stories (similar to those found in Josephus, and to a degree in Philo), to reworking entire scriptural books or sections of books (e.g., Jubilees and *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*).

Many such manuscripts were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. In addition to the kind of rewriting mentioned above, the Qumran literature is also famous for its commentaries (*midrash peshet*, as in *1QpHab*, the Habakkuk commentary), and other documents which expand upon scriptural texts. One of these, *4QReworked Pentateuch*, has been the subject of much discussion. While some scholars initially classified the document as a nonbiblical reworking of the Pentateuch, others—notably Eugene Ulrich, James VanderKam, and Michael Segal—challenged this view on the basis of the rich variation in versions of the biblical text that the Qumran discoveries have revealed. “In their minds, precisely the sorts of exegetical additions and reorganizations that prompted the original editors to classify the 4QRP texts as non-scriptural are characteristic of the emergent *biblical* text in the late Second Temple period.”<sup>5</sup>

“Scribes engaged in two types of activities: exact transcription, and intervention for the purposes of exegesis. Both types were a sign of reverence for a text. Both types were taken seriously by the authors and their audiences alike.”<sup>6</sup>

Finally, G. Brooke notes that, as regards the terminology, a neat separation between “scripture” and “rewritten” is impossible, and instead speaks of a “sliding scale” and degrees of rewriting.<sup>7</sup> Brooke understands “rewritten scriptural texts” as “any representation of an authoritative scriptural text that implicitly incorporates interpretive elements, large or small, in the retelling itself.”<sup>8</sup> In other words, following Brooke and others, many scholars are now viewing “rewritten scripture” as a continuum of documents, from those commenting on a scripture passage or recontextualizing a Biblical story, to enhanced scriptural texts themselves (and everything in between). The point for this article is that the attitudes demonstrated at Qumran of how to use scripture, along with the use of Jewish interpretive methods—as well as the varied scriptural texts themselves—were the attitudes, methods, and scripture texts inherited and used by the early church.

#### *The scriptures of Israel in the first-century church*

At the turn of the era the scriptures of Israel, including the Greek scriptures of the diaspora synagogue,<sup>9</sup> were textually multiform<sup>10</sup> and, in terms of a collection, in flux.<sup>11</sup> That is to say, at the time of Paul, multiple text “types” of the scriptures in Hebrew were known and used, as well as multiple text types in Greek. The differences between Greek and Hebrew texts of the same books could be vast. In addition, the emerging Hebrew and Greek scripture collections which were eventually canonized were

also different,<sup>12</sup> with the so-called “apocrypha” documents enjoying wide-spread popularity in early church circles.<sup>13</sup> The experience of both multiple text types and the pre-canonical reality of differing collections of documents was the norm for the earliest church. They enjoyed scriptures, but not canon. They were exposed to—and were probably aware of—different texts of the same scriptures.<sup>14</sup>

These realities have important implications for understanding ancient Jewish and the first church members’ attitudes towards scripture and scriptural authority, as well as their methods of interpretation. It is the contention of this article that the attitudes toward scripture among church members, fostered by the varied state of the text and the different collections of documents, contributed to the astonishing creative freedom used in handling scripture which we encounter in Paul and other authors in the New Testament.

Much attention has been given recently to the study of “the New Testament use of the Old Testament.” Matthew Bates has criticized some of that effort as anachronistic (there was no “New Testament” or “Old Testament” at the time), and incomplete (it systematically neglects sources written by those within the church).<sup>15</sup> In addition to the criticism offered by Bates, I would add that it appears much recent study has been laboring under false assumptions about the nature and state of the scriptures. Namely, in tandem with its focus on the “Old Testament,” the approach too often assumes later (Protestant) canonical ideas about the extent and authority of scripture,<sup>16</sup> as well as erroneous assumptions about the state of the text of scripture.<sup>17</sup> One result of these false assumptions is the neglect of texts which were revered by the earliest church although later deemed non-canonical. Given those shortcomings, the possibility is limited that such works on “the New Testament use of the

Old” will adequately describe Paul’s engagement with the scriptures of Judaism.

In light of the fluid nature of scriptures in the first century, it is helpful to explore statements and practices from the time related to the notion of prophetic scripture interpretation, both in Judaism and in the early church. We turn now to this point.

*Jewish praxis, Paul’s interpretation,  
and intertextual readings*

Although the extent of scripture as well as the state of its texts were fluid during the first century, the conviction that God speaks through the scriptures pervades the New Testament. Inherited from Judaism, this belief was enthusiastically “enhanced” in the early church through both Christological interpretation of scripture, and its corollary, the authoring of new apostolic writings.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, the authoring of new documents emulated in some respects the practice within Judaism of what is referred to—for lack of a better term—as “rewritten scripture.”<sup>19</sup>

For Paul, the scriptures are the “oracles of God” (Rom 3:2).<sup>20</sup> Similarly, Luke has Stephen refer to the “living oracles” (Acts 7:38),<sup>21</sup> received by Moses directly from God.<sup>22</sup> At least for later rabbinic Judaism, built into this picture was the idea of the “oral Torah.” For the New Testament, the “word of God” is regularly the gospel of Jesus Christ, and specifically the gospel as expounded when the “oracles of God” are read with the early church’s Christological hermeneutic. For Paul and the other early church writers, the notion of the “living word of God” broadly embraces the voice of God which speaks in scripture as well as through the oral message. For the church, this message is the gospel.<sup>23</sup>

This beginning point encourages an intertextual reading of the New Testament uses of Jewish scripture. Expounded masterfully by Richard Hays,<sup>24</sup> this approach has been the subject of lively debate ever since Hays's work appeared. Even though the mechanical identification of "echoes" and "allusions" continues to defy easy quantification, many would concur with Hays when he says that those who deny the presence of these scriptural allusions are simply "tone deaf."<sup>25</sup> Hays has gone a good way toward elucidating the difficult material of Romans 10 (the "near word" of Deuteronomy 30, as well as some of the Isaiah and Psalms material).<sup>26</sup> His exposition of Paul's use of scripture in terms of intertextual re-contextualization is a great improvement over those who assume that Paul was merely citing scripture in the same way a student today cites a resource in writing a term paper.

According to Bates, however, in his method Hays unduly privileges the "pre-text" of the scripture itself.<sup>27</sup> In so doing, he has inadvertently stopped short in his assessment of co-texts and post-texts.<sup>28</sup> Why, asks Bates, must our study of pre-texts and Jewish co-texts be "at the expense of the more intertextually proximate Christian co-texts, post-texts, and inter-texts?"<sup>29</sup> Instead, Bates argues for a "diachronic intertextuality," not just "reading backwards,"<sup>30</sup> but also considering relevant collateral and subsequent readings. While one may argue with Bates's specific point about the role of the church fathers in their reception of Paul, the fact that in this case the reading of several fathers corroborates his understanding of Paul's interpretation is interesting for this study. Specifically, in contrast to the explanation of other scholars, Bates notes that in his interpretation of Isaiah in Romans 10, Paul shifts the emphasis to Isaiah speaking "in the character of" Paul and the other apostles:

Paul did not regard Isaiah as the ultimate speaker of Isa 53:1 (“O Lord, who has believed our audible message”), the citation which appears in the middle of the chain in Rom 10:16. Rather, Paul has made a surprising interpretative move: instead of taking Isaiah as speaking qua Isaiah alone or construing Isaiah and Paul as joining together in concert<sup>31</sup> or reading the text as the words of confessing Israel, Paul understands Isaiah to be speaking in the character of the apostles of Christ in Rom 10:16.<sup>32</sup>

Bates casts his insights in terms of classical Greek literature and drama. He evokes the dramatic technique of an actor assuming the persona of a certain character using a *prosopon* (lit., “face”), which in this usage refers to an actor’s mask intended to achieve a characterization.<sup>33</sup> Bates’s investigatory technique is styled “prosopological exegesis,” which explains a text by suggesting that “. . . the author of the text identified various persons or characters (*prosopa*) as speakers or addressees in a pre-text, even though it is not clear from the pre-text itself that such persons are in view.”<sup>34</sup>

At least initially, Bates’s methodology is consistent with others who have noted that in his adducing of scripture Paul shifts the voice of the speaker, especially in this part of Romans (“Righteousness” speaks, as well as “the Law” and “scripture”). He accomplishes this not just as a series of personifications,<sup>35</sup> however, but by having Isaiah speak in the voice of the apostles (Bates, above). Ultimately, Paul places himself in line with the Hebrew prophets. Two examples will suffice: first, notice how in Romans 10:18-19 Paul seems to expropriate the speech of Isaiah 40:21, 28

(“Have you not known? Have you not heard?”), by speaking in the first person: “But I ask, have they not heard?” (10:18); “Again I ask, did Israel not understand?” (10:19). In this passage, Paul, Moses, and Isaiah seem to speak together, more or less with one voice.

Second, later in Romans, Paul paints his self-portrait as Isaiah’s “light to the nations” and Jeremiah’s “prophet to the nations” who, like the Israelite prophets, confirms his message with “signs and wonders” (Rom 15:18b–19).<sup>36</sup> In my estimation, Bates’s characterization of Paul’s use of Isaiah 53 points beyond mere intertextuality or prosopological exegesis, to a more spiritual, even mystical understanding of the apostle who himself has become the voice of the prophets. Paul engages scripture as a prophet.

For this study, the point of this observation is central: Paul *was* a prophet, and functions in his prophetic role as scripture interpreter.<sup>37</sup> Part of this is observed in Paul placing himself in line with the Hebrew prophets. The corollary is in his fluid recasting (prophetic interpretation) of the pre-text. Paul’s readings (and rewritings) of scripture stem from his vocation as a prophetic scripture interpreter.

### *Prophetic scripture interpretation*

As is well documented, prophecy in first-century Judaism (and Jewish Christ-believers) included a major focus on scripture interpretation, and the scripture as oracle. Speaking specifically of Daniel 9 and Ezekiel 31, Jassen notes:

Already in the later stages of the Hebrew Bible, several prophets appear whose prophetic experience is marked not by traditional modes of revelation but by the inspired reading and reformulation of earlier

prophetic scripture. For these individuals, the older prophecies serve as ancient divine communiques now preserved in literary form. Guided by divine inspiration, these individuals reawaken the divine speech and decipher the contemporary application of the ancient prophetic word. This experience is identified as equivalent to classical modes of prophetic communication and its practitioners are singled out for their prophetic capabilities.<sup>38</sup>

Referring to this view of Scripture and prophecy current in the late Second Temple period, McNamara notes that the Bible itself was regarded as predictive prophecy. He cites 1 Macc 3:48, where at Mizpah, Judas Maccabeus and his brothers “unrolled the book of the law to inquire into the matters about which the Gentiles were consulting their idols.”<sup>39</sup> Hengel says of the same episode, “Judas and his brothers fasted and put on sackcloth and consulted Holy Scripture as an oracle, as the *Urim* and *Thummim* had been consulted in the past.”<sup>40</sup> But “scripture as oracle” requires prophetic interpretation.<sup>41</sup> Early Christians, along with the residents of Qumran, the Pharisees, and the Zealots, including Josephus’s zealot “false prophets” (cf. *J.W.* 6.285-86), claimed prophecy as a divine gift. That prophet--ic gift included the charism of scripture interpretation.

Illustrative of this view, Josephus himself claimed to be a prophet and a prophetic interpreter of scripture (*J.W.* 3.398-408), correcting the erroneous interpretation by the zealots of an “ambiguous” oracle, which they took to predict a coming messianic savior (*J.W.* 6.312-13). One of their leaders (Josephus’s “false prophet”) called for zealot resistance against the Romans based on his interpretation of

the oracle in question. However, by virtue of his prophetic gift, Josephus applied the meaning of the oracle to Vespasian and his son Titus.<sup>42</sup> This tradition—of the Jew-ish fighters erroneously interpreting a prophecy from their own scripture that in fact applied to Vespasian and Titus—is reported in both Tacitus and Suetonius. Tacitus (*Historiae* 5.13) and Suetonius (*Vespasian* 4.5) confirm the essential historicity of Josephus's account of the war, as does Dio Cassius (45.1.4). Tacitus reports the matter of the Jewish fighters who misinterpreted their scripture in terms of a ruler arising from their number (*Historiae* 5.13).<sup>43</sup>

In a compelling study on Mark's Gospel, A. Winn argues from these accounts for understanding Mark, written only a few years after Paul, as a response to the Flavian propaganda attack against his community of Christ-believers, as well as against Jews, to delegitimize their scripture interpretation and thwart their hope of a messianic deliverer.<sup>44</sup> It is within this atmosphere of prophetic scripture interpretation that we should understand Paul's use of scripture.

*New Testament "outcomes" of the scripture praxis of Paul and the other first Christian writers*

In terms of outcomes mentioned above, relevant "subsequent texts," in Bates's model,<sup>45</sup> include 2 Timothy, and 2 Peter. These documents continue the practice of apostolic scripture interpretation, but go beyond the interpretation of Jewish scriptures to include the defense and elucidation of apostolic teaching. Both of these documents invoke the theme of prophecy specifically as it becomes relevant for Scripture interpretation, and for protection of the apostolic teaching (Paul's gospel, in the Pastorals; the apostolic "prophetic word" of 2 Pet 1:19-21). Moreover,

2 Peter has added yet another level to this understanding by including a defense of a body of Paul's *writings* (2 Pet 3:15-16).

In 1 and 2 Timothy, Timothy is portrayed as Paul's successor, specifically in terms of his prophetic role in scripture interpretation and its corollary, the interpretation of (and protection of ["guard the deposit"]) Paul's gospel as carried out in teaching.<sup>46</sup> Timothy follows Paul as *keryx* and *didaskolos* ("herald" [proclaimer] and "teacher," 1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11), albeit not as *apostolos*.<sup>47</sup> Timothy is described in terms of a prophet ("Man of God," 1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 3:17; "the Lord's Servant," 2 Tim 2:24), and his specific roles include "rightly explaining the word of truth" (Paul's gospel, 2 Tim 2:15), as well as scripture (2 Tim 3:16-17). In the Pastorals, the focus of this concern is specifically on teaching, understood as including authoritative (prophetic) scripture interpretation in the elucidation of Paul's gospel.<sup>48</sup>

In 2 Peter, the main argument also encompasses prophecy, specifically the question of who has the right to engage in the interpretation of scriptural prophecy. "No prophecy of scripture is a matter of one's own (or 'private') interpretation" (2 Pet 1:20)<sup>49</sup> is at the heart of the prohibition to the "false teachers" and their alternative understanding of scripture. The causal statement that follows, "because men and women moved by the spirit spoke from God," connects interpretation directly back to (legitimate) prophecy, as does the apostles' revelatory experience while "we were with him on the holy mount."<sup>50</sup> Thus the opponents are denied any claim to prophetic insight into scripture, being warned instead that they would "do well to pay attention to" the apostolic "sure prophetic word" (or "prophetic word more sure"; 1:19)<sup>51</sup> "until the day dawns, and the morning star rises in your hearts" (1:19-20). The false teachers are then compared to false prophets of old in

chapter 2, using the images of opponents taken over from Jude (Cain, Korah, and Balaam), collapsing into the figure of Balaam aspects of all three famous villains. The argument concludes in 2 Pet 3:15-16 with the famous appeal to and protection of “our beloved brother Paul” whose writings, like “the rest of the scriptures,” are subject to misinterpretation at the hands of illegitimate readers of scripture.

Both 2 Timothy and 2 Peter are “canon closing” documents, bringing to a logical end their respective sub-collections of scripture. 2 Timothy functions this way for the Pauline corpus; 2 Peter, for the Catholic Epistles, and, I suspect, for the entire New Testament. Both are written as epistolary “last will and testament” documents, and as such share similar functions with similar Jewish documents—see especially the epistolary testament section of 2 Baruch. The point for this article is simply to suggest that these “outcomes” documents (“subsequent texts”) are the product of a process already begun in Paul’s main letters, especially Romans. As such, we should understand Paul as a prophetic interpreter both as a matter of canonical reading, but also better to understand the forces which made possible the arguments present in these later New Testament documents. In important ways these dynamics were already in play in Paul’s scripture interpretation in Romans 10.

Finally, I believe that the dynamic of prophetic scripture interpretation provides a fruitful avenue to investigate the writings of the New Testament in terms of “re-written scripture.” On analogy to the later authors in Jewish scripture who gave “inspired reading and reformulation of earlier prophetic scripture,”<sup>52</sup> we find a continuation of that practice not only at Qumran, but in the praxis of the earliest church, who “rewrote” both Jewish scripture and apostolic writings (emerging scripture). Although beyond the scope of

this article, the present study suggests that the investigation and development of this idea will prove fruitful in our ongoing understanding of the New Testament.

---

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> See E. Tov, "Rewritten Bible Composition and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5 (1998): 334-354; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1999); M. Segal, "Between Bible and Re-written Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); S. W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); M. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment," *JBL* 131 (2012): 271-88; G. J. Brooke, "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible, and Peshet," in *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> D. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 339-340; *ibid.* "Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, ed. J. Charlesworth and C. Evans (JSPSup 14; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 126-150. See E. Ellis, "Midrash Peshet in Pauline Hermeneutics," *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 173-181; *ibid.* *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957, 1981).

<sup>3</sup> Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 28; A. K. Petersen, "The Riverrun of Rewriting Scripture: From Textual Cannibalism to Scriptural Completion," *JSJ* 43 (2012): 475-496; here 482.

<sup>4</sup> See below: A. Jassen, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Qumran Community," *AJS Review* 32 (2008): 299-334.

<sup>5</sup> M. Zahn, "The Problem of Characterizing the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?" *DSD* 15 (2008): 315-339; See E. Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. P. Flint and J. VanderKam (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999), 1.79-100; J. VanderKam, "Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. L. McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrikson,

2002), 91–109, here 96–100; M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, ed. L. Schiffman et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 2000), 391–99, here 394–95; E. Ulrich, “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus,” in *Congress Volume Basel 2001*, ed. A. Lemaire (VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108, here 102–3.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 4.

<sup>7</sup> G. Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets, and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book: the Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. E. Herbert and E. Tov (London: The British Library, 2002), 31–40, here 36.

<sup>8</sup> G. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” *EDSS 2: 777–781*, here 777. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 11.

<sup>9</sup> As is well known, Paul and the other early church writers vastly preferred the Greek scriptures to Hebrew, even when (if) they knew the Hebrew, as Paul almost certainly did. Although they do not cite the scriptures as often as does Paul or the Gospels, even the latter New Testament books, which bear the names of leaders who originally came from Palestine, use the Greek scriptures (Matthew, Mark, Peter, John, James of Jerusalem, Jude).

<sup>10</sup> M. Zahn, “Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and interpreting authoritative traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. H. von Weissenberg, et al. (BZAW 419; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011) 94; see E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2015). By virtue of their origins within that context, the first Christians possessed as their scriptures the Greek scriptures of the diaspora synagogue, including many documents of the so-called “apocrypha.”

<sup>11</sup> E. Ulrich, “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures,” 85–108; see M. Zahn, “Rewritten Scripture,” *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. J. J. Collins and T. H. Lim (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), n.p.

<sup>12</sup> The collection of Hebrew scripture was probably closed around 135 CE, the time of Bar Kokhba. The closing of the New Testament canon is traditionally dated by the listing of our twenty-seven New Testament books in Athanasius’ 39<sup>th</sup> Easter Letter, 367 CE, although the process continued for some time. The so-called “apocrypha” documents continued to be used by Christians, and a collection of the Apocrypha is included in Christian scripture in the west,

via the Latin Vulgate, as well as slightly different collections in other regions.

<sup>13</sup> Esp. Wisdom of Solomon and Wisdom of Sirach.

<sup>14</sup> Books were later canonized, not specific texts. The texts of scriptures were not fixed. It appears that Paul, Matthew, and the writer of Hebrews, at least, took advantage of different textual readings which fit their theological arguments, whereas other readings do not.

<sup>15</sup> See M. Bates, "Beyond Hays's Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul: A Proposed Diachronic Intertextuality with Romans 10:16 as a Test Case," in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation*, C. D. Stanley, ed. (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 269-270. As examples of the many works of the genre which Bates finds inadequate, he cites G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007); and S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New Testament: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2001).

<sup>16</sup> Such works too often anachronistically privilege pre-canonical versions of the documents which much later became the Protestant canon.

<sup>17</sup> For example, D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 189-190, contends that the advent of printing introduced a new understanding of the text which conferred upon the documents a power that was really "that of the press." The fact is, there has never been a fixed *text* of Christian scripture. The (proto-) Masoretic Text was not *the* original Hebrew text, and even today, the text of the Greek New Testament continues to develop between and within the three or four major modern editions.

<sup>18</sup> "Apostolic writings" refer here to the broad definition in evidence in the New Testament itself.

<sup>19</sup> Scholars continue to debate the appropriateness of this phrase and related terminology; see M. Zahn, "Talking about rewritten texts"; *idem*, "Rewritten Scripture"; and others (above, n. 1, n. 3, n. 5).

<sup>20</sup> τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, *ta logia tou theou*.

<sup>21</sup> λόγια ζῶντα, *logia zōnta*.

<sup>22</sup> That Moses received the law directly from God, *and* that the law was given through angels is possibly a reflection in the latter of Jewish sensibilities which preferred a circumlocution when speaking of God (cf. Acts 7:35; Gal 3:19; Heb 2:2).

<sup>23</sup> See 1 Pet 1:23-25, where believers have been born anew "through the living and abiding word of God" (διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος, *dia logou zōntos theou kai menontos*). 1 Peter's "living

and abiding word of God” (the Gospel) redefines Isaiah’s abiding “word of our God” as “the word of the Lord” (τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα κυρίου, *to de rhēma kyriou*) which abides forever (see LXX Isaiah 40:8); this word “is the good news that was announced to you” (1 Pet 1:25). This passage in 1 Peter calls to mind Romans 10:8 and Paul’s appropriation of the “near word” of Deuteronomy 30, “that is, the word of faith that we proclaim” (τοῦτ’ ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν; *tout’ estin to rhēma tēs pisteōs ho kērussomen*). On “the utterance of faith” in this passage, see Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes,” 274. English Bible citations are from the NRSV unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>24</sup> R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989); see esp. chap. 2, “Echoes of Scripture in Romans.”

<sup>25</sup> From Hays’s Institute of Biblical Research annual lecture (November 16, 2018, Denver, CO).

<sup>26</sup> On Paul’s rewriting of Deuteronomy 30, see J. R. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul “in Concert” in the Letter to the Romans* (NovTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 159-168; D. Lincicum, *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 153-158.

<sup>27</sup> “A *pre-text* shall be a specific textual source that the New Testament author utilized” (Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes,” 271-273).

<sup>28</sup> Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes,” 269: “*Hays’s intertextual model obscures the need to look beyond the source text to coeval and subsequent texts within a fully healthy intertextual model*” (italics original). See Matthew W. Bates, *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul’s Method of Scriptural Interpretation* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012).

<sup>29</sup> Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes,” 273. “A *co-text* is a specific subset of *coeval texts*: a direct citation by a different early Jewish or Christian author of the same pre-text that the text cites, independently of the text.” A *coeval text* is any work contemporaneous with the text which shows awareness of the pre-text but not the text; a *post-text* is a subsequent direct citation of the text or a direct citation of the pre-text; “*inter-text* will be a catchall term for any relevant coeval text or subsequent text that is not specifically a co-text or post-text but nonetheless has special relevance to a text” (Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes,” 271-273).

<sup>30</sup> See R. B. Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014).

<sup>31</sup> Bates critiques the idea of Paul speaking “in concert” with Isaiah, in Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 179–80.

<sup>32</sup> Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes,” 275.

<sup>33</sup> Bates, *Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation*, 192-193.

<sup>34</sup> Bates, *Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation*, 183.

<sup>35</sup> So J. R. Dodson, “The Voices of Scripture: Citations and Personifications in Paul.” *BBR* 20 (2010): 419-432.

<sup>36</sup> V. Rabens, “Paul’s Mission Strategy in the Urban Land-cape of the First-Century Roman Empire,” in *The Urban World and the First Christians*, ed. S. Walton, P. R. Trebilco, and David W. J. Gill (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 104-106.

<sup>37</sup> On Paul’s self-understanding as a prophet, see S. Grindheim, “Apostate Turned Prophet: Paul’s Prophetic Self-Understanding and Prophetic Hermeneutic with Special Reference to Galatians 3.10–12,” *NTS* 53 (2007): 545-565. Paul (Saul) is also called a prophet in Acts 13:1.

<sup>38</sup> Jassen, “Prophets and Prophecy,” 319-320.

<sup>39</sup> M. McNamara, “Early Exegesis in the Palestinian Targum (Neofiti) of Numbers,” *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 16 (1993): 57-79; *ibid.* *Palestinian Judaism and the New Testament* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1963), esp. 62-64.

<sup>40</sup> M. Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (rev. ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1989), 272.

<sup>41</sup> This is precisely the argument in 2 Peter, as well as the assumption in 2 Timothy (below): inspired scripture requires (apostolic) inspired interpretation.

<sup>42</sup> Hengel, *Zealots*, 241; cf. T. S. Caulley, “Balaam’s ‘Star’ Oracle in Jewish and Christian Prophetic Tradition,” *ResQ* 56.1 (2014): 28-40. Hengel argues for the identification of Josephus’s “ambiguous oracle” with Nu. 24:17 (*Zealots*, 240), with which I concur (Caulley, “Balaam’s ‘Star’ Oracle,” 32).

<sup>43</sup> Caulley, “Balaam’s ‘Star’ Oracle,” 32.

<sup>44</sup> A. Winn. *Reading Mark’s Christology Under Caesar: Jesus the Messiah and Roman Imperial Ideology* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2018).

<sup>45</sup> “A *subsequent text* will be defined as any socio-historical discourse that emerges in the wake of the text” (Bates, “Beyond Hays’s Echoes,” 271-273).

<sup>46</sup> See T. S. Caulley, "Ordination," *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, ed. John D. Barry and Lazarus Wentz (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012).

<sup>47</sup> Timothy's "succession" of Paul as prophetic interpreter, but not as apostle, suggests that we must distinguish between Paul's prophetic gift (shared by Timothy), and his apostleship. At least in the second generation church and later, prophetic interpretation continued (through the hermeneutical lens of apostolic teaching), while apostleship in its original sense did not. Although Paul's apostleship constituted a major exception to a traditional understanding (see Acts 1:21-23), it apparently did not have the effect of throwing open the door to apostolic succession.

<sup>48</sup> T. S. Caulley, "New Moses, New Joshua? Paul and Timothy in the Pastorals," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Region of the SBL. Dallas, Tex., March 15, 1986. *ibid.*, "Fighting the Good Fight: The Pastoral Epistles in Canonical-Critical Perspective," in *SBLSP* (1987), 550–564.

<sup>49</sup> πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, *pasa prophēteia graphēs idias epiluseōs ou ginetai*.

<sup>50</sup> See T. S. Caulley, "They Promise Them Freedom': Once again, the Ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι in 2 Peter," *ZNW* 99 (2008): 129-138; T. S. Caulley, "The False Teachers in 2nd Peter," *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 12 (1982): 27-42.

<sup>51</sup> ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, *echomen bebaioteron ton prophētikon logon*.

<sup>52</sup> Jassen, "Prophets and Prophecy," 319-320.