

# 1 An Introduction to Inner-Biblical and Inter-Biblical Interpretation: With Special Reference to the Melchizedek Passages

Later biblical writers did not compose their materials in a vacuum. Primarily, their compositions were influenced by the antecedent Scriptural materials. Through their thorough and careful reading and interpretation of these antecedent Scriptures, these writers framed their compositions to further develop and reinforce the message or messages embodied in the earlier biblical materials. This interpretative phenomenon can be observed within either the OT or the NT canon and the NT use of the OT. In this project, we propose that such processes did exist and we set forth to describe the processes that we generally call inner- and inter-biblical interpretation (with their working definitions provided at the end of this chapter).

The three Melchizedek texts are chosen for two reasons: first, the textual data are sufficient to warrant the study yet confine the scope within set perimeters. In other words, the textual data provide a controlled environment for research and discussion; second, the link between these passages is well-established: no other biblical texts contain Melchizedek. He appears only in three biblical texts – Gen 14:18-20, Psalm 110:4 and Heb 5:1-7:28.<sup>1</sup>

Though Melchizedek could only be found in these three passages in the canonical Scriptures, it has stimulated much discussion in biblical studies. Scholars have produced voluminous literature on Melchizedek, focusing either on the person or centering on the above three biblical texts. The interpretative interests of scholars can be classified in the following ways:

(1) The identity of Melchizedek.<sup>2</sup> Some scholars attempt to identify the figure in a historical context by looking back to the time of Abraham in Genesis, to the time of Jesus, or in particular, looking at the Qumran community. The results are hardly conclusive.<sup>3</sup> The identity of Melchizedek has been understood as strictly that of a

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “Melchizedek” occurs in Gen 14:18, Ps 110:4, Heb 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:1, 10, 11, 15, 17.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, M. Delcor, “Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *JSJ* 2 (1971): 115-35. Delcor’s work concentrates on the “character Melchizedek” in various writings, which include Genesis 14, Psalm 110, intertestamental and Qumran literature, Hebrews, Targum and rabbinic tradition. An updated survey of similar interest is Birger A. Pearson, “Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism,” chap. in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergen (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 176-202.

<sup>3</sup> See a brief discussion about Melchizedek’s identity (and literature cited) in Eugene Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests: A History of Old Testament Israel* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 264.

human figure;<sup>4</sup> an angelic being;<sup>5</sup> or perhaps the most radical suggestion appearing in recent scholarship, a local deity in Canaan.<sup>6</sup>

(2) Interpretation of one of the three Melchizedek passages.<sup>7</sup> One can argue that it is a legitimate pursuit to interpret one of these biblical passages since each has its own unique purpose and setting. Nonetheless, such interpretation is not complete because the inter-connectedness of these three passages provides much richer interpretative data than any interpreter can afford to overlook.

(3) The interrelationships between any two of these three Melchizedek texts. There are only three possible combinations: (a) Genesis and Psalms;<sup>8</sup> (b) Genesis and Hebrews;<sup>9</sup> and (c) Psalms and Hebrews.<sup>10</sup> Such interpretations face the same problem as stated in the above paragraph. Furthermore, it is hard to imagine any justification for omitting any one of the three passages. In the course of our interpreting the Melchizedek texts, we shall see the importance of integrating all three of these biblical passages. Interpretation of this nature promotes a comprehensive understanding of the Melchizedek texts. Unfortunately, there have been no major studies that exegetically examine all three of these texts as a whole, or treat all of them *equally at*

---

4 The most popular identity of Melchizedek as a human is that he is a Canaanite king-priest. See Loren R. Fisher, "Abraham and His Priest-King," *JBL* 81 (1962): 269. Compare Othniel Margalith, "The Riddle of Genesis 14 and Melchizedek," *ZAW* 112 (2000): 501-508. He proposes that Melchizedek is a "local priest to a local deity" (506).

5 The Qumran community postulates this notion in their writings, particularly 11QMelch. See *IDBSupp*, 585. Some early Christian interpreters identify Melchizedek as a pre-incarnation of Christ but such notion is overwhelmingly rejected by biblical scholarship. See Merrill, *Kingdom of Priest*, 264 (note 35), quoting James A. Borland, *Christ in the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1978), 164-74.

6 Martin Bodinger, "L'énigme de Melkisédék," *RHR* 211 (1994): 297-332. After examining biblical and extra-biblical materials, he concludes: "J'ai suivi la présence et l'évolution du personnage de Melkisédék dans la littérature religieuse juive et chrétienne à la lumière de l'hypothèse selon laquelle ce personnage fut à l'origine un dieu solaire adoré en Canaan sous le nom de Sédeq. Cette hypothèse offre la possibilité de résoudre de façon plus satisfaisante les difficultés qui apparaissent dans l'interprétation de textes de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament; elle permet de comprendre pourquoi Melkisédék occupe une place si éminente dans l'Épître aux Hébreux" (331-32).

7 Examples include commentaries on individual books. Regarding the study of Hebrews and Melchizedek, see Michael S. Beates, "Melchizedek and Jesus: An Exegetical and Hermeneutical Study of Hebrews 7" (Master thesis, Biblical Theological Seminary, 1988) and Jun D. Lee, "The Understanding of Melchizedek in Hebrews 7: 1-3" (Master thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, 1990).

8 For example, John Gammie, "Melchizedek: An Exegetical Study of Genesis 14 and the Psalter" (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1962) and H. E. Del Medico, "Melchisédech," *ZAW* 69 (1957): 160-70. Del Medico only deals with Genesis 14 and Psalm 110 in this French article.

9 Charles Baylis, "The Author of Hebrews' Use of Melchizedek from the Context of Genesis" (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1989).

10 See D. Leschert, "Hermeneutical Foundations of the Epistle to the Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of Its Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms" (Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1991); M. P. Harrison, "Psalm 110 in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1967).

length. Notably, many have treated one text more fully than the other two.<sup>11</sup> Recent scholarly works<sup>12</sup> also bring in other non-biblical texts, such as 11QMelch, to understand the three biblical Melchizedek texts at hand. Our interest, however, is limited to how these three biblical texts relate hermeneutically. Our next section will look at some of the scholarly works that may share similar interpretative interest with ours.

## 1.1 A Survey of Relevant Literature

We will examine two literary works that have treated all of the three Melchizedek passages. First, Klein's master thesis<sup>13</sup> most closely reflects our interest, namely, an exegetical study of the inner- and inter-biblical interpretation. He devotes a chapter to each of the three Melchizedek passages: Genesis 14 is covered in chapter two; Psalm 110 in chapter three; Hebrews 5-7 in chapter four; and chapters one and five serve as the introduction and conclusion respectively. The only major deficiency is that Klein's study lacks sufficient discussion germane to how the passage interprets the

---

**11** These are the works that treat only *one or two* of the Melchizedek passages at length though their titles imply an exegetical work on all three of the passages: Ignatius Hunt, "Recent Melchizedek Study," in *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*, ed. John L. McKenzie (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1962), 21-33 (major discussion of Genesis 14 with a mere two to three paragraphs devoted to Psalm 110 and Hebrews 5-7); John McCullough, "Melchizedek's Varied Role in Early Exegetical Tradition," *Theological Review* 1 (1978): 52-66 (Psalm 110 is largely ignored); P. J. Nel "Psalm 110 and the Melchizedek Tradition," *JNSL* 22 (1996): 1-14 (besides Nel's interest is primarily tradition study; therefore, Genesis 14 is largely overlooked in this article). Other works include: T. K. Thomas, "Melchizedek, King and Priest: An Ecumenical Paradigm?" *Bangalore Theological Forum* 31 (1999): 66-74. Thomas' main concern is ecumenical; thus little or no exegetical work is accomplished. Joseph A. Fitzmyer's article ("Melchizedek in the MT, LXX, and the NT" *Bib* 81 [2000]: 63-69) focuses on the LXX of Genesis 14, but makes no exegetical and textual links between the LXX of Genesis and Hebrews.

**12** This list is not exhaustive but illustrative: Heinz-Josef Fabry, "Melchizedek in Bibel und Qumran" in *"Ich werde meinen Bund mit euch niemals brechen!" (Ri 2,1): Festschrift für Walter Groß zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Ulrich Dahmen, Herders biblische Studien, 377-398 (New York: Herder, 2011). Gard Granerød, *Abraham and Melchizedek: scribal activity of Second Temple times in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110*, BZAW 406 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010). Israel Knohl, "Melchizedek: a model for the union of kingship and priesthood in the Hebrew Bible, 11QMelchizedek, and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity*, eds. Ruth Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009), 255-266. E. F. Mason, *'You Are a Priest Forever': Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 74 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008). Dominique Cerbelaud, *Melchisédech prêtre du Dieu très-haut*, Les Suppléments aux Cahiers Évangile 136 (Paris: Biblique Catholique, 2006).

**13** George L. Klein, "An Exegetical Study of Melchizedek" (Master thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1981).

previous one. For example, Genesis 14 is mentioned only once in chapter three when he examines Psalm 110 in details.<sup>14</sup>

Second, the next article for our review, written by Theo de Kruijf, is entitled “The Priest-King Melchizedek: The Reception of Gen 14:18-20 in Hebrews Mediated by Psalm 110.”<sup>15</sup> We intend to treat this article in depth for two reasons: first, the title raises our expectations that the author will exegetically link these three texts while his title neatly summarizes our core interest. Second, our critique of this article will serve as an illustration of the deficiency of biblical scholarship in inner- and inter-biblical interpretation.

### 1.1.1 A Critique of de Kruijf’s Article

The purpose of de Kruijf’s study is “to confront the question of whether it is possible to trace, at least in part and tentatively, the stream of tradition that flowed mostly underground from Genesis 14 to Hebrews and beyond.”<sup>16</sup> From the above statement it is clear that the author has already expanded his scope of investigation beyond the three biblical passages. Progressing through his article,<sup>17</sup> it becomes apparent that de Kruijf’s interest is in more than a comparative study of these three texts.

Our critique of de Kruijf’s article follows. First, while his article’s subtitle seems to argue that the Hebrews interpretation of Genesis 14 is hermeneutically based on Psalm 110, he does not substantially treat this (sub)theme. De Kruijf’s points out the

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 28.

<sup>15</sup> De Kruijf, “The Priest-King Melchizedek: The Reception of Genesis 14, 18-20 in Hebrews Mediated by Psalm 110,” *Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie* 54 (1993): 393-406.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 393.

<sup>17</sup> His article is divided into five sections. We will first summarize the content of each section here and then our critique in the text above. In section one, de Kruijf examines Gen 14:18-20 and calls it an “open text” (de Kruijf, “The Priest-King Melchizedek,” 393). The term “open text” is based on the term “*Unbestimmtheitsstellen*” coined by the Polish philosopher Roman Ingarden according to footnote 3 in de Kruijf’s article. See Edgar V. McKnight’s assessment of Ingarden in his *The Bible and the Reader: An Introduction to Literary Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 26-36. In section two, de Kruijf looks at the relationship between Genesis 14 and Psalm 110. He concludes by claiming that “Any attempt to establish a link between the Psalm and Genesis 14 whereby one text is seen as dependent upon the other can at best be only conjectural” (de Kruijf, “The Priest-King Melchizedek,” 396). He then poses these questions: “Has the psalmist made use of an older (Jebusite) fragment in order to demonstrate the priestly function of the Davidic king of Jerusalem? Or has the redactor of Genesis introduced this fragment into the Abram story in order to establish an early link between the kingdom of David and Abraham? Or did both authors independently have access to an ancient (Jebusite) source (p. 396)?” In section three and continuing into the first part of section four, de Kruijf traces the figure of Melchizedek in the literature of the first century C.E.: Philo, Josephus, intertestamental writings and Qumran literature (especially 11QMelch). The rest of section 4 deals with the verbal similarities of Genesis 14 (the LXX) and Hebrews 6-7. Section five serves as his conclusion.

verbal similarities of these three texts in several places, but unfortunately neglects to build a solid case upon this data.

Second, we question de Kruijf's "open text" theory because he seemingly ignores the context<sup>18</sup> of Gen 14:18-20. This raises the following question: what is the controlling factor(s) when interpreting an "open" text? The "open" text theory promotes subjective interpretation that relies heavily on the interpreter's presupposition and intent.

Third, we disagree with de Kruijf's argument in section two that the relationship between Genesis 14 and Psalm 110, no matter how it is developed, is "conjectural." Instead, we believe the textual dependence of these two texts can be shown through other means.<sup>19</sup>

Fourth, we also wonder *how* the treatment of first-century literature can shed light on de Kruijf's "reception of Genesis 14 in Hebrews mediated by Psalm 110." An understanding of the first-century literature could probably help us to read Hebrews intelligently because the author of Hebrews composed his work in a similar literary milieu. De Kruijf's analysis suggests that the author of Hebrews may have drawn his ideas more from the literature surrounding him than from the texts of Genesis 14 and Psalm 110. It is equally possible, however, to argue that the author of Hebrews may have written his essay based on his interpretation of Genesis 14 and Psalm 110.

As noted earlier, de Kruijf's interest is not primarily in the inner working relationships among these three texts. We, however, affirm the significant influence of the OT and the first-century literature on the writing of Hebrews, and think biblical scholarship, by and large, has not paid adequate attention to how an OT text exerts its influence on a later OT and NT biblical text.

In summary, de Kruijf's analysis suffers from a lack of emphasis on how these passages are hermeneutically connected. His subtitle is misleading. Therefore, his article fails to convincingly argue for the interrelationships ("reception", "mediated") of these texts.

Judging from the above literature review, we can draw a preliminary conclusion that biblical scholarship should address certain deficits.

First, the use of the OT in the NT has been extensively researched yet the use of the OT in the OT is not sufficiently attended to in biblical studies.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, more has to be done on how an OT passage is used by another OT writer *as well as* how it is quoted in the NT. While the bulk of scholarly attention seems to be paid to the

---

<sup>18</sup> Here we will adopt a term used by Peter Cotterell in "Semantics, Interpretation, and Theology," in *NIDOTTE*, ed. Willem VanGeren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 1: 136. See our further explanation of the distinction between "context" and "cotext" in chapter two of this project when we discuss discourse analysis.

<sup>19</sup> We will discuss "other means" in our next two chapters on methodology.

<sup>20</sup> Another highly related subject is the NT use of the NT, and it appears this subject remains an unplowed field. Nonetheless, to investigate this topic thoroughly takes us beyond the scope of our project.

passage's surrounding extra-biblical literary materials, akin to de Kruijf whose interests lie in intertestamental materials, exegetical work on the biblical materials per se is lacking. Second, works addressing the three (or any combination of) texts of Melchizedek have not given sufficient attention to each of the texts *and* how each text interprets the other text (for example, how Psalm 110 interprets Genesis 14). This deficiency needs to be removed, and thereby this need justifies the writing of this project.

The aim of this study is twofold. First, by examining the use of Melchizedek in both the OT and the NT, we come to grasp some of the issues pertaining to inner- and inter-biblical interpretation, such as exegetical principles or the methodology employed by the OT and the NT writers. Second, by theologically tracing the notion of a royal priesthood in Psalm 110 to Genesis 14, we will show that this amalgamation of kingship and priesthood is not the invention of the author of Psalm 110, but is based on the poet's reading of Genesis 14 and its cotexts. Furthermore it is useful to theologically trace the theme of royal priesthood<sup>21</sup> in the historical books (Samuel, Kings and Chronicles), with special reference to 2 Samuel 7.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, we will argue that the notion of kingly priesthood in Hebrews is based on the author's reading of the text of Genesis 14 – with its cotexts – and Psalm 110. Since the structure and the message of Hebrews may possibly be influenced by the Psalter, an examination of the cotexts of Psalm 110 (Psalms such as Psalm 2 and 132) is necessary.

Hence, we propose to investigate these areas by dividing the tasks into various chapters, as outlined in the following paragraph. In the remainder of the chapter, we will discuss briefly some critical issues regarding inner- and inter-biblical interpretation. In chapters two and three, we will examine two methodological approaches to biblical interpretation, discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism. In chapter four, we will examine Genesis 14, paying special attention to vv. 18-20, subjected to both discourse and rhetorical analysis. In chapter five, we will look at the cotexts of Genesis 14. Based on certain semantic-thematic notions in other OT texts that link to Genesis 14, we then expand our scope of investigation to Genesis 12-22, 49, and Numbers 22-24 (all within the Pentateuch). In chapter six, since 2 Samuel 7 contains some semantic-thematic links to Genesis 14 (and its cotexts including Genesis 12, 22 and 49) and Numbers 22-24, we will then examine it in detail. In chapter

---

<sup>21</sup> Regarding the amalgamation of the two offices, namely, king and priest, in one person, there has never been such a person holding both offices in Israel's history, except Melchizedek and possibly, David. David could not have been a priest from the line of Aaron because he was not from the tribe of Levi. His priesthood would have to come from another order, which could be from the line of Melchizedek (Ps 110:4). Granted that David is the author of Psalm 110, does he refer to himself there or to someone else? In our project we will try to answer this question when we approach Psalm 110. See, however, Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*, 263-67.

<sup>22</sup> It is impossible to trace the king-priest notion in all the historical books of the OT but we will consult other works in this regard; for example, Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*.

seven, we will explore the meaning of Psalm 110 through discourse and poetic-literary study. In chapter eight, we will investigate how the Psalter, serving as the cotext for Psalm 110, illuminates the interpretation of Psalm 110; we will perform a literary-structural study of Psalms 1 and 2 and Books I-IV of the Psalter, with special reference to certain psalms (72, 89). In chapter nine, we will investigate Book V, where Psalm 110 is found, with special reference to Psalm 132; at the end of the chapter, a concluding section will tie together all the studies of these OT texts. In chapters ten and eleven, we will focus on Hebrews, with special reference to Hebrews 1-7 and how the OT texts provide thematic and structural influence on Hebrews. In chapter twelve, we will assess the hermeneutical issue of inner- and inter-biblical interpretation and draw a conclusion for this project.

As stated previously, there is a dearth of work in the area of the OT use of the OT<sup>23</sup> while one can find a proliferation of literature in the area of the NT use of the OT.<sup>24</sup> It is our goal that this project will contribute to the discussion of inner- and inter-biblical interpretation. With this goal in mind, we now turn to some issues relating to inner- and inter-biblical interpretation.

Several important issues emerge regarding inner- and inter-biblical interpretation that should be mentioned. These issues might be more clearly formulated in the form of a question. Was the text being used or were the traditions behind the text being used? What text form is quoted? How is the text being quoted? What are the hermeneutical principles used by the biblical writers? What is the relationship between intertextuality and inner- and inter-biblical interpretation? What is the relationship between post-biblical interpretation and inner- and inter-biblical interpretation? We are not claiming this list of queries to be exhaustive, but we believe each component question is relevant to our proposed study.

---

**23** One of the few works in this area is Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

**24** Pertaining to our particular interest, i.e., Hebrews' use of the OT, Simon Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistles to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Van Soest, 1961); Friedrich Schröger, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger*, Biblische Untersuchungen 4 (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1968) and William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, WBC, vol. 47a (Dallas: Word Books, 1991), cxii-cxiv. More relevant bibliographical data will be given when we come to the study of Hebrews.



## 1.2 Issues Regarding the OT and the NT Use of the OT

We have selected two key items to treat here, namely, how a text is quoted, and what hermeneutical methodology was used by the biblical writers. The remaining issues are consigned to a discussion in appendix 1.<sup>25</sup>

### 1.2.1 Issue 1: How a Text is Quoted

Our first issue involves looking at how an earlier text is quoted, alluded to, and echoed. The acute problem in this area is the confusion of terminologies used to describe how texts are used. While there is a wealth of research on the NT use of the OT, biblical scholars use various terminologies to describe the use of the OT in the NT. For example, Stanley Porter denotes fifteen terms being used presently regarding the use of the OT in the NT:

Citation, direct quotation, formal quotation, indirect quotation, allusive quotation, allusion (whether conscious or unconscious), paraphrase, exegesis (such as inner-biblical exegesis), midrash, typology, reminiscence, echo (whether conscious or unconscious), intertextuality, influence (either direct or indirect), and even tradition, among other terms.<sup>26</sup>

At a glance, the great variety of terminology used to describe the use of the OT in the NT is overwhelming and disconcerting. Apparently all of these terms can be viewed within a framework that incorporates these two ends of the spectrum: quotation and allusion.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Among all the issues listed, we consider how a text's being quoted and the hermeneutical methodology used by the biblical writer are more directly related to and also crucial for inner- and inter-biblical interpretation. Furthermore, the hermeneutical method used by a biblical author may reflect *how* he quotes or uses an antecedent Scripture.

<sup>26</sup> Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of Old Testament in the New Testament: a Brief Comment on Method and Terminology" in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 80.

<sup>27</sup> We should reject a refinement of quotation proposed by Merrill C. Tenney's three categories for defining how biblical texts are quoted: citation, quotation and allusion. In his view, the difference between citation and quotation is that the former will identify the source from which the words were taken. Since it is extremely rare for biblical writers to identify or provide their source of reference, scholars have long since abandoned this distinction, and consequently concentrate only on quotation. See Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1957), 103. We are indebted to Jon Paulien who points out Tenney's definitions in his "Elusive Allusions: The Problematic Use of Old Testament in Revelation," *BR* 33 (1988): 39. Some may still use the term "citation." But in a strict sense defined by Tenney, they mean "quotation." For our purpose, we use citation and quotation interchangeably.



While the distinction between quotation and allusion is not as sharply defined as one might wish, especially when there is an absence of quotation formula,<sup>28</sup> the complexity increases, causing scholars like Moyise to articulate a third category: “echo.”<sup>29</sup> Moyise’s “echo” is based on the thesis advocated by Hays.<sup>30</sup> Nonetheless, it goes beyond the scope of this project to discuss in Moyise’s new category, and we will work from the assumption that Moyise’s echo can be subsumed under allusion. Therefore, we will confine our scope to quotation and allusion in the OT use of the OT and in the OT use of the NT.

### 1.2.2 Issue 2: Hermeneutical Methodology Used by Biblical Writers

What kind of hermeneutical principles, axioms, and exegetical methods did the OT writers use when they cited and interpreted an earlier OT text? The same relevant question can be asked of NT writers: what kind of exegetical method(s) did the OT biblical writers employ to interpret an antecedent Scripture? Did the NT writers use Hellenistic rhetoric such as Greco-Roman rhetoric, or did they favor and use a Jewish type of exegesis such as midrash, to understand the OT texts? One of the objectives of this project is to answer these questions. Nonetheless, a brief discussion, in two parts— one for the OT and one for the NT – will be offered next.

The topic of the exegetical method(s) used by the OT writers is best illustrated by Fishbane.<sup>31</sup> He categorizes four types of relationships related to how the OT is used in the OT: scribal comments and glosses, legal exegesis (the OT laws and traditions reinterpreted by later OT books), aggadic exegesis (the OT traditions reinterpreted or reapplied by prophets), and mantological exegesis (the prophetic traditions reinterpreted by others). Fishbane’s categories seem to comprehensively catalog the whole usage of the OT (*traditions*) by later OT texts or writers. Nonetheless, the

---

<sup>28</sup> Hans Hübner, “New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament,” chap. in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. 1, *From the Beginning to the Middle Ages (until 1300)*, ed. Magne Saebo (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996), 334-72. Note: this is the updated version of his article, “New Testament, Old Testament Quotation,” in *ABD* 4: 1096-1104. His thesis, a distinction of the *Vetus Testamentum per se* and the *Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum*, is further delineated in his *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1990), 37-70, particularly 62-70.

<sup>29</sup> Steve Moyise, “Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” in *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise, JSNTSup 189 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 18-19.

<sup>30</sup> See Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

<sup>31</sup> See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*; see a summary of Fishbane’s four categories by C. S. McKenzie, “Inner-biblical Interpretation, Hebrew Bible,” in *DBI* 1: 538-40.

question persists: are these exegetical methods the *only ones* that OT writers used to interpret an antecedent OT text? Our project will seek to answer this question.

In our treatment of the NT, we need to look at two important cultural factors making an impact on the exegetical method(s) used by the NT writers: Jewish and Hellenistic. For the former, the two dominant types of Jewish exegetical methods are midrash and pesher, though according to Longenecker, there were four types of Jewish interpretation methods evidenced in the first century:<sup>32</sup> the literalist, midrashic,<sup>33</sup> pesher, and allegorical. While all four are evident in Jewish literature, the central concept in rabbinic exegesis is midrash<sup>34</sup> and the dominant Qumran exegesis is pesher.<sup>35</sup> Thus our question is raised: did the NT writers use midrash as a dominant part of their interpretative methodology when they cited an OT text? Or did the NT writers use Qumran pesher to interpret the OT? Moreover, did the Hellenistic influence, for instance, Philo's allegorization, play a part in the NT use of the OT?

While we will assess the methodology used by the OT and the NT writers in their use of Scripture at the end of our study, it is sufficient to say here that the hermeneutical issue is not easily resolved. Since our study is unique in the sense that it combines both the OT and the NT use of the OT, we may be able to shed some light on how the OT and the NT writers use Scripture. Was the hermeneutical method used by the OT writer identical to the method used by the NT writer? If there are differences, what are they?

In completing our discussion of the two major issues facing inner- and inter-biblical interpretation, we can safely remark that there is a need for a detailed examination of inner- and inter-biblical interpretation. The Melchizedek passages provide such an opportunity. Before we proceed with our study, however, we should have a working definition of inner- and inter-biblical interpretation.

---

<sup>32</sup> Richard Longenecker, "Negative Answer to the Question 'Who Is the Prophet Talking About?' Some Reflections on the New Testament Use of the Old," chap. in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 380.

<sup>33</sup> Readers can consult some of the representative works that treat midrash and the NT: G. Vermes, "Bible and the Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible: From the beginnings to Jerome*, vol. 1, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. E. Evans (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 199-231; Douglas Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 62-66. A recent discussion of midrash and the NT quotation can be found in E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 66-68, 91-101.

<sup>34</sup> Longenecker, "Negative Answer," 381. For the introductory matter of the study of midrash, see Jacob Neusner, *What is Midrash? and A Midrash Reader*, SFSHJ 106, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1994).

<sup>35</sup> For a preliminary understanding, see Johann Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," chap. in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, 1: 126-29.

### 1.3 Towards Defining Inner- and Inter-Biblical Interpretation

Defining inter-biblical interpretation seems an easier task than defining inner-biblical interpretation. Biblical theologians have addressed the issue of the NT use of the OT far more frequently than the OT use of the OT (not to mention the area of the NT use of the NT). Recently, Fishbane and others<sup>36</sup> set to remove the deficit in biblical scholarship by looking extensively at the subject of the OT use of the OT. Their works can be traced in at least seven areas: the use of the Pentateuch's legal materials by Deuteronomy and the prophets;<sup>37</sup> the Book of Chronicles' use of the materials from the Book of Kings;<sup>38</sup> the Psalter's recast of historical texts in poetic form;<sup>39</sup> the major textual traditions that, like the Septuagint, reflect their reinterpretation of the Hebrew materials;<sup>40</sup> the prophets' usage of other prophetic materials;<sup>41</sup> the prophets' usage of historical materials (e.g., Isaiah 36-38 and 2 Kings 18-20), and the same text appearing in two different canonical books, for example, Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22.

Scholars may have touched on this subject of inner- and inter-biblical interpretation, but few works are labeled in the exact terms of "inner- and inter-biblical interpretation."<sup>42</sup> As noted elsewhere, some scholars use the term "inner-

---

<sup>36</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*. He condensed his book into a recently published article, "Inner Biblical Exegesis," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, 1: 33-48. See also D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). In the course of this project, we will provide more bibliographical data in the OT use of the OT and the NT use of the OT if necessary.

<sup>37</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 91-277.

<sup>38</sup> The major study of Chronicle's use of other OT materials can be found in T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israel*, FRLANT 106 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972).

<sup>39</sup> Brevard Childs, "Midrash and the Old Testament," in *Understanding the Sacred Text: Essays in Honor of Morton S. Enslin on the Hebrew Bible and Christian Beginnings*, ed. John Reuman (Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson, 1972), 51. He also points out "the superscriptions of the Psalter are not derived from independent historical tradition but are the result of inner-biblical exegesis" (57). Therefore, the purpose of the superscriptions is to recast the historical text in a new role. See his article "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis," *JSS* 16 (1971): 137-50.

<sup>40</sup> Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 5. See Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, WUNT 76 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995).

<sup>41</sup> Childs, "Midrash and the Old Testament," 53. There he points to the Third Isaiah use of the Second and the Second use of the First. The classic passage that illustrates an early prophet using a later prophet is Daniel's reinterpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy (Daniel 9). Also F. F. Bruce, "The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation," in *VTSup* 32 (1980): 37-52. In his article, Bruce talks about a later prophet use of an early prophet.

<sup>42</sup> For example, Nahum M. Sarna, "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis" in *Biblical and Other Studies*, ed. Alexander Altman (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 29-46. Thomas B. Dozeman, "Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh's Gracious and Compassionate Character," *JBL* 108 (1989): 207-23.

biblical interpretation” as another term for intertextuality.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, Fishbane’s inner-biblical exegesis is no more than a hybrid of rabbinic-midrashic exegesis, intertextuality, and tradition-history criticism. At the outset we require a working definition of inner- and inter-biblical interpretation.

Therefore, we propose the following two components: inner-biblical interpretation, which is a study of how a later biblical writer made use of other canonical material within the same OT or NT canon; and inter-biblical interpretation, which is a study of how a NT writer made use of the OT materials. In our definition “to make use of” could include quoting or alluding; interpreting or expounding; and text revision by addition or subtraction (omission) – to a minor degree without significant change in meaning of the materials used to fit the later biblical writer’s compositional needs.

Moreover, inner-biblical interpretation could occur within the OT canon, demonstrated most clearly by the writer of Chronicles when he makes use of materials from Kings, or Paul, who in 1 Corinthians 11, interpreted the passion narrative (the Lord’s Supper proper) in the Gospels. Inter-biblical interpretation focuses on the relationship between the OT and the NT and has been studied under a variety of titles: the NT use of the OT; the OT in the NT; the OT quotation in the NT; the NT interpretation of the OT, etc. After defining the inner- and inter-biblical interpretation, what are the approaches to handling these areas of biblical interpretation? That will be the topic of our next two chapters.

---

<sup>43</sup> See Scott L. Harris, *Proverbs 1-9: A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation*, SBLSS 150 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1995), 31; also his article “‘Figure’ and ‘Riddle’: Prov. 1: 8-19 and Inner-Biblical Interpretation,” *BR* 41 (1996): 58-76. See appendix 1 where we address the relationship between inner- and inter-biblical interpretation and intertextuality.