Université de Montréal

Bibliothèque

CONTEMPORAR' ... ..LICAL INSPIRATION
IN LIGF ... ER 1:20-21

par

PATRICK E. MURPHY

FACULTÉ DE THÉOLOGIE

Thèse présentée à la Faculté des études supérieures
en vue de l'obtention du grade de
Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D.)
en théologie - études bibliques

Avril 1998

UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL

CONTEMPORARY EVANGELICAL THEORIES OF BIBLICAL INSPIRATION
IN LIGHT OF 2 TIMOTHY 3:16a AND 2 PETER 1:20-21

par

PATRICK E. MURPHY

FACULTÉ DE THÉOLOGIE

Thèse présentée à la Faculté des études supérieures
en vue de l'obtention du grade de
Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D.)
en théologie - études bibliques

Avril 1998

© Patrick E. Murphy, 1998

Université de Montréal
Faculté des études supérieures

Cette thèse intitulée:

Contemporary Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration
in Light of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

présentée par:

Patrick E. Murphy

a été évaluée par un jury composé des personnes suivantes:

Pierre Létourneau
Jean Duhaime
Jean-Claude Petit
Don A. Carson
Olivette Genest (représente
l'examinateur
externe)
Ruth Solomon Scherzer

Thèse acceptée le: 29. 06. 1998

Abstract

This dissertation addresses several inadequacies in the evangelical reflection concerning the nature of inspiration in the last thirty-five years. Despite extensive discussion of inspiration within evangelicalism during the period which began with "Black Saturday" at Fuller Seminary in December of 1962 and extends to the publication of Donald G. Bloesch's *Holy Scripture* (1994), there have been significant lacunae in the articulation of this aspect of the doctrine of Scripture. These include a failure to appropriately identify and classify the various theories of inspiration which have been developed by evangelicals during this period; adequate exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, texts which are sometimes seen as significant for an understanding of inspiration; and a critical evaluation of various evangelical theories of inspiration in light of this exegesis. This dissertation seeks to advance evangelical consideration of inspiration in these areas.

One of the major contributions of the present work is the identification and classification of various theories of inspiration which have been proposed by evangelicals since the end of 1962. Although there are various possible approaches which might be taken for the organization of these theories, the most promising for a work which seeks to differentiate between perspectives which are present within the same general school of theological thought is one which classifies them according to the locus or loci of inspiration. Each theory is studied to determine *who* or *what* is seen as inspired. Extensive review of the literature reveals that evangelicals have formulated at least twelve distinct perspectives on the nature of inspiration, beginning with the publication of Dewey M. Beegle's *The Inspiration of Scripture* (1963). This study is the first, to the knowledge of its author, which has identified such a range of theories among evangelicals and which has employed a system of classification which allows for analysis based on specific and identifiable differences between them.

This work seeks to assist in the development of evangelical thought not

only in the consideration of various evangelical theories of inspiration but also in the exegesis of two biblical texts which are often cited in the discussion of inspiration, 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. As a study which is prepared in the context of a program of biblical studies, it presents an evangelical exegesis of these passages. While the conclusions of this exegesis are not particularly original, several aspects of the presentation are important. First, an effort has been made to state a contemporary evangelical method of exegesis which will both preserve distinct aspects of Protestant thought since the Reformation and respond to current issues in hermeneutics. Second, the exegesis of both 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 draws together the thought of a wide variety of authors and considers certain questions in a manner which is not found elsewhere in the literature. This exegesis is also important in that it states specific exegetical conclusions that are employed in the evaluation of contemporary evangelical theories of inspiration.

A final contribution of this dissertation is the critical analysis of recent evangelical perspectives on the nature of inspiration in light of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. This work considers evangelical thought and argues that the theories of inspiration of Millard J. Erickson and Carl F. H. Henry most adequately reflect the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

While much work remains for evangelicals with respect to the nature of inspiration, this study claims to make a contribution to this reflection. Although it is prepared from within the evangelical tradition and will be of greatest interest to those who share this tradition, it is of importance to an academic community both as an expression of evangelical thought and a critical evaluation of it.

Key words: Inspiration, Evangelical, Exegesis, 2 Timothy, 2 Peter

Résumé

Cette thèse est une étude critique des théories évangéliques contemporaines sur l'inspiration à la lumière d'une exégèse de 2 Timothée 3.16a et de 2 Pierre 1.20-21. Elle cherche à combler les lacunes suivantes dans la réflexion par rapport à ce sujet: 1) le besoin d'identifier et de classifier les théories de l'inspiration articulées par les chrétiens évangéliques au cours des trente-cinq dernières années, 2) une exégèse adéquate de 2 Tm 3.16a et de 2 P 1.20-21, et 3) une analyse critique de ces théories à la lumière de cette exégèse.

Une telle étude exige deux méthodes; une pour l'identification et la classification des théories de l'inspiration formulées par les chrétiens évangéliques et une autre pour l'exégèse des textes du Nouveau Testament qui sont considérés dans cette thèse. La méthode choisie pour identifier et classifier les théories de l'inspiration consiste à les organiser d'après le ou les lieux d'inspiration. Cette approche cherche à déterminer *qui* ou *quoi* est considéré comme inspiré dans chacune des théories et elle les compare en fonction de leurs ressemblances et différences sur ce point. Pour l'exégèse des textes du Nouveau Testament, cette étude emploie une méthode évangélique contemporaine. Celle-ci veut préserver la façon d'interpréter les textes bibliques couramment utilisée par certains exégètes protestants depuis la Réforme tout en rendant compte de questions actuelles de l'exégèse comme celles de la compréhension antérieure à l'interprétation d'un texte, la nature de la signification d'un texte, et ce qui la détermine.

Voici l'hypothèse de cette recherche:

Les textes bibliques de 2 Tm 3.16a et 2 P 1.20-21 doivent jouer un rôle important dans la formulation d'une théorie sur l'inspiration biblique. Ces textes peuvent être correctement interprétés en utilisant une méthode évangélique contemporaine d'exégèse. Quand les théories évangéliques récentes sur l'inspiration biblique, articulées depuis 1962, sont évaluées à la lumière de ces textes, la théorie la plus adéquate est celle qui présente le texte et les auteurs des Écritures

comme lieux d'inspiration et qui reconnaît au texte biblique la priorité dans cette inspiration.

Cette étude identifie douze théories sur l'inspiration proposées par les chrétiens évangéliques depuis l'ouvrage de Dewey M. Beegle, *The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture*, publié en 1963, jusqu'à celui de Donald G. Bloesch, *Holy Scripture*, paru en 1994. Ce sont, d'après le ou les lieux d'inspiration:

1. L'inspiration du texte des Écritures. Le lieu d'inspiration est le texte biblique lui-même (G. C. Berkouwer).
2. L'inspiration du contenu des Écritures. Le lieu d'inspiration est la signification de l'Écriture (Edward W. Goodrick).
3. L'inspiration du texte biblique et de ceux qui l'ont écrit, avec une priorité sur l'inspiration du texte (Carl F. H. Henry).
4. L'inspiration du texte biblique et de ceux qui l'ont écrit, avec une priorité sur l'inspiration des auteurs des Écritures (Milllard J. Erickson).
5. L'inspiration personnelle, dans laquelle le lieu d'inspiration est compris comme étant la pensée de ceux qui ont écrit la Bible (Ralph Earle).
6. L'inspiration comme la direction divine des auteurs de la Bible (Paul K. Jewett).
7. L'inspiration des auteurs, du texte, et des lecteurs des Écritures. Les lieux d'inspiration ne sont pas que le texte biblique et ses auteurs, mais aussi ceux qui les lisent (Dewey M. Beegle).
8. L'inspiration des auteurs, du texte, et des lecteurs originels des Écritures et leur conservation. Les lieux d'inspiration ne sont pas que le texte biblique et ses auteurs, mais ses premiers lecteurs et sa conservation continuelle (Donald G. Bloesch).
9. L'inspiration sociale dans laquelle le lieu d'inspiration est le processus de la production des Écritures (Clark H. Pinnock).
10. L'inspiration comme impressions produites par des actes de Dieu sur les personnes qui ainsi ont été motivées à rédiger les Écritures (William J. Abraham).
11. L'inspiration comme impressions ressenties par ceux qui lisent les Écritures dans le présent (Kern Robert Trembath).
12. L'inspiration comme manifestation indirecte de Dieu dans les relations personnelles (Charles H. Kraft).

Les chrétiens évangéliques croient en l'autorité de la Bible; une théorie qui se dit évangélique doit donc intégrer les données bibliques et doit être

évaluée à la lumière de cette intégration. Cette thèse examine 2 Tm 3.16a et 2 P 1.20-21 qui sont assez souvent considérés comme importants dans l'articulation d'une théorie sur l'inspiration. Elle présente une exégèse évangélique de ces textes, puis à la lumière de cette exégèse elle fait une analyse critique des théories de l'inspiration articulées par les chrétiens évangéliques.

Les lettres de 2 Timothée et 2 Pierre partagent certaines caractéristiques communes. Elles sont, toutes les deux, du genre littéraire *lettres apostoliques* qui effectuent la présence d'un apôtre dans son absence. Ce sont, aussi, des épîtres dont l'authenticité a été contestée dans l'étude contemporaine de la Bible. Dans le cas de 2 Timothée, les objections sont surtout liées à la différence dans le vocabulaire entre cette épître et certaines autres lettres de Paul. Dans la seconde épître de Pierre, ce sont les questions relatives au manque d'évidence externe concernant son existence, les idées théologiques, et la nature du vocabulaire qui sont les plus souvent posées. Cette thèse soutient qu'il y a des raisons valables pour accepter la perspective traditionnelle de l'Église que ces lettres sont l'œuvre des apôtres dont elles portent les noms.

L'exégèse de 2 Tm 3.16a, qui est traduit «toute Écriture est inspirée de Dieu»,[1] conduit à quelques conclusions importantes pour la formulation d'une théorie sur l'inspiration. Premièrement, ce texte parle de l'Écriture distributivement plutôt que collectivement; c'est *chaque* passage de l'Écriture considéré individuellement qui est inspiré et non l'Écriture dans son ensemble. Deuxièmement, l'Écriture en vue est celle de l'Ancien Testament et, peut être, la partie du Nouveau Testament qui existait au moment de la rédaction de 2 Timothée. Dans le Nouveau Testament, le mot γραφή est un terme qui fait généralement référence à l'Ancien Testament. Néanmoins, l'emploi de ce mot dans 1 Tm 5.18 suggère la possibilité que cela fasse aussi allusion (dans le cas

---

[1] La Sainte Bible. <u>Nouvelle édition de Genève</u>. [n.p.]: Société biblique de Genève, 1970, p. 1199.

de 2 Tm 3.16) aux textes du Nouveau Testament qui existaient quand 2 Timothée a été rédigé. Troisièmement, l'adjectif θεόπνευστος a une relation prédicative et non attributive avec le nom γραφή; alors la traduction «chaque [passage de l'] Écriture est inspirée de Dieu» doit être adoptée et ce qui est accentué dans ce texte doit être compris comme étant l'origine divine de l'Écriture ainsi que son utilité pastorale. Finalement, le terme θεόπνευστος a un sens passif et signifie «inspirée de Dieu». Le sens passif, qui donne l'idée que l'Écriture est inspirée de Dieu, est meilleur que le sens actif selon lequel l'Écriture souffle un esprit divin qu'elle communique à ses lecteurs. Le texte parle de l'origine de l'Écriture et non de son influence sur ceux qui la lisent. Le terme «inspirée (de Dieu)» ne porte pas la même variation de signification que le mot anglais «inspired (of God)». Malgré le fait qu'il est impossible de déterminer exactement la signification de θεόπνευστος à l'époque du Nouveau Testament, l'accent est mis sur l'origine divine de l'Écriture. Alors, l'exégèse de 2 Tm 3.16a indique que chaque passage de l'Écriture (l'Ancien Testament et, peut être, les livres du Nouveau Testament qui existaient au temps de la rédaction de 2 Timothée) tire son origine de Dieu. C'est l'Écriture elle-même qui est le lieu d'inspiration d'après 2 Tm 3.16a.

2 P 1.20-21 est traduit:

sachez tout d'abord vous-mêmes qu'aucune prophétie de l'Écriture ne peut être un objet d'interprétation particulière, car ce n'est pas par une volonté d'homme qu'une prophétie a jamais été apportée, mais c'est poussés par le Saint-Esprit que des hommes ont parlé de la part de Dieu.[2]

Parmi les interprétations de «aucune prophétie de l'Écriture ne peut être un objet d'interprétation particulière» qui ont été proposées, il y en a deux qui sont les plus probables. Le sujet de ce texte peut être l'interprétation de

---

[2] Ibid., p. 1225.

l'Écriture par un lecteur à l'heure actuelle. Dans ce cas, le texte prohibe une interprétation personnelle ou celle qui n'est pas autorisée. Par contre, le texte peut affirmer qu'aucune prophétie de l'Écriture ne vient de l'interprétation du prophète qui l'a communiquée et parle de l'origine de l'Écriture. Celle-ci est la meilleure position parce que 2 P 1.21 indique *la raison* pour laquelle la prophétie n'est pas venue de l'interprétation du prophète et parce que le mot ἐπιλύσεως est utilisé dans la littérature ancienne quand le sujet est l'origine de l'Écriture. Lorsqu'il est question de la «prophétie de l'Écriture», cela fait allusion à tout l'Ancien Testament. Ce verset nie donc l'idée que l'Ancien Testament a eu une origine humaine dans l'interprétation du prophète.

La raison en est indiquée dans 2 P 1.21: c'est que l'Écriture n'a jamais eu son origine dans la volonté humaine. L'Écriture ne vient pas de cette source. Elle tire plutôt son origine dans les paroles des individus qui ont été poussés par l'Esprit de Dieu. Le Saint-Esprit, qui est une personne et non seulement une force impersonnelle, a porté ceux qui ont parlé. Quoique la terminologie n'indique pas exactement la nature de l'influence du Saint-Esprit sur ces personnes, elle exprime un contrôle par lequel elles ont été «poussées». Néanmoins, il y a un rôle important pour les êtres humains dans la rédaction des Écritures, car ce sont «des hommes [qui] ont parlé de la part de Dieu».

2 P 1.20-21 nie donc que l'Ancien Testament ait une source humaine dans l'interprétation des prophètes qui l'ont produit. L'Écriture ne vient pas de la volonté (indépendante) des êtres humains, mais «des hommes» qui, «poussés par le Saint-Esprit,» «ont parlé de la part de Dieu». D'après 2 P 1.20-21 ce sont les auteurs de l'Écriture qui sont le lieu d'inspiration.

L'exégèse de 2 Tm 3.16a et de 2 P 1.20-21 révèle donc deux lieux d'inspiration. L'Écriture elle-même est inspirée ainsi que ses auteurs. Quand les théories évangéliques contemporaines sur l'inspiration sont évaluées à la lumière de l'exégèse de 2 Tm 3.16a et de 2 P 1.20-21, on constate que certaines de celles-ci n'intègrent pas du tout ces lieux d'inspiration. Parmi ces théories on trouve celles qui considèrent l'inspiration comme le processus de la

production des Écritures (Clark H. Pinnock), les impressions produites par les actes de Dieu chez ceux qui ont composé les Écritures (William J. Abraham), des impressions vécues par ceux qui lisent la Bible (Kern Robert Trembath), ou la manifestation indirecte de Dieu dans les relations humaines (Charles H. Kraft). Ces explications sur l'inspiration sont inadéquates à la lumière de 2 Tm 3.16a et de 2 P 1.20-21.

D'autres théories évangéliques contemporaines sur l'inspiration identifient soit les Écritures soit ses auteurs comme lieu d'inspiration. Dans l'œuvre de G. C. Berkouwer, c'est le texte des Écritures qui est considéré comme inspiré, tandis que dans celle de Edward W. Goodrick c'est dans la signification de la Bible que l'inspiration doit être localisée. Ses perspectives affirment l'inspiration de l'Écriture, mais non de ses auteurs. Deux autres chrétiens évangéliques situent l'inspiration chez les auteurs des Écritures. Selon Robert Earle, c'est la pensée des écrivains qui est inspirée. Paul K. Jewett conçoit l'inspiration comme la direction divine des auteurs de la Bible. Chez Earle et Jewett, le lieu d'inspiration est donc les auteurs de l'Écriture, mais non le texte même. Ces quatre théories localisent l'inspiration dans l'Écriture ou dans ses auteurs, mais elles sont toujours inadéquates parce qu'elles ne reconnaissent qu'un seul lieu d'inspiration.

Un dernier groupe de théories de l'inspiration intègre les deux lieux d'inspiration de 2 Tm 3.16a et de 2 P 1.20-21; l'Écriture est inspirée, ainsi que ses auteurs. Parmi ces théories, deux ajoutent d'autres lieux d'inspiration, soit les lecteurs de la Bible (Dewey M. Beegle) soit les premiers lecteurs bibliques et sa conservation (Donald G. Bloesch). Ces perspectives sont inadéquates parce qu'elles n'intègrent pas plusieurs aspects de l'exégèse des textes de cette étude. Milllard J. Erickson et Carl F. H. Henry croient que l'Écriture et les écrivains bibliques sont les lieux d'inspiration. Ces deux théories s'avèrent les meilleures quand elles sont jugées à la lumière de 2 Tm 3.16a et de 2 P 1.20-21.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Although I cannot begin to enumerate all the individuals who have contributed to my life and thought as reflected in this work, certain individuals must be particulary recognized. First, my parents, Pat and Pat Murphy. Before I ever knew that the issues addressed in this work existed, they taught me, by example, that a living faith in the message of Scripture is more important than a mere academic comprehension of certain theological matters. I trust my life, as well as my thought, honours their contribution to me.

This project has been directed by Jean Duhaime, of *la Faculté de théologie de l'Université de Montréal*. M. Duhaime has been a model of academic direction. His suggestions and counsel during many hours together have brought a clarity to my thought and its expression which would not have been present without his assistance. The theology is my own, any clarity in its expression reflects his influence.

My employer, *Mission to the Americas*, willingly granted me the time for this work. *Le séminaire baptiste évangélique du Québec*, where I currently serve, encouraged this study and accepted my lack of availability for certain projects because of it.

It is impossible to adequately acknowledge my gratitude to my five children, Nathan, Anne, John, Timothy, and Patrick, and my beloved wife Joyce. They cheerfully endured hours of scholarly preoccupation and enabled me to maintain a certain balance in life during the years of doctoral study.

While I trust that this dissertation reflects an academic rigor, it is evident that it has been prepared from within a specific ecclesiastical tradition and with the intention to better serve the churches of this tradition. It is especially appropriate, then, that I express my thanks to my Lord, Jesus Christ, for the opportunity of this service and for the study which has been undertaken to enhance this ministry.

1 Introduction

The nature of Scripture and, especially, the character of its inspiration has received significant attention among evangelical Protestant theologians in the second half of the twentieth century. While evangelical considerations of biblical inspiration represent only one aspect of the more extensive discussion of this doctrine, they are worthy of academic consideration for at least two reasons. First, evangelicalism has exercised a certain theological influence in North America during the second half of the present century. Second, despite extensive discussion of the nature of biblical inspiration by evangelicals, especially in the last thirty-five years, several important questions have not been given adequate attention. This thesis seeks to identify and consider these matters.

1.1 Context and Aims

1.1.1 The Need

Significant lacunae in the evangelical consideration of inspiration during the latter half of the twentieth century include, first, a failure to have adequately identified and analyzed the variety of perspectives on the nature of inspiration which have been proposed by evangelicals and to have critically evaluated the validity of these various proposals. Second, the contemporary evangelical discussion of biblical inspiration has been carried on apart from an adequate exegesis of key biblical texts even though a fundamental tenet of evangelicalism is that the Scriptures are authoritative in the articulation of doctrine. A third lacuna has been that of adequate criticism of proposed evangelical theories of biblical inspiration in the light of biblical exegesis, despite the fact that these theories have been subject to critical evaluation both from within this circle of thought as well as from without.

The current study, therefore, seeks to address these inadequacies. It is

prepared from the perspective of evangelicalism and its conclusions will be of greatest interest to those who identify with this tradition. Nevertheless, the extensive popular influence of evangelicalism in North American in the latter half of the present century makes this dissertation of interest to an academic community both as an explanation and an analysis of a particular doctrinal matter within this perspective.

1.1.2 The Objectives

Given the preceding statement of the need for this study, the current research has three specific objectives. This work attempts, first, an analytical description of contemporary evangelical Protestant theories of biblical inspiration. Such an analysis demands both the establishment of a method for such a description and the organization of various understandings of the nature of inspiration according to it. The indication of this method is found in the introductory chapter of this work, whereas its application to contemporary evangelical Protestant theories of biblical inspiration is the concern of chapter 2.

The second objective of this dissertation is to provide an evangelical exegesis of two texts which have often been seen as significant for the question of biblical inspiration. These texts include 2 Timothy 3:16a, which the *New International Version* renders "all Scripture is God-breathed and is useful,"[1] and 2 Peter 1:20-21 which the same work translates:

> Above all, you must understand that no prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet's own interpretation. For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.[2]

---

[1] Kenneth Barker, ed., The NIV Study Bible. New International Version. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, p. 1846. Hereafter abbreviated *NIV*.

[2] Ibid., p. 1900.

This study requires both the articulation of an exegetical method and its application to these texts. As this work is primarily concerned with biblical exegesis, the statement of this method is of significant importance and occupies the majority of chapter 1; the application of this exegetical method to 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 is the subject of chapters 3 through 5.

This dissertation seeks, finally, a consideration of contemporary evangelical Protestant theories of biblical inspiration in light of an evangelical exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21. This is the concern of chapter 6. The various evangelical theories of biblical inspiration analyzed in chapter 2 are evaluated to determine which, if any, of these theories best reflects the conclusions of an evangelical exegesis of these two biblical texts. This chapter, with chapter 7, is both a critical consideration of contemporary evangelical Protestant theories of biblical inspiration and a conclusion.

1.1.3 The Limitations

Any study which seeks to address the concerns of the present work will invariably be limited in its purview. Five limitations are among the most important of this study.

A first limitation of this work is that it examines only one aspect of the nature of Scripture, that of inspiration. Evangelical Protestant theology in the last 150 years has generally subsumed the study of biblical inspiration under that of the nature of Scripture which, in turn, was viewed as an aspect of special revelation. Special revelation was likewise seen as a subdivision of the broader category of revelation in general. Although this approach to the study of biblical inspiration has been questioned[3] or the entire subject generally

---

[3] Stanley J. Grenz, Revisioning Evangelical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993, pp. 113-15. D. A. Carson questions whether the approach of Grenz to Scripture can legitimately be described as evangelical in D. A. Carson, The Gagging of God. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996, p. 481.

ignored[4] in some recent expressions of evangelical thought, the general tendency in contemporary evangelical theology continues to be to follow the pattern of theological organization of the discussion of revelation and the nature of Scripture which has dominated the literature in the last century and a half.[5] This study, however, is limited to only one aspect of the consideration of the nature of the Scriptures, which is that of inspiration. Questions such as biblical authority and, especially, the matter of biblical inerrancy, which has been extensively debated in the contemporary evangelical context,[6] are not here addressed.

A second limitation of this study is that it considers only theories of inspiration which have been articulated by evangelicals.[7] As this work

---

[4] See, Thomas C. Oden, The Living God. Vol. I, Systematic Theology, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987, especially pp. 333-44; J. Rodman Williams, Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective. 3 vols., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988-92.

[5] For various evangelical Protestant formulations of biblical inspiration which indicate this general approach see, Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, [n.d.], I, 151-88; Augustus Hopkins Strong, Systematic Theology. Valley Forge, PA: Judson, 1907, pp. 111-242; James Oliver Buswell, A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962, pp. 183-213; Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985, pp. 153-220.

[6] Some evangelicals hold that inerrancy is a logical correlate of inspiration. See, in this regard, R. C. Sproul, Explaining Inerrancy. Oakland, CA: International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1980, p. 25.

[7] While the title of the present work indicates that the concern is with evangelical theories of biblical inspiration, a more apt description of these perspectives would be "North American English evangelical Protestant" theories of biblical inspiration. The longer designation has not been adopted as the title of this study was already cumbersome. It should be observed that all of the theologians considered in this study have articulated their thought in English and in North America with the exception of G. C. Berkouwer. The thought of Berkouwer has become well-known in North America through the translation of his work on Scripture by Jack B. Rogers (G. C. Berkouwer, Holy

concentrates only on evangelical theories of biblical inspiration, it is immediately evident that an adequate definition of the term *evangelicalism* is essential. For the purpose of this study evangelicalism is defined according to the theological definition of D. W. Bebbington who states that "evangelicalism has tended to centre upon a cluster of four assumptions." He enumerates these assumptions as:

1 the authority and sufficiency of Scripture;
2 the uniqueness of redemption through the death of Christ upon the cross . . .
3 the need for personal conversion;
4 the necessity, propriety and urgency of evangelism.[8]

It must be emphasized that the adoption of this definition is not an affirmation that it is the most adequate description of the distinctive characteristics of evangelicalism. Rather, the use of this definition affirms that each of the theologians considered in this study would generally accept the distinctives of Bebbington as being true of his position. In light of the differences which exist with respect to the nature of evangelicalism, certain of these theologians might hold that biblical inerrancy must be added to this definition in order to truly reflect this thought.

The limitation of this study to evangelical theories of biblical inspiration has significant implications for the content of this work. There is no attempt in this study to consider either theories which represent a broad range of theological thought or even those which have exercised the most influence in

Scripture. Studies in Dogmatics. trans. and ed., Jack B. Rogers, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) and the subsequent interpretative work of Rogers and McKim (Jack B. Rogers and Donald B. McKim, Biblical Authority. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1979).

8 D. W. Bebbington, "Evangelicalism," The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Thought. ed. Alister E. McGrath, Oxford: Blackwell, 1993, p. 183. For a fuller development of these themes see, D. W. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain. London: Hyman, 1989, pp. 1-17.

current discussion of the nature of biblical inspiration.[9]

The present work is also limited in that it considers only contemporary theories of biblical inspiration. The *terminus a quo* which has been adopted in this study is Saturday, December 1, 1962. This day has become known in the literature of evangelicalism as "Black Saturday."[10] Although the organizational expression of evangelicalism as it has been known in North America in the second half of the twentieth century may be appropriately traced to the founding of the National Association of Evangelicals in 1942,[11] and the determination of certain of the intellectual characteristics of the movement, along with its general atmosphere to a cluster of events in the late 1940s,[12] it is the events at Fuller

---

[9] Among non-evangelical studies of the nature of biblical inspiration during the period under consideration in this study the following have either exercised an influence on the direction of theological thought or sought to introduce a unique perspective on the nature of inspiration: Karl Rahner, Inspiration in the Bible. trans. Charles H. Henkey, 2d ed., New York: Herder and Herder, 1964; Luis Alonso Schökel, The Inspired Word. trans. Francis Martin, New York: Herder and Herder, 1972; Bruce Vawter, Biblical Inspiration. Philadelphia/London: Westminster/Hutchinson, 1972; Paul Achtemeier, The Inspiration of Scripture. ed. Howard Clark Kee, Biblical Perspectives on Current Issues, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980; Thomas A. Hoffman, "Inspiration, Norminativeness, Canonicity, and the Unique Sacred Character of the Bible." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 44 (1982), 447-69; Walter Vogels, "Inspiration in A Linguistic Mode." Biblical Theology Bulletin, 15 (1985), 87-93; James M. Reese, "Inspiration: Toward A Sociosemiotic Definition." Biblical Theology Bulletin, 21 (1991), 4-12.

[10] George Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, pp. 208-15; Harold Lindsell, The Battle for the Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976, pp. 110-11.

[11] Alister McGrath, Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995, p. 22.

[12] These include: 1) the use of the term "neo-evangelical" by Harold Ockenga; 2) the publication of C. F. H. Henry's *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*; and 3) the founding of Fuller Seminary, all of which took place in 1947, and the rise to prominence of Billy Graham in 1948. See,

Seminary on this Saturday in 1962 which are of greatest importance for a consideration of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration. Prior to this date there seems to have been general agreement among North American evangelicals with respect to the nature of Scripture, but with changes in Fuller's direction which may be traced to this time[13] and the publication the following year of Dewey Beegle's *The Inspiration of Scripture* (1963), whatever uniformity might have existed before ended. For this reason, this study is limited to evangelical theories of biblical inspiration which have been articulated since the end of 1962.[14]

This limitation has at least two significant implications. First, evangelical theories of inspiration that have exercised a significant influence and which in some cases continue to do so, but which were articulated prior to 1962 are either completely ignored or considered only as they are manifest in contemporary expressions of the nature of inspiration.[15] Second, the theories

---

McGrath, Evangelicalism, pp. 38-41; Richard V. Pierard, ""Evangelicalism," New 20th-Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. ed. J. D. Douglas, 2d ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, p. 312; John C. Pollock, "Graham "Billy" (William Franklin)," New International Dictionary of the Christian Church. ed. J. D. Douglas, Grand Rapids; Zondervan, 1974, p. 427.

[13] It should be noted early in this study that Fuller Seminary has exercised a disproportionate influence in the articulation of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration. The reader must be impressed with the number of theologians considered in chapter 2 which have been in some way identified with this seminary.

[14] It is, of course, evident that Berkouwer's work on Scripture antedates the *terminus a quo* adopted in this work. This is entirely consistent with the method of this study which considers Berkouwer as translated, and then interpreted, in the work of Jack Rogers.

[15] Most influential of all pre-1962 evangelical theories of biblical inspiration are those theories which were articulated by theologians of Princeton Seminary, especially Archibald A. Hodge and Benjamin B. Warfield. Both the primary and secondary literature is extensive. For a statement of the

of inspiration which are reflected in this work have been chosen not necessarily because they are broadly representative of contemporary evangelicalism or particulary significant in themselves, but primarily because they reflect the diversity that has emerged since December 1, 1962.

Another important limitation of this study is that only two texts of Scripture, 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, are considered. Careful recognition of this limitation is essential for an adequate understanding of the dissertation's purpose and results as the complete articulation of Scripture's teaching on inspiration must include many other passages.[16] These two texts have been chosen not only because they have sometimes been included in the discussion of the New Testament doctrine of inspiration but also because, for a dissertation in biblical studies, 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 present significant exegetical questions. The choice of two texts which occur in literary contexts where the primary concern is not the nature of Scripture is appropriate as the general New Testament pattern is that material which is relevant to an understanding of the character of Scripture is found in passages which have other matters as their predominant subject.

A final limitation of this study is that it does not seek either to evaluate the entire theological statement of the nature of inspiration found in the theories of inspiration which are examined or to construct an adequate evangelical definition of inspiration. This dissertation attempts, rather, to judge the adequacy of existing evangelical descriptions of inspiration in light of the

---

doctrine of inspiration in Princeton Theology see, Archibald A. Hodge and Benjamin B. Warfield, Inspiration. 1881; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979. An important bibliography is included in Mark A Noll, ed., The Princeton Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.

[16] Grudem cites a number of texts which are significant for the formulation of a doctrine of Scripture in Wayne A. Grudem, "Scripture's Self-Attestation and the Problem of Formulating a Doctrine of Scripture," Scripture and Truth. eds. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, pp. 19-59.

exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. In this respect the goal of this study is negative as it concerns the discourse between exegesis and systematic theology. No effort is made to determine which of the theories examined is the most adequate theological articulation of the nature of inspiration. The concern is only to evaluate the manner in which the exegetical material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 has been integrated into each theory.

1.1.4 The Hypothesis

The methodological approach adopted in this work which seeks to evaluate evangelical theories of biblical inspiration in light of the exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 is especially appropriate to a consideration of these theories as biblical authority in the formation of doctrinal understanding has generally been understood as a distinguishing characteristic of evangelicalism. The hypothesis of this study is:

> 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 should play an important role in the formulation of a theory of biblical inspiration. These two texts may be correctly interpreted using a contemporary evangelical method of biblical exegesis. When considered in light of such an exegesis, among contemporary evangelical Protestant theories of biblical inspiration since 1962, a doctrine of textual and personal inspiration which places the priority on the inspiration of the biblical text best accounts for the material of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21.

1.2 Method

Two distinct methods are required to achieve the objectives already indicated. There must be, on the one hand, a method for the classification and evaluation of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration. This method must not only reveal what is common to various evangelical theories of biblical inspiration but it must, particularly, accent the differences between these theories which have all been proposed within the context of contemporary

evangelicalism. The first part of the discussion of method examines different approaches which have been employed to categorize theories of biblical inspiration and presents the method which will be used in this work to classify and analyze contemporary evangelical perspectives on the nature of biblical inspiration.

This study must have, as well, a clear exegetical method which is employed in the consideration of the biblical texts. The second part of this section describes the contemporary evangelical exegetical method which will guide the study of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21.

1.2.1 Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Contemporary Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration

At least four different approaches have been employed in the classification of various theories of biblical inspiration. The first, and perhaps the most simple, is to group theories of inspiration according to the theological school of thought from which they are articulated or by the key theologian involved in the statement of a perspective on the nature of inspiration.[17] The latter approach is only of limited value as it is not immediately evident if a theologian's idea of the nature of biblical inspiration is unique to the particular theologian or is reflective of a general school of thought. The former method, by which theories of inspiration are grouped according to the school of thought from which they come, has the advantage of accenting the commonalities among a particular group of theologians in their understanding of the nature of

---

[17] The former approach is illustrated in the consideration of inerrancy, rather than inspiration, by the work of Gordon Lewis and Bruce Demarest eds., Challenges to Inerrancy. Chicago: Moody, 1984, while the latter can be seen in John F. Walvoord, ed., Inspiration and Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957 and Louis Igou Hodges, "Evangelical Definitions of Inspiration: Critiques and a Suggested Definition." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 37 (1994), 99-114. Bush and Nettles employ a similar method with respect to Baptists only in L. Russ Bush and Tom J. Nettles, Baptists and the Bible. Chicago: Moody, 1980.

inspiration. The weakness of this approach is that it tends to blur the distinctions between various representatives of the same general theological perspective. For this reason such an approach is inadequate for a study which seeks to discover the differences between evangelicals in their perspectives on the nature of inspiration.

A second method which has been used to classify theories of biblical inspiration is that which organizes these theories according to the description of the nature of inspiration. Thus, the Baptist theologian Augustus Strong, writing at the beginning of this century, enumerated four theories of inspiration which included those of "intuition," "illumination," "dictation," and "dynamical."[18] James Garret recently employed a similar method. He identifies six theories of inspiration which are: 1) "verbal inspiration with inerrancy," 2) "dynamic or limited verbal inspiration," 3) "different levels or degrees of inspiration," 4) "partial inspiration," 5) "universal Christian inspiration," and 6) "natural inspiration or intuition."[19] This approach has the strength of emphasizing the character of inspiration itself. Rather than looking at a school of theological thought, the concern is with the particular understanding of the nature of inspiration. A weakness of this organizational method is that it is sometimes difficult to adequately distinguish between various ideas of the nature of inspiration and, in some cases, the distinction may be made on the basis of a related issue, such as inerrancy, rather than on the character of inspiration itself.

A third method is that which arranges various theories of inspiration according to the perceived method by which the theory of inspiration was formulated. This approach, found in the work of William Abraham and Kern Robert Trembath, distinguishes between deductive and inductive theories of

---

[18] Strong, Systematic Theology, pp. 202-12.

[19] James Leo Garrett, Jr., Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990, I, 117-19. For a somewhat similar approach which is concerned with evangelical differences with respect to inerrancy see, Robert K. Johnson, Evangelicals at an Impasse. Atlanta: Knox, 1979, pp. 18-35.

biblical inspiration.[20] According to Trembath "a deductive approach is one that reflects the understanding that knowledge is grounded upon beliefs which are not subject to empirical verification but nevertheless guide or influence empirical observations."[21] An inductive approach, by contrast, is one which "begins with what is more surely known by the mind through experience and proceeds to inspect what is not yet known through comparison with the known." In the consideration of inspiration this demands that one begin with "nonreligious instances of inspiration" in order to understand biblical inspiration.[22] While this approach is helpful in that it serves as a reminder of method in the development of theories of inspiration, it is not useful for the present study in that it does not allow for an accurate differentiation between evangelical theories of biblical inspiration. This procedure concentrates too much on the process involved in the formulation of an understanding of inspiration and not enough on a determination of the distinctive content of such an understanding.

A fourth and more promising approach is to arrange these ideas according to the locus of inspiration. Theories are categorized according to who or what is seen as inspired. This method of classification is adequately reflected in the work of Robert Gnuse.[23] Gnuse distinguishes four theories of

---

[20] William J. Abraham, The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981, pp. 16-57; Kern Robert Trembath, Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration. New York/Oxford: Oxford University, 1987, pp. 8-71.

[21] Trembath, Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration, p. 8.

[22] Ibid., p. 47.

[23] Robert Gnuse, The Authority of the Bible. New York: Paulist, 1985, pp. 14-65. See also, Raymond F. Collins, "Inspiration," The New Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990, pp. 1031-32. H. D. McDonald, in his historical study of biblical inspiration, differentiates between theories which concentrated on the inward affirming that "the locale of

inspiration based on their various understandings of the locus of inspiration. These theories include 1) "strict verbal inspiration" in which the words of the Bible are directly communicated by God, 2) "limited verbal inspiration" in which the words of Scripture are communicated by God but conditioned historically or accommodated to humanity, 3) "non-textual inspiration" in which the message or idea of the Bible is inspired (inspiration, then, pertains to the authors of Scripture and not the text itself), and 4) "social inspiration" which places the locus of inspiration with the believing community and not only the text or authors of the Bible.[24]

Theories of biblical inspiration which concentrate on the locus of inspiration are subject to the limitation of blurring the distinctions between schools of theological thought. Representatives of a certain theological perspective, such as evangelicalism, may hold various loci of inspiration. This method will tend to limit an emphasis on the commonalities which are present. The advantage of this approach, however, is that it allows for a clear differentiation between various theories based on an identifiable factor, that of the specific locus or loci of inspiration. It is this capacity which makes this approach the most adequate method for this study. Even if it will tend to ignore certain similarities among various evangelical theories of biblical inspiration, it will clearly delineate differences among them with respect to the critical issue of the locus of inspiration. This distinction will permit a critical evaluation of evangelical theories of biblical inspiration. In the analysis of chapter 2, this work has begun with the loci of inspiration delineated in the work of Gnuse and, then, identified other loci in the theories considered.

---

inspiration was particulary the experiences of religious geniuses," and those which were focused on the outward, holding the Bible as the locus of inspiration. H. D. McDonald, Theories of Revelation. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979, pp. 218-287.

[24] Gnuse, The Authority of the Bible, pp. 14-15.

1.2.2 Exegetical Method

1.2.2.1 The Goal of Biblical Interpretation

The exegetical method which is here presented seeks to account for several significant concerns. It recognizes the contemporary discussion regarding hermeneutics and attempts to respond to several of the major questions found in this discussion. At the same time this study, which is prepared from the context of an evangelical Protestant and particularly a conservative Baptist tradition, attempts to articulate a method which preserves this tradition both with respect to its historical character and its contemporary manifestation. What follows is an effort to clearly state the goal of the exegetical method followed in this study and the procedures used. It is necessary first, however, to consider the meaning of two key terms.

Since the time of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) the use of this term *hermeneutics* has developed in one of two major directions.[25] From earliest usage *hermeneutics* has been understood as the rules or principles which govern the interpretation of a text and, in the case of Scripture, those which govern biblical interpretation.[26] This understanding of hermeneutics has

---

[25] Discussions of the history of hermeneutical thought since Schleiermacher may be found in Franz Mussner, Histoire de l'herméneutique. Histoire des dogmes. Vol. I, Les fondements de la foi. trad. T. Nieberding and M. Massart. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1972; A. C. Thiselton, "Hermeneutics," A New Dictionary of Theology. eds. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, J. I. Packer, Downers Grover, IL: InterVarsity, 1988, pp. 293-97; Bernard C. Lategan, "Hermeneutics," The Anchor Bible Commentary. ed. David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992, III, 149-54. A extensive survey of modern hermeneutical discussion may be found in Anthony C. Thiselton, New Horizons in Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

[26] Richard E. Palmer, Hermeneutics. Northwestern University Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy, ed. James Wild, Evanston: Northwestern, 1969, p. 34.

broadened in recent discussion so that hermeneutics is seen as a description of the whole interpretive process including both the determination of the original *meaning* of the text and its contemporary *significance*.[27] In distinction to this understanding of hermeneutics, the term has been used after Schleiermacher in a broad sense of the "theory of understanding." In this usage hermeneutics is no longer the articulation of principles for the interpretation of Scripture nor is it used of the entire interpretive process, it is, rather, a reflection on the nature and process of understanding.[28] The present discussion touches on both general matters of comprehension and the interpretive process in the determination of the original meaning of the text and in its contemporary application and significance.[29]

The term *exegesis* is more simply defined than hermeneutics as there is general agreement among scholars that exegesis refers to the practice or procedure involved in the determination of the meaning of a biblical text.[30] For

----

[27] Examples of this general approach are: F. F. Bruce, "Interpretation of the Bible," Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, p. 565; Thiselton, "Hermeneutics," 293; Grant R. Osborne, The Hermeneutical Spiral. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991, pp. 5-7.

[28] This use of *hermeneutics* has had an extensive and varied development since Schleiermacher. For presentations of this understanding of *hermeneutics* see, Karl Lehmann, "Hermeneutics," Sacramentum Mundi. ed. Karl Rahner, London: Burns and Oates, 1966, III, 23; Werner G. Jeanrond, "Hermeneutics," The New Dictionary of Theology. eds. Joseph A. Komonchak, Mary Collins and Dermont A. Lane, Collegeville, MI: Liturgical, 1991, p. 462.

[29] Some contemporary hermeneutical discussion limits *hermeneutics* only to the current meaning of a text. See, for example, Ian A. Fair, "Disciplines Related to Biblical Interpretation," Biblical Interpretation. eds. F. Furman Kearley, Edward P. Meyers and Timothy D. Hadley, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986, p. 31.

[30] L. E. Keck and G. M. Tucker, "Exegesis," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. supplementary volume, ed. Keith Crim, Nashville: Abingdon, 1976, p. 296; Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., Toward an Exegetical Theology. Grand

the purposes of this study, exegesis is understood as "the analysis of the final-form of a text considered as an integral and self-referring literary object."[31]

The exegetical method adopted here stands in the tradition which has been called "grammatico-historical" exegesis. The designation "grammatico-historical" was understood as the interpretation of an author's discourse in accord with that which is required by rules of grammar and the content of history. In this concept, the grammatical sense was understood primarily as "the most simple, direct, and ordinary meaning of phrases," and not that of their organization and relationships. The historical sense was "that meaning of an author's words which is required by historical considerations."[32]

Recent study of hermeneutical questions such as authorial intention, literary genre, and the contemporary significance of the biblical message have encouraged continued consideration among evangelicals regarding the nature and appropriate appellation of their hermeneutical method.[33] For this reason the label "grammatico-historical" has not been retained as the designation of the hermeneutical approach employed here, although distinctives of this method are preserved. This study has not adopted, however, an alternative as

---

Rapids: Baker, 1981, p. 47; Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, "Exegesis," Dictionary of Theology. 2d ed., New York: Crossroads, 1981, p. 161; Raymond F. Collins, "Exegesis," A New Dictionary of Christian Theology. eds. Alan Richardson and John Bowden, London: SCM, 1983, p. 197; Elliott E. Johson, Expository Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990, p. 142; Douglas Stuart, "Exegesis," The Anchor Bible Dictionary. ed. David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992, II, 682.

[31] D. A. Carson, "The Role of Exegesis in Systematic Theology," Doing Theology in Today's World. eds. John D. Woodbridge and Thomas Edward McComiskey, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991, p. 46.

[32] Milton S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, [n.d.], p. 208. See also, Kaiser, Exegetical Theology, pp. 87-88.

[33] Cf. Kaiser, Exegetical Theology, pp. 88-89 who adopts the terminology "syntactical-theological method."

none has been broadly accepted.

Contemporary evangelical Protestant theology generally holds that the goal of biblical interpretation is to determine the meaning of the biblical text which the original author intended his original audience to understand. This is not a recent development within Protestantism: Calvin already asserts, "it is almost his [the interpreter's] only task to unfold the mind of the writer whom he has undertaken to expound."[34] The emphasis on authorial intention, with various refinements, continues to guide not only evangelical Protestant hermeneutics but also some of other persuasions.[35]

The goal of biblical interpretation which will guide the exegesis of this study has been taken, with some modification, from the work of Elliott E. Johnson who states that it is

> to understand the Author's/author's single intended meaning for his original audience as expressed in the biblical text and its application/significance for the contemporary audience.[36]

The material which follows attempts to explain, in a cursory manner, the

---

[34] John Calvin. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians. eds. David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance, trans. Ross MacKenzie, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961, p. 1.

[35] See, I. Howard Marshall, "Introduction," New Testament Interpretation. ed. I. Howard Marshall, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977, p. 15; Bruce, "Interpretation," p. 565; Daniel J. Harrington, "Biblical Hermeneutics in Recent Discussion: New Testament," A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics. ed. Donald K. McKim, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986, p. 19; Sidney Greidanus, The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988, pp. 106-10; Osborne, Spiral, p. 367; William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., An Introduction to Biblical Interpretation. Dallas: Word, 1993, pp. 133.

[36] Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, p. 31. Cf. Kaiser Exegetical Theology, pp. 44-45. This goal has been extensively challenged in modern thought. See the discussions in Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, pp. 54-69 and Osborne, Spiral, pp. 368-96.

essential elements of this goal and to examine briefly those aspects which it shares in common with other contemporary articulations of the goal of biblical interpretation.

This proposed goal of biblical interpretation requires the consideration of several interpretative issues, namely: *preunderstanding and the comprehension of meaning*, *the nature of meaning* as it has to do with Scripture; and *the primary determinant of the meaning* of the biblical text.

Preunderstanding and the Comprehension of Meaning

An exegetical method which seeks to discover the meaning of the biblical text must consider the interpreter's preunderstanding and its implication for the comprehension of meaning. Preunderstanding is often construed as an appropriate recognition that all interpreters come to the text with already-existing attitudes and ideas with respect to its meaning,[37] however, this definition does not adequately address the epistemological question involved in this concept as the hermeneutical issue in preunderstanding is more fundamental.

Carson differentiates between two concepts of the nature of preunderstanding. First, preunderstanding may be understood, as it is in evangelical thought, as a "functional non-negotiable." In this perspective, preunderstanding describes the existing attitudes and ideas with which the interpreter approaches the text. They *function* as non-negotiables in that they are not immediately subject to change and, often, are not recognized by the interpreter. This preunderstanding is not, however, finally immutable as "given enough pressure, [it] can be amended into a stance with increased proximity to

---

[37] Thus, Ferguson defines preunderstanding as, "a body of assumptions and attitudes which a person brings to the perception and interpretation of reality or any aspect of it." Duncan S. Ferguson, <u>Biblical Hermeneutics</u>. Atlanta: Knox, 1986, p. 6.

the text."[38]

The second concept of preunderstanding, which is reflected in the work of Bultmann, sees preunderstanding (*Vorverständnis*) as "something like 'immutable non-negotiables.'"[39] It is modes of existence and/or understanding which are not subject to adaption by the influence of Scripture. Bultmann writes, "no man can adopt a view of the world by his own volition—it is determined for him by his place in history."[40] Changes in this view of the world come about not in an interaction with the Scripture but in confrontation with different facts which makes one's previous world-view untenable.[41]

Hans-Georg Gadamer, likewise, holds a theory of preunderstanding which limits the possibility of understanding based on authorial intention. He affirms the historicity of understanding. Preunderstanding is the anticipation of meaning that the interpreter brings to the text which is a consequence of his participation in continually evolving tradition. It involves an anticipation of completion which is based on one's prior relation to the subject of a text and is determinative for an understanding of its meaning.[42]

---

[38] D. A. Carson, "A Sketch of the Factors Determining Current Hermeneutical Debate in Cross-Cultural Contexts," Biblical Interpretation and the Church. ed. D. A. Carson, Nashville: Nelson, 1984, p. 12. Cf. Thiselton, New Horizons, pp. 44-46.

[39] Carson, "Current Hermeneutical Debate," pp. 12-13.

[40] Rudolf Bultmann, "Neues Testament und Mythologie," Kerygma und Mythos. Theologische Forschung, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, Hamburg: Reich & Heidrich, 1948, I, 16-17, [ET, Rudolph Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth. ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. Reginald H. Fuller, London: SPCK: 1953, p. 3].

[41] Ibid.

[42] Hans-Georg Gadamer, Wahrheit und Methode. 2d ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1965. pp. 277-78. Cf. Anthony C. Thiselton, The Two Horizons. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, pp. 304-10.

Preunderstanding, as presented in the work of Gadamer, has significant implications for biblical interpretation. The interpreter can not and should not seek to determine the intention of the author as the only determinant of the meaning of the biblical text. Rather, each age "has to understand a transmitted text in its own way, for the text is part of the whole of the tradition in which the age takes an objective interest and in which it seeks to understand itself."[43] "The real meaning of the text, " according to Gadamer, "is always partly determined also by the historical situation of the interpreter and hence by the totality of the objective course of history."[44] Thus, there is never the possibility of unqualified movement toward the meaning of the text intended by the original author.

This study, in consonance with evangelical Protestant hermeneutics, sees preunderstanding as a reality which, although incontestably present in the experience of the interpreter, does not render impossible a genuine understanding of the meaning of the biblical text intended by the original author. Through a careful recognition of one's own preunderstanding and a rigorous exercise of exegetical method, the interpreter can move from his own preunderstanding toward a true comprehension of the author's meaning. This comprehension, however, will never be exhaustive.[45]

Evangelical hermeneutics prefer to speak of a hermeneutical spiral rather than a hermeneutical circle to avoid the implication of a lack of directionality in the interpretive process. In this spiral the interpreter begins with

---

[43] Hans-Georg Gadamer Truth and Method, eds. Garrett Barden and John Cumming, New York: Seabury, 1975, p. 263.

[44] Ibid.

[45] As has been indicated, it is an evangelical theological preunderstanding which informs this work. Cf. Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, pp. 31-53. Osborne indicates the importance of consideration of one's preunderstanding as part of the hermeneutical process. See, Osborne, Spiral, p. 315.

certain preunderstandings of which one may or may not be aware. In the methodical study of Scripture, the interpreter is influenced by the text so that one's understanding is changed. The process involved is a spiral in which the interpreter moves toward an understanding of the author's meaning.[46]

The Nature of Meaning

This presentation is limited to a brief discussion of six essential aspects of the nature of meaning as it relates to biblical interpretation. These include: *the theory of meaning, the bearers of meaning, meaning and literary genre, the definition of the term literal* as applied to biblical meaning, *the singularity of textual meaning,* and *meaning and significance.*[47]

John S. Feinberg identifies four *theories of meaning.*[48] First, ideational theories of meaning hold that " the meaning of a word is an image."[49] Words, in

---

[46] See Osborne Spiral, p. 6. Cf. Graham N. Stanton, "Presuppositions in New Testament Criticism," New Testament Interpretation. ed. I Howard Marshall, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1977, p. 68.

[47] While this study is prepared within a paradigm in which both evangelicals and non-evangelicals generally accept the assumption that texts have meaning, although they may differ over who determines that meaning and how it is done, one must realize that the questions and issues involved in a discussion of the nature of meaning are presently being radically reconsidered. See, on this topic, the thoughtful presentation in D. A. Carson, The Gagging of God, p. 73.

[48] John S. Feinberg, "Truth: Relationship of Theories of Truth to Hermeneutics," Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible. eds. Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus, Grand Rapids: Academic/Zondervan, 1984, pp. 1-50.

[49] G. H. R. Parkinson, "Introduction," The Theory of Meaning. ed. G. H. R. Parkinson, London: Oxford, 1968, p. 4.

this theory, are seen as marks of the mental experience for which they stand.[50] As Alston points out, the significance of a word in this theory is "its regular association with a certain idea."[51] A second theory, associated with logical positivism, holds that the meaning of a sentence is either that of definition of its observable verification (truth verification semantics) or that of knowing the conditions under which a sentence is true (truth conditional semantics).[52] The emphasis on truth verification is found in the work of A. J. Ayer. He affirms that a sentence has meaning for an individual only if a person knows how to verify its proposition. This verification is observable verification.[53] As a result of the obvious problems associated with the necessity of observable verification, this theory was later adapted in other work to emphasis falsibility. That is, for a sentence to be meaningful it must be capable of being falsified.[54]

The theory of meaning which is rooted in the later writing of Ludwig Wittgenstein is that the meaning of a linguistic unit is its use in language. Wittgenstein holds that language is to be viewed as a language-game. This includes both the language itself and the context into which it is woven.[55] In Wittgenstein's thought language and life are closely related so that language is part of, and must be understood in the terms of, the total context of life.[56] A

---

[50] Keith Allen, Linguistic Meaning. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1986, I, 86; William P. Alston, "Meaning," Encyclopedia of Philosophy. ed. Paul Edwards, New York: Macmillan, 1967, V, 235.

[51] Alston, "Meaning," 235.

[52] Allen, Linguistic Meaning, I, 79; Feinberg, "Theories of Truth," p. 30.

[53] Parkinson, "Introduction," p. 7.

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

[55] Feinberg, "Theories of Truth," p. 34.

[56] Cf. Thiselton, Two Horizons, p, 374.

fourth category of theories of meaning is that of referential theories. In these theories, the meaning of a term is that to which it refers or which it names. As Alston puts it, "for any word to have a meaning is for it to name, designate, or refer to something other than itself."[57] Alston sees two forms of referential theories of meaning. The first, more simplistic, form of referential theories of meaning holds that the meaning of a word is that to which it relates. The second form of these theories asserts that the meaning of a word is the relationship between a word and its referent.[58]

This study adopts a partially-referential theory of meaning. While language in general is certainly not completely and simply referential,[59] much of the biblical vocabulary is,[60] to an extent which allows this theory of meaning to guide the methodological process of interpretation attempted here.

A referential theory of meaning must differentiate between *sense* and *reference*[61] and, also, indicate what is meant by the *reference* of a word or expression. This study follows the distinction of Caird which sees *reference* as "what is being spoken about" while *sense* is "what is said about it."[62] Cotterell

---

[57] Alston, "Meaning," 234.

[58] Ibid.

[59] See, Parkinson, "Introduction," p. 4, and Alston, "Meaning," 234.

[60] Moisés Silva, Biblical Words and Their Meaning. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, pp. 106-07.

[61] The two terms are not always employed in the same way in various discussions. See, Silva, Biblical Words, pp. 102-03; Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation. London: SPCK, 1989, pp. 77-90; G. B. Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980, p. 37; Arthur Gibson, Biblical Semantic Logic. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981, pp. 47-50.

[62] Caird, Language of the Bible, p. 37

and Turner address the question of a reference when they define the referent "of a word or expression in an utterance" as "the thing in the world which is intentionally signified by that word or expression. The thing in question may be an object, an event or a process."[63] An adequate referential theory holds that reference requires both a context and authorial intention. These elements must be present for words or expressions to be genuinely referential.[64] Reference, then, is not a matter only of words or expressions in themselves, but also of their particular context and authorial intention.

The identity of *the bearers of meaning* in a text in recent thought has moved away from a concentration on words as performing this function, especially in light of James Barr's criticism of Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.*[65] Attention has centred on the level of the sentence[66] and, especially in recent work, on the level of the discourse.[67] The position of this study is that the primary bearer of meaning is the discourse. Although the individual words and sentences of the biblical text are not the primary bearers of meaning, they contribute to meaning in such a manner that they may be considered bearers of meaning, though not in a final sense.

Barr's criticism of theological lexicography focused on at least two abuses found in the study of biblical words. First, he exposed an inappropriate

---

[63] Cotterell and Turner, Linguistics, p. 84.

[64] Cotterell and Turner, Linguistics, pp. 84-85; Caird, The Language of the Bible, pp. 49-53, 56-61.

[65] See, James Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language. Oxford: Oxford University, 1961, pp. 206-62.

[66] Cf. Feinberg, "Theories of Truth," pp. 24-26; Paul Ricoeur, "Creativity in Language." Philosophy Today, 17 (1973), 98.

[67] Cf. Cotterell and Turner, Linguistics, pp. 76-83.

elevation of the etymological sense of words over either their existing sense or their use in a particular context.[68] Second, he questioned the identification of biblical concepts with biblical words as found in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.[69] Neither of these criticisms, however, invalidate appropriate lexicography nor the significance of individual words for the discourse meaning of a text.

The capacity of words to contribute to the discourse meaning of a text is rooted in several characteristics of words. First, in the normal use of language, words have a "general" meaning.[70] This meaning, which is that which occurs most frequently when a word is employed, is called a word's unmarked meaning.[71] The existence of the unmarked meanings of words gives words a capacity to contribute to an understanding of the discourse meaning, especially when there is a limited context.

A second aspect of words which enables them to contribute to the discourse meaning is the fact that some words are either fully or partially referential.[72] The more fully referential a word, the more it is able to contribute directly to discourse meaning. Words have a particular meaning, however, only in context.[73] The necessity of context stems from the reality that many words are not fully referential, their reference being determined only by the sentence in

---

[68] Barr, Semantics, pp. 158-60.

[69] Ibid., pp. 206-19.

[70] J. P. Louw, Semantics of New Testament Greek. ed. Dan O. Via, Jr., The Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, p. 40.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Silva, Biblical Words, pp. 106-08.

[73] Cf. Gerald Downing, "Meaning," What about the New Testament? eds, Morna Hooker and Colin Hickling, London: SCM, 1975, p. 136.

which they are found.[74] From the range of possible meanings that a word may have, the context determines which single choice is to be selected. The meaning of a word in a particular context is not the accumulated meaning of all the possible meanings of a word but the specific meaning which is determined by the particular context.[75]

In light of the difficulty of making words the primary bearers of meaning, one may hold that the sentence is the linguistic unit that performs this function.[76] There are, however, two reasons for rejecting this position. One is that just as the meaning of a sentence is not the sum of the meaning of its individual words, so the meaning of a discourse is not merely the sum of its individual sentences. Cotterell and Turner observe that the understanding of a discourse is dependent not only on the relationships of sense within a paragraph but also between them.[77] Another reason that the sentence cannot be the primary bearer of meaning is that this location of meaning fails to recognize the influence of literary genre on the meaning of a composition. Meaning is related not only to the grammatical and syntactical relations in a work but also to its literary genre.[78]

The problems associated with making either the words or sentences of the biblical text the primary bearers of meaning necessitate the argument that it is the discourse itself which is the primary bearer of meaning and that each

---

[74] See, Feinberg, "Theories of Truth," p. 18.

[75] Louw, Semantics, p. 40; Cf. Anthony C. Thiselton, "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation," New Testament Interpretation. ed. I. Howard Marshall, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977, pp. 76-78.

[76] See, Feinberg, "Theories of Truth," pp. 24-26.

[77] Cotterell and Turner, Linguistics, pp. 80-81.

[78] Cf. Osborne, Spiral, pp. 8-9.

individual linguistic unit contributes to this meaning.[79] This is the position of Louw, which is adopted here. Louw recognizes the need in the determination of meaning to work from the smaller linguistic units toward those which are larger. He writes:

> From a practical point of view it seems rather impossible to start immediately with the largest units, although this is the actual starting point in language performance. A speaker or writer naturally has something to say, that is, a theme which is worked out by using paragraphs, sentences, words, and so on. In analyzing what a speaker or document actually intended to convey it is merely practical to begin with the smaller units because they are more manageable, but we must work up to the structure as a whole.[80]

With this in mind, this study will seek to establish the theme of the epistles under consideration and will attempt to achieve the interpretation of the specific passages discussed in the context of the wider meaning of the entire discourse.

The recognition that the discourse is the primary bearer of meaning provides an opportunity for a balanced integration of the consideration of *literary genre* in the interpretive process. Literary genre has been defined by Wellek and Warren in the following terms:

> Genre should be conceived, we think, as a grouping of literary works based, theoretically, upon both outer form (specific meter or structure) and also upon inner form (attitude, tone, purpose—more crudely, subject and audience).[81]

The discussion of literary genre has progressed significantly since the time of Welleck and Warren, especially with respect to the questions of whether literary genre is descriptive or prescriptive and, if it is prescriptive, in what

---

[79] Cf. Louw, Semantics, p. 68.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Rene Welleck and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956, p. 221.

sense. It is the position of this study that genre is both descriptive and prescriptive, although it is especially in the latter sense that it is important in the interpretive process.

Deconstructionists have argued that genre cannot be descriptive because the entire concept is inadequate. Overlap between various genres makes truly meaningful classification impossible. Osborne has responded that the mixing of genres by an author does not destroy but demonstrates the validity of the concept.[82] In its descriptive function, literary genre allows the possibility of organization of texts according to various shared traits.[83]

While recognizing the descriptive nature of literary genre, it is particulary with respect to the epistemological and ontological questions of its prescriptive character that the contemporary interpreter is concerned. There is general recognition among interpreters that literary genre is prescriptive, however, the nature of this prescription varies.

Mary Gehart has shown that recent discussion of genre has emphasized various aspects of this notion. In the thought of E. D. Hirsch genre is determinative of meaning as through a consideration of genre the reader is able to recognize the various "fulfilments" which are possible and to discern the understanding of the text which is most probable. Gadamer differs from Hirsch in that he emphasizes the historicity of genre. On the basis of a consideration of classics of literature, Gadamer argues that genre is "history-bound" and that these works represent the high-points in the development of specific genre. Ricoeur brings at least two distinctives to the consideration of genre. First, he affirms a generative function of genre in that it relates speaker and hearer in "common dynamics" which govern both the production and interpretation of a work. These dynamics include "form" and "thought" so that meaning is

---

[82] Grant R. Osborne, "Genre Criticism—Sensus Literalis." Trinity Journal, NS 4/2 (1983), 9.

[83] Cf. Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, p. 95.

produced at a level which is common with genre. Second, Ricoeur sees genre as praxis for both author and reader. With respect to an author, this praxis involves the creation of a work. A "work" is the production which results from the imposition of form (genre) and the style of the individual upon language. For the reader the mastery of genre is a praxis in that it assists him in the complementary task of interpretation.[84]

This study follows Hirsch in holding that genre is "that sense of the whole by means of which an interpreter can correctly understand any part in its determinacy."[85] The function of literary genre, therefore, is not to provide a category by which the nature of biblical literature may be defined in terms of its forms,[86] but a literary guide which enables the interpreter to understand the nature and function of the discourse in such a way that proper interpretation is made more possible.[87] Obviously genre is not an absolute determinant of meaning apart from other linguistic elements of the discourse, but is one aspect of the entire literary work which must be considered for an adequate interpretation of the biblical text.

Throughout church history a number of biblical interpreters have held that the goal of interpretation is to discover the *literal meaning* of the text. This was understood, at least in a general sense, as the meaning intended by the

---

[84] Mary Gehart, "Generic Studies: Their Renewed Importance in Religious and Literary Interpretation." Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 45 (1977), 311-17.

[85] E. D. Hirsch, Validity in Interpretation. New York: Yale University, 1967, pp. 69-71.

[86] Cf. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "The Semantics of Biblical Literature: Truth and Scripture's Diverse Literary Forms," Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon. eds. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1986, pp. 54-56.

[87] Osborne, "Genre Criticism," 19.

biblical author and which followed the ordinary usage of language.[88] The emphasis on the author's meaning as the literal meaning of the text has continued into the present century. Raymond E. Brown, writing recently, defines the literal sense as the sense which the human author directly intended and which the written words conveyed.[89]

The literal sense of Scripture has been increasingly redefined in contemporary study to mean something other than that which was historically understood. In the work of Brevard Childs the *sensus literalis* of Scripture is understood as the sense which is understood by the community of faith.[90] He writes:

> The literal sense of the text is the plain sense witnessed to by the community of faith. It makes no claim of being the original sense, or even of being the best. Rather, the literal sense of the canonical Scriptures offers a critical theological norm for the community of faith on how the tradition functions authoritatively for future generations of the faithful.[91]

Scalise offers a similar view of the literal sense of Scripture. He sees it as "the authoritative teaching of Scripture, which develops in the dialectic between

---

[88] For various presentations of the historical understanding of the literal meaning of Scripture see, Charles J. Scalise, "The 'Sensus Literalis': A Hermeneutical Key to Biblical Exegesis." Scottish Journal of Theology, 42 (1989), 45-65; Philip Edgecumbe Hughes, "Some Observations on the History of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture," Church, Word, and Spirit. eds. James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, pp. 93-106.

[89] Raymond E. Brown and Sandra S. Schneiders, "Hermeneutics," The New Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990, p. 1148.

[90] Brevard S. Childs, "The Sensus Literalis of Scripture: An Ancient and Modern Problem," Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie. eds. Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart and Rudolf Smend, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1977, p. 94.

[91] Ibid., p. 92.

Scripture and communities of faith."[92]

Sandra M. Schneiders, following Gadamer, defines the literal meaning of the biblical text as the meaning which the text mediates to the interpreter who engages it in dialogue.[93] Each text assumes a question behind it to which the text is a response. The task of the interpreter is to engage the text in conversation in which the text mediates meaning to the interpreter. The meaning thus realized is "constitutive" but is not inherently arbitrary as "the exegete remains always under the judgment of the text and of the faith tradition of the Church."[94] The literal meaning of the text, then,

> is seen to be its religious meaning actualised in innumerable ways and at varying depths throughout Christian history as the faith-structured consciousness of the believer dialogues with the revealing God through the mediation of the inspired text.[95]

A third approach is represented by James Barr. He believes that critical scholarship while claiming to be concerned with the literal sense of the Bible has been working toward a theological understanding of an allegorized text.[96] This approach is not the same as the older allegorical exegesis which is well-known in church history. He states: "the older allegory was allegorization of a literal text, I am talking of the theological understanding of a text that already in itself has some sort of allegorical character."[97] This allegorical approach,

---

[92] Scalise, "Sensus Literalis," p. 65.

[93] Sandra M. Schneiders, "Faith, Hermeneutics, and the Literal Sense of Scripture." Theological Studies, 39 (1978), 729-36.

[94] Ibid., 730-33.

[95] Ibid., 735.

[96] James Barr, "The Literal, the Allegorical, and Modern Biblical Scholarship." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 44 (June, 1989), 6.

[97] Ibid., 13-14.

according to Barr, is not to be rejected in favour of a literal understanding. It does, however, have a limitation in that it must be "(1) contextually defensible and (2) culturally appropriate."[98] Therefore, any effort to discover the literal sense of Scripture misunderstands the nature of the text and the appropriate preoccupation of scholarship.

In contrast to these approaches, evangelical Protestant hermeneutics seeks to articulate an understanding of the nature of the literal sense of Scripture which preserves the historical understanding of this concept and, at the same time, responds to contemporary questions. In the general course of church history the literal meaning of Scripture has been understood as including two essential elements. The literal meaning of Scripture is that meaning which was intended by the biblical author and which understands the language of the text in its plain or normal (customary) sense.[99]

The first element, that of authorial intention will receive due attention shortly.[100] As for the emphasis on the normal usage of language, it has been present throughout church history. Thiselton, writing of the Antiochene school of interpretation, states of the literal meaning:

> It does not exclude metaphorical or symbolic meaning when this plainly accords with the intention of the author, but demands that meaning be understood in the customarily acknowledged sense that it would normally bear in proper linguistic context. In other words, the New Testament is approached as stretches of human language, to which normal linguistic procedures apply, rather than as a reservoir of oracles charged with additional meanings not ordinarily conveyed by the language itself and its context.[101]

---

[98] Ibid., 15.

[99] Cf. Julius J. Scott, "Literalism," Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, 643; Brown and Schneiders, "Hermeneutics," p. 1148.

[100] See below, pp. 39-43.

[101] Thiselton, Two Horizons, p. 115.

A similar emphasis is also seen in a number of theologians in church history[102] and recent evangelical efforts to define the literal meaning of Scripture stand in this tradition. Mickelsen states that the word "literal" makes reference "to customary and socially acknowledge meaning in an actual, ordinary, earthly situation."[103] Bernard Ramm indicates that the word "literal" is used in the dictionary sense of "'the natural or usual construction and implication of a writing or expression; following ordinary and apparent sense of words; not allegorical or metaphorical."[104] Literal meaning is not an indication that there is no figurative language in Scripture. Rather, "it takes as the primary range of designation the customary, the usual, the socially-acknowledged designation."[105]

The method adopted in this dissertation is to seek the single meaning of the biblical text intended by the author. The *singularity of meaning* of the biblical text has been widely rejected in contemporary hermeneutical thought because of at least three factors which are seen as necessitating multiple textual meanings. The first is reader contribution to meaning. Both Susan Witting and Gerald Downing hold that this contribution creates the possibility for polysignification. Witting proposes an understanding of meaning which sees a twofold system of signs functioning simultaneously in the reading of the biblical text. In addition to that which is supplied by the text itself, the reader creates a

---

[102] See Hughes, "Observations," pp. 93-106. For Luther see, Frederic W. Farrar, The History of Interpretation. 1886; rpt., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961, pp. 327-28. For Calvin see, Thiselton, Two Horizons, pp. 316-17.

[103] A. Berkeley Mickelsen, Interpreting the Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963, p. 307.

[104] Bernard Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation. 3d ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970, p. 119.

[105] Ibid., p. 120.

meaning. This meaning is limited both by the text itself and the reader's belief system.[106] Downing sees multiple meanings of the biblical text as possible due to the change of meaning which comes as the listener responds creatively to the text.[107]

A second factor which requires polysignification, according to J. Severino Croatto, is the nature of the biblical text itself. Croatto, following Ricoeur, asserts that the production of a text is the consequence of two "distantiations." The first occurs when the original sender (author) transmits a message which is received by his addressee. The second distantiation occurs when the text is actually produced. It is especially the production of the text which creates the possibility for multiple meanings as in this production the original author disappears and there is a change of both audience and horizon. The text can say many things and various meanings are the result of various readings each of which is "the production of a discourse."[108] It is not only the influence of various readers, for Croatto, which enables the biblical text to have multiple meanings but also the nature of the text itself as it is read.[109]

A third factor which has exercised some influence toward an adoption of textual polysignification is that of *sensus plenior*, which has been defined by Raymond Brown as "the deeper meaning, intended by God but not clearly intended by the human authors, that is seen to exist in the words of Scripture when they are studied in the light of further revelation or development in the

---

[106] Susan Witting, "A Theory of Multiple Meaning." Semeia, 9 (1977), 75-101.

[107] See, Downing, "Meanings," pp. 137-40.

[108] J. Severino Croatto, Biblical Hermeneutics. trans. Robert R. Barr, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987, pp. 13-24.

[109] For an evangelical who accepts polysignification see, Vern S. Poythress, "Analyzing a Biblical Text: Some Important Linguistic Distinctions." Scottish Journal of Theology, 32 (1979), 120-129.

understanding of revelation."[110]   Especially in terms of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, the presence of *sensus plenior* would provide a significant argument for the polysignification of the biblical text, but *sensus plenior* has been viewed as less significant in recent theological discussion as it implicitly accepts a literal sense of the biblical text which is determined by the author. It is in relation to this primary sense that additional or fuller meanings are found.[111]

As opposed to those who hold polysemy of the biblical text, evangelicals have generally held a singularity of meaning. The single meaning of Scripture, to which some evangelicals hold, has been explained by Elliott E. Johnson as the "unified and coherent textual meaning" which is intended by the Author/author.[112] While this single meaning may be sought for any unit of the biblical text, it is specifically at the level of a book of the Bible at which the unique meaning of the text is located.[113] Johnson recognizes both subordinate and component meanings which are part of the unified meaning of Scripture. Component meanings are those meaning which incorporate various distinct aspects into a single meaning.[114]   Evangelical biblical interpretation, then, generally adopts as its goal the discovery of the single meaning of the text of Scripture.

The adoption of a single meaning of the biblical text which is intended by the author must address the problems raised by the use of the Old Testament

---

[110] Brown and Schneiders, "Hermeneutics," p. 1157.

[111] See, Henning Graf Reventlow, Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century. trans. John Bowden, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986, p. 43.

[112] Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, pp. 34, 50.

[113] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[114] See, ibid., pp. 36-37.

in the New Testament and the question of *sensus plenior*.[115] This study follows the view of Elliott Johnson who holds that the New Testament use is a question not of *sensus plenior* but of *references plenior*.[116] Johnson clearly affirms a hermeneutical understanding which emphasizes authorial intention and a single meaning of the biblical text. He claims that "the author's intention expresses a single, defining textual sense of the whole."[117] This single sense which was intended by the author may, however, express fuller reference. Johnson states that "the single sense is capable of implying a fullness of reference. This is not *sensus plenior* but *sensus singular* as expressed in the affirmations of the text. But it also recognizes the characteristic of *references plenior*."[118]

E. D. Hirsch distinguishes between *meaning and significance* in the interpretation of the biblical text. This distinction is important and must be correctly understood.[119] Hirsch views the distinction between meaning and significance as an application in the realm of interpretation of an epistemological distinction drawn by Husserl in his work *Erfahrung und Urteil*.

---

[115] See in this regard, Darrell L. Bock, "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New, Part 1." Bibliotheca Sacra, 142 (1985), 209.

[116] See the description of this position in Bock, "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New," 212-16.

[117] Elliott E. Johnson, "Author's Intention and Biblical Interpretation," Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible. eds. Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus, Grand Rapids: Academic/Zondervan, 1984, p. 427.

[118] Johnson, "Author's Intention," p. 427.

[119] For an evangelical who appears to misunderstand *significance* see, Millard J. Erickson, Evangelical Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, p. 23.

Husserl expressed it as "'the inner and outer horizons' of any act of knowing."[120] For Hirsch, *meaning* "is that represented by a text; it is what the author meant by his use of a particular sign sequence; it is what the signs represent."[121] *Significance*, on the other hand, "names a relationship between that meaning and a person, or a conception, or a situation, or indeed anything imaginable."[122] Significance is not something entirely different from meaning but "meaning-as-related-to-something-else."[123]

Hirsch sees textual meaning as stable while significance is changeable. He writes: "meaning is the determinate representation of a text for an interpreter" and, as such, "a principle of stability in an interpretation."[124] In the discovery of meaning the intention of the author is determinant. Hirsch states,

> when we construe another's meaning we are not free agents. So long as the meaning of his utterance is our object, we are completely subservient to his will, because the meaning of his utterance is the meaning he wills to convey.[125]

Significance, however, is meaning for the interpreter as the interpreter relates the textually stable meaning to changing contexts.[126] It is, of necessity, changeable as significance is the act of the interpreter which relates meaning to

---

[120] E. D. Hirsch, Jr., The Aims of Interpretation. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1976, pp. 1-2.

[121] Hirsch, Validity, p. 8.

[122] Ibid.

[123] Hirsch, Aims, p. 80.

[124] Ibid., pp. 79-80.

[125] Hirsch, Validity, p. 142.

[126] Hirsch, Aims, p. 80.

whatever the interpreter desires.[127]

Among evangelicals, Elliott Johnson has most fully developed the distinction between meaning and significance and the importance of this distinction for biblical interpretation. Johnson follows Hirsch in arguing that *meaning* is determined by the text and is stable. "Meaningfulness" is viewed from the standpoint of the author and the author's definition of matters such as issues and problems. When the interpreter relates the author's meaning to similar matters in the contemporary world, he is *applying* this meaning. *Significance*, on the other hand, is textually free; it views "meaningfulness" from the standpoint of the interpreter. The interpreter defines the matters with which he is concerned and attempts to discover various relationships between these matters and the meaning of the biblical text. Significance is a matter of the interpreter's judgment and its truthfulness depends on valid reasoning.[128]

Both application and significance are important as the end of biblical interpretation. Johnson holds that application is the interpreter's work of drawing the relationship between the author's intended meaning and the reader's situation. In Protestant hermeneutics it proceeds on the basis of principles drawn from the message of the text. Significance is the work of the interpreter to relate matters of his situation and interest to the meaning of the text. In determining significance, the interpreter makes judgments about the relevance of the textual meaning for matters in his situation regarding which the author did not directly intend a certain meaning.[129]

---

[127] Hirsch, Aims, p. 80, and Validity, p. 142.

[128] Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, pp. 227-28.

[129] Ibid., pp. 229-41.

The Determinant of Meaning

The goal of interpretation adopted in this study is to determine the Author's/author's intended meaning for the original audience as expressed in the biblical text. This goal affirms that *the author is the primary determinant of meaning*. Before discussing the issue of the primary determinant of meaning several preliminary observations need to be made. First, the present method limits itself exclusively to the human author's intended meaning. This is the context in which the current hermeneutical discussion takes place and must suffice within the limits of this section. Second, this discussion is presented in terms of the "intention" of the author. At least one prominent evangelical prefers to speak of what the author "affirms" rather than authorial intention,[130] however, in light of both the historical use of the term and an appropriate understanding of intentionality it is legitimate to speak of authorial intention. Third, the intended meanings to be understood are expressed in the biblical text. The entire concept of authorial intention is related to the biblical text in such a manner that "textual meaning" may be understood as the meaning the author intended.[131]

In order to clarify the concept of authorial intention, it is necessary to delineate what is not meant when it is used. Authorial intention is not an indication that the interpreter is to determine the subjective or psychological experience of the author.[132] Authorial intention is not, either, an affirmation about premeditated design or the desired consequences of writing.[133] Authorial

---

[130] Erickson, Evangelical Interpretation, pp. 20-23.

[131] Cf. Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard, Biblical Interpretation, p. 133.

[132] Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, pp. 26-28.

[133] P. D. Juhl, Interpretation. Princeton, NJ: Princeton, 1980, p. 14; Johnson, "Author's Intention," p. 414.

intention, again, is not a matter of the author's *statement* about his intention.[134] Finally authorial intention is not, as argued by G. E. M. Anscombe, the "sense of the whole" which holds the individual parts together. It is not the overarching reason which accounts for the inclusion of each aspect of a discourse.[135]

Authorial intent is properly viewed as the "defining sense" of a passage.[136] Johnson adopts the distinction from Gottlob Frege between sense and reference. *Sense* is "the verbal meaning of the language expressed in the text irrespective of reference."[137] Juhl express a similar concept more simply when he writes that he uses the term "intention" "in the sense of an author's intention in writing a certain sequence of words—in the sense, that is, of what he meant by the words he used."[138] It is immediately evident, then, that intention is indicated in the verbal meaning of the passage. Authorial intent is not a description of intent as divorced from a particular text, but is inextricably tied to it.

A number of arguments have been advanced for the adoption of authorial intent as the primary determinant of textual meaning, not all of which are of equal value. First, Hirsch has argued that authorial intent should be accepted on the pragmatic grounds that it is, in his understanding, the only approach to interpretation which can be validated.[139] More importantly, the adoption of authorial intent as the primary determinant of meaning has been

---

[134] Juhl, Interpretation, pp. 140-43.

[135] Johnson, "Author's Intention," pp. 414-15.

[136] Ibid., p. 416.

[137] Ibid.

[138] Juhl, Interpretation, p. 14.

[139] Hirsch. Validity, pp. 26-27. For a study of the issues and procedure in validation see, Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, pp. 265-306.

historically accepted.[140]   A third argument is that meaning is a matter of consciousness. While this argument does not eliminate the possibility that the reader may be the primary determinant of meaning, it does reject the possibility of semantic autonomy.[141]   Fourth, any appeal to a text implies an appeal to authorial intention.   Juhl states that arguments about textual meaning from internal factors must be based on matters such as coherence or complexity. These features, however, are significant only under the assumption of authorial intention as only the purposive employment of them permit that they be determinative for interpretation.[142] Likewise, the presence of a complete text is implicit evidence, according to Juhl, of authorial intention.[143] Finally, authorial intent is necessary to the very nature of verbal communication.   "Verbal communication," Johnson affirms, "is the expression of a message by an author to an audience.   Therefore,   to banish the author is to redefine communication."[144]

Despite these arguments, it is clear, in the present context of literary study, that this approach has been challenged, especially by two alternative perspectives.   First, there are those who argue that *the text is the primary determinant of meaning*, then, there are those who hold that it is, rather, the *interpreter who is primary in the determination of meaning*.

Paul Ricoeur argues that *the text itself is autonomous and primary in the determination of meaning*. A text is the fixation in writing of a discourse that

---

[140] Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, pp. 24-26.

[141] Hirsch, Validity, p. 4.

[142] Juhl, Interpretation, pp. 69-82.

[143] Ibid., p. 84.

[144] Johnson, "Author's Intention," p. 412.

could not be spoken and, as such, is a direct inscription of what a discourse wants to say.[145] When a text takes the place of verbal discourse the movement toward reference of this discourse is intercepted and the text is suspended, as it were, without a relation to the world. In this situation it is free to enter into relation with other texts with which it creates an imaginary literary world and even the author is distanced from his own text.[146]

A second approach, found in the work of Hans-Georg Gadamer and Sandra M. Schneiders, is that which sees *the interpreter as the primary determinant of the meaning of the biblical text*. This perspective of biblical interpretation places a major emphasis on the historical situation of the interpreter and the significance of this situation for textual interpretation. The interpreter is not a detached and critical observer, separated from history and seeking to determine its objective character but, rather, is personally immersed in and influenced by history. In this perspective the interpreter invariably participates in "effective historical consciousness" as one's understanding, which is viewed ontologically as the essential aspect of human existence, is influenced both by the "effects of history" and historical consciousness which is the participation of the interpreter in the flow of history.[147] Understanding cannot be and should not be reproductive but productive as the text itself is part of the tradition in which each particular age attempts a unique understanding of itself.[148]

An adequate response to contemporary alternatives to authorial

---

[145] Paul Ricoeur, "Qu'est-ce qu'un texte? Expliquer et Comprendre," Hermeneutik und Dialektik. ed. R. Bubner, et al, Tübingen: Mohr, 1970, II, 181-82.

[146] Ibid., 183-85.

[147] Sandra M. Schneiders, The Revelatory Text. San Francisco: Harper, pp. 158-60.

[148] Gadamer, Wahrheit und Methode, p. 280.

intention as the determinant of textual meaning is beyond the limitations of this statement of method. It is significant, however, that the interpretive approach developed here shares certain commonalities both with older methods and with current approaches to interpretation. Some of these commonalities may be briefly described.

The goal of biblical interpretation which sees it as an understanding of the author's intended meaning as found in the text of Scripture has an established history both in classical and reformed interpretation.[149] The exegetical method adopted in this study preserves an established exegetical tradition in a manner which is appropriate in the current hermeneutical context. This goal is also generally adopted in historical-critical study, although the procedures which are employed differ.[150]

The goal of biblical interpretation adopted in this study shares with contemporary hermeneutical thought a profound concern for appropriation of the biblical text in the present. While it is evident that the goal of interpretation adopted by certain evangelicals in their hermeneutical approach rejects aspects of the process of interpretation as described by Schneiders,[151] the subjective appropriation of the biblical text in such a way that it transforms life is a compelling concern for evangelicals.

---

[149] See, in this regard, the affirmations of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentary on Galatians 4:22-31, cited in Johnson, Expository Hermeneutics, p. 24, and John Calvin in John Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians, p. 1.

[150] See, for example, Robert Grant and David Tracy, A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible. 2d ed., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, pp. 134-35.

[151] Schneiders, Revelatory Word, pp. 177-78.

1.2.2.2 Procedure In Biblical Interpretation

Having defined the interpretative goal employed in the exegetical method of this study, brief mention may be made of the exegetical process which is to be employed in order to achieve it.[152]

The first concern of exegesis is with the general context of the text which is studied. As both of the texts considered here are epistolary literature this context will be the epistle as a whole. The major concerns with respect to the context of an epistle are its historical and literary contexts. The epistle's theological character is also important.[153]

While meaning is primary determined at the discourse level (the epistle), the nature and scope of this dissertation require that limited attention be given to this level of meaning; practical considerations in the study of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 necessitate a concentration on more narrow textual limits.

In the direct consideration of the texts themselves, several exegetical steps will be employed. First will be appropriate textual criticism.[154] Second, the study will undertake syntactical exegesis. In this step, an effort is made to determine the general structure and content of the passages under

---

[152] For evangelical works on exegesis see, Gordon D. Fee, New Testament Exegesis. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983; Osborne, Spiral; Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard, Biblical Interpretation. The similarities and differences between the exegetical process employed here and other contemporary approaches may be see in a comparison of these works with handbooks such as, Otto Kaiser and Werner G. Kümmel, Exegetical Method. revised ed., trans. E. V. N. Goetschius and M. J. O'Connell, New York: Seabury, 1981, and John H. Hayes and Carl R. Holladay, Biblical Exegesis. revised ed., Atlanta: Knox, 1987.

[153] See, Osborne, Spiral, pp. 19-40 for a discussion of context.

[154] The method which will be followed is that of Bruce Manning Metzger in, The Text of the New Testament. 3d ed., New York: Oxford, 1992.

consideration by an analysis of their syntax. Robertson has said that syntax is concerned with, "the binding of words together in all relations."[155] Osborne uses the term to speak of "all the interrelationships within the sentence as a means of determining the meaning of the unit as a whole."[156] Syntactical exegesis will attempt to identify and explain these relationships.[157]

A third aspect of the exegesis of the text is lexical exegesis. The consideration of specific words begins with an effort to identify the possible sense of a lexeme as indicated by its history and contemporary usage both within and outside the New Testament as well as its conceptual and relational range of meaning. From this possible range of meaning the context is studied to determine the meaning which is most appropriate to the text considered.[158]

The purpose of the exegesis thus defined is to allow theological conclusions. Therefore, in both the consideration of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21, the analysis of these texts will terminate with an indication of the theological conclusions regarding inspiration which may be drawn from this exegesis.[159]

---

[155] A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament. Nashville: Broadman, 1934, p. 385.

[156] Osborne, Spiral, p. 93.

[157] For a discussion of some of the issues involved in discourse analysis see, Cotterell and Turner, Linguistics, pp. 188-256. For descriptions of the specific process involved see, Fee, New Testament Exegesis, pp. 60-83, and Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard, Biblical Interpretation, pp. 205-14.

[158] For the issues involved in lexical semantics see, Cotterell and Turner, Linguistics, pp. 129-187. For the process of lexical study see, Fee, New Testament Exegesis, p. 85; Leon Crouch, "Greek Word Studies," Biblical Interpretation. eds. F. Furman Kearley, Edward P. Myers, and Timothy D. Hadley, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986, pp. 226-29; Osborne, Spiral, pp. 89-92; Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard, Biblical Interpretation, pp. 189-99.

[159] For related issues see, Carson, The Role of Exegesis," pp. 39-76.

2 Contemporary Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration

During the three decades which began with Dewey M. Beegle's 1963 publication of *The Inspiration of Scripture* and extend to Donald G. Bloesch's recent work entitled *Holy Scripture* (1994) evangelicals have articulated a number of different theories of biblical inspiration. A review of the literature reveals a variety of perspectives among evangelicals with respect to biblical inspiration. This chapter presents some of those views, seeking to reflect the diversity which has been present in evangelicalism in this period. It is organized in such a way as to reflect the locus or loci of inspiration in each theory which is considered. The first two theories of inspiration emphasize the inspiration of the *text* of Scripture: G. C. Berkouwer accents the inspiration of the text itself, while Edward W. Goodrick holds that the *meaning* of the text of Scripture is the locus of inspiration. These theories are followed by two which hold that both the *text* and the *author* of Scripture are loci of biblical inspiration. Carl F. H. Henry places the priority of this inspiration with the text of Scripture, while Millard J. Erickson places it with the authors. The work of Ralph Earle presents a type of personal inspiration. Following the Wesleyan tradition, Earle affirms that it is in the *thoughts of the biblical writers* that inspiration is to be located.

The theories of Dewey M. Beegle and Donald G. Bloesch are similar in that they both affirm that inspiration extends to the *auditors* or *readers* of Scripture; they differ in that Beegle holds that the loci of inspiration are the authors, the text and the readers of Scripture, while for Bloesch inspiration involves the authors, the text, the original readers and the preservation of the text. Clark H. Pinnock adopts a social theory of inspiration in which the locus of inspiration is *the entire process of the production of Scripture*. William J. Abraham and Kern Robert Trembath both believe that inspiration should be considered inductively, beginning with nonreligious instances. These theories view inspiration as *inspiring affects*; Abraham holds that these affects are upon *the authors of Scripture*, while Trembath affirms that they are upon *the readers of the Bible*. The last theory has been formulated by Charles H. Kraft who

claims that the locus of inspiration is *human encounters in which God reveals himself* as inspiration is God's indirect self-revelation in this encounter.

2.1 Textual Inspiration
(Gerrit C. Berkouwer)

Gerrit C. Berkouwer (1903-), formerly Professor of Dogmatics at the Free University of Amsterdam, has exercised extensive influence in the contemporary evangelical discussion of biblical inspiration.[1] It was particularly the 1976 publication of Berkouwer's *Holy Scripture*, edited by Jack B. Rogers, which introduced English-speaking evangelicals to Berkouwer's later thought on Scripture in general and, for the purposes of this study, to his understanding of the nature of biblical inspiration.[2] This work will serve as the primary focal-

---

[1] Despite Berkouwer's influence, a full-length biography has not appeared. Introductions to this Reformed theologian are Lewis B. Smedes, "G. C. Berkouwer," Creative Minds in Contemporary Theology. ed. Phillip Edgcumbe Hughes, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966, pp. 63-97, and Gary L. Watts, "G. C. Berkouwer," Handbook of Evangelical Theologians. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, pp. 193-208. Berkouwer's work on Scripture has evoked strong response from evangelicals. Jack B. Rogers has been Berkouwer's chief proponent in American evangelicalism. For Rogers' assessment see Jack B. Rogers, "A Third Alternative: Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation in the Theology of G. C. Berkouwer," Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation. eds. W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford LaSor, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, pp. 70-91; Jack B. Rogers and Donald B. McKim, The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1979, pp. 426-37. For several critical evaluations of Berkouwer's perspective see Henry Krabbendam, "B. B. Warfield Versus G. C. Berkouwer on Scripture," Inerrancy. ed. Norman Geisler, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980, pp. 411-46; Carl W. Bogue, Jr., "G. C. Berkouwer and the Battle for the Bible," Inerrancy and the Church. ed. John D. Hannah, Chicago: Moody, 1984, pp. 381-411; Hendrik Krabbendam, "The Functional Theology of G. C. Berkouwer," Challenges to Inerrancy. eds. Gordon R. Lewis and Bruce Demarest, Chicago: Moody, 1984, pp. 286-316.

[2] G. C. Berkouwer, Holy Scripture. Studies in Dogmatics, trans. and ed. Jack B. Rogers, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

point in a presentation of Berkouwer's perspective on inspiration.

There are two or three stages in Berkouwer's thought with respect to the nature of Scripture.[3] This presentation will examine only his later thought concerning this matter.

Revelation

Included in Berkouwer's *Studies in Dogmatics* series is a volume on general revelation.[4] General revelation, according to Berkouwer, is God's universal disclosure of himself, integrally related to his preservation and providential government, in the realm of nature, history and the experience of man.[5] General revelation is not unrelated to special. Rather, God's revelation of himself in his works directs toward his special revelation in Christ. It is only in God's unique revelation in Christ that God's general revelation of himself can be properly perceived.[6]

Berkouwer is sensitive to Barth's concern to limit special revelation to God's unique, absolute, and final revelation in Jesus Christ and seems to generally follow him in limiting this revelation primarily, but perhaps not

---

[3] For several presentations of Berkouwer's early and later work with respect to the nature of Scripture see, Watts, "Berkouwer," pp. 194-96, 204-06; Krabbendam, "Warfield Versus Berkouwer," pp. 411-46; Krabbendam, "Functional Theology," 285-316. Berkouwer's account of his own reflection on Scripture is recorded in G. C. Berkouwer, A Half Century of Theology. trans. and ed. Lewis B. Smedes, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977, pp. 107-43.

[4] G. C. Berkouwer, General Revelation. Studies in Dogmatics, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.

[5] Ibid., pp. 293, 289, 115.

[6] Berkouwer, General Revelation, p. 287; G. C. Berkouwer, "General and Special Divine Revelation," Revelation and the Bible. ed. Carl F. H. Henry, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958, pp. 15, 18-19.

exclusively, to this locus. Jesus Christ is the absolute revelation of God.[7] It is primarily in Christ that true knowledge of God may be found.

Consistent with this limitation, Berkouwer excludes Scripture from special revelation of the same nature and status as that which is present in Christ. He does speak of "the revelation contained in Scripture," as "an historical and organic whole,"[8] however, he sees Scripture as primarily a human witness to Christ. The relation and tension between revelation and Scripture in his work is evident when he writes:

> Calling Scripture a human witness, therefore, does not at all mean a separation of Scripture and revelation, but rather an honoring of integral Scripture. The witness is indeed directed to that which is witnessed to. It is not a relativizing of Scripture, but the acknowledgment of its meaning, intention, and function when it witnesses *of* Christ and therefore as God's Word is distinguished *from* him.[9]

Inspiration

Berkouwer's later thought on biblical inspiration, or "the God-breathed character of Scripture" is developed in *Holy Scripture* (1976). Berkouwer begins his consideration of the unique character and origin of Scripture with the assertion that *theopneustos* ("God-breathed") cannot be assumed to be identical with inspiration. This is true because *theopneustos* "entails a positive description and relates Scripture directly to God" and because the idea of "inspiration" involves certain concepts that are not included in the meaning of *theopneustos*.[10] Throughout his discussion of the unique character of Scripture

---

[7] Berkouwer, "General and Special Divine Revelation," pp. 15, 19.

[8] Berkouwer, Holy Scripture, p. 192.

[9] Ibid., pp. 165-66.

[10] Ibid., p. 139.

Berkouwer employs "God-breathed" in the place of "inspired" as the former more adequately accounts for the activity of the Spirit with respect to Scripture. Berkouwer indicates that *theopneustos* in 2 Timothy 3:16 describes Scripture as "spired" rather than "inspired" by God. In this regard he cites Warfield's statement that the significance of the preposition is absent in the meaning of the term. The Latin *inspiratus a Deo,* therefore, is to be rejected as it does not give an adequate sense of the term.[11] While Berkouwer uses "God-breathed" in the place of "inspired" throughout his discussion, this study will consider his presentation as an understanding of biblical inspiration.

Berkouwer's work on the inspiration of Scripture is developed around the confession of the church: "*Sacra Scriptura est Verbum Dei (*Holy Scripture *is* the Word of God)."[12] For Berkouwer this confession captures two aspects of Scripture which must both be affirmed to have an adequate understanding of its nature. Scripture is *the Word of God* in that it originates with God and, therefore, speaks with authority. Scripture is, as well, *Scripture.* It is the words of humans which are neither replaced by the divine word nor removed from their temporal and human limitations.

Berkouwer develops an "organic" view of inspiration which places an emphasis on the function of human beings in the production of Scripture. The terminology is important as "the word 'organ' always indicates a definite relationship in which an event occurs."[13] Organic inspiration emphasizes the part of man in the origination of Scripture with the recognition, as Bavinck indicates, "'that even the guidance of God's Spirit will not destroy man's own activity and inspiration but will precisely confirm and strengthen it.'"[14]

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 139-40.

[12] Ibid., p. 145.

[13] Ibid., p. 153.

[14] Ibid., p. 155.

The inspiration of Scripture, understood as its God-breathed character, is closely related to its function and goal as a testimony to Christ and his salvation. Berkouwer follows Bavinck and denies that Scripture is the Word of God because of inspiration, in a formal sense. It is the Scripture's witness to Christ that is essential in its being the Word of God. Berkouwer writes:

> It is evident from Bavinck's comments that he does not think inspiration by itself makes a writing the Word of God. Scripture is the Word of God because the Holy Spirit witnesses in it of Christ. One may no longer understand the God-breathed character formally, not even by means of a general instrumentality; it must be viewed in connection with the reality of the salvation of which Scripture *testifies*.[15]

This does not separate revelation and the Scripture but it does recognize that Scripture as a witness is directed toward Christ and distinct from him.[16] Scripture *is* the Word of God "points to the mystery of the Spirit, who wants to bind men to Christ through these words, through this witness."[17]

This leads to questions regarding what Berkouwer calls the "continuity" between the speaking of God in the Word and the human aspect of Scripture. The concern is

> the way in which God's Word maintains its sovereign and transcendent character in this continuity, so that it does not become dependent on human, temporal, and historical factors with their particular relativity.[18]

Berkouwer is aware that an organic idea of inspiration must account for the reality of the limitation of the human authors of Scripture. Scripture is the words of humans who did not surpass their contemporaries in their knowledge of science and the Scripture, as their words, comes in languages and with

---

[15] Ibid., p. 162.

[16] Ibid., pp. 165-66.

[17] Ibid., p. 166.

[18] Ibid., p. 171.

concepts which are temporally limited.[19] This problem is resolved by a recognition that the central purpose of Scripture is not to expand scientific knowledge but to deal with matters of faith and eternal life. The "*scopus*" of Scripture indicates that there is a particular goal involved.[20]

The concept of the central purpose of Scripture explains how Scripture can function as normative. Berkouwer would affirm that much that is found in Scripture is not normative in the present. One must, rather, seek the Word of God within the human words of Scripture. Although one might desire a more simple approach, the historical character of Scripture does not allow for this. On the contrary it makes historical research necessary.[21]

The fact that the Word of God comes in the words of humans also demands consideration of the form of Scripture or what Berkouwer calls "the servant-form of Holy Scripture." Scripture comes with a humanness which gives it the humble form of a servant and, as such, seems to stand in contrast with its authority. It does not appear in a miraculous form but in a truly human form with the consequent human and historical limitations. In such form it faces opposition as did Christ who also appeared in a servant's form.[22]

The God-breathed character, or inspiration, of Scripture is for Berkouwer, then, that character of Scripture by which it is the word from God and, at the same time, the words of humans. Its unique character is found especially in its witness to revelation in Christ and its purpose to lead to salvation. While its character as human words means that there is material in Scripture which reflects the limitations of humanness and of the specific cultural situation of its authors, Scripture's continuity with the divine is found in its

---

[19] Ibid., pp. 178, 185-88.

[20] Ibid., pp. 180, 184.

[21] Ibid., pp. 191-93.

[22] Ibid., pp. 195-209.

central purpose of leading to salvation.

Berkouwer's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Berkouwer's terminology with respect to the unique character of Scripture has been influenced by his consideration of *theopneustos* in 2 Timothy 3:16a. Berkouwer emphasizes Scripture's goal which is practical and religious. He writes:

> The meaning of this God-breathed writing is evident; it is aimed at a concrete and great goal: for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and all this is summarized into one goal, 'that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.'[23]

The particular nature of Scripture's goal, as has been evident in the review of his position on inspiration, is central to Berkouwer's understanding of the character of Scripture.

In his consideration of 2 Timothy 3:16a, Berkouwer directs his attention to several matters involved in an understanding of the term *theopneustos* and its significance. He points out the importance of the *theo-* in *theopneustos*. Just as the "by God" of *theodidaktos* is important elsewhere in the New Testament, so here, "the dimension of 'in the name of God' is visible." The emphasis is on the necessary relation between the Spirit's breath and Scripture.[24] Berkouwer recognizes the exegetical question of whether *theopneustos* is passive or active and adopts a passive understanding. The word means, therefore, "God-breathed" and not "God-breathing."[25]

Berkouwer also notes the interpretive issue of whether *pasa* is to be viewed collectively (as in the Revised Standard Version) or distributively (as in

---

[23] Ibid., p. 140.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

The New English Bible). The first alternative, he recognizes, provides a more definitive statement of the inspiration of Scripture while the second is less definitive with inspiration being more assumed. Berkouwer does not take a firm position on this question as neither alternative diminishes the point of the passage. Paul is concerned to affirm that Scripture's utility for salvation is related to its God-breathed character. This concern is realized regardless of which significance is assigned to *pasa.* The functional character of Scripture is related to its God-breathed origin.[26]

Berkouwer considers more briefly 2 Peter 1:21. Although this verse, in his perspective, is concerned primarily with the writers of Scripture and not the writings themselves, it is a verse that has been seen as significant with respect to Scripture's character. On the one hand, the *apo theou* of this verse accents the divine role in Scripture. "*Apo theou* is made the dimension of authority, trustworthiness, and immutability." Berkouwer goes on to say, "confronting a rising of God's Word out of the human heart is the impulse of the Spirit. The firmness of these human words is the mystery of the Spirit."[27] On the other hand, 2 Peter 1:21 recognizes the human involvement in prophecy as it is humans who have spoken.[28] It is this twofold divine and human aspect that allows Berkouwer to say:

> It should not surprise us that also in the light of this passage the church confessed that in Scripture we do not have to do with the unmysterious human opinions and convictions of ancient days but with the inescapability and the authority of *Deus dixit* (God has spoken) in the human words of Scripture.[29]

It is evident that some aspects of Berkouwer's exegesis of 2 Timothy

---

26 Ibid., pp. 140-41.

27 Ibid., p. 142.

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid., p. 143.

3:16a and 2 Peter 1:21 are integrated into his discussion of the nature of biblical inspiration. *Theopneustos* (God-breathed) is used as the term which describes the unique character of Scripture rather than the more traditional term "inspiration." His understanding of the goal of Scripture conditions his presentation of the relation between the divine and the human in the inspiration of Scripture. Scripture is, according to Berkouwer, "God-breathed" in accordance with the passive significance of *theopneustos*. As 2 Peter 1:21 indicates, Scripture is from God and yet there is a human aspect.

Despite the integration of the material of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:21 it would be difficult to affirm that Berkouwer's view of biblical inspiration is directly developed from these texts. His presentation is especially related to the church's confession of *Sacra Scriptura est Verbum Dei*. It is the meaning of this confession, not necessarily controlled by the material of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:21, that primarily directs Berkouwer's consideration of the inspiration of Holy Scripture.

2.2 Content Inspiration
(Edward W. Goodrick)

Edward Goodrick (1913-1992) exercised a considerable influence within a certain sector of American evangelicalism through a long-time teaching role at Multnomah School of the Bible, leadership in the production of research tools for the *New International Version* of the Bible, and participation in the Evangelical Theological Society. He is somewhat unique among evangelicals in that he develops a conceptual theory of biblical inspiration.[30]

The following description of Goodrick's theory of inspiration is based on

---

[30] For a review of content or ideational theories of biblical inspiration see Robert Gnuse, The Authority of the Bible. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1985, pp. 42-46. An influential presentation of content inspiration is John Henry Newman, "The Inspiration of Scripture, 1861," The Theological Papers of John Henry Newman on Biblical Inspiration and Infallibility. ed. J. Derek Holmes, Oxford: Clarendon, 1979, pp. 72-83.

two published works. One is an article which was published in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*.[31] The other is a brief and popular work which appeared in 1988 called *Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God?*[32] In this book Goodrick sought to correct the evangelical effort to limit inspiration to the original autographs of Scripture with a demonstration that inspiration extends to both the manuscript copies of these autographs and their translations.[33]

Revelation

Goodrick's consideration of the nature of revelation is limited and, by design, popular. God has revealed himself in private, general, and special revelation. Private revelation is that which is generally specific to an individual or group and is not an "extensive compendium of what God wanted all to know and heed."[34] General revelation, which in its very nature is more universal, includes both tradition and God's self-manifestation in nature.[35] Goodrick affirms that because of the limitations inherent in revelation which is private and general "something more is needed—a permanent, written record of God's

---

[31] Edward W. Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 25 (1982), 479-87.

[32] Edward W. Goodrick, Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God?. Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1988. Perhaps due to the popular nature of this work it has not elicited extensive discussion in the evangelical community. Reviews of this book include one by Robert P. Lightner in Bibliotheca Sacra, 146 (1989), 459, and another by Thomas F. Bulick in Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 35 (1992), 240-41.

[33] Goodrick, My Bible, pp. 7-9.

[34] Ibid., p. 15.

[35] Ibid., pp. 15-17.

revelation to man in language which is understandable to man."36 This is the special revelation found in Scripture.

Goodrick asserts that God accommodates himself in his intercourse with humanity. This is true both with respect to the means of communication and its mode. Accommodation includes the use of human language "limited and faulty though its wordings and meanings may be."37 It also extends to the mode of communication as God uses a human method of preservation of communication, which is a written record.38 God's communication with humanity involved a partnership between God and humans. God chose people who "were cursed with his [Adam's] living death and heirs to his degeneration, which pervades one's whole being, mind, and culture, including its language."39 These people, however, wrote in the third person and made contributions to God's communication in the production of Scripture which varied from almost nothing to significant content. While the nature of the working of the partnership between God and man is unclear, it is certain that what God wanted written was in fact written.40

---

36 Ibid., p. 17. Goodrick never clarifies the question of whether or not he is following the Barthian perspective of the Bible as a witness to revelation.

37 Ibid., p. 18.

38 Ibid., pp. 17-18.

39 Ibid., p. 21.

40 Ibid., pp. 21-25.

Inspiration

Inspiration is defined by Goodrick as, "that event when God communicates with man."[41] He writes:

> The inspiration event that produced the Bible can be described as that event when the prophet/apostle spoke/wrote what the Holy Spirit revealed to him so that man may be illuminated and, thus, informed, moved, and motivated.[42]

Despite this emphasis on the event of inspiration, an analysis of his work indicates that Goodrick places a priority on the inspiration of the content or the meaning of the Bible. This emphasis is based on two significant considerations which are the nature of language and inspiration of copies and translations of the Bible.

Goodrick develops several characteristics of language that influence his view of inspiration. Language is, first, ambiguous. This is true both of grammar and of specific words. The ambiguity of words is evident in their lack of specific ranges of meaning and the multiplicity of meaning that may exist for a particular word. A second characteristic of language is that meaning is conveyed by word inflections. Third, meaning in language is not located primarily in the individual words but in the semantical sentence. Words in and of themselves do not have meaning. Finally, language exists as an integral part of culture.[43]

The nature of language has significant implications for an adequate concept of biblical inspiration. Language is composed of symbol and meaning. The former is the convention shared by both the speaker and the listener which carries the latter. It is meaning, however, which is of primary importance. These two aspects of language must be included in an adequate understanding of

---

[41] Ibid., p. 67.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid., pp. 31-33.

inspiration. Goodrick affirms that "inspiration should embrace the whole of the Bible's language, not just the Bible's symbols." He continues, "if the language of the Bible is inspired, it is completely inspired in both its parts equally, symbol and meaning."[44]

Not only the nature of language, but the belief that inspiration extends to the copies and translations of Scripture influence Goodrick's understanding of biblical inspiration. 2 Timothy 3:16, when understood in its original context, indicates the inspiration of copies of originals of the Old Testament. Translations of the biblical autographs are also inspired. This is evident by the manner in which the New Testament authors used the Septuagint.[45] An adequate theory of biblical inspiration, therefore, must not only account for the nature of language but for inspiration as extending to the copies and translations of the autographs.

It is these two factors that move Goodrick to place a priority on conceptual inspiration in his understanding of the nature of the inspiration of Scripture. On the one hand, his consideration of language directs toward a theory in which meaning is seen as more important than the symbols which bear that meaning. When God communicated to humans, his primary concern was to communicate certain meaning. The symbols are merely the means for the conveyance of this meaning. Verbal inspiration stresses the means over the content of God's communication. On the other hand, the fact that for Goodrick inspiration extends beyond the autographs to include copies and translations requires an understanding of inspiration which gives precedence to meaning and not the words of Scripture. Verbal inspiration is a concept which, by its nature, must be limited to the words of the original books of Scripture. Content inspiration, by contrast, provides a viable model of inspiration which extends to biblical translations. Goodrick affirms, "verbal inspiration simply does not

---

44 Ibid., p. 34.

45 Goodrick, My Bible, pp. 61-62, 74; "2 Timothy 3:16," 480-83.

survive translation. *But meaning can and does.*"[46]

While Goodrick places a priority on conceptual inspiration, he, nevertheless, holds to a verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. Meaning is controlled by words which cannot be changed without changing the meaning of a sentence.[47] The relation between conceptual and verbal inspiration and the priority of the former are evident when Goodrick writes:

> God first had the meaning. Then he chose the exact wording to convey that meaning. What was written down was exactly the way he wanted it said. And the only way we can get to that meaning is by a careful examination of that wording. We have no other way. When the meaning is God's meaning, its wording is sacrosanct. It is because the meaning is so important that its wording is important.[48]

Inspiration, therefore, in Goodrick's thought is primarily a matter of the inspiration of the content or meaning of the Bible and only secondarily of its words. It is this concept which leads him to affirm that "inspiration is an attribute of the Bible's *wording*, not the Bible's *words*."[49]

Goodrick's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Goodrick discusses briefly 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 in *Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God?*. 2 Timothy 3:16a is employed in the consideration of the inspiration of copies of the autographs as an indication of their inspiration. When the term for Scripture which is used in this context is examined in the New Testament, it is evident that copies of the Old Testament, some of which were in use in New Testament times and had scribal errors, are

---

[46] Goodrick, My Bible, p. 79

[47] Ibid., p. 38.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., p. 29.

included in the reference of this term. Inspiration, then, is not limited to the original autographs of Scripture, but extends to copies of these originals.[50]

2 Peter 1:21 is cited in Goodrick's discussion of the partnership of the human and the divine in the production of Scripture. An examination of the Scripture reveals portions where God seemed to contribute only approval of what the prophet wrote of his own will. This, however, is only appearance. In any situation where one is forced to decide between the will of man and the will of the Spirit as the primary influence in the content of the Bible, 2 Peter 1:21 requires the conclusion that primacy belongs to the Spirit.[51]

In his article on 2 Timothy 3:16 Goodrick's goal is not the articulation of an understanding of the nature of inspiration from this verse, but a demonstration that 2 Timothy 3:16-17 should not be used to support the uncorrupted character of the originals of Scripture but to indicate the value of inspired Scripture.[52]

A first significant aspect of 2 Timothy 3:16-17 is the reference of the words "*every Scripture.*" The New Testament evidence supports the position that the reference is to the "Bible-in-hand" and not just to the autographs. Certain New Testament passages such as Luke 4:21; John 5:39; Acts 8:32; 17:2, 11, clearly designate the copy of Scripture which was in use by various individuals or groups and not the original books of Scripture. The reference to Scripture then, as used in 2 Timothy 3:16a, extends to copies of the autographs. These copies, which were not free of error, are affirmed to be inspired.[53] Related to this observation is that which recognizes translations as Scripture. The New Testament not only calls copies of the originals Scripture but also, in

---

[50] Ibid., pp. 61-62.

[51] Ibid., pp. 22-27.

[52] Goodrick, "2 Timothy 3:16," 487.

[53] Ibid., 482.

quotations from the LXX, speaks of this Greek translation in a similar manner. The purview of 2 Timothy 3:16a extends to translations as well as copies of the autographs,[54] consequently verbal inspiration is an inadequate perspective of the nature of inspiration and priority must be given to content inspiration.

A second significant aspect of 2 Timothy 3:16a is the meaning of the term *theopneustos*. Goodrick rejects Warfield's meaning of "spired" in favour of an understanding of the adjective which gives the sense of "'God breathes'" or "'God breathes into.'" This is done on grammatical grounds. Goodrick states "when an adjective ending in *-tos* is recast into a transitive sentence the first stem becomes its subject, the second stem its verb and the noun modified by the adjective its direct object."[55] The adjective is used causally in the sentence and is not the primary emphasis. This emphasis is, rather, on the usefulness of Scripture.[56]

Although Goodrick adopts a passive sense for *theopneustos* in his exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a, he seems to move, without explanation, to a certain active sense in the summary to his article, where he indicates that Scripture as *theopneustos* is "'alive with the vitality of God, which he himself breathes into it when he created it.'" It is the fact, according to Goodrick, that Scripture is "alive with the vitality of God himself" that makes it useful for the purposes indicated in 2 Timothy 3:16b-17.[57]

Goodrick holds, therefore, a conceptual understanding of biblical inspiration and believes that this view best accounts for the material of 2 Timothy 3:16a. While the Bible is verbally inspired, the primary emphasis must be on conceptual inspiration. Inspiration extends beyond the autographs to

---

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid., 484.

[56] Ibid., 485-86.

[57] Ibid., 486.

copies and translations. A conceptual theory of inspiration also fits the nature of language in which meaning is more important than symbol.

2.3 Textual and Personal Inspiration

2.3.1 Priority of the Inspiration of the Text (Carl F. H. Henry)

Carl F. H. Henry (1913-) has occupied several influential positions within evangelicalism, among which were his participation in the founding faculty of Fuller Seminary and his role as the original editor of *Christianity Today*. In these various situations, Henry has been a primary force in the contemporary definition of evangelicalism and the articulation of its distinctive character.[58]

Henry demonstrates an obvious dependence on the concept of inspiration found in Hodge and Warfield when he defines inspiration as a supernatural influence of the Spirit of God upon writers chosen of God by which these authors were enabled to produce the Scriptures. This influence guided them in their selection of the words of Scripture in a manner consistent with their various personalities and styles and assured the veracity and faithfulness of their writings.[59] This articulation of the nature of biblical inspiration is found

---

[58] For introductions to Carl Henry and his work see Richard A. Purdy, "Carl F. H. Henry," Handbook of Evangelical Theologians. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, pp. 260-75, and R. Albert Mohler, Jr., "Carl F. H. Henry," Baptist Theologians. eds. Timothy George and David S. Dockery, Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1990, pp. 518-38. A discussion of the contribution of Carl Henry to modern thought is Bob E. Patterson, Carl F. H. Henry. Waco, TX: Word, 1983. Henry recounts his own biography in Carl F. H. Henry, Confessions of a Theologian. Waco, TX: Word, 1986.

[59] For definitions of inspiration in Hodge and Warfield see Archibald A. Hodge and Benjamin B. Warfield, Inspiration. 1881; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979, pp. 17-18, and Benjamin B. Warfield, "Inspiration," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. ed. James Orr, 1929; rpt. Grand Rapids:

particularly in his discussion of revelation in volumes two through four of *God, Revelation and Authority*.[60]   Additional works will also be considered as appropriate.

Revelation[61]

Henry begins his consideration of divine revelation with the assertion that "revelation is a divinely initiated activity, God's free communication by which he alone turns his personal privacy into a deliberate disclosure of his reality."[62] Fundamental to a proper conception of revelation is the realization that God is inaccessible to humanity and remains so unless he chooses to reveal himself.   Revelation is concerned primarily with what God discloses, recognizing that what is revealed would have remained concealed apart from this free divine act.[63]   Divine revelation is not a complete unveiling of the mystery of God as God transcends his revelation of himself.[64] God is revealed in nature, conscience, the Scriptures and in Jesus Christ.   None of these

---

Eerdmans, 1939, III, 1473.

[60] Carl F. H. Henry, God, Revelation and Authority. Vol. II, God Who Speaks and Shows: Fifteen Theses, Part One. Waco, TX: Word, 1976; Carl F. H. Henry, God, Revelation and Authority. Vol. III, God Who Speaks and Shows: Fifteen Theses, Part Two. Waco, TX: Word, 1979; Carl F. H. Henry, God, Revelation and Authority. Vol. IV, God Who Speaks and Shows: Fifteen Theses, Part Three. Waco, TX: Word, 1979.

[61] For a discussion of Henry's view of revelation see, Kern Robert Trembath, Divine Revelation. New York: Oxford, 1991, pp. 30-49.

[62] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, II, 17.

[63] Ibid., 18-19, 21.

[64] Ibid., 47.

aspects of revelation can be eliminated or substituted for another.[65]

While Henry rejects a subject-to-subject conception of revelation, he asserts that revelation is personal. It involves communication between persons. In this respect God discloses himself by various names which are intended to communicate to humanity his divine character. In the New Testament the concentration of this divine disclosure of the name of God is Jesus Christ.[66]

Henry develops several loci of divine revelation. God is revealed universally in the history of every people and specifically in the Judeo-Christian redemptive history.[67] Divine revelation climaxes in Jesus Christ in whom "the source and content of revelation converge and coincide."[68] He is, as well, the agent through whom all divine revelation is mediated.[69] This mediation does not eliminate Scripture as revelation for, as will be seen in the discussion of Henry's view of biblical inspiration, he also sees the Scripture as a repository of revealed truth.[70]

Regarding the nature of divine revelation, Henry states: "God's revelation is rational communication conveyed in intelligible ideas and meaningful words, that is, in conceptual-verbal from."[71] Propositional revelation is defined as:

> We mean by propositional revelation, that God supernaturally

---

[65] Ibid., 77, 79-80, 87-88.

[66] Ibid., 151, 245-46.

[67] Ibid., 247-56.

[68] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, III, 9.

[69] Ibid., 203-07.

[70] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, IV, 129.

[71] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, III, 248.

communicated his revelation to chosen spokesmen in the express form of cognitive truth, and that the inspired prophetic-apostolic proclamation reliably articulates these truths in sentences that are not internally contradictory.[72]

Revelation, in summary, is a rational communication from God to people in which, by various modes of revelation, he addresses the minds and wills of individuals in such a manner as to influence the beliefs and actions of revelation's recipients.

Inspiration

In the fourth volume of *God, Revelation and Authority* Henry defines inspiration as "a supernatural influence upon divinely chosen prophets and apostles whereby the Spirit of God assures the truth and trustworthiness of their oral and written proclamation."[73] Elsewhere he writes:

> Inspiration is that supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit whereby the sacred writers were divinely supervised in their production of Scripture, being restrained from error and guided in the choice of words they used, consistently with their disparate personalities and stylistic peculiarities.[74]

While each of these definitions mentions the biblical writings, they appear to place the primary emphasis on the authors of Scripture as the locus of inspiration, but Henry affirms that inspiration is primarily a matter which

---

[72] Ibid., 457.

[73] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, IV, 129.

[74] Carl F. Henry, "The Authority and Inspiration of the Bible," The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Vol. I, Introductory Articles. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979, p. 25. For a similar definition see, C. F. H. Henry, "Bible, Inspiration of," Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, p. 145.

concerns the relation of God with the Bible. "Inspiration," he claims, "is primarily a statement about God's relationship to Scripture, and only secondarily about the relationship of God to the writers."[75] As will be evident in Henry's discussion of *theopneustos*, it is the biblical text which is breathed-out by God and, therefore, inspired.[76] Henry's stated emphasis, however, does not seem to be adequately represented in the definitions of inspiration which he has formulated.

In *God, Revelation and Authority* Henry begins his description of the evangelical perspective of biblical inspiration with several denials. He denies, first, that inspiration implies divine dictation of the contents of Scripture: the authors of Scripture were not merely amanuenses but participated with the Holy Spirit in "a special confluence of the divine and human."[77] Henry also denies that biblical inspiration involves either a profound human insight or the expression of the divine within human beings: "to say that the Scripture is God-breathed (2 Tim 3:16)," Henry writes, "rules out any derivation from a presumptively latent divinity in man and emphasizes instead a divine initiative and compulsion (2 Pet 1:21)."[78] Inspiration is primarily concerned with the relation of God to the text of the Bible and not its authors. For this reason it cannot be primarily an expression of divinity present in humans or merely the profound insights of some gifted individuals.[79]

Henry then turns to a number of affirmations. He states, first, "that the

---

[75] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, IV, 143.

[76] Henry, "Bible, Inspiration of," p. 146.

[77] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, IV, 138-42.

[78] Ibid., 142; cf. Henry, "The Authority and Inspiration of the Bible," p. 26.

[79] Ibid., 142-44.

text of Scripture is divinely inspired as an objective deposit of language."[80] The emphasis on the inspiration of the biblical writings and not just their authors is evident:

> The nonbiblical notions of inspiration obscure the nature of biblical inspiration by asserting the inspiration of only the writers, and not of the written truths they enunciate. The biblical doctrine of inspiration, on the other hand, connects God's activity with the express truths and words of Scripture. The New Testament correlates inspiration with the sacred writings and their verbal statements.[81]

The Scripture itself is "a linguistic revelatory deposit."[82]

An evangelical perspective of inspiration is completely in harmony with the full humanity of the biblical writers. The Spirit used the human capabilities of these authors so that their writings demonstrate appropriate differences between them. Likewise, inspiration did not terminate the fallibility of the biblical writers in their habitual lives. They were errant and lived with the limitations of their own culture, nevertheless these historical limitations do not necessitate that the revelation which was communicated in their words and thoughts cannot impart truth because of the particular historical context. Assertions to the contrary tend to represent either the presumption of the truth of the "modern world view" or a understanding of historicity which negates any claim to objective truth.[83]

The revelation which is found in Scripture exceeds the natural comprehension of the biblical authors. "Biblical doctrine," Henry indicates, "has an authoritative basis only because of communication of specially revealed

---

[80] Ibid., 144.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid., 148-52; cf. "The Authority and Inspiration of the Bible," p. 29.

truths to chosen messengers."[84] Since the end of the age of the apostles the church has special revelation only in the Scriptures.[85] The ultimate author of the Bible is God himself, as the Holy Spirit communicates to the biblical writers. While this does not necessitate the exclusion of the human element of Scripture, "it is on God's authorship that the efficacy of the Word depends."[86]

Finally, Henry holds the verbal-plenary inspiration of Scripture. The Bible, both as a unity and in its distinct parts, is inspired. This inspiration extends to the words of Scripture. He rejects the concept of degrees of inspiration.[87] Henry concludes with the claim that plenary inspiration is the doctrine which has been held in history by all denominations.[88]

Henry's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Henry considers both 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 in the presentation of his understanding of biblical inspiration. They are cited "among the texts that bear decisively on God's action in providing the Scriptures and on their consequent authority."[89] He makes some effort to integrate his exegetical observations into his discussion of the nature of biblical inspiration.

In the context in which 2 Timothy 3:16a is found, there is an emphasis on the source of Scripture as with God. Henry indicates that there are two significant issues for interpretation in 2 Timothy 3:16a. The first is whether the

---

[84] Ibid., 155.

[85] Ibid., 155-58.

[86] Ibid., 159.

[87] Ibid., 160; cf. "The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible," p. 26.

[88] Ibid., 160-61.

[89] Ibid., 131.

inspiration of Scripture is described in a collective or distributive sense. Henry does not take a definitive position, although he claims that there is no necessity of adopting the distributive sense which would limit the inspiration of Scripture only to certain passages. Whether Paul intended the collective or distributive meaning of *pasa*, he attributes to Scripture, as a whole or in its distinct segments, a divine source. It is this source which establishes the worth of Scripture.[90]

A second interpretative issue in 2 Timothy 3:16a is whether current theories of inspiration adequately reflect the action of God as described in this verse. Henry responds to this question by his consideration of the meaning and grammatical significance of *theopneustos*. This term is used "to express God's relationship to the sacred writings." Elsewhere Henry writes that the word is "literally God-'spirated' or breathed out," and "affirms that the living God is the author of Scripture and that Scripture is the product of his creative breath."[91] Henry rejects the translation "'Every inspired Scripture has its use for teaching the truth and refuting error' (NEB)" in that it communicates the idea that a differentiation may be made between Scriptures which are inspired and those which are not. He adopts, rather, the predicative sense of the adjective with the consequent sense that inspiration extends to all of the Scriptures. "In other words," Henry says, "passage upon passage of Scripture is divinely inspired."[92]

Henry discusses, as well, 2 Peter 1:20-21 which he affirms is concerned with the divine origin of Scripture. Negatively, a merely human origin of the Scriptures is disallowed. While Henry's general understanding of these verses has remained somewhat consistent, he appears to have modified his interpretation of verse twenty somewhat. In an earlier discussion he views

---

[90] Ibid.

[91] Henry, "Bible, Inspiration of," p. 145.

[92] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, IV, 131.

verse twenty as referring to the origin of Scripture. "Scripture does not have its ground," Henry writes, "in human inquiry and investigation or in philosophical reflection." Its origin, then, is not with human invention.[93] In a later discussion, his understanding has changed to see the concern of this verse as primarily with the interpretation of Scripture:

> . . . the emphasis here may fall on divine illumination as the necessary corollary of divine inspiration so that, while the sense of Scripture is objectively given and determinable by exegesis, it must be discriminated nonetheless by the aid of the same Spirit by whom it was first communicated.[94]

Whichever alternative is adopted, the passage negates the possibility of a merely human origin of Scripture.

The first phrase of verse twenty-one clearly denies an origin of Scripture which is rooted primarily in human decision. Rather, as the end of the verse indicates, the writers of Scripture were "carried along" by the Holy Spirit. The verb which is used here is found four times in the immediate context. It describes an influence of the Spirit which is beyond a mere supervision. The force of the expression is that "the reason the prophetic word is sure—surer than that of eyewitnesses—is that God is its source and that specially chosen men spoke by the Spirit's agency."[95]

Henry has made some effort to integrate his exegetical observations of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 into his discussion of the nature of biblical inspiration even though he has not clearly incorporated this material into the brief definitions of inspiration found in his work. His consideration of the meaning of *theopneustos* leads him to a major statement on the nature of

---

[93] Ibid., 132.

[94] Henry, "Bible, Inspiration of," p. 146.

[95] Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, IV, 132-33; "Bible, Inspiration of," p. 146.

inspiration and significance of the biblical writings in an understanding of inspiration. After an indication of the meaning of *theopneustos*, Henry states:

> The biblical sense, therefore, rises above the modern tendency to assign the term "inspiration" merely a dynamic or functional significance (largely through a critical dependence on Schleiermacher's artificial disjunction that God communicates life, not truths about himself) . . . . The writings themselves, as an end product, are assertedly God-breathed. Precisely this conception of inspired *writings*, and not simply inspired *men*, sets the biblical conception of inspiration pointedly over against pagan representations of inspiration in which heavy stress is placed on the subjective psychological mood and condition of those individuals overmastered by divine afflatus.[96]

Likewise the consideration of 2 Peter 1:20-21 leads Henry to a certain conclusion with respect to the origin of Scripture. He writes in the context of his discussion of this text:

> A supernatural quality all of its own, therefore, inheres in Scripture. While involving the instrumentality of "holy men," Scripture is affirmed nonetheless to owe its origin not to human but to divine initiative in a series of statements whose proximate emphasis is the reliability of Scripture.[97]

Henry, then, considers 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21, but the content of these texts is not necessarily clearly reflected in his definitions of biblical inspiration: the exegesis of these verses places a significant emphasis on the inspiration of the biblical writings which is not clearly reflected in Henry's definitions. Also, it points to inspiration as a description of the origin of the Scriptures rather than an influence upon its authors or readers.

---

[96] Henry, "Bible, Inspiration of," pp. 145-46.

[97] Ibid., p. 146.

2.3.2 Priority of the Inspiration of the Person
(Millard J. Erickson)

Millard J. Erickson (1932-) is Research Professor of Theology at Southwestern Seminary.[98]   He has exerted a significant influence in the evangelical context through his widely-used theological textbook entitled *Christian Theology* (1985).[99]   Although Erickson has written elsewhere regarding Scripture and inspiration,[100] it is especially the relevant sections of *Christian Theology* which will be the primary focus of the analysis of Erickson's views of these issues.

Revelation

Revelation, in the theology of Erickson, is "God's manifestation of himself to man in such a way that man can know and fellowship with him."[101] He adopts a traditional distinction between general revelation and special revelation. The former is God's self-disclosure which is universally available. It

---

[98] For introductions to Millard J. Erickson see David S. Dockery, "Millard J. Erickson," Baptist Theologians. eds. David S. Dockery and Timothy George, Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1990, pp. 640-59, and L. Arnold Hustand, "Millard J. Erickson," Handbook of Evangelical Theologians. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, pp. 412-26. An earlier form of Dockery's article is David S. Dockery, "Millard J. Erickson: Baptist and Evangelical Theologian." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 32 (1989), 519-32.

[99] Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.

[100] See, Millard J. Erickson, "A New Look at Various Aspects of Inspiration." Bethel Seminary Journal, 25/1 (1966), 16-26, and Millard J. Erickson, "Immanence, Transcendence, and the Doctrine of Scripture," The Living and Active Word of God. eds. Morris Inch and Ronald Youngblood, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983, pp. 193-205.

[101] Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 153.

is general not only in that it is available to all humanity, but also in that its content is less specific than that of special revelation. General revelation has three loci. God manifests himself in nature, history and humanity. It is especially in the moral and spiritual character of man, that aspects of God's character may be seen.[102]

Special revelation is specific to certain people and has a more particular content. It is "God's manifestation of himself to particular people at definite times and places, enabling those persons to enter into a redemptive relationship with him."[103] Its primary purpose is not the provision of information but the realization of a relationship.[104]

There are several aspects of the character of special revelation. Special revelation, in consonance with its relational emphasis, is personal. It is the self-disclosure of God, who is a person, to people. This aspect of revelation is also "anthropic" in that it is in a certain sense accommodated to humanity. It is a revelation which is communicated both in the language and mental conceptions of humanity. Special revelation is, as well, communicated in analogical language which, while sharing univocal sense with man's understanding, reflects a quantitative difference.[105]

Among the modes of special revelation is divine speech which, though it comes through a human spokesperson, is truly revelation. It may be audible or silent, perceived only in the heart of the receptor.[106] A form of divine speech which has particular relevance for this study is that which Erickson designates

---

[102] Ibid., pp. 154-55.

[103] Ibid., p. 175.

[104] Ibid., p. 176.

[105] Ibid., pp. 177-81.

[106] Ibid., p. 187.

as "concursive," which is a merging of revelation and inspiration:

> As the author of Scripture wrote, God placed within his mind the thoughts that he wished communicated. This was not a case of the message's already having been revealed, and the Holy Spirit merely bringing these matters to remembrance, or directing the writer to thoughts with which he was already familiar. God created thoughts in the mind of the writer as he wrote.[107]

In many cases of divine speech, what God communicated was his perspective of a historical occurrence. Not only the event itself, but also the divinely communicated interpretation are revelation.[108]

Special revelation is both personal or propositional as it "is real, objective, rational information communicated from God to man."[109] Erickson rejects the neo-orthodox emphasis indicating that "revelation is not *either* personal or propositional; it is *both-and*. In revelation God primarily reveals *himself*, but he does so, at least in part, by telling us something *about* himself."[110]

Scripture is revelation, but only in a derivative sense. The propositional nature of revelation establishes the possibility of its being preserved in scriptural form. To the degree that the written account of the divine revelation reflects accurately God's self-disclosure it is revelation:

> The definition of revelation becomes a factor here. If revelation is defined as only the actual occurrence, the process or the *revealing*, then the Bible is not revelation. Revelation is something that occurred long ago. If, however, it is also the product, the result or the *revealed*, then the Bible may also be termed revelation.[111]

---

[107] Ibid., pp. 187-88.

[108] Ibid., pp. 188-90.

[109] Ibid., p. 191.

[110] Ibid., p. 196.

[111] Ibid., pp. 196-97.

Revelation, then, is the self-manifestation of God which has as its primary purpose the realization of a relation with him by human beings.

Inspiration

Erickson defines inspiration as "that supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit upon the Scripture writers which rendered their writings an accurate record of the revelation or which resulted in what they wrote actually being the Word of God."[112]

The most creative aspect of Erickson's work on inspiration is found in his consideration of the question of conceptual and verbal inspiration. Erickson recognizes a certain tension between the didactic material of Scripture and its phenomena in this regard. The didactic content of the Bible directs toward an understanding of inspiration which sees it as extending to the selection of the words of the biblical text. The New Testament writers employ the Old Testament in a manner which attributes a value to each grammatical aspect of the text. They also ascribe to God Old Testament statements which are not originally attributed to him. Jesus himself identified the Old Testament with the speech of God. These didactic factors point toward a verbal theory of inspiration. There are, however, certain phenomena, including chronology which are difficult to harmonize and citations of nonbiblical literature, which are difficult to explain if inspiration extends to the choice of the words of the Bible.[113]

Erickson resolves the question by arguing a primarily conceptual understanding of inspiration but one which, by the nature of the Spirit's work in the minds of the biblical authors, extends to the selection of the words of

---

[112] Ibid., p. 199. In light of what Erickson has said about the relation of Scripture and revelation one must assume that in this definition he does not accept the neo-orthodox disjunction between revelation and its record. This assumption, however, is not evident in the wording of the definition.

[113] Ibid., pp. 212-14.

Scripture. The disjunction between words and thought is, according to Erickson, inadequate as the two cannot be separated. In any language there are only a certain number of words which can communicate a given thought. The more precise a thought is, the more limited will be the choice of words until, finally, there is only one term which communicates the precision intended. Erickson believes that the Spirit may have worked in the mind of a biblical writer to move his thought in such a way that the writer used a particular word which had just the precision which God intended. In this way inspiration, which is primarily conceptual, extended to the words of a biblical author.[114] Erickson limits verbal inspiration, however, when he says that "at times thoughts may be more precise than the words available."[115] Verbal inspiration does not necessitate dictation as the author's preparation and intimacy with God allowed reception and communication of the divine message without it.[116]

Erickson concludes with a clear reference to the locus of inspiration:

> Inspiration is herein conceived as applying to both the writer and the writing. In the primary sense, it is the writer who is the object of the inspiration. As the writer pens the Scripture, however, the quality of inspiredness is communicated to the writing as well. It is inspired in a derived sense.[117]

Erickson's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Erickson considers 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 in his discussion of inspiration. They appear in his presentation of the Bible's self-witness to its origin. 2 Peter 1:20-21 reflects the view Peter, as a New

---

114 Ibid., pp. 214-17; cf. Erickson, "A New Look," 22-24.

115 Ibid., p. 217.

116 Ibid., pp. 217-18.

117 Ibid., pp. 219-20.

Testament author, had of the part of Scripture which we designate as the Old Testament. Peter indicates that the Old Testament prophecies did not originate in the initiative of the prophets but with that of the Holy Spirit. It is for this reason that those to whom Peter addresses himself are urged to give attention to the prophecy of Scripture. Its origin is not merely with man but with God. 2 Timothy 3:16a is also considered in this context. The divine inspiration of Scripture described in this text implies that they are produced by God.[118]

Erickson returns to these two texts in his presentation of the extent of inspiration. 2 Timothy 3:16a, in Erickson's opinion, does not clearly enable one to determine the extent of inspiration because the textual problem makes Paul's meaning uncertain. As the copula is not present in the beginning of the verse, a choice must be made regarding its placement. Depending on the choice made, Paul may be affirming the inspiration of the entirety of Scripture or the utility of all Scripture which is inspired. Since Paul's intention is not clear, this verse cannot be used to determine the extent of biblical inspiration. 2 Peter 1:20-21, on the other hand, does provide a certain indication of inspiration's extent. When considered with other biblical texts, the reference of this passage seems to be the entire body of the Hebrew Scriptures. While Erickson does not clearly indicate this, the implication is that inspiration extends, on the basis of 2 Peter 1:20-21, to the entire Old Testament.[119]

In a footnote at the end of his discussion of inspiration Erickson observes, in a consideration of the locus of inspiration, that the dichotomy between the inspiration of the biblical authors and the biblical writings is not a genuine problem as 2 Peter 1:20-21 refers to the former, while 2 Timothy 3:16a speaks of the latter.[120]

---

[118] Ibid., pp. 201-02.

[119] Ibid., p. 210.

[120] Ibid., p. 220, note 14.

Erickson's definition of inspiration integrates certain, but not all, aspects of his exegetical consideration of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21. His exegetical observation that these texts speak of the witness of Scripture to its own origin is reflected in his definition when he speaks of the Spirit influencing the biblical writers. In his definition of inspiration, Erickson preserves the locus of inspiration with both the authors and writings which he finds in his exegesis.

There are aspects of Erickson's exegesis, however, which are either not included in his definition or are not present in a manner which might be expected. The texts, in his opinion, speak of the witness of Scripture to its own *origin*, but his definition of inspiration does not speak of Scripture's origin but of a divine *influence* on its authors. When Erickson discusses 2 Peter 1:20-21 he appears to affirm, on the basis of exegesis, the plenary inspiration of the entire Old Testament. The extent of inspiration is not mentioned, however, in his definition. Indeed, in his distinction between the writings as a record of revelation or the Word of God it is difficult to know if he holds a certain differentiation among biblical texts.

2.4 Personal Inspiration
(Ralph Earle)

As Distinguished Professor Emeritus of New Testament at Nazarene Theological Seminary, Ralph Earle (1907-1995) contributed the section on revelation and inspiration to a 1983 articulation of contemporary Wesleyan theology.[121] Earle's article is an enlargement of an earlier essay in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*.[122]

---

[121] Ralph Earle, "Revelation and Inspiration: The Spoken Word of God," A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology. Vol. I, ed. Charles W. Carter, Grand Rapids: Asbury/Zondervan, 1983, pp. 283-326.

[122] Ralph Earle, "Further Thoughts on Biblical Inspiration." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 6 (1963), 7-17.

Earle believes that inspiration is a dynamic work of the Spirit of God in the minds of the biblical authors by which they were enabled both to receive and to communicate the truth of Scripture. He holds, with the Arminian-Wesleyan tradition, that inspiration is dynamic and is to be located in the thoughts of the writers of Scripture and not their words.

Revelation

Earle adopts the traditional evangelical position with respect to revelation which differentiates between general and special revelation. General revelation is God's self-manifestation through at least creation and conscience. Special relation is specifically related to the Bible. It was one of the fundamental convictions of Wesley, Earle indicates, that God had revealed himself in Scripture.[123]

Inspiration

Earle affirms that the doctrine of inspiration is concerned with the origin of Scripture. It is, primarily, a question of communication. Following Nida, Earle indicates that communication involves three elements: the source of the communication, the message itself and its receptor. Neo-orthodox theologians, Earle believes, have left out an essential element in making communication subject-to-subject and failing to notice the object, which is the Bible. Evangelicals, on the other hand, have tended to ignore the receptor of communication, limiting it to merely a matter of subject-object.[124]

Earle sees his dynamic view of inspiration as historically in consonance

---

[123] "Revelation and Inspiration," 288-89.

[124] Ibid., pp. 297-98. Earle's identification with the Wesleyan tradition of dynamic inspiration is a justification for a treatment of his theory as one of personal inspiration. His inclusion of communication's receptor in inspiration identifies him with those who hold the Bible's reader as a locus of inspiration.

with the Arminian-Wesleyan tradition. The general direction of this tradition has been a rejection of verbal inspiration in favour of a conception of inspiration which sees it as the dynamic work of the Spirit of God through mediate agents in which their minds were prepared and enabled to receive divine truth and by which they were able to express it without error in the Scriptures. Dynamic inspiration has, at least in some cases, affirmed degrees of inspiration.[125]

Earle, who writes as a New Testament scholar, believes that there are two characteristics of Scripture which necessitate a dynamic view of inspiration rather than a verbal theory. First, the wording of the synoptic accounts demonstrates that for the authors of the New Testament correspondence of thought was more significant than identity in wording. Numerous variations in the synoptic accounts demonstrate that "equivalence of thought was more essential to the biblical writers than exact sameness of words."[126] Second, the variations of wording in the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament support a theory of dynamic inspiration.[127]

Earle adopts, therefore, a dynamic view of biblical inspiration which places him within a historic Arminian-Wesleyan tradition and which, in his perspective, best accounts for the evidence of Scripture. Earle closes his discussion of inspiration with several affirmations which draw out implications of his position. Illumination should be included in an adequate understanding of inspiration. He recognizes that illumination was not seen in Reformation theology as an aspect of inspiration, but suggests that Barth's emphasis in this respect may be correct. Revelation is not complete until the Word, with the aid of the Spirit, actually reaches the modern reader. Earle adopts, as well, a theory which affirms degrees of inspiration. The difference between material

---

[125] Ibid., pp. 304-09.

[126] Ibid., p. 311.

[127] Ibid., pp. 309-15.

such as Isaiah or Paul and the genealogies of 1 Chronicles give evidence of variations in the degree of inspiration.[128] He affirms, finally, a dynamic view of inspiration which places priority on the thoughts of the biblical writers and not their words. Earle states that "what we should look for in the Scriptures is not a formal equivalence but a dynamic equivalence. The *words* are not the ultimate reality, but rather the *thoughts* that they are intended to convey."[129]

Earle's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

While the nature of Earle's presentation limits the possibility to develop a thorough exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21, he does comment briefly on both these texts.

Theopneustos in 2 Timothy 3:16a means, according to Earle, "God-breathed." It is a predicate adjective and, as such, the verse stresses the usefulness of Scripture which is rooted in its inspiration. Earle cites affirmatively the well-known position of Warfield that the emphasis of *theopneustos* is not on the "'inbreathing'" of God but on Scripture as divinely breathed out or produced by God.[130]

In his consideration of 2 Peter 1:20-21, Earle rejects the interpretation which sees this text as a reference to individual interpretation in favour of one which sees it as speaking of the source of Scripture. Verse 21 indicates that the prophets were moved by the Spirit in a process which, as Earle understands it, was more than merely heightened comprehension but involved supernatural supervision which enabled them to say that which God desired. Earle cites the observation of Mayor that the position of *anthropoi* at the termination of the sentence next to *theou* indicates that though the prophets were men, their

---

[128] Ibid., pp. 319-20.

[129] Ibid., p. 320.

[130] Ibid., pp. 295-96.

prophecies did not come from impulses which were human but from God. He also notes the affirmation of Warfield that the influence of which this verse speaks is a very particular one which describes the prophets as having been carried by the Spirit of God toward the divinely determined goal.[131]

Earle does not seem to integrate his exegetical observations from the texts of this study into his theory of inspiration. The dynamic theory of inspiration which he adopts is developed on the basis of Arminian-Wesley tradition and particular characteristics of the New Testament, rather than these texts. At least in the article under consideration, there is no clear integration of exegetical conclusions from 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 in his statement of the nature of biblical inspiration.

2.5 Inspiration as the Guidance of the Biblical Writers

Paul K. Jewett (1919-1991) was a professor of theology at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California. He most fully develops his thought with respect to inspiration in *God, Creation, and Revelation*.[132]

Revelation

Jewett believes that there are two modes (modalities) of special revelation in which God discloses himself. The primary is history. History is neither closed with nothing which transcends it, as historical relativism claims,

---

[131] Ibid., p. 296.

[132] Paul K. Jewett, God, Creation, and Revelation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991. Reviews of this work include one by Matthew A. Cook in Trinity Journal, 13 (1992) 225-29, and another by Henry Buis in Reformed Review, 46 (1992), 65-66. Jewett authored an earlier work on revelation which touches on inspiration. It is, Paul K. Jewett, "Special Revelation as Historical and Personal," Revelation and the Bible. ed. Carl F. H. Henry, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958, pp. 43-57.

nor is it disconnected from the temporal-spatial realm as in the thought of idealism. Rather, God has shown himself in history. This revelation, which is not to be identified with history, includes divinely disclosed interpretation of historical events which was communicated to the minds of the biblical authors. Both the events and their interpretation constitute divine revelation.[133] Revelation is "God's making himself known in and through the disclosure of his purpose."[134] He is the God who makes and fulfils promises in history.[135]

The secondary form of revelation is the Bible. Jewett writes:

> The Bible is revelation in the mode (form) of written words. In these words the human authors of Scripture, inspired by God's Spirit, reiterate the promises and warnings, record the events in which they are fulfilled, and preserve the interpretation of these events as events in which God has and will make himself known.[136]

There is clearly a subjective aspect to revelation. Revelation is "a disclosure on the part of the divine Subject to the human subject that eventuates in an I/thou fellowship, a communion with God the Redeemer."[137] Because of this subjective aspect, revelation is not merely an event which is objective but also one which is transitive. It involves the internal witness of the Spirit in the believer to Christ.[138]

---

[133] Jewett, "Revelation," pp. 46-48, 52.

[134] Jewett, God, Creation, and Revelation, pp. 77-78.

[135] Ibid., p. 78.

[136] Ibid.

[137] Ibid., p. 80. In this respect Jewett seems to have changed his thinking. In his 1958 article Jewett stresses the personal aspect of revelation but excludes the *response* from revelation *per se* (Jewett, "Revelation," pp. 55-57). Here the response of the human subject is included in revelation.

[138] Ibid., pp. 80, 78.

Inspiration

Jewett sees inspiration as primarily located with the authors of Scripture:

> Inspiration is that guidance, that influence, that superintendence of God's Spirit which enabled the authors of Scripture to speak the truth which God would have them speak for his own glory and our salvation, faith, and life.[139]

The writers of Scripture were aware of the inspiration of the Spirit, although they do not use this term. The nature of the experience varied among the authors of the Bible, however, in inspiration the truth of God is conveyed to humans. The word of the human is at the same time divine in that it communicates a message from the Spirit.[140]

Jewett describes several characteristics of the inspiration of Scripture. Inspiration is, first, verbal. It extends to the words of Scripture. Verbal inspiration is not to be understood, however, as dictation. Jewett strongly rejects dictation and the consequent inerrancy of the biblical words. Verbal inspiration means, rather, that "the writers of Scripture were 'taught by the Spirit' in the words they used to convey their message."[141] The crucial idea in verbal inspiration is that divine revelation has become located in the words of humans. A "sacramental relation" is established in which the divine word is communicated through the agency of the words of humans in the Bible.[142] Secondly, inspiration is plenary. All of Scripture is inspired and, therefore, the edges of the canon are firmly fixed. While there is material in the Bible which is

---

[139] Ibid., p. 126.

[140] Ibid., pp. 126-27.

[141] Ibid., p. 137.

[142] Ibid.

more relevant for the church at a particular time and other which is less relevant, plenary inspiration affirms that it is all the Word of God. Inspiration is, thirdly, something which may described under a variety of models. While Jewett does not affirm degrees or kinds of inspiration, he does clearly draw a distinction in the relative presence of the divine and human in various genres of Scripture. In prophecy the divine aspect of Scripture is more apparent, while in the Hagiographa it is the human aspect which is more obvious. With respect to those parts of the Bible where the human answer to life's situations seem to be more evident, Jewett appears to affirm that "the human answer is taken up into the divine word and thus the true humanity of the divine word is further underscored."[143]

Jewett's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

in his discussion of the nature of biblical inspiration Jewett makes only limited appeal to Scripture in general and to these texts in particular as a basis for his theory of inspiration. He is familiar with historical Protestant theology and seems to take this theology as a starting point, while adapting the discussion to his own perspective and the contemporary situation.

2 Peter 1:21 is cited in an assertion that we are to give heed to the word which though human is, as well, a divine word in that it communicates a divine message. The word, Jewett says, did not come by "human impulse" but "men and women moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God' (2 Pt. 1:21 NRSV)." In this movement by the Spirit the biblical authors were carried "as a ship is borne by the wind over the sea."[144]

In a correspondingly brief discussion he says of 2 Timothy 3:16a:

The key term *theopneustos* . . . does not occur in classical, but only in Hellenistic Greek, and is found in this text and in no other in the New

---

[143] Ibid., pp. 140-41.

[144] Ibid., p. 127.

Testament. Translated idiomatically "inspired by God," it literally means "God-breathed" and clearly refers to the working of the Spirit . . . in those who wrote Scripture.[145]

The reference of this verse is only to the Old Testament, but the church ascribed the same quality to its holy writings. Thus, as the Scripture is read in the assembly the Spirit is speaking to the churches.[146]

An examination of Jewett's work demonstrates, therefore, only limited reference to the texts of this study. There is, however, some integration of the observations from these passages into the theory of inspiration proposed by Jewett. In accord with his consideration of 2 Peter 1:21, Jewett indicates that the human authors communicated a divine message. The affirmation which is found in his exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a that *theopneustos* describes the work of the Spirit in the biblical authors is reflected in his theory of inspiration which accents inspired persons rather than an inspired text. While Jewett does not engage in extensive exegesis of the texts of this study, his discussion of biblical inspiration reflects a certain integration of his exegetical observations.

2.6 Inspiration as Extending to the Auditors/Readers of Scripture

Although the theories of inspiration of Dewey Beegle and Donald Bloesch share a number of characteristics with other theories of inspiration they differ in that inspiration is extended to include those who heard or read the biblical text. Beegle sees these readers as including those of every age while Bloesch limits them to only the original audience.

---

[145] Ibid.

[146] Ibid., note 36.

2.6.1 Inspiration of the Authors, the Text
and the Readers of Scripture
(Dewey M. Beegle)

The publication in 1963 of *The Inspiration of Scripture* by Dewey M. Beegle (d. 1995) evoked extensive response in the American evangelical community as is evident by the criticism to which the book was subjected.[147] This work, which was followed by a thorough revision ten years later entitled *Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility* (1973),[148] brought to an end any unitary perspective on the nature of inspiration and inerrancy which might have been present in American evangelicalism.

Revelation

Beegle believes revelation has two major aspects. There is, first, the subjective aspect of revelation which is God's self-disclosure to humanity and, second, the objective aspect which is what God discloses of himself.[149]

---

[147] Dewey M. Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. For reviews of this work see, Carl F. H. Henry, "Yea, Hath God Said . . .?" Christianity Today, 7 (1963), 742-44, 761-63; Frank E. Gaebelein, "Dust in a Land of Gold." Christianity Today, 7 (1963), 755-57; William F. Albright, "Albright on Errancy." Christianity Today, 7 (1963), 1070-71; Francis S. Rossiter in Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 504; Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. in Westminster Theological Journal, 27 (1964), 230-38; Roger Nicole, "The Inspiration of Scripture: B. B. Warfield and Dr. Dewey M. Beegle." Gordon Review, 8 (1964-1965), 93-109; Gerrit T. Vander Lugt, "An Incorrect Use of Induction." Interpretation, 28 (1964), 92-97.

[148] Dewey M. Beegle, Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973. For reviews of this book see, Page H. Kelley in Review and Expositor, 71 (1974), 540-41; P. Joseph Cahill in Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 37 (1975), 558-59; Edwin H. Rian in Princeton Seminary Bulletin, NS 1 (1977), 83-85; Gordon Clark, "Beegle on the Bible: A Review Article." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 29 (1977), 265-86.

[149] Beegle, Scripture, Tradition, Infallibility, p. 52.

Although Beegle asserts both sides of revelation, under the influence of neo-orthodox thought, he places primary emphasis on the subjective dimension. In his presentation of revelation as personal encounter, Beegle follows in some detail the work of Barth and, especially, Brunner. Revelation is something which takes place in the relationship between persons and demands personal response.[150] Like communication it has three essential elements which include someone who communicates, the content of that communication and the response of the receptor. For revelation to occur, all these elements must be present.[151] Beegle came to distinguish two types of revelation. Primary revelation is the fundamental insights which come to people of extraordinary mental giftedness. Secondary revelation is the more rational working out of the implications of primary and is not all permanently relevant.[152]

Beegle holds that the Scripture in itself is not revelation but a witness to revelation.[153] The Bible is, however, essential to revelation. Scripture is the means by which repeated encounters with God are experienced.[154] When the Bible is taken seriously, the revelational encounters which it records become the means through which revelation is realized in one's own encounters with God.[155]

---

[150] Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture, pp. 125-26.

[151] Ibid., p. 131.

[152] Beegle, Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility, pp. 70-76.

[153] Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture, p. 125.

[154] Beegle, Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility, p. 44.

[155] Ibid., p. 52.

Inspiration

Beegle affirms, in both of his works, a "dynamic" view of inspiration. "The inspired person," he believes, "has the extraordinary help of the Holy Spirit without violating his individuality and personality."[156] Beegle sees Jeremiah 36 as paradigmatic with respect to the nature of inspiration. Given this model, inspiration is primarily something which belongs to individuals and only secondarily to the Scripture itself.[157] It is not, however, limited to individuals in a narrow sense as Beegle indicates that "the totality of Biblical evidence seems to indicate that inspiration is involved in the whole process of God's revelation: the person, whether speaker or writer, and the message, whether oral or written."[158] In his later work Beegle indicates that the subject of the inspiration of biblical books is complicated by the matter of editors of the material of Scripture.[159]

Although Beegle locates inspiration primarily with the biblical writers, one is justified on the basis of his work in seeing inspiration as extending to more than these individuals. After a survey of the subject of revelation he states:

> Inasmuch as inspiration grows out of revelation, a comprehensive doctrine of inspiration will also include three aspects. First of all, there was the influence of God's Spirit in each of the exceedingly varied ways which God made himself known. This same Spirit was at work in the task of recording for posterity some of the deeds and words associated with God's redemptive activity. Then by means of the record, whether the autograph or a copy, the Spirit of God spoke to the hearer or

---

[156] Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture, pp. 15-16; Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility, p. 125.

[157] Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture, pp. 70-73.

[158] Ibid., p. 73.

[159] Beegle, Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility, pp. 202-03.

reader.[160]

Inspiration, then, extends to the hearers and readers of Scripture and is not limited to either the authors or the text. The Bible is used by the Spirit to complete the process of inspiration which began with the prophets and apostles and now becomes an "event" to those who read or hear it.[161] Beegle writes:

> Thus the Bible, the written Word, becomes God's Word when the Word of God, the risen Christ, speaks through the message of the prophets and apostles. Inspiration, therefore, is being caught up into God's time. The moment this experience is considered, it ceases—its subjective existential character is transmuted into an object, something over which to ponder.[162]

Inspiration, therefore, belongs primarily to the authors of the Scriptures, but includes both the text itself in a secondary sense and the readers and hearers of the Word.

Verbal inspiration is rejected in favour of a concept of inspiration which stresses the ideas as being inspired. The New Testament's uses of the Old Testament indicates that what was important was not the precise wording of the text but its sense. This perspective, however, is not taken to the point of adoption of solely a content view of inspiration. Ideas, Beegle, recognizes, cannot be separated from words. In this regard he adopts the principle that concepts which are true require accurate essential terms but may also be expressed by some inaccurate terms that are not mandatory for the primary argument.[163] With respect to the words of Scripture, therefore, Beegle's position falls between strict verbal inspiration and content inspiration.

---

[160] Ibid., p. 132.

[161] Ibid., pp. 126-27.

[162] Ibid., p. 128.

[163] Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture, pp. 77-80; Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility, pp. 232-35.

Beegle introduces several modifications to an understanding of inspiration which sees it as extending equally to each word of the Scripture. First, canonical considerations make it evident that the edges of the biblical collection are somewhat fluid so a rigid separation cannot be sustained between an inspired biblical text and noncanonical material which is not inspired. A firm line does not exist between the biblical writings which are uniquely the product of inspiration and noncanonical material which is not. Second, the phenomena of Scripture reveals that degrees of inspiration exist in the biblical text. Citing Curtis, Beegle affirms that the help that was given to the biblical authors was only that which was needed at a particular time. The nature of this help varied. All that is found in Scripture is not special revelation so there is no necessity to claim plenary inspiration for its contents.[164] The Bible, therefore, is not plenarily inspired. Rather there are degrees of inspiration and a shading between the Scripture and noncanonical writings.

Beegle's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Beegle does not present an extensive exegesis of either 2 Timothy 3:16a or 2 Peter 1:20-21 in either of his books, but he does refer to these passages is such a way that his perspective on some of the exegetical issues and his integration of this exegesis into his understanding of the nature of inspiration are evident.

In his consideration of 2 Timothy 3:16a Beegle see *theopneustos* as meaning "given by inspiration of God," "inspired," or "God-breathed." He accepts, therefore, the traditional meaning of this term which includes a passive sense. The Scripture which is thus inspired is the Old Testament and, especially, the copies of the Old Testament which existed in Paul's day. Both "sacred writings" (2 Tim. 3:15) and "scripture" (2 Tim. 3:16) refer to the extant

---

[164] Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture, pp, 135-39; Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility, pp. 205-09.

manuscripts of the Old Testament when Paul wrote. These copies, according to Beegle, are inspired. Inspiration is a permanent characteristic of Scripture and is not limited only to the autographs.[165]

Beegle also considers 2 Peter 1:20-21. The "prophetic word" of 2 Peter 1:19 seems to refer, in Beegle's perspective, to the Old Testament Messianic texts. Peter is speaking of those texts as they were found in the copies of the Old Testament which his readers had. These copies could be trusted because, according to 2 Peter 1:21, the prophecies which they recorded had their source in God himself.[166]

The foregoing comments on 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 appear in a context in which Beegle is concerned with the question of the autographs of the Bible. These texts are found again in his development of the nature of inspiration but not with significant exegetical development. Inspiration, in Beegle's thought, includes the inspiration of the *text* of Scripture. This is evident in Paul's use of *theopneustos* in 2 Timothy 3:16a. As has been indicated, this inspiration is an inspiration of the copies of the biblical text which existed in Paul's day. While inspiration extends to the text of Scripture it is primarily an attribute of the *authors*, as is evident in 2 Peter 1:21. Beegle, at the stage of this thought reflected in *The Inspiration of Scripture*, saw inspiration as the entire revelatory process including the inspired person and the inspired message.[167]

Although Beegle includes some exegetical material from 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 in his work, the integration of this material into his theory of inspiration is limited only to the assertions that the former on these indicates a locus of inspiration of the text of Scripture and the latter of the

---

[165] Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture, pp. 19-20.

[166] Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[167] Ibid., p. 71.

authors of the biblical text. The text involved is that which existed in Paul's and Peter's day and not the original autographs.

2.6.2 Inspiration of the Authors, Text and Original Readers of Scripture and Its Preservation (Donald G. Bloesch)

Donald G. Bloesch (1928-), professor of Theology at the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary,[168] affirms a locus of inspiration of both the writers and writings of Scripture as well as their original readers. Inspiration also includes the providential preservation of the biblical writings as the means of revelation.

Revelation

Bloesch defines revelation as "God's self-communication through his selected instruments, especially the inspired witness of his prophets and apostles."[169] He adopts a broad perspective on revelation as

> Revelation refers to the whole movement of God into biblical history culminating not only in the prophetic and apostolic witness but also in the act of faith and surrender on the part of those who are caught up in the movement.[170]

His primary emphasis, however, is on revelation as encounter: "Revelation is a

---

[168] For an introduction to this theologian see Donald K. McKim, "Donald G. Bloesch," Handbook of Evangelical Theologians. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, pp. 388-400. A bibliography of Bloesch's writings through 1985 may be found in Donald Bloesch, The Battle for the Trinity. Ann Arbor, MI: Vine/Servant, 1985, pp. 121-34.

[169] Donald G. Bloesch, Holy Scripture. Christian Foundations. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994, p. 48.

[170] Donald G. Bloesch, "Crisis in Biblical Authority." Theology Today, 35 (1978-1979), 460.

'meeting' between God and the believer whereby God speaks and we hear."[171]

Revelation has both an existential and a conceptual aspect. It is existential in that revelation is an encounter with the living God. God speaks in the Bible, history, dreams, visions and conscience.[172] Revelation occurs at the intersection of this speaking of God and the internal response to the Holy Spirit:[173] Scripture is not inherently divine revelation but only becomes such for the believer when the Spirits illumines it.[174] The experience of revelation is both unique to the apostles and extends beyond them: on the one hand, their encounter with Christ is final revelation, but revelation is also continual in repeated experience of Christ's Spirit.[175]

Bloesch distinguishes his view from that of Barth by the affirmation of a conceptual content of revelation. "Revelation is both a *dandum* (event) and a *datum* (objectively given truth)."[176] In other words, "the event of revelation has two poles; the historical and the experiential."[177] Bloesch's view on the conceptual content of revelation is expressed as following:

> God's revelation is his commandment and his promise, and these come to us in the form of written commandments and written testimonies. Yet they cannot be confined to what is objectively written, since their meaning-content includes their significance for those who hear God's

---

[171] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 49.

[172] Ibid.

[173] Ibid., p. 50.

[174] Donald G. Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation. Vol. I, Essentials of Evangelical Theology. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978, p. 52.

[175] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 50.

[176] Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation, p. 70.

[177] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 50.

Word in every new situation.[178]

This view of the nature of revelation has clear implications for Bloesch's conception of the nature of the Bible. The Bible is not revelation,[179] neither is it identical with the Word of God which is "God in action, God speaking and humans hearing."[180] In fact, a more appropriate symbol for the Word of God is the cross.[181] The Bible is a witness to revelation.[182] Its content is God's self-revelation in Christ; a content communicated to us as the witness of the biblical writers who participated in the event of revelation. This witness is the reflection of these participants in revelation. The Holy Spirit has so guided their reflection and their writings that these writings are now the channel of divine revelation.[183]

The Bible is not revelation but the channel of revelation. It "becomes . . . a divine witness through the revelatory action of God on the writers, the writings and the readers."[184] This human witness becomes revelation in a encounter with the living God.[185]

This understanding of revelation is related to Bloesch's concept of inspiration which, in his perspective, both preserves and prepares for

---

[178] Ibid., p. 52.

[179] Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation, p. 52; Donald G. Bloesch, "The Sword of the Spirit: The Meaning of Inspiration." Reformed Review, 33 (1980), 67.

[180] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 48.

[181] Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation, p. 53.

[182] Ibid., p. 52.

[183] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, pp. 56-57.

[184] Ibid., pp. 57-58.

[185] Cf., ibid., pp. 62-63.

revelation. As will be seen, Bloesch's thought on this topic has undergone a certain evolution.

Inspiration

In Bloesch's earlier work inspiration is defined primarily as divine selection and superintendence of the biblical writers and their writings which provides a faithful witness to the revelation culminating in Jesus Christ. Inspiration "refers to the divine election and guidance of the biblical prophets for the express purpose of ensuring the trustworthiness and efficacy of their witness through the ages."[186] The biblical writers "were elected by God as his instruments to ensure a trustworthy witness to his revelation in the events of biblical history culminating in Jesus Christ."[187]

In his most recent work this understanding has been expanded to include the illumination of the original readers and the preservation of the writings. In *Holy Scripture*, inspiration is defined as:

> . . . the divine election and guidance of the biblical prophets and the ensuring of their writings as a compelling witness to revelation, the opening of the eyes of the people of the time to the truth of these writings, and the providential preservation of these writings as the unique channel of revelation. By the biblical prophets I have in mind all preachers, writers and editors in biblical history who were made the unique instruments of God's self-revealing action.[188]

Bloesch distinguishes between the past inspiration of Spirit, which involves the production of Scripture, and present illumination, although he appears to adopt the perspective of Küng which sees inspiration as the penetration of the Spirit which extends to the entire course of the preparation and response to the

---

[186] Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation, p. 55.

[187] Bloesch, "The Sword of the Spirit," 65.

[188] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, pp. 119-120.

Word.[189]

Inspiration, as an element of God's self-revelation, both prepares for and preserves revelation. It has a preparatory function in that it creates the possibility for revelation by providing the cognitive testimony which is the means of revelation. The material of Scripture, by inspiration, is the channel through which encounter with God may be realized.[190] Inspiration has, as well, a preservative function. By the work of the Spirit the Scripture become a "repository of divine truth" although these writings are never completely identical with revelation.[191]

Bloesch affirms several aspects of inspiration. Inspiration is, first, verbal. It extends to the words of Scripture. Verbal inspiration does not mean that the words of Scripture are either directly the words of God or that they are inerrant in a scientific sense. It describes, rather, the fact that the Spirit actively influenced both the thoughts and writings of the biblical authors and that their words are adopted to serve God's purposes.[192] Inspiration is, also, plenary. All of Scripture is inspired. Although inspiration extends to the entirety of the biblical writings, they are not of equal value as they do not witness equally to the culmination of revelation in Jesus Christ.[193] Finally, Bloesch strongly affirms a human element in inspiration. Inspiration is an "interpenetration by the Spirit" into the situation of the biblical writers in which, although they are prophets, they remain subject to human limitation and err even in doctrinal matters.[194]

---

[189] Ibid., pp. 119, 127.

[190] Ibid., pp. 126-29.

[191] Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation, p. 55

[192] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 120; God, Authority, and Salvation, p. 55.

[193] Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation, pp. 55-56.

[194] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 122.

Inspiration has several implications for the nature of the Bible. Its purpose is "to serve God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ."[195] It both guarantees the reliability of the Bible as a witness to revelation and enables Scripture to communicate God's power and truth. Because God has spoken to those he initially inspired and continues to speak through the Bible it is, as well, normative.[196] The Bible is not, however, either inerrant in factual matters or authoritative because of its inspiration. Its human element is such that the biblical writers retained human fallibility in their perspective.[197] Its authority is founded not on its inspiration but God's communication through it.[198]

Bloesch's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

An examination of Bloesch's writings reveals that he makes only limited use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 in his articulation of the nature of inspiration. This is consistent with his general pattern which roots his discussion more extensively in historical theology than in biblical exegesis.[199] Generally these two texts are mentioned in his discussion of the nature of Scripture in only a passing way and with virtually no development.[200] There are, however, several places in his work where aspects of these texts receive somewhat more attention.

---

[195] Ibid., p. 120.

[196] Ibid., pp. 120, 123.

[197] Ibid., pp. 121-22.

[198] Ibid., p. 126.

[199] Cf. the criticism of Anthony A. Hoekema in his review of God, Authority, and Salvation, in Calvin Theological Journal, 14 (1979), 85-86.

[200] See, Bloesch, God, Authority, and Salvation, p. 54; Holy Scripture, pp. 57, 86, 106, 113.

In an article directed specifically to a discussion of the nature of inspiration, Bloesch comments briefly on several aspects of 2 Timothy 3:16a. First, with respect to *theopneustos*, he adopts a meaning from Warfield for this term of "'breathed out from God.'"[201] He appears to be commenting on this phenomena when he goes on to write:

> The writers of Scripture were not simply assisted by the Spirit in the task of sharing their spiritual insights. Instead, they were elected by God as his instruments to ensure a trustworthy witness to his revelation in the events of biblical history culminating in Jesus Christ.[202]

Elsewhere he indicates that while agreeing with Warfield that *theopneustos* means something more than "'breathed into' in the sense of illumination" he rejects the Princetonian's affirmation that the Bible is divine in a direct sense.[203] The other aspect of this text which receives Bloesch's attention is the word "all" in 2 Timothy 3:16a. He indicates that "the reference is not only to the Old Testament documents but also to those of the New Testament, some of which were even then circulating in written form."[204] The evidence for this inclusion is 1 Timothy 5:18 which cites a New Testament document as Scripture. Thus, for Bloesch, the church has seen the reference of 2 Timothy 3:16a as to the entire canon of Scripture and not only the Old Testament.[205]

Even less attention is given to 2 Peter 1:20-21. This text is cited without comment in a discussion of revelation where Bloesch states:

> Revelation does not consist of revealed truths that are objectively "there" in the Bible but rather in God's special act of condescension and

---

[201] Bloesch, "The Sword of the Spirit," 65.

[202] Ibid.

[203] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 88.

[204] Ibid., p. 65.

[205] Bloesch, "The Sword of the Spirit," 65.

the opening of our eyes to the significance of this act. Revelation is not exclusively objective but objective-subjective (cf. Is 53:1; 55:11; Eph 1:18; 2 Pet 1:19-21).[206]

2.7 Social Inspiration
(Clark H. Pinnock)

Clark H. Pinnock (1937-), who has exercised a significant influence within evangelicalism, teaches at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario.[207] In *The Scripture Principle* (1984) Pinnock affirms a social theory of inspiration. Inspiration describes the long-term and complex activity of the Holy Spirit by which the work of many people, most of them unknown to us, produced a text for the community which is normative and functions as the community's constitution.[208]

---

[206] Bloesch, Holy Scripture, p. 67.

[207] For an introduction to Pinnock in an evangelical perspective see, Robert K. Johnston, "Clark H. Pinnock," Handbook of Evangelical Theologians. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993, pp. 427-44. For Pinnock as a Baptist theologian see, Robert V. Rakestraw, "Clark H. Pinnock," Baptist Theologians. eds. Timothy George and David S. Dockery, Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1990, pp. 660-84. An important work on Pinnock's position on biblical authority is, Ray C. W. Roennfeldt, Clark Pinnock on Biblical Authority. Vol. XVI, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1993.

[208] Clark H. Pinnock, The Scripture Principle. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984, pp. 63-64. For an introduction to social theories of Inspiration see, Gnuse, The Authority of the Bible, pp. 50-62. The most influential Protestant statement of social inspiration is Paul J. Achtemeier, The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980. One may also consult the work of James Barr, The Bible in the Modern World. New York: Harper and Row, 1973, pp. 17-18, and Holy Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983, p. 27. For social inspiration in the Catholic context see Gnuse. As he particularly considers the texts which are the concern of this study one may also consult, for the Catholic perspective, Raymond F. Collins, Introduction to the New Testament. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983, pp. 319-26, 343-55.

Revelation

Pinnock affirms that Scripture is a part of God's revelation, as it is a witness to God's revelation in Christ.[209] Revelation, in his thought, is complex. "It is not a single activity or a simple entity," he writes, "but a complex web and a set of actions designed to disclose the divine message of salvation."[210] Revelation is, as well, both objective and subjective. It is "bipolar." He desires to place a particular emphasis on the subjective aspect of revelation indicating "we always ought to be concerned about both the content of what has been revealed and the way it is being received and appropriated."[211] Revelation is not only objective but both propositional and personal.

Is his discussion of New Testament revelation, Pinnock emphasizes several aspects of this self-disclosure of God. He indicates, first, that the focal point of New Testament revelation is Jesus Christ. The reason for this is "because in him God entered our world within the parameters of a human life."[212] Secondly, he addresses the subjective aspect of New Testament revelation in the coming of the Spirit. The presence of the Spirit "answers the human need for subjective immediacy in relation and forces us to the dynamic and contemporary dimensions of revelation."[213] This presence enables

---

[209] Pinnock, The Scripture Principle, p. 16. In a recent assertion which is not developed the statement is found that "the Bible is the foundational development of the church, and its revelation is transmitted through this witness." Clark H. Pinnock and Robert C. Brow, Unbounded Love. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994, p. 161.

[210] Pinnock, The Scripture Principle, p. 4.

[211] Ibid., p. 5.

[212] Ibid., p. 10.

[213] Ibid., p. 12.

believers in every era to experience the same proximity to the Lord as the apostles and to understand the truth the apostles did in each new situation.[214] Pinnock discusses, finally, "the word of God" in the New Testament. The reference of this term is not directly to the Bible for it "refers primarily to the proclamation of the gospel at work in people's lives when received by faith."[215]

Given these and other aspects of his understanding of revelation, Pinnock is prepared to indicate the relation between revelation and Scripture. Scripture is not the only aspect of God's self-disclosure. Rather,

> inspired Scripture constitutes a term in the rich pattern of revelation given to humanity in Jesus Christ. It is a capstone and completion of it in the sense that it conveys in a reliable manner the freight and burden of revelation secured in an appropriate form by God's own action. . . . The Bible is a witness, although the primary one, to the revelation of God in the face of Jesus Christ.[216]

Pinnock sees the Bible as an aspect of God's revelation of himself.[217]

Inspiration

Pinnock remarks that the term "inspiration" appears only once in the Bible (2 Timothy 3:16) and is not defined. While recognizing Warfield's definition of this term as meaning "breathed out by God," Pinnock affirms that "the context of the verse also suggests a spiritual power possessed by the text that is what makes it effective in the ways specified."[218] A key for Pinnock in the

---

[214] Ibid., p. 13.

[215] Ibid., p. 14.

[216] Ibid., p. 16.

[217] Ibid., p. 3.

[218] Ibid., p. 63.

determination of the nature of inspiration is the presence of the varied products of inspiration which are found in Scripture. He believes that this variety argues for a conception of inspiration which sees it as involving multiple activities of God. Inspiration is prophetic and scribal. A different kind of inspiration is behind wisdom material and, again, poetic literature. Pinnock's recognition of this variety of divine action leads to the conclusion that inspiration is not one activity but a complex supervision over the process of the production of Scripture.[219]

What then is biblical inspiration? "It is probably best," Pinnock counsels, "to think of inspiration as a divine activity accompanying the preparation and production of Scripture."[220] While the exact manner in which the Spirit worked with the biblical writers is not known to us, inspiration describes the reality that God gave us the Bible.[221]

Summarizing his view of inspiration, Pinnock writes:

One does not get the impression that inspiration is a sudden activity in the isolated life of some famous writer known to all of us. It seems to have been a quieter and more long-term affair, as traditions were shaped and texts brought into final form. We may speak of the social character of inspiration and the complexity of its execution, involving the work and gifts of many people, most of them unnamed but doing their part under the care of the Spirit to achieve the desired result. Inspiration cannot be reserved for the final redactor but ought to be seen as occurring over a long period of time as a charism of the people of God. God was at work in the community to produce a normative text for the community to serve as its constitution.[222]

---

[219] Ibid.

[220] Ibid.

[221] Ibid., pp. 63-64.

[222] Ibid., p. 64.

Pinnock's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Pinnock devotes a chapter of *The Scripture Principle* to the question of the doctrine of inspiration which should emerge from the Bible's witness to itself. In this chapter he seeks to answer two questions; first, that of the appropriateness of the decision of the church to accept the two Testaments as inspired Scripture and, second, the doctrine of inspiration demanded by Scripture itself. In regard to these two questions he considers the Old Testament's witness to itself, the New Testament's witness to the Old Testament, and the New Testaments witness to itself. Several of Pinnock's affirmations may be noted.

After observing the character of various literary groups of writings in the Old Testament, Pinnock concludes, with respect to the self-witness of this Testament, that the community played an essential role in the production of Scripture. "Its locus must have been much wider than just a special illumination of the final redactor." Rather, it was a long-term process involving many people and closely related to the development of tradition.[223] Pinnock also claims that the Old Testament's self-witness reveals various kinds or degrees of inspiration. The different kinds of literature show varying degrees of the presence of the divine and the human. Inspiration produces texts which function in a variety of ways.[224]

Pinnock examines both the New Testament witness to the Old Testament and its witness to itself. With respect to the former, Pinnock indicates that the New Testament endorses the Old Testament as the Word of God while qualifying it messianically. With respect to the latter, Pinnock discusses only the question of canonicity.

2 Peter 1:20-21 is not mentioned in *The Scripture Principle*, however, 2

---

[223] Ibid., p. 35.

[224] Ibid., pp. 35-36.

Timothy 3:16a is. Pinnock clearly views the "scripture" of 2 Timothy 3:16a as the copies of the Old Testament which Timothy possessed and not the original autographs.[225] He is aware of Warfield's attribution of a passive sense to *theopneustos*, but sees this adjective as having primarily, if not exclusively, an active sense. The Bible which Timothy had is seen by Paul as "alive with the breath of God." The context of 2 Timothy 3:16 "suggests a spiritual power possessed by the text that is what makes it so effective in the ways specified."[226] Finally, Pinnock sees Paul's emphasis in 2 Timothy 3:16a, as on the utility of Scripture and not its inspiration. Paul is concerned with "the plenary profitability of the Scriptures in the matter of conveying a saving and an equipping knowledge of God." "The whole emphasis [of 2 Timothy 3:16] is upon the practical profitability of the copies of the Old Testament Timothy was using."[227]

Based on his survey of the Bible's self-witness, Pinnock claims that the Bible nowhere gives a complete statement of doctrine with respect to its own inspiration and authority. He asserts, however, that the Bible's teaching about itself does allow certain conclusions:

> It does support the central place of the Scripture principle in Christianity. The evidence suggests that it was God's will that written revelation in the form of Scripture should emerge out of the traditions of Israel and church to preserve the substance of the faith for posterity and make it available to believers.[228]

Pinnock does not visibly integrate the teaching of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 into his social theory of inspiration. 2 Peter 1:20-21 is not touched on in *The Scripture Principle* and the exegetical observations from 2

---

[225] Ibid., pp. xviii, 40.

[226] Ibid., pp. xviii, 63.

[227] Ibid., pp. xviii, 40. The emphasis on inspiration as "practical and functional" continues in Pinnock and Brow, Unbounded Love, p. 161.

[228] Ibid., p. 54.

Timothy 3:16a are not integrated into his definition of the nature of biblical inspiration. Some apparent tensions between his statements about 2 Timothy 3:16a and the nature of inspiration are left unresolved, such as his reference to *Paul's* perspective as revealed in 2 Timothy 3:16a and his understanding of the manner by which the biblical text came into being, and the difference which is evident between his suggestion that "inspiration" in 2 Timothy 3:16a describes a vitality of the biblical text and his social definition of the nature of inspiration.

2.8 Inspiration as Inspiring Affects[229]

2.8.1 The Affects upon the Authors of Scripture (William J. Abraham)

William J. Abraham (1947-) teaches at Perkins School of Theology of Southwestern Methodist University. He seeks to approach the question of inspiration from an evangelical and, particularly, a Methodist, perspective.[230] Abraham sharply distinguishes between revelation and inspiration. The latter Abraham understands, after the model of the relationship between humans, as the inspiring affects of God upon the biblical writers and other authors.

---

[229] Both the theologians who see inspiration as involving "inspiring affects," William J. Abraham and Kern Robert Trembath, accept a tripartite structure of inspiration which includes an agent, a medium, and recipients of inspiration. As neither the agent nor the recipients of inspiration seem to be where inspiration is to be located, this study has adopted the medium of inspiration as the location of inspiration. Inspiration, then, describes the inspiring affects of a particular medium upon its recipients. If the entire structure of inspiration is seen at its locus in these two authors, their corresponding theories must be described differently from that which is here presented.

[230] For Abraham's evaluation of some modern Methodist theories of inspiration see William J. Abraham, "Inspiration, Revelation and Divine Action: A Study in Modern Methodist Theology." Wesleyan Theological Journal, 19/2 (Fall, 1984), 38-51.

Revelation

The starting-point for a consideration of revelation, according to Abraham, is neither the Bible or experience but that of the everyday use of this term. Revelation is used, in this context, of the relation between people: it is people who make themselves known. The idea of revelation is "polymorphous." It is achieved with and through the actions of others.[231] This starting-point is important for a consideration of revelation as used of God. As in the human situation, divine revelation is polymorphous. One cannot approach this revelation apart from the activity through which God reveals himself.[232]

Given that God's revelation involves a variety of activities, Abraham proceeds to indicate three aspects of revelation. It includes miracles, the incarnation and divine speaking.[233] The last of these is especially important for an understanding of Abraham's theory of inspiration. Speaking is essential to divine revelation as God does not have a body and, therefore, cannot communicate through it. In the biblical material one finds an author like Paul speaking of the divine will as directly communicated to him. While, according to Abraham, all this material is not to be taken at face value because of the process of editing and interpretation, it cannot be denied that God really did communicate His will to specific people. Although the mode of this communication cannot be known, it is because God spoke that what He has

---

[231] William J. Abraham, Divine Revelation and the Limits of Historical Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University, 1982, pp. 10-11. Among reviews of this work are those of James Barr in Scottish Journal of Theology, 36 (1983), 247-50; Francis Schüssler Fiorenza in Interpretation, 34 (1985), 97-98; Peter R. Powell, Jr in Christian Century, 100 (1983), 465-66; Donald K. McKim, "Reaffirming Revelation." The Reformed Journal, 33/12 (December, 1983), 23-24.

[232] Ibid., p. 13.

[233] Ibid., pp. 14-66.

done and what His purposes are can be known.[234]

This communication, however, is not to be understood as inspiration. Abraham is emphatic in this regard and asserts that the essential problem with what he calls "deductive" theories of inspiration is a confusion of divine speaking with inspiration.[235]

Inspiration

In *The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, (1981)[236] Abraham develops his understanding of inspiration as the inspiring affects of God upon the writers of Scripture as well as upon other authors beyond the boundaries of the Bible. Abraham proposes an analogical approach which seeks to understand the actions of God by beginning with analogous actions in human agents. He chooses as his illustration the relation between a teacher and a student. There are a number of characteristics of a teacher's inspiration of students. This inspiration will vary in degree depending among the ability and situation of the student and it will engage the capacities of the student making that person more than merely a passive listener. Because the student is subject to a variety of influences mistakes are inevitable. The inspiration of a teacher upon a student is done in consonance with other activities and its effects will be difficult to determine. The content of the work of students who experience such inspiration will display a degree of unity and will not be radically different from the

---

[234] Ibid., pp. 15-21.

[235] William J. Abraham, The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981, p. 37.

[236] Several reviews of this book are D. A. Carson, "Three Books on the Bible: A Critical Review." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 26 (1983), 337-47; John N. Oswalt in The Asbury Seminarian, 37 (1982), 47-50; C. C. Ryrie in Bibliotheca Sacra, 139 (1982), 183-84.

perspective of the teacher.[237]

This paradigm is important for an adequate conception of divine inspiration in that inspiration is seen as "a unique, irreducible activity that takes place between personal agents, one of whom, the inspirer, makes a definite objective difference to the work of the other, the inspired, without obliterating or rendering redundant the native activity of the other."[238] Also, inspiration is viewed as something that is accomplished in consonance with other acts of a person.[239]

Before he integrates these aspects of inspiration into his theory of divine inspiration, Abraham conditions his understanding of divine inspiration, as distinct from human. The inspiration of God upon the biblical authors was primarily by his actions which make manifest his purpose. As well, since God is omniscient his inspiration is intentional in a way that inspiration by a human agent is not. Finally, because God does not exist within the spatial and temporal world, assertions about the working of his inspiration will be difficult to demonstrate.[240]

Divine inspiration, then, is the action of God which is analogous with that of human agents in that it involves the influence of one agent upon the work of another and, at the same time, is achieved in consonance with other actions of those agents. Abraham defines his concept of inspiration as follows:

> It is through his revelatory and saving acts as well as through his personal dealings with individuals and groups that God inspired his people to write and collate what we now know as the Bible. Inspiration is not an activity that should be experientially separated from these other acts that God performed in the past. As a matter of logic, inspiration is a

---

[237] Abraham, Divine Inspiration, pp. 63-65.

[238] Ibid., p. 65.

[239] Ibid.

[240] Ibid., pp. 65-76.

unique activity of God that cannot be defined in terms of his other acts or activity, but as a matter of fact he inspires in, with, and through his special revelatory acts and through his personal guidance of those who wrote and put together the Bible.[241]

There are several implications of Abraham's theory of inspiration. In regard to the nature of the Bible, Abraham affirms that it is a potentially errant but reliable record of the saving acts of God. Historical study may demonstrate factual errors in Scripture, however, it is reliable as the agent of inspiration is God, who is infallible. Also, inspiration is clearly, in this view, distinguished from divine speaking. This approach to inspiration allows, as well, a significant place for critical study. A final implication is that inspiration includes the influence of God upon people outside the boundaries of the production of Scripture.[242]

Abraham's Use of 2 Timothy 3:15-16 and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Abraham touches on 2 Timothy 3:16a twice in the course of *The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture*. The first reference to this text is in his discussion of the concept of inspiration when he seeks to demonstrate the meaning of the term "inspire." In this context, Abraham begins by noting that the literal meaning of the Greek word is "'God-breathed.'" He then states:

> Virtually all translations express the sense of this by means of the phrase 'inspired by God'. This is entirely correct in that it is in keeping with the etymology of the English verb 'inspire', which is, in fact, derived from the Latin verb *spirare, 'to breathe'*. Our English verb 'inspire' therefore supplies quite nearly what is required by the Greek.[243]

Here the English verb is presented as equivalent to the Greek adjective.

---

[241] Ibid., p. 67.

[242] Ibid., pp. 68-73

[243] Ibid., p. 63.

The second reference to 2 Timothy 3:16a comes in the chapter which deals specifically with exegetical matters. Abraham makes several affirmations about what this text does not say. It does not present an articulated concept of inspiration nor does it indicate the words of Scripture are those of God. Inerrancy is not mentioned. This text does, however, indicate that the content of the Scripture is primarily concerned with moral and spiritual matters. "Scripture," according to Abraham, "is centrally to be seen not so much as a book of divine truths but more as a means of grace."[244] He goes on to affirm that Paul is not speaking in this text of the autographs of the Scriptures, but of the Greek Old Testament that Timothy, as a Jew, would have had. It differed from the Hebrew original. When Paul speaks of inspiration, he speaks of the inspiration of the present texts rather than the autographs, a fact which may be seen in the use of the present tense which is found in modern translations of this verse.[245]

Abraham has only one paragraph on 2 Peter 1:20-21, again indicating both what is and what is not said. These verses do not indicate, in his perspective, that the words of the Bible are directly from God or even that the men who spoke were addressed by Him. There is no discussion of autographs, the speaking of God, or inerrancy. The significant point is the initiative that God took in the direction of the prophets. What the prophets said did not originate with humans.[246]

Inspiration in the work of Abraham, then, is that unique activity of God which is analogous to the inspiration of human agents upon other humans. It shares with human inspiration the characteristics of influencing the work of another without rendering null the action of the one influenced and is, as well,

---

[244] Ibid., pp. 93-94.

[245] Ibid., p. 94.

[246] Ibid., p. 94.

an achievement that is realized with other acts of the agent. It is distinct from human inspiration in that the divine inspiration of the biblical writers is primarily through the acts of God and is both intentional and difficult to demonstrate in a space-time world.

2.8.2 The Affects On the Readers of the Bible
(Kern Robert Trembath)

Kern Robert Trembath, who has been influenced by Abraham's thought, moves the locus of inspiration from those who prepared the Bible to those who read it. Biblical inspiration, in Trembath's understanding, is the increased comprehension of God which comes through the reading of the Bible. It is not the affects of God's acts on those who prepared the Bible which is in view but the inspiring affects of the Bible on its (contemporary) readers.

Revelation

Trembath's theory of divine revelation begins with and is shaped by human beings who are the receptors of this revelation. Divine revelation concerns not a particular content but, rather, "divine revelation is what constitutes us as human beings and thus formally distinguishes us form all other known beings."[247] At the outset of the presentation of his understanding of revelation Trembath develops several ideas. First, his methodological starting point is with the concept of the *imago dei*; by virtue of which one is allowed to begin the study of divine revelation with its receivers. Second, Trembath presumes "that God intended the material world to eventuate in the possibility of morality—that is, knowledge, love, and hope—as human beings now express that possibility."[248] Third, that which uniquely distinguishes human beings from

---

[247] Kern Robert Trembath, <u>Divine Revelation</u>. New York: Oxford, 1991, p. 115.

[248] Ibid., p. 117.

all other beings is the capacity of "moralness." This is not to be understood as moral goodness but more fundamentally as the capacity for good or evil.[249]

In the development of his thought Trembath claims that the capacity for good and evil (moralness) is essential to humanness and is related to divine revelation. Humans are characterized by goodness is that they are able to know, to love, to hope and to live in community. All these aspects of goodness, are important with respect to revelation as "divine inspiration . . . in a nutshell, is 'expressed goodness.'"[250] Revelation is a relationship between God and people "that is so constitutive of both God and human beings that we might call it an ontological relationship."[251] While the immediate ground of humanness is goodness, the more distant grounds "is the self-revealing God who is (among other things) the Goodness that moralness presupposes and revelation conveys and expresses."[252] He indicates essential aspects of his idea of the self-revealing God and the nature of revelation when he says:

> To those whose hearts incline them to the pursuit, revelation reveals because goodness beckons them to itself, not as an abstract or lifeless thing, but instead as the ultimate Personal Goodness of reality whom believers call God. The possibility of our moralness is our contact with God, and expressed goodness is our response to that contact. . . . our being good is both a response to divine revelation and an ongoing expression of it. God is both source and object of revelation, of expressed goodness.[253]

Divine revelation is, then, the self-disclosure of God which is found in human existence and, especially, in human goodness. It is in human beings as

---

249 Ibid., pp. 114-18.

250 Ibid., p. 141.

251 Ibid., p. 143.

252 Ibid.

253 Ibid.

they live as humans that God is revealed.[254]

Inspiration

Trembath's theory of biblical inspiration is articulated in *Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration* (1987).[255]   His theory is constructed on the acceptance of Abraham's tripartite (versus bipartite) articulation of the essential elements of inspiration. Trembath explains this structure when he states:

> In any inspired act it is possible to identify an initiating agent, a medium, and a receiving agent. In general, then, an inspired act would be one in which the receiving agent's life is enhanced by the initiating agent by means of the medium in ways which are appropriate to that medium.[256]

This tripartite structure is integral to his discussion of inspiration and, in fact, forms the outline for his consideration of biblical inspiration. His theory also draws a clear distinction between divine inspiration and biblical inspiration, with the latter being a subdivision of the former. Divine inspiration describes the reality that God is the ultimate ground of all acts of knowing.[257] The concept and argument involved in this affirmation are very closely related to what has already been seen in Trembath's presentation of divine revelation. Biblical inspiration is the enhanced knowledge or understanding in the experience of the believer which is mediated by the Bible.[258] In following Trembath's discussion of the nature of biblical inspiration, it is imperative that one

---

[254] Ibid., pp. 166-70.

[255] Kern Robert Trembath, Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration. New York: Oxford, 1987.

[256] Ibid., p. 115.

[257] Ibid., p. 109.

[258] Ibid., pp. 103, 111.

distinguish this inspiration from divine inspiration.

Trembath begins his articulation of his understanding of biblical inspiration with the receivers of that inspiration, who are human beings. There are, according to Trembath, three themes which often reappear in evangelical thought concerning anthropology. These are that human beings are God's creatures; that they are made in his image; and that they are sinful and unable to restore the ruptured relationship between themselves and God. Among the implications of these assertions for biblical inspiration is that biblical inspiration is the experience of people mediated through the Bible in which the consequences of their rebellion are overcome. Human beings, who in their moral freedom have rebelled against God, are inspired in their study of the Bible. That is, they come to an understanding, which they realize does not originate with themselves, of the adequacy of God's character to restore the ruptured relationship with him.[259] Trembath writes in this regard:

> In that reading [of the Bible] a community recognizes the voice or word of God addressed to it and recognizes the voice or word as speaking the truth about it in ways which it is ultimately incapable of originating. Thus, the phenomena of biblical inspiration, as all other instances of inspiration, is one of recognition, enhancement, and response to a mediated message.[260]

Trembath reinterprets the evangelical understanding of verbal and plenary inspiration. He recognizes that verbal inspiration has been used to indicate that the words of Scripture were selected by God and that the affirmation of verbal inspiration was intended as a statement that inspiration does not begin with it human agents. If God is to be known, this knowledge must originate with him and not human beings. Trembath believes that this purpose is admirable, although he rejects verbal inspiration. It is inadequate in that it rests certainty on words rather than, correctly, on mental judgments. It is

---

[259] Ibid., pp. 77-79.

[260] Ibid., p. 81.

also inadequate in that a verbal theory of inspiration is always, in reality, a theory of divine dictation.[261]   Verbal inspiration speaks, rather, of the human response to God, particularly with regard to the salvation of which the Bible speaks.   Neither salvation or "its inspiration within persons" originates with humans.[262]

Trembath also reinterprets plenary inspiration. Plenary inspiration has been used as a designation of the inspiration of the entirety of the Bible and the Bible only. The problem with this conception, according to Trembath, is that it is not the actual experience of the church. When one examines salvation in the human experience, one finds that diverse groups will relate their own experience of salvation to the Bible's description of it in various ways. Plenary inspiration describes the spectrum of perspectives within human experience in the relationship of the experience of salvation with the material of the Bible.[263] Plenary inspiration is "a reflection on the process by which a variety of Christian groups validates the Christianness of their experiences of salvation by means of images drawn from the Bible which are meaningful to their particular group."[264]

Summarizing his view of the nature of biblical inspiration, Trembath affirms that the reference is to

> the enhancement of one's understanding of God brought about instrumentally through the Bible . . . . In other words, "the inspiration of the Bible" refers to the enhancement which the Bible instrumentally causes in persons and not to the Bible itself as the terminus or locus of that enhancement.   In grammatical terms, my theory views "the inspiration of the Bible" as a subjective genitive rather than an objective genitive. This means that the uniqueness of the Bible for Christian life and theology is rooted not in its inspiration, but rather in that to which it

---

[261] Ibid., pp. 88-91.

[262] Ibid., p. 91.

[263] Ibid., pp. 92-95.

[264] Ibid., p. 95.

inspires us, namely a greater understanding and awareness, and fidelity to, the threefold God to whom the Bible bears witness.[265]

Biblical inspiration, thus understood, is a subdivision of divine inspiration. The latter describes the reality that all human goodness is ultimately derived from God. Trembath claims that in observing the experience of human beings and, particulary, the characteristic that they are beings who ask questions, one discovers that humans may move beyond the limits of their experience when they receive answers to the questions they have raised. It is the element of transcendence which is important as it demonstrates that human beings can come to a more developed understanding through answers which originate externally to themselves as questioners. The answers which they will normally choose are those which appear to be "good." It is on the basis of God's character as the ultimate good that people, consciously or unconsciously, choose between evil and good. In these choices God's character is the final grounds for the capacity of human beings to transcend their own finiteness. God inspires all such acts of understanding, not in that he is the immediate cause of these acts, but that they are finally rooted in him. This grounding is divine inspiration.[266]

Biblical inspiration is related to the former in four ways. First, biblical inspiration exemplifies divine inspiration. Since all acts which move beyond present limitations are inspired in that they are rooted in God's goodness, biblical inspiration, in one sense, is "saying no more than that God operates through the Bible in the same mode that he operates through any other means."[267] Second, biblical inspiration is divine inspiration in regard to the experience of salvation; it is the confession of the Christian of his reception of

---

[265] Ibid., p. 103.

[266] Ibid., pp. 105-09.

[267] Ibid., p. 110.

salvation through Christ. Biblical inspiration becomes, then, "an abbreviated reference to 'the experience of salvation by God through Christ as mediated through the Bible.'"[268] Third "biblical inspiration is normative divine inspiration with respect to human salvation." Only that experience which can be demonstrated to be in accordance with the salvation described in the Bible will be accepted by the church as originating with God, biblical inspiration is the way that the church describes the experience of salvation as originating with God.[269] Finally, biblical inspiration is not only normative divine inspiration in regard to salvation, but it is also "foundational." The purpose here is to differentiate between books of the Bible which have had limited influence and later writings which have had significant influence. "'Christian Scripture' is defined as that which is normative and foundational for the Christian church, and 'biblical inspiration' is how the church accounts for the common experience of God's salvation on the part of Christian believers throughout history."[270]

Biblical inspiration in Trembath's thought, then, is different from divine inspiration. Divine inspiration is the reality that all acts of knowing are ultimately rooted in God himself. Biblical inspiration is the developed knowledge of God mediated through the Bible to its readers.

Trembath's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

Trembath makes no reference to either of the texts which are the concentration of this study. In the case of 2 Timothy 3:16a, specifically with respect to the term *theopneustos*, this is by deliberate design. Trembath cites two reasons for his exclusion of a consideration of *theopneustos* in his work on inspiration. The first is the problem of the meaning and the reference of this

---

268 Ibid., p. 111.

269 Ibid.

270 Ibid., p. 112.

term. Trembath believes that despite the attention the word has received its limited occurrence in ancient literature makes it difficult to determine what was intended by it. This limitation is such that the term itself cannot be a significant factor in the consideration of inspiration. Also the particular "Scripture" to which this word refers cannot be determined. Various possible references will, of necessity, eventuate in various meanings of *theopneustos.* In the absence of an adequate means to determine the reference of this term it cannot be employed in the discussion of inspiration.

The second reason why Trembath did not consider *theopneustos* is because of his intention to speak of biblical rather than scriptural inspiration. Trembath draws a distinction between the terms "Bible," which refers to the canonical collection, and "Scripture" which accents the church's acceptance of this collection as authoritative for the church. Inspiration, when used of Scripture, cannot have the primary sense of originating with God as this would be an unnecessary repetition. Rather, it is concerned with a particular kind of inspiration. The crucial difference in whether the Bible is viewed as "Bible" or "Scripture" has to do with whether salvation is present or absent.[271] Trembath has written about *biblical inspiration* (rather than scriptural) as he wishes to consider

> how it is that the Bible becomes Scripture for the believing community, that is, how a particular collection of books serves as the ultimate means through which God awakens salvation within the community that is then called the church.[272]

This is consistent with Trembath's perspective which sees biblical inspiration as located in the reader's developed understanding of God which is mediated through the Bible and not in the Bible itself.

---

[271] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[272] Ibid., p. 7.

2.9 Inspiration As God's Indirect Self-Revelation
in Human Encounter
(Charles H. Kraft)

Charles H. Kraft (1932-) argues that inspiration is an aspect of God's leading of people which involves his continuing self-revelation in dynamic interaction with human beings. It is, primarily, the process by which God indirectly reveals himself through people to other people and, secondarily, the recorded accounts of these encounters.[273]

Revelation

Revelation, in Kraft's theory, is God's self-manifestation in dynamic interaction with humans. Interaction is the primary method which God uses in revelation: "God reveals himself by interacting with the receivers of his revelation (human beings). And whenever he interacts with humans, he, like a human being, reveals something of himself."[274] God has taken the initiative to bridge the gap between himself and humans, employing principles of communication which govern the relation between persons. Among these principles are an emphasis on the receptor and communication through human beings. This revelation takes place within a particular cultural and linguistic context and favours "human-being-to-human-being interaction within the receptor's frame of reference."[275]

As revelation is primarily interaction between God and people, it is dynamic rather than static. Any time the message of God is communicated

---

[273] Charles H. Kraft, Christianity in Culture. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979, pp. 194, 212. An extensive review of this work is Carl F. H. Henry, "The Cultural Relativizing of Revelation." Trinity Journal, NS, I (1980), 153-64.

[274] Ibid., p. 170.

[275] Ibid., p. 171.

through new people or means there are new things which occur. These new communication events may involve new revelation for

> when these communicational events convey accurate messages from God they may stimulate genuinely revelational meanings within the heads of the participants in these events-meanings that have never before happened in just that way in history.[276]

Kraft's dynamic theory of revelation seeks to maintain the informational character of revelation while emphasizing a stimulus to respond as an essential constituent of God's self-manifestation:

> Revealing results when personal beings interact with God. One important type of revelational interaction occurs when persons under the guidance of God's Spirit interact with the products of previous revelational activity (e.g. the Scriptures). The desired output of God's revelational activity is that the meanings stimulated in the receptor's minds correspond with the intention of God for them at that time and place.[277]

Kraft's dynamic view of revelation has certain implications for his perspective on the function of the Bible. Scripture is a "yardstick" for determining that validity of that which claims to be revelation. It measures contemporary revelation to discover if it is dynamically equivalent to that which is found within it:

> If contemporary behaviour is functionally equivalent in meaning within its cultural context to what the Bible shows to have been acceptable (even though perhaps, subideal) behaviour in its cultural context, the measurement has proved positive.[278]

Kraft does not expect that all people will recognize the same meaning in particular passages of the Bible, indeed the influence of culture, personal

---

[276] Ibid., p. 178.

[277] Ibid., p. 184.

[278] Ibid., p. 187.

experience and sin mitigate against this possibility. Rather, "the Bible clearly shows that God is content to accept human behaviour, including understandings of himself and his truth, that fall within . . . a 'range of acceptable variation.'"[279] The Bible is the yardstick by which this variation is measured to determine if it is "reasonably equivalent to the original intent but not corresponding exactly."[280]

The other function of the Bible with regard to revelation is that of a "tether." Just as a tether operates to set a certain radius and boundary, the Bible functions at the present time to set the boundaries within which divine-human interaction must occur in the contemporary context.[281]

Inspiration

As has been indicated, inspiration is, for Kraft, one aspect of God's "leading" of people. God has a constant method for working with humanity. It is the dynamic revelation of himself. This process may also be called "leading" and inspiration is one aspect of this activity of God. Kraft writes:

> I see God in constant, effective interaction with his people both individually and corporately to bring about ends that he and his people mutually agree upon. A key to this leading activity is the process of subjective—individual revelation . . . .[282]

In this divine direction God himself is always the leader, though he manifests himself in different ways which engender particular responses on the part of humanity. Leading is also related to the needs of humanity. These needs,

---

[279] Ibid., p. 188.

[280] Ibid.

[281] Ibid., pp. 191-92.

[282] Ibid., p. 195.

which are often unstated by the people involved, are usually not addressed directly by God but indirectly through concerned humans who speak for him. This communication takes place within the particular context in which the need arises. Certain selected accounts of the interaction between God and humans, which is his leading, have been preserved in the Bible.[283] Kraft's understanding of inspiration focuses primarily on this divine-human interaction in divine leading and only secondarily on the written accounts of it.

Kraft emphasizes two aspects of the Bible. The Bible is, first, an "inspired classic casebook." It is the written record of selected interactions between God and humans. It is a casebook in that it is "a collection of descriptions of illustrative real-life exemplifications of the principles to be taught."[284] It does not preserve all special revelation but represents the selective collection of certain records of divine-human interaction which were first used and then selected and published. As a casebook, the Bible is primarily intended to describe rather than to be hortatory.[285]

A second aspect of the Bible is that it is a human word as well as a divine. As a human word, it speaks from the viewpoint of humans even when the communication of God is most direct. As a divine word, the Bible is inspired by God who, however, is not limited to it in his communication with his people.[286]

Kraft seeks to articulate a dynamic view of the inspiration of Scripture which emphasizes the similarities between the leading of God which produced the Scripture and other divine leading of human beings. With respect to the process of inspiration in which divine-human interaction produces inspired

---

[283] Ibid., pp. 195-97.

[284] Ibid., p. 198.

[285] Ibid., pp. 198-202.

[286] Ibid., pp. 202-05.

statements, Kraft believes that the Bible shows the dynamic interaction between God and humans which continues into the present and "in which we are invited to participate in our time and culture in a way dynamically equivalent."[287] "This interaction," he writes, "has the potential, at least, of the kind of output that God's Spirit will lead others to perceive as God's revelation to them."[288] Inspiration, then, is a continuing process of divine-human interaction that produces material which others recognize as God's revelation of himself.

In summarizing his view of scriptural inspiration Kraft asserts aspects of biblical inspiration, only one of which is unique to the Scripture. They are:

> (1) the original interactions between God and humans participated in the same kind of inspiration that God's leading and a person's positive response to it always do (2 Pet. 1:21—God led people to speak), (2) God led certain persons to record these divine-human interactions (2 Tim. 3:16—God led certain people to write), (3) God has led the church (and Israel before it with regard to the Old Testament) to preserve and employ these particular materials in a unique way in their attempts to discern and follow God's leading, and (4) the Holy Spirit is active in interacting with the readers and hearers of these materials.[289]

Only the third aspect of inspiration is unique to Scripture, therefore, continuing inspiration is to be expected and is an essential aspect of God's leading of his people.

Kraft's Use of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

In Kraft's work, virtually no exegetical consideration is given to the question of revelation and inspiration as presented in the Bible in general, or in 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21. These texts are mentioned only in passing. The only place where Kraft develops their sense at all is in the section

---

[287] Ibid., p. 207.

[288] Ibid.

[289] Ibid., p. 213.

in which he describes the various ways in which Scripture is inspired which has just been cited. There he refers to 2 Peter 1:21 as an indication that God directed people to speak and 2 Timothy 3:16a that he directed them to write.[290]

Chapter two has identified and presented twelve contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration using a method which organizes these theories according to the locus of inspiration. An objective of this study is to analyze these theories in light of an evangelical exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21. That exegesis is the concern of chapters three through six.

---

[290] Ibid.

3 Introduction to the Exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

3.1 Literary Character

Second Timothy and Second Peter may both be described as epistles. The consideration of the literary character of these letters and the consequent implication for exegesis has undergone a certain evolution in this century. Early in the present century Deissmann, on the basis of observations on papyrus letters, formulated a distinction between letters ("real-letters") and epistles ("non-real letters");[1] he placed writings of Paul into the former category and 2 Peter in the latter.[2] Recent genre criticism with respect to the nature of "epistles" has moved away from Deissmann distinctions and tended toward either functional classification or rhetorical analysis of these New Testament writings. The former emphasizes the function of particular letters while the latter considers these works from the perspective of their rhetorical character.[3] This consideration is limited to the functional aspects of the literary genre of 2 Timothy and 2 Peter.

---

[1] Stanley K. Stowers, Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity. Library of Early Christianity, ed. Wayne A. Meeks, Philadelphia, Westminster, 1986, pp. 17-18.

[2] Ibid. Cf. Craig L. Blomberg, "New Testament Genre Criticism for the 1990s." Themelios,15 (1990), 43. For Deissmann's discussion see, Adolf Deissmann, Licht vom Osten. Tübingen: Mohr, 1923, pp. 194-95. For criticisms of Deissmann's classifications see, Stowers, Letter Writing, pp. 18-20; Blomberg, "New Testament Genre Criticism," 43; Richard N. Longenecker, "On the Form, Function, and Authority of the New Testament Letters," Scripture and Truth. eds. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, p. 103.

[3] Blomberg, "New Testament Genre Criticism," 43-44. Cf. Craig L. Blomberg, "The Diversity of Literary Genres in the New Testament," New Testament Criticism and Interpretation. eds. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991, pp. 517-21.

Longenecker has proposed a distinction in the consideration of the genre of *epistle* between *pastoral letters* like 2 Timothy and 2 Peter, which are "real letters dealing pastorally with issues then current," and *tractate letters,* represented by Romans, which "were originally intended to be more than strictly pastoral responses to specific sets of issues arising in particular places."[4] Both types must be viewed as components of the genre *apostolic letters* which effectuate apostolic presence with their recipients and bear apostolic authority.[5]

2 Timothy and 2 Peter also reflect secondary literary genres. 2 Timothy contains certain literary features of parenesis which has been variously defined.[6] Dibelius viewed it as "discourse characterized by aggregations of traditional ethical exhortations," which do not reflect a single consistent perspective.[7] The evidence of 2 Timothy suggests, however, that parenesis should be understood as "as conscious exhortation to or dissuasion from a specific action or attitude, often incorporating antithesis and personal example as part of the persuasive argument."[8] As parenetic discourse 2 Timothy

---

[4] Longenecker, "The Form of the New Testament Letters," 102-06.

[5] John L. White, "Saint Paul and the Apostolic Letter Tradition." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 45 (1983), 433-44.

[6] For the pseudo-Libanius (300-600 A.D.) description of parenetic style see, Jerome D. Quinn, "Parenesis and the Pastoral Epistles: Lexical Observations Bearing on the Nature of the Sub-Genre and Soundings of its Role in Socialization and Liturgies." Semeia, 50 (1990), 191.

[7] David C. Verner, The Household of God. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, No. 71, ed. William Baird, Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983, p. 112. For Verner's consideration of parenesis and criticism of Dibelius' position see, pp. 112-25.

[8] Blomberg, "New Testament Genre Criticism," 43. Bailey and Vander Broek define parenesis as "ethical exhortation, instruction concerning how or how not to live." James L. Bailey and Lyle D. Vander Broek, Literary Forms in

manifests certain characteristics which are distinctive to this particular literary genre.[9]

A significant literary genre of both 2 Timothy and 2 Peter is that of *testament*. Bauckham claims that this genre had two primary characteristics; it contained ethical exhortations and "revelations about the future."[10]

Both 2 Timothy and 2 Peter, then, are apostolic letters. The apostolic letter allowed communication at a distance.[11] It was a means by which an apostle effectuated his apostolic authority in the churches. Funk claims that Paul viewed his presence among his churches under three distinct but associated aspects. These include the apostolic letter, the apostolic delegate and his presence in person. The letter was a means by which though physically absent from the congregation the apostolic presence and consequent authority

---

the New Testament. Louisville, KN: Westminster/John Knox, 1992, p. 62.

[9] For various indications of the characteristics of parenesis or parenetic letters see, Bailey and Vander Broek, Literary Forms, p. 62; Stowers, Letter Writing, pp. 94-96; Abraham J. Malherbe, Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook. Library of Early Christianity, ed. Wayne A Meeks, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986, pp. 124-25; D. Schroeder, "Parenesis," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. supplementary volume, ed. Keith Crim, Nashville: Abingdon, 1976, p. 643; Benjamin Fiore, The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles. Analecta Biblica, 105, Rome: Biblical Institute, 1986, pp. 216-19.

[10] Richard J. Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter. Vol. 50, Word Biblical Commentary, eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, Waco, TX: Word, 1983, pp. 131. Two studies which antedate Bauckham include Johannes Munch, "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique," Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne. ed. J. J. von Allmen, Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950, pp. 155-70; Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology. trans. John Marsh, London: SCM, 1955, pp. 344-47.

[11] D. A. Carson, Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris. An Introduction to the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992, pp. 231-32.

was effectuated.[12] In the words of Longenecker, "the pastoral letters of the New Testament . . . were meant to convey the apostolic presence, teaching and authority."[13]

Two interpretative issues related to the question of the literary character of these epistles may be mentioned. One is the contemporary relevance of occasional documents which may contain material which is limited in its relevance to the particular situation addressed while other aspects are supracultural.[14] Although extensive consideration of this issue is beyond the limits of this study, the position of this work is that even though 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 reflect specific occasions they are not limited in their relevance to these particular situations.[15] The other issue is the significance of literary genre for the question of the authenticity of these epistles. Bauckham

---

[12] Robert W. Funk, "The Apostolic *Parousia*: Form and Significance," Christian History and Interpretation. eds. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr, Cambridge, Cambridge University, 1967, pp. 249, 266.

[13] Longenecker, "The Form of the New Testament Letters," p. 104.

[14] For a statement of the problem see, Grant R. Osborne, The Hermeneutical Spiral. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991, p. 256.

[15] With respect to the situation of 2 Timothy, this study follows the work of George Knight in seeing this epistle as written while Paul was imprisoned in Rome and shortly before his death. 2 Timothy has the twofold purpose of exhorting Timothy to suffer for the Gospel and encouraging him to hold onto the message of the apostle. See, George W. Knight, III, The Pastoral Epistles. The New International Greek Testament Commentary, eds. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, Grand Rapids/Carlisle: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1992, pp. 9-11. The occasion of 2 Peter, in the perspective of the present work, is the imminent death of Peter. This apostle, aware that he will soon die, exhorts his readers with respect to their faith and conduct. This exhortation is, at least in part, in order that they will be prepared to resist false teachers who will come. See, Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction. 4th ed., Leicester/Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990, pp. 843-44.

argues that the genre of *testament* would have been recognized by the recipients of 2 Peter as fictitious. The nature of the genre would serve as an indication that the epistle's author was not the apostle identified. This along with other factors is, for Bauckham, an argument against the authenticity of this letter.[16] The significance of literary genre for the authenticity of an epistle is considered in the following discussion of authorship.

3.2 Authorship

The authenticity of both 2 Timothy and 2 Peter has been extensively challenged in contemporary biblical study. The general consensus of current scholarship is that neither 2 Timothy, in which authorship is ascribed to Paul (2 Tim. 1:1), nor 2 Peter, which presents Peter as its author (2 Pet. 1:1), is entirely the genuine literary work of the person named in the text. The rejection of the authenticity of these epistles is important for exegesis as it may have implications for the exegetical conclusions drawn from 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21.

3.2.1 Authorship of 2 Timothy

Biblical scholarship groups the consideration of the authenticity of 2 Timothy with that of the other Pastoral Epistles.[17] Questions concerning the authenticity of these epistles did not appear until the early years of the

---

[16] Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 133-35.

[17] This presentation assumes a common authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, although this assumption is not accepted without question. Cf. Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "2 Timothy Contrasted with 1 Timothy and Titus." Revue Biblique, 98 (1991), 403-18. For the origin of the term see, Carson, Moo, and Morris, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 359.

nineteenth century.[18] Since that time the consensus of modern scholarship has moved to a general rejection of Pauline authorship of these epistles, although some accept certain fragments as genuine and others view the Pastorals as Pauline in their entirety.[19] 2 Timothy presents the least problems in its accord with accepted Pauline letter patterns.[20] When it is considered in isolation from the other Pastorals, the common arguments against its authenticity may not be strong.[21]

Four general problems have been cited as the grounds for the rejection of Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. A first is that the external evidence for these epistles from the early church is limited. Possible use of the Pastorals by Ignatius and Polycarp cannot be demonstrated and this corpus is absent from the Marcion canon as well as the Chester Beatty Papyri (P[46]). Tatian accepted Titus but neither 1 or 2 Timothy.[22]

---

[18] Werner Georg Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 17th ed., Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973, p. 327, [ET, Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, rev. ed., trans. Howard Clark Kee, Nashville: Abingdon, 1984, p. 371].

[19] For a summary of authors espousing various perspectives regarding Pauline authorship see, Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 327, [ET, Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 371]; Thomas Oden, First and Second Timothy and Titus. Interpretation, ed. James Luther Mays, Louisville, KN: John Knox, 1989, p. 15; Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 22.

[20] Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe. Vol. 13, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Günther Bornkamm, 4th ed., Tübingen, Mohr, 1966, p. 1, [ET, Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles. Hermenia, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972, p. 1].

[21] See, Murphy O'Connor, "2 Timothy," 404.

[22] Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 2, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 1-2].

A second reason for the rejection of Pauline authorship of the Pastorals is that the situation presented with respect to their author, addressees and recipients cannot be reconciled with the genuine Pauline letters and Acts. The description of the life of Paul found in the Pastorals requires a second imprisonment, while 1 Clement describes only one.[23] Likewise the manner in which Paul's co-workers are addressed is problematic for apostolic authorship.[24] The situation of the churches also presents difficulties. Both an institutionalized clergy and an established order for widows are understood as reflecting a time in the life of the church posterior to Paul.[25]

A third problem is the theology of these letters. It is claimed that certain themes present in Paul are not clearly developed, while others are to an uncharacteristic extent. Distinctive Pauline theology is modified,[26] and the style of the theological polemic is unique.[27] The opponents envisioned in these epistles are seen as either possessing Jewish Christian and gnostic characteristics, which make their existence in Paul's time impossible, or they

---

[23] Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 2-3, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 3]; Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, pp. 331-33, [ET, Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 375-78].

[24] A. T. Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles. New Century Bible Commentary, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, p. 4.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 3; C. F. D. Moule, Essays in New Testament Interpretation. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1982, p. 119. Cf. John A. Allan, "The 'In Christ' Formula in the Pastoral Epistles." New Testament Studies, 10 (1963-1964), 115-21.

[27] Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 2, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 2].

are treated in an un-Pauline manner.[28]

A fourth problem for the authenticity of the Pastorals is the linguistic character of these epistles in relation to genuine Pauline material. Harrison argued that the vocabulary and certain grammatical characteristics, as well as their style, distinguished these epistles from the Pauline corpus.[29] Grayston and Herdan affirmed that the linguistic evidence, when statistically evaluated, agreed with Harrison's conclusions,[30] while others have rejected Pauline authorship on the basis of the grammar of sentence conclusions.[31]

Those who reject Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles generally follow one of three theories to explain the origin of these letters. Some adopt a fragment theory which asserts that a certain number of genuine Pauline fragments are present in the Pastorals Epistles;[32] others argue for a theory

---

[28] Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 2; [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 3]; Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 335: [ET, Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 380].

[29] P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles. London: Oxford University, 1921, pp. 18-86. Cf. P. N. Harrison, "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered: III. The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." Expository Times, 67 (1955-1956), 77-81.

[30] K. Grayston and G. Herdan, "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics." New Testament Studies, 6 (1959-1960), 1-15. See also, Kenneth J. Neumann, The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, No. 120, eds. David L. Peterson and Charles Talbert, Atlanta: Scholars, 1990, pp. 199-202.

[31] S. Michaelson and A. Q. Morton, "Last Words: A Test of Authorship for Greek Writers." New Testament Studies, 18 (1972), 192-208.

[32] Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, pp. 93, 115-130. The fragment theory was adopted by A. T. Hanson in his Cambridge Bible Commentary, but later rejected. See Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, The Pastoral

which attributes the variations from Pauline style to the work of a secretary;[33] while the majority of scholars who reject Pauline authorship hold that these letters are pseudonymous.[34]

The consideration of Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles by those who affirm such authorship[35] has generally included a review of the witness of these epistles. Direct claim of Pauline authorship of 2 Timothy is found at the outset of the letter (2 Tim. 1:1). The life and situation of the Apostle as well as his relation with and exhortations to the addressee, his co-worker Timothy, are prominent throughout the work (e.g., 2 Tim. 1:1-8). Indeed, the personal references of 2 Timothy 4:9-22 are such that even some who reject direct Pauline authorship of this epistle regard this section as genuine or difficult to otherwise explain.[36] The authenticity of these epistles was almost universally accepted by the church from the middle of the second century until the

---

Letters. The Cambridge Bible Commentary, eds. P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney, J. W. Packer, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1966, p. 6-7; A. T. Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 10-11.

[33] Moule, Essays in New Testament Interpretation, pp. 113-32.

[34] Lewis R. Donelson, Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986, pp. 7-66. For others who hold a pseudonymous origin of the Pastorals see, A. T. Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 11.

[35] As in the case of the rejection of Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, the literature among those who accept such authorship is extensive and cannot be adequately represented in a brief presentation. For several thorough statements defending Pauline authorship see, Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 621-36; Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 21-52; Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, I, 157-214.

[36] Cf. Moule, Essays in New Testament Interpretation, pp. 116-17; C. K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963, pp. 10-11.

beginning of the nineteenth.[37]

Proponents of the authenticity of the Pastorals have responded to each of the general challenges which have been noted. The external evidence for the early existence of the Pastorals has been traced by Bernard to circa A.D. 116 and, perhaps, circa A.D. 95.[38] Kelly claims that "only excessive caution refuses to admit direct dependence" of several of the letters of Ignatius on the Pastoral Epistles.[39] Adequate explanations for their absence from Marcion's canon and P[46] may be found and their attestation may be affirmed to be as good as any other Pauline epistle, with the exception of Romans and 1 Corinthians.[40]

Supporters of authenticity also affirm that the situation of the author, recipients, and churches which is reflected in the Pastorals is not decisive against their authenticity. It is admitted that the imprisonment reflected in 2 Timothy cannot be fit into the Pauline chronology of Acts,[41] therefore, they argue on the basis of internal[42] and external evidence[43] for a release and second imprisonment. This is possible as the outcome of Paul's Acts imprisonment is

---

[37] Oden, First and Second Timothy and Titus, p. 11.

[38] J. H. Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles. 1899; rpt., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980, pp. xi-xxi.

[39] J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Black's New Testament Commentaries, London: Black, 1963, p. 3.

[40] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 3, 13-14.

[41] J. B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays. London: Macmillan, 1904, p. 399.

[42] Cf. Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, I, 121-46.

[43] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 17-19.

not definitively stated.[44] The situation of the recipients of the Pastorals[45] and of the leadership and order of the churches[46] is not inconsistent with Pauline authorship.

With respect to supposed theological differences of content or polemic, advocates of Pauline authorship affirm that it has not been demonstrated that certain theological themes are always present in his letters. As well, some aspects of the theological differences may be accounted for by the changed circumstances reflected in these epistles. Some perceived differences may also be a reflection of an inadequate comprehension by the interpreter.[47]

The identity of the Pauline opponents and the nature of the polemic is not a persuasive argument against an authorship by the Apostle. There is a tendency among both those who reject and those who accept Pauline authorship to see these opponents as reflecting both Jewish Christian and gnostic elements, although supporters of a Pauline origin tend to see less gnostic characteristics or none at all.[48] The similarity of these opponents with

---

[44] Cf. the discussion of F. F. Bruce, New Testament History. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980. pp. 361-64.

[45] Cf. Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 24-25; B. B. Edwards, "The Genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles." Bibliotheca Sacra, 1851; rpt., 150 (1993), 136-37.

[46] Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 14, 16.

[47] See, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 32-38; Donald Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, ed. R. V. G. Tasker, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957, pp. 32-46; Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 16-21.

[48] See, Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, pp. 411-16; Fenton John Anthony Hort, Judaistic Christianity. London: Macmillan, 1904, pp. 130-46; Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. xlv-lvi; Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 10-12; Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, pp. 85-119.

the false teachers described in Colossians[49] argues for the possibility of the existence of this heresy in a time contemporaneous with Paul.[50] The manner in which the opposition is addressed is consistent with a New Testament pattern in which this address varies between churches directly threatened by false teaching and colleagues who are not.[51]

In response to linguistic criticisms of authenticity,[52] the work of Harrison has been criticized on the basis of methodological errors.[53] As possible solutions to the problem of the linguistic differences with other Pauline material, Guthrie cites differences in the subjects under consideration, the influence of the Apostle's age and situation, and the different addressees of these letters.[54]

Supporters of Pauline authorship also criticize various alternatives which have been suggested for their origin. The fragment hypothesis is

---

[49] Cf. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 413.

[50] This assertion assumes, of course, the authenticity of Colossians. For arguments for this authenticity see, Carson, Moo, Morris, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 331-34.

[51] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 26; Cf. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 413.

[52] For critical considerations of those who reject Pauline authorship on linguistic grounds see, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 38-45; Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 607-10; Guthrie, Pastoral Epistles, pp. 212-28; Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, I, 179-200.

[53] Bruce M. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." Expository Times, 70 (1958-1959), 93; cf. John J. O'Rourke, "Some Considerations About Attempts at Statistical Analysis of the Pauline Corpus." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 35 (1973), 486-87.

[54] Guthrie, Pastoral Epistles, p. 228.

problematic,[55] as is that of a secretary.[56] A pseudepigraphical origin is not likely. Examples of pseudepigraphic *letters* from early Jewish and Christian sources are rare and evidence from both the New Testament and the early church suggests that known pseudepigraphical writings were rejected and the practice condemned.[57] Also, certain elements of the Pastoral Epistles are difficult to account for depending on the particular theory adopted.[58]

The authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, then, has been argued and accepted by a number of commentators from various theological perspectives.

3.2.2 Authorship of 2 Peter

Since the beginning of the twentieth century scholarly discussion has been almost unanimous in seeing 2 Peter as pseudepigraphical.[59] Even in recent evangelical thought there has been the suggestion that this question be

---

[55] See, Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 636-39; Guthrie, Pastoral Epistles, 49-52.

[56] See, the discussion in Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 48-49.

[57] Carson, Moo, Morris, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 367-71; Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 46-47; Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 645-46.

[58] Oden, First and Second Timothy and Titus, p. 15.

[59] For a presentation of those who accept Petrine authorship see, Richard J. Bauckham, "2 Peter: An Account of Research," Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. Part II, Principat, 25/5, eds. Wolfgang Hasse and Hildegard Temporini, Berlin: Gruyter, 1988, pp. 3719-20. Cf. Terence V. Smith, Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2/15, eds. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius, Tübingen, Mohr, 1985, pp. 65-66 for both those defending Petrine authorship and those accepting a later date.

reconsidered.60

The external evidence against 2 Peter, both in terms of its limited attestation and its inclusion in the canon, was long regarded as an essential element in the rejection of Petrine authorship of this epistle, however, this argument has almost disappeared from the contemporary discussion.61 This work is said to have been (virtually) unknown in the Christian literature of the second century.62 2 Peter has a canonical history which is seen as problematic. Its status was questioned or rejected and full acceptance as Scripture was either relatively late or, in the Syrian Church, never fully achieved.63

The theological concepts which are expressed in 2 Peter are also viewed as evidence that this work did not originate with the Apostle Peter. Certain ideas are Hellenistic in nature and cannot have originated with

---

60 See, Blomberg, "The Diversity of Literary Genres in the New Testament," pp. 522-23.

61 Cf. recent commentaries on 2 Peter which do not consider the external evidence with respect to this epistle. Examples are Jerome H. Neyrey, 2 Peter, Jude. Vol. 37C, The Anchor Bible, eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1993; Eric Fuchs and Pierre Raymond, La deuxième épître de Saint Pierre, l'épître de Saint Jude. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, 2d series, 13b, ed. J. Zumstein, 2d ed., Genève: Labor et Fides, 1988.

62 Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 382, [ET, Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 433]. Chase argues that second century literature cannot shown to be dependent on 2 Peter in F. H. Chase, "Peter, Second Epistle of," A Dictionary of the Bible. ed. James A. Hastings, New York: Scribner's, 1908, III, 799-802.

63 Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 382, [ET, Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 433-34]; Chase, "Peter," 804-07. For a discussions of the external evidence see, Chase and Joseph B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter. 1907, rpt.; Minneapolis, Klock & Klock, 1978, pp. cxv-cxxiii.

someone from a Palestinian background.[64]   The opponents appear to be
Gnostics or to manifest gnostic characteristics and, therefore, are more
appropriately identified with the second century than Peter's lifetime.[65] It is also
claimed that certain tendencies with respect to revelation, eschatology, ethics,
and prophecy reflecting early Catholicism are present and, therefore, the epistle
"is from beginning to end a document expressing an early Catholic viewpoint
and is perhaps the most dubious writing in the canon."[66]

The third major argument against Petrine authorship of 2 Peter is that of
its literary characteristics. The vocabulary is marked by a significant proportion
of *hapax legomena* and rare words[67] and the style is cumbersome and
uncharacteristic of the New Testament.[68] It reflects certain aspects of an "Asian"

---

[64] Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, pp. 380-81, [ET,
Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 431-32]; J. N. D. Kelly, A
Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude. 1969; rpt. Grand Rapids:
Baker, 1981, p. 235.

[65] Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 381, [ET, Kümmel,
Introduction to the New Testament, p. 432]. Cf. Chase, "Peter," 811; Ernst
Käsemann, "An Apology for Primitive Christianity," Essays in New Testament
Themes. trans. W. J. Montague, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, p. 171; Smith,
Petrine Controversies, pp. 92-93. For a survey of various identifications of the
opponents considered in 2 Peter see, Bauckham, "2 Peter: An Account of
Research," pp. 3724-28.

[66] Käsemann, "An Apology for Primitive Christian Eschatology," pp.
174-75, 178-85, 187-91. For a summary of elements which are seen as
constitutive of early Catholicism see, Norman Perrin, The New Testament. New
York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974, pp. 268-73.

[67] Bauckham, Jude , 2 Peter, pp. 135-37; Chase, "Peter," 807-08.

[68] Bo Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude. The Anchor
Bible, eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, Garden City,
NY: Doubleday, 1964, pp. 146-47; Chase, "Peter," pp. 808-09.

style.[69] These elements are intended to create a literary effect which is beyond the capacity of the author and, therefore, are indicative of a pseudonymous writer.[70]

The literary relation between 2 Peter and other New Testament documents, especially 1 Peter and Jude, is also seen as indicative that 2 Peter cannot be a genuine work of the Apostle. It is generally assumed that the author of 2 Peter knew of 1 Peter and refers to it,[71] but differences in vocabulary,[72] style, and content indicate that these epistles did not come from the same hand.[73] Second Peter is also dependent on Jude,[74] as is evidenced

---

[69] Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude, pp. 146-47; Neyrey, 2 Peter, Jude, pp. 119-20; Duane Frederick Watson, Invention, Arrangement, and Style. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, No. 104, eds. J. J. M. Roberts and Charles Talbert, Atlanta: Scholars, 1988, pp. 144-46.

[70] Cf. Chase, "Peter," p. 809.

[71] For a discussion of the connections between 1 Peter and 2 Peter see, Denis Farkasfalvy, "The Ecclesial Setting of Pseudepigraphy in Second Peter." The Second Century, 5 (1985-86), 16-20.

[72] For the relation between the vocabulary, style, and content of 1 Peter and 2 Peter see, Mayor, Jude and Second Peter, pp. lxvii-cv.

[73] Fuchs and Reymond, Deuxième Pierre, Jude., pp. 30-31; Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 143-45; Chase, "Peter," 812-13. Cf. Tord Fornberg, The Early Church in a Pluralistic Society. trans. Jean Gray, Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series, 9, [n.p.]: CWK Gleerup, 1977, pp. 12-14; E. M. Sidebottom, James, Jude, 2 Peter. New Century Bible Commentary, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, pp. 96-98; Bauckham, "2 Peter: An Account of Research," pp. 3716-18.

[74] For a summary of the possible explanations of the relationship between 2 Peter and Jude see, Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 141; Bauckham, "2 Peter: An Account of Research," pp. 3714-15; Watson, Invention, Arrangement, and Style, pp. 160-61.

by the more careful literary crafting by Jude;[75] the attitude toward the apocryphal literature in 2 Peter;[76] the further development of the false teachers reflected in 2 Peter;[77] and the possibility that rhetorical criticism favours the dependence of 2 Peter on Jude.[78] Jude is probably subapostolic, therefore, dependence of 2 Peter on Jude excludes Petrine authorship.[79]

A final argument against Petrine authorship is that the epistle is recognizably pseudonymous. Older works tended to view unnatural or anachronistic elements as evidence that the author of 2 Peter had unconsciously revealed his own hand,[80] more recently Bauckham has argued that 2 Peter employs a literary genre of *testament* which was recognized as fictive.[81] Among those who reject Petrine authorship of 2 Peter there is no consensus with respect to its origin.[82]

---

[75] Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 142.

[76] Fuchs and Reymond, Deuxième Pierre, Jude, p. 23.

[77] Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 380, [ET, Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 431].

[78] Watson, Invention, Arrangement, and Style, pp. 171, 189-90.

[79] Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 380, [ET, Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 431].

[80] See, ibid., p. 382, [ET, p. 433]. For a discussion of anachronisms in 2 Peter see, Chase, "Peter," 810-12.

[81] Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 131-35.

[82] For a summary of the dates which are proposed for 2 Peter see, Fuchs and Reymond, Deuxième Pierre, Jude, p. 39. A sample of various suggestions is that 2 Peter is: 1) a composition which originates with the church of Rome in the decade of 80-90 A.D. and reflects the pastoral concern of this

The defense of Petrine authorship begins with the self-witness of the epistle which claims to be a letter of Simon Peter (2 Pt. 1:1) and has a number of personal allusions. It is the second letter from its author to the readers (3:1),[83] written shortly before his death (1:14), with the purpose of reminding the recipients of truth (1:12-13), and with the desire that they recall apostolic communication (3:2).

Those who accept the genuineness of 2 Peter argue that the epistle was known and accepted both as a work of Peter and as Scripture by Origen (ca. 185-254 A.D.)[84] and that verbal similarities with other Christian literature would seem to confirm its existence by the beginning of the second century.[85]

---

church to defend the apostolic message (Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 157-62); 2) the work of a disciple of Peter about 95 A.D. intended to oppose contemporary arguments for political freedom which the author saw as dangerous to societal order (Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, pp. 143-45); 3) a document from the first quarter of the second century originating in Egypt and intended to call the Christian community to faithfulness to the apostolic tradition (Fuchs and Reymond, Deuxième Pierre, Jude, pp. 26-27, 35-41; cf. J. N.D. Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, pp. 236-37); 4) A second century work intended to enable the church to remember apostolic doctrine and to influence the closure of the biblical canon (Farkasfalvy, "The Ecclesial Setting in Second Peter," 20-24).

[83] Although the majority of commentators assume that the "first letter" is First Peter, Zahn rejects this identification in Theodor Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament. ed. Melancthon William Jacobus, trans. John Moore Trout, et al., [n.d.]; rpt., Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1977, II, 195-98.

[84] Benjamin B. Warfield, "The Canonicity of Second Peter," The Selected Shorter Writings of Benjamin B. Warfield. ed. John E. Meeter, Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1973, pp. 49-50; E. M. B. Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered. London: Tyndale, 1961, pp. 5-6.

[85] Warfield, "Canonicity of 2 Peter," pp. 55-58. Bigg, in an argument which requires the dependence of Jude on 2 Peter, claims that Jude is the earliest attestation of 2 Peter in Charles Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical

By the fourth century 2 Peter was accepted as canonical by the entire church except in Syria where, although it is absent at this time, it may have been present at an earlier stage.[86]

The allegation that the Hellenistic expressions of the epistle invalidate Petrine authorship is rejected, as the use of this terminology reflects only Peter's acquaintance with these expressions and not a developed understanding of the philosophical thought with which they were associated.[87] The claim that 2 Peter is a response to Gnosticism is also rejected, as there is nothing in this epistle that clearly depicts the developed gnostic systems of the second century and parallels with the opponents of 2 Peter may be found elsewhere in the New Testament.[88] The position that 2 Peter represents early Catholicism is also seen as inadequate. The epistle's eschatology does not reflect a diminished hope in the *parousia*, but is primitive both in content and terminology. The

---

Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. The International Critical Commentary, eds. Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer, 2d ed., 1901; rpt. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1961, pp. 210, 216-24. It may be noted that Bauckham, who rejects the authenticity of 2 Peter, affirms that it was known during the second century. See, Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 162-63.

[86] Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 58-65.

[87] Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, p. 836; Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 23-24.

[88] Carson, Moo, Morris, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 436-37; Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 25-26; Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, II, 280-83. Neyrey, who rejects Petrine authorship, holds that the opponents are not Gnostics. See, Jerome H. Neyrey, "The Apologetic Use of the Transfiguration in 2 Peter 1:16-21." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 42 (1980), 506. For a critique of the theory of pre-Christian Gnosticism see, Edwin M. Yamauchi, "Some Alleged Evidences of Pre-Christian Gnosticism," New Dimensions in New Testament Study. eds. Richard N. Longnecker and Merrill C. Tenny, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, pp. 46-70.

dualism of 2 Peter is not a *metaphysical* but an *ethical* dualism and its christology is profound.[89]

Finally, linguistic and literary arguments are not viewed as decisive against the authenticity of 2 Peter. Bigg, who does not clearly affirm Petrine authorship of 2 Peter, observes that "the vocabulary and style [of 2 Peter] contain no elements which were not in existence in the apostolic age."[90] It cannot be absolutely demonstrated that 2 Peter originated with a different author than 1 Peter for there are similarities between them, and 2 Peter is linguistically closer to 1 Peter than any other New Testament work.[91] With respect to the relationship between 2 Peter and Jude, Green argues the question of Jude's priority is not critical for the authorship of 2 Peter, but its date. 2 Peter's possible dependence on Jude does not rule out apostolic authorship unless Jude can reliably be dated after the death of Peter. A firm date for Jude is far from certain.[92] Literary arguments against the genuineness of 2 Peter based on a possible pseudonymous origin are also challenged. The affirmation that 2 Peter manifests certain anachronisms which indicate such an origin is

---

[89] Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 16-21. Several critiques of "early Catholicism" are Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 151-54; R. P. Martin, "Early Catholicism," Dictionary of Paul and His Letters. eds. Gerald F. Hawthrone and Ralph P. Martin, Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1993, pp. 223-25; I. Howard Marshall, "Early Catholicism," New Dimensions in New Testament Study. eds. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenny, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, pp. 217-31.

[90] Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 232.

[91] Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 11-12. For a careful discussion of the relation between 2 Peter and 1 Peter see, Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, pp. 224-37.

[92] See, Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 10-11.

countered with an explanation of these features.[93] Bauckham's proposal that the literary genre of *testament* was intended to be taken as fictive is rejected based on the rarity of this genre in *Christian* literature and the clear rejection of both the practice of pseudonymous literary productions and the authoritative character of such works.[94]

3.3 Conclusions

This study adopts the authenticity of 2 Timothy and 2 Peter. The question of authorship can be significant in the exegetical consideration of these epistles. Among those who accept the authenticity of these epistles, the textual material is seen as genuinely apostolic in origin and content. Both epistles are authoritative for doctrine and practice.[95] Among those who hold a pseudonymous origin of 2 Timothy and 2 Peter, some generally affirm that these works have adequately represented the apostolic tradition and, therefore, are

---

[93] Guthrie, New Testament Introduction, pp. 820, 825-27, 829-30; Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 29-32.

[94] Cf. Carson, Moo, Morris, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 367-71; Green, 2 Peter Reconsidered, pp. 32-37.

[95] The questions of the authority of Scripture and the canon cannot be adequately considered here. Calvin argues that the authority of Scripture is not derived from that of the Church, but is based on the fact that God speaks in it and is confirmed in the heart of believers by the testimony of the Spirit. See, Jean Calvin, L'institution chrétienne. [n.p.]: Kerygma/Farel, 1978, I, 37-42. For an evangelical statements of the authority of Scripture see, H. D. McDonald, "Bible, Authority of," Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, pp. 138-40. For the relationship between the canon of the New Testament and authority see, Carson, Moo, Morris, Introduction to the New Testament, pp. 487-500.

apostolic in character.[96]   Other theologians assert that the pseudonymous authors have not always accurately reflected the apostolic tradition and, as a result, these epistles contain at least some material which is a distortion of the teaching of the apostles.[97]   Material which is not authentic may have a circumscribed authority.[98]   Pseudonymous authorship, then, may have significance for exegesis in that when this origin is assumed, there is the possibility of corresponding questions with respect to the accurate reflection of the apostolic tradition and the authority of these texts.

---

[96] Possible examples are Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 16-18, and Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 229

[97] Possible examples are Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 48; Smith, Petrine Controversies, pp. 94-100; Käsemann, "An Apology for Primitive Christian Eschatology," pp. 169-95.   Bultmann says of the Christology of the Pastorals, that it is "a somewhat faded Paulinism—nevertheless, the Pauline tradition works on in it." Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament. Vol. 2, trans. Kendrick Grober, [np]: Scribner's, 1955, p. 186.

[98] See, in this regard, Linda M. Maloney, "The Pastoral Epistles," Searching Scripture. Vol. 2, A Feminist Commentary, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, New York: Crossroad, 1994, pp. 362-64.

4 An Evangelical Exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The Text of 2 Tim. 3:16a

Although 2 Tim. 3:16a is comprised of only five words in the standard Greek text, πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος,[1] it has been translated in a variety of different ways, some of which reflect different interpretations of this text. Examples are:

All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable . . .[2]

All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable . . .[3]

All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful . . .[4]

All scripture is inspired by God and profitable . . . or, Every scripture inspired by God is also profitable . . . (footnote)[5]

All scripture is inspired by God and is useful . . . or, Every scripture inspired by God is also useful . . . (footnote)[6]

---

[1] Barbara Aland, et al., eds., <u>The Greek New Testament</u>. 4th revised ed., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1993, p. 730.

[2] The Holy Bible, <u>Old and New Testaments in the King James Version</u>. reference ed. Nashville: Nelson, 1976, p. 1758. Hereafter abbreviated *KJV.*

[3] Charles Caldwell Ryrie, ed., <u>The Ryrie Study Bible. New American Standard Translation</u>. Chicago, Moody, 1978, p. 1827. Hereafter abbreviated *NASB.*

[4] Kenneth Barker, ed., <u>The NIV Study Bible. New International Version</u>. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, p. 1846. Hereafter abbreviated *NIV.*

[5] The Holy Bible, <u>Revised Standard Version</u>. New York: Nelson, Old Testament, 1952, New Testament, 1946, p. 240. Hereafter abbreviated *RSV.*

[6] The Holy Bible, <u>New Revised Standard Version</u>. New York/Oxford: Oxford University, 1989, p. 230. Hereafter abbreviated *NRSV.*

> Every inspired scripture has its use for . . .[7]
> All inspired scripture has its use . . .[8]

The text of 2 Tim. 3:16a is free of significant textual problems. There are only two textual variants which may be mentioned. The first is the omission of καί between θεόπνευστος and ὠφέλιμος in some older versions and certain patristic authors.[9] This omission is reflected in Luther's translation: "Denn alle Schrift, von Gott eingegeben, ist nütze . . ."[10] The decision regarding the presence of καί is significant for the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16 as in its absence θεόπνευστος is, according to Huther, "an attribute belonging to the subject."[11] The overwhelming textual support for the presence of καί makes its inclusion in 2 Timothy 3:16 virtually certain.

A second variant of interest for the study of this verse is the addition of ἐστιν after ὠφέλιμος. The presence of ἐστιν is worthy of notice because it

---

[7] The Holy Bible, The New English Bible. [n.p.]: Oxford University/Cambridge University, 1970, p. 273. Hereafter abbreviated *NEB*.

[8] The Holy Bible, The Revised English Bible, Oxford/Cambridge: Oxford University/Cambridge University, 1989, p. 192. Hereafter abbreviated *REB*.

[9] J. E. Huther, Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Das Neue Testament Griechisch, ed. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1847, p. 254, [ET, J. E. Huther, The Pastoral Epistles. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1881, pp. 306-07].

[10] Martin Luther, Die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche, 1972, II, 2400.

[11] Huther, Timotheus und Titus, p. 254, [ET, Huther, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 307].

appears in the majority of Latin Fathers.[12] These words also occur together in 1 Tim. 4:8 and the omission of ἐστιν could have been stylistic.[13] By contrast, as Turner indicates, "from the standpoint of class. Attic there is nothing remarkable about the extensive absence of the copula in NT, for this was the most common form of ellipse and, except where ambiguity threatened, was almost the rule."[14] Again, the manuscript tradition makes it virtually certain that ἐστιν is not original.

4.1.2 2 Tim. 3:16a in the Argument of 2 Timothy

The immediate context of 2 Tim. 3:16a is 2 Tim. 3:14-17. These verses form a single unit as part of 2 Tim. 3:10-17 where the Apostle, after having described the general character of humanity in the last days (2 Tim. 3:1-9) and the particular character of certain among this humanity (2 Tim. 3:6-9), turns his address specifically to the recipient of this epistle indicating to him the conduct he is to have in these difficult days (2 Tim. 3:10-17). The exact relation of these verses to their immediate context and their place in the argument of the letter may be clarified by a consideration both of the purpose of Second Timothy and the structure of the thought of this epistle.

Exegetes who accept Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles generally see their purpose as being either to warn against false teaching or to instruct in Christian conduct and church life. These epistles may, indeed, reflect

---

[12] For the texts where this reading is present see, J. K. Elliott, The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Studies and Documents, ed. Jacob Geerlings, Salt Lake: University of Utah, 1986, p. 156.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Nigel Turner, Syntax. Vol. III, A Grammar of New Testament Greek. ed. James Hope Moulton, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963, p. 294.

both purposes. Towner accents the polemic purpose of these letters,[15] while Knight argues for both a polemic and an instructional motivation for the Pastoral Epistles.[16]

A textually-derived understanding of 2 Timothy sees its primary purpose as being a call to loyalty to the Gospel. It is evident from the conclusion of the epistle that the immediate reason for its production was the Apostle's concern, in the face of impending death, to call Timothy to come to him (2 Tim. 4:6, 9, 21). This immediate purpose, however, is secondary. The greater emphasis of the text, and its primary purpose, is to charge Timothy, especially in view of the Apostle's imminent demise and the desertion of others (2 Tim. 4:6; 1:15; 4:10), to be loyal to the Gospel both in suffering for it (2 Tim. 1:3-2:13) and in its faithful defense and preaching (2 Tim. 2:14-4:8).[17] This call to loyalty, then, is the purpose for and theme of 2 Timothy and accounts for the majority of the letter (2 Tim. 1:3-4:8).

2 Tim. 3:16a is found in the second major division of this epistle. After the introduction (2 Tim. 1:1-2), the first part of the letter (2 Tim. 1:3-2:13) is devoted to a call by the Apostle to his son in the faith to suffer for the Gospel.[18] 2 Tim. 1:8 states the theme of this section. This portion of the epistle terminates

---

[15] Philip H. Towner, !-2 Timothy and Titus. IVP New Testament Commentary Series, ed. Grant R. Osborne, Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1994, pp. 23-26.

[16] George W. Knight, III, The Pastoral Epistles. The New International Greek Testament Commentary, eds. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, Grand Rapids/Carlisle: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1992, p. 10.

[17] For this emphasis see, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 11; Gordon D. Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus. New International Biblical Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988, p. 13.

[18] The structure of the epistle as it is here presented is that of the of the author of this study. For a similar perspective on the general structure of 2 Timothy see, P. C. Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales. Études bibliques, Paris: Gabalda, 1969, II, 827.

with 2 Tim. 2:11-13, verses which are set apart both by their content which is described as a word (ὁ λόγος) and by their syntactical structure which consists of four parallel clauses, all beginning with εἰ. They conclude the call to suffer for the Gospel with a statement of both promise and warning for the one who must confront it.

The second major section of 2 Timothy (2 Tim. 2:14-4:8) is the Apostle's charge to Timothy for his ministry of the Gospel. This charge includes an original portion which describes the character of the ministry of the Gospel (2 Tim. 2:14-20) and a final section in which the Apostle issues a concluding exhortation regarding the Gospel ministry (2 Tim. 4:1-8). The text of this study is found in a part of the epistle which occupies the entirety of 2 Timothy 3 (2 Tim. 3:1-17) in which the difficulty of the ministry of the Gospel in the last days is indicated and in which Timothy is called to a particular conduct in that time. This chapter is set off from that which precedes it by the introductory τοῦτο δὲ γίνωσκε of 2 Tim. 3:1 and from that which follows by διαμαρτύρομαι (2 Tim. 4:1), with which the series of exhortations of 2 Tim. 4:1-5 is initiated.

2 Timothy 3 may be divided into two parts. The first portion of the chapter (2 Timothy 3:1-9) is the Apostle's affirmation of the difficulty of the ministry of the Gospel in the last times. The reason for this difficulty is the general character of humanity during this period (2 Tim. 3:1-5), among which are certain persons, apparently leaders, whose lives are characterized by immorality and opposition to the truth and whose foolishness will become evident (2 Tim. 3:6-9). The general literary structure of the chapter may be observed in that this passage (2 Tim. 3:1-9) is distinguished from the remainder of the chapter by the contrast between those who are described in these verses (οἱ ἄνθρωποι, 2 Tim. 3:2) and the direct address to the epistle's recipient (σὺ δέ) which appears in 2 Tim. 3:10 and is repeated in 2 Tim. 3:14.

The second major section of 2 Timothy 3 (3:10-17) is concerned with Timothy's perseverance in these difficult days. Its organization is clear in that

the repeated σὺ δέ sets apart 2 Tim. 3:10-12, in which Timothy's knowledge of Paul's perseverance and the persecution which all who desire to live a godly life will suffer, from 2 Tim. 3:14-17 where Timothy himself is urged to persevere. The specific passage in which the text of this study is found (2 Tim. 3:14-17) is structured around an exhortation to Timothy to persevere in that which he had learned and of which he was convinced. The introductory σὺ δέ, therefore, is followed by an imperative (μένε) with the realm in which perseverance was to take place expressed by a pair of aorist verbs (ἔμαθες, ἐπιστώθης). This continuance was to be based on two specific things which Timothy knew (εἰδώς), first, the (human) source of that which he had learned (παρὰ τίνων ἔμαθες) and, second, his life-long knowledge of Holy Scriptures which are able to give him the wisdom for the salvation which comes through faith in Jesus Christ. It is the theme of Scripture which relates 2 Tim. 3:15 with the verse which is the concern of this work (2 Tim. 3:16). Syntactically this connection is somewhat indirect in that the verses are related by asyndeton (the absence of a connecting conjunction). In the flow of the thought of the passage, the relation is that the Scripture which Timothy had known from childhood is both inspired (θεόπνευστος) and useful (ὠφέλιμος) for particular pastoral purposes. The goal of that pastoral work for which Scripture is useful is that the man of God, influenced by it, would be capable of every good work (2 Tim. 3:17).

2 Tim. 3:16a occurs, therefore, in both a specific and a general context in which Timothy is being urged to persevere. Related to this perseverance is his knowledge of the Holy Scriptures which are "inspired by God" and which both are able to make one wise to salvation and are useful for the equipping of individuals for good works.

4.2 Exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a

4.2.1 The Reference of πᾶσα γραφή

The consideration of the meaning of the first clause of 2 Tim. 3:16 must begin with a consideration of πᾶσα γραφή. A decision must be made with respect to that nature of the adjective πᾶσα, the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15 and its significance for that of πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16, and the reference of πᾶσα γραφή itself as it is found in the singular in this clause.

Nature and Reference of the Adjective πᾶς

Several alternatives exist with regard to the meaning of the adjective πᾶς as it appears in 2 Tim. 3:16a (πᾶσα). It may be used in a collective sense, as in many modern English translations of this verse, and mean "all,"[19] or, alternatively, "the whole."[20] By contrast, the adjective may be employed

---

[19] Among the translations which render πᾶσα as "all" are the *KJV, NASB, NIV, and RSV.* The collective sense is adopted by a number of commentators. See, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 445; Thomas D. Lea and Hayne P. Griffin, Jr., 1, 2 Timothy, Titus. The New American Commentary, ed. David S. Dockery, Nashville: Broadman, 1992, p. 235; H. Wayne House, "Biblical Inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16." Bibliotheca Sacra, 137 (1980), 54-56; cf. Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, II, 787; Huther, Timotheus und Titus, p. 254, [ET, Huther, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 306].

[20] See, C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. 2d ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963, p. 95.

partitively or distributively with a meaning of "every."[21]

If πᾶσα is taken as partitive, the term may be understood in several different ways. It may mean "every" in the sense of "all"[22] and occur of every part of Scripture as a unified whole or it may convey the idea of "every individual 'Scripture'" within the whole of the Old Testament.[23] The adjective may mean "every" and be used of each scripture to which reference is made by [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα.[24] Finally it may have the sense of "every" text of Scripture[25] or each

---

[21] This understanding, which is generally favoured by commentators, is not strongly represented in modern English translations. The *NEB* adopts the partitive sense as does the *RSV* in a footnote. Among commentators who accept the partitive meaning of "every" are, Henry Alford, The Greek New Testament. Vol. III, The Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, to Timotheus, Titus, and Philemon. new ed, London: Rivingtons, 1884, 397; J. H. Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles. 1899; rpt., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980, pp. 136-37; Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe. Vol. 13, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Günther Bornkamm. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1966, p. 89, [ET, Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles. Hermenia, trans. Philip Buttloph and Adela Yarbo, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972, p. 120]; Charles Ellicott, A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Andover: Draper, 1897, p. 162-63; Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 152; J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Black's New Testament Commentaries, ed. Henry Chadwick, London: Black, 1963, p. 202; Bernard Weiss, Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus. Vol. 11, Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, ed. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, 7th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902, p. 305.

[22] H. Harvey, Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Philadelphia: American Baptist, 1890, p. 111.

[23] Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137.

[24] Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163; cf. A. Schlatter, Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus. 2d ed., Stuttgart: Calwer, 1958, p. 259.

[25] R. St. John Parry, The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1920, p. 65.

individual book of the Scripture.[26]

Grammatical usage favours the partitive sense of πᾶσα as it appears in this text in an anarthrous (without an article) construction with the noun γραφή. The general New Testament pattern is that when πᾶς is found in the singular with an anarthrous noun it is employed partitively, while with the article it is collective.[27] When the adjective occurs without the article, then, it emphasizes "the individual members of the class denoted by the noun."[28] This New Testament tendency is seen in instances where πᾶς appears in the syntactical sequence which is found in 2 Tim. 3:16a (πᾶς, singular + a noun + an adjective) as it most often has the sense of "every" (Matt. 7:17; 12:36; Eph. 1:3; Col. 1:10; 1 Tim. 5:10; 2 Tim. 2:21; 3:17; Tit. 1:16; 3:1; Jas. 1:17[2]; Rev. 18:2[2]; 21:19). The presence of πᾶς in an anarthrous construction is the reason that some commentators affirm that the adjective must be used partitively here.[29] Hanson claims that to be employed collectively the adjective requires an article.[30]

---

[26] John William Burgon, Inspiration and Interpretation. Oxford: Parker, 1861, p. 53.

[27] A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament. Nashville: Broadman, 1934, pp. 771-73; cf. Turner, Syntax, pp. 199-200.

[28] Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Berlin/New York: Gruyter, 1971, col. 1251, [ET, W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. trans. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, 2d ed., revised and augmented, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker, Chicago/London: University of Chicago, 1979, p. 631. Hereafter abbreviated BAGD].

[29] Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 136-37; Patrick Fairbarin, The Pastoral Epistles. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1874, p. 377; A. E. Humphreys, The Epistles to Timothy and Titus. The Cambridge Bible, ed. J. J. S. Perowne, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1897, p. 188.

[30] A. T. Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, The New Century Bible Commentary, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, pp. 151-52.

The absence of the article is not necessarily determinative for the meaning of πᾶσα, as the general rule that when πᾶς appears with anarthrous nouns it does not convey a collective sense is not absolute. In the expressions πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον (Matt. 23:35) and πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων (Acts 7:22) the adjective is best rendered "all." Πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ (Acts 23:1) requires a similar understanding of πᾶς as the reference is to the conscience as a unitary whole. Thayer states, in this regard, that with certain anarthrous proper and collective nouns πᾶς has a collective sense.[31] This usage of the adjective, along Kelly's argument that it is not clear how strictly the general rule that πᾶς with anarthrous nouns was not employed collectively was observed in the Greek which is reflected in the New Testament,[32] limits the absolute application of the general principle concerning the adjective in this context.

Although a collective sense of πᾶς is possible in 2 Tim. 3:16a, the weight of the evidence suggests that a partitive sense is to be chosen. The general New Testament pattern is that when πᾶς is found in the singular with an anarthrous noun it is partitive. Such a partitive use appears both in the immediate context of 2 Tim. 3:16a (πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, 2 Tim. 3:17), as well as elsewhere in the epistle (πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, 2 Tim. 2:21). The determination of the particular nuance of the partitive, among those which have been noted, must await the consideration of the associated noun (γραφή).[33]

---

[31] Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York/London: Harper, 1899, pp. 491-92.

[32] Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 202.

[33] While the determination of the nature of πᾶς is important in the identification of the reference of πᾶσα γραφή, an absolute decision between a partitive and collective sense is not imperative, in that as this term is used in 2 Tim. 3:16a of Scripture, the implication is similar whether it is considered as a whole or in its constituent parts. See, in this regard, Arland J. Hultgren, I-II

The Reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα (2 Tim. 3:15) and the Determination of the Reference of πᾶσα γραφή

The effort to determine the reference of πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16 must address a pair of questions with respect to 2 Tim. 3:15. One of these questions has to do with the nature of the relation between 2 Tim. 3:15 and 2 Tim. 3:16. This matter is important in that the presence of a direct connection between the two verses would suggest a relationship between πᾶσα γραφή and [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15. The other question is that of the reference of the two composite terms. A decision must be made with regard to whether or not they share a common reference.

There are two reasons why 2 Tim. 3:15 and 3:16 should be seen as directly connected. First, they are found together in a single literary unit. 2 Tim. 3:14-17 is set apart from what precedes it by the presence of σὺ δέ, which is also found at the beginning of 2 Tim. 3:10. This repetition distinguishes 2 Tim. 3:14 from that which goes before it and begins a literary unit. Although there is some question about the nature of the connection between 2 Tim. 3:15 and 3:16, the next distinct literary division is found at the beginning of chapter 4. The first word of this chapter, διαμαρτύρομαι, suggests that there may be a movement to a different subject. This suggestion is confirmed by the exhortations of 2 Tim. 4:2 which complete the thought of διαμαρτύρομαι. A new literary section begins, then, with 2 Tim. 4:1. As 2 Tim. 3:15 and 3:16 appear together in a single literary unit they should be seen as directly connected, especially in light of the appearance of similar terms. The acceptance of this relation is the best explanation of the place of 2 Tim. 3:16-17, as otherwise these verses appear with not clear liaison with the immediate context. A second

---

Timothy, Titus. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984, p. 135; E. J. Young, Thy Word is Truth. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957, p. 19.

reason that 2 Tim. 3:15 and 3:16 should be seen as directly related is the presence of asyndeton. While the absence of a conjunction between these verses means that their relation is more difficult to determine than if one were present, their juxtaposition permits the assumption that there is an immediate connection. The implication of this syntactical structure, in which the conjunction is absent, is that the assertion of 2 Tim. 3:16 is a continuation or an explanation of what is found in 2 Tim. 3:15.[34]

2 Tim. 3:15 and 3:16 should be viewed as standing in an immediate relation, then, both because they are found in a single literary unit and because of the presence of asyndeton. This connection is important for the reference of πᾶσα γραφή as it suggests that there is a relation between this term and [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα. If is more reasonable to assume a continuity between these terms which a share common context than a discontinuity by which they would have references which are distinctly different. An effort must be made, then, to determine the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα.

A decision with regard to the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα must determine if the definite article is to be read, as in the Nestle-Aland text,[35] or

---

[34] Parry, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 65; Ed. L. Miller, "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16." Lutheran Quarterly, 17 (1965). For asyndeton see, Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. ed. Friedrich Rehkoph, 15th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979, 389-92, [ET, F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament. trans. and ed. Robert W. Funk, Chicago/London: University of Chicago, 1961, pp. 240-42].

[35] Eberhard Nestle, et al., eds., Novum Testamentum Graece. 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979, p. 555; cf. Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 128. Commentators who retain the article include: Bernard, Pastoral Epistles, p. 135; Huther, Timotheus und Titus, p. 252, [ET, Huther, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 305]; cf. R. F. Horton, The Pastoral Epistles. The Century Bible, ed. W. F. Adeney, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901, p. 163.

omitted.[36] Some argue that the article is to be read and view τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα as a technical expression for Scripture,[37] but Kelly says that the absence of the article indicates the technical usage.[38] Between these two positions there are commentators, such as Schrenk, who hold that the expression is technical and the question of the article is not important.[39] Regardless of whether or not [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is a technical term, the anarthrous reading is more difficult and is to be adopted. As the prevailing pattern is that the article is present with this expression, its absence in this text is unusual and more probably original.

The determination of the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα, which occurs only here in the New Testament, must account for both the individual words of the composite term and for the term itself. The noun γράμμα, which is

---

[36] So, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 443; Walter Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. The International Critical Commentary, eds. Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924, p. 109; Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles. London: S. P. C. K., 1968, p. 42; Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 89, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 119-20].

[37] Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 135; Horton, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163; cf. Robert Falconer, The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1937, p. 92.

[38] Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 201; cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 89, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 119-20].

[39] D. Gottlob Schrenk, "γράφω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955, I, 765, [ET, Gottlob Schrenk, "γράφω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964, I, 765]; cf. Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 328, [ET, BAGD, p. 165]; Gottfried Holtz, Die Pastoralbriefe. Vol. 13, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. Erich Fasher, Berlin: Evangelische, 1972, p. 187. It is not clear if a technical use for the term would be affirmed when the article is present.

found less often in the New Testament than the related word γραφή, was used in the first century, as is seen in the work of Josephus, with an extensive range of meaning. The primary sense of the word is that of what is written. Schrenk states it "is properly what is 'inscribed' or 'engraven' and then what is 'written' in the widest sense."[40] Josephus (37-ca. 100 A.D.) employs γράμμα of specific letters of the alphabet (γράμμασι Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς)[41] and of the writing which is specific to a particular people (τῶν Συρίων γραμμάτων).[42] The word is used for a variety of written works. Thus, γράμμα is found of documents in general, whether those of the Egyptians (τῶν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις γραμμάτων)[43] or Moses (Μωυσέος γράμματα),[44] public writings (τοῖς δημοσίοις . . . γράμμασιν),[45] and letters.[46] When the term appears for "letters" it is used both with an article[47] and without.[48] As written documents are essential to learning, γράμμα is found in an extended sense of education (τὰ τῶν Χαλδαίων . . .

---

40 Schrenk, "γράφω," 1, 762, [ET, Schrenk, "γράφω," 1, 761].

41 Flavius Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae. Opera, ed. Benedictus Niese, 2d ed., Berlin: Weidmann, 1955, 14. 319. Hereafter abbreviated AJ.

42 AJ, 12.15.

43 Flavius Josephus, Contra Apionem. Opera, ed. Benedictus Niese, Berlin: Weidmann, 1955, 1.73. Hereafter abbreviated Ap.

44 AJ, 3. 322.

45 Ibid., 14. 255.

46 Ibid., 8. 51, 57; 9.100, 126; 17.145.

47 Ibid., 9.100, 126.

48 Ibid., 8. 51, 57.

γράμματα).49

The New Testament use of γράμμα parallels, to some extent, that of Josephus. It is found of letters of the alphabet (πηλίκοις . . . γράμμασιν, Gal. 6:11) and, in a more general sense, of written documents whether those of the writing of Moses (John 5:47), records of debt (τὰ γράμματα, Luke 16:6, 7), or letters (γράμματα περὶ σοῦ, Acts 28:21). As well, γράμμα is used of "learning" (τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα, Acts 26:24; cf. John 7:15). Somewhat unique, when compared to Josephus is the manner in which γράμμα is employed in Romans (2:27, 29; 7:6) and 2 Corinthians (3:6, 7). The idea seems to be that the (old) covenant was inscribed on stone (ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη, 2 Cor. 3:7). There remains in these texts, as in other appearances of γράμμα, an emphasis on "what is written."

γράμμα was used in the first century, then, very broadly of "written documents" without any necessary indication of their nature. This general sense is made more specific in 2 Tim. 3:15 by the presence of the adjective ἱερός and the history of the use [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα.

ἱερός (ἱερά), which here functions as an attributive, is a term which in Classical Greek "is that which is determined, filled or consecrated by divine power."50 This word appears early in Greek literature, as it is found often in Homer (ca. 9th century B.C.) who uses it of that which is consecrated by its association or identification with a god. Homer employs ἱερός (ἱρός) of a part of

---

49   Ibid., 10.187. For this sense of γράμμα see Schrenk, "γράφω," 1, 762, [ET, Schrenk, " γράφω," 1, 762].

50   H. Seebas, and C. Brown, "Holy, Consecrate, Sanctify, Saints, Devout," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976, II, 232.

a god (ἱερὴ κεφαλή) with no reference to that which is external to deity.51 Often, however, ἱερός describes that which is sacred because it is pervaded by or identified with a god. Day and dusk are holy (ἱερὸν ἦμαρ, κνέφας ἱερόν), perhaps because they are influenced by a god's power.52 Places such as Pergamos, where there was a temple, are also holy (Περγάμῳ . . . ἱερῇ).53

In the LXX ἱερός is also found of that which is associated with or identified with God. The pattern of use in the LXX is worthy of notice in that the majority of occurrences are in 1 Esdras and the books of the Maccabees. The primary use of ἱερός as an adjective in the LXX is that in which it is found with words associated with the Temple or the worship of God. Thus, ἱερός is employed of holy vessels of the temple (τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη, 1 Esdr. 1:51; 2:7; 8:17, 55; 2 Macc. 5:16), the holy treasury (τὸ ἱερὸν γαζοφυλάκιον, 1 Esdr. 5:44), sacred clothing (τὴν ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα, 1 Esdr. 8:68, 71), sacred gateways (τοὺς ἱεροὺς πυλῶνας, 2 Macc. 8:33), and the holy work of construction (τὰ ἱερὰ ἔργα, 1 Esdr. 7:3). There are, however, exceptions to this general pattern, especially in 4 Maccabees which uses the adjective both of people (6:30; 14:6; 16:11) and of certain aspects of either their body or being (τὴν ἱερὰν ψυχήν, 4 Macc. 7:4; τοὺς ἱεροὺς ὀδόντας, 4 Macc. 7:6). This use of ἱερός with respect to people is unique in the LXX. Another usage of ἱερός in the LXX, and one which is more

51 Homère, Iliade. trans. Paul Mazon, Collection des universités de France, Paris: Les belles lettres, 1937-1938, 3, 15.38. This presentation of ἱερός in Homer follows, Gottlob Schrenk, "ἱερός," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938, III, 227, [ET, "ἱερός," The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965, III, 227].

52 Homère, Iliade, 2, 8. 66; 11. 209.

53 Ibid., 2, 5.446.

immediately relevant for the interpretation of 2 Tim. 3:15, is 2 Macc. 8:23 where in τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον, ἱερός appears of a book. In this context there is not a specific identification of the book to which reference is made. In the LXX, then, as in Homer, ἱερός is found as an adjective which identifies certain things as holy because of their identification or association with God or the gods. The term is never found in the LXX of writings as it is in 2 Tim. 3:15, but it is of a book.

In the New Testament, ἱερός is rare where it appears with the meaning "holy." As an adjective it is found only in 2 Tim. 3:15. The sole occurrence as a substantive is 1 Corinthians 9:13a.[54]

The use of ἱερός in 2 Tim. 3:15 is both unusual in biblical Greek and important for an understanding of the composite term. It is unusual in that despite a long lexical history and significant use in non-biblical literature, the term is very rare in biblical Greek, with the exception of the Apocrypha. If this exception is noted, it is possible to affirm that ἱερός was almost never used in Scripture to describe something consecrated because of its association with God. This limited use makes the appearance of ἱερός in 2 Tim. 3:15 somewhat striking, although less so when seen in light of the lexical history of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα. The word is used in 2 Tim. 3:15, as throughout its history, of that which is consecrated because of its association or identification with God or the gods.[55]

While the usage of γράμματα and ἱερός is important for the consideration of the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα, it is the use of the composite term which is most significant for the determination of this reference. Although it was not extensively used either before or after the New Testament,

---

54 Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 738, [ET, BAGD, p. 372].

55 Cf. Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 443.

[τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα appears throughout its lexical history, both in Jewish and Christian writers and in those who are not specifically identified with these traditions, as a term for sacred writings. It occurs outside Jewish and Christian literature prior to the New Testament in the Stoic philosopher Posidonius (ca. 135-ca. 50 B.C.) where [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is employed when he speaks of that which is brought by the priests into the sacred writings (ταῦτα τῶν ἱερέων φιλοπραγμονέστερον ἀναφερόντων εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα).[56] The identical clause is found in the geographer Strabo (ca. 58 B.C.-ca. 20 A.D.).[57] This term was known, then, outside Jewish and Christian circles, where it appears of sacred writings.

In Jewish writers of the first century A.D., specifically Philo (ca. 13 B.C.-ca. 54 A.D.) and Josephus, [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα appears, although not often. Philo, while occasionally referring to the sacred writings by this term, manifests a distinct preference for ὁ ἱερὸς λογός, which occurs frequently and is often found with a direct or indirect citation of Scripture.[58] Philo uses [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα for the writings in which the life of Moses is recorded.[59] While it may

---

[56] Posidonius, Fragmenta. 2a,87,F.79.20 (*TLG*). Citations which have been taken directly from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* are indicated by "(*TLG*)."

[57] Strabo, The Geography of Strabo. trans. Horace Leonard Jones, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et al., London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard University, 1969, 17.1.5.

[58] See, for example, Philo, Legum Allegoriae. Vol. 1, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1956, 1.76; 2.105; 3.11-12.

[59] Philo, De Vita Mosis. Vol. 6, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et al., Cambridge/London: Harvard/Heinemann, 1950, 2.292.

be assumed that Philo employed the term of the Old Testament Scriptures, this cannot be demonstrated from his usage. Among the few appearances of the term in Philo is one in which he recognizes that Egyptian writings were also called holy (τοῖς λεγομένοις ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν).[60] The work of Josephus is, as well, characterized by a limited use of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα and, again, it may only be assumed that the reference is the Old Testament. The term appears when Josephus speaks of that which has been taken from the sacred writings and included in his anthology and of a promised history of Egypt which was to be derived from them.[61] He specifically includes the book of Daniel among the sacred writings.[62] While [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is known to Philo and Josephus, then, neither uses it often as a term for the sacred scriptures of the Jews. Both of these authors are also similar in that they do not clearly indicate the specific writings which are included in the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα.

In Christian literature [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is characterized by both a relatively early occurrence, it was an expression which was known in the second century A. D., and by a sparse usage which corresponds to that which is found prior to its appearance in the writings of the Church. The term occurs in Theophilus of Antioch (end of the second century A. D.) for Christian writings (τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα . . . ἡμᾶς) which are demonstrably more ancient and characterized by a great veracity than those of Greeks and Egyptians.[63] A spurious letter of Ignatius employs [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in an exhortation to fathers to teach the sacred Scriptures to their children (διδάσκετε αὐτοὺς τὰ

---

[60] Ibid., 1.23.

[61] Josephus, *Ap*, 1.127, 228.

[62] Josephus, *AJ*, 10. 210.

[63] Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autolycum. trans. Robert M. Grant, Oxford Early Christian Texts, ed. Henry Chadwick, Oxford: Clarendon, 1970, 3.26.

ἱερὰ γράμματα).64 In Clement of Alexandria (ca. 155-ca. 220) there are two significant occurrences. One appearance includes a citation of 2 Tim. 3:15, without the article, in which Clement asserts that the sacred writings are holy in their working of holiness and godliness (ἱερὰ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὰ ἱεροποιοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα).65 The other occurrence shows that this term was not used only of Scripture as it is found of the holy instruction of Christians by the Son (ἱερὰ ὄντως γράμματα παρὰ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ).66

Origen (ca. 185-ca. 254) is the first Christian author to employ [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα with some frequency and he occasionally gives some indication of the sacred writings to which he makes reference. Thus, he speaks of the holy Scriptures of the prophets (τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν προφητῶν γράμματα)67 and states that the perspective of Moses and the prophets is evident in these works.68 Origen affirms that the sacred writings are to be the object of careful study by the godly and are an appropriate source of learning.69 From them comes spiritual

---

64 Ignatius, Epistulae spuriae. 6.4.6.3 (TLG).

65 Clément d'Alexandrie, Le protreptique. trans. Claude Mondésert, Sources chrétiennes no. 2, eds. H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou, 2d ed., Paris: Cerf, 1949, 9.87.

66 Clément d'Alexandrie, Les stromates. trans. Marcel Castor, Sources chrétiennes, no. 30, eds. H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou, 2d ed., Paris: Cerf, 1951, 20.98.

67 Origène, Contre Celse. trans. Marcel Borret, Sources chrétiennes, No. 147, ed. C. Mondésert, Paris: Cerf, 1969, 6.18, 44.

68 Ibid., 6.44 (TLG).

69 Ibid., 7.30, 34.

food.[70] The Christian writers of the fourth century, although aware of the term [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα, used it only in a limited manner. This expression is found in a range of writers, indicating that it was known in this period, but is never found extensively in any representative of this century. A significant number of the occurrences of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in this literature are direct or indirect citations of 2 Tim. 3:15. The term itself, then, did not have an extensive independent presence during this time.

The form in which [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα occurs throughout its lexical history should be briefly noted. It is almost always articular. There are exceptions, among which are the two appearances in Clement of Alexandria which have already been noted and, perhaps, 2 Tim. 3:15 itself. The articular form, however, is predominant.

This review of the lexical history of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα leads to several observations of importance for the interpretation of 2 Tim. 3:15. First, [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is a term with a relatively limited lexical history. This is unexpected. Although the individual words which make up the composite term were present in Greek literature, and despite the knowledge and use of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in a variety of contexts, the term, which conceivably could have been employed to describe Scripture in a unique manner, was not often used. The appearance in 2 Tim. 3:15 is important, then, in that a term with a restricted lexical history is employed. Second, while [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα does not appear often, when it does it is most often found of sacred writings. This is true both within the Jewish and Christian contexts and without. Third, although the term is almost always employed of sacred writings there is at least one exception, as in the work of Clement of Alexandria it occurs of instruction rather than the Holy Scriptures. This third observation leads to a fourth which is that [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα should

---

70 Origène, Philocalie, 1-20 sur les Écritures. trans. Marguerite Harl, Sources chrétiennes, no. 302, ed. C. Mondésert, Paris: Cerf, 1983, 12.1.

not be seen as a technical term for the Holy Scriptures in a restrictive sense. Clearly, the anarthrous term occurs when the reference is not Holy Scriptures. Perhaps the best explanation of the articular form when it is found of Holy Scriptures is that the use of the article is what is expected with a term which applies to a particular body of writings and does not, in itself, indicate that it is technical. Thus, the understanding of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα which sees it employed technically for the Old Testament at the time of the writing of 2 Timothy based on its use in Hellenistic Judaism, especially in Philo and Josephus, [71] cannot be demonstrated.

The preceding lexical history provides a basis for the determination of the specific reference [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15. A significant majority of commentators affirm that [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is used of the Old Testament;[72]

---

[71] Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 135; Falconer, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 92; Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 89, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 119-20]; Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 201.

[72] Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 114; D. Wilhelm Brandt, Das Anvertraute Gut. Die urchristliche Botschaft, ed. Otto Schmitz, Hamburg: Furche, [1959], p. 138; Norbert Brox, Die Pastoralbriefe. 7/2, Regensburger Neues Testament, ed. Otto Kuss, Regensburg: Pustet, 1969, p. 261; Joachim Jeremias, "Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus," Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Der Brief an die Hebräer. Vol. 9, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975, p. 63; J. P. Lilley, The Pastoral Epistles. Handbook for Bible Classes, eds. Marcus Dodd and Alexander Whyte, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901, p. 209; Huther, Timotheus und Titus, p. 253, [ET, Huther, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 305]; J. W. Roberts, "Every Scripture Inspired of God." Restoration Quarterly, 5 (1961), 33. The discussion regarding reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα usually does not address the question of the inclusion or exclusion of the Apocrypha. Buis argues, with respect to πᾶσα γραφή, that the Apocrypha is to be excluded as it was not considered canonical at the time of the New Testament. Harry Buis, "The Significance of II Timothy 3:16 and II Peter 1:21." The Reformed Review, 14/3 (1961), 43. Scott does not appear to accept the apocryphal books as canonical, but suggests that both these books and the apocalyptic writings may be envisioned in the use of this term. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 126.

Hasler specifies the Greek Old Testament.[73] Neyrey suggests a reference only to the Pentateuch.[74] Others argue for a broader reference which would include the New Testament Scriptures which existed when 2 Timothy was written, or all the canonical New Testament.[75] In light of the unusual [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα, a final understanding sees the term as being related to Timothy's biblical or religious education.[76] The preceding lexical study has demonstrated that [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα was almost always used of sacred writings. When this term appears in a Jewish or Christian context that assumption is that the sacred writings are either those of the Old Testament or of the entire Christian Scriptures. The assertion in 2 Tim. 3:15 that Timothy had known the Holy Scriptures ([τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα) from childhood implies that the reference is to the Old Testament alone and should not be extended to either New Testament materials which existed at the time of the writing of 2 Timothy or all the

---

[73] Victor Hasler, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Zürcher Bibelkommentare, eds. Georg Fohrer, Hans Heinrich Schmid and Siegfried Schulz, Zürich: Theologischer, 1978, p. 75.

[74] Jerome H. Neyrey, First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus, James, First Peter, Second Peter, Jude. Collegeville Bible Commentary, ed. Robert Karris, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1983, p. 38.

[75] See, William Hendriksen, I and II Timothy and Titus. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957, pp. 301-02; cf. Thomas C. Oden, First and Second Timothy and Titus. Interpretation, ed. James Luther Mays, Louisville, KN: Knox, 1989, p. 24, who says that "there was room within the term 'sacred writings' for the New Testament to be considered by later Christians as involved in this assertion."

[76] See, Ernest Brown, who suggests that the concern is with Timothy's sacred training in Ernest Faulkner Brown, The Pastoral Epistles. London: Methuen, 1917, p. 79; Newport White, who affirms that the indication is that Timothy's beginning lessons were in Scripture in Newport J. D. White, The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. Vol. 4, The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, [n.d.]; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988, 174; and R. Parry, who states that Scripture is "regarded as [the] subject of education and learning" in Parry, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 64.

canonical New Testament, as these works were probably not extant during Timothy's early life.[77] Either the restriction of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα to a particular portion of the Old Testament or to that Testament in a particular linguistic form, or the extension to included the New Testament writings in unwarranted. It is, therefore, probable that the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is to the entire Old Testament and to the Old Testament alone.[78]

It is not possible to adequately explain the use of the rare [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15. The suggestion that this term is employed here because it was current among Greek-speaking Jews for the Old Testament,[79] while having some merit, cannot be demonstrated. As has been indicated, the presence of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in Philo and Jospehus is limited and, in the case of the former of these two, a different designation of Scripture was clearly preferred. The reason this term occurs in 2 Tim. 3:15, then, is not clear just as it is also unclear why Christian authors did not employ [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα more often.

---

[77] See, in this regard, Alfred Plummer, The Pastoral Epistles. New York: Armstrong, 1893, p. 390.

[78] In the exegesis of both 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 no effort has been made to address certain questions with regard to the Old Testament canon in the first century A.D., especially as it was known to the writers of these two epistles. Significant matters such as the precise limits of the Old Testament canon and the language(s) in which it was used have not been considered. For the purpose of lexical study the Apocryphal books, including 3 and 4 Maccabees, have been included as part of the Septuagint. This inclusion is not intended to be, however, a judgment on the canonical status of this literature. Generally the term "Old Testament" in these chapters should be understood as the Old Testament which was known and used by the particular apostolic author under consideration. For a discussion of some of the issues involved see, James A. Sanders, "Canon, Hebrew Bible," The Anchor Bible Dictionary. ed. David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992, I, 837-52.

[79] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 443.

The determination of the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is important for the present study because of its possible significance for the decision of that to which πᾶσα γραφή refers. It has been argued that a continuity between these terms must be assumed in light of the literary and syntactical connections between 2 Tim. 3:15 and 3:16. The realization of the relationship between these two verses has lead many commentators to take πᾶσα γραφή as parallel to [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα and, consequently, as having the same reference. This identification is sometimes specifically stated,[80] and sometimes implied.[81]

When πᾶσα γραφή is considered only in relation to [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα, the two terms are most naturally taken as generally parallel. Their appearance in close proximity, with no clear attempt by the Apostle to distinguish between them, favours the idea that they are, at least to some extent, synonymous. A final effort to identify the reference of πᾶσα γραφή must await the analysis of the word γραφή. This further inquiry is important, for a study of γραφή indicates that the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα is not alone determinative for that of πᾶσα γραφή.

---

[80] A. R. C. Leaney, The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Torch Bible Commentaries, eds. John Marsh and Alan Richardson, London: SCM, 1960, pp. 98-99; H. Armin Mollering, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus. Concordia Commentary, Saint Louis/London: Concordia, 1970, p. 163; Warren Vanhetloo, "Indications of Verbal Inspiration." Calvary Baptist Theological Journal, 5/1 (1989), 68.

[81] Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, p. 787; Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 201-02.

Lexical Considerations of the Term γραφή
and their Significance for the Reference of πᾶσα γραφή

The attempt to determine the reference of πᾶσα γραφή must now turn to lexical considerations of γραφή, for which their is a distinct history. The possible references of πᾶσα γραφή follow closely those which have been proposed for [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα. The term may have a general reference to "that which is written, writing . . . hence of various written documents."[82] This sense is found in Classical Greek.[83] If this alternative is adopted, 2 Tim. 3:16a would be translated "all writing is God-breathed (inspired)"[84] or "all writing inspired by God is . . ."[85] The former translation would affirm the inspiration of all writings, while the latter distinguishes between writings which are inspired and those which are not.[86]

It is also possible πᾶσα γραφή is used only of "Scripture" in some sense,[87] although differences exist as to the specific aspect of Scripture which is intended. Certain commentators affirm that the reference is to the Old

---

[82] Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon. rev., Henry Stuart Jones, Oxford: Clarendon, 1968, p. 359.

[83] R. Mayer and Colin Brown, "Scripture, Writing," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978, III, 483.

[84] H. Wayne House, "Biblical Inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16." Bibliotheca Sacra, 137 (1980), 56.

[85] Cf. Hultgren, I-II Timothy, Titus, p. 134.

[86] Ibid.

[87] See the assertion that this term is "in the NT exclusively w. a sacred mng., of Holy Scripture," in Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 329, [ET, BAGD, p. 166].

Testament viewed either in all its specific parts or passages;[88] according to each particular book;[89] or as a unitary whole;[90] while others think that it may involve either some of the New Testament,[91] or "theopneustic writing" beyond the limits of canonical Scripture.[92] A decision regarding the reference of πᾶσα γραφή requires an understanding of how γραφή was employed, especially in the New Testament.

Γραφή had a long lexical history prior to the New Testament, some of which is summarized by Meyer who says that the noun "originally carried the abstract verbal sense of the act of writing, drawing or painting; then the concrete sense of writing, inscription, letter . . . "[93] Moulton and Milligan suggest that the evidence of the papyri indicates a "quasi-official" sense existed before the New

---

[88] Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, p. 44; Parry, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 65; Terrence P. McGonigal, "'Every Scripture is Inspired': An Exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16-17." Studia Biblia et Theologica, 8 (1978), 54-55.

[89] E. F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles. Moffatt New Testament Commentary, ed. James Moffatt, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936, p. 127.

[90] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 445; Lea, 1, 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 235; cf. Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1948, pp. 234-39.

[91] Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, pp. 787-88. Cf. Goodrick, who claims that as Timothy had learned to place the authority of the Word of Christ above that of the Old Testament, there is the possibility that he would not have excluded the potential addition of other Scripture to the Old Testament in Edward W. Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society. 25 (1982), 481, and Hasler, who sees the reference as to apostolic writings in Hasler, Timotheus und Titus, p. 75.

[92] R. M. Spence, "2 Timothy iii. 15, 16." The Expository Times, 8 (October, 1896-September, 1897), 564.

[93] Mayer and Brown, "Scripture, Writing," III, 483; cf. Schrenk, "γράφω," I, 749-50, [ET, Schrenk, "γράφω," I, 749-50].

Testament.[94]

Outside of the occurrences of γραφή in the New Testament, it is the appearances in literature which is relatively close to the New Testament either in character (the LXX) or in time and culture (Philo and Josephus) which is most relevant for the use of this term in 2 Tim. 3:16a. The term is found in the LXX, Philo, and Josephus with a certain range of meaning, all of which is related to the sense of "that which is written or inscribed." This variation reflects a shading between particular aspects of the term.

Γραφή sometimes appears in literature related to the New Testament of that which is written with a certain emphasis on writing by inscription. In this sense it is used of the writing of God on the tablets of stone (ἡ γραφὴ γραφὴ θεοῦ, Exod. 32:16),[95] the writing of a hand on the wall of the king's place (Dan. 5:6, 7, 8, 16), and of that which was inscribed on a monument on Mount Nebo (1 Macc. 14:27). A greater accent on the sense of writing rather than inscription is see in the many occurrences of γραφή in this literature where the reference is to a specific written document. The noun is employed of genealogical records (τῆς γενικῆς γραφῆς, 1 Esdr. 5:39; cf. 2 Esdr. 17:64), (prescriptive) writings (κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν Δαυιδ, 1 Esdr. 1:4; cf. 2 Esdr. 6:18), and generally of a written document.[96] The exact nature of the written document in these uses of γραφή is not indicated by the word itself. As might be expected of a term with

---

[94] James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949, p. 132.

[95] Cf. Deut. 10:4; Josephus, AJ, 3. 101; Philo, Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres. Vol. 4, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et. al, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1949, 167.

[96] Philo, In Flaccum. Vol. 9, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1955, 185.

such a general character, there are particular uses of γραφή which are more specific. In Philo γραφή is found of a written legal document specifying charges.[97] Josephus employs the noun of literary works, both his own and those of others.[98] Similarly the LXX refers to the writing of the Kings (τὴν γραφὴν τῶν βασιλέων, 2 Chr. 24:27). A somewhat extended use of γραφή, apparently related to the idea that pictures were created by a process similar to that of writing, is that which is found in Philo where the word appears of a portrait or picture.[99] In view of the New Testament use of γραφή, the limited use of the noun in this literature for Scripture is unexpected. It is found with this reference (τῷ μὲν ῥητῷ τῆς γραφῆς; τῆς ἱερᾶς γραφῆς),[100] but only infrequently.

The New Testament use of γραφή stands in some contrast to that which is found in the literature just considered. Although an absolute statement cannot be made, an examination of the appearances of γραφή in the New Testament leads to the probable conclusion that the reference of this term in this portion of Scripture is always, with one exception, to the Old Testament. It

---

[97] Philo, De posteritate Caini. Vol. 2, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et. al, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1950, 38.1

[98] Josephus, AJ, 3.74, 94, 218, 223; 16.185.

[99] Philo, De Josepho. Vol. 6, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, Cambridge/London: Harvard/Heinemann, 1950, 87.1; Quod Omnis Probus Liber sit, Vol. 9, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1954, 63.1; 94.2.

[100] Philo, De Abrahamo. Vol. 6, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, Cambridge/London: Harvard/Heinemann, 1950, 68; Philo, De Mosis. Vol. 6, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, Cambridge/London: Harvard/Heinemann, 1950, 2.88.

must be noted that such a conclusion is tentative as in some of the uses of γραφή in the New Testament there is no specific indication that the Old Testament is in view (Mark 14:49; John 2:22; 5:39; 7:38; 17:12; 20:9; Acts 17:2, 11; 18:24; 2 Pet. 1:20; 3:16). While a valid argument may be set forth that on each occasion, with the exception of 2 Pet. 3:16, γραφή is found of the Old Testament, this assertion may not be demonstrated in these particular instances.

In the remaining New Testament appearances of γραφή the reference to the Old Testament is more direct. This may be affirmed for a number of reasons. First, the term must be used of the Old Testament in about a third of the fifty occurrences of γραφή as it is found with direct citations of Old Testament passages (Matt 21:42 of Ps. 118:22-23; Mark 12:10 of Ps. 118:22-23; Luke 4:18-19, 21 of Isa. 61:1-2; 58:6; John 13:18 of Ps. 41:9; John 19:24; of Ps. 22:18; John 19:28 of Ps. 22:15; John 19:36 of Exod. 12:46, Num. 9:12, Ps. 34:20; John 19:37 of Zech. 12:10; Acts 8:32-33, 35 of Isa. 53:7-8; Rom. 4:3 of Gen. 15:6; Rom. 9:17 of Exod. 9:16; Rom. 10:11 of Isa. 28:16; Rom. 11:2-3 of 1 Kgs 19:10, 14; Gal. 3:8 of Gen. 12:3; Gal. 4:30 of Gen. 21:10; 1 Tim. 5:18 of Deut. 25:4; Jas. 2:8 of Lev. 19:18; Jas. 2:23 of Gen. 15:16; 1 Pet. 2:6 of Isa. 28:16 and, perhaps, Jas. 4:5 of Exod. 20:5).

Second, γραφή appears in certain texts in association with an Old Testament citation, but where the text thus cited in not specifically described by the term. Thus, in Matt. 22:29-32 (cf. Mark 12:24-26), which speaks of those who do not know the Scriptures (μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς), a quotation of Exod. 3:6, 15, 16 is found. While this Old Testament text is not specifically called Scripture (γραφή), the use of this word in the context suggests that the Scriptures so designated include the Old Testament passage which is quoted. Rom. 15:3-4 is similar (citation of Ps. 69:9) and, perhaps, Jas. 4:4-5 (citation of Prov. 3:34 LXX).

Third, γραφή is also found in texts which rather than citing directly a

particular passage of the Old Testament refer to information which is found there. John 7:42 presents Scripture as having spoken of the genealogical line and birth place of Christ (οὐχ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυίδ καὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλέεμ). The appearance of γραφή in John 20:9 of the Scripture which indicated that Christ must be resurrected (τὴν γραφὴν ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι) and in 1 Cor. 15:3-4 of those of his death and resurrection should probably be included here, although the Old Testament text(s) to which reference is made is less evident.

A fourth reason why γραφή in the New Testament should be seen as referring to the Old Testament is that it is found, on occasion, with terms which are used to identify these writings. In Luke 24:27, then, the Scriptures in view are stated to be those of Moses and the prophets (ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν). Later in this chapter a similar description occurs (τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς, Luke 24:44-45). Γραφή appears in Gal. 3:21-22 in a context in which there is a reference to the law (ὁ νόμος). Γραφή is used in the New Testament, then, when the Old Testament Scripture is designated by the name of one or more of its constituent portions. A further indication that γραφή in the New Testament refers to the Old Testament is that it is found with descriptive genitives which are best seen as speaking of the Old Testament. The Scriptures, in Matt. 26:56, are called "the Scriptures of the prophets" (αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν) and in Rom. 16:26 "prophetic Scriptures" (γραφῶν προφητικῶν). Γραφή also appears in contexts in which Jewish people are in view. In at least some of these instances (Acts 17:11; 18.28), it may be assumed that the Scripture which is designated by γραφή is the Old Testament. In Acts 1:16 a similar reference is suggested by the use of γραφή in an indication of the source of Scripture (τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προεῖπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυίδ).

A final reason why γραφή in the New Testament should be understood as a reference to the Old Testament is the strong predominance of the articular form of this term which suggests a reference to a particular corpus. Of the fifty New Testament appearances of γραφή twenty are plural. The anarthrous noun is found in the plural only on two occasions (Rom. 1:2; 16:26). The balance of the New Testament occurrences are singular. Again, the articular use is much more common as the noun appears in the singular without the article only four times (John 19:37; 2 Tim. 3:16; 1 Pet. 2:6; 2 Pet. 1:20). The articular form in which γραφή most often appears in the New Testament permits the assumption that the reference of the term is to a particular writing or writings. As these writings are more specifically identified by the evidence which has been cited, the fact that γραφή occurs in the majority of its uses with the article is, possibly, an additional indication that the reference is to the Old Testament.

Although, as has been stated, the affirmation that γραφή in the New Testament refers only to the Old Testament cannot be completely demonstrated, the most probably explanation of the preceding evidence is that this is the case. One exception to this rule is 2 Pet. 3:16 where Pauline epistles are included with τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς.[101] In light of this use of γραφή and that which occurs outside the New Testament, the word should not be viewed as a technical term for Old Testament Scripture in the New Testament. It is certainly not employed in this manner in the LXX, Philo, or Josephus and the exception of 2 Pet. 3:16 indicates that even in the New Testament the word was used with a certain flexibility.

While the recognition that γραφή appears in the New Testament of the Old advances the effort to determine the reference of πᾶσα γραφή, it does not completely address this question because γραφή, in the singular in the New

---

[101] Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 234; Miller, "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16," 58; cf. Mayer and Brown, "Scripture, Writing," III, 490; Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163.

Testament, may mean either "*the* individual *Scripture passage*" or Scripture as "a whole."[102] A complete determination of the reference of πᾶσα γραφή must choose between a partitive and a collective use of the adjective.

Some commentators accept a collective meaning for the adjective πᾶσα and claim that the reference is to the Scripture as a unified whole. This position is adopted on the basis of the grammar and context of 2 Tim. 3:16 and holds that it is more probable that the Apostle, in affirming the specific ways in which the Scripture is useful, is concerned with Scripture viewed as a single entity and not with Scripture considered in its individual parts.[103] Many interpreters, however, argue that the adjective πᾶσα is partitive and that the reference of πᾶσα γραφή is to every passage of the Old Testament.[104] This

---

[102] Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 329, [ET, BAGD, p. 166]. Cf. for the former, Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 236, and for the latter, Schrenk "γράφω," I, 754, [ET, Schrenk "γράφω," I, 754-55]. When γραφή is found in the plural, it may refer to "Scripture in general," (Harold K. Moulton, The Challenge of the Concordance. Greenwood, SC: Attic, [n.d.], p. 281), "the OT as a whole," (Schrenk, "γράφω," I, 751, [ET, Schrenk, "γράφω," I, 752]), or be used as a term which "designates collectively all the parts of Scripture" (Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 329, [ET, BAGD, p. 166]).

[103] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 445.

[104] Lightfoot affirms that "the singular γραφή in the N.T. always means a particular passage of Scripture." His reasoning is that the plural is used when the concern is with Scripture as a whole; that expressions such as "another scripture" are found in the New Testament, thus indicating that the singular refers to particular passages, and that the specific passage which is intended can often be determined. See, J. B. Lightfoot, The Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians. [n.d.]; rpt., 3rd ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962, pp. 147-48. Lightfoot's argument may be dismissed both because of New Testament texts where the reference is not to a particular passage of Scripture (see, Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, for a list of these texts), and the use of terminology such as "contained in Scripture" in 1 Pet. 2:6 (see, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 445).

understanding is based on the absence of the article[105] and the perspective that πᾶσα γραφή is a further definition of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in the preceding verse. Πᾶσα γραφή, then, places "a stress upon *each and every passage* which comprises the 'sacred writings.'"[106] This study has already argued for a partitive sense of the adjective. The reference of πᾶσα γραφή, therefore, is to *every* scripture of the Old Testament.

The preceding consideration indicates that particular nuance of the partitive sense of πᾶς which should be adopted from those which have been previously noted.[107] The use of the term γραφή, especially in the New Testament, does not favour a use of the partitive to mean either "every *text* of Scripture," or "each individual book." The affirmation that πᾶς occurs partitively with the meaning of "all" imposes the collective sense on the partitive. The best understanding of πᾶσα γραφή is that it refers to "every scripture in the Old Testament." As [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα appears in the immediate context, these individual Scriptures should be seen as those which comprise "the sacred writings."

The reference of πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a must be, then, at least to the Old Testament Scriptures. This is true because the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα, which is logically and syntactically related to πᾶσα γραφή, is to the Old Testament and because that of γραφή, in almost all its New Testament occurrences, is to the Old Testament alone. While it may be unequivocally affirmed, therefore, that the reference of πᾶσα γραφή is the Old Testament, the question must be addressed as to whether it is only to the Old Testament in 2

---

[105] Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, p. 44; Humphreys, Timothy and Titus, p. 188; cf. Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 136.

[106] McGonigal, "'Every Scripture is Inspired,'" 54-55.

[107] See above, pp. 156-57.

Tim. 3:16a. Lexical arguments point strongly toward such a limitation, however, two exegetical considerations condition such a perspective.

First, the apparent identification of at least some of the Pauline epistles as γραφή in the τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς of 2 Pet. 3:16 presents the possibility that Pauline material was viewed as Scripture at a date roughly contemporaneous with that of 2 Timothy and should, therefore, be included in the reference of πᾶσα γραφή. The evidence of 2 Pet. 3:16 suggests that the author of this epistle viewed certain Pauline writings as γραφή. As has been indicated, the word γραφή in the New Testament is always used of Scripture in a narrow sense. This reference for γραφή is made even more probable in 2 Pet. 3:16 by the presence of the definite article. The concern in 2 Pet. 3:16 is not with γραφή, understood in a general sense, but with γραφή viewed, as in the rest of the New Testament, as "Scripture." When 2 Peter is viewed as authentic, 2 Pet. 3:16 becomes an indication that Pauline letters were seen as Scripture during the lifetime of Peter and, therefore, during a period generally contemporaneous with the life of Paul. Given this usage of γραφή in 2 Peter, it is possible that the term is employed similarly in 2 Tim. 3:16a. If this is the case, then the reference of πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a is not only to the Old Testament, but to extant New Testament material. The presence of πᾶσα requires that all existing material accepted as Scripture at the time of the writing of 2 Timothy be included in this reference.

The second piece of exegetical material which is significant for a reference of πᾶσα γραφή beyond the Old Testament is the possible Paulinian citation as γραφή of material from Luke 10:7 (ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ) in 1 Tim. 5:18 (ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ). Certain

interpreters think that ἡ γραφή is only used of the first member of Luke 10:7,[108] others, however, hold that the intended reference is both members. Not only is the Old Testament material (Deut. 25:4) cited as Scripture, but that which is parallel to Luke 10:7 is also thus designated.[109] Knight asserts that the immediate syntactial arrangement, as well as the general New Testament pattern of citation of various sections of Scripture joined by καί supports the latter position.[110] In this case, material beyond the limits of the Old Testament is described in 1 Tim. 5:18 as γραφή.

For the use of ἡ γραφή in 1 Tim 5:18 to be significant for the reference of πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a the two epistles must have common authorship and Luke-Acts must antedate 2 Timothy. The former matter has already been considered.[111] With regard to the latter, there are at least two positions with respect to the date of Luke-Acts. In light of the possible knowledge of the destruction of Jerusalem and the developed theological character of Luke-Acts,

---

[108] Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 93-94; Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 126; Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 134; Donald E. Cook, "Scripture and Inspiration: 2 Timothy 3:14-17." Faith and Mission, 1 (1984), 60.

[109] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 233-34; Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, I, 543-44.

[110] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 234.

[111] See above, pp. 131-139. For the question of the authorship of the third Gospel see, Werner Georg Kümmel, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 17th ed., Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973, pp. 116-19, [ET, Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament. trans. Howard Clark Kee, revised ed., Nashville: Abingdon, 1975, pp. 147-50], who questions this authorship, and E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke. New Century Bible Commentary, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black, Grand Rapids/London: Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1981, pp. 40-51, and I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke. International Greek Commentary, eds. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, Exeter: Paternoster, 1978, pp. 33-35, who accept it, at least tentatively.

certain scholars date Luke between 80 and 85 A.D., or even around the end of the first century.[112] In this case, the citation of 1 Tim. 5:18 could not be drawn from canonical Luke. There are, however, certain exegetes who, on the basis of the absence of historical references in Acts after about 63 A.D. and the lack of any clear reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, place the composition of this Gospel earlier; perhaps as early as 60-65 A.D.[113] In this case Paul, writing toward the end of his life, could have made use of canonical Luke. Another possibility for the source of the citation in 1 Tim. 5:18 is that it is from material already recognized as Scripture, but later incorporated into Luke.[114]

The question of the source of the material in 1 Tim. 5:18 and the possibility that such a source could be recognized as Scripture is complex and cannot be adequately addressed here. On the basis of the syntactical structure of this verse, in which the two members are joined by καί without any indication of disjunction, the best position is that the second member is included in the reference of ἡ γραφή. In this case New Testament material is cited as ἡ γραφή. This allows for a reference of πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a which is not limited to the Old Testament alone.

The effort to determine the reference of πᾶσα γραφή, then, must account for a certain interpretive tension. On the one hand, the reference of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15 is best seen as to the Old Testament and that of γραφή throughout the New Testament, with the exception of 2 Pet. 3:16, is almost certainly the Old Testament. This evidence leads to the conclusion that

---

112 Johnson accepts a date of 80-85 A.D., but leaves open the possibility of an earlier date. Luke Timothy Johnson, The Gospel of Luke. Vol. 3, Sacra Pagina, ed. Daniel J. Harrington, Collgeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991, p. 2.

113 Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, pp. 55-60.

114 Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 105-06.

the reference of πᾶσα γραφή is to the Old Testament alone. By contrast, the exegesis of 2 Pet. 3:16 and 1 Tim. 5:18 suggests a wider reference which includes existing New Testament materials.[115] Such an identification provides a possible explanation for why the adjective πᾶσα is employed with γραφή in this verse and for the change from [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15, which must be limited only to the Old Testament, to πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a. It may also explain the absence of the article with γραφή, as the reference of this term is not to the Old Testament alone.[116]

While the nature and extent of the available evidence does not allow a definitive assertion, the tentative conclusion of this work, based on the material just presented, is that the reference of πᾶσα γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a is best understood as the Old Testament and the extant New Testament material at the time 2 Timothy was written. Since it is impossible to determine the exact date of a significant portion of the New Testament writings, a precise indication of what New Testament material is intended is not possible.

4.2.2 The Placement and Significance of the Elided Copula

The elision of the copula in πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος is uncontested by exegetes of 2 Tim. 3:16a. This omission, which Turner indicates reflects Attic Greek, as compared to Ionic which supplies the copula, is common in the New Testament, especially in Luke and Paul.[117] New

---

115 See, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 488; Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, II, 787-88; House, "Biblical Inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16," 57; William Hendriksen, Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles. New Testament Commentary, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957, p. 303.

116 See, Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible," 481.

117 Turner, Syntax, pp. 294-95.

Testament usage of εἰμί reflects that of classical Greek in most often omitting the third person singular.[118] Discussions of 2 Tim. 3:16a accept without significant question that this verb is to be supplied here as its mental substitution is essential. Robertson states that "it [the copula] can be readily dispensed with when both subject and the real predicate are present."[119]

It is not, therefore, the need of a copula in πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος, but its placement which is significant for the interpretation of 2 Tim. 3:16a.[120] A translation which accepts an attributive function of θεόπνευστος places the copula after this adjective which results in a rendering such as, "every scripture inspired by God is also profitable . . . ," while that which assigns a predicative function to θεόπνευστος locates the copula before the adjective and, therefore, reads, "all scripture is inspired by God and profitable . . ."[121] The decision regarding the placement of the copula is contingent upon that of the function of the adjective θεόπνευστος.

---

118   Blass and Debrunner, Grammatik, p. 105, [ET, Blass and Debrunner, Greek Grammar, p. 70].

119 Robertson, Grammar, p. 395.

120 Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible," 483.

121   The former rendering is found in the footnote of the Revised Standard Version, while the latter is found in the text. See, RSV, p. 240.

4.2.3 The Qualification in πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος

The Nature of the Qualification

This most discussed exegetical question in the study of 2 Tim. 3:16a is that of the relation of the adjective θεόπνευστος to the noun which it qualifies. Does it stand in an attributive or a predicate relation to γραφή?[122] Θεόπνευστος may be attributive. In this case it is placed immediately before the copula supplied in translation, and the conjunction καί carries an ascensive[123] or consequential force.[124] This understanding is reflected in the translation "every inspired scripture has its use for . . . .[125] and is found in Origen, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, and Luther, as well as in older English translations such as Wycliff, Tyndale and Coverdale.[126] Many modern commentators see the adjective as attributive.[127] Certain lexical studies also adopt such a

---

[122] For a statement of the issue see, Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163. For a summary of various alternatives see, note 13 in Antonio Piñero, "Sobre El Sentido de θεόπνευστος: 2 Tim 3,16." Filologia Neotestamentaria, 1 (1989), 146-47.

[123] Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137; Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163.

[124] Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, II, 788.

[125] NEB, p. 273. An attributive relation is also seen in the rendering "all inspired scripture has its use . . ." (REB, p. 192), and in "every scripture inspired by God is also profitable . . . " (RSV, footnote, p. 240).

[126] Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137.

[127] Among whom are, C. K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963, p. 114. Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, II, 794; Bronx, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 261; Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 90, [ET,

perspective.[128]

By contrast, θεόπνευστος may stand in a predicate relation to γραφή. When the adjective is thus understood, it is placed immediately after the copula and καί is assigned a copulative[129] or a consequential sense.[130] This alternative is apparent in the rendering "all scripture is inspired by God and profitable . . ."[131] and is found in Chrysostom and Calvin,[132] as well as some modern exegetes.[133]

These explanations of πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος reflect the fact that an adjective may stand in either an attributive or a predicate relation to the noun it modifies. The difference in the nature of these relations is indicated by

Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 120].

[128] Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, eds., "θεόπνευστος," Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, II, 140; Hermann Kleinknecht, et al., "πνεῦμα," Vol. VI, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], p. 452, [ET, Hermann Kleinknecht, et al., "πνεῦμα," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968, VI, 454.

[129] Cf. Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137; Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163.

[130] Fairbarin, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 380.

[131] "RSV, p. 240. The predicate relation is evident in "all Scripture is God-breathed and is useful . . ." (NIV, p. 1848) and "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable . . ." (KJV, p. 1558).

[132] Alford, The Greek New Testament, III, 396.

[133] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 446-47; Gordon Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus. New International Biblical Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque, Peabody, MA/Carlisle: Hendrickson/Paternoster, 1988, p. 279; Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 184; McGonigal, "'Every Scripture is Inspired,'" 56-57.

Robertson who writes:

> The distinction between the attributive adjective and the predicate adjective lies in just this, that the predicate presents an additional statement, is indeed the main point, while the attributive is an incidental description of the substantive about which the statement is made.[134]

When an adjective is attributive it often appears with an article, but this syntax is not invariable.[135] As a consequence, the absence of an article in this verse cannot be determinative for the choice of an attributive or predicate relation. In fact, there is nothing in the syntax of πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος that allows for an absolute determination of the nature of the relation between θεόπνευστος and γραφή.[136]

Those who affirm an attributive relation between θεόπνευστος and γραφή indicate, first, that the context favours such an understanding. 2 Tim. 3:16 is seen as syntactically related to the preceding verse and providing more specific detail, especially with respect to the usefulness of Scripture.[137] This general relation is strengthened by the presence of asyndeton which "indicates that this clause is an immediate explanation of the preceding."[138] Miller thinks that asyndeton is an important argument for the attributive relation.[139] It is also

---

[134] Robertson, Grammar, p. 656.

[135] Ibid.

[136] House, "Biblical Inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16," 58; Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137; Huther, Timotheus und Titus, p. 253, [ET, Huther, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 307].

[137] Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163; Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137; Miller, "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16," 60.

[138] Parry, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 65.

[139] Miller, "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16," 60.

stressed that the concern of 2 Tim. 3:15-17 is with the function and usefulness of the Scriptures and not their nature.[140] The introduction of an affirmation about the inspiration of Scripture would, therefore, be unnecessary or irrelevant.[141]

A second general argument is based on the syntactical arrangement of πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος. Spence studied twenty-one New Testament occurrences in which, as in 2 Tim. 3:16, πᾶς appears with substantive, followed by another adjective. He found that elsewhere in the New Testament the translation into English places the adjective before the noun, thus reflecting an attributive understanding of the adjective.[142]

The major syntactical criticism of an attributive relation is that καί becomes unnecessary and may be left untranslated as in the *NEB*.[143] This position is rejected by Spicq who argues for a consequential use of the conjunction and states that rather than being unnecessary the καί "veut précisément souligner la relation de cause à effet entre l'inspiration et l'utilité."[144] Ellicott sees the καί as ascensive and part of the specific detail provided in 2 Tim. 3:16a in relation to the preceding verse.[145]

---

[140] Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, II, 794; Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 89-90, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 120]; Charles R. Eerdmans, The Pastoral Epistles. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1923, p. 125.

[141] Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163.

[142] R. M. Spence, "2 Timothy iii. 15, 16." The Expository Times, 8 (October, 1896-September, 1897), 564-65.

[143] See, Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 447.

[144] Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, II, 788, 795.

[145] Ellicott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 163.

The alternative view, however, which holds a predicate relation between γραφή and θεόπνευστος, more accurately accounts for the relevant grammatical and syntactical evidence. First, the elided copula favours a predicate function of θεόπνευστος as it "can be readily dispensed with when both subject and the real predicate are present."[146] McGonigal claims that *"theopneustos* can take the predicate position without the actual presence of *estin* in the sentence."[147] Second, in the absence of the copula it is more natural to construct the two adjectives in πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος either both attributively or both predicatively. Since ὠφέλιμος clearly stands in a predicate relation to γραφή, θεόπνευστος should be understood as having the same relation to the noun.[148]

A further argument is the parallel with the syntax of 1 Tim 4:4: πᾶν κτίσμα θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον. This is an important passage because, as in 2 Tim. 3:16a, there is a structure in which two adjectives follow πᾶς (singular) + an anarthrous noun and, as well, the copula must be supplied. In biblical Greek both the sequence of πᾶς (singular) + an anarthrous noun, + an adjective (as in πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος) and that with the further addition of καί and another adjective (as in πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος) are found in texts other than 2 Tim. 3:16a. The extended sequence of πᾶς (singular) + an anarthrous noun + an adjective + καί + an adjective appears at least eleven times in the LXX (Exod. 35:22; Num. 31:20; 1 Kgs. (Sam.) 14:52; 30:22; 4 (2) Kgs. 3:19; Prov. 24:4; Ezek. 20:28; 21:3; 29:18; Tob. 8:15; 1 Macc. 7:5).

---

146 Robertson, Grammar, p. 395.

147 McGonigal, "'Every Scripture is Inspired," 56-57.

148 McGonigal, "'Every Scripture is Inspired," 57; Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 447; cf. Miller, "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16," 59.

Although all of these passages have a syntactical sequence which is similar to 2 Tim. 3:16a, the majority may be immediately excluded from consideration because of a significant difference with the text of the Pastorals. This variation is that the final adjective of the sequence is πᾶς which, rather than being related to the preceding noun, as in 2 Tim. 3:16a, functions with one which follows (e.g. πᾶσαν πόλιν ὀχυρὰν καὶ πᾶν ξύλον ἀγαθόν, 4 (2) Kgs. 3:19; cf. Exod. 35:22; Num. 31:20; 1 Sam. 14:52; Ezek. 20:28; 21:3; 29:18).

In the four texts which remain 1 Kgs. (Sam.). 30:22; Prov. 24:4; Tob. 8:15; 1 Macc. 5:5), the final adjective is related to the noun and in each of these instances the two adjectives stand in an attributive relation with the preceding substantive (πᾶς ἀνὴρ λοιμὸς καὶ πονηρός, every troublesome and worthless man, 1 Kgs. (Sam.) 30:22; παντὸς πλούτου τιμίου καὶ καλοῦ; every valuable and beautiful treasure, Prov. 24:4; πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ καθαρᾷ καὶ ἁγίᾳ, every pure and holy blessing, Tob. 8:15; πάντες ἄνδρες ἄνομοι καὶ ἀσεβεῖς, every lawless and ungodly man, 1 Macc. 7:5). This pattern would appear to favour an attributive relation of θεόπνευστος to γραφή. There are, however, two significant observations which condition this conclusion. First, in each of the LXX examples *both* adjectives stand in an attributive relation with the preceding noun, while in 2 Tim. 3:16 it is only θεόπνευστος which may do so. The second adjective (ὠφέλιμος) is predicative. Second, while in the four texts of the LXX it is not necessary to supply a copula, one must be in 2 Tim. 3:16a. The LXX passages vary somewhat, therefore, from 2 Tim. 3:16a and are not determinative for the decision concerning the nature of the relation between θεόπνευστος and γραφή.

In the New Testament, the extend sequence πᾶς (singular) + an anarthrous noun + an adjective + καί + an adjective is relatively rare, occurring in Jas. 1:17 (πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον) and Rev. 18:2 (καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς ὀρνέου

ἀκαθάρτου [καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς θηρίου ἀκαθάρτου]). It is immediately evident that neither of these passages sheds significant light on the question of the relation between the adjective and the noun in 2 Tim. 3:16a. In the former text is found the pattern which has already been observed in the LXX, in which the second adjective is πᾶς which functions with a following substantive. The latter text happens to have the same syntactical sequence as 2 Tim. 3:16a, but a cursory evaluation of this passage reveals that its true syntax is different from that which is exists in Timothy. The sequence of πᾶς (singular) + an anarthrous noun + an adjective appears relatively often in the New Testament. In some of these occurrences the adjective is attributive, as may be seen in the other uses of this sequence, outside of 2 Tim. 3:16a, in this epistle (πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, 2:21; and 3:17; παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ 4:18; cf. Matt. 7:17; 12:36; Eph. 1:3; Col. 1:10; 1 Tim. 5:10; Tit. 1:16; 3:1; Rev. 21:19). What is observed in this sequence has limited value for the analysis of 2 Tim. 3:16a, however, both because the extended structure is not present and it is often not necessary to supply the copula. These instances, therefore, manifest a certain divergence from 2 Tim. 3:16a.

This leaves πᾶν κτίσμα θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον in 1 Tim. 4:4 as one of the biblical sequences which is most closely related to 2 Tim. 3:16a. While there are extra words in this sequence (θεοῦ, οὐδέν) neither interrupts the flow of the syntax in such a way as to alter the function of those terms which are similar to 2 Tim. 3:16a. In 1 Tim. 4:4 both adjectives stand in a predicate relation to the substantive, therefore, the adjectives in the parallel structure in 2 Tim. 3:16a are probably predicative.[149]

A additional reason that it is best to see the adjective as standing in a predicate relation with the noun is that if it was attributive, a different structure

---

[149] McGonigal, "'Every Scripture is Inspired,'" 57; Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 203; Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 446.

would be expected, with the adjective being placed before, not after, the substantive.[150] This assertion has been challenged by J. W. Roberts who argues that in the New Testament, as well as the Septuagint, when πᾶς occurs with a substantive and an adjective without an article and with no other words to interrupt the sequence the order is always "(1) πᾶς, (2) the noun, and (3) the adjective." Roberts cites one exception in the Septuagint (Exod. 22:9) and claims that 1 Tim. 4:4 is not a true exception as other words intervene between the noun and the adjectives.[151] Knight asserts that his perspective may be rejected both because the examples of Roberts do not allow, in the construction of the sentence, the adjective to be taken as a predicate and because in some cases there are intervening words.[152]

A final syntactical argument is the presence and function of καί, which is generally taken as copulative by commentators who accept a predicate relation.[153] If θεόπνευστος is in an attributive relation with γραφή, the καί becomes unnecessary as there is nothing with which it is naturally connected.[154]

---

[150] Simpson, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 150; Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 203; cf. Miller, "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16," 59.

[151] J. W. Roberts, "Note on the adjective after πᾶς in 2 Timothy 3:16." Expository Times, 66 (October 1964-September 1965), 359.

[152] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 446.

[153] Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 164. Fairbarin argues for a consequential sense of the conjunction in The Pastoral Epistles, p. 380.

[154] McGonigal, "Every Scripture is Inspired," 57; cf. Lock, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 110. Miller questions Lock's position as the καί may be used in a clause which intends to identify the use of Scripture in addition (also) to its function with respect to salvation (2 Tim. 3:15). See, Miller, "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16," 59.

A possible argument against a predicative use of the adjective, that such a use requires a direct assertion of inspiration in 2 Tim. 3:16a which is not appropriate in this context, is not a persuasive. A specific statement of inspiration is appropriate in this verse for at least two reasons. First, the inspiration of Scripture may have been questioned by Timothy's opponents, which would justify such an assertion.[155] Hanson indicates that the writer desired to affirm the inspiration of "*every* passage of Scripture" and not only certain passages as the heretics held.[156] A direct affirmation of inspiration is also appropriate in 2 Tim. 3:16a because the utility of Scripture, expressed in the second adjective predicatively related to the noun (ὠφέλιμος) is a consequence of its origin, indicated by the adjective θεόπνευστος which is also in such a relation.[157]

The decision between an attributive or a predicate relation of the adjective to the noun may or may not be important for interpretation. Spicq states that when either option is adopted the basic sense is not significantly modified: if the predicate relation is followed this clause contains a direct assertion of biblical inspiration, while if the attributive is adopted the emphasis is on its pedagogic finality and pastoral usefulness.[158] Other commentators emphasize the importance of this question for exegesis. Those who accept an attributive relation see the primary emphasis of the text as on the usefulness of

---

[155] Fairbarin, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 380.

[156] Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 152.

[157] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 447; cf. Fairbarin, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 380; R. J. A. Sheriffs, "A Note on a Verse in the New English Bible." Evangelical Quarterly, 34 (1962), 94.

[158] Spicq, Les épîtres pastorales, II, 794. Fairbarin holds a similar view, claiming that if the attributive is accepted then inspiration is affirmed as extending to each part of Scripture, while if the predicate is followed there is a direct statement of inspiration. See, Fairbarin, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 378.

Scripture, while those who adopt a predicate relation affirm that the concern is with Scripture's divine origin. For this latter group, the adoption of the attributive relation implies that some writings are not inspired,[159] which is the view that the author was, in fact, disputing.[160]

A determination of the nature of the relation of θεόπνευστος to γραφή cannot be made on strictly grammatical or syntactical grounds. Two considerations, which are the relation with 1 Timothy 4:4 where, in a similar structure, the adjectives are predicative and the presence of καί, tend to favour the predicate relation. The latter of these is especially important, as while an ascensive use of καί is possible, the copulative use is better in the context. Θεόπνευστος should be understood as standing, therefore, in a predicate relation with γραφή.

The Content of the Qualification

A study of the term θεόπνευστος itself must address two exegetical questions. First, that of the meaning of the word. Is the idea "breathing the Spirit of God," "inspired," or "God-breathed"? If the sense of "inspired" is adopted, a decision must be made whether or not to adopt the English sense of the word "inspired" as "moved by or as if by a divine or supernatural influence."[161] A second question is whether the term is active or passive. Does θεόπνευστος

---

[159] Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 203; Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 447.

[160] Hanson, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 152; Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, p. 44.

[161] Philip Babcock Grove, ed., Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield: Merriam, 1976, p. 1170.

mean, according to the former alternative, "'breathing the divine Spirit,'"[162] with a possible sense being that the Scriptures possess divine inspiration which they communicate to people,[163] or, following the latter option, is a passive force of "inspired" or "God-breathed" intended with the implication that the origin of Scripture is in God's breath?[164] The effort to address these questions will, first, consider certain aspects of the lexical history of the term, then attempt to determine the meaning of the word and if it is used actively or passively.

The consideration of the lexical history of θεόπνευστος may begin with the recognition that the term, at the present time, is generally understood as meaning "inspired by God" or "God-breathed." An examination of lexical studies makes this apparent, as in recent thought θεόπνευστος is defined as "inspired by God,"[165] "God-breathed, inspired by God,"[166] "'inspired by God, divinely

---

[162] Hermann Cremer, Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch. ed., Julius Kögel, 11th ed., Stuggart: Perthes, 1923, p. 492, [ET, Hermann Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek. 4th ed., trans. William Urwick, 1895; rpt. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1954, p. 730].

[163] J. W. Roberts, "Every Scripture Inspired by God." Reformation Quarterly, 5 (1961), 37.

[164] John Henry Bennetch, "2 Timothy 3:16a, A Greek Study." Bibliotheca Sacra, 106 (1949), 188. Karl Barth adopts both a passive and an active sense when he speaks of θεόπνευστος as "given and filled and ruled by the Spirit of God, and actively outbreathing and spreading abroad and making known the Spirit of God," in Karl Barth, Die Lehre Vom Wort Gottes. I/2, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik, 4th ed., Zollikon/Zürich: Evangelischer, 1948, p. 559, [ET, Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God. I/2, Church Dogmatics, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. G. T. Thompson and Harold Knight, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956, p. 504].

[165] Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 704, [ET, BAGD, 356].

[166] E. Kamlah, J. D. G. Dunn, Colin Brown "Spirit, Holy Spirit," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978, III, 689.

inspired,'"[167] "soufflé, insufflé par Dieu."[168] These definitions are similar to those found in certain older works where the meaning is, as well, "inspired by God."[169] This understanding of the word reflects its history.

The term θεόπνευστος is a verbal adjective and, as such, part of a class of words which is found not infrequently in the New Testament. The designation "verbal adjective," according to Robertson, reflects the formation of these terms "from verb stems, not from tense-stems."[170] Although this group of words have certain similarities to participles, they are not strictly such as they have neither voice or tense.[171] It is especially the lack of voice which leads to a certain lack of clarity in the meaning of these terms. Verbal adjectives may have, therefore, "an intransitive, an active, or a passive meaning" depending on the context in which they are used.[172]

Beyond these general characteristics, certain particularities are affirmed for the type of verbal adjective represented by θεόπνευστος. First, in

---

[167] Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988, I, 418.

[168] Ceslas Spicq, Lexique Théologique du Nouveau Testament. Paris/Fribourg: Cerf/Éditions Universitaires, 1991, p. 704, [ET, Ceslas Spicq, Theological Lexicon of the New Testament. ed. James D. Ernest, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994, II, 193-95]. An earlier presentation is Ceslas Spicq, Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire. 22/1 Orbis biblicus et orientalis, Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, pp. 372-74.

[169] Liddell and Scott, Lexicon, p. 791; Thayer, Lexicon, p. 287.

[170] Robertson, Grammar, p. 1095.

[171] Robertson, Grammar, p. 1095; James Hope Moulton, Prolegomena. Vol. I, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3rd ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978, p. 221.

[172] Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 222; cf. Robertson, Grammar, 1096.

this class of words the noun governs the adjective.[173]   Second, Blass and Debrunner state that when "nouns are also prefixed to verbal adjectives; these then designate the agent of the passive act."[174] Therefore, the noun expresses the agent of the action. Finally, verbal adjectives in -*tos* may "either (a) have the meaning of a perfect passive participle or (b) express possibility." Of these two possibilities, the former sense is more commonly found in occurrences of these terms.[175]

Θεόπνευστος may be considered etymologically, as although this aspect of lexical consideration has inherent difficulties it has played a role in the historic discussion of the term. The word itself, as Goodrick indicates, "combines two stems and an adjective suffix: *theo-pneu-stos.*"[176] There is agreement among exegetes that the first part of this term is from θεός, the second stem, however, is debated. Knight argues that it is from "the verb 'breathe,' πνέω using the first aorist stem πνευσ-."[177] Cremer, on the other hand, states that it is the stem ἐμπνέω and not πνέω on which the word is formed, as "the single verb

---

[173] C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of the New Testament Greek. 2d ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963, p. 97.

[174] Blass and Debrunner, Grammatik, p. 94, [ET, Blass and Debrunner, Greek Grammar, p. 63].

[175] Bruce M. Metzger, Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek. Princeton: Metzger, 1971, p. 44. For a helpful presentation of the nature of verbal adjectives, especially as related to 2 Timothy 3:16, see, Frank L. Griffith, "The Meaning and Extent of Inspiration in II Timothy 3:16." Unpublished M.A.B.S. thesis, La Mirada: Talbot, 1980, pp. 37-39.

[176] Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible," 484.

[177] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 446; cf. Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible," 486; Bennetch, "2 Timothy 3:16a, A Greek Study," 187; Spicq, Lexique, pp. 704-05.

is never used of divine action."[178]   This assertion has been challenged on the basis of the use of πνέω in the LXX of Isaiah 40:24.[179] The distinction between the two possibilities is important, as Knight's understanding leads to a rendering of "God-breathed,"[180] while Cremer's comprehension would reflect a meaning like "God-in-breathed."

Θεόπνευστος is a *hapax legomenon* in biblical Greek. It is rare prior to its appearance in 2 Tim. 3:16 which is probably the first extant occurrence of the term. This does not mean, however, that lexical considerations prior to the New Testament are unimportant for an understanding of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16, as verbal adjectives of the type θεο . . . τος are found in Greek literature prior to this period. This type of verbal adjective appears in Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.) of one possessed or inspired by god(s) (φρενομανής τις . . . θεοφόρητος), honoured by god(s) (θεοτίμητος),[181] and sent by god(s) (θεόσυτος).[182] His contemporary Pindar (518-438 B. C.) employs a verbal adjective meaning "given by god(s)" (θεόσδοτος) both in the fragment of a hymn[183] and of the

---

[178] Cremer, Lexicon, p. 282.

[179] See, Griffith, "Inspiration in II Timothy 3:16," 32; Kleinknecht, "πνεῦμα," VI, 450, [ET, Kleinknecht, "πνεῦμα," VI, 452].

[180] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 446.

[181] Aeschylus, Agamemnon. Vol. 1, Prolegomena, Text, Translation, ed. Edward Fraenkel, Oxford, Clarendon, 1962, 1140, 1337.

[182] Eschyle, Prométhée. trans. Paul Mazon, Vol. 1, Oeuvres, Collection des universités de France, 6th ed., Paris: Les belles lettres, 1953, 116.

[183] Pindare, Isthmiques et Fragments. trans. Aimé Puech, Vol. 4, Oeuvres, Collection des universités de France, Paris: Les belles lettres, 1923, Fr. 42.5.

power thus given (τὰν θεόσδοτον δύναμιν).[184] The geographer Strabo describes a people who are inspired of god (τῶν θεοφορήτων πλῆθος),[185] although he does not develop the sense of the word, referring to these individuals only in terms of their occupation of a particular city. In these pre-Christian uses specific characteristics of verbal adjectives of this type may be observed. The noun in these words designates the agent of the action. Thus, in each of occurrences the agent is indicated by θεο-. Also, these verbal adjectives have a passive sense. This observation is significant for an understanding of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16 as, on the basis of pre-Christian usage of similar verbal adjectives, the term most probably has a passive sense.

As may be observed in the recent study of Spicq[186] and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,* there are very few early uses of θεόπνευστος which may be cited as possibly pre-Christian. Θεόπνευστος is found in certain works which are difficult to date, most noticeably, the fifth book of the *Sibylline Oracles*.[187] Although some of the *Sibyllines* may antedate the New Testament, those in which this adjective appears certainly do not. Collins dates the fifth book of the *Sibylline Oracles* to the beginning of the second century A. D and the immediate context of the appearance of θεόπνευστος in 5, 308 may support a date as late

184 Pindare, Pythiques. trans. Aimé Puech, Oeuvres, Vol. 2, Collection des universités de France, Paris: Les belles lettres, 1922, 5.16.

185 Strabo, Geography, 12. 2.3.

186 Spicq, Lexique, pp. 704-05; cf. Augustinus Bea, De Inspiratione et Inerrantia Sacrae Scripturae. Rome: Pontifical, 1954, p. 3.

187 For these occurrences see, Spicq, Lexique, pp. 704-05; Hermann Cremer, "Inspiration," Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. ed. Albert Hauck, 3rd ed., Graz: Akademische, 1970, 9, 184, and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.*

as the end of that century.[188] While some commentators affirm a pre-Christian existence of θεόπνευστος, this cannot be demonstrated and the extant occurrences are best seen as all being posterior to the New Testament.[189]

The lexical history of θεόπνευστος which is significant for a comprehension of the term in 2 Tim. 3:16 may be divided into two distinct periods. The first covers the second and third centuries of the Christian era. During this period θεόπνευστος occurs infrequently in Greek literature but the use of the adjective, both by authors who stand in the Christian tradition and by those who are not clearly identified with it, is important for the present discussion. An analysis of these early uses of θεόπνευστος provides a perspective on how the word was understood at the time closest to the New Testament. The second period in the lexical history of θεόπνευστος begins with the dawn of the fourth century. As Christianity experienced an increasing expansion and acceptance in the Roman Empire, the number of appearances of θεόπνευστος grew rapidly. Certain observations regarding the use of the word during the fourth century and following, especially as it is found in contexts which reflect a direct influence of 2 Tim. 3:16, are also important for an understanding of θεόπνευστος in its one biblical appearance.

The study of early occurrences of θεόπνευστος begins with a consideration of those which are found in literature which is not specifically

---

[188] John J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," The Anchor Bible Dictionary. ed. David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992, VI, 4. For the later date see, H. N. Bate, The Sibylline Oracles. London/New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge/Macmillian, 1918, p. 108.

[189] Commentators who hold that θεόπνευστος appears prior to it use in 2 Tim. 3:16a include, Cook, "Scripture and Inspiration," 58, and Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 203. Among those who affirm that the New Testament occurrence may be its first are Spicq, Lexique, p. 704; Cremer, Wörterbuch, p. 492, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, p. 730]; and Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 263.

Christian.[190]   If, as has been suggested, the *Sibylline Oracle 5* dates from the early second century A. D., the two appearances of θεόπνευστος in this oracle may be the first after the New Testament.   This work, which Collins affirms reflects a tradition of Egyptian Judaism, consists of oracles against various peoples.[191] Θεόπνευστος is found in 5, 308 where, in a word about the fall of foolish Cyme, the oracle reads, Κύμη δ' ἡ μωρὰ σὺν νάμασι τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις, (and foolish Cyme, with her god-animating or inspired rivers).[192] This text is significant, in part because the adjective may have either an active or passive significance. If a meaning of "oracular" is adopted, especially in light of the fact that Cyme had a temple and oracle of Apollo,[193] then the adjective most probably has an active sense and carries a meaning of "god-animating" in that the streams conveyed the message of the god. If, by contrast, the term means "god-breathed or "divine," θεόπνευστος is passive and the term is employed of the source of the streams of Cyme.[194] There is nothing in the immediate context which allows a definitive decision between an active and passive meaning.

Similar alternatives also exist with respect to the other occurrence of

---

[190] For the discussion of θεόπνευστος in this literature see, Cremer, Wörterbuch, pp. 492-93, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, pp. 730-32]; Cremer, "Inspiration," 9,184; Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 263-72. Cf. Douglas Farrow, The Word of Truth and Disputes About Words. Winona Lake, IN: Carpenter, 1987, pp. 89-90.

[191] Collins, "Sibylline Oracle," VI, 4.

[192] Oracula Sibyllina. 5.308 (*TLG*).

[193] Bate, The Sibylline Oracles, p. 108.

[194] Cremer recognizes the possibility of an active significance here, in Cremer, Wörterbuch, pp. 492, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, pp. 731], while Warfield, on inadequate grounds, rejects this possibility. See, Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 265-66.

θεόπνευστος in the *Sibylline Oracle* (5, 406). The concern of the oracle is people who did not engage in false worship but true (ἀλλὰ μέγαν γενετῆρα θεὸν πάντων θεοπνεύστων ἐν θυσίαις ἁγίαις ἐγέραιρον καὶ ἑκατόμβαις, but they honoured the great Father or begetter God of all who are breathed-out by God or who animate God with holy offerings and great public sacrifices).[195] Again two possibilities exist for the adjective, in this case, depending on the reference of πᾶς. If this reference is to all people who are created by God, then the adjective is passive in its meaning. This is certainly possible, especially with the presence of γενετῆρα. The difficulty with this position is that it requires an unusual sense of θεόπνευστος in that the people in question are not "inspired by God" in the sense of "influenced by God," but "breathed-out by God." If, by contrast, the reference of πᾶς is to the worshippers of which the oracle speaks an active sense of θεόπνευστος is possible, the idea being that they "animate God." The syntax of this oracle favours a passive sense of the adjective because of its proximity to γενετῆρα, however, a final decision between these two possibilities cannot be made in this context. In the *Sibylline Oracle 5*, then, either an active or passive meaning of θεόπνευστος is possible in both occurrences. In the first of these appearances (5, 308) the adjective is used to express either that the streams of Cyme animated god or that they flowed from a divine source, while in the second (5, 406), θεόπνευστος is found of people either as created by or exuding God.

Other early uses of θεόπνευστος outside Christian literature occur in the second and third century A. D. The text of a pseudonymous work of Plutarch reads, τῶν ὀνείρων τοὺς μεν θεοπνεύστους κατ᾽ ἀνάγκην γίνεσθαι, τοὺς δε φυσικοὺς ἀνειδωλοποιουμένης τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ συμφέρον αὐτῇ,[196] which

---

195 <u>Oracula Sibyllina</u>, 5.406 (*TLG*).

196 Pseudo-Plutarchus, <u>Placita philosophorum</u>. 904 F.6 (*TLG*).

Warfield translates, "'theopneustic dreams' ('dreams divinely inspired,' Holland; 'the dreams that are caused by divine instinct,' Goodwin), 'come by necessity; but natural ones' ('natural dreams,' Holland. 'dreams which have their origin from a natural cause,' Goodwin) 'from the soul's imagery of what is fitting to it."[197] In this passage the adjective describes dreams and is followed by another (φυσικούς) also used with the same substantive. These words contrast dreams which are divine and those which are natural. This contrast leads to the conclusion that θεόπνευστος carries a passive meaning in Pseudo-Plutarchus as the term occurs of dreams which have their source with a god, as opposed to those which have a natural origin. Another second century appearance of θεόπνευστος is in the grammarian Aelius Herodianus, or in a pseudonymous work attributed to him. In Herodianus the adjective is used, figuratively, of a physician (ὁ θεόπνευστος ὁ ἰατρός).[198] Vettius Valenus, an Antiochian astrologer of the second century, employs θεόπνευστος once in his work entitled *Anthologiarum*. In a context in which he considers the suffering of men, Valenus affirms that it is the gods' inspired workmanship in them (θεῖον ἐν ἡμῖν θεόπνευστον δημιούργημα).[199] Θεόπνευστος then, describes that which has its source in and comes from god(s).

The first occurrences of θεόπνευστος in Christian literature after the New Testament are in the work of Clement of Alexandria (ca. 155-ca. 220) where, although the adjective is used with different nouns, the reference appears always to be to Holy Scripture. Thus, when Clement uses θεόπνευστος with τὰ συντάγματα it occurs in a context where he is speaking

---

[197] Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 264.

[198] Aelius Herodianus, περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων. 3,2.655 (*TLG*).

[199] Vettius Valens, Anthologiarum. 330.19 (*TLG*).

of "the sacred writings" of 2 Tim. 3:15;[200] when the adjective is found with λόγος the reference is to inspired words which were restored by Zerubbabel (ὁ τῶν θεοπνεύστων ἀναγνωρισμὸς καὶ ἀνακαινισμὸς λογίων) or to those which are from the apostles and teachers who are blessed (τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις λόγοις ὑπὸ τῶν μακαρίων ἀποστόλων τε καὶ διδασκάλων).[201] While θεόπνευστος is not found often in Clement, his usage sheds certain light on the interpretation of 2 Tim. 3:16 in two ways. One the one hand, the pattern which predominates in patristic literature in which θεόπνευστος is used of Scripture appears for the first time, after the New Testament, in his work. Also, Clement relates the inspiration of Scripture to its usefulness. In this respect he affirms that God directs according to inspired Scriptures (ἡγεῖται δε κατὰ τὰς θεοπνεύστους γραφάς)[202] and, in a text which is important for the present study, Clement claims that the sacred writings are inspired as they are useful for pastoral purposes (θεοπνεύστους καλεῖ, ὠφελίμους οὔσας).[203] A designation of the Scriptures as θεόπνευστος grows out of their practical utility.

In the writing of Origen (ca. 185-ca. 254) a remarkable exception is found to the limited use of θεόπνευστος in the second and third century. Origen's work is very significant not only in that it manifests a rather abundant use of the adjective, but also in that it establishes the pattern, found in embryonic form in Clement of Alexandria and developed in Christian authors after 300 A. D., in which θεόπνευστος occurs primarily of Holy Scripture. Indeed, Origen is more restrictive than most of the Church Fathers in that he

---

[200] Clément d'Alexandrie, Le protreptique, 9.87.

[201] Clement of Alexandria, Stromata. 1.21.124; 7.16.103 (*TLG*).

[202] Ibid., 7.16.101.

[203] Clément d'Alexandrie, Le protreptique, 9.87.

seems never to employ θεόπνευστος in any other way. In his corpus, the adjective is found once with λόγος (τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων),[204] apparently of the words of Scripture, and four times with βίβλος, especially of the twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon.[205] The balance of the forty-seven appearances of θεόπνευστος in Origen are all used with γραφή. In these occurrences γραφή is found more often in the singular than in the plural and, as well, generally with an article.

Origen uses the term θεόπνευστος as well as the adjective θεῖος (divine), in different aspects of his consideration of the nature of Scripture. Inspired Scripture (ἡ θεόπνευστος γραφή) is found in (one) book.[206] Origen argues, as evidence of this limitation, that all the holy books are one in that they together speak of Christ and that John saw a single book which was written "on the inside and the back." This book seen by John is a reference to all of Scripture, the two writings indicating the possible readings of it.[207] While inspired Scripture is to be located in only one book, Origen also uses θεόπνευστος of the twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon.[208] The adjective is found, then, both of Scripture as a unitary whole and, in the case of the Hebrew Scriptures, of the individual books. Although Origen views inspired Scripture as a collective whole, this does not mean that all of its content is of equal value. Paul, in 2 Tim. 3:16, states that all Scripture is inspired, but there is a distinction

---

[204] Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. 2.22.142 (*TLG*).

[205] For this use see, Origène, Philocalie, 3.

[206] Ibid., 5.in.

[207] Ibid., 5.5.

[208] Ibid., 3.

between the value of his words and those of the Lord.[209]

Θεόπνευστος appears, as well, in a context in which Origen seeks to demonstrate Scripture's inspiration. The evidence of inspiration (συναποδείκνυμεν θεοπνεύστους εἶναι τὰς προφητευούσας περὶ αὐτοῦ γραφάς) is related to the demonstration of Jesus' deity which is found in Scripture.[210] The adjective is also employed in the consideration of certain characteristics of Scripture. Although Origen does not argue that Scripture is inspired because it is "breathed-out" by the Spirit, he does affirm that the Spirit speaks in inspired Scripture (τῷ ἐν ταῖς θεοπνεύστοις γραφαῖς λαλοῦντι πνεύματι)[211] and that the wisdom of God is found throughout it (ἐπεὶ πᾶσαν ἔφθασε θεόπνευστον γραφὴν ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ).[212] In a text which is important for the interpretation of 2 Tim. 3:16, Origen states that as Scripture is inspired, it is useful (πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος οὖσα ὠφέλιμός ἐστιν).[213] In his perspective, therefore, Scripture's pastoral usefulness is a function of its inspiration

The only other occurrences of θεόπνευστος in Christian literature prior to the fourth century are in Hippolytus (ca. 170-235 A. D.). This Roman presbyter uses the adjective of the prophets (τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις προφήταις)[214]

---

[209] Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. trans. Cécile Blanc, Sources chrétiennes, no. 120, ed., H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou, Paris: Cerf, 1966, 1.16.

[210] Origène, Philocalie, 1.6 (*TLG*).

[211] Origène, Jean, 6.48.248 (*TLG*).

[212] Origène, Philocalie, 2.4.

[213] Ibid., 12.2.

[214] Hippolytus, De universo. 130 (*TLG*).

and of Scripture (θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς),[215] thus portraying inspiration as both personal and textual. He is the first, in the Christian realm, to use the term of the prophets themselves and not specifically of their writings.

This survey of the lexical history of θεόπνευστος in the second and third centuries A. D. leads to a number of significant observations. In occurrences outside Christian literature it may be seen, first, that the adjective θεόπνευστος was known, but not widely used. This may suggest that the concept(s) conveyed by this term were articulated in other ways in the non-Christian context. Second, when θεόπνευστος is found in this literature it may have, in certain instances, an active sense. Third, the loci of inspiration in these non-Christian uses vary widely and no clear pattern is evident, however, these appearances of θεόπνευστος are similar in their distinction from what is found in the Christian context. While Christian use during this period locates inspiration almost exclusively in Scripture, non-Christian writings never describe books or sacred writings with this adjective. There is no evidence that the adjective is found outside of Christianity to describe the religious writings of a people. This fact leads to a final observation with respect to the non-Christian appearances of θεόπνευστος which is that no indication exists that these occurrences reflect a knowledge of 2 Tim. 3:16 or an influence of this text. Inspiration is consistently seen outside the Christian realm as located somewhere other than in sacred books. For this reason it may be concluded that although the adjective was known and used beyond the boundaries of Christianity, this knowledge cannot be shown to be dependent upon 2 Tim. 3:16.

In somewhat striking contrast to the use of θεόπνευστος outside the Christian context, the occurrences in Christian literature prior to 300 A. D. manifest a certain unitary character. With the single exception of one appearance of θεόπνευστος in Hippolytus, the adjective is always used of Holy

---

[215] Hippolytus, In Canticum canticorum. 5.3.4 (*TLG*).

Scripture, although several different nouns are found. This observation becomes even more significant when it is seen in light of the aforementioned contrast with non-Christian writings of this period. A second observation regarding θεόπνευστος in Christian writings is that, at least in Origen, Scripture's inspiration is what sets it apart as unique. Although Origen never affirms, in a context where he employs the adjective, that Scripture is inspired because it is "breathed-out" by the Spirit, he does use θεόπνευστος in his articulation of the nature of Scripture. It is this characteristic of Scripture which differentiates it from other literature. A final matter to be noted in the Christian use of θεόπνευστος is that Scripture's inspiration is related to its pastoral usefulness. In Clement of Alexandria, Scripture is called "inspired" because it is useful. The appellation comes from the recognition of its utility. In Origen Scripture is useful because it is inspired. Its inspiration is the reason for its usefulness.

There exists, then, two distinct currents in the use of θεόπνευστος prior to the fourth century A. D. These distinct currents manifest only a very limited confluence at least with respect to the location of inspiration. It is the stream of Christian usage which is reflected in the Church Fathers after 300 A. D.

With the dawn of the fourth century and the increasing acceptance of Christianity, θεόπνευστος became a term which was often employed, especially of Scripture. The adjective is used rather extensively in certain Christian authors. These individuals include Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 265-ca. 339 A. D.), Athanasius (ca. 296-373 A. D.), Didymus the Blind (314-396 A. D.), Basil the Great (ca. 329-379 A. D.), Gregory of Nyssa (330-ca. 395 A. D.). The term is found less often in Gregory of Nazianzus (330-389 A. D.), John Chrysostom (ca. 344/354-407 A. D.), and Theodoret (ca. 393-ca. 458 A. D.). Occasional appearances of θεόπνευστος occur in other writers of this period as well as several important uses in John of Damascus (ca. 675-ca. 749 A.D.). There are enough occurrences of the adjective in these authors (around 350) that reliable

perspective is possible regarding the manner in which θεόπνευστος was employed and understood by these Church Fathers.

The vast majority of appearances of θεόπνευστος in these Fathers is with a noun which in some way refers to Scripture. This assertion must be immediately qualified by the recognition that the affirmation that these substantives are used of Scripture is only probable and cannot be demonstrated. These Church Fathers do not generally indicate the particular writings which are included in the reference of nouns like γραφή and λόγος, so this must almost always be determined on the basis of general usage, context, and the understanding of these terms in Church history rather than on that of a clear statement by these authors. Nevertheless, the way in which certain nouns, particularly γραφή, were used and have been understood make it impossible to adequately argue for a reference other than Scripture in most occurrences. The overwhelming majority of appearances of θεόπνευστος in the Church Fathers of the fourth century and following, then, occur with nouns which designate Scripture.

The substantive γραφή is, by far, the term with which θεόπνευστος is used most often. This noun appears both in the singular and plural and is often articular. Thus, for example, in almost half of the 100 or so occurrences of θεόπνευστος in Gregory of Nyssa the corresponding noun is γραφή. Gregory is somewhat unique in that almost all of these appearances of γραφή are articular and singular. Eusebius employs θεόπνευστος about fifty times, over two-thirds of which are with γραφή. In the majority of these occurrences an article is present and they are about equally divided between the singular and the plural. A similar pattern is found in Didymus. Often in this literature θεόπνευστος is used with γραφή as a designation of Scripture, but not in such a way that significant light is cast on the meaning of the adjective. There are some appearances of the adjective with this noun which are especially important for

this study because 2 Tim. 3:16a is particulary in view. These will be considered shortly.

Although θεόπνευστος occurs frequently with γραφή, it is found with other substantives of Scripture. The adjective appears in Gregory of Nyssa with λόγος of inspired words of those with the Spirit's guidance (τοὺς τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι θεοφόρου . . . διὰ τῶν θεοπνεύστων ἑαυτοῦ λόγων), [216] and with ῥῆμα, in a similar sense, of words which are inspired (τὰ θεόπνευστα τῆς ψαλμῳδίας ῥήματα).[217] Gregory also employs θεόπνευστος with φωνή of the inspired voice placed before us (τῆς δὲ θεοπνεύστου φωνῆς προκειμένης ἡμῖν) which, apparently, is heard in Scripture, although this is not entirely clear.[218] The noun βίβλος is found in Athanasius with θεόπνευστος in a context in which he seeks to respond to the unbelief of the Jews. Athanasius affirms that the entire inspired Bible (πάσης ἁπλῶς θεοπνεύστου βίβλου), which the Jews themselves read, speaks of things they do not believe.[219] Basil uses διδασκαλία, a substantive which would not necessarily designate Scripture itself, to refer directly to Scripture when he speaks of the inspired teaching (ἡ

---

[216] Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunomium. 3.1.11 (*TLG*). For other occurences of θεόπνευστος with λογός see, Eusebius, Vita Constantini. 4.17.1 (*TLG*), Athanasius, De virginitate. 2.3 (*TLG*).

[217] Gregory of Nyssa, In inscriptiones Psalmorum. 5.144 (*TLG*). The adjective also is found with ῥῆμα in Basil, Homiliae in hexaemeron. 6.11 and Regulae morales. 31.868 (*TLG*).

[218] Gregory of Nyssa, Contre Eunomium, 3.4.54, cf. 1.1.186 (*TLG*). For the use of θεόπνευστος with φωνή in Gregory see as well, Contre Eunomium, 1.1.690, 2.1.601 (*TLG*).

[219] Athanasius, De incarnatione verbi. 33.3 (*TLG*).

θεόπνευστος . . . διδασκαλία) and continues by citing Scripture.220 Similarly, in the same author, the inspired direction of God (τῆς θεοπνεύστου χειραγωγίας) is used of Scripture.221 Here as well probably belong the appearances of θεόπνευστος with wisdom (θεοπνεύστου σοφίας) and thought (τὰς τῶν θεοπνεύστων νοημάτων τε καὶ ρημάτων) as they are identified with or found in Scripture.222 The adjective is also found with substantives which designate only a part of Scripture, for Eusebius speaks of the inspired Gospels (τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις Εὐαγγελίοις)223 and the inspired Proverbs (τὰς θεοπνεύστους Παριμίας).224 While most of the occurrences of these nouns are found in contexts where there is not a specific reference to a particular portion of Scripture, there are exceptions. Athanasius, for example, follows a call to be influenced by inspired words (καταδεξάσθω τὰ ὦτά σου θεοπνεύστους λόγους) with a citation of a biblical text.225

The pattern which emerges from the many appearances of θεόπνευστος with substantives which refer to Scripture in certain Greek Fathers is that the term occurs primarily with γραφή but, as well, with a variety of nouns. Its use was not limited either to a single noun or to a particular manner of describing

---

220 Basil, Epistulae. 189.4 (*TLG*). Gregory of Nyssa employs the same term of the teaching of Scripture (τῆς θεοπνευύστου τῶν γραφῶν δι διδασκαλίας), Contra Eunomium, 3.1.5 (*TLG*).

221 Ibid., 38.4.

222 Gregory of Nyssa, In sanctum Ephraim. 46.829; In Canticum canticorum. 6.25 (*TLG*).

223 Eusebius, Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marinum. 22.937 (*TLG*).

224 Eusebius, Contra Marcellum. 1.3.17 (*TLG*).

225 Athanasius, De virginitate. 2.3 (*TLG*).

Scripture. Rather, the adjective appears with a number of words and in different contexts.

Θεόπνευστος does appear in this literature, although not often, with substantives other than those used of Scripture or that which is directly related to it. Θεόπνευστος is found in patristic writings of people. Paul is thus described by Gregory of Nyssa (ὁ γὰρ θεόπνευστοσ ὡς . . . καὶ θεοδίδακτος Παῦλος)[226] and Eusebius applies the term to the author of the Apocalypse (Ἰωάννου ταύτην οὐκ ἀντερῶ . . . εἶναι . . . θεοπνεύστου) in a context in which he questions whether this person is John the son of Zebedee.[227] In both of these occurrences the adjective is found of individuals involved in the production of Scripture. Chrysostom, despite a more limited use of θεόπνευστος than some patristic authors, employs it with more breath. He describes the Church as inspired in contrast to the synagogue which fights against God (τὴν θεομάχον συναγωγὴν, πρὸς τὴν θεόπνευστον Ἐκκλησίαν)[228] and uses the adjective, as well, for the lustre from heaven associated with the incarnation of Christ (λαμπηδόνες θεόπνευστοι οὐρανόθεν προέκυψαν).[229]

Two exceptional occurrences of θεόπνευστος may be indicated here, although only one may be traced with some certainty to the period under consideration. The adjective is found in the *Testament of Abraham*, a work

---

226 Gregory of Nyssa, De perfectione Christiana. 8,1.187 (*TLG*).

227 Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica. 7.25.7 (*TLG*).

228 Chrysostom, In illud. 61.691 (*TLG*).

229 Chrysostom, In natale domini et in sanctam Mariam genitricem. 1.16 (*TLG*).

which a number of later manuscripts attribute to Chrysostom,[230] but which cannot be dated with accuracy. In a dramatic account of Abraham's death the *Testament* states that as death took hold of this just man, Michael the archangel came with a multitude of angels, placed his soul in a fine cloth woven by God (σινδόνι θεοϋφάντῳ), and cared for it with "inspired" perfumes and spices (μυρίσμασι θεοπνεύστοις καὶ ἀρώμασιν).[231] It is possible that θεόπνευστος is used actively in this appearance as, presumably, the perfumes in view are not natural but those which come from God and are, therefore, filled by Him. The idea is, then, that the presence of God radiates from them. Given the language of the immediate context, however, a passive sense is preferable. The muslim in which Abraham's soul is said to have been placed is described by θεοϋφάντῳ which must be passive. This passive, in close relation with μυρίσμασι θεοπνεύστοις, favours a similar sense of θεόπνευστος. Even with the choice of a passive sense, the determination of the meaning of the adjective is difficult. The idea seems to be that the perfumes are "inspired" in that their source is God or His Spirit, but the exact significance is not entirely evident. To make this term roughly synonymous with "divine" as does Warfield[232] seems to blur its precision, but it is not clear how perfumes could be "inspired" or "God-breathed." This occurrence of θεόπνευστος in the *Testament of Abraham*, then, is characterized by certain difficulties, although it is relatively certain that it is used passively, with the idea that the source of the perfumes is God.

A rather late and, again, somewhat exceptional occurrence of θεόπνευστος is found in Nonnus (fl. 450-70 A.D.) who, in a paraphrase of John 1:27, renders the words of John the Baptist, "'and he that cometh after me stands

---

230 Francis Schmidt, Le Testament grec d'Abraham. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986, pp. 30-32.

231 Ibid., p. 167.

232 Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 268.

to-day in your midst, the tip of whose foot I am not worthy to approach with human hand though only to loose the thongs of the theopneustic sandal'"[233] (οὐκ ἄζιός εἰμι πελάσσας λῦσαι μοῦνον ἱμάντα θεοπνεύστοιο πεδίλου).[234] In this appearance the adjective may have an active sense of "radiating God'"[235] or, perhaps, a passive one of "inspired by God" in that the sandal is influenced by the divine Person to whom it belonged.[236] The latter is more difficult in that it requires an unusual understanding of θεόπνευστος.

In occurrences of θεόπνευστος in patristic authors where 2 Tim. 3:16 is not specifically in view, then, the predominant use of the adjective is with nouns which are used of Scripture or that which is related to it. There are some occasions, however, where it is employed either of those who produced the Scriptures or with other substantives. These appearances of θεόπνευστος are rare.

Although the use of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16 may stand behind that which is found in the Church Fathers of the forth and fifth century, there is generally no clear reference to 2 Tim. 3:16 when the term is used in their writings. There are, however, certain occurrences of θεόπνευστος which are more specifically related to 2 Tim. 3:16 either in that they appear in an exposition of this text by a patristic author or in that they are found where there is a (possible) reference to πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος (καὶ ὠφέλιμος). These appearances of θεόπνευστος are significant for a comprehension of the term in the text of this study as they provide some indication of how it was understood by these Fathers.

---

233 The translation of Warfield in ibid., 268-69.

234 Nonnus, Paraphrasis sancti evangelii Joannei. 1.99 (*TLG*).

235 Cf. Cremer, Wörterbuch, p. 493, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, 731].

236 See, Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 269.

One of the contexts in which θεόπνευστος is related directly to 2 Tim. 3:16 is that in which there occurs an indication of the reason why Scripture is inspired. Most often Scripture is seen as inspired (θεόπνευστος) because it is from the Spirit. This assertion is found in Didymus (θεόπνευστος . . . ἡ Γραφὴ, ὡς τοῦ πνεύσαντος αὐτὴν ἁγίου Πνεύματος Θεοῦ καθεστῶτος)[237] and Basil (πᾶσα Γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος, διὰ τοῦτο συγγραφεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος).[238] The exact manner in which Scripture comes from the Spirit is elsewhere described as spoken by the Spirit (ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος λαληθεῖσα),[239] written by the Spirit (διὰ τοῦτο συγγραφεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος),[240] or communicated by the Spirit through the Prophets and Apostles.[241] While Scripture is primarily seen to be inspired because it is given by the Spirit, it is, as well, because of its influence on people.[242]

Another context in which the Fathers of the fourth century and following provide certain perspective on the relation between θεόπνευστος and 2 Tim. 3:16 is in their indication of the significance of Scripture's inspiration. As Scripture is inspired it differs from writings which are from human wisdom (τὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας συγγράμματα).[243] Scripture's inspiration, as well,

---

[237] Didymus Caecus, De trinitate. 39.644 (*TLG*).

[238] Basil, Homiliae super Psalmos. 29.209 (*TLG*).

[239] Basil, Adversus Eunomium. 29.765 (*TLG*).

[240] John of Damacus, Sacra Parallela. 96.13 (*TLG*).

[241] Theodoret, Interpretatio in xii epistulas sancti Pauli. 82.849 (*TLG*).

[242] Chrysostom, Expositiones in Psalmos. 55.453 (*TLG*).

[243] Theodoret, Epistulas Pauli. 82.849 (*TLG*).

should condition the response of its hearers. It's reliability is to be believed (γὰρ δεῖ ἁπλῇ πιστεύειν πίστει ταῖς Γραφαῖς, ὅτι θεόπνευστοι)[244] and the commands of the Lord (found in it) accepted without hesitation (τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνεξετάστως δεχόμεθα εἰδότες, ὅτι πᾶσα Γραφὴ θεόπνευστος).[245] Because Scripture is inspired, says John of Damascus, a diligent study (seeking) of it is a beautiful and profitable exercise (κάλλιστον καὶ ψυχωφελέστατον ἐρευνᾶν).[246]

The perspective on the meaning and of θεόπνευστος and the way in which it was employed in certain Greek Fathers which has been presented is similar to Lampe's who indicates that the patristic use of θεόπνευστος was of scripture as "divinely inspired" and, as such, "representing the voice of H. Ghost."[247] Lampe understands θεόπνευστος as passive and meaning "inspired (by God),"[248] as did certain early versions of Scripture.[249]

Given this pattern of use, it is evident that the Vulgate's rendering of θεόπνευστος as *divinitus inspirata* in *omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata*[250]

---

244 Basil, Enarratio in prophetam Isaiam. 7.198 (*TLG*).

245 Basil, Prologus 5. 31.888 (*TLG*).

246 John of Damascus, De Fide Orthodoxa. 90.12 (*TLG*).

247 W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961, p. 630.

248 It should be noted that there is certainly more than a nuance of difference in Lampe's rendering of θεόπνευστος as "*divinely* inspired" and the familiar "inspired *of God.*"

249 See, Cremer, "Inspiration," 9, 185, [ET, in Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 249].

250 Biblia Sacra. [Torino]: Marietti, 1959, p. 1188.

continues a comprehension of this term which had been present in the writings of the Church Fathers for about two centuries before the preparation of this version. This understanding appears again around the time of the Reformation in both Luther, who translates "von Gott eingegeben,"[251] and the English tradition from the time of Wycliff (1380 A.D.).[252]

Contemporary Bible versions reflect either a continuity with the patristic rendering of θεόπνευστος or a certain discontinuity. On the one hand, the vast majority of works continue to translate this term with a passive sense and meaning "inspired by God."[253] At least one recent version, by contrast, reflects a trend found in certain conservative commentators to retain the passive sense of θεόπνευστος but to translate it as "God-breathed."[254]

A number of observations emerge from even a cursory study of the appearances of θεόπνευστος in certain Church Fathers of the fourth century and following, some of which are important for the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a. First, θεόπνευστος was a term which occurred with some frequency, especially in the fourth century. The limited use of θεόπνευστος prior to this time has already been presented. With the dawn of this century, however, θεόπνευστος appears

---

251 Luther, Die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch, II, 2400.

252 Examples are: "onspirid of god," (Wycliff, 1380 A.D..), "geven by inspiracion of god," (Tyndale, 1534 A.D.), "geuen by inspiracyon of God," (Cranmer, 1539 A.D.), "is geuen by inspiration of God," (Geneva, 1557 A.D.), "inspired of God," (Rheims, 1582 A.D.) and "is given by inspiration of God (Authorized Version, 1611 A.D.)." The English Hexapla. London: Bagster, 1841, [n.p.].

253 Thus the NASB, p. 1827; RSV, p. 240; NRSV, p. 230; NEB, p. 273.

254 Thus the NIV, p. 1846. This translation was adopted a century ago by Rotherham. See, Joseph Bryant Rotherham, ed., The Emphasized Bible. Cincinnati: Standard, 1897, p. 219. Cf. Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 446. Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 279.

much more often. Presumably, some of the increased usage may be accounted for by factors such as greater Christian literary production and the possibility that theologians of the Church devoted more attention to concepts which might be expressed by means of terms such as θεόπνευστος. Beyond these explanations, it is possible that a reason for the increase in occurrences of θεόπνευστος in this literature is that the term itself gradually came to play a significant role in the articulation of the nature of Scripture.

A second observation, and one which is key for an understanding of θεόπνευστος, is that the vast majority of appearances of this term in Christian writers of this period are with substantives which designate Scripture in various ways. The adjective occurs with other nouns, indicating a certain flexibility in usage. These exceptions should not cloud, however, the clear pattern which is that the primary use of θεόπνευστος is with this particular group of nouns. Apparently these patristic writers understood the term as expressing something which was particularly characteristic of Scripture. Related to this second observation, a third is that θεόπνευστος was a term which described a unique characteristic of Scripture. Often in this literature the adjective appears with a noun like γραφή apparently indicating a unique aspect of Scripture, although the exact nature of this uniqueness is left undeveloped. The fact that the Scripture is θεόπνευστος also sets in apart from other writings which, although having certain value, do not possess this characteristic (ἡ Ελληνικὴ παίδευσις οὔτε παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὔτε παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν, ἢ ὡς θεόπνευστος ἐδέχθη).[255] The adjective was employed, then, in the articulation of the unique character of Scripture. A fourth observation regarding the use of θεόπνευστος is that the term was not limited just to substantives of Scripture. It appears of people, although perhaps only of those who are "inspired" in that they had a direct part in the production of the Scriptures. It occurs rarely, as

---

[255] Socrates Scholasticus, Histoire ecclésiastique. 3.16 (*TLG*).

well, with other nouns. This usage is significant both in that it demonstrates that θεόπνευστος was not a term which, in the thought of these theologians, could *only* be employed as a description of Scripture and in that the exceptional nature of these appearances reinforces the importance of the predominant use of θεόπνευστος with substantives of Scripture.

Beyond these general observations with respect to the use of θεόπνευστος in Christian authors of the fourth century and following, there are a pair which are more directly related to occurrences of the adjective in contexts where 2 Tim. 3:16a is directly in view. On the one hand, the appearances of θεόπνευστος in certain Greek Fathers does not shed significant light on the meaning of the term. As these writers employ the same language as that of the New Testament, the kind of insight into their understanding of a word which might be found by an investigation of terms used in translation is not available in their work. In most of the instances in which θεόπνευστος occurs in this literature it occurs with no indication whatsoever of what the particular author understood its meaning to be. These writers are more helpful in the consideration of whether θεόπνευστος carries an active or passive sense in 2 Tim. 3:16a. The adjective was clearly understood in this literature as passive. Scripture is not, in their thought, inspired (θεόπνευστος) in that it is "alive with God" or "animates God," but because, as its source is the Spirit of God, it is "God-breathed." In this regard inspired Scripture is described as having been spoken by or written by the Spirit.[256]

The use of θεόπνευστος has been considered, then, in both Christian and non-Christian writers of the period directly after the New Testament and in

---

[256] The preceding discussion of the use of θεόπνευστος in certain Greek authors should not be understood as implying that these theologians shared an identical comprehension of the nature of Scripture's inspiration. While certain similarities have been observed, no effort has been made either to completely develop the idea of inspiration in each of these Fathers or to compare these perspectives.

Church Fathers of the fourth century and following. This consideration is important in the resolution of two questions in the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a which are, first, is θεόπνευστος to be understood as active or passive and, second, what is the meaning of the adjective?

With respect to whether θεόπνευστος is active or passive, a review of the lexical history of the adjective has demonstrated that the term occurred most often with a passive sense. This is, perhaps, universally accepted by commentators. Cremer and Warfield, for example, agree that at least in some of the early occurrences of θεόπνευστος (such as ἀλλὰ μέγαν γενετῆρα θεὸν πάντων θεοπνεύστων ἐν θυσίαις ἁγίαις ἐγέραιρον καὶ ἐκατόμβαις in *Sibylline Oracle*, 5.406)[257] the term has a passive sense. The question is whether θεόπνευστος always thus appears. Warfield argues for this position, while Cremer affirms, on the basis of texts such as Κύμη δ᾽ ἡ μωρὰ σὺν νάμασι τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις (*Sibylline Oracle*, 5.308) that the word, on occasion, has an active significance of "'breathing a divine spirit.'"[258] Cremer asserts, similarly that θεόπνευστος may have been used by Origen in an active sense in his *sacra volumina Spiritus plenitudinem spirant* (Hom. 21 in Jerem.).[259] In the Latin context, Reck recognizes an active meaning in the work of Ambrose of Milan, who in place of the common *inspirate,* employs *spirare*,[260]

---

257 Cremer, Wörterbuch, pp. 492, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, pp. 731]; Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 266-67.

258 Cremer, Wörterbuch, pp. 492-93, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, pp. 731-32]; Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 263-72.

259 See, Cremer, "Inspiration," 9, 185.

260 Reinhold Reck, "2 Tim 3,16 in der altkirchlichen Literatur: Eine wirkungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Locus classicus der Inspirationslehre." Wissenschaft und Weisheit. 53 (1990), 91.

thus reflecting "breathing out" as opposed to "breathing into or on."[261]

The debate over whether θεόπνευστος is active or passive in force is concentrated around the change in the thinking of Hermann Cremer. In the early editions of *Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* he adopted a passive force for θεόπνευστος which is understood, therefore, as "divinely inspired."[262] In later editions, however, this understanding was at least partially adapted to reflect an active force for the adjective. Cremer defines θεόπνευστος in the fourth edition of his lexicon as "prompted by God, *divinely inspired*," but later in the same edition affirms a meaning in 2 Timothy 3:16 of "*spirit-filled,* breathing the Spirit of God."[263]

Cremer arrives at a meaning of "breathing the Spirit of God" in 2 Timothy 3:16a by a series of steps. First, while affirming that θεόπνευστος occurs in the passive in certain early uses of the term, he denies that the word means "inspired (by God)." Θεόπνευστος is taken, rather, as meaning "gifted with

---

261 Cf. *inspiratio, inspiro* and *spiratio, spiro* in, Albert Blaise, Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens. revised Henri Chirat, Turnhout, Belgique: Brepols, 1954, pp. 456, 770; P. G. W. Glare, Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982, pp. 928, 1805-07.

262 Hermann Cremer, Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Stuggart: Perthes, 1866, p. 231, [ET, Hermann Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek. trans. D. W. Simpson and William Urwick, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872, p. 267].

263 Cremer, Lexicon, pp. 282, 731. Cremer is joined by other exegetes who either admit the active meaning as a possibility or imply the active force in their discussion. Lock recognizes that θεόπνευστος may mean "inspired by God," but suggests the alternative possibility of "'with *its* breath given it by God,' so 'conveying inspiration'" (Lock, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 110). Leaney and Lilley do not directly accept the active meaning of θεόπνευστος but seem, by their comments, to imply this force as they consider the influence of Scripture on its readers (see, Leaney, Timothy, Titus and Philemon, p. 99; Lilley, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 210).

God's Spirit, breathing the Divine Spirit."264 Second, Cremer argues that when θεόπνευστος is connected with words like γραφή and νᾶμα, the word is not easily made to mean "*inspired by God* in the sense of the Vulgate." On the contrary, an active sense of "*breathing a divine spirit*" is signified "in keeping with the ordinary transference of the passive into the active meaning, as we find it in ἄπνευστος, εὔπνευστος, *badly or well imbued, breathing forth good or ill.*"265 The third step in Cremer reasoning is to indicate that the active sense he has proposed fits both the immediate context of 2 Timothy 3:15-16 and that of other texts of the Bible "where what Scripture says is distinctly designated the saying or word of the Holy Ghost."266

While it may be readily admitted that θεόπνευστος may have an active sense is some contexts in which it occurs, for example that of the *Sibylline Oracles* 5, the perspective that such a sense occurs in 2 Tim. 3:16a should not be adopted for a number of reasons. First, Cremer's work has been criticised in that he did not adequately consider the range of semantic alternatives, perhaps because of a flawed etymological understanding. His acceptance of an active meaning for θεόπνευστος appears to be based on a rejection of the Vulgate's "inspired by God." As Warfield points out, he did not consider a third option, which is that the term may mean "divinely spired."267 This failure may be a reflection of Cremer's understanding of the etymology of θεόπνευστος, which he traces to ἐμπνέω and not to πνέω.268 A second reason why an active sense of

---

264 Cremer, Wörterbuch, p. 492, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, pp. 730-31].

265 Ibid., pp. 492-93, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, p. 731].

266 Ibid., p. 493, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, p. 731-32].

267 Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 277, 283-84.

268 Ibid., pp. 284-87.

θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a is not to be preferred is that there is a general tendency for verbals which terminate in -tos to have a passive sense, although this is not always the case. Robertson indicates that "the verbal in -tos goes back to the original Indo-Germanic time and had a sort of perfect passive idea." He does, however, recognize limitations in this position, for he goes on to write, "but we must not overdo this point. Strictly this pre-ethnic -tos has no voice or tense and it never came to have intimate verbal connections in the Greek." "It becomes," in Robertson's view, "a lexical, not a syntactical problem to decide in a given instance whether the verbal is 'active' or 'passive' in signification."[269] While this grammatical consideration is not absolutely determinative for the sense of θεόπνευστος in 2 Timothy 3:16a, the general pattern of use favours a passive sense, which should be retained. Similarly, as has been noted, there are verbal adjectives in θεο . . . τος which appear prior to the New Testament which are passive in sense. Although an active sense might be found among such adjectives, the predominant pattern seems to be that of the passive. Warfield states that "verbals in -τος and with θεός normally express an effect produced by God's activity."[270] This favours a passive sense in 2 Tim. 3:16a. Another reason why the passive is to be chosen in 2 Tim. 3:16a is that this is clearly what is found in the majority of occurrences of θεόπνευστος in literature posterior to the New Testament. While an active sense may be possible in certain texts, some uses of θεόπνευστος must be understood as passive and this sense is possible in virtually every occurrence of the adjective in the writings which have been considered. The strong tendency toward the passive favours this sense in 2 Tim. 3:16a. Finally, certain patristic authors, on occasions where 2 Tim. 3:16a is clearly in view in their work, hold a passive sense of θεόπνευστος as Scripture is affirmed to be inspired in that its source is the Spirit

---

[269] Robertson, Grammar, pp. 1095-96.

[270] Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 281-82.

of God. An acceptance of an active sense of the adjective in 2 Tim. 3:16a requires a rejection of the perspective of these authors on this questions. The foregoing argument is convincing enough that an active sense of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a is only rarely adopted in theological literature. Θεόπνευστος is here used passively, then, the sense of the term being "inspired by God" or "breathed-out by God."

Having examined the nature of the adjective θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a, an attempt may be made *to determine its meaning.* At least three possibilities have been suggested. Θεόπνευστος may have an active sense and mean "gifted or filled with God's Spirit, *divinely spirited.*"271 It may, by contrast, carry a passive sense and convey the idea as Warfield has argued, "divinely spired,"272 or "God-breathed." Finally the term θεόπνευστος may be passive in sense and mean, as throughout much of its lexical history, "inspired by God."

The first alternative, that θεόπνευστος means "gifted or filled with God's Spirit, *divinely spirited,*" is the position of Hermann Cremer. As has been seen, Cremer questioned the Vulgate's "inspired by God" because of the difficulty of this meaning with a noun like γραφή and adopted instead an active sense of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16. This understanding of the adjective, however, is not the best in that, as has already been argued, it is probably not employed actively in this text. The first alternative for the meaning of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a, then, that it is "divinely spirited" or "breathing a divine spirit" is unacceptable in that it requires an active sense of θεόπνευστος.

The second meaning which has been proposed for θεόπνευστος, that of "divinely spired, God-breathed," has exercised a considerable influence among

---

271 Cremer, Wörterbuch, p. 492, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, p. 730].

272 Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 277, 283-84.

evangelicals since it was vigorously defended by Warfield. This influence has been so important that it may be said that this is the meaning assigned to θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a by the majority of evangelicals at the present time.[273] Two arguments, which have not changed significantly since the work of Warfield, have been advanced for a meaning of "God-breathed" in 2 Timothy 3:16. These include, first, the etymology of the term which, according to Warfield, "has . . . nothing to say of *in*spiring or of *in*spiration: it speaks only of a "spiring" or "spiration."[274] The importance which Warfield attaches to the etymology of θεόπνευστος is clear:

> What it says of Scripture is, not that it is "breathed into by God" or is the product of the Divine "inbreathing" into its human authors, but that it is breathed out by God, "God-breathed," the product of the creative breath of God. In a word, what is declared by this fundamental passage is simply

---

[273] Warfield appears to be one of the first who forcefully argues for this meaning (See, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 132-33; 277, 285-86) although its appearance in Rotherham's Emphasised Bible, (IV, 219) raises the question of when this translation of θεόπνευστος was first employed. Among contemporary evangelicals who understand θεόπνευστος to mean "God-breathed" are Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 446; Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 279; Gordon H. Clark, The Pastoral Epistles. Jefferson, MR: Trinity Foundation, 1983, pp. 179-80; John R. W. Stott, Guard the Gospel. The Bible Speaks Today, ed. John R. W. Stott, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, pp. 101-02; Edward J. Young, "Scripture-God-Breathed and Profitable." Grace Journal, 7/3 (Fall, 1966), 7; House, "Biblical Inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16," 58; Moisés Silva, God, Language and Scripture. Vol. 4, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation, ed. Moisés Silva, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990, p. 37; George Eldon Ladd, "Why did God Inspire the Bible?" Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation. eds. W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford LaSor, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, p. 49. Among important contemporary translations of the Scripture it is only the *NIV* which renders θεόπνευστος as "God-breathed" (*NIV*, p. 1827; cf. Robert Young, ed., Young's Literal Translation of the Holy Bible. revised ed. Youngstown, OH: Schnell, 1953, NT, p. 148). Caemmerer states that the word means "God-spirited," in Richard R. Caemmerer, "The Educational Use of Scripture in Light of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit." Concordia Theological Monthly, 28 (1957), 214.

[274] Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 133.

that the Scriptures are a Divine product, without any indication of how God has operated in producing them.[275]

The second reason given for the meaning "God-breathed" is that the concept of "'the breath of God'" in the Bible is "the symbol of His almighty power, the bearer of His creative word."[276] Warfield argues that the term θεόπνευστος captures a universal Jewish conception "that God produces all that He would bring into being by a mere breath."[277] The meaning "God-breathed" is, therefore, supported on the basis of the concept which is involved in the word θεόπνευστος.

Although Warfield and those who have been influenced by him have exercised a significant influence in evangelical circles, his indication of the meaning of θεόπνευστος may be challenged at several points. First, this understanding is built primarily on a particular perspective with respect to the etymology of the term. While etymology is difficult to avoid in a term such as θεόπνευστος which had limited, if any, pre-Christian history,[278] it is questionable whether a particular meaning for a word and, then, a related doctrinal understanding can adequately be constructed primarily on etymology. Second, this position ignores the weight of the patristic tradition which, while having the

---

[275] Ibid. This concern to eliminate the place of the preposition "in-" in the meaning of θεόπνευστος is echoed in recent literature. Stott says "'inspiration' is doubtless a convenient term to use, but 'spiration' or even 'expiration' would convey the meaning of the Greek adjective more accurately. Scripture is not to be thought of as already in existence when (subsequently) God breathed into it, but as itself brought into existence by the breath of the Spirit of God." Stott, Guard the Gospel, pp. 101-02; cf. Young, "Scripture-God-Breathed and Profitable," 7-8.

[276] Ibid., p. 133.

[277] Ibid., pp. 285-86.

[278] Cf. Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible," 484.

option of rendering the term as "divinely spired," almost universally adopted a meaning of "divinely inspired."[279] Although Warfield is aware of and adequately reflects this tradition,[280] he completely ignores it when deciding between "divinely spired" and "divinely inspired" as renderings of 2 Timothy 3:16. This is a major weakness in Warfield's argument and the primary reason for the rejection of the meaning he proposes. A final problem is the assumption that the retention of the preposition "*in-*" in "inspired by God" necessitates a breathing of God into already existing Scripture. Certain evangelicals reject the meaning "inspired by God" because it appears to communicate the idea of God breathing into Scriptures which have a prior existence. While this is a possible implication, there is nothing in the term itself which demands it and the rejection of the meaning "inspired by God" on the basis of this argument requires reading into the term certain concepts which are not inherent to it. The meaning "divinely spired" or "God-breathed" is, therefore, not the best choice for the meaning of θεόπνευστος in 2 Timothy 3:16a, especially because it fails to adequately reflect the historical understanding of this term.[281]

Having rejected two of the possible three meanings for θεόπνευστος in 2 Timothy 3:16a, only the third alternative, which see θεόπνευστος as passive in sense and meaning "divinely inspired" or "inspired by God" remains. This is the

---

279 Reck, "2 Tim 3,16 in der altkirchlichen Literatur," 91.

280 Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 272-75.

281 It must be noted in the analysis of Warfield's position that there is not necessarily a significant difference in meaning between "divinely spired" and "divinely inspired" in 2 Tim. 3:16. The reason why careful distinction is important in the current discussion of inspiration is that certain evangelicals, following Warfield, have, first, adopted "divinely spired" on questionable grounds and, second, sought to establish a significant difference between this meaning and that of "inspired by God." It is, then, the manner in which the meaning "divinely spired" has been used which is important in the consideration of these alternatives and not just the meaning itself.

meaning which is adopted by this study both because of the weakness inherent in the other alternatives and because of the strong tradition of this understanding both in the early period of the Church and throughout its history.

The affirmation that θεόπνευστος is passive in sense and is to be understood in 2 Timothy 3:16a as meaning "inspired by God" does not demand that the semantic range of meaning of this term be the same as the English "inspired (by God)." This is true for two reasons. The first is etymological. A lexical examination of θεόπνευστος indicates that there may be an etymological difference between this term and the English "inspired (by God)."

A second reason is that the English word "inspired" has neither a unitary meaning or one which is historically fixed. An abbreviated review of the definition of "inspired" in a recent authoritative English dictionary indicates that this word possesses a certain range of meaning and that, when used of Scripture, this meaning may have varied somewhat. The definitions is:

> **inspired**
> A. *ppl a.* 1. Blown on or into, inflated . . .
> 2. Breathed in . . .
> 3. Actuated or animated by divine or supernatural influence . . .
> 4. Infused or communicated by divine or supernatural power; having the character of inspiration. As applied to Sacred Scriptures, there is now usually a blending of senses 3 and 4, the word being viewed as still animated by the divine influence which communicated it
> 5. *transf.* a. Promoted by, or emanating from, and influential (but unavowed) source . . .
> b. Phr. *inspired guess* . . .
> B. as *sb.* An inspired person . . . [282]

This definition demonstrates both that the word "inspired" possesses a certain range of meaning and that, with respect to the inspiration of Scripture, this meaning does not seem to have always been understood exactly as in this contemporary definition. This variation within the English language certainly justifies a refusal to identify the Greek and English term as having the same

---

[282] J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, The Oxford English Dictionary. 2d ed., Oxford: Clarendon, 1989, 7, 1037.

range of meaning.

The attempt to determine the exact range of meaning of the Greek term θεόπνευστος is probably impossible,[283] due to factors such as the paucity of early occurrences of the term and that writers who employ the adjective rarely provide any indication of its meaning. Nevertheless, the preceding study of θεόπνευστος makes it possible to trace the outlines of its meaning. It is a word that is almost always found with a passive sense and which designates God or the gods as the agent of its action. Θεόπνευστος, then, generally means "inspired by God or the gods" and not "breathing or animating God or the gods." In Christian literature θεόπνευστος occurs most often as an epithet of Scripture and, in several instances, with the indication that Scripture is "inspired by God" because it is from the Spirit. If this is the sense of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a when used with γραφή, then Scripture is "inspired by God" in that its source is the Spirit. The affirmation of Spicq that the term was used "pour exprimer le caractère sacré des Ecritures, leur origine divine et leur vertu active pour sanctifier les croyants,"[284] may be adequate summary of the manner in which the adjective was employed but not of its meaning. Warfield's claim that the word is always used to "express production by God"[285] seems to go beyond what the lexical evidence allows. Θεόπνευστος should be understood in 2 Tim. 3:16a, then, as meaning "inspired by God" in the sense that "all Scripture" originates with God.

The preceding study has considered 2 Tim. 3:16a, πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος and arrived at certain exegetical conclusions. The

---

[283] See, in this respect, Goodrick's criticism of Warfield in, Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible," 484.

[284] Spicq, Lexique, p. 704.

[285] Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 264-72.

first is that he adjective πᾶς has a partitive sense here and means "every." A second conclusion is that γραφή, the substantive, refers to Old Testament Scripture and, perhaps, emergent New Testament materials. Also, this study has indicated that the copula (εἰμί) must be supplied in translation and, as θεόπνευστος stands in a predicate relation with γραφή, it is placed before the adjective. A further conclusion is that θεόπνευστος is a verbal adjective which appears here with a passive sense and meaning "inspired by God." The additional words (καί and ὠφέλιμος), although an integral part of the beginning of 2 Tim. 3:16a, have not been analyzed individually because they are less important for the present study. When these exegetical conclusions are taken into account in the translation of 2 Tim. 3:16a, the best rendering of this text is "every Scripture is inspired by God and useful."

4.3 The Contribution of 2 Tim. 3:16a
to an Understanding of Biblical Inspiration

This presentation has discussed the interpretive questions associated with 2 Tim. 3:16a and adopted various conclusions based on an exegesis of this text. The examination of 2 Tim. 3:16a concludes with a consideration of the significance of this verse for a perspective on the nature of the inspiration of Scripture.

There are certain commentators who affirm that 2 Tim. 3:16a says little or nothing that is important for an understanding of biblical inspiration. Dibelius and Conzelmann affirm simply that "the emphasis of the passage doubtless lies, not on the concept of inspiration, but on the usefulness of the inspired scriptures."[286] Earle limits the contribution of this verse to a perspective on inspiration when he writes "here in 2 Tim. we have the fact [of divine inspiration]

---

286 Dibelius and Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, pp. 89-90, [ET, Dibelius and Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 120].

simply and plainly stated; the process of inspiration is not dealt with."[287] Others emphasize that essential aspects of inspiration such as the role of the human agent in the production of Scripture,[288] the "manner" and extent of inspiration,[289] the relationship between inspiration and the words of Scripture,[290] and any indication that the Scripture which is produced by inspiration is without error[291] are not developed. Fee states that 2 Tim. 3:16a does not articulate a theory of inspiration.[292] Some exegetes, therefore, believe that the text of this study is only of limited importance, if it is significant at all, for an adequate perspective on the nature of inspiration.

It is clear that this text does not present a full statement of the nature of biblical inspiration and that certain aspects of this doctrine are not mentioned. It is, however, also evident from the foregoing exegesis that the text does make certain contributions to an understanding of inspiration. The nature of this contribution is variously understood.

Certain authors think that 2 Tim. 3:16a demonstrates that the writer of 2 Timothy had adopted a (Hellenistic) Jewish theory of inspiration.[293] Kelly affirms

---

[287] Earle, "2 Timothy," 409.

[288] Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 114.

[289] Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137.

[290] Cf. Plummer, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 393-94; Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 127.

[291] Elliott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 164; Plummer, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 394-95; cf. McGonigal, "'Every Scripture is Inspired,'" 62; William J. Abraham, The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981, pp. 93-94.

[292] Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 279.

[293] See, for example, Fee, ibid.

that the term θεόπνευστος "accurately expresses the view of the inspiration of the O.T. prevalent among the Jews of the first century," and "the Church took it over entire."294

One representative of Judaism, although not necessarily the only or most representative, is Philo. A. T. Hanson has argued that 2 Tim. 3:16a reflects his view of inspiration. While admitting that Philo does not use the term θεόπνευστος, he states that "it exactly expresses Philo's idea of the relation of scripture to the authors of scripture. What *theopneustos* implies is that the author of scripture is possessed by God and therefore what he writes is inspired by God."295 Hanson claims that Philo did not see the writers of Scripture as reflective authors but as men that were "inspired" and, therefore, produced their work without cognitive reflection on what they wrote. He holds that Philo's view was that "they [the biblical writers] were not so much prophets as mediums."296 Hanson extends his study to other passages of the New Testament and then draws the conclusion that "Paul was not interested in the actual mode of inspiration," while the author of the Pastorals, who reflects a Philonian influence, was so concerned.297

The point of view that 2 Tim. 3:16a reflects a complete adoption of the theory of inspiration present in Philo cannot be sustained for at least two reasons. First, it is not clear that Hanson has accurately reflected Philo's view of inspiration. There are several problems with Hanson's argument which call into question his perspective. In the consideration of Philo's description of Jeremiah

---

294 Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 203. For similar perspectives see, Houlden, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 129; Cook, "Scripture and Inspiration," 58.

295 Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, p. 45.

296 Ibid.

297 Ibid., p. 54.

as "'being inspired and divinely possessed'"[298] (καταπνευσθεὶς ἐνθουσιῶν),[299] Hanson seems to equate this state with an absence of reflection on the part of the prophet. While the terminology which is employed permits such a possibility, Philo does not explicitly indicate this. Rather Jeremiah is cited as an example of a proper, and seemingly thoughtful response to those who would undermine firmness of the soul.[300]

An especially weak point in Hanson's thought is his application of what Philo presents as Hannah's description of Samuel ("an inspired temper possessed by a God-sent frenzy," τρόπον ἐνθουσιῶντα καὶ κατεχόμενον ἐκ μανίας θεοφορήτου),[301] first to Samuel as a *writing* prophet and, then, to Moses. This description of Samuel is found in De Somniis. In this context, Philo is not concerned with Samuel as a prophet involved in the production of Scripture but with his dedication to God by his mother. There is no indication that Philo intended this language to be used of the prophet in relation to his role in Scripture's production. Even more problematic is Hanson's use of terminology which Philo employs of Samuel ("God-sent frenzy," μανίας θεοφορήτου) of Moses, apparently as indicating a manic state, in a context where Philo himself does not use these words of the Hebrew Lawgiver. Hanson claims that "this divine frenzy is frequently predicated of Moses" and cites De Vita Mosis I. 175. The text reads, however, γίνεται καταπνευσθεὶς ὑπὸ . . . πνεύματος καὶ

---

[298] Ibid., p. 45.

[299] Philo, De Confusione Linguarum. Vol. 4, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et al., London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1949, 44.

[300] Ibid., 43-44.

[301] Philo, De Somniis. Vol. 5, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps et al., London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1949, I.254.

θεσπίζει προφητεύων τάδε ("he became possessed . . . with the spirit . . . [and] uttered these oracular words of prophecy").[302] There is nothing in this language which describes Moses either as ecstatic or unreflective in his prophecy. To the contrary, Moses is depicted as having uttered prophecy which was both rational and appropriate to the situation. A similar difficulty is evident in Hanson's citation of *De Vita Mosis* II. 251. While the terminology itself, that Moses "was taken out of himself by divine possession and uttered these inspired words" (οὐκέτ' ὢν ἐν ἑαυτῷ θεοφορεῖται καὶ θεσπίζει τάδε),[303] might seem to support the conclusion that Moses spoke in an ecstasy, the greater context is against it. Philo is presenting oracles which Moses delivered by divine inspiration (τὰ κατ' ἐνθουσιασμὸν τοῦ προφήτου θεσπισθέντα λόγια)[304] including the prophecy given at the crossing of the sea, that of the Sabbath, and that of the absence of food from heaven on the seventh day.[305] All these oracles involve reflective communication appropriate to a particular circumstance. Again, there is nothing in Philo's description of the state of Moses which would clearly indicate that these prophecies were uttered in ecstasy and, therefore, apart from rational reflection.

There is a Philonian text from *Questions in Exodus II.* 49, which appears to support Hanson's perspective. Hanson adopts the translation of Marcus and reads "'But he who says this should bear in mind that every prophetic soul is divinely inspired and prophesies many future things not so

---

302 Philo, De Vita Mosis. Vol. 6, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et al., London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1951, I.175.

303 Ibid., II. 250, 251.

304 Ibid., II. 246.

305 Ibid., II. 246-69.

much by reflecting as through divine madness and certainty.'"306 If this passage is genuine with Philo, it offsets to some degree the weakness of other aspects of Hanson's presentation. The problem is that it is cited as a translation of an Armenian version of Philo307 with no indication of the reliability of this work either in general or with respect to this particular text.308

If Hanson has not adequately reflected Philo's understanding of the nature of inspiration, the claim that 2 Tim. 3:16a reflects a first century Jewish formulation of inspiration is called into question as his perspective on this theory may be different than what was, in reality, the case.

A second reason why Hanson's argument that 2 Tim. 3:16a reflects an adoption of a (Hellenistic) Jewish theory of inspiration cannot be sustained is that both the way in which this position is presented and the language of 2 Tim. 3:16a itself are against such a conclusion. Hanson has claimed that θεόπνευστος, while not used by Philo, expresses his idea of the relation between Scripture and its authors. This relation is understood to be that these writers were possessed by God and, accordingly, wrote in a manic state and more as mediums than prophets. This is unacceptable, in part, because it cannot be demonstrated that θεόπνευστος expresses Philo's thought since he never employs the term. It may be observed in the foregoing consideration of Philo, that he used certain terminology related to authorial inspiration. Θεόπνευστος is not among this vocabulary. While it is impossible to determine whether Philo knew the word θεόπνευστος and did not employ it because it did *not* express his understanding of inspiration or whether this term was unknown to him, the assertion that a word he never used expresses an aspect of his

---

306 Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, p. 45.

307 Ibid., p. 126.

308 The limitations of this work do not permit an investigation of this question.

thought is certainly not open to verification. Even more important for this study, is Hanson's representation of the significance of θεόπνευστος. He affirms that "it exactly expresses Philo's idea of the relation of scripture to the authors of scripture" and that it "implies that the author of Scripture is possessed by God and therefore what he writes is inspired by God."[309] The exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a in this study has argued, to the contrary, that θεόπνευστος describes the relation of God or the Spirit of God to Scripture. The biblical authors are not in view in this term, nor is their relation with either God or Scripture. The theory that 2 Tim. 3:16a expresses a Philonian understanding of inspiration, as presented by A. T. Hanson, is inadequate, then, both in that it is not clear that he has accurately summarized Philo's thought and in that the use of θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a is not adequately explained.

A second perspective on the contribution of 2 Tim. 3:16a to an understanding of biblical inspiration is that this text emphasizes the divine *character* or *quality* of Scripture. It is essential to differentiate this perspective from that which holds that the concern of the text is with the *origin* of Scripture, as this perspective, while accepting that Scripture's origin may be in view, places an emphasis on its quality.[310]

An articulation of this position is found in the work of Ewald. In Ewald's consideration of θεόπνευστος he assigns a meaning of "'full of God's Spirit,'" or "'permeated and animated by God's Spirit'" rather than "inspired by God." From this meaning Ewald can argue that the primary emphasis in the term θεόπνευστος is the quality of Scripture, in that it is "permeated and animated by God's Spirit," rather than its origin.[311]   Lilley, while much less clear in his

---

309 Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, p. 45.

310 See, Warfield's presentation of the position of Ewald in, Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, pp. 277-80, 287.

311 Ibid., pp. 278-79.

argument, holds a similar position when he writes that θεόπνευστος, when used of Scripture, indicates that "the presence and association of God [is] indissolubly associated with it."312

The perspective that the primary concern of 2 Tim. 3:16a is with the *quality* of Scripture has not received significant support and cannot be sustained on lexical grounds. As has been demonstrated, the verbal adjective θεόπνευστος does not carry a meaning of "full of God's Spirit" or "permeated and animated by God's Spirit" but of "inspired of God" or, if etymology is emphasized, "God-breathed." Both the term itself and the historical understanding of 2 Tim. 3:16a indicate that the primary concern of the text is not with the character or quality of Scripture but with its origin.

The affirmation that there is at least a certain emphasis on the influence of Scripture on its readers in 2 Tim. 3:16a is an essential element in a third perspective on the contribution of this text to an understanding of biblical inspiration. Scripture is "inspired by God," in this view, in that it exercises an influence on those who read it. This perspective does not seem to be carefully articulated among exegetes of 2 Tim. 3:16a and must be discerned from indirect or undeveloped comments.313

Although Cremer does not directly apply his understanding of the meaning of θεόπνευστος to the nature of biblical inspiration, it may be argued that his comprehension of this term as *"spirit-filled,* breathing the Spirit of God,"314 leads to an understanding of θεόπνευστος as used of the influence of Scripture on its readers. A further step in that direction is the discussion of Barth

312 Lilley, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 210.

313 For a statement of this general perspective on inspiration see, Thomas Hoffman, "Inspiration, Normativeness, Canonicity, and the Unique Sacred Character of Scripture." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 44 (1982), 447-69.

314 Cremer, Wörterbuch, p. 493, [ET, Cremer, Lexicon, p. 731].

where he combines a passive and an active sense of θεόπνευστος and states that 2 Tim. 3:16a means "given and filled and ruled by the Spirit of God, and actively outbreathing and spreading abroad and making known the Spirit of God."[315]

More immediately important to this study, however, are certain authors who speak of inspiration as an influence on Scripture's readers. This seems to be the thrust of Leaney's statement when he explains, "every scripture brings to the Christian its own divine inspiration for its use in building up faith in Christ."[316] He may be speaking of the quality of Scripture but, perhaps, his concern is that of its influence on its readers. Lilley is more definitive. While it has been seen that Lilley holds that an emphasis of 2 Tim. 3:16 is the quality of Scripture he states, as well, that the concern is with its influence. He writes, with respect to the meaning of "inspired by God," that "this gracious influence of the Spirit as the direct Agent at work will be felt by every one that reads them with a humble and teachable heart."[317] Oden and Mollering may also tend toward a perspective that an emphasis of 2 Tim. 3:16a is the influence of Scripture on its readers, although this is not clear in their work.[318]

While not denying the reality of the influence of Scripture on its readers, the position which holds that this emphasis is found in 2 Tim. 3:16a must be rejected, as this perspective requires that θεόπνευστος be understood in an active sense. This study has shown that θεόπνευστος is passive and should be rendered either as "inspired by God" or "God-breathed." This meaning negates

---

[315] Barth, Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes, p. 559, [ET, Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God, p. 504].

[316] Leaney, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, p. 99.

[317] Lilley, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 210.

[318] See, Oden, First and Second Timothy and Titus, p. 25; Mollering, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 164.

the possibility that the emphasis is on the influence of Scripture on its readers.

A fourth perspective on the contribution of 2 Tim. 3:16a to an understanding of the nature of biblical inspiration is that which sees this text as emphasizing the *origin* of Scripture. Scripture originates with God. Towner claims in this regard, "this is a statement of origin."[319] Barrett says, with respect to θεόπνευστος, that it "makes it clear that the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and thus Holy Scripture itself, is from God.[320] Paul here asserts, according to Fee, "Scripture's divine origin."[321] This perspective seems to be most common among evangelical Protestants,[322] but is not limited to them.[323] It is Calvin's view, although he states it in different terms.[324] Generally commentators who adopt this position indicate only that Scripture's divine origin is here affirmed. At least two authors, however, go further and state that as the concern of 2 Tim. 3:16a is with Scripture, the text demands an understanding of verbal inspiration. Ladd says "this verse demands a view of verbal inspiration."[325] According to Bennetch, the presence of the word for Scripture (γραφή) in 2 Tim. 3:16a "necessarily suggests words or the product of writing, hence a theory . . . of

---

[319] Towner, 1-2 Timothy and Titus, p. 200.

[320] Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 114.

[321] Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 279.

[322] e.g., Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 446-47; Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 279; Lea and Griffin, 1, 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 236.

[323] See, Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 114.

[324] Jean Calvin, Commentaires de Jean Calvin sur le Nouveau Testament. Paris: Meyrueis, 1855, IV, 300-01.

[325] Ladd, "Why Did God Inspired the Bible?" p. 49.

verbal inspiration."[326]

The support which is set forth for this position is almost exclusively lexical, related to the meaning of θεόπνευστος. Among those who see this term as meaning "God-breathed" there is a general tendency to argue that the concern of the text is with the origin of Scripture[327] and, indeed, this is virtually the only acceptable alternative when this lexical understanding is adopted. This particular meaning of θεόπνευστος is not, however, essential to an understanding of 2 Tim. 3:16a as concerned with the origin of Scripture. Ladd can speak of the activity of God in inspiration as "he inbreathed what they [the biblical writers] wrote."[328]

Among exegetes who adopt the idea that the concern of 2 Tim. 3:16a is with the origin of Scripture there are at least two significant implications of this text for an understanding of biblical inspiration. First, the verse is a strong statement that Scripture *originates* with God. It is the product of God's creative breath. The classic statement of this position is by Warfield who may be quoted again at some length:

> What it [the term θεόπνευστος] says of Scripture is, not that it is "breathed into by God" or is the product of Divine "inbreathing" into its human authors, but that it is breathed out by God, "God-breathed," the product of the creative breath of God. In a word, what is declared by this fundamental passage is simply that the Scriptures are a Divine product, without any indication of how God operated in producing them. No term could have been chosen, however, which would have more

---

[326] Bennetch, "2 Timothy 3:16a," 192.

[327] So, Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 133; Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 446; Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, 291; Stott, Guard the Gospel, pp. 101-02; Warren Vanhetloo, "Indications of Verbal Inspiration." Grace Journal, 5/1 (1989), 68-69; E. J. Young, Thy Word is Truth. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

[328] Ladd, "Why Did God Inspire the Bible?" 49. Ladd seems to be speaking here of the divine origin of Scripture, but he is not entirely clear in this respect.

emphatically asserted the Divine production of Scripture than that which is here employed.[329]

Warfield is echoed by Young who affirms that "it was God the Holy Ghost who breathed them [the Scriptures] forth; they owed their origin to Him; they were the product of the creative breath of God Himself."[330] This general argument is found recently in Knight who claims that "Paul appears to be saying, therefore, that all scripture has as its source God's breath and that this is its essential characteristic."[331] In this perspective, therefore, the clear indication of 2 Tim. 3:16a is that Scripture originates with God. A second implication of this text, according to those who accept this position, is that the usefulness of Scripture which is described in 2 Tim. 3:16b-17 is a consequence of its divine origin. Knight may again be cited. "Because 'all scripture is God-breathed' Paul can state categorically that it is 'useful for teaching . . . ' and that as a result of its fourfold work in one's life that 'the man of God' is adequate and equipped (v. 17)."[332]

The position that the concern of this text is with the origin of Scripture has been questioned or conditioned by commentators in at least two ways. Fee affirms that this text deals with the origin of Scripture but denies, in effect, that it adds anything to the perspective on inspiration which existed in the time in which the Apostle wrote. He believes that 2 Tim. 3:16 does not express a theory of inspiration but merely restates the view which was current in Judaism.[333] Fee's position is difficult to evaluate as he does not indicate what he believes

---

[329] Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 113.

[330] Young, Thy Word is Truth, p. 21.

[331] Knight, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 447.

[332] Ibid.

[333] Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 279.

this theory to have been, however, when seen in light of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a it seems inadequate. 2 Tim. 3:16a introduces a term (θεόπνευστος) which does not previously appear in the Jewish articulation of the nature of inspiration. This alone suggests that there may be at least some difference in the Apostle's understanding of inspiration from that which was present in the Judaism of his day. Additionally, Philo's view of inspiration emphasizes the inspiration of the prophet,[334] while it is Scripture itself which is affirmed to be inspired in 2 Tim. 3:16a. Both the term θεόπνευστος itself, then, and the location of inspiration with Scripture and not its authors suggest a distinction between the comprehension of inspiration in first century Judaism and that which is found in 2 Tim. 3:16a.

Plummer also sees certain limitations in the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a as he denies that affirmations, which might be implications of the concept that Scripture originates with God, may be made on the basis of this verse. In his thought, 2 Tim. 3:16a does not teach verbal inspiration. This text does not, as well, support a view that the Bible is free from errors.[335] While it is clear that 2 Tim. 3:16 does not speak directly to questions such as inerrancy, Plummer's view is inadequate when considered in light of the exegesis of this study. This verse requires some theory of verbal inspiration for it is Scripture, as an written document, which is here described as inspired. Although certain aspects of the nature of Scripture are not developed in this text, the significance of 2 Tim. 3:16a for an understanding of verbal inspiration goes beyond what Plummer allows and requires a perspective which sees it as extending to the words of the Bible.

An attempt may now be made to summarize the elements of a doctrine of inspiration which may be drawn from the preceding evangelical exegesis of 2

---

[334] See, for example, Philo, De Vita Mosis, II. 246, 250-51.

[335] Plummer, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 393-95.

Tim. 3:16a.[336] These conclusions, along with those which are taken from the study of 2 Pet. 1:20-21, will be used in the critical analysis of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration.

The first conclusion of an evangelical exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a is that the inspiration which is here presented is plenary. While the reference to Scripture in 2 Tim. 3:16a is not collective but partitive—*every* (not all) Scripture is inspired by God—plenary inspiration is, nevertheless, properly inferred from this verse. It has been argued that πᾶσα γραφή refers to the Old Testament and, perhaps, emerging New Testament materials. What 2 Tim. 3:16a affirms is that each Scripture included in this reference is inspired by God. Inspiration is not limited to particular portions of Scripture or certain literary forms but extends to every Scripture. Inspiration is, therefore, plenary.

It is necessary, in speaking of plenary inspiration, to articulate exactly what is intended when it is affirmed. As inspiration is not a matter of the literary character of the Bible, plenary inspiration does not imply either a single literary genre or the absence of distinctive literary features in various parts of Scripture. Neither does plenary inspiration require that every Scripture be of the same contemporary significance or immediate personal application. What is affirmed is that the specific inspiration described in this text characterizes every Scripture.[337]

A second affirmation which may be made as a consequence of the

---

[336] The present analysis assumes that a movement can be made from biblical exegesis to the formulation of doctrine. For an evangelical presentation of important issues in this movement see, Richard Lints, The Fabric of Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, pp. 290-311, and D. A. Carson, "The Role of Exegesis in Systematic Theology," Doing Theology in Today's World. eds. John D. Woodbridge and Thomas Edward McComiskey, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991, pp. 39-76. For a statement of the specific method involved see, Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985, pp. 66-79.

[337] Bernard seems to reject the idea that plenary inspiration can be affirmed on the bases of 2 Tim. 3:16a. See, Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137.

exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a is that the location of inspiration is *Scripture*, and in this text, Scripture alone. The preceding exegesis has sought to identify the reference of γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a. It may be affirmed, virtually without question, that this reference must include at least the Old Testament. This is true for two reasons. First, the [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15, which is logically and syntactically related to the γραφή of 2 Tim. 3:16a, is best seen as used of the Old Testament. Although the term appears only here in the New Testament, it is found in Philo and Josephus, probably with such a reference. The appearance of [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα in 2 Tim. 3:15 as that which Timothy had known from childhood, suggests that the purview of this term is exclusively the Old Testament. Second, as in many of the New Testament occurrences of γραφή the concern is clearly the Old Testament, a similar reference should be seen here. On the basis of 2 Pet. 3:16 and 1 Tim. 5:18, this reference may extend as well the New Testament material which existed at the time of the writing of 2 Timothy. As it is impossible to determine exactly what this material included, this study merely claims that the reference of γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a may go beyond the Old Testament to such New Testament material..

Whatever the exact reference of γραφή in 2 Tim. 3:16a may have been originally, it is this material, which existed in a written form and is identified as a single object, which is the locus of inspiration in this verse. This fact is of importance for an understanding of biblical inspiration as it leads to the conclusion that the locus of inspiration is *Scripture*. It was demonstrated in the second chapter of this study, that evangelicals have proposed a number of loci of inspiration. In 2 Tim. 3:16a, however, it is only Scripture which is thus identified. In addition, because θεόπνευστος is used only here in biblical Greek, it is Scripture alone, in the New Testament, which is described as the locus of inspiration by the specific use of this term. These observations are significant for an understanding of the nature of inspiration. If inspiration is located in Scripture alone, any other locus of inspiration which has been

proposed by evangelicals cannot be demonstrated on the basis of 2 Tim. 3:16a. As a consequence, an articulation of the nature of biblical inspiration which demands a different locus of inspiration in its formulation cannot be sustained on the basis of this text. A theory of inspiration which adequately reflects the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a requires a locus of inspiration of Scripture which is not, without exegetical basis, merely subsumed under that of authorial inspiration.[338] While this verse does not indicate the relation between the inspiration of Scripture and that of its authors, it does locate inspiration with Scripture itself.

A further implication of the fact that inspiration is located in Scripture is that it must be verbal. While 2 Tim. 3:16a does not affirm that the *words* of Scripture are inspired, it does state that Scripture, which existed in written form, is. Inspiration cannot be divorced from the words of Scripture.

A third conclusion from the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a is that inspiration describes a present state of the biblical text and not only one which existed in the past. Inspiration does not merely characterize the biblical writings at the time of their origin, but is a present quality of Scripture. This conclusion must be held tentatively as the copula is elided. If, however, the copula to be supplied is ἐστίν, then the emphasis in the inspiration of the biblical text is not primarily on the time of its origin in written form or its canonization, but on its present state.

A fourth affirmation, which results from the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a, is that the inspiration which is here predicated of πᾶσα γραφή is an essential characteristic of this material and the basis of the pastoral usefulness described in 2 Tim. 3:16b-17. The adjective θεόπνευστος is not used attributively in 2 Tim. 3:16a, therefore, what is found here is neither an incidental description

---

[338] Fairbarin is an example of a commentator on 2 Tim. 3:16a who appears to so impose a particular understanding inspiration on the text of 2 Tim. 3:16a that he can affirm that "the quality expressed by θεόπνευστος is primarily and strictly applicable only to men." Scripture is inspired only in that it is the product of the work of authors who are borne by the Spirit. Fairbarin, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 381.

subordinated to the primary emphasis on the usefulness of Scripture,[339] nor is it an indication that only some of Scripture is inspired. Θεόπνευστος is, rather, an adjective, which used predicatively describes an essential characteristic of Scripture. Scripture is inspired and the implication is that this inspiration is the basis of its profitableness.[340]

A fifth conclusion which may be draw from the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a is that inspiration describes Scripture as originating with God. Exegesis has argued that an active sense of θεόπνευστος is not to be preferred in 2 Tim. 3:16a. This is significant as such a sense would describe a dynamic characteristic of Scripture either in that it breaths the Spirit of God, or that it influences its original or contemporary readers at a cognitive or emotional level. Θεόπνευστος is a passive. All Scripture, then, is "spired" or "inspired" by God. Regardless of which translation is accepted, the implication for a doctrine of biblical inspiration is the same. Inspiration, in 2 Tim. 3:16a, describes Scripture as originating with God.

It is necessary to clearly set the limits of what is affirmed. There is no indication in this text of the mode of inspiration, nor of the relation between the human and divine in Scripture's production. There is no statement of the process involved in inspiration or of exactly how God works in the origin of Scripture. There is, as well, no consideration of the historical process involved in the writing of the Bible. All that is here stated is that the Scripture originates with God, with the implication that it is this origin which is the basis of its pastoral usefulness.

An evangelical exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a leads, then, to several conclusions. The first conclusion is that of the plenary inspiration of Scripture. *Every* Scripture is inspired. Second, as inspiration is to be located in Scripture

---

[339] Cf. Bernard, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 137.

[340] Cf. Hendricksen, I and II Timothy and Titus, p. 303.

which exists in written form, it is verbal. The words of Scripture are inspired. Third, inspiration describes not just a characteristic of Scripture at its origin, but a continuing quality. Scripture *is* inspired. Fourth, inspiration is an essential characteristic of Scripture and the basis of its pastoral usefulness. Fifth, inspiration is a description of the divine origin of Scripture. These five conclusions, along with those which will be derived from the exegesis of 2 Pet. 1:20-21, will be the basis of a critical evaluation of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration.

5 An Evangelical Exegesis of 2 Peter 1:20-21

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 2 Pet. 1:20-21 in the Argument of 2 Peter

The determination of the place of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 in the argument of the epistle is influenced by the perspective which is adopted by the interpreter both of the general purpose or purposes of the letter and of the relation of these verses with the preceding context (especially 2 Pet. 1:16-18) and that which follows. These questions are here considered.

The literary genre of 2 Peter is testamental, as the author is writing, before his death, "to remind" his readers of certain essential truths (2 Pet. 1:12-15; 3:1-2). Beyond this general purpose of reminder, several possible purposes for this epistle include those of exhortation to growth in Christian life or piety, warning against false teachers and mockers of the Parousia, and encouragement to perseverance in eschatological hope.[1] The evidence of 2 Pet. 3:17-18 suggests this epistle was written to warn against false teachers and mockers of the Parousia and to exhort to growth in Christian life and character,[2]

---

[1] Donald W. Burdick and John H. Skilton, "2 Peter," The NIV Study Bible. ed. Kenneth Barker, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, p. 1898. cf. Samuel Bénétreau, La deuxième épître de Pierre et l'épître de Jude. Vaux-sur-Seine: Édifac, 1984, p. 65; J. W. C. Wand, The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. Westminster Commentaries, eds. Walter Lock and D. C. Simpson, London: Methuen, 1934, p. 135; J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude. Harper's New Testament Commentaries, ed. Henry Chadwick, 1969; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981, p. 229; Eric Fuchs and Pierre Reymond, Le deuxième épître de Saint Pierre, l'épître de Saint Jude. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, 2d series, 13b, ed. J. Zumstein, 2d ed, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1988, pp. 26-27; Jerzy Klinger, "The Second Epistle of Peter: An Essay in Understanding." St. Vladmir's Theological Quarterly, 17 (1973), 167-68.

[2] D. Edmond Hiebert, Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. III, The Non-Pauline Epistles and Revelation. revised ed. Chicago: Moody, 1977, 153.

as it concludes with a warning (φυλάσσεσθε) of the personal defeat which could result from the influence of lawless individuals and a call to growth (αὐξάνετε) in grace and the knowledge of Christ.

2 Pet. 1:20-21, which forms the conclusion to the first chapter of this epistle, also terminates the first major portion of the letter. After the salutation (2 Pet. 1:1-2), the author indicates the blessings which have been granted to those who have received a common faith (2 Pet. 1:3-4) and urges his readers to develop those virtues which are consequent upon their reception of these blessings (2 Pet. 1:3-7). The possession of these virtues is important in that, as they are present, there is a certainty of an abundant entrance into the eternal kingdom (2 Pet. 1:8-11). This section indicates important aspects of the epistle's theme of Christian growth.[3] In the verses which follow (2 Pet. 1:12-15), which reveal the testamental character of the letter, the writer indicates his constant readiness to remind his readers of certain things, especially in light of his imminent death. The reference of τούτων in 2 Pet. 1:12 is to the entire content of 2 Pet. 1:3-11. 2 Pet. 1:3-15, therefore, has a twofold role in the development of the epistle. This text sets forth material concerning the Apostle's teaching on Christian progress as it is found in this letter and it states his intention to remind his readers of these matters in order that they would be able to recall them after his death.

The exact relationship of 2 Pet. 1:16-21 with what precedes, which is syntactically indicated by γάρ, it is not entirely evident.[4] It may be a response to

---

3 Cf. Richard J. Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter. Vol. 50, Word Biblical Commentary, eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, Waco, TX: Word, 1983, p. 132.

4 For unique perspectives of this relationship see, Thomas Scott Caulley, "The Idea of 'Inspiration' in 2 Peter 1:16-21," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Evangelisch-theologischen Fakultät an der Eberhard-Karls-Universität, Tübingen, 1982, p. 149, and Ceslas Spicq, Les épîtres de Saint Pierre. Sources bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1966, pp. 206, 216.

certain objections,[5] or provide evidence of the truthfulness of the writer of this letter or of his testimony.[6]   Kelly holds that it demonstrates "the apostolic testimony is firmly founded on a historical revelation which itself only confirms what earlier prophecy foretold."[7] The flow of the argument of 2 Peter 1 favours the view that 2 Pet. 1:16-21 provides the basis of the authority of the Apostle. The teaching of 2 Pet. 1:3-11 is not the product of fables or myths, but rests upon the foundation of God's direct verbal revelation at the Transfiguration and the testimony of prophetic Scripture.[8] The author, therefore, has stated a certain teaching (2 Pet. 1:3-11) of which he intends to remind his readers, especially in view of his imminent death (2 Pet. 1:12-15).   He then proceeds to state two foundations of his authority (2 Pet. 1:16-21).   The second foundation on which his authority rests, which is the prophetic word, is indicated in 2 Pet. 1:19-21. It is in this section that the verses of the present study appear.

The τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες (knowing this first) of 2 Pet. 1:20 creates a certain difficulty for the determination of the relation of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 with 2 Pet. 1:19.[9] This phrase is to be understood as related to καλῶς ποιεῖτε

---

[5] Jerome H. Neyrey, 2 Peter, Jude. Vol. 37C, The Anchor Bible, eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1993, p. 112, and Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 204-05, 223, 228.

[6] R. H. Strachan, "The Second Epistle General of Peter," Vol. V, The Expositor's Greek New Testament, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, [n.d.]; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988, pp. 130-31; cf. Wand, Peter and Jude, p. 144.

[7] Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, pp. 315-16.

[8] Burdick and Skilton, NIV, p. 1900; Michael Green, The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, ed. R. V. G. Tasker, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968, pp. 81, 86.

[9] Cf. Archibald Thomas Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament. 4th ed., Nashville: Broadman, 1934, p. 1039.

(προσέχοντες)[10] and not the following clause,[11] as it is more probable that it is syntactically connected with the preceding text than that it is introduced with little relation to that which goes before. This connection is significant in that 2 Pet. 1:20-21 indicates what the Apostle's readers were to know as a matter of first importance (πρῶτον) as they paid attention to the prophetic word.[12] The content of this knowledge designated by τοῦτο is indicated in what follows,[13] which is ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται (that all prophecy of Scripture is not a matter of one's own interpretation). When 2 Pet. 1:20-21 is seen as speaking of the origin of Scripture, the sense becomes that it is the divine origin of prophecy that the readers are to keep in mind as they read the prophetic word. Attention to the prophetic word is rooted in an awareness of its origin.

Most of the remainder of 2 Peter which follows the text of this study (2 Pet. 2:1-3:16) is primarily a warning against those false teachers and mockers

---

[10] Archibald Thomas Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament. Vol. VI, The General Epistles and the Revelation of John. Nashville: Broadman, 1933, p. 158.

[11] Jon. Ed. Huther, Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den 1. Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas und den 2. Brief des Petrus. Vol. 12, Das Neue Testament Griechisch, ed. Heinr. Aug. Wilh. Meyer, 2d ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1852, p. 284, [ET, Joh. Ed. Huther, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of Peter and Jude. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, trans. D. B. Croom, J. Gloag, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1881, p. 322].

[12] Henry Alford, The Greek New Testament. Vol. IV, The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Catholic Epistles of St. James and St. Peter: The Epistles of St. John and St Jude: and The Revelation. new ed., London: Rivingtons, 1884, 400.

[13] Huther, 1. Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas und den 2. Brief des Petrus, p. 284, [ET, Huther, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 322].

who by word and deed oppose the Apostle's teaching (2 Pet. 1:3-11),[14] which is founded on the direct voice of God at the Transfiguration and the prophetic word (2 Pet. 1:16-21) and of which he is writing to remind his readers (2 Pet. 1:12-15). 2 Peter 1:20-21 is related to what directly follows through the theme of prophets and prophecy. The consideration of true prophecy and by implication true prophets, turns to false prophets and, because of their similarity with these prophets, to false teachers who endanger the church.

5.1.2 The Text of 2 Pet. 1:20-21

2 Pet. 1:20-21 reads:

τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται· οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.[15]

The text of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 is relatively free from problems even with the discovery of Papyrus 72.[16] The only variant in 2 Pet. 1:20 from the text of Nestle-Aland is with respect to προφητεία γραφῆς, which some minuscules

---

[14] This study will not consider either the specific identity of the false teaches of 2 Peter 2:1-22 or of the mockers of 2 Peter 3:3 ff. For this discussion see, Bénétreau, Deuxième Pierre et Jude, pp. 52-59; Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 154-57; Fuchs and Reymond, Deuxième Pierre et Jude, pp. 27-29; Green, Second Peter and Jude, pp. 37-40.

[15] Barbara Aland, et al., eds., The Greek New Testament 4th revised ed., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1993, p. 801.

[16] The text of Papyrus 72 is in Michel Testuz, ed., Papyrus Bodmer VII-XII. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1959. Introductory studies are, Floyd V. Filson, "More Bodmer Papyri." The Biblical Archaeologist, 25 (1962), 50-57, and Marchant A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript." Bibliotheca Sacra, 121 (1948), 54-56. A comparative study with the Codex Vaticanus is Sakae Kubo, p72 and the Codex Vaticanus. ed., Jacob Greelings, XXVII, Studies and Documents, Salt Lake: University of Utah, 1965.

read γραφὴ προφητείας, while Papyrus 72 has προφητεία καὶ γραφή.[17] The former reading is easily accounted for as introduced from 2 Timothy 3:16.[18] The latter reading may indicate a perceived distinction between the two terms.

In 2 Pet. 1:21 the significant textual variation is toward the end of this verse where, even though various readings occur, a choice must be made between ἅγιοι θεοῦ and ἀπὸ θεοῦ.[19] Support for the former reading is that "holy" is used to describe the prophets elsewhere in the New Testament (Luke 1:70; Acts 3:2; 2 Pet. 3:2).[20] The repetition of ἅγιος is not a problem as the author, in this epistle, repeats identical or similar words in an immediate context (2 Pet. 1:2, 3; 1:3, 4; 1:12, 13). In favour of the reading ἀπό is the presence of ἁγίου in the verse which may have been incorrectly repeated.[21] The context favours the originality of ἀπό since ἅγιοι fits the thought of the passage and, therefore, may have been imported.[22] The reading ἅγιοι has more diverse external weight than that of ἀπό, but the latter has the strong support of the alliance of p72 and B. ἀπό is more difficult and appears to be original.

---

[17] Eberhard Nestle, et al., eds., Novum Testamentum Graece. 26th ed., Stuttgart:: Deutsche Biblestiftung, 1979, p. 610.

[18] B. M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. 3d ed., London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975, p. 701.

[19] For the various readings see, Nestle, Novum Testamentum, p. 610.

[20] Charles A. Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. International Critical Commentary, eds. Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer, 2d ed., 1902; rpt. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1961, p. 270.

[21] Metzger, Textual Commentary, p. 701.

[22] Kubo, p72, p. 129.

5.2 The Exegesis of 2 Pet. 1:20-21

5.2.1 The Meaning of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται

Interpretation of 2 Peter 1:20-21 centres around the meaning of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, which will be considered by reviewing the explanations which have been proposed as to its meaning and, then, analyzing the text itself.

Alternative Explanations of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται

A first explanation of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται is that this clause forbids individual interpretation of Scripture apart from the Church. This understanding asserts that ἰδίας refers to the readers of the epistle or to people in general. In either case a positive idea is to be supplied,[23] which is that of the necessary role of the Church in biblical interpretation.

Certain Catholic scholars affirm that this statement limits the interpretation of prophecy to authoritative interpreters as against autonomous individuals.[24] The necessary direction in the interpretation of Scripture "is to be found in the apostolic tradition handed on in the Church."[25] Curran concludes

---

[23] Huther, 1. Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas und den 2. Brief des Petrus, p. 286, [ET, Huther The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 323-24].

[24] H. Wilmergin, "2 Peter," A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. eds. Dom Bernard Orchard et al., New York: Nelson, 1953, p. 1183; cf. Jean-Claude Margot, Les épîtres de Pierre. Genève: Labor et Fides, 1960, p. 109.

[25] Thomas W. Leahy, "The Second Epistle of Peter," The Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968, p. 496. Calvin criticizes

that the original readers of 2 Peter would have understood this passage as a limitation on their own interpretation as against "the inspired interpretations of the great apostolic leaders or . . . the official interpretations given by their local *didaskaloi*."[26]   The reference to the role of the *magisterium* is, therefore, implicit.[27]

A number of non-Catholic commentators adopt the position that the concern is with individual interpretation apart from the Church. Kelly holds that the apostle is affirming the place of the Church in the interpretation of Scripture:

> There can be little doubt that he is not thinking of the Spirit-endowed individual or prophet in the community, but rather of apostolic authority as embodied in the recognized ministers and charismatic teachers of the local churches who, as he understands it, bear the Spirit's commission. The notion of the official Church as the appointed custodian of scripture is evidently taking shape.[28]

---

the Catholic position in Jehan Calvin, Commentaires de Jehan Calvin sur le Nouveau Testament. Paris: Meyrtueis, 1855, III, 759.

[26] John T. Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20." Theological Studies, 4 (1943), 347-68.

[27] Ibid., cf. Joseph Chaine, Les épîtres catholiques. Paris: Gabalda, 1939, p. 56.

[28] Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 324; cf. E. M. Sidebottom, James, Jude and 2 Peter. The Century Bible, eds. H. H. Rowley, Matthew Black, new ed., [n. p.]: Nelson, 1967, p. 111; Horst Balz and Wolfgang Schrage, Die Katholischen Briefe. Vol. 10, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, eds. Gerhard Friedrich and Peter Stuhlmacher, 12th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980, pp. 137; Henning Paulsen, Der Zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief. Vol. 12/2, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, ed. Ferdinand Hahn, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992, pp. 123-24; James Moffat, The General Epistles: James, Peter, and Jude. New York: Harper, [n. d.], p. 189; Bo Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude. The Anchor Bible, eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964, p. 159.

A second explanation of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται also holds that this clause deals with the interpretation of Scripture, however, ἰδίας is not taken as referring to the apostle's readers or people in general but to the individual alone. The concern is with unauthorized or individual interpretation of Scripture.[29]

Although there is general agreement among these interpreters that the concern of the text is with unauthorized interpretation apart from the necessary assistance, there is no unanimity with respect to the positive idea to be supplied. Some commentators believe that the positive implication is the necessity of the assistance of the Holy Spirit,[30] while others think it is the need for authoritative interpretation.[31] Spicq affirms a text of Scripture remains God's property and an individual is not to give it a different sense than that given by the prophet who spoke from God.[32]

---

[29] A. R. C. Leaney, The Letters of Peter and Jude. The Cambridge Bible Commentary, eds. P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney, J. W. Packer, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1967, p. 117; C. E. B. Cranfield, I & II Peter and Jude. Torch Bible Commentaries, eds. John Marsh and Canon Alan Richardson, London: SCM, 1960, p. 182; G. H. Boobyer, "II Peter," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. ed. Matthew Black, [n. p.]: Nelson, 1962, pp. 1032-33; Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 270; Montague Rhodes James, ed., The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude. Cambridge Greek Testament, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1912, p. 18; Wand, Peter and Jude, pp. 161-62; Edwin A. Blum, " 2 Peter," Vol. 12, The Expositor's Bible Commentary. ed. Frank A. Gabelein, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981, p. 275.

[30] Leaney, The Letters of Peter and Jude, p. 117; Cranfield, I & II Peter and Jude, p. 182.

[31] Bigg, "The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 270; Boobyer, "II Peter," pp. 1032-33; Wand, Peter and Jude, p. 162.

[32] Spicq, Les épîtres de Saint Pierre, p. 225.

Some interpreters see ἰδίας as referring to the προφητεία specifically mentioned in the verse, rather than the prophets or readers.33   In this perspective the meaning of the clause is either that prophecy does not interpret itself, it is not self-interpreting, or that prophecy should not be interpreted apart from other Scripture. Prophecy is interpreted either in that which takes place as its fulfilment or by other prophecy.34

Molland also takes the reference of ἰδίας as προφητεία but sees a different sense for the verse than others who hold this reference. Adopting a meaning for ἰδίας of "particular" or "arbitrary," he affirms that the verse may be rendered in the following manner. "Avant tout, sachez ceci : aucune prophétie de l'Écriture n'est affaire d'interprétation arbitraire." This passage, then, is addressed against those who attribute an erroneous meaning to the prophetic words.35

Mayor suggests that a possible purpose for this text is to indicate how the readers of Scripture are to view prophecy. They are to recognize that it has many possible fulfilments. In this view prophecies

> are not limited to what the prophet himself may have regarded as their purpose and scope, or to any single event of the future, but reveal principles which will be continually illustrated by God's government of the world, while they find their highest fulfilment in the work of Christ

---

33 Bénétreau, Deuxième Pierre et Jude, p. 127.

34   Lewis Sperry Chafer, Systematic Theology.   Vol. I, Prolegomena—Bibliology—Theology Proper. Dallas: Dallas Seminary, 1947, p. 118; Bénétreau, Pierre, Jude, p. 129; cf. Mayor, The Epistles of Jude and Second Peter, p. 114.

35 Einar Molland, "La thèse « La prophétie n'est jamais venue de la volonté de l'homme » (2 Pierre I, 21) et les Pseudo-Clémentines." Studia Theologica, 9 (1955), 69.

and the establishment of His kingdom.[36]

Strachen, following Mayor, holds that the prophet speaks to his own time, but in so doing he communicates general principles of the work of God. Therefore, prophecy may have multiple fulfilments in that they are recurrent illustrations in history of a single principle.[37] The reference of ἰδίας is to the prophet as he communicated to his own time. The idea of the clause is that all the meaning or fulfilment of the prophecy of Scripture is not limited to the prophet's interpretation as applied to his own time. The prophet, in speaking to his own generation, set down principles which find fulfilment in times other than that which is his own.

In a unique understanding of this clause, one Catholic commentator affirms that the reference of the adjective is not to the apostle's readers or to the prophets in general, but to the author of 2 Peter alone. The concern of the clause is to affirm that the author's interpretation is not idiosyncratic or self-serving. This interpretation is related to a perspective of 2 Pet. 1:16-21 which sees its purpose as refuting the heretical claim that the prophecy about the Parousia is not divine in origin, but merely human.[38] The writer is affirming his own correct interpretation of the eschatological traditions of the community and that "his interpretation is not idiosyncratic or mercenary,"[39] but both his

---

[36] Joseph B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter. 1907; rpt. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1976, p. 113.

[37] Strachen, "The Second Epistle General of Peter," p. 132.

[38] Jerome H. Neyrey, "The Apologetic Use of the Transfiguration in 2 Peter 1:16-21." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 42 (1980), 519.

[39] Ibid., 517.

reception and interpretation of this material is inspired by God.[40]   This interpretation accords with the group of which he was a part. "Thus the claim is made to know the collective wisdom of the group and to adhere to it."[41]

Vögtle has recently argued that the concern of the pseudonymous author of 2 Peter is to affirm that the prophecy he will use in his argument is genuine prophecy. It is not just words. This genuineness is a consequence of the prophecy's origin which is with the same God who gave his word to Jesus at the Transfiguration. In Vögtle's perspective, the author of 2 Peter is seeking to demonstrate the genuineness of the prophecy which he will employ.   To achieve this purpose, the writer indicates that the prophecy with which he will make his case is not unconventionally or originally interpreted, it is not explained in an impermissible manner. The reason for this is that this prophecy originates with God. In this interpretation, the reference of ἰδίας is the πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς of 2 Pet. 1:20a.[42]

A final interpretation of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται sees the reference of ἰδίας as to the prophet.[43] Commentators differ with respect to the meaning of the clause. Lenski thinks that the writer is seeking to deny that the prophets formed their own interpretation and then designed prophecy to fit what they had

---

[40] Jerome H. Neyrey, "The Second Epistle of Peter," The New Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Ftizmyer, Roland E. Murphy, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990, p. 1019.

[41] Neyrey, 2 Peter, Jude, p. 182.

[42] Anton Vögtle, Der Judasbrief / Der 2 Petrusbrief.   Vol. 22, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, eds. Norbert Bronx, et al., Düsseldorf/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benzinger/Neukirchener, 1994, pp. 171-80.

[43] Ibid.

formed.[44]   Green sees the denial as a negation of the possibility that the prophets, on their own, created prophecy.[45]   Hillyer asserts that "true prophecy never came about as a result of some individual's personal ideas."[46]

A more general approach is to see this assertion as a denial that the interpretation of prophetic visions came from the prophet himself.[47]   This understanding may be taken to the point of claiming, as does Fronmüller, that the prophets were passive in the interpretation of what they saw in their prophetic visions:

> The prophets, receiving the prophecies, were passive: a vision, a painting appeared before their mind, which they described to their hearers and readers as they saw it, without understanding all it signified, so that they themselves searched what or what manner of time the Spirit did signify.[48]

From a similar perspective, Plumptre emphasizes not what the prophets saw but the truth which they handled.   Prophecy does not come "by the prophet's own interpretation of the facts with which he has to deal, whether those facts concern

---

44   R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1966, p. 297.

45   Green, Second Peter and Jude, pp. 90-91.

46   Norman Hillyer, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude.   New International Biblical Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992, p. 180.

47   Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 231-33; D. Edmond Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life: An Exposition of 2 Peter 1:19-21." Bibliotheca Sacra, 141 (1984), 165; cf. Paul J. Achtemeier, The Inspiration of Scripture.   Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980, pp. 109-10; Samuel Cox, "From Starlight to Sunlight: 2 Peter 1:16-20," The Expositor.   Vol. I, London: Hingham, (1985), 180-81.

48   C. Fronmüller, The Epistles of Peter.   trans J. Isidor Mombert, New York: Armstrong, 1873, p. 21.

the outer history of the world or the unfolding of the eternal truth of God's kingdom, "[49] rather, the source of prophecy, as is evident in 2 Pet. 1:21, is with God.

The preceding explanations, then, have been proposed for the meaning of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται in 2 Pet. 1:20-21. The study which follows seeks to establish an exegetical basis for a decision among these alternatives.

Exegetical Analysis of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται

The determination of the meaning of this clause must take account of the syntactical connection between 2 Pet. 1:20 and 2 Pet. 1:21. While the conjunction γάρ does not indicate the exact connection between what precedes and what follows it,[50] the presence of γάρ does indicate that the writer intended a relationship to be seen between 2 Pet. 1:21 and what goes before this verse. In the Greek of secular writers,[51] as in the New Testament,[52] the primary usage of the conjunction is either to give a reason or provide an explanation. In Petrine literature γάρ functions both to indicate a reason (1 Pet. 2:19, 21; 3:5, 10; 4:3, 6, 15) and an explanation (1 Pet. 2:20, 25; 3:17; 2 Pet. 1:8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17; 2:4, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21; 3:4, 6). Here the conjunction provides a reason for the

---

[49] E. H. Plumptre, The General Epistles of St. Peter & St. Jude. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. J. J. S. Perowne, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1889, p. 175.

[50] Robertson, Grammar, pp. 1190-91.

[51] J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particle. 2d ed., Oxford: Clarendon, 1954, p. 58.

[52] Robertson, Grammar, pp. 1190-91.

preceding statement.[53]

There is not unanimity with respect to the nature of that reason. Among those who believe that the prohibition is of unauthorized or individual interpretation of prophecy, the conjunction is seen as providing the reason why the individual is not to interpret prophecy according to his own interpretation: prophecy originates with the Spirit, therefore, the individual needs the interpretation which is derived from the Spirit,[54] or the assistance of the Spirit in interpretation.[55] Exegetes who hold that the concern is with the prophets see γάρ as indicating why prophecy does not arise from the prophet's own interpretation.[56] This reason is that the origin of the prophecy was not with the will of man. The source of prophecy, rather, was with prophets who spoke as moved by God.[57]

The argument for the former explanation is that it is better to see ἰδίας as a reference to the readers than the prophets, as prophets are not mentioned in the passage and that the alternative explanation of the relationship makes 2 Pet. 1:21a only a repetition of 2 Pet. 1:20.[58] There are, however, problems with this view. The first is the terminology used by the Apostle. Alford claims that the choice of οὐ with γάρ rather than οὐδέ indicates that Peter's intention was to

---

[53] Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 401; Robertson, Word Pictures, VI, 159; Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 232-33; Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 270; Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 324.

[54] Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 324.

[55] Leaney, The Letters of Peter and Jude, p. 117.

[56] Fronmüller, The Epistles of Peter, p. 21; Robertson, Word Pictures, VI, 159; Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 400-01.

[57] Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 400.

[58] Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 324.

provide a "direct reason" and not "an analogical or remote reason."[59] Second, the role of 2 Pet. 1:21 is not clear when it is seen as providing a reason that there should not be individualistic interpretation of prophecy. As Bauckham puts it:

> This means that the author has left his main point—the need for Spirit-inspired interpretation—implicit rather than explicit. But even if this is allowed, the cogency of the argument requires a further crucial-step: that the interpretation followed by the author *is* inspired by the Spirit, while that proposed by the false teachers is not. Surely this point could not have been left unstated if this were the argument intended.[60]

Thus, an explanation which sees 2 Pet. 1:21 as speaking of the interpretation of the prophets it to be preferred.

A decision regarding the reference of ἰδίας, as well as its meaning, is also essential for a proper interpretation of the clause in which this term stands. The reference of the adjective may be to prophecy, to the prophets, to the readers of the letter, or to the writer himself, while possible meanings are "one's own" or "private."

The use of ἴδιος both inside and outside Scripture favours the conclusion that the reference of this term in 2 Pet. 1:20 is to people and, therefore, not to that which is impersonal. This adjective appears of people from at least the time of Homer (ca. 9th century B. C.) who employs it of a person's own affair as opposed to that which is public (πρῆξις δ' ἥδ' ἰδίη, οὐ δήμιος).[61] Pindar (518-438 B. C.), likewise, uses ἴδιος of people when he writes of an ancient race providing for their own praises (παλαίφατος γενεά, ἴδια

---

59 Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 400.

60 Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 232.

61 Homer, The Odyssey. trans. A. T. Murray, rev. George E. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library, ed. G. P. Goold, London/Cambridge: Harvard, 1995, 1, 3.83.

ναυστολέοντες ἐπικώμια).62 Pillon indicates that the term expresses that which is "proper and peculiar to an individual, to a species."63 The personal use also seems to be characteristic of Patristic Greek.64

In biblical Greek the reference of ἴδιος is almost always to people. Although exceptions occur (especially in the Wisdom of Solomon) such as ἡ κτίσις ἐν ἰδίῳ γένει (the creation with its own created things, Wis. 19:6; cf. 16:23; 18:14; 19:20) and ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκεται (every tree is known by its own fruit, Luke 6:44), the prevailing pattern in both the LXX and the New Testament is that the adjective refers to persons. The use of ἴδιος of people characterizes most of the occurrences of the adjective in 2 Peter (e.g. κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, conducting themselves according to their own lusts, 3:3; ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, fall from one's own firmness, 3:17; cf. 1:3; 2:16; 3:16). In most of its 113 New Testament occurrences,65 therefore, ἴδιος is used primarily, if not exclusively, of persons.66 This personal reference is evident in Bartsch's

62 Pindar, The Odes of Pindar. trans. John Sandys, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, T. E. Page, W. H. D. Rouse, London/New York: Heinemann/Putnam, 1927, 6.22.

63 Alexandre Pillon, Handbook of Greek Synonyms. ed. Thomas Kerchever Arnold, London: Rivington, 1850, p. 260.

64 G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961, p. 664.

65 J. Eichler, et al., "Possessions, Treasure, Mammon, Wealth, Money," The International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976, II, 839.

66 Cf. Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Berlin/New York: Gruyter, 1971, cols. 730-32, [ET, W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. trans. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, 2d ed., rev.

definition of the term as "one's own, peculiar to, belonging to an individual."[67] The pattern of biblical Greek, then, is that ἴδιος generally appears of people.

Interpretation also requires a decision as to whether ἰδίας means "'someone's own'" (as opposed to what is another's), or "'private'" (as over against) "'general.'"[68] Both meanings occur outside the New Testament, as the sense of "one's own" is found in phrases such as ἴδια κέρδεα (their own gain),[69] ἰδίοις νόμοις (their own laws),[70] ἰδίᾳ γνώμᾳ (one's own will),[71] while that of "private" appears in those like πρῆξις δ' ἥδ' ἰδίη, οὐ δήμιος (my own affair and not public)[72] and εἴτε ἰδίῳ στόλῳ εἴτε δημοσίῳ (whether a private journey or one of the state).[73] Greek of the Roman and Byzantine period used

---

and augmented, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker, Chicago/London: Universiry of Chicago, 1979, pp. 369-70. Hereafter abbreviated BAGD].

[67] H. W. Bartsch, "ἴδιος," Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament. eds. Hortz Balz and Gerhard Schneider, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, II, 171.

[68] Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 229; cf. Ceslas Spicq, Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire. Vol. 22/3, Orbis biblicus et orientalis, Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982, p. 337.

[69] Herodotus, Herodotus. trans. A. D. Godley, Loeb Classical Library, ed. E. H. Warmington, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1969-1975, 6,100.

[70] Eschyle, Prométhée. trans. Paul Mazon, Vol. 1, Oeuvres, Collection des universités de France, 6th ed., Paris: Les belles lettres, 1953, 404.

[71] Ibid., 544.

[72] Homer, Odyssey, 1, 3.83; cf. 6.314.

[73] Herodotus, Herodotus, 5.63.

this term as opposed to κοινός or to ἀλλότριος.74 Patristic Greek has the latter contrast, but not necessarily the former.75

The pattern of New Testament usage strongly favours a meaning for ἴδιος of belonging to the individual and not "private." While the adjective appears in the LXX with the meaning of "private" (ἣ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἥξουσιν, to meet privately, 2 Macc.14:21), as well as in the New Testament (καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι, ἀλλ᾽ ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά, and no one said that his possessions were private, but they had everything in common, Acts 4:32), it is most often found with the idea of possession. This meaning is evident in occurrences of ἴδιος elsewhere in 2 Peter (e.g. ἰδίας παρανομίας, his own lawlessness, 2:16; ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, fall from one's own firmness, 3:17; cf. 1:3; 2:22; 3:3; 3:16) and is to be accepted here. The author's concern in 2 Pet. 1:20, therefore, is with interpretation that is "one's own" and not with interpretation which is private as over against public or general.

Deissmann has argued for an "exhausted use" of ἴδιος on the basis of studies of the Septuagint where this adjective is found with no correspondence in the original (e.g. וְאֵשֶׁת מִדְוָנִים נִשְׁתָּוָה, a contentious woman is [are] alike, ὡσαύτως καὶ γυνὴ λοίδορος ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου, likewise also a destructive woman [drives him] from his own house, Prov. 27:15, cf. Job 24:12).76 It would

---

74 E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. New York: Ungar, [n.d.], I, 592.

75 Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, p. 664.

76 G. Adolf Deissmann, Bibelstudien. Marburg: Elwert, 1895, pp. 120-21.

be, then, about equivalent to a pronoun of possession.[77] However, the pattern in Second Peter is that the meaning of the adjective is "one's own" (2 Pet. 1:3; 2:16, 22; 3:3, 16, 17).[78] The adjective here communicates the sense of what is one's *own* in a manner emphasizing the person.[79]

A further reason why ἴδιος in 2 Pet. 1:20 should be seen as employed with reference to people and as meaning "one's own" is that this adjective appears in certain Jewish and Christian contexts in which there is a concern to deny that prophecy has a human origin. This use of the adjective is particularly evident in Philo (ca. 13 B.C.-ca. 54 A.D.). In *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres*, he affirms that the prophet did not speak his own opinion but echoed that which belonged to another (προφήτης γὰρ ἴδιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἀποφθέγγεται, ἀλλότρια δὲ πάντα ὑπηχοῦντος ἑτέρου).[80] Again, Philo states that it is not that which is his own which the prophet declares but that he is an interpreter prompted by another (προφήτης μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἴδιον ἀποφαίνεται τὸ παράπαν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἑρμηνεὺς ὑποβάλλοντος ἑτέρου).[81] The term is employed in a similar manner by certain Christian authors. Hippolytus (ca. 170-235 A.D.) claims that the prophets did not speak from their own power (οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως οἱ

---

[77] James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949, p. 298.

[78] Cf. James Hope Moulton, Prolegomena. ed. James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3rd ed., 1908; rpt. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919, p. 90.

[79] Cf. Moulton, Grammar, pp. 87-90.

[80] Philo, Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres. Vol. 4, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et al., London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1949, 259.

[81] Philo, De Specialibus Legibus. Vol. 8, Philo, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1954, 4.49.

προφῆται ἐφθέγγοντο).[82] In Pseudo-Justin ἴδιος appears of those who did not teach from their own imaginations but from the knowledge received from God (καὶ μηδεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν φαντασίας διδάξαντος . . . ἀλλὰ . . . τὴν παρὰ θεοῦ δεξαμένους γνῶσιν).[83]

There is an early Christian text, especially significant because of the proximate appearance of ἴδιος and ἐπίλυσις, in which ἴδιος is used differently. Clement of Rome (fl. ca. 90-100 A.D.) employs the adjective in the expression ἰδίᾳ παρέχειν τὴν ἐπίλυσιν (to present the interpretation in private)[84] not as meaning "one's own" but "private." While this is a noteworthy occurrence of ἴδιος for the interpretation of 2 Pet. 1:20, it seems to be exceptional. The general tendency is to employ the term as meaning "one's own," particulary in contexts where there is a concern with the origin of prophecy. This use of ἴδιος in both Jewish and Christian literature is important for an understanding of adjective in 2 Pet. 1:20 as in these occurrences the word is most often used of people and meaning "one's own." Also, these citations demonstrate that ἴδιος was employed, at least on occasion, of prophets.

Several conclusions may be drawn, then, with respect to the reference and meaning of ἰδίας in 2 Pet. 1:20. First, the personal nature of the term makes it unlikely that the intended reference is προφητεία. Second, an intended contrast with ἀλλότριος is implied by the use of the term in biblical Greek. While Classical Greek employs the adjective both as meaning "one's own" and "private," the pattern of Scripture favours the former sense. This invalidates the

---

[82] Hippolytus, De Antichristo. 2 (*TLG*).

[83] Pseudo-Justin, Cohortatio ad gentiles. 9.8 (*TLG*).

[84] Clement of Rome, Homiliae. 2.39 (*TLG*).

claim that the sense is "private" as opposed to "general"[85] or "authoritative."[86] Third, the difficulty involved in making ἰδίας refer to prophets who have not been mentioned in the passage[87] is moderated by a recognition that outside the New Testament the term occurs in contexts where there is an effort to deny the human origin of prophecy. In light of the foregoing it may be concluded that the meaning of ἰδίας in 2 Pet. 1:20 is "one's own." In this text the reference of the term is to the prophet(s).

An understanding of the clause ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται also requires that the meaning of ἐπίλυσις, which is found only here in biblical Greek, be ascertained. A contextual determination of its meaning must recognize this limited usage. The cognate verb is present elsewhere in the New Testament (Mark 4:34 and Acts 19:39), while the noun and the verb are found in Genesis in Aquila (Gen. 40:8; 41:8, 12).[88] In Classical Greek, the verb appears with the primary meaning of "to loose, to untie, or to release."[89] The noun and verb are considered together here.

It is the primary meaning of "(to) loose" or "(to) release" which characterizes early appearances of these terms. The verb ἐπιλύω occurs in Plato (427-347 B.C.) to express the lack of release from anger experienced in certain men, despite their age, as they face the presence of misfortune (ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς ἐπιλύεται ἡ ἡλικία τὸ μὴ οὐχὶ ἀγανακτεῖν τῇ παρούσῃ

---

85 Cf. Mayor, Jude and Second Peter, p. 114

86 Cf. Moffatt, James, Peter and Jude, p. 189.

87 Cf. Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 324.

88 A. C. Thiselton, "Explain, Interpret, Tell, Narrative," The New International Dictionary of New Theology. ed. Colin Brown, Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1975, I, 577.

89 Ibid., I, 577.

τύχη),[90] while the noun ἐπίλυσις is used even earlier by Aeschylus (525-456 B. C.) in a request to Poseidon for release from fears (ἐπίλυσιν φόβων, ἐπίλυσιν δίδου).[91] Closer to the time of the New Testament, Philo employs the verb of release from vows and limitations of the soul (αἱ εὐχαὶ καὶ οἱ ὁρισμοὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιλύονται).[92]

Beyond the primary sense of "(to) loose" or "(to) release" which characterizes ἐπιλύω and ἐπίλυσις, these terms appear with a certain range of meaning. The verb is found in the realm of financial obligation in Flavius Arrianus (ca. 86-ca. 160 A. D) for the annulation of (release from) debts (τὰ χρέα ἐπιλύσασθαι)[93] and in Acts 19:39 of the resolution of a complaint in a legal assembly (ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται). The physician Soranus, who practiced at the beginning of the second century (ca. 98-ca. 138 A.D.), employs the noun for a change (loosening) of bandages (ἐν ταῖς ἐπιλύσεσιν τοὺς τελαμῶνας).[94]

It is, however, the use of ἐπιλύω and ἐπίλυσις in the sense of "to solve, to resolve" or "solution, resolution, interpretation" which is most important for an understanding of 2 Pet. 1:20. This usage appears to be derived from the primary sense of "(to) release" in that as certain questions are resolved or interpretations made there is a release of meaning. In Acquila's version of Genesis (40:8) these terms are found in the account of Joseph in place of

---

90 Plato, Crito. 43.c (*TLG*).

91 Aeschylus, Septem contra Thebas. 131 (*TLG*).

92 Philo, Legum Allegoriae. II.63 (*TLG*).

93 Flavius Arrianus, Alexandri anabasis. 7.5.1 (*TLG*).

94 Soranus, Gynaeciorum libri iv. 1.28.6 (*TLG*).

συγκρίνω and διασαφής for the interpretation of dreams (ὁ συγκρίνων οὐκ ἔστιν, there is no interpreter, οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ διασάφησις . . . ἐστιν, is not the interpretation by God, cf. Gen. 41:8, 12). Philo employs the verb for the explanation of sophisms (τὰς διὰ τῶν σοφισμάτων πιθανότητας ἐπιλύῃ).[95] These words are found outside Christian literature in the second century A. D. with a similar sense. The sceptic Sextus Empiricus (fl. ca. 200 A. D.) uses them of the solution of sophisms, especially in his argument that dialectic is useless in this resolution (ἐπιλύεσθαι . . . σοφίσματα . . . ἄχρηστός ἐστι κατὰ τὴν ἐπίλυσιν τῶν σοφισμάτων ἡ διαλεκτική).[96] Vettius Valens, an Athenian astrologer of the second century A. D., writes of explanations not made because of envy (τὰς ἐπιλύσεις οὐκ ἐποιήσαντο διὰ τὸν φθόνον).[97]

The noun ἐπίλυσις occurs in Christian literature from an early date, where there are two works in which a cluster of appearances are found. In the *Homilies*, attributed to Clement of Rome (fl. ca. 90-100 A. D.) but probably pseudonymous, ἐπίλυσις is used with the sense of the "explanation" or "solution" of problems or questions.[98] A portion of these homilies recount the words of the Apostle Peter against Simon Magnus. It is in this context that ἐπίλυσις occurs of a promised explanation (σοι τὴν ἐπίλυσιν . . . παρέξω, I

---

95 Philo, De Agricultura. 16 (*TLG*).

96 Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes. 2.246 (*TLG*).

97 Vettius Valens, Anthologiarum. 172 (*TLG*).

98 For the authorship of *The Clementine Homilies* and the context of the appearances of ἐπίλυσις see, A. Cleveland Coxe ed., The Twelve Patriarchs, Excerpts and Epistles, The Clementina, Apocrypha, Decretals, Memoirs of Edessa and Syriac Documents, Remains of the First Ages. Vol. 8, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, [n.d.]; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951, pp. 69-71, 223-339.

will present you the explanation)[99] and, as well, of the explanation of the Law by Moses (τὸ νόμον σὺν ταῖς ἐπιλύσεσιν).[100] In a text which demonstrates how the noun could be used of the explanation of difficult questions, Peter asserts that Jesus avoided a certain method of argumentation as by that approach He might have provided explanations of that which could be perceived by the toil of the soul (εἰς ὀλίγων λόγων ἐπιλύσεις ἀσχολουμένῳ τῶν ὑπὸ πόνου ψυχῆς νοεῖσθαι δυναμένων).[101]

The other concentration of occurrences of ἐπίλυσις in Christian writings of the first two centuries A. D. is in the *Similitudes* of Hermas which, in its completed form, may be dated to the middle of the second century A. D.[102] This noun and the corresponding verb occur a number of times in the work of the "explanation" or "interpretation" of parables or similitudes.[103] The substantive appears in conversation between Hermas and the Shepherd (angel) of having the interpretation of a parable (ἔχεις . . . τῆς παραβολῆς τὴν ἐπίλυσιν)[104] and hearing such an interpretation (τὴν ἐπίλυσιν ἀκούσας).[105] The term

---

[99] Clement of Rome, Homiliae. 2.53.1; cf. 2.50.2 (*TLG*).

[100] Ibid., 2.31.8.

[101] Ibid., 17.6.5.

[102] For the date of *The Shepherd of Hermas*, as well as the context of the occurrences of ἐπίλυσις see, Kirsopp Lake, trans. The Apostolic Fathers. Loeb Classical Library, ed. G. P. Goold, Cambridge/London: Harvard, 1985, 2, 2-3; 158-265.

[103] For occurrences of the verb see, for example, Hermas, Pastor. 56.2; 57.3; 58.1 (*TLG*).

[104] Ibid., 59.8; cf. 93.7.

[105] Ibid., 60.1.

occurs, as well, for the interpretation of specific parabolic details including certain rods (τὰς ἐπιλύσεις πασῶν τῶν ῥάβδων)[106] and people who were rejected (τὴν ἐπίλυσιν τῶν ἀποβεβλημένων).[107]

Other occurrences of ἐπίλυσις are found in early Christian literature. Clement of Alexandria (ca. 155-220 A. D.) employs it for possible alternative explications of the New Testament account of the coin in the mouth of the fish (καὶ ἄλλας ἐπιλύσεις οὐκ ἀγνοουμένας ὁ στατήρ),[108] and Irenaeus (fl. ca. 175-ca. 195) for the interpretations of parables (τὰς ἐπιλύσεις τῶν παραβολῶν).[109] The term also appears in the *Philocalia* of Origen (ca. 195-ca. 254 A.D.) both in the introductory statement that this work has selected explanations of Origen with regard to Scripture (γραφικῶν . . . ἐπιλύσεων)[110] and in the indication of its content which includes explanations of certain Scriptures (γραφικῶν ἐπίλυσις).[111]

In the New Testament, the verb is used in Mark 4:34 (ἐπέλυεν πάντα) of the explanation or interpretation of parables.[112] Although it has been

---

[106] Ibid., 77.1.

[107] Ibid., 90.3.

[108] Clement of Alexandria, Paedagogus. 2.1.14.2 (*TLG*).

[109] Irenaeus, Adversus haereses. 1.12.1 (*TLG*.).

[110] Origen, Philocalia. p.1 (*TLG*).

[111] Ibid., p.c.61.

[112] Cf. O. Procksch and F. Büchsel, "λύω," Vol. IV, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], 338-39, [ET, O. Procksch and F. Büchsel, "λύω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967, IV, 337.

suggested that the sense of interpretation here is "translation of parabolic speech into straightforward discourse,"[113] the meaning is better seen as an indication of the explanation of the parables on the part of Jesus.

The words ἐπιλύω and ἐπίλυσις are found, then, from the time of Classical Greek with a primary sense of "(to) loose" or "(to) release." Among the derived meanings, that which is most important for an understanding of 2 Pet. 1:20 is the use of these terms for "explanation," "interpretation," or "solution," the idea being that such explanation releases meaning. These words appear to carry a certain nuance in that the explanation or interpretation involves the unfolding of meaning which is either complex or hidden as ἐπιλύω and ἐπίλυσις are found of the explanation of (difficult) questions, sophisms, and parables, as well as the interpretation of dreams. Thus, Curran affirms that "both noun and verb are employed to express the idea of interpretation or explanation, and generally with a connotation of obscurity or even mystery in the object of interpretation."[114]

While a number of diverse meanings have been suggested for ἐπιλύσεως in 2 Pet. 1:20,[115] the use of the noun and its cognate verb both inside and outside Scripture requires the sense of "explanation," "interpretation," or "solution" be preferred here. Even when this sense is

---

[113] Thiselton, "Explain," I, 578.

[114] Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20," 357.

[115] Exemples of suggested meanings are: "revealment," in R. M. Spence, "Private Interpretation." Vol. 8, The Expository Times, ed. James Hastings, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, (October, 1896-September, 1897), 285; "set-forth," in E. P. Boys-Smith, "'Interpretation' or 'Revealment' (II)." Vol. 8, The Expository Times. ed. James Hastings, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, (October, 1896-September, 1897), 331; "prompting" or "loosing," in E. R. Andry, "The Translation of Epilyeos in II Peter 1:20." Journal of Biblical Literature, 70 (1951), xvii. Green, following Jacobszoon and Loow, believes the word in its context "almost comes to mean 'inspiration,'" see, Green, Second Peter and Jude, p. 91.

adopted, however, interpreters vary with respect to the meaning of the text. Those who believe that ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται refers to the individual's own interpretation affirm that ἐπιλύσεως deals with the interpretation of prophecy carried out by the individual.[116] Those who hold that the concern is with the origin of prophecy think that the term describes the prophet's interpretation of what was presented to him.[117] The use of ἐπιλύω and ἐπίλυσις may favour the latter interpretation although either is possible. The noun appears in Origen of the explanation or interpretation of Scripture which is what is required if the individual's interpretation is in view, but the substantive and the verb are found in Aquila and the Similitudes of the explanation of visions or dreams. This interpretation may precede and be the basis for prophecy[118] or follow the dream or vision.[119] This perspective of the use of ἐπιλύσεως accords with what is said of the prophets in 1 Pet. 1:10-12.[120] In 2 Pet. 1:20, therefore, ἐπιλύσεως may appear with the sense of "interpretation" or "explanation" and be used of the prophet(s).

A final concern in the study of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται is the meaning of οὐ γίνεται, which may be "[does not] comes under the scope of,"[121]

---

[116] Sidebottom, <u>James, Jude and 2 Peter</u>, p. 111.

[117] Fronmüller, <u>The Epistles of Peter</u>, p. 21.

[118] Huther, <u>1. Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas und den 2. Brief des Petrus</u>, p. 287, [ET, Huther, <u>The Epistles of Peter and Jude</u>, p. 324].

[119] Bauckham, <u>Jude, 2 Peter</u>, p. 231.

[120] Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 165.

[121] Mayor, <u>The Epistles of Jude and Second Peter</u>, p. 112.

or "'does not fall to," or "does not come under.'"[122] It may mean, as well, "is [not] a matter of,"[123] especially since γίνομαι is used in the New Testament "as a substitute for the forms of εἰμί,"[124] a usage which is found both in the immediate context (2 Pet. 1:16; 2:1) and elsewhere in the Petrine literature (e.g., 1 Pet. 3:6; 4:12; 2 Pet. 2:20). A third possibility is that οὐ γίνεται here means "arises from,"[125] "comes" or "springs,"[126] with a negation, perhaps to denote origin.[127]

All three possibilities may be found elsewhere in Greek literature, although the first is somewhat questionable. Aristotle uses οὐ γίνεται often in his work. It appears a number of times in *Analytica priora* in his description of situations in which a certain syllogism (conclusion) does not come about (συλλογισμὸς οὐ γίνεται).[128] The sense of this negation may be "does not come under the scope of a syllogism," but, perhaps, only "is not a matter of a syllogism." The use of οὐ γίνεται for "is not (a matter of)" is more evident. Thus, Aristotle employs οὐ γίνεται in a description of atmospheric conditions in which there is no wind (οὐ γίνεται πνεῦμα),[129] while Theophrastus employs the same

---

[122] Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 269.

[123] *RSV*, p. 265.

[124] Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 317, [ET, BAGD, p. 160].

[125] Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 323.

[126] Robertson, Word Pictures, VI, 158.

[127] Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 401.

[128] Aristotle, Analytica priora. 66a.28; cf. 26b.17; 28a.7; 33a.19; 37a.30; 61a.2, 41 (*TLG*).

[129] Aristotle, Problemata. 944a.28; cf. 944b.12 (*TLG*).

terminology of the absence in a plant of dryness from sun and wind (ἀπὸ καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου τοῦ πνεύματος οὐ γίνεται ξηρότης).[130] Οὐ γίνεται is also found as "does not arise from" or "does not come from." Aristotle asserts that laughter does not come from the individual himself (ὁ γέλως . . . οὐ γίνεται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ).[131] Plutarch, similarly, writes of a situation in which a zeal for imitation does not spring forth (πρὸς ἃ μιμητικὸς οὐ γίνεται ζῆλος).[132] Οὐ γίνεται occurs once in the New Testament in Heb. 9:22 which reads καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφσεις (and apart from the shedding of blood there is no pardon). In this text the sense is closest to "is not (a matter of)."

The decision regarding the meaning of the verb is related to the significance of the genitive (ablative) ἐπιλύσεως.[133] The genitive may be seen as one of "quality or of pertinence—variations of the possessive genitive."[134] Curran argues that ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν (he purposed to return) in Acts 20:3 may be such a "quasi-possessive" genitive.[135] When the genitive is taken in this sense, the meaning of γίνομαι is "'fall to (the lot, etc.) of,' 'belong to,' 'come under the scope of.'"[136]

---

[130] Theophrastus, De Causis Plantarum. 5.6.5 (*TLG*).

[131] Aristotle, Problemata. 965a.17 (*TLG*).

[132] Plutarchus, Pericles. 2.2 (*TLG*).

[133] Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 231.

[134] Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20," 353.

[135] Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20," 353; cf. Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. ed. Friedrich Rehkopf, 15th ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979, p. 136-37.

[136] Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20," 354.

The genitive may, as well, be one of origin or an ablative. This is the perspective of those who think the concern of this verse is with the prophet's interpretation of visions or dreams.[137]   This may not the most natural interpretation, as elsewhere in the New Testament ἐκ is generally used after this term (e.g. τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ, who was born from the seed of David, Rom. 1:3; γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, born of a woman, Gal. 4:4),[138] however, the syntax of 2 Pet. 1:20 is different from other instances in that ἐπιλύσεως precedes γίνομαι.   Despite this difficulty, Robertson thinks that ἐπιλύσεως is an ablative and, as such, indicates "origin" or "source."[139]   Even when this meaning of the genitive is not adopted, this usage is allowed as possible.[140]

In light of the use of οὐ γίνεται in its one other New Testament appearance, it is best understood as meaning "is not a matter of" in 2 Pet. 1:20, although the translation itself reflects the difficulty of adequate interpretation. The meaning "comes under the scope of" does not appear to be common in the extra-biblical uses which have been examined and the evidence that the genitive is one of "quality or pertinence," which would favour such a meaning, is not strong.   By contrast, the meaning "arises from," or "comes from," which suggests origin, while not impossible, requires that the verb carry a somewhat unusual sense.   In the other New Testament occurrence of οὐ γίνεται, γίνεται functions as a substitute for εἰμί, and should be understood similarly in 2 Pet.

---

137   Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 231; Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 165; Lenski, Peter, John and Jude, p. 297.

138   Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 231.

139   Robertson, Grammar, p. 514.

140   Cf. Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20," 354; Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 323.

1:20.

The sense of ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται is most probably either "(no prophecy of Scripture) is a matter of one's own interpretation," and refers to the reader's present interpretation of prophecy or "(no prophecy of Scripture) derives from the prophet's own interpretation," and speaks of prophecy's source.[141] The interpretation of this clause which sees the concern as with the origin of Scripture is best, although the alternative may at first seem more natural. This is true for several reasons. First, the syntax of 2 Pet. 1:21 suggests that the Apostle's purpose in this verse is to provide a reason why prophecy is not a matter of "one's own interpretation;" namely that it originates not in the will of humans, but with individuals carried by the Spirit. Second, the usage of ἐπιλύσεως is possible evidence that the concern is with the origin of prophecy as the term is often used of the interpretation of a vision or a dream, especially in literature belonging to or dependent on Scripture. Third, as the verb probably does not mean "comes under the scope of," this understanding of the clause is possible despite the difficulties of the genitive (ablative) in the predicate with γίνομαι and ἐκ absent. Fourth, this interpretation best accounts for the connection with 2 Pet. 1:19. The attention to the "prophetic word" called for in that verse is rooted in a knowledge of its origin.

---

[141] Cf. Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 229.

5.2.2 The Identification of προφητεία γραφῆς

The interpretation of 2 Pet. 1:20 requires that the identity of προφητεία γραφῆς be determined. It cannot be merely assumed, as a number of suggestions have been made with respect to its intended reference.

Proposals Regarding the Identity of προφητεία γραφῆς

The most narrow identification of the prophecy in this passage limits it to one individual part of Scripture. Προφητεία γραφῆς, then, is used of specific texts. Among the key passages suggested is Num. 24:17, as a reference to Christ.[142] A second possible identification is that which views this as a reference to Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah. These would include portions such as Mal. 4:2; Isa. 40:5, 9; 60:1.[143] A third alternative widens the possible reference of προφητεία γραφῆς to include all the prophecy of the Old Testament.[144]

A fourth perspective sees the intended reference as to Old Testament in general, perhaps with an emphasis on the entire Old Testament as prophetic of

---

[142] Tord Fornberg, The Early Church in a Pluralistic Society. trans. Jean Gray, Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 9, [n.p.]: Gleerup, 1977, p. 82. Cf. the description in Bénétreau of the position of O. Betz. Bénétreau, Deuxième Pierre et Jude, p. 125.

[143] Mayor, The Epistles of Jude and Second Peter, p. 108; Curran, "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20," 349; cf. Dewey M. Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963, p. 22.

[144] Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 269; Wand, Peter and Jude, p. 161; Otto Knoch, Der Erste und Zweite Petrusbrief, Der Judasbrief. Regensburger Neues Testament, eds. Jost Eckert and Otto Knoch, Regensburg: Pustet, 1990, p. 257.

Christ. A number of commentators adopt this interpretation.[145] The writer's purpose is, then, to speak only of prophecies of the Old Testament as against other prophecies, whether generally extra-biblical[146] or the utterances of those who prophesied in a time contemporaneous with the author of 2 Peter.[147] According to this perspective, neither biblical prophecy beyond the Old Testament nor non-biblical prophecy is intended as the reference of προφητεία γραφῆς. This is evident because of the presence of ποτέ and the aorist tenses in 2 Pet. 1:21.[148]

This term has also been seen as in some manner including New Testament material. A fifth position, then, is that προφητεία γραφῆς speaks of "the transfiguration . . . understood as a parousia-prophecy." In the immediate context the author has described the Transfiguration and it is this event, understood as prophecy of the parousia, that is here in view.[149] A sixth perspective sees the reference as to the New Testament; this approach views

---

[145] Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 400; Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 164; Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 323; J. Rawson Lumby, The Epistles of St. Peter. The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, New York: Doran, [n.d.], p. 277; Moffatt, James, Peter and Jude, p. 188. Cf. Lenski, St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude, p. 292; Bénétreau, Deuxième Pierre et Jude, pp. 118-19; Walter Grundmann, Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus. Vol. 15, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. Erich Fascher, Berlin: Evangelische, 1974, p. 86.

[146] Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 164.

[147] Wand, Peter and Jude, p. 161.

[148] Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 400.

[149] Neyrey, "The Apologetic Use of the Transfiguration," 515; Neyrey, 2 Peter, Jude, p. 179; Neyrey, "The Second Epistle of Peter," 1019. It is to be noted that Neyrey's position is developed with respect to τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον in 2 Pet. 1:19. It is not entirely clear that he sees this term as synonymous with προφητεία γραφῆς in 2 Pet. 1:20.

the prophets of 2 Pet. 1:19 and 2 Pet. 3:2 as those of the New Testament and the scripture of 2 Pet. 1:20 as "the New Testament itself."[150] A final position is that the entire Scripture is in view in this designation.[151] As the prophetic gift was not limited to the Old Covenant and as the term "Scripture" was taking on a wider usage at the time 2 Peter was written, the limitation of the intended reference of προφητεία γραφῆς to only the Old Testament is seen as unnecessarily restricting the proper identification.[152]

Exegetical Considerations in the Identification of προφητεία γραφῆς

The identification of προφητεία γραφῆς must account for several distinctive aspects of this term. First, this is the only New Testament use of προφητεία with γραφή, although it appears several times with λόγος (2 Pet. 1:19; Rev. 1:3; 22:7, 10, 18, 19); the use of the composite term, therefore, must be determined in light of one New Testament occurrence. Second, 2 Pet. 1:20 is one of only two New Testament texts in which γραφή appears without the article and is definite, the other is 1 Pet. 2:6.[153] Third, the use of γραφή in 2 Pet. 1:20 parallels, to some extent, that which is found in 2 Tim. 3:16a; a general lexical study has already been undertaken,[154] and will not be repeated here.

---

[150] Sidebottom, James, Jude and Second Peter, pp. 110-11.

[151] Plumptre, The General Epistles of St. Peter & St. Jude, p. 175; cf. James I. Packer, "A Lamp in a Dark Place," Can We Trust the Bible? ed. Earl D. Radmachar, Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1979, p. 21.

[152] Plumptre, The General Epistles of St. Peter & St. Jude, p. 175.

[153] Robertson, Grammar, p. 772.

[154] See above, pp. 175-180.

The effort to determine the reference of προφητεία γραφῆς will consider each of these words separately and, then, the composite term.

The attempt to discover the meaning of προφητεία based on a consideration of other literature is here limited only to Jewish and Christian writings. The word does not appear outside this literature until the second century.[155]

Although προφητεία appears in Jewish and early Christian literature of that which is spoken by a prophet, which is the sense it carries in 2 Pet. 1:20, the word is also found with a wider range of meaning.[156] Προφητεία is employed for the position or responsibility of a prophet. The LXX affirms that Joshua was the successor of Moses in his prophetic office (διάδοχος Μωυσῆ ἐν προφητείαις, Sir. 46:1), while Josephus says that he was appointed to this position (Ιησοῦν καθίστησιν . . . ταῖς προφητείαις).[157] Josephus also employs προφητεία of the prophetic office of Samuel (τὴν σὴν προφητείαν, your prophetic office).[158] A request to buy a prophetic office is found in a papyrus of the second century A. D. (β[ούλομα]ι ὠνήσασθαι τὴν . . . προ-

---

[155] See the affirmation of Krämer that it appears in non-Jewish Greek literature only beginning with the second century A.D. Helmut Krämer, et al., "προφήτης," Vol. VI, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], 784, [ET, Helmut Krämer, et al., "προφήτης," The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968, VI, 784].

[156] For various meanings of προφητεία see, Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, rev. Henry Stuart Jones, Oxford: Clarendon, p. 1539.

[157] Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae, 4.165 (TLG).

[158] Ibid., 6.39.

φη[τ]εία[ν], I want to purchase the prophetic office).159 This use of προφητεία for the office of a prophet may be what is intended in Rev. 11:6 where the term is found of the two witnesses (τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς προφητείας αὐτῶν, the days of their prophecy or prophetic office).

As prophecy is seen in Jewish and Christian writings as originating with God and not the prophet, προφητεία also occurs in this literature of the gift of prophecy. Philo describes Moses as the receptor of (the gift of) prophecy (ὁ νομοθετικὴν ὁμοῦ καὶ προφητείαν . . . λαβών, received the capacity for legislation and prophecy)160 and Josephus indicates Aaron had this gift (τὴν προφητείαν).161 Προφητεία can also carry the sense of the prophet's capacity as Josephus uses the term of Elisha who through his prophetic capability demonstrated wondrous and marvellous works (θαυμασατὰ γὰρ καὶ παράδοξα διὰ τῆς προφητείας ἐπεδείξατο ἔργα, cf. Sir. 44.3).162 In the New Testament προφητεία appears as the gift of prophecy in several texts which speak of gifts of individuals within the church (Rom. 12:6; 1 Cor. 12:10). Clement of Rome affirms that Rahab possessed (the gift of) prophecy along with her faith (οὐ μόνον πίστις, ἀλλὰ καὶ προφητεία ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ γέγονεν).163

Although προφητεία is found in Jewish and Christian writings with certain breath of meaning, it is the use of this term for that which is stated or

159 Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., The Tebtunis Papyri, Part II. London: Frowde, 1907, no. 294.

160 Philo, De Confusione Linguarum. 132.2 (TLG).

161 Josephus, AJ, 3.192 (TLG).

162 Ibid., 9.182.

163 Clément de Rome, Épître aux Corinthiens. trans. Annie Jaubert, Sources chrétiennes, no. 167, ed. C. Mondésert, Paris: Cerf, 1971, 12.8.

spoken (and then written) by the prophets which is most important for an understanding of 2 Pet. 1:20. The LXX employs προφητεία for that which is spoken by a prophet (καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ τὴν προφητείαν Αδαδ τοῦ προφήτου, and when [he] heard these words and the prophecy of Oded the prophet, 2 Chr. 15:8; ἐν προφητείᾳ Αγγαιου τοῦ προφήτου, at the prophecy of Haggai, the prophet, 2 Esdr. 6:14), as does the New Testament (ἡ προφητεία Ἠσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα, the prophecy of Isaiah which says, Matt. 13:14). Προφητεία also appears ın the *Mandate* of Hermas as the utterance of the prophet who receives something for his prophecy (μισθοὺς λαμβάνων τῆς προφητείας αὐτοῦ).[164]

The particular prophetic utterances to which reference is made by προφητεία vary depending on the context in which the word occurs. On occasion this reference is to a particular text of the Old Testament. Thus, the Epistle of Barnabas employs προφητεία for the prophecy of Jacob to Joseph found in Genesis 48 (καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ προφητείᾳ λέγει φανερώτερον ὁ Ἰακὼβ πρὸς Ἰωσήφ),[165] while in Justin Martyr (ca. 100-165 A.D.) the term is used of Isaiah's announcement of the birth of Christ by a virgin.[166] The reference of προφητεία to a specific Old Testament passage also appears in the New Testament where in ἡ προφητεία Ἠσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα (Matt. 13:14) it is to Isaiah 6:9-10. Προφητεία does not occur, however, only of a specific Old

164 Hermas, The Shepherd of Hermas. Vol. 2, The Apostolic Fathers, trans. Kirsopp Lake, Loeb Classical Library, ed. G. P. Goold, Cambridge/London: Harvard, 1985, 11.12.

165 Barnabas, The Epistle of Barnabas. Vol. 1, The Apostolic Fathers, trans. Kirsopp Lake, Loeb Classical Library, ed. G. P. Goold, Cambridge/London: Harvard, 1985, 13.4.

166 Justin, Apologies. trans. André Wartelle, Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1987, 33.1-3.

Testament text. Justin Martyr, while not specifically including all of the Old Testament in the reference of this term, extends it to include writings of Moses and David. In his argument that the books of the Jewish prophets in which their prophecies (τὰς προφητείας) were recorded announced the coming and work of Jesus Christ, these leaders of Israel are described as prophets and texts from Genesis (49:10-11) and Psalms (1; 2; 21 [22]:17-19; 95 [96]:1, 2, 4-10) counted among the prophecies.[167] In this context he employs προφητεία of writings of David (καὶ πάλιν δι' ἄλλης προφητείας μηνύον τὸ προφητικὸν Πνεῦμα δι' αὐτοῦ Δαυῖδ, and again in another prophecy the prophetic Spirit reveals by David).[168] Origen, in a similar manner, refers to the entirety of Psalm 118 as a prophecy of Judas (ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῶν ψαλμῶν ὅλος ὁ ἑκατοστὸς ὄγδος ψαλμὸς τὴν περὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα περιέχει προφητείαν, in the book of the Psalms, the whole of Psalm 118 contains a prophecy concerning Judas).[169]

While προφητεία appears in the New Testament for a particular text of the Old Testament, the term is also found as referring to other prophecy. The word occurs at both the beginning and end of Revelation for that particular book (τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας, the words of the prophecy, 1:3; τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, the words of the prophecy of this book, 22:7, 10, 18; cf. 22:19) and, therefore, can be employed of a New Testament text. The occurrences of προφητεία in First Timothy indicate that the term also appears of prophecies which are apparently not included in Scripture as προφητεία is found of utterances concerning Timothy (κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας, according to the prophecies made previously concerning

---

[167] Ibid., 31-45.

[168] Ibid., 41.1.

[169] Origène, Contre Celse. trans. Marcel Borret, Sources chrétiennes, no. 132, ed. C. Mondésert, Paris: Cerf, 1967, 2.11.

you, 1 Tim. 1:18) and of the gift which was, by means of prophecy, given to him (μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος, ὃ ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας, do not neglect the gift which is in you which was given to you by prophecy, 1 Tim. 4:14). In the New Testament and a period relatively close to it, then, προφητεία occurs of specific texts of the Old Testament, of portions of the Old Testament outside of the prophetical books, of a book of the New Testament and of prophecies which were not included in Scripture.

While the New Testament does not draw a distinction in the use of προφητεία between prophecies such as those of Isaiah and the book of Revelation which were or came to be accepted as canonical Scripture and those prophecies referred to in 1 Tim. 1:18 and 4:14 which, apparently, are not, there is a later effort to make such a differentiation. Origen distinguishes between prophecies like those of Isaiah and Jeremiah which are of a second order after the teaching of the apostles and those of an order with spiritual gifts (τὴν μὲν γὰρ καθολικωτέραν καὶ μιμουμένην τὰς προφητείας Ἡσαΐου καὶ Ἰερεμίου δευτέραν τάξιν μετὰ τὴν ἀποστολὴν ἐρεῖ, ταύτην δὲ τὴν τελευταίαν τεταγμένην τάξιν μετὰ τὰ εἰρημένα χαρίσματα τοιαύτην οὖσαν).[170]

Although the expression προφητεία γραφῆς of 2 Pet. 1:20 is not often found in Jewish and Christian literature around the time of the New Testament, the understanding that prophecy could be written down and preserved in books was. Josephus speaks of prophecies of Jeremiah as written down (ὃς ἁπάσας αὐτοῦ τὰς προφητείας συγγραψάμενος, he wrote all of his prophecies)[171] and, as well, of those of Daniel (κατέλιπε [Daniel] δε γράψας, ὅθεν ἡμῖν ἀληθες τὸ τῆς προφητείας αὐτοῦ ἀκριβες καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον ἐποίησε δῆλον, he left

---

[170] Claude Jenkins, "Origen on 1 Corinthiens, IV." Journal of Theological Studies, 10 (1909), p. 31.

[171] Josephus, AJ, 10.93 (*TLG*).

behind writings where the truth of the accuracy and unchangeableness of his prophecy is made evident to us).[172] He even depicts Cyrus as reading the book in which the prophecies of Isaiah were found (Κῦρος ἀναγινώσκων τὸ βιβλίον, ὃ τῆς αὐτοῦ προφητείας ὁ Ἡσαΐας).[173] The terminology of Josephus which is closest to that of 2 Pet. 1:20 is τὰς τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν ἀναγραφὰς (the records of the ancient prophets).[174] The comprehension of prophecy as written in a book also appears in the New Testament as in Stephen's defense before the Sanhedrin he refers to that which is written in the book of the prophets (γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν, Acts 7:42). Justin Martyr describes prophecies in books arranged by the prophets themselves (τὰς προφητείας . . . ἐν Βιβλίοις ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν τῶν προφητῶν συντεταγμένας).[175]

Προφητεία appears in 2 Pet. 1:20 with γραφῆς, therefore, identification of the reference of προφητεία γραφῆς must determine to what the word γραφή by itself refers. It has been argued in the study of 2 Tim. 3:16a that this term is generally used in the New Testament of the Scripture of the Old Testament.[176] This reference is so universal in the New Testament that the γραφῆς of 2 Pet. 1:20 must include at least the Old Testament. On the basis of 2 Pet. 3:15-16, however, where Pauline writings appear to be included in Scripture (τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς), the question of whether the reference γραφῆς is to be limited only to

---

172 Ibid., 10.269.

173 Ibid., 11.5.

174 Flavius Josephus, De bello Judaico. Opera, ed. Benedictus Niese, 2 ed., Berlin: Weidmann, 1955, 6.109.

175 Justin, Apologies, 31.1.

176 See above, pp 175-180. For the canon of the Old Testament see above, p 172.

the Old Testament or if certain New Testament material must be included in this term must be addressed. While some deny that 2 Pet. 3.15-16 indicates that Pauline literature was viewed as "Scripture,"[177] the terminology of that text seems to require this identification[178] as the word γραφή is always employed of the Scripture in the New Testament and the presence of the definite article suggests such an identification.[179] The use of γραφή in 2 Pet. 3:16 is not general[180] but, as in the rest of the New Testament, it is employed in a specific and limiting manner. The term γραφή itself, then, could be used of "Scripture" beyond the limits of the Old Testament.

The recognition of this broader usage does not require, however, that γραφῆς in 2 Pet. 1:20 include certain Pauline material. In light of the use of ποτέ and the aorist tense in 2 Pet. 1:21,[181] the most probable conclusion is that the reference of γραφῆς is only to the Old Testament, although the usage of 2 Pet. 3:15-16 allows the possibility of a wider reference.

While γραφή alone, then, is employed of the entire Old Testament, the determination of the reference of προφητεία γραφῆς is more difficult, in part because of the limited use of the composite term. Προφητεία γραφῆς may be

---

[177] Cf. Mayor, The Epistles of Jude and Second Peter, p. 168.

[178] Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1981, p. 978; Kelly, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 373; Strachan, "The Second Epistle General of Peter," p. 147.

[179] Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 333. Bauckham argues that the description of Paul's writing as Scripture does not necessarily indicate the author of 2 Peter knew of a distinct New Testament canon, but that these letters were recognized as inspired and authoritative.

[180] Cf. Green, Second Peter and Jude, p. 148.

[181] See, Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 400.

more specific than γραφῆς and be limited only to the portions of the Old Testament which are identified as those of the prophets in an expression like τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς (the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms, Luke 24:44; cf. John 1:45). By contrast, as προφητεία is found of material beyond that of the Old Testament prophets both elsewhere in the New Testament and in early Christian literature the reference of προφητεία γραφῆς may extend to all of the Old Testament. This latter perspective is to be chosen, although the former is possible. The manner in which προφητεία was employed makes it evident that the term was not understood as limited only to that which was spoken by the Old Testament prophets. Indeed, even in a statement such as πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ (everything written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms concerning me, Luke 24:44) there is the sense of all of the Old Testament being prophetic in that what is therein written concerns Jesus. Προφητεία γραφῆς in 2 Pet. 1:20, then, is a term which is employed of all the Old Testament and conveys the nuance that this Scripture was prophetic throughout.

2 Pet. 1:20 indicates what the readers of this epistle were to keep in mind as they read the Old Testament Scriptures. This was that the origin of Scripture was not with the prophet's own interpretation (of what was seen or of the truth dealt with). While this statement may have application beyond the Old Testament, it is specifically this portion of Scripture with which the verse is concerned. The intention is not to restrict the reader's interpretation of Scripture, either by placing this responsibility with the Church or suggesting the need for the assistance of the Spirit, but to indicate that Scripture did not originate with the interpretation of the prophet. The reason for this assertion is indicated in what follows.

5.2.3 Reason for the Negation of 2 Pet. 1:20

The purpose for 2 Pet. 1:21 is to provide a reason for the assertion of 2 Pet. 1:20 that πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται. The reason the Old Testament Scripture did not originate with the interpretation of the prophet is here explained. This explanation is presented in two clauses which are separated by an emphatic ἀλλά.[182] Negatively, the author asserts that prophecy did not originate with the will of man. Positively, he affirms in the end of verse that men carried by the Spirit spoke from God. This affirmation concludes the text of this study.

Negative Statement Regarding the Origin of Scripture

2 Pet. 1:21 states that θελήματι ἀνθρώπου was not the cause by which ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ. The verb φέρω is used in both major divisions of this verse. Here the verb is employed with the sense of "bring" and refers to verbal communication. The idea is, then, to "bring, utter, make a word, speech, announcement."[183] This usage is not unique to the New Testament as it is also found in Homer[184] and in the papyri.[185] Thus, in Homer φέρω appears with

---

182 Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 166.

183 Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 1691, [ET, BAGD, p. 855].

184 K. Weiss, "φέρω," Vol. IX, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973, 58, [ET, Konrad Weiss, "φέρω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, IX, 56].

185 Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p. 666.

μῦθος (μῦθον φέρε, bring word)[186] and ἀγγελία (ἀγγελίην πατρὸς φέρει ἐρχομένοιο, bring news of the coming of father)[187] and in a first century papyri of a request to an oracle (τοῦτό μοι σύμφωνον ἔνενκε, announce this to me harmoniously).[188] The term occurs in a similar manner in the immediate context of 2 Pet. 1:21 (φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης, declaration was brought, 2 Pet. 1:17; cf. 1:18). The sense "came from heaven to men," is an unnecessary introduction of the sense of 2 Pet. 1:17-18,[189] the concern, however, is with origin.[190]

The particle ποτέ may be taken of past time (formerly), which would be appropriate since, as has been argued, the concern of the text is with the Old Testament. This is consistent with the usage in 1 Peter (οἵ ποτε οὐ λαός, which formerly were not a people, 1 Pet. 2:10; cf. 3:5, 20). The sense of "never" (ever)[191] is also possible, especially in light of 2 Pet. 1:10 (οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε, you will never stumble). Both other clear New Testament examples of the particle with the negative (2 Pet. 1:10; οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν, no one ever hated his own flesh, Eph. 5:29) appear in this latter sense, which is better here. The author, while limiting what he says to only the Old Testament Scripture, still employs a general statement.

The concern of the clause is to deny that the Old Testament Scriptures

---

186 Homer, Illiade. trans. Paul Mazon, Collection des universités de France, Paris: Les belles lettres, 1937, 2, 10, 288.

187 Homer, Odyssey. 1, 408.

188 Arthur S. Hunt, ed., The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1911, 8, no. 1148.

189 Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 270.

190 Fronmüller, The Epistles of Peter, p. 21.

191 NASB, p. 1874; RSV, p. 960.

ever originated with a particular cause, identified here as θελήματι ἀνθρώπου. The word θέλημα does not often appear in Classical Greek. It was used, in this literature to express "intention" or "wish" but primarily of (the) "will."[192] The sense of "intention" is found in Antiphon (ca. 480-411 B. C.) who writes of the mind being turned away from its intentions (ἀπέστρεψε τὸν νοῦν τῶν θελημάτων)[193] and the tactician Aeneas (4th century B. C.) who speaks of the gatekeeper who fails to realize his intention (εἰ δ᾽ ἀπετύγχαρεα ὁ πυλωρὸς τοῦ θελήματος).[194] The meaning "will" occurs in Aristotle's (384-322 B. C.) indication that the realization of our will depends on our senses (τὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου δὲ θελήματος τέλος πρὸς τὴν αἴσθησιν ἀποστρέφεται)[195] and in Empedocles (ca. 490-ca. 430 B. C.) who, in a context where he speaks of love, writes of that which the will unites from various directions (ἀλλὰ θελημὰ συνιστάμεν᾽ ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα).[196] Near the time of the New Testament, θέλημα is found in Philo for the will of God (Αβρααμ ἀκολουθῶν τῷ θεοῦ θελήματι, Abraham, obeying the will of God).[197]

In the Septuagint the noun is found both of God and man. When

---

[192] D. Müller, "Will, Purpose," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, III, 1019.

[193] Antiphon, Fragmenta. 15 (*TLG*).

[194] Aeneas, Aeneas Tacticus; Asclepiodotus; Onasander. trans. Illinois Greek Club, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et al., London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1948, 18.19.

[195] Aristotle, On Plants. Minor Works. trans. W. S. Heff, Loeb Classical Library, eds. E. Capps, et al., London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1955, 1.1.

[196] Empedocles, Fragmenta. 35.23 (*TLG*).

[197] Philo, Legum Allegoriae. 3.197 (*TLG*).

employed of God, it most often refers to "the divine good-pleasure" but also appears for "the will of God;" when of people, θέλημα can indicate a "wish," or "the will."[198] Each of these uses is found in the Psalms. Θέλημα appears, then, of the good pleasure of God (καὶ ζωὴ ἐν τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ, and life in His good pleasure, Ps. 29:6) and of His will (τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, to do your will, Ps. 39:9). It occurs, as well, of the desire of people (θέλημα τῶν φοβουμένων αὐτὸν ποιήσει, He does the desire of those fearing Him, Ps. 144:19) and of the will of an individual (καὶ ἐκ θελήματός μου ἐξομολογήσομαι αὐτῷ, and from my will I shall give thanks to you, Ps. 27:7).

Θέλημα occurs in the New Testament both objectively of "what is willed," the idea being "what one wishes to happen," and subjectively of "will," with the sense of "the act of willing or desiring."[199] Schrenk states that when the noun is used of God's will, generally it is singular because the will of God is seen as unitary.[200] Elsewhere in the Petrine literature θέλημα is always found of the will of God both objectively (ὅτι οὕτως ἐστίν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, because this is the will of God, 1 Pet. 2:15; cf. 4:2) and subjectively (οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, those suffering according to the will of God, 1 Pet. 4:19; cf. 3:17). In 2 Pet. 1:21 θέλημα appears subjectively of people (prophets) as it does in Luke 23:25 (τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι

---

198 Müller, "Will, Purpose," III, 1019.

199 Bauer, Wörterbuch, cols. 700-01, [ET, BAGD, pp. 354].

200 D. Gottlob Schrenk, " θέλω," Vol. III, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938, 54, [ET, Gottlob Schrenk, "θέλω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965, III, 54].

αὐτῶν, but Jesus he delivered to their will).[201] The meaning is, then, that the origin of prophecy is not in the act of the will of the prophet.[202]

The dative (θελήματι) is a dative of cause,[203] referring to the origin of prophecy. The concern is more than to merely deny that prophecy had a human origin,[204] it is, especially, with the "cause" with which prophecy had its origin. It is not "'the free will of man determining itself thereto.'"[205]

The denial of a human origin of prophecy is not unique to 2 Pet. 1:21. Philo affirms that the prophet did not speak his own opinion (προφήτης γὰρ ἴδιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἀποφθέγγεται),[206] or declare what was his own (προφήτης μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἴδιον ἀποφαίνεται).[207]

---

[201] Cf. Bauer, Wörterbuch, col. 701, [ET, BAGD, p. 355].

[202] Cf. D. Edmond Hiebert, Second Peter and Jude. Greenville, SC: Unusual, 1989, p. 83, and Fronmüller, The Epistles of Peter, p. 21.

[203] Fronmüller, The Epistles of Peter, p. 21; Alford, The Greek New Testament, IV, 401.

[204] A. R. Fausset, "I Corinthians-Revelation," Vol. IV, A Commentary: Critical, Experimental and Practical. eds. Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, David Brown, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948, 256.

[205] Huther, 1. Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas, und den 2. Brief des Petrus, p. 288, [ET, Huther, The Epistles of Peter and Jude, p. 326].

[206] Philo, Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres, 259.

[207] Philo, De Specialibus Legibus, 4.49.

Positive Statement Regarding the Origin of Scripture

Having denied that the source of Scripture was in human will, the author of 2 Peter now indicates the origin of prophecy. The concern of this portion is with the speech of the prophets; first its agency and, then, its origin.

The indication of the agent of prophetic utterance and the nature of the influence of this agent on the prophets, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι, appears before the finite verb and, therefore, emphasizes this agent.[208]

The preposition ὑπό appears in 2 Pet. 1:21 with the ablative (genitive) to indicate the agent by which those who spoke from God were borne. Syntax similar to that found here, in which ὑπό is followed directly by a noun, appears elsewhere in Petrine literature, (ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον, rejected by men, 1 Pet. 2:4; ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, driven by hurricanes, 2 Pet. 2:17). All these occurrences share common characteristics in that ὑπό is used to express agency and the noun (and adjective) is found with a participle. In other Petrine appearances (2 Pet. 1:17; 2:7; 3:2), ὑπό functions similarly.

The agent designated in this text is πνεύματος ἁγίου. As πνεύματος ἁγίου is anarthrous, some hold that this agent is an impersonal "'holy spirit' of wisdom,"[209] or "spirit" of "divine power,"[210] others, however, see this as a reference to the Holy Spirit.[211] The consideration of the question of the

---

208 Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 166.

209 James, Second Peter and Jude, p. 19.

210 Reicke, The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, p. 159.

211 Cranfield, I & II Peter and Jude, p. 182; Leaney, The Letters of Peter and Jude, p. 117; Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 166; Fronmüller, The Epistles of Peter, p. 21; Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, p. 233; Fuchs and Reymond, Deuxième Pierre, Jude, p. 75; Bigg, The Epistles of St.

personality of the "Holy Spirit," as the term is found in 2 Pet. 1:21, is here limited only to the material of the New Testament.[212]

New Testament usage favours a personal, and not impersonal, understanding of πνεύματος ἁγίου in 2 Pet. 1:21, when personality is conceived of as possessing "intelligence, will and individual subsistence."[213] The most important New Testament evidence for the personality of the Spirit is found in contexts in which the Spirit is referred to by an articular πνεῦμα (often

---

Peter and St. Jude, p. 270. It is usually not possible to determine in these citations whether the Holy Spirit is seen as a personal being or not in that this question is generally not addressed by commentators.

[212] The personality of the "Spirit of Yahweh," as related to the Old Testament word רוח, cannot be discussed in the limits of this study. There are at least two alternatives. On one hand this term has been seen as primarily impersonal. Thus the "holy spirit," has been defined as "the manifestation of divine presence and power perceptible especially in prophetic inspiration." In this discussion, the "spirit" in the Old Testament is seen in earlier portions as the (impersonal) source of power for "charismatic judges and ecstatic prophets," while in the later period of the kings there is "a static understanding of spirit as related to office (F. W. Horn, "Holy Spirit," The Anchor Bible Dictionary. ed. David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992, III, 260; cf. P. K. Jewett, "Holy Spirit," The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. ed. Merrill C. Tenny, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976, III, 184, and T. S. Caulley, "Holy Spirit," Evangelical Dictionary of the Bible. ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, p. 521)." Other theologians either allow or affirm that the "Spirit of Yahweh" is personal. Mullins says that there are "numerous OT passages which are in harmony with the Trinitarian conception and prepare the way for it." He goes on to claim that "the Spirit is grieved, vexed, etc, and in other ways is conceived of personally (E. Y. Mullins, "Holy Spirit," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. ed. James Orr, 1929; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, III, 1407)." Payne argues on contextual grounds and the analogy of the New Testament that the majority of appearances of the "Spirit of Yahweh" in the Old Testament are personal and of the Holy Spirit (J. Barton Payne, "רוח," Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. ed. R. Laird Harris, Chicago: Moody, 1980, II, 836-37).

[213] Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, [n.d.], I, 523.

followed by an articular ἅγιος), which is different from the anarthrous πνεύματος ἁγίου of 2 Pet. 1:21. The Spirit (πνεῦμα) is described as knowing the things of God (τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, the things of God no one knows except the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 2:11) and as having a will in that the Spirit gives specific directions for individuals (εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, Ἀφορίσατε δή μοι τὸν Βαρναβᾶν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς, the Holy Spirit said, "set apart to me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them," Acts 13:2; cf. 11:12; 16:6). The Spirit has emotions as well as the Spirit can be grieved (καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ θεοῦ, and do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, Eph. 4:30).

Further indication of this personality is that actions which characterize people or personal relations are, in the New Testament, ascribed to the Spirit. The Spirit is described as speaking either directly (εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ Φιλίππῳ, and the Spirit said to Philip, Acts 8:29; cf. 10:19; 11:12; 13:2; 1 Tim. 4:1) or indirectly through a person (ἣν προεῖπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυίδ, that which the Spirit spoke beforehand through the mouth of David, Acts 1:16; cf. 28:25) or Scripture (καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, just as the Holy Spirit says, followed by a citation of Psalm 95:7-11, Heb. 3:7; cf. 10:15). In Revelation, there is a repeated call to hear what the Spirit says to the churches (ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, let the one having an ear hear what the Spirit says to the churches, Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22). The Spirit also partakes of that which distinctive to personal relationships in that one can lie to (ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, Acts 5:3) or oppose (τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε, Acts 7:51) the Spirit. Occasionally both the Spirit and humans are described as having the same activity. Thus, the Spirit and the Apostles are witnesses of the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus (καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, καὶ

τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, Acts 5:30-32) and the decision of the Jerusalem council is one which seemed good to both the Spirit and the human beings involved (ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, for it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us, Acts 15:28).

The personality of the Spirit is less evident is texts such as 2 Pet. 1:21 in which both πνεῦμα and ἅγιος are anarthrous.[214] While Acts 4:25 (ὁ . . . διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου . . . εἰπών, who said by the Holy Spirit) is somewhat similar to that which has been previously cited, the composite term without the article generally does not occur where there is such direct indications of the personality of the Spirit. In the Gospels and Acts the Spirit is often referred to by terminology similar to that of 2 Pet. 1:21 in indications of persons being filled with the Spirit (καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται, Luke 1:15; cf. Luke 1:67; 4:1; Acts 2:4; 6:5; 7:55; 9:17; 11:24; 13:52) or receiving the Spirit (λάβωσιν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, Acts 8:15; cf. Acts 8:17, 19; 19:2). While πνεύματος ἁγίου, as in 2 Pet. 1:21, is not found in the New Testaments texts in which the personality of the Spirit is most evident, it should be understood as referring to a personal Holy Spirit here: to argue that the term is impersonal requires that it refer to a different Spirit than the one designated when the article is present. Since there is no compelling evidence for such a distinction, it should not be adopted. The personality of the Spirit which is most clearly indicated when the article is present with πνεῦμα and ἅγιος, then, may also be affirmed when the anarthrous πνεύματος ἁγίου (2 Pet. 1:21) occurs. The agent who influenced the prophets, therefore, was the Holy Spirit.

---

[214] For the presence and absence of the article see, Gordon D. Fee, God's Empowering Presence. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994, for Pauline patterns. Green speaks of the anarthrous use as reflecting a subjective reference to the Spirit with regard "to His operations, gifts or manifestations in men," as against an objective reference where the article is normally found. Samuel Green, Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek New Testament. revised ed., London: Religious Tract, 1904, pp. 189-90.

The participle φερόμενοι is significant in this text as it describes the influence exerted by the Holy Spirit on those who spoke from God. The word appears in LXX in a command to bring livestock (φέρετε τὰ κτήνη ὑμῶν, Gen. 47:16),[215] illustrating the primary sense of "to bring."[216] Variations of this basic sense also occur. Plato employs the verb of a horse which, leaping, passes violently on (σκιρτῶν δὲ βίᾳ φέρεται),[217] while in Josephus it appears of a gate which opens and brings (one) into a palace (τῆς ἀνοιγομένης καὶ φερούσης εἰς τὸ βασίλειον πύλης)[218] and of the movement of Mordecai about the city (Μαρδοχαῖος . . . διὰ τῆς πόλεως ἐφέρετο).[219]

In the New Testament, the verb occurs a number of times in John for "bearing fruit" (τὸ καρπὸν φέρον, John 15:2; cf. John 12:24; 15:4, 5, 8, 16). Closer to the syntax of 2 Pet. 1:21 is the use of φέρω in the description of the wind at Pentecost (ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίαις, Acts 2:2) and that of those on a ship carried before the wind (ἐφερόμεθα, Acts 27:15; cf. 27:17). φερόμενοι, in 2 Pet. 1:21, is best seen as having a sense of "carried along."[220] Warfield

---

215 Πνεύματι φερόμενος, of a person's spirit in the LXX (Job 17:1), manifests similarities and differences with 2 Pet. 1:21.

216 For this review of φέρω see, Weiss, "φέρω," IX, 58-59, [ET, Weiss, "φέρω," IX, 56-57].

217 Plato, Phaedrus. Vol. 1, Plato. trans. Harold North Flower, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1953, 1, 245a.

218 Flavius Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae. Oprea, ed. Benedictus Niesse, 2d ed., Berlin: Weidmann, 1955, 9.146. Hereafter abbreviated AJ.

219 Ibid., 11.221.

220 NIV, 1900, contra "moved," in NASB, p. 1874; RSV, p. 960; KJV, p. 1795.

states:

> The term used here is a very specific one. It is not to be confused with guiding, or directing, or controlling, or even leading in the full sense of the word. It goes beyond all such terms in assigning the effects produced specifically to the active agent.[221]

πνεῦμα is found outside the New Testament with compounds of φέρω in contexts where it is used either of wind or of the divine Spirit. In Plutarch πνεῦμα appears of that which is carried by much wind (ὑπὸ πνεύματος πολλοῦ . . . διαφερομένους),[222] while Eusebius employs similar terminology of a ship which is thus driven along (τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ναῦν διαφερομένην).[223] Eusebius uses πνεῦμα as well of the Spirit when he speaks of words which are brought from the Spirit (τοὺς ἐκ θείου πνεύματος προφερομένους λόγους).[224] Also significant is the presence of πνευματοφόρος in the LXX of the man (ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος, Hos. 9:7) and the prophets (οἱ προφῆται αὐτῆς πνευματοφόροι, Zeph. 3:4) who bear the Spirit of God. The term is found, as well, in the *Mandates* of Hermas of the individual who claims to be borne by God (τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν πνευματοφόρον εἶναι).[225]

The use of φέρω in 2 Pet. 1:21 shares some commonalities with the work of Philo who uses the verb θεοφορέω in contexts specifically concerned with inspiration. In a section of *De Vita Mosis* where Philo presents sayings

---

221 Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible. ed. Samuel G. Craig, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1948, p. 137

222 Plutarchus, De fortuna. 97.F.6 (*TLG*).

223 Eusebius, La préparation évangélique. 5.17.6 (*TLG*).

224 Ibid., 12.23.4 (*TLG*).

225 Hermas, Pastor, *Mandate*, 11.16.

Moses delivered by divine inspiration (θεσπισθέντα λόγια), Philo employs θεοφορέω of the God-borne possession of Moses (τῆς θεοφορήτου κατοκωχῆς);[226] of the influence of God on him when he was taken out of himself and prophesied (ὣν ἐν ἑαυτῷ θεοφορεῖται καὶ θεσπίζει);[227] and of this same influence when he spoke from God of the Sabbath (θεοφορηθεὶς ἐθέσπισε τὴν ἑβδόμην).[228]

In the phrase πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι, then, is found an indication of both the agent who influenced those who spoke from God and the nature of this influence. It was the Holy Spirit who "carried along" the individuals who are in view in this verse.

The author closes his explanation of why Scripture does not originate with the prophet's interpretation by indicating the source from which the prophets spoke. The term used to describe the action of speaking is λαλέω.[229] Aristotle claims that speaking is uniquely characteristic of humanity (λαλεῖ γὰρ οὐθὲν τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων πλὴν ἀνθρώπου, for no other living thing but man

---

226 Philo, De Vita Mosis, 2.246 (*TLG*).

227 Ibid., 2.251.

228 Ibid., 2.265.

229 Debrunner claims that the word is one which "imitate[s] the babbling of small children (A. Debrunner, et al., "λέγω," Vol. IV, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], 75, [ET, A. Debrunner, et al., "λέγω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed., Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967, IV, 76])." Buck adds that in the classical period of Greek it was used with the sense of "babble, chatter," but that it finally became the common term for speaking (Carl Darling Buck, A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in Principal Indo-European Languages. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1949, pp. 1254, 1231).

speaks),[230] an assertion which is especially interesting in that he employs both λαλέω and ἄνθρωπος. In 1 and 2 Peter λαλέω occurs four times (1 Pet. 3:10; 4:11; 2 Pet. 1:21; 3:16), while λέγω is found just once (2 Pet. 3:4). The difference between them, according to Buck, is that the former is used with the sense of "speak" to indicate the "actual speech activity" while the latter has that of "'say'" with the emphasis on the result rather than the action."[231] The evidence of the material of Peter suggests that there is little distinction between the terms. Λαλέω appears, for example, of the speaking of the gifted person (εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ, if anyone speaks, as the sayings of God, 1 Pet. 4:11). Λέγω is found of that which is said by those who mock the Parousia (καὶ λέγοντες, 2 Pet. 3:4), perhaps with more of an emphasis on the content of what is said than the act itself. The idea in 2 Pet. 1:21 is not that the prophets spoke as over against remaining silent, nor is λαλέω employed instead of λέγω, as Lenski suggests, to avoid the idea of human contribution to the content of what was spoken.[232] The concern of this portion of the verse is, rather, to indicate that individuals, moved by the Holy Spirit, expressed themselves in the activity of speaking.

The origin of what was spoken is described simply as ἀπὸ θεοῦ. The preposition ἀπό is not the only one of significance in the discussion of the origin of Scripture, as διά is used in a passage with similarities to this one in Luke 1:70 (καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων, just as He spoke through the mouth of the holy ones). While there is not universal agreement that ἀπό is

---

[230] Aristotle, Problems. trans. W. S. Hett, Loeb Classical Library, eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington, London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1953 1, 899a.

[231] Buck, Dictionary of Selected Synonyms, p. 1253.

[232] Lenski, The Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude, p. 299.

used of the source of speaking,[233] it should be so understood here as this is probably the sense in the other New Testament text in which λαλέω is directly followed by ἀπό (γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, for he will not speak from Himself, John 16:13).[234]

The final word of this section, ἄνθρωποι, designates who it was that spoke. The position is emphatic (cf. ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, when men shall hate you, Luke 6:22),[235] which stresses the role of human beings as agents in the production of prophecy.[236] Buck affirms that ἄνθρωπος is the general Greek term for "human-being."[237] In Petrine literature the term appears with a certain emphasis on human sinfulness.[238] Of the eight occurrences of the term (1 Pet. 2:4, 15; 3:4; 4:2, 6; 2 Pet. 1:21; 2:16; 3:7), five (1 Pet. 2:4, 15; 4:2, 6; 2 Pet. 3:7) are in some way associated with this aspect of humanity. The word does appear when there is no such indication. It is found in a context specifically concerned with women of the inner person (ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας

---

233 See, C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963, p. 73, and Turner, Syntax, p. 258.

234 For ἀπό employed for "starting-point" or source see, Robertson, Grammar, p. 577.

235 Mayor, The Epistles of Jude and Second Peter, p. 115.

236 Strachen, "The Second Epistle General of Peter," p. 133.

237 Buck, Dictionary of Selected Synonyms, p. 79.

238 See, Jeremias who affirms that ἄνθρωπος is used in the New Testament with a "special emphasis on the transitoriness of and sinfulness of human nature." Joachim Jeremias, "ἄνθρωπος," Vol. I, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament ed. Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955, 365, [ET, J. Jeremias, "ἄνθρωπος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 1, 364].

ἄνθρωπος, 1 Pet. 3:4), thus including woman in the reference of ἄνθρωπος as well as that which forms the inner nature of the individual. It also occurs of the human voice (ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ, 2 Pet. 2:16). In the majority of appearances of ἄνθρωπος in Petrine literature, however, its reference is to humanity as in some way characterized by sin. Those addressed by the Apostle are to do good in order to silence the ignorance of foolish humanity (φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν, 1 Pet. 2:15) and they are no longer to live for the lusts of men but for the will of God (εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ . . . βιῶσαι, 1 Pet. 4:2). The present universe awaits the destruction of ungodly humanity (ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, 2 Pet. 3:7).

Given this use of ἄνθρωπος in 1 and 2 Peter, the final word of 2 Pet. 1:21 is especially significant. The Apostle does not assert that prophecy originated with the prophets, individuals who would be understood to be characterized by a certain holiness, but with men, thus employing a term which refers to humanity with its characteristic sinfulness. Both commonalities and differences with the affirmation of 2 Pet. 1:21 are evident in Eusebius who states that God spoke through the prophets and apostles (ἐλάλησε γὰρ καὶ διὰ προφητῶν, ἐλάλησε καὶ διὰ ἀποστόλων).[239]

The extent to which both the concepts and language of 2 Pet. 1:21 are similar to and distinct from other ancient Jewish and Christian literature may be observed in several citations. Philo, who shares certain terminology with 2 Pet. 1:21, also holds certain concepts in common as he affirms that prophecy does not originate with the prophet himself but with God and that he speaks that which God wills. Philo writes:

προφήτης θεοφόρητος θεσπιεῖ καὶ προφητεύσει, λέγων μὲν

---

[239] Eusebius, Commentaria in Psalmos. 23.597 (TLG).

οἰκεῖον οὐδέν—οὐδὲ γάρ, εἰ λέγει, δύναται καταλαβεῖν ὅ γε κατεχόμενος ὄντως καὶ ἐνθουσιῶν . . . ἑρμηνεῖς γάρ εἰσιν οἱ προφῆται θεοῦ καταχρωμένου ταῖς ἐκείνων ὀργάνοις πρὸς δήλωσιν ὧν ἄν ἐθελήσῃ).[240] (a prophet, borne by God, speaks oracles and prophecies, saying not that which is his own—for he is not able to understand as he is possessed and inspired . . . For the prophets are interpreters and God makes full use of their organs for the manifestation of that which He wills).

Theophilus of Antioch (end of second century A. D.), who includes among the prophets not only those of the Hebrews, but those of the Sibyllines, also reflects a common vocabulary with the Apostle Peter for he says that the men of God, who were moved by the (a) Holy Spirit and became prophets, were inspired and instructed by God (οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι, ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες καὶ σοφισθέντες).[241] Likewise in Justin such similarities are found, as he indicates that there were certain men among the Jews who became prophets of God, through whom the Spirit proclaimed things which were to come before they happened (ἄνθρωποι οὖν τινες ἐν Ἰουδαίοις γεγένηνται θεοῦ προφῆται, δι᾽ ὧν τό Πνεῦμα προεκήρυξε τὰ γενήσεσθαι μέλλοντα πρὶν ἤ γενέσθαι).[242]

While the shared terminology and concepts between these Jewish and Christian authors and 2 Pet. 1:21 is worthy of note, the differences are as well. None of these writers completely duplicates either the language or the concepts of the Apostle Peter with respect to the origin of prophecy. The citation of this text in early Christian literature was rare, οὐ γάρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη

---

[240] Philo, De Specialibus Legibus, 1.65.

[241] Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autolycum. trans. Robert M. Grant, Oxford Early Christian Texts, ed. Henry Chadwick, Oxford: Clarendon, 1970, 11.9.

[242] Justin, Apologies, 31.1.

προφητεία ποτε, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἅγιοι ἄνθρωποι in *De trinitate* of Didymus Caecus (309/314-398 A. D.), being a significant exception.[243]

5.3 The Concept of Inspiration In 2 Pet. 1:21

It is now possible to seek to determine what contribution, if any, 2 Pet. 1:21 makes to a theory of inspiration. Some hold that this text has almost nothing of significance for an understanding of inspiration,[244] while others emphasize the limitations of what is found here.[245] Certain commentators, however, see some material in 2 Pet. 1:21 which bears upon an understanding of inspiration. Three general explanations, which are not mutually exclusive, have been proposed.

First, some exegetes hold, especially in light of the shared terminology between 2 Peter and Hellenistic Judaism,[246] that the concept of inspiration reflected in 2 Pet 1:21 has been drawn from or influenced by this thought.[247] A second approach to the concept of inspiration in 2 Pet. 1:21, and one which may share certain similarities with the preceding, asserts that the verse teaches

---

[243] Didymus Caecus, De trinitate. 39.644 (*TLG*).

[244] See, Paul J. Achtemier, The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980, p. 110, and William J. Abraham, The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981, pp. 94-95.

[245] See, Green, Second Peter and Jude, p. 91, and Plumptre, The General Epistles of St. Peter & St. Jude, p. 178.

[246] Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 233-34.

[247] See, Moffatt, James, Peter, and Judas, pp. 189-90; Grundmann, Judas und zweite Petrus, p. 87; Bauckham, Jude, 2 Peter, pp. 233-34; Spicq, Les épîtres de Saint Pierre, pp. 225-26.

a passivity of the prophets.[248] This explanation does not require, according to one representative, adoption of a mechanical theory of inspiration.[249]

A third explanation of inspiration in 2 Pet. 1:21 sees the verse as reflecting a concept of inspiration in which both the Spirit and human beings are involved in the production of prophecy, although there is not complete unanimity with regard to the relative contribution of the divine and human. Certain commentators, while recognizing the reality of human involvement, see the emphasis here as on the role of God or the Spirit in inspiration,[250] while others emphasize, to varying degrees, the human contribution.[251]

---

[248] Fronmüller, The Epistles of Peter, p. 21.

[249] Cf. Fausset, "I Corinthians-Revelation," pp. 622-23.

[250] Among whom are Lenski, who affirms "the fact is that God and the Spirit are the real speakers, the *anthropoi* are their mouthpieces. Our fathers, therefore, called God the *causa efficiens* or *principalis*, the speakers (writers) the *causae instrumentales*," in Lenski, The Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude, p. 299; Warfield, who states that while Scripture comes through the "instrumentality" of man, it is "an immediate Divine word," in Warfield, Inspiration and Authority, p. 137; and Kistemaker, who asserts "in the writing of Scripture, man is passive and the Spirit active," and "that men are active, not passive in the formation of Scripture." The priority, however, rests with God as "the message that man conveys comes from God, for God is the source of Scripture," in Simon J. Kistemaker, Exposition of the Epistles of Peter and the Epistle of Jude. New Testament Commentary, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989, pp. 273-74.

[251] Thus, Hiebert states that though the movement of the Spirit was the most important element, "the prophets were treated as living men, not lifeless tools," in Hiebert, "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life," 166-67. Green goes a step further and indicates that "the prophets raised their sails, so to speak (they were obedient and receptive), and the Holy Spirit filled them and carried their craft along in the direction He wished," in Green Second Peter, Jude, p. 91. Strachen extends the human role to the point that the spoken words are clearly related only to men in Strachen, "The Second Epistle General of Peter," p. 132. Karl Barth, while indicating that the biblical writers speak only as "*auctores secundarii*," affirms an inspiration in which their activity "was surrounded and controlled and impelled by the Holy Spirit, and became an attitude of obedience in virtue of its direct relationship to divine revelation," in

In seeking to determine the concept of inspiration which is present in 2 Pet. 1:21, a number of observations related to the exegesis of this verse are important. The idea that the biblical authors were taken over by prophetic ecstasy and, therefore, lost their distinctive personalities, may be immediately rejected. 2 Peter presents an understanding of inspiration in which the authors of prophecy preserve their individuality. Although borne by the Spirit, it is the authors themselves who speak.[252]

Likewise a concept of inspiration which stresses the passivity of the prophets may be rejected in favour of an understanding which sees some concurrence between the Spirit and humans. First, the emphatically placed ἄνθρωποι, which describes human beings, demonstrates that humans are the speakers of the words of Scripture and that this truth is to be emphasized. Second, the plural ἄνθρωποι indicates that it is not mankind as a whole but specific individuals who are in view. This is significant in that individual uniqueness is not lost, which might be suggested if the singular was used, but preserved. The concentration of 2 Pet. 1:21 is not mankind, as a single, non-distinct entity, but particular human beings with their distinctive personalities and styles of communication. Third, Peter does not use διά, as do the Synoptics (καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων, just as He spoke through the mouth of the holy ones, Luke 1:70; cf. Matt. 1:22), for the role of the prophet, but indicates that while what was articulated had its starting-point with God, it was, nevertheless, spoken by ἄνθρωποι. The view that the prophets were passive in the production of prophecy, therefore, stresses one aspect of this verse, that of the influence of the Spirit on them especially as reflected in the participle

---

Karl Barth, Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes. 1/2, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik. 5th ed. Zollikon/Zürich: Evangelischer, 1948, pp. 559-60, [ET, Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God. I/2, Church Dogmatics, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956, pp. 504-05].

252 Cf. Chaine, Les épîtres catholiques, p. 57.

φερόμενοι, to the neglect of other indicators of an active role.

This place of humans is, however, circumscribed by God. 2 Pet. 1:21 begins with the denial that the cause in which Scripture originated was an act of the will of the prophet. While humans have a role in the genesis of Scripture, it is limited in that the exercise of volition, which is inherently characteristic of humanity, is denied as the cause in which Scripture found its origin. Although there is no indication that the prophet's volition was violated, this denial demonstrates that the source of prophecy was not the uninfluenced will of the prophet. Human participation in the authorship of Scripture, then, cannot extend to include the independent exercise of human will.

Scripture does not originate with the will of man but it does have a definite source, which is the Spirit. Several indicators in the second clause of the verse emphasize this divine origin. First, the authors of Scripture are said to have been "carried along" by the Holy Spirit. This Spirit is not "an agency rather than an agent,"[253] but a personal being who exercised an influence on the speakers of Scripture. Second, the use of φερόμενοι shows a profound influence on the speakers by this personal agent. The appearance of this word in the passive in Acts, of those driven before the wind, suggests an idea here of a powerful influence over the prophets. It extends beyond general guidance or superintendence[254] and is an influence such that while the prophets spoke as men, they also spoke as "carried along" by this agent. This language indicates certain restrictions on the human role in the production of Scripture in relation to the divine. Third, and most important, the origin of what was spoken was ἀπὸ θεοῦ. Men speak, but the source of that speech is specifically God.

It is significant that the description of the divine role in this verse

---

[253] Strachen, "The Second Epistle General of Peter," p. 132.

[254] Green makes too much of the maritime picture and ignores the passive when he speaks of the responsiveness of the prophets. See, Green, Second Peter and Jude, p. 91.

characterizes the speech of all the individual prophets. As distinct human beings the prophets had particular personalities and communication styles. There is no indication in 2 Pet. 1:21 that these distinctions are lost or muted in the production of prophecy. There are, however, commonalities in the experience and work of all the prophets. These include, first, that none of their prophecy which is in view in this verse originated with uninfluenced human volition. Second, each of them is "carried along" by the Holy Spirit. Third, the source of the prophecy which each of them spoke was God. The prophecy of Scripture, therefore, although it originated with different individuals, presumably living in different times and places, has certain common characteristics. These characteristics are all related to the divine origin of prophecy.

This exegesis of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 has concluded that the purpose of these verses is to indicate to the readers of this epistle what they were to have in mind as they read the Old Testament, which is that these Scriptures did not originate with the interpretation of the prophets because prophecy does not have its source in an act of human will. It originated with God when humans, who were "carried along" by the Holy Spirit, spoke from him. The concept of inspiration in this passage ascribes a genuine place to humans in the production of Scripture, however, there is an emphasis on the divine role. The Holy Spirit is the agent who "carried along" humans. What they spoke originated with God.

5.4 The Contribution of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 to an Understanding of Biblical Inspiration

The conclusions of this exegesis of 2 Pet. 1:20-21, may be summarized to serve as the criteria, along with the conclusions of the exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a, for the evaluation of contemporary evangelical theories of inspiration.

A first conclusion is that the concern of these verses is with the origin of prophecy (the Old Testament Scripture) and not its (contemporary) interpretation by its readers. The ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται of 2 Pet. 1:20 addresses the question of the origin of prophecy and denies either that the

prophets independently created this prophecy or that they independently interpreted that which was revealed to them. In either case, 2 Pet. 1:20 is concerned with the origin of prophecy and, as this prophecy is that which is contained in the (Old Testament) Scripture, with the origin of Scripture. In this respect, the subject of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 shares certain commonalities with that of 2 Tim. 3:16a which, as well, addresses the origin of Scripture.

A second affirmation is that the προφητεία γραφῆς of 2 Pet. 1:20 is a reference to the Old Testament Scripture. This material is not to be identified as extra-biblical prophecy or only certain portions of the Old Testament which may be uniquely characterized as "prophecy," it does not include, as well, either emergent New Testament writings or the entire canonical New Testament. The προφητεία γραφῆς of 2 Pet. 1:20 refers to the Old Testament Scripture. Γραφή is used in this verse, as always in the New Testament, of "Scripture" and, here, of the Old Testament Scriptures. Προφητεία is employed to describe these Scriptures as prophetic in character. 2 Pet. 1:20-21, then, speaks of the origin of Old Testament Scripture.

A third conclusion is that 2 Pet. 1:20-21 specifically denies that (Old Testament) Scripture originated in (uninfluenced) human volition, it is, rather, the Holy Spirit who is the primary agent in the origin of (Old Testament) Scripture. This study has argued that the Holy Spirit is, here, a personal agent who "carried along" the speakers of prophecy. While the prophets spoke, they did not speak as uninfluenced human beings, but as men moved by the Holy Spirit.

Another conclusion is that the nature of the influence of the Holy Spirit upon those who spoke the words of Scripture was that of "carrying along" these individuals. The term goes beyond that of general guidance or supervision and yet stops short of a control that implies a complete passivity on the part of the prophets. Because the exact sense of the expression is not certain and in view of the lack of further definition, there is a certain imprecision involved in the

determination of the nature of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the prophets. While the text does not precisely define the relation between the divine and the human in the production of Scripture, it does establish the parameters within which this influence must be understood.

A further conclusion is that 2 Pet. 1:20-21 affirms, without condition, that (Old Testament) Scripture originated with God. The indication of the text is that (Old Testament) Scripture never had human volition as its originating cause, but that human beings spoke from God. God is the source of Scripture. It must be affirmed, however, that while the source of Scripture is God, it is human beings who "speak" that which became (Old Testament) Scripture. This activity is not assigned to God, but to human beings who speak "from God."

A related conclusion is that what is contained in the (Old Testament) Scripture is spoken by specific and distinct individuals. The human role in prophecy is not located with humanity as a whole, but particular individuals. Although these individuals all share a common influence in their work of prophecy, there is no textual indication that their personal identities are lost or muted by this influence.

A final conclusion is that while the origin of (Old Testament) Scripture is clearly with God, the speaking in prophecy is emphatically attributed to human beings. Human beings "carried along" by the Holy Spirit, spoke that which originated with God.

6 Critical Analysis of Theories of Biblical Inspiration in Light of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21

6.1 Introduction

This study has examined contemporary evangelical Protestant theories of biblical inspiration. It was affirmed at the outset that despite rather extensive consideration by evangelicals of the question of biblical inspiration, there remained several significant lacunae in their work. These included, first, an adequate identification and analysis of the perspectives on the nature of inspiration which have been proposed by evangelicals in the contemporary period: there has been no consistent effort to either identify these various understandings or to adequately categorize them according to their distinct characteristics. A second missing feature has been a careful exegesis of key New Testament texts, especially 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, which are often seen as significant for the nature of inspiration, and an application of this exegesis to the formulation of a theory of the nature of biblical inspiration. A third lacuna in contemporary evangelical thought on inspiration has been that of a critical evaluation of theories of biblical inspiration which have been proposed by evangelicals in light of such an exegesis. This study was prepared to address these lacunae and, at the same time, to identify the specific evangelical theory or theories of biblical inspiration which would most adequately integrate the exegetical conclusions from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

At the outset of this study several limitations were articulated, some of which are significant for the analysis of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration. One important limitation of this work is that only two New Testament texts, 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, have been considered. There are significant implications of this limitation for the present analysis. First, these two texts do not present the entire New Testament teaching on inspiration. They are not even, necessarily, the most important for this matter. Rather, they have been chosen in a dissertation which concentrates on biblical studies, in part, because of the exegetical questions they present. The evaluation of this chapter, therefore, cannot be understood as one which reflects the entire New

Testament presentation of inspiration. Second, because there are texts of both the Old Testament and the New which must be included in the articulation of Scripture's teaching regarding its own nature, this analysis cannot make any judgment with respect to how each of the theories of inspiration considered has integrated all the material of Scripture concerning this subject. It can only determine if that of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 has been so included.

Another significant limitation of this work is that its concern is not to provide a critical evaluation of the entire theological statement of the nature of inspiration found in various evangelical theories but only to evaluate these constructs in light of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. In this respect the goal of this study is negative as it concerns the discourse between exegesis and systematic theology. The analysis of the present chapter is limited solely to the determination of the adequacy with which each of these theories integrates the exegetical conclusions from the study of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. This evaluation should not be understood as a critique of the entire theological statement of inspiration found in each theory. Also, as the concern of this analysis is with the manner in which the conclusions from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 are reflected, each theologian is considered not in terms of whether he constructs his theory directly from an exegesis of these texts but in light of his integration of that which is found in them. Certain theories of inspiration may be articulated on grounds other than an exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 and, nevertheless, adequately reflect some or all of the material of these texts.

The first major concern of this work was to identify and to categorize contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration in such a way that critical distinctions between these theories could be recognized and employed as the basis for a classification of these various understandings of inspiration. The method which was selected for the analysis and classification of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration was one which organizes them by the locus of inspiration. Twelve distinct theories of

inspiration, which have been articulated by evangelicals since the end of 1962, have been presented and described in some detail in chapter two. For the purpose of a critical analysis, these approaches are listed here, along with the name of the theologian who formulated the particular theory.

1. Textual inspiration: the locus of inspiration is the Scripture itself (G. C. Berkouwer).
2. Content inspiration: the locus of inspiration is the meaning of Scripture (Edward W. Goodrick).
3. Textual and personal inspiration: the priority of the inspiration of the text. Both Scripture and the biblical authors are loci of inspiration. It is, however, primarily the Scripture itself which is inspired (Carl F. H. Henry).
4. Textual and personal inspiration: priority of the inspiration of the person. Both the text of Scripture and the biblical authors are loci of inspiration. It is, however, primarily the biblical authors who are inspired (Millard J. Erickson).
5. Personal inspiration: the locus of inspiration is the thoughts of the biblical writers (Ralph Earle).
6. Inspiration as the guidance of the biblical writers. The locus of inspiration is this divine guidance of the biblical authors (Paul K. Jewett).
7. Inspiration of the authors, the text, and the readers of Scripture. The loci of inspiration are not only the biblical writers and Scripture but, as well, its readers (Dewey M. Beegle).
8. Inspiration of the authors, text, and original readers of Scripture and its preservation. The loci of inspiration are the authors, the text, and the original readers of Scripture, along with its continued preservation (Donald G. Bloesch).
9. Social inspiration: the locus of inspiration is the entire process of the production of Scripture (Clark H. Pinnock).
10. Inspiration as inspiring affects upon the authors of Scripture. The locus of inspiration is the affects which were experienced by the biblical authors (William J. Abraham).
11. Inspiration as inspiring affects on the readers of the Bible. The locus of inspiration is the affects which are experienced by the Bible's readers (Kern Robert Trembath).
12. Inspiration as God's indirect self-revelation in human encounter. The locus of inspiration is the encounter between human beings (Charles H. Kraft).

This study has chosen to evaluate the diverse theories of biblical

inspiration on the basis of their integration of the conclusions of an evangelical exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. This exegesis was the subject of chapters three through five, in which a contemporary evangelical exegetical method was applied to the consideration of these two texts. A summary of the conclusions of this exegesis is here indicated. These conclusions are the criteria upon which contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration will be judged.

The conclusions of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a are:

1. All Scripture is inspired. This verse teaches, then, plenary inspiration.
2. Scripture is a locus of inspiration. It is Scripture itself which is described as inspired in 2 Timothy 3:16a. Because Scripture exists in written form, inspiration is, as well, verbal.
3. The present inspiration of Scripture. Scripture is, in the present, inspired.
4. Inspiration is an essential characteristic of Scripture and the basis of its usefulness.
5. Inspiration is a description of the origin of Scripture. The affirmation of the inspiration of Scripture is the indication that it originates with God.

Conclusions from the exegesis of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 are:

1. The concern of 2 Peter 1:20-21 is with the origin of prophecy and not its present interpretation.
2. The prophecy which is in view in 2 Peter 1:20-21 is that of the Old Testament Scripture.
3. (Old Testament) Scripture never originated with (uninfluenced) human will.
4. The primary agent in the origin of (Old Testament) Scripture was the Holy Spirit.
5. The influence that the Holy Spirit exercised on the human authors of Scripture was to "carry along" these individuals. The authors of Scripture were not "directed," "controlled," "lead," etc., but they were "carried along" by the Holy Spirit.
6. While the fact that the authors of Scripture were "carried" by the Holy Spirit indicates that the (Old Testament) Scripture did not originate with (uninfluenced) human volition, the exact nature of the divine-human concurrence in the origin of Scripture is not defined by the term "carried along."

7. The origin of Scripture in 2 Peter 1:21 is with God.
8. Although the source of (Old Testament) Scripture is with God, it is human beings who "speak" that which contained in Scripture.
9. That which is contained in (Old Testament) Scripture is spoken by specific and distinct individuals.
10. While Scripture does not originate with (uninfluenced) human volition but with God, it is (emphatically) humans who speak in Scripture.

The foregoing exegetical conclusions indicate that 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 point to two loci of inspiration. In the former text it is Scripture which is "inspired by God," while in the latter it is the biblical prophets. These two loci of inspiration are important for the evaluation which follows as they form the most general criteria for criticism of contemporary evangelical theories of inspiration. These theories are examined to determine, first, if either of these loci is integrated into a particular theory and, second, if they both are reflected. It is assumed that theories which include both loci are the most representative of the exegetical conclusions of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, those which integrate only one somewhat less, and that theories in which neither locus plays a visible role are the least reflective of the exegetical conclusions of this study. The affirmation of the original hypothesis that the priority in inspiration should be placed with the biblical text could not be confirmed by the preceding exegesis and is not a criteria by which these theories of inspiration are judged.

Having, then, both identified contemporary evangelical theories of inspiration and categorized these theories according to the locus or loci of inspiration in each theory and having drawn a number of conclusions from the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, this study now proceeds to a critical evaluation of these theories according to their integration of these conclusions. This presentation is organized in such a way that there is a progression from those theories which reflect neither locus of inspiration identified in exegesis to those which integrate only one of these loci and, finally, to theories which, in their articulation of the nature of biblical inspiration, include both Scripture itself and the biblical writers as loci of inspiration.

6.2 Theories with Loci other than Scripture and its Authors

The theories of biblical inspiration which are here evaluated see neither the biblical text or its authors as loci of inspiration: something or someone other than these two loci is viewed as inspired in these particular theories. In the evaluation which follows these constructs are analyzed only in light of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Any capacity of these theories either to reflect other texts of Scripture or their general acceptability as evangelical statements of the nature of inspiration is not considered.

A first evangelical theory of inspiration which does not incorporate either the text of Scripture or its writers as loci of inspiration is the social theory found in the work of Clark Pinnock. In this theory the locus of inspiration is the entire process of the production of Scripture:

> We may speak of the social character of inspiration and the complexity of its execution, involving the work and gifts of many people, most of them unnamed but doing their part under the care of the Spirit to achieve the desired result. Inspiration cannot be reserved for the final redactor but ought to be seen as occurring over a long period of time as a charism of the people of God. God was at work in the community to produce a normative text for the community to serve as its constitution.[1]

This account of the nature of inspiration does not include Scripture as a locus of inspiration and its authors are not accorded a unique place. Rather, inspiration is seen as the Spirit's care of many people in the formation of the community's tradition. While Pinnock would certainly include the final redactor as part of the process of inspiration, in his theory this redactor is not inspired in a manner which is distinct from the rest of the community. The biblical text, while normative, is not itself inspired. Pinnock does not completely integrate, then, the

---

[1] Clark H. Pinnock, The Scripture Principle. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984, p. 64.

loci of inspiration identified in this work in his theory of inspiration. The locus of Scripture is not included at all and that of the authors is not developed in such a way that these individuals may be distinguished from the community as a whole.

Pinnock does not integrate certain material, especially from 2 Tim. 3:16a, into his perspective on the general nature of inspiration. His theory, that inspiration describes a broad divine superintendence of the process of Scripture's formation, is developed in two steps. First, Pinnock begins with the various products of inspiration which are the diverse literary genres of the Scripture. He then affirms that these various products are the consequence of diverse actions on the part of God. This diversity in divine activity is made the basis of the claim that inspiration must describe the general divine supervision of Scripture's gradual formation. The exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a has concluded that inspiration, in this text, is primarily a matter of Scripture's origin being with God. Even though it manifests a variety of literary genres, all of (Old Testament) Scripture has a common divine origin. While Pinnock may argue his understanding of the nature of inspiration on grounds other than that of 2 Tim. 3:16a and, therefore, not be subject to the criteria of judgment of this study, he has, at least, not integrated the exegetical material of 2 Tim. 3:16a into his theory of the nature of inspiration.

There are other problems with Pinnock's position relative to the texts of this dissertation. While apparently wanting to preserve a passive idea for θεόπνευστος he, as well, adopts an active sense when he states that "the context of the verse [2 Tim. 3:16] . . . suggests a spiritual power possessed by the text that is what makes it so effective in the ways specified."[2] Exegesis has demonstrated that the lexical history of the term does not favour such an active sense in 2 Tim. 3:16a. Also, Pinnock holds that the work of the Spirit in inspiration is a "care" of the Spirit, while the language of 2 Pet. 1:21 is more definitive in describing the biblical prophets as "carried along" by the Holy Spirit.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 63.

Pinnock's concept of social inspiration does not adequately integrate the exegetical conclusions of this study from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. While some aspects of his fundamental premise, that inspiration is a broad divine superintendence of the process of Scripture's formation, cannot be judged on the basis of the conclusions of this study, other elements of his thought either fail to reflect conclusions from the study of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 or do not adequately do so.

The work of William J. Abraham, which affirms that the locus of inspiration is the inspiring affects of the acts of God upon those who wrote and prepared the Bible, does not clearly state that either Scripture or the biblical authors are loci of inspiration. Abraham conditions his position and speaks of God's direction of those who wrote and collated the Bible. In this sense, then, he certainly expresses elements of authorial inspiration. The main emphasis of his model is, however, God's influence on people through his acts. For this reason, Abraham may be generally classified as an evangelical who does not integrate either Scripture or the biblical writers as loci of inspiration in his theory. He affirms:

> It is through his revelatory and saving acts as well as through his personal dealings with individuals and groups that God inspired his people to write and collate what we now know as the Bible. Inspiration is not an activity that should be experientially separated from these other acts that God performed in the past. As a matter of logic, inspiration is a unique activity of God that cannot be defined in terms of his other acts or activity, but as a matter of fact he inspires in, with, and through his special revelatory acts and through his personal guidance of those who wrote and put together the Bible.[3]

An important positive aspect of Abraham's work is that he considers the present tense of the copula in 2 Timothy 3:16a. Abraham is somewhat misleading in that he discusses the verb "is" in 2 Tim. 3:16a as it appears in

---

[3] William J. Abraham, The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981, p. 67.

English translations and does not indicate its absence in the Greek text, but he is helpful in that he does attempt to explain the significance of the present. Abraham affirms, correctly, that the present indicates that the concern of the text is not with the original autographs, but with the text of Scripture that Timothy possessed.

The major weakness of Abraham's theory of inspiration, in terms of the criteria of this study, is that he does not include the loci of inspiration which have been identified nor does he integrate most of the other material which emerges from the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Rather, he seeks to understand what "inspiration" is in human relationships and, then, applies this understanding to the divine-human relationship.

Beyond the general failure to include the loci of inspiration which are found in 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, Abraham's theory is also deficient with respect to certain other matters. One is his assumption that the term θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a carries generally the same meaning as the English verb "inspire." Abraham reaches this conclusion by questionable lexical steps. He affirms that the word "God-breathed" is generally translated by "inspired by God." This is, in Abraham's view, an adequate translation in that the English verb "inspire" is from the Latin verb *spirare* which means "to breath." The English "inspire" is, therefore, what is demanded by the Greek θεόπνευστος. Lexical study reveals difficulties with Abraham's assertion. Movement from the Latin *spirare* to the English "inspire" does not demonstrate the accuracy of the Greek term's representation in English. Also, he fails to preserve the entire meaning of the Greek word. The term θεόπνευστος does not mean "inspire[d]," but "inspired *by God*."

His comments on 2 Pet. 1:21 are also inadequate. Abraham states both that there is no indication that the words of the Bible are provided by God and that the main idea is that the initiative in the direction of the prophets was with God. The proceeding exegesis would question these affirmations. 2 Pet.

1:20-21 is concerned with the origin of the Old Testament, indicating that this (written) document did not originate with the will of men but of God. It is not accurate to claim, then, that the words of Scripture do not originate with God or to affirm that the prophets were merely directed by God. The language of 2 Pet. 1:21 is much stronger, stating that the prophets were "carried along" by the Holy Spirit in such a way that it may be said that the Old Testament did not originate with the (uninfluenced) will of humans.

Kern Robert Trembath has been influenced by the work of William Abraham. Both of them think that inspiration is a matter of the affects of an inspiring agent through a particular medium upon recipients of this inspiration. Abraham, in this tripartite structure, holds that inspiration is the influence that God had upon the writers and collators of Scripture through his revelatory acts and personal involvement with them. Trembath consciously follows Abraham's threefold structure of inspiration but changes both the medium and the recipients. In Trembath's perspective, inspiration is the influence which God exercises through the Bible on its contemporary readers.

It is impossible to critique Trembath's thought with the criteria of this dissertation, other than to indicate that inspiration is not located either with Scripture or its authors, because Trembath is not attempting to define the meaning of the Greek term θεόπνευστος or to determine what the biblical concept of inspiration is either from 2 Tim. 3:16a or 2 Pet. 1:20-21 or from other scriptural passages. Rather, he is starting with the concepts involved in the English terms "inspired" or "inspiration" and seeking to discover the effects which the Bible has upon those who read it in the present.

Trembath gives two reasons why he does not address the meaning of θεόπνευστος or incorporate this meaning into his understanding of biblical inspiration. First, in his view, the term θεόπνευστος occurs infrequently in

ancient literature and, therefore, its meaning cannot be determined.4 Second, his intention is not to discuss the inspiration of *Scripture*, when Scripture is viewed as the Bible which is authoritative for the community's life, but *biblical* inspiration. This latter inspiration concerns how the Bible becomes the means of salvation within the church.

Given the criteria of criticism of this work and Trembath's purpose and methods, then, his theory can be evaluated in only the most general terms. He has not incorporated either of the loci identified in the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 in his theory nor any other exegetical material from these texts. He has not intended to do so. Any further determination of the adequacy of Trembath's theory as an evangelical definition of the nature of inspiration, therefore, must be done on grounds other than those of this study.

Charles H. Kraft is a final author who fails to include Scriptures and/or the writers of the Bible as loci of inspiration in his theory of inspiration. Kraft, who wants to relate concepts drawn from theology and the social sciences as well as from exposure to non-Western culture to the study of revelation and inspiration, holds that inspiration is an aspect of God's leading of his people which involves his continuing self-revelation in dynamic interaction with human beings. It is, primarily, the process by which God indirectly reveals himself through people to other people and, secondarily, the recorded accounts of

---

4 While the occurrence of θεόπνευστος in ancient literature is not a conclusion of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and, therefore, not a criteria for evaluation, it may be noted that Trembath cannot be considered accurate in his assertion that the term occurs infrequently in ancient literature. A review of this literature has shown an abundant use of θεόπνευστος in the Church Fathers of the fourth and fifth century. In addition, there are enough appearances of the term prior to that date, both inside and outside Christian literature, that tentative conclusions with respect to its meaning may be drawn on the basis of this material alone. To exclude θεόπνευστος from consideration because of a perceived paucity of early occurrences in inappropriate, then, unless there is further definition of the precise period in which this term does not appear.

these encounters.

Kraft's effort to articulate a theory of inspiration does not integrate the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Neither the authors of Scripture or Scripture itself are understood to be inspired. There are problems in his work with respect to the representation of these texts. Kraft appears to see a continuity between God's general leading of humans and the phenomena described in 2 Pet. 1:20-21. The text, however, presents a discontinuity. While God's normal leading of people presumably involves human volition, the exegesis of this work has indicated that 2 Pet. 1:21 describes a certain circumscription of human will in that the prophets, as they spoke, were "carried along" by the Holy Spirit. Kraft's understanding of 2 Tim. 3:16a is also not in consonance with the conclusions of this dissertation. He see here an affirmation that God led certain people to record the interaction between God and humans, while the conclusion of this study is that the concern of the text is with the divine origin of Scripture. The work of Charles Kraft on inspiration, then, does not reflect the material of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

The preceding theories of inspiration are all similar in that they do not identify either Scripture or its authors as loci of inspiration. In this respect they have not integrated some of the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21. While in certain instances these theories consider the texts of this study and, therefore, may be evaluated with respect to this presentation, they generally define inspiration in a manner which is not connected with 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21. For this reason, much of the thought reflected in these theories cannot be judged on the basis of the criteria of this study.

6.3 Theories with Scripture or its Authors
as the Locus of Inspiration

Certain contemporary evangelicals have articulated theories of the nature of inspiration which hold that Scripture alone or the biblical authors alone are to be recognized as the locus of inspiration. The former alternative, which locates inspiration only with Scripture, is represented by the work of Berkouwer and Goodrick.[5] The latter perspective, in which it is the biblical authors who are inspired, is the view which is found in the writings of Earle and Jewett.

6.3.1 Theories with Scripture as the Locus of Inspiration

The thought of G. C. Berkouwer accurately reflects certain exegetical conclusions from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 and introduces a clarity into the consideration of inspiration which exceeds all other theologians considered in this study. Berkouwer carefully distinguishes between what he calls "the God-breathed character of Holy Scripture" and its inspiration. Although the discussion of a certain aspect of the nature of Scripture will always be carried on around the designation of "the inspiration of Scripture," this terminology inevitably distorts the meaning of the Greek term θεόπνευστος. Berkouwer has clearly noted this problem and, correctly, restricted the application of θεόπνευστος to Scripture alone. Even if his position with respect to exactly what is signified by θεόπνευστος is not supported by the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a, Berkouwer, nevertheless, represents the most accurate use of the term θεόπνευστος among the evangelicals considered here. Evangelicals generally seem to equate θεόπνευστος and "inspiration;" with the latter term being seen as referring to Scripture considered both in terms of the origin of the text itself

---

5 As Goodrick locates inspiration in the meaning of Scripture rather than Scripture itself, there is some question as to the proper classification of his thought.

and, even more importantly, the influence of the Holy Spirit on the biblical writers. The word θεόπνευστος is often taken as applicable to both loci of inspiration. Berkouwer rightly limits the locus of θεόπνευστος to Scripture itself and, therefore, both integrates the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and clarifies the evangelical discussion.

A second possible strength in Berkouwer's thought is that he seems to view inspiration as concerned with the divine origin of Scripture. This affirmation adequately reflects the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a. It is not clear, however, that Berkouwer's emphasis is on the divine origin of Scripture, as his more specific description of the "God-breathed" character of Scripture is that this indicates "the mystery of its [Scripture] being filled with truth and trustworthiness."[6] To the extent that Berkouwer places the primary emphasis of the God-breathed nature of Scripture on its trustworthiness he does not reflect the exegesis of this work.

A third positive aspect of Berkouwer's work is that he relates the Scripture's functional character to its God-breathed origin. Exegesis has argued that 2 Tim. 3:16a makes the divine origin of Scripture the basis of its usefulness. Berkouwer has grasped this concept in his discussion.

Despite the strengths of Berkouwer's consideration, there are certain weaknesses in his perspective when judged by the criteria of this dissertation. The major weakness is the manner in which he relates the divine and human in inspiration. Berkouwer fails to adequately account for how "Scripture" can be both the words of humans and, at the same time, θεόπνευστος. On the one hand Berkouwer is correct in affirming, according to 2 Pet. 1:21, that the words of Scripture are human words. Exegesis has demonstrated that there is a certain emphasis in this verse on the fact that humans spoke the words which become Scripture. The problem is that in an attempt to preserve the humanity of

---

6 G. C. Berkouwer, Holy Scripture. Studies in Dogmatics, trans. and ed. Jack B. Rogers, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976, p. 140.

these words, he does not integrate the biblical material which deals with their origin with God. Scripture is, as Berkouwer states, the words of humans. Scripture is, at the same time, θεόπνευστος. It is significant in 2 Tim. 3:16a that it is not the Word of God which is thus described, but Scripture, referring at least to the *written* Old Testament and perhaps emergent New Testament material, which is stated to be θεόπνευστος. Berkouwer does not adequately account for this divine aspect.

Berkouwer also does not properly reflect the influence of the Spirit on the biblical writers in Scripture's production. Berkouwer's organic theory of inspiration holds that the Spirit led these authors in their work. The terminology of 2 Pet. 1:21 is, however, more definitive. There, the Spirit's work is not described as "guidance" but as a "carrying" of the speakers of prophecy. In an effort to protect the human aspect of Scripture, Berkouwer has not done justice to the terminology used to describe the influence of the Holy Spirit.

A further problem with the integration of the divine and human in Berkouwer's work is his affirmation that Scripture exists in a "servant form." This understanding fails to account for the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. It is clear in the latter passage that prophecy is spoken by humans. It is, however, a greater emphasis of both texts that Scripture as Scripture (i.e., the Old Testament and, perhaps, emergent New Testament material), is θεόπνευστος. In the words of 2 Pet. 1:21, humans spoke "from God." While Berkouwer's presentation of "the servant form of Scripture" accounts for the humanness of Scripture, it does not adequately reflect the emphasis on its divine origin.

A second general criticism of Berkouwer's concept of inspiration has to do with his description of the nature of Scripture as revelation. Berkouwer is not entirely clear here. On the one hand, he does not seem to want to deny that Scripture is revelation but, on the other, he seeks to develop the role of Scripture as a witness to Christ and salvation to the point that it is no longer

revelation in a primary sense. If Scripture is thus understood, Berkouwer does not represent an element of the exegesis 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Both texts presents Scripture as originating with God and, as Scripture indicates aspects of God's nature and work, it reveals God himself. Berkouwer's effort to stress Scripture's role as a witness to revelation appears to inadequately account for its being, itself, revelation.

Edward W. Goodrick holds that the content or meaning of the Bible is the locus of inspiration.[7] The most positive aspect of Goodrick's discussion is his emphasis on inspiration as a present aspect of Scripture, which accords with one of the exegetical conclusions from the study of 2 Tim. 3:16a. Although his work does not develop this idea, it is implicit in his argument that inspiration characterizes not only the autographs, but also manuscript copies and versions of the Bible. Goodrick supports this perspective both on the basis of the New Testament's identification of "the Bible in-hand" as "Scripture" and its reference to the LXX in the same terms. Inspiration is, then, not merely a characteristic of the autographs but, as well, an attribute of Bible manuscripts and versions and, presumably, may be spoken of as present. Goodrick considers "the elided copula" in 2 Tim. 3:16, but does not touch on the significance of a possible present tense either for the inspiration of manuscripts and versions or for the continuance of inspiration.

Despite this positive contribution, there are weaknesses in Goodrick's thought when evaluated in light of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21. Goodrick's definition of inspiration is not consistent with what might be derived from the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a. Goodrick defines inspiration as the event in which prophets or apostles spoke or wrote that which was revealed to them by the

---

[7] In the consideration of Goodrick's work it is necessary to indicate that the extent of his writing on this subject is limited and some of what is available is popular in nature. The following criticism, then, recognizes the possibility that his published material on biblical inspiration may not be adequate to clearly expose his thought.

Holy Spirit.   Thus, inspiration is described as an event rather than God's "breathing out" or "breathing into" Scripture.   Although Goodrick's study of θεόπνευστος defines the word in terms of God's breathing of Scripture, his definition of inspiration presents it as an "event."

A further weakness of Goodrick's theory is his rejection of verbal inspiration in favour of an inspiration of the content of the Bible.   Goodrick denies that inspiration is primarily verbal because of the inherent limitation of language, the nature of language which is composed of both symbols (the specific words) and meaning, and the fact that inspiration extends to Bible manuscripts and versions beyond the original autographs.   The denial of a primacy of verbal inspiration fails to account for several of the conclusions from an exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.   In both texts it is Scripture, as a written document, and not its meaning which is said to be inspired or to originate with God.   An additional difficulty is that although Goodrick seeks to distinguish between verbal symbols and the meaning which is conveyed by those symbols, there is no warrant in the text for this distinction.   2 Tim. 3:16a speaks of "Scripture" as inspired and does not differentiate between the symbols which exist in written form and the meaning which is conveyed by these symbols.   Goodrick, in the end, seems to reject his own position.   This variation in his thought appears in his argument that while meaning is primordial, that meaning can only be reached by words.   A distinction between symbol and meaning is not supported by the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

Goodrick's theory is also problematic in its use of θεόπνευστος. Goodrick, correctly, adopts a passive sense of "'God-breathes'" or "'God breathes into,'"[8] however, in his conclusions he moves, without explanation, to an active sense for the adjective when Scripture is described as "alive with the

---

[8] Edward W. Goodrick, "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 25 (1982), 484.

vitality of God."[9] This unjustified change from a passive to an active sense of θεόπνευστος reflects an inadequate application of his own exegesis.

A final weaknesses is Goodrick's theory is his consideration of the relation between the role of the prophets and that of the Holy Spirit in the production of the prophecy of Scripture according to 2 Pet. 1:20-21. In order to preserve the place of humans in the creation of Scripture, he affirms several things which are either not found in the text or which appear to misrepresent it. The first is that "humans have a will."[10] While no adequate understanding of the nature of inspiration would deny this, the text which Goodrick has in mind, 2 Pet. 1:20-21, specifically denies that the origin of prophecy was with the (uninfluenced) will of humans. Goodrick again inadequately represents the text in that while acknowledging that a biblical writer was "carried along by the Holy Spirit," he seems to make this influence a certain manipulation of a prophet who was unaware of it. Goodrick affirms that, "the prophet thinks he has willed to say something . . . and still . . . the Holy Spirit manipulates the prophet's thought so that the prophet's will becomes the will of the Holy Spirit."[11] This statement is problematic both because the term "manipulate" does not communicate what is intended in the concept of the prophet being "carried along" by the Spirit, and in that there is no indication in 2 Pet. 1:21 of a concurrence of wills.

Goodrick holds that it is Scripture's meaning which is inspired and not, primarily, Scripture itself. In this position he has not adequately integrated the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

---

[9] Ibid., 486.

[10] Edward W. Goodrick, Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God? Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1988, p. 24.

[11] Ibid., pp. 24-25.

6.3.2 Theories with the Author as the Locus of Inspiration

Ralph Earle holds that inspiration is a dynamic work of the Spirit of God in the minds of the biblical authors by which they were enabled both to receive and to communicate the truth of Scripture. He affirms, in continuity with the Arminian-Wesleyan tradition, that inspiration is dynamic and is to be located in the thoughts of the writers of Scripture and not their words.

Earle's work on the nature of inspiration is limited and, therefore, it is not to be expected that he will have adequately reflected all of the conclusions of this study. A review of his thought, however, indicates several positive aspects. Earle holds that the inspiration of the Bible has to do with its origin, which is a major emphasis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Earle's other exegetical conclusions from these texts generally follow those which have been here adopted. The term θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3:16a is seen as a predicate adjective meaning "God-breathed." Earle quotes Warfield's claim that the force of this word is to indicate that Scripture is a product of God's creative breath. 2 Pet. 1:20-21 is viewed as speaking of Scripture's origin and not its interpretation. Earle correctly sees φερόμενοι as meaning more than an increased comprehension by the prophets, it describes, rather, a supernatural movement of the Spirit on the biblical authors. He indicates, as well, that although ἄνθρωποι stands in an emphatic position, 2 Pet. 1:21 places an accent on prophecies not coming from human will but from God.

Even though Earle accurately represents 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, his theory of inspiration does not integrate this understanding. This lack of integration seems to be the result of development of his understanding of the nature of inspiration on the basis of historical Methodist thought rather than the conclusions of biblical exegesis. Earle considers the perspective on inspiration which has been present in Methodism not only from the time of its beginning with Wesley, but also earlier in the work of Arminius. He affirms that dynamic inspiration has always been the Arminian view. At no point in his argument,

however, does Earle attempt to thoroughly integrate the exegetical conclusions from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Rather, he adopts this perspective, at least in part, because it is the historic view of Methodism. While the legitimacy of the articulation of an evangelical theory of inspiration on the basis of historical theology must be judged on criteria other than those of this work, this approach seems to be a reason why Earle's exegetical conclusions do not play a significant role in his articulation of the nature of inspiration. In this adoption of historical theology, Earle has not completely represented the exegetical conclusions from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Peter 1:20-21 in his statement of the nature of inspiration.

The material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 is not adequately integrated into Earle's biblical defense of his thought. In this defense, Earle does not appeal directly to Scripture as teaching a dynamic view of inspiration, he points, rather, to two phenomena which, in his opinion, demonstrate that the Bible itself puts a greater emphasis on thoughts than words. These phenomena include the wording which appears in the Synoptic parallels and the manner in which the New Testament cites the Old Testament. In both cases, it is the lack of exact citation which becomes the basis of his argument for the priority of thoughts over words. Earle compares, however, things which are different. He has affirmed that inspiration has to do with the origin of Scripture. On the basis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, verbal inspiration is a matter of the origin of the *words* of Scripture. These words have both a divine and human origin. Earle's examples do not consider the origin of the words of Scripture, but the representation of the words of Jesus by the synoptic authors and of those of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers. Here the concern is not primarily with the origin of these words, but with their representation. The fact that the biblical writers may have exercised a certain liberty in their representation of the words of the Old Testament and/or of Jesus, has no necessary relation with the source from which the words of Scripture originated.

A distinctive aspect of Earle's thought, that the concept of illumination

must be included in the idea of inspiration, cannot be judged by the criteria of this study. Earle defines inspiration as a matter of communication. As such, Earle thinks that, like other communication, inspiration must include the elements of an original source, an object or message of communication, and recipients. In Earle's perspective it is the Bible which is the message of inspiration, but the contemporary reader is also an essential aspect of inspiration as it is the reader who provides the element of communication's receptor. The legitimacy of this perspective must be determined on grounds other than those of the conclusions of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

In summary, while Earle's understanding of the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 is in consonance with a number of conclusions of the foregoing exegesis, his thought on these texts is generally not integrated into his description of the nature of inspiration. Earle's perspective on inspiration is developed primarily on considerations other than the exegetical conclusions of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

Paul Jewett locates inspiration with the authors of Scripture. He defines it as "that guidance, that influence, that superintendence of God's Spirit which enabled the authors of Scripture to speak the truth which God would have them speak for his own glory and our salvation, faith, and life."[12]

Certain aspects of Jewett's understanding of the nature of inspiration, are acceptable when viewed in light of the conclusions of this dissertation. Jewett clearly locates inspiration with the biblical authors and does so on the basis of 2 Pet. 1:21. Although Jewett's consideration of this text is very limited, he sees that the force of the language and the implication of this verse require that the biblical authors be understood as inspired.

Another positive element is that he clearly affirms verbal and plenary inspiration. Inspiration is verbal in that it extends to the words of Scripture.

---

[12] Paul K. Jewett, <u>God, Creation, and Revelation</u>. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, p. 126.

Inspiration is, also, plenary. Jewett recognizes that particular portions of the Bible may have greater or lesser relevance for the church at a particular time, but claims that plenary inspiration describes not the relative significance of Scripture, but the fact that it is, in its entirety, the Word of God. In his adoption of verbal and plenary inspiration, Jewett reflects the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a.

Despite the strengths of Jewett's work, certain problems are evident. He fails to include Scripture as a locus of inspiration and his definition of inspiration does not reflect the terminology of 2 Pet. 1:21 with respect to the Spirit's influence on the biblical writers. While Jewett can speak of these writers as being carried in a manner which is similar to a ship before the wind, his definition uses a weaker description of "guidance" or "superintendence" to describe this influence.

Another problem is Jewett's perspective on the nature of verbal inspiration. He holds that the words of Scripture are inspired, but he appears to depart from what some evangelicals mean by this. For Jewett, verbal inspiration is an affirmation that the Bible is written in human language and that the writers of Scripture were instructed by the Spirit in the words they used. Verbal inspiration is, therefore, a matter of the humanity of Scripture's language and the Spirit's influence on the authors which produced its words. According to the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a, however, verbal inspiration must emphasize the idea that the words of Scripture originate with God.

A further weakness is the manner in which Jewett relates the divine and human in Scripture. In his concern to maintain a genuinely human role in the Bible's production Jewett reflects some, but not all, of the conclusions of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. For Jewett, the words of Scripture are human words and, apparently, only human words. These human words have become the locus of God's revelation and, as such, a sacramental relation exists between the human and divine word. The difficulty with this approach is that it integrates only a portion of the exegetical material. Jewett's thought certainly captures the affirmation of 2 Pet. 1:21 of the human speaking which

resulted in the prophecy of Scripture. It does not reflect 2 Tim. 3:16a which indicates that the source of Scripture is with God.

This same general problem, that of the balance between the divine and human in Scripture, is evident in Jewett's indication of the difference in the presence of the divine and human in prophecy and in the Hagiographa. In the former the divine is much more evident, while in the latter, according to Jewett, it is the human answer which is incorporated into the divine word. This distinction, however, does not adequately represent 2 Tim. 3:16a, which does not affirm a distinction in the degree of inspiration of Scripture, but only that Scripture is inspired in its entirety. Likewise 2 Pet. 1:20-21, speaking of all the Old Testament with its various literary genres, recognizes no difference in the relative presence of the divine and human. While this distinction may be argued on other grounds beyond what this study can judge, in 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 there is no indication of degrees of either divine or human presence.

Jewett's theory, therefore, while correctly affirming that the biblical authors are a locus of inspiration, does not completely integrate the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

6.4 Theories with both Scripture and its Authors as Loci of Inspiration

Certain contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration affirm that the biblical text itself and the biblical authors are loci of inspiration. This affirmation is consistent with the exegetical conclusions of this study. Among these theologians there is not agreement, however, as to whether these two loci are the only loci of inspiration. Dewey Beegle and Donald Bloesch both hold the loci of inspiration identified in the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, but add at least one other locus in their respective concepts of inspiration. Millard Erickson and Carl Henry, likewise, hold the loci which are indicated in these texts but differ with Beegle and Bloesch in that they limit inspiration to these loci.

6.4.1 Theories with Scripture, its Authors, and additional Loci as Loci of Inspiration

Dewey M. Beegle has articulated what he designates as a "dynamic" view of inspiration. In his perspective inspiration describes a broad process, but with specific priorities in terms of the various loci of this inspiration. Beegle holds that inspiration involves the entire process of revelation including the inspired person, whether as a speaker or a writer, and the inspired message, whether oral or written. Despite this broad concept of the nature of inspiration, Beegle places the priority in inspiration on the inspired person. It is this person, in some cases an individual with special giftedness, who receives the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Spirit, but in a manner which does not compromise the person's individuality or personality. The texts which are produced by such individuals are inspired, but only in a secondary sense in that they are the result of the work of the inspired person. Scripture is not inspired, then, in the same way in which its authors are. Beegle adds an additional locus of inspiration to those of the biblical authors and the Scripture itself for he affirms that those who hear or read the Bible and to whom Christ speaks in this reading are to be included in a proper understanding of inspiration. In this regard he states that inspiration is "being caught up into God's time."[13]

When Beegle's theory of inspiration is evaluated in terms of the conclusions of the present work, there are several aspects of his approach that adequately reflect these conclusions. Beegle sees inspiration as located both with the writers of Scripture and the text itself, although Scripture is inspired only because it is the product of inspired people. Beegle has, nevertheless, preserved the two locus of inspiration identified in this study, apparently to some degree because of the teaching of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Beegle has also made at least some effort to resolve the tension between oral and written

---

[13] Dewey M. Beegle, Scripture, Tradition and Infallibility. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973, p. 128.

prophecy which is found in 2 Pet. 1:21 where, when speaking of the prophecy of Scripture, the writer of 2 Peter indicates that it was "spoken" by those who were moved by the Spirit. Beegle addresses this tension by extending inspiration to both the oral and the written message. Without necessarily adopting Beegle's conclusion, his work is helpful in that he has at least addressed a matter which is often left unconsidered.

Another strength of Beegle's work is that he affirms inspiration to be a present characteristic of Scripture and not merely an attribute at the time of Scripture's origin. Beegle develops this observation with regard to the question of the relation between the autographs and the copies of Scripture and not in terms of the implications of this fact for an entire theory of inspiration. He has again, however, recognized an aspect of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a which is often not developed in the discussion of the Bible's inspiration.

Beegle's theory of inspiration has certain weaknesses when judged by the criteria of this study, although his lack of precision at points makes objective evaluation difficult. He may not represent the conclusions of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 in his thought on authorial inspiration. Beegle holds that the inspired person is the primary locus of inspiration. In his discussion of revelation, Beegle differentiates between primary revelation, which is the fundamental insights of those with extraordinary giftedness, and secondary revelation, which is the more rational working out of the implications of primary revelation. He does not indicate the relation between inspiration and these two forms of revelation. This question is important for an adequate evaluation of his thought. If Beegle thinks that there is a difference in the inspiration of those who received primary revelation and those to whom secondary was given, his conclusions conflict with the material of 2 Pet. 1:20-21. In that text no distinction is drawn in the experience of those who produced the Old Testament Scriptures. The entire Old Testament, which is made of up a variety of kinds of literature with various content, is equally described as the work of individuals moved by the Spirit of God. There is no difference in the nature of inspiration

which these individuals experienced. Beegle is also unclear regarding the relation of the divine and human in inspiration. He affirms that the inspired person has a special assistance of the Spirit and seems to relate inspiration and God's speaking to the prophet, but his description lacks the precision which is necessary to determine if it can account for the material of 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

A further problem with Beegle's theory is his treatment of verbal and plenary inspiration. He partially rejects verbal inspiration. As Beegle understands that concepts cannot be separated from words, he does not completely dismiss this characteristic of inspiration. He does, however, question it, apparently because of an unwillingness to accept inerrancy. In his work on verbal inspiration Beegle does not consider either 2 Tim. 3:16a or 2 Pet. 1:20-21, both of which speak of "Scripture," as an identifiable, written document, as originating with God. Rather, he examines the matter on the basis of the attitude of Jesus and Paul. In Beegle's perspective, both Jesus and Paul were more concerned about the spirit of the law than its letter, so there should not be an excessive emphasis on the words of Scripture. This reasoning is inadequate as the issues involved are different. Verbal inspiration, in evangelical Protestant thought and apparently in the work of Beegle, is a matter of whether the words of Scripture, or only its ideas or meaning, originate with God. The question addressed by Jesus and Paul was not that of the origin of the words of the law, but the manner in which these words were applied in life. In 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 "Scripture," which is an identifiable written document, is described as having God as its source. The words of Scripture are inspired in that Scripture in written form originates with God.

Beegle rejects the plenary inspiration of Scripture on the basis of the phenomena of the Bible. Certain biblical difficulties demonstrate, according to Beegle, that every word of Scripture cannot be seen as inspired. Such a level approach is, rather, a deduction which is consequent upon an assumption of inerrancy. Beegle thinks that plenary inspiration cannot be held not only because the phenomena of Scripture are opposed to this affirmation, but also

because the fluid edges of the canon do not allow such a perspective. Also, as the biblical authors were only given such help as was necessary for a particular time, all that is found in Scripture is not special revelation. Beegle's understanding of limited inspiration should not be accepted as it conflicts with the statement of 2 Tim. 3:16a that *all* Scripture is inspired.

The preceding evaluation of Beegle's perspective of verbal and plenary inspiration may be directly applied only to the Old Testament and, perhaps, certain portions of the New Testament, as it is only this material which is specifically in view in the texts of this study. While these conclusions may have implications for the nature of the inspiration of the rest of the New Testament, neither 2 Tim. 3:16a nor 2 Pet. 1:20-21 speaks of the New Testament as a whole.

While there are several unique strengths in Beegle's theory of inspiration, there are, as well, certain weaknesses.

Donald Bloesch accepts both the loci of inspiration which have been identified in this study and adds others as well. The loci of inspiration which he adopts and his understanding of the nature of inspiration as related to these loci are seen in his definition of inspiration as:

> the divine election and guidance of the biblical prophets and the ensuring of their writings as a compelling witness to revelation, the opening of the eyes of the people of the time to the truth of these writings, and the providential preservation of these writings as the unique channel of revelation. By the biblical prophets I have in mind all preachers, writers and editors in biblical history who were made the unique instruments of God's self-revealing action.[14]

Certain elements of this definition of inspiration, which includes an influence on the people at the time of Scripture's appearance which enlightened them to its truth and, as well, the preservation of these writings as

---

[14] Donald G. Bloesch, Holy Scripture. Christian Foundations. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994, pp. 119-20.

the means of revelation as loci of inspiration, cannot be evaluated on the basis of the criteria of this dissertation. Both these loci are added on grounds other than the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 and, therefore, may not be appropriately judged here.

There are several aspects of Bloesch's work which demonstrate a certain integration of the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. He preserves the two loci of inspiration which have been identified in exegesis, although he appears to modify the way in which the biblical authors and the text of Scripture should be seen as inspired. He also holds to plenary inspiration in consonance with 2 Tim. 3:16a. While he asserts that the Scripture is not all of equal value because it does not witness equally to Jesus Christ, he affirms, nevertheless, that all of Scripture is inspired.

Bloesch's work has certain weaknesses. A first criticism of Bloesch's perspective is the manner in which he defines inspiration. Bloesch holds that inspiration is, in part, the divine election and guidance of the biblical prophets. This aspect of his definition does not fully represent the conclusions from 2 Pet. 1:20-21. While his term "guidance" might be in some way equivalent with the "carrying along" of the Spirit which is described in 2 Pet. 1:21, it appears to describe a more general phenomena. It has been argued that the term φερόμενοι describes a powerful influence of the Holy Spirit which circumscribed the normal exercise of human will. The concept involved in "guidance" appears to be weaker and, therefore, not completely adequate. Bloesch's definition of inspiration is also inadequate as it has to do with the biblical writings as a locus of inspiration. This study has concluded on the basis of 2 Tim. 3:16a, that these writings are a locus of inspiration in that they originate with God. Bloesch's perspective is that their inspiration consists in the divine activity which makes these writings a convincing witness of revelation. Inspiration is not a matter of Scripture's source, but its direction or preservation toward a certain end.

A further problem with Bloesch's work is his articulation of the "God-breathed" character of Scripture which he appears to distinguish from its

inspiration. For Bloesch, the "God-breathed" character of Scripture describes it as produced by the breath of God and accounts for its origin and vitality. Bloesch has, in effect, understood the term θεόπνευστος as having a passive sense and speaking of Scripture's origin, and as having an active sense and describing its influence. Bloesch is correct in understanding θεόπνευστος as a passive, but his adoption of an active sense is not supported by the foregoing exegesis.

Bloesch's thought is also problematic with respect to the relation between the divine and human in the inspiration of Scripture. Bloesch wants to preserve a genuine human role in the production of Scripture. He affirms, therefore, that the words of Scripture are merely human words which are adopted by God for his purposes. While the *content* of Scripture is entirely dependent on the divine meaning, its words are uniquely human. This perspective cannot be sustained in light of the conclusions of this work. First, Bloesch draws an apparent distinction between the content of Scripture and its words, although the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a does not allow such a differentiation. Also, while Bloesch has adequately reflected the indication of 2 Pet. 1:21 that Scripture originates with the speaking of certain persons, he has not accounted for 2 Tim. 3:16a which affirms a divine origin of Scripture which exists in the form of written words.

Bloesch's theory of inspiration is not reflective, for the most part, of the exegetical conclusions drawn from an evangelical study of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Indeed, the relevant sections of *Holy Scripture* make no reference to either text. This fact requires a certain comment with respect to the preceding criticism of his thought. The assumption of this evaluation has been that when Bloesch refers to Scripture and its authors as inspired he does so, at least in part, on the basis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 although he does not directly cite these texts. If this is the case, the foregoing analysis is acceptable. If, however, Bloesch intends that his theory of inspiration be developed completely apart from the material of these texts this evaluation is not

appropriate as it judges his thought on the basis of conclusions derived from the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

6.4.2 Theories which Limit Inspiration to Scripture and the Authors

Millard Erickson and Carl Henry both hold that the loci of inspiration are the biblical authors and Scripture itself and limit inspiration to these two loci. Erickson places a priority on the inspiration of the biblical writers; Henry, by contrast, claims that it is Scripture which is the primary locus of inspiration and the biblical writers are secondary.

Erickson defines inspiration as "that supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit upon the Scripture writers which rendered their writings an accurate account of the revelation or which resulted in what they wrote actually being the Word of God."[15] There are positive aspects of this definition. First, Erickson clearly holds the specific loci of inspiration which have been identified in this work. The biblical authors and the writings which they produced are inspired. Second, inspiration is seen as a supernatural influence on the biblical writers by the Holy Spirit. Erickson seems to integrate the material of 2 Pet. 1:21 into his understanding of inspiration, although his lack of precision raises certain questions. Third, in Erickson's definition the influence of the Spirit is not viewed in isolation, but as having a result in the writings of those moved by this influence. Inspiration is not merely an encounter between the Spirit and the biblical authors, but an influence which has results in their writings. In this description of inspiration Erickson adequately represents 2 Pet. 1:20-21 which states that men "carried along" by the Holy Spirit spoke the prophecy which became Old Testament Scripture. Inspiration is more than the experience of the writers of Scripture with the Spirit. It is an influence of the Holy Spirit upon these

---

[15] Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985, p. 199.

individuals which has significance for what they wrote.

Erickson's thought on the reason why a verbal theory of inspiration should be adopted is in consonance with the conclusions of this study. He holds that the inspiration of the words of Scripture is to be held not on an abstract basis of the general character of God, but on the grounds that this was the view which was held and taught by Jesus and the apostles. Exegesis has argued that the understanding of inspiration in 2 Tim. 3:16a is genuinely Paulinian.

Several of Erickson's comments with respect to plenary inspiration are also reflective of the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a. He indicates, correctly, that there is no necessary correlation between literary genre and inspiration. This affirmation accords with 2 Tim. 3:16a which states that *all* Scripture, which includes a variety of literary genres, is inspired. Inspiration, in this text, is a matter of Scripture's divine origin and not the literary characteristics of its distinct parts. Erickson also holds that inspiration is not a question of Scripture's contemporary application, but its origin. This is important as plenary inspiration is often rejected because certain portions of Scripture are seen as having less direct significance to the contemporary reader than others.

Certain aspects of Erickson's perspective on inspiration cannot be judged on the basis of the criteria of this dissertation One is his representation of the relation between the thoughts of the biblical authors and their words, Erickson claims, in this regard, that there is a specific correlation between increasing precision in thought and a diminishing range of words which are available to express this thought. The Spirit's work in inspiration may have been to direct the thoughts of the biblical writers to a level of precision which demanded a certain word. While this suggestion may be helpful in the consideration of inspiration, its adequacy cannot be evaluated on the basis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

Another matter which cannot be determined on the basis of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 is the validity of Erickson's

affirmation that the writings which were produced by those upon whom the Spirit moved were "an accurate record of revelation" or that what they wrote was actually the Word of God. Erickson's thought at this critical point in his definition of inspiration is unclear, a lack of clarity which may reflect his uncertainty about how to view the relation between revelation and the Scripture. On the one hand, his perspective may draw a distinction between various parts of Scripture. Some of Scripture is a witness to revelation and other parts are actually the Word of God and, therefore, revelation. It may be, by contrast, that he does not have a settled position with respect to whether Scripture is actually revelation or merely a witness to it. In either case, neither 2 Tim. 3:16a nor 2 Pet. 1:20-21 speak directly to this question, although, it may be affirmed that there is nothing in either text which would allow a disjunctive view of Scripture in which some of it is revelation and the rest merely a witness to it.

Erickson's theory of inspiration, then, manifests certain strengths when considered in light of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 and there are some aspect of his thought which cannot be evaluated. In addition there are several possible weaknesses. The first concerns his understanding of the nature of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the biblical writers. When Erickson speaks of the inspiration of the biblical writers he describes them as being "supernaturally influenced by the Holy Spirit." The adequacy of this affirmation depends on its intention. The exegesis of 2 Pet. 1:20-21 has demonstrated that the "influence" of the Spirit in the production of Scripture was distinct and specific. Prophecy is described as not originating with (uninfluenced) human volition, but in the speaking of humans "carried along" by the Holy Spirit. While Erickson's "influence" may be taken to convey this significance, it does not necessarily do so. In the absence of further development, it is difficult to know exactly what Erickson intends and, therefore, whether he has accounted for the language of 2 Pet. 1:21. It may be, as well, that Erickson's "influence" imposes concepts derived from the term "inspiration" as it is used in a contemporary context on the biblical description of the prophets being "carried" by the Spirit.

A second possible problem is the manner in which Erickson handles the question of plenary inspiration. He appears to hold that all of the Scripture is inspired, but does not directly affirm it. The treatment of 2 Tim. 3:16 in this regard is inadequate. Erickson eliminates this text from the discussion of plenary inspiration because it is not clear whether the adjective θεόπνευστος should be taken attributively or predicatively. While this is true, it is not an adequate reason for its exclusion from a consideration of plenary inspiration. When θεόπνευστος is understood predicatively, as in this study, 2 Tim. 3:16a is a clear statement of the inspiration of all Scripture. Even when the adjective is understood attributively, it is possible that this verse asserts that all of Scripture, as against that which is not Scripture, is inspired. Although a certain ambiguity exists, it is not such that this verse should be eliminated from the discussion of the nature of plenary inspiration.

The greatest criticism of Erickson's thought is that he subsumes biblical inspiration to authorial inspiration, although he does condition this affirmation.[16] Erickson holds that Scripture is a locus of inspiration, but only in a secondary and derived sense. The inspired writer communicates "the quality of inspiredness" to Scripture in the process of writing. In placing this priority on the writers, Erickson may reflect a contemporary understanding of the nature of inspiration. Inspiration, in current thought, is generally seen as the influence which one person exerts on another, allowing the recipient of that inspiration to produce work of extraordinary character. The student, for example, under the influence of an outstanding teacher, produces work of unusual quality in which this inspiration is manifest. This concept misrepresents, however, the biblical idea at least as expressed in the term θεόπνευστος. Scripture is θεόπνευστος in that it originates with God himself. There is no textual evidence in 2 Tim. 3:16a that this inspiration is derived from that of the biblical author. If Erickson is

---

16 For Erickson's affirmation that the Bible is inspired in that its writers communicate their inspiration to it and for his own clarification of this affirmation see, Erickson, Christian Theology, pp. 219-20.

arguing this concept on grounds other than those of the exegetical conclusions from 2 Tim. 3:16a, his thought may not be judged on the basis of this material. He has, however, either inadequately reflected the concept involved in the word θεόπνευστος or has not completely accounted for that which is found in this text.

Erickson's view on inspiration, therefore, it is not entirely adequate in light of the conclusions of the present work. While there are a number of positive aspects of his thought, it has several problems or possible problems.

Carl Henry also holds that there are two loci of inspiration, that of the biblical authors and the Scripture itself. He defines inspiration as "a supernatural influence upon divinely chosen prophets and apostles whereby the Spirit of God assures the truth and trustworthiness of their oral and written proclamation."[17] There are a number of elements of Henry's thought which represent the exegetical conclusions of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. His definition is adequate in that Henry holds the two loci of inspiration which emerge from a study of 2 Tim. 3:16 and 2 Pet. 1:20-21; Scripture and the biblical writers are inspired. Also, his denial that his perspective involves divine dictation is consistent with the teaching of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. While Scripture is described as originating with God and not in an act of human volition, it is, as well, spoken of as having come from humans who were "carried along" by the Spirit of God. Although there are aspects of this description which require a divine origin of Scripture and a circumscription of the human role in its production, there is nothing which requires divine dictation.

Henry's view is also correct in its affirmation that the ultimate author of the Bible is God himself, as the Holy Spirit communicates to the biblical authors. Exegesis has shown that the Scripture's origin is stated to be with God (2 Tim. 3:16a) and with those who were "carried along" by the Spirit of God (2 Pet. 1:21). These texts place the ultimate source of Scripture with God himself.

---

17 Carl F. H. Henry, God Who Speaks and Shows. Vol. IV, God, Revelation and Authority. Waco, TX: Word, 1979, p. 129.

Henry may be criticised at the same time, however, in that while these texts emphasize Scripture's ultimate origin as with God, this origin is not described in terms of authorship. From the point of view of authorship, it is more correct to speak of a concursive operation of God and the biblical writers.

A final strength of Henry's theory of inspiration is that he affirms verbal and plenary inspiration. 2 Tim. 3:16a indicates that all Scripture, which exists in written form, is inspired. Inspiration extends to *all* of Scripture and, as it is written, must include its words. This text refers only to the Old Testament and, perhaps. emergent New Testament material. Whether these characteristics extend to all of the New Testament cannot be determined by the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a.

There are certain possible weaknesses in Henry's thought. He describes the influence of the Spirit on the Bible's writers as a "supernatural influence." This terminology may not appropriately reflect the language of 2 Pet. 1:21 in which the biblical authors are spoken of as "carried along (φερόμενοι)" by the Spirit. Henry's understanding of inspiration may also be inadequate when he affirms that the result of the influence of the Spirit of God on the prophets and apostles is that the truth and trustworthiness of their writings is assured. The truth of Scripture is only one aspect of the results of inspiration and is not specifically considered in either 2 Tim. 3:16a or 2 Pet. 1:20-21. It is closer to the thought of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 to say that the consequence of the Spirit's influence was the production of Scripture, rather than to concentrate on one characteristic of the Scripture thus produced. It may be, however, that Henry has argued that the result of inspiration in Scripture's truthfulness on grounds other than these texts, in which case his perspective cannot be judged by the criteria of this work.

Henry's theory of inspiration may be inaccurate in the extension of inspiration to the oral proclamation of the prophets and apostles. It is true that 2 Pet. 1:21 describes human "speech" and not writing. Both 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, however, are specifically concerned with Scripture. Neither would

clearly extend inspiration to include the oral proclamation of the prophet and apostles, except to the extent that this proclamation is directly included in Scripture. These texts, then, provide no basis for a concept of inspiration which includes all the written and oral proclamation of inspired individuals, but only for that which is contained in Scripture. If Henry's thought in this regard is intended to represent this material it is inadequate.

The work of Carl Henry on inspiration, then, is not completely acceptable as an evangelical theory of inspiration which would reflect the exegetical conclusions of the present study. While Henry has correctly identified both the loci of inspiration which have been identified in this work, there are possible weaknesses when his theory is evaluated on the basis of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

None of the foregoing evangelical theories completely integrates all the conclusions from an exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 into an understanding of the nature of inspiration. While certain constructs capture aspects of these texts, no one theory reflects all that is found this exegesis. Material from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 which is most often absent or inadequately represented includes, first, an emphasis on Scripture itself as a locus of inspiration which accounts for the meaning of the term θεόπνευστος. Among the theologians considered, it is Berkouwer who has best understood the word θεόπνευστος and its implication for a theory of inspiration. Others tend to conflate the meaning of θεόπνευστος with that of the English "inspired" and to subsume textual inspiration to authorial. Second, the present inspiration of Scripture, as suggested in 2 Tim. 3:16a, is often ignored. Third, the divine role in inspiration, which is found in 2 Pet. 1:21, is not adequately developed. Although most evangelical theories of inspiration indicate the place of humans in the production of Scripture, the full significance of the language of 2 Pet. 1:21 with respect to the role of God is not reflected in these statements of the nature

of inspiration.

Given these common weaknesses, the preceding analysis suggests that it is the perspectives of Erickson and Henry which most fully integrate the conclusions of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 into a theory of inspiration. This work has argued that these texts identify two loci of inspiration. Scripture is inspired as are its authors. The evangelical theory or theories which best represent the exegesis of this work, then, will reflect both loci of inspiration. While Beegle and Bloesch join Erickson and Henry in holding these loci, their articulation of the nature of inspiration is less adequate, not because they add additional loci of inspiration, but because they do not reflect that which may be derived from 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 to the same extent that Erickson and Henry do. The validity of other loci of inspiration cannot be decided on the grounds of the criteria of this study. There are shortcomings, however, in their representation of that which is found in 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Beegle, whose work is characterized by a certain lack of clarity, restricts the sense in which Scripture is inspired, as does Bloesch. In both, the locus of authorial inspiration does not include all the material present in 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

It is, then, Erickson and Henry who best integrate the conclusions of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 in their thought on inspiration. Both of these evangelicals hold that authors of Scripture and Scripture itself are inspired. They share the common understanding that inspiration is a "supernatural influence" upon certain individuals which had results in what they wrote. While Erickson and Henry appear to miss certain elements which have already been noted of the exegesis of the texts of this study, they most adequately include the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21.

This dissertation does not provide the necessary grounds for a choice between the position of Erickson and that of Henry with respect to which locus of inspiration should be given priority. It has been argued that Henry places a certain emphasis on the inspiration of Scripture itself, although this emphasis is

not carried into his definition of inspiration. Erickson, by contrast, clearly places the priority in inspiration with the biblical writers and subsumes the text of Scripture to this locus. The decision of the proper balance between these two loci of inspiration must be made on the basis of all the relevant biblical material and, therefore, cannot be determined here.

7 Conclusion

The preceding study has critically evaluated contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration in light of an evangelical exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. It was undertaken with the recognition that despite extensive discussion among evangelicals of the nature of inspiration there were several shortcomings in this consideration. These included the identification and classification of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration, adequate exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, and critical evaluation of these evangelical theories in light of this exegesis. This study was, in part, an attempt to address these lacunae.

The work began in chapter one with the articulation of methods for the identification and classification of various perspectives of the nature of inspiration which have been proposed by evangelicals and for a contemporary evangelical biblical exegesis. In chapter two the former method was applied to the writings of twelve evangelicals whose work has appeared since 1962. Their thought was categorized and described on the basis of the locus or loci of inspiration which was identified. Chapters three through five employed the exegetical method in the study 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. After extensive exegesis, the conclusion was formulated that a doctrine which locates inspiration both with Scripture and the biblical authors best accounts for the material of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Chapter six critically examined contemporary evangelical theories in light of this conclusion.

There are, evidently, many questions related to the concerns of this study which either have not been developed or remain unresolved. This work has not considered any biblical texts other than 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. No claim may be made, therefore, regarding the consistency of the conclusions of this study with the entirety of the teaching of Scripture concerning its own inspiration.

Certain aspects of inspiration such as the relation between the divine and human in the production of the Scriptures and the process involved in

verbal inspiration have not been extensively considered. There are at least two reasons for these limitations. First, this study has examined only two New Testament texts. Second, the purpose of this dissertation was to criticize existing evangelical theories and not to articulate a particular understanding of biblical inspiration.

Despite its many limitations, this dissertation claims to make a significant contribution in those areas which were identified at the outset. This work is unique in that it is the first, to the knowledge of its author, to have both identified the broad range of contemporary evangelical theories of biblical inspiration and to have classified them in such a manner that the difference between these theories would be highlighted. While there have been other considerations of these theories of inspiration, none has either captured the breath of evangelical thought or classified them in a way that their distinctives would be evident. These theories are:

1. Textual inspiration, in which he locus of inspiration is the Scripture itself (G. C. Berkouwer).
2. Content inspiration, in which the locus of inspiration is the meaning of Scripture (Edward W. Goodrick).
3. Textual and personal inspiration, in which both Scripture and the biblical authors are loci of inspiration. It is, however, primarily the Scripture itself which is inspired (Carl F. H. Henry).
4. Textual and personal inspiration, in which both the text of Scripture and the biblical authors are loci of inspiration. It is, however, primarily the biblical authors who are inspired (Millard J. Erickson).
5. Personal inspiration, in which the locus of inspiration is the thoughts of the biblical writers (Ralph Earle).
6. Inspiration as the guidance of the biblical writers. In this theory the locus of inspiration is this divine guidance of the biblical authors (Paul K. Jewett).
7. The Inspiration of the authors, the text, and the readers of Scripture. The loci of inspiration in this theory are not only the biblical writers and Scripture but its readers as well (Dewey M. Beegle).
8. Inspiration of the authors, text, and original readers of Scripture and its preservation. In this theory the loci of inspiration are the authors, the text, and the original readers of Scripture, along with

its continued preservation (Donald G. Bloesch).
9. Social inspiration, in which the locus of inspiration is the entire process of the production of Scripture (Clark H. Pinnock).
10. Inspiration as inspiring affects upon the authors of Scripture. The locus of inspiration, in this theory, is the affects which were experienced by the biblical authors (William J. Abraham).
11. Inspiration as inspiring affects on the readers of the Bible. This theory sees the locus of inspiration as the affects which are experienced by the Bible's readers (Kern Robert Trembath).
12. Inspiration as God's indirect self-revelation in human encounter. The locus of inspiration, in this theory, is the encounter between human beings (Charles H. Kraft).

This study does not claim to have identified the entire range of evangelical thought and other evangelical theories may exist which have not been represented here. These need to be considered to the extent that they exist. Also, this study has made no effort to isolate the major directions of thought among evangelicals with respect to the nature of inspiration. Certain views considered here are extreme while others represent a greater consensus of thought. Further study which would better identify the most important contemporary evangelical theories of inspiration is appropriate.

A second general area in which this work makes a contribution is in the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. Regardless of the acceptance or rejection of the specific conclusions of this exegesis, one of the most significant criticisms of contemporary evangelicals is that their articulation of the nature of inspiration has generally reflected inadequate exegesis. A summary review of the evangelical works cited in the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, as well as a survey of the integration of the material of these texts by the authors considered in chapter two, indicates that evangelical exegesis of these passages has been limited. While it is certain that not all evangelicals will agree with the conclusions of the exegesis here presented, this work has both identified a number of the exegetical issues involved in the consideration of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 and provided direction in their consideration. Although the complete articulation of an evangelical theory of biblical

inspiration will require the consideration of other material, that which may be derived from these texts has a role in the formulation of an understanding of inspiration.

It has been argued that inspiration, when considered according to the biblical term θεόπνευστος, is not primarily a concept which describes a divine influence on the biblical authors which enabled them to produce works of extraordinary character. It is, rather, a matter of the origin of Scripture. To assert that Scripture is "inspired by God," is to affirm its divine origin. To be acceptable in terms of this study, then, a doctrine of inspiration must include a statement about the origin of Scripture with God.

The exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 has also demonstrated that these texts identify two loci of inspiration, which are Scripture and its human writers. An adequate view of inspiration, therefore, must not only emphasize inspiration as being a matter of the origin of Scripture, but also identify these two loci of inspiration. The best evangelical theories of inspiration, from the perspective of this work, are those which include the loci of inspiration of the Scripture itself and its authors.

A final major contribution of this work is the critical consideration of contemporary evangelical theories of inspiration in light of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21. All evangelicals assert the authority of Scripture. While there are, perhaps, major differences among them with respect to exactly the meaning of this affirmation and the manner in which it should be applied in the understanding of a specific area of doctrine, evangelical theories of biblical inspiration must, in some manner, reflect scriptural teaching on this matter. Again, previous consideration has been inadequate. While there are many evangelical critiques of the work of fellow evangelicals, there is nothing in the literature which has exposed as broad a range of theories of inspiration to critical evaluation in light of the exegesis of these two New Testament texts. This criticism is limited in that evangelical theories of inspiration were judged only in terms of their integration of two texts. Their capacity to reflect material

from the rest of Scripture was not considered.

Exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21 has argued that a contemporary evangelical theory of biblical inspiration should have at least two characteristics. It should view inspiration as a statement of Scripture's origin and it should hold two loci of inspiration, that of Scripture and the biblical authors. While none of the theories considered in this work are completely adequate in that they incorporate all the aspects of the exegesis of 2 Tim. 3:16a and 2 Pet. 1:20-21, the theories of Millard J. Erickson and Carl F. H. Henry, which integrate these two aspects of inspiration, are the most representative of this exegesis. Their theories should be seen as most clearly reflecting the conclusions of this study.

This dissertation has argued that biblical exegesis needs to be more clearly integrated by evangelicals into the articulation of a particular doctrine of inspiration. It is to be expected that a study of the entire teaching of Scripture on this subject will bring even more precision into the formulation of an evangelical understanding of the nature of inspiration.

8 Bibliography

Unless otherwise noted citations of ancient Greek literature are from the CD ROM *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Packard Humanities Institute. Regents of the University of California, 1992, and are indicated by the notation *TLG*

Abott-Smith, G. A Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981.

Abraham, William J. Divine Inspiration and the Limits of Historical Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University, 1982.

_____. The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981.

_____. "Inspiration, Revelation and Divine Action: A Study in Modern Methodist Theology." Wesleyan Theological Journal, 19/2 (Fall, 1984), 38-51.

Achtemeier, Paul J. The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.

Aeneas. Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander. trans. Ilinois Greek Club. Loeb Classical Library. eds. E. Capps, et al. London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1955.

Aeschylus. Agamemnon. 3 vols. ed. Eduard Fraenkel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

_____. Oeuvres. trans. Paul Mazon. Collection des universités de France. 6e ed. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1953-1955.

Aland, Barbara, et al., eds. The Greek New Testament. 4th revised ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1993.

Alford, Henry. The Greek New Testament. 4 vols. new ed. London/Cambridge: Longmans, Green/Deighton, Bell, 1894.

_____. The Greek New Testament. 4 vols. new ed. London: Rivingtons, 1884

Allan, John A. "The 'In Christ' Formula in the Pastoral Epistles." New Testament Studies, 10 (1963-1964), 115-21.

Allen, Keith. Linguistic Meaning. 2 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1986.

Alonso Schökel, Luis. The Inspired Word. trans. Francis Martin. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.

Alston, William P. "Meaning." Encyclopedia of Philosophy. ed. Paul Edwards. New York: Macmillian, 1967, V, 223-41.

Andry, E. R. "The Translation of Epilyseos in II Peter 1:20." synopsis by Kenneth W. Clark. Journal of Biblical Literature, 70 (1951), xvii.

Aristotle. Problems. 2 vols. trans. W. S. Hett. eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington. London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1953, 1957.

_____. On Plants. Minor Works. trans. W. S. Hett. Loeb Classical Library. eds. E. Capps, et al. London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1955.

Bailey, James L., and Lyle D. Vander Broek. Literary Form in the New Testament. Louisville, KN: Westminster/Knox, 1992.

Balz, Horst, and Wolfgang Schrage. Die Katholischen Briefe. Vol. 10, Das Neue Testament Deutsch. eds. Gerhard Friedrich and Peter Stuhlmacher. 12th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

_____, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. "θεόπνευστος." Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, II, 140.

Barker, Kenneth, ed. The NIV Study Bible. New International Version. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.

Barr, James. The Bible in the Modern World. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

_____. Fundamentalism. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.

_____. Holy Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1983.

_____. "The Literal, the Allegorical, and Modern Biblical Scholarship." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 44 (1989), 3-17.

_____. rev. of William J. Abraham. Divine Inspiration and the Limits of Historical Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University, 1982. Scottish Journal of Theology, 36 (1983), 247-50.

_____. The Semantics of Biblical Language. Oxford: Oxford University, 1961.

Barrett, C. K. The Pastoral Epistles. The New Clarendon Bible [New Testament]. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

Barth, Karl. Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes. I/2, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik. 5th ed. Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer, 1948.

_____. The Doctrine of the Word of God. I/2, Church Dogmatics. eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrace. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956.

Bartsch, H. W. "ἴδιος." Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament. eds. Hortz Balz and Gerhard Schneider. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, II, 171-72.

_____, ed. Kerygma and Myth. 2 vols. trans. Reginald H. Fuller. London: SPCK, 1953.

_____, ed. Kerygma und Mythos. 2 vols. Theologische Forschung. Hamburg: Reich & Heidrich, 1948, 1952.

Bate, H. N. The Sibylline Oracles. London/New York: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge/Macmillian, 1918.

Bauckham, Richard J. Jude, 2 Peter. Vol. 50, Word Biblical Commentary. eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Waco, TX: Word, 1983.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. trans. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 2d ed., rev. and augmented, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker. Chicago/London: Universiry of Chicago, 1979

_____. Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Berlin/New York: Gruyter, 1971.

Bea, Augustinus. Die Inspiratione et Inerrantia Sacrae Scripturae. Rome: Pontifical, 1954.

Bebbington, D. W. "Evangelicalism." The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Thought. ed. Alister E. McGrath. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993, pp.182-84.

_____. Evangelicalism in Modern Britan. London: Hyman, 1989.

Beegle, Dewey M. The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

_____. Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.

Bénétreau, Samuel. Le deuxième épître de Pierre et l'Épître de Jude. Vaux-sur-Seine: Édifac, 1984.

Bengel, John Albert. New Testament Word Studies. trans. Charlton T. Lewis and Marvin R. Vincent. 2 vols. 1864; rpt. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1971.

Bennetch, John Henry. "2 Timothy 3:16a, A Greek Study." Bibliotheca Sacra, 106 (1949), 187-95.

Berkouwer, G. C. Holy Scripture. Studies in Dogmatics. trans. and ed. Jack B. Rogers. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

_____. A Half Century of Theology. trans. and ed. Lewis B. Smedes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

_____. General Revelation. Studies in Dogmatics. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.

Bernard, J. H. The Pastoral Epistles. 1899; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980.

Bigg, Charles. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. International Critical Commentary. eds. Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer. 2d ed. 1902; rpt. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1961.

Black, David Alan, and David S. Dockery, eds. New Testament Criticism and Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.

Blaise, Albert. Dictionnaire Latin-Français des autres chrétiens. rev. Henri Chirat. Turnhour, Belgique: Brepols, 1954.

Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. ed. Friedrich Rehkoph. 15th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

_____. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.

Bloesch, Donald. The Battle for the Trinity. Ann Arbor, MI: Vine/Servant, 1985.

_____. "Crisis in Biblical Authority." Theology Today, 35 (1978-1979), 455-62.

_____. God, Authority and Salvation. Vol I, Essentials of Evangelical Theology. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.

_____. Holy Scripture. Christian Foundations. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994.

_____. "The Sword of the Spirit: The Meaning of Inspiration." Reformed Review, 33 (1980), 65-72.

Blomberg, Craig L. "New Testament Genre Criticism for the 1990s." Themelios, 15 (1990), 40-49.

Blum, Edwin A. "2 Peter." Vol. 12, The Expositor's Bible Commentary. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981, 255-89.

Bock, Darrell L. "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New, Part 1." Bibliotheca Sacra, 142 (1985), 209-33.

Boobyer, G. H. "II Peter." Peake's Commentary on the Bible. ed. Matthew Black. 1962; rpt. [n. p.]: Nelson, 1976.

Boys-Smith, E. P. "'Interpretation' or 'Revealment' (II)." Expository Times, ed. James Hastings. VIII, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, (October, 1896-September, 1897), 331-32.

Bradley, James E., and Richard A. Muller, eds. Church, Word, and Spirit. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Brandt, Wilhelm. Das anvertraute Gut. Die urchristliche Botschaft. ed. Otto Schmitz. Hamburg: Furche, [1959].

Brown, Raymond E., and Sandra S. Schneiders. "Hermeneutics." The New Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990, 1146-65.

Brown, Ernest Faulkner. The Pastoral Epistles. London: Methuen, 1917.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. trans. Edward Robinson. [n.d.]; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.

Brox, Norbert. Die Pastoralbriefe. 7/2, Regensburger Neues Testament. ed. Otto Kuss. 4th ed. Regensburg: Pustet, 1969.

Bruce, F. F. "Interpretation of the Bible." Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

_____. New Testament History. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980.

Bubner, R., et al., eds. Hermeneutik und Dialektik. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr, 1970.

Buck, Carl Darling. A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in Principal Indo-European Languages. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1949

Buis, Harry. "The Significance of II Timothy 3:16 and II Peter 1:21." Reformed Review, 14/3 (1961), 43-49.

_____. rev. of Paul K. Jewett. God, Creation, and Revelation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, Reformed Review, 46 (1992), 65-66.

Bulick, Thomas F. rev. of Edward W. Goodrick. Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God. Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1988. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 35 (1992), 240-41.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. trans. Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribner's, 1955.

Burgon, John William. Inspiration and Interpretation. Oxford: Parker, 1861.

Burtchaell, James Tunstead. Catholic Theories of Biblical Inspiration Since 1810. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1969.

Bush, Russ L., and Tom J. Nettles. Baptists and the Bible. Chicago: Moody, 1980.

Buswell, James Oliver. A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962

Buttmann, Alexander. A Grammar of the New Testament Greek. Andover: Draper, 1878.

Caemmerer, Ricahrd R. "The Educational Use of Scripture in Light of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit." Concordia Theological Monthy, 28 (1957), 211-19.

Cahill, Joseph, P. rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963. The Evangelical Quarterly, 48 (1976), 170-72.

Caird, G. B. The Language and Imagery of the Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.

Calvin, Jehan (John). Commentaires de Jehan Calvin sur le Nouveau Testament. 4 vols. Paris: Meyrueis, 1855.

_____. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians. Vol. 8, Calvin's Commentaries [New Testament]. trans. Ross Mackenzie. eds. David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.

_____. L'institution chrétienne. 2 vols. [n.p.]: Kerygma/Farel, 1978.

Campbell, Ernest R. Second Timothy. Silverton, OR: Canyonview, 1983.

Carson, D. A. The Gagging of God. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

_____. "Three Books on the Bible: A Critical Review." rev. of William J. Abraham. The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 26 (1983), 337-47.

_____, ed. Biblical Interpretation and the Church. Nashville: Nelson, 1984.

_____, Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris. An Introduction to the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

_____, and John Woodbridge, eds. Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1986.

_____, and John Woodbridge, eds. Scripture and Truth. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983

Carter, Charles, W., ed. A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Asbury/Zondervan, 1983.

Caulley, Thomas Scott. "Holy Spirit." Evangelical Dictionary of the Bible. ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, pp. 521-27.

_____. "The Idea of Inspiration in 2 Peter 1:16-21." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Evangelisch-theologischen Fakultät an der Eberhard-Karls-Universität, Tübingen, 1982.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry. Systematic Theology. 8 vols. Dallas: Dallas Seminary, 1947.

Chaine Joseph. Les épîtres catholiques. Paris: Gabalda, 1939.

Chase, F. H. "Jude." A Dictionary of the Bible. ed. James Hastings. New York: Scribner's, 1902, II, 799-806.

_____. "Peter, Second Epistle of." A Dictionary of the Bible. ed. James A. Hastings. New York: Scribner's, 1908, III, 796-818.

Childs, Brevard S. The New Testament as Canon. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Clapp, Philip S., Barbra Freiberg, and Timothy Freiberg. Analytical Concordance of the Greek New Testament. 2 vols. Baker's Greek New Testament Library. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991.

Clark, Gordon. "Beegle on the Bible: A Review Article." rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 29 (1977), 265-86.

_____. The Pastoral Epistles. Jefferson, MD: Trinity, 1983.

Clément d'Alexandrie. Le protreptique. trans. Claude Mondésert. Sources chrétiennes, no 2. eds. H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou. 2d ed. Paris: Cerf, 1949.

_____. Les stromates. trans. Marcel Castor: Sources chrétiennes, no. 30. eds. H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou. 2d ed. Paris: Cerf, 1951.

Clément de Rome. Épître aux Corinthiens. trans. Annie Jaubert. Sources chrétiennes, no. 167. ed. C. Mondésert. Paris: Cerf, 1971.

Collins, John J. "Sibylline Oracles." The Anchor Bible Dictionary. ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, VI, 2-6.

Collins, Raymond F. "Exegesis." A New Dictionary of Christian Theology. eds. Alan Richardson and John Bowden. London: SCM, 1983, 197-201.

_____. "Inspiration." The New Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990, 1023-33.

_____. Introduction to the New Testament. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.

Cook, Donald E. "Scripture and Inspiration: 2 Timothy 3:14-17." Faith and Mission, 1 (1984), 56-61.

Cook, Matthew A. rev. of Paul K. Jewett. God, Creation, and Revelation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991. Trinity Journal, 13 (1992), 225-29.

Cotterell, Peter, and Max Turner. Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation. London: SPCK, 1989.

Cox, S. "From Starlight to Sunlight." The Expositor, ed. Samuel Cox. I, London: Higham, (1885), 169-85.

Cranfield, C. E. B. I & II Peter and Jude. Torch Bible Commentaries. eds. John Marsh and Canon Alan Richardson. London: SCM, 1960.

Cremer, Hermann. Biblico-Theological Lexicon. trans. D. W. Simon and William Urwick. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872.

_____. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. 4th English ed. trans. William Urwick. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.

_____. Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch des Neutestamentlichen

Griechisch. Gotha: Perthes, 1866.

_____. Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch. ed. Julius Kögel. 11th ed. Stuttgart: Perthes, 1923.

_____. "Inspiration." Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. ed. Albert Hauck. 3rd ed. Graz: Akademische, 1970, 9, 183-203.

Croatto, J. Severino. Biblical Hermeneutics. trans. Robert R. Barr. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.

Curran, John T. "The Teaching of II Peter 1:20." Theological Studies, 4 (1943), 347-68.

Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. A Manuel Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: Macmillian, 1957.

Debrunner, A., et al. "λέγω." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. and ed., Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1967, VI, 69-192.

_____, et al. "λέγω." Vol. VI, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], 69-197.

Deissmann, Adolf G. Bibelstudien. Marburg: Elwert, 1895.

_____. Licht vom Osten. Tübingen: Mohr, 1923

Denniston, J. D. The Greek Particle. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.

Dibelius, Martin. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus I/II, an Titus. 3/2, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübnigen: Mohr, 1913.

_____, and Hans Conzelmann. Die Pastoralbriefe. Vol. 13, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Günther Bornkamm. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1966.

_____, and H. Conzelmann. The Pastoral Epistles. Hermenia. trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

Dockery, David S. "Millard J. Erickson: Baptist and Evangelical Theologian." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 32 (1989), 519-32.

Donelson, Lewis R. Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.

Donner, Herbert, Robert Hanhart, and Rudolf Smend, eds. Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977.

Earle, Ralph. "Further Thoughts on Biblical Inspiration." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 6 (1963), 7-17.

_____. "2 Timothy." Vol. 11, The Expositor's Bible Commentary. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967, 391-418.

Easton, Burton Scott. The Pastoral Epistles. New York: Scribner's, 1947.

Edwards, B. B. "The Genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles." Bibliotheca Sacra, 1851; rpt. 150 (1993), 131-39.

Eichler, J, et al. "Possessions, Treasure, Mammon, Wealth, Money" The International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976, II, 829-53.

Ellicott, Charles J. A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Andover: Draper, 1865.

Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.

Elliott, J. K. The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Studies and Documents. ed. Jacob Geerllings. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1986.

Ellis, E. Earle. The Gospel of Luke. New Century Bible Commentary. eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. Grand Rapids/London: Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1981.

Elwell, Walter A, ed. Handbook of Evangelical Theologians. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.

English Hexapla. London: Bagster, 1841.

Erickson, Millard, J. Christian Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.

_____. Evangelical Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.

_____. "A New Look at Various Aspects of Inspiration." Bethel Seminary Journal, 25/1 (1966), 16-26.

Fairbairn, Patrick. The Pastoral Epistles. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1874.

Falconer, Robert. The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1937.

Farkasfalvy, Denis. "The Ecclesial Setting of Pseudepigraphy in Second Peter." The Second Century, 5 (1985-86), 3-29.

Farmer, W. R., C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr, eds. Christian History and Interpretation. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1967.

Farrar, Frederic W. The History of Interpretation. 1886; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961.

Farrow, Dougals. The Word of Truth and Disputes about Words. Winona Lake, IN: Carpenter, 1987.

Fausset, A. R. "I Corinthians-Revelation." Vol. VI, A Commentary: Critical, Experimental and Practical. eds. Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, David Brown. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.

Fee, Gordon D. God's Empowering Presence. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

_____. New Testament Exegesis. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983.

_____. 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus. The New International Biblical Commentary. ed. W. Ward Gasque. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

Ferguson, Duncan S. Biblical Hermeneutics. Atlanta: Knox, 1986.

Filson, Floyd V. "More Bodmer Papyri." The Biblical Archaeologist, 25 (1964), 50-57.

Fiore, Benjamin. The Function of Personal Example in the Socractic and Pastoral Epistles. Analecta Biblica, 105. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1986.

Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler. rev. of William J. Abraham. Divine Inspiration and the Limits of Historical Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University, 1982. Interpretation, 34 (1985), 97-98.

Fornberg, Tord. The Early Church in a Pluralistic Society. trans. Jean Gray.

Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series 9. [n.p.]: Gleerup, 1977.

Fronmüller, G. F. C. The Epistles of Peter. trans. J. Isidor Mombert. New York: Armstrong, 1873.

Fuchs, Eric, and Pierre Reymond. Le deuxième épître de Saint Pierre, l'épître de Saint Jude. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament. 2nd series, 13b. ed. J. Zumstein. 2d ed. Genève: Labor et Fides, 1988.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Truth and Method. eds. Garrett Barden and John Cummings. New York: Seabury, 1975.

_____. Wahrheit und Methode. 2d ed. Tübingen. Mohr, 1965.

Gaffin, Ricahrd, B., Jr. rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. Westminister Theological Journal, 27 (1964), 230.

Garrett, James Leo, Jr. Systematic Theology. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Gasque, Ward, and William Sanford LaSor, eds. Scripture, Tradition, and Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Gealey, Fred D. "The First and Second Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus." The Interpreter's Bible. ed. George Arthur Buttrick. New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1955, XI, 341-551.

Gehart, Mary. "Generic Studies: Their Renewed Importance in Religious and Literary Interpretation." Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 45 (1977), 311-17.

Geisler, Norman L. Inerrancy. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.

George, Timothy, and David S. Dockery, eds. Baptist Theologians. Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1990.

Gibson, Arthur. Biblical Semantic Logic. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

Glare, P. G. W. Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

Gnuse, Robert. The Authority of the Bible. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1985.

Goodrick, Edward W. Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God? Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1988.

_____. "Let's Put 2 Timothy 3:16 Back in the Bible." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 25 (1982), 479-87.

Grant, Robert, and David Tracy. A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Grayston, K., and G. Herdan. "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics." New Testament Studies, 6 (1959-1960), 1-15.

Green, E. M. B. 2 Peter Reconsidered. London: Tyndale, 1961.

Green, Michael. The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. ed. R. V. G. Tasker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Green, Samuel G. Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek New Testament. revised ed. London: Religious Tract, 1904.

Greidanus, Sidney. The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. The Oxyrhychus Papyri. London: Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1898-.

_____. The Tebtunis Papyri, Part II. London: Frowde, 1907.

Grenz, Stanley. Revisioning Evangelical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.

Griffith, Frank L. "The Meaning and Extent of Inspiration in II Timothy 3:16." Unpublished M.A.B.S. thesis. Talbot Theological Seminary, La Mirada, CA, 1980.

Grove, Philip Babcock, ed. Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield, MA: Merriam, 1976.

Grundmann, Walter. Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus. Vol. 15, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. ed. Erich Fascher. Berlin: Evangelische, 1974.

Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction. 4th ed. Leicester/Downers Grove, IL: Apollos/InterVarsity, 1990.

_____. New Testament Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1981.

_____. The Pastoral Epistles. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. ed. R. V. G. Tasker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

_____. "The Pastoral Letters." New Bible Commentary. eds. D. A. Carson, et al. 4th ed., revised. Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1994.

Hannah, John, ed. Inerrancy and the Church. Chicago: Moody, 1984.

Hanson, A. T. The Pastoral Epistles. New Century Bible. eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

_____. The Pastoral Letters. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. eds. P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney, J. W. Packer. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1966.

_____. Studies in the Pastoral Epistles. London: S. P. C. K., 1968.

Harrison, P. N. "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered: III. The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." Expository Times, 67 (1955-1956), 77-81.

_____. The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles. London: Oxford, 1921.

Harvey, H. Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Philadelphia: American Baptist, 1890.

Hasler, Victor. Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Zürcher Bibelkommentare. eds. Georg Fohrer, Hans Heinrich Schmid, and Siegfried Schulz. Zürich: Theologischer, 1978.

Hasse, Wolfgang, and Hildegard Temporini, eds. Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. Part II, Principat, 25/2. Berlin: Gruyter, 1988.

Hayes, John H., and Carl R. Holladay. Biblical Exegesis. Atlanta: Knox, 1982.

Hendriksen, William. I and II Timothy and Titus. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957.

Henry, Carl F. H. Confessions of a Theologian. Waco, TX: Word, 1986.

_____. "The Cultural Relativizing of Revelation." rev. of Charles H. Kraft. Christanity in Culture. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979. Trinity Journal, NS I (1980), 153-64.

_____. God, Revelation and Authority. 6 vols. Waco, TX: Word, 1976-1983.

_____. "Yea, Hath God Said . . . ?" rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. Christianity Today, 7 (1963), 1070-71.

_____, ed. Revelation and the Bible. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958.

Herodotus. Herodotus. 4 vols. trans. A. D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library. ed. E. H. Warmington. London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1969-1975.

Hiebert, D. Edmond. Introduction to the New Testament. 3 vols. revised ed. Chicago: Moody, 1977.

_____. "The Prophetic Foundation for the Christian Life: An Exposition of 2 Peter 1:19-21." Bibliotheca Sacra, 141 (1984), 158-68.

_____. Second Peter and Jude. Greenville, SC: Unusual, 1989.

Hillyer, Norman. 1 and 2 Peter, Jude. New International Biblical Commentary. ed. W. Ward Gasque. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. Validity in Interpretation. New York: Yale, 1967.

_____. The Aims of Interpretation. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1976.

Hodge, Archibald A., and Benjamin B. Warfield. Inspiration. 1881; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Hodge, Charles. Systmatic Theology. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, [n.d.].

Hodges, Louis Igou. "Evangelical Definitions of Inspiration: Critiques and a Suggested Definition." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 37 (1994), 99-114.

Hoekema, Anthony A. rev. of Donald G Bloesch. God, Authority and Salvation. Vol I, Essentials of Evangelical Theology. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978. Calvin Theological Journal, 14 (1979), 85-86.

Hoffman, Thomas A. "Inspiration, Normativeness, Canonicity, and the Unique Sacred Character of Bible." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 44 (1982), 447-69.

Holden, J. L. The Pastoral Epistles. The Pelican New Testament Commentaries. Harmondsworth: Peguin, 1976.

Holtz, Gottfried. Die Pastoralbriefe. Vol. 13, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. ed. Erich Fascher. Berlin: Evangelische, 1972.

Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius. Die Pastoralbriefe. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1880.

Holy Bible. New English Bible. [n.p.]: Oxford University/Cambridge University, 1970.

Holy Bible. New Revised Standard Version. New York/Oxford: Oxford University, 1989.

Holy Bible. Old and New Testaments in the King James Version. reference ed. Nashville: Nelson, 1976.

Holy Bible. The Revised English Bible. Oxford/Cambridge: Oxford University/Cambridge University, 1989.

Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Nelson, Old Testament, 1953, New Testament, 1946.

Hooker, Mona, and Colin Hickling, eds. What about the New Testament?

London: SCM, 1975.

Homer. Illiade. 4 vols. trans. Paul Mazon. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1937-1938.

_____. The Odyssey. 2 vols. trans. A. T. Murray. rev. George E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library. ed. G. P. Goold. London/Cambridge: Harvard, 1995.

Horn, F. W. "Holy Spirit." The Anchor Bible. ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, III, 260-80.

Hort, John Fenton Anthony. Judaistic Christianity. London: Macmillian, 1904.

Horton, R. F. The Pastoral Epistles. The Century Bible. ed. W. F. Adeney. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.

House, Wayne H. "Biblical Inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16." Bibliotheca Sacra, 137 (1980), 54-63.

Hübner, H. "γραφή." Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament. eds. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990, I, 260-64.

Hughes, Phillip Edgcumbe, ed. Creative Minds in Contemporary Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.

Hughes, Robert J. "An Inductive Inquiry into the Biblical Doctrine of the Inspiration of Scripture." Unpublished M.Th. thesis. Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, 1958.

Hultgren, Arland J. I-II Timothy, Titus. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Humphreys, A. E. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus. The Cambridge Bible. ed. J. J. S. Perowne. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1897.

Huther, J. E. The Epistles of Peter and Jude. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. ed. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. trans. D. B. Croom, Paton J. Gloag. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1893.

_____. Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über den 1. Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas und den 2. Brief des Petrus. Vol. 12, Das Neue Testament. Griechisch. ed. Heinr. Aug. Wilh. Meyer. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1852.

_____. Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Das Neue Testament Griechisch. ed. Heinr. Aug. Wilh. Meyer. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1847.

_____. The Pastoral Epistles. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. ed. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. trans. David Hunter. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1881.

Inch, Morris, and Ronald Youngblood, eds. The Living and Active Word of God. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbranus, 1983.

James, Montague Rhodes, ed. The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude. Cambridge Greek Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge Universtiy, 1912.

Jeanrond, Werner G. "Hermeneutics." The New Dictionary of Theology. eds.

Joseph A. Komonchak, Mary Collins and Dermont A. Lane. Collegeville, MI: Liturgical, 1991, 462-64.

Jenkins, Claude. "Origen on 1 Corinthiens, IV." Journal of Theological Studies, 10 (1909), 29-51.

Jeremias, Joachim. "ἄνθρωπος." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, I, 364-66.

_____. "ἄνθρωπος." Vol. I, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament ed. Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955, 365-67.

_____. "Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus." Vol. 9, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Der Brief an die Hebräer. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. ed. Gerhard Friedrich. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Jewett, Paul K. God, Creation, and Revelation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

_____. "Holy Spirit." The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible. ed. Merrill C. Tenny. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976, III, 183-96.

Johnson, Elliott E. Expository Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.

Johnson, Luke Tiimothy. The Gospel of Luke. Vol. 3, Sacra Pagina. ed. Daniel J. Harrington. Collgeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991.

_____. The Writings of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Johnston, Robert K. Evangelicals at an Impasse. Atlanta: Knox, 1979.

Josephus, Flavius. Opera. 7 vols. ed. Benedictus Niese. 2d ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1955.

Juhl, P. D. Interpretation. Princeton, NJ: Princeton, 1980.

Justin (Saint). Apologies. trans. André Wartelle. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1987.

Kaiser, Otto, and Werner Georg Kümmel. Exegetical Method. trans. E. V. N. Goetchius. New York: Seabury, 1967.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. Toward an Exegetical Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

Kamlah, E., J. D. G. Dunn, Colin Brown. "Spirit, Holy Spirit." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978, III, 689-706.

Karris, Robert J. "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles." Journal of Biblical Literature, 92 (1973), 549-64.

_____. The Pastoral Epistles. Vol. 17, New Testament Message. eds. Wilfrid Harrington and Donald Senior. Wilmington, DL: Glazier, 1979.

Käsemann, Ernst. Essays in New Testament Themes. trans. W. J. Montague. Phildadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Kearley, F. Furman, Edward P. Myers and Timothy D. Hadley, eds. Biblical Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.

Keck, L. E., and G. M. Tucker. "Exegesis." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the

Bible. supplementary volume. ed. Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976, 296-303.

Kelley, Page H. rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963. Review and Expositor, 71 (1974), 540-41.

Kelly, J. N. D. A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. ed. Henry Chadwick. 1969; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

_____. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Black's New Testament Commentaries. ed. Henry Chadwick. London: Black, 1963.

King, Marchant. "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript." Bibliotheca Sacra, 121 (1964), 54-56.

Kistemaker, Simon J. Exposition of the Epistles of Peter and the Epistle of Jude. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.

Klein, William W., Craig L. Blomberg and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. An Introduction to Biblical Interpretation. Dallas: Word, 1993.

Kleinknecht, Hermann, et al. "πνεῦμα." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich. trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968, VI, 332-455.

_____. "πνεῦμα." Vol. VI, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], pp. 330-453

Klinger, Jerzy. "The Second Epistle of Peter: An Essay in Understanding." St. Vladmir's Theological Quarterly, 17 (1973), 152-69.

Knight, George W., III. The Pastoral Epistles. New International Greek Commentary. eds. W. Ward Gasque and I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Knoch, Otto. Der Erste und Zweite Petrusbrief, Der Judasbrief. Regensburger Neues Testament. eds. Jost Eckert and Otto Knoch. Regensburg: Pustet, 1990.

Kraft, Charles H. Christanity in Culture. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979.

Krämer, Helmut, et al. "προφήτης." The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich. trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968, VI, 781-861.

_____. "προφήτης." Vol. VI, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], 781-863.

Kubo, Sakae. p72 and the Codex Vaticanus. Vol. 27, Studies and Documents. ed. Jacob Geerlings. Salt Lake: University of Utah, 1965.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 17 ed. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973.

_____. Introduction to the New Testament. revised ed. trans. Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.

_____. The New Testament. trans. S. McLean Gilmour and Howard C.

Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.

Lake, Kirsopp, trans. The Apostolic Fathers. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. ed. G. P. Goold. Cambridge/London: Harvard/Heinemann, 1985.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.

Lategan, Bernard C. "Hermeneutics." The Anchor Bible Commentary. ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, III, 149-54

Lea, Thomas, and Hayne P. Griffin, Jr. 1, 2 Timothy, Titus. Vol. 34, The New American Commentary. ed. David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.

Leahy, Thomas W. "The Second Epistle of Peter." The Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968, pp. 494-98.

Leaney, A. R. C. The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. London: SCM, 1960.

Lehmann, Karl. "Hermeneutics." Sacramentum Mundi. ed. Karl Rahner. London/New York: Burns and Oates/ Herder and Herder, 1966, III, 23-27.

Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1966.

Lewis, Gordon R., and Bruce Demarest, eds. Challenges to Inerrancy. Chicago: Moody, 1984.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. rev. Henry Stuart Jones. New York/Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

_____. An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1889.

Lightfoot, Joseph. Biblical Essays. 2d ed. London/New York: MacMillan, 1904.

_____. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians. [n.d.]; rpt. 3d ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962.

Lightner, Robert P. rev. of Edward W. Goodrick. Is My Bible the Inspired Word of God? Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1988. Bibliotheca Sacra, 146 (1989), 459.

Lilley, J. P. The Pastoral Epistles. Handbook for Bible Classes. eds. Marcus Dodd and Alexander Whyte. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.

Lindsell, Harold. The Battle for the Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Lints, Richard. The Fabric of Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Lock, Walter. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. The International Critical Commentary. eds. Alfred Plummer, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.

Longenecker, Richard N., and Merrill C. Tenny, eds. New Dimensions in New Testament Study. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

Louw, Johannes K., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. 2 vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.

Louw, J. P. Semantics of New Testament Greek. ed. Dan O. Via, Jr. The Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies. Philadelphia: Fortress,

1982.

Lugt, Gerrit, T. "An Incorrect Use of Induction." rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. Interpretation, 28 (1964), 92-97.

Luther, Martin. Die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch. 2 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.

Lumby, J. Rawson. The Epistles of St. Peter. The Expostior's Bible. ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. New York: Doran, [n.d.].

Malherbe, J. Moral Exhortation, A Greco-Roman Sourcebook. Library of Early Christinaity. ed. Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

Margot, Jean-Claude. Les épîtres de Pierre. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1960.

Marsden, George M. Reforming Fundamentalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Marshall, I. Howard. The Gospel of Luke. International Greek Commentary. eds. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.

_____, ed. New Testament Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Martin, R. P. "Early Catholicism." Dictionary of Paul and His Letters. eds. Gerald F. Hawthrone and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1993, 223-225.

Mayer, R., and C. Brown. "Scripture, Writing." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978, III, 482-97.

Mayor, Joseph B. The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter. 1907; rpt. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1978.

McDonald, H. D. "Bible, Authority of." Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984, pp. 138-40.

_____. Theories of Revelation. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

McGrath, Alister. Christian Theology. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

_____. Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995.

McGonigal, Terrence P. "'Every Scripture is Inspired': An Exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16-17." Studia Biblia et Theologica, 8 (1978), 53-64.

McKim, Donald K. A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

_____. "Reaffirming Revelation." rev. of William J. Abraham. Divine Inspiration and the Limites of Historical Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University, 1982. The Reformed Journal, 33/12 (December, 1983), 23-24.

_____, ed. The Authoritative Word. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

McNab, Andrew. "II Peter." The New Bible Commentary. ed. R. Davidson. 1953; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.

Meinertz, Max. Die Pastoralbriefe. Vol. 8, Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testamentes. ed. Fritz Tillmann. 5th ed. Bonn: Hanstein, 1931.

Metzger, Bruce M. Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek. Princeton: Metzger, 1971.

_____. "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." Expository Times, 70 (1958-1959), 91-94.

_____. The Text of the New Testament. 3d ed. New York: Oxford, 1992.

_____. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. 3d ed. London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975.

Michaelson, S., and A. Q. Morton. "Last Words: A Test of Authorship for Greek Writers." New Testament Studies, 18 (1972), 192-208.

Mickelsen, A. Berkeley. Interpreting the Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.

Miller, Ed. L. "Plenary Inspiration and II Timothy 3:16." Lutheran Quarterly, 17 (1965), 56-62.

Moellering, H. Armin. 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis/London: Concordia, 1970.

Moffatt, James. The General Epistles: James, Peter and Jude. New York: Harper, [n. d.].

Molland, Einar. "La thèse «La prophétie n'est jamais venue de la volonté de l'homme» (2 Pierre 1,21) et les Pseudo-Clémentines." Studia Theologica, 9 (1955), 67-85.

Moule, C. F. D. Essays in New Testament Interpretation. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1982.

_____. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963.

Moule, H. C. G. The Second Epistle to Timothy. Philadelphia; Union, 1905.

Moulton, Harold K. The Challenge of the Concordance. 1977; rpt. Greenwood, SC: Attic, [n.d.].

Moulton, James Hope. Prolegomena. ed. James Hope Moulton. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. 3rd ed. 1908; rpt. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919.

_____. A Treatise of the Grammar of New Testament Greek. trans. W. F. Moulton. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882.

_____, and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek New Testament. 5th ed. revised H. K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.

Muller, D. "Will, Purpose." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978, III, 1015-23.

Mullins, E. Y. "Holy Spirit." International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. ed. James Orr. 1929; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, III, 1406-17.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "2 Timothy Contrasted with 1 Timothy and Titus." Revue Biblique, 98 (1991), 403-18.

Mussner, Franz. Histoire de l'Herméneutique. Histoire des Dogmes. Vol. I, Les fondements de la foi. trad. T. Nieberding and M. Massart. Paris: Cerf, 1972.

Nestle, Eberhard, et al., eds. Novum Testamentum Graece. 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.

Neumann, Kenneth J. The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, No. 120. eds. David L. Peterson and Charles Talbert. Atlanta: Scholars, 1990.

Newman, John Henry. The Theological Papers of John Henry Newman on Biblical Inspiration and Infallibility. ed. J. Derek Holmes. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Apologetic Use of the Transfiguration in 2 Peter 1:16-21." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 42 (1980), 504-19.

_____. First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus, James, First Peter, Second Peter, Jude. Vol. 9, Collegeville Bible Commentary. ed. Robert J. Karris. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1983.

_____. "The Second Epistle of Peter." The New Jerome Biblical Commentary. eds. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990, 1017-22.

_____. 2 Peter, Jude. Vol. 37C, The Anchor Bible. eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Nicole, Roger. rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. The Gordon Review, 8 (1964-1965), 93-109.

Noll, Mark A., ed. The Princeton Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.

Oden, Thomas. First and Second Timothy and Titus. Interpretation. ed. James Luther Mays. Louisville, KN: Knox, 1989.

_____. Systematic Theology. 3 vols. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987-1992.

Origène. Commentaire sur Saint Jean. 4 vols. trans. Cécile Blanc. Sources chrétiennes, nos. 120, 157, 222, 290. ed. C. Mondésert. Paris: Cerf, 1966-1982.

_____. Contre Celse. 5 vols. trans. Marcel Borret. Sources chrétiennes nos. 132, 136, 147, 150, 227. ed. C. Mondésert. Paris: Cerf, 1967-1976.

_____. Philocalie, 1-20 sur les Écritures. trans. Marguerite Harl. Sources chrétiennes, no. 302. ed. C. Mondésert. Paris : Cerf, 1983.

Osborne, Grant R. "Genre Criticism-Sensus Literalis." Trinity Journal, NS 4/2 (1983), 1-27.

_____. The Hermeneutical Spiral. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991.

Oswalt, John N. rev. of William J. Abraham. The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981. The Asbury Seminarian, 37 (1982), 47-50.

O'Rourke, Jon J. "Some Considerations About Attempts at Statistical Analysis of the Pauline Corpus." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 35 (1973), 483-90.

Palmer, Richard E. Hermeneutics. Northwestern University Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philospphy. ed. James Wild. Evanston: Northwestern, 1969.

Parkinson, G. H. R., ed. The Theory of Meaning. London: Oxford, 1968.

Parry, R. St. John. The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1920.

Patterson, Bob. E. Carl F. H. Henry. Waco, TX: Word, 1983.

Paulsen, Henning. Der Zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief. Vol. 12/2, Kritisch-exegetisher Kommentar über das Neue Testament. ed. Ferdinand Hahn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

Payne, J. Barton. "רדה." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. ed. R. Laird Harris. Chicago: Moody, 1980, II, 836-37.

Perrin, Norman. The New Testament. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974.

Philo. Philo. 10 vols. trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library. eds. E. Capps, et al. London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1949-1962.

Pierard, Richard V. "Evangelicalism." New 20th-Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. ed. J. D. Dougals. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, pp. 311-13.

Pillon, Alexandre. Handbook of Greek Synonyms. ed. Thomas Kerchever Arnold. London: Rivingtons, 1850.

Pindare. Oeuvres. 4 vols. trans. Aimé Puech. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1922-1923.

_____. The Odes of Pindar. trans. John Sandys. Loeb Classical Library. eds. E. Capps, T. E. Page, W. H. D. Rouse. London/New York: Heinemann/Putnam, 1927.

Piñero, Antonio. "Sobre El Sentido de θεόπνευστος: 2 Tim 3,16." Filologia Neotestamentaria, 1 (1989), 143-153.

Pinnock, Clark H. The Scripture Principle. San Franciso: Harper and Row, 1984.

_____, and Robert C. Brow. Unbounded Love. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994.

Plato. Plato, I. trans. Harold North Flower. eds. I. A. Post and E. H. Warmington. London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1953.

Plummer, Alfred. The Pastoral Epistles. New York: Armstrong, 1893.

Plumptre, E. H. The General Epistles of St. Peter & St. Jude. The Cambridge Bible. ed. J. J. S. Perowne. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1889.

Pollock, John C. "Graham "Billy" (William Franklin)." New International Dictionary of the Christian Church. ed. J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, 427.

Powell, Peter R., Jr. rev. William J. Abraham. Divine Inspiration and the Limits of Historical Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University, 1982. Christian Century, 100 (1983), 464-65.

Poythress, Vern S. "Analyzing a Biblical Text: Some Important Linguisitc Distinctions." Scottish Journal of Theology, 32 (1979), 113-37.

Procksch, O., and F. Büchsel. "λύω." Theological Dictionary of the New

Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967, IV, 328-56.

_____. "λύω." Vol. IV, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, [n.d.], 329-59.

Quinn, Jerome D. "'Parenesis and the Pastoral Epistles: Lexical Observations Bearing on the Nature of the Sub-Genre and Soundings of Its Role in Socialization and Liturgies." Semeia, 50 (1990), 189-210.

Radmacher, Earl D., and Robert D. Preus, eds. Hermenutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

_____, ed. Can We Trust the Bible? Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1979.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935.

Rahner, Karl, and Herbert Vorgrimler. "Exegesis." Dictionary of Theology. 2d ed. New York: Crossroads, 1981, 161-62.

_____. Inspiration in the Bible. trans. Charles H. Henkey. 2d ed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

Ramm, Bernard. Protestant Biblical Interpretation. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970.

Reck, Reinhold. "2 Tim 3,16 in der altkirchlichen Literatur: Eine wirkungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Locus classicus der Inspirationslehre." Wissenschaft und Weisheit, 53 (1990), 81-105.

Reese, James M. "Inspiration: Toward a Sociosemiotic Definition." Biblical Theology Bulletin, No. 21 (1991), 4-12.

Reicke, Bo. The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude. The Anchor Bible. eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964.

Reventlow, Henning Graf. Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century. trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Rian, Edwin, H. rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963. The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, NS 1 (1977), 83-85.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Certainty in Language." Philosophy Today, 17 (1973), 97-111.

_____. Interpretation Theory. Fort Worth: Texas Christian, 1976.

Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.

Roberts, J. W. "Note on the Adjective after πᾶς in 2 Timothy 3:16." Expository Times, 76 (1964-65), 359.

_____. "Every Scripture Inspired of God." Restoration Quarterly, 5 (1961), 33-37.

Robertson, Archibald Thomas. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament. 4th ed. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.

_____. Word Pictures in the New Testament. 6 vols. Nashville: Broadman, 1933.

Roennfeldt, Ray C. W. Clark Pinnock on Biblical Authority. Vol. 16, Andrews

University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1993.

Roetzel, Calvin J. The Lettters of Paul. 3d ed. Louisville, KN: Westminster/Knox, 1991.

Rogers, Jack B. "A Response." Theology Today, 37 (1981), 344-49.

_____, ed. Biblical Authority. Waco, TX: Word, 1977.

_____, and Donald B. McKim. The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1979.

Rossiter, Francis S. rev. of Dewey M. Beegle. The Inspiration of Scripture. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 25 (1963), 504.

Rotherham, Joseph Bryant, ed. The Emphasized Bible. Cincinnati: Standard, 1897.

Roux, Hebert. Les épîtres pastorales. Genève: Labor et Fides, 1959.

Ryrie, Charles Caldwell. rev. of William J. Abraham. The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Oxford: Oxford University, 1981. Bibliotheca Sacra, 139 (1982), 183-84.

_____, ed. The Ryrie Study Bible. New American Standard Translation. Chicago: Moody, 1978.

Sainte Bible (La). Nouvelle édition de Genève. [n.p.]: Société biblique de Genève, 1979.

Sanders, J. A. "Hermeneutics." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. supplementary volume. ed. Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976, 402-07.

Sanders, James A. "Canon., Hebrew Bible." The Anchor Bible Dictionary. ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 1, 837-852.

Scalise, Charles J. "The 'Sensus Literalis': A Hermeneutical Key to Biblical Exegesis." Scottish Journal of Theology, 42 (1989), 45-65.

Schlatter, A. Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1958.

Schmidt, Francis. Le testament grec d'Abraham. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.

Schneiders, Sandra M. "Faith, Hermeneutics, and the Literal Sense of Scripture." Theological Studies, 39 (1978), 719-36..

_____. The Revelatory Text. San Francisco: Harper, 1991.

Schrenk, Gottlob. "γράφω." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964, I, 742-73.

_____. "γράφω." Vol. I, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955, 742-773.

_____. "θέλω." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965, III, 44-62.

_____. "θέλω." Vol. III, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.

ed. Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938, 43-63.

_____. "ἱερός." The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965, III, 221-83.

_____. "ἱερός." Vol. III, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938, 221-84.

Schroeder, D. "Parenesis." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. supplementary volume. ed. Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976, 643.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. A Feminist Commentary. 2 vols. New York: Crossroads, 1994.

Scott, Julius J., Jr. "Literalism." Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 643-44.

Scott, E. F. The Pastoral Epistles. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. ed. James Moffatt. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.

Seebas, H., and C. Brown. "Holy, Consecrate, Sanctify, Saints, Devout." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976, II, 232-36.

Sheriffs, J. A. "A Note on a Verse in the New English Bible." Evangelical Quarterly, 24 (1962), 91-95.

Sidebottom, E. M., ed. James, Jude and 2 Peter. The New Century Bible. eds. H. H. Rowley, Matthew Black. new ed. [n. p.]: Nelson, 1967.

Silva, Moisés. Biblical Words and Their Meaning. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.

_____. God, Language and Scripture. Vol. 4, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.

Simpson, E. K. The Pastoral Epistles. London: Tyndale, 1954.

Simpson, J. A., and E. S. C. Weiner. The Oxford English Dictionary. 20 vols. 2d ed. Oxford/Toronto: Clarendon/Oxford University, 1989.

Smith, Terence V. Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity. 2/15, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. eds. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius. Tübingen, Mohr, 1985.

Sophocles, E. A. Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. 2 vols. New York: Ungar, [n.d.].

Spain, Carl. The Letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus. Austin, TX: Sweet, 1970.

Spence, R. M. "Private Interpretation." Expository Times, ed. James Hastings. VIII, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, (1896-1897), 285-86.

_____. "2 Timothy iii. 15, 16." Expository Times, ed. James Hastings. VIII, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, (1896-1897), 563-64.

Spicq, Ceslas. Lexique théologique du Nouveau Testament. Paris/Fribourg: Cerf/Éditions Universitaires, 1991.

_____. Les épîtres de Saint Pierre. Sources bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1966.

_____. Les épîtres Pastorales. 2 vols. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda

et Cle, 1969.

_____. Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire. 22, Orbis biblicus et orientalis. Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

_____. Theological Lexicon of the New Testament. ed. James D. Ernest. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994

Sproul, R. C. Explaining Inerrancy. Oakland, CA: International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1980.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. trans. John Marsh. London: SCM, 1955.

Stoger, Alois. The Second Epistle of Peter. New Testament for Spiritual Reading. ed. John L. McKenzie. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

Strabo. The Geography of Strabo. 8 vols. trans. Horace Leonard Jones. Loeb Classical Library. eds. E. Capps, et al. London/Cambridge: Heinemann/Harvard, 1949-1959.

Strachen, R. H. "The Second Epistle General of Peter." Vol V, The Expositor's Greek Testament. ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.

Stott, John R. W. Guard the Gospel. The Bible Speaks Today. ed. John R. W. Stott. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1973.

Stowers, Stanley, K. Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity. Library of Early Christianity. ed. Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

Strong, Augustus Hopkins. Systematic Theology. Valley Forge, PA: Judson, 1907.

Stuart, Douglas. "Exegesis." The Anchor Bible Dictionary. ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, II, 682-88.

Terry, Milton S. Biblical Hermenutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, [n.d].

Testuz, Michel, ed. Papyrus Bodmer VII-XII. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmerians, 1959.

Thayer, Joseph Henry. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. corrected ed. New York: American, 1889.

Theophilus of Antioch. Ad Autolycum. trans. Robert M. Grant. Oxford Early Christian Texts. ed., Henry Chadwick. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.

Thiselton, Anthony C. New Horizons in Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

_____. "Hermeneutics." A New Dictionary of Theology. eds. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David E. Wright, and J. I. Packer. Downers Grover, IL: InterVarsity, 1988, pp. 293-97.

_____. The Two Horizons. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

_____. "Explain, Interpret, Tell, Narrative." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975, I, 573-84.

Thompson, J. E. H. "Apocalyptic Literature." International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. ed. James Orr. 1929; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, I, 161-78.

Towner, Philip H. 1-2 Timothy and Titus. The IVP New Testament Commentary

Series. ed. Grant R. Osborne. Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1994.

Trembath, Kern Robert. Divine Revelation. New York: Oxford, 1991.

_____. Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration. New York: Oxford, 1987.

Turner, Nigel. Syntax. ed. James Hope Moulton. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Vanhetloo, Warren. "Indications of Verbal Inspiration." Calvary Baptist Theological Journal, 5/1 (1989), 63-85.

Van Til, Cornelius. The Sovereignty of Grace. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1969.

Vawter, Bruce. Biblical Inspiration. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.

Verner, David C. The Household of God. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, No. 71. ed. William Baird. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983.

Vogels, Walter. "Inspiration in a Linguistic Mode." Biblical Theology Bulletin, 15 (1985), 87-93.

Vögtle, Anton. Der Judasbrief / Der 2 Petrusbrief. Vol. 22, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. eds. Norman Bronx, et al. Dûsseldorf/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1994.

von Allmen, J. J. Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne. Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1950.

Walvoord, John F., ed. Inspiration and Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

Wand, J. W. C., ed. The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. London: Methuen, 1934.

Ward, Ronald A. Commentary on 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus. Waco, TX: Word, 1974.

Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge. Critical Reviews. New York: Oxford University, 1932.

_____. "Inspiration." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, ed. James Orr. 1929; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1939, III, 1473-83.

_____. The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible. ed. Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1948.

_____. The Selected Shorter Writings of Benjamin B. Warfield. ed. John E. Meeter. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1973.

Watson, Duane Frederick. Invention, Arrangement, and Style. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, No. 104. eds. J. J. M. Roberts and Charles Talbert. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.

Webster, William. The Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek New Testament. London: Rivingtons, 1864.

Weiss, Bernhard. Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus. Vol. 11, Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. ed. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.

Weiss, Konrad. "φέρω." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. ed. Gerhard Friedrich. trans and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids:

Eerdmans, 1974, IX, 56-87.

_____. "φέρω." Vol. IX, <u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>. ed. Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973, 57-89.

Welleck, Rene, and Austin Warren. <u>Theory of Literature</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956.

White, John L. "Saint Paul and the Apostolic Letter Tradition." <u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>, 45 (1983), 433-44.

White, Newport, J. D. "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus." Vol. IV, <u>The Expositor's Greek New Testament</u>. ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. [n.d.]; rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Williams, J. Rodman. <u>Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective</u>. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988-92.

Wilmergin, H. "2 Peter." <u>A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture</u>. eds. Dom Bernard Orchard, et al. New York: Nelson, 1953, pp. 1181-84.

Winer, George Benedict. <u>A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament</u>. 7th ed. Gottlieb Lünemann. Andover: Draper, 1872.

Witting, Susan. "A Theory of Multiple Meanings." <u>Semeia</u>, 9 (1977), 75-101.

Wood, Leon J. <u>The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament</u>. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Woodbridge, John D. <u>Biblical Authority</u>. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.

_____. "Biblical Authority: Towards an Evaluation of the Rogers and McKim Proposal." <u>Trinity Journal</u>, NS I/2 (Fall, 1980), 165-236.

_____, and Thomas Edward McComiskey, eds. <u>Doing Theology in Today's World</u>. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.

Young, Edward J. "Scripture-God-Breathed and Profitable." <u>Grace Journal</u>, 7/3 (1966), 3-11.

_____. <u>Thy Word is Truth</u>. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

Young, Robert, ed. <u>Young's Literal Translation of the Holy Bible</u>. rev ed. Youngstown, OH: Schnell, 1953.

Zahn, Theodor. <u>Introduction to the New Tesament</u>. 3 vols. trans. John Moore Trout, et al. [n.d]; rpt. Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1977.