

INSPIRATION
AND
INCARNATION

*Evangelicals
and the Problem of the Old Testament*

SECOND EDITION

PETER ENNS


Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2005, 2015. Used by permission.

(Unpublished manuscript—copyright protected Baker Publishing Group)

© 2005, 2015 by Peter Enns

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287
www.bakeracademic.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Enns, Peter, 1961–

Inspiration and incarnation : evangelicals and the problem of the Old Testament / Peter Enns. — Second Edition.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8010-9748-5 (pbk.)

1. Bible. Old Testament—Evidences, authority, etc. 2. Bible. Old Testament—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 3. Evangelicalism. I. Title.

BS480.E56 2015

221.13—dc23

2015002055

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture quotations are from the Holy Bible, New International Version®. NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.™ Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide. www.zondervan.com

Scripture quotations from the Apocrypha are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

The illustration on page 43 is from Alan P. Dickin, *On a Faraway Day . . . : A New View of Genesis in Ancient Mesopotamia* (Columbus, GA: Brentwood Christian Press, 2002), 122. Used by permission of the author.

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2005, 2015. Used by permission.

(Unpublished manuscript—copyright protected Baker Publishing Group)

For Erich, Elizabeth, and Sophia
“That’s a really good question. . . .”

Contents

Preface to the Second Edition ix

Preface to the First Edition xiii

1. Getting Our Bearings 1

What I Hope to Accomplish in This Book • A Way toward Addressing the Problem: The Incarnational Analogy

2. The Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern Literature 13

The Impact of Akkadian Literature • Some Other Ancient Near Eastern Texts • What Exactly Is the Problem? • How Have These Issues Been Handled in the Past? • How Can We Think Differently through These Issues? • How Does This Affect Us?

3. The Old Testament and Theological Diversity 61

The Problem of Theological Diversity in the Old Testament • Diversity in Wisdom Literature • Diversity in Chronicles • Diversity in Law • God and Diversity • What Does Diversity Tell Us about Scripture?

4. The Old Testament and Its Interpretation in the New Testament 103

Do New Testament Authors Misuse the Old Testament? • Biblical Interpretation in the Second Temple Period • Apostolic Hermeneutics as a Second Temple Phenomenon: Interpretive Methods • Apostolic Hermeneutics as a Second Temple Phenomenon: Interpretive Traditions • What Makes Apostolic Hermeneutics Unique? • Should

We Handle the Old Testament the Way the Apostles Did? • What We Can Learn from Apostolic Hermeneutics

5. The Big Picture 157

What Is the Bible, and What Are We Supposed to Do with It? • Continuing the Conversation: Learning to Listen

Postscript 165

Glossary 181

Index of Scripture and Other Ancient Writings 195

Index of Subjects 199

Preface to the Second Edition

I am honored that Baker is releasing this tenth anniversary edition of *Inspiration and Incarnation*. This edition has some slight revisions, a modestly expanded bibliography, and a reflective postscript.

As for the revisions, they are slight indeed and are largely for clarification. I considered at one point doing a more substantive revision—adding examples, expanding and adjusting some arguments to reflect movement in my own thinking since the book came out—but decided against it. For one thing, in reading through the book cover to cover (for the first time in several years), I was struck—and pleased—by how much of the book has remained with me over the past decade. The themes and general approach to Scripture I take in *Inspiration and Incarnation* remain an important part of my thinking. Still, I am no longer exactly where I was when I first conceived of the book in 2001—which is to say I am human. No one’s thinking truly lies motionless for so many years, and so it stands to reason that I would write *Inspiration and Incarnation* somewhat differently today in midlife than I did when barely forty with children in grammar school.

I wrote *Inspiration and Incarnation* firmly and self-consciously in support of a “progressive inerrantist” or “genre inerrantist” point of view. Those who subscribe to this view affirm inerrancy in different ways, but they all agree that inerrancy is not to be equated with literalistic readings of Scripture. Rather it must be sensitive to ancient genres and ancient conventions of speech. In my own articulation of this progressive inerrantist view, I would stress that inerrancy is misconceived if it is used to delimit interpretive conclusions as a matter of a priori philosophical necessity, that is, coming to Scripture with thick interpretive boundaries already drawn. Instead, I would explain inerrancy as an expression of faith and trust in God, that *whatever* the Bible does,

no matter how it might or might not fit into preconceived categories, reflects the “free pleasure of God.”¹ Thus, things like historical inaccuracies, myth, and theological diversity in Scripture are not errors needing to be explained away or minimized but, paradoxically, embraced as divine wisdom. Inerrancy, in other words, entails accepting by faith the Bible that God has in fact seen fit to provide us, allowing the biblical phenomena to define the Bible’s own framework and for us to adjust our thinking accordingly.

I continue to believe that the Bible we have is the Bible God means for us to have, but I no longer use the term “inerrancy” to describe this phenomenon because the term has accumulated cultural baggage that it seems unable to throw off.² This shift in thinking would invariably result in my phrasing some things differently or making certain qualifications were I to write *Inspiration and Incarnation* today. But rather than revising the book to reflect this change, I felt (and Baker agreed) that leaving the book essentially as is was best. For one thing, the ideas expressed in *Inspiration and Incarnation* do not necessarily need to be understood within any sort of inerrantist framework, even though the book was written as an expression of progressive inerrancy. Progressive inerrantists and non-inerrantists can engage the book within either paradigm.³

But much more importantly, I am conscious that many readers over the years have been encouraged and helped by the book and its central theme—that a thoroughly encultured Bible, like a thoroughly encultured Jesus, is exactly what God has given the church and should therefore be embraced as is and engaged honestly and without apology (in both senses of the word). *Inspiration and Incarnation* has been used as an assigned text in many colleges and seminaries and used in churches to give faithful readers of Scripture spiritual space for thinking through some of the challenges of the study of Scripture in modern times. Perhaps the biggest challenge, especially for college and seminary students, is in seeing how firmly situated Scripture is in its varying

1. The quotation is from Herman Ridderbos: “[It] is not up to us, it is up to the free pleasure of God to decide what kind of effect divine inspiration should have in the mind, knowledge, memory, accuracy of those whom he has used in his service, in order that their word really can be accepted as the inspired Word of God. If we deny or ignore this, we dispose of the very nature of the Scriptures as the Word of God, and also of the nature of his authority and infallibility.” *Studies in Scripture and Its Authority* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 26.

2. I’ve written up some of my thoughts on inerrancy in greater detail than I can do here in “Inerrancy, However Defined, Does Not Describe What the Bible Does,” in *Five Views on Biblical Inerrancy*, ed. J. Merrick and Stephen M. Garrett (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013), 83–116.

3. Though “non-inerrantist” is a cumbersome double-negative antonym to “inerrantist,” I prefer it to “errantist.” Opposing “errancy” to inerrancy, as is often done, perpetuates the inerrantist rhetoric of presuming that “inerrancy” is the proper way to speak of Scripture. Those who are not inerrantists are doing much more theologically speaking than “pointing out errors.” They are calling into question why the matter is framed this way at all.

historical contexts, the study of which has been the core focus of modern biblical studies. Rather than supporting a suspicious or defensive posture, *Inspiration and Incarnation* has helped students resolve at least some tensions between their faith in God and modern scholarship by showing that many of the “problems” allegedly caused by the modern study of Scripture are really problems with faulty expectations of how the Bible “should” work perpetuated within evangelicalism.

For this reason I am eager to see the message and content of *Inspiration and Incarnation* remain as is and continue to help other readers who are currently processing their faith in similar ways. My hope now, as it was ten years ago, is that *Inspiration and Incarnation* can be of help and encouragement to these readers. The postscript will address various other matters concerning the book’s reception, some criticisms of it, and my continued hope for its future.

Peter Enns
September 3, 2014

Preface to the First Edition

The aim of this book is not novelty but synthesis. My focus is twofold: (1) to bring together a variety of data that biblical scholars work with every day for readers who do not have firsthand familiarity with these data and (2) to look at these data with a clear view toward discussing their implications for an evangelical doctrine of Scripture.

Although it is not always made explicit, in working through these issues I lean heavily on the work of many scholars, some of whom are listed in the “Further Reading” sections at the end of each chapter. Also influential has been my own theological tradition, represented by my colleagues at Westminster Theological Seminary, past and present, and the wider tradition of which that institution is a part. This is not to imply that I speak for that institution or tradition. Nevertheless, I am thankful for being part of such a solidly faithful group that does not shy away from some difficult yet basic questions and with whom I am able to have frank and open discussions. This does not happen at every institution, and I do not take that privilege for granted.

Biblical citations are quoted from the New International Version, except where noted. Apocryphal material (i.e., the Wisdom of Solomon in chap. 4) is quoted from the New Revised Standard Version. With the exception of the *Code of Hammurabi*, which is quoted from James Pritchard’s *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (though I have modernized it in places), the ancient Near Eastern texts in chapter 2 are quoted from *The Context of Scripture* by W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger. In chapter 4, the pseudepigraphal texts are quoted from James Charlesworth’s *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* and the Dead Sea Scrolls from G. Vermes’s *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Full bibliographic data for these works is given in the “Further Reading” sections at the end of the respective chapters.

Key terms and concepts, especially those that may be unfamiliar to the reader, are defined in the glossary and appear in boldface type on first mention in the text.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my editor, Jim Kinney, who has spent much time interacting with me on this project. My former student, Shannon Geiger, now a church planter in Dallas, Texas, spent many hours reading an earlier draft of this book and made numerous invaluable suggestions. This is a better book for her efforts.

I believe with all my heart that honesty with oneself is a central component to spiritual growth. God honors our honest questions. He is not surprised by them, nor is he ashamed to be our God when we pose them. He is our God, not because of the questions we ask (or refrain from asking), but because he has united us to the risen Christ. And being a part of God's family is ultimately a gift to us, not something to be obtained by us. God has freed us in Christ and made us his children. And, as all children do, we ask a lot of questions.

— 1 —

Getting Our Bearings

What I Hope to Accomplish in This Book

The purpose of this book is to bring an evangelical doctrine of Scripture into conversation with the implications generated by some important themes in modern biblical scholarship—particularly Old Testament scholarship—over the past 150 years. To put it this way is to suggest that such a conversation has not taken place, at least not to the degree that it could have. It is not to suggest, however, that evangelical biblical scholarship has not engaged many of these issues responsibly on an academic level. There is no question that evangelical scholars have made many excellent contributions, for example, in archeological, historical, and textual studies.

In my view, however, what is needed is not simply for evangelicals to work *in* these areas but to engage the *doctrinal implications* that work in these areas raises. Without wanting to overstate the matter, I know or hear of a fair number of Christians who conclude that the contemporary state of biblical scholarship makes an evangelical faith unviable. These are the primary readers I envision for this book, those who desire to maintain a vibrant and reverent doctrine of Scripture but who find it difficult to do so because they find familiar and conventional approaches to newer problems to be unhelpful.

On the one hand, I am very eager to affirm that many evangelical instincts are correct and should be maintained, for example, the conviction that the

Bible is ultimately from God and that it is God's gift to the church. Any theories concerning Scripture that do not arise from these fundamental instincts are unacceptable. On the other hand, how the evangelical church *fleshes out* its doctrine of Scripture will always have somewhat of a provisional quality to it. This is not to say that each generation must disregard the past and start afresh, formulating ever-new doctrines, bowing to all the latest fads. But it is to say that at such time when new evidence comes to light, or old evidence is seen in a new light, we must be willing to engage that evidence and adjust our doctrine accordingly.

Such adjustments do not simply represent recent developments. One need only think of Copernicus (1473–1543), the Polish astronomer who determined that the earth revolved around the sun, a heretical view at the time. The Catholic Church resisted this evidence for many years. (Galileo was imprisoned for it in 1633.) Eventually, however, the previously held “biblical” geocentric view was abandoned by the church. This is just one of many examples that could be given where evidence outside the Bible, in this case scientific evidence, affected how we view the Bible. Or to put it better, the scientific evidence showed us that the worldview of the biblical authors affected what they thought and wrote, and so the worldviews of the biblical authors must be taken into consideration in matters of biblical interpretation and formulating a doctrine of Scripture.

Reassessment of doctrine on the basis of external evidence, therefore, is nothing new. To state it differently, our topic is the age-old question of the relationship between **special revelation** (the Bible) and **general revelation** (creation, i.e., everything else). My concern is that, at least on a popular level, a defensive approach to the evidence tends to dominate the evangelical conversation. For recent generations of evangelicals, this tendency has its roots in certain developments that occurred in biblical scholarship during the nineteenth century and made headlines in the so-called modernist/fundamentalist controversies around the turn of the twentieth century (e.g., the Scopes monkey trial). The effects of these developments can still be felt today. Much of the evangelical theological landscape of the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries was dominated by a “battle for the Bible.” The terms are familiar: liberal vs. conservative, modernist vs. fundamentalist, mainline vs. evangelical, progressive vs. traditionalist. Such labels may serve some purpose, but they more often serve to entrench rather than enlighten.

I want to make it clear here at the outset that this book is not intended to solve “Bible difficulties” here and there, nor is it to perpetuate the debate by defending either side of the debate, nor even to find a middle way between them. My aim is somewhat more foundational while at the same time being far less ambitious. I want to contribute to a growing opinion that what is needed

is to move beyond both sides by thinking of better ways to account for some of the data, while at the same time having a vibrant, positive view of Scripture as God's word.¹ By focusing on three problems raised by the modern study of the Old Testament, my hope is to suggest ways in which our conversation can be shifted somewhat, so that what are often *perceived* as problems with the Old Testament are put into a different perspective. To put it another way, my aim is to allow the collective evidence to affect not just how we understand a biblical passage or story here and there within the parameters of earlier doctrinal formulations. Rather, I want to move beyond that by allowing the evidence to affect how we think about what Scripture as a whole *is*.

The end result, I truly hope, will be to provide a theological paradigm for people who know instinctively that the Bible is God's word but for whom reading the Bible has already become a serious theological problem—perhaps even a crisis. I have come across many Christians for whom this clash between the biblical world and the modern world is a very real issue. The Bible is central to their lives, but sometimes evangelical defenses of the Bible are exercises in special pleading, attempts to hold on to comfortable ideas despite evidence that makes such ideas problematic. It is precisely the ineffectiveness of certain ways of thinking about the Bible that can sometimes cause significant cognitive dissonance for Christians who love and want to hold on to their Bibles but who also feel the weight of certain kinds of evidence.

With this in mind, one of the central themes of this book is this:

The problems many of us feel regarding the Bible may have less to do with the Bible itself and more to do with our own preconceptions.

I have found again and again that listening to how the Bible itself behaves and suspending preconceived notions (as much as that is possible) about how we think the Bible ought to behave is refreshing, creative, exciting, and spiritually rewarding.

To work through this process, I want to focus on three issues that have not been handled well within evangelicalism (at least in America). These three issues are not based on fanciful, trendy theories but on evidence that comes from within the Bible itself as well as from the world surrounding the Bible.

1. *The Old Testament and other literature from the ancient world*: Why does the Bible in places look a lot like the literature of Israel's ancient neighbors? Is the Old Testament really that unique? Does it not just

1. I use the uppercase "Word" when speaking of Christ and the lowercase for speaking of Scripture.

reflect the ancient world in which it was produced? If the Bible is the word of God, why does it fit so nicely in the ancient world?

2. *Theological diversity in the Old Testament*: Why do different parts of the Old Testament say different things about the same thing? It really seems as if there are contradictions, or at least large differences of opinion, in the Old Testament.
3. *The way in which the New Testament authors handle the Old Testament*: Why do the New Testament authors handle the Old Testament in such odd ways? It looks like they just take the Old Testament passages out of context.

Each of these three points has its own chapter in this book. To those perhaps more familiar with biblical studies, the importance of these three issues will be immediately recognizable. The latter two problems are generated directly by the Bible itself. And for at least the first and last items, older approaches to the Bible do not always take the extrabiblical evidence into account. This is partly the case because these extrabiblical evidences have made their presence felt only over the past 150 years or so; older approaches to understanding the Bible were already well established before this evidence came to light.

Why these three issues? I could have brought others into the discussion or arranged the evidence in different ways, but I choose these three for what I think is a very good reason. Each of these issues, in its own way, presents challenges to traditional, evangelical views about Scripture.

The first issue deals with the Bible's *uniqueness*. It is a common expectation, often implicit, that for the Bible to be God's word, it should be unique, that is, it should not bear striking similarities to the literature of other ancient peoples.

The second concerns the Bible's *integrity*, its trustworthiness. It is a common expectation that the Bible be unified in its outlook, be free of diverse views, if we are being asked to trust it as God's word (does not God have just one opinion on things?).

The third deals with the Bible's *interpretation*. To modern readers, the New Testament authors sometimes seem to interpret the Old Testament in fanciful ways, seemingly unconcerned about the meaning of the Old Testament in its original context. This seems to make the whole issue of Old Testament interpretation highly subjective. Should this have an effect on how Christians today handle the Old Testament?

Regardless of how we organize the data, the issue before us is not how we handle this verse or this issue, one at a time. Rather, what needs to happen is that we take a step back from the details and allow these issues to

challenge us on a more fundamental level. What is needed is a way of thinking about Scripture where these kinds of issues are addressed from a very different perspective—where these kinds of problems cease being problems and become windows that open up new ways of understanding. It is not enough simply to say that the Bible is the word of God or that it is inspired or to apply some other label. The issue is how these descriptions of the Bible bear fruit when we touch down in one part of the Bible or another. How does the study of Scripture in the contemporary world affect how we flesh out descriptions such as “word of God” or “inspired”?

A Way toward Addressing the Problem: The Incarnational Analogy

I do not want to suggest that difficult problems have simple solutions. What I want to offer, instead, is a proper starting point for discussing these problems, one that, if allowed to run its course, will reorient us to see these problems in a better light. This starting point can be traced back to the early centuries of the church and can be applied to modern issues with considerable profit. The starting point for our discussion is the following: *as Christ is both God and human, so is the Bible*. In other words, we are to think of the Bible analogously to how Christians think about Jesus. Christians confess that Jesus is both God and human at the same time. He is not half God and half human. He is not sometimes one and other times the other. He is not essentially one and only apparently the other. Rather, one of the central doctrines of the Christian faith, worked out as far back as the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451, is that Jesus is 100 percent God and 100 percent human—at the same time.

This way of thinking of Christ is analogous to thinking about the Bible. In the same way that Jesus is—*must be*—both God and human, the Bible is also a divine and human book. Although Jesus was “*God with us*,” he still completely assumed the cultural trappings of the world in which he lived. In fact, this is what is implied in “*God with us*.” Perhaps this is part of what the author of Hebrews had in mind when he said that Christ was “made like them, fully human in every way” (Heb. 2:17). Jesus was a first-century Jew. The languages of the time (**Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic**) were his languages. Their customs were his customs. He fit, he belonged, he was one of them.

So too the Bible. It belonged in the ancient worlds that produced it. It was not an abstract, otherworldly book dropped out of heaven. It was *connected to* and therefore *spoke to* those ancient cultures. The encultured qualities of the Bible, therefore, are not extra elements that we can discard to get to the real point, the timeless truths. Rather, precisely because Christianity is a historical

religion, God's word reflects the various historical moments in which Scripture was written. God acted and spoke in history. As we learn more and more about that history, we must gladly address the implications of that history for how we view the Bible, that is, what we should expect from it.

This way of thinking about the Bible is referred to differently by different theologians. The term I prefer is *incarnational analogy*: Christ's incarnation is analogous to Scripture's "incarnation." As with any analogy, one could highlight places where the analogy does not quite fit. Moreover, we must reckon with the incarnation of Christ itself being mysterious; one could rightly question the merit of using an ultimately unexplainable entity to explain something else! That being said, my starting point is the orthodox Christian confession, however mysterious it is, that Jesus of Nazareth is the God-man. The long-standing identification between Christ the Word and Scripture the word is central to how I think through the issues raised in this book: *How does Scripture's full humanity and full divinity affect what we should expect from Scripture?*

The ancient heresy of Docetism stated that Christ was fully divine and only *seemed* to be human (the Greek verb *dokein* ["to seem"] is the root of the word *Docetism*). The Council of Chalcedon rightly concluded that if Christ only appeared to be human, then the death and resurrection are not real. And if that is the case, then there is no forgiveness of sins. Although I am in no way implying that people who do not see things as I do are heretics, there is an analogy to be drawn here. What some ancient Christians were saying about Christ, the Docetic heresy, is similar to the mistake that other Christians have made (and continue to make) about Scripture: it comes from God, and the marks of its humanity are only apparent, to be explained away. Of course, no evangelical would willingly or consciously put it that way, but, when confronted with some of the problems addressed in this book, "scriptural docetism" rears its head. But the human marks of the Bible are *everywhere, thoroughly integrated* into the nature of Scripture itself. Ignoring these marks or explaining them away takes at least as much energy as listening to them and learning from them.

The human dimension of Scripture is, therefore, part of what makes Scripture Scripture. But it is precisely this dimension that can create problems for modern Christian readers, because it can make the Bible seem less unique, less "Bible-like," than we might have supposed.

Here are some of these human marks of Scripture (focusing mainly on the Old Testament). Most of these will not be discussed in the following chapters. I mention them at this juncture only in an effort to orient us to the general discussion.

1. *The Bible was written in Hebrew and Greek (with a little Aramaic).* This is stating the obvious and hardly poses a theological problem. Still, there is a lesson to be learned. Neither Hebrew, Aramaic, nor Greek has any special quality about it that makes it somehow specially suited to be the conveyor of God's word. This may have been thought to be the case at one time, but it is a position that cannot be held in light of modern developments in linguistics. We know, for example, that Hebrew is simply one ancient **Semitic language** that has a lot in common with many other ancient languages, such as Aramaic, **Moabite**, **Edomite**, **Ammonite**, **Ugaritic**, and **Phoenician**. All of these ancient languages existed during Old Testament times, and some of them are in fact quite a bit older.

The point is made more clearly in the case of Greek. Until the late nineteenth century some considered the Greek of the New Testament to be a unique, heavenly language. This was thought to be the case because the style of the New Testament was very different from that found in Greek philosophical texts or in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. So some concluded that the Greek of the New Testament was a special "Holy Spirit language" prepared by God to convey his word. This was a maintainable position (although still conjectural) until archeologists began unearthing documents written in a Greek style similar to the New Testament. And these documents were not concerned with anything official, nor were they meant for public consumption. Rather they were written by everyday, insignificant people about things that were never intended to be handed down through the ages, such as letters and contracts. Even in the language of the Bible, God demonstrates that he is "one of us."

For the Old Testament or New Testament, the point is the same. That the Bible is written in human language, and in the common tongue at that, is already an example of God "incarnating" himself, in a sense. He adopts the current cultural conventions and uses them for his purpose. The languages are not specially designed to carry God's word, but God makes those languages adequate to do so.

2. *The Old Testament world was a world of temples, priests, and sacrifice.* Israel was not the first nation, nor the last, to have a religious system centered on temples, priests, and sacrifice. Such things were woven into the fabric of the ancient societies of the Mesopotamian world.
3. *Israel as well as the surrounding nations had prophets that mediated divine will to them.* The role of the prophets in the Old Testament is a very important one. They were God's mouthpieces to Israel and the kings. But prophecy was by no means unique to ancient Israel. Every ancient society had prophets and seers.

4. *Through much of its history, Israel was ruled by kings, as were the nations around it.* In fact, when it comes to kingship, Israel was a “Jacob-come-lately.” A refrain in 1 Samuel is that the Israelites wanted a king like “all the other nations” (8:5). Was Israel simply mimicking the political structures of the surrounding peoples?
5. *Israel’s legal system has some striking similarities with those of surrounding nations.* When compared side by side with other ancient legal codes, such as the Babylonian *Code of Hammurabi* (see chap. 2), one can see significant similarities between the Mosaic law and those of other—older—nations.

All of these examples (and a good many more) have been brought to light by linguistic, historical, and archeological investigations that began to flourish around the middle of the nineteenth century. In other words, these are problems that are specific to people who live in the modern world, where scholarly investigation demonstrates time and time again that the Bible is firmly situated in the ancient world in which it was produced.

What is so helpful about the incarnational analogy is that it reorients us to see that the Bible’s situatedness is not a lamentable or embarrassing situation but a positive one.

That the Bible, at every turn, shows how connected it is to its own world is a necessary consequence of God incarnating himself.

When God reveals himself, he always does so to people, which means that he must speak and act in ways that they will understand. People are time bound, and so God adopts that characteristic if he wishes to reveal himself. We can put this even a bit more strongly:

It is essential to the very nature of revelation that the Bible is not unique to its environment. The human dimension of Scripture is essential to its being Scripture.

This, I argue, is the proper starting point for looking at the relationship between the Bible and the issues we will discuss in this book.

That the Bible is so easily situated in its ancient context is a source of difficulty for many modern readers. A conclusion some draw is that the Bible is, therefore, *merely* just like any other ancient book. On the other hand, the conservative reaction tends toward minimizing some of the more challenging of these human marks of Scripture, thus accenting its uniqueness *over against* the ancient world. What I propose, however, is an approach that accepts neither alternative as the final word. That the Bible bears an unmistakable human stamp

does *not* lead to the necessary conclusion that it is *merely* the words of humans rather than the word of God. To those who hold such a position the question might be asked, “How *else* would you have expected God to speak? In ways wholly *disconnected* to the ancient world? Who would have understood him?”

And to those who fear the human stamp as somehow dirtying the Bible, marring its perfect divine quality, I say, “If you wouldn’t say that about Jesus (and you shouldn’t), don’t think that way about the Bible. Both Christ and his word ‘are’ human through and through.” In fact, it is precisely by having the Son become human that God demonstrates his great love. Is it so much of a stretch, then, to say that the human nature of Scripture is likewise a gift rather than a problem? Of course, simply saying this does not make the issues float away, but it is the proper way to begin addressing those issues.

It is somewhat ironic, it seems to me, that both liberals and conservatives make the same error. They both assume that something worthy of the title *word of God* would look different from what we actually have. The one accents the human marks and makes them absolute. The other wishes the human marks were not as pronounced as they were. They share a similar opinion that nothing worthy of being called God’s word would look so common, so human, so recognizable. But when God speaks, he speaks in ways we would understand. With this in mind, we can now look at some of the evidence that has been part of the scholarly conversation for several generations, not to determine *whether* the Bible is God’s word but to see more clearly *how* it is God’s word.

Further Reading

Allert, Craig D. *A High View of Scripture? The Authority of the Bible and the Formation of the New Testament Canon*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Though focusing on New Testament canon formation, Allert’s argument mirrors my own here in this book: evangelical notions of canon formation that do not take into the account historical factors will be neither convincing nor truly a “high view” of Scripture.

Benedict XVI. *Verbum Domini*. Part 1, *Verbum Dei*. 2010.

A robust and engaging articulation of Scripture that employs incarnational language.

Brettler, Marc Zvi, Peter Enns, and Daniel J. Harrington. *The Bible and the Believer: How to Read the Bible Critically and Religiously*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Reflections on the life of faith and critical biblical scholarship from Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic perspectives.

Enns, Peter. "Bible in Context: The Continuing Vitality of Reformed Biblical Scholarship." *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 203–18.

Reformed biblical scholarship in the Old Princeton and Westminster tradition carries with it a genuine though incomplete appreciation for the theological value of engaging Scripture in its historical contexts. (Published version of my inaugural lecture as professor of Old Testament and Biblical Hermeneutics at Westminster Theological Seminary.)

———. *The Evolution of Adam: What the Bible Does and Doesn't Say about Human Origins*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2012.

Application of the core topics addressed in *Inspiration and Incarnation* to the specific issue of the theological and hermeneutical challenges raised for Christians by evolution, particularly as they affect the reading of Genesis and Romans.

———. "Preliminary Observations on an Incarnational Model of Scripture: Its Viability and Usefulness." *Calvin Theological Journal* 42, no. 2 (2007): 219–36.

Further reflections on the incarnational model of Scripture.

Knight, Douglas A., and Amy-Jill Levine. *The Meaning of the Bible: What the Jewish Scriptures and Christian Old Testament Can Teach Us*. San Francisco: HarperOne, 2011.

An historical-critical overview of the themes of the Old Testament that is conversational in tone and reasonably sympathetic to conservative readers.

Noll, Mark A. *Jesus Christ and the Life of the Mind*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Following up on his *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (1994), Noll argues that a truly orthodox understanding of Christology should encourage a deeper intellectual engagement among evangelicals in history, science, and biblical studies. Noll accurately assesses the argument and intention of my use of the incarnational analogy in *Inspiration and Incarnation* (pp. 132–45).

Orr, James. *Revelation and Inspiration*. London: Duckworth, 1910. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.

A relatively early attempt to understand the nature of Scripture from a conservative perspective but one that also engages constructively the intellectual climate of the time.

Ridderbos, Herman. *Studies in Scripture and Its Authority*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Theologically astute and sensitive exposition of biblical authority vis-à-vis the Bible's historical situatedness from a Dutch Reformed perspective.

Rogerson, John. *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

A helpful, fact-filled book on the major European critical Old Testament scholars of the nineteenth century.

Smyth, J. Patterson. *How God Inspired the Bible: Thoughts for the Present Disquiet*. New York: James Pott, 1892.

This book was written during the so-called modernist/fundamentalist controversy and addresses many of the same issues as I do. What is perhaps most striking about Smyth's book, besides the honesty and spiritual sensitivity of the author (he was both a professor and pastor), is the reminder that an incarnational approach to Scripture was employed generations ago to address the problems introduced by the modern study of the Bible.

Warfield, B. B. "The Divine and Human in the Bible." In *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, by B. B. Warfield, edited by Mark A. Noll and David N. Livingstone, 51–58. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.

Originally written in 1894, this brief article is a wonderfully succinct explication of Warfield's notion of "concursum" in the Bible, which is the working together of human and divine elements to produce the Bible. Warfield taught at Princeton Theological Seminary until his death in 1921 and leaves a legacy of informed, scholarly defense of traditional Christian positions.

Work, Telford. *Living and Active: Scripture in the Economy of Salvation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

See especially pp. 15–32 and 36–50, where Work summarizes some of the history of the "christological analogy" of Scripture beginning with Athanasius (fourth century).