

## GOING BEYOND WHAT IS WRITTEN OR LEARNING TO READ? DISCOVERING OT/NT BROAD REFERENCE

IAN TURNER\*

**Abstract:** *When NT authors quote the OT, are they evoking the larger context of the precursor text and inviting readers to explore it? This question of “broad reference” has received affirmative answers within the field of the NT use of the OT. Broad reference has been described as a matter of authorial intent (Beale) or as textual resonances discerned by skilled readers (Hays). Building upon prior insights, this study suggests linguistic categories to develop a discourse-focused description of broad reference. The ideas of cohesion and coherence from discourse analysis (Halliday/Hasan) are used to clarify the process of broad reference, which is seen as a collaboration of author, (con)text, and reader to achieve a coherent sense of how Christ and the Scriptures redemptively speak to our situation. We then explore broad reference of Psalm 34 in 1 Peter 1–2, discerning surprising resonances of Psalm 34 beyond the explicit quotation in 1 Pet 2:3.*

**Key words:** *pointer quotations, broad reference, OT/NT, discourse analysis, cohesion, coherence, Dodd, Beale, Hays, Halliday and Hasan, 1 Peter*

### I. DISCOVERING OT/NT BROAD REFERENCE

In her commentary on 1 Peter, Karen Jobes arrives at a passage where Peter teaches believers to love one another (1:22) since they have been born again “through the living and abiding word of God” (1:23). The apostle then quotes Isa 40:6–8—“all flesh is like grass ... but the word of the Lord remains forever”—in order for his original audience of scattered Christians in Asia Minor to see that they “are now part of the people to whom God has been faithful for long ages past” and that they “can face the hostility of their society with the assurance that God is powerful to deliver.”<sup>1</sup>

What is unexpected is Jobes’s next statement: “The Christians needed to be reminded of the power of their God. *Though not quoted, the words of Isaiah continue* in 40:12–26, reminding them of the great dimensions of their God.”<sup>2</sup> Jobes argues that Peter quoted Isa 40:6–8 with the hope that his readers might consult its wider context: “Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand? ... Who has known the mind of the Lord? ... *He is* the one who causes rulers to rule as nothing. ... Lift up your eyes to the height and see; who has brought all these things to

---

\* Ian Turner is a Ph.D. student in Biblical Studies at Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary, 2965 Leonard St NE, Grand Rapids, MI 49525. He may be contacted at iturner11@prts.edu.

<sup>1</sup> Karen H. Jobes, *1 Peter* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 129.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* (emphasis added).

light?” (Isa 40:12–13, 15, 23, 26). Jobes’s remarkable statement suggests that the *unquoted surrounding context* of Isa 40:6–8 *was part of Peter’s message* to his audience.

When the NT authors quote/allude to verses from the OT, are they inviting readers to make further sense of the passage by bringing more into play from the wider OT context? Does the NT author hope for readers to explore the wider OT context of verses cited? Affirmative answers have been given to this question.<sup>3</sup> Following Dodd, G.K. Beale observes that when the OT is quoted by NT authors, “single verses and phrases are merely signposts to the overall OT context from which they are cited.”<sup>4</sup> Robert Rendall observes that “it is not so much the actual words of a quotation that matter (though these also have importance) but the wider passage of Scripture to which they are an index.”<sup>5</sup> In NT quotations of the OT, “the unit of reference was sometimes wider than the usually brief form of words actually quoted” and the quotation was “intended to call the reader’s attention to the wider OT context or theme and might be referred to as a ‘pointer quotation.’”<sup>6</sup>

1. *Broad reference, intertextuality, and echoes.* The term “broad reference” will be used to label the intertextual phenomena where a NT author signals his audience to refer to the wider context of the precursor (OT) text cited. The term “pointer quotation”<sup>7</sup> is too narrow since broad reference often involves allusions. Another candidate for labeling the intertextual phenomena under question is Hays’s use of the term “metalepsis”:

Because the Evangelists are so deeply immersed in Israel’s Scripture, their references and allusions to it are characteristically *metaleptic* in character: that is, they nudge the discerning reader to recognize and recover the context from which their intertextual references are drawn ... [often] a recovery of the fuller original context will shed light on the story the Evangelists are telling and add important nuance to an otherwise flat surface reading.<sup>8</sup>

However, since Hays’s nuance of “metalepsis” seems different than its use in literary studies, which itself has a complex history,<sup>9</sup> the term “broad reference” is tenta-

<sup>3</sup> C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1957).

<sup>4</sup> G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 5. Cf. Eric James Gréaux Sr, “The Lord Delivers Us: An Examination of the Function of Psalm 34 in 1 Peter,” *RevExp* 106 (2009): 607.

<sup>5</sup> Robert Rendall, “Quotation in Scripture as an Index of Wider Reference,” *Exp* 36 (1964): 215.

<sup>6</sup> H. Gloer, “Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament,” in *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (ed. Chad Brand et al.; Nashville: Holman, 2003), 1218.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* Cf. E. E. Ellis, “Quotations in the New Testament,” in *New Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. R. W. Wood et al.; Leicester, UK/Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 1002.

<sup>8</sup> Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 360–61 (emphasis original). Cf. *idem*, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (London: SPCK, 2015), 97. Matthew’s “formula quotations are often richly allusive, depending for their full force on the device of *metalepsis* ... meant to lead the reader back to recover their original context.”

<sup>9</sup> “*Metalepsis* has a complex history in that it has been regarded either as a variety of metonymy, a particular form of synonymy, or both.” John Pier, “*Metalepsis*,” *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, Interdisciplinary Center for Narratology, University of Hamburg, 2013, <http://wikis.sub.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/index.php/Metalepsis>.

tively most appropriate until more descriptive precision is brought to this intertextual phenomenon. I will also follow Beale in dispensing with the term “intertextuality,” because of its postmodern origins and overtones, in favor of his term “inner-biblical exegesis.”<sup>10</sup> Finally, the term “echo,” popularized by Hays, will not be used but will be subsumed under the term “allusion,” following Beale’s convincing argument to use the latter term to cover both ideas.<sup>11</sup>

This study will suggest clarifying language from discourse analysis to sharpen a description of the process of biblical broad reference. This description will be used to identify the process of broad reference in the use of Psalm 34 by 1 Peter 1–2. We will argue that the practice of broad reference, as an outgrowth of the conviction that NT authors used the OT contextually, holds value for biblical exegesis and application.

## II. LOCATING BROAD REFERENCE IN OT/NT STUDIES

1. *OT/NT studies and contextuality.* Describing broad reference involves locating it within a larger discussion in the field of OT/NT studies. This field, recognized as a specialized subdiscipline only relatively recently, comprises a plethora of questions.<sup>12</sup> Lunde identifies five key issues in OT/NT studies, revolving around one central concern: how to relate the OT and NT authors’ intended meanings.<sup>13</sup> Most relevant among these five issues to the question of broad reference is the issue of contextuality: whether NT authors “take into account the *context* of the passages they cite”<sup>14</sup> or “atomistically pull verses out of their contexts.”<sup>15</sup>

Arguably the most important scholar on the question of authorial respect for context in OT/NT studies is C. H. Dodd. Allen views Dodd’s work as being a founding influence for OT/NT studies, and certainly the starting point for the issue of the NT authors’ respect for the OT context.<sup>16</sup> Dodd concedes that NT au-

<sup>10</sup> Beale, *Handbook*, 40. Cf. Samuel Emadi, “Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading,” *CurBR* 14 (2015): 16. However, for a more nuanced distinction between “intertextuality” and “inner-Biblical exegesis,” see M. R. Stead, “Intertextuality,” *DOTPr* 355–64.

<sup>11</sup> G. K. Beale and Benjamin L. Gladd, *Hidden but Now Revealed: A Biblical Theology of Mystery* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014), 23.

<sup>12</sup> David M. Allen, “Introduction: The Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New,” *JSNT* 38 (2015): 4.

<sup>13</sup> Jonathan Lunde, “An Introduction to Central Questions in the New Testament Use of the Old Testament,” in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde; Counterpoints Series: Bible & Theology; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 11–12. These five issues are: (1) assessing the explanatory power of *sensus plenior*; (2) defining typology; (3) whether “NT writers take into account the context of the passages they cite”; (4) assessing the explanatory power of Jewish exegetical convention for OT/NT issues; and (5) whether replication of NT authors’ exegetical methods is appropriate. Lunde, writing this volume’s introduction, mentions textual form of cited material as another important issue but leaves it out of the five key issues.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 12. Our focus on one issue out of the five is for convenience; discussion of one necessarily involves the rest, and there will be echoes of some of the other relevant issues throughout this study.

<sup>15</sup> Kenneth Berding, “An Analysis of Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament,” in *Three Views*, 236 (emphasis original).

<sup>16</sup> Allen, “Introduction,” 4, 7.

thors sometimes quoted the OT for illustrative purposes, but that in general, their use of the OT remained true to the intention of the OT writer, with varying levels of precision in picking up the OT context correctly.<sup>17</sup> Dodd observed that NT authors relied on certain key OT contexts from which most of their citations were drawn. However, repeated citations of the same verses from these key OT contexts in the NT are rare; instead, different verses scattered across the landscape of these same OT contexts were used in the NT. Therefore, “the unit of reference was sometimes wider than the usually brief form of words actually quoted,” which acted more “as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves.”<sup>18</sup> By using an OT citation as “as a pointer to a whole context,” the NT author was inviting readers “to study the context as a whole, and to reflect upon the ‘plot’ there unfolded” which would “help him to see the significance of the strange events of the life and death of Jesus, and what followed.”<sup>19</sup> Both Beale and Hays express indebtedness to Dodd’s work.

2. *Hays and figural reading.* The work of Hays and Beale on contextuality in general and broad reference in particular will be discussed at length. Hays sees NT authors using the OT contextually, arguing “that the context of a whole OT book helps the reader to see how one quotation from that book renders it a contextual interpretation.”<sup>20</sup> However, Hays prioritizes the text’s power to generate meaning, rather than solely conveying the author’s intent. Drawing upon Auerbach’s literary work,<sup>21</sup> Hays sees NT authors engaged in what he calls a “figural reading” of the OT.<sup>22</sup> In this view, “texts can generate readings that transcend both the conscious intention of the author and all the hermeneutical strictures that we promulgate” and therefore

to limit our interpretation of Paul’s scriptural echoes to what he intended by them is to impose a severe and arbitrary hermeneutical restriction ... what he intended is a matter of historical speculation [and] his intertextual choices are acts of figuration. Consequently, later readers will rightly grasp meanings of the figures that may have been veiled from Paul himself. Scripture generates through Paul new figurations; the righteousness from faith in Paul finds a new voice.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 99, 102.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 46, 99.

<sup>19</sup> C. H. Dodd, “The Old Testament in the New” (1963), in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 176.

<sup>20</sup> This summary of Hays is taken from G. K. Beale, “The Cognitive Peripheral Vision of Biblical Authors,” *WTJ* 76 (2014): 66 n. 288.

<sup>21</sup> “Figural interpretation establishes a connection between two events or persons, the first of which signifies not only itself, but also the second, while the second encompasses or fulfills the first.” Erich Auerbach, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 53.

<sup>22</sup> Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 100–101. Here, Hays observes some limitations of the term “typology”; he favors “figural reading” over the former.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

Hays's reticence to confine himself to questions of authorial intent stems from the influence of New Criticism in literary studies, which paid more attention to the dynamics of a text itself than to the background and influences on/from the author.<sup>24</sup> NT authors employ a "practice of figural reading: the discernment of unexpected patterns of correspondence between earlier and later events or persons within a continuous temporal stream."<sup>25</sup> The text itself, unified by the mind of its divine author, invites readers to explore its figural fusions. Thus, for Hays, NT writers are engaged in "the task of reading backwards, discovering figural fusions between the story of Jesus and the older and longer story of Israel's journey with God," and Hays invites readers "to the task of exploring those fusions."<sup>26</sup> Hays is primarily interested in helping "dull"<sup>27</sup> modern readers heed Scripture's call for us "to become more interesting people—by teaching us to be more interesting readers."<sup>28</sup> "What sort of hermeneutical landscape might open before us," Hays asks, "if we learned to read Israel's Scripture not only through the filtering lenses of modern critical methods but also through the eyes of John and the other authors of the canonical Gospels?"<sup>29</sup> Hays wants contemporary readers "to read as though we were among Jesus' early followers, discovering with surprise after his death and resurrection how our memories of him awaken unexpected echoes of Israel's Scripture."<sup>30</sup> Hays's work therefore picks up and extends Dodd's contention that NT authors refer readers to the wider context of the OT texts they use.

3. *Beale and cognitive peripheral vision.* Beale is a leading voice in the proposal that NT authors always used the OT contextually, and that it is often our failure to discern the NT author's hermeneutical nuance behind an ostensibly non-contextual usage since, "often, upon closer examination such uses reveal an ironic or polemical intention."<sup>31</sup> Interestingly, Beale allows for the possibility of non-contextual usage when "there is unintentional and unconscious allusion" made to the OT by an NT writer, which leads him to call for better hermeneutical categories than the labels "contextual" and "non-contextual."<sup>32</sup> Beale's proposal to rearrange terms suggests that it is the labels, not the NT authors' use of the OT, that have limitations.

---

<sup>24</sup> Garrett Brown, "Interview with Richard B. Hays," *Note & Query* blog, 31 October 2016, <https://noteandquery.com/2016/10/31/interview-with-richard-b-hays>. Hays explains, "The New Critics were not particularly concerned about the historical circumstances of the production of the text, or influences on the author, or those kinds of things. Rather, I was taught [at Yale in the 60s] to look at the way in which the language of the text itself worked—its imagery, music, metaphor—and to think about how the text functioned as a complete work of art."

<sup>25</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 347.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>27</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 101.

<sup>28</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 360.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 347.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 439 n. 2.

<sup>31</sup> G. K. Beale, "Positive Answer to the Question: Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of Jesus' and the Apostles' Exegetical Method," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, 391.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

The possibility of a NT author making an unconscious allusion to the OT is developed more precisely in Beale's work which sees NT authors working from (tacit) understandings in their cognitive peripheral vision of the OT context. Since even OT authors "knew more about the topic of their speech act than only the explicit meaning they expressed about that topic," there existed "an explicit intention and an implicit wider understanding related to that intention"; and "it is sometimes this implicit wider intention that NT writers develop instead of the OT author's explicit or direct meaning."<sup>33</sup> Superintending over these exchanges of meaning in (human) authorial practice is God, the divine and unifying author of Scripture.

Drawing upon Hirsch's theory of "willed type" and Polanyi's theory of "subsidiary knowledge," the idea of "cognitive peripheral vision is a theory of knowledge in itself," observing that "all speakers and writers, including ancient writers, are aware of more than what they are directly saying in their speech act,"<sup>34</sup> such that

NT writers looked at an OT book and observed the particulars of the verses (subsidiaries) that compose that book. They then discerned through their skilled reading certain patterns that a group of those verses formed (e.g. a pattern based on and organized by a common theme, which is the explicit focus). They then might cite only one of those verses as their explicit focus in their argument in the NT context and interpret the verse in the light of the whole observed pattern (which itself has now become subsidiary knowledge). ... The challenge is for the contemporary commentator rightly (!) to discern the pattern first recognized by the biblical writer (the subsidiary awareness) in order to understand the goal (the explicit focus) of quoting the single verse.<sup>35</sup>

Beale demonstrates the usefulness of exploring a NT author's "peripheral sense" by showing how traditionally difficult OT/NT uses (e.g. Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15) can indeed be seen as contextual.<sup>36</sup> In cases where it is difficult to justify contextual usage even in a peripheral sense, "we may call it 'controlled speculation' [but there is still] ... an 'organic' connection between the direct and the tacit meaning."<sup>37</sup> Thus Beale strongly defends the contextual use of the OT by NT authors, arguing that it is modern readers who often have not done the work of discerning the peripheral sense a NT author may (implicitly) be working with in his inner-biblical exegesis. Beale therefore sees NT authors using the OT contextually, not emphasizing the role of the text itself to generate new meaning as much as Hays does but focusing on the author's cognitive peripheral vision as a landscape which, however remotely, would have included ostensibly non-contextual readings of the OT.

<sup>33</sup> Beale, "Cognitive Peripheral Vision," 263–64.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 265–73.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 274–75.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 275–85.

<sup>37</sup> Beale and Gladd, *Hidden but Now Revealed*, 363.

4. *A discourse perspective on broad reference.* Using Miller's two-fold "reader-oriented" (synchronic) and "author-oriented" (diachronic) categorization scheme for approaches to intertextuality,<sup>38</sup> Emadi places Hays and Beale in the author-oriented category. In view of postmodern reader-response hermeneutics, it is correct to say that Hays and Beale are occupied with what lies behind the text and the author's intention more than they are with the process with which today's readers derive meaning.<sup>39</sup> However, within this "author-oriented" camp, it is clear that Hays does not prioritize authorial meaning as much as Beale does, being more focused on how the biblical texts themselves resonate with figural fusions, how NT writers reread the OT in light of the resurrection, and how modern readers should imitate this practice of *reading* "backwards." Beale, on the other hand, focuses heavily on the NT authors' cognitive landscape, their level(s) of awareness of explicit and tacit meaning, and how these insights defend the (divine/human) authors' respect of the OT context. Thus, it is correct to say with Emadi that Hays and Beale are more author-oriented than they are reader-oriented with respect to their hermeneutical methods and their presuppositions about the locus of meaning. But with respect to the goals and priorities of their work, Beale aims to vindicate Scripture's (divine/human) author's (contextual) use of the OT, portraying the apostles as authors whose methods deserve our respect; and Hays aims to make modern readers more attentive to the figural resonances between the OT and the NT, portraying the apostles as readers to be imitated. Thus, within Emadi's "author-oriented" camp, with regard to hermeneutical method, we have a reader-focused approach (Hays) and an author-focused approach (Beale) to the issue of biblical broad reference. What we are missing is a text- or discourse-focused approach that uses resources from discourse analysis to describe the textual phenomenon of broad reference. This discourse-oriented approach to broad reference will be synthesized from the relevant insights of Hays, those of Beale, Halliday/Hasan's work on cohesion, and perspectives on the relationship between cohesion and coherence.

### III. A DISCOURSE-ORIENTED PERSPECTIVE OF BROAD REFERENCE

We will identify relevant cohesive ties from Halliday/Hasan's influential study, *Cohesion in English*,<sup>40</sup> and see how they subsume Hays's criteria for allusions. These observations, strengthened by the assumption of Beale's hermeneutic of the NT author's cognitive peripheral vision, will give us a discourse-focused description of

<sup>38</sup> Geoffrey D. Miller, "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research," *CurBR* 9 (2011): 285.

<sup>39</sup> Emadi, "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship," 9–13, 15–16.

<sup>40</sup> M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, *Cohesion in English* (English Language Series 9; London: Longman, 1976). Campbell notes that Halliday/Hasan's "approach has several strengths and useful applications for study of the Greek New Testament, some of which ought to be self-evident." Constantine R. Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek: New Insights for Reading the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 159. For instance, see Guthrie's application of Halliday/Hasan's cohesion analysis to Philippians in G. H. Guthrie, "Cohesion Shifts and Stitches in Philippians," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; JSNTSup 113; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 36–57.

broad reference and the process of its exploration, which may enhance biblical exegesis/application. Our focus is defining the nature of biblical broad reference. Beale and Hays provided vivid descriptions of the nature of broad reference from author- and reader-focused perspectives, but to outline a discourse-focused approach to clarifying the nature of broad reference, we will need insights from discourse analysis.<sup>41</sup> With Beale's idea of the NT author's cognitive peripheral vision in mind, we will combine insights from Halliday/Hassan's work on cohesion and Hays's criteria for discerning allusions to construct a discourse-oriented description of broad reference.

1. *Cohesion, coherence, and collaboration.* Campbell identifies Halliday/Hasan's work on cohesion, among other approaches to discourse analysis, as being valuable for opening "exciting new areas of research."<sup>42</sup> According to Halliday/Hasan, a text achieves cohesiveness (texture) through signaled relationships ("cohesive ties") between lexico-grammatical structures (i.e. lexemes, clauses, etc.) such as "reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion."<sup>43</sup> Cohesion between structures in a text build toward a reader's mental representation of a text, its *coherence*. Coherence is the way a text hangs together as a "single mental representation" in a reader/hearer's mind,<sup>44</sup> such that a reader can "make sense" of the text against the backdrop of his/her situational context (the internal contextualization of the text), creating "a logical flow of interrelated concepts ... in a text, thus establishing a mental textual world."<sup>45</sup> The ways in which cohesion contributes to a text's overall cohesion is an important ongoing issue in discourse analysis.<sup>46</sup> In this study, we will assume that cohesion contributes to coherence,<sup>47</sup> following Halliday/Hasan, who saw cohesion as "the central concern of discourse analysis" and were able to account for "coherence" (internal and external texture) within their theory of cohesion.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Jeffrey T. Reed, "Discourse Analysis as New Testament Hermeneutic: A Retrospective and Prospective Appraisal," *JETS* 39 (1996): 224: "The term 'discourse analysis' ... at its broadest level refers to the study and interpretation of both the spoken and written communication of humans."

<sup>42</sup> Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek*, 148, 152–56.

<sup>43</sup> Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, 4.

<sup>44</sup> Robert A. Dooley and Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts* (Dallas: SIL International, 2001), 27.

<sup>45</sup> K. Menzel, E. Lapshinova-Koltunski, and K. Kunz, "Cohesion and Coherence in Multilingual Contexts," in *New Perspectives on Cohesion and Coherence: Implications for Translation* (ed. Katrin Menzel et al.; Translation and Multilingual Natural Language Processing 6; Berlin: Language Science Press, 2017), 1–2.

<sup>46</sup> T. Sanders and H. Pander Maat, "Cohesion and Coherence: Linguistic Approaches," in *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (ed. Keith Brown; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), 592.

<sup>47</sup> Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen, *Collaborating towards Coherence: Lexical Cohesion in English Discourse* (Pragmatics & Beyond 146; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006), 7: "Cohesion contributes to coherence, i.e. cohesion is one of the ways of signaling coherence in texts." For instance, a "speaker will plant linguistic signals in the text [cohesion] as clues to assist the hearers in coming up with an adequate mental representation [coherence]." Dooley and Levinsohn, "Analyzing Discourse," 13.

<sup>48</sup> "A text is a passage of discourse which is coherent in these two regards: it is coherent with respect to context of situation, and therefore consistent in register; and it is coherent with respect to itself, and therefore cohesive." Campbell, *Advances in the Study of Greek*, 152–54. Cf. Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, 20, 23.



When we consider the work of Beale and Hays together, we see that broad reference is a process that involves (OT/NT) authors, the text, and today's readers in discerning the coherence that is inherent in Scripture. The authors of Scripture *make* broad reference; the text *resonates* with broad reference; and modern readers *explore* broad reference. Without the work of *readers* to explore the full resonances of the *texts* (OT in the NT), the intention of the author to *communicate* the full counsel of God is not achieved (though the text remains inherently coherent). To be sure, the full counsel of God is not located within the reader, but in Scripture. In a collaboration toward coherence,<sup>49</sup> readers, guided by the cohesive signals planted in the text by NT authors, discover the same (contextual) connections the NT authors perceived (and possibly beyond), and arrive at a life- and doctrine-enriching sense of the (internal and external) coherence of Christ, the OT Scriptures, and their present situation. Broad reference itself is not a referential signal (a cohesive tie). Broad reference is instead the interplay of signals toward coherence<sup>50</sup> (from the author) embodied in cohesive ties (in the text) that builds a coherent textual world (in the mind of the reader) of the counsel of God.<sup>51</sup>

In a collaboration toward coherence, authors place cohesive elements in texts so that readers would build coherent mental models of the text. What impelled NT writers to place these signals in the text? It is the inherent *coherence* of the Scriptures that NT authors have discerned that prompts them to plant cohesive signals for readers to see and savor the same coherent message. NT authors place cohesive (intertextual) ties in their texts for readers to follow because they themselves have discerned inherent coherence in the Scriptures, have witnessed the events of Christ's cross and resurrection, and were taught by Christ to see how these things were prefigured in the Scriptures (Luke 24:27). Even OT authors are prompted to place cohesive ties in their texts so that readers would discern the same glorious inherent coherence of prior Scripture that had captivated them—a coherence borne of Scripture's interpretation of redemptive history and their place in it. The NT author, taught by Christ and prompted by the Spirit, cannot overlook the coherent harmony between Scripture and his own place in its redemptive story; so his writings, perhaps not always driven by an agenda to signal broad reference, nonetheless overflow with it, since the moment in time he is living and witnessing (Christ's cross and resurrection) resonates so strongly with the testimony of OT Scripture. Any reader who has been captivated by a sense of the coherence between the texts cited by NT authors and the broader OT contexts of those texts are walking through a door opened by the divine/human author of Scripture.

---

<sup>49</sup> Tanskanen expresses the unity of coherence and cohesion as a *collaboration*, where “in monologic discourse, collaboration is realised at two stages. ... At the production stage, the producer interacts with the implied receiver with the help of mental representations [coherence], while at the interpretation stage the receiver can take this collaboration into account and look for its signals in the message [cohesive ties].” Tanskanen, *Collaborating towards Coherence*, 26.

<sup>50</sup> Since the text is coherent with or without a reader, it may be better to say that broad reference signals readers to *recognize* coherence.

<sup>51</sup> It is collaboration toward *coherence*, not collaboration toward *revelation*. Recall Poythress's statement about the “coherence” of communication.

2. *Cohesive ties: reference and lexical cohesion.* One of the central elements of cohesion discussed by Halliday/Hasan is the idea of reference. In general, reference functions as a signal that meaning must be imported from the outside.<sup>52</sup> Various textual devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis) are involved in the idea of reference.<sup>53</sup> When reference is signaled, there is a semantic presupposition that meaning is recoverable from outside of the immediate context. Exophoric reference calls for the satisfaction of a situational presupposition to garner meaning (that meaning must be imported from the context of situation), whereas endophoric reference seeks to satisfy a textual presupposition (that meaning must be imported from elsewhere within the text). Whereas Halliday/Hasan use reference in view of the sentence and clausal levels within an immediate context, we are adapting Halliday/Hassan's observations about reference to describe how broad reference signals reference to an *external* text.

Broad reference signals both endo- and exophoric reference. In general, "both exophoric and endophoric reference embody an instruction to retrieve from elsewhere the information necessary for interpreting the passage in question."<sup>54</sup> Since broad reference involves an author pointing us to something outside of the immediate text, the signal of broad reference is partly exophoric. The author wants us to import meaning from the outside—from a combined context of situation<sup>55</sup> and external text, just as he has imported meaning from the OT Scriptures and the person and work of Jesus Christ to which the NT author is a living witness. However, during the signaling of broad reference the NT author is also pointing us to another *text* (anaphorically), making broad reference partly endophoric, a "reference within the text."<sup>56</sup> The fact that 'the text' is external to the referring/alluding text, however, may present a difficulty in using the endophoric category; and yet, from the NT author's point of view, 'the text' includes both the NT text he is authoring and the 'external' OT context of reference. They are both cohesive to him; they are one—not via a unity he is imposing, but because of the manifest coherence he discerns between the work of Christ (context of situation), the OT Scriptures, and the present moment at which he is writing. The apostles were "engaged in relating the two most important realities of their lives—the Scriptures and Jesus Christ";<sup>57</sup> and instead of confusion, they found coherence: they "believed the Scripture and the word that Jesus had spoken" (John 2:22); they could write "we have heard ... we have seen with our eyes ... we looked upon and have touched with our hands ... the word of life" (1 John 1:1). So the person/work of Christ and prior Scripture—so richly interwoven in the apostles' minds (by the illumination of the Spirit)—was

---

<sup>52</sup> Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, 21, 33, 145.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>57</sup> Klyne R. Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *New Testament Criticism and Interpretation* (ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 409.

the source of coherence that became the basis for their inviting us to look to the OT Scriptures while looking at Christ (as they presented him in the NT).

Incidentally, Halliday/Hasan's referential cohesive tie of "ellipsis" helps describe one important feature of broad reference. Ellipsis is a "substitution by zero," where the reader substitutes what is left unsaid (filling an empty slot). When broad reference is signaled, a reader fills an empty slot in a NT text that quotes from the OT with themes imported from the wider context of the OT precursor text. A NT author may quote one small portion of an overall OT context he has in mind, leaving much unsaid. Thus broad reference has a similar function to ellipsis, calling readers to fill in the silence from elsewhere by exploring the broader OT context, thus enriching biblical exegesis/application. This is a mere adaptation of Halliday/Hasan's category of ellipsis to clarify the nature of broad reference as involving 'thematic slots' or 'hermeneutic slots' or 'theological slots' needing to be filled from elsewhere (as opposed to Halliday/Hasan's structural slots).<sup>58</sup>

Moreover, Halliday/Hasan's discussion of lexical cohesion is also an important resource for describing broad reference, not only in how it applies to discerning allusions to the OT in a NT text, but also in how it helps describe the process of finding OT to OT lexical correspondences in the precursor text's broader context. Lexical cohesion is the "cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary," involving reiteration (including word relations like synonymy) and (more problematically) collocation.<sup>59</sup> Our focus on Halliday/Hasan's work, and especially reference and lexical cohesion, is a fitting starting point for building a discourse-oriented perspective on broad reference and does not suggest that lexical correspondences are the only mode of connection used in inner-biblical exegesis.<sup>60</sup>

3. *Connecting Hays and Beale to cohesion and coherence.* One of the most obvious places where the work of Beale and Hays overlaps is Beale's incorporation of Hays's seven criteria for discerning the presence of echoes from the OT in the NT as "one of the best ways to discern and discuss the nature and validity of allusions."<sup>61</sup> Discerning allusions is an integral first step to exploring broad reference. Hays's criteria themselves are even useful for tracing connectedness between OT immediate contexts and OT broader contexts. Since we will exclude historical considerations from the present analysis, only Hays's criteria of volume, recurrence, thematic coherence and satisfaction will be considered. Briefly, "volume" refers to the frequency of repetition of OT lexemes or syntactical structures present in an

<sup>58</sup> Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, 143.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 274, 277–78, 288.

<sup>60</sup> Miller, "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research," 295, 303–4: "Lexical resemblances constitute the best criterion by which to measure proposed intertextual relationships." All of the modes of correspondence Miller identifies are "shared language [i.e. lexical resemblances above], shared content, and formal resemblances" (p. 298).

<sup>61</sup> Beale, *Handbook*, 32–34. The criteria are: (1) availability; (2) volume; (3) recurrence; (4) thematic coherence; (5) historical plausibility; (6) history of interpretation; and (7) satisfaction. Cf. Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 34–45.

allusion to the OT.<sup>62</sup> Hays's criterion of volume carries in essence Halliday/Hasan's idea of lexical coherence but is broader in that it includes grammatical as well as lexical structures. Hays's criterion of recurrence describes "references in the same immediate context (or elsewhere by the same author) to the same OT context from which the purported allusion derives"; Hays's thematic coherence sees that the precursor OT text contains themes that fit into and illuminate the NT passage and that this alluded material is seen to fit into a "larger thematic pattern."<sup>63</sup> Finally, Hays's criterion of satisfaction shows how "the proposed intertextual reading" illuminates the surrounding NT passage's discourse and makes "some larger sense ... as a whole."<sup>64</sup> Thematic coherence and satisfaction are subsumed under the idea of coherence presented above. A reader who recognizes thematic (local) coherence sees that "the content of an individual precursor text is materially related to the sense of [the NT author's] argument at the place where the putative echo occurs," but satisfaction (global coherence) is achieved when a reader sees "more broadly [that] the resultant reading of [the NT author's] discussion is clarified and enhanced by an awareness of the proposed intertexts."<sup>65</sup> In our description of broad reference, we can see thematic coherence as a kind of local coherence (seeing how an OT precursor text illuminates the immediate NT passage "in the place the echo occurs") and *satisfaction* as a kind of global coherence (a broader awareness of how a greater number of OT intertexts enriches our reading of larger sections or the whole of the NT book). Moreover, under the discourse analytic idea that *coherence* depends upon cohesion, we can see how volume and recurrence (cohesive ties) may be the building blocks of thematic coherence and satisfaction (local/global coherence).<sup>66</sup>

We can therefore begin to describe a discourse-focused process of broad reference, drawing upon the different perspectives presented. Beale has given us confidence to begin the venture in the first place as he emphasizes that wider contextual use of the OT is within the NT author's cognitive peripheral vision. Hays has given us criteria to strengthen our discernment of possible allusions NT authors placed in their passages. Discourse analysis helps us see how, in broad reference, Hays's criteria are markers of cohesion that contribute toward overall coherence. These perspectives on broad reference help describe on a textual level what we presuppose theologically—that because the apostles were aware of a coherence that existed between Christ and the OT Scriptures, they testified under the inspiration

---

<sup>62</sup> Hays, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 35–37. The criterion of "volume" has two elements: first, "the degree of exact of verbal correspondence"; and second, "the relative weightiness of the material cited" (p. 37).

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 38. Beale, *Handbook*, 33.

<sup>64</sup> Hays, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 44. During satisfaction (what I call "recognizing global coherence" during the exploration of broad reference), the reader can say (to quote Hays), "Oh, so *that* is what Paul means here in passage *x*; and furthermore, if that's right, then we can begin to understand what he means in passage *y* and he uses *these* certain words in that place."

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> "Recurrence," is seen as a *cohesive* feature, since it concerns the (surface) textual distribution of multiple references to the same OT context in a NT passage.

of the Holy Spirit and, in the process, left signals for us to explore the different Scriptural contexts that God had weaved into a captivating coherent whole.<sup>67</sup>

4. *Describing the process of broad reference.* Combining the concepts and perspectives above, we can describe how readers discern, explore and use broad reference, such as the way Jobes saw more of the context of Isa 40:6–8 in 1 Pet 1:22–25. Observing figure 1, our description can envision four steps where readers (1) discern OT quotations/allusions in the NT passage; (2) identify the OT precursor text behind the allusion, using themes from the immediate NT context to guide their initial observations; (3) explore the broader context of the precursor text, using further themes discerned in the NT passage or in the immediate OT context as guides for exploration, picking up related (sub)themes corresponding to the NT allusive context; and (4) finally discern how themes in the NT passage are illuminated by the broader OT context, themes which may stimulate other treks into the same or adjacent OT contexts.

Table 1. Broad Reference, Hays's Criteria, and Halliday/Hasan's Cohesive Ties

Steps in the Process of Broad Reference	Hays's Criteria for Discerning Allusions	Halliday/Hasan's Cohesive Ties & Discourse Coherence
1. Identify the allusion	Volume, recurrence	Lexical cohesion
2. Explore the precursor OT text	Thematic coherence	Hybrid endo/exophoric reference
3. Explore broader context of precursor text (with immediate OT precursor text and NT context in mind)	Volume, thematic coherence	Lexical cohesion, referential items within OT to OT exploration (reference, ellipsis, substitution), local coherence
4. Shed light on NT meaning, discern even more correspondences	Satisfaction	Global coherence

#### IV. DISCERNING BROAD REFERENCE OF PSALM 34 IN 1 PETER 1–2

First Peter 1–2 is a suitable candidate for the exploration of broad reference. First, this epistle does not appear in the works of Beale and Hays that are relevant to broad reference; they instead focus on inner-biblical exegesis in the Gospels, Revelation, and Pauline Epistles. Also, many studies on the use of Psalm 34 in 1 Peter have either often fallen short of discerning allusions or the hermeneutical

<sup>67</sup> Scripture is not unique in evincing such coherence, as any corpus of related texts may do so. Nevertheless, it is important to defend the view that, in Scripture, historical reality and textual record, superintended by a divine author, cohere harmoniously, especially in light the claims of some historical critical scholars that historical reality and textual record can both be 'true' in their own different senses, but do not cohere. See, e.g., Kratz: "An identity between prophet and prophetic book does not exist ... neither the biblical prophet nor the content of the prophetic book can simply be correlated with historical reality." R. G. Kratz, A. C. Hagedorn, and N. MacDonald, *The Prophets of Israel* (Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 2; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 144–45.

effect of broad reference to Psalm 34 or have focused on the longer quotation of Psalm 34 in 1 Pet 3:10–12.<sup>68</sup> Finally, 1 Peter has the highest concentration of allusions to the OT out of any NT book after Revelation, making it a rich trove of possible signals of broad reference unlikely to disappoint the reader.<sup>69</sup>

An exploration of the broad context of Psalm 34 and 1 Peter 1–2 reveal far more connections than just Ps 34:8, quoted in 1 Pet 2:3. Selwyn confirms the observations of this study, that, “the whole Psalm was present to St. Peter throughout the Epistle ... cf. verse 10 with i.15–17; verse 5 with i.17 and with *πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι* in ii.4 ... verse 23 *λυτρώσεται ... ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ’ αὐτόν* with i.18, 13; and verse 20 with the Epistle *passim*.”<sup>70</sup> Going further, Snodgrass argues that Peter “attempted to convey the consolation and exhortation of the righteous sufferer [in Psalm 34] to his readers and that he used explicit quotations, allusions, and themes from [Psalm 34] to do so.”<sup>71</sup>

1. *Discerning allusions and exploring the immediate precursor text (steps 1–2).* Therefore, following the steps of the exploration of broad reference presented above (fig. 1), we discern the quotation of Ps 34:8 in 1 Pet 2:3 as a possible signal (step 1) by Peter that more is to be explored in Psalm 34 as a whole (step 2). Then, exploring the immediate context of our precursor text, Ps 34:8, we notice that this verse was only half-quoted. The unquoted half reads *μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐλπίζει ἐπ’ αὐτόν* (“Blessed is the man *who hopes in him*”). The presence of *ἐλπίζει* in verse 8 establishes strong thematic coherence (via lexical cohesion) not only with the theme of hope in 1 Pet 1:13 (“set your *hope* fully on the grace being brought to you”) but also with the letter’s opening that celebrates God’s act of causing “us to be born again to a *living hope*” (1:3). High lexical cohesion (Hays’s “volume”) of the word “hope” between 1 Peter and Psalm 34 indicates the author’s understanding of the thematic coherence between the Psalmist’s message of the benefits of hoping in the Lord and the author’s own message of hope to his Christian readers.

There is another benefit to tarrying with the immediate precursor text (Ps 34:8) before making excursions into the precursor’s wider context: the theme of “hope” in Ps 34:8 (and 1 Pet 1:13) now serves as a guide, alerting us to look for more allusions to Psalm 34 at least between 1 Pet 1:13 (or even 1:3) and where we started (1 Pet 2:3). So, our search for allusions in the NT context should broaden just as our exploration of the OT context broadens.

<sup>68</sup> See, e.g., G. W. Bromiley, “History and Truth: A Study of the Axiom of Lessing,” *ETQ* 18 (1946): 197–98, for a scholar who misses important lexical ties between 1 Peter 1–2 and Psalm 34. For scholars applying Dodd’s thesis of broad reference to 1 Pet 3:10–12, cf. Gréaux, “The Lord Delivers Us”; and Sean M. Christensen, “Solidarity in Suffering and Glory: The Unifying Role of Psalm 34 in 1 Peter 3:10–12,” *JETS* 58 (2015): 335–52.

<sup>69</sup> Gréaux, “The Lord Delivers Us,” 606. See also Klyne R. Snodgrass, “1 Peter II. 1–10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities,” *NTS* 24 (1977): 97.

<sup>70</sup> Edward G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Essays* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Thornapple Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 157. Cf. D. A. Carson, “1 Peter,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 1022.

<sup>71</sup> Snodgrass, “1 Peter II. 1–10,” 102.

2. *Exploring the broader context of the precursor text (step 3).* Having discerned the thematic linkage of “hope” between the texts, we discover the possibility that the context between 1 Pet 1:13 and our starting point (1 Pet 2:3) is allusive as well. Keeping that in mind, we now explore the wider context of Psalm 34 for further lexical cohesion and thematic links at least to 1 Pet 1:13–2:3. A number of proposed correspondences between the two texts are presented below, including the connections discerned by Selwyn and Snodgrass.<sup>72</sup>

Table 2. The sojourner’s hope, holiness and fear<sup>73</sup>

Psalm 34	1 Peter 1
9 γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος, μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἐλπίζει ἐπ’ αὐτόν. Taste and see that the Lord is good. Blessed is the man <u>who hopes in Him</u> .	13 ἐλπίζετε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν Set your hope on the grace being brought to you
10 φοβήθητε τὸν κύριον, οἱ ἅγιοι αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑστέρημα τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν. <u>Fear the Lord</u> , all you <u>holy ones of him</u> , because there is no deficiency for <u>the ones who are fearing him</u> .	15 κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε As he who called you is <u>holy</u> , you also be <u>holy</u> in all your conduct
5 καὶ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν παροικιῶν μου ἐρρύσατό με And he rescued me <u>from all of my sojourning</u>	17 ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε Conduct yourselves <u>with fear</u> throughout the time <u>of your exile</u>
23 λυτρώσεται κύριος ψυχὰς δούλων αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐ μὴ πλημμελήσωσιν πάντες οἱ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ’ αὐτόν. <u>The Lord will redeem</u> the souls of his servants, and surely never shall all those <u>who are hoping in him</u> go astray.	18 εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου Knowing that <u>you were ransomed</u> from the futile ways inherited from your forefathers

We discover that Peter’s message for us to be a people of hope, holiness, and fear during our exile was already present in Psalm 34. Selwyn mentions Ps 34:10 as being significant to verses 15–17, without explicitly stating what themes are involved. We have discerned that these themes are hope, holiness and fear of God in 1 Pet 1:13–17. Sojourners who *fear* God and *hope* in his deliverance are characterized as *holy ones* (Ps 34:9–10, 23). The *fear* during the time of exile that Peter enjoins upon believers is unmistakably resonant of the fear of the Lord that the sojourning

<sup>72</sup> Another possible allusion to Psalm 34 (v. 2) is εὐλογητός in the letter’s opening (1:3).

<sup>73</sup> Quotations from Psalm 34 are taken from the LXX. Lancelot Brenton, *The Septuagint Version: Greek* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851). Rick Brannan et al., eds., *The Lexham English Septuagint* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2012).

Psalmist takes such comfort in. Selwyn and Snodgrass do not mention the connection between hope in 1 Pet 1:13 and the unquoted half of Ps 34:9, “Blessed is the man who hopes in him.”<sup>74</sup> Further, the holy ones who fear the Lord (Ps 34:10) are brought into Peter’s command to “be holy in all your conduct” (1 Pet 1:15). It is true that the holiness command is resonant of a direct quotation from Leviticus (11:44–45) in verse 16, but the immediate context of Psalm 34 seems to be the major cohesive force bringing sojourning, fear, and holiness together in 1 Peter 1–2. These are all instances of (local) thematic coherence between the intertexts.

3. *Illuminating the NT passage and seeing additional correspondences (step 4)*. Interestingly, for the text quoted in Peter’s holiness command (1 Pet 1:15), in the immediate context of Lev 11:44–45 God commands holiness because he is “the one who led you up from the land of Egypt to be your God,” strengthening the *coherence* of the exodus-from-exile theme prominent in 1 Peter. In fact, in terms of satisfaction or global coherence, the broad context of 1 Pet 1:13–2:5 seems to mirror the narrative movements of the exodus, echoing the girding up of the loins of your mind (1 Pet 1:13) through the lamb without blemish or spot (1 Pet 1:19) to the act of coming to [Christ] (1 Pet 2:4) and being built up as a spiritual house (1 Pet 2:5).<sup>75</sup> The people of God are a people on the move, just as the Psalmist and 1 Peter’s readers were; it is a move *away* from the past futile passions and ignorant ways of our forefathers and *toward* Christ—sanctification reimagined as an exodus from sin.<sup>76</sup>

With increased confidence of the evidence of interplay between these texts, the search for correspondences can widen. An exploration of broad reference reveals that Ps 34:6 may be a compressed repository for the major themes in 1 Pet 2:4–9. The apostle also seems to have Ps 34:6 in mind as he declares the Christian sojourners’ experience of “coming to Christ” and declaring “the excellencies of him” who called them “out of darkness into his marvelous light” (1 Pet 2:4–9). Resonances of “come to him” (1 Pet 2:4), “never be put to shame” (1 Pet 2:6), and “be enlightened” (1 Pet 2:9) from Ps 34:6 teach us that the “marvelous light” into which the sojourners are called is a light related to the joyful experience of deliverance; belonging to a new family with God as father; and the shining countenance, clear conscience (1 Pet 3:21), and dignity that this new identity of belonging to God brings.

<sup>74</sup> Snodgrass, “1 Peter II. 1–10,” 102. Snodgrass confirms every other finding of this study, however.

<sup>75</sup> Edmund P. Clowney, *The Message of 1 Peter: The Way of the Cross* (The Bible Speaks Today; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988), 62.

<sup>76</sup> “A constant coming out of exile and leaving behind of old baggage forms a lens through which the apostle [Paul] understands the ongoing nature of the Christian life, or sanctification.” G. K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 860–61. Christians “have experienced their own ‘exodus’ from slavery to sin, coming now under the domination of the high king of the universe.” Carson, “1 Peter,” 1030.



Table 3. The enlightened countenance of the one who hopes in God

Ps 34:6	1 Peter 2
<u>προσέλθατε</u> πρὸς αὐτὸν <u>Come</u> to him	4 Πρὸς ὃν <u>προσερχόμενοι</u> As you <u>come</u> [to him]
καὶ <u>φωτίσθητε</u> , and <u>you will be enlightened</u>	9 ἔκ σκοτούς... εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ <u>φῶς</u> Out of darkness into his marvelous <u>light</u>
καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν <u>οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ</u> . and your faces will <u>never be put to shame</u>	6 <u>οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ</u> Will never be <u>put to shame</u> <sup>77</sup>

Psalm 34:6 seems to pull the themes of 1 Pet 2:4, 9, and 6 closer together in that there is “no shame” but rather “light” for those who “come to” Christ. First Peter 2:9 declares that God called us “out of darkness” into “his marvelous light”—a theocentric light of God’s glory and a soteriological light of salvation, new identity, and hope. What Ps 34:6 does as it is interwoven with this NT context is widen the reference of this “light” to a subjective experience of lifted countenance (“you will be enlightened, and your faces will never be disgraced”) during the experience of afflictions before revilers and persecutors. Read together, as we argue they appropriately should be, Ps 34:6 and 1 Pet 2:9 teach us that the light of God’s glory into which God called believers from darkness is a *glory* reflected in enlightened faces, a life experience full of glory-reflective joy amid affliction. This reading is all the more satisfying (coherent) because it picks up on 1 Pet 1:6–9, that we “rejoice” though “grieved by various trials,” not only because of promised *future* “praise and glory and honor,” but because our hearts *at present* are filled with “joy that is inexpressible and filled with glory” because of a (darkness-to-light) salvation worked by the one whom, not seeing, we love. The light of God’s salvation is reflected subjectively in the lives of God’s people who sojourn through a dark world on a new exodus out of sin. Furthermore, this experience of joy, so palpable in Psalm 34 and 1 Peter 1–2, is an extension of the glory of God, as “the glory of God is magnified when we rejoice in him.”<sup>78</sup>

Exploring broad reference helps us discern that Psalm 34 and 1 Peter 1–2 shed mutual light on each other. We began from one quotation (Ps 34:9 in 1 Pet 2:3) and followed thematic guides to see other less obvious correspondences between the intertexts, concluding with the above observation that two items in the NT context, the light of God’s salvation (1 Pet 2:9) and our experience of it in glory-reflecting joy (1 Pet 1:9), seem to be tied by the bridge of Ps 34:6. We agree therefore with Rendall’s conclusion that the

<sup>77</sup> Isa 28:16 is quoted in 1 Pet 2:6, but Ps 34:6 seems to be present as well, especially given the high degree of resonance we have seen between 1 Peter 1–2 and Psalm 34.

<sup>78</sup> John Piper et al., *The Pastor as Scholar and the Scholar as Pastor: Reflections on Life and Ministry* (ed. Owen Strachan and David Mathis; Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011), 46.

Scriptures enclose hidden meanings ... in the sense that they have a richness of internal reference that requires to be “opened up” by diligent search and enquiry. ... Scripture is interlocked with Scripture, and in each a sort of chain-reaction takes place, triggering off a whole series of interrelated passages.<sup>79</sup>

By studying Psalm 34, Peter indeed “found the answer to the problem of Christian persecution.”<sup>80</sup> It is an answer that involves contrasting the temporal griefs (“Many are the afflictions of the righteous,” Ps 34:20) with the glory-reflecting ecstatic joy of being loved and rescued (“Let the humble hear, and let them rejoice,” Ps 34:3) and the present guarantee of not being shamed by unbelieving revilers, fortified by a future hope of ultimate deliverance (“he will rescue them ... surely never shall all those who are hoping in him go astray,” Ps 34:20b, 23).

## V. AN INVITATION TO EXPLORE BROAD REFERENCE

Implicit in divine revelation is an invitation to direct our attention to the God who calls us to a transformative relationship.<sup>81</sup> One aspect of that transformation is becoming more interesting readers of Scripture, what Hays calls a “conversion of the imagination” that leads us to adopt a “hermeneutic of trust” where we see ourselves with all our “critical” acumen with suspicion and read “Scripture receptively and trustingly with the aid of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>82</sup> It is true that, because Scripture is divinely inspired, “we should not be surprised to find that the authorial will of God goes beyond the human will” to yield unexpected readings.<sup>83</sup> Yet we also find in the human Scripture writers a cognitive peripheral awareness of broader contexts and themes that reveal ostensibly non-contextual readings or surprising meanings to be within the authors’ “willed types.” If we are serious about the divine inspiration of Scripture, we must yield more ground on our resistance to the idea that NT writers respected the context of the OT; they were more aware of that context than we have often been willing to grant. When exploring broad reference reveals surprising and illuminating connections in Scripture, we are not “going beyond what is written”; we are learning how to read.

---

<sup>79</sup> Rendall, “Quotation in Scripture as an Index of Wider Reference,” 221.

<sup>80</sup> Snodgrass, “I Peter II. 1–10,” 106.

<sup>81</sup> Murray Rae, “Incline Your Ear So That You May Live’: Principles of Biblical Epistemology,” in *The Bible and Epistemology: Biblical Soundings in the Knowledge of God* (ed. Mary Healy and R. Parry; Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2007), 161–62.

<sup>82</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 4; idem, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 197–98.

<sup>83</sup> S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration* (Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 50, 79.