



**UNTIL THE TWO WORLDS MERGE INTO ONE:
A REDEMPTIVE-HISTORICAL
CONCEPTUALIZATION OF SERMON APPLICATION**

ERIC PRICE
Teaching Assistant
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

ABSTRACT

Sermon application is often conceptualized as a process of traversing historical distance between the original readers of Scripture and contemporary Christians. This essay seeks to qualify such accounts of application by setting historical distance within the context of the overarching theological continuity between God's people throughout redemptive history. While there is an element of historical distance between the biblical text and the listener, this need not be the exclusive or even primary category by which homileticians understand and teach sermon application. The essay suggests that the primacy of historical distance in the theology of sermon application arises from conceptual disjunctions central to biblical studies as an academic discipline. It then proposes a more integrated approach to application which foregrounds theological continuity. Finally, it concludes with suggestions for how teachers of preaching might integrate this theology of application into their homiletical pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

Sermon application is central to the task of preaching. The process of application is often conceived of as something needed

to traverse distance between “the ancient text” and “the modern listener.”² John Stott famously described preaching as “bridging two worlds” –that of the text and that of the listener.³ The primacy of historical distance in conceptualizing the relationship between the biblical text and contemporary Christians is often assumed in evangelical homiletics. Yet in this article, I want to suggest that, while there is an element of historical distance between the text and the listener, this should not be the exclusive or even primary category by which we think about and teach sermon application. In this article, I explain that this distinction draws unnecessarily from biblical studies as an academic discipline; I then propose an alternative model and provide some brief pedagogical suggestions.

BIBLICAL STUDIES AND ITS DISJUNCTIONS

Here I suggest that the goal of biblical studies, by virtue of its focus on historical backgrounds and ancient contexts, differs from that of homiletics. As such, there are three conceptual disjunctions often assumed in biblical studies that are unhelpful for homiletics if they become absolutized in the way we describe sermon application. The three disjunctions, explained below, show how the goals and concerns of biblical studies are largely historical in nature.

Original Meaning Versus Contemporary Application

The first disjunction—the overarching one that creates the other two—is between what a biblical text “meant” in its original context and what it “means” for contemporary readers.⁴ For example, J. P. Gabler, a key figure in the development of biblical studies, held that interpreters must “do the biblical theological work of separating the central core [of the biblical message] from the details of historical ideas.”⁵ This central core “is what is left when the theology of the New Testament in its own time. . . . [is] shorn of its time-conditioned inessentials.”⁶ Functionally, this

means historical details of the biblical text are an encumbrance to contemporary usage.

This approach privileges the historical details behind the text by holding that they are essential for understanding the text itself. A survey of technical commentaries will show this—their focus is on ancient Near Eastern or Greco-Roman backgrounds, linguistic analysis, textual criticism, and (depending on the commentary) discussion of redaction and editing behind the final form of the text. Except for explicitly theological or homiletical commentaries, it is rare for such commentaries to discuss how the text relates to systematic theology or the Christian life.

Douglas Sweeney, in a study of biblical interpretation, says: “In more recent modern history, learned preachers have been taught to think primarily as historians, explaining sermon texts by reference to their ancient, social contexts.”⁷ The truth of Sweeney’s observation is evident when one surveys how introductory homiletics texts speak of the applicational process. Haddon Robinson’s widely used text provides a representative example:

We cannot decide what a passage means to us unless first we have determined what the passage meant when the Bible was written... Only after we comprehend what he [the biblical author] meant in his own terms and to his own times can we clarify what difference that should make in life today.⁸

Historicizing the text distances modern readers from it. The need to “bridge worlds” or traverse historical distance then arises, and the process of bridging this distance is often conceived of as principlizing. This is a process whereby the preacher identifies a spiritual truth contained within a biblical passage and then extracts that truth from the biblical passage in order to state it in a timeless way for present listeners.⁹ When meaning is identified with events behind the text, rather than the text itself, this atomistic conception of sermon application becomes necessary.

Biblical Studies Versus Theology

The second divide, between biblical studies and theology, also results from prioritizing historical circumstances behind the text, as described above. A key issue in navigating the relationship between biblical studies and theology is the relationship of exegesis to the essential components of doctrinal orthodoxy, often called the rule of faith.¹⁰ There is a mutually informative relationship between the rule of faith and biblical exegesis, with the former delimiting and guiding the latter, and the latter nuancing and refining (but not, I would argue, overturning) the former.¹¹

As biblical studies emerged as an academic discipline divorced from an ecclesial context, it developed a methodology that required an *a priori* bracketing of theological tradition from the interpretive task. The tools of academic biblical studies are not incompatible with a confessional approach to Scripture, but the danger nonetheless for evangelical theology is that the rule of faith becomes merely a guardrail against heresy rather than a handmaiden of interpretation.¹² A classic example of this issue is whether the plural “us” in Gen 1:26 ought to be taken as a Trinitarian reference (as in a confessional approach) or a utilization of the ancient Near Eastern concept of a “heavenly court” (as in biblical studies).¹³

Academic Versus Applicational Study

The third disjunction homiletics has inherited from academic biblical studies is between academic study and applicational study. In considering the history of writing commentaries, biblical scholars Mark Gignilliat and Jonathan Pennington say “it is only from a modern viewpoint that distinctions between ‘scholarly’ and ‘devotional’ arise; modernity will come to define ‘scholarly’ and ‘academic’ commentary as somehow objective and nonpersonal, nonsapiential, and nonexhortational.”¹⁴ The frequently utilized threefold method of inductive Bible study—

observation, interpretation, application—reflects the division between studying the text and applying the text.¹⁵ This implies that interpretation can take place in a cognitive manner detached from affectional concerns.

TOWARD A MORE INTEGRATIVE APPROACH

We are indebted to biblical scholars who have provided us with increasingly precise tools to interpret Scripture. I highlight these three disjunctions, not to dismiss the value of academic biblical studies, but to show that the goals of biblical studies are not identical to those of homiletics. The disjunctions described above may facilitate goals prized by biblical scholars, but they can become problematic when applied uncritically to homiletics. Thus, I propose a model of interpretation and application that provides an alternative to the disjunctions described above.¹⁶

A Pauline Case for Theological Continuity between the Text and the Readers

The three disjunctions described above create distance between the biblical text and the reader. I propose that the way the Apostle Paul views the New Covenant believer's relationship to OT stories in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22 provides us with an alternative homiletical model. My focus here is the theological lens through which Paul views OT characters and events; this lens substantiates his use of the OT for the church by showing a continuity between contemporary readers of Scripture and the believing community whose life is recorded in Scripture.

In 1 Corinthians 10, Paul appeals to Exodus 32 and Numbers 25 to warn the Corinthian congregation about the danger of idolatry; his repeated use of the comparative adverb *καθώς* (1 Cor 10:6, 7, 8, 9, 33) indicates that commonality between the church and Israel is central to his argument. He refers to OT believers as the church's fathers, or ancestors (*πατέρες*, 10:1). In what sense, though, is there a paternity between OT believers and NT believers? Here I will sketch

briefly a three-fold continuity that substantiates the correspondence he draws between the OT and the church for the purposes of instruction and exhortation.

First, there is continuity of divine identity. In 1 Cor 10:4, Paul in some measure identifies the rock which followed Israel in the wilderness with Christ.¹⁷ This enigmatic statement is often attributed to Jewish interpretive strategies such as midrash.¹⁸ While Paul may indeed draw upon such interpretive traditions, it is also likely that his identification of the rock as Christ is an intentional application of an OT designation for Yahweh to the Messiah Jesus. Yahweh is identified as a rock in the OT (cf. Deut 32, Ps 18:2). Further, his provision of water from a rock later functions as a reminder of his presence (Ps 78:15, 78:20, 105:41, 114:8), and also as a foreshadowing for his provision of a Messiah (cf. Isa. 48:20-49:7). Thus by identifying Jesus as the rock in the wilderness, Paul (1) expands the identity of Yahweh to include Jesus within it, as he has already done in 1 Cor 8:6, and (2) identifies Jesus as the ultimate instantiation of Yahweh's provision for his people. The same God who gave provision to Israel in the wilderness has now given redemptive provision to his people anew in Christ.

Second, there is a redemptive-historical continuity. Paul's statement that Christians are those on whom "the culmination of the ages" (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων) has come (1 Cor 10:11) indicates redemptive-historical intensification of God's activity in the world—intensification that, through the Messiah, "constitutes the fulfillment of God's promises of Israel's restoration and humanity's salvation."¹⁹ This fulfillment presupposes the unity of God's work through Israel and through the church. Though Israel appeared in a scene less proximate to the Scriptural plot's climactic resolution, she and the church are both actors in the same play, on the same stage, guided by the same divine Director.²⁰ Commenting on 1 Cor 10:1-22, Richard Hays says that "the point of Paul's metaphor depends on seeing Israel and church as pilgrim people who stand in different times, different chapters of the same story, *but in identical relation* to the same gracious and righteous God."²¹ The description of the Israelites

being baptized into Moses parallels the New Covenant concept of baptism into Christ.²² Moses prefigured faintly what Christ provides in full.

Third, there is an ethical continuity. Paul warns the church not to test Christ, as the Israelites did. This parenthesis is grounded in the broader continuity of divine presence—both OT and NT believers are to abstain from idolatry and worship the one true God. The connection between redemptive-historical progression and ethical exhortation is indicated when Paul identifies the events that happened to OT believers as τύποι for the church (1 Cor 10:6). Modern translations render this “examples,” although τύπος is usually translated “type.” The differences in translation point to an underlying interpretive question: Are these OT incidents simply examples employed retroactively by Paul, or could they properly be considered types in the sense that they are intended by God to foreshadow Christ and the church?

Much could be said about this question, but here I note that the two defining features of typology – historical correspondence and escalation – are both present in this text.²³ As Eric Watkins explains, the experiences of OT Israelites parallel those of NT believers because both live in the interim period between the initiation and consummation of redemption: “The Israelites were already brought out of Egypt in the Exodus but were not yet in the land of promise.”²⁴ This interim status is, for the church, even more eschatologically significant due to the onset of the end times (described above) and her anticipation of redemption’s eschatological completion. Thus, Jim Hamilton’s comment applies well Paul’s use of OT events in this text: “the events of Israel’s history function like schematics or templates, and they are used to communicate the meaning of who Jesus was and what he accomplished.”²⁵ In light of 1 Cor 10:6, I suggest that those who experienced God’s presence in the OT function, by extension, as schematics for New Covenant believers who are likewise God’s people through the Spirit. The events that happened to OT Israel are types insofar as Israel herself anticipates the Messiah. Christ, as the fulfillment of Israel, is “the one...in whom God’s people are summed up.”²⁶ Since Christ

sums up Israel in himself, those joined to him stand in antitypical relationship to OT believers.²⁷

This continuity enables Paul to draw moral exhortation from OT events, but the redemptive-historical logic by which he does so places the Corinthian believers in close proximity to OT Israel.²⁸ The proximity is not spatial or temporal, but rather theological and familial. Notably, though Israel is typical of Christ and the church, the nation's typical status does not preclude Israelites from serving as ethical models of Christian living. In this way, a canonical interpretation of Scripture is inseparable from the hortatory element of Scripture, and typology is undergirded by a redemptive-historical framework that allows it to be both predictive of the Christ event and exhortational in its instruction for the Christian life.²⁹

How Redemptive-Historical Continuity Collapses Dichotomies

I suggest the canonical continuity within which Paul relates OT Scripture to NT believers collapses the three dichotomies I outlined above that are frequently found in evangelical homiletics. First, the Israel-church proximity collapses the distance between original and contemporary meaning by placing the saints of old within the same redemptive-historical context. The writers and characters of Scripture may indeed occupy different historical, social, and circumstantial contexts than contemporary readers, but the common context of redemptive history places situational discontinuities within the larger context of an overarching theological continuity. This is not meant to deny that legitimate situational discontinuities do exist and may require understanding of historical background – Paul's comments on head coverings in 1 Cor 11:2-16 come to mind here. However, it does keep us from absolutizing discontinuity in a way that might implicitly inhibit readers without training in historical backgrounds from studying the Scriptures and finding instruction for discipleship.

Second, this redemptive-historical continuity collapses the distance between interpretation and application by orienting

Scripture toward a divine *telos*—worshipful obedience—which indicates that one cannot know a biblical text apart from obedient response. Dean Flemming rightly says that “in Paul’s contextualizing hermeneutic, the relationship between understanding and application becomes almost seamless.”³⁰ I suggest that this seamlessness actually reflects the redemptive-historical continuity between Israel and the church, which means that both entities have a divine mandate to avoid idolatry. Israel’s corporate identity as a people was rooted in her reception of God’s redemptive initiative, and this identity had ethical entailments. Upon redeeming Israel from Egypt, Yahweh said: “I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery. You shall have no other gods before me” (Ex. 20:2-3). Likewise, the God who redeemed Israel has now redeemed the church in Christ, and this continuity of redemption means that the church’s mandate to avoid idolatry is even more significant. Thus, Paul identifies the events of Scripture as types because we have inherited Israel’s ethical mandate: “Do not be idolaters, as some of them were” (1 Cor 10:7a). This imbues Scripture with a teleology that means right worship is an essential, not incidental, component of Scripture’s function in the Christian life.

Finally, this Pauline continuity collapses the divide between biblical studies and theology by locating individual texts within the context of the Christian canon. The identity of God and his revelation in the Christ event provide the theological fabric for relating biblical texts to contemporary believers. This theological fabric means that a methodological bracketing of Christian theology from the exegetical process risks separating what God has joined together.³¹

Implications for Homiletical Pedagogy

I propose that this continuity has implications for the language and concepts by which we teach the homiletical process. Here I will offer four suggestions.

First, I offer the following analogy that may help explain how Paul conceptualizes Scriptural application. Imagine that a gentleman named Fred operates a family business founded by a great-grandfather whom he had never met. One day, Fred uncovers the diary of his great-grandfather, and there he reads about this distant relative's founding vision for how the business could provide quality customer care. Though the world of business has changed since his great-grandfather's lifetime, Fred nonetheless finds the continuity of vision and purpose between these two worlds to be a valuable guide for how to navigate contemporary business challenges. He shares and is inspired by his great-grandfather's vision for the business.

Though an imperfect analogy, I offer it to highlight this point: When Fred reads his great-great-grandfather's vision for the business, he likely would not think primarily in terms of "my ancestor's world" and "my contemporary world." He likely would not suspend personal involvement until he had investigated the historical circumstances surrounding the diary entries. The experience of reading it would be one of familial involvement and personal investment. Of course, there would be historical and circumstantial bridges to cross in order to learn from the previously undiscovered diary entries and apply their lessons to the contemporary state of the business. Yet the size of these gaps between Fred and his ancestor would also be relativized, I suggest, by the context of common familial identity and commonality of purpose in running the business.

Similarly, we share with saints throughout Scripture a common family and God-given purpose—to worship and make known the one true God. Their struggles are our struggles, their God our God, and their purpose our purpose. The shared familial identity and common purpose precludes major chasms between academic and devotional study and between "then" and "now." Redemptive-history is a familial bond that unites these polarities by joining believers across time into a common family with a common Parent.

Second, I propose that we explain the homiletical process in terms that are explicitly theological. The inspired apostles

provide controlling conceptual categories by which we understand what takes place in preaching. Because of this, it is incumbent upon us to conceptualize the homiletical process in ways that draw upon Scripture's own self-understanding. Systematic theologian John Webster has called for us to do "theological theology," a recognition of the fact that even theology can be done in non-theological ways. Similarly, I suggest we should strive for a "theological homiletic," one that derives its conceptual categories for explaining the homiletical transaction from the NT's own use of Scripture.³²

Third, I suggest that we nuance the way that we describe the process of application when teaching homiletics courses. It is important to emphasize the need for application, as students in theological schools must be trained to think of preaching as more than the regurgitation of exegetical tidbits about a biblical text. Yet while it is pedagogically sensible to an extent that we emphasize application as distinct from explanation to a certain extent, I would suggest we be careful not to overstate the distinction. Perhaps we might speak of explanation as a twofold process of addressing the world of the text and also the world in front of the text, with explanation being complete when the two worlds have been fused so that contemporary believers may respond with worship. This conceptualization of the application process seems to accord better with Paul's theological method in 1 Cor 10 than does a rigid distinction between interpretation and application. Timothy Gabrielson's comments state the matter well: "innerbiblical exegesis has a 'contemporizing' bent; that is, it emphasizes the immediacy of God's word to later generations rather than moving between 'exegesis' and 'application' as a two-stage process or back-and-forth method."³³ If this is so, then a theological homiletic ought to likewise emphasize application as an essential facet of explanation rather than a totally distinct component of the sermon.

Fourth, I suggest we develop sermon delivery strategies that implicitly capture the familial continuity of contemporary listeners with saints of ages past. Here I suggest the African-American preaching tradition offers guidance, as it understands

intuitively this theological continuity better than Anglo preaching traditions. Homiletician Cleophus LaRue says:

So often in black preaching there will be little distance between the preacher and the events of the text. It's not uncommon to hear the preacher proclaim, 'I heard Paul say the other day...' as if the preacher and Paul had recently been in conversation, for the preacher believes that God is speaking in the hear [*sic*] and now directly through the text.³⁴

Similar strategies, such as anachronism, in explaining biblical texts allow preachers to collapse the distance between the biblical world and contemporary world in order to show that cultural and temporal separation between God's people is secondary to their shared identity and mission as members of God's redeemed family.³⁵ Such delivery strategies help re-create the communal and 'contemporizing' (to use Gabrielson's term) nature of Scriptural application.

CONCLUSION

This article has suggested that the primary conceptual categories often utilized to speak of sermon application are somewhat in tension with the way the NT itself conceptualizes the application of Scripture to new situations and to Christians living subsequent to the inscripturation of God's revelation. Here I offered 1 Cor 10 as a case study of a Scriptural theology of application. This text demonstrates how the NT's application of prior Scripture merges two worlds into one rather than traversing them as if they were two historically, culturally, and temporally distinct entities. In light of this, I suggested some pedagogical strategies for teaching and communicating these theological truths. A homiletic that is truly evangelical ought to draw from Scripture its understanding of what preaching is and of what this communicative process consists. This will put us on the path toward a theological

homiletic that teaches us to merge two worlds into one rather than merely build a bridge between them.

NOTES

1. The author would like to thank Kevin Vanhoozer and Timothy Gabrielson for providing feedback on a draft of this article. Any shortcomings remain the author's own. This article draws, in language and thought, from the author's ThM thesis written at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.
2. Here I draw these terms from the title of Sidney Greidanus' book *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text: Interpreting and Preaching Biblical Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988).
3. John R. W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Challenge of Preaching Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982).
4. My understanding of the hermeneutical and theological issues involved in this is indebted to Rhyne R. Putman, *In Defense of Doctrine: Evangelicalism, Theology, and Scripture* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015).
5. M. Elliott, "Gabler, Johann Philipp (1753-1826)," in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2007), 454.
6. *Ibid.*, 453.
7. Douglas Sweeney, *Edwards the Exegete: Biblical Interpretation and Anglo-Protestant Culture on the Edge of the Enlightenment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 42.
8. Haddon Robinson, *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014), 58. For a more technical explanation of a hermeneutical approach that produces this kind of view, see Robert H. Stein, "The Benefits of an Author-Oriented Approach to Hermeneutics," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44:3 (September 2001): 451-466.
9. My definition draws from Ramesh Richard, who critiques this approach: "Principlization is the theory of preaching that takes a passage, extracts a universal principle, and applies it to the contemporary context" (*Preparing Expository Sermons: A Seven-Step Method for Biblical Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 160). For a defense of principlizing, see Walter C. Kaiser Jr., "A Principlizing Model," in *Four Views on Moving Beyond the Bible to Theology*, ed. Gary T. Meadors, Zondervan Counterpoints Series (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 19-50.
10. See Adriani Milli Rodrigues, "The Rule of Faith and Biblical Interpretation in Evangelical Theological Interpretation of Scripture," *Themelios* 43:2 (2018): 257-70.
11. Daniel J. Treier, *Introducing Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Recovering a Christian Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 59.

-
12. For an account of the transition of biblical studies from an ecclesial discipline into an academic one, see Michael C. Legaspi, *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010). For an appreciative review by a biblical scholar who nonetheless differs with Legaspi's assessment that the tools of biblical studies should not be appropriated by confessional scholars, see Mark S. Gignilliat, "Review of 'The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies' by Michael C. Legaspi," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 15:1 (January 2013): 107–110.
 13. On the interpretation of Gen 1:26 as an example of tension between historical and theological readings of Scripture, see Treier, *Introducing Theological Interpretation*, 70–77.
 14. Mark Gignilliat and Jonathan T. Pennington, "Theological Commentary," in *A Manifesto for Theological Interpretation*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew and Heath A. Thomas (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 239–240.
 15. This three-fold division of the study process is utilized, for example, in Howard G. Hendricks and William G. Hendricks, *Living By the Book: The Art and Science of Reading the Bible*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: Moody, 2007).
 16. As I was developing this model for myself based on a study of 1 Corinthians, I read the following article which addressed the same issue and offered a proposal with similarities to my own: Timothy A. Gabrielson, "Along the Grain of Salvation History: A Suggestion for Evangelical Hermeneutics," *Trinity Journal* 36NS (2015): 71–90. I am indebted to Gabrielson for helping me better understand, solidify, and articulate my views. This article is more focused on homiletics, whereas Gabrielson is more focused on various models of evangelical hermeneutics; yet the model I suggest 1 Cor 10 offers us for thinking about application is similar to what Gabrielson finds in other passages of Scripture. The reader is encouraged to consult his article for elaboration on what I have presented here.
 17. On the meaning of Paul's statement that "the rock was Christ," see the discussion by Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 450–451; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Revised Edition, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 494–496.
 18. See, for example, Wayne A. Meeks, "'And Rose Up to Play': Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 16 (October 1982): 64–78.
 19. Eckhard Schnabel, *40 Questions About the End Times* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011), 19.
 20. Here I employ the metaphor developed by Kevin Vanhoozer of Scripture as a divine drama. See Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "A Drama-of-Redemption Model," in *Four Views on Moving Beyond the Bible to Theology*, ed. Gary T. Meadors, Zondervan Counterpoints Series (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 151–199. For examples of how this metaphor applies to homiletics, see Ahmi Lee, *Preaching God's Grand Drama: A Biblical-Theological Approach* (Grand Rapids:

Baker, 2019) and Eric Brian Watkins, *The Drama of Preaching: Participating with God in the History of Redemption* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2017).

21. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 99. Italics are added for emphasis.

22. So Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 447–448.

23. James Hamilton Jr. says: “Typological interpretation attends to historical correspondence and escalation. Real events that took place in history are seen to match in sequence and import, and as we progress from a type to fulfillment, we find an increase in significance” (*God’s Glory in Salvation Through Judgment* [Wheaton: Crossway, 2013], 365).

24. Watkins, *Drama of Preaching*, 124.

25. James Hamilton Jr., *What Is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible’s Story, Symbolism, and Patterns* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2014), 39. Hamilton did not make this statement specifically about the passage under our consideration; but it is a broad truth of biblical theology that applies to and informs my reading of 1 Cor 10:6.

26. N. T. Wright, *Justification: God’s Plan & Paul’s Vision* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2016), 125. Italics removed from the original text.

27. This antitypical relationship between Israel and Christ is one that may be affirmed by both dispensational and non-dispensational biblical theologians. For a summary of the issue and, in this writer’s judgment, a helpful mediating position, see Brent E. Parker, “The Israel-Christ-Church Relationship,” in *Progressive Covenantalism: Charting a Course Between Dispensational and Covenant Theologies*, ed. Stephen J. Wellum and Brent E. Parker (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016), 39–68.

28. Eric Watkins, whose work has been of great assistance to me, says this about the church-Israel continuity in 1 Cor 10: “The comparisons between Israel and the church are clear, demonstrable, and are anchored in the overarching DR [drama of redemption] theme of God’s redemptive metanarrative as that which binds not only Scripture together, but also binds the faith experiences of God’s people *back then* with God’s people *now*” (*Drama of Preaching*, 125).

29. Again, Eric Watkins’s comment is helpful, as he is the only scholar I am aware of whose homiletic accounts for this dual function of typology: “It is customary to think of typology foremost as a category of Christocentric revelation...While it is appropriate to think of typology in this way, the New Testament also employs the language of typology as a pastoral means of illustrating ethical norms” (*Ibid.*, 124).

30. Dean Flemming, *Contextualization in the New Testament: Patterns for Theology and Mission* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2005), 169.

31. For a helpful example of how biblical and systematic theology facilitate theological interpretation of history, see Grant Macaskill, “History, Providence and the Apocalyptic Paul,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 70:4 (2017): 409–426.

32. The phrase “theological homiletic” and its connection to John Weber was suggested to me by Kevin Vanhoozer. For a summary and overview of Webster’s theological method, see Michael Allen, “Toward Theological Theology: Tracing the Methodological Principles of John Webster,” *Themelios* 41.2 (2016): 217–37.

33. Gabrielson, “Along the Grain of Salvation History,” 74. Similarly, Daniel Doriani says that “it is ill advised to draw a sharp line between exegesis and relevance, for the boundary between them is fuzzy and permeable” (*Putting the Truth to Work: The Theory and Practice of Biblical Application* [Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2001], 23). See also Gregory W. Lee, *Today When You Hear His Voice: Scripture, the Covenants, and the People of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016).

34. Cleophus J. LaRue, *I Believe I’ll Testify: The Art of African American Preaching* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 62.

35. For more suggestions on how to implement such strategies in ways that draw from African-American preaching, see Jared E. Alcántara, *Crossover Preaching: Intercultural-Improvisational Homiletics in Conversation with Gardner C. Taylor* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015), 243–245.

National Preaching Conference

November 19-21, 2019
Waco, TX

FEATURING

Alistair Begg, Tony Evans,
Joel Gregory, Mary Hulst,
Jimmy Mellado, Beth Moore,
and Ralph D. West

Learn more and register at
baylor.edu/truett/npc



Baylor University

GEORGE W. TRUETT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Kyle Lake Center for Effective Preaching