

STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

ESSAYS ON  
TYPOLOGY

G. W. H. LAMPE, M.G., D.D.

*Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology,  
University of Birmingham*

K. J. WO OLLCOMBE, M.A.

*Fellow and Chaplain of St. John's College, Oxford*



S CM PRESS LTD  
56 BLOOMSBURY STREET  
LONDON

*First published April 1917*

## **CONTENTS**

*Preface*

(7)

The Reasonableness of Typology

G. W. H. LAMPE

(9)

The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development  
of Typology

K. J. WOOLLCOMBE

(39)

*Index*

(76)

## PREFACE

THESE essays originated in a conference of the Society for the Study of Theology held at Oxford in the spring of 1955. The subject of the conference was 'Biblical Theology', and since the problem of the validity and usefulness of the typological method of exegesis must be of vital importance in any discussion of what is meant by 'Biblical theology', it naturally received a considerable amount of attention. The essay which now appears under the title 'The Reasonableness of Typology' was one of the papers read on that occasion. The second essay, 'The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology', may be said to have arisen out of its author's contribution to the discussion of the former paper. Some of the material used in the latter essay is taken from an article by the author—'Le Sens de "type" chez les Peres' in *La Vie Spirituelle*, published by Les Editions du Cerf, Paris.

The primary objects of the essays are different. The first seeks to discuss the question of the principles underlying the use of the typological method of interpretation, and to suggest, in general terms, some considerations which may help to establish a rationale of typology. In the second essay there is a more detailed examination of the actual ways in which typology was employed by early writers, both within the canon of Scripture and in the patristic period. It would scarcely be possible to integrate these essays into a single work. The approach of the one is by way of a general inquiry, and that of the other is historical. They are accordingly presented as independent essays, without any direct connexion with each other, although it is hoped that the consideration of general principles may be illuminated by the historical investigation and vice versa.

September, 1956

G. W. H. L.  
K. J. W.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
CW	Cohn and Wendland
ET	English translation
GCS	<i>Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
M.	Migne, <i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
OCD	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>
RSV	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
RV	<i>Revised Version</i>
St.D	<i>Studies and Documents</i>
TWNT	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>

## I

### THE REASONABLENESS OF TYPOLOGY

G. W. H. LAMPE

Now WHERE do the changes which have come over our reading and understanding of the Bible find more striking expression than in the different attitudes which have been adopted towards the typological and allegorical methods of interpreting the Scriptures. The ordinary reader of a century ago took a large measure of allegory and typology in his stride, as it were, when he turned to his Bible. The headings of the pages of the Authorized Version told him plainly that in the Song of Songs, Christ was addressing the Church; he found no difficulty in reading out of the text the true lesson that the Church is at once black with sin, but comely as being justified in Christ. When he recited the `cursing' Psalms he knew that the enemies which were denounced there were the enemies of Israel, and consequently the enemies of the Church as the new Israel: his own enemies, the spiritual powers of wickedness against which he knew himself to be engaged in Israel's warfare. He would have been surprised to hear that these verses might be thought shocking, or that they might come to be politely bracketed in the 1,928 Psalter as suitable for omission by the more squeamish worshipper. There was much in his Bible which he was accustomed, and had always been accustomed from childhood, to read as allegory. It was not an allegory which he had to work out himself; it was traditional and standard, a regular and almost invariable accompaniment of the sacred text. He knew that the Old Testament was a book about Christ. Again, the Authorized Version headings told him so, and he had been brought up to read the prophets as foretellers of Jesus, so that the Servant of the Lord was actually Jesus himself, and it was perfectly legitimate to interpret Christ's death by reference to what was revealed about it by the prophet Isaiah centuries before the event. Indeed, what the prophet disclosed to the Christian reader concerning the meaning of the death of Jesus was fully as relevant for Christian faith and theology as the records of the Evangelists themselves. Prophet and apostle

delivered the same message; the former, it is true, discerned the truth partially and expressed it in veiled foreshadowings and symbolical pictures, whereas the latter stood in the clear light of the fulfilment and spoke openly the truth which the prophets predicted in riddles and images. Yet their witness was identical. Hence it was perfectly legitimate to read a detailed statement of the doctrine of the Atonement out of the prophet's words. Isaiah 5<sup>3</sup> was significant, not merely because in it Jesus found the scriptural expectation which was most nearly fitted to express his own conception of his mission to be the Servant of the Lord, but because it set out in prophetic language the divinely authorized explanation of what the Cross meant. The Gospel story fulfilled the prophecy, and in its turn the Gospel story had to be read and interpreted in the light of Isaiah. If the prophet was actually describing Jesus in his picture of the Servant, then such apparently difficult phrases as 'we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted', and 'it pleased the Lord to bruise him' . . . passages which, on this interpretation would imply a sharp distinction between God the Father and the Incarnate Son, had somehow to be reconciled with Christian theology. They were part of the actual data from which theology had to proceed.

Many events recorded in the historical books of the Old Testament, as well as the prophecies, were significant, not primarily for themselves, but for what they foreshadowed. They were not fundamentally important for their value as literal history, but as types and images in and through which the Holy Spirit had indicated what was to come when God would bring in the New Covenant to fulfil and supersede the Old. They denoted what was to be enacted in the Gospel events, and the Christian reader, looking back on the events recorded in the Old Testament in the light of the fulfilment, found himself in the position of the spectator of a drama who already knows how the play will end. He knew the plot, and so he could recognize and appreciate the subtlety of the dramatic irony by which the divine dramatist had made every stage of the action prefigure (though this could not be understood by the characters themselves in their historical setting) the final *denouement* described in the New Testament books.

The ordinary Bible-reader of a century ago would naturally, therefore, read the account of the sacrifice of Isaac as a story, expressed in veiled language, of the Father's gift, his only-begotten Son, for man's salvation. That was the real importance of the

passage; it was to be understood typically or spiritually, not merely as a literal narrative. That was why it had been recorded in the first instance by Moses; for Moses was not his own master in what he wrote; he was moved and directed by the Holy Ghost, and in narrating this episode he was being guided not simply to describe an edifying and moving tale of faith and devotion, but to write, as it were, a First Lesson for a Christian lectionary, designed to correspond to a Second Lesson from the Gospels. The crossing of the Red Sea, again, was to be understood as an actual account, expressed in type and imagery, of the redemption of Christians from bondage to the devil and their entry into the inheritance won for them through Christ.

Our imaginary reader thus found a coherent pattern running through every part of Scripture. Each part of it spoke to him of Christ and of the Christian life. He still shared the preconceptions of the New Testament writers themselves, of their patristic interpreters and of all the preachers and commentators throughout the centuries who had sought to expound the inner meaning of the text and to exhibit the correspondence of types and prophecies with their fulfilment. He shared the outlook of those primitive Christians who interpreted the events of Christ's life and death and resurrection in terms of the experience of the old Israel, who expressed the significance for themselves of the Gospel events by finding in them a replica of the pattern of Old Testament history and prophecy with which they, as people of the covenant, were familiar. He was still, like the men of the first century, the heir of Biblical and Hebraic culture. The world of the Hebrew Scriptures was still familiar to him, and it was natural for him to follow the early Christian interpreters in expressing his experience of redemption in Christ in thought-forms derived from the exodus from Egyptian bondage and entrance into the Promised Land, or to see the escape of the Israelites as a picture, bearing some real though undefined relation to what it portrayed, of man's deliverance from the devil's tyranny through the saving work of Christ.

Such a reader was at home in the world of Old Testament imagery. He was accustomed to hear from the pulpit and in school the traditional typological and allegorical expositions of Scripture—not the elaborate fantasies of Origen or of many medieval exegetes, but the simpler interpretations of Old Testament narratives which had gradually come to be commonplace

in preaching, teaching and liturgical expression, and which rested on the principle that the Bible is a unity and that in every part it speaks of Christ. Those elements in the Church's traditional liturgical forms which today so often seem to be most in need of revision or deletion in order to make what is said and done appear relevant to the ordinary man of the twentieth century and within the compass of his experience and understanding are precisely those which would have given the service a familiar and homely touch in the ears of his ancestor. Allusions to the Hebrew patriarchs and their wives may now seem to be puzzling intrusions into the modern marriage service. The reference to Noah's ark in the Anglican baptismal rite may appear equally unintelligible to present-day parents and godparents; but to an earlier generation these allusions must have served to link the worshipper with a world which was in no way strange to him but represented the ordinary mode in which spiritual truth was communicated to him and in which he expressed his own religious thought, a world with which he was conscious of a genuine continuity. There would be nothing difficult to such a worshipper, but rather the contrary, in the idea that his own marriage was in some way connected with those Biblical figures whom he recognized as his spiritual ancestors, or that the baptism of his child was part of the same pattern of God's dealings with his people which had been manifested in the salvation of souls by water in the ark.

Behind the outlook of such a person there stood the combined and continuous Christian and Jewish tradition of scriptural exegesis, in which the modern interpreter was directly linked through a common cultural inheritance with the actual authors of the Biblical books. The natural expression of this sense of cultural and religious unity was the typological interpretation of the ancient Scriptures, used by the New Testament writers and expanded and developed in later literature and in Christian art. Early Christian painting, as is well known, delights to interpret the New Testament events in terms of the Old. Thus the Christian sacraments are portrayed in pictures of the striking of the rock and the manna in the desert, Christ's death in the representation of Abraham's sacrifice and so on. As Mr R. L. P. Milburn expressed it in his Bampton Lectures on *Early Christian Interpretations of History*, 'the view gradually gained acceptance that, in the providential ordering of affairs by God, the events of the Old

Testament were carefully designed to foreshadow and prepare the way for those redemptive actions- which were to mark the decisive turning-point in the history of the world. St Augustine expressed this belief by the formula: "In the Old Testament the New lies hid; in the New Testament the meaning of the Old becomes clear", while Paulinus of Nola put the matter thus in his poetic jingle: "The Old Law establishes the New, the New Law completes the Old. In the Old you find Hope, in the New Faith. But the grace of Christ links Old and New together." Yet this proleptic honour enjoyed by the events of the Old Testament in no way deprived them of straightforward historical reality; indeed it is their historicity that bestows upon them an evidential value denied to imaginative speculations. The matter is summed up thus by St Augustine: "Abraham our father was a faithful man who lived in those far-off days. He trusted in God and was justified by his faith. His wife Sarah bore him a son . . . God had a care for such persons and made them at that time to be heralds of his Son who was to come; so that not merely in what they said, but in what they did or in what happened to them, Christ should be sought and discovered. Whatever Scripture says about Abraham is both literal fact and prophecy, as the Apostle says somewhere: 'It is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by the handmaid, the other by the freewoman; and these things have an allegorical meaning.' Now these two women represent the two Testaments."

The primitive symbolism of the catacombs and early sarcophagi, with its emphasis on deliverance from danger as indicated by the conventional figures of Noah in the Ark or Daniel in the lions' den, soon yielded, at any rate in the west, to a full and free use of characters and scenes drawn from the historical books of the Old Testament . . . The twenty-seven panels which remain (of the set of mosaics in the Church of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome) . . . illustrate a varied selection of the events chronicled in Scripture . . . While some of the subjects, such as the representation of Abraham entertaining the three angels at the oaks of Mamre, possess clear theological importance, many of them have no special lessons to inculcate but owe their place in a scheme of church decoration to the belief that all facts in the Bible are part of God's revelation and deserve a careful and reverent scrutiny. They are put forward as objectively true happenings but, when interpreted aright, are seen to be something more,

in that . . . they form a kind of *via sacra* which leads up to Christ."

Nor does this conviction find expression only in early and medieval art. In every century, and not least in the nineteenth, Christian painters, sculptors and especially designers of stained glass have exercised their ingenuity in balancing Old Testament incidents and characters against their New Testament antitypes in such a way that both contribute to expound the Christian Gospel. No doubt the use of this symbolism was to a large extent a matter for the experts; the typological allusions are often too recondite to appeal to the uninstructed worshipper. Often, too, the schemes of type and antitype are formal and conventional, part of the artistic fashion of an age rather than living attempts to proclaim the truth. Yet within the narrow limits of the extent to which Church art did provide a 'poor man's Bible', that Bible, like the written word, was a Bible written and understood in terms of type and allegory.

\* \* \* \* \*

The rise of modern critical study broke the chain of continuity which had hitherto existed between the modern reader and his medieval and early Christian predecessors. Until this development took place, the unity of the Bible was the fundamental premise upon which all were agreed. A common belief linked the authors of the New Testament books with their readers. This was the conviction which they shared; that the whole Bible spoke directly of Christ, in prophecy, type and allegory so far as the Old Testament is concerned, and the consequent belief that the historical context of a passage and the immediate intention which the original author had in writing it in the circumstances of his own time were of relatively minor importance. The word 'relatively', of course, needs to be emphasized. We must not forget that to the mind of the New Testament writers the prophetic foreshadowings that they discerned in the history of Israel could have had no importance if the events had not occurred in actual fact. We must remember, too, that Origen himself professed to attach importance to the literal sense of Scripture, at least as a starting-point for the deeper spiritual interpretation, and that there is a fairly considerable difference of outlook on this question of the importance of literal exegesis between such Antiochene exegetes as Diodore and Chrysostom on the one hand and Origen, Ori-

/ op. cit., pp. 107 f.

genists such as Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyril of Alexandria on the other. Nevertheless, it would be fairly safe to maintain that for all these interpreters alike, and for their successors down the ages, the unity of the Bible meant in effect that a passage was valuable primarily for its application to Christ or to Christians, and that texts could properly and legitimately be collected together as *testimonia* to the Gospel and to aspects of the Christian life without much regard for their original significance. The Bible was one book, capable of having certain principles of interpretation applied uniformly throughout its various parts. It followed that until the rise of modern Biblical criticism every reader of the Fourth Gospel accepted as a matter of course its author's belief that 'these things came to pass that the scripture might be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced.' The various texts are all alike 'scriptures', whose importance lies in their prophetic and typological significance rather than in their historical contexts in the books from which they are drawn or in the original meaning which they possessed in their literal sense for the writers who penned them. The unity of Scripture transcended the diversity of books and authors.

Historical and literary criticism took the opposite view, and for the first time, practically speaking, the reader found himself standing outside the sphere of those common presuppositions which had served in the past to bring the thought of the reader into harmony with that of the author, and to unite the modern expositor with the mind of the interpreters of past centuries. Now it was chiefly the historical approach which mattered. In place of the unhistorical attitude which saw the Bible as a vast harmonious complex of prophecy and fulfilment, type and antitype, allegorical picture and spiritual reality, fused together by the uniform inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Biblical criticism sought to recover the true and original meaning of the literal sense, and to set the various documents comprising the Bible in their proper context in history instead of seeing them as pieces fixed unalterably in a divinely planned mosaic pattern of Holy Scripture.

The effect of this attempt was naturally to lay a new emphasis on the diversity of the Biblical writings and the outlook and theology of their authors. Passages could no longer be legitimately taken out of their setting in history and formed into a single pattern. Prophecy ceased to be thought of as a direct foretelling

of the actual details of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The prophet might indeed have been gifted with unusual spiritual insight, and as a consequence he might have foreseen in general terms what must be the nature of God's future dealings with his people; his quickened moral and spiritual perception might have enabled him to see the necessity for something to happen on the lines which Christ actually followed; the prophet might at times have spoken more truly than he knew; but he was not a seer in the traditional sense. The question had once again to be asked concerning Isaiah 53, and this time it was asked by instructed Christian readers: 'Of whom speaketh the prophet this? Of himself or of some other man?' The story of Isaac was no longer read as though it bore directly and by the author's own intention upon the sacrifice of Christ. It no longer seemed natural or legitimate to see a type of the Cross in the lifting up of the hands of Moses, nor did it still appear necessary and inevitable that the circumstances of the crucifixion should be associated with, and indeed directly indicated in, a combination of texts taken from the law relating to the Passover rite and the spurious chapters appended to the prophecies of Zechariah. The historical character and importance of the Exodus was an absorbing subject for the historian and archaeologist, but its connexion with the Christian experience of redemption now seemed far-fetched and artificial. Allegory, such as St Paul's interpretation of Hagar and Sinai, was dismissed as an encumbrance to the Apostle's argument, a decided hindrance to the modern reader rather than a demonstration from the sacred text of Scripture to clinch and drive home the rational arguments; and at long last it was happily established that Deut. 25.4 was not said 'altogether for our sake', but that God does care for oxen.

The typological method of interpretation, like the traditional form of the argument from prophetic fulfilment, became, it is hardly too much to say, an historical curiosity, of very little importance or significance for the modern reader. The new emphasis upon the diversity of Scripture and the original independence of its several parts tended to overthrow the foundations upon which that method rested. This was perhaps the most important, as well as the most profoundly revolutionary, effect of the 'higher criticism'. At the time it seems to have received relatively little direct attention or explicit notice; the impact of, modern literary and historical criticism was felt primarily in the

field of the 'letter'. The literal truth of historical narratives was being called in question; the dating and ascription of the various books was being drastically revised, and the principal question that was asked concerned the factual reliability of the Biblical records. In the end, however, the most definite and conclusive result of all this critical investigation was the breaking down of the old conception of the unity of Scripture and the consequent discrediting of the typological and prophetic exegesis familiar to so many generations of Christians.

We must be very careful not to undervalue the salutary effects of this revolution. There can be no serious doubt that the development of the historical method of approach to the Bible brought about an immense advance in the understanding of Scripture. It is true, perhaps, that so far as the ordinary reader is concerned the consequence of this great change has been to present him once more with the dilemma which confronted the Church of the second century: either the typological and allegorical method of dealing with the Old Testament, so as to make it readable as a Christian book, or the more drastic solution advocated by Marcion. Either follow such rules of exegesis as will allow the Gospel to be read out of the Hebrew Scriptures, or throw away the Old Testament as irrelevant to those who live under the New Covenant. Since at the same time the modern reader was convinced by the historical method that the Old Testament could not be read as a directly Christian book, there can be little doubt that one of the most far-reaching effects of the growth of the critical attitude has been the impression gained by the general reader and the ordinary Christian that the Old Testament is of no great significance to him and is of little real interest except to the student of religions. This unfortunate development, however, is not too large a price to pay for the recovery of a proper appreciation of what the Old Testament writers said in and for their own day and generation, and we should be grateful for the recognition of the real diversity of thought and purpose which undoubtedly exists in the Biblical literature. Amid the fashionable enthusiasm for the present-day rediscovery of the unity of Scripture we must not forget that there is this diversity, and we should be on our guard against ignoring it. The unity of the Bible ought never to mean the same thing for us as for the pre-critical generations. It must be sought in a collection of literature recognized to belong to very diverse times and circumstances,

not in a single harmonious body of revealed truth expressing in its complex pattern of interlocking themes, typological, allegorical, parabolic and prophetic, the one vast theme of the divine plan of creation and redemption.

\* \* \* \* \*

In recent years, however, with a renewed emphasis on the unity and continuity of the Scriptures as a whole and on the supposition of a common pattern to which every book of the Bible contributes its share, typology has again come into its own. It is again recognized that the New Testament writers, as well as Christian commentators from the earliest times, treated the Old Testament as a book about Christ in which every part contributed harmoniously to the pattern of typology and prophecy. The exegetes of the critical period had shown little interest in this aspect of the thought of the primitive Church; they had indeed been inclined to discount the extent to which it prevailed in the minds of the writers of the New Testament. Whether they were right in holding that the presuppositions which underlie the typological method are of small value to the modern Christian is a question to which we must later return. There can be little doubt that they were wrong in failing to attach due weight to the importance of these presuppositions for the understanding of the purpose and method of the Evangelists and the apostolic writers. This is simply a matter for the historian and the literary critic, and the reader who wants to discover how the first Christians actually thought about their faith. As Dr L. S. Thornton expresses it in his prefatory note to a chapter in *The Apostolic Ministry*: 'In order to elucidate the thought (of the New Testament writers) it is necessary to explore the use which the apostolic authors make of the Old Testament. For it is difficult to exaggerate the extent to which their minds were occupied with the things "written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and the psalms" concerning the Christ. The attitude of these writers towards the Old Testament was in certain respects widely different from that of modern critical scholarship. If, however, we are to understand what they were trying to say, it is quite indispensable that we should seek to retrace their thoughts, reading the Old Testament as they read it. We must endeavour to see the Scriptures through their eyes. Unless we do this we shall remain in ignorance of their presuppositions; and it is doubtful whether

we can hope to understand the contents of any mind whose presuppositions we have not yet learned to recognize.'

So far, Dr Thornton's plea for a renewed attempt to grasp the New Testament writers' methods of appealing to the Old Testament will meet with general agreement. It will be easily conceded that, as a plain matter of historical fact, we are much more likely to succeed in understanding and evaluating the thought of the New Testament writers if we try to enter sympathetically into their approach to the ancient Scriptures than if we try to read them simply from the standpoint of the modern critical method of interpretation with its 'scientific-historical' interests and presuppositions. If we try to recognize the typology which these writers employ and seek to grasp the meaning which the scriptural images had for them, we shall learn much about their thought and so about their conception of the significance of the Gospel events. Typological study is necessary if we are to appreciate the meaning of the New Testament. It is, for instance, of little use for us to read the speech attributed to St Stephen in the seventh chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, if we fail to recognize the typological correspondence which it presupposes between Christ and Moses, nor the story of the raising of the widow's son at Nain if we are not prepared to see that St Luke is telling us that Christ, by acting like Elisha, is showing himself to be 'the prophet' predicted in the Scriptures; nor again can we make sense of the Johannine Passion narrative if we dismiss from our minds the typological interpretation of the Passover sacrifice. In each case we learn much from this typology about the way in which St Luke and St John, or perhaps their sources, thought about the Person and work of Christ. One thing, for example, which we may learn is that they felt free to modify the details of the narrative tradition in order to bring out the meaning which it possessed for them when it was expressed in imagery derived from the Old Testament history. The events came to be clothed, as it were, in Old Testament dress, and thereby came to acquire a richer significance, so that the more closely a narrative could be assimilated to scriptural imagery, the more readily could its full significance be apprehended by men whose ideas found their natural expression in terms of the Hebraic history, prophecies and liturgy which formed the basis and background of the religion and culture both of the original Palestinian converts and of the Gentile Christians who had received the Septuagint Bible along with the proclamation of the

Gospel. A not dissimilar process may sometimes happen, though to a much lesser extent, even today. In 1940 speeches and newspaper articles showed a distinct tendency to assimilate the threatened German invasion of England to the historical forms and pattern of the events of 1588. The events associated with the Spanish Armada presented themselves as a sort of 'type' of just such a menace and of its successful repulse; they were, so to speak, an 'image' rooted in the national tradition and culture of England. The English are not a historically-minded people, and 'types' of this sort do not often find expression in their interpretation of events. In this respect they differ strikingly from the Irish with their tendency to make all subsequent history conform to the pattern established in Cromwell's day. For the Jew of the first century, however, to see the past episodes in Israel's history as a foreshadowing of the future, and to express the significance of the present in terms of the past, was entirely natural.

Dr Thornton's warning that we cannot hope to understand the New Testament without entering into its outlook on the Old must, however, provoke the further question whether we ought to be content to recognize, as a matter of historical importance for the understanding of early Christianity, that the New Testament writers were concerned above all to find scriptural fulfilments and antitypes in the events they were recording, or whether we ought to go further. Should we accept this object as legitimate and proper and try to read the Bible ourselves in the same fashion? Ought we, like the Fathers in their sermons and commentaries, to find types and fulfilments where the New Testament writers appear, at least at first sight, to have seen none? It is the latter course to which we are in fact being asked by modern exponents of typological exegesis to commit ourselves. If we are right in so doing, then the appeal to Scripture as the source and criterion of doctrine may legitimately be made through the use of the typological method. The ingenious discovery and putting together of types and fulfilments, the ability to discern subtle indications of correspondences and verbal reminiscences, may properly be employed to answer the appeal to the Bible for the establishment and confirmation of doctrine. Examples of this use of the method may be found in the attempts made in the second and third chapters of the late Dr Kirk's book, *The Apostolic Ministry*, to provide a scriptural foundation for a particular doctrine of the Christian Ministry by the typological interpreta-

tion of New Testament episodes, or the more recent endeavour of Dr Thornton in his book, *Confirmation: Its Place in the Baptismal Mystery*, to ground a particular theory of the relation of Confirmation to Baptism in Scripture as so treated.

This being so, it is obviously a matter of great importance for us to inquire whether the typological method may legitimately be employed in what is said to be a 'post-critical' age, or whether it rests upon pre-critical presuppositions which the development of the historical and critical approach to the Bible has rendered untenable. Does typology, in fact, imply a reversion to Biblical fundamentalism? Can any criteria be discovered for making a distinction between legitimate and exegetically justifiable typology, on the one hand, and the unwarrantable exercise of private and uncontrolled ingenuity on the other? Can typology be employed without a return to that conception of Scripture which essentially belongs to a pre-critical age—the notion that the sacred writings are a mysterious collection of enigmas revealing divine secrets to those who can discover the key to their solution?

Some, no doubt, will think this inquiry a waste of time from beginning to end. In their view the typological method is a wholly unscientific and fanciful way of dealing with the text; it is at best only an historical curiosity, scarcely deserving of serious consideration. On the other hand, typology appeals to many others as a fascinating study, and as something more besides: as a theologically and spiritually useful and illuminating method of interpretation, at least in some of its manifestations. There would seem to very many Christians to be sound reason, and not merely pious fancy, in the liturgical reading of the history of the Exodus and the Passover at Eastertide. The problem before us is to discover some means of distinguishing between helpful and misleading forms of typology; we have to try to separate those which can be rationally explained and defended from those which are far-fetched. We have the undoubted fact confronting us that the New Testament writers look for the fulfilment of Old Testament imagery in the story which they are relating. The study of the way in which they set about this will clearly be useful to us in our endeavour to understand their conception of the Christian Gospel. So far we are simply trying, as historians, to enter into the thought of the first-century writers in order to understand their point of view. Then there is the

question whether in fact their search for prophetic fulfilments and typological correspondences clarifies or obscures for the modern reader the subject matter which they were trying to illuminate. When is their typological reading of the Old Testament a help to us, and when, if at all, is it misleading? Then there remains the question whether we ought to approach the New Testament with the intention of searching for clues which may suggest still more typological allusions over and above those which the New Testament writers show plainly to us and about which there can be little doubt. Can we distinguish between legitimate and fanciful typology? Can this method ever provide a firm scriptural basis for Christian doctrine, or is it too subjective and individualistic for this purpose? Can we find any criteria for the use of the typological method, so that we may restore to the ordinary Christian reader something of his inheritance of Biblical exegesis, while still remaining faithful to the canons and principles of literary and historical criticism?

\* \* \* \*

The problem which we have set ourselves, and which present-day tendencies in Biblical theology are making it increasingly important for us to consider seriously, is a very difficult one. No easy answer can be given to it, and in this book no more can be attempted than to raise the question, and perhaps to indicate one or two pointers towards the direction in which we may expect to find some help.

It is a problem which turns largely on what we mean by the unity of the Bible. It is true that in the early days of the apostolic mission, when the Gospel was being proclaimed to Jews, the chief importance of typology, like that of prophecy, consisted in its value as a weapon for the apologist. The Christian preacher of apostolic times had to show conclusively that the truth of his message could be proved out of the sacred books recognized by his audience as possessing absolute authority. If the immediate reaction of his hearers was to 'search the Scriptures' in order to discover whether the things which they had heard from him were so, he was compelled to demonstrate that the Old Testament spoke about Christ. He had to preach the fulfilment of Old Testament types and prophecies; and we can easily see from a glance at Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* how easily the argument from Scripture might degenerate into a competition in fanciful

and far-fetched exegesis. The Rabbis themselves had set a high standard of ingenuity in extracting controversial proofs from texts which in their original contexts were totally irrelevant to the purpose for which they were thus to be employed, and we cannot blame the early Church for using typology as well as prophecy as a main line of attack on Judaism and of defence for the Christian view that the ancient Scriptures led up to Christ. Nevertheless, this apologetic use of typology which must have been part of the regular armoury of every preacher from very early times, and which had evidently been carried very far indeed by the time that the Gospels were written, is not to be dismissed out of hand, despite its many absurdities, as a method of the early Christian apologist which has no relevance outside the primitive controversies and may now be safely discarded. If the Bible is a unity in any sense, then it is plain that it must, in some sense, be a book about Christ; and typology is simply a method of discovering and interpreting the implications of that fact.

It would not be possible in the space available to us now to discuss at any length the very difficult problem of the unity of Scripture. It may be pointed out, however, that the primary sense in which the whole Bible is unity is that the writers of every book contained in it are bound together at least by a common cultural inheritance. They are either Hebrews by race, sharing in a single national tradition of language, culture and religion, or they are Gentiles who have become sufficiently imbued with Hebraic modes of thought and whose ideals and outlook, particularly in the religious sphere, have been so largely conditioned by the Hebrew Scriptures in their Greek form that they may be reckoned, for all practical purposes, among the heirs of the same tradition which was the racial possession of the Old Testament authors. The literature of the Bible, despite its great diversity, exhibits nevertheless its own distinctive way of thinking and its own peculiar imagery in which to express its thought. It represents a culture which is determined by, and founded upon, historical experience. Its religious thought is conditioned by the great events of the early history of the Hebrew people. The Exodus, the wilderness wanderings, the mysterious happenings at Sinai, the conquest of the inhabitants of Canaan and the establishment of the monarchy under David and his successors on the throne at Jerusalem are foremost among the events through which the ancestors, whether physical or spiritual, of the Biblical writers

had passed and which determined the outlook of their successors who penned the books of the Old and New Testaments.

The cultural unity which binds together these writers is inseparably connected with their religious unity. The books of the Bible, generally speaking, focus themselves upon, and presuppose, the basic idea of God's people and his covenant with them, so that this theme runs through and holds together the very varied literature of the Scriptures and the often remarkably diverse points of view from which the different writers approach their task. The Old Testament is the literature of a national community which was conscious of itself as being above all the People of the Covenant; and since the Church came into being as Israel reformed, a new Israel continuous with the old (as its apologists claimed), and inheriting all the complex of belief which accompanied the religion of the Covenant; since, too, the New Covenant which is the basic principle of the Church's life did not abolish but rather fulfilled and completed the old, the books of the New Testament, and indeed the literature of the post-apostolic Church, continue that central theme of the covenant relationship between God and his chosen people. The same theme which runs through and unifies the Hebrew Scriptures is maintained in the New Testament and expressed through the medium of the ancient imagery and thought-forms, now transformed in meaning so as to serve as a vehicle for the Christian Gospel.

It was the immense task of the early Christian preachers and teachers to effect this transformation, and to establish a relationship of prophecy to fulfilment, type to antitype, image to reality between the events of Christ's life, death, resurrection and ascension, and the familiar pattern of Old Testament religious thought, grounded in the more ancient historical series of Creation, the Exodus, Sinai and the Covenant, the Davidic Kingdom, and the insights of the great prophets into their significance and their implications. To some extent, as we have already indicated, this task was necessitated by the pressure of anti-Jewish controversy. Yet we should seriously misjudge the purpose of this re-interpretation of the ancient Scriptures if we were to think of it as no more than a process by which Christian apologists tried to bandy inappropriate proof-texts with their opponents in the manner of Justin and Trypho. The task had to be carried out at least as much for the Church's own sake as for the purposes of missionary propaganda. It was necessary for the Christian under-

standing of the Gospel, and all the indications show that it was a process initiated by Christ himself. The task of transforming the content of the ancient imagery had evidently been already to a considerable extent accomplished before the New Testament writings assumed their present form. Its achievement is in large measure presupposed by the early Christian preaching, so far as this can be reconstructed from our written documents. It underlies the thought of St Paul and of all the Evangelists, and there can be little doubt that the process of re-interpretation was not delayed until after the Resurrection. It is impossible to make sense of the Gospel narratives or of the apostolic preaching which lies behind them unless we accept the view that Jesus himself envisaged his mission in terms of Old Testament prophecy and typology, and that he deliberately fulfilled the role which the history of the Covenant People and the spiritual insight of its prophets had revealed at sundry times and in divers manners as having been laid down by the will of God for man's salvation.

Jesus himself stood within the unified pattern of Hebraic thought and culture. He evidently interpreted his life and work through the medium of that pattern. His assertion that 'the Son of Man must suffer many things' is but one indication among many of the way in which he understands the modes of God's self-revelation in the history of his people as determining the character of his own work as the climax and completion of that self-revelation. Whether or not the story of the Lord's discourse on the road to Emmaus is to be taken as literal history, the picture which St Luke presents to us of the risen Christ beginning from Moses and all the prophets to expound to his followers in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself must represent in large measure the truth of the matter. Christ must surely have believed himself to be the fulfilment of God's dealings with his ancient people, and his disciples must have learnt that truth from him. It would be difficult to find any other satisfactory explanation for the rapidity with which the first Christians came to see that the theme of God's Covenant with his people was really the theme of Christ, since Christ was the central and culminating point of that long historical process of the unfolding of God's purpose for Israel.

The saving work of Christ, inaugurating the New Covenant between God and man, was thus seen as the moment which gave significance to the whole course of covenant-history that had

preceded it. In the light of this decisive event, the pattern of God's dealings with his people could for the first time be clearly discerned. Only now could the full meaning of the history of Israel be properly understood. The Old Testament had therefore to be read anew, with fresh presuppositions, in order to be understood as Christians believed that God meant it to be understood, namely as a book which pointed forward to the climax of Christ's life and work. Read in this new light, the Old Testament events came to be viewed in a fresh perspective and so to be seen as manifesting a pattern or rhythm. That the great events of Israel's past exhibited a certain pattern of God's acts had indeed already been appreciated by some of the Old Testament writers themselves. The prophets from time to time look forward in the future to a repetition or recapitulation of the rhythm of divine action evident in the history of the past. There is Hosea's prophetic expectation of a repetition of the wilderness period. Here the prophet is not simply predicting that a particular historical situation will recur. His insight into the spiritual significance of the desert wanderings and the Covenant made at Sinai makes him see that Israel's relations with God in the contemporary situation demand a recapitulation in some form of the ancient pattern of God's saving acts of election and redemption. It is the pattern of divine action which the prophet discerns, rather than the recurrence of the outward historical events; but for him, as for Israelite thought as a whole, divine action is mediated in the actual events of history.

In the thought of the Second Isaiah there is a further development. The prophet suggests a correspondence between the primal act of salvation in the creation conflict, the decisive act of redemption in the deliverance from Egypt, and the expected future awakening of the arm of the Lord to bring the ransomed of the Lord home with singing unto Zion. The great acts of God in the past illuminate the significance of the present time and determine in some degree the form of the prophet's future hope. Conversely, the prophet's divinely given assurance of coming deliverance for Israel enables him to understand the full significance of past history when he looks back upon the ancient traditions in the fresh light which it provides for him. This prophet has realized that the divine purpose of salvation is one and the same throughout the historical process, and that it is reasonable to see a corresponding unity and consistency in the

successive stages by which that purpose has been worked out in the actual sequence of events. In such passages as Isaiah 51.9-11, the prophetic interpretation of the pattern of history assumes a form which may fairly be called typological. The creation struggle finds its antitype in the Exodus and both alike are in turn recapitulated and fulfilled in the future act of deliverance from the Exile.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Christian reader sees in Christ the central point which gives meaning to the entire process of God's dealings with man. He believes that Christ did actually, as his immediate followers supposed, complete the working out of the divine purpose in creation and redemption. The Church therefore took his fulfilment of the historical process recorded in the Scriptures as the key by which the real meaning of the whole of that process must be unlocked. Christ as the climax of the story gives unity and significance to all that had preceded him. At no stage within the process of pre-Christian history could its full meaning become apparent. The prophet might have his vision of the Suffering Servant of the Lord, but even the prophet himself could not grasp the full implications of his vision until the part of the Servant was actually undertaken and fulfilled by Christ. In the light of Christ's saving work the meaning of the Servant poems becomes intelligible in a way which no one previously, not even the prophet himself, could have perceived. At the same time the prophetic picture of the Servant illuminates and in some degree explains to us, the meaning of the Person and mission of Christ.

This does not necessarily imply that the vision of the Servant was not fully significant, within its own limits, in relation to the prophet's contemporary situation. We must not admit the absurd idea that the message of the prophets was meaningless or even incomplete for those to whom it was addressed, and that it was intended only for readers as yet unborn. The Christian, however, will naturally look back on the Old Covenant with its fulfilment in Christ continually in mind, and he will be able to discern in the light of the fulfilment how the earlier stages in the working out of the divine purpose, each of which was significant for its own time, fall into place in an harmonious pattern and foreshadow the character of the final culmination. He will see a recurring rhythm in past history which is taken up more fully and perfectly in the Gospel events. Thus he soon realizes that the

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

the belly of Hades and his restoration to life brings the message of repentance to Gentiles. The author of that story did not consciously foresee Christ as the end towards which his own thought was pointing; but in the light of Christ's saving work it is possible to see that the picture which he painted held elements of a deeper truth than he himself could know, and that it was in fact an adumbration, as St Matthew, if not Jesus himself, pointed out, of what was to come. The insight, or the inspiration, of the Old Testament writer brought the picture which he painted within the pattern of God's dealings with mankind, and so his book did in fact contain a real mystery revealed in Christ. In such mysteries there is a real correspondence between the type in the past and the fulfilment in the future. Typology of this kind is an expression of the particular view of history held by the Scriptural writers as a whole, and in this expression the type is a genuine foreshadowing; it is indeed

It may be possible to distinguish this form of typology, which consists in a recognition of historical correspondences and deals in terms of past and future, from another kind of typology which rests, not on an interpretation of history, but on a particular quasi-Platonist doctrine of the relation of the literal sense of Scripture—the outward form or 'letter' of the sacred writings—to eternal spiritual reality concealed, as it were, beneath the literal sense. On this theory a scriptural type is a 'mystery', certainly, but a 'mystery' in the sense of a quasi-sacramental presentation of spiritual reality in an outward and earthly form. This may rightly be described as 'quasi-sacramental' rather than properly sacramental because on such an interpretation of scripture as this the outward form is really of negligible importance. It does not so much convey the inward reality as disguise it. It is the mere outward shell or husk containing, and hiding from the un-instructed, the inner truth of the mystery. It is on the basis of such a theory of Scripture as this that the tradition of exegesis followed by Philo, Origen (at least in part), Gregory of Nyssa and a host of other interpreters rested.

To those who hold such a conception of the Biblical books, Scripture is indeed a unity, but its unity does not consist in its character as a body of diverse literature united by a common cultural inheritance and certain great common themes; Scripture is a unity because it is at every point the outward garb of an entire system of spiritual truth, a coherent and integrated body of

spiritual and moral instruction, veiled in the outward forms of the 'letter', but capable of being discerned by those to whom its author, the Holy Spirit, gives the key. Some of this spiritual meaning is plainly to be read on the surface, as it were, of Scripture or at least 's ready to hand at no great depth; but in many parts of the Bible the reader is confronted with Tyconius' *immensa silva* of apparently profitless material where the real truth, the essential meaning, lies deeply hidden and needs the researches of the allegorist to bring it to light. According to this view, the Scriptures are primarily a body of oracles. The historical significance of a passage, its context in the process of covenant-history and the intention of its original author are all of very minor importance, if any; for the Bible is a uniform collection of the oracles of the Holy Ghost, differing only in their outward embodiment and in the relative difficulty of their interpretation.

This conception of Scripture as a single vast volume of oracles and riddles, a huge book of secret puzzles to which the reader has to find clues, is the foundation of allegorical exegesis. Allegory differs radically from the kind of typology which rests upon the perception of actual historical fulfilment. The reason for this great difference is simply that allegory takes no account of history. The exegete has to penetrate through the shell of history to the inner kernel of eternal spiritual or moral truth. The whole range of the Scriptures is one enormous field of symbolism in which the interpreter is free to wander at will, unrestricted by considerations of historical accuracy, the apparent intention of the Biblical authors, or the superficial diversity of their outlook. He can gather his symbolism whence he pleases and combine it into any pattern which he may happen to fancy. Examples of this sort of exegesis are familiar enough. Philo's exposition of the migrations of Abraham is an early instance of it. The interpretation given by the Epistle of Barnabas to the ceremonial Law of Moses is similar in many respects, as is the ingenuity with which Clement, Origen, Cyril and others deal with the lists of clean and unclean beasts and draw moral improvement from their meditations on the excellence of parting the hoof and chewing the cud. Origen's exposition of the Parable of the Good Samaritan may stand alongside these examples. Another remarkable instance is the interpretation given to the Massacre of the Innocents by a sermon included among the *spuria* of Chrysostom. The fact that only the children of „two years old and under were murdered while those

of three presumably escaped is meant to teach us that those who hold the Trinitarian faith will be saved whereas Binitarians and Unitarians will undoubtedly perish.

If it can be claimed for typology, in the sense of the recognition of historical correspondences, that it is grounded upon the Biblical writers' own understanding of history, allegory must be referred to Hellenistic ideas about the correspondence of the earthly order as the shadow with the intelligible sphere as the reality, to the Alexandrian tradition of the moralizing allegorization of the Homeric poems, and to a lesser extent to Rabbinic exegesis with its disregard of the context and the original meaning of proof-texts. Hebraic and Greek elements are intertwined in allegorical exegesis. The idea of the earthly counterpart to the heavenly reality can be read out of the Pentateuch as well as out of Plato. This idea, when applied to the form and content of Scripture, seems to have been especially popular with Gnostic exegetes, as we can see in the case of the Valentinian Heraclion. As employed by them in their interpretation, this principle enabled the exegete to take the text of Scripture as his jumping-off point, as it were; he is not afterwards bound by it, but, on the contrary, he can feel himself free to disregard the literal meaning altogether in the interests of what seems to him to be an edifying allegory. A good example of this process can be seen in Heraclion's treatment of the episode of the woman of Samaria.

Pure allegory is still generally discredited, even today, except in some 'fundamentalist' circles. Apart from the plain fact that as exegesis it is for the most part sheer rubbish, it is moralistic rather than evangelical. The allegorist is concerned usually with moral edification rather than with pointing to Christ, though this is not always the case, and we may cite the sad history of the interpretation of the Song of Songs as an example to the contrary. Sometimes it consists in the addition to a genuine type (that is, one which indicates a real historical correspondence) of an otiose piece of edification. Thus in patristic exegesis we find that to the figure of Isaac as a type of Christ there has been added the reflection that his name, meaning 'laughter', aptly indicates the joy caused by Christ to the faithful. Allegory of this sort is also, of course, open to the very serious objection that it scarcely requires Holy Scripture for its field of application. Why should a scriptural allegory have more value than a good allegorical interpretation of any other book? Many of the lessons which Alexandrian

exegetes draw with such desperate ingenuity from the ceremonial Law of Moses might, one could suppose, have been taken with less trouble from Homer or any other non-Biblical writings. Pagan mythology, indeed, might provide as good a field as the Scriptures for the exercise of such methods, and the Peratic Gnostics described by Hippolytus evidently recognized this fact and combined allegorical interpretations of the mystery-cult legends with material drawn from Christian and Biblical sources. Allegory has held a most important place in the history of Christian thought and, especially, as the record of the interpretation of the Song of Songs reminds us, in mystical theology; but it is a method which cuts away the roots of sound exegesis, it rests upon false presuppositions, and no allegorist can claim to be interpreting Scripture or to be a Biblical theologian. The use of allegory, in fact, vitiates the appeal to Scripture for the establishment or the confirmation of doctrine and renders invalid any teaching which depends upon it for authority.

A much more difficult problem is presented by a form of typology which is closely akin to allegory and appears to rest upon the same theory of the unity and inspiration of Scripture. This could not be applied, like some moralistic allegorizing, to non-Biblical literature, for its object is to illustrate the meaning of the Gospel and to point to Christ. It tries to find correspondences between the Old Testament and the New, but, unlike the typology which depends upon the Biblical view of history, the methods of this form of typology are wholly unhistorical. The correspondence which it seeks to establish is not so much a relation between the past and the future, the foreshadowing and the fulfilment, as between the earthly and the heavenly, the shadow and the reality. The antitype which corresponds to the type is not so much *TO p.e'AAov* as *TO a) 70tvdv*. Consequently, this kind of typology tends, like allegory, to disregard historical verisimilitude, the original significance of texts or the meaning of events in their proper context in history, and the intention of the ancient authors. To this sort of typology belongs the supposed correspondence which was popular in the Church of the Fathers between the scarlet cord of Rahab at Jericho, which served as a token of salvation, and the blood of Christ, the sign of the salvation of mankind. Here the parallel between the type and its supposed fulfilment is plainly unreal and artificial. Historically the only connexion lies in the fact that in both cases there is immunity from destruction,  
E.T.-C

guaranteed by a sign; but the kind of destruction, of immunity and of signs is different in each case, while the fact that both the thread of Rahab and the blood of Christ were red is of no significance outside the mind of an over-ingenuous typologist. The analogy between them might possibly serve as a preacher's illustration, an admittedly far-fetched comparison designed to impress on simple listeners the truth that men are saved under the token of Christ's blood, but there is no real type here. The difference between such alleged correspondences as this and the relation of the Second Isaiah's Servant to the Person and work of Christ is obvious and needs no further comment.

It is by no means always so easy, however, to decide whether a particular example of typology belongs to the legitimate or the illegitimate category. In which class are we to place the use made by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews of the type of Melchizedek? As an *argumentum ad homines*, it is true, Melchizedek is a significant type of Christ. He is a priest-king, he is king of peace, and he can be shown (by a far-fetched process of reasoning) to be superior to the Levitical priesthood. The writer's use of this type can teach us much about his own thought and his own understanding of the Person of Christ; but except as an apologetic argument directed to a particular class of readers in a particular situation it lacks force. There is no clear correspondence between the type and the fulfilment, and no genuine historical recapitulation of a single pattern of the divine activity. The point that Melchizedek is a figure of Christ as the eternal priest rests upon a piece of sheer allegorizing about his lack of genealogy, and the idea that in Abraham the ancestor of the Aaronic priesthood, Levi, paid tithes to this type of the eternal priest depends upon fantasy. The correspondence here is unreal, useful as the point may have been in anti-Jewish controversy. The same unreality characterizes even more fully the common patristic expansion of the Melchizedek type to include his bringing forth of bread and wine as a type of the Christian Eucharist. Historically considered, his action in so doing has absolutely no part in the pattern of God's redemptive activity, and what Christ did at the Last Supper has no relation whatever to what Melchizedek did for Abraham.

It is far otherwise with the same Epistle's primary typology of the High Priest's actions on the Day of Atonement. Here there is a genuine correspondence within the pattern of history between the type and the antitype. The theme of redemption and an

identical concept of expiation runs continuously through from the ritual provisions of the Old Law to the fulfilment of its intentions and aspirations by Christ's entry, through the shedding of his blood, into the heavenly sanctuary as man's representative. Because the correspondence is real and clear the ancient rite becomes an illuminating means of interpreting the meaning of Christ's high-priestly work, while the fulfilment in Christ enables the Christian reader to grasp more fully the meaning, the aims and the relative deficiency of the Temple and the sacrifices.

\* \* \* \* \*

The kind of typology which rests upon artificial and unhistorical correspondences may, as we have already suggested, find a place in sermon illustrations. When it is used in this way it can be appropriate, provided that we do not over-estimate its importance and that we are prepared to recognize that it can at best do no more than afford us possibly helpful and edifying illustrations. It can never claim to be providing us with genuine exegesis, nor ought it ever to be used in order to obtain the answer to the appeal to Scripture for the proof of doctrine. The Hagar-Sinai-earthly Jerusalem allegory of St Paul may seem to fall within this category. There is indeed a real historical type here. The election of Isaac and the election of the Church, the rejection of Ishmael and the rejection of first-century Judaism, are part and parcel of one and the same continuous pattern of God's activity towards his people. There is an actual historical connexion between the type and the antitype, and a real series of divine election and rejection reaches its climax in the rejection of Israel and the election of the Gentile Church, a climax which explains and gives meaning to the preceding sequence and is in its turn illuminated by the past. But the rest of the Apostle's comparison is allegorical and unhistorical, though, once again, it is justifiable as a telling illustration *ad homines* of the truths which he has been expounding. It is a picturesque and valuable sermon illustration, designed for a limited purpose of apologetic; it does not advance or clinch his argument.

The Fathers developed this kind of typology, that is the 'sermon-illustration' method of handling the text of Scripture, to an almost unlimited extent. Gregory of Nyssa's comparison of Moses with Christ is an instructive example of their work. That Moses prefigured Christ is, of course, a traditional and accepted

belief, resting upon sound historical typology. The genuine correspondence had been worked out as early as St Stephen's time, and it is often alluded to explicitly or by implication in the Gospels. Gregory's embellishments of this familiar theme, however, do not belong to historical typology but rather to the artificial 'sermon-illustration' class. He claims, for example, that Moses prefigured Christ when he stretched out his hand to stay the plague of frogs : for Christ, like Moses, is a lawgiver; he stretched out his arms on the Cross and banished from the minds of his followers all filthy and frog-like thoughts. So also, since the first sign performed by Moses had to do with water and blood, it therefore prefigured the last sign wrought by Christ.

We must remember in connexion with these illustrations that the Fathers as preachers were by no means immune from the influence of contemporary rhetorical methods. Their ingenuity in finding typological material in the most unlikely quarters is often little more than a rhetorical trick, designed to stir the interest and admiration of their audiences; and their skill in extracting edifying types from highly unpromising passages of the Old Testament, and in combining in one illustration allusions to a number of obscure texts, is in some measure parallel to the use of recondite mythological allusions by some of the Alexandrian and the later Latin poets, eager to display both their erudition and their ingenuity. We ought not always to treat their fancies too seriously.

The danger of this sort of typology lies less in its sheer artificiality than in its encouragement to the reader to ignore history, to treat the Bible unhistorically, and, in defiance of the solid achievements of the critical approach, to regard the whole of Scripture as a bundle of oracles from which any and every expositor can quarry pieces at random to fashion into a mosaic of his own design. Much of the typological exegesis so fashionable at the present time suffers from precisely this fault. I have elsewhere alluded to 'that dangerous territory between typology and allegory where parallels begin to be forced into the text by artificial playing with words, instead of being naturally suggested by it,' and I have in the same place complained of the prevalence of jugglery with words and etymologies.

It is easy to complain, but much harder to find any criterion which is more than purely subjective; for it is very difficult

indeed to know where to draw the line in typological exegesis. What to one reader will seem a plausible and valid piece of historical typology will strike another as fantastic; and to some extent the typologist can only hope to proceed by a kind of system of trial and error. Nevertheless, we must try to distinguish. There does seem to be genuine and useful typological correspondence in, for example, the parallel which was indicated by Dr Austin Farrer in *The Apostolic Ministry* between the appointment by Moses in Num. 11.16 ff. of the seventy elders to deal with the complaints of the mixed multitude, Christ's institution of the Seventy in connexion with a journey through the territory of the 'mixed' race of the Samaritans, and the appointment of the Seven to deal with the murmurings of the Hellenists and, indirectly, to be concerned with the spread of the Gospel to non-Jews. We may well agree that St Luke saw a real correspondence and a single pattern in these events, and that this helped him to understand their significance. Similarly, it would seem reasonable to hold with Dr L. S. Thornton in another chapter of the same book that St John was thinking of the story of David and Absalom when at the beginning of the eighteenth chapter of his Gospel he mentioned Christ's passage of the brook Kidron. Dr Thornton, however, goes on to ask us to believe further that behind John 18.1 there stands the last verse of Psalm 109, 9) in the Septuagint version, a verse which he supposes implausibly to be itself based on the story of II Sam. 15.21 ff., the description of David crossing the Kidron. 'XEt, Letppov', he says, 'in John 18.1 would recall the last verse of that psalm in LXX; and with this clue all the details agree. Jesus drank the cup of agony by "the brook" in the way which he must tread. Therefore he, "the head", was "lifted up", whereas his enemies were "put under his feet".' Here the alleged typology rests entirely upon superficial verbal similarities which are seized upon as 'clues' (the use of the term is significant), without reference even to the meaning of the sentences in which they occur. Yet in the implications of this purely artificial and quite unreal correspondence we are asked to find some positive Scriptural teaching about Christ's relationship as Head to the Church as his Body.

An even more implausible piece of almost incredibly involved typology, founded upon purely verbal echoes without any reference either to the context or to the sense of the texts which have been assembled at random from different parts of the Bible,

occurs in the additional note to the same chapter of *The Apostolic Ministry*. Here Dr Thornton brings the Johannine parable of the vine into conjunction with Gen. 30.41 and Num. 17.4-7 on the strength of little more than the occurrence in all three passages of the not uncommon word *ἡ ἀμφοῖς*, and a vague complex of verbal associations based on Ezekiel's use of *ἡ ἀμφοῖς* in connexion with the imagery of a vine in his chapter 19.11.

This sort of typology is very dangerous. It lends itself to the varied and unlimited exercise of private ingenuity, there is no means of control by which its speculations can be checked, it rests upon a view of Scripture which is unhistorical and pre- rather than post-critical and it obscures the fundamental distinction between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, the Law and the Gospel. It is often unpleasantly reminiscent of the very similar exegetical methods employed by British Israelites.

Yet we should be mistaken if in reaction against these extravagances we were to deny the value and importance of all forms of typology, particularly those which were unmistakably present in the minds of the New Testament writers and which have so largely come to be incorporated in the liturgical tradition of the Church. Our safest guide to the very difficult task of distinguishing what is of permanent value from what can only at best serve as a homiletic embellishment would seem to be found in the insistence that typology must rest upon authentic history, interpreted in accordance with the Biblical view of the divine economy and with due regard for the literal sense of Scripture and the findings of critical scholarship.

## II

### THE BIBLICAL ORIGINS AND PATRISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF TYPOLOGY

K. J. WOOLLCOMBE

#### INTRODUCTION

IT is not easy to give a precise definition of the nature and scope of typology. As an exegetical method, it bears some resemblance to allegorism; in so far as it deals with the linkages between the Old and New Testaments, it is akin to the study of the fulfilment of prophecy. Hence the word 'typology' has often been used in a broad sense to cover the study of *all* the linkages between the two Testaments. In a recent article in the *Manchester Guardian*,<sup>1</sup> Professor T. W. Manson wrote: 'Many passages in the Old Testament have been held to foreshadow, hint at, or openly predict things that came to fulfilment centuries later in the New Testament. In the New Testament itself, not a few of these linkages are established, notably by St Matthew with his recurrent "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets". We know that this method of handling the Old Testament was not devised by the Christians; it was already practised in Judaism; and all that the early Christians did was to turn it in a new direction.' It is evident that the title of the article, 'Typology', is intended to cover the study of passages in the Old Testament which 'foreshadow, hint at, or openly predict' things fulfilled in the New Testament, i.e., all linkages of a typological, allegorical or prophetic nature.' But, while it is indisputably convenient to use one word to embrace the study of all such linkages, it is open to question whether typology is the right word.

Typology, considered as a method of exegesis, may be defined as the establishment of historical connexions between certain events, persons or things in the Old Testament and similar events, persons or things in the New Testament. Considered as a method of writing, it may be defined as the description of an event, person or thing in the New Testament in terms borrowed from the

<sup>1</sup>Monday, June II, 2 95 6. 'e.g., I Cor. **io.1-13**; Gal. 4.22-32; Matt. 1.22.

description of its prototypical counterpart in the Old Testament. Thus, if we were to say that Isaac, who carried the wood for his sacrifice, is a type of Simon of Cyrene, who carried the wood of the Cross, on the grounds of an etymological similarity between the names of their children,<sup>1</sup> we should be using the typological method of exegesis. On the other hand, when St Matthew and St Mark described John the Baptist in terms borrowed from the description of Elijah, they were using the typological method of writing.

No merit is claimed for the first example given above; it is simply offered as an illustration of what an exegete can find in the Gospels by using the typological method of exegesis. The odds against St Mark having seen the connexion between Alexander and Israel, Rufus and Edom are extremely high. It is more than probable that he did not create an intentional linkage between Isaac and Simon, but that an exegete saw it and sought to establish it by a piece of doubtful etymology. The second example, however, is a good illustration of an intentional linkage between John and Elijah created by the Evangelists. The Jewish people expected that the Advent of the Messiah would be heralded by the return of Elijah.<sup>2</sup> But they did not perceive that John the Baptist fulfilled the role of Elijah *redivivus*.<sup>3</sup> St Matthew and St Mark therefore described John in terms borrowed from the description of his prototype in the Old Testament in order to make the typological linkage plain.

We are now in a position to see the difference between allegorism and typology as methods of exegesis. Typological exegesis is the search for linkages between events, persons or things *within the historical framework of revelation*, whereas allegorism is the search for a secondary and hidden meaning underlying the primary and obvious meaning of a narrative. This secondary sense of a narrative, discovered by allegorism, does not necessarily have any connexion at all with the historical framework of revelation. Indeed the allegorical interpretations of Philo never have any historical reference: 'In the hands of Philo, the poetry, the prophecy, the narratives, even the simplest legal ordinances of Scripture are evaporated into commonplaces of philosophy, or

<sup>1</sup>Rufus = Edom = Red; Alexander = a man who defends himself (304e-Ccv-hp), Israel = wrestler with God (Gen. 3.z.8).

<sup>2</sup>Malachi 4.5.

<sup>3</sup>Mark 9.9-13; Jos. *Ant.* XVIII, 5.z. The term *redivivus* is commonly used by typologists; it does *not* signify a re-incarnation.

turned into a vehicle for the rhetorical expansion of moral platitudes . . . Instead of the glorious story of Abram, the father of the faithful, we get a typical Stoic who departs from the Chaldaea of the sensual understanding to Haran, which means "holes", i.e., the five senses which teach him that they are nothing without the soul! Finally he becomes "Abraham" that is "an elect father of sound"; in other words he attains to a knowledge of God and marries Sarah or abstract Wisdom." It is only when the secondary, allegorical sense has an accidental reference to God's self-revelation in history (as in Jewish and Christian interpretations of the Song of Songs), that there is an accidental resemblance between allegorism and typology.

The difference between typological writing and writing up the fulfilment of prophecy will become clear, if we examine the Matthaean account of John the Baptist. The formula 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets' (or a similar variant) occurs ten times in Matthew; in each case the reference is to a prophecy which, in the Evangelist's view, had been literally fulfilled.<sup>2</sup> But, in spite of the fact that Matthew associates the Baptist with Elijah even more explicitly than Mark,<sup>3</sup> he nowhere states that John fulfils the prophecy of Malachi. The prophecy fulfilled by John, according to Matthew, is Isa. 40. 3, which is *not* amplified by the insertion of Malachi 4.5, as is the Markan account. The inference is that, in Matthew's view, John did not literally fulfil the prophecy of Malachi. If he had come from heaven in like manner as Elijah had gone into heaven, and if he had claimed to be none other than Elijah, then he would have fulfilled the prophecy. But he had been born of ordinary parents, was content with the name of John, and may even have repudiated the suggestion that he was Elijah;<sup>4</sup> he was therefore not Elijah himself, but the antitype of Elijah. He might be described in terms borrowed from the description of Elijah, but he could not be said to have fulfilled the prophecy that 'Elijah must first come'.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (Bampton Lectures, 1885), p. 140.

<sup>2</sup>e.g., The Virgin Birth, the disposal of Judas' bribe, etc.

<sup>3</sup>Matt. 17.13.

<sup>4</sup>John 1.z1.

<sup>5</sup>In early Christian apocalyptic, the return of the two witnesses, Elijah and Moses, was regarded as a *future* event (Rev. it). The difficulties in Matt. 17.9-13 disappear, if it is assumed that, according to Matthew, the Lord saw the Baptist as the antitype of Elijah, and still expected the prophet himself to return.

Allegorism, typology and the fulfilment of prophecy are consequently to be differentiated. St Paul's interpretation of the story of Hagar in Gal. 4 is an example not of typological, but of allegorical exegesis. The account of the Triumphal Entry in Matt. 21.1-11 is a record of the fulfilment of Zech. 9.9, and not a piece of typological writing. Admittedly, typological writing and the fulfilment of prophecy overlap each other to a certain extent: in Matt. 21.1-11 the reference to the blind and the lame has probably been borrowed from the story of David's capture of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> There is also a close resemblance between St Paul's allegorism and his typological exegesis, because his allegorism was of the historical kind. But the similarities between allegorism, typology and the study of the fulfilment of prophecy are not so close as to justify ignoring the differences between them, and using one of the terms to cover them all. It may indeed be positively misleading to do so. When, for instance, Professor Manson states that typology, considered as a method of handling the Old Testament, was not devised by the Christians but was already practised in Judaism, he does less than justice to the complexity of the problem. The methods of handling the Old Testament which were already practised in Judaism were allegorism and the study of the fulfilment of prophecy. Historical typology, as defined above, came into existence with Christendom. Its character, as a method of writing, was of course determined by the character of prophecy, and its character, as a method of exegesis, by the character of the study of prophecy. It was also considerably influenced by allegorism. But when St Paul wrote that Adam was a figure (*typos*) of him that was to come, he was saying something substantially new.<sup>2</sup> We shall therefore first give some account of the study of the fulfilment of prophecy and of allegorism, which form the background of Christian typology. We shall then be in a position to determine how far it was influenced by previous methods and in what sense it was a novelty.

#### THE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY

Much of the eschatological prophecy in the Old Testament is, in the Irenaean sense, *recapitulative*. In Irenaeus, the word *typos* (*recapitulatio*) has two aspects, which may be called *consummative* and *reiterative*. When he said, 'The Son of God

Sam. 5.6 ff.    Rom. 5.14.

became Son of David and Son of Abraham; *perfecting and summing up* this in himself, that he might make us to possess life',<sup>1</sup> he was using the word in its consummative aspect. He meant that God's purpose in electing the Jewish nation out of all the families of the earth, and the House of David out of the Jewish nation, had been consummated or perfected in Christ, the head of the royal line. Moreover, Christ had not only perfected the divine purpose, but had also incorporated, or summed up, in himself the whole of mankind. 'Luke shows that the genealogy which runs from the generation of our Lord back to Adam, contains seventy-two generations . . . signifying that it is our Lord who has summed up in himself all nations and tongues, dispersed since the time of Adam, and the entire human race with Adam himself (*generationem hominum cum ipso Adam in semetipso recapitulatus est*).'<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, when Irenaeus said that the redemptive acts of God in Christ *recapitulated the acts of God in creation*, he was using the word in its reiterative sense. Here is an example 'And as that first-formed man, Adam, received his substance from unformed and still virgin earth . . . and was formed by the hand of God—that is, the Word of God (for all things were made by him)—and the Lord took clay from the earth and formed man; so it was proper that the Word himself, being of Mary who was still a virgin, when he was recapitulating Adam in himself, should receive a birth suitable for the recapitulation of Adam.'<sup>3</sup> Irenaeus held that for every event in the first Creation there was a corresponding event in the second: the Virgin Mary's obedience annulled the disobedience of the virgin Eve, and the trespass which came by a tree was undone by the tree of obedience.<sup>4</sup> He compared the Fall to the tying of a knot, which the Redeemer had to untie, bend by bend. Recapitulation therefore meant that the Incarnation reiterated the Creation, and that the Atonement annulled the Fall.

This concept of recapitulation is not, as is sometimes claimed, an idea invented by Irenaeus, following a hint from St Paul. It is a concept which he found entrenched in the Old Testament eschatological prophecies. For instance, the Temple in Ezekiel's vision' was a recapitulation of Solomon's Temple,<sup>7</sup> since it both consummated the Solomonic plan and reproduced its principal

<sup>1</sup> *Demonstratio* 37 (S.P.C.K., p. 103).    *Haer.* 3.22.3.    *Ibid.* 3.21.10.

<sup>2</sup> *Demonstratio* 33 and 34 (S.P.C.K., p. 100).

<sup>3</sup> *Mph.*    8Ezek. 40-42.    Kings 6-7.

features. Likewise, Solomon's Temple is represented in the Bible as a recapitulation of the Tent of Meeting.<sup>1</sup> Each building was, in its own day, the place appointed for the worship of Yahweh, and was filled with his glory.<sup>2</sup> But whereas the first two structures were temporary (the first by reason of its nature, and the second by reason of Solomon's sin<sup>3</sup>), the final structure was envisaged as the eternal home of Yahweh--"This is the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever."<sup>4</sup> It was the perfection and consummation of its predecessors.

Ezekiel's vision of the new Jerusalem is probably the clearest example of recapitulative prophecy in the Old Testament. But there are others of greater theological importance. Yahweh's final deliverance of his people is consistently foreshown as a recapitulation of the events of the Exodus: "I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably to her . . . and she shall make answer there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt."<sup>5</sup> "Thus saith the Lord, which maketh a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters; . . . Behold I will do a new thing; now shall it spring forth; shall ye not know it? I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert."<sup>6</sup> "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah." Elsewhere it is prophesied that the end of the age will be a recapitulation (a) of the Flood: "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall my covenant of peace be removed";<sup>8</sup> and (b) of the primeval combat with the dragon of the deep: "In that day the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the swift serpent, and leviathan the crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea."

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 35-40. The fact that these chapters were written *after* the building of Solomon's Temple does not affect the argument.

<sup>2</sup>Ex. 40.34; I Kings 8.10-11; Ezek. 43.4-5. Kings 9.1-9; 11.1-13.

<sup>3</sup>Ezek. 43.7. <sup>4</sup>Hos. 2.14-15. <sup>5</sup>Isa. 43.16-20. <sup>6</sup>Jer. 31.31. <sup>7</sup>Isa. 54.9 f.

<sup>8</sup>Isa. 27.1; cf. 51.9-11; for further discussion of recapitulative prophecy, see J. Danielou, *Sacramentum Futuri* (Paris, 1950), esp. pp. 3 ff., 55 ff., 131 ff.

Having established the fact that eschatological prophecy was recapitulative,<sup>1</sup> we must next observe that the fulfilment of a prophecy was often demonstrated or guaranteed by a sign (*crwlov*). Thus the fulfilment of Samuel's prophecy that Saul would be king is demonstrated by Saul becoming as one of the prophets: "And let it be when these signs are come unto thee, that thou do as occasion serve thee; for God is with thee."<sup>2</sup> The cure of Hezekiah's illness, prophesied by Isaiah, is guaranteed by the sun going back ten steps on the dial of Ahaz: "This shall be the sign unto thee from the Lord, that the Lord will do the thing that he hath spoken;"<sup>3</sup> and the end of the Syro-Ephraimite confederacy is signified by the birth of Immanuel.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, it was expected that the fulfilment of eschatological prophecy would be denoted by signs: "Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off;"<sup>5</sup> "And I will set a sign among them, and I will send such as escape of them . . . to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the nations;"<sup>6</sup> "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: . . . And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke."<sup>7</sup>

Finally, we must note that Yahweh's ultimate deliverance of his people was to be heralded by a proclamation of good tidings (*dayylAtov*): "The Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek (LXX *dayyeAtcradiat 77-7-wxots*) . . . to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God."<sup>8</sup> From the prophet's point of view, therefore, the Day of the Lord would be a recapitulation of God's creative and redemptive acts in the past; it would be guaranteed by certain signs; and it would be heralded by a proclamation of *eziayyatov*. The content of the proclamation would be that the eschatological signs, promised by the prophets, were being made plain, and that the

<sup>1</sup>It is probable that the annual recitation of the Creation Drama gave prophecy its recapitulative character. It is interesting to note that Aage Bentzen approved of a typological approach to the Bible; see his *King and Messiah*, p. to, n. 8.

Sam. 10.7. <sup>2</sup>II Kings 20.8-i 1. <sup>3</sup>Isa. 7.10-17. <sup>4</sup>Isa. 55.13.

<sup>5</sup>Isa. 66.19. <sup>6</sup>Joel 2.28 ff. <sup>7</sup>Isa. cf. 40.9; 52.7; Nah. 1.15.

recapitulation of God's creative and redemptive acts was about to begin: 'In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he is about to sound, then is consummated the mystery of God, according to the good tidings which he declared to his servants the prophets.'<sup>1</sup>

The prophets were given admission to the secret counsels of Yahweh: they could reveal the mystery of his redemptive purpose, and predict the signs which would mark its accomplishment: 'For the Most High knoweth all knowledge, and he looketh into the signs of the world, declaring the things that are past, and the things that shall be, and revealing the traces of hidden things.'<sup>2</sup> Consequently the student of prophecy, whether Christian or Jewish, had a twofold task: he had first to study the nature of God's creative and redemptive purpose in history, and the prophecies which foretold its ultimate recapitulation; secondly, he had to discern the signs of the times, in order to know when the proclamation of *EZczyyatov* should be expected.<sup>3</sup>

The New Testament writers diligently performed both parts of the task. The astonishing speed at which they collected catenae of *testimonia* from the Old Testament proves how careful a study they had made of eschatological prophecy. Isa. 8.1 i ff., Isa. 28.15 and Ps. 118.1 9 ff. had already been conflated by the middle of the first century, and possibly turned into a Gospel-hymn.<sup>4</sup> Ex. 17.9-14 (Moses holding up his hands during the battle between Israel and the Amalekites) was probably associated with Num. 21. 9 (the brazen serpent) not much later, and referred to the Crucifixion; the reference to the Crucifixion may even have been rebutted in Rabbinic exegesis before the end of the first century.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, since the Gospels are full of linguistic echoes of prophecies, it is evident that the Evangelists did not search the Scriptures superficially, but in minute detail. The words of the Magi, for instance, in Matt. 2.2 (*Mo;ze-v yap at na*)\*

Todg ttlepatc -c-7c TOU ips6p.ou ecykAou, 5-rav ti.iXA7) craXTn% civ, xat ETEAe6e'1^ Td t.I.LSTIpLOV ¶05 eac cky6XL6e Tok iocutoli 8o6Xouq -roUg 77p0CF/704 Rev. 10.7; cf. Amos 3.6-7; Joel 2.1. yvw yap o xtiptoq 761crav eMtp.v xat iv6PX4ev sic mietov Cot ocyy6)am Tic 7rapcX-0,u0O-ra) cal breocrOieva, y.oci ircoxaXtirmcav txv11 c'c7coxp6pov Ecclus. 42.18 (R.V. 18 f.)

<sup>1</sup>See T. W. Manson, *The Argument from Prophecy*, JTS, XLVI (1945), p. 129. Pet. 2.4-8; Rom. 9.33; see E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St Peter*, Additional Note E, pp. 268 ff.

<sup>2</sup>Mishnah, *Rosh Hashanah*, 3.8 (Danby, p. 192); see T. W. Manson, *JTS*, loc. cit.

*TOP ciaTlpa 7-f ava-roAfi Kai 7j2■Oop,Ev 7rponowfjout atircP) echo the last prophecy of Balaam do-Tpov E<sup>3</sup>.1"alcoV3, Kai civaar\*rerat Civü pcoon-os E 'Iapa7'A Num. 24.1 7).* Modern commentators have sometimes been reluctant to acknowledge such minute resemblances: A. H. McNeile wrote, 'The star which pointed out the Messiah's birthplace could hardly have been derived from a star which would be the Messiah Himself. If it had been, Mt. would doubtless have quoted the passage.'<sup>1</sup> He entirely overlooked the fact that 'the star' had already been differentiated from 'the man' (i.e., the Messiah) in the LXX, and that the number of Matthew's references to the Old Testament is not equivalent to the number of his direct quotations.<sup>2</sup> It is in the minute details, which are not explicit quotations, that the Evangelists reveal the thoroughness of their Scriptural knowledge.

That the New Testament writers also recognized the recapitulative nature of prophecy and of the final redemption of mankind is proved by their consistent representation of the acts of God in Christ as a recapitulation of his earlier acts. St Luke and St John relate the Incarnation to the Creation<sup>3</sup>; St Matthew and St John see the work of Christ as a recapitulation of the Exodus,<sup>4</sup> and the Parousia is described in Q as a recapitulation of the Flood.<sup>5</sup>

There is no lack of evidence to show that the Evangelists discerned the signs of the times. The word *en tEiöv* occurs in two sections of St Mark's Gospel: Mark 8.11-13 and 13.3-37. Mark 8.11-13 is the third of a series of four pericopae which together constitute a fairly well defined unit of the Gospel (Mark 7.31-8.21):

1. The healing of the deaf-mute (7.31-37).
2. The feeding of the four thousand (8.1-9).
3. The Pharisees' request for a sign (8.10-13).
4. Discourse with the disciples about their failure to understand the feeding miracles (8.14-21).

It is obvious from the text that the second and the fourth pericopae must be taken together. But there is also a connexion, less

<sup>1</sup>A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St Matthew*, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup>For further discussion of this point see Hoskyns and Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, Chapter IV, third ed., pp. 60

<sup>3</sup>Luke 1.78-79; John 1.1-14, cf. Col. i.15-18; Heb.

<sup>4</sup>Matt. 5-7; 8.23-27; 14.13-21; John 3.14; 6; 7.37 ff.; 8.12. Cf. the parallels between Luke 9.51-18.14 and Deuteronomy adduced by C. F. Evans in his essay on the central section of St Luke's Gospel (*Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, pp. 37 ff.).

<sup>5</sup>Matt. 24.37 ff.; Luke 17.26-27.

obvious, but no less certain, between the first and the third pericopae. Both are prefixed by cryptic geographical notes, the meaning of which has not yet been discovered.' Both contain the observation that Jesus sighed: 'And looking up to heaven, he sighed (L-TIvæE),<sup>2</sup> and saith unto him, Ephphatha'; 'And he sighed deeply (dvaaTcv<sub>ci</sub> in his spirit, and saith, How doth this generation seek a sign !'<sup>3</sup> To Mark, who discerned the signs of the times, the healing of the deaf-mute was a sign because it fulfilled the promises made in Isa. 35. 5 and 6. It was therefore an occasion for good tidings to be preached, in spite of the Lord's injunctions to silence: 'The more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it (410jpvcrgov).' Once the sign had been revealed and the good news had been preached, nothing could be said or done to make the sign plainer or more effective. So when the Pharisees came to the Lord and asked for a sign, they were making an impossible request—they were asking for the manifest to be made more manifest. They were, moreover, making a dishonest request—they were asking for a sign, not because they genuinely wanted one, but because they wanted to tempt the Lord. The Lord's answer, and the sigh which accompanied it, must be interpreted not as a criticism of their search for signs (which was perfectly legitimate), but as a comment on their blindness to signs already given, and their deafness to the proclamation of the good news. The Pharisees had not obtained the gladness and joy which those who had witnessed the healing of the deaf-mute had obtained, nor had sorrow and sighing departed from them. Therefore the Lord sighed with them and for them,<sup>4</sup> as he had sighed with and for the deaf-mute, and declared, 'How doth this generation seek a sign! There shall no sign be given to this generation.' No sign *could* be given to a generation which wilfully closed eyes and ears to the signs of the times, and which refused to admit and proclaim the good news. Indeed their very refusal was itself a sign.<sup>5</sup>

On the other hand, when the four leading disciples—Peter,

<sup>1</sup>Mark 7.31; 8.10.

<sup>2</sup>Or CCVE67eVC4e D fam. 13 E 0131. This and the following are the only occurrences of either word in the Synoptic Gospels. It is possible that Mark was referring to Isa. 35.10 (LXX) do-c68pa aa6v7 | xoct aun<sub>t</sub> xat atevayti.Oc.

<sup>3</sup>Following the translation suggested by M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, p. 89.

<sup>4</sup>Again the reference is probably to Isa. 35.10.

<sup>5</sup>Isa. 6.9-1 (LXX), cf. Mark 4.11-1a; 8. 17-18.

James, John, and Andrew—asked the Lord, 'When shall these things be ? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished ?'<sup>1</sup> they were given a full answer to their question. Their eyes and ears were open; they *could* be given the mystery of the Kingdom of God. The Apocalyptic discourse which follows is too complex to be treated fully here; for our present purpose it will suffice to note the following points :

- i. The discourse itself is recapitulative: 'For those days shall be tribulation such as there hath not been the like from the beginning of creation which God hath created until now, and never shall be' (verse 19).
2. It is, in part, a mosaic of eschatological prophecies : verses 24-27 alone contain echoes of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Amos, Zephaniah, Daniel, and Zechariah.
3. The signs which the Lord promised probably have a double reference—to the Passion and to the Parousia. And the first fulfilment in the Passion 'was itself regarded as a sign, a seal or assurance, and a sacrament of the ultimate fulfilment'.<sup>2</sup>
4. The occurrence of the signs was to be proclaimed as *dayyacov*: 'And the Gospel must first be preached unto all the nations' (verse in).

The origins of typology are to be found in the way the New Testament writers handled the Old Testament prophecies. Search of the Scriptures and discernment of the signs of the times, both of which were fundamental elements in the evangelists' study of the fulfilment of prophecy, were adopted as the fundamental elements in typological writing and exegesis. Again, just as the recapitulative nature of the saving acts of God in Christ is at the heart of the fulfilment of prophecy, so it is at the heart of typology. Irenaeus having stated that Christ summed up the entire human race with Adam himself, was perfectly justified in concluding : 'Therefore Adam was said by Paul to be *Tinros* *tlAAovTos*, because the Word, who made all things, had formed beforehand for himself the Economy of mankind which would centre in the Son of God; God predestinating the natural man to be saved by the spiritual man.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mark 13.4.

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St Mark*, Chapter IV, P. 54.

<sup>3</sup>*Haer.* 3.22.3.

## ALLEGORISM I

The Iliad and the Odyssey were at a very early date adopted as the basic text-books in Greek education; not even the vigorous protests of Plato could oust them from the established position which they occupied in the schools by the fourth century B.C. Moreover, because the sagas were believed to contain eternal truths, they were accorded far greater reverence than mere literary admiration. They owed their place of honour not to their literary beauty, but to the high ideals of chivalry and ethics which they enshrined. The attitude of the Greeks to the Iliad and the Odyssey thus resembles the Jewish attitude to the Pentateuch far more than the English and Italian attitude to Shakespeare and Dante. From the sixth century B.C. onwards, this popular, quasi-religious admiration of Homer raised certain problems with which the philosophers were obliged to grapple. They had, for instance, to inquire whether a collection of writings which contained a high proportion of humble folk-lore merited such reverence. They had also to show that it was morally justifiable to admire deities, who not infrequently were recorded as having committed acts of gross immorality.

Discussion of these problems is almost as old as Greek prose: from the earliest days philosophers sought to attach a more profound significance to the Homeric folk-tales in order to render them philosophically respectable and morally justifiable. Celsus<sup>3</sup> hints that one of the earliest Greek writers, Pherecydes of Syros (fl. c. 550 B.C.), had already begun to understand the words of Zeus to Hera in a sense other than literal.<sup>4</sup> Certainly he initiated a kind of etymological exegesis, soon to become widespread, whereby the name *KpOvos* was derived from *xpOvos*, 'from *yjioces* etc.' This method was adopted by Theagenes of Rhegium a

<sup>1</sup>It should be borne in mind that the word *COOoyeopia* was not extensively used until the Hellenistic period. Earlier writers used periphrases in which *67sevo* played the greatest part. When *COavropEcc* did come into common use, it first referred to allegory as a mode of expression, i.e., it meant *figurative language*. Later on, it was used to denote allegory as a method of exegesis, i.e., it meant *allegorical interpretation*. But the latter usage is not found in pagan literature before Plutarch, and the probability is that Jewish and Christian writers were the first to use the word, in its exegetical sense. (See H. de Lubac, 'Typologie et Allegorisme', RSR, 34 (1947), p. .)

<sup>2</sup>Republic, II, III and X; Laws VII. See H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'Education dans l'Antiquite* (Paris, 1950), pp. 35 ff. and 112 ff.

<sup>3</sup>ap. Orig. Cels. 6.42. <sup>411</sup>XV, 18-24; cf. *ibid.* I, 590 f.

<sup>5</sup>Diogenes Laertius L11 § 119.

quarter of a century later, and by the end of the fourth century, the allegorical and etymological interpretation of Homer was in full swing. Tatian reports that Metrodorus of Lampsacus (331-278 B.C.), in his treatise on Homer, turned everything into allegory. For he says that neither Hera, nor Athene, nor Zeus are what those persons suppose who consecrate to them sacred enclosures and groves, but parts of nature and certain arrangements of the elements.<sup>1</sup>

After the fourth century, allegorism became especially associated with the Stoics, and Chrysippus of Soli (280-207 B.C.) was its chief exponent. Origen writes that 'in one place Chrysippus . . . expounds the meaning of a picture at Samos, in which Hera is portrayed as performing unmentionable obscenities with Zeus. This honourable philosopher says in his treatises that matter receives the generative principles of God, and contains them in itself for the ordering of the Universe. For in the picture at Samos matter is Hera and God is Zeus.'<sup>2</sup> Origen's description of Chrysippus—'this honourable philosopher'—is an indication of the high regard which Alexandrian scholars had for Stoic methods of exegesis. Pseudo-Aristeas and Aristobulus<sup>3</sup> had first applied them to the Old Testament towards the end of the second century B.C. Just over a hundred years later, Philo offered his allegorized Pentateuch to the Hellenistic world, and thereby prepared the way for the application of a transformed Stoic exegesis to the whole Bible.

Greek allegorism had two distinct aims: (t) to unearth the deeper meanings, or undersenses (*inrelvocat*), which underlay the Homeric myths, and (z) to defend the myths from charges of immorality and blasphemy. It assumes accordingly two different forms: (I) positive allegorism, the object of which is to elucidate the undersenses of the myths, and (z) negative allegorism, the object of which is to defend morally offensive passages.<sup>4</sup> Professor J. Tate has argued that positive allegorism is prior to negative allegorism both in time<sup>5</sup> and in importance.<sup>6</sup> In his view, 'The defensive function of allegorism is wholly derivative and subordinate. It cannot account for the spate of allegorical interpretations which, from Metrodorus of Lampsacus onwards,

<sup>1</sup>Or. *ad Graec.* 21. *Gels.* 4.48.

<sup>3</sup>Or the author of works ascribed to him by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea.

<sup>4</sup>OCD s.v. 'Allegory, Greek'. <sup>5</sup>CR, XLI, p. 214.

<sup>6</sup>*Q*, XXIII, p. 142; XXIV, p. 119.

encumbered the inoffensive just as much as the offensive passages of Homer. Nor can it, I submit, account for the origin of allegorism, which is to be found, as I have said, in the desire of speculative thinkers, like Pherecydes, to appropriate for their own use some at least of the mythical traditions which they could not help venerating.<sup>1</sup> Professor Tate's conclusions about the use of allegorism in classical literature do not appear to have been rebutted by scholars in that field, and they are certainly true of the use of allegorism in Jewish and Christian literature. The main object of Christian allegorism has always been to elucidate the secondary, hidden meaning of the Old Testament, rather than to defend its primary and obvious meaning against charges of immorality.

A comparison of the allegorism of Cornutus and Philo is sufficient to show that by the first century A.D., the chief interest of Jewish and pagan exegetes lay in positive, rather than negative, allegorism; and it is against the background of this kind of Hellenistic exegesis that Pauline and patristic exegetical methods are seen in their true light. Cornutus, a teacher of rhetoric at Rome in the middle of the first century A.D., held that myth was the language in which the earliest philosophy of religion was expressed, and that Homer and Hesiod were merely the propagators of a religious philosophy which had come down to them in mythical form. Occasionally they bowdlerized it, or made futile additions to it, and so obscured it.<sup>2</sup> The object of the Homeric exegete was therefore, in Cornutus' view, to extricate the original pre-Homeric theology from the poetic form in which Homer presented it. Philo, writing at Alexandria at the same date, was endeavouring to prove that what underlay the Pentateuch could be expressed in the theological language of Hellenism. Philo's object was to justify Judaism in terms of contemporary thought, and to read into it as much of the conventional theology of the Hellenistic world as he could drag in by hook or by crook.<sup>3</sup>

There is obviously some similarity between the positive allegorism of St Paul, with its own special object, and that which was

<sup>1</sup>CG, XXVIII, p. 108.

"One day you shall have a more perfect exegesis of the genealogy of Hesiod, who, in my view, took over some things from philosophers more ancient than himself, and added other things of his own in more mythical vein, whereby most of the ancient theology was destroyed." Cornutus, *Theol. Graeff • Comp end.* (Teubner, p. 2).

<sup>3</sup>W. L. Knox, *St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, p. x.

current in the Hellenistic world at the same time. But the resemblance is not much more than superficial, and it is mistaken to suppose that Alexandrian Hellenism was the only parent of Christian allegorism.<sup>1</sup> A comparison of St Paul's exegesis of the story of Hagar and Sarah with Philo's treatment of the same story makes this plain.<sup>2</sup> In Gal. 4, Hagar is said to represent the Old Covenant given on Mount Sinai, and Sarah the New Covenant with the children of promise; the way in which God dealt with Abraham's two wives is used as an allegory of the way in which he deals with Christians and with those Jews who do not accept the New Covenant. Philo, on the other hand, wrote that, 'Sarah, virtue, bears the same relation to Hagar, education, as the mistress to the servant-maid, or the lawful wife to the concubine, and so naturally the mind which aspires to study and to gain knowledge, the mind we call Abraham, will have Sarah, virtue, for his wife, and Hagar, the whole range of school culture, for his concubine.' In the Pauline interpretation, *the historical pattern* of the story of Sarah and Hagar is used as a parable of the historical pattern of God's dealings with the Old and the New Israel. In the Philonic interpretation, however, the historical pattern of the story plays no part at all: Philo used only the names of Sarah and Hagar, interpreted allegorically, as a key wherewith to open the door to his own notion of the undersense of the narrative. And the undersense which he discovered has no connexion with God's self-revelation in history, but is merely an aspect of Hellenistic education for which Philo wished to find sanction in Holy Writ.

The story of Hagar and Sarah is allegorized in at least six passages in Philo, and he adheres consistently to the interpretation given. St Paul's treatment of the story is therefore influenced by a different exegetical tradition. The probability is that he owed more to Palestinian exegesis than to Alexandrian.<sup>3</sup> The Palestinian Rabbis had recourse to allegorical interpretation of Scripture for two reasons: (1) They found allegories in the prophetic writings, e.g., Isaiah's allegory of the vineyard, and Ezekiel's allegory of Oholah and Oholibah. (2) Some of the

<sup>1</sup>e.g., C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology*, p. 619; E. Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, p. 72.

<sup>2</sup>Gal. 4.21-31; Philo, *De congr. erud. Brat.* 23 (CW, p. 77. 2 ff.).

<sup>3</sup>"Seine Allegorese steht der palästinensischen wohl näher als der philonischen". Büchsel, *TIVNT*, I, 264 s.v. eaXwopetv.

writings for which they had the greatest respect, e.g., The Song of Songs,<sup>1</sup> could only be admitted to the Canon of Scripture by allegorical interpretation of their content. The Song of Songs, interpreted literally as a fine collection of love-lyrics, is of little or no spiritual value, and would certainly not have been admissible as canonical literature. But, interpreted as an allegory of the love of Yahweh for his people, it has constantly been used as an aid to devotion in both the Jewish and the Christian faiths.

There are two features of the Palestinian interpretation of the Song of Songs which reveal the sharp contrast between Rabbinic and Alexandrian allegorism. First, the undersense which the Rabbis perceived in the Song of Songs does concern the nature of God and his dealings with men—they made no attempt whatever to discover an undersense which would fall outside the field of revelation. Secondly, the Rabbis used the *actual text* of the love-lyrics to describe the divine love. They did not discard the text, once they had found the undersense, as one discards the shell of a nut, having found the kernel. Herein lies the principal difference between the allegorism of Palestine and that of Alexandria. The object of Alexandrian exegesis was to free the spirit of the text from the shell of words in which it was encased, whereas the object of Palestinian exegesis was to use the actual text to describe the activity of God.<sup>2</sup>

There cannot be many tasks harder than that of presenting a balanced view of the part played by allegorism in St Paul's exegesis of the Old Testament, and of the influence which it had on later patristic exegesis. It is, on the one hand, unwarrantable to justify the wholesale application of allegorism to the Scriptures by some of the Fathers, on the ground that St Paul himself used the allegorical method. On the other hand, it is also unwarrantable to minimize the importance of the allegorical method in the Pauline Epistles on the ground that St Paul used it only once, and that for illustrative rather than exegetical purposes. This was the view of some English theologians in the nineteenth century: F. W. Farrar, for example, wrote in the Preface to his Bampton Lectures on the History of Interpretation: 'But of allegories which in any way resemble those of Philo or of the Fathers and the Schoolmen, I can find but one (Gal. 4.21-27). It may be merely

<sup>1</sup>'All the ages are not worth the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel', R. Akiba, Mishnah, *Yadain*, 3.5 (Danby, p. 782).

<sup>2</sup>See Strack-Billerbeck III, p. 397.

intended as an *argumentum ad hominem*; it does not seem to be more than a passing illustration; it is not at all essential to the general argument; it has not a particle of *demonstrative* force; in any case it leaves untouched the actual history."

Farrar protested too much against allegorism in general to give a fair estimate of St Paul's use of it. None of his arguments has sufficient force to support the contention that allegorism did not play an important part in St Paul's exegesis. Let us examine them one by one: (2) He claimed to have found only one allegory in St Paul comparable to the allegories of Philo and the Fathers. We have, however, shown that St Paul's allegorism is *not* comparable to Philo's. Moreover, Philo cannot be classed with the Fathers, because, although some of the Fathers owed much to him, others were more indebted to the distinctively historical allegorism of St Paul, as we shall presently see. Finally, Gal. 4.22-27 is not the only piece of allegorism in the Pauline Epistles; Deut. 25.4 is interpreted allegorically in I Cor. 9.9 f.,<sup>2</sup> and the Passover in I Cor. 5.6-8. (2) He suggested that Gal. 4.21-27 was an *argumentum ad hominem*. In substance and character, however, the argument of Gal. 4.21-27 is extremely similar to the argument of Rom. 9, and the probability is that both passages are instances of a consistent interpretation of the Abraham-saga adopted by St Paul. (3) As in Rom. 9 St Paul introduced his discussion of the redemption of the Gentiles by expounding Abraham's marriage with Sarah and Isaac's with Rebekah, so in Gal. 4 and 5 he introduced his discussion of freedom by expounding Abraham's marriage with Hagar and Sarah. In both cases exposition of the Old Testament served as a text or basis for his teaching, and not as a passing illustration. (4) Granted that St Paul's allegorical exposition of the Old Testament is integral with his teaching, it was unquestionably essential to his argument. It has not, of course, the same demonstrative force now as it had in the first century A.D. But, so far from leaving the actual history untouched, St Paul was making use of the historical narrative of the Old Testament to illustrate the consistency of God's dealings

<sup>2</sup>p. xxiii.

<sup>3</sup>It might be supposed that in this passage St Paul out-Philo's Philo, since Philo, on the only occasion when he refers to Deut. 25.4, is content merely to allude to the humanitarianism of the Law (*de ant.* 145, CW, V, p. 311.z). But readers who are patient enough to study some eighteen pages of Strack-Billerbeck *ad loc.* will be persuaded that this is another example of Palestinian exegesis.

with men both in Abraham's day, and in his own. The aims of modern Biblical theology are the same.

St Paul's allegorism was firmly anchored to history, and thereby preserved from extravagance. Unfortunately the majority of the early Fathers had a preference for the less edifying and more enigmatic methods of Philo, and the cardinal first principle of Pauline exegesis was obscured for more than two hundred years. It was not seen to be regulative until the great period of Antiochene Biblical scholarship, which began in the middle of the fourth century. Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his commentary on Galatians, seized the opportunity offered by Gal. 4.24 to deliver a resounding attack on allegorists of the Alexandrian type, who, in his view, perverted the plain sense of Holy Scripture, and robbed its contents to manufacture stupid fables. 'What St Paul called allegorism, he said, was the juxtaposition and comparison of events in the past with events in the present.'<sup>1</sup> Theodoret insisted even more strongly on the historical character of Pauline allegorism, and wrote in his commentary, 'When the Apostle said "these things contain an allegory", he meant that they had an additional meaning; for he did not discard the historical narrative, but taught what was foreshadowed in it.'<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom shared this view, adding the comment that St Paul used the word *τύπος* in an unusual sense, since what he had called an allegory was in fact a type.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere Chrysostom admonished Biblical students that they were not to act as if they were the lords of Scripture; their task was not to adapt passages such as Isa. 5.1-7 to suit their own preconceived ideas of what the allegory meant, but rather to follow the guidance of the context, and accept the interpretation given therein; for wherever allegories occurred in the Bible, they were invariably accompanied by their interpretations.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> B. Swete, *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii* (Cambridge, 1880), Vol. I, p. 73.20.

<sup>2</sup> *Ὁ ἄγιος Παῦλος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ πρὸς τὸν Γαλάταις*, 4.24 (M. 66.908C).

<sup>3</sup> *Ἐπιτομή τῆς ἱστορίας τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, 1.11.385.

<sup>4</sup> *Καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία* (Gaume, X, 710B); cf. Severian (K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche*, 1933, p. 302.17). Chrysostom was wrong, but in view of the close similarity between allegorism and typology in the Pauline Epistles, pardonably wrong.

<sup>b</sup> *Isa. interpr.* 5.3 (Gaume, VI, 54E, et seq.).

Although the Antiochene Fathers correctly understood the allegorism of St Paul, they had no liking for it, and usually abjured it as an exegetical method. They were, however, somewhat less than fair to the Alexandrines, when they castigated them for perverting the plain sense of scripture by uncontrolled allegorism.<sup>2</sup> Admittedly, Clement and Origen owed much to Philo, and frequently interpreted scripture on Philonic rather than Pauline lines. Clement, for example, borrowed Philo's interpretation of the story of Hagar and Sarah,<sup>3</sup> and there are innumerable echoes of Philo in Origen's Pentateuchal homilies. On the other hand, Origen generally used allegorical exegesis in addition to, and not as a substitute for, literal exegesis, and he was just as aware as the Antiochenes of the danger of treating historical facts as allegories.<sup>4</sup> His commentary on John 4.22 (Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know: for salvation is from the Jews) is a good example of the way in which he first expounded the literal meaning of a text, and then its allegorical meaning. He wrote: 'The *Ye*, taken literally, refers to the Samaritans; in a deeper sense, it refers to those who have heterodox views about the Scriptures. The *We*, taken literally, refers to the Jews; taken allegorically, it means "I, the Logos, and those who are formed after me, who have salvation from the Jewish Scriptures".'<sup>5</sup> Observe that Origen gave the verse its correct literal interpretation before proceeding to discuss the meaning which he claimed to have found at a deeper level. The Antiochenes were therefore only partly justified in their strictures upon Origen: they failed to see that he did not despise literal interpretation, and that he only dispensed with it on the rare occasions when he

In their writings the word *τύπος* very seldom means a method of exegesis. It nearly always refers to allegory considered as a mode of expression, found in the Bible alongside parables, proverbs and other similar modes of expression (see H. N. Bate, 'Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis', *JTS*, XXIV (1923), p. 59). Chrysostom occasionally incorporates a piece of allegorism into his homilies, but makes it plain that he has borrowed it from another source (*homily 12.1 on Matt.* [Gaume, VII, 29E]; *homily 8y.1 on John* [VIII, 504A]).

<sup>2</sup> See H. de Lubac, 'Typologie et Allegorisme', *RSR*, 34 (1947), pp. 180 ff. This article contains many valuable comments and references, but, in the present writer's view, it makes light of the real contrast between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis, and fails to show the essential points of difference between typology and allegorism.

<sup>3</sup> *Str.* 1.5.30 (GCS, p. 19.21 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> He protested strongly against Gnostic treatment of the actual miracles of Jesus as allegories of spiritual cures. *John* 20.20 (GCS, p. 352.14).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 1.3.17 (GCS, p. 240.30).

found the plain sense of a passage repulsive. They were, however, right to object to his search for allegorical meanings in texts which did not contain them. The 'deeper sense' of John 4.22 is no part of the argument of the Fourth Gospel; it arose from the accidental fact that the verse, taken out of its context, could be applied with some relevance to the situation in which Origen found himself as an orthodox Christian *vis-d-vis* the Gnostics. As a preaching point it doubtless had some force, but as exegesis it was quite invalid.

There is a convenient summary of Origen's views on allegorism in the eleventh homily on Numbers: 'We have shown, I think, with the authority of Holy Scripture, that some of the things which are written in the Law are certainly to be cautiously avoided, lest they should be literally observed by students of the Gospel, but that other things are at all costs to be retained as written. In the case of certain other passages, it is useful and necessary for us to accept them in an allegorical sense, in addition to accepting their literal truth.'" In the first class of texts—those which are to be cautiously avoided—we may cite the conclusion of Balaam's second prophecy, 'Behold, the people riseth up as a lioness, and as a lion doth he lift himself up: he shall not lie down until he eat of the prey, and drink the blood of the slain: · Origen commented that only the inflexible champions of the literal text would not be horrified at the thought of taking Balaam's words at their face value. People of sensibility would rush to the 'sweeter' allegorical interpretation, viz., that since the Jewish people were scandalized at the idea of eating flesh and blood,<sup>3</sup> the deeper sense of Balaam's prophecy was fulfilled by the Christian people in the Eucharist.<sup>4</sup> In the second class of texts, which are to be retained as written, Origen cites the Decalogue; and in the third class, the story of Sarah and Hagar.

In the second and third classes of texts, it is hard to distinguish between Origen's approach and that of the Antiochenes, but there is an interesting difference between the comments of Origen and Theodoret on Num. 23.24. Origen was evidently so anxious to expound his idea that the verse was fulfilled in the Eucharist, that he entirely overlooked the fact that it was never intended to be taken literally at all. Balaam's words are, in fact, a *parable* of the victory of Israel, which is described as a lion, hunting for its

<sup>3</sup>Num. 33.3 (GCS, p. 78.6 ff.).  
<sup>4</sup>Num. 36.9 (GCS, p. 353.38 ff.).

<sup>5</sup>Num. 23.24.

<sup>6</sup>John 6.5z ff.

prey, and not lying down until it has consumed it. If Origen had studied the verse in its context, instead of interpreting it piece-meal, he would not have experienced any revulsion from the literal interpretation. Theodoret understood it correctly, and did not consider it worthy of special comment: having fully discussed verses 22 and 23, he went straight on to expound the next section.'

The preference of the Alexandrines for allegorism, and of the Antiochenes for literalism comes out most clearly in the comments of Origen and Theodoret on Genesis 3.21 (And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife coats of skins, and clothed them). Origen claimed that it was quite absurd to think of God stitching skins together like a tailor, and therefore the verse could not be interpreted literally. He had some sympathy for the view that the 'coats of skins' were to be understood as the human bodies of Adam and Eve. This interpretation, he maintained, was plausible, and could command assent but for the fact that earlier references to Adam's flesh and bones made it difficult to see *how* it could be true. He discussed the passage at some length and, after suggesting some alternative explanations, came to the rather unsatisfactory conclusion that some kind of allegorical interpretation was necessary. Theodoret, on the other hand, denied that the passage should be allegorically interpreted, and saw no reason why it should have been impossible for God to have created skin coats for Adam and his wife. In his view, the literal interpretation of the verse did not necessarily involve an anthropomorphic conception of God.<sup>3</sup>

We have been chiefly concerned with the opinions expressed by the Fathers of Antioch and Alexandria, because it was in these two centres of learning that discussion of the problems raised by allegorism was liveliest. It should not, however, be supposed that there was no discussion of the matter elsewhere. Irenaeus strongly objected to Gnostic attempts to treat the Resurrection as an allegory,<sup>4</sup> and Basil of Caesarea frequently expressed a preference for literal interpretation.<sup>5</sup> But it is not possible to go

<sup>1</sup>Int. Num. 43 (Schulze I.249). <sup>2</sup>Gen. 2.21.

<sup>3</sup>Qu. Gen. 39 (Schulze I. z). Theodoret quotes Origen's commentary in full.

<sup>4</sup>Ham 5.35 .2.

<sup>5</sup>οΙ Soc v6p.ouc ctOamoptoccc, et xat ei nap' itczzuvois5 geupeov Oa& 'so% reap' &lip/by nersovwevotq nept-ruxWv ... 'Eye:) 6 x6p-rov ecto6crocc, x6pTov vow. Bas. hex. 9.3 (M.29.388B), cf. *ibid.* 3.9 (1|1.29.73 C). Evidently he liked to call a spade a spade.

into greater detail in this short study. Enough has been said to give a fairly reliable picture of the use of allegorism in early patristic works. On the one hand, we can discern a strain of allegorical exegesis which derives from the historical allegorism of St Paul. On the other hand, we can see a much greater strain of the non-historical kind of allegorism which derives from Philo.<sup>1</sup> The two strains are almost inextricably intermingled; but it is in general true to say that the Alexandrians were more dependent on Philo, and the Antiochenes on St Paul.

In the fifth century even the Antiochenes began to exhibit a tendency to indulge in the Philonic kind of allegorism. Theodoret wrote on Psalm am (LXX 109). 7, 'The prophecy seems to me to have another deeper sense', and then proceeds to give an interpretation which is indisputably allegorical, though he does not call it so.<sup>2</sup> They also tended to lose their grasp of the historical nature of typology, and began to treat typology as if it were allegorism. The same author wrote of the events of the Exodus: 'The Red Sea is a type of the baptismal font; the cloud, of the Holy Spirit; Moses, of the Saviour Christ; his rod, of the Cross; Pharaoh, of the devil; the Egyptians, of the demons; manna, of the eucharistic food; and the water which sprang from the rock, of the saving blood of Christ.'<sup>3</sup> This is virtually allegorism got up in typological dress, and Pere Danielou rightly comments: 'Ici encore nous avons Pectio de la tradition mystagogique que Theodoret, ennemi de l'allegorisme, ne met même pas en question.'<sup>4</sup> These tendencies were the result of the enormous influence which pre-Christian, Hellenistic methods of exegesis had on patristic interpretation of the Bible.

#### BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY

##### 1. Lexical Study

The word *rinrog* is the principal noun formed from the stem of 7137FEW 'to strike', and has the basic meaning in classical Greek of a 'blow', or the 'mark' left by a blow.' It was therefore particularly suitable to signify the 'impression' made on wax by a seal,

<sup>1</sup>Particularly in the works of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Ambrose and Gregory of Nyssa.

<sup>2</sup>Schulze 1.1398. 'Qu. in Ex. z7 (Schulze 1.144).

<sup>3</sup>Traversee de la mer rouge et bapteme aux premiers siecles', RSR, 33 (1946), p. 417.  
<sup>4</sup>Cf. John zo.25.

which is by far the commonest meaning, and that from which most of the others originate. These can generally be classified either under the heading of 'matrix' (i.e., the archetypal mould from which the seal-impressions are made) or under the heading of the 'impression' or 'image' produced by the matrix. Of the meanings given in Liddell and Scott, the following have reference to the matrix:

1. 'Hollow mould', 'die'.
2. 'Archetype', 'pattern', 'model' capable of exact repetition in numerous instances.
- 3 'Prescribed form', 'model to be imitated'.

The following have reference to what is produced by the matrix :

- I. 'Seal-impression'.
2. 'Cast' or 'replica' made in a mould.
3. 'Figure worked in relief', whether made by moulding, modelling or sculpture.
4. 'Carved figure', 'image'.

Other meanings, such as 'form', 'shape', 'general impression', and 'outline' may have reference either to the matrix or to the impression or to both.

The principal uses of the word in the Bible correspond to the two main headings given, and may be exemplified by two consecutive verses in the speech of St Stephen<sup>2</sup>: 'And ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of the god Rephan, the figures (1-157TOVS) which ye made to worship them: and I will carry you away beyond Babylon. Our fathers had the tabernacle of the testimony in the wilderness, even as he appointed who spake unto Moses, that he should make it according to the figure (T/57rov) that he had seen.' Curiously enough, these two verses quote the only two passages in the Old Testament in which *Tiiiros* occurs: Amos 5.z6 and Exodus 25.4o.<sup>3</sup> In the first instance it means a 'graven image', in the second a 'pattern' or 'model'. The former is the only example in the New Testament of the use of *Tinros* with reference to the thing produced by moulding, modelling or sculpture. If Rom. 5.14 and I Cor. 30.6, which contain the first

<sup>2</sup>Ninth edition (1940). 'Acts 7.43-44.

<sup>3</sup>There are, besides, two references in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: III Mac. 3.3o, where it means the 'text' of a letter, and IV Mac. 6.19, where it means 'pattern'.

appearances of *vsitros* in a typological setting, are left on one side, and John 2o.2<sub>5</sub> and Acts 2<sub>3</sub>.2<sub>5</sub><sup>1</sup> are excepted, all the other instances of *l-67ros* come under the heading of 'matrix', and mean 'pattern' or 'model', e.g., Rom. 6.1<sub>7</sub>, 'You accepted obedience with all your hearts to the pattern of teaching which was handed on to you',<sup>2</sup> Phil. 3.1<sub>7</sub>, 'Mark them which so walk, even as ye have us for an example (i.e., a model to be imitated)'.<sup>3</sup>

In determining what St Paul meant when he said that Adam was *TO7TOS* Tot; p,ZAAopros, and that the events of the Exodus were *TISITOG*, two things must be taken into consideration:

- r. The meaning of the word elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles.
2. The meaning of the word in contemporary religious literature.

We have already seen that St Paul invariably uses *1151703* in the sense of 'pattern' or 'model' and that this is the commonest meaning elsewhere in the New Testament. In Philo *7111705°* and its cognates are extremely common, both in the sense of 'image'<sup>4</sup> and in the sense of 'pattern' or 'model', but it was to the latter sense that he attached greater importance, particularly in his account of the creation. Philo believed that the world which we perceive with our senses was created according to a pattern (*Twos*) which was discernible only to the mind, and that the creation of the world was, therefore, preceded by the creation of the pattern. He compared the creation to the way in which an architect conceives and builds a city. The architect, he wrote, first conceives a city as a mental impression: temples, gymnasia, town halls, market places, harbours, streets, walls, etc., are envisaged as parts of a general plan which is stamped on his mind, as a seal-impression is stamped on wax. Then he proceeds to build the city, following the pattern which has been stamped on his mind. In just such a way, 'When he was minded to found the one great city, God conceived beforehand the models (*T-Trovs*) of its parts, and out of these he constituted and brought to completion a

<sup>1</sup>Where it means 'mark' and the 'text' of a letter respectively.

<sup>2</sup>Following Knox mg. RV has 'form', which is an acceptable rendering; RSV has 'standard', and Moffatt 'rule', both of which are improbable.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. I Thess. 1.7; II Thess. 3.9; I Tim. 4.,z; Tit. z.7; Heb. 8.5. In the Pastoral Epistles, *TO7TOS* and *TI7TOS* are virtually equivalent; cf. I Tim. r.16; II Tim. r.13.

<sup>4</sup>e.g., 'The image (-cOrcoc) of Joseph and exact form of his character', *Quod Deus sit immut. a z i* (CW, II, p. 82.6),

world discernible only by the mind, and then, with that for a pattern, the world which our senses can perceive'.<sup>1</sup> Philo justified this double creation, of the pattern-world and the perceptible world, by his exegesis of the first chapter of Genesis. He claimed that the first *solid*, perceptible body to be created was the firmament (*cri-Ep&ip,a*) the morning and the evening which were created before it, belonged, not to the perceptible world, but to the world of ideas and patterns: 'We must place morning and evening in the category of the incorporeal, discernible by the mind (*VO7r611*); for there is in these nothing whatever which is perceptible (*cdcOrp-Ov*), but everything consists of ideas and measuring-rules and patterns (*TITOL*) and seals (*Opayncs*)—incorporeal things made for the creation of other bodies.'<sup>2</sup>

*TO7TOL* were thus archetypal patterns which existed in the world of ideas. But because God had made man's rational nature according to the pattern of the Logos, the archetype of rational existence<sup>3</sup>, he could impress them on the minds of men; e.g., he impressed the *157703* of the Tent of Meeting on the mind of Moses, who then had the edifice built according to that pattern.<sup>4</sup> It will be helpful to summarize Philo's account of the building:

1. God conceived the *etpx&tnros* of the Tent of Meeting. He impressed it as a *747TOS*' or *arcipci8Etyp,a*, which reproduced the archetype, upon the mind of Moses.
3. Moses instructed Bezaleel to build the Tent, according to the pattern which God had given him.
4. Bezaleel *Epp:7711E0E1g . . . Ev cri04 0E07.3*) made a copy (*tipaiila*) or shadow (*oxia*) of the pattern in Moses' mind.'

In this description *7-15z-os* is the mediating term between *apxIvvaros*, and *pl,atn,im*. The *cipx6-varos* is the original pattern of the structure, conceived by God; the *Ti5770s* is an exact copy of the archetype impressed on the mind of Moses; the *papaiila* is the pattern which the completed structure exhibits, and is an exact copy of the *Twos*. There is consequently a gradation of values from the archetype, which belongs solely to the ideal world, to the *pampa* which is a mere copy. The mediating *TO7TOS* belongs to the ideal

<sup>1</sup>*De opif.* 19 (CW, I, p. 6.5).

<sup>2</sup>*De opif.* 34 (CW, I, p. 10.22).

<sup>3</sup>*De spec. leg.* III. 207 (CW, V, p. 207.17).

<sup>4</sup>*De vita Mos.* 11.76 (CW, IV, p. 218.6).

*De somn.* I.zo6 (CW, III, p. z.5 o.r); cf. *Wisd.* 9.8.

world, in so far as it partakes of the nature of the archetype, and to the world of perception, in so far as it engenders the it-val.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which exhibits many signs of Philo's influence,<sup>1</sup> a different vocabulary is used to express the distinction between the heavenly and the earthly Tabernacles.  $\delta\pi\lambda\tau\iota\tau\omega\varsigma$  is not found; in its place we have a periphrasis  $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{own}^*$   $\tau\eta\iota\gamma\ \text{DIA}^*$ ,  $\text{h}\eta\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$  (Heb. 8.2; cf. 8.5 and 9.24).  $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{OS}$  is used only in quotation from Exodus, and is closely associated with  $\alpha\text{Kia}$  and  $\zeta\sigma\tau\eta\tau\alpha$ : 'There are those who offer the gifts according to the law; who serve that which is a copy and shadow ( $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omega\varsigma\ \text{to}\ \text{seinkat}\ \text{kai}\ \text{07}\text{-}\text{A}$ ) of the heavenly things, even as Moses is warned of God when he is about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was she-wed thee in the mount.'<sup>13</sup> Instead of  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\eta\varsigma$  we find  $\text{inract}\eta\iota\alpha$  (copy), which Philo used only four times in the sense of 'example', and  $\text{civrimros}$  which Philo did not use at all. E. G. Selwyn claims that the meaning of  $\text{dv}\tau\eta\tau\eta\mu\alpha$  in Heb. 9.24 lies 'somewhat aside from the normal usage of the first two centuries',<sup>4</sup> but the evidence is wholly to the contrary. The basic meaning in classical Greek is 'corresponding to', as an impression corresponds to a seal. In Hebrews it is used of earthly forms which correspond to heavenly realities; in I Peter 3.21 it is used of baptism, which corresponds to the deliverance of Noah and his family from the flood. In the second century literature, we find references which reproduce the usage in Hebrews; e.g.,  $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{yap}\ \text{aape}\ \text{dv}\tau\eta\tau\eta\mu\alpha\ \text{Ar}\text{Tcv}\ \text{TO}\ \text{D}\ \text{IT}\ \text{m}\ 51145\text{-}0_3^{\circ}$  (3138 $\epsilon\lambda\varsigma$   $\text{OisV}\ \text{TO}\ \text{civ}\ \text{TITv}\ \text{Trov}$

<sup>1</sup>As E. G. Selwyn has shown in his commentary on I Peter (p. 299), the word has an equivocal connotation. In some passages Philo associated  $\text{-cti}\tau\tau\omega$  or  $\text{nagasty}\eta\chi$  with  $\text{cipx6-curcoc}$ ; e.g., *De pill* 16 (CW, I, p. 4.20 ff.), *De mum.* I 173 (CV, III, p. 242.2). But in other passages where  $\text{Tin-cog}$  means 'impression', he associated it with 1.4.71p.cc; e.g., *Quad det. pot. insid. sol.* 8<sub>3</sub>. (CW, I, p. 277.7).

<sup>2</sup>See C. Spicq, *L'EpUre aux Hlbreux*, Vol. I, Chapter 3 (Paris, 195 2).

<sup>3</sup>Heb. 8.5. I differ here from Spicq (*op. cit.*, pp. 74 ff.) who writes: 'Le  $\text{TO}\ \text{OTroc}$  de Hebr. est celui de Philon; modele congu par Dieu, ainsi que l'explique *De opif. mundi.* 16 . . . 'AvTiturcog a le sens d'image, signe de la realite, et connote inferiorite et imperfection par rapport au  $\text{mSrcoc}$ .' Spicq overlooks the equivocal connotation of  $\text{-c}\&\text{rcog}$  which is of the utmost importance because, whereas in Philo  $\text{-767roc}$  is used both in the sense of archetype, and also in the sense of something secondary, in Hebrews it is obviously used in the sense of something secondary. The author's purpose in quoting Ex. 25.40 was to show that Moses' tent was at best a  $\text{TURcog}$ , i.e., something inferior to the true archetype.  $\text{Tin-cog}$  and  $\text{civTiTuTcog}$  are synonymous in Hebrews, as in many patristic works. Cf. Iren. *haer.* 4.19.1. with 1.5.6.

<sup>4</sup>*op. cit.*, p. 298.

$\text{00eipas}\ \text{TO}\ \text{cat-vTiKov}\ \text{f}\eta\text{teraAOeTat}\ \text{II}\ \text{Clem.}\ 14.3$ ; and 'ex eorum derivatione cum alii facti essent et antitypi eis qui super eos essent' (Gnostic) Iren. *haer.* 1.24.3.

We shall presently have to examine the meaning of  $\text{TOT}\omega\varsigma$  and its cognates in the Fathers. At this juncture we need only state the conclusion that in spite of the enormous *theological* differences between St Paul and contemporary writers, the word  $\text{7-7-17}\omega\varsigma$  invariably has the primary meaning of 'model' or 'pattern'. We should therefore adopt A. Nygren's interpretation of Rom. 5.14: 'Adam is called *Tinros*, a pattern or model for Christ'.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Theological Study

There is no *theological* similarity whatever between the typology of Philo and that of St Paul. The only point of contact between the two writers is their common use of the typological vocabulary. But whereas in St Paul the vocabulary is harnessed to the exposition of God's redemptive work in history, in Philo it is harnessed to allegorism. It is in fact hardly possible to separate typology from allegorism in Philo, and if the word typology must be used of certain aspects of Philonic exegesis, it should always be qualified by the adjective *symbolic*, in contradistinction to the *historical* typology of the New Testament.

On the story of Eve and the serpent Philo wrote, 'These are no mythical fictions, such as poets and sophists delight in, but ways of demonstrating  $\text{TII/rot}$ , bidding us have recourse to allegorism and to be guided in our interpretations by the undersenses of the narrative ( $\text{SE}\eta\text{tpa}\ \text{Ta}\ 7\text{-inrcav}\ \text{ciA.177yoplav}\ 7\text{rapaicaAofivra}\ \text{KaTa}\ \text{Tag}\ 8\text{c}'\ \&\ \text{To}'\ \text{ota},\ \text{a7ro8doets}$ ). One may say with reasonable certainty that the snake is a suitable  $\text{ad}\ \text{t}\eta\text{loAov}$  of pleasure, etc.'<sup>2</sup> This kind of approach to the creation narratives differs *toto caelo* from St Paul's approach. The presuppositions which conditioned the latter were those of Rabbinic Judaism, whereas the former was conditioned by the presuppositions of Middle Platonism. Philo believed that the types and ideas, which belonged to the word of  $\text{vOird}$ , were hidden in the Old Testament narratives in  $\text{015p}\ \text{floAa}$ , which belonged to the world of  $\text{alca}\ \text{rd}$ . His task was therefore to apply allegorism to the symbols in order to make them yield up their secrets, the  $\text{157ot}\ \text{Or}\ \text{f57rOvotat}$ .

St Paul had no such end in view, even in those passages where

<sup>1</sup>*Commentary on Romans* (ET, C. C. Rasmussen, p. 219).

<sup>2</sup>*We apif. 157* (CW, I, p. 54.26).

his exegesis most resembles Philo's. For instance, both Philo and the author of the Wisdom of Solomon saw in the rock of Massahl an allegory of the divine wisdom.<sup>2</sup> St Paul also interpreted the rock allegorically in I Cor. 10.4<sup>3</sup>: 'Our fathers . . . did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ.' Undoubtedly the two interpretations closely resemble each other, but St Paul's goes much deeper than Philo's. Philo's purpose was achieved when he asserted that the rock was a *aligoAov* of divine wisdom—the discovery of the hidden sense was an end in itself. St Paul's allegorism, however, was not an end in itself: having shown by allegorism that the rock was not merely the divine wisdom, in a general sense, but in the particular sense of Christ, the Word and Wisdom of God, he proceeded to show that the events which the 'fathers' experienced in the Exodus, directly corresponded to the events which he and his contemporaries were experiencing, *because Christ was the prime mover in both*. This is the meaning of *TavTa 8E TVIII.Ketj3 ovaPacvov EICEIVOL\$* in verse 1; the historical pattern of the Old Covenant exactly corresponds to the historical pattern of the New Covenant, because both are the work of the Word and Wisdom of God.<sup>4</sup>

The same historical emphasis lies behind the assertion that Adam is *111770\$ TO17 plAArrros* in Rom. 5.14, although the meaning of *To<sup>g</sup> ILIAAOVTOS* is not entirely clear. Dr J. A. T. Robinson has suggested three possible explanations<sup>5</sup>:

1. Adam, since he knew the will of God for man, is regarded by Paul as prefiguring humanity under the law, which was not given historically in the Jewish Torah until the time of Moses. *ToV/ ILEAAOI,TO3* will then refer to Moses, or, generally, to man under the law.
2. *TOV μEA O111-0\$* may perhaps be neuter and mean simply 'the future', 'what was to come' (cf. Luke 1<sub>3.9</sub>; I Tim. 6.19).
3. It may refer to Christ, in which case the relative clause is no more than a device for resuming the main argument and must be taken closely with what follows.

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 17.6; cf. Deut. 8.15.

<sup>2</sup>*Leg. alleg.* 2.86 (CW, I, p. 107.24); *Wisd.* 11.4.

<sup>3</sup>See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, Chapter 7, esp. p. 153.

<sup>4</sup>Observe how, in the Pauline Epistles, typology emerges as a development of allegorism.

<sup>5</sup>*The Body (Studies in Biblical Theology No. y)*, p. 35, n.1. Robinson advocates the first explanation.

The second of these explanations may be ruled out on linguistic grounds. If *Γ25770g* means a pattern or model, St Paul cannot have meant that Adam was a pattern of anything so vague as 'the future'.<sup>1</sup> There is not a great deal to choose between the first and the third solutions of the difficulty, but, in view of I Cor. 15.22 (As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive), I am inclined to think that the third is correct. The argument of Rom. 5.1 *z-z i* is a detailed elaboration of the statement in I Cor. 15.2z; it sets out to contrast Adam with Christ, and not to compare him with Moses, who only occupies a subordinate place in the argument. In both epistles St Paul was concerned to show that the Incarnation was a new creation, and that the Redemption undid the Fall. To this end he introduced the concept of the Second Adam, who in the historical events of his life and death recapitulated the pattern of the first creation.

There is not a trace of Platonic idealism in St Paul's typology. In fact his doctrine of the Second Adam is the reverse of Philo's; as W. D. Davies has written, 'Paul reverses the order found in Philo and identifies the Heavenly Man, not with a pre-existent Idea, who was chronologically prior to the earthly Adam of Genesis, but with Jesus, the Son of David, who was later than the Adam of Genesis in time, and therefore might be called a Second Adam. For Philo the Heavenly Man belonged to another realm of being, a realm that could never come to terms with matter; for Paul the Heavenly Man is Christ, who has introduced that other realm into this, into time, space and sense.'<sup>2</sup> Much the same might be said of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in spite of the fact that its author borrows a great deal from Philo. The 'Ideal' Atonement in Hebrews does not belong to Philo's world of Ideas, but actually took place in history when Christ offered himself on the Cross and entered into heaven itself. The author only uses symbolic typology to describe the insufficiency of earthly sacrifices compared with the supreme historical reality of the sacrifice of Christ. It is, moreover, subordinate to the use of historical typology, which is applied to Melchizedek (Chapter 7), the Covenant (Chapter 8, cf. 12.24), the Day of Atonement (Chapter 9) and Mount Sinai (Chapter 12.18 ff.). Nothing could be less Philonic than this last passage. The country which Philo sought

<sup>1</sup>I know of no patristic parallel. Just. *Dial.* 114.1 has *7-cp&TtecOcd* 8-L-67-coc 766 ti.6AAov-roc (neuter), but there is a neuter antecedent, Tr., '01). *Cit.*, p. 52.

was a realm apart, but according to Hebrews the country to which the Christians were come was a heavenly city come to earth in the person of Jesus.

The New Testament writers held that the *Heilsgeschichte* exhibited a consistent pattern—it was like the weaving of a carpet, from its inception on the loom to the central motif, and from the central motif to its completion; all the parts of the pattern were closely related to each other and converged on the central motif; and the pattern between the beginning and the central axis mirrored the pattern from the central axis to the end. Consequently the main object of their exegesis was to show how the parts of the pattern were related, and how they converged on the centre—to bring to light the evidence of God's consistent purpose in history. Naturally they saw the pattern in different lights, and concentrated on the parts in which they were specially interested, e.g., St Paul concentrated on the typology of Adam and the Exodus, and the *auctor ad Hebraeos* on that of the Day of Atonement. But these aspects of typology hardly amount to the five forms or categories which Pere Danielou distinguishes in the New Testament':

1. Matthaean, which is concerned with the realization of the types in the biographical details of Christ's life.
2. Johannine, which is more theological, and concerned with 'fulfilments in the mysteries of the Incarnation'.
3. Churchly, or sacramental.
4. Mystical, according to which the inner life of the Christian was prefigured in the Old Testament.
5. Eschatological.

Danielou's fourth category, of which he cites I Cor. 5.6-8, and the opening of I Peter as examples, does not seem to belong to typology at all. I Cor. 5.6-8 is a piece of figurative writing, typical of Palestinian allegorism, and the opening of I Peter is concerned with the fulfilment of prophecy. The second category is ill-defined: it is as difficult to determine in what sense Johannine typology is 'more theological' than the Matthaean, as it is to say how the fulfilment of types in the mysteries of the Incarnation differs from their realization in the biographical details of Christ's life. In any case, St John is as interested as St Matthew in the latter; as H. W. Montefiore has shown, the position of the Cana

*Theology*, LVII, (March 1954), p. 87.

miracle and the Cleansing of the Temple in the Fourth Gospel was probably determined by typological consideration of Isa. 9.1 (LXX 8.z3) and Ezek. 47.1 ff.'

New Testament typology is resistant to this kind of scientific classification—probably because it was not considered to be a science. It was to the Apostolic writers, what Biblical theology is to the modern exegete—an historical approach to the understanding of the saving acts of God. The most that can be said of it is that it *was* historical, as opposed to symbolic, and that it had many different aspects, which the Fathers were to develop later in their own distinctive ways.

## PATRISTIC TYPOLOGY<sup>2</sup>

In the sub-apostolic age the historical typology of the Bible was at once obscured and overlaid by the symbolic typology of Hellenistic Platonism. Most of the responsibility for this change must be attributed to the Gnostics, because it is in Gnostic writings that *Timros* and its cognates are most frequently used to describe the relationship between the material world and the world of ideas.' But there is also a strong element of symbolic typology in some of the works of the Apologists and the Apostolic Fathers. Theophilus of Antioch, for example, described the three days before the creation of the lights in the firmament as *T757rot Tijso* Tptci8os, *Toi3 OE015 Kai TOV Aciyov at'tro13, Kai ri;s uoOtas airro0*.<sup>4</sup> Again, in the homily known as *II Clement*, we read: 'The Church, being spiritual, was manifested in the flesh of Christ, thereby showing us that, if any of us guard her in the flesh and defile her not, he shall receive her again in the Holy Spirit: for this flesh is *d<sub>VT</sub>TV7T03* of the spirit. No man therefore, when he hath defiled *TO AVTIVITOV* shall receive for his portion *TO a.)OevnuaSv*.'<sup>5</sup> This kind of typology appears to be predominant in writings which contain parallels to the Valentinian. *Gospel of Truth*, recently discovered at Nag Hammadi. When the full text of this has been published, I hope to be able

UTS, L (1949), p. 183.

'The subject-matter of patristic typology is too vast to be treated here. I have confined my attention in what follows to a consideration of its methodology.

'The Gnostics used *Timoc* in the sense of 'image' rather than of 'pattern'. They called the earthly church *ONTETOISOV Tijc 'ExxAvriaq Iren. haer.* 1.5.6.

<sup>4</sup>*Autol.* 2.15.    *II Clem.* 14.3.

to show that II Clement, Theophilus' *Ad Autolyicum*, the *Apology* of Aristides and the *Epistle to Diognetus* do not belong to the main stream of orthodoxy, but to what Professor H. E. W. Turner has called the 'penumbra' between orthodoxy and Gnosticism'. But it is in any case true to say that symbolic typology occurs most frequently in Gnostic works and in orthodox works which contain Gnostic traits. The inference is that the introduction of symbolic typology into second century exegesis was partly due to direct Gnostic influence. But it was also partly due to the indirect influence of Gnosticism, because the Apostolic Fathers sometimes used symbolic typology, by way of reaction, to counter some of the Gnostic assertions. Ignatius' description of the Bishop as  $\nu\iota\rho\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\varsigma$ <sup>2</sup> is probably an instance of symbolic typology with an anti-Gnostic bias. It is likely that he was insisting that the Bishop was a genuine 'type' of God, as opposed to the spurious types about which the Gnostics fancifully speculated.

Furthermore, Gnosticism affected historical typology because of its contempt for the historical value of Scripture. The plain sense of Scripture was considered suitable only for beginners—the simple faithful; the deeper allegorical sense was for the true Gnostics—the fully initiated. Thus we read in one of Clement's *Extracts from Theodotus*, 'The Saviour taught the Apostles at first figuratively (*τυπικαίῳ*) and mystically, later in parables and enigmas, and thirdly clearly and openly, when they were alone.'<sup>3</sup> This doctrine imposed a totally artificial scheme on the teaching of Jesus, and at once substituted allegorism for historical typology as the normal method of interpreting it. In consequence the orthodox Fathers were obliged to pay less attention to historical typology and more to the task of countering Gnostic allegorism. The immediate effect of this second Gnostic impact on Christian exegesis may be measured by comparing Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*,<sup>4</sup> which is exclusively concerned with historical typology, with the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria, who was a master of the art of parrying Gnostic exegesis with allegorism of his own. The ultimate effect, however, was the gradual fusion of allegorism with historical typology, which resulted in (a) the

*The Pattern of Christian Truth* (Bampton Lectures, 1954). Appended Note A. *Trail*. 3.1; cf. *Magn.* 6.1; contrast *Clem. exc. Thdot.* 33.3 (*St. D.* I, p. 64). '66 (p. 82).

Especially chapters 112-14.

most bizarre forms of spurious historical exegesis (e.g., Gregory of Nyssa interpreted Miriam's timbrel as a symbol of her virginity, and therefore claimed that she was a type of the Virgin Mary);<sup>2</sup> Theodoret saw in the Red Heifer of Num. 19 a type of the earthly body of Christ<sup>1</sup>) and (b) the use of the typological vocabulary for allegorical purposes (e.g., Cyril of Alexandria wrote that the 'village' of Mark  $\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\alpha\varsigma\ \iota\text{-}\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\alpha\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ).

The most important orthodox rationale of historical typology in the second century is contained in the *Homily on the Passion* by Melito of Sardis.<sup>5</sup> Melito likened the Old Testament types to the scale-models which a sculptor uses for patterns by which to work when he is carving the full-scale sculpture. The scale-model is of service only while the sculpture is being made; by looking at it, the sculptor gets a mental picture of the finished work and knows how to shape the material; but when he has completed the sculpture, he discards the pattern, because it is no longer serviceable. In exactly the same way 'The People was held in honour before the Church arose, and the Law was wondrous before the light of the Gospel was shed abroad. But since the Church arose and the Gospel was shed abroad upon men on earth, the type is made void, giving over the image to the natural truth.' Melito then went on to show how the old Passover must be discarded, because in Christ, the Paschal Lamb of God, the type had been fulfilled.<sup>6</sup>

Two features of Melito's discussion must be noted: In the first place, he believed that the Old Testament types ceased to be of service when they had been fulfilled. In the second place, he believed that they were, in their own time, powerful mysteries, because of the truth which they foreshadowed. Thus he wrote of the first Passover, 'The sacrifice of the sheep was found to be the salvation of Israel, and the death of the sheep became the life of the people, and the blood abashed the angel. Tell me, angel, what stayed thy hand, the sacrifice of the sheep or the life of the Lord? The death of the sheep, or the type of the Lord? . . .

Map4.

*Virg.* t9 (M.46.396B).

<sup>3</sup>*Qu.* 35 in *Num.* (Schulze 1.243).

*Hom.* iz (Aubert V, 2, 394A).

*St. D.* XII, pp. 207 (the genuineness of the work is assumed). See the important note by Campbell Bonner in his Introduction, pp. 68 ff.

<sup>5</sup>Melito used  $\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$  in the same sense as St Paul, and, like St Paul, he searched the Scriptures for traces of a consistent pattern in the saving acts of God.

Thou sawest the mystery of the Lord enacted in the sheep, the life of the Lord in the sacrifice of the sheep, the type of the Lord in the death of the sheep. Therefore didst thou not smite Israel.<sup>1</sup>

Melito's analogy was taken over both by Origen and by Chrysostom, and it is interesting to compare their use of it. Origen wrote, *Sicut hi, quibus artificium est sign ex aere facere et statuas fundere, antequam verum opus aeris producant aut argenti vel auri, figmentum prius luti ad similitudinem futurae imaginis formant . . . tale aliquid intellige etiam in his, quae 'in typo' et figura futurorum in lege et prophetis vel scripta vel gesta sunt.*<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom slightly changed the metaphor, and preferred to speak of the outline sketch which a painter makes for a portrait before he fills in the colours.<sup>3</sup> Like Melito, both writers held that the patterns or types were worthless when they had fulfilled their purpose. Thus Origen said, *Cum autem fuerit effectum opus illud, propter quod figmentum luti fuerat formatum, usus eius ultra non quaeritur*, and Chrysostom said, *kel5av SE 611710v Ta, av071, Kp&rercu p,b I caocti, -1-6708, KCa. 073 ikaiverat*. The second feature of Melito's argument was, however, only taken up by Chrysostom, who stated elsewhere that the blood sprinkled on the lintels of Jewish homes at the first Passover was effective *because it was a type of the Blood of Christ*.<sup>4</sup>

Origen's omission of this aspect of Melito's typology is another indication of the difference between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis to which we have already drawn attention. The Antiochene Fathers<sup>5</sup> had an infinitely greater respect for the continuity of the Biblical narratives than the Alexandrians, and therefore consistently used typology as an historical method of exegesis. The Alexandrians always had a tendency to confuse historical typology with symbolic typology or allegorism, and consequently to overlay the search for historical patterns in God's redemptive work with the search for hidden meanings which belonged to the world of *voirra*. According to Origen, the Old Testament types could actually hinder the manifestation of truth,<sup>6</sup> and the man who sought after truth must first be delivered

<sup>1</sup> *id.* 105 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Horn. o.t in Lev. (GCS, p. 441.5).*

<sup>3</sup> *Horn. 10.2 in Phil. (Gaume, XI, 276 D).*

<sup>4</sup> *Apud Jo. Dam. pared/. (M.96.17A).*

<sup>5</sup> i.e., the early Antiochenes.

<sup>6</sup> *Jo. 28.12 (GCS, p. 404.3).*

from bondage to the types,' *oii yap ?lop, UYT-0V --TOPGKa laTOPLKW (him r'rrros, Kai Ta acopaTitKaawparcKC6v,d.AAA-rdawiLaTitKairivEvp-aTitKeliv, Ka Ta laTopcKa v0717631.2*

There is no such disparagement of the historical value of the types in early Antiochene theology. Chrysostom, when comparing Isaac, carrying the wood for his sacrifice, with Christ, carrying the Cross, wrote, *diva TOTE j,6, jLExi yvu'ip,7s TOV irarpOs 10'771 TO 7paypa*. Tirtros *yap ill. v'fiv SE Kai Bri Tan. 4)yo.,v e'17A (3ev• ca7jOeta yap 733/.*<sup>3</sup> The significant word here is *TO 7pay,ta*—the matter, which is in the purpose of God. At the sacrifice of Isaac it 'stood still' in the type, i.e., it remained concealed. But at the sacrifice of Christ it 'came out' and was made plain. The *7paypa* was common to both type and antitype, but it was present in each in a different degree of revelation. In Chrysostom's typology, therefore, the two parts of a type-pair were revelations, differing in magnitude, of a single *vpay,ka* in the divine purpose; hence the types had a force which only differed in magnitude from the force of their antitypes, and were no less real and divinely willed.

The Antiochenes seem to have borne in mind the primary meaning of *TO-ros* seal-impresion, because they liked to insist that the identity between the two parts of a type-pair must be real and intelligible. They were thus preserved from many of the errors of the less historically-minded Alexandrians. Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote on Micah 4.1-3, 'I am amazed at those who have said that these words were spoken by the prophet primarily with reference to the things which were to happen to the Israelites when they were led out of Babylon, but that they also constitute a type of the things which were to happen in the time of the Lord Christ. I entirely approve of their excellent remarks to the effect that the words signify the return of the people from Babylon; but I have no idea how they were persuaded to say that they constitute a type of the things that would come to pass in the time of the Lord Christ. It is surely obvious that every type has some resemblance to that which it is said to typify. But the words "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" differ vastly from the directions of Christ, who plainly said to the Samaritan woman, "Believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship

13.18 (*GCS*, p. 242.27).

to.18 (*GCS*, p. 189.28).

*Hone. 85.1 in Jo. (Gaume, VIII, 504A).*

the Father", and also gave the reason, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." <sup>1</sup>

Chrysostom used the word *εννυγία* (kinship) to express the identity between the type and its antitype. Commenting on Gal. 4.24 he said that St Paul allegorized the story of Hagar and Sarah because he desired to show the typological kinship between the Old and the New Testaments, 'For the type is akin to the truth and not contrary to it.'<sup>2</sup> He illustrated this kinship by saying that St Paul could not have allegorized any of the events in Greek history to prove his point, because those events had nothing whatever in common with the Christian revelation of truth. Unfortunately he did not go so far as to say exactly what he meant by the relationship or kinship between the types and their fulfilment, but it is just possible that the use of *τιπρω* as a *sacramental sign* may throw some light on the matter.

It has long been recognized that when St Cyril of Jerusalem referred to the consecrated elements in the Eucharist as *types* of the Body and Blood of Christ, he did not mean that they were merely *symbols*, in the modern sense of the word.<sup>3</sup> In the ancient world a symbol was not held to be a mere representation of an object, but was believed to participate in the being of the object which it symbolized.<sup>4</sup> In some sense, it *was* what it represented. Consequently, the use of *τύπος* and other similar words of the consecrated elements in the Eucharist did convey the meaning of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. But it is scarcely credible that when St Cyril of Jerusalem used *τιπρω* in the sense of *sacramental sign*, he meant one thing, and when he used it to signify that Jonah was a type of Christ,<sup>5</sup> he meant something completely different. It is even less credible that St Basil the Great,<sup>6</sup> and Theodore of Mopsuestia<sup>7</sup> should use *τιπρω* in connexion with Baptism, so that it is difficult to determine whether

<sup>1</sup>14.66.364D. I cannot accept the conclusions which Pere Danielou draws from the Antiochene tendency to restrict typological interpretation to 'those cases where tradition made it practically obligatory'. (*Theology*, LVII (March 1954), p. 88.) Not only does he confuse the early Antiochenes with the later (e.g., Severus) but he also underestimates the significance of *τιπρω* as a *sacramental sign*, and appears to have forgotten where Neoplatonism originated.

<sup>2</sup>Hom. 2.5 in II Cor. 4.13 (Gaume, III.274B).

<sup>3</sup>*Catech.* 22.3; 23.20.

<sup>4</sup>See Kleinknecht s.v. *τύπος*, *TUNT*, II, p. 386.

<sup>5</sup>*Catech.* 14.20.

<sup>6</sup>*Spin.* 15.35 (M.32.129C).

<sup>7</sup>Rom. 6.17 (M.66.804C).

they meant *sign* or *type*, if they had not some significance in mind which was common to both. The probability is that if it was considered in the ancient world that a sign or symbol actually *was*, in some sense, that which it represented, it was also considered that a type or figure actually *was*, in some sense, that which it prefigured.<sup>1</sup> We have already seen that Chrysostom believed that the two parts of a type-pair had a common *τύπος*; it is therefore likely that he believed in a relationship of being between them, and that he called this relationship *ο-ννυγία*.

## CONCLUSIONS

The principles which determined the use of historical typology in the Bible, and in the writings of those Fathers who followed the Biblical rather than the Hellenistic tradition of typological exegesis, seem to have been:

1. To confine typology to the search for historical patterns within the historical framework of revelation.
2. To reject spurious exegesis and Hellenistic allegorism as means of discerning the patterns.
3. To insist that the identity between the type and the antitype must be real and intelligible.
4. To use it solely for expressing the consistency of God's redemptive activity in the Old and in the New Israel.

<sup>1</sup>See my article 'Le sens de "type" chez les Peres', *La Vie Spirituelle*, *Suppl. Tome IV* (February 1951), p. 84.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
3.21	59	8.11 ff.	46
30.42	38	9.1	69
32.28	40 n.	27.1	44
<i>Exodus</i>		28.15 ff.	46
17.6	66	35.5 f., <b>20</b>	48
<sup>1</sup> 7- <sup>9</sup> - <sup>14</sup>	46	40.3	41
<sup>2</sup> 5- <sup>4</sup> <sup>0</sup>	61	40.9	45 n.
35-4 <sup>0</sup>	44	43.16-20	44
4 <sup>0</sup> -34	<b>44</b>	51.9-11	26 f., 44
<i>Numbers</i>		52-7	45 n.
ii.16 ff.	37	53	xo, 16
<sup>1</sup> 7-4-7	38	54.9 f.	44
21.9	46	55.13	45
2 <sub>3</sub> .22 f.	59	61.1 f.	45
2 <sub>3</sub> .24	58	66.19	45
2 <sup>4</sup> . <sup>1</sup> 7	47	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		31.31	44
18.15	66	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
25.4	16, 55	19.11	38
<i>I Samuel</i>			43
10.7	45		44
<i>II Samuel</i>			44
5.6 ff.	42	<sup>48</sup> 7, <sup>414</sup> 2ff	69
15.21 ff.	37	<i>Hosea</i> 7	
<i>I Kings</i>			44
6-7	43	<i>Joel</i>	
8.10 f.	44	2.1	46 n.
9.1-9	44	2.28 ff.	45
11.1-13	44	<i>Amos</i>	
<i>II Kings</i>		3.6 f.	46 n.
zo.8-11	45	5.26	6i
<i>Psalms</i>		<i>Micah</i>	
<b>II()</b>	37	4.1-3	73
110.7	60	<i>Nahum</i>	
118.19 ff.	46	1.15	45 n.
<i>Isaiah</i>		<i>Zechariah</i>	
5. <sup>1</sup> -7	56	9.9	42
6.9-11	48	<i>Malachi</i>	
7.10-17	45	4.5	40 /I., 41

<i>Bible Ref</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Wisdom</i>		<i>III Maccabees</i>	
9.8	63 n.	3.3o	61 n.
11.4	66		
<i>Ecclesiasticus</i>		<i>IV Maccabees</i>	
42.28 f.	46	6.19	61 n.

NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Acts</i>	<i>Page</i>
1.22	39 n.	8.34	26
2.2	46	23.25	6z
5-7	47	<i>Romans</i>	
8.23-27	47	5.12-21	67
<sup>1</sup> 4- <sup>1</sup> 3- <sup>21</sup>	47	5. <sup>1</sup> 4	z8, 42, 49, 65 f.
<sup>1</sup> 7- <sup>9</sup> - <sup>1</sup> 3	41 n•	6.17	6z
17.13	41	9	55
21	42	9.33	46
21.14	42	<i>I Corinthians</i>	
24.37 ff.	47	5.6-8	55, 68
<i>Mark</i>		9.9 f.	16, 55
4.ix f.	48 n.	10.1-13	39 n.
7.31	48	10.4	66
7.3 <sup>1</sup> -37	47	1o.6	6i
8.1-9	47	<b>Io.12</b>	66
8.10	48	25.22	67
8.11-13	47	<i>Galatians</i>	
8.24-22	47	4	4z
8.17 f.	48 11.	4.22-7	55
8.31	25	4.21-31	39 ri., 53 n.
9.9-13	40 n.	<i>Epbesians</i>	
11.2	71	<b>1.10</b>	43
<sup>1</sup> 3-3-37	47, 49	<i>Philippians</i>	
<i>Luke</i>		3.17	6z
9.51-18.14	47 11.	<i>Colossians</i>	
13-9	66	1.15-18	47 n.
17.26 f.	47	<i>I Thessalonians</i>	
24.27	25	1.7	6z n.
<i>John</i>		<i>II Thessalonians</i>	
1.21	41	3.9	6z n.
3. <sup>1</sup> 4	47	<i>I Timothy</i>	
4.22	57f.	1.16	6z n.
6	47	4.12	62 n.
7.37 ff.	47	6.19	66
8.22	47	<i>II Timothy</i>	
19.36 f.	15	1.13	62 11.
20.25	62	<i>Titus</i>	
<i>Acts</i>		2.7	62 II.
7.43 f.	61		

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Hebrews</i>		<i>I Peter</i>	
I	47 <sup>n.</sup>	2.4-8	46
7-9	67	3.21	64
8.z	64		
8.5	6z n., 64		
9-24	64	<i>Revelation</i>	
12.18 ff.	67	10.7	46
12.24	67	II	41 n.

## INDEX OF NAMES

Abraham	rz f., 34, 4 <sup>1</sup> , 55	Dante	50,
Absalom	37	Davey, F. N.	47n.
Adam	28, 4 <sup>z</sup> f., 59, 6z, 67 f.	David	23, 37, 4z:f., 67
Akiba	54 n.	Davies, W. D.	66 n., 67
Alexander	40	Diodore of Tarsus	14
Ambrose	60 n.	Diogenes Laertius	50 n.
Amos	49	Diognetus	70
Andrew, St	49	Elijah	40 f.
ps. Aristeas	51	Elisha	19
Aristides	70	Eusebius	51 n.
Aristobulus	51	Evans, C. F.	47 n.
Augustine	13	Eve	42, 59, 65
alaam	58	Ezekiel	37, 43 <sup>f.</sup> , 49, 53
Barnabas	31	Farrar, F. W.	41 n., 54 f.
Basil the Great	59, 74	Farrer, A. M.	37
Bate, H. N.	57 n.	Gregory of Nyssa	14, 30, 35 f., 60 la., 71
Bentzen, A.	45 n.	Hagar	16, 35, 53, 55, 57f., 74
Bezaleel	63	Hatch, E.	53 n.
Black, M.	48 n.	Heracleon	32
Bonner, Campbell	71 U.	Hesiod	52
Biichsel, F.	53 n.	Hezekiah	45
Celsus	50	Hippolytus	33
Chrysippus	51	Homer	33, 5 <sup>1</sup> f.
Chrysostom	14, 31, 56, 5711., 72 ff.	Hosea	26
Clement of Alexandria	31, 5 <sup>1</sup> n., 57, 60 n., 70	Hoskyns, E.	47 n.
Clement of Rome	65, 69 f.	Ignatius	70
Cornutus	52	Irenaeus	42 <sup>f.</sup> , 49, 65, 69 xi.
Cromwell	20	Isaac	10, 16, 35, 40, 73
Cyril of Alexandria	14, 31, 71	Isaiah	45, 49, 53
Cyril of Jerusalem	74	Isaiah, Second	z6, 34
Danby, H.	46 11., 54 n.	Ishmael	35
Daniel	13, 49	James, St	49
Danielou, J.	44 n., 60, 68, 74 n.	Joel	49

John the Baptist	40 f.	Paul, St	16, 25, 29, 35,
John, St	19, 37, 47, 49, 68		42, 5 <sup>2</sup> , 54 ff., 60, 6z, 65 ff., 74
Jonah	29, 34	Paulinus of Nola	13
Joseph	62 n.	Peter, St	48
Josephus	40 11.	Pherecydes	50
Judas Iscariot	41 n.	Philo	3 <sup>o</sup> f., 40, 51 ff., 55 ff., 60, 62 ff.
Justin Martyr	22, 24, 67 IL, 70	Plutarch	50 n.
Kirk, K. E.	20	Rahab	33 f.
Kleinknecht, H.	74 n.	Rebekah	55
Knox, W. L.	52 n.	Robinson, J. A. T.	66
Levi	34	Rufus	40
Liddell and Scott		Samuel	45
Lightfoot, R. H.	49 n.	Sarah	4 <sup>1</sup> , 53, 55, 57f, 74
Loewe, H.	53 n.	Saul	45
Lubac, H. de	50 O., 57 n.	Selwyn, E. G.	46, 47, 64
Luke, St	1 <sup>9</sup> , 2 <sup>5</sup> , 37, 47	Severian	74
Malachi	41	Shakespeare",	30
Manson, T.	39, 42, 46	Simon of Cy	40
Marcion	17	Solomon	43 f.
Mark, St	40 f., 47	Staab, K.	36 n.
Marrou, H. I.	50 n.	Stephen, St	15, 36, 61
Mary, Virgin	42, 71	Strat-a-	
Matthew St.	3 <sup>0</sup> , 39 ff., 47, 68	Bilerbeck	
McNeile, A. FL	47	SN <sup>4</sup> , H. B.	
Melchizedek	34, 67	Tate	31 f. 31
Melito of Sardis	71	of	
Metrodorus	51	Regrum	30
Millburn, R. L. P.	12	Theo. of	
Miriam	71	Mc: uesda	36, 75 f.
Montefiore, C. G.	53 O.	heo tel	39 f., 71
Montefiore, H.W.	69 f.	7,aeoc: 125	73
Moses	II, 16, 19 29, 3 <sup>1</sup> , 33, 35 ff., 60 f., 63, 67	•Daeor... us of	
Nineham, D. E.	47 n.	An. ch	63 f.
Noah	L, 28, 44	Mort	A ff., 37 f. 22, 24, 70
Nygren, A.	65	H. E. W.	70
Origen	II, 1 <sup>6</sup> 50 O., 57 ff., 72	Zechariah	
		Zephaniah	49

6 THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	by A. J. B. HIGGINS	8s net
7 MYTH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	by IAN HENDERSON	6s net
8 GOD WHO ACTS-Biblical Theology as Recital	by G. ERNEST WRIGHT	8s 6d net
9 STUDIES IN DEUTERONOMY	by GERHARD VON RAD, translated by David Stalker	8snet
10 EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP	by OSCAR CULLMANN, translated by A S. Todd and J. B. Torrance	8s Gd net
11 ORAL TRADITION-A Modern Problem in Old Testament Introduction	by EDUARD NIELSEN	8S net
12 THE MISSION AND ACHIEVEMENT OF JESUS	by REGINALD H. FULLER	8s 6d net
13 LIFE IN CHRIST	by THEO PREISS, translated by Harold Knight	8s net
STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF LAMENTATIONS	by NORMAN K. GOTTWALD	8s 6d net
14 CONSCIENCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	by C. A. PIERCE	9s 6d net
15 GALILEAN CHRISTIANITY	by L. E. ELLIOTT-BINNS	7s 6d net
16 AN APPROACH TO THE THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS	by NEVILLE CLARK	8s net
17 THE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	by HELMER RINGGREN	73 6d net
18 EARLY ISRAEL IN RECENT HISTORY WRITING	by JOHN BRIGHT	9s /id net
19 THE SERVANT OF GOD	by W. ZIMMERLI and J. JEREMIAS	ins 6d net
20 THE PROBLEM OF HISTORY IN MARK	by J. ROBINSON	Is net
21 ESSAYS ON TYPOLOGY	by G. W. H. LAMPE and K. WOOLLCOMBE	7s 6d net
22 PROMISE AND FULFILMENT-The Eschatological Message of Jesus	by W. G. KUMMEL	ars 6d net

*In preparation:*

JESUS' PROMISE TO THE NATIONS	by J. JEREMIAS
HUMILIATION AND EXALTATION	by B. SCHWEIZER