

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 5³ 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

theme of death and resurrection, annihilation (or at least peril and disaster) followed by restoration, is recurrent in the Old Testament narratives from Noah through the Egyptian bondage, the Exodus, the wilderness wanderings and the entry into the Promised Land. In all these cases water, the 'deep' which signifies so frequently in Hebrew thought the abyss of Sheol, is central in the story. The theme of deliverance and restoration is continued in the history of the Judges, through the varying fortunes of the monarchy and of individual kings, to the Exile and the Return, and it is resumed on a somewhat different level in the apocalyptic literature. The Christian must inevitably see this pattern of God's dealings with his people completed and summed up in the death and resurrection of Jesus and the deliverance of mankind in and through him. The fulfilment makes it possible for him to understand the past events, and the past events help him to grasp the meaning of Christ's redemptive work. It would be difficult for the Church to have come to any full understanding of the Gospel events if it had not been able to interpret Christ in terms of, and by reference to, the traditional imagery of Hebrew religious thought, imagery taken from Old Testament history. It would not have been easy for one aspect, at any rate, of Christ's saving work to have been appreciated if he had not been seen as the antitype of Adam who was 7157ros TOD tini\ovros. It would have been equally difficult for the rich significance of the death of Christ to have been apprehended if it had not recalled the stories of the sacrifice of Isaac and the Passover lamb and thus been seen as fitting into the same pattern of divine activity which those foreshadowings had revealed. The Gospel history had been prefigured in the Old Testament events, and conversely those events themselves came to be understood as having a definite place in the divine purpose in so far as they formed part of a continuous pattern and stood in a discernible relationship to its climax.

The Jew looked back to the mighty acts of God in ancient history to find the reality which gave coherence and unity to all subsequent development. The Christian, in some measure, reversed this position. The great acts of God in Israelite history acquired significance because of their character as foretastes of what was later accomplished in Christ. The Jew interpreted later history by reference to the first Passover; but to the Christian the Passover was important because of what happened later. It was significant because it foreshadowed and in some measure

partook of the character of Christ's redemptive work. The crossing of the Red Sea was significant because in it there could be discerned the pattern of God's activity towards man of which the Christian was conscious in his own experience as one who had been delivered by Christ from spiritual bondage. The Christian believed himself to be, as St Paul tacitly assumed, a spiritual descendant of those with whom God had made the Covenant; or rather, perhaps, he thought of himself as actually one of those Israelites who had been baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and had entered into the Covenant with God after eating the bread from heaven and drinking of the rock. He saw the redemptive action of Christ already modelled or patterned in that history and the history as meaningful to him on account of that fact. The type and the fulfilment were all of a piece.

If we admit the unity of Scripture in the sense that it is the literature of people whose thought was controlled by a single series of images, and that it is a body of writings whose explicit or implicit theme throughout is the people and the Covenant, and if, further, we hold that Christ is the unifying centre-point of Biblical history, deliberately fulfilling the various images presented by that literature and bringing together different threads within it to form a consistent pattern, then we can have no objection to a typology which seeks to discover and make explicit the real correspondences in historical events which have been brought about by the recurring rhythm of the divine activity. We cannot object to this, unless, indeed, we are willing to 'demythologize' very freely.

* * * *

Typology in this sense of the term would appear to be grounded in a particular view of history which the New Testament writers undoubtedly held themselves and which Christians for whom the Bible is authoritative can scarcely repudiate. On this view a type may be called in the language of the Fathers a 'mystery', but it is a 'mystery' in the normal New Testament sense of the word. It is a secret in the counsel of God which is being made known in Christ; an element in the hidden purpose of God which has been made manifest in being fulfilled. The prophecies of the Second Isaiah are mysteries in this sense. They point to, or reach out after, divine secrets which are laid open in the Christian revelation. The Passover is another such mystery. So also, we may think, is the story of Jonah who, through his swallowing up in

tupoj tou/
me|l ontoj =
type of things
to come

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 a

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 unconstructed, 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

immensa silva
= vast forest

tupoj tou
me|l|ontoj =
type of things
to come

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

to. me| l on as
to. al hqinon =
the coming
thing as the
true thing

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 Letpox~~, 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 ~~7,071P~~ and a vague complex of verbal associations based on Ezekiel's use of ~~el380~~ in connexion with the imagery of a vine in his chapter 19.11. rabdoj

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.